

UC-NRLF



\$B 247 589

YB 72239

BERKELEY  
LIBRARY  
UNIVERSITY OF  
CALIFORNIA

Genevieve Sharp

1735-1813

Abdication of Queen Victoria

1775 Eastern United Territories

Foundation of British & Foreign

Volume 257-



Digitized by the Internet Archive  
in 2007 with funding from  
Microsoft Corporation



---

# REMARKS

ON THE USES OF THE DEFINITIVE ARTICLE

IN THE GREEK TEXT OF

*The NEW TESTAMENT.*

---

---

*Printed by C. and W. Galabin,  
Ingram-court, London.*

# REMARKS

ON THE USES OF THE

## DEFINITIVE ARTICLE

IN THE

GREEK TEXT OF THE NEW TESTAMENT,

*Containing many New Proofs*

OF THE

## DIVINITY OF CHRIST,

From Passages which are wrongly translated

in the

COMMON ENGLISH VERSION.

---

---

BY GRANVILLE SHARP.

---

---

To which is added

AN APPENDIX,

Containing

1. A TABLE OF EVIDENCES OF CHRIST'S DIVINITY,

*By Dr. Whitby.*

2. A PLAIN ARGUMENT FROM THE GOSPEL HISTORY FOR THE DIVINITY OF CHRIST,

*By the former learned Editor.*

AND TWO OTHER APPENDIXES,

*Added by the Author.*

---

---

THIRD EDITION.

---

---

LONDON:

sold by

VERNOR AND HOOD; F. AND C. RIVINGTON; J. WHITE; AND  
J. HATCHARD:

AND L. PENNINGTON, DURHAM.

1803.

ADVERTISEMENT TO THE THIRD EDITION.

---

The Third Edition, published by the *Author* himself, (for the purpose of *correcting* some of *his own* inadvertent mistakes,) with the consent of the learned and worthy *Editor* of the former editions, the Rev. Dr Burges, (now Lord Bishop of St David's,) whose opinion and friendly patronage alone first occasioned the publication of the work, as he selected it from among a number of other old MSS. that had been, for many years, *laid aside by the Author*, without the least intention of publishing them; so that (except for this circumstance) the work, most probably, would never have been printed.

---

---

## ADVERTISEMENT

TO THE

FIRST EDITION.

---

*THE first part of the following Remarks, on the uses of the definitive article in the Greek text of the New Testament, was printed in the second Fasciculus of the Museum Oxoniense. A Supplement to the Remarks was at the same time promised to be published in the third Fasciculus of the Museum. But, as many learned friends concurred with the Editor in thinking that the Remarks contain a very valuable accession to the evidences of Christ's divinity, he was unwilling to detain the Supplement, which exemplifies the rules of the Remarks, any longer from the public, and has therefore prevailed on Mr Sharp to permit him to publish it with the Remarks. He earnestly recommends them both to Mr Wakefield's most deliberate consideration.*

A 3

To

*To Mr Sharp's Remarks and Supplement he has subjoined a plain historical proof of the divinity of Christ, founded on Christ's own testimony of himself, attested and interpreted by his living witnesses and enemies, the Jews, — on the evidence of his trial and crucifixion, — and on the most explicit declarations of the Apostles after the Resurrection of Christ. What appeared to him, on a former occasion,\* to be a substantial and unanswerable argument, he has, in this little exercise on the subject, endeavoured to render an easy and popular proof of our Saviour's divinity. It was printed separately for the use of the unlearned part of his parishioners, and is subjoined to this treatise for the convenience of other unlearned readers, and such as have not much considered the subject.*

DURHAM, Nov. 1798.

\* In a sermon on the divinity of Christ. Second edition, 1792.

---

*Letter of the worthy and learned Editor, the Rev. Dr  
Burgefs, to the Author, prefixed to the fecond edition.*

TO GRANVILLE SHARP, Esq.

---

Dear Sir.

I HAVE great pleasure in prefenting you with a new Edition of your valuable Tract. That you have very happily and decifively applied your rule of construction to the correction of the common Englifh verfion of the New Teftament, and to the perfect eftablifhment of the great doctrine in queftion, the divinity of Chrift, no impartial reader, I think, can doubt, who is at all acquainted with the original language of the New Teftament: I fay, decifively applied, becaufe, I fuppofe, in all remote and written testimony the weight of evidence muft ultimately depend on the grammatical analogy of the language in which it is recorded. I call the rule yours; for, though it was acknowledged and applied by Beza and others to fome  
of

of the texts alleged by you, yet never so prominently, because singly, or so effectually, as in your remarks.

In the advertisement to the former Edition I wished to excite the attention of a learned and declared enemy to the doctrine of our Saviour's Divinity. But he is no more: and I do not know that he ever expressed, or has left behind him, any opinion on the subject; or that any other Socinian has undertaken to canvass the principle of your Remarks. The public, however, has very lately seen an ample and learned confirmation\* of your rule, drawn from a very minute, laborious, and candid, examination of the Greek and Latin Fathers.

I have taken some pains to improve the *plain argument* for Christ's Divinity, which I before subjoined to your Remarks. In this edition I have prefixed to it a *Table of Evidences* by Dr WHITBY, which, I hope, the  
younger

\* IN SIX LETTERS addressed to GRANVILLE SHARP, Esq. respecting his Remarks on the uses of the definite article in the Greek Text of the New Testament. London, 1802.



younger part of your readers will find useful to them in pursuing the different branches of this most important subject; and you, I think, will not disapprove, because it is conducive to the principal purpose of your Tract.

I am, dear Sir,

With great respect and esteem,

Your faithful humble Servant,

T. BURGESS.

College, Durham, }  
March 5, 1802. }



( 1 )

... ..  
... ..  
... ..  
... ..  
... ..

... ..  
... ..

1953  
...

---

## PREFACE

to the

THIRD EDITION.

BY THE AUTHOR.



AFTER the author had sent to the press a copy of this work, containing all the corrections and additional notes which are now printed in this third edition, he received a printed book, addressed to himself, intituled “Six more Letters to *Granville Sharp, Esq.* on his Remarks upon the Uses of the Article in the Greek Testament, by *Gregory Blunt, Esq.*” *G. Sharp* carefully perused these “Six more Letters,” and could not discover, throughout the whole of *Mr Blunt’s* laborious work, (consisting of 218 pages,) more than *one single censure* which had any *just* foundation, viz. that  
which

which mentions *G. Sharp's* erroneous quotation\* from the Alexandrian MS. But all the other censures and allegations of Mr *G. Blunt* are so evidently *frivolous* and *groundless*,† and some of them so *blasphemous*, that they form, altogether, an attack more obviously levelled against the supreme dignity and “*divinity of Christ,*” and against the *competency* of the *original writers of the New Testament*, than against the Remarks of *G. Sharp*, which are founded *merely on their authority*.

Mr *Blunt's* unhappy want of *faith* in the doctrine of *Christ's divinity*, (to which he too plainly alludes when he mentions “*a monstrous consequence,*” p. 48; and “*an absolute impossibility,*” p. 49 and 70,) together with his *dis-*  
*belief*

\* Before Mr *Blunt's* book was published, *G. Sharp* had acknowledged his obligations to another person for the *first discovery* and correction of this *erroneous quotation*, viz. to a learned writer in the *British Critic*, (see note in p. 38 and 39,) whose judicious remarks, published so long ago as July, 1802, were evidently known to Mr *Blunt*, for he has cited them in his own work, (not published till March, 1803,) though he has not thanked that learned writer for giving him the *first hint* of *G. Sharp's* error!

† See note, No. 2, in the fourth Appendix, p. 124.

*belief* even of the existence of the *Holy Spirit*, p. xxii. 70, and 83,) are manifestly the true sources of his laboured opposition to *G. Sharp*, — nay, the *only foundations*, it seems, that he has for all his (otherwise) *groundless* remarks, allegations, and censures! But, if his unguarded assertions had really been true, he would not have found it necessary, for the support of his own *groundless principles*, so strenuously to decry the authority of the *original writers* of the Greek Testament; and to endeavour, in the *most contemptuous* terms, to depreciate their abilities, by denying their competency to express themselves with grammatical *accuracy* or *elegance*: (p. 26, l. 1—11, and p. 27, l. 19:) calling them “*popular, loose, and informal, writers,*” (p. 26,) — “*men, disqualified, by their rank and education, for ELEGANT writing,*” (p. 34,) — “*more rude than the most rude of the Galilæan penmen,*” (p. 74.) As if he had never read or heard of the miraculous “*gift of tongues,*” nor of the pertinent remark of those who heard the wonderful power of expression, even *in all languages*, that was then conferred upon those

very men whom Mr *Blunt* has deemed “ *disqualified for elegant writing!*” — “ ARE NOT ALL THESE THAT SPEAK GALILÆANS?” (Acts, ii. 7.)

