

THE  
PRESBYTERIAN QUARTERLY  
AND  
PRINCETON REVIEW.

---

NEW SERIES, No. 8.—OCTOBER, 1873.

---

ART. I.—THE MODERN ENGLISH PULPIT.

By Rev. W. H. LORD, D.D., Montpelier, Vt.

IN order to prepare the reader to appreciate our estimate of the Modern English Pulpit, we shall first give some illustrations of the natural correspondence between the physical and intellectual character of a people and their religious faith and teaching. Each national mood of mind or tribal idiosyncrasy brings its own special mode of want and supply. John Knox would have been impossible in Athens, and Jeremy Taylor could not have lived in Paris. The ultimate seat of human faith lies deep below all national or tribal propensities, but the modes in which religious faith manifests and interprets itself are widely various. Ere faith comes to the surface and crystallizes itself in concrete shape, its type and color will be affected by the strata of thought and feeling through which it emerges into light. The ideas and forms of national life will therefore more or less affect the interpretation and disclosure of the same faith. The national character determines the character of its preachers. It is very rare, and then only in some grand exceptions, like Paul the Apostle to the Gentiles, that a preacher, celebrated in one nation, is equally celebrated in another. An exotic preacher, unless he is very tough and hardy, rarely flourishes out of his native soil. Lebanon is the place for cedars and Elim for palm trees, while the sombre olive thrives best along the slopes of the Mediterranean hills.

And to a great extent the order and constitution of churches are determined by the traditions and peculiarities of national life. The Romish Church, inheriting the apparel and household

ART. VIII.—A HARMONY OF THE GOSPEL ACCOUNTS OF  
CHRIST'S RESURRECTION.

By JOHN MACLEAN, D.D., LL.D., Princeton, N. J.

The Jewish day was reckoned from sunset to sunset. The Sabbath began at the going down of the sun on our Friday evening and ended at the same time on Saturday evening. Between the end of the Sabbath and the dawn of the next day several hours intervened. After the Sabbath, during which our Lord lay in the grave, and before the full dawn of the following day, which was the first day of the week, Mary Magdalene and her companions, having provided spices to embalm the body of Jesus, set out for the sepulchre. That they all left Jerusalem at the same time, or that they arrived at the sepulchre together, is nowhere affirmed by any of the sacred writers. On the contrary some of the facts mentioned by them favor the opinion that the women were not all at the sepulchre at any one time, but at different times; and it is certain that one of them, if none others, went thither more than once.

Before any of them reached the sepulchre, there had been a great earthquake, and an angel had descended from heaven, and rolled away the stone from the door of the sepulchre. The soldiers keeping watch, appalled at the sight of the angel, whose countenance was like lightning, and whose raiment was white as snow, became *as dead men*. Upon recovering from their fright, they perceived that the body of Jesus had disappeared from the tomb, and they evidently believed that he was risen from the dead. Coming into the city, while the women were returning to it, they shewed unto the chief priests all things that were done. It is not said that the risen Saviour was seen by the Roman soldiers, and it is most probable, that in their great terror, they did not see him as he left the tomb. Largely bribed they reported, as they were instructed to do, that the disciples had come and stolen him away while they were asleep.

\* Upon coming to the sepulchre and seeing the stone rolled away from the door, and not seeing the body of Jesus, Mary Magdalene runs and tells Peter and John. Whether the other Mary, and Salome, who accompanied Mary Magdalene on her

first visit to the sepulchre, also returned with her to Jerusalem is not mentioned; nor is there in the narrative anything that indicates the contrary. They probably did go back with her, or soon after, and confirmed her statement.

The first report brought to the disciples was simply a report of these two facts, viz., that the stone had been rolled away from the door of the sepulchre, and that the body of Jesus was not there.

Upon learning these facts Peter and John immediately ran to the sepulchre, accompanied, or followed, by Mary Magdalene. While she was on her way to tell Peter and John of the rolling away of the stone and of the removal of the body of the Lord, her companions may have gone in search of some of the other disciples to give them like information. (See John's Gospel, xx. 1, 2, 11.) The silence of the Evangelist John in regard to their accompanying Mary Magdalene upon her first return to the city, is no evidence that they did not accompany her, or soon follow her; for he is also silent as to the fact that they went with her on her first visit to the sepulchre, a fact expressly affirmed by Mark—xvi. 1, 2. The very feelings which prompted Mary Magdalene to run and inform Peter and John that the sepulchre had been found open, and that the body of the Lord had been removed, would naturally prompt them to do the same; and it can be readily imagined, that having told some of the other disciples of what they knew of the occurrences at the sepulchre, they would be very apt to go back and seek further information, especially upon hearing that Peter and John had gone thither, and Mary Magdalene with them; but there is nothing said in the gospels with respect to their being, or *not* being, at the sepulchre a second time, on the morning of the resurrection. The probability, or the improbability, of their having been there must be determined by a comparison of the various incidents connected with the Saviour's resurrection from the dead.

Certain other women also went to the sepulchre, (See Luke xxiv. 1, 10), but arrived there, as we suppose, after Mary Magdalene had left it, and before her return to it. They entered into the sepulchre and there saw two angels, who said to them, "Why seek ye the living among the dead? He is not here; but is risen." Whereupon they went back to the city, and told the disciples what they had seen and heard.

They not only confirmed the report which Mary Magdalene

had carried to the disciples, that the sepulchre was open, and that the body of Jesus was not there, but the *additional* fact of their having seen, at the sepulchre, two angels, who told them that Jesus was risen. It was after the departure of the women just named from the sepulchre that Peter and John came to it, and Mary Magdalene a second time. The two disciples having, one after the other, entered the sepulchre, and seen the linen clothes in which the body of Jesus had been wrapped, and the napkin which had been about his head lying by itself, left the place and returned to their homes. But Mary Magdalene remained at the sepulchre, and while standing there weeping, she stooped, and saw two angels, the one sitting at the head and the other at the feet, where the body of Jesus had lain. And they say unto her, "Why weepest thou? And she saith unto them, Because they have taken away my Lord, and I know not where they have laid him." It is evident from these words taken from John's gospel (ch. xx.), that before this Mary Magdalene had seen no angel, and that she had heard no reports of the Lord having risen from the dead.

