invent when he cannot find. Luke did not invent, but only at most touched up stories given to his hand by a reliable tradition. This is his method in narratives common to his Gospel with those of Matthew and Mark. Noting this, we can well believe it to have been his method all through, even in those portions of his Gospel where he is our sole authority.

A. B. BRUCE.

ON SOME PHRASES IN THE RAISING OF LAZARUS.

I. (John xi. 33, ἐνεβρημήσατο τῷ πνεύματι). The regular meaning of the word ἐμβρήμασθαι is "threaten loudly," "be noisily angry." Yet some of the Synoptists use the word of Jesus as though He "threatened," or "was angry with," those whom He cured. Such a tradition might naturally cause difficulty to educated readers, especially at the beginning of the second century, when people were familiar with the tricks of those exorcists who pretended to drive out evil spirits and to cure diseases by shouting at their patients and terrifying them into a stupor that might seem to be recovery.

Hence the Fourth Evangelist appears to have thought it well to use this misunderstood word in such a context as to demonstrate that it had not the meaning popularly associated with it. How could it mean anger of the common kind, since Jesus (xi. 57) "wept" almost in the same moment? And that it referred to some more inward and suppressed feeling was denoted by the qualification (xi. 33)

1 Rev., in text, has "groaned." But there is no authority for "groan," and abundant authority for "be angry," "threaten loudly," "bellow," or similar meanings.

2 Mark says that Jesus (Mark i. 43) "threatened, or reproached (ἐνεβρημήσατο)" a leper, that he should not make his cure known to others. Matthew ix. 30 (ἐνεβρημήθη) says the same of Jesus addressing two blind men.
"in His spirit," and then (xi. 38) "in Himself." If we ask what was the object of this internal anger, or rebuking, the author suggests, rather than gives, an answer. The Messiah, in this crowning sign, is figuratively overcoming what St. Paul calls "the last enemy that shall be overcome," that is to say, death—death material, as the type of death spiritual. If this be so, the object of Christ's stern though suppressed wrath would seem to be "the Prince of this world" regarded as the author of death and sin.

II. (John xi. 33, "ἐτάραξεν εαυτόν, He troubled Himself.") This expression, unique in the Bible amid frequent uses of the passive "to be troubled," seems intended to have a unique meaning. It will be best appreciated by examining, first, the ancient Messianic uses of the phrase in the passive; then, any Synoptic passages that bear on them; lastly, the Johannine use of the word.

The Psalms abound with passages in which the Psalmist cries, "My heart, or soul, is troubled (ἐταραχθη)." But it is only in Psalms xlii., xliii. that the words come as a refrain thrice repeated, "Why art thou full of grief, O my soul (περιλυπος ει, η ψυχη μου), and why dost thou fill me with trouble (συνταρασσεσι;)" Comp. Psalm xlii. 7: "My soul is troubled within me (προς εμαυτον η ψυχη μου εταραχθη)."

This word "full of grief" is found only here in the canonical O.T. In N.T. also it is very rare, but Jesus is represented as using it before His thrice-repeated prayer in Gethsemane (Mark xiv. 34, Matt. xxvi. 38), "My soul is full of grief (περιλυπος εστιν η ψυχη μου) even unto death." Luke omits these words, possibly for the same reason for which he omits the words given by Mark and Matthew (Mark xv. 34, Matt. xxvii. 46), "Why hast Thou forsaken Me?"

Now, from the analogy of abundant instances, we may
anticipate that what the Third Gospel thus omits the Fourth will insert, but in some quite new shape that shall bring out its latent spiritual meaning. In the place of the cry "My God, my God, why hast Thou forsaken Me?" it substitutes—probably from a Psalm with a somewhat similar beginning (lxiii. 1, "God, my God, or, God is my God . . . my soul thirsteth for Thee")—"I thirst," as though Christ's meaning were, not that He reproached the Father for absence, but that He longed for the Father's immediate presence. So here, what the first two Gospels express by "full of grief" (from Psalm xlii. 6) the Fourth expresses by a word (ταράσσειν) almost identical with that found in the same sentence of the same Psalm (συνταράσσειν). No other author in the N.T. uses the word "to be troubled" except of timorousness, or the fears of distrust, or the doubts of a bad conscience, or the confused alarms of a mob; and this very author represents Jesus as saying to the disciples (xiv. 1), "Let not your heart be troubled." Yet here, not content with speaking of Christ's "heart" or "soul," he represents Christ Himself, as subjected to "trouble."

