

THE EXPOSITORY TIMES.

Notes of Recent Exposition.

MR. D. G. HOGARTH, M.A., F.S.A., has published the paper on the Hittites which he read at the Winnipeg Meeting of the British Association in 1909. He has published it in the thirty-ninth volume of the *Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute*.

Mr. HOGARTH gives an account of recent Hittite research. He does not review in detail the early history of the Hittite problem. That problem was set before scholars in the latter part of the nineteenth century by the discovery that a West Asiatic people, called the Kheta or Khatti, played an important part in the foreign relations of Egypt and Assyria, together with the further discovery of a class of monuments in a peculiar art and script which were claimed to be the work of that people. It was generally agreed that the Kheta or Khatti were identical with the Hittites of the Old Testament.

The monuments were observed first in Northern Syria. Scholars were accordingly inclined to regard the Hittites and their civilization as primarily Syrian. And so long as this view held the field, they were considered of comparatively small account. But after similar monuments were found in Asia Minor, the estimate of Hittite importance began to grow; and some scholars, notably Professor SAYCE, spoke roundly of a

'Hittite Empire.' Presently RAMSAY, PERROT, and others agreed with SAYCE that the original home of Hittite culture was not in Syria but in Cappadocia.

This was the signal for a great battle, which was fought as only archæologists' battles can be fought. But Mr. HOGARTH is able to say that the issue was practically decided four years ago, and in SAYCE'S favour. For in 1906 the whole Hittite problem was set in a new light by the discovery that the rock-reliefs at Boghaz Koi in North-Western Cappadocia belonged to the Hittite civilization.

The site of Boghaz Koi (as Mr. HOGARTH spells the name) was discovered in 1834. It was discovered independently, and almost simultaneously, by TEXIER and HAMILTON. What attracted their attention most was a series of rock-reliefs on the walls of a hypæthral recess in a hillside, a short distance away. Thirty years later Napoleon III. sent an expedition to explore Galatia and Cappadocia, and these rock-reliefs were published. But it was not till 1878 that it was observed by SAYCE that the style of the reliefs was identical with what was already known as Hittite art. Then in 1890 CHANTRE did some digging at the spot. Others followed; and after several applications had been made to the Ottoman Government for leave to

excavate the place, a German application was successful, and Dr. Hugo WINCKLER proceeded to the site of the ancient city in 1906.

A startling revelation ensued. Many tablets were found. One of the fragments contained part of a document, whose tenor was identical with that of the famous treaty made by Rameses II. with Khetasar, King of the Hittites, about 1280 B.C., and inscribed on a wall at Karnak. The Kheta kings named on the wall at Karnak were named also on the Boghaz Koi tablet. The spelling was not exactly the same, but there was no doubt of the identity. Khetasar, who made the treaty, was Hattusil; his predecessor, Mutnara, was Mutallu; the next in ascent, Maurasar or Marsar, was Mursil; and finally Sapalulu or Sapararu, who had treated with Seti I., was written Subbiluliuma.

When other tablets were read, most of which were found in 1907, it was discovered not only that Boghaz Koi had taken part in the conspiracy of the Kheta against Rameses, and that it was a worshipper of the Hittite god Teshup, but that it was the head of the conspiracy and the chief city of Khetasar or Hattusil. It was now beyond question that the tablets belonged to royal archives, that they were the archives of the kings of Boghaz Koi from the fifteenth to the twelfth dynasty B.C., and that the Hatti or Hittites were really a great people, widespread and warlike, who formed an empire fit to cope with the mighty empires of Egypt or Babylon. Subbiluliuma writes to Katashman-Turgu, King of Babylon, not as a vassal, but as an equal, and urges him to take action against a common enemy, conjectured by WINCKLER to have been the rising North Semitic power of Assyria.

Hittite figures carved in the rock near Smyrna cease to be an inexplicable puzzle. SAYCE'S contention that Lydia was once a Hittite satrapy passes from the region of much derided speculation into the domain of reasonable inference. The observations of RAMSAY, PERROT, and others, that

the earlier Phrygian monuments display strong Cappadocian characteristics, find their justification and their explanation. And Mr. H. R. HALL does not go too far in calling the Hatti the 'type-people of Asia Minor,' and in saying that those conceptions, usages, and the like, which we have long recognized in ancient life as 'Anatolian,' must in future be regarded as in origin Hittite.

There is a great deal that has yet to be discovered about the Hittites. What happened to the Hittites in Syria? How is it that the Amarna correspondence speaks of the Kheta as a danger only to the northern borders of Syria, while the 'children of Heth' are mentioned in the history of Abraham as dwelling at Hebron in the far south, and a fragmentary chronicle of the First Babylonian Dynasty states that the Hatti invaded Southern Mesopotamia about 1800 B.C.? These questions cannot be answered yet. WINCKLER thinks that the Cappadocian Hatti were not the only Hittites, but were part, if ultimately the most important part, of a race once widely distributed over Western Asia. And that, which is the easiest, may be the best way out of the difficulty. But there are other and perhaps greater difficulties than that. There is the difficulty, and supreme surprise, of the Boghaz Koi tablets, that the royal house of Mitani, in the time of Hatti domination, invoked gods who have familiar Aryan names, Indra, Mithra, Varuna, and the Açvin Twins.

