

Theology on the Web.org.uk

Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible

This document was supplied for free educational purposes. Unless it is in the public domain, it may not be sold for profit or hosted on a webserver without the permission of the copyright holder.

If you find it of help to you and would like to support the ministry of Theology on the Web, please consider using the links below:



Buy me a coffee

<https://www.buymeacoffee.com/theology>



PATREON

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

[PayPal](#)

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

A table of contents for *The Expositor* can be found here:

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_expositor-series-1.php

So in Arabic the commonest designation is derived from the Semitic root for *holy k-d-s*. It appears in various forms: Bêt el Makdis, el Muḳaddas, el Muḳaddis,¹ or (in the modern vernacular) el Ḳuds esh-Sherif, or more briefly el Ḳuds "the Sanctuary." In the East this is by far the commonest name to-day.

The interesting suggestion is made by M. Clermont Ganneau, *Archaeological Researches in Palestine*, vol. i. 186, that el-Muḳaddas or el Ḳuds betrays a reminiscence of a dedication of the sanctuary at Jerusalem to the Canaanite deity Ḳadesh. But for this there appears to be no evidence.

GEORGE ADAM SMITH.

WENDT ON THE FOURTH GOSPEL.

II.

THE next case which Wendt brings forward is the speech in vi. 27 sqq. It does not harmonize with the historical situation. The speech follows upon the request of the people for a sign similar to that given by Moses in the manna. Could any more inappropriate occasion, Wendt asks, be imagined for such a demand? The people who asked this sign had received precisely such a sign the day before. Wendt thinks that in the original tradition the discourse vi. 27 sqq. had no connexion with the miracle of the feeding of the multitude. The Evangelist thought to give it an appropriate setting by connecting it with this miracle. What more fitting than that the feeding of the multitude should be followed by the speech in which Jesus spoke of Himself as the bread of life! So he endeavoured to connect the two by vi. 26 in which Jesus reproaches the people with seeking Him, not because they saw the signs, but because they ate and were filled. But the connexion thus estab-

¹ Yaḳût, iv. 590; *Taj el 'arus*, iv. 214.

lished is but artificial; and the demand of the people for a sign, which the Evangelist faithfully transcribed from the Source, is a witness against the setting he has given the speech. There are further traces, Wendt thinks, that the speech is not in its right place. In *v.* 36 Jesus says to the people, "But I said unto you, that ye also have seen Me, and believe not." To what previous saying of Jesus does this refer? Wendt can find nothing in the chapter to which the words may apply. But he does find something to correspond in *v.* 17-47, where, after speaking of the works which bear witness to Him (*v.* 36), Jesus reproaches the people with their unbelief (*vv.* 37-47). But the speech in chapter *v.* is addressed to the people of Jerusalem, while that of chapter *vi.* is delivered in Galilee. How can Jesus say that He has told these Galileans things which He said a long time before in Jerusalem? The only conclusion is that He must have had one and the same audience before Him in both cases, i.e. that the speech in chapter *vi.* was delivered not in Galilee at all, but in Jerusalem on the same occasion as that in chapter *v.*

Whatever difficulties there may be with regard to the points which Wendt here adduces, it is questionable whether his explanation does not raise more than it solves. The Evangelist is supposed to have deliberately broken up a speech into two portions, giving to one an entirely different setting and audience from the other. For what purpose? Merely because the latter part of the speech spoke of Jesus as the bread of life, and it seemed a happy idea to connect that saying with the miracle of the loaves. In the latter portion of the speech there is an allusion to something that has been said in the former. But the Evangelist brought so little intelligence to bear upon the matter that, though he had the speech as a unity before him, he was "not conscious of the reference of *vi.* 36 to the speech in chapter *v.*," a reference, however, which is per-

