

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

THE EXPOSITORY TIMES.

Notes of Recent Exposition.

MESSRS. T. & T. CLARK will publish about September the first volume of an *ENCYCLOPÆDIA OF RELIGION AND ETHICS*.

The aim of the *ENCYCLOPÆDIA* will be to give an account of Religion and Ethics in all ages and in all countries of the world. If it is found impossible to attain to so high a purpose, that is no reason why the purpose should not be entertained. The editor knew from the beginning that the thing which he aimed at was beyond him.

But he remembered that in all life's undertakings it is necessary to undertake not only what one is fit for, but also what one is not fit for. It is necessary to undertake what one is fit for. That is to say, there are certain lines along which one's gifts and opportunities lie—lines marked out by heredity perhaps in the first place, and afterwards by experience and environment. It is necessary for a man to understand the lines which are thus laid down for him by nature and to follow them. He must undertake what he is fit for.

But sometimes also a man must undertake what he is not fit for. There is a distinguished physician in London, at this moment perhaps the most distinguished, who has put it on record that just when his medical studies came to an end he

received the offer of an appointment which he considered himself unfit for. He called upon one of his professors and laid the matter before him. 'You consider yourself unfit for this appointment?' said the professor; 'then it is just the appointment for you.' And there is another man of whom we know, who received an appointment which was yet more clearly beyond his ability, who received about the hardest task in life that was ever given to a man to undertake. Yet he undertook and accomplished it. For when he told the story of it afterwards he said, 'Unto me *was this grace given* that I should preach among the Gentiles the unsearchable riches of Christ.'

'Unto me was this grace given.' Without it, how little a man can do; with it, how much. A month or two ago there appeared in *THE EXPOSITORY TIMES* an interesting discussion as to whether two and two could ever mean anything but four. We know that in life, where there is faith and courage, or what the cool philosopher calls optimism, two and two very often mean five, the additional one being due to this grace that is given. It is under that conviction that in the *ENCYCLOPÆDIA OF RELIGION AND ETHICS* an effort will be made persistently to give an account of Religion and Ethics throughout the world and in every age of it.

It is true that the attempt has never been

made before. For never before have Religion and Ethics held the place which they now hold in men's thoughts and interests. There was not encouragement before. Here and there a man has, single-handed, attempted an explanation of each of the great religions of the world. And once or twice each of the great religions has been put into the hands of a special student of it. But never before has every separate religious belief and practice, and every separate philosophical and ethical idea or custom, been treated in separate articles, and each of them by a man who has made that particular custom or idea his special study.

The *ENCYCLOPÆDIA OF RELIGION AND ETHICS* will contain articles on all the great religions of the world, and also on all the small religions. And these articles will not be colourless sketches. For such colourless sketches have hitherto done nothing to enlist our interest in religion or to advance its study. Space will be afforded to men like Warde Fowler to describe the Religion of Rome, Ridgeway and Farnell the Religion of Greece, Macdonell the Religion of Vedic India, Goldziher Muhammadanism, Schrader the Aryans, and Nöldeke the Ancient Arabs, with sufficient fulness to put life into their articles.

But the *ENCYCLOPÆDIA* will not only contain articles on all the great and small religions of the world. It will also contain separate articles, as we have said, on every separate religious belief and practice. For it is not possible to meet our present needs by a general article on each religion. These needs are partly the result of the immense increase in our knowledge of the world, but they are partly due to the direction which in quite recent years the study of the Bible has taken. That direction may perhaps be most shortly expressed by saying that the question is no longer what is the inspiration of the Bible, but what is the Bible. In other words, the believer in the Bible, whatever his belief may be, has now to lay the Bible alongside the sacred

books of other religions, and by a comparison maintain the reason for this preference. The 'attack' upon the Bible is made now along the lines of Comparative Religion, and parallels are produced from other religions to every doctrine and almost to every incident that it contains. Does it contain the doctrine of a Messiah? There are 'pagan Christs,' we are told, all the world over. Does it contain the incident of a Burning Bush that was not consumed, or the Institution of a Memorial Supper? We have to make good the superiority of these incidents for the spiritual life of man over similar incidents which are recorded elsewhere.

