

Theology on the Web.org.uk

Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible

This document was supplied for free educational purposes. Unless it is in the public domain, it may not be sold for profit or hosted on a webserver without the permission of the copyright holder.

If you find it of help to you and would like to support the ministry of Theology on the Web, please consider using the links below:



Buy me a coffee

<https://www.buymeacoffee.com/theology>



PATREON

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

[PayPal](#)

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

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

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_churchman_os.php

THE
CHURCHMAN

SEPTEMBER, 1889.

ART. I.—HENRY MARTYN AS A TRANSLATOR OF
THE SCRIPTURES.

THE character of Henry Martyn, as a Christian whose light burned and shone with peculiar intensity and brilliancy, has in some degree hindered his work from being adequately understood. The man is known, but the workman is not known; the workman, however, is as worthy of study as the man himself.

That Martyn was born in 1781; that he came out Senior Wrangler in 1801, at just a month short of twenty years of age; that he was elected fellow of St. John's at the age of one-and-twenty; that he was ordained in 1803; that he embarked for India in 1805; that he reached Calcutta in 1806; that, after less than five years of astonishing industry and brilliant achievement, he left Calcutta again in the first week of 1811; that he settled at Shiraz just before midsummer of that year; that he remained there till the following summer, and then died at Tocat in Armenia on his journey home—all this is written in Sargent's "Life and Letters of Martyn," and all this is part of the store of those whose good fortune it was to be born before the generation had passed away which had felt the spell of the saintly young Cornishman's genius.

Besides this, there is a general impression that Martyn went to Persia chiefly to translate the Bible into better Persian than Sabat and he (chiefly Sabat) had managed to achieve in India, and that before he left Persia he had accomplished his task. And then, in the lapse of time, there grew up another impression, that Martyn was a glowing seraph living between earth and heaven, dreaming of versions of Scripture springing up quick as thought, and, after working a few months in Persia, leaving behind him—well, just what a man might be expected to leave who came to Shiraz in the June of one year and left

Tabriz on the first of the following September. These and similar statements have somehow got into currency, and even into credence; they deserve, however, a very small share of either. I propose, therefore, in this paper to draw attention to some neglected facts, to put right some current errors, and to offer some evidence in support of the view that the pedestal to which Martyn has been lifted because of the exceeding grace of God that was in him, is no less his due on the ground of his remarkable gifts. It appears to me, after careful and repeated study of his "Journals," which, it will be remembered, were not published till 1837, when ten editions of the "Life" had already printed upon people's minds Martyn's image as Mr. Sargent saw it, that the breadth of Martyn's mind was as ample as its height was lofty, and that he was as great as he was good.

There was in Martyn, notwithstanding all his humility, a clear consciousness of power; he could not help knowing that he possessed high gifts. Yet there was in him, too, that "under-sense" of which Ruskin speaks, "that the gifts worked rather through than in him." It cannot be desirable that a man should under-value what has been committed to his charge. Much, however, of life's discipline, in the case of men whose gifts are not of the obviously popular quality, arises from the fact that the earlier, sometimes even the later, judgments of their elders and superiors are founded, not upon what there is in them, but upon what there is not; not upon the presence of something which is nature's morning-gift to them, but upon the absence of something of which already there is an abundant store in the world.

How instructive, as well as interesting, are these two entries in Martyn's "Journal," after he had seen and been seen by Cecil:

"Brother M.," says he, "you are a humble man, and would gain regard in private life; but to gain public attention you must force yourself into a more marked and expressive manner."¹

Mr. Cecil has been taking a great deal of pains with me; my insipid inanimate manner in the pulpit, he says, is intolerable. "Sir," said he, "'tis cupola painting, not miniature, that must be the aim of a man that harangues a multitude."²

Mr. Simeon was probably behind the scenes, for, on March 6th, 1803, Martyn writes: "After evening church Mr. S. told me I ought to read with more solemnity and devotion, at which I was not a little grieved and amazed. He also, and my other friends, complained of my speaking too low and with too little elocution . . . I began to see (and amazing it is to say, for the first time) that I must be contented to take my place amongst men of second-rate abilities."

¹ Vol. i., p. 266.

² *Ibid.* p. 269.

“And in very good company, then,” most of us would be willing to say, but then it is not comfortable to be assigned to a “lower room” for the wrong reasons.

For cupola painting and the haranguing of multitudes are not the whole duty of man. There is room for other aims, and there is scope for other gifts. The Kingdom of Heaven is sometimes concerned with other arts than these: with the discovery of treasures hid in human speech; with goodly pearls of phrase and idiom; with the polishing of light-flashing gems of expression, the Urim and Thummim of God’s revelation of Himself behind and within the veil of uttered speech. That delicacy of touch, which was one of the notes of Martyn’s earliest style; that interest in the finer qualities of thought and expression which, in Cecil’s opinion, reduced Martyn to the dimensions of a merely interesting person, likely to win “regard in private life,” lay at the very foundation of his usefulness, was of the very essence of his allotted gifts, and helped him to be, not simply the first of modern translators in the quality of his work, but one of the most permanent in the abiding value of what he did.

Martyn’s academical laurels were gained at the great Mathematical University. His interest in what used to be called Natural Philosophy never died away. But the bent of his mind was distinctly towards philosophy in the regions, not of science, but of the higher human interests, towards language as the vehicle of thought, towards grammar as the science of language.

To read Martyn’s “Journals” with the single object of noticing this point is to discover another Martyn, not a saint only, but a grammarian. He read grammars as other men read novels, and to him they were more entertaining than novels. This feature in his character is noticeable from the first, and it is there to the last. For example:

Sept. 28th, 1804.—At prayer, after dinuer, my soul was seriously affected, and I went to my work of visiting Wall’s Lane with a heart strengthened against my vanities; returned and finished the *Bengalee* grammar which I had begun yesterday, and construed a little. I am anxious to get Carey’s *Bengalee* New Testament.

Oct. 2nd.—My mind was seriously turned towards God, somewhat in a spirit of calm devotion, this morning. Read Thomas à Kempis and a few hymns with some sweetness of soul. Wrote sermon. Engaged all the rest of the morning by Gilchrist’s *Hindoostanee* Dictionary. . . . After dinner began Halbed’s *B-ngalee* Grammar, for I found that the other grammar I had been reading was only for the corrupted Hindoostanee.

Three months earlier in the same year, the first year of his clerical life, there is clear evidence that his Persian studies had already begun:

June 27th, 1804.—A funeral and calls of friends took up my time till eleven; afterwards *read Persian*, and made some calculations in trigonometry in order to be familiar with the use of logarithms.

Here, then, before anything definite had been settled as to Martyn's future work, while India was only the chief thought amongst other thoughts, we find him turning to philology, to Eastern languages, to three in three months; in two out of the three the grammar or dictionary is specially mentioned. Besides this, it is in all three instances distinctly for relaxation and mental enjoyment that he thus follows his bent.

There is yet a fourth: it is mentioned with a note of regret, but it, too, as will be seen presently, was not without important consequences in after days. It is the same year, 1804, and it is the 23rd of November:

Through shortness of time I was about to omit my morning portion of Scripture, yet after some deliberation conscience prevailed, and I enjoyed a solemn seriousness in learning "mem" in the 119th Psalm. Wasted much time afterwards in looking over *an Arabic grammar*.

Two other extracts—two out of scores of such notices—will illustrate his delight in these studies; the first occurs on the voyage to India, the other finds place in India itself:

Feb. 28th, 1806.—Had much comfort and enlargement in prayer over chapters in Isaiah. Learnt Hindoostanee words, which, however dry an employment in itself, is made so delightful to me, by the mercy of God, that I could with pleasure be always at it.

August 27-29, 1807.—Studies in Persian and Arabic the same. Delight in them, particularly the latter, so great, that I have been obliged to pray continually that they may not be a snare to me. . . . 31st.—Resumed the Arabic with an eagerness which I found necessary to check.

Two years later Martyn writes from Cawnpore, Oct. 17th, to David Brown, a letter in which his passion for grammatical studies is seen in its full breadth and depth:

There is a book printed at the Hirkara Press called "Celtic Derivatives"—this I want; also grammars and dictionaries of all the languages of the earth. I have one or both in Latin, Greek, French, Italian, Portuguese, Dutch, Hebrew, Rabb. Hebrew, Chaldee, Syriac, Ethiopic, Samaritan, Arabic, Persian, Sanscrit, Bengalee, Hindoostanee.

I want them in the languages of *Northern* Europe, such as German, Danish, Icelandic, etc.; languages of Ireland and Scotland, Hungarian, Turkish, Modern Greek, Armenian. But do not stare, sir; I have no ambition of becoming a linguist, but they will help me in some inquiries I am making closely connected with our work. . . .

On further consideration I approve most fully of your new orders for commencing the Arabic. A year ago I was not adequate to it; my labours in the Persian and other studies have, in the wisdom of God, been the means of qualifying me. So now, *favente Deo*, we will begin to preach to Arabia, Syria, Persia, India, Tartary, China, half of Africa, all the south coast of the Mediterranean, and Turkey; and one tongue shall suffice for them all.

That "one tongue" was, of course, the Arabic. It was not given to Martyn to realize this hope. That work was accom-

plished in later years, "on the coast of the Mediterranean," by men who had not entered the field in Martyn's time; but no account of Martyn is even approximately correct which does not give a prominent place to his efforts to provide a translation of the Scriptures in Arabic. For the moment, however, we are concerned with grammars and dictionaries rather than with translations.

To complete our view of Martyn's philological powers two other extracts must now find place. To explain them it is necessary to premise that, in 1810, it was possible for a man of even the best education to think of Hebrew as the original language of mankind, and to find a mystery in every letter. In a letter to Corrie, written July 17th, 1809, he says: "My Hebrew speculations stick to me still, but instead of advancing in my pursuit I am entangled in a jungle, without being able to see my path exactly. I think that when the construction of Hebrew is fully understood, all the scholars in the world will turn to it with avidity, in order to understand other languages, and then the Word of God will be studied universally." Again, "I sit," says Martyn in 1810, "for hours alone contemplating this mysterious language. If light does not break upon me at last it will be a great loss of time, as I never read Arabic or Persian. I have no heart to do it; I cannot condescend any longer to tread in the paths of ignorant and lying grammarians. I sometimes say in my vain heart I will make a deep cut in the mine of philology, or I will do nothing; but you shall hear no more of scriptural philology till I make some notable discoveries."¹ This mood of mind lasted for nearly two years; it represents a phase of his intellectual orbit. It provides us with a test, of surprising subtlety and of searching penetration, of the real value of his intellectual apparatus. He entered, without external guidance, into a region of fog and mist. He failed to find any solid truth in that land of clouds, and he found his way out again, baffled and disappointed, but not for a moment deceived. In those days it might be said of that region of speculation, "Who enters here leaves truth behind," but Martyn's faithful intellect served him well. He gave, indeed, precious days, and nights as precious, to a hopeless quest, but with delight we see that he never was permitted to catch at any of the shapes that flitted before his excited imagination as if they were real manifestations of the truth. The powers that enable some men to make a great discovery in philology, or in any other science, are more fortunately, but not more severely, tested than those which hinder other men from proclaiming a great discovery where no discovery can possibly be made.

¹ "Journals," vol. ii. p. 304.

In March, 1811, being then at Bombay, on his way to the Persian Gulf, Martyn writes in his journal: "Chiefly employed on the Arabic tract, writing letters to Europe, and my Hebrew speculations. The last encroached so much on my time and thoughts that I lost two nights' sleep, and consequently the most of two days, without learning more than I did the first hour." Then he grew tired of speculation, as all men do in turn, some in hopelessness, some in trustfulness; but, whether these or those, all alike in the deepened conviction that we know only "in part." He writes:

Happening to think this evening on the nature of language more curiously and deeply than I have yet done, I got bewildered, and fancied I saw some grounds for the opinions of those who deny the existence of matter. . . . Oh, what folly to be wise where ignorance is bliss! . . . The further I push my inquiries the more I am distressed. It must be now my prayer, not, "Lord, let me obtain the knowledge which I think would be so useful," but "Oh, teach me just as much as Thou seest good for me." Compared with metaphysics, physics and mathematics appear with a kind and friendly aspect, because they seem to be within the limits in which man can move without danger, but on the other I find myself adrift. Synthesis is the work of God alone.

How many since, as well as before Martyn's time, have followed this path of thought, thankful at last to rest, as he did, on Christ, "the wisdom of God" for men!

But still he speculated. "Every day, all day long" he "Hebraized," until he made "the same complaint" of his mind "that Anacreon does of his harp. He struck one string and the harp replied from another." At last his release from this tyranny comes: "My Hebrew reveries have quite disappeared, merely for want of leisure." What that want of leisure arose from we shall presently see.

What was it that took Henry Martyn to Persia? The answer is not altogether easy to give.

The answer given in the "Life" (p. 273, new edition), is as follows:

The precise period of his departure from Cawnpore, as well as the place of his ultimate destination, was fixed by information received from Calcutta concerning the Persian version of the New Testament.

The version which had first been made in that language, the Gospels of which had been printed, had been considered, on further inspection and more mature consideration, to require too many amendments to admit of its immediate publication. It was accordingly returned to the translator, who, under the superintendence of Mr. Martyn, bestowed so much pains and attention upon it as to render it a new and, it was hoped, a sound and accurate work. By those, however, who were considered competent judges at Calcutta it was still deemed unfit for general circulation, inasmuch as it was thought to abound with Arabic idioms, and to be written in a style pleasing indeed to the learned, but not sufficiently level to the capacities of the mass of modern readers.

At this decision Mr. Martyn was as keenly disappointed as he was delighted at the complete success of the Hindostanee version, which, on

the minutest and most rigorous revision, was pronounced to be idiomatic and plain. But . . . he instantly resolved . . . to go into Arabia and Persia for the purpose of collecting the opinions of learned natives with respect to the Persian translation which had been rejected, as well as of the Arabic version, which was yet incomplete, though nearly finished.

So, with much literary skill, did Mr. Sargent gather together and harmonize Martyn's swift and conflicting resolves and purposes. This is, indeed, the true history of Martyn's departure from India; but the order in which the countries referred to are mentioned must be strictly noticed. First Arabia, then Persia. The current myth, which does duty for history, takes no notice of Arabia at all. And yet Arabia was his intended destination, and the Arabic version was the first charge upon his feelings. The proof is found in his reply to David Brown's letter conveying the opinions which condemned Sabat's work. At this point it is convenient to remind those to whom the history of translations of the Bible is a subject of interest that, in the matter of the two attempts made by Martyn in India to provide a translation of the Gospels into Persian, as well as in the instance of the Hindustani version, he himself was superintendent rather than actual translator. His Hindustani translator was Mirza Fitrut, his Persian translator was Nathaniel Sabat. The Persian New Testament connected afterwards with Martyn's name was accomplished in Persia, and was his own. His superintendence, however, of the earlier efforts was not nominal. Sheet by sheet he went over Sabat's work. Unknown to Sabat he submitted it also to Mirza Fitrut. An Arabic version was also in progress, and he felt himself involved in responsibility as much for the Arabic as the Persian. So, in the reply to which reference has been made, he says:

Yours of the 27th ult. is a heartbreaking business. Though I share so deeply in Sabat's disgrace, I feel more for you than myself. . . . Your letter will give a new turn to my life. Henceforward I have done with India. Arabia shall hide me till I come forth with an approved New Testament in Arabic. I do not ask your advice, because I have made up my mind, but shall just wait your answer to this and come down to you instantly. . . . Will Government let me go away for three years before the time of my furlough arrives? If not, I must quit the service; and I cannot devote my life to a more important work than that of preparing the Arabic Bible.¹

Thus, in this passionate outburst of disappointed feeling, it is Arabia and the Arabic version which are uppermost in his thoughts.

