

drian Christology, "a high priest forever, without father, without mother, without a genealogy." So far from showing appreciation of, or consideration for, the native Jewish type of Christology, it eliminates entirely the genealogies, and leaves the reader uncertain whether the acclamation of the blind beggar at Jericho and the crowd at Jerusalem have, or have not, any basis in fact. Its only reference to the subject is the supplementary question appended to the series of debates between Jesus and his Jewish opponents in the temple, the scornful:

How say the scribes that the Christ is the son of David? David himself said in the Holy Spirit:

The Lord said unto my Lord,
Sit thou on my right hand
Till I make thine enemies thy footstool.

H. ROMAN RITUAL AS AFFECTING MARK

The most specifically Roman trait in Mark is found in the sphere of early ritual and observance, matters which in the East especially are clung to with intense devotion. The principal feature of this kind belongs, like Mark's ultra-Pauline apologetic and Christology, to a stratum of the Gospel which is clearly secondary. It is all the more conspicuous because in this case undeniably in conflict with the basic story.

We have, unfortunately, for the trait in question no designation simpler than "Anti-quartodecimanism." The recognition of its specifically Roman (or at all events western) character depends on familiarity with the early history of the observance of the Church's one great annual festival, the Easter feast of Redemption, which combined characteristics of the Jewish feast of national redemption (Passover) with the much more widely-observed Oriental feast of resurrection celebrated in commemoration of the triumph over death of various redeemer-gods, such as Attis, Adonis, and Osiris. The celebration took place among the churches of Cappadocia, and in Tertullian's time at Rome itself, annually, on the 25th of March, the vernal equinox of the Julian calendar. It can be traced, of course, much further back than the celebration of the birth of Jesus on December 25th (Julian winter solstice, the dies invicti

solis); in fact it goes back beyond question to the Apostles themselves. This is not merely the claim of Polycarp in 154, it is easily demonstrable from Paul's references to "keeping the feast" of "Christ, our passover," and his employment of the passover imagery of the "new leaven," and the seed-corn which after perishing in the earth is divinely restored. It appears also from the references to Christ as the first-fruits (*ἀπαρχή*) of the buried saints (1 Cor. 5, 7-8; 15, 20, 35-37).

Polycarp, as representative of the churches of Asia in this observance at Rome in 154, claimed to have it by direct and unbroken succession from "the Apostles and disciples of the Lord," and there is every reason to admit this claim since Paul himself, unless all implications are deceptive, when he wrote from Ephesus to the Corinthians on the questions involved in the meaning of the Easter observances, was himself at the time engaging in them with the Ephesian church. The present writer has expressed the belief¹ that the "Scripture" on the ground of which Paul (in common with all the early preachers of the resurrection, 1 Cor. 15, 11) dated the mysterious unseen act of divine power which broke the gates and bars of Sheol as having taken place "on the third day," is the ancient law of First-fruits in the sacred calendar of Lev. 23, 9-14. The requirement which determines Pentecost, and as a consequence the whole calendar, is that of Lev. 23, 15:

Ye shall count unto you from the morrow after the sabbath (of Passover), from the day that ye brought the sheaf of the wave offering, seven complete sabbaths unto the morrow after the seventh sabbath, fifty days.²

According to the interpretation of the Sadducees,³ which may quite possibly represent the older practice, this makes First-fruits (and Pentecost) always fall on a Sunday, or Lord's day (*κυριακή ἡμέρα*). First-fruits in the year of the crucifixion

¹ "The Resurrection in Primitive Tradition and Observance," *American Journal of Theology*, XV, 3 (July, 1911).

² On this use of "the third day" (i.e., from the beginning of the feast) see John Lightfoot on Matt. 12, 1. He interprets the curious β reading *δευτεροπρώτη* of Luke 6, 1 as "first sabbath after the second day of Passover." The numbering of days in the period Passover — Pentecost must be interpreted in view of the calendar system.

³ Menahoth 65 a, b.