After her reply to the angels, she turned herself back and saw Jesus, but knew not that it was he. Accosting her in a voice well known to her, he says, "Mary;" upon which *she turns herself* and says, "Rabboni," that is to say, "Master." "Jesus saith unto her, Touch me not; for I am not yet ascended to my Father, but go to my brethren, and say unto them, I ascend unto my Father and your Father, and to my God and your God." She went and told the disciples, "that she had seen the Lord, and that he had spoken these things unto her."

If Mary and Salome, also went again to the sepulchre, their second arrival there occurred after our Lord's appearance to Mary Magdalene. They then entered the sepulchre, saw the angel mentioned by Matthew and by Mark, received from him a message to the disciples, ran from the sepulchre to deliver their message; and on their way they are met by the risen Saviour, who addresses them with the salutation "All hail." Upon his saying this, they came and held him by the feet and worshipped him. Then said Jesus unto them "Be not afraid, go tell my brethren, that they (may) go into Galilee, and there shall they see me."

According to the view here presented, the Saviour, after his



resurrection, showed himself first to Mary Magdalene, and next to the women who accompanied her upon her first visit to the sepulchre; one of whom, mentioned both by Matthew and Mark, was Mary the mother of James, and the other mentioned only by Mark, was Salome. The silence of Matthew in regard to Salome is no evidence that she did not accompany the two Marys; while the positive statement of Mark is conclusive as to the fact that she went with them. If the other Mary and Salome did *not* go a second time to the sepulchre, then the expressions in Matthew, respecting the women who saw our Lord on the morning of resurrection, must be restricted to Mary Magdalene the first mentioned of them; the plural form being used by enallage for the singular, a thing of very frequent occurrence. (See Robinson's Harmony, Section 15.)

The Saviour's next appearance was *probably* to Cephas, that is Peter, of which mention is made by Luke, ch. xxiv. 34, and by Paul, 1 Cor. xv. 5—but at what precise time, or under what precise circumstances this manifestation of himself occurred, no hint is given us, only the fact of such an appearance is mentioned. The next manifestation of himself was to Cleopas and his companion, near and at the village of Emmaus, on the first evening after he rose from the dead. His next appearing was to the company of disciples, somewhat later on the same evening. This manifestation of himself is mentioned by Luke and John, and alluded to by Mark and Paul. On the evening after the first day of the following week, he showed himself again to the disciples, as appears from John's gospel, ch. xx. 26. This third appearance to his disciples was at the Sea of Tiberias in Galilee. The feast of unleavened bread being over, the disciples left Jerusalem, and returned to Galilee, according to the instructions sent to them through the women to whom our Lord first showed himself alive, after his passion. His next appearance to his disciples was at the mountain in Galilee at which they, according to his instructions went to meet him, see Matthew, xxviii. 16. On this, or on some other occasion, he was seen of the five hundred brethren of whom Paul speaks as being witnesses of his resurrection. See 1 Cor. xv. 6. After this he was seen of James, then by all the Apostles; when, assembled with them once more at Jerusalem, he led them out as far as Bethany, on the eastern slope of the Mount of Olives, and lifting up his hands he blessed

them, and was parted from them and taken up into heaven. See Luke's gospel, xxiv. 50, and Acts, i. 12.

These include all the recorded appearances of Christ, after he arose from the dead, and before his ascension into heaven. Luke, the writer of the Acts, tells us that after his resurrection, and before his ascension, he was seen by the apostles for forty days, in which he was speaking to them of the things pertaining to the kingdom of God. During this period of forty days, he may have showed himself on other occasions, of which no mention is made; but whether he did, or did not, is a matter of no moment to our purpose, which is to show the perfect accord of the several accounts given by the sacred writers respecting the resurrection of Christ, and of the attending circumstances. By a comparison of these several accounts with the above arrangement of all the incidents, it will be seen, that, notwithstanding any seeming discrepancies, there is an entire harmony in the statements of the several Evangelists. And these apparent but *not* real discrepancies, show that in narrating the circumstances of our Saviour's resurrection, the several Evangelists did not copy one from another, and that they have given us each one his own independent testimony, selecting such evidences of the fact as they, under the guidance of the Holy Spirit, severally deemed best suited to their purpose. The perfect harmony of their several narratives, where such a variety of incidents is mentioned, and the manifest absence of all collusion on the part of the writers, furnish strong evidence of the truthfulness of their statements, and justify, and even demand, our assent to the fact that our Lord rose from the dead, as predicted and affirmed in the holy Scriptures. Let us now compare the statements respecting *the time* at which the women went to the sepulchre.

According to our English version, Matthew says: "In the end of the Sabbath, as it began to dawn toward the first day of the week came Magdalene and the other Mary to see the sepulchre." Matthew xxviii, 1.

The use of the phrase, "*as it began to dawn, etc.*" shows that by Ὁψὲ δὲ σαββάτων, the original of the first clause, Matthew did not mean the evening or first watch of the night that followed the Jewish Sabbath, but simply that the Sabbath was ended, and the original terms might, in conformity with the

best Greek usage, have been rendered "after the Sabbath;" leaving the second clause, "as it began to dawn toward the first day of the week," *τῆ ἐπιφωσκούσῃ εἰς μίαν σαββάτων*, to indicate the time of their coming to the sepulchre, which, according to Mark xvi. 2, was "very early in the morning, the first day of the week," *λίαν πρῶτῃ, τῆς μιᾶς σαββάτων*.

Luke used a like expression, "Now upon the first day of the week, very early in the morning," or, *at the earliest dawn, ὄρθρου βαθέος*.

And John says, "The first day of the week cometh Mary Magdalene early, when it was yet dark," *πρῶτῃ, σκοτίας ἔτι οὔσης*.

