

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

Mustard Seed, Matthew and Luke (Mt 13^{31, 32}, Lk 13^{18, 19}) describe the seed as 'becoming a tree' (δέιδρον). As the mustard plant is only a herb—an *annual*—this expression is now allowed to be an 'exaggeration.' Mark does not employ this inaccurate expression, but uses instead the words 'putteth out great branches'—κλάδους μεγάλους—perhaps more correctly translated 'large twigs.'

Matthew and Luke again describe the birds of the heaven as 'lodging *in* the branches thereof.' Mark, on the other hand, says: 'can lodge *under* the shadow thereof'—a much more suitable expression for a herb. And Mark is careful not to say that birds do actually lodge under its shadow, but only that it is possible (δύνασθαι) for them to do so.

(iv) In the account of the Withering of the Fig-tree (11¹³) only Mark makes the significant explanation, 'for it was not the season of figs.' And in describing the condition of the tree after it had withered, he alone adds, 'from the roots': as a gardener Mark knew that an accidental injury might have caused a partial withering, but here the life of the tree had entirely passed out of it.

(v) In his account of the Triumphal Entry (11¹⁻¹¹) only Mark uses the technical term σπιβάδας—'layers of leaves' (11⁸). Matthew has only the ordinary word for 'twigs'—κλάδους.

It is also noteworthy that the four parables recorded by Mark all deal with the life of the garden and the fields. The parable peculiar to Mark—the Seed growing secretly—takes the place of the domestic parable of the Leaven, given in Matthew. And the exactness of the

language of Mark in this parable is very striking—the seed 'sprouting and *lengthening*'; the three stages of growth—'first the blade, then the ear, then the full corn in the ear'; and the fruit 'permitting' the husbandman to 'put forth the sickle.' It is hard to believe that Mark received from Peter the parable in this concise form where almost every word is charged with suggestive detail.

I believe that the cumulative effect of these citations goes far to prove that Mark's occupation was gardening, and to confirm the theory that I have propounded.

We may now try to reconstruct the scene in the Garden. When Jesus and His disciples went to Gethsemane, Mark was already there, passing the night, as the custom was, in the watch-tower. He did not know that Jesus would be coming there, and when he heard voices in the garden he immediately arose in his night garment to see what was taking place. And he came across Jesus, and overheard His words of anguish. It may be, indeed, that he even tried to console Him, and that his appearance in a white garment caused those of the disciples who had remained on the confines of the garden—farther away than Peter, James, and John (Mt 26³⁶)—to imagine him to be an angel. (This would explain the origin of the interpolated verse about the angel in Lk 22⁴³.) When soon afterwards the crowd led by Judas entered the garden, Mark hastened to remonstrate with them for their intrusion, but they began to jeer at him and rough-handle him, so that he was fain to escape naked to the watch-tower.

The Raising of Lazarus.

By EDWARD GRUBB, M.A., LETCHWORTH.

Is the narrative in the eleventh chapter of John a story of fact, or is it a piece of deliberate fiction? Quite obviously the author intended it to be taken as history, for in the next chapter 'Lazarus, whom he raised from the dead,' is introduced again, and in a very matter-of-fact way; and the miracle is represented as the chief cause of the temporary popularity of Jesus at Jerusalem, and of the determination of the chief priests to put Him to death (Jn 11^{46-12¹⁹}). But those critics who conclude

that the story is unbelievable have weighty arguments on their side.

1. In the first place, the modern conception of the miracles of Jesus (which in fact goes back at least to Augustine), that they were 'not contrary to nature, but only to what is known of nature,' seems to fail us altogether when it is a case of believing that a man was restored to life when so completely dead that his body had begun to decay. (It is true that this supposition of the anxious

Martha is not explicitly endorsed by the writer, but he seems to have reported it with the aim of bringing out to the utmost the astounding character of the miracle.) Belief in such an occurrence is only consistent with the doctrine which represents miracles as infractions of the ultimate laws of nature—a theory which I for one find myself quite unable to hold.

2. The most serious evidential objection to the reality of the occurrence is, of course, the silence of the Synoptists. Mark's omission of it might possibly be explained by the absence, at the time, of his informant, Peter (see Burkitt, *Gospel History*, pp. 96, 97); and the first Gospel was mainly dependent on Mark for its narrative of events. But the silence of Luke, who claims to have 'traced the course of all things accurately from the first,' and whose Gospel is now by most critics given a high place as history, is a graver difficulty. If the miracle really occurred, it would seem that Luke must have heard about it; and if it held the important place in determining the events that followed, which it has in the Fourth Gospel, he could hardly, as a careful historian, have omitted to mention it.

3. The raising of Lazarus does not stand alone, but may be regarded as an extreme instance of the tendency of the fourth evangelist to deal very freely with his material, whether this consists of events or discourses. Every careful student now agrees that his Gospel is not to be put side by side with the Synoptic narratives, but should be regarded as an *interpretation* of the person and teaching of Jesus rather than as a bare narrative: the happy phrase of Clement of Alexandria, 'a spiritual Gospel,' is felt to describe it accurately. The presence of a rather subtle and elaborate symbolism, underlying his choice of subjects and his method of dealing with them must be admitted; and symbolism is found here—the story must be read as illustrating the great saying, 'I am the resurrection and the life.' Further, the fact that he transfers to the beginning of our Lord's ministry the expulsion of the money-changers from the temple, which Mark and Luke represent as mainly determining the authorities 'to destroy him,' leaves a gap in the sequence of events. It is plausible to suggest that he has filled the gap by the invention of this resounding miracle.

