

TWO ANSWERS TO THE CHALLENGE OF JESUS.

BY WILLIAM WEBER.

(Continued)

THE Cleansing of the Temple has a double aspect. It was, on the one hand, an attack upon the chief priests and their allies, the scribes. On the other hand, it was a bold stroke for the religious liberty of the people. From both sides there must have come an answer. His enemies could not simply ignore what happened. Unless they were ready to accept the Galilean as their master, they were compelled to think of ways and means by which to defeat him. At the same time, his friends and admirers would discuss his valiant deed and formulate certain conclusions as to his character and authority, the more so as the chief priests themselves had first broached that question in public. Thus we may expect a twofold answer to the challenge of Jesus provided the Gospels have preserved a complete account.

The story of the Cleansing of the Temple is not continued at once. It is followed in all four Gospels by a rather copious collection of sayings of Jesus. Especially the Synoptists represent him as teaching in the temple as well as on his way to and from that sanctuary. Those teachings consist of three groups. The first comprises parables and sayings which are found in one Gospel only. The second contains discourses vouched for by two of the Gospels. The third belongs to all three. The first two groups may be put aside without any further examination because they do not form part of the common Synoptic source. They may be very important as far as they hand down to us genuine words of Jesus; but they cannot be classified as sources as to what actually occurred during the last days before the crucifixion. The third group demands a closer study. It may be an integral part of the oldest Synoptic writing to which the Cleansing of the Temple has to be assigned. It contains the following sections: (1) The Tribute to Cæsar (Mt. xxii. 15-22), (2) The Question of the Sadducees (Mt. xxii. 23-33),

(3) The Sonship of the Messiah (Mt. xxii. 41-46), and (4) The Destruction of Jerusalem, the Coming of the Messiah, and the Lesson from the Figtree (Mt. xxiv. 1-51).

The last three sections fit hardly into the situation which Jesus had created by cleansing the temple. The problem proposed by the Sadducees was a trick question, designed to cast ridicule upon the Pharisaic doctrine of the resurrection. One imagines to behold them grinning sarcastically while asking their query. But after the cleansing of the temple the Sadducees did not feel like playing with Jesus. Besides, the answer, put into his mouth, might have been returned by any Pharisee as is proved by pre-Christian, apocryphal writings of the Jews. Judging by the Gospels, Jesus did not make special efforts of either ratifying or rejecting the Pharisaic resurrection doctrine.

The question whether the Messiah is the son of David bears likewise the imprint of unmitigated Pharisaism. The Pharisaic Christ was not merely a lineal descendant of King David. The Book of Enoch identifies him with Enoch, the scribe of righteousness. We read there, lxxi. 13 f.: "The Head of Days came—to me and greeted me with his voice and said unto me: Thou art the Son of Man and thou art born unto righteousness and righteousness abides over thee and the righteousness of the Head of Days forsakes thee not." Also Noah was identified with the Messiah, as we may learn from a fragment of a Noah Apocalypse we possess in En. cvi.-vii. That was the Jewish way of expressing the idea of the pre-existence of the Messiah. Therefore even a Jew who had never heard of Jesus, might have asked the question of Mt. xxii. 42 ff. The proper Pharisaic answer would have been: The Christ is not only the son but also the father of David. For the royal forebear of the Messiah was himself the offspring of one of the earlier incarnations of the Chosen One of the Most High. Not the slightest trace of any relation of the question to the circumstances under which Jesus labored at that time can be discovered, nor is any attempt made of solving the riddle. We may thus consider it as one of the problems of Jewish theology which were discussed in the schools of the scribes who employed something resembling the Socratic method for prompting the correct answer, which had been memorized by their students together with the question.

The destruction of the temple may have been foretold by Jesus. But it did not require any prophetic gifts, not to speak of Messianic

powers, to foresee that event. Any intelligent Jew who realized the tremendous strength of Rome and was familiar with the stubborn longing of his countrymen for recovering their national independence, could predict a Jewish rebellion and the subsequent destruction of Jerusalem and the temple. Of course, such a Jew must either doubt the power of God or the worthiness of his nation.

