



**University of Massachusetts Amherst**

---

**From the Selected Works of Keith L. Yoder**

---

Spring March 11, 2022

# One and the Same? Lazarus in Luke and John

Keith L. Yoder, *University of Massachusetts Amherst*



Available at: <https://works.bepress.com/klyoder/60/>

**One and the Same? Lazarus in Luke and John**  
**Keith L. Yoder, October 2021**  
**Warring States Project**  
**University of Massachusetts at Amherst, USA**

**Abstract:**

Readers of John from Origen to the present have asked: Is the Lazarus of John 11-12 wholly separate from the Lazarus of Luke 16, or are they, somehow, one and the same? *Whence* John's Lazarus, however, cannot be answered without also asking *When, How,* and *Why*. When was the story composed relative to the contiguous text? How is it interwoven with the rest of John? Whence came this otherwise unknown brother of Mary and Martha? Why is his story here at this turn in the Fourth Gospel? The interpretation of John's Lazarus narrative has languished in virtual stalemate for some time. This study aims to bring new evidence to the table, to gain a fresh perspective on the composition of that story and its relationship to Luke 16, in the context of a carefully constructed array of network connections with earlier and later texts in John.

**Key Words:** Gospel, John, Luke, Lazarus, Mary, Martha

Already in the third century church, some now unknown reader(s) identified John's Lazarus of Bethany and Luke's Poor Lazarus as one and the same. This proposal was of such weight that the writer of a fragment attributed to Origen (circa 185-254 CE) was moved to describe and refute it:

Those holding that both evangelists speak of one <Lazarus> say that during the three intervening days before he arose on the fourth, Lazarus was taken by the angels to rest in the bosom of Abraham, because of what was spoken by the Rich Man, "I beseech you, Father <Abraham> that you send him to my father's house so that they may not also come into this place of torment." He was not sent by Abraham, who said, "They have Moses and the Prophets," but our Savior and Lord did raise him, evidently on condition that he refrain from revealing what he had seen about the souls managed there.

But this is rubbish! That one was unattended by the Rich Man and an outcast in his gates, while this one had, as his benefactors and helpers among the Jews, his sisters Mary and Martha, to welcome him as they had Jesus. And hear what the evangelist John himself says: "now Mary was the woman who anointed the Lord with perfume." It is unreasonable that she who had the perfume and was beloved by Jesus would not have shown mercy to her brother, when he longed to be filled by the crumbs fallen from the Rich Man's table.<sup>1</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> Translated from the Greek text of Catena LXXVII in E. Preuschen, *Origenes Werke: Der Johanneskommentar* (GCS; Leipzig: J.C. Hinrich, 1903) 4:543-544; R.E. Heine discusses attribution issues in "Can the Catena Fragments of Origen's Commentary on John Be Trusted?" *VC* 40 (1986) 118-134, here 131, but whether this fragment was correctly attributed to Origen does not alter the fact that the proposal of one Lazarus was widespread enough to call for rebuttal early on. For our discussion, "Origen" will be retained as author.

Their reputedly shallow construction of “one” Lazarus is easily rebutted by the sophisticated Origen, suggesting that the notion originated from the early grassroots piety that sought to name and connect those nameless and disconnected of the Gospel stories. Our learned critic himself later argues that Lazarus' sister Mary is the same woman who anointed Jesus in Luke 7:36-50 (Μαρία ἡ αὐτὴ ἐστὶ καὶ παρὰ τῷ Λουκᾷ ἡ ἀλείψασα τὸν κύριον μύρω δῆλον),<sup>2</sup> thus connecting the sinful woman of Luke 7 with Luke's and John's Mary, sister of Martha, as *one and the same*.

While modern interpreters may prefer to pose such issues in terms of literary relationship rather than historical identity, it is illuminating that the notion of inter-figural relationships between these two pairs of characters was a live issue this early in the reception history of John and Luke, one rejected and the other embraced by Origen. For decades, scholars have resisted the notion of a direct literary connection between the two Lazaruses, allowing at most for indirect borrowing via secondary oral tradition or influence flowing from a (pre-)Johannine source to Luke; but that view of an independent John is no longer certain.<sup>3</sup> We here give his Lazarus a fresh look.<sup>4</sup>

### John 11-12 Without Lazarus

We first ask *when* was the Lazarus saga added to the Fourth Gospel. Raymond Brown persistently maintained that the Lazarus story was added, and the Temple Cleansing repositioned, in a **secondary** draft.<sup>5</sup> To test that hypothesis, we ask how John 11-12 might have looked without any Lazarus, Mary, and Martha material, and would the remaining text still work as a coherent story? Just before the first *Lazarus* in John 11:1, *many* in 10:40-42 went out to see and hear Jesus preaching and doing signs in the desert; later, in 11:46 *some* of those *many* came back and reported to the Pharisees, who convened a council to discuss, not Lazarus who is **missing from** 11:47-53 but, *all* those who were *believing* in Jesus because of the *many signs* he *was doing*. 11:46 and following connect lexically and thematically with the desert activity in 10:40-42, and both together echo Josephus' accounts of the recurring popular enthusiasm generated by charismatic wilderness leaders which the Romans brutally suppressed.<sup>6</sup> Since 11:45

---

<sup>2</sup> Preuschen, *Origenes Johanneskommentar*, Catena LXXVIII, 4:544-545; both fragments are also available in A.E. Brooke, *The Commentary of Origen on St. John's Gospel* (2 volumes; London: Cambridge University Press, 1896) 2:286-288.

<sup>3</sup> See now the survey of H.W. Attridge, “John and Mark in the History of Research,” in E.-M. Becker, H.K. Bond, and C.H. Williams (eds.) *John's Transformation of Mark* (London: Bloomsbury, 2021) 9-22. I **rebutted** the suggestion that the name of Luke's beggar came from a pre-Johannine Lazarus tradition in, “In the Bosom of Abraham: The Name and Role of Poor Lazarus in Luke 16:19-23,” *NovT* (2020) 2-24, here 22-23.

<sup>4</sup> I thank **E. Bruce Brooks for his decade of support for my Lazarus and other projects, and Samuel Zinner for his helpful encouragement along the way.**

<sup>5</sup> R.E. Brown and F.J. Moloney (ed), *An Introduction to the Gospel of John* (ABRL; New York: Doubleday, 2003) 84-85. Brown envisioned a *redacted* subsequent *edition*; I prefer *draft*.

<sup>6</sup> Josephus in B.J. 2:259-263 mentions the imposters who went ahead of their followers “into the *wilderness* (ἐρημίαν) as if *there* (ἐκεῖ) God would show them *signs* (σημεῖα) of freedom”; in A.J. 20:97-98, Theudas convinced a large crowd (τὸν πλεῖστον ὄχλον) to follow him to “*the Jordan*” (τὸν Ἰορδάνην) which he claimed he would divide; A.J. 20:167-172 relates that many other

simply reprises key elements of 10:40-42, including a variation of “many came **to him**” as “many came **to Mary**,” the narrative of 10:42 attaches directly to 11:46 *without any break in stride*:<sup>7</sup>

---

10:40 Καὶ ἀπῆλθεν πάλιν πέραν τοῦ Ἰορδάνου εἰς τὸν τόπον ὅπου ἦν Ἰωάννης τὸ πρῶτον βαπτίζων καὶ ἔμεινεν ἐκεῖ. 41 καὶ πολλοὶ ἦλθον πρὸς αὐτὸν καὶ ἔλεγον ὅτι Ἰωάννης μὲν σημεῖον ἐποίησεν οὐδέν, πάντα δὲ ὅσα εἶπεν Ἰωάννης περὶ τούτου ἀληθῆ ἦν. 42 καὶ πολλοὶ ἐπίστευσαν εἰς αὐτὸν ἐκεῖ...

---

10:40 And he went-back again across the Jordan to the place where John was first baptizing, and he remained there. 41 And many came to him and were saying, “John did not one sign, but all the-things that John said about him were true.” 42 and many believed in him there...

(11:45 Πολλοὶ οὖν ἐκ τῶν Ἰουδαίων οἱ ἐλθόντες πρὸς τὴν Μαριάμ καὶ θεασάμενοι ἃ ἐποίησεν ἐπίστευσαν εἰς αὐτόν)

(11:45 Many, therefore, of the Jews who had come to Mary and saw the-things he-had-done believed in him)

11:46 ...τινὲς δὲ ἐξ αὐτῶν ἀπῆλθον πρὸς τοὺς Φαρισαίους καὶ εἶπαν αὐτοῖς ἃ ἐποίησεν Ἰησοῦς. 47 ... οὗτος ὁ ἄνθρωπος πολλὰ ποιεῖ σημεῖα. 48 ἐὰν ἀφῶμεν αὐτὸν οὕτως, πάντες πιστεύσουσιν εἰς αὐτόν ...

11:46 ...but some of them went-back to the Pharisees and told them of the-things that Jesus had-done. 47 ... this man is-doing many signs. 48 If we leave him thus, all will believe in him ...

