

Theology on the Web.org.uk

Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible

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

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



Buy me a coffee

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



PATREON

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

PayPal

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

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

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_expository-times_01.php

pdfs are named: [Volume]_[Issue]_[1st page of article].pdf

sacrifice ; second, the similar disappearance of the archangel Raphael, when he throws off his disguise, ceases to be your cousin Azarias, and goes back abruptly to Paradise. The parallelism between the two events, so far as language is concerned, is in the following direction : the angel in Judges ' *goes up* in the flame of the altar,' in Tobit we can see that there was once a similar statement, if we make a minute and necessary correction to the text ; as it stands it reads that

' they rose up and saw him no more.'

Evidently it was the angel that rose up, and we should say :

' he rose up and they saw him no more.'

Now look at Jg 13²¹ :

' the angel did no more appear to Manoah and his wife. Then Manoah knew that he was an angel of the Lord.'

So in Tobit 12²² :

' then they confessed . . . that the angel of the Lord had appeared unto them.'

The parallel being now complete, we see that the terms employed are the proper words to describe the ascension of an angel, that is to say, his disappearance. This brings us back to the New Testament again, for we shall find the angel in Tobit intimating that he is about *to return to Him that sent him*, which we recognize to be Johannine language, the constant expression of Jesus Himself. The Son of Man is to ascend where he was aforetime. It was the Father that sent Him.

We see, then, that the first idea of what we call the Ascension is that of the return of a celestial messenger. It is Jesus as Angel rather than Jesus the Son that is being contemplated by the

New Testament writers in the first instance. On the human side the emphasis is laid on disappearance ; that seems to be the explanation of the shorter text-endings of Luke, where the modern critics edit :

' He was parted from them,'

and omit :

' He was carried up into heaven,'

though the one was implied in the other, if we study the parallels.

From the same quarter we get a ray of light on the closing words of Luke's Gospel.

The end of Tobit's Gospel, if we may so say, is that they were continually ' praising and blessing God.' It is well known that the dual expression of adoration with which Luke concludes was reduced by Hort to a single term, ' blessing God ' instead of ' blessing and praising God,' and that the verse so simplified was one of the corner-stones in his theory of conflated texts ; according to this view, two separate textual streams, one saying ' blessing ' and the other ' praising,' were united to a single resultant text, ' blessing and praising God ' : but this is curiously like what we find in Tobit. Here, too, we have the angel insisting on the note and necessity of praise. ' Praise God, praise him for ever . . . give God thanks,' is the language of his farewell. If we find a close coincidence between the text of Tobit and the longer text of the end of Luke, we shall have to inquire *de novo* whether the supposed conflation really exists ; and, if it does, what part Tobit has in its reconstruction. For the influence of Tobit upon New Testament language may now be considered as established. It may even have affected the manner of narration of the Ascension.

The Other Mary.

BY PROFESSOR JOHN R. MACKAY, D.D., EDINBURGH.

I WISH to restate an old argument, in the sense that one of the witnesses to whom Matthew appeals in support of the truth of the death and burial, of the empty grave and post-resurrection appearing of Jesus, is none other than his own mother. Dr. Dunlop Moore of Pittsburg, more than thirty years ago, gave the primary reasons for this per-

suasion in an excellent, although brief, paper contributed by him to *The Presbyterian and Reformed Review*. But much water has passed under our bridge since then, and it now seems to me that there is a call for a restatement of the grounds upon which a conclusion, in the sense now stated, may reasonably be cherished.

1. I shall, to begin with, submit the direct, and obvious, reasons which lead one to think that 'the other Mary,' who was with Mary Magdalene on the Resurrection morning (Mt 28¹), was Matthew's mother.

(a) Matthew and Levi are merely two different names for one and the same Apostle. That identification is accepted as correct by practically all.