The different phrases here cited, viz., *τῆ ἐπιφωσκούσῃ εἰς μίαν σαββάτων*, used by Matthew; *λίαν πρῶτῃ τῆς μιᾶς σαββάτων*, by Mark; *τῆ δὲ μιᾶ τῶν σαββάτων ὄρθρου βαθέος*, by Luke; and the *ἢ δὲ μιᾶ τῶν σαββάτων . . . πρῶτῃ σκοτίας ἔτι οὔσης* by John, all indicate, with more or less precision, the early dawn of the first day of the week.

Mark indeed uses, in connection with the words, *λίαν πρῶτῃ*, the phrase *ἀνατείλαντος τοῦ ἡλίου*; but this phrase, as here used, does not necessarily mean that the sun had actually appeared above the horizon at the time Mary Magdalene and her companions first came to the sepulchre. This would be contrary to the import of the other terms used by him; and it has been shown by Dr. Robinson, in his "Harmony of the Gospels," that this phrase, according to its Hellenistic use, denotes the dawn of day, or the morning twilight, while the sun is yet below the horizon. In his comments on the word *ἀνατείλαντος*, Grotius calls attention to the fact that the first aorist is often used for the present tense, and he refers to Matthew xvii. 7, 16, 17, as furnishing instances of such use of the aorist: *ἐγέρθητε, arise*; *θεραπεύσαι, to heal*; *ἀποκριθεῖς, answering*; so in the phrase, *ἀνατείλαντος τοῦ ἡλίου*, at the rising of the sun, that is, as soon as the first light of the sun began to appear, while it was yet mixed with much darkness; which is the *λίαν πρῶτῃ* of Mark. (See Lightfoot in Poole's Synopsis.)

Here, then, we see that there is an actual agreement among the four Evangelists, in regard to the time of going to the sepulchre; the *only seeming* discrepancy being that of the two expressions used by Mark, and which expressions, for the reason just

mentioned, must be fully in accord, and not at variance with each other.

The time at which the spices were purchased, is another matter calling for an explanation. Of this particular time mention is made only by Mark, who says in express terms, *when the Sabbath was past* Mary Magdalene, and Mary the mother of James, and Salome *bought* spices, that they might come and anoint him. There is no occasion for inserting the auxiliary verb *had* before the word *bought* as in our English version. It is true that the *aorist* ἡγόρασαν may be rendered as a pluperfect, but there is no need of this in the present instance, and the more simple method is to regard it as an *aorist*, and then the entire verse teaches us that after the Sabbath, which ended at the going down of the sun, when also the first day of the week began, these women bought the spices, that they might come and anoint him. There is every reason to believe that they began this work as soon as the Sabbath was at an end; and although they came to the sepulchre, "bringing the spices which they had prepared," (see Luke xxiv. 1,) at the earliest dawn, they would have had several hours for getting spices ready for the anointing of their Lord's body. It is evident from the statements of Matthew and Mark, that Mary Magdalene and Mary the mother of James and Joses were at or near the sepulchre in the evening of the day on which the Saviour was crucified, and witnessed the taking down of his body from the cross, and the depositing of it in the tomb. They therefore could have made no purchase of the spices before the Sabbath. Luke, speaking of these things, says, "And the women also which came with him from Galilee, followed after, and beheld the sepulchre, and how his body was laid, and they returned and prepared spices and ointments, and they rested the Sabbath-day according to the commandment. And on the first day of the week, very early in the morning, they came unto the sepulchre, bringing the spices which they had prepared." The thought here which was uppermost in the mind of the sacred writer was the preparation made by the women, for the anointing of the body of Jesus, as soon as this could be done after the Sabbath, and hence he very naturally makes mention first of the spices and ointments, and then, as it were incidentally, of their strict observance of the Sabbath. There is nothing in the language of Luke which renders it necessary to understand him as



saying, that the spices and ointments were bought before the Sabbath, and as all the circumstances detailed by the several Evangelists tend to a different supposition from this, we may and must understand Luke as stating two separate facts, but not in the order of their occurrence. In the order of time, the keeping of the Sabbath preceding the purchase of the spices; but for the reason suggested, it is mentioned after the other.

The order of time, in which our Lord appeared to Mary Magdalene, merits particular attention. The whole difficulty, in determining this point, does *not* arise, as Dr. Robinson thinks, "from the use of the word *πρῶτον*, in Mark xvi. 9, which," as he says, "seems to imply that this appearance to Mary Magdalene was *first of all*," *ἐφάνη πρῶτον Μαρία Μαγδαλινῇ* but which he maintains was *not* the case. Admitting the criticism he makes upon the meaning of *πρῶτον* as often signifying the first of any series of things or facts mentioned by the writer, and therefore not always used to denote the first absolutely, but simply the first of the matters enumerated, yet this does not hinder its use in a given case from being absolute as well as relative. And this I apprehend is the fact in the case before us. And although the explanation upon this supposition may be more "complex and cumbersome" than upon the Doctor's, yet, I think, it avoids a serious difficulty not provided for by Dr. R. The difficulty would remain, were we to admit, as some learned critics have done, that the latter part of the 16th chapter of Mark, viz., from the 9th verse to the end, is spurious; which, however, we are not ready to do, being thoroughly persuaded of their genuineness. It is *morally certain*, that Celsus, of the 2nd century, an adversary of the Christian faith, refers to the *ninth* verse of this *sixteenth* chapter, when he asks in reference to the resurrection of Christ, *τίς τοῦτο εἶδε*; and then adds, *γυνή πάροιστρος ὡς φατέ*. "Who saw this? A half frantic woman, *as ye affirm*," alluding to what Mark says of Mary Magdalene, "out of whom he had cast seven devils." See Angors Synopsis, page 275. Also on the genuineness of the entire xvi. chapter of Mark, see notes of the Editor, in the translation of Lange's Commentary, published under the supervision of Dr. Schaff. It is admitted by Dr. Robinson, that Mary Magdalene did not see any angel before her return to the sepulchre in company with Peter and John. She therefore could not have mentioned the facts narrated by Luke, respecting *the*