Nevertheless, Mr *Blunt* ventures to assert, that the writers of the English Bible “ *were much better acquainted with, and much more studious of, grammatical niceties than any of the apostles and evangelists,*” &c. (p. 26.) — “ *Let us appeal to those,*” (says he, in p. 27,) “ *who, compared with apostles and evangelists, were accuracy itself; to those who were men of superior education, were trained to grammar from their infancy, and wrote in their native language; none of which things can be affirmed of the writers of the New Testament.*”

Now, though this is Mr *Blunt's* own proposal and appeal, yet, when two gentlemen of unexceptionable character in all the points required by himself; (except, indeed, in the unreasonable *pride* of pretending, like him, to vie “ *with apostles and evangelists*” for accuracy and abilities;) — men of regular academical education, and both of them justly eminent for their learning and abilities; — when two  
such

such unexceptionable men have openly declared their conviction of the truth of this *apostolical doctrine*, “*the Divinity of Christ*,” contrary to the unhappy prejudices of Mr *Blunt*; the one, (the learned editor of the two first editions of this little work,) by citing, in an appendix, ample evidences, from the Holy Scriptures, for “*the Divinity of Christ*:” and the other, (the learned writer of the first “*Six Letters to Granville Sharp*,”) by his full and clear confirmation of the first and principal rule of construction, to demonstrate *the same necessary doctrine*, as stated by these despised “*apostles and evangelists*.” Such worthy examples, by regular academical scholars, ought to have occasioned some little restraint on the mind of Mr *Blunt*: but, alas! the clear testimonies of these two learned and respectable advocates for *apostolic doctrine* have had no other effect on the violent opposer of it than that of irritating his prejudices, whereby he has been unhappily hurried into the most inconsistent abuse and contempt of these “*men of superior education*,” — the very de-

b 2

scription

scription of persons to whom he himself has proposed to appeal!

And as to the author of the rules, *G. Sharp*, who has no such literary pretensions, — not the least claim to “*superior education*,” or to academical acquirements, Mr *Blunt* (confiding, we will suppose, in the importance of *his own classical* abilities) treats him with the most contemptuous language, and is careful to impress on the minds of his readers the degrading trait of *G. Sharp’s inferiority of education*; alluding, by frequent repetitions, to his being bred as a mere *tradesman*,\* *mechanic*, or *manufacturer*.† Whereas, on the other hand, Mr *Blunt* himself, being sufficiently sensible, no doubt, of his own “*superior education*,”‡ is manifestly *inflated*, by the comparison, to a greater extent and *stretch* of *self-confidence* than any human skin can contain: for, he has *burst* forth into such strains of *magisterial* importance, and has assumed such *inquisitorial* authority

\* See Note, No. 4, in the fourth Appendix, p. 133.

† See Note, No. 5, in the fourth Appendix, p. 134.

‡ See Note, No. 6, in the fourth Appendix, p. 137.



thority over the supposed *tradesman*, as if he were really *responsible* to his jurisdiction! “*What is your experience?*” (says he, p. 42.) — “*Wherein does it consist? — What does it amount to?*” No culprit was ever more contemptuously examined, with so many hasty questions all in a breath. But *G. Sharp* does not wish to evade these imperious demands, howsoever worshipful *Mr Blunt* may think himself in his self-appointed station on the upper bench of *critical* authority. As to the *experience*, therefore, of *G. Sharp*, and, in the first place, the *experience* acquired by *education*, it was just like the *experience* of other *tradesmen* and *manufacturers*, i. e. by no means *classical*. And, if he afterwards acquired some little knowledge of *Greek*, he has not presumed to extend his *experience* beyond the *Greek Testament*; except now and then by occasional reference to the several *Greek* versions of the Old Testament, and sometimes also to a few *Greek* historians. But, from the *Greek Testament*, more especially, he has been convinced, by *experience*, that the *writings* of those eminent persons, whom the *magisterial* *Mr Blunt*

contemptuously calls "*rude Galilean penmen*," as well as the more antient canonical *writings* of their *Israelitish* countrymen,\* are of so *superior* a nature, in comparison with all other *writings*, (even with those that are deemed most eminently *classical*,) and are so very different in their general *idiom* and *peculiarity of expression*, that *rules* drawn from the syntax of these sacred writings,† whether *Hebrew* or *Greek*, (for the interpretation, respectively, of the *Hebrew* or *Greek* Scriptures,) cannot *reasonably* be censured for want of conformity to any *other* writings, either in *syntax* or *senti-ment*, though they may fairly receive confirmation occasionally from *other writings*, as the learned and modest writer of the first *Six Letters to G. Sharp* has clearly proved by his candid and judicious selection of examples from the writings of the *Greek* fathers in defence of the *first* and most important *rule*; and whose remarks also on the *other* rules had induced G. Sharp to withdraw an example from his fifth rule,

\* See Note, No. 7, in the fourth Appendix, p. 142.

† See Note, No. 8, in the fourth Appendix, p. 143.

rule, and to place it among the *exceptions*, because of the high and respectable authorities cited by the worthy writer of the first *Six Letters* in favour of a contrary *interpretation* of that text, and more especially because it had been construed as a testimony of *the Divinity of Jesus*. But, if G. Sharp had previously seen Mr *Blunt's* "*Six more Letters*," he would not so readily have made that concession; because the *experience* of the *mechanic* is considerably enlarged since he examined Mr *Blunt's* *frivolous* and *groundless* objections, not only to the first rule, but also to all the other *rules*.\*

For, by the *experience* gained in perusing these *Six more Letters*, G. Sharp has discovered that Mr *Blunt's* unhappy want of *faith* in the necessary doctrine of "*Christ's Divinity*,"† is the true cause of all his miserable *twistings*, *strainings*, *shufflings*, and *fruitless endeavours* to evade the "*articular straps*," — "*forcing irons*," and other *bands* proposed for literary *security* in the *manufacturer's* new-invented *machine*, (as  
Mr

\* See Note, No. 2, in the fourth Appendix, p. 124.

† See Note, No. 3, in the fourth Appendix, p. 131.

Mr *Blunt* calls it,) by which Mr *Blunt* himself, it seems, has been unwarily “*caught and held willy nilly,*”\* notwithstanding his most violent and unfair exertions to evade and oppose it. So that this subsequent *experience* of *G. Sharp*, which he acquired by Mr *Blunt*’s forcible *trial* and *proof* of the *machine*, has convinced him that even the writings of the *Christian Fathers* do not afford sufficient authority to set aside any *rules of syntax* which are fairly and honestly formed according to the *general syntax* of the *Greek Testament*; — no, not even for the purpose of retaining the *supposed* testimony of any text whatsoever in favour of our *Lord*’s *Divinity*; especially as that doctrine is abundantly and sufficiently confirmed by a great multitude of other plain texts, without deviating from the *ordinary syntax* of the *Greek Testament*. For, as we are assured that all *Scripture* (all the canonical *Scripture* of the *Jewish* nation †) is given “*by inspiration of God*;” (2 Tim. iii. 16;) — that “*holy men of God*  
*spake*

\* See Note, No. 5, in the fourth Appendix, p. 134.

† See Notes, No. 7 and 8, in the fourth Appendix, p. 142 to 144.

spoke as they were moved by the Holy Ghost;" (2 Pet. 20, 21;) and not according to their own will, as Mr Blunt seems to suppose by his quotation from Dr Whitby, "*Scripisset ergo Judas si hoc voluisset;*" † and that even those persons, whom he calls "*rude Galilean penmen,*" had an absolute promise of being endowed with the most ample abilities for teaching. "THE HOLY GHOST" (said our Lord) "*shall TEACH you, in the same hour, what ye ought to say.*" (Luke, xii. 12; though Mr Blunt has been pleased to prefer "*the accuracy of our English translators,*" p. 20.) And it would be absurd to conceive that our *divine and infallible* instructor, our blessed Lord, the light of the world, should promise his disciples the future guidance of the *Holy Spirit* in terms so unquestionably expressive of an *actual agency*, if the *Holy Spirit* was an *imaginary being*, a mere "*temper*" of the human mind, according to the *groundless* notions of Mr Blunt! (p. xxii. l. 3 from bottom, 70, and 83.) At another time our Lord said to these *Galileans*,

"These

† See Note, No. 9, in the fourth Appendix, p. 144.