We must meet these demands. And for that purpose the feature of the *ENCYCLOPÆDIA* to which the editor has given most consideration is a great series of comparative articles. On every important topic which belongs to more than one religion there will be a series of articles by different authors, each author describing the subject according to the religion on which he is an authority. Thus—to take a single great example—on *WOMAN* there will be not one article only, but a number of articles. Professor Starr will write the American article, Professor Price the Babylonian, Mrs. Rhys Davids the Buddhist; there will be three Christian articles—Early by Professor Gwatkin, Mediæval by Professor Labanca, Modern by Principal Lindsay; the Egyptian article, will be written by Professor Flinders Petrie, the Hindu by Dr. Fick, the Muslim by Professor Hartmann, the Parsi by Bishop Casartelli, the Roman by Mr. Hall, the Teutonic by Miss Steele Smith; and there are others which are not assigned yet.

But, thoroughly as religion will be treated, it is only half the contents of the *ENCYCLOPÆDIA*. Ethics will be treated as thoroughly. When the editor began the preparation of the *ENCYCLOPÆDIA* six years ago, he expected to have to explain why he had made it cover both Religion and Ethics. For even a few years ago it was not understood

that the study of Religion and Ethics cannot be separated. One eminent scholar to whom our plans were imparted, objected to the inclusion of both in one work on the ground that one of them was all theory and the other all practice, and that therefore it was not only not necessary but not possible to bring them together. That opinion, we believe, is scarcely held now. Innumerable books have recently appeared on Religion or Ethics. But in all cases in which they have been treated separately, if they have been treated at all scientifically, the author has pointed out that he has found it impossible to keep Religion and Ethics apart, and that the separate treatment is in appearance, not in reality, and due only to the exigencies of space. Almost every article in the *ENCYCLOPÆDIA* will be a witness to the impossibility of treating them apart.

So the inclusion of Ethics along with Religion was determined upon, not merely because so much would otherwise have been lost, but because, in our present state of knowledge, the one cannot be separated from the other. And when it was determined to include Ethics it was determined to deal with it as thoroughly as with Religion. Every ethical and philosophical system will be described, as well as every separate ethical idea and every separate moral practice. It may be found sufficient to describe RELIGION itself in a single great article, but it is probable that besides that which is said about Ethics in the articles on the various tribes and nations of the world, and besides Professor Muirhead's introductory philosophical article, there will be a great comparative series of articles on ETHICS, the Ethics of the American Indians being laid alongside those of the Australians, Babylonians, Buddhists, Celts, and all the rest. There will also be separate articles on Commercial Ethics, on International Ethics, on Literary, Medical, and Military Ethics, and on the Ethics of Art. And each article will be written by a man who has made a special study of the subject and is recognized as an authority upon it.

The study of Ethics enters into Socialism and Psychology. And although there may be physical or material parts of these sciences which will not be embraced within the scope of the *ENCYCLOPÆDIA*, everything in them that touches us most closely and makes them living issues will be found in it. There will be articles on the Abandonment of the Aged and the Exposure of Children, on Abetment, Abortion, Aboulia, on Accidents, Accidie, Accumulation, Activity, Adaptation, Adolescence. There will be a series of articles on Adoption and on Adultery. There will be an article on Adulteration; an article on Age, on Agitation, on Alcohol; a series of articles on Almsgiving or Charity; an article on Ambition, on Amusements, on Anarchism; a great article on Animals; and many more.

There has been no difficulty in fixing the scope of the *ENCYCLOPÆDIA OF RELIGION AND ETHICS*, but there has been great difficulty in estimating its probable extent. What is wanted is thoroughness. Every line will be watched to see that it is not wasted, but in the present temper of the students of Religion and Ethics the book that is content with colourless epitomizing is doomed to failure. Each volume will be a handsome imperial octavo of some 900 pages. Special printing devices have been adopted in order to catch the eye and give ready access to the information. In this there is some advance on all previous dictionary or encyclopædic work. It is estimated that the volumes required will be ten in number. After the first, which will be issued in September, they will appear, it is expected, about the rate of one in the year. But not more than one. So that, although the price of such a volume must be large—it is fixed at 28s. net—it will not be so difficult to pay it at such an interval. It is a great satisfaction that a very large number of those who have already been made aware of the nature of the work have subscribed for it in advance. And if any of the readers of *THE EXPOSITORY TIMES* have the courage to send their names before publication, the editor or the publishers will be glad to receive them. It will

involve no prepayment or other obligation. The volumes may be obtained in the usual way through the booksellers. Prospectuses have been prepared and will be sent to any address that is given.

Messrs. Hodder & Stoughton have published a new edition of Bishop Hall's *Christ Mystical*. It is the reprint of a copy which General Gordon read and marked and then presented to the Rev. H. Carruthers Wilson, M.A. And it contains an introduction by Mr. Carruthers Wilson on General Gordon's theology. What was General Gordon's theology?