But interwoven with his thoughts at this time, drawing him steadily, with a constant though unacknowledged attraction, was the love which to his last hour bound him to his "dearest Lydia" Grenfell. All roads to the east and north of him ran

¹ "Journals," vol. ii. p. 316.

at length into "the road to Cabul and Candahar." All rivers ran into the sea that stretched undivided from Calcutta to Cornwall. He wonders whether she imagines "the billows that break at" her feet have made their way from India. To her, five days after leaving Cawnpore, he writes in terms much less definite than those which he employs in his letter to David Brown: "I am come forth, with my face towards Calcutta, with an ulterior view to the sea." It is hard to resist the suggestion which lies latent in the last seven words.

On New Year's Day, 1811, the day on which he preached the "unwieldy," but in every way memorable sermon which marks the foundation of the Calcutta Bible Society, he writes in his journal: "I now pass from India to Arabia, not knowing what things shall befall me there." Before the day was over he had seen the Governor-General and obtained leave to go to *Persia*, "an intimation," he considers, "of the will of God." Two days after he saw Lord Minto again . . . "he had no objection to my going on to *Syria*" . . . "considered their compliance as indicative of the will of God." Three days after that we read: "Took leave of Sebastiani. Obtained from him a list of places in *Mesopotamia*." Thus does the dream of a journey, "by the will of God, to come" to the shores of the Mediterranean, form itself in his mind—a dream never to be realized; whose shifting scenery, however, lured him on from day to day, yet without drawing him away for an hour from the business of translating the Word of God.

On the 21st of May he landed at Bushire, praying that his journey might be for the future good of *Persia*. But *Arabia* is not yet forgotten. On Midsummer-Day he wrote to David Brown that "the advanced state of the season rendered it necessary to go to *Arabia* circuitously by way of *Persia*." That very letter contains the important statement which severs Martyn from any further connection with Arabic work. "The men of *Shiraz* propose to translate the New Testament with me. Can I refuse to stay?"

He did not refuse. He stayed. He wintered with them. Without plan or purpose, it simply so fell out. He was as ready, perhaps almost as competent, for the one task as for the other, but the *Persian* was taken, and the *Arabic* was left. One entry in his diary is express, definite, and on this point conclusive, though strangely neglected, if not ignored. It was written at *Shiraz* in the first week of 1812.

Spared by mercy to see the beginning of another year. The last has been in some respects a memorable year; transported in safety to *Shiraz*, I have been led, by the particular providence of God, to undertake a work, *the idea of which never entered my mind till my arrival here*, but which has gone on without material interruption, and is now nearly

finished. To all appearance the present year will be more perilous than any I have seen, but if I live to complete the Persian New Testament, my life after that will be of less importance. But whether life or death be mine, may Christ be magnified in me. If He has work for me to do I cannot die.

He did live to complete it, and, as this last extract shows, he uses almost the same words about its value as, in the September of 1810, he had used about the importance of living to prepare the Arabic Bible; so evenly balanced in his mind were these two chief claims upon his thoughts.

And now, let two other points be cleared up, not of equal importance, but still both of much interest in various ways.

Martyn's Persian New Testament has, in our days, submitted to be revised. To what extent that revision has gone I am not able to say. Circumstances, to which I need not refer, have enabled me to know that nothing has been wanting on the part of the guardians and custodians and inheritors of Henry Martyn's dying labours, that was in their power to provide, to secure that sacred deposit against unnecessary change. The high character, the long experience, even the natural bent of Dr. Bruce's mind, are so many pledges that nothing will have been needlessly done to blot anything of Martyn's out of the Book of Life. And there are yet other guarantees. Still, it is good that a watchful jealousy should guard these inheritances, and a conserving temper prevail whenever they are examined afresh in the light of later and longer experience. It has happened before now to the present writer to hear the question of Martyn's Persian scholarship discussed upon what may be called *à priori* grounds. Briefly put, the statement of the case runs thus: "Martyn came to Persia in 1811, in June; he left it in 1812.¹ Is it likely that the cleverest man could make himself a competent translator of such a book as the New Testament in such a time as part of a single year?" No; it is not likely. But then this way of putting the question is absurdly misleading. The Government of India has a staff of Persian interpreters and translators, some good, some better, some not very good, some as good as good can be. Not one in ten has ever been in Persia at all. Persian, as the result of history, is an Indian language. Martyn began Persian before he left England. He never ceased to study it. It is constantly referred to in his journal. It comes in again and again, even in the years in which his chief employment was the Hindustani translation of the New Testament, of which he made so little and time has made so much. Let a single extract find place. It is an incident in 1809, when he was revising the

¹ The "Journal" is silent between April 7 and July 9.

translation of the Hindustani, on which Mirza and he had been employed. He had gathered about him "some Orientals" at Patna, and, as his custom was, he tried the translations upon them. "Last Tuesday we began the Hindoostanee, and to my surprise and mortification it was found necessary almost to new model it. Sentence after sentence was not understood till the Persian was read. It was a satisfaction to see how plain the Persian was to them, so that this Persian will probably appear to be the first useful translation of modern times."¹ In this Martyn was wrong, for two years afterwards he condemned this very "Persian" himself. But it settles the question that it is here quoted to settle, viz., that Martyn's Persian acquirements were equal to the translation of the New Testament two years, and even three years, before he saw Persia at all. So much, then, for Martyn's competence as a Persian translator; there still remains an error to correct as to his priority. That error finds accidental and unintentionally misleading expression in the valuable and authoritative "Life of Dr. Carey," written by Dr. George Smith. Dr. Smith is dealing with the earliest printing achievements of the Serampore press. He says (p. 265), "The press issued also the Persian New Testament, first of the Romanist missionary, Sebastiani—' though it be not wholly free from imperfections, it will doubtless do much good' wrote Dr. Marshman to Fuller—' and then that of Henry Martyn, whose assistant, Sabat, was trained at Serampore.'" These four statements are provably incorrect, and yet all four are current in a work of high value. The Serampore press did print Sebastiani's Persian translation, and it did print Henry Martyn's. But in neither case was it at first a New Testament, nor were they printed in the order which Dr. Smith assigns to them; nor was Sabat, though a visitor, and an intelligent one, ever "trained at Serampore." Dates are of importance here. In the month of June, 1808, being then at Dinapore, Martyn writes: "Sent the Persian of St. Matthew to Mr. Brown for the press," and in August of the same year: "Sent off the Persian of St. Mark to the press." These Gospels were afterwards revised and reprinted, but the dates remain as fixed points indicative of priority. The proof, however, of the four corrections here made is soon forthcoming. Martyn's version of the four gospels was printed at Serampore between 1808 and 1809, for the Serampore balance-sheet attached to the third "Memoir" has an entry dated August, 1809, of Rs. 1,100 towards the cost of it, and the minute-book of the Calcutta Committee has an entry of Rs. 1,700 on the same account. A third notice, in the same minute-book, records that the estimate

¹ "Journals," vol. ii. p. 237.

of the cost of printing the version at Serampore was Rs. 2,800.¹ The date of the printing of Sebastiani's version of the four Gospels can be fixed with equal certainty. It lies on page 28 of the appendix to the Second Report of the Calcutta Auxiliary. It is in a letter from Ward to David Brown, informing him of the losses sustained at Serampore by the great fire of March 11th, 1812. First it gives the dates on which, in *June*, 1811, certain stores of paper belonging to the corresponding committee had been received at Serampore. It then recites: "From this paper have been printed 1,000 copies of the Persian Gospels, by the Rev. Mr. Sebastiani." Thus it happens, though so long a time has passed, that the means still exist to put Martyn's priority, as well as his powers, into a true light. In each case it was the four Gospels, and not the New Testament, and Martyn's Gospels were printed two years before Sebastiani's. When Martyn's New Testament was really printed for the second time, the first edition having appeared at St. Petersburg, it was printed at Serampore; that was in 1816.

Sabat's "training" at Serampore is a myth. In May, 1807, he is still an unknown man on his way to Calcutta, by an arrangement between Henry Martyn and Dr. Kerr, a Madras chaplain. In November of that same year he reached Martyn's house at Dinapore. In some part of that interval he was at Serampore, but the merest glance at these dates disposes of all idea of training.

This paper must close. There is yet much to say about Martyn's work as a translator. His Hindustani New Testament, with Mr. Bowley's Hindi rendering of it, is a subject in itself. It was printed and reprinted, again and again. It still appears in the Bible Society's list. It was under revision in 1840, the reason being that "it is above the level of common readers." In 1841, though the revision was still in progress, Martyn's version was once more reprinted "as the best for a certain class of readers." In 1844 there is a still more significant statement; the Benares revision is laid before the Calcutta committee by the Rev. Mr. Shurman, and it is recorded that "in the course of the revision Mr. Shurman saw reason to revert in a great measure to the translation by Henry Martyn, especially in the latter half of the work."

I know no parallel to these achievements of Henry Martyn's. The sense of his greatness grows upon one with each repeated reading of his journals. But this paper is concerned only with the translator, not with the man, the minister, or the saint. There are in him the things that mark the born translator. He masters grammar, observes idiom, accumulates vocabulary, reads

¹ It was so, but the cost exceeded the estimate, and the exact sum paid to the Serampore press was Rs. 4,080.

and listens, corrects and even reconstructs. Above all, he prays. He lives "in the Spirit," and rises from his knees full of the mind of the Spirit. Pedantry is not in him, nor vulgarity. He longs and struggles to catch the dialect in which men may speak worthily of the things of God. And so his work lives. In his own Hindustani New Testament, and in the recovered parts of the Old Testament in which he watched over the labours of Fitrut, his work is still a living influence; men find "reasons for reverting" to it. His earlier Persian, and what is demonstrably distinct from it, his Persic translation, or rather Sabat's, done under his superintendence, these indeed have gone. They did not survive his visit to Persia. Nor did the Arabic, which, as this paper shows, was the chief acknowledged motive of his journey. But what a gifted man is here, and what a splendid sum total of work, that can afford these deductions from the results of a five or six years' struggle with illness, and still leave behind translations of the New Testament in Hindustani and in Persian; the Hindustani version living a double life, its own and that which William Bowley gave it in the humbler vocabulary of the Hindi villages! We live in hurrying times; our days are swifter than a shuttle. New names, new saints, new heroes ever rise and dazzle the eyes of common men. So it should be, for God lives, and through Him men live and manifest His unexhausted power. But Martyn is a perennial. He springs up fresh to every generation. It is time, though, to take care that he does not become simply the shadow of an angel passing by. His pinnacle is that lofty one which is only assigned to eminent goodness, but it rests upon, and is only the final of, a broad-based tower of sound and solid intellectual endowment.

W. J. EDMONDS.

ART. II.—THE TRANSFIGURATION.

IT might be considered superfluous at this age of the Church to try to impress upon its members the importance, the duty, and the necessity of studying the predictive portions of the Scriptures—those which direct our faith onwards to the great winding up of the world's mysterious history at the appearing of the Son of man, the subject having been presented now so many years to the attention of men, both in the press and in the pulpit. But the tone of recent commentaries and expositions shows incontestibly that there still exists an imperative necessity to urge Christian men "to take heed unto

the sure word of prophecy."¹ Our Lord's warning exhortation ought surely to be sufficient, "Behold I have told you before. What I say unto you I say unto all, Watch;" the certainty of the event and the uncertainty of the time adding emphasis to His teaching—in fact, giving it all its peculiar force.

In accordance with this is all the teaching of the Apostles in their respective writings. Believers in the Christ are described as those who wait for, look for, love His appearing. St. Paul expresses his own individual expectation: "Henceforth there is laid up for me a crown of righteousness, which the Lord, the righteous Judge, will give me at that day; and not to me only, but unto all them also that love His appearing." To Titus he writes that the grace of God brings salvation, teaching us to live soberly, righteously, and godly in this present world; and as regards the future, teaching us to look for that blessed hope, even the appearing of the glory of the great God and our Saviour, Jesus Christ. Men have substituted for this an entirely different hope, even on death to go up to heaven, there to dwell for ever with the Saviour, regardless of the resurrection at His coming. In direct contrariety to this, St. Paul instructs the Corinthians (2 Epis. v. 1-4), "earnestly desiring—*ἐπιποθοῦντες*" (longing, R.V.)—"to be clothed upon . . . not for that we would be unclothed, but that we would be clothed upon, that what is mortal—*τὸ θνητὸν*—may be swallowed up of life—*οὐθέλωμεν ἐκδύσασθαι*—we do not desire to be unclothed." The coming of our Lord Jesus Christ and the gathering together unto Him is, then, our desire, our hope, according to the Scriptures, and at His coming the establishment of the kingdom of God.

The coming of the Lord and the kingdom are so intimately connected that they cannot be conceived as ever separated; hence the expression, "coming in His kingdom," and the penitent robber's petition, "Lord, remember me when Thou comest in Thy kingdom," a petition in accordance with Daniel's account of his vision, in ch. vii., verses 13, 14. This vision is the source of all those passages in the New Testament which speak of our Lord coming in, or with, the clouds of heaven.

Now, though the life of our Lord was one of the deepest humiliation and suffering, yet on certain occasions He thought fit to assert His true dignity, and to exhibit His real glory, as the result of His sufferings, as "the joy that was set before Him, for which He endured the cross, despising the shame." Such an occasion was His manifestation to the Gentiles, when the gifts and homage of the eastern sages were an earnest of the

¹ 2 Peter i. 19. This passage should be read thus: "We have the word of prophecy *made* more sure (*i.e.*, confirmed). Whereunto ye do well that ye take heed (as unto a lamp shining in a dark place, until the day dawn and the day star arise) in your hearts"

homage of the whole earth (Ps. lxxii. 8-15; Isa. lx. 6-10). Another similar occasion was His riding into Jerusalem a few days only before His death, when He openly avowed Himself the Messiah King. But especially on the Mount of the Transfiguration did He exhibit the glory in which He will appear when He shall "take unto Him His great power and reign; when the kingdoms of this world shall become the kingdom of the Lord and of His Christ." The reference of this scene to His coming and kingdom must at the outset be established. The account of the Transfiguration occurs in the first three Gospels, and in each is immediately preceded by a declaration by the Lord, that the Son of man shall come in the glory of His Father with the holy angels. This is followed by the promise, in evident connection with the statement—might we say *suggested* by it?—"There be some of them that stand here which shall not taste of death till they see the Son of Man coming in His kingdom" (Matt. xvi. 28); "till they see the kingdom of God come with power" (Mark ix. 1); "till they see the kingdom of God" (Luke ix. 27). "The Son of man coming in His kingdom" and "the coming of the kingdom of God with power" are only two different forms of expression conveying the same truth—"the Son of man shall come in the power of His kingdom and set up the kingdom of God on earth."

