

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

a Persian palace was in itself significant, but in 1900-1902 a second expedition to the same mound was undertaken. This time there was discovered that most valuable of all relics for the study of the Old Testament, the stele of Hammurabi, the king who reigned in Babylon about 2000 B.C. Inscribed on the stele in cuneiform were 240 or more laws which offered a basis of comparison between Biblical laws and those of the other peoples of the ancient Orient, thus ushering in a new era in the study of the Hebrew codes.

Accompanying de Morgan on this mission was the Assyriologist, Père Scheil. In an incredibly short time the genial and indefatigable scholar, now with the University of Paris, had published an excellent translation of the code.

Once more in recent years France made Old Testament scholars indebted to her when the archæological expedition which went to Syria in

1921 unearthed a new-ancient city at Byblos (in the shadow of the mount on which Renan wrote his *Vie de Jésus*). The greatest treasure this time was the tomb of Akhiram, on which was an inscription in Phœnician characters which is the oldest yet discovered. It dates from the thirteenth century or about the time of Moses.

Every one of the major archæological discoveries which have shed light on the Old Testament has been contributed to the world by France.

And thus we bring to a close this brief review of the brilliant course of French scholarship in Old Testament research. A fine intuitiveness, combined with courage, indefatigable energy, and a wholesome curiosity concerning the unknown—these have characterized the study of the Old Testament by the French. What a debt enlightened scholarship owes to them!

Mary Magdalene and Mary, Sister of Martha.

BY PROFESSOR F. C. BURKITT, D.D., CAMBRIDGE.

ONE of the oldest differences between East and West is as to whether Mary Magdalene and Mary, the sister of Martha, are two persons or the same person. The Eastern view is that they are different; the Western view, as attested by the Roman services for July 22nd, is that they are the same, and, further, that the same Mary was the unnamed 'sinful woman' of Lk 7³⁶⁻⁵⁰. The objection to the Western (or Roman) view is that neither in S. Luke nor in S. John does Mary, Martha's sister, give the impression of a once notorious but now repentant sinner. The objection to the Eastern view is that we seem to be compelled by the evangelical details to acknowledge the identity of the sister of Lazarus with the woman who anointed Jesus at Simon's supper, and also the identity of this woman with the 'sinful woman' of S. Luke's Gospel, who is further supposed to be the Mary Magdalene from whom seven devils had gone out.

The two different views, it is interesting to remember, are represented in the extant forms of Tatian's 'Diatessaron.' In the Arabic, with which Ephraim in this matter seems to agree, the 'sinful woman' is separated from the supper at Bethany; in Cod. Fuldensis and the Dutch Harmonies the two accounts are run together.

Historical problems of this kind used to be studied on the supposition that the four Gospels were of equal authority and equally accurate. This has now been succeeded by very different suppositions. There is general agreement that Mark was a principal source for Matthew and Luke, and a good deal of what we read in John is now regarded as adaptation by the Evangelist rather than objective history. That is to say, such statements or 'concessions' are often made when 'the Synoptic Problem' or 'the composition of the Fourth Gospel' is the subject of discussion. But if these literary conclusions are sound they should be acknowledged when purely historical questions are discussed, in questions of historical reconstruction. How does the question of Mary Magdalene appear, when viewed with modern critical presuppositions?

Beginning with Mark, we only read of Mary Magdalene—*Μαρία ἡ Μαγδαληνή*, Mary of (?) Magdala—as one of the women who watched the Crucifixion to the end, who saw the hasty burial, and on the Sunday morning found the body of Jesus gone. We further read of a supper at Bethany at the house of one 'Simon the Leper,' apparently on the day before the Last Supper, at which an

unnamed woman anointed the head of Jesus with 'pistic nard.' It cost three hundred pence, but Jesus accepted the homage as a sort of anticipatory funeral honour. It is a curious incident, and the exact meaning of 'pistic nard' appears to be forgotten, but the remark of Jesus about burial accords with the last week and with that alone. Who 'Simon the Leper' may have been does not appear. There is no word in the tale to suggest that the woman was not virtuous.