Now, the withdrawal to Ephraim in 11:54 becomes superfluous, a simple replication of the retreat of 10:40, but the bridge of 11:55-57 remains in place to build suspense over Jesus’ possible arrival from the wilderness for Passover. In 12:1-8, the unspeaking Bethany siblings may be eliminated or replaced by anonymous actors, and still leave an intelligible Anointing in Bethany, where Jesus stops on his way into Jerusalem. Without Lazarus, the transition of 12:9-11 also becomes redundant, as it only replicates and extends the decision of the council in 11:53. Finally, eliminating the last Lazarus remembrance of 12:17-18 leaves the Triumphal Entry entirely intact. Thus, 12:9-11 and 12:17-18, along with the named actors of 12:1-3, are intelligible as insertions made upon the addition of the new Lazarus-Mary-Martha material in John 11. The remaining text without the Bethany family is quite coherent: the arrival of the wilderness signs-worker in Jerusalem for Passover would have been more than enough to attract both the welcoming crowd and the Sanhedrin’s lethal attention, especially were he then to create a disturbance in the temple, rendering the questions *Whence* and *Why Lazarus* even sharper.<sup>8</sup>

---

deceivers persuaded “the crowd” (τὸν ὄχλον) to follow them *into the wilderness* (εἰς τὴν ἐρημίαν) where they would show miracles and *signs*” (σημεῖα) from God. The language and themes of John 10:40-42 resonate well with these features in Josephus. Signs in villages and cities were trouble enough for the Jews, signs *in the desert* brought death from the Romans. <sup>7</sup> Already observed by J. Wellhausen, *Das Evangelium des Johannis* (Berlin: Georg Reimer, 1908) 54: “11:45 precisely resumes 10:42, and does not tie back to the Lazarus story” (translated).

<sup>8</sup> See the appendix below for my proposed pre-Lazarus text of John 10:40-12:19.

## Cleansing the Temple

The seemingly redundant repetitions of “Lazarus, raised from the dead” in the Lazarus insertions **identified** above in John 12 invite attention:

12:1 ... where Lazarus was, *whom Jesus had-raised from the dead* (ὄν ἤγειρεν ἐκ νεκρῶν Ἰησοῦς)

12:9 ... but also to see Lazarus, *whom he had-raised from the dead* (ὄν ἤγειρεν ἐκ νεκρῶν)

12:17-18 ... when he called Lazarus from the tomb, and *he raised him from the dead* (ἤγειρεν αὐτὸν ἐκ νεκρῶν) ... this sign he had done

The designation in 12:17-18 of this three-fold “raising Lazarus from the dead” as *the sign he had done* (πεποιηκέναι το σημεῖον), that here enthralled many *Jews* (12:11), recalls their challenge to Jesus back in 2:18, “what *sign* (σημεῖον) will you show us, that you *do* (ποιεῖς) these-things,” and Jesus’ ensuing reply in 2:19, “destroy this temple and in three days *I will raise it* (ἐγερῶ αὐτόν),” where *this temple* and *it-him* (αὐτόν) are identified by the narrator in 2:21-22 as *Jesus’ body*. Thus, Jesus’ riddling *sign* for the Jews in John 2, like the *sign* of Lazarus seen by Jews in John 12, is expressed in a similar threefold chain of *raising* (ἐγείρω) Jesus, from *death*:

2:19 ... you-destroy this temple and in three days *I-will-raise it* (ἐν τρισὶν ἡμέραις ἐγερῶ αὐτόν)

2:20 ... this temple, *you yourself will raise it* in three days? (καὶ σὺ ἐν τρισὶν ἡμέραις ἐγερεῖς αὐτόν;)

2:21-22 but he was speaking of the temple of his body; when therefore he *was-raised from the dead* (ἠγέρθη ἐκ νεκρῶν) ...

These two triads of ἐγείρω, all of *raising (from) the dead*, are highly distinctive in John, as the only other such uses are in 5:21, “the Father *raises the dead*” (ὁ πατήρ ἐγείρει τοὺς νεκρούς), and 21:14, “this was the *third-time* (τρίτον) Jesus appeared to the disciples, *having-been-raised from the dead* (ἐγερθεὶς ἐκ νεκρῶν).”<sup>9</sup> Further, John’s positioning of his final raising of Lazarus in 12:17-18, identified as Jesus’ final sign, here at the tail end of his Triumphal Entry (12:12-15), brings us precisely to the parallel Synoptic positioning of their Temple Cleansing immediately after the Triumphal Entry (Mark 11:15-17 after 11:1-10; Matt 21:12-13 after 21:1-9; Luke 19:45-46 after 19:29-38). This fits well with Brown’s notion that John’s Temple Cleansing, originally located here between 12:19 and 12:20 (or very close by), was displaced to its current position in 2:14-22 *when the Lazarus saga was added to 11-12* in a second draft. The neighboring contexts in John 2 and 12 support this hypothesis:

- Of Jesus’ five visits to Jerusalem in John, his final one begun in 12:12 is, inexplicably, *the only one in which he does not also enter the temple*: (1) he entered Jerusalem in 2:13, and entered the temple in 2:23; (2) Jerusalem in 5:1, the temple in 5:14; (3) Jerusalem in 7:10, the temple in 7:14 which he then left in 8:59; (4) Jerusalem in 10:22, the temple 10:23 which he again left in 10:39; (5)

<sup>9</sup> John’s remaining uses of ἐγείρω are in 5:8, 7:52, 11:29, 13:4, and 14:31.

Jerusalem in 12:12, but the temple is only once mentioned after debate over his *absence* from it in 11:56, in his remembrance of 18:20, the exact opposite of Mark's Jesus who visited the temple *only after* the Triumphal entry.

- The context after 12:19, comprising the events of 12:20-36, is easily understood as taking place within the temple complex: the Hellenists who in 12:20 have “come-up to *worship* in the feast,” Jesus’ solemn teaching in 12:23-27 about the hour of the glorification of the Son of Man, the thundering voice from heaven and the ensuing exchange with the crowd in 12:28-36a, and Jesus’ final departure and “hiding from them” (ἐκρύβη ἀπ’ αὐτῶν) in 12:36b, language reminiscent of previous departures from the temple in 8:59 and 10:39, all make eminent sense when pictured as taking place *in the temple*.
- The texts before and after 2:14-22 fit well together without that segment: in 2:13, *Jesus went-up to Jerusalem* (καὶ ἀνέβη εἰς Ἱεροσόλυμα ὁ Ἰησοῦς) for the *Passover of the Jews*, followed in 2:23 by *he-was in Jerusalem...* (ἦν ἐν τοῖς Ἱεροσολύμοις). This same pattern is replicated in Jesus’ next journey to Jerusalem in 5:1 where *Jesus went-up to Jerusalem* (καὶ ἀνέβη Ἰησοῦς εἰς Ἱεροσολύμοις) for a feast *of the Jews*, followed immediately in 5:2 by *it-was in Jerusalem...* (ἔστιν δὲ ἐν τοῖς Ἱεροσολύμοις).

Finally, why is Lazarus’ raising described in 12:1, 9, 18 exclusively with *ἐγείρω*, when its prior description in 11:23-25, formulated exclusively with the cognate pair *ἀνίστημι*–*ἀνάστασις* creates an expectation that any chapter 12 remembrances of that event would also use *ἀνίστημι*? The unexpected uses of *ἐγείρω* in John 12 are more intelligible if the temple-Jesus triad were previously **positioned** in the nexus of the John 12 events, at or close to 12:19-20. Now, John’s emulation of this *ἐγείρω* triad, here for Lazarus, *in that same nexus*, makes sense as a compositional balancing, or compensation, for moving the Temple Cleansing to chapter two. This evidence all fits well with Brown’s hypothesis. The wilderness signs-worker welcomed as “King of Israel” by the festival crowd, under whose protective aegis he had now disrupted the temple’s sacrificial merchandising support system, would have been completely intolerable for the Jewish authorities, even without the Lazarus miracle.

### **The Bethany Family of John 11 and the Disciples of John 1**

Asking *How* John’s Lazarus fits with the rest of his Gospel reveals his efforts to blend the new Bethany siblings into the flow of the exposition by interweaving subtle memories of earlier and later characters and events. Connections between Mary and Lazarus in John 11 with *later* descriptions of Judas and the Beloved Disciple in John 13 have recently been recognized.<sup>10</sup> Now, we recognize echoes of *earlier* text, beginning in 11:1, a verse often criticized as clumsy.<sup>11</sup> However, the form of 11:1 is closely patterned after the

---

<sup>10</sup> K.L. Yoder, “Gathered into One: Mary and Judas in John 11-13,” *NovT* 63 (2021) 323-345.

<sup>11</sup> 11:1 is described as “clumsy” by C.K. Barrett, *The Gospel According to St. John*, (London: SPCK, 1978<sup>2</sup>) 387, and “awkward” by U. Von Wahlde, *The Gospel and Letters of John* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2010) 2:489, but its construction is, nevertheless, intelligible as is. D. Burkett, “Two Accounts of Lazarus’ Resurrection in John 11,” *NovT* 36 (1994) 209-232, here 216-217, and A.

introduction of Philip with his cohorts, brothers Andrew and Peter, back in 1:44. Here, word/syllable counts are in parenthesis:

**Table 1: Philip and Lazarus Introduced**

Segment	Philip (1:44)	Lazarus (11:1)
1	ἦν δὲ ὁ Φίλιππος (4/6)	ἦν δὲ τις ἀσθενῶν Λάζαρος (5/9)
2	ἀπὸ Βηθσαιῶν (2/6)	ἀπὸ Βηθανία (2/6)
3	ἐκ τῆς πόλεως (3/5)	ἐκ τῆς κώμης (3/4)
4	Ἀνδρέου καὶ Πέτρου (3/6)	Μαρίας καὶ Μάρθας (3/6)
5		τῆς ἀδελφῆς αὐτῆς (3/6)

Having already appeared in 1:43, Philip is simply “he, Philip” (ὁ Φίλιππος). Lazarus, as new, enters as “a certain sick” (τις ἀσθενῶν), a closely reserved formulation in John.<sup>12</sup> Back in 1:40, Andrew had just been introduced as Peter’s brother, and Peter as Andrew’s brother in 1:41, so “his brother” (τοῦ ἀδελφοῦ αὐτοῦ) is not repeated in 1:44, but that space is later filled when Andrew is again “the brother (ὁ ἀδελφὸς) of Simon Peter” in their only other joint mention *with Philip* in 6:8. To match the configuration of 1:44, 11:1 must end with “her sister” (τῆς ἀδελφῆς αὐτῆς) rather than “his sister(s).” Thus, the placement of Martha’s sibling relationship with Mary in 11:1, before the notice of her relationship to Lazarus in 11:2, however awkward for linear exposition, fits well as an emulation of 1:44. Even the form and order of the names reveal artistry: replacing Μαρίας with his customary (indeclinable) Μαριάμ, or Πέτρου with Σίμωνος, or “Mary and Martha” with “Martha and Mary”, would have disturbed the delicate prosodic match now present in segment four.<sup>13</sup> The three new Bethany names in 11:1 all line up *in the same prosodic order* as their Bethsaida matches in 1:44.<sup>14</sup> The ordering of the sisters in 11:1 makes sense, then, without recourse to prioritizing Mary and disparaging, or even eliminating, Martha.<sup>15</sup> For this author, narrative *echo*

Marchadour, *Lazare: Histoire d'un recit, Recits d'une histoire* (LD 132; Paris: Cerf, 1988) 27, note 3, have separately noticed the structural emulation of 1:44, but without further explication.