In fulfilment of this promise was the scene on the Mount, when, a few days after—"six days," "about eight days"—Jesus brought Peter, James, and John up into an exceeding high mountain, and exhibited to them His glory—"His own glory" in which He will appear when He "cometh in His kingdom." St. John's reference to this scene is short but pregnant: "The word was made flesh, and dwelt among us (and we beheld His glory—glory as of the only begotten from the Father)"—the glory of the incarnate word, the glory of the Son of man, when He shall appear in the power of the kingdom of God.

St. Peter's appeal to what he and his companions witnessed on the Mount is decisive as to the character and design of the revelation. The great subject of his teaching, as of that of all the Apostles, was the coming of the Christ and the "salvation ready to be revealed in the last time." He desired, even gave diligence, that the Christians for whom he wrote his Epistles might after his departure (*ἔξοδον*) be able to call these things to their remembrance at all times. On his own mind the reality of the coming and kingdom was deeply impressed. He had all the evidence that could possibly reach his understanding. The sure word of prophecy had revealed all to him; and he had that word confirmed to him by the evidence of his own eyesight, than which nothing could be more convincing. With confidence, therefore, he asserts, "We have not followed cunningly-devised

fables, when we made known to you the power and coming (or presence) of our Lord Jesus Christ, but we were eye-witnesses of His majesty." This majesty was therefore "the power and coming" of the Christ, "the coming of the Son of man in His kingdom," "the coming of the kingdom of God with power." Nor does he leave us in any doubt as to the time and place when and where he saw this coming and kingdom. He adds: "He received from God the Father honour and glory, when there came such a voice to Him from the excellent glory, This is My beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased; and this voice we heard when we were with Him in the holy mount." From all these references no room is left for doubt that the Transfiguration was "the coming of the Son of man in His kingdom, the kingdom of God come with power, the coming and power of our Lord Jesus Christ."

We have now to consider the scene itself in its details. We have of these: 1. Our Lord Himself in glory. 2. His two glorified companions. 3. The unglorified disciples. 4. The cloud. These are the principal incidents.

1. The scene was designed to manifest the glory of the Christ especially, not His Divine glory as abstract Deity, but His glory as the word become flesh; the glory of the Man Christ Jesus. The language in which the change in His appearance is described is a strong proof of this: "He was transfigured;" the word imparts a change of form, that is, His humble human form, in which His Deity tabernacled, was transfigured for one of glory. In St. Luke ix. 19 it is said, "the fashion of His countenance was altered;" and St. Matthew and St. Mark say, "His face did shine as the sun; and His raiment became white as snow" (compare Rev. i. 13-15; Ezek. i. 26; Dan. vii. 9). He did not lay aside His human body, but was glorified in it. The utmost importance attaches to this, because of our interest in it; for in His glory we see that to which He designs to conform us, in the day when, rising from the dead, we shall see Him as He is, and be like Him (see 1 John iii. 2; Col. iii. 4; Phil. iii. 20, 21). In the glory of Christ as God the redeemed can have no share; they cannot be manifested in it, nor personally be interested therein; they can be interested only in that glory which Jesus has earned for Himself as their Redeemer. As surely as Christ suffered for them, so surely was He glorified for them. By suffering in human nature He has procured for it glory, which He claims as the reward of His righteousness and obedience unto death; a glory for that nature which He has thus raised in His own person. To Him in His pre-existent state it was unnecessary, possessed as He was of all the glory of eternity. The voice from "the excellent glory" confirms this, that it was the reward of His

obedience unto death, as it is written, "Being found in fashion as a man, He humbled Himself, and became obedient unto death, even the death of the Cross. Wherefore" (because of this humiliation and death) "God hath also highly exalted Him," etc. (Philip. ii. 8, 9). As at His baptism the words, "This is My beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased," conveyed the Divine sanction for the work He was about to undertake, and His perfect qualification, when the Spirit descended on Him from on high and abode with Him, so here they convey to men for their comfort and peace, in anticipation, the Father's approval of His work as perfected, and His acceptance of human nature, not before, since Adam's fall, acceptable in His sight.

2. The two saints who appeared in glory with Christ. I conceive that this adds to the evidence already adduced, that the glory was not the Divine glory, but that which the Saviour vouchsafed to obtain for man. By introducing into the scene two of His redeemed invested with like glory, He gave a strong confirmation that the glory was an earnest of that which is to come; and by seeing two of its members so invested, the Church has an indisputable assurance that the glory is its own.

But why were Moses and Elias specially selected for the occasion? Can we hesitate to answer, because in their respective persons they represented the two classes of the saints who shall pass into glory from this mortal state?—the first, by death, followed by resurrection in immortality and incorruption at the coming of the Lord; the second, by translation, without dying, caught up to meet Him as He descends. Thus we read, "We shall not *all* sleep, but we shall *all* be changed, in a moment, in the twinkling of an eye, at the last trump: for the trumpet shall sound, and the dead shall be raised incorruptible, and we shall be changed" (1 Cor. xv. 51, 52). Somewhat more fully: "Them which sleep in Jesus will God bring with Him. For this we say unto you, by the Word of the Lord, that we which are alive, and remain unto the coming of the Lord, shall not prevent" (precede, R.V.) "them that are asleep. For the Lord Himself shall descend from heaven with a shout, with the voice of the archangel, and with the trump of God; and the dead in Christ shall rise first, then we which are alive and remain shall be caught up together with them in the clouds to meet the Lord in the air: and so shall we be ever with the Lord" (1 Thess. iv. 14-17). Though in a moment all shall take place, yet there will be order. The voice of the archangel shall waken the saints sleeping in their graves, who, rising in life immortal and incorruptible, shall mingle with the living saints on earth their mortal bodies also changed into immortal and incorruptible, bodies; and then both, one glorious multitude, shall be caught up to meet the descending Lord, and "the Lord God shall come

and all the saints with thee" (Zech. xiv. 5). Of these two ways in which believers pass into glory Moses and Elias were examples, or types; Moses slept—he died; Elias died not—he was translated, caught up into heaven. Thus was the whole Church represented in this scene of the coming glory and kingdom of the Redeemer, sharing the glory and consequently reigning with him.¹

3. The persons who were privileged to witness the glorious scene, and who also fulfilled a representative character in it. "He took with Him Peter, James and John, and was transfigured before them"—three unglorified believers. As one reason why they were present, we can quote Peter's own words, when vindicating the Church's hope as not following "cunningly devised fables" when looking for "the power and coming of our Lord Jesus Christ." He says: "We were eye-witnesses of His majesty." No description or historical record could bring such convincing proof to the minds of believers as the testimony of three eye-witnesses who could say they had beheld His majesty and glory.

But, similarly as Moses and Elias, they occupied a representative position, even of the nations of the earth, converted to Christ when He comes, but not glorified. Thus when we look to the Mount of the Transfiguration we behold Christ's future kingdom, so to speak, *in miniature*. It is on earth; our Lord is there in His glorified humanity; His saints are with Him sharing His glory—His saints both risen and translated; risen as Moses, translated as Elias; the converted nations of the earth, as represented by Peter, James and John, in ordinary, not glorified, humanity. Such will be the kingdom of the Christ at His appearing.

4. Another accompaniment of the vision, which is of the utmost moment in deciding its character and reference, must be specially noted, the "bright cloud which overshadowed them." It overshadowed Jesus, Moses and Elias, and "they (the

¹ "They spake of his decease—*ἐξοδος*, departure—which he was about to accomplish at Jerusalem." This word *ἐξοδος* is remarkable, "because in its wider range of meaning it covered all the special phenomena connected with the close of the ministry of the law-giver and the Tishbite (comp. Deut. xxxiv. 5, 6; 2 Kings ii. 12), and not less so the resurrection and ascension of our Lord, as well as the crucifixion."—*Bishop Elliott's Commentary*. "The word, as Godet shows, is especially chosen to include the death and ascension of Christ."—*The Speaker's Commentary*. "Vocabulum valde grave, quo continetur passio, crux, mors, resurrectio, ascensio."—*Bengel*. May we not conclude from this that the scene was designed for the Lord Himself, to strengthen Him to pass through the fearful ordeal that was before Him, but which should eventuate in the glory of His kingdom? "For the joy that was set before Him He endured the cross, despising the shame, and is set down at the right hand of the throne of God."

Apostles) feared when they (the glorified ones) entered into it." It was a cloud of heaven's own glory. In the prophecies this specially marks "the coming of the Son of man in His kingdom." In the vision of Daniel (chap. vii.) we read, "I saw in the night visions, and behold, one like the Son of man came with the clouds of heaven, and came to the Ancient of Days, and they brought Him near before Him. And then was given Him dominion and glory, and a kingdom, that all people, nations and languages should serve Him: His dominion is an everlasting dominion, which shall not pass away, and His kingdom that which shall not be destroyed" (vers. 13, 14). His kingdom to be shared with the saints—"And the kingdom, and dominion, and the greatness of the kingdom *under the whole heaven* shall be given to the people of the saints of the most High, whose kingdom is an everlasting kingdom, and all dominions shall serve and obey Him" (ver. 27). In these two quotations from Daniel we have an exposition of the scene on the Mount of the Transfiguration.

Our Lord appropriates this prophecy to Himself. "Then shall appear¹ the sign of the Son of man in heaven; and then shall all the tribes of the earth (land) mourn, and they shall see the Son of man coming in the clouds of heaven with power and great glory" (Matt. xxiv. 30). Again, in answer to the adjuration of the High Priest, "Tell us whether Thou be the Christ, the Son of God" (xxvii. 63, 64), He answered: "Thou hast said; nevertheless, I say unto you, hereafter shall ye see the Son of man sitting on the right hand of power, and coming in the clouds of heaven." It was surrounded with the bright cloud of heaven's glory that He ascended into heaven: and the promise given to console the disciples on their Master's departure was, that He "shall so come in like manner—that is, in the clouds—as they saw Him go into heaven" (Acts i. 11).

Once more, the subject of the Book which specially is "the revelation of Jesus Christ" is, "Behold He cometh with clouds, and every eye shall see Him," etc. (Rev. i. 7).

Thus have we given to us a defined view of our future state. The Church in these latter times has a most undefined view of that future. The hope of the resurrection from the dead, that most blessed hope, which speaks to man's nature, and to his sympathies, is exchanged for the being unclothed, disembodied: the pagan view of the future in ignorance of the Divine revelation of the resurrection being adopted by the Church. Alas! *immaterialized being*, which is most undesirable, substituted for the substantial reality of the resurrection unto life.² "Not that

¹ "The sign of the Son of man" is the Son of man Himself, just as "the sign of the prophet Jonas" was Jonas himself.

² Perhaps a mistaken view of the words "spiritual body" has mainly

we would be—*οὐ θέλωμεν*—unclothed, but clothed upon that mortality might be swallowed up of life" (2 Cor. v. 1-5), the almost identical words the Apostle uses in 1 Cor. xv., where he treats so fully of the resurrection. Until the resurrection mortality triumphs. It is then that this mortal shall put on immortality, and this corruptible shall put on incorruption. In the body, while it is unregenerate, we groan, being burdened because of sin; but can we not look to the time when it shall be builded up anew in holiness? Can we not look upwards to Christ, who, in holy, risen, and glorified flesh, is now seated on the Father's throne, and in the sure and certain hope of being like Him, await the resurrection? Until then we cannot be like Him in glory. Until then this body of our humiliation shall not be fashioned like unto the body of His glory. He Himself, in prophecy, looked forward to His resurrection: "My flesh shall rest in hope, for Thou wilt not leave My soul in hades, neither wilt Thou suffer Thine Holy One to see corruption." And though, unlike Him, we shall see corruption, unless we shall be alive and remain unto His coming, yet shall we be like Him when we shall awake from the sleep of death to die no more. "I shall be satisfied when I awake with Thy likeness."

The scene on the Mount substantiates to us our hope, and the vision may be translated into the words of St. Paul: "Behold I shew you a mystery; we shall not all sleep, but we shall all be changed in a moment, in the twinkling of an eye at the last

contributed to this. St. Paul distinguishes between the *σῶμα ψυχικόν* and the *σῶμα πνευματικόν*; the former the body of the present life, the mortal body; the latter the body of the resurrection, the immortal body. The former derived from the first Adam, who became *ψυχήν ζῶσαν*; the latter from the second Adam, who became *πνεῦμα ζωοποιόν*. The life gives to the body its characteristic. The *ψυχή* life actuates the present body; the *πνεῦμα* life quickens the future, the resurrection body. The body is in each case the same; the life is different. The body in each case is "flesh and bones," not "flesh and blood." Our Lord's own statement is peculiarly full: "See My hands and My feet, that it is I Myself; handle Me and see; for a spirit hath not flesh and bones, as ye behold Me having" (Luke xxiv. 39). The same flesh and bones as before His death, but the life, the actuating force, totally different. Our Lord's resurrection was altogether distinct from the resurrection of Lazarus and others, who were recalled to *ψυχή* life by a fiat of power, but to die again. His resurrection was a birth into an altogether new life. The spirit of life. God, the Holy Spirit, begat in His dead body, as it lay in the tomb, spiritual life. He was thus "born, begotten from the dead" (Psa. ii. 7, Col. i. 18, Rev. i. 5). And because the Church shall also be thus born from the dead, He is designated "the first-born—the first begotten of, or from, the dead." Hence His body was spiritual—*i.e.*, having spiritual life; not immaterial, but as material as when He was born of the Virgin. "See," He says, "it is I Myself; handle Me; feel My material hands and feet; and be assured I am the very Jesus you associated with before I died." The bearing of this on various matters of controversy will at once be recognised.

trump ; for the trumpet shall sound, and the dead shall be raised incorruptible ; and we shall be changed."

Further still, the Transfiguration reveals perfected humanity—humanity as in the eternal purpose of God. At its creation human nature was imperfect, surrounded with infirmities, weak and mortal. "The Word became flesh," as thus weak and mortal ; He hungered, thirsted, was weary, felt sorrow deeply and keenly, and died. He rose, leaving for ever all these infirmities and mortalities ; He rose to die no more ; He rose the perfected man. The Resurrection was the completement of the Incarnation. At the Transfiguration He appeared, in anticipation, the perfected man, the fulfilment of the purpose of God, as He now is and will be for ever, "the image of the invisible God."