The signs of the coming of the Messiah cannot be ascribed to Jesus. He was conscious of being the Messiah himself. His coming into the world was an accomplished fact. His kingdom was established. Henceforth the world could only further or hinder the gradual growth and development of the dominion of Jesus Christ. The Christians adopted indeed very early the doctrine of the Second Coming of Christ. But in doing so, they confounded the ideal conception of the kingdom of God as cherished by Jesus with the Messianic expectations of the Jews. Because the Jewish apocalyptic descriptions of the coming of the Messiah had not been realized by Jesus, they concluded he was bound to return a second time in order to fulfill those prophecies. They even put such apocryphal prophecies into his own mouth. That has been done, at least, in the passage under discussion. It was a reactionary step undoing the work of Jesus to a large extent. But that is no reason why we should insist upon perpetuating that fatal error and assigning the doctrine of the Second Advent to the founder of the Christian religion.

The question of the Pharisees: "Is it lawful to give tribute to Cæsar or not?" calls for special attention. It is the first of the four sections mentioned above, which occur in all three Synoptic Gospels; and it seems to be connected with the account of the Cleansing by a casual tie. The interviewers are clearly enemies of Jesus. They hoped he would declare no true, law-abiding Jew ought to pay taxes to a heathen ruler. If he had given such an answer, he would have branded himself as a rebel and been treated accordingly. Since Jesus was arrested apparently not long afterwards and crucified by order of the Roman governor, the pericope seems to stand in the right place.

The only thing which, in my opinion, opposes that simple explanation are the terms "the Pharisees" and "their disciples with the Herodians" of Mt. xxii. 15 f., and "certain of the Pharisees and of the Herodians" of Mk. xii. 13. Luke reads: "the chief priests and the scribes (with the elders)" (Lk. xx. 1). The mortal enemies of Jesus are "the chief priests and the elders of the people" in Matthew, and "the chief priests and the scribes" in Mark and Luke. The

Pharisees are not mentioned at all in the Luke account of the passion of Jesus and appear in Mark only in the pericope of the Imperial Tribute and in Matthew there and xxvii. 62. That seems to assign our story to a different source, and that impression is not weakened by the word "Herodians," which occurs only thrice in all the Gospels. The unexplained entrance of the Pharisees and the Herodians is under these circumstances rather strange. The former might be the scribes, but that would not account for the presence of the latter. Moreover, after the temple had been cleansed, the chief priests assumed the leadership. The scribes would therefore do hardly anything without their advice and consent. But our sources have nothing to say of a conference for that purpose.

The Luke version does not present that difficulty. For the phrase, "with the elders," may be dropped as a gloss derived from Matthew. But that raises at once the question whether Luke or Mark and Matthew have preserved the original text. It is easy enough to understand why the appellation of the men who interviewed Jesus about the imperial tax might have been altered in Luke so as to identify them with the enemies of Jesus in the principal source. But it is absolutely impossible to explain an uncalled for introduction of entirely new terms in the Mark and Matthew versions. They must belong to the source from which the pericope has been derived, and that source cannot therefore be identical with the oldest Synoptic account of the suffering and death of Jesus.

That compels us to turn our attention to the term "Herodians." Some exegetes have seen in them a political party that wanted to restore the kingdom of Herod the Great and reunite all the districts subject to him under the administration of one of his descendants. The members of that party were called Herodians. The chief objection is the silence of our historical sources as to the existence of such a political party. Those scholars seem to be unacquainted with the government of the Roman Empire. Under the emperors there existed no political parties which exercised or strove to exercise influence upon the administration of the empire. Especially the imperial provinces were governed by the emperor directly. The inhabitants of such a province were never asked whom they wanted for governor, or where their boundary lines should be drawn. Sometimes it suited the emperor to entrust a whole subject nation to the care of a native prince whose loyalty had been tested. Sometimes he deemed it wiser to split up an unruly people into small administrative groups in accordance with the rule *Divide et Impera*.

