# ARTICLE IV.

## THE LAST DAYS OF CHRIST; EXEGETICAL NOTES ON THE BASIS OF MARK XIV. 17–XVI. 20.

BY THE LATE REV. HORATIO B. HACKETT, D.D., LL.D.

### CHAPTER XVI.

**Verses 1–4.—The Morning of Resurrection, and First Visit to the Tomb.**

Ver. 1. This Sabbath, now ended, was the Jewish Sabbath — our Saturday. Mary Magdalene and other women (Salome and the other Mary, mother of James and Joses, are mentioned) purchased spices for embalming the body of Christ, in the evening after sundown, and came at an early hour next morning to the sepulchre. This agrees precisely with Luke xxiii. 56. The previous embalming by Nicodemus (John xix. 39, 40) may have been hurried and imperfect.

The moment of the resurrection we may suppose to have been that of the descent of the angel who rolled away the stone, and of the earthquake, before the arrival of the women. Mark, Luke, and John do not mention the earthquake, but seem to presuppose it by saying that the women found the door of the sepulchre open. Some of those on guard may subsequently have become believers, and made known the facts of which they were eye-witnesses to others.

Ver. 2. The time of coming to the sepulchre is said by Mark to have been when the sun was up, which is defined at the beginning of the verse as very early (λίαν πρωί). The sun in the Orient comes up very rapidly above the horizon, and a brief interval only marks the twilight; so that the two expressions could be, and actually are, used in the Old Testament as quite equivalent or interchangeable. See Robinson's Harmony (¶ 160 p. 230). He adds unquestionable



Digitized by Google

instances of that interchange of expressions in the Old Testament.

Ver. 4. *And when they looked up* (ἀναβλέψασαι). The tomb may have been on the side of a cliff or eminence, so that they must look up to see it, especially while yet at some distance from it. *For it was very great*, is the evangelist's explanation to the reader of this act of the women's looking up in their perplexity at the stone in which they feared such an obstacle. Some (Meyer, Alford) think that it explains why the women could not fail to notice that the stone was rolled away, it being so conspicuous.

**Verses 5–8.—The Resurrection of Christ, and First Visitors to the Tomb.**

The scriptural ground on which we rest our belief of the resurrection of Christ is manifold and incontrovertible. It was typified or predicted in the Old Testament; e.g. Jonah ii. 1, cf. Matt. xii. 39, 40; Ps. xvi. 10, cf. Acts ii. 27, 31. Christ himself again and again foretold it in the most explicit terms (Matt. xvi. 21; xvii. 9; Mark viii. 31; ix. 9; John xvi. 16). It was attested by the angelic visitors (Mark xvi. 6; Luke xxiv. 6), by the sentinels at the grave (Matt. xxviii. 4, 11), by the entire body of the apostles (Acts ii. 24; x. 40; Rom. iv. 24; 1 Pet. i. 3; Rev. i. 5, 18). The founding and continued existence of the church becomes inexplicable, unless we admit the postulate of Christ's having suffered death and risen again to life. The subsequent fearlessness and decision of Christ's disciples, as compared with their timidity when Jesus was apprehended and led to the cross, we can account for only on the supposition of the reality of that attestation of his word and office. On one page of the history we read that the disciples in that crisis all forsook him and fled (Matt. xxvi. 56; Mark xiv. 50); and shortly after that we hear them declaring almost defiantly in the ears of the Jewish rulers and populace: "Jesus of Nazareth, proved by God unto you by miracles and signs and wonders, him ye by the hands of heathen (lawless) men nailed to a

Digitized by Google

cross and slew, whom God raised up, having loosed the pangs of death, because it was not possible that he should be holden by it" (Acts ii. 22 sqq.).

The New Testament records ten separate appearances of Christ after his resurrection. These are:

1. To Mary Magdalene at the tomb, while it was yet dark (John xx. 1 sq.);

2. To certain other women on their return home from the grave (Matt. xxviii. 9, 10);

3. To Peter (Luke xxiv. 34; 1 Cor. xv. 5);

4. To the two disciples on the way to Emmaus (Luke xxiv. 31);

5. To the disciples, except Thomas, on the evening of the same day (Luke xxiv. 36);

6. Eight days after that, to the apostles with Thomas (John xx. 26);

7. To the disciples at the Sea of Tiberias (John xxi. 1);

8. On the mount in Galilee, probably to the five hundred there (Matt. xxviii. 16; 1 Cor. xv. 6);

9. To James, the brother of the Lord (1 Cor. xv. 7);

10. To the eleven apostles on Olivet when he ascended to heaven (Mark xvi. 19; Luke xxiv. 50; Acts i. 4, 9).

Luke in the Acts speaks of these "proofs" of the resurrection as not only many, but positive, indubitable in their character (see Hackett on Acts i. 3). Some would add to the foregoing the appearance to Saul on the way to Damascus, but less correctly, as that was a vision or revelation after the ascension.