“*These things have I spoken unto you, being present with you; but the HOLY GHOST, whom the Father will send in MY NAME,*” (for that inestimable gift must be *asked* in the name of *Jesus,*) “*HE WILL TEACH YOU ALL THINGS,*” (so that they could not be deficient, as Mr *Blunt* has conceived, in any respect whatsoever,) “*and (shall) bring all things to your remembrance whatsoever I have said unto you.*” John, xiv. 25 and 26. But, alas! Mr *Blunt*’s rooted prejudices against “*the divinity of Christ,*” and his fatal disbelief of the existence of *the Holy Spirit,* by which alone he might have been enabled to resist the false suggestions of *evil spirits,* are ample and sufficient causes to be assigned for the *darkness* of his mind when he charged the Apostles and Evangelists with the want of *grammatical* “*accuracy,*” and with want of *ability* to express themselves with *elegance!*

G. *Sharp,* having thus far submitted to the arbitrary demands of Mr *Blunt,* in *freely* declaring the nature of his *experience,* may now seem entitled to demand of Mr *Blunt,* in return, — “*What is your experience? — Wherein does it consist? — What does it amount to? —*

But

But such haughty demands are suitable only to the character of Mr *Blunt* himself; and, indeed, he has precluded the necessity of putting any such questions about his own *experience*, by venturing, *boldly* and *bluntly*, all at once, to inform us, both “*wherein it doth consist,*” and also “*what it does amount to,*” — nay, even the sum total of all the *experience* and knowledge that he has acquired, as he says, “*by a diligent and careful study of the Bible!*” — “*namely,* (says he, in p. 171,) *that moral and practical Christianity is the only Christianity contained in the Scriptures.*” But, surely, this falls very short of what he ought to have *acquired* by his study of the Bible! — Did he never read, that “*without faith,\* it is impossible to please God?*” (Heb. xi. 6.) So that Mr *Blunt's* “*moral and practical Christianity,*” without that necessary *faith* and *knowledge*, which the Scripture clearly *teaches*, is not worthy to be called *Christianity* at all! For, even Pagans and Unbelievers, from the *natural knowledge of good and evil* in man, pretend to virtue and morality; and *Julian*, the Apostate, the hero of Mr *Gibbon*, would

\* See note p. xxxviii

would have contended as stiffly for the *morality and practical virtue* of the worshippers of *Jupiter* and *Hercules* as our modern *Unitarians* can possibly do, or any other sectaries of *merely nominal* Christians, who learn nothing at all from the Holy Scriptures but *morality* alone!

This pretence to *morality*, when adopted separately from the necessity of acquiring *faith* and *knowledge*, is manifestly the baneful doctrine of *works*, whereon the *Papists* build that notorious branch of Popish superstition, *supererogation*; a doctrine not less unscriptural and absurd than that of *transubstantiation*, which Mr *Blunt* has so earnestly and repeatedly pressed upon *G. Sharp*, (in the true *Papistical* way, under a *cloak* of contrary pretensions,) in his vain comparison between that and the doctrine of the Trinity; insinuating, that he who admits the one must needs admit the other! Now, with respect to the doctrine of *transubstantiation*, — unless Mr *Blunt* and his friends, the *Papish* and *Socinian* advocates for it, (see the *Unitarian* tracts to which he refers us in a note at p. 151,) can shew, by plain proofs of Holy Scripture, that our Lord's institution of  
the



the sacrament of *bread* and *wine* was not designed merely for the purposes universally acknowledged by the primitive churches of the three first centuries, and by the *reformed churches*, or true *Catholic Church*, of the present day, but for several *other different* purposes, as that of constituting the outward symbol of *bread* to be set up as an object of *public worship and adoration*,—that of reserving the bread, consecrated on Easter-Day, for a whole year, as an infallible *charm* for various purposes, — and that of making every mass a *new sacrifice*, instead of the *commemoration*, only, commanded by our Lord, of *the one* efficacious sacrifice *once offered*;\* besides the gross presumption of altering our Lord's institution, by denying the cup to the laity, though our Lord had expressly com-

\* “Knowing that Christ, being raised from the dead, DIETH NO MORE; death hath no more dominion over him; for, in that he died he died unto sin, ONCE, but in that he liveth he liveth unto God.” Rom. vi. 9 and 10. — “And as it is appointed unto men ONCE TO DIE, but after this the judgement: so Christ was ONCE OFFERED to bear the sins of many,” &c. Heb. ix. 27 and 28. “For *Christ* also hath ONCE SUFFERED for sins,” &c. 1 Pet. iii. 18.

manded, — “ DRINK YE ALL OF IT, for *this is my blood of the new covenant*,” † ( τὴν καινὴν διαθήκην, instead of the abrogated sign of the old covenant circumcision,) “ *which is shed for many, for the remission of sins :*” “ *But, I say unto you, I will not drink henceforth of THIS FRUIT OF THE VINE until that day that I drink it new with you in my Father’s kingdom.*” Matth. xxvi. 27 to 29. — The commemoration of our Lord’s *blood* is more particularly described by St. Paul, I Cor. xi. 25 to 29. “ *This cup is the NEW COVENANT in my BLOOD: this do ye, as oft as ye drink (it) IN REMEMBRANCE of me :*” so that the *wine* was the *outward sign* only of our Lord’s *blood*, to be so taken *in remembrance* of him. And in four succeeding verses the drinking of the cup is expressly mentioned, jointly with the *eating* of the BREAD, as of *equal* importance, by being *equally* commanded; and, so far from any *change of substance*, or *transubstantiation*, taking place, that our Lord himself, according to St. Matthew’s account, called the contents of the cup “ *this fruit of the vine,*” even after his  
*eucharistical*

† See note p. xxxviii.

*eucharistical* consecration of it by *thanksgiving*, (*ευχαριστιας*.) So that unless all this gross *innovation* from the *eucharistical* ceremony, ordained by Christ, can be plainly proved, either by *Papists* or *Socinians*, to be consistent with the *faith* and *practice* of the Apostles and the primitive church, it surely does *not* stand upon the same foundation as the generally-received doctrine of the primitive church, concerning the "*divinity of Christ*," and actual existence and *divinity of the Holy Spirit*; and must therefore be condemned with an *anathema*, even if it had been taught by *one* of the Apostles, (contrary to the general evidence of the rest,) or by "*an angel from Heaven!*" (Gal. i. 8 and 9.) And, in like manner, Mr *Blunt's* declaration, that "*morality, and practical Christianity is the only Christianity contained in the Scriptures*," is surely an entire exclusion of the true Christian's *belief* or *faith*; an exclusion which manifestly favours the Popish SUPEREROGATION of works, whereby a man may lay up such a *treasure of his own merits* as may entitle him, after his death, to a *Papal* canonization as a *SAINTE* of the *Roman* church, whereby he becomes a

*Popish* object of *religious worship* and prayer, for his *mediation*, instead of the only "ONE MEDIATOR *between God and Man*," (1 Tim. ii. 5.) And Mr *Blunt* seems not at all to be aware that this deceitful *Popish* atonement, by the pretended *mediation of dead saints*, must be equally efficacious as that of the *one mediator*, if the *Socinian blasphemy* was really true, that Christ "was a *mere man*, and *nothing more*;" for in this, as in many other points, the *Papal* and *Socinian* tenets are intimately and closely combined together for the perversion of the true primitive doctrines of *Christianity*, notwithstanding the imaginary differences which are generally supposed to exist between these two notorious sects of *heretics*, and their open opposition and external contempt of each other. This has been remarkably demonstrated in a learned work of Mr *Jameson*, printed at Edinburgh, in 1702, entituled "*Roma Racoviana et Racovia Romana*," \* which Mr *Blunt*, if he pleases,

\* Id est *Papistarum* et *Socinistarum*, in plurimis, iisque maximi momenti, religionis suæ capitibus, plena et exacta harmonia: in quâ, unam eandemque utriusque religionis esse

pleases, may add to the proposed new edition of the *Unitarian tracts*, to demonstrate the intimate connection between their *two churches*.