The real identity of the Herodians is easy enough to determine. The word, to use a Latin term, is a *nomen gentile*, denoting descent or relationship. In classical Greek such nouns were formed only of names of countries and towns outside of Greece. In Latin the ending characteristic of a *nomen gentile* is added especially to names of places and ordinal numbers to express to what a thing or a person belongs. Thus *montanus* is what belongs to or what is characteristic of a mountain; *primanus* is a soldier of the first legion; *Caesarianus*, which corresponds directly to *Herodianus*, denotes during the imperial period a certain officer of the emperor. Therefore, *Herodianus* in our passages must mean an officer of Herod, the tetrarch of Galilee and Perea. Such officers may have made common cause with the Pharisees against Jesus and may have been at Jerusalem on account of the passover. But all the Gospels fail to name them among the mortal enemies of Jesus. Herod himself is represented as having recommended his acquittal. For Pilate declares: "I, having examined him before you, found no fault in this man touching those things whereof you accuse him: no, nor yet Herod: for he sent him back unto us; and behold, nothing worthy of death hath been done by him. I will therefore chastize him and release him." (Lk. xxiii. 14-16.)

Under these circumstances we have to turn back to Mk. iii. 6, where the Pharisees and the Herodians are reported to have plotted together against Jesus. There the story breaks off abruptly. For we are not informed of any steps taken by the conspirators against Jesus, although it is said they decided to destroy him. The parallel accounts of Mk. iii. 1-6, namely, Mt. xii. 9-14 and Lk. vi. 6-11, are left incomplete at exactly the same place. Mk. xii. 13-17, Mt. xxii. 16-22 and Lk. xx. 20-26 cannot belong therefore to the last days of Jesus. They are the misplaced conclusion of the Cure on the Sabbath, which aroused the deadly resentment of the scribes and Pharisees. The officers of Herod were the proper persons to take part in the interview of Jesus. It took place in Galilee where the tetrarch was responsible for the strict observance of the Roman law. If Jesus had declared in their presence the imperial tribute was against the law of Moses, as they very likely had been led to believe by the Pharisees, it would have been their duty to arrest Jesus on the spot and bring him before the tribunal of the tetrarch.

The clash between Jesus and the Pharisees may be called the prelude, while the conflict with the chief priests is the finale of the great drama. Both run along parallel lines. The Pharisaic attempt

of having Jesus convicted for opposing the rule of Rome, has its counterpart in the crucifixion, which was brought about by the chief priests. Thus it could happen that a compiler of apostolic memoirs might insert the episode of the Imperial Tax into the story of the decisive battle after it was separated by some accident from its original context.

We are now enabled to decide with certainty what the continuation of the account of the Cleansing of the Temple must have looked like. The original story of the passion cannot have contained longer discourses of Jesus; it was only a short review of the leading events. Jesus is represented as the man of deeds, not of words. After he had bearded the lion in his den, there was no time left for discussing religious problems. The chief priests and the scribes, retiring before Jesus and the multitude, did not depart for their homes and wait several days before they could make up their mind to hold a common meeting in order to decide what they ought to do. They went at once to a place where they could discuss a plan of action. That meeting is described in the First Gospel as follows: "The chief priests and the elders of the people were gathered together unto the court of the high priest, who was called Caiaphas; and they took counsel together that they might take Jesus by subtlety and kill him. But they said, Not during the feast lest a tumult arise among the people." (Mt. xxvi. 3-5.) The passage joins directly Mt. xxi. 46. Mt. xxvi. 1-2 belongs evidently to the compiler who inserted Mt. xxii.-xxv. That is indicated by the clause, "when Jesus had finished all these words" (verse 1), and by the particle "then" at the beginning of verse 3. According to verse 2, the meeting of the enemies of Jesus as well as the cleansing of the temple took place two days before the passover. But that date is supported only by the Second Gospel (Mk. xiv. 1) and has not been derived therefore from the oldest Synoptic source.

The corresponding statement of the Second Gospel is: "And the chief priests and the scribes sought how they might take him with subtlety and kill him. For they said, Not during the feast lest haply there shall be a tumult of the people." (Mk. xiv. 1-2). Luke reads: "And the chief priests and the scribes sought how they might put him to death; for they feared the people." (Lk. xxii. 2.)