On the other hand, the negative conclusion, to which many serious students feel themselves driven,

is itself attended with grave difficulties. Chief among these, perhaps, are the realistic details which are by no means what we should expect were the author simply romancing. The realism of the story so impressed Ernest Renan that, rejecting as he did the possibility of miracles, he yet came to the grotesque conclusion that Lazarus really came from the tomb at the bidding of Jesus, but that it was a bogus miracle got up by the family at Bethany to further (as they thought) the purposes of Jesus—to which, in a moment of weakness, He lent Himself.¹

As has been said above, we inevitably tend to classify a narrative such as this in the light of our impression of the whole book in which it occurs. And it is not easy to hold steadily, in view of all the facts, the impression that this book is one of pure romance. On some points of history, such as our Lord's ministry at Jerusalem, and the date of His crucifixion, it seems to give us real facts, the truth of which is testified to by fragmentary references in the Synoptics themselves, though contrary to the views they seem to have held. And the details which occur in many of the Johannine narratives, even after full allowance is made for the author's love of symbolism, are most simply and readily explained as due to some one's recollection—his own or that of his informant. Personally, I find it very difficult to believe that he would deliberately invent a story of such importance as that of the raising of Lazarus, and try to pass it off as fact. Of course, if that is the only conclusion to which the evidence leads us, we must accept it, whatever surrender of cherished convictions this involves, and however sorrowfully it may lower our sense of the religious value of the book and the spiritual sustenance it has brought us. But I do not think we are driven to this issue. In the Lazarus story, especially, it may be there is a middle path by which we may avoid the

¹ *Life of Jesus* (English translation, 1863), pp. 250, 251. 'Tired of the cold reception which the Kingdom of God found in the capital, the friends of Jesus wished for a great miracle which should strike powerfully the incredulity of the Hierosolymites. The resurrection of a man known at Jerusalem appeared to them most likely to carry conviction. . . . We must remember that in this dull and impure city of Jerusalem, Jesus was no longer himself. Not by any fault of his own, but by that of others, his conscience had lost something of its original purity. Desperate, and driven to extremity, he was no longer his own master. His mission overwhelmed him, and he yielded to the torrent,' etc.

difficulties of either extreme. Perhaps it is based on something that did really occur, but which the author has characteristically idealized—telling it in his own way, to make it yield thoughts about Jesus and His work which he believed were true. The objection that this does not get over the omission of the story by the Synoptists is not perhaps fatal. The silence of Mark (and also of Luke, supposing an early date for his Gospel can be accepted, say during the sixties or seventies of the first century) may possibly be due in part to the reluctance of the Bethany family to be brought into public notice during their lifetime.

If we take the story as it stands, we see that it is so reported as to give the impression that Jesus knew from the first moment when He received the news of the sickness of Lazarus that He would raise him from the dead, and so would manifest the 'glory' of His Father (Jn 11⁴). But incidents are recorded which, if we read carefully between the lines, seem capable of a different and certainly more natural explanation. Jesus began by telling the disciples that 'this sickness is not unto death'—by which, surely, He may have meant exactly what He said, that He thought it would not prove fatal. He remained 'two days in the place where he was'; then, having apparently received an inward intimation that the illness had after all ended in death, He proposed, fully knowing the risk, to go at once into Judea. The reason given for this shows almost certainly that the explanation of His delay is that He had not been sure what the Divine will was. 'If a man walk in the night, he stumbleth, because the light is not in him.' He then told His disciples what He had inwardly discerned—breaking the death gently to them under the figure of sleep, and afterwards stating it in plain terms.

When He reached the neighbourhood of Bethany the information came that Lazarus had died four days before. There is evidence, I understand, of a notion among the Jews that the departed soul lingered near the body for four days; so that if He had thought it might be God's will that He should restore His friend to life, He may now have feared that it was too late to do so. The behaviour of the two bereaved sisters is strikingly consistent with their characters as depicted in the brief passage Lk 10³⁸⁻⁴², but, so far as I can see, there is no trace of borrowing. The restless