(b) Mark (2¹⁴) speaks of Levi, *i.e.* Matthew, as the son of Alphæus. The same Mark (3¹⁶) speaks of an Apostle James who also was the son of Alphæus. It is a fair inference, since there is no countervailing evidence, that Alphæus, the father of James, is the same Alphæus who is the father of Matthew. The Evangelists are very careful to supply us with helps of one kind or another whereby we can distinguish any two or more distinct individuals that in their record bear one and the same principal name. No such help is supplied in the instance before us, and the *onus probandi* must therefore be on those who question that the same Alphæus was the father of both Matthew and James, or that Matthew and James, the son of Alphæus, were brothers.

(c) 'The other Mary,' who accompanied Mary Magdalene to the cross, and who with her was a witness of the Resurrection, was the wife of Alphæus. Our Apostle James is, in the New Testament, four times styled the son of Alphæus, doubtless with a view to distinguish him from another Apostle James, who was the son of Zebedee. On the other hand, Mary is four times called the mother of James. That could not have been James, the son of Zebedee, for his mother was Salome. We conclude, therefore, that Alphæus was the husband of 'the other Mary.' The other Mary was also the mother, or, failing that, the stepmother, of Matthew, and all the indications are in the direction of the conclusion that she was simply his mother. We therefore conclude that one of Matthew's sources for what he avers concerning the death, burial, empty grave, and post-Resurrection appearances of Jesus was his own mother.

2. This conclusion finds support from the circumstance that it helps us to understand certain expressions in the Gospels, and in the Gospel of Matthew in particular, that, on any other supposition, would remain a puzzle:

(a) Mary the mother of James, 'the other Mary,' occupies a considerably larger place in Matthew's narrative than she does in that of any of the other Evangelists. They all accord her an honourable place, but Matthew more than any. He brings her in as a witness of the Crucifixion, of the

Burial, of the empty grave, of a post-Resurrection appearing, of Jesus. If she was his mother, and one of his most immediate sources, the phenomenon now under consideration finds the amplest explanation.

(b) The expression—'the other Mary'—which Matthew, of all the Evangelists, alone uses, is arresting. It sounds in one's ear a note of tender feeling. The expression is uncommon: there seems to lurk a depth of significance behind that uncommonness.

(c) Matthew has another unparalleled expression, which finds its ready and adequate explanation on the basis of the theory which is here being advocated. I refer to Matthew's manner of alluding to Salome. Mark styles her Salome simply, John seems to refer to her as the sister of the mother of Jesus. Matthew calls her the mother of Zebedee's children—a strange form of speech. Further, Mark calls 'the other Mary' the mother of James the Little, adding, I suppose, the epithet 'the Little' so as to distinguish her more sharply from Salome, who might also be referred to as the mother of James. To Matthew that method of making a sharp distinction between two women, either of whom might conceivably be alluded to as the mother of James, would be less natural, if 'the Little' was his own brother. Matthew, therefore, falls back on the unparalleled form 'the mother of Zebedee's children,' and uses the term 'the mother of James' only for her whom we suppose to be his own mother, alternating the expression, when it suits him, with the significant term—'the other Mary.'

(d) The acceptance of the theory here advocated seems to lend a new significance to Matthew's grouping of the twelve Apostles (10²⁻⁴) so far as Matthew's own place in the group is concerned. Matthew seems to give the names of the Apostles in pairs, possibly having in mind the actual grouping when Jesus sent them out, two and two. Mark's order is: 'Matthew and Thomas, and James the son of Alphæus.' Luke, too (6¹⁵), has that order. Matthew puts it: 'Thomas and Matthew, James the son of Alphæus,' and thereby at once gives himself a humbler place in relation to Thomas than does Mark, and brings himself into closer contiguity with his own brother—James the son of Alphæus.