While the *clumsy* emulation may flag intentional echo, it may also have been a factor behind the alternate readings in 11:1-3 of P<sup>66</sup> observed by E. Schrader, “Was Martha of Bethany Added to the Fourth Gospel in the Second Century?” *HTR* 110 (2017) 360–392, here 363-368.

<sup>12</sup> ἦν (δέ) τις ἀσθενῶν is a stock sequence in John, used elsewhere in 4:46 (“there was a certain nobleman whose son was sick”) and 5:5 (“there was a certain man who had been sick for 38 years”); these seem to be only other instances of *sick* individuals who are healed in John. Elsewhere in the NT, the combination τις + ἀσθεν- occurs only in Luke 8:2 and Acts 5:15.

<sup>13</sup> Ictic (–) and non-ictic (υ) syllables in both fourth segments scan as {υ – υ υ – υ}; for Koine loss of quantitative vowel length and tonal accent by the first century BCE, see, Geoffrey Horrocks, *Greek: A History of the Language and its Speakers* (West Sussex: Wiley, 2010<sup>2</sup>) 167-169, and A.-F. Christidis, *A History of Ancient Greek: From the Beginnings to Late Antiquity* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007) 2:1320-1321.

<sup>14</sup> Φίλιππος and Λάζαρος both scan as {– υ υ}; then, Ἀνδρέου and Μαρίας as {υ – υ}; and finally, Πέτρου and Μάρθας as {– υ}.

<sup>15</sup> For critical responses to F.J. Moloney, “Can Everyone be Wrong? A Reading of John 11.1–12.8,” *NTS* 49 (2003) 505-527, here 516-517, who finds a *primacy* in Mary (516-517) but almost everything of Martha to be *defective*, and to E. Schrader, “Was Martha?” who eliminates Martha altogether, see Yoder, “Gathered,” 334, 337-338, and 343-344.

trumps narrative *elegance*, as he creates allusion, not with word-for-word duplication but, by a few repetitions in the key connective sequence of ἦν δὲ / ἀπὸ / ἐκ τῆς, structuring a five-part correspondence between the two sets of three.

Some may object that these parallels only reflect inter-figural reading, not authorial design.<sup>16</sup> For further evidence of design, however, consider how John book-ends the entire Lazarus saga with John the Baptist and Philip: John is the *last* named character in 10:40-42 immediately before the *first* “Lazarus” in 11:1, and Philip is the *first* named character in 12:20, immediately after the *final* “Lazarus” in 12:17. The author highlights this feature by repeating each bookend three times: *John* (Ἰωάννης) once in 10:40 and twice in 10:41, in an inclusive span of 25 words, and *Philip* (Φίλιππος) once in 12:21, and twice in 12:22, in a span of 26 words. This echoes the author’s only previous book-ending of the Baptist with Philip in 1:28-46, encompassing 1:44, which we have just discovered is emulated in 11:1. It is no surprise then, that *Philip* was also mentioned there *three* times within a span of 22 words in 1:43-45, and was immediately associated with *Andrew* in 1:44, just as in 12:22.

It is fitting for the Baptist to preface John’s Lazarus story. Who better could introduce the new Bethany family than John’s *Adam*, who first stepped out of the prologue and initiated the action of 1:19 and all that follows? In reversal of his Synoptic sternness, John’s Baptist is the sole individual showing positive emotion in John 1-10, calling himself in 3:29 the *friend/beloved* (φίλος) of bridegroom Jesus, who “*rejoices with joy*” (χαρᾶ χαίρει) and whose “*joy is filled*” (ἡ χαρὰ ἡ ἐμὴ πεπλήρωται) at the sound of his voice. How appropriate that the detailed memory of the earlier place and activities of the now departed Baptizer becomes the threshold to this story in which Jesus *first loves* (ὄν φιλεῖς, 11:3) and *rejoices for* (χαίρω δι’ ὑμᾶς, 11:15) humans.

John, never called “the Baptist,” is the first of three who span this entire Gospel as the only individual men in a *love* relationship with Jesus, in non-overlapping sequence: the Baptist in chapters 1-10, Lazarus in 11-12, and the Beloved Disciple in 13-21. *Lover-friend* (φίλος) is even embedded in the name of John’s matching bookend, *Philip* (Φίλ-ιππος, “fond of horses, horse-loving,” LSJ 1935). While the book-ending connects him back to the Baptist, Lazarus is connected forward to the Beloved Disciple by a **figural “love” cantilever** structure spanning John 11-13,<sup>17</sup> and both occupy a momentous 4-day stretch of story time, 11:14-44 and 13:23-20:10 respectively, ending in a fourth=*last* day resurrection. Finally, all three “testify” about Jesus. John’s Baptist *testifies* about Jesus, even twice *testifying spoken testimony* (μαρτυρία as the object of μαρτυρέω) in the **first use** of these lexemes in 1:7, and later, **while speaking in 3:27-36 as the mouthpiece of the author, he himself attests in 3:32 to the testimony that Jesus testified**.<sup>18</sup> The Beloved Disciple, at the other end, twice *testifies written testimony*

---

<sup>16</sup> Moloney thus diminishes the work of Ingrid Rosa Kitzberger in his review essay, “A Response: Where from and Where To?” in I.R. Kitzberger, *Interfigural Readings of the Gospel of John* (Atlanta: SBL Press, 2019), 281-290, here 283 n.6.

<sup>17</sup> Yoder, “Gathered,” 335-336.

<sup>18</sup> T. Engberg-Pedersen, “John the Baptist in Mark and John: An Exercise in Comparison,” Becker et al (eds), *John’s Transformation*, 135-148, here 142 and 146-147, argues that the Baptist speaks



about Jesus in the last uses of the same lexemes in 19:35 and 21:24. In between, Jesus’ “calling <of> Lazarus,” who neither speaks nor writes, “from the tomb and raising him from the dead,” is *testified* by **one crowd to another** in 12:17, **to the complete exasperation of** the Pharisees in 12:19. Lazarus is **thus** the middle link connecting the Baptist with the Beloved Disciple.

### Lazarus, Philip, and Bethany

Listening further, we hear more low-volume echoes in Lazarus of chapter 1’s Philip.<sup>19</sup> When Jesus asked, “Where (ποῦ) have you laid him,” the Jews reply in 11:34, “come and see” (ἔρχου καὶ ἴδε), an exact repetition of Philip’s reply (ἔρχου καὶ ἴδε) to Nathanael in 1:46, and a singular form of the plural “come and see” (ἔρχεσθε καὶ ὄψεσθε) spoken by Jesus to Philip’s comrade Andrew and another unnamed disciple, when they asked in 1:39 “where (ποῦ) are you staying?” A second echo emerges when, unlike Peter who was *found* (εὕρισκει) by Andrew in 1:41, and Nathanael who was *found* (εὕρισκει) by Philip in 1:45, Philip is the only disciple in chapter 1 *found* (εὕρισκει) by Jesus himself in 1:43, upon arriving in Galilee, just as Jesus in 11:7 *found* (εὔρεν) Lazarus, upon arriving in Judea. Third, both of these findings occurred on a *fourth day*: Philip on the third “on the morrow” (τῆ ἐπαύριον) in 1:43, which is the *fourth* day counting from 1:19-28 as Day One, and Lazarus explicitly on the *fourth day* (11:17 τέσσαρας ἡδη ἡμέρας, 11:39 τεταρτάως) of his entombment.

Finally, consider the echo in 11:1 of place name *Bethany* in 1:28, as 10:40-42 meticulously places Jesus in the same location where John “at first” baptized “across the Jordan,” pointing the reader back to John “in *Bethany*” in 1:28<sup>20</sup>. The scene in 11:1 shifts immediately to the location where Lazarus “from *Bethany*” is now sick. Although later identified as “near Jerusalem” in 11:18, *Bethany* is integral to the new emulation of 1:28’s geographical setting:

---

<p>ταῦτα ἐν <b>Βηθανία</b><sup>21</sup> ἐγένετο πέραν τοῦ Ἰορδάνου ὅπου ἦν ὁ Ἰωάννης βαπτίζων (1:28)</p>	<p>καὶ ἀπῆλθεν πάλιν πέραν τοῦ Ἰορδάνου εἰς τὸν τόπον ὅπου ἦν Ἰωάννης τὸ πρῶτον βαπτίζων ... <b>ἀπὸ Βηθανίας</b> (10:40-11:1)</p>
--	---

---

This replicated lexical cluster, associating the two Bethany’s as one,<sup>22</sup> hints that the Baptist’s activities and preaching in 1:19-34, and Jesus’ engagement with his first

---

as a “puppet in his authorial master’s hand” (142, note 19). In spite of flaws, the prescient essay of D. Foster, “John Come Lately: The Belated Evangelist,” in F. McConnell (ed.), *The Bible and Narrative Tradition* (New York: Oxford, 1986) 113–131, reprinted in H. Bloom (ed), *The Gospels (Modern Critical Interpretations; New York: Chelsea House, 1988) 131–147*, remains the most provocative exploration of how author John speaks through the words of the Baptist or Jesus.

