

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

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 κεχαρισμένη*, 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 *Συμεῶν* (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 teetotaller—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