

THE PRESBYTERIAN QUARTERLY.

NO. 38.—OCTOBER, 1896.

I. THE CONSTITUTION OF THE SEMINARY CURRICULUM.¹

I AM disposed to look upon the subject the discussion of which I have been asked to open, as a practical rather than as a purely theoretical one. One result of this mode of looking at it will be that we shall approach it from the point of view of our existing institutions, and ask, not what is the ideal curriculum for theological study, but what is the ideal and what the practicable curriculum for such institutions as our theological seminaries actually are.

The fundamental facts here, I take it, are three.

(1), Our theological seminaries are not the theological departments of universities, but training schools for the Christian ministry. That is to say, the object they set before themselves is fundamentally a practical one. They do not exist primarily in order to advance theological learning, but in order to impart theological instruction; their first object is not investigation, but communication; and they call their students to them, not that these may explore the unknown, but that they may learn the known in the sphere of theological truth. They do not exist primarily, again, in order to place in reach of all who may be interested in theological thought facilities for acquiring information concerning whatever department of theological learning each inquirer may for the moment desire to give his attention to; but in order that they may provide for a select body of young men, who

¹ A paper read before the "General Association of the Professors of the Theological Seminaries of the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America," June 3, 1896.

INTERNAL EVIDENCE AS TO THE AUTHENTICITY OF MARK XVI. 9-20.

THE genuineness, and even the authenticity, of this passage being called in question on grounds of external evidence, the internal evidence is worthy of careful attention. This paper aims to indicate, at least, the direction in which this evidence leads.

While no word or expression used in this passage and elsewhere in Mark in the same sense is to be pleaded in favor of the genuineness of this passage, if the word or expression is used also in one of the other Gospels in the same sense (and here belong nearly seventy examples), yet a word or expression used in a certain sense here and elsewhere in Mark, but not in any of the other Gospels, would deserve careful consideration as possibly affording evidence for the genuineness; but the only word occurring here and elsewhere in Mark, but in no other Gospel, is *κτίσις* (Mark x. 6; xiii. 19; xvi. 15); and in this passage it means the (intelligent) *creature*, while elsewhere in Mark it means the *creation*. There is, therefore, the complete absence of linguistic evidence that the same man wrote this passage as wrote the rest of Mark.

On the other hand, of the twenty-two examples of words or expressions of this passage not occurring elsewhere in Mark in the same sense, twelve are not to be pleaded against the genuineness, since Mark had no occasion to use them. Here belong ἀναλαμβάνω, ἀπιστέω, βλάπτω, βεβαιώω, γλώσσαις λαλέω καιναῖς, ἔνδεκα, ἐπακολουθέω, θανάσιμος, μορφή, ὄφεις, παρακολουθέω, πενήθω. This leaves ten examples peculiar to this passage.

For ἀπας as an adjective Mark elsewhere uses πᾶς or ὅλος, cf. especially Mark xiv. 9 ("Wherever the gospel shall be preached in the whole world") with xvi. 15 ("Go into all the world and preach the gospel"), but Mark uses this word as a substantive (certainly in viii. 25), and the adjectival use of it here should not count for much. Instead of καλῶς ἔχω, we should have expected him to use the passive of either σώζω (as in v. 23, 28; vi. 56) or ἰαομαι (as in v. 29) to express recovery from sickness or disease; but he uses the similar κακῶς ἔχω (i. 32, 34; ii. 17; vi. 55); and so, although καλῶς ἔχω occurs here only in the New Testament, it should not count for much. Rather than ὁστερον as an adverb with δέ, Mark uses the simple καί in xiv. 57 (cf. Matt. xxvi. 60), and he nowhere uses ὁστερον at all. Yet, as it is not a common word, occurring in only nine other places in the Gospels, it, too, should not