The three accounts come evidently from a common source. Still there are certain differences. The Matthew version reports a regular meeting at the court of the high priest, which is not mentioned in the other Gospels. The consensus of Mark and Luke proves the

original text to have read: "And the chief priests and the scribes sought how they might kill him." The two verbs "kill" and "put to death" of Mark and Luke, respectively, are only different renderings of the same Semitic verb. The sentence "for they feared the people," in Luke, states why they wanted to put Jesus to death. They were afraid the whole nation might believe in him. The words impress one as being the original text because the statement of the first two Gospels offers some difficulties. In the first place, it does not explain why they wanted to kill Jesus, but only why they intended to do so with subtlety. In the second place, the words "not during the feast," if understood as an adverbial phrase of time, have no meaning at all. As a matter of fact, Jesus was crucified during the feast on the fifteenth day of Nisan, and still no tumult arose among the people. It looks to me as if "not during the feast" were correlated to "with subtlety" and denoted, not the time when, but the place where. In that case, "during the feast" is an error of translation for which the Greek interpreter of the Semitic text is to be held responsible. It ought to read: "not in the temple." The Greek noun for "feast" stands in the Septuagint for two Hebrew nouns. It expresses fifty-eight times the one and thirty times the other. The latter signifies either "an appointed time" or "an appointed place," and the appointed place may be the temple. (Hebrew English Lexicon by Brown, Driver & Briggs, p. 417.)

The Johannine parallel to the council of the chief priests and the elders of the people is found Jn. xi. 47-50. It is separated from the Cleansing of the Temple just as the corresponding Synoptic accounts by copious insertions derived from other sources. It is related to Jn. vii. 38 and 45 ff. to judge by the term, "the chief priests and the Pharisees." In its present shape, however, it has nothing to do with the Cleansing of the Temple. For the reason why they wanted to kill Jesus is because he had raised Lazarus from the dead.

Yet that explanation is fraught with serious difficulties. The miracle itself offers the greatest objection. The enemies of Jesus could send to Bethany and verify the report brought to them by eye witnesses in all its details. The ancient world believed that such deeds could be done. Many persons were credited with supernatural gifts and highly honored and rewarded by their followers. The chief priests and the Pharisees might be insanely jealous of the influence which Jesus, the worker of wonders, obtained over the people; but at the same time they were bound to cherish a wholesome respect and fear of him. For Jesus would not hesitate, as they

had to take for granted, to turn his supernatural powers against them if forced to defend himself. Even at that age, self-defence was recognized as the first law of nature. An individual able to call back to life a putrid body might easily turn living bodies into corpses by a mere word of his mouth if anybody should prove bold enough to lay violent hands upon him.

Such a consideration compels us to study the story of Lazarus (Jn. xi. 1-46) with great care. The narrative is not distinguished by literary skill and fluency. Even the opening sentence, "Now a certain man was sick, Lazarus of Bethany, of the village of Mary and her sister Martha," hardly fits into the given situation. Martha and Mary are designated afterwards the sisters of Lazarus; Martha calls him "my brother" (verse 21), and Mary does the same thing (verse 32), and Jesus speaks of him as "thy brother" both in his interview with Martha and with Mary (verse 28 and 39). Still verse 1 by itself alone does not indicate such a relationship between Lazarus and the sisters. It looks almost as if the original beginning of the narrative had been lost and replaced by notes taken from the Third Gospel.

Verse 2: "And it was that Mary who anointed the Lord with ointment and wiped his feet with her hair, whose brother Lazarus was sick," is likewise hard to account for. The anointing of Jesus by Mary occurred, according to our Gospel, quite a time after the raising of Lazarus from the dead and is related Jn. xii. 1-8; and it is not exactly customary in historical writings to refer to happenings before they have taken place.

Also verse 5: "Now Jesus loved Martha and her sister and Lazarus," is open to criticism. After the message of the sisters, "Lord, behold, he whom thou lovest is sick" (verse 3), there is no need for such a statement. Besides the Greek verb for "love" in verse 5 is not the same as that employed in the rest of the narrative (see verse 2 and 36).

