---

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

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_expository-times_01.php

pdfs are named: [Volume]_[Issue]_[1st page of article].pdf

# THE EXPOSITORY TIMES.

## Notes of Recent Exposition.

"PRINCIPAL WITTON DAVIES' indictment of the Baptist Colleges in Britain, for expecting every teacher to be able to teach half a dozen distinct branches of theology might well be taken to heart by the managers of other theological colleges in which we are more interested." So says the *Record* in reviewing the May issue of THE EXPOSITORY TIMES. Other papers have spoken to a like effect.

---

The *Independent* holds that the "college question is at the bottom of much of our present distress as a denomination." It may be well to quote the words in full: "The May number of THE EXPOSITORY TIMES contains, as usual, a wealth of interesting and useful matter. But if it contained nothing else than the article by Principal Davies on 'The Study of Theology in British Baptist Colleges,' it would still be a notable number. The article is, in brief, an outspoken condemnation of the present college system among the Baptists, with some suggestions for reform, and should be read by all interested in the 'college question' of the Free Churches. We can congratulate our Baptist brethren that so candid and competent a critic as Principal Davies has taken up this matter for them, and that the Baptist Union is actually moving in the direction of college reform. We would even venture to hope that someone may be found ere long to perform the same office for the Congregational body. Certainly the 'college question' is at the bottom of much of our present distress as a denomination. And we shall look in vain for much improvement in the denominational outlook until we have set on foot a root and branch reform of the college system."

---

We have received some letters on the subject, two of which we publish in this issue. The importance for all our Churches of the "college question" can scarcely be overstated. But it has the proverbial two sides; and it becomes us to be watchful and patient, lest we either stifle or overstrain the liberty of speech, and sin in this matter with our lips. Yet, perhaps, the greatest sin we can fall into is the sin of apathy. The attitude of resistance to a "man-made ministry" has an apology; so has the insistence upon a universal college curriculum. The one position for which there is no apology is the fancy of "a golden mean" between these two. Of all our complacent phraseology these words bear the heaviest burden of responsibility. There are those amongst us who believe that there is "a golden mean" in everything; and it is their peculiar glory that they spend their lives in seeking and finding it, in the only satisfactory and conscientious way of sitting still and doing nothing. What is the golden mean between a ministry college-bred and one not college-bred? Plainly it is having colleges and keeping them utterly undermanned.

Since the notes were written on Miss Amelia B. Edwards' *Pharaohs, Fellahs, and Explorers*, that distinguished Egyptologist has died. She began her literary life in a sphere in which women have long since taken their place, and now almost made their own; she passed to another, which no woman had dreamt of approaching, and made of it a complete conquest and possession. In the year 1873 she went to the south of France to seek a holiday. Not finding it, she started with a friend for Egypt, hired a Nile boat at Cairo, and went up the river as far as the third cataract. That journey found her a novelist and made her an Egyptologist. The record of it—*A Thousand Miles up the Nile*—has become, in its cheap Tauchnitz edition, says the editor of the *Academy*, as indispensable as Murray or Baedeker. In time she was appointed hon. secretary of the Egypt Exploration Fund. Then she lectured, wrote reviews, edited reports, and made recruits with an energy that knew no tiring. "A rare faith was hers," says Professor Reginald Stuart Poole, "in her work, and in each new labourer who came to her aid"; and he adds: "Her work as editor, and her part of the annual reports, are always to be traced by a peculiar charm, which was the result of enthusiasm that never failed, and pains that were never grudged." Thus she made her place in Egyptology, where the door was as strait as the straitest sect of specialists could make it, and Egyptological giants like Mariette, Maspero, and Grébaut would send her the first news of their discoveries. Three years ago she received an invitation from America to lecture on the subject which had now become closely associated with her name—more closely in that and other lands than in her own. The invitation was signed by the Vice-President of the United States, by Holmes, Lowell, Whittier, Howells, and "no fewer than twenty-five presidents of colleges." She went and fulfilled her engagements. She even fulfilled her engagements by lecturing the same night as she had accidentally fallen and broken her arm, and then further by travelling some hundreds of miles the following day. But she never was quite the same again. "A journey to Italy last year proved beneficial, but it was evident to all who knew her well that she had never wholly recovered from the shock. She died of bronchitis at Weston-super-Mare on Good Friday, having been attended through many months' illness by her devoted friend and fellow-traveller in America, Miss Kate Bradbury."