(which took place on a Friday) was "on the third day," if the Friday in question was (as all the Asiatic churches insistently maintained) the 14th of Nisan, the full-moon marked by the killing of the Passover lamb. It was invariably the 16th Nisan; in the year of the crucifixion it fell on a Sunday. To Paul, therefore, as to the ancient Church generally (with the single exception of Mark), the resurrection when Christ "became the 'first-fruits' of them that slept" was "on the third day." Even Mark presupposes exactly the same interval between Jesus' death and resurrection, though for some peculiar reason he persistently employs the phrase "after three days." To this we must return presently.

Whether the particular "Scripture" referred to by Paul as implying that God had burst the Lord's prison house "on the third day" be, as we have surmised, Lev. 23, 9-14; or some other,¹ it is perfectly clear that the ancient "quartodeciman" practice of the Oriental churches, which continued in a Christian significance the ancient Jewish feast of Redemption, celebrated annually on the 14th of the first month of the year (vernal equinox according to empirical calculation), has convincing support in the earliest and most authentic documents of the New Testament. Probably this celebration of "the Lord's Passover," and of "the third day," was accompanied, at least in the regions nearer to the Palestinian home-land, by a corresponding emphasis on "the fiftieth day," Pentecost (Acts 2, 1 ff.; 20, 16). At all events, the "quartodeciman" observance of the annual Easter feast, characteristic in various forms and modifications of the Eastern churches where Jewish practices were still strong, has convincing attestation both in the New Testament and the Apostolic Fathers.

Against this stands the practice of Rome, traceable (thanks to the later peacemaking intervention of Irenaeus on behalf of his Asiatic friends) back to the time when Polycarp at Rome had resisted the friendly effort of Anicetus to induce him to swerve from the method of observance which he had received "from the Apostles."² Anicetus and the Romans were ac-

¹ Hos. 6, 2 is not employed by the early writers in this application.

² The Vita Polycarpi credibly relates that Polycarp had been brought to

customed (we know not on what authority nor from how far back) to subordinate the annual commemoration to the weekly as respects breaking of the fast. They doubtless regarded the keeping the feast of Nisan 14 as a Judaizing practice (as we know to have been the case at a later time), insisting that "the mystery of the Lord's death" must be observed on no other than the first day of the week; whereas quartodeciman practice of course made observance on other days, including even fast-days, unavoidable. They had no objection, however, to heightening and emphasizing the normal significance of that particular "Lord's day" which happened to fall next after the vernal equinox,¹ a form of compromise which was ultimately adopted and forms the present determination of Good Friday and Easter Sunday. Dislike of Jewish practices, and especially of any coincidence in celebration of a church feast with the festival of the "murderers of the Lord," was a prominent, if not a dominant, factor in Western rejection of the Eastern calendar. In Irenaeus' time, it threatened to disrupt Christendom because of the intolerant threat of Victor of Rome to disfellowship the Asiatic churches which should persist in their refusal to conform.

Both sides of course insisted that their opponents "made the Gospels disagree," and had methods of their own for bringing them into alleged harmony. As a matter of fact, modern study shows them hopelessly in conflict. The fourth (or Ephesian) Gospel is (as we should expect) quartodeciman. The parting supper of Jesus with the Twelve in John 13, 1-30 is not "the Passover"; this feast has still to be prepared for the succeeding night (John 13, 29; 18, 28). The Friday of the crucifixion is the "Preparation," not of the regular weekly sabbath only, but of Passover Sabbath; for, as the evangelist remarks, "the day of that sabbath was a high day" (18, 31). Hence Jesus'

Smyrna in his early youth as a slave from "the East" (i.e., Syria). Since his birth was ca. 79, he may well have had contact with "the elders" in Jerusalem, including "the Elder John" whom Irenaeus confuses with the Apostle.

