

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

I have made for Osiris, who is greater than all the gods.'

Although there are some large portions of this remarkable and valuable chapter restored to us by the papyrus Ani, there are some fragments of the latter portion preserved in other MSS., as published in Naville's edition of the *Book of the Dead*, which must be mentioned, as they contain many important passages. Here we read: 'He enters among the revered dead, and shouts of joy ascend. His name shall endure for millions of millions of years.' These are the passages relating to the state of the blessed in the papyrus of Ani, a document of the sixteenth century before the Christian era; but those found in the still more ancient Pyramid Texts are much more remarkable, especially on account of their striking resemblance to the Apocalypse of St. John.

'His place is at the side of God, in the most holy place; he himself becomes God (*netet*) and an angel of God; he himself is triumphant (*makheru*). He sits on the great throne by the side of God. The throne is of iron (?), ornamented with lion's faces and having the feet of bulls. He is clothed with the finest raiment of those who sit on the throne of living right and truth.

'He hungers not nor thirsts, nor is sad, (for) he eats daily the bread of Ra and drinks what he drinks daily, and his bread also is that which is spoken of by Seb, and that which comes forth from the mouth of the gods.

'Not only does he eat and drink of their food, but he wears the apparel they wear,—the white linen and sandals, and he is clothed in white,—and he goeth to the great lake in the Fields of Peace, whereon the great gods sit, and these great and never-failing gods give unto him (to eat) of the Tree of Life of which they themselves do eat, that he likewise may live.'

It is impossible to read these remarkable extracts from the inscriptions in the tomb of Unas (Vth Dynasty) without being struck with their almost verbatim resemblance to the Apocalypse of St. John.

The expression constantly applied to Osiris—indeed derived from his name—is, 'he that sitteth on the throne,' with which we may compare 'him that sat on the throne' (Rev. v. 1); and hence it was given to the 'victorious one' also to sit upon the throne, so 'To him that overcometh will I grant to sit with me in my throne even as I overcame' (Rev. iii. 21); and again as to the beautiful

life in heaven, 'They shall hunger no more, neither thirst any more; neither shall the sun light on them, nor any heat . . . and God shall wipe away all tears from their eyes' (vii. 16-17, also xxi. 4); and they shall be 'clothed in white robes, with palms in their hands' (vii. 9). He who overcometh is given to eat of the tree of life which is in the midst of the paradise of God (ii. 7), and near to the crystal sea (iv. 6). The food with which he is fed is not material food, but that which cometh forth from the mouths of the gods; as we read, 'Man shall not live by bread alone, but by every word that cometh forth from the mouth of God' (Matt. iv. 4).

In the tomb of Pepi i. also there are some very remarkable passages. 'Hail, Pepi! thou hast come, thou art glorious, and thou has gotten might like the god who is seated upon his throne, that is Osiris. Thy soul is with thee in thy body. Those who sing songs of joy are upon both sides of thee; those who follow in the train of God are behind thee. The shining ones come unto thee bowing down even to the ground in adoration at thy feet.' With these passages we may compare nearly all Rev. iv.

Such remarkable verbatim coincidences cannot be the result of mere chance. We must remember that Egypt has always been, as I have said, the home of eschatological and apocalyptic literature. In its schools the phraseology of such literature was moulded long centuries before the advent of Christianity. If, as I shall show, the Egyptian Amenta became the Coptic Hades, and the Tuat the place of the damned, may not the Egyptian heaven, the *Sekhet Hetep* ('Fields of Peace') have become the Christian heaven? The Pyramid Texts, as I have already remarked, were known, accessible, and quoted as late as 200 A.D. for certain, possibly later. That is more than a century after the supposed date of the Apocalypse of St. John. May not their beautiful words have supplied at least the phraseology of this remarkable work? We see traces of Egyptian influence both in the Gospel and the Apocalypse of St. Peter, works written before the influence of the old Egyptian school of eschatology had died out. May we not also see the same influence in that of St. John?

It must be remembered that these texts come from the oldest of the Egyptian priestly schools, that of Annu or On, the Greek Heliopolis, a school whose influence survived until very late, and was to

some extent transferred to Alexandria after the decay of the temple of Ra-Tum. The theological teaching of this school is higher and purer than that of either the Theban or Memphitic schools, and the conception of the divinity a most remarkably monotheistic one.

With regard to the exact meaning and etymology of the word *neter* (God), there is much division of opinion between scholars; but the remarks of M. Maspero seem very apt, 'that the word is so old, even in the pyramid times, that its first sense is unknown to us.'

That there was a conception, a God (*neter*), as distinct from the *neteru* ('gods'), seems perfectly clear. In the pyramid of Unas we read: 'Thou existest by the side of God'; in another place, 'He weigheth words, and behold God (*neter*) hearkeneth unto words.' More important still is the phrase which occurs in the tomb of Pepi I.: 'Thou hast received the form of God (*neter*), thou hast become great therewith before the gods (*neteru*).' Again, 'This Pepi is then God (*neter*), the son of God.' Compare Rev. xxi. 7: 'He that overcometh shall inherit all things; and I will be his God, and he shall be my son.'

This conception of God is not confined to the priestly literature alone, but enters into the popular literature as well, for it is the current idea throughout the well-known maxims of Phtah-hotep found on the papyrus Prisse,¹ the oldest book in the world.

The following extracts will show the nature of the conception of God current in the time of the Vth Dynasty, about B.C. 3500:—'The things which God will do are not known.' 'Thou shalt not cause terror in men and women, for this is opposed to God.' 'The eating of bread is according to the plan of God.' 'If thou wouldst be a wise man, cause thy son to be pleasing to God.' 'Satisfy those dependent upon thee so far as it can be done by thee; it should be done by those favoured by God.' 'What is loved by God is obedience; God hateth disobedience.'