Ver. 5. No one of the evangelists testifies that he himself saw the resurrection. No one of them was present at the time. But they certify the fact that Christ did rise from the dead on the strength both of their own testimony and that of others. I have sketched the probable order of Christ's manifestations. I will only add here that if one prefers he may suppose that Mary Magdalene, instead of being accompanied by other women, came at first alone to the sepulchre, and, finding it unoccupied, left to inform Peter and John;

Digitized by Google

that in the meantime the other women came without seeing him, found the tomb vacant, and departed. Peter and John, thus summoned, arrived next; and on their leaving, Mary came, and was alone there, and the first person, as Mark states (xvi. 9), to whom Jesus manifested himself. Mary's saying (John xx. 2), "We know not," etc., would then show that she knew other women had been there, as well as herself, but not that she and they had been together. The angel mentioned here may be the one who had opened the sepulchre at first (Matt. xxviii. 2), and with him, as Luke says (xxiv. 4), was now associated another angel.

Ver. 6. *Is risen* (ἠγέρθη) is still the identical word, or its equivalent ἀνέστη, with which members of the Greek church salute each other on Easter morning.

Ver. 7. Meyer thinks this designation of Peter recognizes in him a certain personal importance (the Roman Catholics say official) above the other disciples. The ordinary view is that it graciously recognizes him as still one of their band, notwithstanding his fall. *As he said to you* (see Matt. xxvi. 32). Luke mentions Peter's visit to the grave (xxiv. 12), but John, who went with him, describes it much more fully and vividly (xx. 3–10). Strauss says that John shows his egotism here in speaking of himself as outrunning Peter. The critic unwittingly makes here an important concession, viz. that John, a disciple of Christ, wrote our fourth Gospel. As has been remarked already, John never mentions himself by name in his entire Gospel. He refers to himself here as *that* disciple, well known as Peter's associate on this occasion. Dr. Bushnell has a noted sermon on the power of unconscious influence, which he founds on what may have been the reactive effect of John's and Peter's example on each other. The one was first to reach the sepulchre, the other first to enter it (see Bushnell, Sermons for the New Life, p. 186). The care with which the grave-clothes had been collected and laid together showed that no violence had been committed, and that Jesus had left the tomb deliberately and leisurely. Had his friends or the soldiers carried away

Digitized by Google

the body, this care would hardly have been taken (John xx. 6–10).

Ver. 8. *Having gone out*, i.e. from the tomb (see ver. 5). *Quickly* (A. V.) and ταχύ (T. R.) are not genuine. *Said nothing to any one*, as they went to carry tidings to the apostles (see Matt. xxviii. 8; John xx. 2). To say that Mark means that they said nothing of this at any time, i.e. did not deliver the message as Christ directed, contradicts the other evangelists, and is wholly unnecessary.[1]

**Verses 9–13.—Christ appears to Mary Magdalene, and to the two Disciples on the Way to Emmaus.**

The disputed paragraph begins here, and reaches to the end of the Gospel. I have stated to you Bleek's reasons for maintaining the genuineness of these verses. See also, on the same side, Morrison's Commentary on Mark, pp. 467–472. "The inference seems to me to be," says Alford, "that it is an authentic fragment, placed as a completion of the Gospel in very early times; by whom written must of course remain wholly uncertain, but coming to us with very weighty sanction, and having strong claims on our reception and reverence" (see Alford's Greek Testament, Vol. i. p. 438).

Ver. 9. John relates this appearance very minutely (xx. 11–18). Mary was there at the sepulchre after the departure of the other women and of Peter and John. At first she was so absorbed in the feeling of sorrow as not to recognize Jesus. But as soon as she heard her name uttered with his familiar tone, she knew him, and exclaimed with wonder and joy, "Rabboni." It was the highest title she could ascribe to him as the great Teacher. The final vowel here is either paragogic, or the suffix *my*. The other women shortly after this (Matt. xxviii. 9) approached him, held him by the feet, and worshipped him. But here, apparently in direct opposition to that unforbidden act, he says: "Touch me not, for I have not yet ascended to my Father" (John

[1] At this point a manuscript on the genuineness of the last twelve verses of Mark's Gospel was read by Dr. Hackett.