*angels* seen by the women. See Luke xxiv. 4, 5 and 23. All that she had to report was, that the stone had been rolled from the door of the sepulchre, and that the body of Jesus had been taken away. Is it not evident from Luke's account that the other women had been to the sepulchre and had returned to Jerusalem without seeing the Lord? They had indeed "seen a vision of angels, even two men in shining garments," who said to them, "Why seek the living among the dead? He is not here, but is risen, remember how he spoke unto you while he was yet in Galilee." The women say nothing of having seen the Saviour. Is it possible that Christ should have appeared to them on their first return from the sepulchre, and that in making their report to the disciples they should have made no mention of their interview with him, and have reported only what was said to them by the angels? Luke mentions in connection all the facts reported by the women; first, those brought by Mary Magdalene, and those given by Joanna and the other women, and at the close he adds, "then arose Peter and ran unto the sepulchre." But John, in his account of the resurrection, is more particular in mentioning that Peter and himself went to the sepulchre upon learning from Mary Magdalene that the body of Jesus had been removed from it. They left Jerusalem before the report of the vision of angels was brought to the city by the other women. Mary Magdalene goes with Peter and John, or follows immediately after. The two apostles, one after the other entered the sepulchre, saw there the linen clothes in which Christ had been buried, and the returning to the city confirmed Mary Magdalene's report. No mention is made of any angel seen by them; and it is expressly said, that they did not see the Saviour. See Luke, xxiv. 24. Up to this time he had shown himself to no one. But now he makes himself known to Mary Magdalene. See John, xx. 14-18.

If Christ did appear to any of the other women, as the language of Matthew, at first sight, seems to indicate, then all those to whom he appeared must have gone a second time to the sepulchre, and have been met by the Saviour, after his interview with Mary Magdalene. But it is worthy of note that Luke makes no mention of the Saviour having been seen by any of the women; that Mark and John mention the fact of his appearance to Mary Magdalene, but say nothing of his appearing to the other women, and that Matthew is the only one who uses

the plural form, in speaking of the women to whom the Saviour showed himself alive, on the morning of the resurrection. It may therefore be made a question, whether the forms of expression used by Matthew may *not be explained*, on the supposition that the *only* woman to whom he appeared, at this time, was Mary Magdalene. But be this as it may, it is evident, I think, that Mary Magdalene was the first person to whom he showed himself alive after his passion, and that if he was seen at all by any of the other women on this occasion, it was upon a second visit of theirs to the sepulchre, and after his appearance to Mary Magdalene. "There was," says Dr. Robinson, "probably something in respect to Mary Magdalene, which gave her a peculiar pre-eminence in these transactions. This may be inferred from the fact that John mentions Magdalene and her alone; while the other Evangelists likewise name her first, as if holding the most conspicuous place." All this is readily accounted for, if she was the first, or the only one of the women to whom Christ showed himself alive on the morning of the resurrection. Otherwise, there is a peculiar prominence given to her without any apparent reason.

Let us now examine the question, whether the words of Matthew respecting the Saviour's appearing to the women and his address to them, may not, in strict accordance with the customary use of language, be restricted to Mary Magdalene? For if this be so, the whole difficulty vanishes. From an examination of the following, it will be seen that the plural is often used for the singular form. Take the following examples: Matthew xxvii. 44, "*The thieves* which were crucified with him cast the same in his teeth," compared with Luke xxiii. 39, "And *one* of the malefactors which were hanged railed on him." Matthew xxvi. 8: "But when the disciples saw it, they had indignation, saying, to what purpose is this waste?" compared with John xii. 45, "Then said *one* of his disciples, Judas Iscariot, Simon's son, which should betray him, Why was not the ointment sold for three hundred pence and given to the poor." Matthew ii. 20: ". . . for *they* (Herod) are dead which sought the young child's life." Matthew ix. 8: "But when the multitude saw it they marvelled and glorified God, which had given such power unto *men*, (Jesus). Mark viii. 17: ". . . his disciples asked him concerning the parable," compared with Matthew xv. 15, "Then

answered PETER and said unto him, Declare unto us this parable." Matthew xxiv., 1, 2, "And Jesus went out and departed from the temple, and his *disciples* came unto him to show him the buildings of the temple, and Jesus said unto *them*, see ye not all these things, verily I say unto *you*, there shall not be left here one stone upon another that shall not be thrown down," compared with Mark xiii. 1, 2, "And as he went out, *one of his disciples* saith unto him, Master, see what manner of stones and buildings are here! And Jesus answering saith unto *him*, seest *thou* these great buildings? there shall not be left one stone upon another that shall not be thrown down." Matthew xxvii. 48, "And straightway *one* of them ran and took a sponge and filled it with vinegar," compared with John xix. 29, ". . . and *they* filled a sponge with vinegar."

Now here are numerous instances in which the plural form is used for the singular. The plural form, τὰ σάββατα, is often used to denote the *Sabbath-day*, as well as *Sabbath days*; and it is also used to denote the entire week, as in τῇ δε μιᾷ τῶν σαββάτων, the first day of the week.

What then is there to hinder our understanding the words given in Matthew xxviii. 9, 10, as spoken of Mary Magdalene? "And as they went to tell the disciples, behold Jesus met them, saying, All hail, (or rather, hail ye). And they came and held him by the feet, and worshipped him. Then said Jesus, Be not afraid; go tell my brethren that they go into Galilee, and there shall they see me." Compare this passage with Mark xxi. 9, 10, "Now when Jesus was risen early the first day of the week he appeared first to Mary Magdalene out of whom he had cast seven devils. And she went and told them that had been with him as they mourned and wept;" and also with John xx. 16, 17, 18, "Jesus saith unto her, Mary. She turned herself and saith unto him, Rabboni; which is to say, Master. Jesus saith unto her, Touch me not, for I am not yet ascended, οὐπω γὰρ ἀναβέβηκα, to my Father; but go to my brethren and say unto them, I ascend (Ἀναβαίνω) unto my Father and your Father, and to my God and your God. And Mary Magdalene came and told the disciples that she had seen the Lord, and that he had spoken these things unto her." Although about to ascend to his Father shortly, he would not ascend immediately, but would meet his disciples before his ascension.



