

general reader is a very ignorant person, and it is sheer ignorance that says the preaching of the Cross makes the Law of God of none effect.

Messrs. Sonnenschein have published a bulky volume by the late James Thomas, entitled *Genesis and Exodus as History: a Critical Inquiry* (6s.). His conclusion is that Genesis and Exodus are not history. He mentions many of the recent authors who have attempted to reconcile these books with modern knowledge, and treats their attempts to a scathing exposure—Dr. Cunningham Geikie, Dr. Kinns, Dr. M'Caul, Dr. Ackland, Dr. Ensor, the present Bishop of London, Dr. Wace, and a few more. Some of them deserve his severity. But if we were all to be judged by a sentence picked out here and there from our writings, which of us would escape scarifying? On the whole, this is *not* the way to make progress. There is nothing in the book that is not now common property, and the spirit of it is not for edification. Nay, sometimes it misses the matter altogether. 'The whole Jewish system,' we read in one place, 'of ritual and ceremonial is redolent of blood. We have especially in Leviticus (a book so little read by the laity) the most minute instructions in slaughter-house and butchery work, interminable blood-smearings and sprinklings, all to be performed in exact accordance with rigorous regulation by the priest, "lest he die," though with never a word of spiritual import.'

Mr. Charles Hart, B.A., Assistant Master at St. Cuthbert's Grammar School, Newcastle-on-Tyne, is writing *A Manual of Bible History*, and

has already published the Old Testament volume (Washbourne; 3s. 6d. net). The manual is intended to serve as a text-book of Scripture History in Catholic secondary schools. It is written in the form of an easy orthodox narrative, and Mr. Hart has been careful to interweave with his narrative as many as possible of the exact words of the Sacred Text. Upon this he quotes a letter from the Rev. Dr. Wheatley, Professor of Scripture at St. Cuthbert's College, Ushaw, who says: 'I think it such an advantage that we should become as familiar as possible, even from our youngest years, with the very words of the inspired writings; and as we cannot put Bibles into the hands of young people, such a book as the one you have written will prove of the greatest advantage.' It is a well-printed, handsome volume, and contains many useful maps.

Daniel and his Critics is a curious title for a 'Critical and Grammatical Commentary.' Is it as wise as it is curious? In any case, the commentary is good, and it will be welcomed even by the critics who may be supposed to be smitten in its title. It is enough to say that the author is Dr. Charles H. H. Wright, in order to understand the title and appreciate the book. It bristles with Hebrew, Arabic, Syriac, and what not, which makes the title more absurd than ever; for such a title can attract only the unlearned, and the book is for the very learned indeed. It is, in spite of its title, a welcome addition to the commentaries on Daniel. Dr. Wright uses the best authorities, including Bevan and Driver, and he has scholarship of his own (Williams & Norgate; 7s. 6d.).

Problems of the Fourth Gospel.

BY REV. ROBERT SMALL, M.A., NORTH BERWICK.

I.

CHRIST'S TEMPTATION RETAINED IN THE SUBCONSCIOUSNESS OF THE FOURTH GOSPEL.

1. The Juncture at which Christ opened this Chapter of Autobiography to His Apostles.

THE problems inherent in our Fourth Gospel obtrude themselves upon every reader, even the least critical. They baffle those who with scholar-

ship and scientific acumen have laboured to solve them. Yet it is possible that some of these difficulties are governed, if not eradicated, by the express announcement of the *Doctrinal* purpose for which this version of the Memoirs was compiled (20⁸¹).

Let us assume that it keeps in view, as its aim throughout, the thesis—'Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God,'—and what incidents already narrated by the Synoptics should we expect to reappear in this later *vidimus* of Christ's life? One naturally thinks of that mysterious experience which goes by the name of 'His temptation,' and one is surprised that these pages should apparently ignore it. Was it not the very truth embodied in this Gospel, the Divinity of Christ, on which the challenge fell—'If thou art the Son of God?' Surely then, in writing up this final anthology of the traditions about Christ, the author (or the authors) could not overlook that episode. Hundreds of well-attested miracles and logia might be omitted, as the concluding footnote acknowledges; but could the Temptation, with its twofold innuendo upon the Sonship of Christ?

It may reasonably be conjectured that *the Synoptic accounts of the Temptation were in the mind of the Fourth Evangelist* when he composed his opening chapters. The salient points of that episode were vividly before him. He knew whether Matthew or Luke had arranged the three Temptations in correct chronological order. And he could do what neither of these, his literary predecessors, had done,—he could penetrate the allegorical drapery in which Christ had clothed that reminiscence of His, and could interpret the spiritual conflict through which Christ had passed.

Chapter 6 is the *locus classicus* in the Johannean rendering of the Temptation. The preceding chapter has introduced the first portents of antagonism. Christ has seen the malignant looks of his audience at Jerusalem, and has caught a premonitory glimpse of death. It is at this crisis in Christ's own career that the execution of John the Baptist is reported to Him. He retires with His disciples,—some of whom had been the Baptist's disciples,—and seeks a period of seclusion in the desert. His environment of wilderness and mountain recalled those solitudes in which his dead kinsman had ministered and He Himself had plunged into spiritual wrestlings. 'Jesus went up into the mountain, and there he sat with his disciples.' Did He sit there, chin on palm, gazing dreamily into the distance, but saying no word to the stricken men beside Him? No, He spoke to them. He related something new and startling enough to rouse them from their melancholy pre-occupation. He told them of a combat which He

had waged with Satan soon after the Baptist had announced Him to the Jewish world. The language used by Christ in this chapter of autobiography sunk deep into the Apostolic tradition, and re-emerged with little change in the first and third Synoptic Gospels. John remembered every phrase and intonation. But brooding over what Christ said, he had gradually come to understand that Christ was allegorizing a very real experience of His, and was straightway to furnish His hearers with a clue to the allegory.

