

10. The excavations of Dr. Naville in 1884 at Saft-el-Henneh showed that here was the site of Qesem or Qos, called Pha-kussa in Greek geography, the capital of the Arabian nome. As Goshen is written Gêshem in the Septuagint, the land of Goshen will have corresponded with the Arabian nome. It thus comprised the modern Wadi Tumulât, south of Zoan, along the line of the Freshwater Canal. It is bounded on the east by Tel el-Maskhuta, the ancient Pa-Tum or Pithom, near Ismailiyeh, and on the west by Belbês and Zagazig. The name of the 'Arabian nome' indicates its proximity to the desert as well as the nature of its population. Menepthah II. says of Pa-Bailos (the modern Belbês), 'the country around was not cultivated, but left as pasture for cattle because of the strangers, having been abandoned since the times of old.' As Menepthah II. was the son and successor of Ramses II., the Pharaoh of the Oppression, 'the strangers' referred to may well have been the Israelites. A despatch to the same king, dated in his eighth year,

states that certain Shasu or Bedawin, from Edom, had been allowed to pass the Khetam, or Fortress, of Menepthah-Hotephirma, in the district of Succoth (Thuku), and make their way to the lakes of the city of Pithom, in the district of Succoth, 'in order to feed themselves and their herds on the possessions of Pharaoh.' The advantage of settling the family of Jacob in Goshen was threefold: it was near Zoan, the Hyksos capital; while forming part of Egypt, it was nevertheless not inhabited by the Egyptians themselves; and it was better suited to the needs of the nomad Asiatics and their herds and cattle than any other part of the country.

11. If the first part of Joseph's Egyptian name is *Zaf*, 'nourisher,' there may be an allusion to it here.

19. It was during the Hyksos period that waggons and horses were introduced into Egypt. Like the chariot (*merkobt*, Canaanitish *merkâbâh*), the waggon (*âgolt*, Can. *'agâlâh*) was borrowed from Canaan, as is shown by its name.

## The Temptation of Christ.

BY THE REV. ALFRED E. GARVIE, B.A., B.D., MONTROSE.

### III.

THE conclusion of our second inquiry into the literary character of the communication made by Jesus to His followers regarding His temptation is briefly that the narratives need not be taken literally, but may be, nay, must be, interpreted symbolically. Where can we look for certain guidance in our next inquiry into the significance of each of the three temptations? If the narrative is throughout symbolical, it will not itself at once suggest the facts figuratively presented; but must be made intelligible by the entire historical situation of Jesus, at the time when the temptation took place. It came just after the baptism in Jordan, when, by the descent of the Spirit, Jesus was endowed with supernatural powers for His Messianic ministry, and by the voice from heaven was confirmed in His consciousness of filial relation to God. It was the certainty of this filial relation to God, and the possession of powers hitherto unexercised, that formed the moral situation of

Jesus when He withdrew from Jordan to the wilderness. The certainty of a unique relation to God suggested various uses of the supernatural powers, which at first sight did not appear inappropriate or inconsistent. The moral insight and vigour of Jesus appeared in the stripping off of the disguises, and the discovery of the evil concealed in each suggestion. The temptation was a test of moral insight as well as a trial of moral vigour. The exact significance which we give to each separate temptation depends, however, on the aspect of the unique relation to God, which we emphasize, as presumably the more prominent for the mind of Jesus, either the personal, or the official. Was His filial relation to God viewed by Jesus as a personal privilege, or as an official function? Without at this stage deciding which of the two views is more probable, let us see what significance the temptations assume in each case.

1. Let us assume that Jesus thought of His

filial relation to God as personal privilege, then the temptations may be severally understood somewhat as follows:—In the first temptation it was suggested to Him to use His powers as a proof of His peculiar position in self-indulgence, the satisfaction of His own desires, the relief of His own wants. In the second, self-protection in all circumstances of difficulty and danger by an appeal to God on the ground of His unique relation appeared as a not unreasonable, and a not immodest demand upon God. In the third, self-advancement among men insinuated itself as a not extravagant ambition for one who knew Himself so highly favoured and so richly endowed by God. In each of these suggestions Jesus saw a temptation to distrust in and disobedience to God. What each of these suggestions, innocent as at first sight they might appear, involved was a refusal on His part to submit to the limitations of the Incarnation of the Son of God. Had Jesus met all His bodily wants, saved Himself from all His earthly dangers, and furthered all His worldly aims by use of the powers given to Him as Son of God, that He might be the Saviour of men, then assuredly the Incarnation would have been semblance and not reality. The habitual exercise of divine prerogatives in His personal experience as distinguished from His official activity would have turned His humanity into a mere pretence. How meaningless and false would have been a manhood in which all human conditions were being constantly transcended. Whether powers so abused would not have been at last forfeited is a speculative problem about which we need not concern ourselves, as the moral problem was solved by Jesus in His unhesitating acceptance of human limitations, and His unflinching rejection of all exclusive privilege.

Such would seem to be the significance of the temptations on the assumption that the filial relation to God presented itself to Jesus as a personal privilege; but it may be questioned whether this assumption is justified. It may be doubted with reason whether Christian theology in its anxiety to accumulate proofs of the divinity of Jesus has done justice to the consciousness of Jesus. It usually speaks of Christ's claims; it is likely that Jesus thought most of His duties. His Sonship presented itself to Him, 'the meek and the lowly in heart,' 'whose meat and drink it was to do His Father's will,' not as a right to be asserted,

but as a duty to be discharged. The dependence upon God that He felt, the obedience to God that He owed, and the communion with God that He ever sought—these had the first place in His consciousness, not His privileges and prerogatives. Accordingly, it is probable that the temptations related to the duties of His calling rather than to the rights of His person.