From Hebrews xi. 21 to Genesis xlvii. 31 is a marginal reference which there can be no hesitation in making. It is after it is made that the hesitation begins. Separately, the passages read very well. But how can "Jacob worshipped, leaning upon the top of his staff" (Heb. xi. 21) be a correct quotation of "Israel bowed himself upon the bed's head"? (Gen. xlvii. 31). The difficulty has been twice touched upon in THE EXPOSITORY TIMES. Dr. Robertson of Whittinghame, replying to a request in the issue for November 1891, took the view that the Septuagint translators "went off on a wrong scent" when they translated the Hebrew word "staff," and they were followed in the way of quotation by the writer of the Epistle to the Hebrews. He described the translation "bed" of the Authorised Version at Gen. xlvii. 31 (it has been kept unaltered by the Revisers) as a sensible one—"Jacob bowing in thankful adoration upon his bed's head is very intelligible."

But the Rev. John Reith, B.D., of Rickarton, in an interesting note which he has sent us, suspects that the very reason why the LXX. "looked about for the alternative 'staff'" was the impossibility, under the circumstances, of Jacob doing the thing that is thus attributed to him. "If he bowed himself on the bed's head while he worshipped, he must have got up on his knees and turned round to do it (Vulgate: *Conversus ad lectuli caput*), displaying a degree of agility hardly to be expected from a man of a hundred and forty-seven on his deathbed." Nevertheless, Mr. Reith agrees with Dr. Robertson as to the correctness of the word "bed" in the translation of Genesis xlvii. 31. "What Jacob actually did is clearly shown by the exactly parallel passage 1 Kings i. 47, where the

same words are used of David on his deathbed, except that 'head' is awanting, and another word for 'bed' is used. This is translated: 'And the king bowed himself upon the bed.'"

---

On the other hand, in our issue for March, the Rev. J. Newenham Hoare, advocated the correctness of the Septuagint translation "staff." And now we find that Mr. Hoare is strongly supported by the Rev. H. G. Tomkins in his recently issued and most satisfactory volume of the "Bypaths of Bible Knowledge" Series, *The Life and Times of Joseph* (R. T. S., crown 8vo, pp. 192, 2s. 6d.). As Dr. Robertson pointed out very clearly, the variation arises from the fact that the same word in Hebrew means either "bed" or "staff," according to the vowel sounds with which it is pronounced. Supposing then that "staff" is right, the next question is, as Mr. Hoare has said, Who's staff? By rendering "Jacob worshipped, leaning upon the top of his staff," our translators give it as their opinion that it was Jacob's own staff. But the word "leaning" is not in the text. It is inserted to help out the English translation. And "upon" may at least as well be "towards." Whereupon we get the rendering "Jacob worshipped towards the head of his staff." Now, the staff of office wielded by Egyptian potentates may be seen in the British Museum, made of ebony or other wood, and its head of ivory carved as a papyrus flower or otherwise. The staff may, therefore, very well have been Joseph's staff; the symbol of high authority of the deputy of the Pharaoh, the lord over all the land of Egypt; and Jacob, as he turned towards it, might well remember his own incredulous question —"Shall I indeed come to bow down myself to thee to the earth?" It is an interesting circumstance, adds Mr. Tomkins, that at Hebron, in the sepulchral chamber where it is said that Joseph was ultimately buried, a staff is hung up.