<sup>19</sup> R. Hays, *Echoes of Scripture in the Gospels* (Waco: Baylor University Press, 2016) 293 and 340, uses “low-volume echo” to describe some of John’s OT allusions, but it also fits quite well here.

<sup>20</sup> The Philip bookend also included matching geographical locators: Philip is “he from Bethsaida of Galilee” in 12:21, echoing *Galilee* where Jesus in 1:43 found Philip *from Bethsaida* in 1:44.

<sup>21</sup> This NA<sup>28</sup> resolution of the many variants of 1:28 foregrounds the phrase ἐν Βηθανία and gently separates it from the following πέραν τοῦ Ἰορδάνου by the intervening ἐγένετο.

<sup>22</sup> One and the same Bethany is most recently argued by W.E. Sproston North in “‘Bethany Beyond the Jordan’ (John 1:28) in Retrospect: The View from John 10:40 and Related Texts,” in A

disciples in 1:35-42, all took place in the home neighborhood of Lazarus, Mary, and Martha. The literary association is patent: auditors unfamiliar with Judea, or inattentive to geography, would, at first glance, identify the two as the same village, since John is careful elsewhere to distinguish entities with the same name.<sup>23</sup> A geographical identification is, of course, unlikely.<sup>24</sup> How interesting that we meet here the same question already posed about Bethany's first narrated inhabitant, Lazarus: are they two, or one and the same?

This village where Lazarus lived (11:1, 18), where Mary anointed Jesus (12:1), and Lazarus' forerunner was active (1:28), was already endowed with a distinctive Synoptic halo from Jesus' last week. It was *from Bethany* that Jesus sent the two disciples to prepare the Passover (Mark 11:1 || Luke 19:29), *to Bethany* he returned from Jerusalem to stay overnight (Mark 11:11 || Matt 21:17), *from Bethany* he departed the following morning hungry (Mark 11:12), *in Bethany* he was anointed (Mark 14:3 || Matt 26:6), and finally *from Bethany* he ascended after his resurrection (Luke 24:50). Is it only coincidence that John now names this enchanted village *four* times, all connected with the Lazarus saga and climaxing in the final anointing scene (12:1), fitting his Gospel into a precisely balanced frequency pattern with the Synoptics, two each for Matthew and Luke, and four each for Mark and John?

### Retouching John 1

These echoes in John 11 of a) Bethany, b) the Fourth Day, and c) found by Jesus, are each associated with potential textual disturbances in John 1. First, the secondary addition of "in Bethany" (ἐν Βηθανίᾳ) in 1:28 disturbs what was otherwise a fully intelligible description of John's baptizing location "beyond the Jordan" (πέραν τοῦ Ἰορδάνου), phrasing duplicated in the later remembrance of 3:26.<sup>25</sup> Second, the variant πρωῖ ("early morning") in place of πρωτον/πρωτος ("first") in 1:41, and the lateness of the "tenth hour" in 1:39, together suggest that the *fourth day* actually occurred in 1:41-42, so that τῆ ἐπαύριον ("on the morrow") in 1:43 originally signalled that Philip was found on the *fifth* day.<sup>26</sup> Third, 1:43 now somewhat awkwardly implies that *Jesus* found

---

*Journey Round John* (London: Bloomsbury T&T Clark, London, 2015) 168-178. She identifies the two as the same village, construing "Bethany" in 1:28 as "...on the far side of the Jordan where John was accustomed to baptize," in spite of syntactic awkwardness.

<sup>23</sup> Sproston North, "Bethany," 174, notes the example of "Judas *not* Iscariot" in John 14:22.

<sup>24</sup> See, for example, J.M. Hutton, "Bethany beyond the Jordan" in *Text, Tradition, and Historical Geography, Biblica*, 89 (2008) 305-328; S.G. Brown, "Bethany Beyond the Jordan: John and the Longer Gospel of Mark," *RB* 110 (2003) 497-516; and, R. Reisner, "Bethany Beyond the Jordan (John 1:28): Topography, Theology, and History in the Fourth Gospel," *Tyndale Bulletin* 38 (1987) 29-63. All three, however, too quickly discard the lucid discussion of R. Bultmann, *The Gospel of John: A Commentary* (Philadelphia: Westminster, 1971) 93-94, note 3.

<sup>25</sup> See note 21.

<sup>26</sup> So argued by M.-E. Boismard, *Du Baptême à Cana* (Paris: Cerf, 1956) 84: a) the reading πρωι ("in the morning") in 1:41 completes the array of chronological nomenclature ("the next day" in 1:29, 35, 43; "the third day" in 2:1); b) it fits well in context, as Andrew and his companion meet Jesus around the "tenth hour" (4:00pm, shortly before sunset) and go to stay with him, so he may have met Peter *early* the next day; c) although mss support is thin, the combined agreement of the Old Syriac and Old Latin cannot be easily discarded, especially here where Tatian's

Philip, breaking the pattern of the previous finding of Peter by Andrew and the finding of Nathanael by Philip, suggesting that *Peter* or *Andrew* originally stood as the named finder of Philip in 1:43.<sup>27</sup>

It is highly improbable that these clustered disturbances in 1:28, 41, and 43, each adding significant *awkwardness* in chapter 1, but simultaneously contributing to the cumulative *narrative allusion* in chapter 11, all arose from unrelated compositional events. More likely, these three instabilities arose from editorial changes made at the same time, upon the subsequent composition of 11:1-44, for the express purpose of *retroactively enhancing the fit of the figural features of John 1 with their newly designed echoes in John 11*. John has here lightly re-shaped his own prior text, not for theological but, for narrative compositional purposes.

To clarify, conceptualizing a second, or subsequent, *draft* does not necessarily demand notions of successive *editions, redactors, or layers*. At most, it only requires envisioning, behind the suggestive “we” and “I” remarks in 21:24-25 about the *writer* and what was included (or not) in the final *written* product, a cooperative process between author and associate(s), prior to releasing this Gospel for public reading.<sup>28</sup>

### Character Alignments

The emulation of 1:44 in 11:1 suggests a triple character alignment of Lazarus, Mary, and Martha with Philip, Andrew, and Simon Peter, respectively, enabling the Bethsaida three to cast implicit commentary on the new Bethany three.<sup>29</sup> While the latter abruptly enter and leave the story in 11-12, these echoes of chapter 1 paint an *allusive patina of age* over their relationship with Jesus, suggesting roots for the siblings reaching back to the earliest days of Jesus with John the Baptist. This patina blends well with other brushstrokes of age – the repeated notices of Jesus’ established love for the Bethany three, Lazarus’ established friendship with the disciples (11:11), as well as Martha’s *having-believed* (11:27, perfect tense) and Mary’s *anointed* (11:2, aorist) in the *past*. John leads us to imagine an untold story of a long friendship with Jesus, so we are comfortable with the brother and sisters of Bethany.

This triadic alignment proves richly evocative. *Martha* delivers the important tripartite confession of 11:26, corresponding to *Peter’s* Synoptic confession with an

---

Diatessaron omits the word in question; d) πρωτον ("at first") is intelligible as secondary to πρωι ("in the morning"), as a scribe may have read πρωτον/τον/αδελφον for πρωι/τον/αδελφον by dittography. All this may well, however, reflect *deliberate editing* instead.

<sup>27</sup> Cogently argued by Bultmann, *John*, 97-98.

<sup>28</sup> This fits well with the suggestion of M. Hengel, *The Johannine Question* (London: SCM Press, 1989) 102-108, that John’s manuscript, repeatedly revised over many years but left unfinished by the aging author, was edited and published posthumously by his students.

<sup>29</sup> Mark Stibbe, *John as Storyteller: Narrative Criticism and the Fourth Gospel* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992) 99-105, also noted John’s allusive re-use in the arrest and courtyard scenes of 18:1-27 of the earlier images in 10:1-18 of sheep and shepherd “going out and in” (ἐξελεύσεται καὶ εἰσελεύσεται) of the sheepfold (αὐλή), through a “door” (θύρα), which is opened by a “doorkeeper” (θυρωρός) to those who are “known” (γινώσκω/γνωστός), creating implicit commentary on Peter and the other (Beloved) disciple in the later scene.

exact duplication of “You are the Christ, the Son of God” (σὺ εἶ ὁ χριστὸς, ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ) from Matt 16:16. Fitting with another Synoptic connection, reader John has likely noticed Luke’s association of Martha with Peter by the way Jesus addressed both with distinctive double-naming: “Martha Martha” (Luke 10:41), and “Simon Simon” (Luke 22:31).<sup>30</sup> Later in John 21:15, 16, Peter becomes the only other, besides Martha in 11:2, to answer Jesus’ direct question with “yes Lord” (ναὶ κύριε). The roles of *Mary* and *Lazarus* are enhanced by their connection with *Andrew* and *Philip* in John’s only other mention of the Philip-Andrew-Peter sequence in the Feeding, where Jesus tested *Philip* with his question in 6:8 about feeding the crowd, whereupon *Andrew*, the brother of *Simon Peter*, advises Jesus of the boy with five loaves and two fish (6:8-9). Just as *Andrew* brought a solution to the crowd’s hunger, *Mary* in 12:3 brings a solution in her Anointing that resolves the unfinished plot of John 11. Finally, Jesus’ testing of *Philip* darkly foreshadows his testing of *Lazarus* and the sisters begun by his two-day delay in 11:6.