'It will easily be seen,' says Mr. Carruthers Wilson, 'that such a man would never have a theology exact and homogeneous in all its details.' And so far General Gordon is not singular. Very few of us have a theology that is exact and homogeneous in all its details. 'He took a few great truths of Scripture and made them part of his very being.' He made them part of his very being—General Gordon's singularity lies in that. Mr. Carruthers Wilson mentions four great truths.

The first is the Indwelling of God. This was the central truth of religion to Gordon. This was the truth that brought abiding peace to his own soul. 'It would have been a great blessing to me,' he said, 'if someone had told me early in my wilderness journey to seek the realization of the Holy Ghost's presence in me, and leave the rest. When he found it at last, he did not possess it; it possessed him.'

The doctrine which took the next place in Gordon's personal theology was Faith as the result of the indwelling of God. He held that we receive the Holy Spirit as the gift of God, and that He awakens in us the faith which works out our salvation. His own words are, 'Faith is the direct effect of the indwelling of the Holy Ghost.' The indwelling first, faith next—that is the order.

And 'on this point Gordon was very decided.' So the ordinary arguments about conversion did not touch him. They were folly to him. 'No argument is wanting,' he said; 'just realize that God's Spirit is in you.'

The third thing was an absolute trust in Providence. 'Everything is from God, and of God.' These were his usual words. And when he said everything, he meant it. If the indwelling of God gave him peace, this gave him courage. It was his courage that most astonished the world. Why should he fear? He was only an instrument in God's hand. Death? Death could only bring him closer to God. It was for this they called him fatalistic. 'But at least,' says Mr. Carruthers Wilson, 'it was not the fatalism of the slothful. He was one of the most indefatigable workers I ever knew. Up early every morning, his first hour was given to prayer and reading. No one dare disturb him there. At nine he began his work at the Forts, and often was in Thames mud till two o'clock. The afternoon and evening were devoted to visiting the infirmary, workhouse, or the sick and infirm.'

The last great truth was Union with Christ. Union with Christ was by the indwelling of the Holy Ghost. And the fruits of the Holy Ghost were the outcome of it. He called union with Christ 'the Alpha and Omega of all life.' To nourish this union he read certain books of devotion. His three favourites were *The Imitation of Christ*, Hill's *Deep Things of God*, and Hall's *Christ Mystical*.

In estimating the place of those four doctrines in Gordon's life, Mr. Carruthers Wilson differs from Gordon himself. Gordon himself thought that the Indwelling of God was the most potent factor in his creed. Mr. Carruthers Wilson thinks that the Union with Christ had most influence in moulding his character and conduct. It grew with his growth. In 1868 he held it firmly. In 1883 it pervades every thought, and is to be

noticed on almost every page of his *Reflections*. On one page he says: 'To me the fact that my soul is so united to my body that I know not which is my body and which my soul, is a proof of the oneness of Christ with our souls, neither step being visible as a definite step, while each is a step.'

Two volumes by the Rev. Henry Howard have been published about the same time. The one is an exposition of the 23rd Psalm. *The Shepherd Psalm* it is called (Culley; 1s.). The other is called *The Raiment of the Soul, and Other Studies* (Culley; 3s. 6d.). It is a volume of sermons. Both books are thoughtful and independent enough in their exposition to be called original. Even on the 23rd Psalm one may stay and discover something new. But there is nothing in either book by which to identify the thinker quite so unmistakably as the first sermon in *The Raiment of the Soul*, the sermon that gives the volume its title.

The text of the sermon is 'The fine linen is the righteous acts of the saints' (Rev 19⁸). You observe the translation. Mr. Howard follows the Revised Version. The fine linen is not the 'righteousness' of the saints, but their 'righteous acts.' And it is not the righteousness of saints, as the Authorized Version has it, but the righteous acts of *the* saints, of the very saints who are wearing it. In short, the meaning of the text, as Mr. Howard understands it, is that 'the raiment in which the ransomed saint shall appear at the Marriage Supper of the Lamb will have been woven out of the deeds which he has done in the body.'

So we have here the old metaphor of the web of life, and a new and startling use of it. 'What we put into the shuttle,' says Mr. Howard, 'comes out in the web.' If we do not want to see it there, we must not put it in here. The garment with which the soul shall be girt in that life will be woven with our own hands. It will not be a robe

with which we shall be invested from without, or by the hands of any other.