One is tempted to reject all those verses as glosses. But as soon as they are dropped, the narrative is left incomplete. Even the omission of verse 5 does not improve the text unless the clause, "when he heard that he was sick," at the beginning of verse 6, is stricken off simultaneously. It is merely a repetition of what is said before in verse 4.

All these blemishes, however, may be characteristic of the style of the author. For their elimination would render necessary a re-writing of the whole introduction. They would mark him, not as a

person who tells a familiar story, but as one who evolves awkwardly a fictitious narrative out of his own mind and finds it quite a task to get his proper start. One even might suspect him to have based his account upon data borrowed from Luke, namely, the pericope of Martha and Mary (Lk. x. 38-42) and the parable of Lazarus (Lk. xvi. 19-31).

The list of objectionable features is by no means exhausted. When the disciples warned Jesus not to go to Bethany because the Judeans might stone him (verse 8), he is reported to have replied: "Are there not twelve hours in the day? If a man walk in the day, he stumbleth not because he seeth the light of this world. But if a man walk in the night, he stumbleth because the light is not in him" (verse 9-10). The words are very likely a genuine saying of Jesus. But as long as the exact circumstances under which they were first pronounced are unknown, it is impossible to determine their true meaning. Even in an allegory "stumble" cannot denote "be stoned to death." In order to avoid murderers, traveling by night is often safer than traveling by day. If "the light of this world" is the sun, the closing words, "the light is not in him," have no meaning. Even if we suppose Jesus to have intended to say: A man who walks in the light of righteousness, need not fear an attack of the wicked, Jesus would be contradicted by common experience if he spoke of personal violence. Thus Jn. xi. 9-10 must be a fragment of some discourse of Jesus which the writer of our pericope thought proper to add to his story.

Verse 11-14, the disciples are described as more than commonly stupid. They fail to understand their master's announcement: "Our friend Lazarus is fallen asleep; but I go that I may awake him out of sleep." For they return the silly answer: "Lord, if he is fallen asleep, he will recover."

Verse 24 Martha declares: "I know that he shall rise again in the resurrection at the last day." Jesus corrects her in verse 25 f. by saying:

"I am the resurrection and the life:
He that believeth on me, though he die,
Yet shall he live;
And whosoever liveth and believeth on me
Shall never die."

The statement is not less beautiful than true and evidently a genuine word of Jesus. The parallelism of members, expressing the leading thought in two ways, cannot be overlooked. But we inquire in vain

how it could apply to the case of Lazarus. He had died, and the life that was given back to him was not the life of which Jesus speaks. The former was the animal life of the body, the latter is the spiritual life of the soul. The one is transient, the other permanent, or eternal. As a matter of fact, Jesus in the just quoted words controverts directly the Pharisaic doctrine of the resurrection, which is put into the mouth of Martha. The Pharisees believed that all who died were dead and had to stay in Sheol until on the last day of the present world, the first day of the kingdom of God would dawn. Then the pious in the nether world would arise from the dead and enter together with the living elect the heavenly kingdom. As Jesus held a different idea of the kingdom of God, he also cherished a different conception of the resurrection. He was not waiting for a bodily resurrection, but identified "the resurrection" with "the life," that is to say, with the life everlasting. Those who believe in Jesus live forever in spite of death; and those who thus live in Jesus never die.

Verse 33 we are surprised to learn that Jesus "groaned in the spirit and was troubled," or "was moved with indignation in the spirit and troubled himself" because Mary and her friends were weeping. We are not told why he was indignant at their tears. According to verse 35 he wept himself. He certainly could not be moved with grief and compassion. For he had come to raise his friend from the dead and restore him to the bosom of his family. The groaning of verse 38 is just as much a mystery as the first. It looks almost as if the narrator deemed it wise to equip Jesus for the occasion with a few juggler's tricks.

Such observations make our pericope appear, not as one organic whole, but as a patchwork quilt. That in turn suggests a comparatively late origin and a probable dependence of the composer upon the before named Luke passages.

