

THE EXPOSITORY TIMES.

Notes of Recent Exposition.

OUR Notes on Dr. Schauffler's interpretation of Christ's Agony in the Garden have called forth a large number of useful comments from contributors. We cannot touch the subject again this month, but we hope to be able to do so in our next issue.

Canon Cheyne contributes an article to the *Contemporary Review* for July on 'The Archæological Stage of Old Testament Criticism.' The subject is not to the average student of the Bible of so much interest as it used to be. A year or two ago it was firmly believed that the Higher Criticism would split upon the rock of the Monuments. But since the publication of Professor Sayce's *Higher Criticism and the Monuments*, it has been clearly seen by everyone, that to appeal from Criticism to Archæology is to escape Scylla and fall into Carybdis. Professor Sayce has little faith in the *methods* of the Higher Critic,—Canon Cheyne complains in this article that he has even changed his attitude into open antagonism,—but with the results which the Higher Criticism professes to reach, he is in most conspicuous agreement.

So the interest in Canon Cheyne's article is chiefly historical now. And it is historically that he writes. He traces the progress that the Higher Criticism has made in the recognition of Archæology. He admits that there was a time when even

so reputable a critic as Alfred von Gutschmid could attack 'one fact after another stated by the Assyriologists.' He acknowledges that even Wellhausen and Robertson Smith at one time fell, 'quite excusably,' into 'a greatly exaggerated distrust of the science of Assyriology.' But he claims that from that distrust he himself was saved at the very beginning, frankly confessing that he owed his deliverance to Professor Sayce, and that now there is no critic of any standing who refuses to test his work by the findings of the pick and the spade.

In pointed illustration of Canon Cheyne's words comes the new *Commentary on Deuteronomy* by his colleague, Canon Driver. Never before, not even in Cheyne's own books, was Archæology in all its branches made use of as here. This indeed is one of the features of the series to which it belongs, and one of the ways in which that series marks a new departure in English exegesis.

Take an example at random. There is a reference in Deut. xi. 10 to some early custom in Egyptian agriculture which now has passed away, and is very hard to understand. The words are: 'The land of Egypt, whence ye came out, where thou sowedst thy seed, and wateredst it with thy foot.' Travellers in Egypt, travellers in Palestine, and those who never travelled anywhere, have all had their interpretation of these words, but no one

has seen the seed watered by the foot or discovered any account of it. Canon Driver goes over all the independent references from Shaw's *Travels in Barbary* in 1738 to Conder's *Tent Work in Palestine* of 1877. He just mentions Conder's suggestion that in Palestine vegetable gardens are irrigated by means of small ditches trodden by the foot. He describes the water-wheels of Egypt which Robinson imagined and Niebuhr actually saw, but they do not meet the meaning. And he ends by saying that possibly the reference may be to the mode of distributing water from the canals over a field by making or breaking down with the foot the small ridges which regulate its flow, or by using the foot for the purpose of opening and closing sluices.

The rapid sale of Dr. Driver's *Deuteronomy*, though it was issued at the beginning of the dull season, is a striking evidence of the reputation his *Introduction* has won for him. And there is no reason to doubt that the new book will add to that reputation. It is indeed a more popular book than the other. That is to say, it directly appeals to the immense body of men whose pleasure it is to read the Bible, whose business it is to preach it. And it appeals to them so as neither to waste their time nor weaken their conscience. Homiletic is excluded from the plan of the whole series. For practical and homiletical theology are of no value unless they are made at home, and the preacher who cannot produce his own 'application' is not a preacher. But the things which the preacher has neither the time nor the skill to produce for himself are here in clearness and fulness of detail. For the series does include questions of History, Archæology, and Biblical Theology. And to the last and most fruitful of studies, Dr. Driver has given particular attention.

But the feature that one finds most useful, after using the book for some time, is none of these. It is the scrupulous care with which Dr. Driver makes his translations, and the information he gives in making them. Thus he comes upon the expression

in Deut. xxii. 21: 'Because she hath wrought folly in Israel,' as it is rendered in both our English versions. He translates it: 'Hath wrought senselessness in Israel,' and adds a note to account for the translation.