fectly clear to the critic of the present day, in spite of the fact that the two speeches are represented as being given on entirely different occasions. Still the Evangelist does seem to have felt that vi. 36 must refer to something, and accordingly invented *v.* 26 to account for it. And though the demand of the people for a sign could not have been introduced on a more unfortunate occasion than after the miracle of the feeding of the multitude, he never seems to have felt the incongruity, but was apparently quite satisfied that by the interpolation of *v.* 26 he had not only accounted for *v.* 36, but made the transition from the miracle to the speech smooth and natural. There may be inconsistencies enough in the Fourth Gospel calling for explanation, but it is questionable whether any or all of them present difficulty to be compared with the character of the Evangelist, as we must imagine him on the Wendtian hypothesis,—a man at once of preternatural dulness and most lively imagination; blind to the most obvious allusions in the speeches he records, yet anxious to establish a connexion where none exists; with no regard for the unity of the text before him, yet with such respect for the letter that he will not omit one word that may bear witness against himself; a man at once of a most destructive and most constructive tendency, with a passion for breaking a whole to pieces for the mere pleasure of the thing, yet delighting to manufacture out of the merest fragments such as ix. 4 sq. and xi. 23, 25 sq. such wholes as the story of the blind man in chapter ix. and the resurrection of Lazarus in chapter xi.; a man who has wilfully broken the magnificent window on which the Apostle had painted the picture of the Saviour, in order that with the pieces of painted glass he might construct the kaleidoscope of the Gospel. Wendt may think to account for the Fourth Gospel by the character of the Evangelist, but who shall account for the character of the Evangelist?

To return to the passage immediately under consideration, the chief reason Wendt has for arguing that the speech vi. 27 sqq. cannot have been delivered on the occasion described in the Gospel is that the demand of the people for a sign is singularly inappropriate after the miracle of the feeding. One would rather think that this very inappropriateness is a strong reason against the hypothesis that the Evangelist invented the situation. A man with such an imagination as the Evangelist is supposed to have had must surely have realized that the request of the people was out of place. What was to have hindered him from leaving out the demand altogether? He had but to omit *vv.* 28-32, and all would have run smoothly. The apparent effrontery of the demand for a sign in the circumstances is, to our mind, rather a witness to the historical truth of the situation. And upon consideration, the demand is not so unwarranted as we are apt to think at first. Weiss's explanation serves sufficiently to account for the facts. The miracle of the feeding of the multitude had created great enthusiasm among them. Their Messianic expectations had been aroused (*v.* 14). Jesus, fearing an outbreak, had withdrawn Himself from them. He would not immediately confirm their expectations. Yet He required them still to believe in Him. Let Him, then, give them some specific sign from heaven to attest His Messiahship, and they would be content to wait. "What sign shewest Thou, then," they ask, "that we may see, and believe Thee?" On this interpretation, the preceding narrative of the miracle and the excitement it aroused, so far from rendering inappropriate, rather suggests the motive for the demand of the people for a sign, a sign to confirm the expectations which had been kindled and yet chilled by Jesus' refusal to fall in with them. And for the allusion of the word in *v.* 36 we do not need to go beyond the present chapter. Wendt would refer it to *v.* 17-47. But the very length of the passage cited is a proof

of how indefinitely it satisfies the requirements of the case. When Jesus says, "But I said unto you, that ye also have seen [Me], and believe not," we look for some direct, pointed saying, rather than a long discourse in which this conclusion may be implied but is never distinctly stated. And such a direct statement we have in *v. 26* of the present chapter. There Jesus reproves the people for seeking Him, not because they saw the signs, but because they ate of the loaves and were filled. They have seen, and yet they have not believed. Wendt's distinction between the "works" of Jesus and the "signs" of the Evangelist obscures to him the reference of *v. 36* to *v. 26*. He finds the allusion of *v. 36* in chapter *v.*, because Jesus is there speaking of His "works"; and refuses to admit the much more evident reference to *v. 26*, because Jesus there speaks of "signs," and it is essential to his theory to maintain that Jesus never did appeal to "signs." But to those who are not bound by the exigency of such a hypothesis, it will seem much more natural to find the allusion of *v. 36* in the saying, a few verses before, that, though the people have seen the "signs," they are drawn to Jesus not by any worthy motives, but only for the satisfaction of their material expectations. We may note in passing that there is some doubt about the "us" in *v. 36*. If it be omitted, the reference to *v. 26* becomes even plainer.