### Surface echoes of Luke’s Lazarus

Now on to the *Whence* question of a literary relationship between Luke’s and John’s Lazaruses: are they two, or somehow *one and the same*? Whatever may have been held in prior centuries, only a handful of modern interpreters have entertained the possibility of a literary version of *one and the same*.<sup>31</sup> The majority would likely stand with the most detailed, and still unchallenged, opposition of John P. Meier.<sup>32</sup>

As to the evidence, all agree that John’s Lazarus shares obvious surface features with Luke’s poor beggar: both are named *Lazarus*, a distinctive name within the New

<sup>30</sup> Luke’s epizeuxes bring Martha and Peter together into the elite circle of biblical characters thus addressed by the deity: Abraham (Gn 22:1,11), Jacob (Gn 46:2), Moses (Ex 3:4), Samuel (1 Sam 3:4,6), Absalom (2 Sam 19:5, addressed posthumously by his grieving father), Daniel (BelTh 1:37), Jerusalem (Luke 13:33-34), and Saul/Paul (Ac 9:4, 22:7, 26:14). Dorothy Lee, “Martha and Mary: Levels of Characterization in Luke and John,” in C.W. Skinner (ed.) *Character and Characterization in the Gospel of John* (London, New York: Bloomsbury, 2013) 197-220, here 203-204, observed on other grounds that John’s Martha parallels the Synoptic Peter.

<sup>31</sup> K. Pearce, “The Lukan Origins of the Raising of Lazarus”, *ET* 96 (1985) 359-361, best summarized the evidence for Lukan influence in John 11:1-44; C.K. Barrett found regarding Lazarus, “suggestive parallels,” but concluded it only “probable, though not certain ... that John knew Luke”, in *The Gospel According to John* (London: SPCK, 1978<sup>2</sup>) 389; J. Kremer suggested a common older, simpler Lazarus tradition behind both John 11-12 and Luke 16:19-31, in *Lazarus: Die Geschichte einer Auferstehung*, Katholisches Bibelwerk, Stuttgart, 1985, 102-109. More recent advocates of John’s knowledge of Luke have not advanced beyond Pearce in terms of finding additional connections between John 11 and Luke 16: Hartwig Thyen, “Die Erzählung von den bethanischen Geschwestern (Joh 11,1-12,19) als ‘Palimpsest’ über synoptischen Texten”, in F. Van Segbroeck, C.M. Tuckett, G. Van Belle, and J. Verheyden (eds), *The Four Gospels* (3 vols; Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1992) 3:221-2050, here 2034-2039; U. Busse, “Johannes und Lukas: Die Lazarusperikope, Frucht eines Kommunikationsprozess,” in in A. Denaux (ed), *John and the Synoptics* (Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1992) 281-306, here 305; M. Labahn, *Jesus als Lebensspender* (Berlin: De Gruyter, 1999) 451-453; W.E. Sproston North, *The Lazarus Story within the Johannine Tradition* (JSNTSS 212; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2001) 119; J. Zumstein *Das Johannes-evangelium* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2016) 416.

<sup>32</sup> J.P. Meier, *A Marginal Jew* (New York: Doubleday, 1994) 3:822-831.

Testament;<sup>33</sup> both die; and, both are involved with a contemplated or actual raising from the dead. These and other less obvious surface pairings line up in a *well-ordered* array of direct or inverse linguistic/thematic matches:

**Table 2: Lazarus in Luke and John**

<b>Feature</b>	<b>Luke 16:19-31</b>	<b>John 11:1-46</b>
<i>A certain...</i>	16:19,20	11:1
man named <i>Lazarus</i> ...	16:20	11:1
<i>Died</i>	16:22	11:14 (21,32)
A Rich Man/Jesus <i>lifted up his eyes...</i>	16:23	11:41
<i>and said, "Father" ...</i>	16:24	11:41
<i>twice petitioning or thanking for sending back Lazarus from the dead</i>	16:28,30	11:41-43
<i>Petition denied or granted...</i>	16:29,31	11:41,42
resulting in <i>impenitence, or in belief</i>	16:31	11:45

### Brothers and Sisters

While this ordered array of parallels is *prima facie* evidence of allusion to Luke's Lazarus, additional deeply embedded connections are at hand. First, Luke's Rich Man in hell fire asked Abraham to send Lazarus back from the dead to warn his "five brothers" (Luke 16:28), so that they not meet a similar end. Now in John 11:1-44, we find exactly *five* uses of *brother* (ἀδελφός), in 11:2, 19, 21, 23, and 32. That this is no coincidence is confirmed by *five* interwoven uses of the cognate *sister* (ἀδελφή), in 11:2, 3, 5, 28, and 39. The connection with Luke strengthens when we consider that John's deployment of these two sets of *five* "brothers" and "sisters" is comparable to Luke's deployment of a series of verbal *doublets* in his Mary and Martha story (Luke 10:38-42) that suggestively contrast the opposing reactions of these *two* sisters to Jesus: *sister* (ἀδελφή, 10:39, 40), *Mary* (10:40, 42), *Martha* (10:38, 40, and twice in 41), *Lord* in narration (κύριος, 10:39, 41), *about much* (περί πολλήν/πολλά, 10:40, 41), and *serve* (διακονία/διακονεῖν, 10:40, 40)<sup>34</sup>. John's deployment of *two* matching *quintets* is simply an adaptation of Luke's *duet* device, here featuring *the same two women* as sisters of Lazarus.

Robert Alter has observed that variations of relational epithets in Hebrew Bible narrative often reveal significant aspects of "character, moral, social, or political stance, and even plot."<sup>35</sup> We detect such an artistic design in John's deployment of *brother* and *sister* hinting at differences in the sisters' relationships with their brother:

<sup>33</sup> **Serious** flaws in Richard Bauckham's statistical argument against the distinctiveness of "Lazarus" **are presented in** Yoder, "Bosom of Abraham," 9-10.

<sup>34</sup> Detailed by J. Brutscheck, *Die Maria-Marta-Erzählung: Eine redaktionskritische Untersuchung zu Lk 10,38-42* (Bonner Biblische Beiträge 64; Frankfurt am Main: Harnstein, 1986) 37-40.

<sup>35</sup> R. Alter, *The Art of Biblical Narrative* (New York: Basic Books, 2011<sup>2</sup>) 227-228.

- John's first *brother* and last *sister* tie Mary with *sick* Lazarus, and Martha with *dead* Lazarus, respectively:

<u>Μαριάμ</u> ... ἦς ὁ ἀδελφὸς Λάζαρος ἡσθένει	John 11:2
ἡ ἀδελφή τοῦ τετελευτηκότος <u>Μάρθα</u>	John 11:39

- The fronting of the possessive pronoun *my* (μου) and the marked detachment from its object in Mary's otherwise verbatim repetition of Martha's opening statement suggests a closer emotional attachment for Mary to her brother:

Martha ... οὐκ ἂν ἀπέθανεν ὁ ἀδελφός <u>μου</u>	John 11:21
Mary ... οὐκ ἂν <u>μου</u> ἀπέθανεν ὁ ἀδελφός	John 11:36

These features suggest that Mary, who before (11:2) and after (12:3) is cited as the woman who anointed Jesus for his burial, was closely associated with personal care for *sick* Lazarus during his illness, death, and possibly anointing for burial. Likewise, Martha, who later objects to removing the stone from Lazarus' grave in 11:39, was associated with the business of gravesite and entombment of *dead* Lazarus. This implicit commentary is confirmed by their different reactions when they meet Jesus. Although both greet him with nearly identical statements about their brother, Martha proceeds to carry on a deep theological conversation with Jesus, but Mary collapses at his feet, helpless to do anything but weep.

While the repositioned *my* in 11:36 is subtle, we find a similar move in the speeches of John's other Mary, who also met Jesus, while weeping at or near the tomb of a recently deceased beloved, one already or soon to be raised from the dead, a Mary who is also first introduced as *Maria* (Μαρία, 11:1, and 20:1, 11) but later referenced as *Mariam* (Μαριάμ, eight times in 11:2-12:3, twice in 20:16, 18). Like Mary of Bethany who *replicated* the opening sentence of her sister's speech, the Magdalene *replicates* to the *two* angels in 20:13 the beginning and ending of her previous speech to the *two* disciples in 20:2, but with the addition of the same subtle *my* (μου) that was fronted in emphatic hyperbaton by Mary of Bethany:

**Table 3: My Brother and My Lord**

11:32 - κύριε, εἰ ἦς ὧδε οὐκ ἂν <u>μου</u> ἀπέθανεν ὁ ἀδελφός	20:2 - ἦραν τὸν κύριον ἐκ τοῦ μνημείου καὶ οὐκ οἶδαμεν ποῦ ἔθηκαν αὐτόν
	20:13 - ἦραν τὸν κύριόν <u>μου</u> καὶ οὐκ οἶδα ποῦ ἔθηκαν αὐτόν