Mr *Blunt* himself informs us, in a note, (p. 146,) “that the *Papists* have not only confessed, but contended, that the *Trinity* cannot be proved by *Scripture* :” and he cites for this a *Popish* writer, *Sandius*, and also the *Unitarian tracts*; and in notes, at p. 148 and 149, cites nearly the same doctrine from the *Popish* writer, *Petavius*, and from his own favourite *Socinian* writer, *Taylor*, the author of *Ben Merdecai*!

Thus far it seems obvious, that the *Papists* conform to the *Socinian* notions against the *Trinity*; and Mr *Blunt*, in return for this so-  
ciable degree of conformity, argues as stoutly as the *Papists* for the *Popish* doctrine of *transub-*

esse animam et medullam clarissimè ostenditur; unum eundemque Spiritum pariter in utraque Apostasia regnare evincitur; utriusque sectæ αυτοκαλακρῖσις; latè declaratur; simpliciores, adversus eorum impetus et technas muniuntur; S. literarum, in impletis vaticiniis, adversus *scepticos* et *atheo.*, veritas, et divinitas demonstratur; haud pauca, denique, Christianæ theologiæ amanti proficua oppidò toti passim operi insperguntur.”

*stantiation*, (in p. 151 and 166,) in his comparison between that false *notion* and the doctrine of the *Trinity*: and all this in the true *Papistical* or *Jacobinical* way, under a cloak of *contrary pretensions*, to disguise his desire of favouring that *Popish error*!

In p. 168, Mr *Blunt* charges *G. Sharp* with having, “*for a while at least*,” forgotten “*that love of the brotherhood, and charity towards all mankind, which is the characteristic of a true Christian, and of having turned (his) back on the maxim of doing to others as (he) would that others should do unto (him)*.” In return to this very serious charge *G. Sharp* requests Mr *Blunt* to believe what he now asserts with great sincerity, viz. that his *usual* severity, in censuring the *doctrines* either of ROMAN CATHOLICS or of SOCINIANS, was never occasioned by any the least want of *charity* to the *persons* or *individuals* of either persuasion, but, on the contrary, was always exerted with the kindest intentions, to warn them of the extreme danger of their respective errors.

With respect to the *Socinians*, *G. Sharp* has produced, many years ago, such ample proofs,

in

in his tract on the *Nature of Man*, of “*the divinity of Christ*,” and of “*the Holy Spirit*,” and more especially of that doctrine which Mr *Blunt* denies, in p. 133, l. 5; p. 136, l. 10; and p. 165, l. 24; that the title of *Jehovah* is applied to *Christ*, and also to the *Holy Spirit*; that, if Mr *Blunt* will fairly examine these proofs, he will find it impossible to set them aside without an equal perversion of the Holy Scripture from whence they are drawn. *G. S.* would not make such a confident assertion, if he had not submitted that work, previous to its publication, to the careful examination of a very learned and conscientious *Socinian*, who had quitted holy orders, and a good living in the *Church of England*, merely on account of some prejudices he had imbibed in favour of the *Unitarian* doctrines; and *G. S.* has ample reason to believe, that he would not have deserted the *Church of England* if he had previously been at all aware that any such proofs existed; for he did not make the least objection to any of them, but only requested some few alterations of *expression*, to lessen the severity of censure against the *Socinians*. And at another time

a very learned *Socinian* Clergyman having addressed to *G. Sharp* a *private letter*, containing many laboured arguments against "*the divinity of Christ*," *G. Sharp* returned such proofs of *the CONTRARY DOCTRINE*, that the learned and able disputant was obliged entirely to change the ground and position of his former arguments, and to advance again with new propositions, in a second letter; which also *G. Sharp* fully answered, indeed, but not in sufficient time for the perusal of the candid inquirer; whose death will be ever remembered by *G. Sharp* with regret, through the consideration of his own natural slowness, or, perhaps, want of sufficient exertion (though he is not conscious of any wilful neglect) to return such a timely answer as might have been useful to his solicitous correspondent!

Though the recital of such circumstances may subject *G. Sharp*, with too much appearance of probability, to the invidious charges of *vanity*, and even of *boasting*, yet he would willingly submit in silence to such charges, provided his *true motive* for mentioning them should prove effectual, viz. that of exciting



in Mr *Blunt* a desire to examine more carefully and seriously the tendency of his own professed principles, *the want of faith in Christ*, and in the *Holy Spirit*: for, if Mr *Blunt's* assertions were true, that the latter is only an *imaginary being*, it would follow, of course, that *man*, the only being in God's creation which really stands in continual need of the guidance and protection of the *Holy Spirit*, would be miserably *disarmed* of the most effectual promised means of resisting his most dangerous enemies, the *assiduous*, though *silent*, invaders of his soul; so that he must be easily conquered and *led captive* into the most deplorable *slavery* both of body and mind: for, without the *Spirit of God*, there can be no true *liberty*; and therefore *G. Sharp*, as a sincere friend to *liberty*, cannot view the professed principles of Mr *Blunt* and his *Unitarian* brethren with indifference, nay, not without the most anxious concern and interest for their safety and welfare, (whatever Mr *Blunt* may think of his want of *charity*,) knowing, for a certainty, that their most valuable *citizenship*, in the true *Catholic Church*, or *universal communion of saints*, (either in that branch of it which

is

is still *militant here on earth*, or in that other most numerous and glorious part of it which, in spite of all the malice of *Pagan, Arian, and Popish*, persecutors, is now triumphant with their *Lord*, in Heaven,) cannot possibly exist without the *universal communion of the HOLY SPIRIT*, that promised *participation of the Divine nature* to the *nature of man*, in which the true *unity of the city of God*, our most inestimable *citizenship*, must necessarily consist !

It is *not*, therefore, through any *vanity* or spirit of *boasting*, that *G. Sharp* has recited some circumstances of his former communications with *Unitarians*, but really for the sake of Mr *Blunt's* own true interest and welfare ; and if, either under his *real* or *feigned* name, he will call on *G. Sharp*, he will certainly find no occasion to complain of *any want of charity* in his most earnest endeavours to warn him of his danger, to satisfy his objections, and remove his difficulties.

For, if he will but seriously consider what contemptuous expressions he has used against *Christ*, (p. 48, 49, 71, 110, 136, 138, 140, 144, 150, 151, 153, 154, 160, 161, 164, and 173,)

173,) and against the *Holy Spirit* ! (p. xxii. 70, 83, &c.) he must surely be convinced that the ancient *apostates*, mentioned by the Apostle to the Hebrews, x. 29, could not, by any outward profession of doctrine, have been more guilty of “*treading under foot the Son of God,*” and of doing “*despite unto the Spirit of Grace,*” than he himself has really been, in the fullest extent of those impieties ! The former *apostates*, indeed, were deemed worthy of a “*much sorer punishment* than those that *despised Moses’ law,* and *died without mercy* ; (compare the 28th and 29th verses ;) but, as the Apostle has added, in the two next verses, — “*for we know him that hath said, vengeance (belongeth) unto me, I will recompence, saith the Lord,*” &c.—we are thereby assured, that the “*much sorer punishment,*” there denounced, is not of a *temporal* kind, like that inflicted *by man on the despisers of Moses’ law* : for, as we are now under a *milder and more perfect* system of revelation, we must not (after the manner of the Church of *Rome*, though her doctrines are deemed so weighty and unanswerable by Mr *Blunt*) presume to persecute with *fire and sword* on account of religion, or

to *burn men alive* for their opinions, as she has done! These are proofs only that the *Roman Church* herself *both long ceased to be Christian*, though she has assumed the title of *Catholic Church*, to the exclusion of all other churches. But her true character was foreseen by the beloved Apostle, who has represented her as seated on the *scarlet-coloured* beast of *temporal* power, *drunk with the BLOOD of the Saints* (note,\* No. 10) *and with the BLOOD of the Martyrs of JESUS!* But the members of the true *Catholic Church* are restrained, by the principles of their faith, from opposing either *Popish or Socinian heretics* with any other weapon than the *two-edged sword of God's Word*, and from wishing to extirpate and dissolve them with any other sort of *heat* than the *purifying fire of truth*, accompanied with hearty wishes and prayers, that a timely repentance may avert the vengeance!