Our space will not permit us to discuss with fulness the other passages in which Wendt thinks to find evidence of displacement of certain of the speeches of Jesus. But we might briefly indicate the nature of Wendt's arguments in the other cases he brings forward, and our reasons for dissenting from them.

The passage *vii. 15-24* he would also connect with chapter *v.* on the ground that it refers to the healing of the man on the Sabbath, which had given occasion to the speech in that chapter, and to the design against the life of Jesus

there recorded (v. 18). But according to the chronology of the Gospel, there is an interval of at least seven months between chapter vii. and chapter v. Yet Jesus addresses the Jews before Him at the Feast of Tabernacles as if they were the same as the men of chapter v., and speaks of their design upon His life, and their attitude towards the healing of the man on the Sabbath, not in the past, but in the present tense (*ζητείτε* v. 19, *θαυμάζετε* v. 21, *χολᾶτε* v. 23). The conclusion is, according to Wendt, that vii. 15-24 must be dated not seven months after chapter v., but on the same occasion. It is a sufficient answer to these arguments to point to vii. 1, in which we read that Jesus was aware that the conspiracy against His life was still active. If that was the case, then no doubt the discussion of the Sabbath desecration, which had provoked it, and the anger at it, were active too; and we can quite well understand Jesus referring to them not as past but as present. This explanation seems much more reasonable than the hypothesis of Wendt, who can suggest no better reason for the Evangelist's destroying the original continuity of the Source than the fact that the question of the Jews in vii. 15 led him to suppose that this must be the beginning of a new scene. The Wendtian treatment of such passages labours under peculiar difficulties. It must make the connexion between the passage under discussion, and the place in the Source to which it would refer it, so plain as to convince the critic of to-day that this is where the passage must have originally stood; and yet the plainer it makes the connexion, the more difficult it is to explain how the Evangelist could have missed it.

Further traces of the disintegrating work of the Evangelist are found, Wendt believes, in chapters vii. and viii. Chapter viii. opens with the words, *πάλιν οὖν αὐτοῖς ἐλάλησεν ὁ Ἰησοῦς* (v. 12). The *αὐτοῖς* cannot refer to the officers or members of the Sanhedrim who have been men-

tioned immediately before (vii. 45-52), but must apply to the people. That is to say chapter viii. continues as if the situation remained the same as in vii. 37-44. And the speech of Jesus in chapter viii. is really a continuation of that in the latter part of chapter vii. The theme is practically the same. The saying, viii. 12, "I am the light of the world," etc., is only a different figure to express the thought of vii. 37, "If any man thirst, let him come unto Me, and drink." viii. 14 takes up the thought of vii. 28 sq., and viii. 21 that of vii. 33 sq. The conclusion is that, as it is the same theme that is pursued in these various sayings, they must all have been uttered on the same occasion, and that the episode of the attempt to take Jesus (vii. 32, 45-53) is an interpolation of the Evangelist. We need not again press our question,—Why should the Evangelist thus break up the unity of the speeches of the Source? It is the ever-recurring objection to the procedure of Wendt. We would only remark that to our mind it is much more likely that Jesus, in addressing the same audience, should have dwelt upon the same points, particularly points which had given rise to considerable misunderstanding (vii. 27, 35, 40 sqq.), than that the Evangelist should have acted in the way Wendt supposes.

In xii. 44-50 the similarity of theme is again the reason with Wendt for connecting the passage with 35, 36*a*, and regarding *vv.* 37-43 as an interpolation of the Evangelist. We should rather say that the similarity in question is the reason for the Evangelist's introducing here the saying for which he assigns no special occasion. The connexion between 35, 36*a* and 44-50 does not appear so close as Wendt would make out. If the two passages were originally connected, *vv.* 44, 45 would rather disturb the continuity of the thought. While we recognize, then, that *v.* 46 has a certain relation to *vv.* 35, 36*a*, in virtue of the figure employed (which was possibly the Evangelist's reason for

introducing the passage 44-50 here), we fail to feel that *v.* 44 sqq. contains, as Wendt says, "the natural, we may say the necessary, continuation of the thought of *v.* 35 sq." To the question,—Why should the Evangelist have inserted the heterogeneous section 36*b*-43 in the middle of the speech of Jesus instead of at the end, Wendt has a most ingenious reply. In the Source, he thinks, there must have stood after xii. 36*a* some remarks about the attitude of the Jews towards the words of Jesus, probably something to the effect that the meaning of His saying was hidden from them. But the Evangelist misunderstood the remark, and took it to mean that Jesus had hidden Himself from the Jews. The explanation, while not complimentary to the intelligence of the Evangelist, is certainly creditable to the ingenuity of the critic.