The story represents Jesus as most deliberately planning and executing a great and undoubted miracle in order to convince the people that he was "the Christ, the Son of God, even he that cometh into the world" (verse 27). When he heard the news of his friend's sickness, he said: "This sickness is not unto death, but for the glory of God, that the Son of God may be glorified thereby" (verse 4). He waits purposely for two days (verse 6), that is to say, till Lazarus had died (verse 11 and 14), before he set out on his journey to Bethany. For had he arrived there while his friend was still living, he would have been obliged to cure him at once and thus missed the

opportunity of demonstrating his power over death. That is implied in not less than three passages. Both Martha and Mary greet Jesus with the identical words: "Lord, if thou hadst been here, my brother had not died" (verse 21 and 32). And verse 37 we read: "Some of them said, Could not this man, that opened the eyes of him that was blind, have caused that this man also should not die?" Thanks to the delay of Jesus, he found at his arrival that Lazarus not only was dead, but also buried for four days (verses 17 and 39). As a result decomposition had advanced, as was proved by the smell that arose from the tomb. The Greek verb, translated "decay" in the American Revised Version (verse 39), means "to smell," that is, "to smell sweet" as well as "to stink." Lazarus without doubt was dead, and no mortal man could have called him back to life. Martha indeed has supreme confidence in Jesus and confesses: "Even now I know that whatsoever thou shalt ask of God, God will give thee" (verse 22). Nevertheless she does not comprehend the true significance of the promise of Jesus: "Thy brother shall rise again" (verse 23). Verse 40 Jesus appeals to the faith of Martha: "Said I not to thee that, if thou believedst, thou shouldst see the glory of God?" When the stone had been removed, Jesus offered thanks to God because He had heard him. In doing so, he also stated: "because of the multitude that standeth around I said it, that they may believe that thou didst send me." The result came up to his expectations. For we learn, verse 45: "Many therefore of the Judeans, who came to Mary and beheld that which he did, believed on him." But not all believed; for "some of them went away to the Pharisees, and told them the things which Jesus had done" (verse 46). Jesus had decided beforehand to make use of the death of Lazarus for performing a miracle that would establish his Messianic character beyond the possibility of a doubt.

The word for "miracle" in John as well as in the Synoptic Gospels is "sign," or "sign from heaven" (Lk. xi. 16). The term is used quite often in the Fourth Gospel. But right here a fundamental difference between the Fourth Gospel on the one hand and the Synoptic Gospels on the other hand ought not to be overlooked. The Jesus of the former does many signs in order to make the people believe in him. He also teaches, but his miracles are much more important. The Jesus of the latter refuses expressly to perform a miracle for that purpose and confines himself to proclaiming the law of the kingdom of God and exemplifying that law by his own conduct. He does not even tell the people who he is, and forbids his

disciples to inform them that he is the Messiah. He evidently wanted the people to judge and decide for themselves, without being prompted by others.

The parable of the Rich Man and Lazarus, of which we were reminded as a possible source of the story of Lazarus, is a protest against the demand for a sign. The Rich Man had realized in Hades his mistake and desired to save his brethren from having to share his terrible fate. The terms "rich" and "poor" are used in the parable, of course, in the same Ebionitic sense as in the Beatitudes and Woes of Lk. vi. 20-26. The one class of people trust and obey God, and the other do not. The Rich Sinner implores Abraham to send Lazarus to his brethren that they might be converted. But Abraham declines to grant that request. If the brethren want to be saved, they have to listen only to Moses and the prophets. If they do not care for the word of God, as revealed by his great servants, they will not be persuaded even if one should rise from the dead to bear witness of the hereafter. Belief in God and His righteousness is a moral act. Unless it guides and controls man's conduct, he does not believe in God. For it is not identical with being informed and certain of the existence of God. For such a faith even the devil possesses, if he is the Miltonic leader of the host of fallen angels who enjoyed personal intercourse with God before they rebelled. According to the Book of Job, Satan has access to God even now (Job i. 6 ff). In the case of religion, seeing is not identical with believing. That is also illustrated by those witnesses of the raising of Lazarus from the dead who could not denounce Jesus quickly enough to his mortal enemies. Thus the answer of Abraham is absolutely true and applies, as a matter of course, to all religious teaching, that of Jesus not less than that of Moses and the prophets. It is easy enough to see why Jesus refers to the Old Testament. The parabolic character of his tale demanded that. Besides, the parable was addressed without doubt to those Pharisees who insisted on a sign from heaven. Jesus desired very naturally to direct their attention to their own experiences with unbelievers.