But this is very like a doctrine of good works. Mr. Howard is a Wesleyan. Is there such a thing as an unevangelical Wesleyan? No, there is no such thing. Mr. Howard is evangelical. He asserts the necessity of good works certainly, but he asserts the necessity of faith also. And he puts them in the right order. Faith goes first, works follow. Spiritual life must precede the performance of spiritual acts. Just as we must postulate the possession of vital force as the necessary antecedent to the exercise of vital function, so, says Mr. Howard, we must presuppose the possession of a righteous principle as the necessary prelude to righteous practice.

But if the saint's robe of righteousness is woven by his own hands, how is it the gift of God? It is the gift of God just as Bezalel's work in the setting of precious stones and the carving of wood was the gift of God. God did not carve the wood for him, He gave him the heart to carve it. It is said in the Gospels that God clothes the grass of the field. It is not said that He clothes the field with grass. He clothes the grass itself. For there is a time when the grass is naked. It is bare grain, it may chance of wheat or of some other kind. But in that bare grain, in every naked seed of grass, there is packed a whole set of weaving machinery, distilling apparatus, and pumping gear; and along with it all there is packed driving power in the shape of vital force. Place the seed under favourable conditions and the pumps begin to work, the shuttles begin to fly, and the grass receives its raiment of green or gold.

There is still one difficulty remaining. There is a text which says, 'Abraham believed God, and it was imputed to him for righteousness.' Has Mr. Howard forgotten the doctrine of imputation? Has he forgotten that the righteousness of saints is the imputed righteousness of Christ?

Mr. Howard has considered the doctrine of imputation. He has come to the conclusion that no Christian doctrine has been more misunderstood or more persistently misrepresented. For the evangelical is often slanderously reported to believe that in heaven he will be able to appear in fine linen made of the imputed righteousness of Christ, although he has never done any righteous acts on earth or ever had any serious intention of doing them. And it must be confessed that sometimes, if he is a very ignorant evangelical, he thinks and says that that is the way of it. What, he asks, is the imputed righteousness of Christ for? Is it not to be a substitute for those righteous acts which he has omitted to do, and for the lack of which he means to have a thorough death-bed repentance?

Mr. Howard believes in the imputed righteousness of Christ. He believes it is righteousness with which a man is credited before he possesses it actually, if he possesses it potentially. But he must possess it potentially. The bank manager gives the farmer an advance upon the coming harvest when the seed has just been sown. The harvest is not gathered in. There is not a blade of corn above the ground yet. It is an imputed harvest. But no bank manager would be justified in crediting a farmer with an ungathered harvest if he did not know that the ground had been made ready and that the seed had been sown.

In the season of Advent, 1907, the Dean of Westminster delivered three lectures in Westminster Abbey on 'The Historical Character of St. John's Gospel.' He has now published them (Longmans; 6d. net). Dr. Robinson knows that the historical character of St. John's Gospel cannot be satisfactorily established in three lectures. He has selected for discussion such points as appeal most readily to a popular audience. One of these is the raising of Lazarus from the dead.

The Dean of Westminster addresses not only a

popular audience, but also a believing one. He deliberately disregards 'those who are unable to admit that any of the narratives of the raising of the dead can possibly be historically true.' And, having selected his audience, he asks them why they should have more difficulty in believing in the raising of Lazarus than in the raising of the daughter of Jairus or the son of the widow of Nain. The only difference that he can see is that Lazarus was longer dead.

But it is something that Lazarus was longer dead. It is a good deal in a country like Palestine. The difference must not be made light of. Dr. Robinson does not make light of it. He believes that 'the ordinary processes of decay were suspended by the Divine providence which intended the return to life.'

What proof has Dr. Armitage Robinson of that? Of direct proof he has none. And it is somewhat doubtful if the consideration he suggests by way of indirect proof will bear the meaning he puts upon it. He says that our Lord first spoke of the death of Lazarus as a 'sleep.' And in that word he sees a hint that the process of decay was suspended in expectation of Christ's personal intervention. But the same word is used at the death of Jairus's daughter. And it cannot have escaped the notice of the Dean of Westminster that the use of the word 'sleep' for death is part of our Lord's teaching on the difference between the death that is only 'falling asleep in Jesus' and the death that is death indeed. 'He that is alive and believeth in me shall never die.' But (in the apostolic phrase) 'she that liveth in sin is dead while she liveth.'