be counted for much. As he uses *ἔπιτομαι* in ix. 4 ("there appeared unto them Elias"), we might have expected him to use it in xvi. 9 instead of *φαίνομαι*, and in xvi. 14 instead of *φανερῶομαι*; but we must remember that at ix. 4 was the only occasion he had to use such a word of the appearance of one who had died, and that in xvi. 14 he may have wished to lay emphasis upon the self-manifestation of Jesus to those who were not expecting him. Accordingly, these five examples are none of them of much weight, nor are all of them together decisive, but certainly the concurrence of even thus many in so short a space is suggestive. And the five examples yet to be considered appear to me still more important. Mark vi. 34, parallel with the use of *θεῖομαι* in John vi. 5, and Mark ii. 14, parallel with the use of the same word in Luke v. 27, have a form of *δράω*, agreeing in both instances with Matthew. (ix. 36; xiv. 14; ix. 9.) It is, therefore, strange that he does not use a form of *δράω* here like Matthew in the parallel. (xxviii. 10, 17.) His use of *κτίσις* here instead of *ἔθνος*, which he uses in similar instances in xi. 17 and xiii. 10, is not easily accounted for. And it is particularly surprising that he should use the plural of *σάββατον* for *week* in xvi. 2 in contrast with the singular for *Sabbath* in xvi. 1, and then use the singular for *week* in xvi. 9. Mark has never used *ὁ Κύριος* of Jesus. Is it Mark who so uses it in vs. 19 and 20? And when Mark wished to speak of casting a demon out of a person, he used *ἐξ* with the person (vii. 26), and even when speaking of a demon going out of a person (vii. 29), as the other evangelists used *ἀπό* (Matt. xvii. 18; Luke iv. 35, 41; viii. 2, 33, 35, 38); but the writer of this passage uses *παρά*. It was like Mark to use *ἐξ* instead of *ἀπό*, but it would be difficult to account for his using *παρά*. The concurrence of these five cases, any one of which would raise a strong presumption, is as conclusive as this sort of evidence could well be.

A distinct argument against the genuineness is the obvious fact that this passage is not a continuance of the narrative where it occurs. The narrative begins at xvi. 1 by introducing three women going to the sepulchre, and follows these women on till they flee from the sepulchre. If the author is continuing his narrative, why does he drop out of sight all the women but one? Especially is this question pressing when we notice that the author of vs. 9*f*. is laying emphasis on the failure of the disciples to believe the testimony of those who claimed to have seen the risen Jesus. Why did he forego the strength of the concurrent testimony of three witnesses? Whether Mark

wrote a continuance after vs. 8 that has been lost, or, having stopped there, was accidentally prevented from ever finishing, or stopped at that point on purpose, either to turn his readers to the testimony of living witnesses, or to a second treatise that he intended to prepare, as did Luke, this passage cannot be his continuance of his narrative.

Whatever makes against its genuineness makes also, though with less force, against its authenticity. Were the passage a part of what Mark wrote, that fact would establish its authenticity upon the same basis as the authenticity of the Gospel of Mark as a whole; but the disproof of its genuineness is the destruction of the only sure foundation on which its authenticity can be established in the present state of the external evidence. And now I proceed to arguments that show its lack of consonance with the apostolic tradition and teaching, arguments, therefore, that make as well against its authenticity as against its genuineness.

It deserves serious consideration that this passage contains two statements that contradict the apostolic testimony. The first of these is that Jesus appeared first to Mary Magdalene. According to Matthew, Mark and Luke, he appeared to the company of women as they were running from the sepulchre to the city; and according to these three, Mary Magdalene was in this company when they set out from the city that morning. But according to John, Mary left the sepulchre without hearing of the resurrection of Jesus, and ran and told Peter and John that the body had been taken away. She therefore separated from the rest of the women at the sepulchre before they saw the vision of angels; and she never joined the company of women again before she, by herself, saw Jesus. From the time she left the sepulchre till she saw Jesus there intervened her going to the city and back, coming back after Peter and John had had time to examine the sepulchre and go away; but from the time she left the sepulchre till the company of women saw Jesus there intervened only the vision of the angels to them in the sepulchre, their immediate flight, and their getting back toward the city only a part of the way. Accordingly, he must have appeared to them before he appeared to her.

The other statement is that the assembly of disciples disbelieved the two who reported that they had seen Jesus in the country; but according to Luke, the assembly of disciples were already convinced of the resurrection of Jesus by the testimony of Peter. (Luke xxiv. 33, 34.)