---

Did Jephthah slay his daughter? The Rev. A. A. Ramsey, whose sermon on the subject is quoted in the *Christian World* of March 3, replies with an emphatic "No." "Jephthah's vow," he says, "was *whatsoever* cometh forth of the doors of my house to meet me . . . shall surely be the Lord's, and I will offer it up for a burnt-offering." The margin gives *or* in place of *and*—"or I will offer it up." So that the vow, he holds, might be translated: "Whatsoever cometh forth from my house to meet me shall surely be the Lord's; or, if suitable, I will offer it up as a burnt-offering." Only creatures of a certain kind were acceptable in sacrifice to Jehovah. Jephthah knew this; hence his vow must have been conditional, as the "or" in the text would indicate. The vow was fulfilled, Mr. Ramsey believes, by Jephthah's surrendering his daughter to a life of celibacy. After she returned from bewailing her virginity upon the mountains, she was devoted to a life-long separation from society and the engagements of the world. The loss of posterity was itself a sufficient sacrifice to Jephthah. She was his only child.

---

Father, Son, and Spirit, and these three one God; soul, body, and spirit, and these three one man—there are many who will assent to both propositions. But Dr. Balgarnie of Bishop Auckland goes beyond them both. In an article in the *Homiletic Review* for April, he argues that, inasmuch as man was made in the image of God, *each part* of the trinity in man was made in the likeness of *each Person* in the Trinity of God. The soul is the image of the Father; the body, of the Son; and the spirit, of the Holy Ghost.

---

The reasoning by which this startling thesis is supported scarcely attains to mathematical demonstration; but it is skilfully conducted, and never altogether wanders out of sight of reason and revelation. Thus Dr. Balgarnie holds that in Old Testament times God manifested Himself as the second Person in the Trinity, and in a human shape. In this shape the Son then appeared among men "in the days of His flesh." In this shape He ascended into heaven. "It is only natural then to conclude that He still bears our

image and likeness. When He comes again, it is promised that 'we shall be like Him'; and our hope of happiness for eternity is that we shall be with Him where He is, and see Him face to face. There is the strongest reason, therefore, to suppose that He existed in that form from all eternity."

"For a right understanding of the life and thoughts of the ancient Egyptian, there is nothing more important than a right understanding of what is called a *Ka*." So says Professor Sayce in the *Academy* of February 13. Now, the most courageous effort to give an explanation of what is called a *Ka* is found in Miss Amelia B. Edwards' new book, *Pharaohs, Fellahs, and Explorers* (Osgood, M'Ilvaine, & Co., 8vo, pp. 325, 18s.). But before looking into that fascinating volume, let us hear Professor Sayce's own explanation. He says: "I am inclined to identify the *Ka* with the Accadian *Zi*, which in my Hibbert Lectures I have defined as life manifested under the form of movement, whether real or imaginary. Whatever was conceived of as capable of movement possessed a *Zi*, just as much as it possessed a shadow. Originally, of course, it was only an object which could possess a *Zi*; but in course of time the necessities of logic caused the conception of a *Zi* to be extended to the phenomena and powers of nature, as well as to the gods themselves. Whether there was any historical connexion between the Accadian idea of this *Zi* and the Egyptian idea of the *Ka* we shall probably never know. Psychologically there was a very close relation between them."

This seems to need further explanation. Let us turn to Miss Edwards, and go back a little. "Man, emerging from barbarism, is like an intelligent child, full of curiosity about himself. He is puzzled by the mystery of his own existence, and, according to his limited experience, he seeks to account for that mystery. Now, the ancient inhabitant of the Nile Valley accounted for himself in a very elaborate and philosophical fashion. He conceived of man as a composite being, consisting of at least six parts; namely, a body (Khat), a soul (Ba), an intelligence (Khou), a shadow (Khaïbit), a name (Ren), and another element called in Egyptian a Ka. The co-operation of these several parts as one harmonious whole constituted the living man. But they were dissociated by death, and could only be reunited after a long probation. When so reunited, it was for ever. The man attained immortality, and became as one of the gods. Meanwhile, being dead, the Body lay inert in the depths of the tomb; the Soul performed a perilous pilgrimage through a demon-haunted Valley of Shades; the Intelligence, freed from mortal encumbrance, wandered through space; the Name, the Shadow, and the Heart awaited the arrival of the Soul when its pilgrimage should be accomplished; and the Ka dwelt with the mummy in the sepulchre."