Let us carefully analyze the language of the passages here cited; and first Matthew's statement. "And as *they* went to tell his disciples." Is Mary Magdalene included in the terms, *ὡς ἐπορεύοντο* as they went or were going? This seems at least to be implied in what Matthew says, as he names only her and the other Mary; and if this be so, it could not have been upon her first return to the city; for it is absolutely certain that she did not see the Lord at this time. It must have been after her second visit to the sepulchre. And had she no further tidings for the anxious disciples at Jerusalem, before Jesus made himself known to her? She had seen two angels, one sitting at the head and the other at the feet, where the body of Jesus had lain, and having answered their inquiries as to the cause of her weeping, she turned herself back, *ἐστράφη εἰς τὰ ὀπίσω*, not simply *ἐστράφη*, as in the case of the participial form *στραφεῖσα* in the 16th verse of the same chapter, John xx, but with the words *εἰς τὰ ὀπίσω* following, compare the expression here used with Mark, xiii. 16, "Let not him that is in the field, *turn back again* to take up his garment, *ἐπιστρεψάτω εἰς τὰ ὀπίσω*. Although she sees Jesus, she does not go towards him, nor does she accost him, but with her face averted from the stranger, as she regards him, she is going, if not already started, on *her way back* to tell the disciples what further discoveries she had made at the sepulchre. Upon her leaving the tomb, Jesus makes of her the same inquiry that the angels had made. Supposing him to be the gardener, she says to him, "Sir, if thou hast borne him hence, tell me where thou hast laid him, and I will take him away. Jesus says to her, Mary. She *turned herself*, *Στραφεῖσα*, and saith to him, Rabboni. Jesus saith unto her, *Touch me not*, for I am not yet ascended to my Father, *but go to my brethren and say unto them*, I ascend to my Father and your Father, and to my God and your God." How does this agree with Matthew xxviii. 9, 10, ". . . And they (Mary Magdalene) came and held him by the feet and worshipped him." Then said Jesus unto them, that is, unto Mary Magdalene, "Be not afraid, *go, tell my brethren.*"

Mary Magdalene was one of a company of women who went to the sepulchre with a common purpose, viz., to embalm the body of Jesus, and to prepare it for its final sepulture. What was said by her and to her may be mentioned as said by and to

those associated with her. And in a general way she may be represented as participating in the acts of her companions, and they in hers, unless the contrary be specifically stated. In his exceedingly brief account of the occurrences at the sepulchre, Matthew does not discriminate with exactness between the things done by the women individually and collectively, but tells what was done by them, or happened to them as a company.

The 5, 6, 7 and 8 verses of Matthew xxviii. chapter, as also the same verses of Mark xvi., contain an account of the women going into the sepulchre, and of their seeing an angel, of their receiving from the angel instructions to tell his disciples that he was risen from the dead, and of their going in haste, with joy and fear, to carry these tidings to the city;—then follows in Matthew's account, a statement of the Saviour's appearing to the women named by Matthew, and of the message sent to the disciples by the Saviour himself, in order that they may go into Galilee and see him there.

Grouping these several things, viz., those said and done by Mary Magdalene, and those said and done by her companions, Matthew speaks of them as said and done by them collectively, without assigning to each one her particular share in these transactions; and hence, in the case of Mary Magdalene, he uses the plural for the singular number, in the way of an enallage, a mode of speech common to sacred and other writings, and, as shown above, of frequent occurrence in the New Testament.\* Now upon either supposition, viz., the one, that of the women who went to the tomb, Christ appeared only to Mary Magdalene, or the one, that he appeared also to her companions, *it is evident* that Mary Magdalene was the first of his followers who was permitted to

---

\* Since this article was written, the writer has discovered that the view here given of the import of the language employed in Matthew's gospel, xxviii. 9, 10, accords with the one taken by that eminent biblical scholar, Dr. John Lightfoot, who understands the words as addressed to Mary Magdalene. Commenting on the words "They held him by the feet," he says, "This seems to have been done to kiss his feet. . . . Compare the Evangelists here, and you will find that this was done by *Mary Magdalene only* . . . who had gone twice to the sepulchre; however, Matthew makes mention of but once going. . . . They (Peter and John) having seen the signs of the resurrection return to their company, but she stays there. Being ready to turn back, Christ appears to her, taking him for the gardener. As soon as she knows him, she worships him and embracing his feet kissed them; and this is the history before us, which Matthew relates in *the plural number*, running over it briefly and compendiously according to his manner."

see the Saviour upon his rising from the dead. And this view of the case agrees with those taken by Tischendorf, and others mentioned by Dr. Gardner, in his *Harmony of the Gospels*, with the exception of Dr. Robinson; and it is also further evident that upon either of these suppositions there is no contradiction in the accounts given by the sacred writers respecting the things seen and done by the women who went to the sepulchre, at the earliest dawn of the first day of the week, to embalm the body of Jesus.

Mark's account fully accords with the view here presented. After describing the visit of Mary Magdalene, Mary the mother of James, and of Salome to the sepulchre, he says in express terms, that Jesus appeared *first* to Mary Magdalene.

Luke makes no mention whatever of his appearing to any of the women, but merely of their going to the sepulchre, and of their seeing a vision of angels who said to them, that Jesus was risen from the dead.

And John speaks only of the Saviour's appearing to Mary Magdalene, and of his sending by her a message, to the end, that the disciples might meet him in Galilee.