Is it necessary to say that 'the ordinary processes of decay were suspended by the Divine providence which intended the return to life'? We must never make a miracle a greater miracle than we find it. But, on the other hand, we need never try to make it less. The Dean of Westminster is not one to be deliberately guilty of it, but there are those who

whittle away the supernatural elements from the miracles till they are no longer miracles. The Evangelists may have been mistaken in believing that Christ worked miracles, but no one need try to prove that they did not believe it.

The difficulties about the raising of Lazarus from the dead do not include the length of time he was in the tomb. If we can believe that he was raised, we can believe that he was raised after the fourth day. The Dean of Westminster knows where the difficulties lie. They belong to the criticism of the Gospels. They arise out of a comparison between St. John and the Synoptics—especially between St. John and St. Mark.

The first difficulty is that there seems to be no place for the raising of Lazarus in the framework of St. Mark's Gospel. The second is that this miracle seems to contradict St. Mark's account of the events which led to the crucifixion. And the third is that, if it happened, St. Mark must have known of it and would have mentioned it. Dr. Robinson considers these difficulties separately.

The first objection to the raising of Lazarus is that there is no place for it in the framework of St. Mark's Gospel. Dr. Robinson admits that. But he holds that that is the fault of St. Mark's framework. It is too narrow. It is too narrow to admit all the facts which we receive even from the other Synoptic Gospels. Take the journey from Galilee to Jerusalem. St. Mark tells it in fifty-two verses. St. Luke occupies four hundred verses. It is evident that St. Luke found St. Mark's framework too narrow for all the incidents which he had discovered relating to this time, and, not having the means of rectifying that framework, he fitted in his materials as best he could without disturbing it.

The second objection is that St. Mark's narrative of the events which led up to the crucifixion not only leaves no room for the raising of Lazarus, but is absolutely inconsistent with it. This is a more

serious matter. St. John seems to say that the raising of Lazarus was the immediate cause of the arrest, condemnation, and crucifixion of Jesus. St. Mark shows that as the Jewish rulers got more hostile, the Galilean popularity melted away. Jesus knew that the powers would strike when they could. He was conscious that this visit to Jerusalem would be His last. He forewarned His disciples. As He prophesied, so it came to pass. After a few days of public teaching in the Temple, He was betrayed, arrested, and put to death. No particular incident is emphasized as hastening on the crisis.

Now it would be folly to deny this difference. Dr. Armitage Robinson does not deny it. He admits that in some respects the two narratives are inconsistent. He thinks that sometimes we must choose between a detail in St. Mark and a detail which conflicts with it in St. John; and that in default of other evidence we must 'cautiously apply the test of intrinsic probability.' And he gives an example. He thinks that we get from St. John an explanation of the enthusiasm of the triumphal entry which is missing in St. Mark, and cannot be quite satisfactorily harmonized with his narrative. That explanation is, of course, the astonishment and excitement over the raising of Lazarus from the dead.

But, after all, if there are discordant details, they are minor details. And they seem to be due to a difference of standpoint in telling the story. 'The one narrator stands in Galilee, so to speak, and watches the fatal progress from Galilee to Jerusalem; the other narrator stands in Jerusalem, or its immediate vicinity, and watches the reception there, and describes the particular circumstances which made it what it was.'

And besides that, is it true to say that St. John represents the raising of Lazarus as the immediate cause of our Lord's arrest and death? Dr. Robinson holds that it is altogether an exaggeration to say so. St. John does indeed emphasize

the exasperation and the plotting of His enemies in connexion with this miracle. But not in connexion with this miracle only. And he quotes nine passages, in all of which some strong offence is noted, and all before the raising of Lazarus. The impression which the raising of Lazarus makes upon some of the critics of the Gospels is due to their way of taking that section of St. John's Gospel and making it stand alone. Take it as it comes. Give it its place in St. John's whole story, and it has by no means the emphasis which is claimed for it. Certainly it roused public interest, and in proportion as it roused public interest and enthusiasm, it would doubtless whet the edge of hostility. But the intention to destroy Him was already formed, and several attempts had been made to carry it out.

The last objection is that if a miracle, creating so great a sensation in Jerusalem, had actually taken place, St. Mark must have known of it, and if he knew of it he must have mentioned it.

This is the objection which appeals most forcibly to the indifferent reader of the Gospels. With the careful student it carries much less weight. For it is an application of the old argument from silence, and the argument from silence has been much discredited in our day. A single discovery has often made the argument from silence look foolish. In this case no discovery is needed. St. Mark treats this whole period with excessive brevity. He has omitted many other things. And if this thing is not so very significant as it has been claimed to be, he may have deliberately omitted it also. He has enough, from the Galilean point of view, to explain the fatal issue. He has no need to explain, if indeed he knew, that the issue was hastened by the public sensation which this miracle produced.