Digitized by Google

xx. 17). The imperative present form here, "Touch me not" (*Μή μου ἅπτου*), implies an incipient act, either actually begun, or on the point of being done, as indicated by some look or gesture. The other clause assigns a reason why this act was unnecessary. It is the risen Christ, she is assured; but is he corporeal, having really come forth from the grave as he was before; or is it his glorified spirit, having already gone up to God, but now having manifested himself to her in a spiritual body? She would procure for herself by the criterion of touch, the conviction which the eye cannot give her. The Saviour's answer is, that he does not yet appear to her as a spirit, but is still in the body as he was before his crucifixion. Her uncertainty was like that of Thomas, who thought that Jesus must be an apparition or a spirit, and was told to handle him and see, "for a spirit hath not flesh and bones" such as he had (Luke xxiv. 39). The word of Christ is sufficient for Mary; but the doubting Thomas must have the tangible proof of both touch and sight (see Bib. Dict., Art. *Mary Magdalene*, Dr. Hackett's note).

Ver. 10. *She*, or, more exactly, *that one* (*ἐκείνη*), as distinguished from the other women. *Those* (*τοῖς μετ' αὐτοῦ γενομένοις*, lit. *who became with him*, i.e. had become his disciples and followers), not the apostles alone. These latter are included; but if they alone were meant, it would be *the eleven* (*ἕνδεκα*), as in Luke xxiv. 9, 33.

Ver. 11. *Was beheld* (*ἐθεάθη*, not *seen* merely), as with an eye of wonder and scrutiny. Note such expressions. These believers were not fast witnesses, but slow to believe, exacting in their evidences.

Ver. 12. *After these things*, mentioned in verses 9–11. *Two of them*, i.e. of Christ's followers, as defined in ver. 10. *Walking* states how they travelled, i.e. on foot, and *into the country*, whither they went, from the city. They were going to Emmaus, sixty stadia distant, or seven and one half miles from Jerusalem (Luke xxiv. 13). The name of this village (it denotes *warm spring*) has disappeared, and in a volcanic

Digitized by Google

region like that of Judea the spring itself may not exist any longer. As to the original place, see the conjectures under the Art. *Emmaus* in Smith's Bib. Dict. (the American edition contains additional material).

Ver. 13. *And those*, as well as Mary, had their tidings to report. *To the others*, who were Christ's followers, whether apostles or others (see ver. 10). This additional testimony found as little credence as that of the others. Before this appearance to the two disciples at Emmaus, and that to the eleven at Jerusalem, we are to insert that to Peter (Luke xxiv. 34; 1 Cor. xv. 5), of which we know almost nothing beyond the fact itself. It belongs manifestly here, because the apostles announce it to the two as having already taken place when they arrive at Jerusalem. Trench has a very interesting Article on "Christ and the Two Disciples on the Way to Emmaus," in his Studies in the Gospels, pp. 318–332 (Eng. ed.).

**Verse 14.—Christ appears to the Apostles, Thomas being absent.**

Ver. 14. Mark speaks of eleven as present at this meeting; while Luke (xxiv. 33) speaks of them and others with them. John designates them as the disciples. The time was the evening, the first day of the Jewish week; hence the evening of our Sabbath and the day of Christ's resurrection (John xx. 19). The doors were closed, and of course very strongly, as the object was to protect them against any assault or entrance of the Jews. The Jewish enmity to Christ was now directed anew against his disciples; for the leaders clearly foresaw that unless they also were put to death they would fill Jerusalem with their doctrine, and bring down upon the Jews the blood which had been shed by them (see Acts v. 28). The *eleven*, as the word is used here, seems to have been at this time a conventional phrase for the apostles. The number was no longer twelve after the fall and death of Judas; and Thomas was absent at this particular interview. Those actually present were ten, but were called "the eleven" in the sense of "the disciples." Luke