In his enumeration of the witnesses to the resurrection, in the xv. chapter of the first Epistles to the Corinthians, Paul has special reference to the apostles, the witnesses spoken of by Peter "as chosen of God, even to us who did eat and drink with him after he rose from the dead." Acts x. 41. The 500 brethren mentioned by Paul doubtless included the apostles.

When I began this inquiry, I inclined to the opinion, that the Saviour appeared first to Mary Magdalene, and then to some of her companions, upon their visiting the sepulchre a second time, and this I apprehend does give a perfect, although a somewhat complex, harmony of all the facts of the case; but upon a further study of the subject, I have been led to the conclusion, that the simplest method of harmonizing the several accounts, and it is one that does no violence to the language of the sacred writers, is the supposition that on the morning of the resurrection, the Saviour appeared only to Mary Magdalene, and that he was not then seen by any of the other women. In the course of the day, and probably towards evening, he appeared to Peter, and also to Cleopas and his fellow traveler, while they were on their way to the village of Emmaus; but to which of them he

first showed himself it is not said, and we merely know that before the two returned from Emmaus to tell *the eleven*, and those gathered with them at Jerusalem, Peter had informed them, that the Lord was risen and had appeared to him. This may have been shortly before or very soon after the Saviour's appearance at Emmaus.

Another matter which seems to call for a word of explanation, is what is said of the angels; but this is readily explained in either of these two ways. If the women were not all at the sepulchre at the same time, *one* angel may have been seen by some of them, and *two* by the others. Or both angels may have been seen by them all; and yet as only one of the two appears to have announced the fact that Jesus was risen, and gave the women a message to the disciples, Matthew and Mark make mention only of this one, while Luke and John speak of both; a variation of frequent occurrence in the writings of the Evangelists; as, for example, in the case of the two thieves crucified with the Saviour, and of the two demoniacs healed by Christ, and in several of the instances cited above. A maxim of LeClerc's, cited by Dr. Robinson in his comments on the case of the demoniacs, is applicable to that of the angels: "Qui plura narrat, pauciora complectitur; qui pauciora memorat, plura non negat." He that speaks of the larger number includes the less; he that makes mention of the less does not deny the existence of the greater.

Matthew says nothing of the women going *into* the sepulchre, and yet he speaks of their *coming out* of it; and therefore when he says, that the angel, who rolled away the stone from the door and sat upon it, answered and said unto the women, "Fear not ye; come, see the place where the Lord lay," we are not to suppose that he was still sitting upon the stone, but that he had gone into the sepulchre, and that it was within the tomb that the women saw him and received from him the announcement which he made to them respecting the resurrection of their Lord, and that he gave them a message to the disciples; and thus understood, there is an exact agreement with Mark's account of this occurrence; not that the words are precisely the same, but they convey substantially the same ideas, both being a rendering into the Greek of things spoken in the Hebrew language.



Mark speaks of the young man, or angel, as sitting on the right side when the women entered the sepulchre; and Luke says, "as they (the women) were much perplexed . . . two men *stood* by them in shining garments." It is not improbable that for a portion of the time they were in a sitting posture, and that for another part of it they stood erect; but perhaps a better explanation may be this, and not an uncommon one, that the word *ἐπέστησαν* has reference to their unexpected and sudden appearance rather than to their position. When at a later period two angels were seen by Mary Magdalene, they were sitting, one at the head and the other at the feet where the body of Jesus had lain. If the body was placed opposite the door, so that the head would be to the right hand of a person entering the tomb, and the feet to the left, then the position of the angel at the head would correspond to that of the angel spoken of by Mark; and there is nothing to hinder our supposing him to be the same as the one mentioned by Matthew and Mark.

With respect to the message sent by the angels, Dr. Robinson justly observes, Matthew and Mark dwell more upon Galilee, and Luke more upon our Lord's previous announcement of his resurrection.

Matthew makes no mention of the appearances which took place at Jerusalem, nor does he even allude to them unless it be in the remark, "some doubted," and in his record of the commission given to the disciples to teach all nations, and in the promise of Christ to be with them unto the end of the world. But the words spoken by our Lord at the time of his ascension may have been to some extent a reiteration of what he said to the disciples at the mountain in Galilee, where they met him by his appointment; and the doubting here spoken of may include the case of Thomas, mentioned by John, as well as that of the persons who saw him in Galilee. The remark, "but some doubted" is worthy of particular note, as it is evidently a remark not of one bent upon spreading abroad a false report of things, but rather of a witness, who, fully persuaded of the truth of what he says, hesitates not to give the reader an exact account of what he saw and heard, including the doubts of those who were not prepared at first sight, or without full evidence, to recognize the risen Saviour as the Jesus who had been put to death for proclaiming himself to be the Son of God. And Matthew does

not even say that their doubts were overcome. He simply states the fact, without addition or comment, as was usual with him. Mark records the message sent by the angel to Peter and the other disciples, that they should see the Saviour in Galilee, but he makes no mention of the interviews which took place there, but he does speak of the appearance of the Saviour to the disciples on the evening after his resurrection, and of the commission which he gave them to preach the gospel to every creature ; and of his being received up into heaven, and of his sitting upon the right hand of God.