But He was not alone, the individual Christ, for "Moses and Elias appeared in glory," one with Him in His glory, therefore one with Him in His risen life, exhibiting there the full union for which He prayed (John xvii.) between Him and His people. For the life of the head is the life of the body, and the glory of the head is the glory of the body. The type of the marriage of the first Adam and the first Eve, "signifying unto us the mystical union that is betwixt Christ and His Church," was thus fulfilled in the perfected humanity of both the risen Christ and the risen Church, one for ever.

Who can tell the far-reaching issues of the scene on the Mount of the Transfiguration ?

THEOP. CAMPBELL.



ART. III.—THE LANGUAGES OF THE NEW TESTAMENT.—PART III.

I NOW turn to the language in which "the Gospel" was written. There is a considerable interval betwixt the Ascension of the Lord and the appearance of the first *written* document connected with the new faith. Our Lord, like Elijah and John the Baptist, left behind Him nothing in writing. His work was oral, and we have no indication that His companions and hearers caught up and recorded His words at the time. In Luke xvi. 6 we read that the Lord, in the parable of the unjust steward, used the following words : "Take thy bill and *write* fourscore." The word "write" never passed His lips save in that parable. He knew how Jeremiah had written, "Write all the words that I have spoken," but He himself gave no such orders. The eyes of his followers were darkened. One Evangelist, who had special knowledge, tells us that there were many other things which Jesus did, of which we have no

records; and St. Paul hands down one sentiment attributed to the Lord which is not found in the Gospel, and he tells us also in the Epistle to the Galatians that the Gospel which he preached was not by him "received of man, but by *the revelation of Jesus Christ.*"

Our Lord no doubt made other communications to His Apostles after His Resurrection, beside those narrated; but the neglect of the two disciples (one of whom was Cleopas, possibly Alpheus) who went to Emmaus to record on paper the wonderful communication made to them, explaining to them the whole *raison d'être* of His sufferings and glory, seems to pass all conception, and it is remarkable that St. Luke, who had had the advantage of living so long in intimate connection with St. Paul, and would therefore appreciate the extreme importance of this discourse, should have failed to collect and record the details, which, coming from His own lips, would have set so many questions at rest. We have to recognise a period of oral teaching and preaching at first by eye-witnesses, who had no conception of the magnitude of the movement which they were making. They rather expected a speedy end of the world, and the second appearance of their Lord, and the idea of writing books to edify future generations never occurred to them. The art of writing was rare among the simple peasants of Galilee. The commands of the risen Saviour were *μαθητεύσατε, κηρύξατε*, and they took Him at His word. Their aim was to convert their own people only. Oral handing down of legends, ballads, and traditions is common in the East to an extent which we cannot conceive in Europe.

A notable miracle is reported. On the tenth day from the Ascension, the disciples, *with the women and the Virgin Mary*, were all in one place, when the Pentecostal miracle took place, and the Holy Spirit fell upon all, male and female. This is supposed to have affected the language spoken. There are many interpretations; it is not recorded that all made use of the gift, whatever was its nature, either at Jerusalem, Samaria, Cæsarea, or elsewhere. Some of them certainly obtained a wonderful boldness to speak the Word of God, and to speak it effectually, so as to convince the intellect and convert the hearts of their hearers. St. Paul states that he received the same gift, and he certainly had the power of preaching and convincing to a marvellous extent, but on the only occasion recorded, when he came into contact with people who did not speak Greek or Aramaic, but used the speech of Lycaonia, he did not seem to understand them until they carried their words into action. We are told that Peter readily conversed with Cornelius, the centurion of the Italian band in the fortress of Cæsarea, the key of the country. He was probably a Roman, or at least one of

the Latin race, and knew little of Greek and Aramaic. He and his kinsmen and friends, probably military men, or camp-followers, were heard to speak with tongues and magnify God. We may believe that these men, on their return to Rome, laid the foundation of the Christian Church which St. Paul found in existence, by their earnest teaching and preachings. If they did so, they made full and beneficial use of the talents entrusted to them.

Preaching in Aramaic must have been the employment of the disciples at this period, telling over and over again the same wonderful story, but necessarily varying in details, as all had not had the same experiences. Some had seen miracles and listened to parables; others had been cured of diseases. The services of the deacons, who were Hellenists, would be valuable to address the Hellenist strangers from Alexandria and Cyrene in Africa, and Cilicia, and Asia Minor in Asia. But as the eye-witnesses passed away by death or dispersion, it was felt that this *oral* teaching had its disadvantages. There was danger of additions being made, omissions of important doctrines, and inaccuracies. We have an exact parallel in our missionary deputations of this day. The missionary comes home, and tells his story, from his own point of view solely, what he saw and heard; the speaker at secondhand gets up his story, or arms himself with notes: he is less fresh, but has a larger grasp of the subject. At length an official history of the mission is compiled, in the same way, but under authority. *Oral* Gospels gradually came into existence, definite in general outline, uniform to a certain extent in language, quoting freely from the Aramaic Targums of the Old Testament (and sometimes from the Septuagint, when Hellenists were addressed). It is asserted that a Palestinian version of the Septuagint existed. The *oral* grew on into *written* accounts, to the existence of which St. Luke, in the first verse of his Gospel, alludes; these were in Aramaic or Greek, according to the requirements of the country where one or other language was used. Each Apostle and each speaker naturally laid stress upon the particular portion of the great story which impressed him most. At last, when the number of adherents increased, and the men who had known the Lord in the flesh disappeared, it became necessary to have some authoritative Gospel, which might be appealed to in case of divergence of statement, as different sects were coming into existence, and thus we arrive at the time A.D. 60, when the Gospel of St. Matthew is supposed to have appeared, twenty-seven years after the Ascension. It was composed by an Apostle, by a man whose business, as collector of taxes, satisfies us that he could write: it was written for the benefit of his countrymen, the people of Galilee, for he was called from his

seat of office in our Lord's own city of Capernaum. There is a direct statement of the early Fathers, Papias, Origen, and Jerome that he wrote his Gospel in Aramaic, and the probability coincides with the statement: he must have spoken Aramaic to be able to manage his office; there was no more *primâ facie* necessity for his knowing Greek than for a Hindu village-accountant, who keeps the account of his village in Hindi, to know Persian or English. He collected the customs on the little sea of Galilee. Like the books of Livy and many of the most valuable Greek works, this Aramaic Gospel has disappeared; but there is credible evidence of the genuineness and authenticity of the Greek Gospel attributed to Matthew which has come down to us; it has never been disputed that the Aramaic Gospel once existed, and the Greek is in our hands. It is not necessary to assume that the Greek "replica" (the term used by painters who paint the same picture twice over) has not the force and authority of an original Gospel. Up to the fall of Jerusalem, A.D. 70, the Aramaic version may have met the wants of the Palestine Church: after that event a Greek version was required: some illustrious books of antiquity exist only in translations—or St. Matthew himself may have superintended the work of translation into Greek, so as to supply the needs of Hellenists residing in Palestine. Of this we have remarkable illustration in the case of a writer of the same epoch, also a Jew. Josephus wrote his works originally in Aramaic, and admits his weakness in Greek composition. In the preface to the "Wars of the Jews," § 1, he writes: "I have proposed to myself *for the sake of such as live under the Government of the Romans*, to translate these books into the Greek language;" it is a fair inference that Matthew may have done the same. Nor is it anything out of the way for an author to publish a book in two languages for two different classes of readers. In the Empire of Austria, to this day, authors publish books at the same time in German and Slavonic languages; the "Life of Frederick the Noble" was published last year at London and Berlin in German and English; I have published books at Agra, in India, in English and Hindustani at the same press, the same day, being responsible for every word in either language. After the lapse of centuries, copies of portions of the Scripture in Samaritan, Koptic, Abyssinian, Gothic, and Syriac have been recovered. The Aramaic Gospel of St. Matthew in this wonderful age may some day gladden our eyes.

Before alluding to St. Paul's Epistles, I must try and throw some light upon the duties of an amanuensis in Eastern countries, and specially in bilingual countries. In St. Paul's Epistles we find phrases like this: "I, Tertius, *who wrote this Epistle*, salute you in the Lord;" "Ye see how large a letter I

have written with *my own hand*;" "The salutation of the *hand of me, Paul.*" To the official of British India such remarks come home with peculiar force. Jerome writes, "Habeat ergo Paulus Titum interpretem." If St. Paul employed an amanuensis, it was because of the weakness of his sight, not on account of his inability to compose grammatically, and write legibly, a letter in Greek, for he was an accomplished Grecian. An English statesman or man of business at the present time dictates a letter "*totidem verbis*" to his private secretary, or gives him the purport, and leaves the skilled and trusted secretary to produce the proper phraseology. In unimportant matters this answers, but when a different language is used, and a French or German clerk is employed, greater caution is necessary, and the draft letter has to be read and corrected and approved. Such is the necessity of office-life in British India. The English official has native clerks seated on the ground near him, quite capable of rendering his brief, ungrammatical orders into grammatical, courteous, official, elegant language in Persian, Hindustani, or any other language required. I think that I state a fact, that not a single British official throughout India could engross his own judgments or orders in such a form that they could be issued and understood. But none the less, the orders issued are accurate and faithful, for they are read over, and, if need be, corrected, before the seal and English signature is attached. In the thousand documents to which I have attached my name I have never been tripped up once; of course, the *style* of the particular amanuensis who draws up a particular proceeding is evident. When these facts are considered, many difficulties with regard to the Greek Epistles ascribed to the Galilean fishermen, St. Peter and St. John, are cleared away. The difference of style in the Epistle of St. John, and in the Revelation, may be explained by the fact that he had a different amanuensis. Should it be argued that St. Peter was not responsible for the wording of his Epistle, this objection cannot be maintained. Jerome writes: "*Denique duæ Epistolæ, quæ feruntur Petri, stylo inter se et caractere discrepant, structurâque verborum. Ex quo intelligimus diversis eum usum interpretibus.*"

But another consideration forces itself on those familiar with the mode in which India is governed. The Viceroy has occasion to write a letter, possibly complimentary, possibly of most serious import, rebuking him, fining him, perhaps dethroning him, to a native Hindu Raja. Neither the Viceroy nor the Raja has the least elementary knowledge of the Persian language, but in that language, in courteous phraseology, a letter is indited by a skilled official penman, signed and sealed by the Viceroy or his Chief Secretary. On arrival at the Native Court it is read and explained to the Raja by his own

bilingual official. The letter-writer, so familiar in the streets of an Italian town, is unknown in England, but in India, among the unlettered people, I have known letters on the ordinary details of life indited in Persian. Neither the sender nor recipient knew any language at all. I remember one of my grooms in camp bringing me a long letter in Persian, the meaning of which he wished to know. It was couched in high-flown language, and common-form expressions, but the object was to announce the birth of a baby and the well-doing of the mother.

When it is objected that the Epistle to the Hebrews could not have been intended for the Jews of Palestine, or the Epistle to the Galatians for the Galatians, as they did not know Greek, the circumstances above stated must be borne in mind, especially the patent fact already alluded to that the Papal rescripts to the Irish people are still to this day published in Latin.

About St. Paul being bilingual there can be no doubt. He could speak Aramaic and Greek, and write Greek; as to his power of writing or reading Aramaic we have no evidence. In a spirit of antagonism to the Jews, the early Christians west of Palestine adopted the use of the Septuagint. St. Stephen was bilingual; his dying speech to the Sanhedrim was in Aramaic. St. Paul's companions, Barnabas, Mark, Luke, Apollos, Aquila, and Priscilla, Titus, Timothy and Philemon, were all Hellenists. Something may be collected as to the degree of literary culture to which St. Paul had attained. He quotes four Greek poets—it is true that one of the quotations occurs in the works of two poets, Aratus and Kleantes. St. Paul writes, "Some (*τινες*) of your own poets say so." He puts the words of Æschylus in the play of Agamemnon into the mouth of our Lord as the Greek rendering of his Aramaic utterance: *πρός κέντρα μή λακτίζε*. Apparently he did not know Homer, although an Ionian; he had visited Troas; his eyes must have looked at Pergamus and Mount Ida, and across the sea to Samothrace, yet the *religio loci* had not stirred him. A man of Macedon had appeared to him, and he could not possibly have been ignorant of that greater man of Macedon, who had, three centuries before, come to fulfil the prophecies of Daniel, had conquered the Eastern world, had been welcomed by the High Priest at Jerusalem, had destroyed Tyre, and founded Alexandria. At Athens St. Paul must have been aware of the existence of the theatre of Dionysos under the Acropolis, where the plays of Euripides were still repeating the old Homeric story so dear to the Athenian people; he had stood on Mars Hill (as I have done repeatedly) and looking at the Propylæus, he had beheld the colossal statue of the Virgin Goddess, with her helmet and shield glittering in the sun, and visible to sailors, as they doubled the distant Cape Sunium.

His travels and experiences must have taught him lessons which no Jew of the old time could ever learn; as he stood on Mars Hill in front of the Temple of Athené, at his feet was the Temple of Theseus, further to the right the great Temple of Jupiter Olympius; on the Promontory of Sunium was the Temple of Athené; on his left through the pass of Daphne was the Temple of Eleusis; over the waters of the Egean was the Temple of Ægina; the fragments which remain of these wonderful buildings still chain mankind. St. Paul saw them in their noonday splendour. He had resided at Ephesus, and knew too well the Temple of Artemis, one of the wonders of the world, on the columns of which we gaze with awe in the British Museum. He had seen the Temple of Daphne at Antioch, and heard of the gigantic Temple of the Sun at Baalbec in Cœle-Syria, on the road to Damascus, the columns of which astonish the modern traveller. He must have heard from Apollos of the Serapéum at Alexandria, and dimly of the wonders of Om, and Memphis, and Thebes in Egypt. His eyes were opened, and contrasting temple with temple, nation with nation, city with city, he knew how utterly insignificant in comparison with them was the Lord's House at Jerusalem, the City of Zion, and the few sheep of the Lord's chosen flock in the land of Canaan; *but to them were committed the oracles of God*; to them in the fulness of time had come that Jesus, whom he (St. Paul) preached, and while in his heart he gave the preference to the glory of the Latter House, still, on Mars Hill he repeats in the Greek language the words which, years before, he had heard in the Aramaic from the lips of Stephen, to whose death he had consented, that "the Lord of heaven and earth dwelleth not in temples made with hands," echoing words spoken by the Lord to the woman of Samaria, who had seen nothing but Gerizim, and had heard of nothing but Zion. St. Paul fully comprehended the meaning of our Lord's parting orders to preach the Gospel *to all nations, to every creature, to the uttermost parts of the earth*, when Jerusalem was no longer the centre of the universe, the joy of the whole earth. Admitting that he wrote in Greek, he *thought* in Aramaic; here is the difference betwixt the Epistles which bear his name, and the anonymous Epistle to the Hebrews; the writer of that was entirely a Greek in his logic as well as his expressions. If the question be asked whether St. Paul spoke or wrote Latin we have no evidence whatsoever; he got on well with Julius of the Augustus' band, presumably a Roman; he addressed the crew and the soldiers on board the ship, and they understood him. It was easy for him to communicate with the Punic inhabitants of the island of Malta. As regards intellectual culture he stood just on the dividing line of Oriental and Occidental knowledge. His successors,

and even some of his companions—for instance, Apollos—had profited from a knowledge of Philo, and perhaps a greater one than Philo, Plato; a generation later the early Fathers were not ignorant of the works of Tacitus and Pliny, Seneca, Epictetus, and Marcus Aurelius. Asiatic and European literature had come into contact with each other. The very salutation of some of St. Paul's Epistles indicate a man in whom two cultures met: *χάρις καὶ εἰρήνη*. In the first word we have the Greek *χαίρε*, and in the latter the Hebrew "Shalóm," which still lives in the Oriental translation "Salám," or Peace.