This is the Note: '*Nābāl* and *nebālāh* are very difficult to render in English. "Fool" and "folly" (besides being needed for the more common כָּסִיל, אִיִּל, אִוִּלָּה, כְּסִילוֹת, אִוִּלוֹת) are inadequate, and suggest wrong associations. The fault of the *nābāl* is not weakness of reason, but moral and religious insensibility, a rooted incapacity to discern moral and religious relations, leading to an intolerant repudiation in practice of the claims which they impose. The ideas associated with the *nābāl* appear most clearly in Isa. xxxii. 6; he is painted there as at once irreligious and churlish (cf. "Nabal," 1 Sam. xxv. 25). The term is thus applied to Israel, unappreciative of Jehovah's benefits (Deut. xxxii. 6), to the heathen (Deut. xxxii. 21; Ps. lxxiv. 18, 22), to the man who cannot perceive that there is a God (Ps. xiv. 1, liii. 1); see also 2 Sam. iii. 33, xiii. 13; Isa. xxxii. 5; Jer. xvii. 11; Ezek. xiii. 3; Ps. xxxix. 8; Prov. xvii. 7, 21, xxx. 22; Job ii. 10. *Nebālāh*, besides the passages quoted, occurs only 1 Sam. xxv. 25; Isa. ix. 17 (*profanity*); Deut. xxxii. 6. The cognate *nablūth* occurs Hos. ii. 10, in the sense of *immodesty*. *Senseless* and *senselessness* may be suggested as fair English equivalents, it being understood that the defective "sense" which they predicate shows itself particularly in acts of impiety, profligacy, and churlishness, and that it is, in fact, the latter ideas which the two words in actual use really connote.'

Professor Lloyd of Oakland Theological Seminary, California, has a short article in *The Homiletic Review* for July on the meaning of the word (κληρός) which St. Paul uses in Rom. i. 6, and which is translated in our English versions 'called.' He believes that by translating it so we miss its

meaning, and that in any case we have no right to translate it so. For it has no proper parallel anywhere but in the Septuagint of 1 Kings i. 41, 49 and Zeph. i. 7. Now in all these passages the word means 'guests,' and is so rendered in both the Authorized and Revised English Versions. Professor Lloyd believes, therefore, that 'guests' is its meaning here. And then the apostle's word has peculiar force as well as beauty. For the Roman Christians would greatly rejoice to be called the guests of the Lord Jesus Christ, while St. Paul himself, who was 'the servant and apostle of Jesus Christ,' would intimate to them, in his pregnant way, that he was doing only that which it was his duty to do, when he gave himself to serve his Lord's guests wherever they were found.

The translation is interesting and by no means impossible. We might even say that all it does is to go a little farther along the road on which the common translation lies. To be the guest of Jesus Christ is more than to be called, more than to have obeyed the call; it is to rest in comfort in the Father's house already, welcomed there because the Elder Son has brought us in.

The new translation would have been still more welcome if it had relieved St. Paul's language of a difficulty in the use of this very word. In the Gospel according to St. Matthew (xxii. 14, it is also found in the Received Text in xx. 16), this word translated 'called' is distinguished from another (*ἐκλεκτός*) translated 'chosen.' And it is evident that the distinction is vital. 'For many are called, but few chosen,' clearly means that those who are 'called' have been invited to enter the kingdom of God, but have not accepted the invitation, while those who are 'chosen' have also accepted it. In St. Paul's language, however, the 'called' (or the 'guests' in Professor Lloyd's translation) are clearly those who have not only been invited, but have accepted the invitation. That is to say, he makes no distinction between the two words which the

Gospel distinguishes so sharply. Professor Lloyd's translation does not remove that difficulty.

'What is it that saves?' The question is so old, and has been repeated so often, that it is a wonder we are not tired of it. But there are some questions we never tire of. 'What is it that saves?' The question has been often asked. But when we find Mrs. Humphry Ward asking it again, we discover that it is still interesting to us, and we somewhat eagerly scan her answer.

Mrs. Humphry Ward contributes a preface to the new translation of Hausrath's *Time of the Apostles* (Williams & Norgate, 8vo, 4 vols.), and it is in the course of that preface that she asks this question. She has scarcely entered on the preface when she asks it, and though it is a very long preface indeed, she takes it all to find the answer. We may be surprised that Mrs. Humphry Ward should ask such a question as this. But we need not be. She is just as conscious as any of us that she must be saved. She calls it 'the eternal problem,' and 'the perennial question on which Paul's life and preaching turned'; and she says that 'it confronts us as it confronted him on the agonized journey to Damascus'—'What is it that saves?'