What, then, is this Ka? We have heard Professor Sayce's opinion. Before reading that of Miss Edwards, let us, by way of contrast, for there is instruction in the contrast, quote the opinion of other Egyptologists of light and leading. Dr. Brugsch, in his *Hieroglyphic Dictionary*, explains it as "the person, the individuality, the being." Professor Maspero, recognising its incorporeal character, calls it "the double." Mr. Le Page Renouf likens it to the "eidolon" of the Greeks, the "genius" of the Romans. And Dr. Wildemann has lately written an interesting paper to show that it was not the person, but what he calls the "personality" or "individuality" of the deceased—meaning thereby that which distinguished him in life from other men; in other words, the mental impression which was evoked when his name was mentioned.

Widely as these definitions differ, they agree, as Miss Edwards points out, in one thing. They all bear witness to the unsubstantial nature of the Ka. It is not the man, it is not the body of the man, nor his soul, nor any substantial reality. It is a "Spectral Something," inseparable from the man

during life, surviving him after death, and destined to be reunited with him hereafter.

---

Yet this shadowy something, as unsubstantial apparently as a dream, is known to us almost entirely in connexion with its prowess in the matter of eating and drinking. "Though the Ka occasionally figures in historical texts, and with reference to living persons, he is *invariably* met with in memorial inscriptions, from the old Pyramid period down to the comparatively recent time when the ancient religion was superseded by Christianity. Throughout that long time (namely, from about four thousand years before Christ to the reign of the Emperor Theodosius I., three hundred and seventy-nine years after Christ), one special formula, graven on funerary tablets, remained almost word for word the same. That formula was neither more nor less than an invocation addressed by the deceased to all who might visit or pass by his tomb, imploring them to offer up a prayer on his account to Osiris, the God of the Dead. This sounds curiously modern, reminding us of a similar prayer which we have all seen many a time in little village churchyards on the continent of Europe. The resemblance, however, does not go very far. Jacques Bonhomme petitions you to say a *Paternoster* for the repose of his soul. But the ancient Egyptian appealed to passers-by on behalf, not of his soul, which was performing its pilgrimage in Hades, but of his Ka, which was the companion of his mummy in the tomb. And what may we suppose he wanted for his Ka? Peace, after the battle of life? Loving remembrance on the part of those who survived him? Not at all. His supplication was of a far more material character. It was literally for the good things of this world —in a word, for what is expressively termed 'a square meal.'"

---

Miss Edwards quotes two of these petitions. They are almost exactly alike. Here is the earliest. It is the funerary tablet of one Pepi-Na, who lived in the early part of the Sixth Dynasty, some three thousand five hundred years before our era :—

> "O ye who live upon the earth !
> Ye who come hither and are servants of the gods !
> Oh, say these words :
> "'Grant thousands of loaves, thousands of jars of wine, thousands of jars of beer, thousands of beeves, thousands of geese, to the Ka of the Royal Friend Pepi-Na, Superintendent of the Royal Household, and Superior of the Priests of the Pyramid of King Pepi.'"

---

The mere repetition of this formula was supposed to be sufficient to furnish forth this dainty meal. But the Egyptians were not content with an imaginary banquet. They actually provided the things that were asked for. "The four oxen who dragged the funeral sledge to the tomb on the day of burial were slaughtered and cut up on the spot; gazelles and geese were also slain; and these, together with great sheaves of onions and cucumbers, and basket-loads of bread, corn, dates, nuts, and other eatables, as well as a number of large jars filled with wine, milk, water, and barley beer, were deposited in the sepulchral chamber, and then walled up with the mummy. And afterwards, at stated dates, the descendants of the dead deposited food and drink in the votive chapel attached to the tomb."