The *brothers* and *sisters* of John 11 also appear in this Magdalene scene when Jesus commissioned her in 20:17 to go tell "my *brothers*" that he was alive, using the same new (in John) designation for his followers as in 21:23. *Brothers* brings John into line with Synoptic (Matt 28:10, 25:40) and broader tradition (Romans 8:29). However, we now see that the artistically calculated (5x each) play in John 11 on *brothers* and *sisters* fits well with that later picture of another *sister* as the first to meet her resurrected Lord, but even more importantly, it retrofits the lifetime of the earthly Jesus with the author's own time horizon. For, in his sublime staging of Mary in 11:28-32, John

has embedded a unique constellation of *Parousia* themes and lexemes: at the calling *voice* (φωνεῖ) of Jesus, who had finally *arrived* (πάρεστιν, cognate with παρουσία), after a prolonged absence, a *sister* (ἀδελφή) *quickly got-up* (ἠγέρθη ταχὺ) and *arose* (ταχέως ἀνέστη), for the *tomb* (εἰς τὸ μνημεῖον) of her *brother*, who had *died* while waiting for Jesus to *come*.<sup>36</sup>

### Parallel Characterizations

Some may argue that while the resurrection and **the five brothers could have originated** from the **ending** of Luke's parable (16:29-31), John "shows *no* knowledge of the main section of the parable."<sup>37</sup> However, John's Lazarus characterization turns out to be a well-balanced reflection of Luke's beggar precisely *in that main section*. Both men are almost completely passive.<sup>38</sup> Each is a man spoken about who never speaks, one acted upon who never acts. Each is afflicted, one with *sores* (Luke 16:20,21) and the other with *sickness* (John 11:1,2,3,4,6), and both finally *die* (Luke 16:22, John 11:14). Luke's was *thrown* (Luke 16:20) at the Rich Man's gate and *carried* (Luke 16:22) upon death to Abraham's bosom, while **John's** was *laid* (John 11:34) upon death in a tomb.

Here we recognize John's two notable exceptions to the passivity of Luke's Lazarus: a) Luke's Lazarus "longed to be filled with the crumbs that fell" from the Rich Man's table (Luke 16:21), and b) his Rich Man repeatedly asked that Lazarus be "sent" back from the dead to warn his surviving brothers (Luke 16:27-30). Now we see that John's Lazarus is given *precisely these two desires that were denied to Luke's*. Luke's starving Lazarus longed in vain to eat, but John's Lazarus dines with Jesus at Martha's dinner party (John 12:2). Luke's Lazarus was not sent back from the dead as the Rich Man *twice* requested, but John's Lazarus is resurrected back to life by Jesus after he *twice* thanks the Father for hearing him (John 11:41, 42), without even asking! These two positive wishes disallowed to Luke's Lazarus are both fulfilled in overflowing measure for John's Lazarus, in intertextual reversals, and in reverse order of exposition. John even fulfills a well-known Lukan mandate by putting on view an (intertextually) *poor* man reclining with Jesus at the Bethany family's *dinner*, using Luke's *dinner* (δείπνον) and *poor* (πτωχός) together in close association (Luke 14:12-13, 16-21 and John 12:2, 5-6).

### Two Thieves

Continuing with that main section of Luke's parable, one of John P. Meier's *vast differences* between the two Lazaruses is that John's story "lacks any character that functions as the antithesis to Lazarus."<sup>39</sup> The missing antithesis, however, is very close by in John's Anointing, where we discover that Judas Iscariot in 12:5-6 is deliberately cast as Lazarus' opposite, and in the same pattern as Luke's Rich Man. John's *love*

---

<sup>36</sup> Developed by W.E. Sproston North, *Lazarus*, 146, based on a suggestion by Barrett.

<sup>37</sup> Sproston North, *Lazarus*, 119-121, note 9 (emphasis added), sparred well with previous scholarship on this issue, but too quickly conceded.

<sup>38</sup> Well outlined for John's Lazarus by M. M. Thompson in "Lazarus: 'Behold a Man Raised up by Christ'", in (eds.) S. A. Hunt, D.F. Tolmie and R. Zimmermann, *Character Studies in the Fourth Gospel*. Mohr Tieback, Tübingen, 2013, 460-472, here 460-461.

<sup>39</sup> Meier, *Marginal Jew*, 2:824.

connection between Lazarus and the Beloved Disciple, and their joint contrast against Judas has been noted elsewhere: Lazarus is the *first* to appear just after Jesus opens the paragraph of 12:1-8, while Judas is the *last* to appear before Jesus closes that paragraph.<sup>40</sup> Now, we uncover at least five important features shared in common by Luke's Rich Man and John's Judas:

- both have *speaking* roles as counter-characters to a *mute* Lazarus;
- both voice objection to a state of affairs brought about by God or Jesus;
- both objections are negated by divine authority;
- both are the "men with the money" in their respective stories;
- both are implicitly "*thieving* from the poor."

The final *thief* element merits further discussion. John distinctively characterized Judas in 12:6 as one who cared not *for the poor* (περὶ τῶν πτωχῶν), but was instead a *thief* (κλέπτης), ironically carrying the collective *purse* (τὸ γλωσσόκομον) as group treasurer. This replicates information from 13:28-29, which lacks the *thief* notice, where the disciples had mistakenly supposed, since Judas *had the purse* (ἐπεὶ τὸ γλωσσόκομον εἶχεν), that he left the supper to do what he customarily did with the group's money: either buy something needed for the feast, or give to the *poor* (τοῖς πτωχοῖς). Since Judas had done nothing to raise suspicion of his secret embezzling, he must have stolen from the funds designated for *the poor* rather than from the group's grocery and festival fund. John again leaves dots for readers to connect: Judas indeed thieved from what the disciples *supposed* he gave to the poor. Luke's Rich Man, of course, had also *cared not* for *poor* Lazarus, effectively *stealing* from what he should have shared with that beggar, willfully ignoring Moses and the Prophets. The origin of John's singular *thief* detail, missing from the Synoptics, becomes fully intelligible when Luke's Lazarus is brought into the picture. This also augments the likelihood that 12:6 was inserted into John's Anointing story when the Lazarus material was added to the text of 12:1-19.<sup>41</sup>

### **In the Bosom of...Abraham**

The interconnected network architecture of John 11-13 has proven to be a platform for migrating key information elements between network nodes. For example, Mark's rare *raging* (ἐμβριμάομαι) and Luke's co-joined *crying/tears* (κλαίω, δάκρυσιν), both involving their respective *anointing women*, would have entered John's network in his own Anointing node (12:1-8), but both elements were skillfully migrated to his inter-linked meeting of anointing Mary (11:2) with Jesus on his way to Lazarus' tomb in 11:32-38.<sup>42</sup> We now observe this same technique at work with Luke's highly distinctive vision of Lazarus, also in the parable's *main section*, resting "in the bosom of Abraham" (εἰς τὸν κόλπον Ἀβραάμ, Luke 16:22, 23), an element that would have entered John's network in the Lazarus node (11:1-44), but was migrated over to the interconnected Last Supper where Lazarus' *Doppelgänger*, the Beloved Disciple, is seen resting "in the bosom of Jesus" (ἐν τῷ κόλπῳ τοῦ Ἰησοῦ, John 13:23). Their *Doppelgänger* connection is

---

<sup>40</sup> Further detailed by Yoder, "Gathered," 336.

<sup>41</sup> See again my proposed pre-Lazarus text in the appendix below.

<sup>42</sup> Fully argued by Yoder, "Gathered," 340-342.



one of *intimate love*, which is precisely what “in the bosom of” physically pictures.<sup>43</sup> If John added his Lazarus story in a second draft, then “in the bosom of Jesus” reflects a coincident retouching of 13:23. The same phrase also made its way into the prologue, there of Jesus in the Father’s bosom, perhaps evidencing another coincident retouching of 1:18, which then matches Luke’s two uses of his *bosom* trope (Luke 16:22, 23).

John has already shown himself to be a detail-oriented composer, using the epithets *brother* and *sister* exactly five times each, and working with word counts of the important names *Bethany*, *John*, and *Philip*. Here in 11-12, he uses *Mary* (Μαρία, Μαριάμ) and *Martha* (Μάρθα) exactly nine times each. *Lazarus*, however, is named 11 times, like John’s *Abraham*, also named 11 times in 8:31-59 but nowhere else, creating a subdued echo of Lazarus with Abraham in Luke 16. In 8:52-53, the Jews twice curiously pair Abraham who *died*, with *the prophets* who also *died*, but only in syntactic (retouched?) after-thoughts that are subsequently ignored.<sup>44</sup> “And the prophets” fits better, however, with “*Moses and the prophets*,” twice spoken by Luke’s *Abraham* after his pair of men had *died*. Has not John created here another small web of connections linking in turn, Martha with Lazarus, and Lazarus with Abraham? His coloration of Judas as *thief* and his painting of the Beloved Disciple *in the bosom of Jesus* both reflect John’s sensitive appropriation of Luke’s parable. A subtle composer must first be a subtle reader, and we today are certainly not the first “close readers” of Luke.