¹ In Tertullian's time "Easter" was celebrated at Rome, as in Cappadocia, annually on March 25th. At Alexandria it had been celebrated on April 7th, but this was changed to the Sunday after the first full moon after the vernal equinox, and this method subsequently became general in Palestine, Egypt, and throughout the West, while Mesopotamia, Syria, and Asia Minor clung to the Ephesian observance.

death coincides to the hour with the killing of the passover lamb, just as his anointing in Bethany is made by a change of date from Mark 14, 1 to coincide with the date¹ fixed in the Law (Exod. 12, 3-6) for the consecration of the victim (John 12, 1). Christ thus appears, in Paul's language, "our passover that is sacrificed for us." He suffers on the 14th, the Preparation (Friday), the eve of the great day of the feast (first of Unleavened Bread), and "on the third day," Sunday, "the day after the sabbath," the "high sabbath" of Passover, the 16th of Nisan, or "First-fruits," he comes forth from the grave.²

This dating of the fourth Gospel is not only in harmony with First Corinthians and the ancient practice attested by Polycarp, it is also required by the underlying data of Mark itself and its two later satellites. Fundamentally the Synoptic story of the Passion required the same dating as the Johannine. The haste of the authorities to put Jesus out of the way before the gathering of the multitude "at the feast" is intended to avoid the tumult which might occur from a crowd likely to attempt the rescue of a popular prisoner. The seizure was not so flagrantly mismanaged as to take place on the very night of the great national festival. It was effected "before the Passover." Jesus was safely (and secretly) conveyed into the hands of Pilate before the multitude from Galilee had time to act. The supper of Mark 14, 17-26, which has none save the usual elements of the daily meal, leavened bread (*ἄρτος*) and wine, not the unleavened cakes (*maṣṣoth*), the sauce (*ḥaroseth*), and the roasted flesh of the Passover, corresponds to that preparatory to sacred days, sabbaths and feast-days alike, when the head of the household distributed bread and wine with a brief ritual of blessing and thanksgiving known as the Kiddush, which precedes the evening meal. Mark's description of this parting meal, has in short, nothing save the "hymn" (verse 26) to

¹ Epiphanius (Haer. i. 3) makes the motive unmistakable: "We take the sheep from the tenth day, recognizing the name of Jesus on account of the iota." The name Ἰησοῦς begin with the letter whose numerical value was 10.

² On the whole question of early Christian observance of the "Feast of Weeks" with reference to the calculation of the day of resurrection and Lordship (*κυριακή ἡμέρα*) see my article, "The Resurrection in Primitive Tradition and Observance," in *American Journal of Theology*, XV, 3 (July, 1911).

make it really correspond to the elaborate ritual of Passover, with its series of prescribed cups, and its prohibition of egress from the house until the morning. The hymn itself needs no identification with the Great Hallel to account for its citation. Christian assemblies too had their "hymns" for such occasions, which would surely appear in a description designed, like Mark's, to account for and justify prevailing usage. Even the datings beginning the paragraph on the preparation (Mark 14, 12) are so sadly confused that the preparation (which included purging the house of leaven, a ceremony of the day preceding Passover night) appears to take place "on the first day of unleavened bread." In short the circumstances and events narrated imply, even in Mark, that the last supper was not the Passover, but the meal marked by the ceremony of Kiddush which normally fell on the night before. The evangelist, who introduces the inconsistent datings of 14, 1 and 12 and the paragraph on "making ready the Passover" in the upper room (14, 12-16), is responsible for identifying the meal with the Passover; and his motive becomes apparent in the turn given to the Q logion of Luke 22, 28-30 = Matt. 19, 28. The logion has reference to a "covenanted" (*διαριθμη*) tryst at the heavenly banquet-table, a redemption feast which Jesus promises to share "in the kingdom of God" with those who have shared his "trials" here. Instead of this, Mark 14, 25 brings into special prominence the idea that the Jewish feast has no more occasion for observance, seeing it is from this time on "fulfilled in the kingdom of God."

It should not be necessary here to repeat the well known indications that the datings of the Passion story in Mark are altered from the original, and that this original would require the same "quartodeciman" datings as those of the fourth Gospel. Neither should it be necessary to repeat the reminders given in "Beginnings of Gospel Story" that we have no other explanation of the systematic marking of each quarter (or "watch") of day and night for the story of Mark 14-16 than ritual observance for the two periods of commemoration in the early Church, "the night in which (Jesus) was betrayed," marked by a vigil corresponding to the vigil of Passover, with