I now approach the subject of the Epistles of St. James and St. Jude. I must ask my readers to accept, for argument's sake, that they were the Lord's brothers (Matt. xiii. 55), and not the Apostles, who bore these names. They were thus carpenters like the Lord, and probably first cousins to the fishermen, the sons of Zebedee, whose mother, Salome, was mother to the Virgin Mary. It goes without saying that they spoke Aramaic, and we have no evidence that they had learnt Greek. Accepting these facts, it is noteworthy that out of the twelve Apostles only two, St. Peter and St. John, have left behind them any writings at all; the other ten no doubt preached and preached, and went forth to the Eastern regions, but they had no recorded dealings with Europeans or Hellenized Jews. The Lord had chosen a new army for the European campaign under the leadership of St. Paul. It is clear that there was little sympathy betwixt St. Paul and St. James; their antecedents, experiences and convictions were totally different. St. Paul claimed to have received a special revelation, and was a travelled man. St. James, as far as we know, never left Jerusalem, or shook himself free of his Judaizing environment. There is no doubt that St. James either wrote his Epistle solely in Aramaic or allowed it to be translated by an amanuensis into Greek under his own superintendence for the benefit of the Jews of the Dispersion. In the first view of the case the Greek version has no more original authority than the early Syriac version which has come down to us. In the second it is like the Gospel of St. Matthew in Greek. Both St. James and St. Jude, in their style, betray their Semitic origin and Jewish education: their Greek expressions are sometimes peculiar. It has been remarked by an acute critic that the word-store of St. Jude is more real and powerful than his grammatical construction; the number of words which are his, *and his alone*, as far as the New Testament is concerned, is remarkable.

With Luke we have to deal with a Gentile and a Greek scholar of no ordinary power.¹ He could never have seen the

¹ It is not faultless: In Acts xxvii. 14, he writes of the ship as *αὐτή*, "she," forgetting the gender of *πλοῖον* in the preceding verses. Like the

Lord, but he had all the qualifications of a conscientious historian. He was the companion of St. Paul, and dwelt two years with him at Cæsarea. During that period he had inquired, sifted and weighed evidence; he gives his opinion on facts stated; e.g., he adds to Peter's remarks at the Transfiguration the opinion of an historian, that Peter knew not what he said. No doubt he had access to fragmentary *written* accounts, and took down from the lips of competent persons *oral* accounts, collated them, and transferred the matter thus collected in Aramaic to his own limpid Greek. Nothing in the Greek language can surpass in beauty the two first chapters of his Gospel. We sometimes wonder from what source he obtained not only some of his facts, but the purport and sentiments of some of the utterances recorded. Let us take, for instance, the beautiful words of Zechariah, the father of John the Baptist, and old Simeon; they must have passed away sixty years before St. Luke took up the pen, and probably long before his birth. They had no connection of any kind with the Lord's ministry. The same remark applies to the *Magnificat*, and to the words uttered by the angel Gabriel to the Virgin at Nazareth. It is a bold assertion that the Virgin herself was St. Luke's informant, for she must have been in extreme old age when he began his inquiries, if indeed she were still alive, or if he ever met her; had he done so he would have recorded the fact. The theory requires a succession of unsupported assumptions. Some go further, and assume that the Virgin left documentary evidence, but we have no evidence of any Jewish woman knowing how to write. The hymn itself is but an echo of the beautiful prayer of Hannah on the occasion of the birth of Samuel more than one thousand years before, and it is comforting to think that women even then knew passages of the Bible by heart. In the words uttered by the angel to the Virgin occur the following: *χαῖρε κεχαριτωμένη*, a play of words of extreme elegance. It may be presumed that the words of the angel found their way to Mary's understanding in the only language which she could have understood, and that was Aramaic, and in the Syriac version, dated 200 A.D., and Delitz's Hebrew version of the present time, no such play of words can be supplied from the word-store of those kindred languages; for how much, then, of these beautiful Christian hymns the world is indebted to St. Luke's inspired touch can never be known. At any rate, they were translations of precious Aramaic fragments, which had

other writers of the New Testament he found a dialect of Greek ready to hand more suitable to convey Oriental conceptions, and better supplied with word-moulds for representing the Monotheistic idea than the Greek of the Athenian schools; for the Septuagint Greek has been elaborated by six generations of Jews in Alexandria.

survived either in the memories or the note-books of some of the second generation of Christians. To those who accept inspiration as an illuminating influence, not a physical or intellectual coercion, there will be no difficulty in facing these difficulties.

With regard to Peter and John, the Galilean fishermen who led the great crusade, it is distinctly stated that they were reputed to be "*ἀγράμματοι*," which certainly means ignorant of letters. The Pharisees had, however, said the same of our Lord: "How knoweth this man letters, having never learned?" Here they erred, as our Lord read from the Roll of Scripture at Nazareth, and on another occasion wrote with His finger on the ground. Of neither of His apostles, Peter and John, have we any such evidence. Jerome tells us: "(Habeat) Petrus Marcum interpretem, cujus Evangelium Petro narrante, et illo scribente compositum est." If St. Peter helped St. Mark with the matter of his Gospel, there is reason to believe that Mark helped Peter in the composition and writing of his first Epistle; at any rate, his name appears in a very marked way in the concluding verses of the last chapter, and he is described as *μαθητῆς καὶ ἑρμηνευτῆς Πέτρου*. The question naturally arises how an old fisherman of Galilee, past the prime of life, was able to write Epistles in good grammatical style in a foreign language. Old fishermen, who take up a different kind of business in middle life, are generally unable to write a decently expressed and spelt letter in their own language, much less in a language which they had never seriously learned. We must all feel that, however quickly we may pick up the power of talking a foreign language in middle life, we fight shy of writing a letter, especially on a subject of grave importance. Is there a single ordained minister of any church in England, who, unless of French extraction or education, would venture to publish a written sermon in French, though there are many who can converse with tolerable accuracy? We are told that Augustine, the Bishop of Hippo in the fourth century, with all the advantages of his station, epoch and environment, shrank from the difficult task of mastering Greek, though we know what a master he was of the Latin language, one so closely allied in structure and word-store to the Greek, and yet we are asked to believe that somehow or other St. Peter, a fisherman, between forty and sixty years of age, managed to write two Epistles in excellent Greek, though his native vernacular, the Aramaic, was totally different in every particular, and he himself was uneducated and untrained in literary subjects. Now we may assume that Peter dictated the matter of his Epistles to "his son" Mark, who was a Hellenist of Cyprus, as public officers in India dictate elaborate judgments on suits, decided by them in the courts in Hindustan, to the trained native clerk, who carefully

draws up the draft for the perusal and correction of the judge, who is responsible for every point of the argument, and for the turn of every expression. It is noteworthy he calls himself *Πέρπος*; St. Paul spoke of him as *Κηφᾶς*; St. James as *Συμεών* (Acts iv. 14).

ROBERT CUST.



ART. IV.—THE PROSECUTION OF THE BISHOP OF LINCOLN.

A REJOINDER.

IT is a serious and perilous thing to criticize the action of the Church Association. You may hold the same Evangelical doctrines. You may be equally attached to the Protestant principles of the Reformed Church of England. You may have devoted your time and dedicated your talents (if you have any) to the promulgation of those doctrines and the maintenance of those principles. You may have stood up boldly at one Church Congress against any approach to reunion with the Church of Rome, as a thing not even to be discussed. At another you may have argued strenuously that laymen are as much spiritual persons as the clergy, and that to “preach the Word” is more effectual for conversion and edification than to celebrate choral or fasting communions. You may, to the extent of your poor ability, have been active in the committee-room or on the platform in the cause of all the distinctly Evangelical Church Societies, and of the Religious Tract Society and Bible Society; but if you have ventured to suggest that a particular course of action taken by the Church Association for the attainment of objects, which you in common with every true Evangelical have at heart, is unwise, and likely to defeat its purpose; and if you have adduced facts and arguments in support of this shocking contention; if, though you pronounce Shibboleth with precisely the same accent as the council of that eminent body, you decline to make war upon those whose intonation is different, why then, indeed, you must “look out for squalls.” All that you have said and done goes for nothing. You are what a moderate drinker is in the eyes of a teetotaler—worse than a drunkard. You have found fault with the action of the Church Association, and must be silenced at any cost. Your arguments will be misrepresented and your language misquoted. Words you never used will be imputed to you in inverted commas. The *English Churchman* will read you out of the Evangelical party. It will open its columns to personal attacks upon you

and your father, and the secretary of the Church Association will circulate a pamphlet, informing all who take the trouble to read it that you are a foolish and ignorant layman, who prays in vain for the teaching of the Holy Spirit! With the fear of such dire consequences before his eyes, it is no wonder that the writer in the *Record* of the following sentiments conceals himself under the signature "A Septuagenian":

I have no sympathy with the Church Association, or with the present or former prosecutions. To give my reasons would require more space than you could allow me. I must simply express my feeling that no good has come or could come from them. Confessedly, in spite of all partial victories, Ritualism is unchecked and confident. It will never be checked by antagonism of this kind. And this partly on the general ground that no body of earnest men, strongly imbued with what seems to them vital principles, can ever be put down by external force; partly, also, because their spiritual instinct rebels against the authority of secular courts in matters spiritual. On this point, and on this only, I regard the Ritualists as having a sound principle on their side.

Before accepting the last paragraph I must have a definition of the word "spiritual." The Ritualist would perhaps define it by "clerical." To my mind converted men, lay or cleric, are spiritual; unconverted men, though ordained or even consecrated, are not. The rest of the paragraph fairly represents my own views, and those, I have good reason to believe, of the great majority of Evangelical Churchmen.

Let me now turn to Mr. Miller's pamphlet, which first appeared in the June number of the *CHURCHMAN*. It is called a reply to Mr. Sydney Gedge's "Attack upon the Church Association;"—a curious misdescription of my article, which contained stronger language against the Bishop of Lincoln than against the Church Association.

Neither Mr. Miller nor the *English Churchman* has taken the trouble to realize the object for which my article was written, or to understand my line of argument. My purpose was to show, first, that the prosecution of the Bishop of Lincoln is a proceeding so mischievous to the Church, that both his lordship who provoked it, and the Church Association which instigates and supports it are greatly to blame; and, next, that the prosecution is a blunder from the point of view of the Association, because it is calculated to have the opposite effect to that desired by the promoters, and to increase rather than diminish Ritualism, and to spread the Romish doctrines of which Ritualism is the exponent.

The object of the prosecution is stated by Mr. Miller himself to be to establish the falsehood of six doctrines which he specifies, all and each of which I repudiate as heartily as he does, and I am conceited enough to believe that "I and my friends *have* an intelligent acquaintance with the existence of

these six-root heresies." And we have also as earnest desire as Mr. Miller has to eradicate them from our beloved Church.

But the question with me was a practical one: Will the prosecution tend to this end? Looking at it from this practical standpoint of utility, I gave my reasons for answering this question in the negative. I set forth, as fairly as space allowed, the considerations which are urged on either side. The illegality of the Bishop's conduct was pointed out and made the subject of severe comment, and he was urged to consider the grave inconsistency of his position as an officer of the Church, who disobeys its laws. The cumulative force of the six or seven practices "circling round the Holy Communion" was duly noted, as well as their direct relation to Romish false doctrine; and I urged that they should be combatted by all lawful methods which were likely to be successful. I approved the aim, the purpose and the principle of the Church Association, and adopted them as my own; but of the means used and the way taken to win the battle, I gave cogent reasons for my disapproval. My contention was, and is, that whatever be the issue of the prosecution, it will neither stop nor diminish Ritualism; and it will not touch the six-root heresies, or any of them. And I showed that if these momentous doctrinal questions be dragged by the Church Association into the fight, if the Ark of God be brought down into such a battle-field, then failure to win the legal conflict about the rites may involve the allowance of the heresies, and the Ark will fall into the hands of the Philistines.

My contention was supported by *à priori* reasoning, based upon the nature of the case, the character and position of the parties, and the effect upon the minds and sympathies of ordinary people of prosecutions of such persons for such offences. This *à priori* reasoning was confirmed by a review *a posteriori* of the results which have followed the series of prosecutions for which the Church Association is responsible.

With this argument neither Mr. Miller nor the *English Churchman* has made any attempt to grapple. Indeed, they seem to me rather to have dipped into the article, and fished up anything they could find disparaging to the Association of which they are the secretary and organ, than to have mastered its scope and purport. Their point of view is marvellous. They seem to care not for the effect of the prosecution upon the Church of England, but for the effect of my article upon the Church Association.

Will my readers bear with me while I deal seriatim with Mr. Miller's principal statements and arguments?

1. He imputes to me the assertion that every one of the doctrines which he declares to be involved in the six points of ritual is true. What I asserted was that the doctrines

now symbolized were, so far as I could ascertain, so and so, and that these doctrines are true. Mr. Miller has not ventured to deny their truth, but he enters into an historical inquiry to show that three hundred years ago other doctrines, not true, were also symbolized. This may be so, but we are dealing with the present time, and with ordinary people. Mine was not an historical inquiry, but a practical investigation into the effect in the nineteenth century of these ritual practices upon the minds of the "men in the street," who have not had occasion to make themselves professionally acquainted with ecclesiastical lore. Taking myself, if I may do so without conceit, as a fairly good specimen of the average worshipper, with regard to knowledge of such matters, my very ignorance of the recondite meanings so plain to Mr. Miller, proves this point of my argument. Further, this part of my manuscript was submitted to two friends—one lay, very high Church; the other an "old-path Evangelical" clergyman, a man of considerable theological learning. Each assured me that my statements were correct as to the doctrines symbolized. Unless Mr. Miller and his council prefer paganism to ritualism, they should follow the example of the Quakers, and consistently write the 5th day of the week, and the 12th day of the 1st month, rather than Thursday, the 12th of January; for does not the last expression recognise two false gods, Thor and Janus? Are we bound as practical men and women to be always searching into the origin of practices which, by themselves, are harmless? Shall the yule-log and the mistletoe be forbidden at Christmas-time because they originally were adjuncts to a feast in honour of Odin? Must we be continually asking questions for conscience' sake? A little more robustness in our Christianity would do it no harm. Let us lay fast hold of essentials, and courageously deal as we please with things of minor importance.