The awful warning which was given to an eminent person, who for some time unhappily opposed the necessary doctrine of *Christ's divinity*, not less *violently* than Mr *Blunt* himself, seems

\* Fourth Appendix, p. 147.

seems as peculiarly applicable to the *present* as to the *former* occasion; and, as the sentence originally proceeded from *supreme Authority*, the citing of it now must not be considered as having the least reference to the facetious sarcasm which Mr *Blunt* has affected throughout his work, (*i. e.* the trite contrast between *Sharp* and *Blunt*,) for, the true application of it is certainly of a much more serious nature; because it shews the extreme difficulty and danger of opposing the divine dignity of our blessed Redeemer, — σκληρον σοι προς κειρα λακτιζειν, (Acts, ix. 5, xxvi. 14 :) — and a man who has wrote and published such degrading and contemptuous expressions against the *divinity of Christ*, as are contained in Mr *Blunt's* book, surely, has not less cause for “*fear and trembling*,” than *Saul* had, on his supernatural conversion; nor less need, apparently, to be “*led by the hand*,” and instructed, (Acts, xxii. 11 to 16,) until his *eyes* and *understanding* are opened to the bright and irresistible evidence, throughout the Holy Scriptures, of *Christ's supreme dignity*.



Note transferred from p. xxiii.

\* What kind of *faith* is here to be understood, may clearly be known by the general topics of this epistle; but, more especially, by those in the two preceding chapters, and in the following chapter; for, the objects of our *faith* and *hope* are stated in them all. See Heb. ix. 14 to 18; x. 9 to 15, and 28 to 30; (wherein *vengeance* is denounced against him “*who hath trodden under foot the Son of God,*” &c. “*and have done despite unto the Spirit of Grace;*”) and chap. xii. 2, wherein our Lord *Jesus* is expressly called “*the Author*” (or Leader, ἀρχηγόν) “*and finisher of our FAITH.*” Τὸν τῆς πίστεως ἀρχηγὸν καὶ τελευτῶν Ἰησοῦν, &c.

Note transferred from p. xxvi.

† It is, at the same time, a *new testament*, (as well as a *new covenant*,) of which *Christ*, by his death, was the *testator*. See Heb. ix. 15 to 18.

Note transferred from p. xxv. l. 3 from bottom.

(— the gross presumption of altering † our Lord’s institution, by denying the cup to the laity, &c.)

† Deut. xii. 32.—“*What thing soever I command you, observe to do it: thou shalt not add thereto, nor diminish from it.*” — A continual breach of this COMMAND OF GOD (in either “*adding to,*” or “*diminishing from,*” almost every *divine ordinance*) is a notorious mark of the *apostacy* of the *Roman church*, whatsoever her *Socinian* advocates may think of it! The *exorcisms* of water, &c. for *Baptism*, and also for purposes *not commanded*, are abominable acts of *sorcery*! See the detestable forms in the “*Missale Romanum,*” under the heads of “*Benedictio Fontis,*” (p. 273 to 285,) and “*Ordo ad faciendam aquam benedictam,*” (p. cxxvi to cxxix.) Plantin. edit. Antwerp, 1682. But the time of her judgement is *now* very near at hand! (See Note, No. 10, 4th Appendix, p. 147 and 148.)

CONTENTS.

---

# CONTENTS.

---

## RULE I.

When two personal nouns of the same case are connected by the copulative *και*, if the former has the definitive article, and the latter has not, they both relate to the same person . . . . . page 3

## EXAMPLES.

1. Ὁ Θεὸς καὶ πατὴρ τῆ κυρίου ἡμῶν . . . . .	4
2. Τῷ Θεῷ καὶ πατρὶ . . . . .	5
3. Ἐν τῇ βασιλείᾳ τοῦ Χριστοῦ καὶ Θεοῦ . . . . .	30
4. Κατὰ τὴν χάριν τοῦ Θεοῦ ἡμῶν καὶ κυρίου Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ,	34
5. Ἐνώπιον τοῦ Θεοῦ καὶ κυρίου Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ . . . . .	38 39
6. Ἐπιφανείαν τῆς δόξης τοῦ μεγάλου Θεοῦ καὶ Σωτῆρος ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ . . . . .	22 50
7. Ἐν δικαιοσυνῇ τοῦ Θεοῦ ἡμῶν καὶ Σωτῆρος ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ . . . . .	20 52
8. Καὶ τὸν μόνον δεσποτὴν Θεὸν καὶ κύριον ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦν Χριστὸν ἀγνούμενοι . . . . .	54

## Common Version.

1. The God and Father of our Lord.
2. To God, even the Father.

## Corrected Version.

## Common Version.

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 3. In the kingdom of<br>Christ, even of God.                       | In the kingdom of Christ,<br>and of God.                            |
| 4. According to the<br>grace of Jesus Christ, our<br>God and Lord. | According to the grace of<br>our God, and the Lord<br>Jesus Christ. |

Corrected

*Corrected Version.*

*Common Version.*

5. Before Jesus Christ, the God and Lord; *or*, our God and Lord: *for*, the definite article has sometimes the power of a passive pronoun.

Before God, and the Lord Jesus Christ.

6. The glorious appearing of our great God and Saviour Jesus Christ.

The glorious appearing of the great God, and our Saviour Jesus Christ.

7. Through the righteousness of Jesus Christ, our God and Saviour.

Through the righteousness of God, and our Saviour Jesus Christ.

8. And denying our only Master, God, and Lord, Jesus Christ.

And denying the only Lord God, and our Lord Jesus Christ.

*RULE II.*

If both nouns have the article, but not the copulative, they relate to the same person . . . page 7

*RULE III.*

If the first has the article, and the second has not, and there is no copulative, they relate also to the same person . . . . . 10

*RULE IV.*

If the nouns are not personal, they relate to different things or qualities . . . . . 11

*RULE V.*

If personal nouns, of the same case, are connected by the copulative, and the first has not the article, they relate to different persons . . . . . 12

*RULE VI.*

If they are connected by the copulative, and both have the article, they relate also to different persons 13



---

A  
L E T T E R

TO THE

*Rev. Mr ———,*

CONCERNING THE USES OF THE GREEK ARTICLE  
ὁ IN THE NEW TESTAMENT.

---

*Old Jewry, London, 10th June, 1778.*

Dear Sir,

WHEN I look upon the date of your last obliging letter, I am much ashamed that I have so long neglected to acknowledge the receipt of it. The truth is, I began a letter a few days afterwards; but, recollecting that I had written on the same subject (viz. the use of the Greek article ὁ and copulative καί) to a very learned friend, at a great distance in the country, I was willing to wait for his answer, lest it should oblige me to make any alterations in my rules; and so, indeed, it has proved; for, he objected to my first rule,

B

(as

(as it was then stated,) and has cited several exceptions to it, which he thought sufficient to set it entirely aside: but this, I am convinced, is going too far, and would be an injury to truth. The use, therefore, which I have made of my friend's objections, has been, to correct my rule, and add to it such limitations as might include the several exceptions cited by my learned friend, as well as others that are similar to them.

The waiting for my friend's answer, and the necessary corrections in consequence of it, together with a variety of other engagements, have prevented me from complying with your request so soon as I could have wished; but I shall now submit to your consideration and candour the rules in question, and beg that you will be pleased to favour me with whatever examples may occur in the course of your reading, either as exceptions to invalidate the *first rule*, or as proofs to establish and confirm it. The reason of my recommending the first rule more particularly to your attention, is, because it is of much more consequence than any of the

the

the rest, as it will enable us (if the truth of it be admitted) to correct the translation of several important texts in the present English version of the New Testament, in favour of a fundamental article of our church, which has, of late, been much opposed and traduced; I mean the belief that our Lord Jesus Christ is truly God.