The Rev. George HANSON, D.D., delivered the Murtle Lecture in Aberdeen on the 30th of January 1910. And now, through the Religious Tract Society, he has published the lecture, under the title of *The Originality of the Gospel*.

The title is not well chosen. His subject is not the originality of the Gospel, but its uniqueness. When he went to Aberdeen to deliver the Murtle Lecture, Dr. HANSON determined to show that in certain particulars Christianity or the Gospel—for he uses the one word for the other—is separate

from, and superior to, every other form of religion in the world. He determined to show that Christianity is 'unapproachably pre-eminent' in three particulars.

Christianity is pre-eminent in respect of its doctrine of Atonement. That is the first thing. There is a doctrine of Atonement in other religions. There is scarcely a religion on the face of the earth that is without the doctrine or the practice of Atonement. But in every religion, except the Christian, Atonement means the self-sacrifice of man for God's sake. In the Christian religion it means the self-sacrifice of God for man's sake.

The doctrine of Atonement, outside Christianity, may be summed up, says Dr. HANSON, in the words, 'Man so feared God that he offered his best and dearest to Him; if thereby he might turn away His anger.' The Christian doctrine of Atonement is 'God so loved the world that he gave his only-begotten Son.' These two doctrines are in opposition fundamentally. In the one, man seeks by pain and anguish, often unto death, to reconcile God to him. In the other, God seeks by pain and anguish unto blood to reconcile man to Him. The one idea arises out of man's dread of God, the other out of God's love to man. And these two ideas, though both are gathered under the title of the doctrine of Atonement, are wide as the Poles apart. The idea of God taking upon Himself the burden of the sin of the world, and expiating its guilt at infinite cost to Himself, 'is absolutely undreamt of outside the New Testament.' That is the first thing.

But Christianity is also unique in respect of the conditions of salvation. What are the conditions of salvation? Everywhere but in Christianity salvation is by human merit. In Christianity it is by the grace of God.

In all non-Christian religions, says Dr. HANSON, man earns the divine favour by his own virtues. If he attains to salvation he has himself to thank

for it. It is the result of his own exertion. It is his own achievement. And there is no Gospel in good works. But the Christian religion is a Gospel. The Gospel is that the salvation of man is the gift of God. And so free is the gift that no merit in any man can improve it. So free is it that no sin in any man can depreciate it. The Gospel is that the chief of sinners is offered at once, without effort or delay, the place of the chief of saints. That is the second thing.

The third respect in which Christianity is unique is in its doctrine of the Person of Christ. What is that doctrine? It is that *God was in Christ reconciling the world to Himself*. And that being so, Christ cannot be separated from the Christian religion. Its uniqueness lies in that. It lies in that more than in anything else. For you can separate Muhammad from Muhammadanism, Buddha from Buddhism, Confucius from Confucianism, and these religions will remain religions still. But you cannot separate Christ from Christianity. Christianity is Christ. The messenger here is also the message. The preacher is the sermon. Christ Himself is our peace. He is the way. He does not merely speak to us of immortality. He is the Resurrection and the Life.

'Not long ago,' says Mr. Claude MONTEFIORE, 'I received a letter from one of the greatest Jewish scholars of Germany, in which he differentiates, to the disadvantage of Jesus, between him and the prophets, on this ground that the prophets are so grandly impersonal; they think and speak of God and Israel, and never of themselves.' For this is the distinction between Christianity and Judaism, as between Christianity and every other prophetic religion in the world. And Mr. MONTEFIORE, Jew as he still is, has discovered this superiority. The quotation which we have made is from his new book on *The Teaching of Jesus* (Macmillan; 2s. 6d. net). The life and the teaching of Jesus, he bravely says, are inseparable. And in spite of the letter of the German scholar, 'Herein,' he declares, 'we may at once observe that Jesus

differs from, or, as some would say, goes beyond, the prophets: "More than a prophet is here."

The central place now given to the Gospel according to St. Mark in the study of the Synoptics is one of the results of the Higher Criticism which one can point to with unmixed pleasure. It is so sure. It is so welcome. We read St. Mark now as he has not been read in all the history of the Church.

And as we read St. Mark, we are ever more impressed with his naturalness. More than the others, he sees what there is to be seen, and writes that down. When he describes the Feeding of the Five Thousand, he says that our Lord 'commanded them that all should sit down by companies upon the green grass.' St. Matthew omits the 'companies'; and both he and St. Luke disregard the greenness of the grass. When he tells the story of the Rich Young Ruler, he alone notices that Jesus 'was going forth into the way,' and that the ruler 'ran to him and kneeled.'

The local colouring gives the scene reality. But it is not the art of the painter; it is the work of the historian. We do not ask, Why did St. Mark say that the ruler ran? We ask, Why did the ruler run?