This slender Abraham connection strengthens when we consider how John 11 alludes to the same LXX text of Genesis 22-24 standing behind Luke 16.<sup>45</sup> There we find the first OT mentions of “love/beloved” (ἀγαπάω/ἀγαπητός), three times describing Abraham’s love for Isaac (Gen 22:2,12,16), just as John 11 first mentions Jesus’ “love” (ἀγαπάω, φιλέω), also thrice, of Lazarus (John 11: 3,5,36). Second, Sarah’s burial site in Genesis 23, the “cave” (σπήλαιον, Gen 23:9 plus 13 later uses) where the patriarchs and their wives (except Rachel) were interred, is with one exception the only OT *cave* tomb, just as the grave of John’s Lazarus is the only NT *cave* tomb (σπήλαιον, John 11:38).<sup>46</sup> Third, Genesis 24 is the only OT narrative with a *closely balanced* deployment of *brother* (ἀδελφός-6x: Gen 24:15,19,29,48,53,55) and *sister* (ἀδελφή-5x: Gen 24:30,30,59,60,60), corresponding to their *exactly balanced* deployment in John 11. Fourth, Gen 24:15-31 and John 11:20-43 share a matching story board sequence: protagonist dialogues with a sister / sister leaves to tell sibling about protagonist / sibling immediately meets protagonist at the same place / sibling speaks to un-speaking protagonist / sibling and protagonist leave meeting place together – whereupon, *Eliezer* is told, “Here! Come-in,” (Δεῦρο εἴσελθε, Gen 24:31), and *Lazarus* is conversely told, “Here! Outside,” (δεῦρο ἔξω, John 11:43). Finally, both texts, along with Luke 16, embody the theme of divine

---

<sup>43</sup> The particulars of John’s elegant *love* connection between Lazarus and the Beloved Disciple are presented by Yoder, “Gathered,” 335-336. Luke had fashioned his *bosom of Abraham* trope from Genesis 16 and 24, Yoder, “Bosom of Abraham,” 12-13.

<sup>44</sup> Although R. Sheridan, *The Figure of Abraham in John 8* (London: Bloomsbury, 2020) 201 and 361, establishes a background affiliation of Abraham with “the prophets,” the phrase remains unintegrated with the rhetorical flow of John 8.

<sup>45</sup> Extensively argued by Yoder, “Bosom of Abraham,” 10-17.

<sup>46</sup> The 14 LXX instances are Gen 23:9,11,17,17,19,20; 25:9,10; 49:29,30,30,32; and 50:13,13. The exception is the cave tomb of Judith and her husband Manasses (Jdt 16:23).

testing: God tested Abraham in Gen 22:1-2, and *Eliezer*, Abraham's παῖς and the model for Luke's *Lazarus*, tested the women by God's help in Gen 24:12-14; by divine orchestration, Luke's *Lazarus* was sent by Abraham to test the Rich Man, and John's *Lazarus* became a severe test for Jesus himself.<sup>47</sup> We conclude that John 11, as a composition, is plausibly a literary triangulation on the *Abraham* stories of Luke 16 and Genesis 22-24.<sup>48</sup>

### Reading Luke?

Can we confirm that John was elsewhere a close reader of Luke's *written* Gospel? Abundant evidence is right next door where he has composed his Footwashing, a scene with which his *Lazarus* story is tightly inter-networked,<sup>49</sup> with the same sequence, features, and structures as the *Sinful Woman* episode of Luke 7:36-50. The likeness is so extended, so orderly, and contains such unmistakable Lukan literary DNA, that it is a veritable *mimesis* that could only have flowed from Luke into John.<sup>50</sup> How fitting then, that John makes *Luke's Sinful Woman* into the *headliner tie that binds together* chapters 11-13: the Raising of *Lazarus* (11:2), the Anointing (12:3), and the Last Supper (13:4-5).<sup>51</sup> Luke's *Sinful Woman* already had a contextual tie with his *Lazarus* story as both were immediately preceded by teachings of Jesus about John the Baptist, 7:22-35 (citing Jesus' "raising of the dead" in 7:22!) just before 7:36-50, and 16:14-18 just before 16:19-31. The Baptist is, thus, on familiar ground when he prefaces John's raising of dead *Lazarus*, headlined as it is by the distinctive *Sinful Woman* details of John 11:2.

Close reading of Luke could also have led John to connect Mary and Martha as *sisters* of *Lazarus*, when Luke's *Lazarus* was intimately connected only with Abraham. In line with his proven interest in names, John easily may have noticed Luke's distinctive formulation for introducing both Martha and *Lazarus*, "but a certain woman/poor by-name Martha/*Lazarus*":

Luke 10:38	γυνή	δέ τις ὀνόματι	Μάρθα
Luke 16:20	πτωχός	δέ τις ὀνόματι	Λάζαρος

This exact naming sequence is replicated by Luke elsewhere only in Acts 8:29 (ἀνὴρ δέ τις ὀνόματι Σίμων).<sup>52</sup> And, appealing to John's proven interest in name *counts*, Luke mentioned these two names exactly four times each: *Martha* in 10:38, 10:40, and twice in 10:41, and *Lazarus* in 16:20, 16:23, 16:24, and 16:25. Those advocates of "one" *Lazarus*, in spite of their halting formulation, had perceived a verity deep in John's *Lazarus* that Origen could not admit, even though he did recognize "one" *Mary*.

<sup>47</sup> See notes 55-56 and referenced discussion below.

<sup>48</sup> Not far from Abraham Geiger's 1868 proposal, cited in Yoder, "Bosom of Abraham," 3.

<sup>49</sup> Yoder, "Gathered," 324-327, 332-333, 335-336, 338-339.

<sup>50</sup> In K.L. Yoder, "Mimesis: Foot Washing from Luke to John," *ETL* (2016) 655-670, here 657-662 and 668, I discuss key factors (footwashing delay, verb clustering, ἄρχω + infinitive, ἐκμάσσω with implied object) that render the directionality of influence as irreversibly *from* Luke *into* John, thus contradicting Barbara Shellard, "The Relationship of Luke and John: A Fresh Look at an Old Problem," *JTS* 46 (1995) 71-98, and others, who would picture Luke as dependent on John.

<sup>51</sup> Yoder, "Gathered," 339.

<sup>52</sup> Variants of this construction are found in Luke 1:5, and in Acts 5:1, 5:34, 9:10, 9:33, 9:36, 10:1, 16:1, 16:14, 18:17, 18:24, 19:24, 20:9, 21:10, and 27:1.

All this requires only author John, not necessarily his auditors, to have read or heard Luke (or Mark). John stages his distinctive presentations of the words and actions of Jesus and those with whom he dealt, to enable his readers/hearers to (re-)assimilate the oft differing Synoptic presentations in accord with his own special viewpoint, whether his readers/hearers had *already* encountered, or might anytime *in the future* encounter, those differing presentations. Although possibly hesitant in that regard, he was in the end enduringly successful.

### Why Lazarus?

Why relocate the Temple Cleansing to chapter two? 2:1 had already opened with John's only other "third day," recalling Bultmann's insight into the new Wedding-Temple synthesis: making water into wine on the third day, and rising from the dead on the third day, respectively comprised the *beginning* (ἀρχή) and the *ending* (τέλος) signs that Jesus gave to Israel.<sup>53</sup> John, however, adds to the Synoptic accounts his distinctive remembrance of Psalm 69/68:10, "Zeal for your house will *eat me up* (καταφάγεται με)," complementing the wedding's *drinking wine* with *eating Jesus*. Thus, John alone, unlike Matthew and Luke who both diminish Mark's Cleansing, recognized that **Jesus, who cleansed** the temple in Mark 11:15-17, had just departed "from Bethany" (ἀπὸ Βηθανίας) *hungry and finding nothing to eat* (11:12-13), prompting him to use the Psalm to invert his own Temple Cleanser into one *completely eaten-up*. John's Wedding and Cleansing together foreshadow the sensuous tropes of drinking and eating *Jesus* in the Eucharistic language of 6:52-58. Like Mark, John staged his Lazarus "from Bethany" (ἀπὸ Βηθανίας, 11:1) where Jesus is emotionally *eaten-up* on his way to the tomb (11:32-38), but by *love*.<sup>54</sup> Consumed by life-giving love (Lazarus) better fits the stoic Jesus of John 1-10 for the love themes of 13-17, than being consumed by zeal (Cleansing). We begin to see *Why Lazarus* rather than Temple Cleansing in John 11-12.

**Conversely**, *Why Lazarus* is clarified by his role as that sore-clothed one in Luke 16, sent by Abraham as the final test for the Rich Man before he died.<sup>55</sup> So also, John's Lazarus brings the final test for Jesus before he enters his Passion Week: out of his glorification zeal, Jesus delayed coming to Bethany, not taking into account the adverse effect of such testing on Mary, whose near-defection ironically and severely, but only momentarily, *tested Jesus himself*.<sup>56</sup> Again, it was his *love for Lazarus*, and for Mary and Martha, that rendered him uniquely susceptible to this test. There, in his tortured distress at the prospect of losing Mary to the Jews, Jesus finally *wept*. Beloved *brother Lazarus*, sick, dead, and buried, but raised on the *last* day of 11:1-44, **along with** those clustered Parousia allusions of 11:28-31, **now** brings that distressed and weeping Jesus into the time horizon of the *brothers* reading this gospel of John (21:23), who must know that Jesus *weeps* at their suffering as well, and that he will on the *last* day raise all those who believe alongside *sister* Martha, even though they die.

---

<sup>53</sup> Bultmann, *John*, 129.

<sup>54</sup> The collision of John's *love* and *glory* (zeal) trajectories in 11:28-38 is discussed in Yoder, "Gathered," 337.

<sup>55</sup> Yoder, "Bosom of Abraham," 19-20.

<sup>56</sup> Yoder, "Gathered," 343-344, **extensively discusses Jesus' anger and weeping in 11:28-38.**

We end with John's love-witness triangle of the Baptist, Lazarus, and the Beloved Disciple. While that anonymous Disciple is the last (writing) witness in and behind the Gospel of *John*, the named Baptizer was the first (speaking) witness, whose testimony about Jesus, especially in 3:28-36, cannot be distinguished from the narrator's. The mouthpiece of the author, he is always only *John*, never the *Baptist*. Lazarus himself neither speaks nor writes, but he is the otherwise missing narrative link between this first and that last witness, who both function as alter egos of the author. Masked and costumed actors in ancient theater could play multiple roles in a single play. At mid-performance, beloved Lazarus points forward with one hand to the Disciple, the last to exit John's stage, and backward with the other to the Baptist, the first to enter John's stage, joining that un-named writing witness with the name of this baptizing witness who spoke for the writer. Like mute Zecharias, Lazarus gestures to us that the roles of this Baptizer and that Writer, irrespective of historical realities, were played on this stage by one and the same actor-evangelist, and his name is John.