2. Mr. Miller in his pamphlet, and Mr. du Boulay in a letter to the *English Churchman*, accuse me of "the fallacy of isolation." Surely they cannot have read the long paragraph (pp. 454-5) in which I carefully pointed out that it is the circling of all these individually harmless things round the Holy Communion, and their combined significance of reference to the bread and wine upon the Lord's Table, which make them objectionable as converging towards certain false doctrines—Mr. Miller's "root heresies"—which ought to be resisted unto blood. Where is the "fallacy of isolation" here?

3. I have not the time, and can scarcely hope for the space, to track out and expose Mr. Miller's misstatements of my language under his different heads, one to six. I will ask the readers of the *CHURCHMAN* to compare, paragraph by paragraph, what I wrote and what he imputes to me. One instance shall

suffice. As to the sixth charge, that the Bishop cleansed the chalice with wine and water, and drank the wine and water in the face of the congregation, I wrote that anyone ignorant of Church controversies would probably allow the plea that this act was but great carefulness in obeying the directions that "if any of the consecrated wine remain it shall be reverently drunk in the Church." Contrast this with Mr. Miller's version (the italics are mine; they show his ingenuity in misquoting):

That the officiating clergyman should *ostentatiously* drink the *rinsings* of the chalice, *and of his own fingers (over which water is poured lest a crumb or drop of the deified "substance" should adhere to them)*, Mr. Gedge regards as a proof of great carefulness in obeying the direction of the rubric to consume reverently. *What Mr. Gedge*, as a matter of taste, calls "reverent," the Primate of the Northern Province more justly characterized as "disgusting."

Mark the unfairness of Mr. Miller's way of putting it. I might as fairly attribute to him the statement that the bread and wine had become God.

4. With regard to the "grave responsibility incurred" by me in "making rash and inaccurate statements which ought not to be published," I quoted the *ipsissima verba* of Bishop King and Lord Halifax in relation to the matter in question. If these words are "a misrepresentation of their well-known public utterances," the misrepresentation is theirs, not mine, who do not pretend to be acquainted with all their speeches and writings. If Bishop King does teach the six doctrines set out in Mr. Miller's pamphlet, he teaches what I believe to be false. But the present prosecution has nothing to do with them; he may be condemned on every one of the six points of ritual, and yet be free to teach and preach all these root-heresies. Their truth or falsehood will not affect the judgment, or be affected by it.

5. As to the use of the surplice in the pulpit, which I asserted to have been established by the Church Association, justice can only be done to the reasoning and tone of Mr. Miller's reply by giving it at length:

Now, since the dress of the preacher has never been made the subject of litigation or of a judicial decision, this alleged fact would, on the Gedgeian (*sic*) system of "reasoning," go to show that it was the absence of "persecution" which had caused the change; that does not help Mr. Gedge's contention very much.

This is a mere quibble. Few on reading this statement would know that the gist of it lies in the word "preacher," and that Mr. Miller begs the question altogether when he silently assumes that *preaching* is not *ministration*.

In "*Hebbert v. Purchas*," one of "the subjects of litigation and judicial decision" was the vestments of the minister in the administration of the Holy Communion and in other ministra-

tions. The Privy Council, after a careful summary of the arguments on both sides, decided that the cope is to be worn at certain times and in certain places in administering the Holy Communion, and the surplice *in all other ministrations*.

An attempt has been made to get out of this decision by those Church Association men who do not like it, by a contention that preaching is not a ministration; but they have very wisely abstained from submitting this question to the decision of a court of law. And the fact remains that, in consequence of the judgment in "*Hebbert v. Purchas*," a large majority of the Evangelical clergy have shown their loyalty to the law as apparently laid down by the Privy Council and wear the surplice in the pulpit. "Old-path Evangelicals" have done this at the request of their Evangelical bishops, in order to set to the other side an example of obedience to the law. Thus my assertion was true that the action of the Church Association against Mr. Purchas has established the use of the surplice in the pulpit.

6. Next comes the most astounding of all Mr. Miller's charges. My statement that the Church Association has "obtained from the highest courts the declaration that it is lawful to affirm three specified definite propositions," is enlarged by Mr. Miller into a general statement that it is lawful to affirm "Mr. Bennett's doctrines," and characterized as "an extraordinary statement for a lawyer to make, showing a want of candour and fairness in a gentleman who *professes* Evangelical principles." My statement was true; the Court of Appeal did decide what I said it did, and I quoted the precise words of the judgment. "But," says Mr. Miller, "the judge of the *inferior* Court was brother-in-law of Archdeacon Denison!" and "Mr. Gladstone had pitchforked two brand-new judges into the Court of Appeal within a week of the trial."

Well done, Mr. Miller! This out-Herod's Herod! The Ritualists make to the decisions of Lord Penzance and of the Privy Council the respectable objection that they are secular courts meddling with spiritual matters; but it is reserved for the secretary of the Church Association to object to a decision which he dislikes, of a Court to which he has himself appealed, and to stigmatize as unfair and uncandid a dry statement of the fact that the decision was given, because of the family relationship of one judge and the recent elevation to the Bench of two others. An Irish M.P. declaiming against two resident magistrates as creatures of Mr. Balfour is comparatively reasonable. Nor is Mr. Miller more happy in his next sarcasm at the poor lawyer whom he is refuting. He imputes to me this dictum: that "a verdict of not proven means the pronouncing lawful everything charged against the person acquitted, as though one murderer acquitted proves the lawful-

ness of murder." Not so, Mr. Miller! Mr. Bennett *was* proved to have affirmed the propositions which I quoted, and it was decided that those propositions were not contrary to law. The exact analogy is rather as follows: Mr. Miller was proved to have shot a man who was burglariously entering his house by night, and the court decided that this was not murder, but justifiable homicide. Therefore, it has been decided to be lawful to shoot a man who is entering your house burglariously by night; but it has not been decided that murder is lawful.

The force of my article in no way depended upon the name, position, reputation, or character of the writer. It might have been published anonymously with the motto of the writer of "Imitatio Christi." "Ne quis hoc dixerit sed quid dicatur attendas," and its effect would have been the same. I have no pretence to authority in such matters. I give the reasons for my opinion: let them be weighed and their proper value ascertained. The Church Association paid a high compliment to my article when they set to work, through their organ in the press (the *English Churchman*), and their secretary, Mr. Miller, to run down the writer. They faithfully followed the instructions given to the defendant's counsel: "No case; abuse the plaintiff." My article was to be "read between the lines," my private friendships exposed, and my dark designs and sinister conspiracies dragged to light!

"A Watchman" wrote in the *English Churchman* (May 16): "It is well known in London that Mr. Sydney Gedge and certain of his co-advocates of concession have *intimate, personal, and official relationship* with the Archbishop of Canterbury and the Bishop of Rochester. Mr. Sydney Gedge and his Grace are old schoolfellows. Since his Grace's accession to the See of Canterbury those relations, I am informed, have become more intimate than ever." The Protestant readers of the *English Churchman* are then warned of the plot to traitorously surrender to the Ritualists which these prelates, and Mr. Gedge and his friends, had concocted, but this "Watchman" had discovered and revealed. On the 23rd May I replied that this "well-known" story was a pure fiction. Note this "Watchman's" apology (*English Churchman*, May 30): "I call attention to the words 'and certain of his co-advocates of concession'—words which Mr. Sydney Gedge has overlooked. I was well aware that he alone had no official connection, and did not intend to imply it." Need I waste any words in further exposing the misstatements of such a mendacious writer as this "Watchman"?

Mr. Miller brings a more serious charge against me. He asserts that at every crisis at which the Church has had to cope with her enemies I have been found a consistent supporter of

compromise with error, in order to save the Establishment. This is about as cruel an accusation as could be brought against a Christian man. No honest man would make it, unless he believed it to be true, nor would he believe it to be true unless he knew facts to justify his belief. I, therefore, in the July CHURCHMAN, challenged Mr. Miller to send me a statement of these facts, that it might be published with my reply. He has refused to do so! I am left to grope in the dark, aided by such light as the "Watchman" gives me, and I have thus reason for believing that he referred to my action as a member of the committee of the Church Missionary Society.

There have been four great questions upon which that committee (*quorum pars fui*) have adopted a line of policy, which has been strenuously opposed by those of its members who are more or less identified with the Church Association. They are as follows:

1. The Society's general relation to the High Church Bishops, such as the Bishops of Lincoln or Bombay.
2. Its particular relations with the Bishop of Colombo.
3. Its taking part in the endowment of the Bishopsrics in Japan and Jerusalem.
4. The service in St. Paul's Cathedral last year after the unveiling of the reredos.

With regard to (1), The principle upon which the great majority of the committee acted is that principle which I, for one, imbibed from the teaching of that "Old Path Evangelical," Henry Venn; viz., that we are a Church society, bound to be loyal to Church principles and Church laws, that we deal with bishops as officers of the Church, and must treat them officially, all alike, whatever may be their peculiar views. We do not alter our principles or our practice to suit the taste of any bishop, and if a bishop likes to come to us and accept office on our own terms, we give him his official position, and do not go behind his acceptance of it.

(2). The same principles guided our conduct towards the Bishop of Colombo. The bishop of a diocese in which we have missions is a *fact* with which we have to deal. We cannot, if we would, do away with him or ignore him. We go to his lordship for episcopal ministrations, and ask him to ordain and license our missionaries, and to confirm our candidates, etc., and then, when he attempts to exercise episcopal supervision and authority, are we to snap our fingers in his face, on the ground that he has no coercive jurisdiction? Such conduct would be a sin and a blunder. Though the courts of law and the policeman might not enforce the bishop's authority, he would have at his back the whole weight of the entire ecclesiastical system of the Church of England. If we had treated the Bishop of Colombo

in the manner which a few ardent spirits desired, our missions in Ceylon must have been abandoned, and the Bishop, who now welcomes our missionaries with both hands and assists their work, would have been confirmed in the belief with which he entered his diocese, that the sooner they were got rid of the better for the cause of the Christian Church.

(3). Similarly with regard to the bishoprics in Japan and Jerusalem. The committee agreed to pay a part of the incomes of these bishops, although the selection was in the hands of the Archbishop of Canterbury. By so doing they established a strong moral claim to the appointment of a man who would not impede their work, and they helped to pay for services which their work required. A shabby refusal to contribute would have placed their missionaries in a most invidious and painful position towards the Bishop under whose overseership they are placed alike by the voice of the Church and the laws of the Society.

These three questions had certainly no connection with the maintenance of the Establishment. With regard to the reredos—whose removal from St. Paul's would give me great joy—it seems very hard that the Church Missionary Society should be so abused for holding a service in its presence, when the Bible Society did the same without rebuke. Apart from other reasons for not countermanding the service at the last moment, it seemed to me clear that if we refused to hold it in the nave because of the reredos in the chancel, we must consistently decline to allow our young Islington men to be ordained in the chancel, kneeling down in the very front of all the statues or graven images upon the reredos. Evidently the result would have been that they must have gone out to the mission-field unordained, and not improbably would have failed to obtain ordination there.

Such were among the practical considerations which guided an overwhelming majority of the committee after frequent prayer and anxious deliberation to the decision to which they came; and I thank God they have no reason to be dissatisfied with the result. An abundant blessing has followed them both at home and abroad. Salisbury Square is still the centre of the best evangelical influence, and from that centre the circle is enlarging and the circumference expanding. More numerous and better qualified candidates come forward; larger sums are poured into the treasury. Our principles remain the same as those of our founders; our practice, if there be a change, is not quite so "churchy" as theirs; our reports breathe the same spirit, and show each year increasing results. To God be all the glory.

I am nearly at the end of my task, but one thing more remains

to be said. Mr. Miller claims that his association has for many years been the only motive force for Protestantism in the Church, and charges that "Mr. Sydney Gedge and his friends" have not done one single thing to resist Ritualism and the root-heresies. Taking that expression "Mr. Gedge and his friends" to mean those Evangelicals who have not joined the Church Association—with some few notable exceptions, such as my late dear friend, Edward Auriol—I claim that we have done more to prevent the spread of Romish doctrines, and its outward expression in Ritualism than all the prosecutions instituted by the Church Association. I specify two things.

1. Despite the disloyal, but, thank God, the unsuccessful attempts of some of the leading members of the Church Association to break up the Church Missionary Society, we have doubled its income and its work.

2. We have also founded the two theological halls—Wycliffe Hall, at Oxford, and Ridley Hall at Cambridge, where many of the choicest of University graduates have received at the hands of Canon Girdlestone and Mr. Handley Moule such sound Biblical and religious instruction as has, by God's blessing, so permeated their minds and filled their hearts as to leave no room for Sacerdotalism, Ritualism, or Latitudinarianism. These heresies do not flourish in parishes or missions where clergymen trained at Wycliffe, at Ridley, or at the Church Missionary College in Islington, teach, preach and exhort. We have done what we could, and could have done much more if the large sums lavished on the cost of prosecutions had been spent in assisting these good works, and if the Evangelical cause had not suffered so sorely from the bitter spirit and intolerance of the leaders of the Church Association towards all who differ from them. It may be that that body comprises all the ninety-nine sheep which went not astray. Does that justify them in hounding every sheep that has wandered from the fold into the remoter wilderness? Would it not be better, by the display of a little of the Christian forbearance and love that thinketh no evil and rejoiceth not in iniquity, to tempt the sheep back into the fold, than to lock the door against it, and to treat as a goat any sheep which has a little pity and would fain make the way easy for the wanderer's return?

What said the great Missionary Apostle? "Some, indeed, preach Christ of contention, not purely, imagining that they add affliction to my bonds. What, then, except that in every way, whether in pretence or in truth, Christ is preached: and in this I rejoice, yea, and will rejoice!" St. Paul reprov'd error and demonstrated the truth: but he overlooked the wrong in his joy that the Gospel of Christ was proclaimed. May we Evangelicals have grace to do the same!

SYDNEY GEDGE.

ART. V.—CREMATION.