Of equal seriousness is the dissonance between the teaching of

this passage and that of the apostolic writings. It is noticeable what an emphasis is here laid on the wonderful in the miraculous. In mentioning the fact that seven demons had been cast out of Mary Magdalene (a fact which did not belong to this account), the writer says *ἑπτὰ δαιμόνια*, to put the emphasis on "seven" (cf. Luke viii. 2, which has *δαιμόνια ἑπτὰ*). He says that Jesus appeared "in another form," an element of wonder not mentioned in Luke; and he represents Jesus as predicting that his disciples would work wonderful miracles, such as casting out demons, speaking with new tongues, taking up serpents and drinking poison with impunity, and healing the sick by the laying on of hands. Not only does Matthew omit all mention of these predictions in the parallel accounts, but it would have been quite out of analogy with genuine predictions for Jesus to specify that wonder of speaking with tongues so definitely before such a thing had taken place. Moreover, there is no evidence that any of the apostles or any disciple of Jesus has ever been able to drink poison with more impunity than other persons; and he closes with emphasis on "miracles" as the great method of assistance to the apostles as evangelists. This accumulation of emphasis on the wonderful is not consonant with the tone of the teaching of Christ and his apostles.

Perfectly harmonious with this stress upon the wonderful in miracles is the stress upon the sin of unbelief. The writer carefully records (with exaggeration) the unbelief of the disciples as to the resurrection of Jesus, and then introduces Jesus as upbraiding them for this unbelief as a great sin, and continuing into the great commission, by which all who fail to believe (*ἀπιστέω*) are consigned to damnation, and all this with not a word to suggest that the writer is thinking of anything but the mere absence of assent upon evidence. From this passage one could not learn that trust and consent are essential to evangelical faith; one would rather conclude that credulity is the safe way to escape damnation. Accordingly, the writer reports Jesus as merely sending his disciples out to "preach the gospel," making a proclamation to be assented to. Making disciples and training them in all the teaching of Christ, the growth of character, upon which Jesus did lay the emphasis according to Matt. xxviii. 19, 20, are not within the view of this writer. The fact that so many in the modern church quote this passage much oftener than they quote the parallel in Matthew does not prove the inspiration of this passage.

And finally, here is an unevangelical emphasis upon baptism. Jesus could not have said, "He that believeth and is baptized shall be

saved." Such a doctrine could not have come from the lips that spoke those words to the robber on the cross. Such a commission was not given to the other apostles by him who did not send Paul to baptize, but to evangelize. (1 Cor. i. 17.) It is true that in the parallel in Matthew mention is made of baptism; but there the emphasis is not upon the baptism simply, but upon the modifying clause, "into the name of the Father, and the Son, and the Holy Spirit." And, in general, it is not that the different statements here might not, any one of them, be understood in a sense in harmony with the teaching that is of authority, if they occurred in certain contexts, but that, as they lie here, they together contradict the authoritative teaching.

F. P. RAMSAY.

Augusta, Ky.

EFFECTUAL CALLING—REGENERATION.

SUCH is the title of No. 13 of "The Shorter Catechism Course," by Dr. Beattie, in the *Observer* of July 29th. As we take issue with Dr. Beattie on one point, it is best to have the Catechism citations and the Doctor's own words before us. The *italics* are ours:

"29. We are made partakers of the redemption purchased by Christ by the effectual application of it to us by his Holy Spirit.

"30. The Spirit applieth to us the redemption purchased by Christ by working faith in us, and thereby uniting us to Christ in our effectual calling.

"31. Effectual calling is the work of God's Spirit, whereby, convincing us of our sin and misery, enlightening our minds in the knowledge of Christ, and renewing our wills, he doth persuade and enable us to embrace Jesus Christ, freely offered to us in the gospel."

"It is *worth while* noting the *fact* that the Catechism does *not* use the term *regeneration*, which theologians use so much in this connection. At first sight this may appear to be a defect in the Catechism, but a little examination of the questions set down at the head of this article will show that what the theologians term *regeneration* is there described under *effectual calling*."

We are glad that Dr. Beattie has called attention to the *fact* that the Catechism does not countenance the use of the word "regeneration" as a synonym for effectual calling. Nor can we look upon this omission as a defect in the Catechism. Neither the Catechism nor the Scriptures identify regeneration and effectual calling. In Question 31