Martha jumped up at once to go to Jesus, while Mary the dreamer 'still sat in the house.' The conversation of Jesus with Martha appears to be idealized so as to bring out with the greatest force the statement 'I am the resurrection and the life,' and to suggest that belief in Jesus as the Son of God is the great essential. Then Martha returned to her sister with the news that Jesus wanted her. It was from her that He had received special sympathy and understanding, and He needed now again to receive as well as to give it. Why did He remain at that distance from the place, instead of going at once to Mary? No cause for the further delay is suggested; but if His path had been obscure before, is it not reasonable to suppose that the information about the date of the death had brought back His doubts? This, it seems to me, is the only adequate explanation of the terrible agitation that followed. Jesus *ἐνεβριμήσατο τῷ πνεύματι καὶ ἐτάραξεν ἑαυτόν*. He shook all over, and groaned inwardly (the word by its derivation suggests snorting like an excited horse), and finally broke down in sobs. The evangelist puts this down to sympathy with the sorrow of Mary and her friends; but if he correctly represents Jesus as fully knowing that He would shortly raise Lazarus to life, what need was there for such intense sympathy? Another explanation¹ is that He was indignant at their unbelief (the word *ἐμβριμάομαι* expresses indignation in Mk 14⁵ and elsewhere), but this appears equally unsatisfactory. Surely He would not be angry with them for not expecting such a miracle as the raising to life of one who had been dead four days!

Neither of the extreme views of the narrative—first that it is all fact, and second that it is all fiction—gives any acceptable explanation of the almost unbearable stress and strain through which the soul of Jesus is represented as passing. On the first view there was no need for it; on the second it is about the last thing that a romance writer would have invented. He would surely have made Jesus thoroughly master of the situation—perfectly calm and self-possessed. What the writer has done, it seems to me, is to record facts without having rightly understood their mean-

¹ See article 'Notes on Jn 11,' in THE EXPOSITORY TIMES, Dec. 1920, by Rev. A. Henderson, D.D. (pp. 123 ff.). The writer sees (correctly, as I think) that Jesus delayed to go to Bethany because 'He was waiting for light,' but he does not carry the suggestion through.

ing.¹ The real explanation, I venture to suggest, is that Jesus was seeking with the most intense earnestness to know His Father's will, which had not yet been fully revealed to Him. To go forward 'in the night' would be not only to 'stumble,' it would be to 'tempt the Lord thy God'; and to fail in the effort would bring utter disaster and final ruin on all He had lived for.

The agitation of Jesus is represented as continuing until He reached the tomb. Then, the stone having been removed at His bidding, in spite of Martha's anxious protest, He '*lifted up his eyes*, and said, Father, I thank thee that thou hearest me.' In answer to His agonizing prayer, the light had come to Him at last, and He saw clearly what He was to do. He called Lazarus from the tomb, and Lazarus came.

I think this story must be based on fact, because of the uninventible details it contains; and, with such reading between the lines as is here suggested, it seems possible to understand (more or less) what happened.² I do not myself suppose that Martha's fears about the opening of the tomb were justified. I do not take it that Lazarus was so completely 'dead' as to be beyond the possibility of resuscitation if the right methods could have

¹ Other instances of apparent misunderstanding of things recorded are in Jn 2²¹, 'He spake of the temple of his body,' and 12²⁸, 'this he said, signifying by what manner of death he should die.' The presence of these apparent misapprehensions tells strongly against the romance theory of the book.

² For a similar view of the problem see *Cambridge Biblical Essays*, 'The Historical Value of the Fourth Gospel,' by A. E. Brooke, esp. pp. 312-316.

been employed. There are death-like trances which may last for many days; and I imagine the few cases in which Jesus is reported to have raised the dead to life were of this character. The patients were probably beyond the power of any medical skill or methods available in those days, and would, I suppose, soon have succumbed completely if Jesus had not intervened with a supernatural control of matter by spirit. These 'miracles' I take to have been simply an extension to persons apparently dead of His ordinary works of healing, and to have been wrought in the same way. The fewness of the reported cases suggests that He never attempted to restore the dead indiscriminately, and only did so when He had an inward intimation that it was the Divine will for Him to act.

The most satisfying view of the Fourth Gospel as a whole appears to be that its records are based on fact, but that the facts are idealized and interpreted in accordance with the deep spiritual purpose of the writer. Used with care, the religious purpose being always kept in mind, its records may be found to supplement and even usefully to correct the Synoptic account. It has often been pointed out, for instance, that there is a hiatus in the Synoptic story of the events leading up to the crucifixion: nothing is recorded by Mark which adequately accounts for the enthusiasm of the people at the triumphal entry into Jerusalem (Mk 11⁸⁻¹⁰). Such a mighty work as the raising of Lazarus, even if somewhat less 'mighty' than the fourth evangelist has made it appear, seems to fill the gap.

In the Study.

Virginitus Puerisque.

Upside Down.

'These that have turned the world upside down.'—Ac 17⁶.

THE other month Mr. Horace Hutchinson, who writes about all kinds of interesting things like golf and fishing, told a story of a magpie. It seems he has a brother who is fond of gardening: and one day he was planting out his geraniums, if I remember it aright—a whole heap of them, bed on bed. It's tiring work, and no doubt he grew hot and stiff:

but at last it was finished, and he rose up and straightened his sore cramped back, and looked at his work with pride and went indoors. A magpie had been watching, and now it hopped forward and looked at the neat beds, thought, evidently, there was something wrong, took each geranium and with a sharp tug pulled it out, planted it upside down, with its roots in the air and its leaves in the hole; and then, sitting with its head on one side, looked again at this new rearrangement of it all, as if it were saying to itself, 'Ah! now that's a good deal better!'