Is the difficulty increased or diminished by the peculiar form of the expression, "He troubled Himself"? At first sight, it may seem increased; for the phrase seems fatal to the genuineness of the "trouble." And so it would be if it were literally taken, apart from ancient traditions and controversies. But we have to bear in mind that the Psalm represents a dialogue between the Psalmist and his soul, in which the latter is as it were personified and remonstrated with on its action. "Why art thou so disquieted within me?" says the Hebrew: and the Greek is still stronger, "Why dost thou fill me with trouble?"—as though the "soul" were conflicting with the man. Now we learn from Origen (Cels., ii. 9, and comp. vii. 55) that such passages as those above quoted from the Synoptists were used
by antagonists for the purpose of decrying Jesus; and Origen protests against the supposition that Christians believe either the body or the soul of Jesus to be God—"the soul about which is uttered the saying, 'My soul is full of grief.'" What Origen thus protests negatively, our Evangelist seems to be protesting positively, namely, that the Being whom we worship as Divine is one in whom there is no conflict between the Divine and the human. He asserts, not that Christ's "trouble" was unreal, but that he spontaneously took the "trouble" into Himself, in harmonious obedience to the will of the Father and to the dictates of His own love for man. So far from artificially rousing the mere semblance of "trouble," the Divine Nature—knowing sin in contrast to perfect righteousness—was capable of feeling infinitely keener "trouble" than imperfect humanity can feel. But, with all its keenness, it was voluntary. He was the Son, and one with the Father in will and act. What the Father did, the Son did. The Father "troubled" the Son? Then the Son "troubled" Himself.

Another motive also could hardly fail to be in the author's mind—a desire to correct the prevalent Stoic teaching about "trouble." The fundamental precept in the Encheiridion is, "Be free from trouble (ἀτάραχος)." "Troubles," the author tells us (Ench., 5), "arise not from facts but from fancies." No one ought to be ever "troubled (ταράσσεσθαι)." A man may be allowed to pretend to be "troubled" and "grieved" out of sympathy with others; just as one may "pretend" in playing games with children. But to be really troubled is foolish and wrong and faithless. Such sayings are scattered broadcast over the Lectures of Epictetus.

There was a truth in this doctrine, and it accords, as we have seen, with words of Jesus. To be "troubled," in a sense, is to be unbelieving: (John xiv. 1) "Let not your
heart be troubled, neither let it play the coward. Ye believe in God? Believe also in Me." No man who perfectly "believed" in Jesus could ever be so "troubled" as to disturb the fundamental peace on which his spiritual life finds footing. But on the other hand, there are possibilities of what may be called surface-trouble, yet trouble sincere and painful, for all those who recognise—what Epictetus did not recognise—that there is a devil as well as a God, and that God Himself is to be regarded as conflicting against evil, and (in the person of His Son) suffering in the conflict. Because St. Paul felt this "trouble," he became a living power and drew multitudes to Christ through himself; because Epictetus did not feel it, he remained, comparatively speaking, a passive monument of the nobility of patience.

It is the object of our Evangelist to show that, if at any time the Logos gave up the calm, or ataraxia, on which philosophers set so high a price, it was, in the first place, in conformity with the Divine laws of the universe—just as the wind, blowing on the waters, keeps them sweet and pure, or as God's Wind (or Breath, or Spirit) moved on the abysmal water in the beginning in order to impart the harmony of spiritual life; and in the next place, He was thus "troubled," not for Himself, but for the human race. Out of this "trouble"—as in the beginning, so now—there sprang words of Creation—in Genesis, "Let there be light," and there was light, light out of darkness, and order out of chaos; in the Gospel, "Lazarus, hither, forth!" and man came forth, bound hand and foot, but living, and delivered from the cave of death.

The Divine mystery of the "trouble" of the Logos is thrice mentioned, and it ends in a climax. Here the Logos troubles the Logos. Presently we shall find the Logos (xii. 27) "troubled" in "soul." Last of all (xi: 21) He is "troubled in spirit."
ON SOME PHRASES IN

III. (John xi. 43, "ἐκραυγάσεν, he cried aloud"). The word (xi. 43) κραυγάζειν (six times used in the Fourth Gospel), "cry aloud," "clamour," "shriek," occurs in N.T. (apart from Acts xxii. 23 of a crowd "clamouring") only in Matthew xii. 19, quoting Isaiah xlii. 2 concerning the Messiah, "He shall not cry aloud (κραυγάσει) (LXX. κεκραύξεται)." The prophecy continues: ". . . He shall bring forth judgment in truth. He shall not fail nor be discouraged till He have set judgment on the earth."