The passage xiii. 12-20 presents, according to Wendt, a particularly favourable opportunity for observing the interposition of the Evangelist. Having explained to the disciples that His washing their feet is meant to be an example to them to exhibit like humility, Jesus goes on, "If ye know these things, happy are ye if ye do them" (17). Here follow two verses in which the traitor is excluded from the promise of blessedness thus given. And the section concludes with the words, "Verily, verily, I say unto you, He that receiveth whomsoever I send receiveth Me; and he that receiveth Me receiveth Him that sent Me" (20). Plainly *vv.* 18, 19 are an interpolation, Wendt says. *V.* 20 stands in utter isolation, while *vv.* 18, 19 proceed on a misconception of what immediately precedes them. For Jesus has not given an absolute promise of blessedness to the disciples, but only on condition of their obedience to His admonition. Omit *vv.* 18, 19 and *v.* 20 follows naturally upon *v.* 17. But as the passage stands *vv.* 18, 19 indicate a misconception of Jesus' saying, while *v.* 20 is unintelligible, a state of matters to be accounted for only on the

theory that the Evangelist was reproducing the words of Jesus at second hand.

We cannot accept this explanation. If there is an interpolation at all, we should say it is *v.* 20 rather than *vv.* 18, 19, not so much because of its want of relation to what precedes it, as because it interrupts the connexion between 19 and 21 sq. But it does not seem necessary to resort to this explanation. Such connexion as exists between *v.* 20 and *v.* 17 does not appear to be seriously interrupted by *vv.* 18, 19. In *v.* 17 Jesus has announced the blessedness of the disciples if they follow His example. Wendt's objection that the exclusion of the traitor ignores the condition on which this blessedness is pronounced seems somewhat finical. Jesus is describing the conduct of the true disciple. He is addressing His own band of faithful followers. And He looks forward with confidence to their obtaining the blessedness of which He has given them the promise. But not all. There is one who will not share this blessedness, because he is no true disciple, but a traitor. If *v.* 20 resumes the thought of *v.* 17, magnifying the office which is to be discharged in the spirit described, does it not cast a side-glance, too, at the case of him who has proved himself unworthy that office? Judas is excluded from the blessing, because he has proved untrue to the duty, of discipleship. "He that receiveth whomsoever I send," says *v.* 20, "receiveth Me." These words take us back again to the lowly service and rich blessedness of faithful discipleship described in *vv.* 16 sq., but they have their side-reference, too, to the case of Judas, who is not of the faithful, who is not included in the "whomsoever I send."

The last instance cited by Wendt in support of his hypothesis is the farewell speech, chapters xiii.-xvi. The speech appears to close at the end of chapter xiv. Not only do the last words *ἐγείρεσθε, ἀγωμεν ἐντεῦθεν* (which in his earlier volume Wendt regarded as an addition of the Evan-

gelist, founded on Mark xiv. 42) indicate this, but the whole tenour of the speech from *v.* 25 onwards points in this direction. But with chapter xv. the speech goes on as if there had been no interruption, and without any formula such as *πάλιν οὖν αὐτοῖς ἐλάλησεν* (cp. viii. 12, 21) to introduce what follows. A further point which attracts attention is the remark of Jesus, xvi. 5, that He is going away to Him that sent Him, and none of them asketh Him, Whither goest Thou? How can Jesus say this in view of the questions of Peter and Thomas, xiii. 36, xiv. 5? Both these facts point to some transposition in the order in which the farewell words of Jesus are placed. Wendt suggests that chapters xv. and xvi. should be inserted after xiii. 35. The mistake is due to the Evangelist, who quoted from memory, and thought that the question of Peter xiii. 36 was called forth by the words of Jesus in xiii. 33, "Whither I go ye cannot come," and did not realize that by introducing xiii. 36, on which chapter xiv. followed close, at this point, he was disturbing the close connexion between xiii. 34 and chapter xv.