If we are surprised that Mrs. Humphry Ward should ask this question, we are more surprised at the time she takes to answer it, and the long journey that she makes. But the reason is at hand. She seeks the answer in the life of St. Paul, for she sees and says most truly that this is the perennial question on which St. Paul's life and preaching turned. But she is wiser than St. Paul himself. He thought he found the answer on that 'agonized journey to Damascus.' She says he found it before that journey began. He thought he found the answer in the vision of the risen LORD. She says he never had such a vision. And so, being compelled to contradict the apostle at the beginning, and yet being resolved that he shall furnish the answer, she has to go a long way round

to find it—a long, weary, and really impossible way, almost losing herself and us as she goes. But there is no surprise like the surprise that meets us at the end, when we find that she has come upon the right answer after all.

‘What is it that saves?’ The early Israelites faced this question, just as we have to face it now, and the answer that they made was ‘Sacrifice.’ It was a reasonable, almost an inevitable answer. For they had been commanded by the God of Israel to offer sacrifice. They had been told that Jehovah ‘smelled a sweet savour’ as the smoke of the burnt-offering rose to Him, and that He ‘had respect’ unto the man who made his offering in due form according to the commandment. So they said, It is sacrifice that saves; give it often, and give it generously; then other things may go; it is sacrifice that saves.

And one day Saul the king of Israel was sent on a journey. The Lord said, Go and utterly destroy the sinners the Amalekites, and fight against them until they be consumed. Saul went. He smote the Amalekites from Havilah until thou comest to Shur, and destroyed all the people with the edge of the sword. But the word of the Lord came to Samuel: ‘It repenteth Me that I have set up Saul to be king, for he is turned back from following Me, and hath not performed my commandments.’ And it grieved Samuel, and he cried unto the Lord all night. What had Saul done? When Samuel went out to meet him in the morning, Saul said, Blessed be thou of the Lord; *I have performed the commandment of the Lord.* No doubt he honestly thought it. For there is no evidence that greed was one of the vices which rendered of none effect the gifts of this unhappy king of Israel. No doubt he thought for the moment that he had performed the commandment of the Lord, though he had spared the best of the sheep and of the oxen. For he did it to sacrifice unto the Lord. He had done even more than it was his duty to do. Would not the Lord be pleased with the destruction of the sinners the Amalekites? And would

not the Lord be yet more pleased with the sweet savour of the burnt-offerings when he offered them there in Gilgal? But Samuel said, Hath the Lord as great delight in burnt-offerings and in sacrifice as in obeying the voice of the Lord? And from that day forth, no one could safely answer, ‘It is sacrifice that saves.’ Samuel found that out.

Then they said, It is descent from Abraham that saves. Take down your genealogical lists. Trace accurately your ancestry till it brings you back to the patriarch. Or at least let aristocratic custom call you Pharisee, separate you, on account of your supposed purity of descent, from the ‘people of the land’ whose blood got so mixed at the time of the Exile. Believe yourself a son of Abraham, and you need no repentance, for you are saved already. It is purity of descent from Abraham that saves.

But John the Baptist was making such a stir in the wilderness of Judea, that though he had no other gospel to preach than the baptism of repentance, the Pharisees and Sadducees followed the multitudes to his baptism. And when John saw many of the Pharisees and Sadducees come to his baptism, he said unto them, O generation of vipers, who hath warned *you* to flee from the wrath to come? Bring forth therefore fruits meet for repentance; and think not to say within yourselves, We have Abraham to our father: for I say unto you, that God is able of these stones to raise up children unto Abraham. And from that day forth no one could safely answer, It is descent from Abraham that saves. John the Baptist found that out.

Then they said, It is circumcision. Let us grant, they said, that the ‘people of the land,’ those mixed multitudes in our midst, may yet repent and be saved. Let us grant that salvation is offered to the Gentiles—ay, even to the hateful Samaritans. But there is one thing we must abide by. Salvation is of the Jews, and every one that would be saved must become a Jew, he must be circumcised, and keep the law of Moses.

It was a long way to go. How few of the 'children of Abraham' were able to go even so far as that. How wonderful that one of them could go still further. We follow the steps of the apostle to the Gentiles as he compasses sea and land to make one proselyte to the Lord Jesus Christ. But it is his mental progress that most amazes us. What is it that saves? It is circumcision, said even the Apostle Peter. But Saul, the Hebrew of the Hebrews, as touching the law (and descent from Abraham), a Pharisee, Saul says: 'Circumcision is nothing, and uncircumcision is nothing, but the keeping of the commandments of God' is everything. Henceforth no one can safely say, It is circumcision that saves. Saul the Pharisee fought his life's battle against that, conquered, and made an end of it.

Then they said, It is good deeds that save. Be and do and suffer, especially suffer, abundantly, and God will be well pleased with you. It is good deeds that save.