Why did the ruler run? Dr. Alexander MACKENNAI, a wise, far-seeing student of the Gospels, suggests that Jesus was already on His way before the ruler could overcome his reluctance to seek His spiritual direction. That is very likely. For it meant more than an effort to overcome a natural shyness. It meant a victory over the deep-seated, far-reaching prejudice of his class. The ruler was probably present all the time. All the time, it is probable, an agitating struggle was going on within him. And it is at least possible that what turned the scale at last was the incident of the blessing of the little children.

We may take it that that incident, which immediately precedes in all the narratives, immediately preceded in the course of events. What was it? Certain persons—we are not told that they were 'mothers of Salem,' but we are ready to believe it—brought little children to Him that He should touch them. The idea was very likely a superstitious one. The touch, the mere physical contact with a wonder-worker, has always been held to be good. Try it: you would wonder what good it might do. But the disciples were more enlightened than that. They rebuked those that brought them. And the ruler was looking on.

To his great surprise Jesus disapproved of the disciples' action. He was even moved with indignation. And yet there is no doubt that the disciples were right. If one's actions are to be regulated by rules, if reason is to be the guide of conduct, it is certain that the disciples were right. What astonished the ruler was the fact that Jesus superseded reason, that He set the rules of conduct aside. And His indignation with the disciples was evidence enough that no passing sentimentality moved Him, but a far-reaching motive of life.

As the ruler was considering this, Jesus left the house, passed into the road, and began His journey. The moment had come for decision. Gladly would he have taken time to think. What might this new attitude to law and conduct involve? But at least Jesus was larger-minded than ordinary men. He ran to Him, and kneeled to Him, and asked Him, 'Good Master, what shall I do that I may inherit eternal life?'

Jesus sent him back to the commandments. A moment before, the commandments were set aside; now they are brought prominently forward. 'Thou knowest the commandments, Do not kill, Do not commit adultery.' It must have been a disappointment, as well as a shock. Is He simply an original then? Does His behaviour mean no more than that it must always be different from the behaviour of other people? When you expect

Him to say, Keep the commandments, does He set them aside? When you come to set them aside, or at least to go beyond them, does He say, Keep the commandments? 'All these have I observed from my youth: *what lack I yet?*'

Jesus was not inconsistent. That is not the way in which He was original. He led the disciples to see that life is greater than the laws that try to measure it. He will lead the ruler to see the very same thing, though in another way. 'All these have I observed.' And He does not doubt it. Then 'Jesus, looking upon him, loved him.' But it is not enough to observe all these. If eternal life is to be gained by observing the commandments, it is necessary to observe more than these. It is necessary to have a rule for every act of life, for every utterance, and for every thought.

Jesus did not say so to the ruler. For that the ruler knew already. In the history of the commandments the Jews had discovered that. And they had tried to meet the difficulty. Is there a heroic effort after righteousness to be compared with the effort these Jewish rabbis made to find a law that would fit every circumstance of life, and insist that every law under every circumstance should be observed? The ruler knew that if he was to obtain eternal life, which is the fulness of righteousness in the sight of God, he must observe not only the weightier matters, but also tithe mint and anise and cummin; he knew that he must not omit one jot or tittle of all the rabbinic refinements which the ages of baffled experience had gathered round the original law.

The man was there at Jesus' feet simply because he knew that, and knew that he had not done it. If he had been able to keep all the commandments, he would have felt no heart-hunger driving him to seek Jesus. 'All these have I observed'; but he was compelled to add, 'What lack I yet?'

And Jesus led him as He led the disciples. It is not in the letter. It is in the spirit. To keep all and yet offend in one—it is at least to lack. It is to find Jesus necessary. But when the commandments are known, not in the letter, but in the spirit, there is nothing lacking.

And how easily could this young ruler be led to know the commandments in the spirit. Is it not expressed in the Scriptures of the Old Testament? Thou shalt *love* the Lord thy God, and thy neighbour as thyself. On this hangs all the law. Let the rich young ruler, like the disciples, drop all the minutæ of regulations and fall back on love, love to God and man, and he has in that moment inherited eternal life.

As to how that is to be accomplished, as to how a man is to learn to love—that depends on the man. For this ruler the way is evident. 'Sell that thou hast and give to the poor.' Between him and the love of God stood the love of 'that he had.' If he can put it out of the way, he will be free to love God with all his heart. And if, in putting it out of the way, he can give it to the poor, he will also be showing that he loves his neighbour.

With the rich young ruler the way was clear. He had to learn to love. But how will it be with those who have already learned to love, but not to love God? Will the love of lover do, the love of husband or wife, the love of children? It will do very well if it is an unselfish love. In all unselfishness he that is not against God is for Him. But if it is a selfish love it will not do. And then sometimes there is no way but the removal of the object of it.

Eyes that the preacher's art in vain hath schooled,
By wayside graves are raised;
And lips cry, God be merciful,
That ne'er said, God be praised.