2. We turn now to the more probable aspect of the temptations; they related to His work as Messiah. But in this relation an alternative again presents itself. The temptations may have referred to isolated supernatural acts as means of establishing the Messianic kingdom, or to distinctive permanent features of it. In the first case, the question to be settled by Jesus was, How is the kingdom to come? in the second case, What is the kingdom to be? It may be said that the two questions are at bottom indistinguishable and inseparable. The character of the kingdom must depend on the means taken for its establishment. That is undoubtedly a moral certainty; but we must not forget that men are always hiding this certainty from themselves. It is thought possible to gain worthy ends by unworthy means, to purify results from the moral defect of their causes. The possibility of so divorcing means and ends, causes and results, is very generally assumed. This assumption that it was possible for Him to establish an ethical and spiritual kingdom by secular means might have presented itself to Jesus as a temptation. Later events in His ministry show that this temptation was again and again forced upon Him. Each of the three temptations in the wilderness can be illustrated by an incident in His life. The multitude whom He had fed in the wilderness tried to seize Him and make Him a king. His disciples were ever expecting the kingdom to be established. The Galileans who had come up to the feast welcomed Him with royal honours. On the last occasion He yielded to the wishes of the people, because He knew that the attempt to make Him king would and could go no further, but on the first occasion He withstood the clamour, and so estranged many of His followers. Thus He was really tempted to seek an earthly kingship, as a means of bringing to earth the kingdom of God. That was the third temptation in the wilderness. Again, the multitudes once fed wanted to be fed again, and had to be driven away with scathing

rebuke. This surely shows what was meant by the first temptation. Let Him use His powers to meet bodily needs, and many will be sure to follow Him. When His enemies bade Him work a sign from heaven that they might believe, and He might thus secure their allegiance, He was tempted to use His power to compel faith in His mission. In a very vivid pictorial form this temptation appears in the demand of the tempter that He should cast Himself down from the pinnacle of the temple. In each case an unworthy means for securing a worthy end is suggested. But it seems to me that at the beginning of His work Jesus' mind would be busy with not simply the means, but even the ends of the work, and that accordingly we get a truer view of the temptations by viewing them in relation to the nature of the Messianic kingdom.

3. It may be thought that Jesus came to Jordan to be baptized by John with a clear and firm idea of the nature of the kingdom, that in the quietness and loneliness of Nazareth He had thought out the whole plan of His ministry, and that accordingly it was impossible that He should in the wilderness be in any doubt about what His kingdom was to be. But this assumption may be challenged. It divorces Jesus' inner experience from His outward history; it deprives the baptism in Jordan, the descent of the Spirit, and the voice from heaven of their distinctive significance as the signs of a moral and spiritual crisis in the inmost life of Jesus; and it reduces the temptation in the wilderness, about which Jesus thought it needful and fit to make a communication to His disciples, to secondary importance as compared with certain experiences in Nazareth, about which no report is given to us. It seems more probable that in the wilderness the plan of the ministry was first fixed. We have no evidence of how far the development of Jesus' consciousness of Sonship and Messiahship had gone when he left Nazareth; that it had not reached the complete and final stage, as is often assumed, seems probable, if we do justice to the strain and stress of the situation in which Jesus found Himself. The inward change that accompanied the outward signs raised new questions, brought strange surprises, and so demanded fresh decisions. The inward waits upon the outward, experience upon history. It would have been quite unnatural for Jesus to make plans for a work to which He had not yet been called for

which He had not yet been endowed with the needful gifts. When the call came, when the gifts were bestowed, then the plans were formed. Doubtless Jesus had reached perfection and maturity of personal character prior to His baptism, but His consciousness of His message and mission became distinct and certain only after the conflict in the desert. Assuming, then, that Jesus was learning what His kingdom was to be, let us see what each of the three temptations may mean. There can be no kingdom without a country. A land and a people must go together to form a realm; and the health and happiness of the people, and so the greatness of the kingdom, depend on the land. That the land of God's promise to Abraham must be the seat of the kingdom of the seed of David, was beyond question; but the land was in many parts barren, dry and waste wilderness. Must not the wilderness be changed into a garden for the health and happiness of the people and the greatness of the kingdom? 'Command that these stones become bread.' As Messiah use your power to set the people in a goodly and fair land. But, again, is not Jerusalem the city which God has chosen for Himself, and the temple His own dwelling-place? and yet the heathen tread the streets of the town, and even the outer court of the temple, and a Roman fort overlooks its most holy places. Surely the Messiah with His devoted followers may, to cleanse town and holy place from defilement, hurl themselves in bold and brave defiance against the heathen hosts, sure that God will keep His own safe in all danger. 'Cast Thyself down.' Desperate as may seem the attempt to drive out the Romans, make it, trusting in God. But has not God promised that He will give to the Messiah 'the heathen for an inheritance, and the uttermost parts of the earth for a possession'? Claim the fulfilment of the promise. Having driven out the Romans from Jerusalem and Palestine, lead thine armies against theirs, until the world-wide rule of Rome totter to its fall, and then become heir of its glory. 'All shall be Thine,' that was the evil suggestion, 'if Thou wilt bow down and worship me,' that was the concealed condition of the promise which Jesus' moral insight at once detected. Make thy kingdom temporally happy, politically free, imperially great—these were the temptations. How did they form themselves in the mind, and force themselves on the will of Jesus?—that is our next inquiry.