## Appendix: Text of John 10:40-12:19 Before Adding Lazarus Material

[10:40] Καὶ ἀπῆλθεν πάλιν πέραν τοῦ Ἰορδάνου εἰς τὸν τόπον ὅπου ἦν Ἰωάννης τὸ πρῶτον βαπτίζων καὶ ἔμεινεν ἐκεῖ. [41] καὶ πολλοὶ ἦλθον πρὸς αὐτὸν καὶ ἔλεγον ὅτι Ἰωάννης μὲν σημεῖον ἐποίησεν οὐδέν, πάντα δὲ ὅσα εἶπεν Ἰωάννης περὶ τούτου ἀληθῆ ἦν. [42] καὶ πολλοὶ ἐπίστευσαν εἰς αὐτὸν ἐκεῖ. **(omit 11:1-45)** [11:46] τινὲς δὲ ἐξ αὐτῶν ἀπῆλθον πρὸς τοὺς Φαρισαίους καὶ εἶπαν αὐτοῖς ἃ ἐποίησεν Ἰησοῦς.

[11:47] Συνήγαγον οὖν οἱ ἀρχιερεῖς καὶ οἱ Φαρισαῖοι συνέδριον καὶ ἔλεγον· τί ποιούμεν ὅτι οὗτος ὁ ἄνθρωπος πολλὰ ποιεῖ σημεῖα; [48] ἐὰν ἀφῶμεν αὐτὸν οὕτως, πάντες πιστεύσουσιν εἰς αὐτόν, καὶ ἐλεύσονται οἱ Ῥωμαῖοι καὶ ἀροῦσιν ἡμῶν καὶ τὸν τόπον καὶ τὸ ἔθνος. [49] εἷς δὲ τις ἐξ αὐτῶν Καϊάφας, ἀρχιερεὺς ὢν τοῦ ἐνιαυτοῦ ἐκείνου, εἶπεν αὐτοῖς· ὑμεῖς οὐκ οἴδατε οὐδέν, [50] οὐδὲ λογιζοσθε ὅτι συμφέρει ὑμῖν ἵνα εἷς ἄνθρωπος ἀποθάνῃ ὑπὲρ τοῦ λαοῦ καὶ μὴ ὅλον τὸ ἔθνος ἀπόληται. **(omit 51-53)** [54] ἀπ' ἐκείνης οὖν τῆς ἡμέρας ἐβουλεύσαντο ἵνα ἀποκτείνωσιν αὐτόν.

[55] Ἦν δὲ ἐγγὺς τὸ πάσχα τῶν Ἰουδαίων, καὶ ἀνέβησαν πολλοὶ εἰς Ἱεροσόλυμα ἐκ τῆς χώρας πρὸ τοῦ πάσχα ἵνα ἀγνίσωσιν ἑαυτούς. [56] ἐζήτουν οὖν τὸν Ἰησοῦν καὶ ἔλεγον μετ' ἀλλήλων ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ ἐστηκότες· τί δοκεῖ ὑμῖν; ὅτι οὐ μὴ ἔλθῃ εἰς τὴν ἑορτήν; [57] δεδώκεισαν δὲ οἱ ἀρχιερεῖς καὶ οἱ Φαρισαῖοι ἐντολὰς ἵνα ἐὰν τις γινῶ ποῦ ἐστὶν μηνύση, ὅπως πιάσωσιν αὐτόν.

[12: 1] Ὁ οὖν Ἰησοῦς πρὸ ἕξ ἡμερῶν τοῦ πάσχα ἦλθεν εἰς Βηθανίαν. **(omit 1bc)** [2] ἐποίησαν οὖν αὐτῷ δεῖπνον ἐκεῖ. **(omit 2bc)** [3] <Γυνὴ δὲ τις> (replacing **Ἡ οὖν Μαριάμ**) λαβοῦσα λίτραν μύρου νάρδου πιστικῆς πολυτίμου ἤλειψεν τοὺς πόδας

[10:40] And he-went-off again across the Jordan to the place where John was first baptizing, and he remained there. [41] And many came to him and were-saying, "John did not one sign, but everything John said about this one was true." [42] And many believed in him there **(omit 11:1-45)** [11:46] But some of them went-off to the Pharisees and told them what Jesus had-done.

[11:47] Therefore the high priests and the Pharisees gathered-together a council and were-saying, "What are we to-do? This man is-doing many signs. [48] If we allow him thus, everyone will-believe in him, and the Romans will come and destroy us and our place and our people." [49] One of them, Caiaphas, who was high priest that year, said to them, "You know not one-thing, [50] nor have you reckoned that it is beneficial for you that one man dies for the nation, rather than all the people perish." **(omit 51-53)** [54] From that day they took-counsel to kill him.

[55] Now the Passover of the Jews was near, and many went up to Jerusalem from the countryside before the Passover, to purify themselves. [56] They were looking for Jesus and saying with each other standing in the temple, "What do you think? He certainly will not come to the feast, will he?" [57] Now the high priests and Pharisees had given orders that anyone knowing his whereabouts should report it, so they might-arrest him.

[12: 1] Therefore Jesus, six days before the Passover, came to Bethany. **(omit 1bc)** [2] There they made him a dinner. **(omit 2bc)** [3] <Now a certain woman,> (replacing **therefore Mary,**) taking a pound of costly pure nard ointment, anointed the feet of

τοῦ Ἰησοῦ καὶ ἐξέμαζεν ταῖς θριξίν αὐτῆς τοὺς πόδας αὐτοῦ· ἡ δὲ οἰκία ἐπληρώθη ἐκ τῆς ὀσμῆς τοῦ μύρου. [4] Λέγει δὲ Ἰούδας ὁ Ἰσκαριώτης εἷς ἐκ τῶν μαθητῶν αὐτοῦ ὁ μέλλων αὐτὸν παραδιδόναι, [5] διὰ τί τοῦτο τὸ μύρον οὐκ ἐπράθη τριακοσίων δηναρίων καὶ ἐδόθη πτωχοῖς; **(omit 6)** [7] εἶπεν οὖν ὁ Ἰησοῦς· ἄφες αὐτήν, ἵνα εἰς τὴν ἡμέραν τοῦ ἐνταφιασμοῦ μου τηρήσῃ αὐτό· [8] τοὺς πτωχοὺς γὰρ πάντοτε ἔχετε μεθ' ἑαυτῶν, ἐμὲ δὲ οὐ πάντοτε ἔχετε. **(omit 12:9-11)**

[12] Τῇ ἐπαύριον ὁ ὄχλος πολὺς ὁ ἐλθὼν εἰς τὴν ἑορτήν, ἀκούσαντες ὅτι ἔρχεται ὁ Ἰησοῦς εἰς Ἱεροσόλυμα [13] ἔλαβον τὰ βαῖα τῶν φοινίκων καὶ ἐξῆλθον εἰς ὑπάντησιν αὐτῷ καὶ ἐκραύγαζον· ὡσαννὰ· εὐλογημένος ὁ ἐρχόμενος ἐν ὀνόματι κυρίου, καὶ ὁ βασιλεὺς τοῦ Ἰσραὴλ. [14] εὐρῶν δὲ ὁ Ἰησοῦς ὄναριον ἐκάθισεν ἐπ' αὐτό, καθὼς ἐστὶν γεγραμμένον· [15] μὴ φοβοῦ, θυγάτηρ Σιών· ἰδοὺ ὁ βασιλεὺς σου ἔρχεται, καθήμενος ἐπὶ πῶλον ὄνου. [16] ταῦτα οὐκ ἔγνωσαν αὐτοῦ οἱ μαθηταὶ τὸ πρῶτον, ἀλλ' ὅτε ἐδοξάσθη Ἰησοῦς τότε ἐμνήσθησαν ὅτι ταῦτα ἦν ἐπ' αὐτῷ γεγραμμένα καὶ ταῦτα ἐποίησαν αὐτῷ. **(omit 17-18)** [19] οἱ οὖν Φαρισαῖοι εἶπαν πρὸς ἑαυτούς· θεωρεῖτε ὅτι οὐκ ὠφελεῖτε οὐδέν· ἴδε ὁ κόσμος ὀπίσω αὐτοῦ ἀπῆλθεν.

Jesus and wiped his feet with her hair, and the house was filled with the scent of the ointment. [4] But, Judas Iscariot, one of his disciples, who was about to betray him, said, [5] “Why was not this ointment sold for three hundred pence and given to the poor?” **(omit 6)** [7] Therefore Jesus said, “Leave her be, so that she may keep it for the day of my burial. [8] The poor you always have with you, but me you do not always have.” **(omit 12:9-11)**

[12] The next day, the large crowd that had-come to the feast, hearing that Jesus was coming to Jerusalem, [13] took palm branches and went-out to meet him and were shouting, “Hosanna! Blessed is he who comes in the the name of the Lord, even the King of Israel!”. [14] Now finding a donkey, Jesus sat on it, just as it was written, [15] “Fear not, daughter of Zion. Behold your king is coming, sitting on a donkey’s colt.” [16] His disciples did not know these things at first, but when Jesus was glorified, then they remembered that these things were written of him and they did these things to him. **(omit 17-18)** [19] Therefore, the Pharisees said to one another, “You see that not one-thing has-helped you! Behold, the world has gone-off after him!”