THERE is no stronger evidence that these are indeed "the latter days" of the world, than the rapidity with which the gravest questions affecting our every-day lives are forced upon public attention, and brought, in spite of determined opposition, to a speedy settlement. Formerly any great change in men's ordinary habits, even where it did not affect any deeply-rooted and long-cherished sentiment, was wont to be canvassed again and again, now making some way in public opinion, now falling out of notice, it might be for years, and then coming up again with renewed force; until at last, when men's minds had become thoroughly familiarized by long discussion with it, some legislative adoption of it might ensue. How many generations passed before the doctrine of the divine right of kings to absolute authority ceased to be the belief of a large section of the English people! How slowly did Catholic Emancipation and Parliamentary Reform, and Jewish Citizenship and Vote by Ballot make their way into men's convictions! Those who could remember the first mootings of some of these questions in their early youth, found themselves still discussing them after their hair had grown gray with age. For how many years did public prejudice struggle against steamships and railways, and only acquiesce discontentedly in them after all! None of these questions affected the most sacred feelings, the most inveterate prejudices of men, as does this question of cremation, nor did their promulgation call forth so loud an expression of horror and repugnance. Yet, although it has scarcely been fifteen years before public notice, there are signs that men are beginning to yield a reluctant assent at once to its utility and its necessity. Crematories have been set up, and are in use in this as well as in several foreign countries; a court of law has pronounced the process to be legal; nearly eighty members voted for a Bill in its favour brought into the House of Commons. Even at the Church Congress in the present year, the very last place at which it might have been expected to find favour, many voices were raised in its advocacy. Doubtless there will be a determined struggle before it is generally adopted, but its adoption is, nevertheless, a matter only of time.

The considerations which have brought about such a change in popular feeling must needs, one would think, be of grave importance; and such is indeed the fact. The conviction has forced itself on the public mind, that the belief so long entertained of the efficacy of the earth as a complete disinfectant, so that when bodies have once been deposited beneath it there is no fear of any disastrous results—that this belief, I say, is a

fatal mistake. In proof of the truth of this conclusion the clearest testimony has been adduced. Eminent authorities, among them Sir Henry Thompson (the first in recent times to bring this question before public notice), Dr. L. Playfair, Dr. Milroy, Dr. Lewis, and others, have incontestably shown that the putrid exhalations from corpses are not absorbed by the surrounding soil, but escape in all directions, poisoning air and water alike. How many of the terrible diseases, which in past ages decimated the population, may have been due to this unsuspected cause, it is impossible to say. But there is no doubt that malignant diseases of one kind or another have continually resulted from intramural interments in cities; and so far from the noxious vapours from corpses dying out after a year or two, their capacity for mischief continues even after the lapse of generations.¹ The vicinities of graveyards have been shown to be notorious for constant outbreaks of cholera and other maladies. The evidence produced by the Sanatory Commission of 1850 was fully sufficient to establish this. There is no need to shock the reader by a recapitulation of the horrors then elicited.

No doubt the worst of these have been put an end to by the interdict laid on intramural interments, and the closing of crowded churchyards, for which cemeteries have been substituted. But these are, after all, only partial and temporary remedies, palliatives rather than cures. The corpses buried in these do not spread pestilence and death through crowded neighbourhoods, but they exercise a deleterious influence in the districts immediately surrounding them; and the time must come—and considering the rapidity with which population increases, come speedily—when the evil will be renewed in all its enormity. As Sir H. Thompson has pithily and conclusively put it: “No dead body is ever buried within the earth without polluting the soil, the water, and the air above and around it.”²

But this is a conclusion which no right-minded man can regard without serious disquietude. It is often a very painful thought to men in the last hours of their lives that the evil they have done will not die with them, but will be bequeathed as a legacy of sin and misery to those who will come after them. The profligate thinks of the victims of his lust who will carry

¹ The opening of the great plague-pit in Spitalfields, a century and a half after the burial of the bodies, caused an outbreak of virulent disease among the adjoining residents.

² The method employed by the Necropolis Society, and known as the “earth to earth burial,” is no doubt a vast improvement on burials in brick graves and solid wood or leaden coffins. But this, too, is obviously only a *palliative*. The deleterious exhalations last for a shorter time, but while they do last, the effect is equally pernicious to health.

on the work of ruin and suffering which he began; the gamester and the swindler, of the families they have wrecked; the writer of godless and licentious literature of the dragons' teeth he has sown about the world, yielding crops of sin and despair, which will be reckoned to his account hereafter. They would fain annihilate these germs of evil, if they could, and leave none but wholesome influences behind them. So, too, will every right-minded man desire that no taint of disease or pain should result to his fellow men from anything that has belonged to him—from his body, no less than from his mind. The dying cry which Dickens puts into the mouth of one of the most detestable characters that imagination has ever drawn, is most fearfully accordant with the notion of an incipient hell: "Throw me on a dunghill and let me rot there to infect the air!"¹

Supposing the above to be conceded, we have next to inquire what is the most befitting mode of disposing of the dead—not what is the simplest, the most picturesque, not even what is the most in accordance with traditional reverence, but what—having an eye to all these things—it becomes our plain duty to ourselves, no less than to our neighbours, to adopt.

There have been, and are, many forms of burial in use among men. The most ancient, it may be assumed, was the depositing of the body in some cavern or rift of the rocks. "Burying the dead out of sight" is the idea which would naturally first occur to men—the wish to behold no more an object which had become so full of painful association and natural disgust. Cain, it would seem, had hidden his brother's corpse, probably in some such place, hoping that all trace of his crime would be removed. In Abraham's time interment in caverns seems to have been the one in general use. There were doubtless secret places in mountains and hollow rocks, natural mausoleums, where any number of bodies might be deposited. There is no reason for supposing that in those early days graves were dug beneath the surface of the earth. When men dwelt in tents, frequently changing their place of sojourn, or in cities, which probably did not number many hundreds, the disposal of the dead would be an easy matter enough. If there were not natural hollows in the mountains sufficient for the purpose, artificial ones might easily be constructed, far enough removed from the living to occasion neither disgust nor injury. But when in process of time cities grew in size, and the dead were numbered not by units, but by tens and by hundreds, difficulty would be felt. Then probably the practice of cremation sprang up, and it is easy to see how. The custom of destroying by fire articles which had been closely associated with, or especially dear to

¹ "Nicholas Nickleby," chap. lxii.

the dead—his wearing apparel, his weapons, his ornaments, his drinking-vessels,¹ etc.—existed from an early date. No one should sleep on the bed where he had been wont to repose, no one wear his garments or signet-ring, or use the cup and plate whence he had taken his food. As some of these things could not well be buried in his grave, they were cast into the fire, and at the same time spices and balsams burned to signify the fragrant memory which the deceased had left behind. It was an easy addition to burn the corpse itself, and then collect the ashes, which were then entombed or preserved in urns arranged in rooms set apart for the purpose. These rooms were called by the Latins *columbaria*, from their resemblance to pigeon-houses, and were used by all classes for the reception of the remains of their departed friends, their names being inscribed on the shelves upon which the cinerary urns were deposited.

This was, in all likelihood, the origin of cremation, and we can understand that it would be especially resorted to when it was feared that an enemy might exhume a body for the purpose of offering insult to the remains, or of depriving it of interment, which was accounted by the ancients as the gravest of misfortunes.² Hence, no doubt all the burials in Homer's *Iliad* were by cremation, the Greeks and Trojans alike being in danger of suffering outrage at the hands of their enemies.

But it should be observed that although religious ceremonies were observed at the burning of the dead, they had no special connection with that mode of disposing of the body. Nor can it be said with truth, though it has been often alleged, that humation was the Jewish and Christian method of burial, and cremation the heathen. No doubt it was the practice of the Hebrew race to inter, though not always actually by excavation *in* the ground, without any destruction of the corpse by fire; and that there is strong reason for believing that they derived this practice by tradition from the early Patriarchs. But it does not appear that they regarded this mode of sepulture as a divinely appointed ordinance, or thought that any other mode would be a breach of duty. The patriarch Joseph ordered his body to be embalmed after the Egyptian manner,³ in order that it might be conveyed by his descendants into the Land of Promise, and this is mentioned by St. Paul as an evidence of his faith. After the establishment of the kingdoms of Judah and Israel it seems to have been a regular practice of the Jews to have "a great burning" at the burial of their kings. In the instance of Jehoram, King of Judah, about 900 B.C., it is said that the

¹ See Lucan, ix. 225; Virg. *Æn.* vi. 225, etc.

² *Odyss.* xi. 6; Horace, *Od.* i. 28; *Ælian* v. iv.

³ *Gen.* i. 25, 26. ⁴ *Heb.* xi. 22.

burning, which had been customary at the sepulture of his fathers, was omitted. The practice was evidently very ancient. Nor is it certain that on these occasions the body itself was not burnt, and only the ashes interred in the sepulchre. It is said of King Asa (2 Chron. xvi. 14) that they laid him in the bed (the bier in which he was borne to the grave), "and that the bed was filled with odours and sweet spices," which, it would appear, were then set on fire and burnt.¹ The natural inference would be that the body imbedded in them was burned along with them. So again (Jer. xxxiv. 5) the prophet promises that Zedekiah "shall die in peace, and with the burnings of his fathers, the former kings which were before him, so should they burn for him." If the aromatic herbs were heaped on the bed and set on fire, and the royal corpse laid on it, as seems to have been the case, it is difficult to understand how the body could have escaped burning along with them. In any case it is certain that the Jews resorted to cremation, when special circumstances made it expedient for them to do so. Thus they burned the bodies of Saul and Jonathan when they feared that insult would be offered to the remains; and, again, when the decomposition of bodies during an epidemic sickness threatened contagious disease, they burnt them in order to prevent it.²

Still less could cremation be properly termed the heathen method of burial. It was with them, not the rule, but the exception. According to Cicero³ the Greeks in the earliest ages practised humation, and it was the prevailing practice with them down to the times of Constantine. Even in Socrates' day, as we may gather from his own words, it was regarded as matter of indifference whether a body was interred or burned. Such was also the custom among the ancient Romans. It was not until the later days of the Republic that cremation came into general use, and even then it was only the upper classes who practised it. With the establishment of Christianity as the religion of the Roman Empire, cremation died out. Nor has it been revived until our own day. There was an attempt to adopt it during the period of the French Revolution, but it did not succeed.

There were various other methods of sepulture in use among one nation or another. Cremation was regarded with horror by the Persians, who considered it as a profanation of the sacred element. They left their dead to be devoured by wild beasts or vultures. Recent authorities assure us that the custom of the Parsees is nearly the same. They construct round towers thirty

¹ The LXX. say of Asa *ἔθαψαν*, not *κατωρύξαντο*. The latter word specially denotes humation; the former is common to both forms of burial.

² See "Pusey on Amos vi. 10."

³ Cicero de Legibus, ii. 25.

and forty feet high, on the top of which are iron gratings, on which the corpses of the dead are laid. The flesh is devoured by birds, and the bones fall through the bars into the interior of the tower. The idea connected with this mode of burial seems to be that the disposal of the human body after death is a matter between man and his Maker, with which no one should presume to interfere. Some nations, as the Hindoos, fling their dead into rivers, where they are devoured by crocodiles or fishes. Some barbarous tribes eat the bodies of their relatives, esteeming that preferable to being devoured by worms. The Calatian Indians are related by Herodotus (iii. 38) to have upheld this notion, expressing at the same time the greatest horror of either burying or burning. Friar Odoric, Marco Polo and other travellers have collected evidence of the same practice among various Asiatic tribes. In some countries the dead are enclosed in wax, by which the bodies are preserved entire. In others, as among the ancient Egyptians, they are artificially preserved as mummies. In some, again, the remains are thrown into a mass of quicklime, which speedily reduces them to dust. This is the practice at Naples, where there are three hundred and sixty-five burial-pits, one being opened anew every day in the year to receive those who have died within the last twenty-four hours. This may be regarded as a species of cremation, and it is possible that some modification of this might meet the present difficulty.

Of all the above-named customs there are but two which it is possible for a civilized or a Christian nation to adopt—humation or cremation. The objections to the first-named have already been considered. It remains that we now deal with those made to the second. These, we must allow, let our conclusion be what it may, are of grave importance.

1. In the first place it is urged that the process of cremation is one revolting to natural feeling. Who could endure to fling into the fire, it is asked—and so entirely destroy all trace of anything that has been closely associated with anyone very dear to—the chair in which a parent was wont to sit, the book he delighted to read, the stick he carried in his daily walks? What mother could burn her dead child's favourite toys; what husband could fling away his wife's wedding ring? Yet these are but trifles compared with the body, in which the spirit dwelt during its earthly sojourn. But, let it be remembered that, in the first place, the chair and the book, and the toys, and the ring may be preserved unaltered, but the body cannot; and, in the next, that this is, after all, only sentiment, and sentiment cannot be allowed to bar the way where the social welfare of society is seriously at stake.

2. But, in the next place, it is contended that the artificial

destruction of the body would weaken popular belief in the resurrection of the body. This is the contention of so wise and good a man as Bishop Wordsworth, and coming from him, it must be treated with respect. But, excepting the weight of his name, I am aware of nothing that can be said in its favour. No doubt the heathen are recorded by Eusebius (H.E.v.i.) to have burned the bodies of Christian martyrs, and flung the ashes into the rivers to destroy, as they thought, all idea of their resurrection. But how can their vital ignorance of that great doctrine be any rule for us? They evidently thought that it would be necessary for all the particles which had formed a human body to be brought together, before it could again be raised to life, utterly misconceiving the great miracle revealed in Christ. But we know how vain and impotent would be the efforts of men to prevent its accomplishment.¹ We might, if we chose, alter somewhat the famous passage in Campbell's poem, "Hallowed Ground," and say :

But cast his ashes far and wide,
 Who for his Lord has lived and died ;
 Yet he at Resurrection-tide
 Shall rise once more,
 The same, though blessed and glorified,
 He was before.

No doubt, again, the metaphor by which St. Paul describes the resurrection (1 Cor. xv. 37 ff.) has a more direct application to the interment of the body in the earth than to its reduction to ashes. But the doctrine of the resurrection does not depend on any metaphor, but on the truth of the resurrection of Christ Himself, the first-fruits of the dead, as we are to be its after fruits.

3. Nor can much more be said for those who argue that the process which nature has provided for the reduction of the body to its native dust is the one which reverence requires us to follow. The words of Genesis iii. 19 inform us of the penalty which sin has brought on man, but do not specify the means by which it is to be effected. Nor is there anywhere any intimation that it is the Divine pleasure that human remains should be reduced to dust by the agency of worms. That is simply the result which would ensue if man did not interfere; but he is free to modify its horrors, or shorten the period of danger to himself by any means that are not forbidden.² Sir H. Thomp-

¹ So the late Lord Shaftesbury exclaimed, when he heard the above objection stated, "what then has become of the blessed martyrs who were burned at the stake!" Bishop Fraser and Canon Liddon have given an emphatic denial that any Christian doctrine can be affected by the manner in which this mortal body of ours crumbles into dust.