---

And all this was for the Ka. It was neither a sacrifice to the gods nor yet for the benefit of the mummy. The mummy, indeed, is a very secondary personage compared with the Ka. The tomb itself was called the "House of the Ka," not the house of the mummy. A creature that "clamoured for beeves and geese and wine and beer, whose bill of fare put the most stupendous of civic banquets to shame, to whom an ox roasted whole would be of no more account than a beef-lozenge to an alderman," in Miss Edwards' expressive phrase, could scarcely be the airy nothing which the Egyptologists try to conceive. Miss Edwards holds the belief (and she supports it by a strong array of arguments as well as the evidence of sculptures and inscriptions) that the Ka stood for *the life*, the vital principle in the man.

"The ancient Egyptian was incapable of conceiving abstract ideas; hence it follows that he necessarily conceived of vitality as a separate entity. We ourselves speak figuratively of the life as 'going out of the body' at the moment of death; but the Egyptians believed not only that it went out, but that it thenceforth led an independent existence. They knew that the living man nourished his life—his Ka—with meats and drinks; and they naturally and naïvely concluded, from their concrete point of view, that meats and drinks were necessary to the existence of the Ka when its partnership with the body should be dissolved. It was, in fact, because the Ka was the life that it required nourishment; and because it was of divine origin that it survived the death of the body. The starvation of the Ka was, therefore, a more grievous calamity than the destruction of the body. The body could be replaced by a statue, or even by a painting; but the extinction of the Ka meant the extinction of the divine spark, the annihilation of the dead man's prospects of ultimate reunion with his Ka. In a word, it meant the loss of his immortality." Thus Miss Edwards persuasively argues.

---

We shall not follow her now into the question of the bearing of this subject upon Egyptian painting and sculpture. It is enough merely to notice that the statues and even the paintings which were buried in the tomb with the mummy were intended to form a body for the Ka, if the mummy should be destroyed. In order, therefore, that the Ka should feel at home in his new body of stone or wood, the statue was bound to be as exactly like the man as the sculptor's art could make it. If the man was ugly, the statue must also be ugly. If he had any personal defect, the statue must faithfully reproduce it; as, for instance, in the funerary statue of Nemhotep, a deformed dwarf, who held a high office at Court under a Pharaoh of the Sixth Dynasty. The sculptor of a Ka statue dared not flatter.

---

Of more immediate interest for us is Miss Edwards' suggestion that this very word Ka is none other than the usual Hebrew *Khai* (חַי), meaning "life." "It may be," she says, "that the Greeks borrowed their 'vital spark,' as they borrowed so much else, from the Egyptians; and I do not doubt that the Hebrews—who carried away even more intellectual spoils than spoil of silver and gold and raiment out of the land of Bondage—were indebted to their taskmasters for their doctrine of the "Khai" or life. They, in fact, borrowed not only the notion, but the word, for the 'Kha' and the 'Khai' are surely one and the same."

---

And so we recall that touching scene in the life of Joseph when his brethren came down to the land of Egypt to buy themselves corn, and the wronged brother saw them for the first time since he had been left to starve in the pit at Dothan. "Send one of you," he said, "and let him fetch your brother, and ye shall be kept in prison, that your words may be proved, whether there be any truth in you; or else by the life of Pharaoh surely ye are spies" (Gen. xlii. 16). "I have not the slightest doubt," says Miss Edwards, "that what he actually said was, 'By the Ka of Pharaoh, surely ye are spies.' It was the most solemn judicial oath which an Egyptian could take. To take it lightly was punishable by death. For the Ka was the life, and the Ka of the king was the life of the king which he received directly as a divine gift from Ra, the greatest of the solar gods."