The Gospel of Matthew follows Mark exactly, so far as we are now concerned. It adds a direct vision of Jesus to the women, immediately following after our Mark has left off, but Mary Magdalene is not explicitly named or characterized in it.¹

Luke brings in new accounts. He leaves out the supper at Bethany and only mentions Mary Magdalene once (24¹⁰) at the end. On the other hand, he tells us in 8¹⁻³ that Mary Magdalene was one of those whom Jesus had healed of 'evil spirits and weaknesses,' in fact 'seven demons had gone out from her' (8²): she was one of those who had travelled about with Jesus and the disciples in Galilee, and helped to maintain them. This account seems to rest on good historical information: names like 'Johana wife of Chuza, Herod's steward,' look more like reminiscence than myth. But valuable as the information is, it does not go very far. It is useless to speculate on the nature of the 'seven demons': does it mean a very severe visitation of some kind, or recurring attacks of fits or epilepsy? We cannot tell. But in any case it is not very likely that Johana the wife of Chuza would be travelling about Galilee with a notorious courtesan. There is nothing whatever in Lk 8¹⁻³ to suggest that the Mary Magdalene there mentioned was anything but a respectable invalid.²

We come now to Lk 7³⁶⁻⁵⁰, the story of the 'sinful woman.' The first thing that may be remarked about it is that there is every reason to dissociate this woman from the Mary Magdalene mentioned in 8². In 8² the Evangelist introduces Mary Magdalene to us as a new personage, and, further, the 'sinful woman' in 7⁵⁰ is dismissed.

¹ I take no account here of the Appendix to the genuine Mark (16⁹⁻²⁰), which is uncritically compiled out of the other Gospels.

² In this conclusion I rejoice to have the support of one very diligent reader of theological literature: 'Well, you know,' said Lady Palmerston, 'people used to abuse Melbourne because he said Mary Magdalene was not near so bad as she was represented' (Guedalla, *Palmerston*, 388).

Even if the two women were the same person, we may say that the Evangelist has gone out of his way to put them before us as two.

Is the story, as Luke tells it, credible? Yes, and No. The main tale is, I suppose, credible enough, but I cannot help feeling that the Evangelist has cut it about somewhat in the process of taking it out of its original context and inserting it in his Gospel. If the Pharisee invited Jesus to a meal, why did he not receive his Guest with a kiss, and with the usual opportunity for ablutions (vv. 44-46)? As a rule with 'Pharisees' it was the other way (Lk 11³⁸). Very likely it would have taken too much space to explain the situation; the Evangelist had his eye on the main moral, and was not concerned with Simon the Pharisee, etc. All this is justifiable, but there remains a feeling that the *mise-en-scène* is not explained, that something has been altered by Luke. Perhaps at the same time he has taken the opportunity of adding a touch or two from another scene of anointing at another supper, which then he will not need to reproduce. If we must take all the details as they stand, there is some resemblance between the two suppers, and therefore between the women who anoint: perhaps in Luke's source there was no resemblance whatever.

Next, we come to Lk 10³⁷⁻⁴², the story of how a certain woman by name Martha received Jesus. She had a sister called Mary, who preferred staying and listening to Jesus to helping her sister with getting the meal ready. There is nothing to indicate the place or the time: were it not for what we read in the Fourth Gospel it would surely never have occurred to any one to suppose that the sisters lived just outside Jerusalem. Still less does it seem likely that this Mary was identical with the Mary Magdalene of Lk 8² or the 'sinful woman' of Lk 7³⁷⁻⁵⁰.

Let us collect at this point the results obtained. We learn that the Mary Magdalene who visited the grave of Jesus was a Galilean disciple of some property, who had been cured by Jesus from a severe, perhaps recurrent, complaint, and that there is no reason to suppose that her morals had been irregular. We have a story of a pair of sisters, Martha and Mary, who seem to have lived in Galilee. And further, we learn that there were current two different stories of a meal at which a woman brought a special box of unguents for Jesus: in the one case it is in the last week, in the other the special point of the story is that the woman was a notorious bad character. Further, there is some reason to guess that features from the first story have been imported into the second, as we

have it, there are two Mariés, not one Mary, two anointings, and not one anointing; but neither Mary is connected with any story of anointing.