² It might fairly be contended that the preservation of the body by embalming, or desiccation, or burial in wax and lead, are inconsistent with Gen. iii. 19.

son has well remarked that, in the instances where nature throws off diseased portions of the human frame to preserve life, it is no breach of the Divine will to shorten the period of suffering by the use of the surgeon's skill. Nor, again, can it be undutiful to relieve the pangs of childbirth by the use of anæsthetics. No doubt God has said to woman (Gen. iii. 16): "In sorrow (or strictly, *in pangs*, *λίπαις*, *lxx.*) shalt thou bring forth children." But who can doubt that anæsthetics are God's merciful revelation to mankind in this age, which they are to use and be thankful? In the well-known passage (St. Mark ix. 26) where our Lord quotes the destruction of bodies in the valley of Hinnom by worms and by fire as emblematic of hell—that being the well-known idea of the Jewish people—He gives no kind of intimation that the one process was what may be called the rightful and the other an unlawful one, but speaks of them simply as two modes by which the human frame might be reduced to dust. It is an *obiter dictum*, no doubt—if any saying of our Lord's could be called an *obiter dictum*—but it has its significance nevertheless.

4. The above considerations will answer another favourite class of objections, that cremation is *dishonouring* to the human body. The heathen, it is urged, might regard it with contempt, because in their eyes it was the mere instrument of carnal indulgence; but the Christian recognizes in it the temple of the Holy Ghost and the companion of the soul throughout eternity. As such it deserves all possible honour. No believer will undervalue this argument. But it seems strange that the destruction of human remains by fire should be regarded as more degrading, at all events, than the ordinary progress of corruption. I do not propose to enlarge on "the horrors of the charnel-house, the loathsome banquet of the beetle and the worm," which Washington Irving has so graphically represented as being the favourite study of a mind which had become morbidly insane.¹ It cannot be doubted that they were designed by Providence as a rebuke to human pride; nor can they ever fail to be so. Yet it is lawful for man to mitigate the evil resulting to himself from them, even as it is lawful for him to allay by medicine the agonies of disease. And why should fire be accounted a degrading agency at all? It is the Divinely-appointed means of purification—the purification which all must undergo—the trial (St. Mark ix. 49; 1 Cor. iii. 12) which will test their work on earth, whether they are to be presented, cleansed, and sanctified before God or consumed by His wrath. What fitter process whereto to subject the body? What more suggestive of solemn and wholesome thought? Everything connected with fire in

¹ See Irving's "Tale of the Young Italian."

the Scripture is grand and ennobling. If it is the emblem of God's wrath, it is also the emblem of His mercy. In fire He appeared to man in the wilderness and in the temple. In fire He came down on the Day of Pentecost. It is to fire that the sacred writers have likened the Deity Himself (Deut. iv. 24, Heb. xii. 29). If we would have a case still more directly apposite to the burning of the body, that of Elijah cannot be overlooked. He was taken from Elisha's side in the fleshly body, but he must needs have entered heaven in the spiritual and glorified body. What was fleshly and corruptible in him must needs have been purged away by the fire in which he was enveloped. Fire being the emblem of clearing away all in us that offends our Maker, it seems strange indeed that any should consider its application to the human body after death as *degrading*.

To turn to more practical aspects of the matter; it is commonly argued that the total destruction of the body immediately after death might frequently facilitate the escape of murderers from punishment by destroying the evidence which might have proved their guilt. But this might be remedied without difficulty. An examination by experts of human remains before they were subjected to the crematory might be made, in every instance, imperative; and in this event the detection of poisoners would become, not less, but more probable than is the case at present.

Again, there is the complaint that if the body be "resolved into dust and scattered over fields and gardens"¹ there will be no spot directly associated with the departed, no grave to which affection might resort to muse and to weep, no place where man may look forward to merging hereafter his own dust with that of the beloved. These complaints may be condemned as selfishness, or derided as sentiment; but the feelings involved are among the most sacred which humanity cherishes, and their moral value no wise man will disregard. If cremation were irreconcilable with them we might well hesitate ere we adopted it. But the dust and ashes of our beloved may be preserved as entirely as is now the case, and without the painful thought of the continual and revolting decay ever going on. Nay, by cremation the ashes of husband and wife, of dear and devoted friends may intermingle without injury or danger, rest together to the very end of time, rise together at the Resurrection Day.

We cannot afford to sacrifice any of the precious privileges we at present possess—the sleeping under the shadow of the

¹ Sir H. Thompson, "Cremation," p. 9. But he afterwards explains that cremation is quite as compatible with the remains of the dead as the present practice; indeed, it may be said to be more so.

Church, her blessing over our remains, the special place where our dear ones lie, and where we hope to lie ourselves.¹ Happily we are not called on to forego any of these things. It only remains to make such changes as will adapt the proposed new mode of interment to the religious sentiments and requirements of the present day.

These need not be many.

In the first place it will be necessary to have a crematory attached to every burial ground; or possibly a movable furnace which should be taken by night to the house where the dead is lying; and where the reduction of the body to ashes should be made, previously to any other ceremony, by officials properly appointed.

Then the ashes should be enclosed in a coffer, which might be carried into the church by the nearest relative or chief mourner, the funeral *cortège* accompanying the remains, as now.

Then the present service should be read from end to end, exactly as now, only that the word "remains" might be substituted for "body" when the coffer is deposited in the ground, or other receptacle provided for it.

What this might be is a matter for further discussion. A building might be erected suitable for the purpose, in which families might have their special nook, or strangers and those who have near relatives might find a common shelter—kinsmen, friends, neighbours, fellow-parishioners awaiting, in one common home, the Voice that will summon them to arise. I cannot but think, however, that the bosom of our common mother must ever be the fittest resting-place for the ashes of her children; and that nothing that art can devise will ever exceed the beauty of the country churchyard.

H. C. ADAMS.

¹ The wish to associate one particular spot with the memory of the dead, to decorate it with flowers and hallow it with prayer, may be a weakness, but it is one very dear to humanity. There are those, indeed, who cannot understand this—who would regard, for instance, the sea, when such localization would be impossible, as the grandest of all cemeteries, where they would wish the remains of those they have loved and honoured to lie. But this is poetry, rather than natural feeling. When it is remembered how many penitential tears have been shed over the ashes of men in their lives slighted and wronged—how many holy resolutions formed by the graves of pious parents, how many heartfelt thanks rendered for holy teaching and example, how many joyful hopes of reunion cherished—we shall hardly consent to substitute anything for the simple grave of the departed.

Short Notices.

The Christian Ministry. By the Rev. WILLIAM CARUS, M.A., late Canon of Winchester, and formerly Senior Fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge. Pp. 26. Bournemouth.

A PREFATORY NOTE tells the readers of this valuable pamphlet (which may be obtained, we suppose, from Messrs. Jarvis and Co., Printers, 1, The Quadrant, Bournemouth) that "this Address was delivered to the clergy of the Plymouth combined Clerical Meeting, June 28th, 1865, and was printed at their request. It is now reprinted by desire, as especially seasonable on account of the increasing spread of Sacerdotalism." And truly seasonable it is. But although the Address deals especially with Sacerdotalism, it brings the whole subject into view, and is in every way suggestive. It is the result of long experience and earnest research, while the argument throughout is of the ablest. Such an essay on the Christian Ministry, at once rich and clear, vigorous and spiritual, ought to be, and doubtless will be, largely read and influential. For ourselves, we know nothing like it, and we cannot too earnestly recommend it.

The honoured author begins by determining what the Christian Ministry is *not*. Here is a specimen passage :

Now since it has pleased God to separate a body of men for the Ministry of the Gospel, as He formerly separated a tribe for the service of the Tabernacle, the idea has not unfrequently been entertained that the Christian Ministry has taken the place of the Levitical Priesthood. *That* Priesthood being obviously no more, it has been argued that the Ministry of the succeeding Dispensation must have something so far corresponding to the former one, that we may reason from the duties and prerogatives of the one to those of the other; and that hence the Christian Ministry may justly be regarded as a *Sacerdotal one*. Now this hypothesis, I believe, we shall find upon reference to Scripture to be wholly without foundation.

He then proceeds to ask, "What saith the Scripture?" Is the minister of Christ invested with an office similar to that once held by the priest under the Mosaic economy, and is he a successor to his title or his functions? From the answer we give two extracts—First, as to the *title* :

A variety of titles is given to the minister of the New Testament, but never once the title of *priest*. This is surely very significant; and was manifestly designed to distinguish, as clearly as the use or disuse of a special term can do, the character of the one office as something altogether diverse from the other.

Second, as to the *mode* by which the Aaronic priests came to their office—a point to be carefully noticed, as exhibiting a procedure entirely opposite to the calling and ordination of the minister of Christ :

The priest, then, of the old economy enjoyed his office, not by selection from the whole congregation of Israel—not by the voice of those in authority—not from any persuasion of an inward call from God to the work—not, in short, upon any ground of *moral, mental, or spiritual* qualification, but simply and solely on the ground of *pedigree*; he came to his office as a matter of course, by *birthright*: he became a priest because he was the son of a priest; and was only rejected and considered disqualified for the office if, after examination, any *bodily* defect was discovered.

Cremation and Urn Burial. Cassell, 1889.

The evils of the existing system of interment, and the necessity of some radical change in the interests of decency and the health of the community, are forcibly, though temperately, put forward in this work. It shows that cremation involves no denial of Christian doctrine, no irreverence to the dead, no outrage to the feelings of the living. The question is largely engaging public attention, and this volume will help to remove many prejudices which are still entertained respecting it.

The *Art Journal* this month—bright, as usual—has several good things.

There is always something informing in *Cassell's Family Magazine*. The Tales are very well written, and there is a fair proportion of light reading.

The *Report* of the C.M.S. for the past year—just out—has more than usual of bright and vigorous matter. We must return to it; but at present we can only quote a few words: "The Committee rejoice to be assured that there is an increasing number of Christian men and women at home who follow their representatives in the mission-field with sympathy and prayer; yet there are many parishes in all parts of the country sending a yearly contribution to the Society, in which, beyond the annual sermon, no effort whatever is made to spread actual knowledge of the work and interest in it. Is it surprising that groundless objections to missionary methods obtain credence even in Christian circles, that funds increase slowly or not at all, that Parochial Associations are satisfied with 'not going back,' and that missionaries have to be sent out by ones and twos instead of by tens and twenties? The Committee entreat their clerical friends not to be content with the scanty summaries of an annual report, but to study for themselves, and to invite their people to study, month by month in the Society's publications, with not less keen interest than is accorded to the daily newspaper or the monthly review, the story of the Lord's own work. Then there would be more intelligent appreciation, and more prayerful sympathy; and very soon the present income of the Society would be looked back to with wonder that we were ever disposed to boast of so inadequate an offering to so vast a work."

The second part of Messrs. Hatchard's *Dignitaries of the Church* is as good as the first.

The *Leisure Hour* well keeps up, in every way, its high standard.

In the *Quiver* appears an interesting sketch by "A Member of the Society of Friends," of the Quaker Mission in Madagascar. The Mission was begun, it appears, by an American "Friend" in 1867; and it has carried on an educational and evangelistic work with success. The illustrations in *Little Folks*, as always, are "first-rate," and so, we are told, are the stories and chatty papers.

In "Curiosities of Leperdom," *Cornhill* gives many interesting facts. The lepers, it seems, were confounded with the outcast Gagots in the fifteenth century. An ordinance of Louis XI. speaks of "the malady of leprosy and gagoty" at Toulouse. Mr. Payn's story in *Cornhill* goes on well. The sketch of the solicitor, "really a religious man," whose chief client was a leader of the Evangelical party, is fresh and (of course) clever.

The second edition of a capital book for beginners has been published by the famous American Organ Company, and we have pleasure in making it known—*The Organists' Parlour Companion*, by Mr. W. H. Clarke (Smith American Organ Company, 59, Holborn Viaduct). It is a good and full system of instruction, with selections from the great composers.

THE MONTH.

THE Dean of Peterborough's proposal is still being discussed, chiefly by critics of the Protestant Church Alliance.

The *Guardian* (of the 7th) and the *Record* (of the 16th) refer to the paper on Home Reunion in the August CHURCHMAN. The *Guardian*, in an article headed "Churchmen in Council," says :

There are two points connected with the Dean of Peterborough's proposal to which it is important to call attention before it encounters that detailed consideration which it will doubtless receive in the autumn. The first is by whom it can best be put forward. There is a natural wish on the part of Churchmen in Council to make their ranks as inclusive as possible. . . . The other point we wish to notice is the necessity of keeping the project completely dissociated from all schemes of Prayer-book Revision or Home Reunion. The chief merit of the Dean of Peterborough's proposal is that it leaves the Prayer-Book untouched. . . . We have added the disclaimer of any connection with Home Reunion, because Mr. Philip Smith, in an interesting paper in the current CHURCHMAN, seeks to associate this scheme with that attributed to Churchmen in Council.

The *Record*, in an article headed "The new Bishop of Sydney, and referring to Reunion, says :

The appearance in this month's CHURCHMAN of a careful and exceedingly interesting sketch of the present position and probable direction of the movement, from the pen of Mr. P. V. Smith, is in itself a good sign, and will well repay careful perusal. The writer is cautious without falling into the common mistake of supposing that a few safe platitudes are all that the reader expects from a writer who undertakes a difficult subject. Every part of Mr. Smith's article may possibly not receive universal assent, but he deals with the matter on the right lines, and with marked moderation. We could hardly desire a better basis for discussion of this urgently important topic ; for we hope to see Evangelical Churchmen at home actively interesting themselves and co-operating with their brethren in the Colonies in promoting the reconciliation of the Protestant Churches.

With much pleasure we record the appointment of Canon Saumarez Smith, D.D., to the Bishopric of Sydney and the Primacy of Australia. As Principal of St. Aidan's he has been most successful, and he is very generally esteemed as a divine of marked ability, of spirituality and common sense. A valuable essay from his pen, "Christ or Muhammad," was published in a recent CHURCHMAN.

The Government, on the 14th, changed front over the Tithes Bill. Instead of "occupier" was to be read "owner." The result of obstruction and mismanagement is the loss of the Bill.

The recent visit of the Archbishop of Cyprus to England was an occasion of many expressions of goodwill. The *Record* says :

This excellent prelate has rendered very valuable services to Bible circulation in Cyprus ; and his influence in the future promises to be equally important. His letter of thanks for the Bible in modern Greek, which was presented to him, is most cordial.

The *Methodist Recorder* was "much gratified" by a friendly reference to the Wesleyan Conference made by Archdeacon Blakeney, Vicar of Sheffield, in the course of a sermon in the Parish Church.¹ The *Methodist Recorder* adds :

It was our privilege to worship at the Parish Church on Sunday week. We found the church full, and nearly everyone was seated before the service opened. With every part of the service we were greatly pleased. The reading of the prayers and lessons was beautifully reverential, and the manner of the congregation throughout was orderly and devout. The anthem, "They that go down to the sea in ships," was rendered with exquisite taste, and the hymn before the sermon, "O, come to Me, ye weary, and I will give you rest," was sung with great meaning and power.

¹ When preaching upon the work of the Holy Ghost, the Ven. Archdeacon told his flock it was their privilege to offer up fervent prayer that the deliberations of the servants of God then assembled in the town might be guided and blessed by the Divine Spirit.