## RULE I.

*When the copulative και connects two nouns of the same case, [viz. nouns (either substantive or adjective, or participles) of personal description respecting office, dignity, affinity, or connection, and attributes, properties, or qualities, good or ill,] if the article ὁ, or any of its cases, precedes the first of the said nouns or participles, and is not repeated before the second noun or participle, the latter always relates to the same person that is expressed or described by the first noun or participle: i. e. it denotes a farther description of the first-named person; as, — και εθεραπευσεν αυτον, ὡσε ΤΟΝ τυφλον ΚΑΙ κωφον και λαλειν και βλεπειν. Mat. xii. 22. And, again,*

Ευλογητος Ὁ Θεος ΚΑΙ Πατηρ τε Κυριε ἡμων Ιησὺ Χριστῷ, Ὁ Πατηρ των οικτιρημων ΚΑΙ Θεος πασης παρακλησεως. 2 Cor. i. 3. This last sentence contains two examples of the first rule. See also in 2 Cor. xi. 31, Ὁ Θεος ΚΑΙ Πατηρ τε Κυριε ἡμων Ιησὺ Χριστου οιδεν, &c. Also in Eph. vi. 21, Ὑψιστος Ὁ αγαπητος αδελφος ΚΑΙ πιστος διακονος εν Κυριω. Also in Heb. iii. 1, κατανοησατε ΤΟΝ αποστολον ΚΑΙ αρχιερεα της ὁμολογιας ἡμων Ιησὺν Χριστον, &c. See also in 2 Pet. ii. 20, εν επιγνωσει ΤΟΥ Κυριε ΚΑΙ Σωτηρος Ιησὺ Χριστῷ, &c. And again, in 2 Pet. iii. 2, και της των αποστολων ἡμων εἰβολης, ΤΟΥ Κυριε ΚΑΙ Σωτηρος. And again, in 2 Pet. iii. 18, Αυξανετε δε εν χαριτι και γνωσει ΤΟΥ Κυριε ἡμων ΚΑΙ Σωτηρος Ιησὺ Χριστῷ. αὐτῷ ἡ δόξα και νυν και εις ἡμεραν αιωνῶν, αμην. - Also in Philippians, iv. 20, Τῷ δε Θεῷ ΚΑΙ Πατρι ἡμων ἡ δόξα, &c. In Rev. xvi. 15, μακαριῶν Ὁ γρηγορων ΚΑΙ τηρων τα ἱματια αὐτα, ἵνα μη γυμνος περιπατή, &c. And in Col. ii. 2, εις επιγνωσιν τε μυστηριε ΤΟΥ Θεε ΚΑΙ Πατρὸς και τε Χριστῷ\*, εν ᾧ εἰσι καινεις οἱ θησαυροι της σοφιας, &c. And in 1 Thes. iii. 11, Αὐτος δε Ὁ Θεος ΚΑΙ Πατηρ ἡμων

\* The distinction of persons mentioned in this sentence is preserved by the insertion of the article τε before Χριστῷ, which had been omitted before πατρός.

ἡμῶν καὶ ὁ Κύριος ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦς Χριστός, καλεῖσθαι τὴν ὁδὸν ἡμῶν πρὸς ὑμᾶς. This solemn ejaculation for the divine direction is addressed jointly to the God and Father, and to our Lord Jesus;\* (so that here is good authority for offering up prayers to Christ, which some have lately opposed;) and the distinction of the persons is preserved (as in the last example) by again inserting the article ὁ before Κύριος, which had been omitted before Πατήρ. The apostle James also used the same mode of expression, θρησκεία καθαρά καὶ ἀμικτάτος παρὰ τῷ Θεῷ ΚΑΙ Πατρὶ ἀύτη ἐστίν, ἐπισκεπτεῖσθαι ὀρφανούς καὶ χήρας ἐν τῇ θλίψει αὐτῶν, &c. James, i. 27. And there are at least a dozen other places, (viz. Rom. xv. 6. 1 Cor.

B 3

xv.

\* This text is clearly a supplication to Christ for providential assistance; and, being addressed to him *jointly* with God the Father, most certainly amounts to *supreme worship*, because the direction of Providence belongs to God alone: so that a prayer for it, addressed to Christ, were he merely a minister and dispenser of God's providence, and not also truly God, would be utterly unlawful: and more especially so if such an inferior dispenser of providence (one that was not truly God) was to be addressed jointly with the heavenly Father; for, that would be blasphemous.

xv. 24. Gal. i. 4. Ephes. v. 20. Col. i. 3 and 12.\* and iii. 17. 1 Thes. i. 3. 1 Thes. iii. 13. 2 Thes. ii. 16. James, iii. 9. Rev. i. 6.) wherein “*the God and Father*” is mentioned exactly according to this rule; and there is no exception or instance of the like mode of expression, that I know of, which necessarily requires a construction different from what is here laid down, EXCEPT the nouns be *proper names*, or *in the plural number*; in which cases there are many exceptions; though there are not wanting examples, even of plural nouns, which are expressed exactly agreeable to this rule.

As the examples which I have annexed to my first rule consist of texts, wherein the sense is so plain that there can be no controversy concerning the particular persons to whom the several nouns are applicable, it will be thought, I hope, that I have already cited a sufficient number of them to authenticate and justify the rule. There are several other

\* Some copies have not the words *θεω και* in this twelfth verse; but only *τω πατρι τω ικανωσαρι*; in which last case this verse affords an example only of the second rule.

other texts wherein the mode of expression is exactly similar, and which therefore do necessarily require a construction agreeable to the same rule; though the present English version has unhappily rendered them in a different sense, and has thereby concealed, from the mere *English* reader, many striking proofs *concerning the Godhead* (περι “της Θεότητος,” Col. ii. 9.) of our Lord and Saviour, Jesus Christ. The rules which follow are intended only to illustrate the *particularity* of the several sentences which fall under the *first rule*, by shewing, in *other* sentences, the different senses that are occasioned by adding, omitting, or repeating, the article, as well *with* the copulative as *without* it.

## R U L E II.

*A repetition of the article before the second noun, if the copulative be omitted, will have the same effect and power: for, it denotes a farther description of the same person, property, or thing, that is expressed by the first noun; as in the following examples: — και ηγαλλιασε το πνευμα μου επι Τω Θεω Τω Σωτηρι μου, Luke, i. 47.*

και

καιην αυτω κεχρηματισμενον υπο ΤΟΥ Πνευματος ΤΟΥ  
 αγιου, &c. Luke, ii. 26. ιδε Ο αμνος τς Θεου Ο  
 αιρων την αμαρτιαν τς κοσμου, John, i. 29. οιδαμεν  
 οτι ουτος εστιν αληθως Ο Σωτηρ τς κοσμου, Ο Χριστος,  
 John, iv. 42. ο μη τιμων τον Υιον, ου τιμα ΤΟΝ  
 πατερα ΤΟΝ πεμφαντα αυτον, John, v. 23. εργαζεσθε  
 μη ΤΗΝ βρωσιν ΤΗΝ απολλυμενην, κλλα ΤΗΝ  
 βρωσιν ΤΗΝ μενυσαν εις ζωνη αιωνιου, ην ο Υιος τς  
 ανθρωπων υμιν δωσει· τβλον γαρ Ο Πατηρ εσφραγισεν Ο  
 Θεος, John, vi. 27. This verse contains three  
 examples. Ταυτα δε γεγραπται ινα πισευσητε, οτι Ο  
 Ιησους εστιν Ο Χριστος Ο Υιος τς Θεου, &c. John, xx.  
 31. Ο δε Θεος της ειρηνης Ο αναγαγων εκ νεκρων  
 ΤΟΝ ποιμενα των προβατων ΤΟΝ μεγαλ\* εν αιματι  
 διαθηκης

\* The apostle, in this text, expressly calls our Lord Je-  
 sus Christ “ *the Great SHEPHERD OF THE SHEEP,*”  
 τον ποιμενα των προβατων τον μεγαλ: and the apostle Peter  
 entitles him “ *THE CHIEF SHEPHERD,*” ο αρχιποιμην,  
 1 Pet. v. 4, which compare with Psalm xxiii. 1. “ *JEHO-*  
 “ *VAH is my SHEPHERD,*” and with Isaiah, xl. 9, 10, 11;  
 “ *O Zion that bringeth good tidings,*” &c. “ *say unto the ci-*  
 “ *ties of Judah, behold YOUR GOD! Behold the Lord JE-*  
 “ *HOVAH will come in mighty (power), and HIS arm shall*  
 “ *rule for him: behold HIS reward is with him, and HIS work*  
 “ *before him. HE*” (i. e. the Lord JEHOVAH) “ *shall*  
 “ *feed HIS flock like a SHEPHERD: he shall gather the lambs*  
 “ *with*



διαθηκης αιωνιου, ΤΟΝ κυριον ἡμων Ἰησουν καθαρτισαι ὑμας, &c. Heb. xiii. 20. This sentence also contains three examples.

GENERAL EXCEPTION.