But Luther found out that. You know the history—his 'terror at the sight of the Holy Sacrament'; his ceaseless agony, 'Oh, my sins, my sins'; his penance and his prayers; his unflinching effort to do good deeds till they find him on the floor of his cell in the early morning nearly dead; and then the sudden revelation of 'the just shall live by faith.' Good deeds, they said, will save you. But Luther found out that. And we dare not say good deeds will save us now.

Now we say that membership in the true Church will save us. And the man has not yet been sent who will find out that and end it. Yet we know that he will come with the hour. And this we know also, that he will come from within the true Church itself. For so it has been always. Samuel knew the efficacy of sacrifice, and felt the pressure of the law of God. Yet he said, 'Behold, to obey is better than sacrifice.' John the Baptist was of the family of the priesthood in Israel, the purest and the proudest of all who traced their descent from Abraham. Yet he said, 'God is able of

these stones to raise up children unto Abraham.' Saul of Tarsus was a Hebrew of the Hebrews, even of the tribe of Benjamin, which never had revolted from the family of David. Yet Saul of Tarsus said, 'Circumcision availeth nothing.' And Luther found that good deeds will not save us, simply because he had given them so fair and full a trial. So the man to whom the world will listen in the burning days that are to come, and learn that membership in the true Church does not save, must have his own Gethsemane within it.

'What is it that saves?' St. Paul's answer is the most unmistakable: 'The keeping of the commandments of God' (1 Cor. vii. 19). For a moment we are surprised that of all men St. Paul should answer so. We should not have been surprised at St. James. For we call St. James the apostle of works, but St. Paul the apostle of faith. Yet this is not the only place in which he says that it is the keeping of the commandments of God that saves. And he is not the only one that says it.

His Master said so before him. One day a rich young ruler came running and kneeling in the way, and this was the very question that he asked. Jesus answered, If thou wilt enter into life, keep the commandments. And when the young man asked Him, Which? Jesus referred him to the Ten: Thou shalt do no murder; Thou shalt not steal; and all the rest he knew so well.

Yet when the young man answered, 'All these have I kept from my youth up,' Jesus answered and said, 'One thing thou lackest: sell that thou hast, and give to the poor, and thou shalt have treasure in heaven; and come, and follow Me. Does Jesus take back the word He has spoken, then? After saying that the way to enter into life was to keep the commandments, does He now make some addition to that? Does He make so serious an addition that the young man who found the keeping of the commandments easy, finds this quite impossible to do? No, He makes no addition. He simply tells the young man most

courteously, that with all his honest pride in the keeping of them, he has not kept the Ten at all.

For this rich young ruler had looked upon the commandments as if each contained so many words which could be learned by heart and *kept*. So he learned the eighth commandment among the rest: 'Thou shalt not steal.' And, finding really little temptation to break it, for was he not a rich young ruler? had kept it from his youth up. But a commandment involves a commander; a law carries us back to a lawgiver. These ten commandments cannot be separated even from one another, but especially they cannot be separated from God. Does this rich young ruler think that he keeps the eighth commandment to God's satisfaction while he revels in his riches, and leaves the beggar to starve at his palace gates? No, says the Lawgiver Himself, 'One thing thou lackest: sell that thou hast, and give to the poor.'

It was not the imposition of a new commandment. It was simply the interpretation of one of the old. If thou wilt enter into life, keep the commandments. It is always so, and always sufficient. But then they must be kept, they must be kept to God. And God gave the eighth commandment about stealing, not to protect thy property, oh luxurious rich man, but to protect the property of the poor. Sell that thou hast, and give to the poor.

Thus this answer, 'The keeping of the commandments of God,' is a good one; but we must keep them as God understands the keeping. That is a most reasonable demand. It is so with commandments everywhere. Ignorance of the scope of a commandment is as useless a plea in law as ignorance of its existence. But when we consider the commandments of God, and what He means by keeping them, we are utterly confounded. Our rich young ruler, when he heard that the keeping of the eighth included selling all that he had, and giving to the poor; went away sorrowful. When we hear that the sixth likewise means that whosoever is angry with his brother without a cause is a

murderer; and when we learn that the seventh means that he who looketh upon a woman to lust after her hath committed adultery already, we turn away in deepest sorrow also, for we have great passions and lusts.

But man's extremity is God's opportunity. If there is no way of entering into life but by keeping the commandments, and if I must keep the commandments in God's way, then nothing short of this will do—that God should keep them in me. And this is exactly Mrs. Humphry Ward's answer. She goes a very different road to find it than we have gone. But she finds it. 'St. Paul says, I live; yet not I, but Christ liveth in me. Go where you will, seek where you will, *this*, and nothing else than this—though it be told in a hundred diverse ways—is the ultimate secret of man's moral life; this is *what saves*.' These are her words. Surely they are surprising words from her.