3. A few observations may here be made which perhaps do not bear so directly on our argument as the foregoing, and which, nevertheless, may be regarded as yielding some support to our thesis:

(a) John's allusions to her of whom Matthew speaks as 'the other Mary' are interesting. She appears to be brought in by John as a witness of the Crucifixion. That view of the matter is no

doubt based on the assumption that Clopas, in John, is an alternative Greek form for Alphæus, in the Synoptists. But that assumption is almost unavoidable. The Evangelical tradition is of one voice in associating Mary, the mother of James, that is, 'the other Mary,' most closely with Mary Magdalene, as together witnesses of the Resurrection. The Sinaitic Syriac Version makes ܡܠܟܐ the equivalent of Alphæus. Dr. A. H. McNeile seems to have no hesitation in accepting Clopas as an alternative for Alphæus. Regarding, then, this assumption as well-founded, I am inclined to say that our Mary is present in John, even if we must add, in submerged form; as one to whom the Lord showed Himself alive after His passion. John, indeed, makes much of the witness of Mary Magdalene to the resurrection of our Lord. But when he records (20²) the Magdalene as saying: 'They have taken away the Lord out of the tomb, and *we* know not where they have laid him,' it is reasonable to think that the Magdalene was including another with herself in this *we*. It is surely not a plural of majesty, it is hard to regard it as an instance of the literary plural. That being so, we seem justified in identifying the appearing of our Lord recorded in Mt 28⁹⁻¹⁰ (R.V.) and that recorded in Jn 20¹¹⁻¹⁸ as one.

(b) It is worth while drawing attention to the character of the women of whom the Evangelists are so careful to make mention as witnesses of the Crucifixion, of the Burial, and, in some cases, of the empty grave, and of the post-Resurrection appearances of Jesus. For, I believe, they are not introduced into what is, after all, a compressed narrative of the greatest tragedy and the greatest

triumph on record, save with a profoundly significant and intelligent aim. They are regarded by the Evangelists as first-rate sources of information. And why should they not? They are not giddy young girls, nor hysterical women. They are, for the most part, elderly married women, and women we may well believe of the strongest character. It is not possible to associate the idea of a questionable quality with the mother of our Lord, or with the mother of Zebedee's sons, or with the mother of James and of Joses, and, may I not add, of Matthew. And even with regard to Mary Magdalene, of whom it is recorded that out of her had been cast seven devils, the idea is a legitimate one, that the expression referred to invites us to think, not only of how foolish she had been, but of how sane she now is.

(c) It is not absolutely certain that Matthew made use of Mark. Zahn and Springer have a firm conviction in another sense. Even Cadbury would scarcely affirm more than that it is the more probable view. Yet a conclusion in that sense, and order of dependence, has approved itself to so many scholars of all schools that, at the least, one is bound to regard the conclusion with respect. But what one feels bound to protest against is the inference that, if Matthew made use of Mark in the Crucifixion and Resurrection narrative, Matthew should no longer, in this region, be regarded as an independent investigator. It is not in that way that 'the most important book in all the world' could have been written. His own mother may very well have been his source in scenes that he did not himself witness—such as the Crucifixion, the Burial, and the empty grave of Jesus.

In the Study.

Virginitus Puerisque.

Silver Paper.

BY THE REVEREND W. J. MAY, ILKESTON.

'He hath made every thing beautiful in his time.'
—Ec 3¹¹.

WHAT is the good of silver paper, anyhow? You get silver paper round all manner of things nowadays. They wrap it round Daddy's cigarettes, round Mother's chocolate biscuits, round those wonderful little Tangerine oranges that smell as nice as they

taste, even round the toffees which you buy for birthdays and special occasions. And what is the good of it all? The oranges have not a nicer flavour or the chocolates a better taste because they were wrapped in silver paper. Yet somehow it makes things look nicer, you say. They may not taste better or be worth more, but you are glad of the thing that looks better.

Have you ever stopped and thought how fond God is of silver paper? He is always wrapping nice things up in nice wrappers so that it does us good to look at them as well as to have them. Our