Digitized by Google

and John state very fully the circumstances and the words of Christ on this occasion; but Mark mentions only the fact of the sudden interview. The sudden entrance of Jesus when the doors were closed, and the terror which fell on the apostles, indicate that the mode of entrance was miraculous. Whether Jesus caused the bars and bolts to give way at his touch, or passed by a single step, as it were, through the walls of the chamber, the description does not decide (Luke xxiv. 36; John xx. 19). Christ's next appearance was (John xx. 26) to the eleven with Thomas, a week later, and was attested by his allowing Thomas to put his finger into the prints of the nails which had fastened his feet to the cross, and his hand into his side which had been gashed by the soldier's spear. Yet it is not the resurrection merely that produces so strong an impression upon Thomas, but the proof also of Christ's omniscience, as evinced by his repeating Thomas's words spoken by him when Christ was not present (John xx. 27, 28). The effect here was very similar to that in the case of Nathanael (John i. 49, 50). As in that instance, remarks Godet, so here, the light flashes suddenly into the very depths of the soul of Thomas, and dispels all the darkness. As often in the case of such revolutions, he mounts up at once from the lowest step of faith to its summit, and he declares the divinity of his Lord more explicitly than Peter himself had done. Jesus partakes of food in their presence to convince them that he was not a spirit, as they might think, but a corporeal being, as he had been before his crucifixion (Luke xxiv. 41–43).

**Verses 15–18.—Christ appears to his Disciples in Galilee, and sends them forth to preach his Gospel everywhere.**

Ver. 15. The other evangelists, especially John, supply various important events and teachings which Mark omits. The period which Christ spent in Galilee before his ascension was a part of the forty days between that event and his resurrection. *To every creature* (A. V.), but more exactly, *all the creation*,—by which human beings are meant here, as the head

Digitized by Google

and crown of all God's creatures. What Mark states here corresponds to what Matthew states (xxviii. 18 sqq.), and hence was spoken on the mount in Galilee where he met the apostles and five hundred of his followers at once (Matt. xxviii. 16; 1 Cor. xv. 6). Yet we may well suppose that he repeated this commission again and again during these last days. Luke represents our Lord as enjoining it upon them just before he was parted from them and taken into heaven (xxiv. 51).

Ver. 16. The condemnation here presupposes a knowledge, as well as a rejection, of the gospel. They could not reject the message, unless it was made known to them. So Paul teaches explicitly in Rom. ii. 12. The necessity of baptism, says Meyer here, viewed as a divinely appointed ordinance, is taught as regards believers, but not for children in virtue of their relation to parents who are believers.

Ver. 17. The *signs* here are miracles that should attest the truthfulness of the gospel and its saving power for those who embrace it. Though not restricted to teachers, what is promised would naturally be true of them in a very special sense. *Shall follow with them*, as a seal of their commission.

Ver. 18. *Take up serpents*, with impunity, whether by accident, as in the case of Paul (Acts xxviii. 3–5), or when required to handle them, and thus in danger of being bitten or stung to death.

**Verses 19, 20.—Ascension of Christ, and Departure of the Apostles to their Work.**

Ver. 19. The transition here from Galilee to Olivet is very abrupt, and presupposes a notoriety of the last events in Christ's life which justified that brevity. *Was taken up into heaven*, in the manner that Luke intimates in xxiv. 51, and relates so fully in Acts i. 9–12. It is altogether probable that the disciples in going back to Jerusalem from Bethany, after having seen the Lord taken up into heaven, passed Gethsemane on their way. What new thoughts must have arisen in their minds! What deeper insight must have



Digitized by Google

flashed upon them as they looked once more upon that scene of the sufferings and humiliation of the crucified and ascended One!

Ver. 20. *But they*, on their part, proceeded to their work after he had thus ascended to heaven. *The signs which followed*, as Christ foretold and promised.

---

## ARTICLE V.

## RELATIONS OF THE ARYAN AND SEMITIC LANGUAGES.[1]

BY REV. J. F. McCURDY, PH.D., PRINCETON, N.J.

### NO. III. — COMPARATIVE PHONOLOGY.

An examination of the grammatical systems of these two families of speech led us to the conclusion that, if these languages have arisen from a common source, they must have diverged while still in a rudimentary stage of their development, that is, before their characteristic structural features had been evolved. In our search after proper data for comparison, we found ourselves, for this reason, shut out from the province of the grammar, and left to that of the lexicon. After considering the objections which have of late been urged strongly and skilfully against the admissibility of mere verbal analogies in linguistic comparison generally, we thought ourselves justified in regarding them as inconclusive and invalid. We therefore now feel ourselves at liberty, as far as the well-grounded principles of glottology are concerned, to proceed to an examination of the vocabularies of the respective groups.

It will now be necessary for us to establish our views as to the scope of this special inquiry, and as to the general principles which are to govern it. Before going farther, it should be recognized that the kind of treatment which needs to be accorded to the question of Aryo-Semitic relations is essen-

[1] This discussion, which was interrupted by the ill-health of the writer, is resumed from Vol. xxxiii. pp. 352–380 (April, 1876).

Digitized by Google