One has some sympathy with the feeling of the Evangelist that xiii. 36 should follow the saying of Jesus in xiii. 33, for the connexion between the question of Peter and what precedes it, in the present arrangement of the Gospel, is much more striking than that which Wendt would assign to it by his re-arrangement of the farewell speech. If we insert chapters xv. and xvi. in the place Wendt suggests, then the question of Peter xiii. 36 is called forth by the saying of Jesus in xvi. 32. But Jesus says nothing there about His leaving the disciples, but tells the disciples that they will all desert Him. This certainly leads up well to the announcement of Peter's denial in xiii. 38, but not to the question of Peter, "Lord, whither goest Thou?" (xiii. 36). That question comes in much more naturally where it stands, and we are disposed to account for its place, not by

assuming a mistake on the part of the Evangelist, but by accepting the order of the Gospel as the true order of events. But further, if we follow the arrangement of Wendt, it is difficult to understand the questions of Peter xiii. 36 and Thomas xiv. 5 at all. Jesus has distinctly said that He is going to the Father (xvi. 5, 16, 28). How then can Peter and Thomas immediately after ask whither He is going? And what answer does He give save that which He has given already, that He is going to His Father (xiv. 2-4, 12)? As to Wendt's objection that the saying of Jesus (xvi. 5) is unintelligible after the questions of Peter and Thomas referred to, that depends upon the sense in which the saying is interpreted. The most natural explanation is that of B. Weiss, that they do not ask whither Jesus is going because they know already. The questions of Peter and Thomas have brought out the answer, and they have no need to ask further. Indeed in the verse in question Jesus repeats the information, "I go My way to Him that sent me" (xvi. 5*a*). What need is there to ask further, "Whither goest Thou?" But if we place chapter xvi. before xiii. 36, then it is difficult to understand why none of the disciples acts immediately upon the suggestion of Jesus in xvi. 5. Jesus' remark, "none of you asketh Me," must be understood here as a reproof. But none of them lays it to heart. They listen without question to the rest of the speech in chapter xvi., in which He speaks of going to His Father, and then at the end of it Peter, apropos of no special reference to Jesus' departure, suddenly bethinks him of the question which Jesus some time ago complained about their not asking. To our mind the present order of the chapters gives a much more connected account than that which Wendt proposes.

As to the objection that the speech at supper appears to come to a close with the end of chapter xiv., that is quite true. But even under Wendt's rearrangement, chapter xvii. still

remains to be spoken after they have risen from table. Why not chapters xv. and xvi. as well? It is true that there does seem to be a certain connexion of thought between xiii. 34 sq. and chapter xv., in which we find a further reference to the commandment to love one another (*vv.* 12-17). But the opening verses of chapter xv. do not immediately pursue this theme, and the manner in which it is introduced suggests rather recurrence to a subject touched on before (*cp.* xv. 15, 20) than continuous development of the line of thought presented in xiii. 34 sq. The connexion secured by making chapter xv. follow on xiii. 35 is too dearly purchased at the cost of the difficulties in which this rearrangement of the chapters involves us.

We have examined, with such fulness as our space permitted, the evidence which Wendt brings forward in support of his hypothesis that the Fourth Gospel is based upon a written Source. We have sought rather to investigate the grounds than to discuss the conclusions of his hypothesis. In respect of the latter much more might be said in opposition to the theory he advances. But it seemed better to give a fair hearing to the reasons he brings forward in support of his hypothesis, and to weigh carefully the evidence upon which it is based. We do not believe that that evidence justifies the conclusion Wendt draws. We take exception to his treatment of many of the passages he discusses. But we cannot withhold our admiration of the critical acumen displayed in the book. Wendt states his case with a clearness and vigour that captivate the reader. No stronger defence could be desired of the Source-hypothesis. If the book fails to convince us of the truth of that hypothesis, it is not through any imperfection in the manner of its presentation, but because of the inherent weakness of the hypothesis itself.

G. WAUCHOPE STEWART.