Now we come to the Fourth Gospel. Let us confess that we do not come unprejudiced. That is to say, we come knowing that much of the dialogue in that work can only be regarded as the free composition of the writer, that the whole presentation of the story is bound up with theological rather than historical views, and that in particular the whole story of the Raising of Lazarus cannot be harmonized with the course of events sketched in Mark. I am not attempting to prove these statements: they are not new, and are to be found in almost any modern discussion of the Fourth Gospel. But granting their general correctness, what then? Surely this, that no historical statement made in the Fourth Gospel, and there alone, is of sufficient weight to disturb an otherwise probable conclusion in the story of the ministry of Jesus.

The Fourth Gospel¹ has the pair of sisters, Martha and Mary, and puts them in Bethany near Jerusalem. It has the story of the anointing at a supper just before the last Passover, with the 'pistic nard' worth three hundred pence and the objection to the waste; and it expressly identifies the woman with Mary, sister of Martha. But both in 11² and 12³ it tells us that Mary wiped the feet of Jesus with her hair, thereby identifying her with the 'sinful woman' of Lk 7³⁸. 'Mary Magdalene' is brought in without an explanation of who she is at Jn 19²⁵: it does not seem, therefore, that the writer means us to understand that she is Mary, sister of Martha, about whom so much has been already said.

But if we are to take the statements in 11 and 12 seriously, then we must locate at Bethany the tale of Mary sitting and listening to Jesus; and

¹ See, on this part of the subject, Streeter, *The Four Gospels*, 378.

what is still more improbable, we must suppose that this supper-party is independently described in Lk 7, and therefore that Mary was a notorious sinner, so notorious that at the very end of Jesus' career her presence at a supper-party with Jesus is regarded as extraordinary. For if there be only one anointing, it must clearly be placed in the last week, as it is done in the Latin Diatessaron.

Thus it is the Fourth Gospel and the unhistorical use it has made of tradition already in circulation that brings in psychological improbabilities into the figure of Mary, the sister of Martha. Quite distinct from this is the question of the identity of Mary Magdalene and her character: I have attempted to show that there is no reason in any of the Gospels to regard her as either Mary, the sister of Martha, or as the 'sinful woman' of whom we read in Luke. As I understand the matter, the only time Mary Magdalene is mentioned in any of the Gospels apart from the burial of Jesus and the Resurrection is Lk 8^{2f}.

It should further be added, in justice to the Fourth Evangelist, that we must not ascribe to him the psychological monstrosity of himself making Mary, the sister of Martha, into a notorious sinner. The only one of all these women that the Gospels themselves put before us as a 'sinner' is the woman in Lk 7³⁷⁻⁵⁰. The Fourth Evangelist has identified the woman who brought the 'pistic nard' to the supper at Bethany with Mary, sister of Martha and of Lazarus: it is only the presence of certain details in Lk 7 that has made Western interpreters identify Luke's anointing with the anointing at Bethany.

The main conclusions, then, that we should draw is that the story of the 'woman that was a sinner' has received in the form that we read it in Lk 7³⁷⁻⁵⁰ certain details which do not belong to it, but belong to another supper, that at Bethany; and further, that both Mary, sister of Martha, and Mary Magdalene emerge from our inquiry with unblemished reputations.

Literature.

THE RELIGION OF ANCIENT PALESTINE IN THE LIGHT OF ARCHÆOLOGY.

ARCHÆOLOGICAL evidence regarding Old Testament history has been accumulating rapidly within

recent years. Ancient sites in Palestine, Syria, and Mesopotamia have been yielding up their secrets in monuments, tablets, and objects of almost every description. Dr. Stanley A. Cook, the well-known Semitic scholar, in his latest work,