'Jesus *therefore* (6^s) lifting up his eyes, and seeing that a great multitude cometh unto him,' proceeds to work a miracle prearranged already in His thoughts, and designed to illustrate what He has just said. The 'therefore' does not attach itself to the parenthetic note anent the approaching Passover, as though these crowds were *en route* for that Feast: it reaches back to the conversation in which Christ had engaged His disciples, and forward to the Master's own commentary about to be enshrined in His miracle of the loaves and fishes.

Why does John, working within strict limitations of letterpress, surcharge his pages with a fourth report of this miracle? He adds no details of prime importance to the threefold narrative of the Synoptics. Even though he infuses into his version of it a Eucharistic significance, much of his labour, many of those minute touches, expended on it are thrown away, unless we recognize the Janus-head which he has here given to the miracle. Its retrospect is toward that enigmatic experience of which Christ has been speaking. Its predictive outlook, from the Evangelist's standpoint, is toward the Eucharist *via* the Capernaum discourse (vv. 26-59).

What, then, is this retrospective and illuminative meaning which we are to find in the miraculous meal? It is, as it stands, a signal demonstration of Christ's Omnipotence. Challenged to appease His own hunger by transmuting the stones of the wilderness into bread, He had refused to do any such thing. But here He accomplishes, in the presence of His disciples, something not less marvellous. He multiplies a handful of barley loaves into food sufficient for five thousand hungry people.

Who, meantime, are the outstanding *dramatis personae* among those that had heard His autobiographic monologue? Not Judas, although the commissariat is entrusted to him. Not Peter, nor 'the beloved disciple,' though they are prominent

enough in this Fourth Gospel. Philip and Andrew come to the front. And these two men had been the first two men to bring in recruits to Christ. When He returned to the Jordan, wearied with His Temptations, good angels—evangelists—had ‘ministered unto Him,’ bringing Him converts, more to Him than meat and drink. These angels of the Church stand forward here—Andrew and Philip. The others recede into the background: have naught to do (so far as this Fourth Gospel can see) with the handling of that miraculous bread, except the gleaning of its fragments.

But the Temptations did not cease when Christ declined to transform stones into bread. There ensued another Temptation, with which He Himself has associated the catchwords ‘Pinnacle of the Temple.’ Jewish exegetes had long associated the Temple Pinnacle with the Messianic prophecy in

Mal 3¹. ‘The Messiah, ‘the prophet that cometh into the world,’ was to leap from that giddy height into the courtyard below, and was to be received with acclamation by the worshippers. Christ renounced that crude and blatant method of advertising His Messiahship. The disciples caught this at least of His meaning, as they listened to His autobiographic allegory. They asked themselves, Why did He refuse to display His Messianic credentials? And, in His Third Temptation, why did the kingdoms of the world and all their regalia prove so unattractive to Him? They have their answer now, these perplexed hearers. Christ is hailed by ‘the people’ as ‘the prophet that cometh into the world,’ though He has not taken the leap from the pinnacle. He is all but made a king perforce by them, though He has dazzled them and duped them with none of Satan’s wiles (6^{14, 15}).

Recent Biblical and Oriental Archaeology.

BY PROFESSOR A. H. SAYCE, D.D., LL.D., OXFORD.

Two more volumes of the Babylonian Expedition of the University of Pennsylvania have just been published, containing copies of cuneiform tablets found at Nippur (*Documents from the Temple Archives of Nippur*, Ser. A, xiv. xv., by Albert T. Clay, Philadelphia, 1906). The Rev. A. T. Clay has again been the copyist and decipherer, and has again shown himself one of the most efficient of Assyriologists. The elaborate indices and tables of contents with which the volumes are provided imply a huge amount of labour, and, so far as I have been able to check them, have been compiled with extraordinary accuracy. The introductions, in which specimen translations of the tablets are given, are full of new information; the signification of words and ideographs hitherto unknown, like KU-QAR, ‘payment,’ has been fixed, and fresh chronological data are quoted to disturb the mind of the Babylonian historian. Indeed, it is a little difficult to see how the dates which Mr. Clay’s tablets necessitate can be made to agree with those of the famous ‘Annalistic List.’ For the study of Kassite proper names, and therewith of the Kassite language, the newly published docu-

ments are of considerable importance. The list of cuneiform characters distinctive of the Kassite epoch, which Mr. Clay has drawn up, will be much appreciated by his brother Assyriologists, and its usefulness has been increased by its having been reprinted in a separate form.

THE NAME OF YEHO, YAHVEH.

For Old Testament students the most interesting names in the newly published tablets from Nippur will probably be those which show that the name of the national God of Israel was employed in Babylonia in the Kassite age. I was the first to notice, some years ago (in the pages of THE EXPOSITORY TIMES), that the name of a West Semite in a contract tablet of the Khammu-rabi period,—Ya(h)um-ilu—contains the name of יהו, י, with the mimmatation that was characteristic of the time, and exactly corresponds with the later Joel. Now in the tablets of the Kassite period Mr. Clay has found the names Ya-â-u, Ya-a-u,¹ Ya-û-ba-ni (*i.e.* Yau-bani, like Ea-bani, etc.), and Ya-u-a or Jehu, from which we learn that the name con-

¹ Perhaps also Ya-wu.