The parable of Lazarus therefore demonstrates in comparison with the story of Lazarus that Jesus in the Synoptic Gospels is guided by a higher and truer principle than in some portions of the Fourth Gospel. What he strenuously objects to in the former, he volunteers to do in the latter. That contradiction cannot be smoothed over and leads to only one conclusion: Jesus did not raise Lazarus from the dead. We have only the testimony of the Third Gospel

for the genuineness of the parable. But that testimony is corroborated by the refusal of Jesus to prove his authority by giving a sign from heaven, which is recorded in all three Synoptic Gospels. The story of Lazarus, however, which, according to the Fourth Gospel, records the greatest and final Messianic deed of Jesus, is nowhere else alluded to in the whole New Testament. It was put together by a party familiar with our present Luke, who attempted to compose a life of Jesus, not as he knew it to have been, but as he imagined it ought to have been. He resuscitated the Lazarus of the parable, after giving him a home at Bethany and two sisters, Martha and Mary. Bethany was suggested as the scene of the miracle by Mt. xxvi. 6 and Mk. xiv. 3. The place had to be near Jerusalem so that the Jewish authorities might learn at once what Jesus had done.

Since the historical Jesus did not raise Lazarus from the dead, Jn. xi. 1-46 cannot account for the resolution of the chief priests and the Pharisees to kill Jesus, which is a well established historical fact. That is indicated also by the term "Pharisees" of verse 46. The agents in verse 47 ff. are "the chief priests and the Pharisees." Jn. xi. 47 ff. may therefore be connected directly with the account of the Cleansing of the Temple just as the corresponding passages of the Synoptic Gospels. The statement, "for this man doeth many signs" of verse 47, has been added by the compiler. The original narrative reads: "Therefore the chief priests and the Pharisees gathered a council and said, What shall we do? If we let him thus alone, all men will believe in him; and the Romans will come and take away both our place and our nation. But a certain one of them, Caiaphas, being high priest that year, said unto them, Ye know nothing at all nor do ye take account that it is better for you that one man should die for the people than that the whole nation should perish."

The passage offers no special problems. "Thus" in the clause, "if we let him thus alone," is significant. It refers to the fact that they had been unable to do anything against Jesus. What is said about the Romans is correct. They were the masters of Palestine and did not shrink from the task of regulating the internal affairs of the Jewish commonwealth whenever necessary. They even deposed and installed high priests, although, according to the law of the Jews, that office was held for life and descended from father to son. The Romans demanded that the high priest should assist them in controlling the people; and if he could not or would not do that, he had to make room for a more adroit and pliable successor. (Ant. xviii. 2, 1.) If the Jewish nation as a whole had accepted the lead-

ership of Jesus and thrown off the yoke of the priests and the scribes, the Roman governor would not have taken the part of the latter. He had no use for the Pharisees; and even a superficial investigation would have exposed the abuses of the chief priests. While the Roman governor might extort all the money he could from the Jews, he would not permit the priests to impoverish his subjects. Moreover, it would have been an easier task to govern the Jews when led by Jesus than under the control of the rapacious priests and the fanatical scribes.

The proposition of Caiaphas was the answer to the question, "What shall we do?" and ended the discussion. Those who were present at the council realized it was a battle for life and death between them and Jesus and that they had either to kill him or surrender everything they possessed and prized. The usual translation of the words of Caiaphas: "It is expedient for you that one man should die for the people, and that the whole nation perish not," sounds rather awkward in English as well as it does in Greek. It is an unskillful attempt of rendering to original Semitic text. Hebrew lacks the comparative and superlative degrees. These ideas are expressed by the construction of the sentence. The Semitic construction of the statement points to a Jewish-Christian author and demonstrates the old age of the whole paragraph. It ought to read in English: "It is better for you that one man should die for the people than that the whole nation should perish."

(To Be Continued).