the following day of fast (Good Friday), and the Easter morning. In Mark 14, 17, 72; 15, 1, 33, 42; 16, 2 the periods which by the Roman Hermas are termed "stations" ¹ are marked off with the regularity and explicitness of a rubric. The evangelist could hardly say in plainer language to his reader: As Peter at midnight failed to "watch" at Jesus' entreaty (14, 37-41), so yield not thou to the weakness of the flesh, but watch and pray. As Peter at cock-crowing denied his Lord, deny thou not; remember his trial at dawn before Pilate, his crucifixion at "the third hour," his parting cry "at the ninth hour," his burial "when even was come." Remember also the tomb found empty "on the first day of the week when the sun was risen." The datings of Mark cover systematically and perfectly Rome's (anti-quartodeciman) observance of the sacred season of the Passion, reflecting every detail so far as we have the means of tracing it. But they do not in their present form correspond with the immemorial practice of the East, nor with the implications of Paul's Epistles, nor with the clear statements of the Ephesian Gospel. They even fail to correspond with the requirements of the narrative as we should infer them from the substance of Mark's own account.

Allusion has already been made to one special peculiarity of the phraseology, wherein Mark stands in curious contradiction even to the later Synoptists, who elsewhere follow his lead. It is the systematic employment of the phrase "after three days" for the interval between Good Friday night and Easter Sunday morning. In Matthew and Luke this is always changed to "the third day" save the single passage Matt. 27, 63 where Red.-Matt. has overlooked his usual correction. How perplexing the Markan expression was to early writers may be seen in the attempt of Syriac Didascalia to make out "three days" by counting the darkness of the crucifixion day as a night! ² Certainly when we consider the very early observance of Friday as a fast (Mark 2, 20, Didache, 8, 1) and the primeval observ-

¹ Sim. v. 1. *στρωλιν*.

² Syr. Didasc. 21. A trace of the same may be seen in Ev. Petri 5, 18. For fuller discussion and references see the article above referred to in American Journal of Theology, XV, 3 (July, 1911).

ance of "the Lord's day" (Rev. 1, 10) as that of the breaking of the bonds of death, it cannot be questioned that Paul's "the third day" (1 Cor. 15, 4) represents the authentic and original phrase. How, then, account for the singularity of Mark? — All the other features of his Passion story find explanation, so far as datings are concerned, in the actual practice of Roman ritual. We cannot be sure that the expression "after three days" has a similar origin, for we cannot certainly say that the fast by which the Easter festival was always preceded, varying from forty hours to forty days in its present ultimate form, was a fast of "three days" in the Roman church at the time when this evangelist wrote. We do know, however, that the vernal celebration of the fast and feast of resurrection were early prevalent at Rome, where the official establishment of the festival of the Megalesia in 204 B.C. was followed by introduction of the rites of the Phrygian Attis on March 15, 22, 24, 25, and 26. In this ritual the period of mourning, fasting, and vigil between the death of the divinity culminated in the three days, March 24 ("Sanguen"), 25 ("Hilaria"), and 26.¹ The resurrection festival of his greatest rival at Rome, Osiris, was of a like period. Early Christian observance of the paschal fast varied (as we are explicitly informed) in regard to its duration. As the story itself shows that in Mark the period really meant is the same (approximately) forty-hour period contemplated by all the evangelists, what needs to be explained is only the anomaly of an inexact expression. It is at least conceivable that the expression takes its rise from a ritual practice affected (like so many others) by the custom of pre-Christian times, the custom of a three-days' observance at vernal equinox.

The evidence for a Roman provenance for Mark derivable from indications of Roman (or Western) ritual observance forms a chapter by itself in which Mark's peculiar *façon de parler* in speaking of the interval between the crucifixion and resurrection of Jesus is only one detail. As regards this the

¹ Men, originally a lunar divinity, is later combined by theocracy with Attis, a vegetation deity. We may perhaps conjecture that the days of mourning originally coincided with the period at (astronomic) new moon when the luminary is invisible for (approximately) three days.

explanation here offered is only one of several possibilities which, so far as it goes, points to Rome as the most probable place of origin. What is really required for valid decision is a detailed and exact comparison between all the peculiarities of the Markan account of the Passion and resurrection, especially those which have reference to the fixing of days and hours, with the known peculiarities of early Roman observance.