The foregoing notes had just been written when the *Contemporary Review* for April arrived, with

an article by Professor Gwatkin on 'The Raising of Lazarus.'

Professor Gwatkin has been reading Burkitt's *Gospel History and its Transmission*. He is immensely impressed by that book. He calls it 'Professor Burkitt's brilliant work'; and again he describes it as 'most suggestive.' But when Professor Burkitt argues that the Fourth Gospel cannot be historical because the Synoptists do not record the raising of Lazarus, he frankly rejects the argument.

'Of course,' he says, 'Professor Burkitt is far above the reckless criticism which summarily sets down every omission to ignorance. He is well aware that an *argumentum e silentio* is precarious, unless particular reason can be given why the omitted fact should have been recorded. He fully allows that no argument can be based on the omission of an ordinary incident. But, says he, and quite rightly, the raising of Lazarus is not an ordinary incident. It not only made a great stir at the time, but is actually the turning-point of our Lord's life, for it directly caused the decision to put Him to death. Now if the story were historical, the Synoptists must have known it; and if they knew it, they must have recorded it—which they have not done. Therefore he concludes that the story is not historical. And if the raising of Lazarus is not historical, we can all agree that neither is the Fourth Gospel, as a whole, historical.'

That is Professor Burkitt's argument. Professor Gwatkin summarizes it in those few sentences, with perfect accuracy and perfect lucidity. He does not agree with it. He is about to call the reasoning reckless. He does call it unsound. At which step in the argument does the fallacy lie? It lies in the statement that if the Synoptists knew the fact they must have recorded it.

Before we can presume to say that an author *must* record this or that, we have to make sure what sort of book he meant to write. Professor

Gwatkin does not think that Professor Burkitt made sure. He does not think that he gave the matter a thought. Professor Burkitt, he says, treats the Evangelists as if they were modern historians. He takes it as self-evident that they could not have deliberately omitted any fact which a modern historian would think important. But this cannot be taken as self-evident. It must be proved. And until it is proved Professor Burkitt's argument is in the air.

Professor Gwatkin does not deny that the Evangelists have an interest in facts. But their interest in facts, he says, is not historical, it is religious. It is true that St. Luke is careful to determine a single date. But his determination of that single date is the exception which proves the rule. In this respect the Gospels are like the 'Lives of the Saints.' Adamnan's *Life of Columba* gives us a very good idea of the man, but it is singularly barren of historical information. In like manner, the purpose of the Evangelists is not to satisfy the historian's curiosity, but to show what manner of man the Lord was. We may think that they would be careful to record at least the most astonishing displays of power they could hear of. But they are not careful. If the Synoptists do not record the raising of Lazarus, neither does St. John record the raising of Jairus's daughter and of the widow's son at Nain.

And there is more in the matter than that. If the Evangelists had their reasons for recording certain facts, they may have had their motives for omitting other facts. Let us take a hint from the marked reticence of St. Luke about the family at Bethany. Is it not possible that the

Synoptists left out the story of Lazarus, whom the Jews sought to kill, deliberately, just as they have omitted the name of the disciple who struck off the servant's ear? 'There are many stories,' says Professor Gwatkin, 'and even some of passing notoriety, which no right-minded man will care to publish till certain persons have been placed by death beyond the reach of danger.'

But, says Professor Burkitt, the difficulty about the omission of the raising of Lazarus is that, according to the Fourth Gospel, it actually caused the decision to put Jesus to death. Professor Gwatkin thinks that Dr. Burkitt makes too much of that. That decision was coming at any rate. It was only a question of sooner or later. The Pharisees had long ago taken counsel with the Herodians to put Him to death. These Herodians were roughly the Sadducees. But the dominant Sadducees, the priests who had the power to carry the counsel into action, seem to have been unwilling to help them. When they gave their help it was effective. But why should they help? The Prophet of Nazareth was a pestilent fellow, but He had not attacked *them* very much; and if He was a thorn in the side of the Pharisees, that was a reason for letting Him alone. The stir made by the raising of Lazarus, however, thoroughly alarmed them. Caiaphas went over to the Pharisees. The way was clear for a decision. It is partly as a preface to this decision that St. John seems to tell the story, just as he relates the Feeding of the Five Thousand with a view to the discourse at Capernaum. And as he tells it he enables us to see that if Christ died for that nation, and not for that nation only, He gave His life a ransom in a special sense for Lazarus.