Except when genitive cases depend on one another in succession; as, εἰ δε και εἰ κεκαλυμμενου το ευαγγελιον ἡμων, εν τοις απολλυμενοις εἰ κεκαλυμμενον, εν οἰς ὁ Θεος τε αιωνος τε τε ετυφλωσε τα νοσηματα των απιστων, εις το μη αυγασαι αυτοις τον φωτισμον ΤΟΥ ευαγγελιου ΤΗΣ δοξης ΤΟΥ Χριστου ὅς εἰν εικων ΤΟΥ

“with his arm,” &c. &c. To explain this still farther, the prophet Ezekiel foretold that “all shall have one Shepherd,” Ezekiel, xxxvii. 24. And Christ himself expressly acknowledged that *eminent pastoral* character, saying, “I am the good Shepherd;” ὁ ποιμην ὁ καλος, “and I know MY sheep and am known of MINE.” (John, x. 14.) And a little farther (v. 27) our Lord mentions the *true mark* by which *his* flocks are known, viz. that of *bearing his voice*: (compare with 95th Psalm.) “My sheep” (said our Lord) “hear my voice, and I know them; and they follow me, and I give unto them eternal life,” &c. which power of *giving eternal life* cannot be an attribute of any person that is not truly God, and one with Jehovah or the heavenly Father, as in the 30th verse he is expressly declared to be: “I and my Father are one,” ἐν εἰς μεν, *we are one*; in which brief expression both the plurality and the unity of the two persons are unquestionably asserted.

ΤΟΥ ΘΕΟΥ ΤΟΥ ΑΟΡΑΤΟΥ, 2 Cor. iv. 3. And, again, *ἵνα παρακληθῶσιν αἱ καρδίαι αὐτῶν συμβιβασθέντων ἐν ἀγάπῃ καὶ εἰς πάντα πλεον ΤΗΣ πληροφορίας ΤΗΣ συνέσεως, εἰς ἐπιγνώσιν ΤΟΥ μυστηρίου ΤΟΥ ΘΕΟΥ καὶ Πατρὸς καὶ τοῦ Χριστοῦ, &c.* Coloff. ii. 2.

### R U L E III.

*And the omission of the copulative between two or more nouns (of the same case) of personal description or application, even without the article before the second noun, will have the same effect: viz. will denote a farther description of the same person, property, or thing, that is expressed by the first noun; as in the following examples.* ΠΕΠΟΙΘΑΣ ΤΕ ΣΕΑΥΤΟΝ ὍΔΗΓΟΝ εἶναι τυφλῶν, ΦΩΣ ΤΩΝ ἐν σκοτει, ΠΑΙΔΕΥΤΗΝ ἀφρονῶν, ΔΙΔΑΣΚΑΛΟΝ νηπιῶν, ΕΧΟΝΤΑ τὴν μορφοσιν τῆς γνώσεως καὶ τῆς ἀληθείας ἐν τῷ νομῷ, Rom. ii. 19, 20.

Εὐχαριστοῦντες πάντοτε ὑπὲρ πάντων ἐν ὀνόματι τοῦ ΚΥΡΙΟΥ ἡμῶν ΙΗΣΟΥ ΚΡΙΣΤΟΥ, τοῦ Θεοῦ καὶ Πατρὸς ὑποτασσομενοι ἀλλήλοις ἐν φόβῳ\* Χριστοῦ, Ephes. v. 20,

\* ἐν φόβῳ Χριστοῦ. In the modern printed editions the reading is ἐν φόβῳ Θεοῦ, but in the Complutensian and several of the oldest editions it is ἐν φόβῳ Χριστοῦ; as also in the Alexandrian and other old MSS. as well as the ancient versions, and the citations of the Fathers: for which see

Wetstein's

20, 21. ΠΑΥΛΟΣ, ΔΟΥΛΟΣ ΘΕΟΥ, ΑΠΟΣΤΟΛΟΣ ΔΕ ΙΗΣΟΥ, &c. Tit. i. 1. Παυλος Αποστολος Ιησου Χριστου κατ' επιταγην\* Θεου σωτηρος ημων, και κυριου Ιησου Χριστου της ελπιδος ημων, 1 Tim. i. 1.

#### RULE IV.

*Yet it is otherwise when the nouns are not of personal description or application; for, then they denote distinct things or qualities: as, Τιμοθεω, γνησιω τεκνω εν πισει, χαρις, ελεος, ειρηνη απο Θεου Πατρος ημων, και Χριστου Ιησου κυριου ημων. 1 Tim. i. 2. 2 Tim. i. 2. Titus, i. 4. † See also 2 John, 3.*

Wetstein's Testimony. Now compare this expression (εν φοβω Χριστου) with 1 Pet. ii. 17. τον θεον φοβεισθε, τον βασιλευα τιματε: and also with 2 Kings, xvii. 35 and 36. "Ye shall not fear" (rendered by the seventy ου φοβηθησισθε) "other gods; but ΙΕΗΟΥΑΗ, who brought you out of "the land of Egypt, &c. him shall ye fear."

\* Here the *command of Christ* is mentioned jointly with the command of *God himself*; which is a mode of expression never used concerning any other man, but the *Man Christ Jesus* our Lord, "by whom are all things: (1 Cor. viii. 66. Hebrews, i. 2. John, i. 3. Col. 1. 16.) and "by whom all things consist." Col. 1. 17.

† In all these three texts, and in 2 John, 3, there is a manifest supplication made to *Christ, jointly with God the Father*, for *grace, mercy, and peace*; all divine gifts. The supplications, therefore, must necessarily be considered as *acts of supreme worship to both.*

3. εσαι μεθ' ὑμων χαρις, ελεος, ειρηνη, παρα Θεου Πατρος, και παρα Κυριου Ιησου Χριστου τῷ Υιῷ τῷ Πατρι, εν αληθεια και αγαπη.

### RULE V.

*And also when there is no article before the first noun, the insertion of the copulative και before the next noun, or name, of the same case, denotes a different person or thing from the first: as in the following examples.\** Πασα ΠΙΚΡΙΑ,

και

\* Note by the Author. [In the former editions of this little work, as well as in the original MS. of it, the 1st verse of the general epistle of St James was cited as the *first* example of this 5th rule; viz. Ιακωβος Θεου και Κυριου Ιησου Χριστου δουλος. For, the author had supposed that the words Θεου και Κυριου, having no article before the first substantive, must here denote two different persons, according to the general idiom of similar expressions throughout the New Testament, when the copulative is inserted without the article; but, having since read the just reasons and ample testimonies produced for a *contrary* interpretation of *this particular text*, in one of the *six letters* addressed to himself (p. 114 to 120) by the Rev. Mr Chr. Wordsworth, (for, it would be injustice to conceal that gentleman's name, since his merit and indefatigable labour, in forming that learned work, have been so generally approved,) he is thereby convinced that this

text

και ΘΥΜΟΣ, και ΟΡΓΗ, και ΚΡΑΥΓΗ, και ΒΛΑΣΦΗΜΙΑ, αρθητω αφ' υμων, συν παση κακια, Ephes. iv. 31. This last sentence contains four examples of the fifth rule. ΧΑΡΙΣ υμιν και ΕΙΡΗΝΗ απο ΘΕΟΥ ΠΑΤΡΟΣ ημων και ΚΥΡΙΟΥ ΙΗΣΟΥ ΧΡΙΣΤΟΥ. 2 Cor. i. 2. 1 Ephes. i. 2. Gal. i. 3. Philem. 3. ΕΙΡΗΝΗ τοις αδελφοις ΚΑΙ ΑΓΑΠΗ μελα πιςεως απο ΘΕΟΥ ΠΑΤΡΟΣ ΚΑΙ ΚΥΡΙΟΥ ΙΗΣΟΥ ΧΡΙΣΤΟΥ, Ephes. vi. 23.\*

C

EXCEPT

text may with more propriety be placed among the *exceptions* to the fifth and six rules than as an *example* of the fifth; and he hath, therefore, withdrawn it from the examples, notwithstanding that Mr Wordsworth hath produced (in p. 120) the authority even of an antient Greek writer for that example, in the same sense that was at first cited in this place as denoting two distinct persons, contrary to Mr Wordsworth's own opinion of it. "But there is *one* Greek writer" (says he) "who has clearly adopted the other interpretation. It is Œcumenius, in his commentary. *Ιακωβος Θεσ και Κυριου Ιησυ Χριστου δουλος ταις δωδεκα κ. τ. λ. Θεσ μεν τω Πατρωσ, Κυριου δε τω υιω,*" &c. Vol. ii. p. 441.]

\* The supplications for *grace* and *peace* jointly from God the Father, and from the Lord Jesus Christ, in all these five texts last cited, are so many unquestionable instances of *prayer* and *supreme worship* to CHRIST, as being

EXCEPT the numerical adjective *εις* precedes the first noun; in which case the copulative *και* will have the same effect that it has between two nouns where only the first is preceded by the article, agreeably to the first rule; as, *ΕΙΣ ΘΕΟΣ ΚΑΙ ΠΑΤΗΡ ΠΑΝΤΩΝ, ὁ ἐπὶ πάντων, καὶ διὰ πάντων, καὶ ἐν πασὶν ὑμῖν.* Ephes. iv. 6.