Matthew is apparently dissatisfied with the LXX. translation. How could it be denied that the Messiah did "cry" (Matt. xxvii. 50, κράζει) on the cross? There were three ways of removing the difficulty. (1) The word κεκραύξεται being retained, it might be urged that the "crying aloud" did not take place till Christ's death, when He had "brought forth judgment to victory"; so that κράζει in Matthew xxvii. 50 was justifiable. Or (2) κεκραύξεται might be changed, e.g., into κραυγάσει, "shriek," or "clamour"; and this, it might be said, Christ never did. Or (3) the Evangelist might avoid using the word κραυγάσει altogether concerning Christ. Mark and Luke adopt this third course; Matthew adopts the second. The Fourth Gospel (vii. 28, 37, xii. 44) records that Christ on three solemn occasions "cried (ἐκραύξε)," but that, on this single occasion, He "cried aloud (ἐκραυγάσε)," i.e. with a sound of the nature of a clamour or multitudinous cry of distress. This is all the more noteworthy because John subsequently uses the latter almost non-Biblical word (xii. 13, xviii. 40, xix. 6, 12, 15) to denote the outcry of a crowd, in the first instance applauding Jesus, in the rest seeking His death. Why does he apply to Jesus on this single occasion a word so apparently unsuitable, applied to Him by no other Evangelist, and expressly disavowed by the first of the three?

The answer extends beyond a mere verbal dissimilarity between the three Evangelists and the fourth. It affects
their several conceptions of Christ’s last moments. Although Matthew alone uses κραξεῖν of Jesus on the cross, yet the three Synoptists agree that Jesus cried with “a loud utterance (φωνῇ μεγάλῃ)” (Mark xv. 37; Matt. xxvii. 50; Luke xxiii. 46). John, on the other hand, uses simply (xix. 26-30) “say” (λέγει, ἐπερ) of the last utterances of Jesus, while he selects, as the single occasion for a “loud utterance (φωνῇ μεγάλῃ)” on the part of Jesus, the moment now under consideration, when He is figuratively rescuing mankind from death, and “bringing forth judgment unto victory.” Having regard to the remarkable rarity of κραξεῖν in the Bible, and to our Evangelist’s necessary acquaintance with the quotation in Matthew and with the controversies that were sure to arise out of it, we seem safe in concluding that he had these controversies in mind when writing this description of a supreme Messianic “sign” in which every step was to be the fulfilment of some type or prediction.

But at the same time a deeper thought is revealed in the frequency with which he subsequently applies the word to the multitude, only once “shouting” or “screaming” for the Messiah, four times “shouting” or “screaming” against Him. It is essentially a word of weakness, often indicating passion and want of self-control. The author appears to suggest that, on the single occasion when the Redeemer allowed Himself to overpass the calm that characterized His utterances, it was not in any cry uttered for Himself from the cross, but when He was crying aloud for Lazarus “bound hand and foot,” for Lazarus whom He “loved,” and therein for the world which He came to save. The Apocalypse had taught that from the New Jerusalem God would banish (Rev. xxi. 41) “every tear” and all “crying (κραυγῇ).” This Gospel carries us a step further. Before that consummation could arrive, the Messiah Himself must endure to pour forth “tears” (xi. 35, ἐδάκρυσεν)
and to utter "crying." But how this great truth was liable to misunderstanding may be gathered from the Epistle to the Hebrews, which asserts that the Messiah (v. 7) "offered up prayers and supplications with strong crying and tears (κραυγῆς καὶ δακρύων) unto Him that was able to save Him from death." Whatever truth there may have been in the supposition that Christ so identified Himself with the sinful world that He entertained in His mind (not as a doubt of His own, but as a Satanic thought to be wrestled with and overthrown) the possibility that He too, together with those whom He had come to save, might not be saved from "the last enemy of all"—the Evangelist felt that at least it must be erroneous to impute to the Saviour, in His deepest sufferings, a self-regarding attitude. Such an imputation he contradicts here. There were indeed "tears," there was indeed "crying aloud"; but they were not for Himself. On the cross there was no "crying" and no "tears," nothing but quiet "saying," indicative of thought for others ("Woman, behold thy Son"), or of an absorbing thirst for the Father's presence ("I thirst"), or of a delight in having accomplished His will ("It is accomplished"). But what Christ could not do for Himself, He could do for miserable mankind. There was a truth in the mocking reproach of the Pharisees, "He saved others, Himself He could not save." So here, He could not "weep" and "cry aloud" for Himself; He could for Lazarus,
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