From St. Paul, however, they are not surprising. He tells us how he reached them. There was a time when he could say as proudly as the young ruler, 'Touching the righteousness that is in the law blameless.' But that was before he knew the Lawgiver. When he came into touch with the Lawgiver, and learned that to look and lust was to be guilty of the whole law, he could do nothing but cry out, Who shall deliver me? And then deliverance was at hand. The Son of God came into that human flesh which was too weak to keep the law, and, dying in it, conquered sin and death. So that now it is not merely that I see One in human flesh able to keep the law for ever; but I see my flesh and His flesh so completely identified by the touch of faith that I can say, 'I am crucified with Christ: nevertheless I live; yet not I, but Christ liveth in me; and the life which I now live in the flesh I live by the faith of the Son of God, who loved me, and gave Himself for me.'

When the rich young ruler came running and kneeling, Jesus did not merely show him the impossibility of keeping the commandments in his own way. He also showed him the way to

keep them. He said, 'Come, and follow Me.' And when St. Paul would translate that 'Come, and follow Me' into his own language, this is how he puts it: 'For in Jesus Christ neither circumcision availeth anything, nor uncircumcision; *but faith which worketh by love*' (Gal. v. 6). For the two things which go to the making of faith are these: First, 'O my God, I cannot keep Thy commandments'; and second, 'but Thou canst keep them in me.' And so faith works. It calls down God to keep His own commandments in my person, and He being in me, I keep them and live; nevertheless it is not I, but He that liveth and keepeth them in me. And faith works by love. For God keeps His own commandments in His own way; and the way of God is love.

What is it that saves? It is still, you see, the old and only answer—the keeping of the commandments of God. And it is still *my* keeping them. And if you ask how it is possible that I, whom you know, can so keep the commandments as to satisfy the Giver of them, the answer is at hand. I am *created in Christ Jesus unto good works*. You will not miss the words 'in Christ Jesus,' and you must not miss the 'I.' But the emphasis lies on the word 'created.' For that is the word that brings Christ Jesus and me together. And so the same apostle is able to give his third and final answer: 'In Christ Jesus neither circumcision availeth anything, nor uncircumcision, but a new creature' (Gal. vi. 15).

The Egyptian Heaven.

BY W. ST. CHAD BOSCAWEN, F.R.H.S.

THE papyrus Ani supplies us with a new and most important chapter of the *Book of the Dead*, of which only a fragmentary copy was hitherto known. The chapter is entitled, 'The Chapter of not Dying a Second Time'; and the vignette represents 'Ani and his wife standing with hands upraised before the god Thoth, who has the symbol of *ankh* (life) on his knee.'

The chapter commences with an address to Thoth. 'Hail, Thoth! what is it that hath happened unto the holy children of Nat? They have done battle, they have upheld strife and have done evil, they have created the fiends, they have made slaughter, they have caused trouble; and, in truth, in all their doings the mighty have worked against the weak. Grant, O might of Thoth, that that which the god Tmu hath decreed may be done!' The decree of Tmu is described a little further on in the chapter. We learn the nature of the blessed state decreed by Tmu—the god of Annu, On, or Heliopolis. The mention of this god and the nature of his decree indicate that this chapter clxxv. formed part of the oldest or Heliopolitan version, and this is amply confirmed when we compare its contents with the Pyramid Texts.

'Hail, Tmu! What manner of place is this unto which I have come? It hath not water, it hath not air, it is deep, unfathomable; it is black as the blackest night, and men wander helplessly therein. In it a man may not live in quietness of heart, nor may the longings of love be satisfied therein. But let the state of the shining ones (*khu*) be given unto me for water and for air and for the satisfying of the longings of love, and let quietness of heart be given unto me for (instead of) bread and ale. The god Tmu hath decreed that I shall see his face, and that I shall not suffer from the things that pain him. Every god shall transmit his throne during millions of years. Thy throne hath descended to thy son Horus. The god Tmu hath decreed that his course shall be among the princely-ones. In truth, he shall rule over thy throne, and be heir to the throne of the dweller in the Lake of Fire. It hath been decreed that in me he shall see his likeness, and that my face shall look upon the Lord Tmu.' Ani, as Osiris, then asks: 'What shall be the duration of my life?' The answer is: 'It is decreed that thou shalt live for millions of millions of years, a life of millions of years.' And, again, 'Man knoweth not, and the gods cannot see that which