Mark does not in express terms say, that Christ showed himself to his disciples on the evening after the resurrection, but the connexion implies that he did, and this view of Mark's language accords fully with the express declarations of Luke and John. It may admit of a question, whether the words "as he said unto you," at the end of the 7th verse of the 16th chapter of Mark, has reference to the clause immediately preceding, "there shall ye see him," or whether, as in Matthew xxviii. 6, they are used more especially in reference to what Christ had repeatedly said to his disciples concerning his rising from the dead. Understood in this way they involve no contradiction of the one by the other, for the reason that the Saviour might have spoken of both, although there is no previous mention of his having done so. But without violence to the words of Mark, we may understand them as having special, or even exclusive, reference to the angel's first declarations, "ye seek Jesus of Nazareth, which was crucified, *he is risen.*" On several occasions, and in Galilee, too, Christ did speak to his disciples of his approaching death and of his rising from the dead, as appears from Matthew xvi. 21 ; xvii. 22, 28. Mark viii. 31 ; ix. 31 and 33. Luke ix. 22 ; xviii. 32. Understood as referring to the death and resurrection of Christ, these words, "as he said unto you," employed by Mark, have reference to the very matters to which the like words used by Matthew have ; and also to those mentioned by Luke in his report of what was said by the angels to the women who came to the sepulchre. "He is not here, but is risen ; remember how he spake unto you, when he was yet in Galilee, saying, the Son of man must be delivered into the hands of sinful men, and be crucified, and the third day rise again." The concluding verses of Luke's gospel, from the 36th verse, in-

clusive, contain a concise account of the Saviour's appearance to the disciples on the evening after the resurrection ; of the evidence he gave them that he was truly risen, and that it was not merely a spirit which they saw ; and also the instructions which he gave them for the confirmation of their faith and for their guidance in making known to all nations the gospel of his salvation. A part of what is here recorded evidently refers to what the Saviour said on the occasion of his first appearance to his disciples ; and the latter part as evidently refers to what took place at the end of the forty days immediately following his resurrection, when he ascended to heaven in the sight of his assembled disciples : and among the directions given at the time of his ascension is to be included the one, "but tarry ye at Jerusalem until ye be endowed with power from on high." This view of the words here cited is confirmed by what Luke says in the first chapter of the Acts of the Apostles. There is, therefore, no contradiction between the message sent to the disciples, that they might go into Galilee, and the direction that they should "tarry at Jerusalem ;"—the latter not having been given until the return of the disciples from Galilee to Jerusalem, to witness the Saviour's ascension.

John speaks of the Saviour's appearance to Mary Magdalene on the *morning* of the resurrection, and of his showing himself to his assembled disciples on the *following evening* ; and also of his second appearance to them eight days after, that is, according to the Jewish method of computing time, on the evening after the first day of the ensuing week ; and of a third manifestation of himself to seven of the eleven disciples at the Sea of Galilee. He says nothing of the ascension of our Lord beyond what he records of the message sent to the disciples by the Saviour through Mary Magdalene : "I ascend unto my Father and to your Father, and to my God and your God."

It is believed by the writer, that the above arrangements of the various incidents connected with the resurrection of our Lord, and the explanations given, do show that there are no discrepancies in the accounts furnished by the writers of the four gospels ; nor is there any conflict between these statements and anything said in the Epistles of Paul, or in the Acts of the Apostles, touching the rising of Christ from the dead. And while there are seeming difficulties in the way of harmonizing the ac-

counts of the different Evangelists, we may be thankful and rejoice that they are capable of a full solution, and that the discrepancies are only seeming and not real, and that, under the guidance of the Holy Spirit, the sacred writers were led to make the several selections of the facts mentioned by them respectively, that we might be led into a more careful study of this portion of Holy Scripture, and thereby have our faith the more fully confirmed by the several narratives, which, as their very structure shows, are independent of each other. Peculiarly applicable to the wonders connected with the resurrection, are the words of John, ch. xx. 30, 31 : "And many other signs truly did Jesus, which are not written in this book. But these are written that ye might believe that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God, and that believing ye might have life through his name."

Besides the direct testimony of the sacred writers, there are two other sources of evidence suggested by the study of the gospel accounts of the resurrection, viz., the *undesigned* coincidences in the statements of the different Evangelists, and the arguments deduced from the mathematical doctrine of probabilities as applied to evidence.

The case of Magdalene mentioned by Matthew ch. xxviii., as falling at the feet of Jesus, and worshipping him ; and the words "Touch me not," in John's gospel, afford an instance of an undesigned agreement. And the record of Mark, that at the time the Saviour first appeared to the disciples they were sitting at meat, probably at the end of their meal, and the statement of Luke, that while the disciples believed not for joy, and wondered, he said unto them, "Have ye here any meat?" and they gave him a piece of broiled fish and of honey-comb, and he took it, and did eat before them, furnish another instance. Luke makes no mention of the fact that the disciples were seated at the table ; nor does Mark allude to their giving the Saviour anything to eat. There are other instances, but these are the ones most obvious.

In his Bridgewater treatise Mr. Babbage has shown that a limited number of witnesses of *ordinary veracity*, and *without collusion*, bearing concurrent testimony to any event, are sufficient to render the probability in favor of its occurrence far greater than the *a priori* probability against it, as inferred from the uniform experience of all mankind. Professor Young, of Belfast, has gone a step further, and has shown that in this matter the



veracity of the witnesses may be dispensed with ; and that if a considerable number of witnesses voluntarily affirm the occurrence of a miracle, and all testify to the same miracle, and that without any collusion, then the simple fact of this concurrence in their testimony will give a probability to their statement which is altogether irresistible. The eclectic method adopted by the Evangelists, and their seeming discrepancies, furnish evidence that there was no collusion between them ; and there is no accounting for the fact, that the omissions of each are supplied by the statements of the others, in such a manner that their several accounts furnish one consistent narrative, excepting upon the assumption that their separate and combined accounts are alike true. The *improbability* of their being false would far exceed the *improbability* of the occurrence of the event affirmed.

If there be any number of witnesses, both true and intelligent, and who know whereof they affirm, what is the probability that they will contradict one another in regard to the incidents connected with any particular event? Evidently none whatever ; for all the incidents must have occurred at the time and under the circumstances mentioned by the witnesses, whether they severally mention them all or not. A contradiction cannot take place, unless some of the things mentioned as having occurred at a given time and place did not then and there occur in the way indicated.

If the particular event, which it is the aim of the witnesses to establish, did *not* occur, then the larger the number of persons testifying to its actual occurrence, and the greater the number of incidents mentioned by them severally, the greater is the probability, while they agree as to the event particularly in question, that they will not only differ in their several reports of the accompanying incidents, but that those reports will be more or less contradictory of each other.