These ideas survived also in the XVIIIth Dynasty, as in the maxims of Ani we read: 'The house of God abhors much speaking. Pray thou with a loving heart; the petitions of all are in secret. He will do thy business, he will hear that which thou sayest and will accept thine offerings,'—a curious

parallel to the biblical: 'When thou prayest enter into thy closet, and when thou hast shut thy door, pray to thy Father which is in secret; and thy Father which seeth in secret will reward thee openly' (Matt. vi. 5-6). The distinction between *neter* and *neteru* is most clearly brought out in a passage which occurs in a papyrus already referred to,—that of Thothmes III. The king prays: 'Preserve me behind thee, O Tmu, from decay, such as that which thou workest for every god, and for every goddess, for all animals and reptiles; for each passeth away, and when his soul hath gone forth after death he perishes, he passes away.' From mythological inscriptions we know that to the *neteru* were attributed all the weaknesses and frailties of mortal man, and that gods and goddesses were classed with the beasts that perish. Above all towered in a majesty for which no word can be found, the great 'Almighty,' *neter*, for whom no true name can be found.

There is little information, either in the Pyramid Texts or in the Ani papyrus, regarding the ideas which the Egyptians had formed as to the state of the wicked. Still, however, we have the usual nature myth, of the war between light and darkness becoming gradually an ethical and moral warfare between good and evil. The same is the transition of the war between the serpent of Night and the young Sun god in Babylonia represented by the war between Merodach and Tiamat, which gradually was transformed into the unceasing combat between good and evil. It was the worm and corruption which the Egyptian dreaded as able to destroy his body, so the demons of the Tuat, the opponents of the gods, took the shape of huge worms and serpents; in Babylonia the same idea was current. It was 'the serpent of Night,' the serpent of Death with 'seven heads and seven tails,' 'the offspring of the tomb,' and 'the great dragon worms' of stormy skies who fought against the powers of goodness. So in Egypt it was the serpent Apep and the other curious creatures of the Tuat or Eastern part of the underworld that the victorious Osirian fought. In the hymn to Ra, which commences the Ani papyrus, we read: 'The majesty of the God who is to be feared setteth forth and cometh into the land of Marni; he maketh bright the earth each day at his birth; he cometh into the place where he was yesterday. O mayest thou be at peace with me, may I behold thy beauties, may I advance upon the earth, may I

¹ The papyrus Prisse is a work of the time of the XIIth Dynasty, but is stated to have been first written during the reign of Assa, a king of the Vth.

smite the Ass, may I crush the evil one, may I destroy Apep in his hour.'

The subject, however, of the Egyptian theories of punishment is one the consideration of which may be reserved for a future time. One chapter, the cxxvth, which contains the famous negative confession, must not be passed unnoticed, as it is here given very fully. It is a remarkable code of ethics, and must be compared with that which ruled such codes of morals as the maxims of Phtah-hotep and Ani.

To quote some of the denials: 'I have not done iniquity; I have not stolen; I have done no murder; I have done no harm; I have spoken no lies; I have caused no pain; I have not set my lips in motion against any man; I have not defiled the wife of any man; I have not cursed God; I have not cursed the king.' All these indicate principles very similar to those of the Mosaic Decalogue, but the negative confession is not all equally admirable. The material interests of the temple and the priesthood are too prominent. 'I have not defrauded the offerings; I have not minished the oblations; I have not plundered the God; I have not defrauded the offerings of the gods, or plundered the offerings of the blessed dead; I have not filched the food of the infant, neither have I sinned against the God

of my native town; I have not slaughtered with evil intent the cattle of the God.' Although there are these traces of priestly cupidity, the code contains all our morality in a germ, and with refinements of delicacy often lacking among later and more advanced people. This remarkable confession of faith is very ancient, and it is probably, like the Pyramid Texts, the product of the Heliopolitan school of priest scribes. Little need be said now as to the immense importance of this work, and it indeed places Egyptian eschatology in an entirely new light, and supplies us with material for the comparative study of so important a subject totally unexpected. There remains, however, one subject to be mentioned,—the excellence of the translation, not only of the papyrus of Ani but of the large number of texts from all sources embodied in the work. In this work not only has Dr. E. A. W. Budge shown his great knowledge of the Egyptian language, but also his great care in avoiding the use of words which might convey in the least degree a false philological or theological idea. The work has taken many years to produce and entailed great cost, but it is no exaggeration to say that in it we have one of the finest works ever produced in connexion with the great and important science of Egyptology.

'What shall I do, Lord?'

Being the General Assembly's Annual Temperance Sermon, preached in Free St. George's Church, Edinburgh, during the Sitting of the General Assembly, 1895.

BY THE EDITOR.

'And I said, What shall I do, Lord?'—Acts xxii. 10.

'WHAT shall I do, Lord?' That question touches the very heart of Christianity. If it were ever possible to give a definition of anything by means of a question, that question might be given as a sound and sufficient definition of Christianity. 'What shall I do, Lord?'—that is the religion of Christ in its simplest and completest form.

But we must take it all. 'What shall I do?' is not Christianity, nor indeed any religion at all. 'What shall I do?' is simple morality. And even Matthew Arnold recognised that morality is not religion. Religion, he said, is morality touched

by something. What, then, is that something which, touching it, turns morality into religion? It is emotion, said Matthew Arnold. 'Religion,' he said, 'is morality touched by emotion.' And as soon as he had said it, the sentence leaped into fame. But it will not do. Warm up morality with feeling till it reaches fever heat, and it is 'mere morality' still. To become religion, our common conduct must be touched by something from without, not simply heated from within. The spark of fire must descend from heaven; it cannot be created by hard rubbing. Religion is not