On the other hand, if several independent witnesses to an important event mention a large number of incidents in corroboration of their testimony respecting the said events ; and if each witness mentions certain facts not even alluded to by the others ; and if the facts mentioned by them all are more fully narrated by one than by another, and yet upon a careful comparison of the several accounts it be found that there is no real discrepancy in their several accounts, but on the contrary a full and perfect

agreement, this of itself is a strong proof of the truthfulness of the witnesses, and also of the actual occurrence of the event affirmed by them to have taken place.

Now this, apart from any knowledge of the character of the witnesses derived from other sources, is just what we have in the case of the four Evangelists, who have recorded the circumstances connected with the resurrection of Christ from the dead.

These several narratives of the event here mentioned, are of themselves sufficient evidence that they are independent of each other. Each account contains a large number of incidents ; and each details certain facts not given in the other narratives ; and of the facts reported by all the Evangelists some are described at greater length by one than by another ; and yet, upon a comparison of the four accounts, it is found that they are all in full accord ; which, as remarked above, is of itself strong proof of the truthfulness of the testimony given by the writers of the gospels, and of the actual occurrence of the great event recorded by them, viz., the resurrection of our Lord from the dead. Matthew and John were of the number of his constant attendants during his public ministry. Mark and Luke were intimately acquainted with the things believed and taught by those whom Christ chose to be with him, and to be special witnesses of his resurrection. They were, therefore, competent witnesses of what was received and maintained by the whole body of believers, including all the apostles, with respect to the resurrection ; and their two narratives, independent of each other, confirm the statements of Matthew, and are themselves confirmed by the gospel written by John.

If Christ really rose from the dead, then we have an easy solution of the fact, that the gospels are of entire accord in their several accounts of this occurrence ; notwithstanding the numerous incidents mentioned by the different writers, and some *seeming* discrepancies in their statements. On the contrary, if Christ did *not* rise from the dead, but his disciples stole away his body from the tomb, as was alleged by the unbelieving Jews, then it is inconceivable how, writing as they evidently did without collusion, the Evangelists have made no contradictory statements. In Matthew's account, short as it is, there are not less than thirty distinct incidents mentioned ; in Mark's as many, in Luke's not less than fifty, in John's upwards of fifty : yet all the different

incidents can be made to form one consistent narrative; *although more than half of them must be untrue, if Christ be not risen.\**

From the remarks made above, it appears that the probability of any number of independent witnesses contradicting each other must depend in a great degree upon their want of veracity combined with the number of incidents related by them respectively.

Hence if there be no discrepancy in narratives by several different hands, and these narratives abound with numerous incident, it may be fairly inferred, that this is so, because all the facts related are true; in which case, and in which alone, a real discrepancy is impossible.

In the mathematical doctrine of probabilities, *one* or *unity*, is adopted as the symbol of certainty; and a fraction of one as the symbol of probability, and what this fraction lacks of being a unit is the symbol of improbability.

¶ Now if there be four narratives of the same event, by different persons, uniting without concert or collusion, and each narrative be composed of numerous incidents, what is the *probability* that there will be a perfect agreement in all matters, if the several narratives be false both as to the principal and many of the subordinate events? Let the whole number of incidents mentioned be equal to those assigned above to the four Evangelists, say in all, not less than 160; and let us suppose only half of them to be untrue, which is an underestimate; and as it will make but little or no difference, for the purpose which we are about to use them, what numbers we assign to each of the four respectively, we will suppose each to have made only twenty statements, and all of them false. In the case here supposed, it is obvious that although the incidents mentioned by each writer may agree with one another, it is just as likely that, taken as a whole or separately, they will be at variance, as in agreement, with the 60 incidents mentioned by the other three; and then the probability of their agreeing with any one of these 60 will be denoted by  $\frac{1}{2}$ , and the probability of their agreeing with them all will be denoted by 60th power of  $\frac{1}{2}$ , or  $(\frac{1}{2})^{60} = 1 \div 1,152,921,504,606,846,976$ .

According to M. Babbage, in his *Bridgewater Treatise*:

The *improbability* of a dead man being restored to life, on the principles laid down by Hume, is only 200,000,000,000 to 1—and it has just been shown that the *improbability* of there being no

---

\* The numbers here given are rather below than above the actual numbers.

discrepancy in the statements of the four Evangelists, upon the supposition that their accounts are *not* true, is *more* than 1,000,000,000,000,000 to 1. Or, in other words, the *improbability* of there being no discrepancy in the accounts of the resurrection, *if those accounts be false*, is more than 5,000,000 times greater than the improbability that one has risen from the dead. The fact, then, that in the gospel accounts of the resurrection of our Lord, replete as these accounts are with numerous incidents, there is no real discrepancy, *renders it certain that these narratives are true*; and if they are true, then the Saviour *did rise from the dead*. But let it be remembered with thankfulness that this is only one of several proofs of our Lord's resurrection.

From the terms of our supposition made above, it will at once be evident to a mind familiar with estimates of this kind, that the *improbability* of there being *no* discrepancy in the gospel accounts of the resurrection of Christ, *if these accounts be false*, is vastly greater than here represented. But we prefer to give an under-estimate rather than over-estimate.

---

ART. IX.—THE CONTRAST BETWEEN MAN AND THE BRUTE CREATION ESTABLISHES THE DIVINE ORIGIN OF THE SCRIPTURES.

By JAMES A. LYON, D.D., of the University of Miss.

WE are informed in the Scriptures that the lower orders of the animal tribes "honor" and "praise God." "The beasts of the field shall honor me, the dragons and the owls." (Isa. xliii. 20.) We do not understand by this that these lower orders of God's creatures render any intelligent praise or worship to the Supreme Being, although it might be inferred from certain portions of the Bible that they were not altogether without some instinctive knowledge of the source from which they derived their food. "The young lions roar after their prey, and seek their meat from God." (Ps. civ. 21.) But while the thought is not unpleasing, nor the doctrine heretical, that all God's creatures, from the