## RULE VI.

*And as the insertion of the copulative και between nouns of the same case, without articles, (according to the fifth rule,) denotes that the second noun expresses a different person, thing, or quality, from the preceding noun, so, likewise, the same effect attends the copulative when each of the nouns are preceded by articles: as in the following examples. — Ὁ νομῶς διὰ Μωσέως ἐδόθη· Ἡ χάρις ΚΑΙ Ἡ ἀληθεῖα διὰ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ ἐγενετο, John, i. 17. ὅτε ἐν ἠγερθῆ” (Ἰησοῦς) “ἐκ νεκρῶν, ἐμνησθήσαν οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ, ὅτι τῆτο ἐλεγεν αὐτοῖς, καὶ ἐπίστευσαν τῇ γραφῇ, καὶ τῷ λόγῳ ᾧ*  
*Εἶπεν*

a free disposer of those divine gifts *jointly* with his Almighty Father; agreeably to what I have already remarked above on 1 Thess. iii. 11, and Titus, i. 1.

ΕΙΠΕΝ ὁ Ἰησους, John, ii. 22. — φωνὴ μεγάλη ἐκραυ-  
γασε,” (Ἰησους) “ Λαζαρε, δευρο εξω. Καὶ ἐξηλθεν  
ὁ τεθνηκως, δεδεμεν⊕ ΤΟΥΣ ΠΟΔΑΣ ΚΑΙ ΤΑΣ  
ΧΕΙΡΑΣ κειριαῖς, καὶ ἡ οψις αὐτου σουδαριω περιεδεδετο.

John, xi. 44. — ΕΙΣ ΕΠΙΓΝΩΣΙΝ ΤΩ ΜΥΣΤΗΡΙΩ ΤΟΥ ΘΕΟΥ  
καὶ Πατρ⊕, ΚΑΙ ΤΟΥ ΧΡΙΣΤΟΥ, ΕΝ ᾧ ΕΙΣΙ ΠΑΝΤΕΣ  
οἱ θησαυροὶ ΤΗΣ ΣΟΦΙΑΣ ΚΑΙ ΤΗΣ ΓΝΩΣΕΩΣ  
ἀποκρυφοὶ. Col. ii. 2. ὑπομνησιν λαμβανων τῆς ἐν  
σοὶ ἀνυποκριτου πισεως, ἣτις ἐνώκησε πρῶτον ἐν τῇ  
μαμμη σε Λωιδι καὶ τῇ μητρὶ σε Εὐνεικῇ· πεπεισμαι  
δε, ὅτι καὶ ἐν σοὶ, 2 Tim. i. 5. — ἵνα ἐν πασι δοξαζή-  
ται ὁ Θε⊕ διὰ Ἰησὺ Χριστῶ, ᾧ ἐσὶν Ἡ δοξα ΚΑΙ ΤΟ  
κρατ⊕ εἰς τὰς αἰωνὰς τῶν αἰωνῶν. Ἀμην. 1 Pet.  
iv. 11.

EXCEPT distinct and different actions are  
intended to be attributed to *one and the same  
person*; in which case, if the sentence is not  
expressed agreeably to the three first rules,  
but appears as an exception to this sixth rule,  
or even to the fifth, (for, this *exception* relates  
to both rules,) the context must explain or point  
out plainly the person to whom the two nouns  
relate: as in 1 Theff. iii. 6. Ἀρτι δὲ ΕΛΘΟΝ-  
ΤΟΣ ΤΙΜΟΘΕΟΥ πρὸς ἡμᾶς ἀφ' ὑμῶν ΚΑΙ ΕΥΑΓ-  
ΓΕΛΙΣΑΜΕΝΟΥ ἡμῖν τὴν πίσιν, &c. And also in

John, xx. 28. Και απεκριθη ὁ Θωμας, και ειπεν αυτω Ὁ ΚΥΡΙΟΣ ΜΕ ΚΑΙ Ὁ ΘΕΟΣ ΜΕ. If the two nouns (viz. ὁ Κυριος and ὁ Θεος) were the leading nominative substantives of a sentence, they would express the descriptive qualities or dignities of *two distinct persons*, according to the sixth rule; but, in this last text, two distinct divine characters are applied to *one person* only; for, the context clearly expresses *to whom the words were addressed by Thomas*: which perspicuity in the address clearly proves, likewise, the futility of that gloss for which the Arians and Socinians contend; viz. that Thomas could not mean that *Christ was his God*, but only uttered, in his surprise, a solemn exclamation or ejaculation to God. The text, however, expressly relates that our Lord first addressed himself to Thomas: *εἶτα λεγει τω Θωμα, φερε τον δακτυλον σε ὧδε, &c. και απεκριθη ὁ Θωμας και ειπεν αυτω,* (that is, without doubt, to JESUS,) ὁ Κυριος μου, και ὁ Θεος μου. So that both these *distinct* titles (for, they are plainly mentioned as *distinct*) were manifestly addressed, αυτω, to that *one person, Jesus*, to whom *Thomas replied*, as the text expressly informs us.

The



The language is so plain, when the whole context is considered, that the Socinian perversion of it is notorious. See also 1 Cor. i. 24.

— Χριστον Θεον δυναμιν και Θεον σοφian,\* and Acts, ii. 36.† There are also other examples of this exception which clearly prove that *Christ is God*: as, Μη φοβεσθε. ΕΓΩ ειμι 'Ο πρωτος ΚΑΙ 'Ο εσχατος, ΚΑΙ 'Ο ΖΩΝ.‡ και εγενομην νεκρος, και ιδεσθε ζων ειμι εις τους αιωνας των αιωνων' αμην. Και εχω τας κλεισ τας αιδης και τας θανατου.‡ Rev. i. 17, 18.

These are the words of him whom John saw, ομοιον 'Υιω ανθρωπου, with a two-edged sword proceeding out of his mouth; which was undoubtedly a representation of the Λογος, or word of God, as this declaration alludes plainly to his death and resurrection. Εγενομην νεκρος, και ιδεσθε ζων ειμι. And again in the second

C 3

chapter,

\* Example of the exception to the fifth rule.

† Note lately added by the Author. [See also James, i. i. the text withdrawn from the examples of the fifth rule for the reasons assigned by the learned and Rev. Mr Chr. Wordsworth, in his six letters to the author, p. 114 to 120.]

‡ Example of the exception to the sixth rule.

chapter, ver. 8. ταδε λεγει 'Ο πρῶτος ΚΑΙ 'Ο εσχά-  
 τος,\* (and the same infallible mark of distinction is added to prove which of the divine persons is here to be understood,) ΟΣ εγενετο νεκρος, και εζησεν. Now, though the explanation which Grotius has given us of these titles (ὁ πρῶτος και ὁ εσχάτος) is certainly true when applied to Christ, yet it does not appear to be the *whole truth*, or the full meaning that ought to be attributed to these titles, either in the Revelation or elsewhere; for, they have a manifest reference to the supreme titles of *the Almighty* in the first chapter and eighth verse, (which also contains examples of this exception,) ΕΓΩ ειμι ΤΟ Α και ΤΟ Ω,\* λεγει 'Ο κυριος, αρχη και τελος, † 'Ο ων ΚΑΙ 'Ο ην,\* και 'Ο ερχομενος, ὁ παντοκρατωρ. And, in the 22d chapter, 13th verse, where these titles, το Α και το Ω, are manifestly, by the context, to be understood as the titles of Christ, we find them explained by these other titles, ὁ πρῶτος και ὁ εσχάτος, to which Grotius has attributed a much inferior and less comprehensive

\* Example of the exception to the sixth rule.

† Example of the exception to the fifth rule.

five meaning. Εγω ειμι ΤΟ Α ΚΑΙ ΤΟ Ω,\* αρχη και τελος,† Ὁ πρῶτος και Ὁ εσχ.ατος.\* And as I have shewn in my Tract on *the Law of Nature*, &c. p. 270 and 271, that these titles, "*the first and the last*," are antient titles of *Jehovah*, in the Old Testament, to declare his *eternal existence*, there can be no just reason for giving them an inferior sense when they are applied to Christ, who was truly *Jehovah*, as a variety of texts demonstrate. [*Law of Nature*, p. 248 to 345.]

Another example of the exception to the fifth rule occurs in the Rev. xx. 2. — τον οφιν τον αρχαιον, ὃς εστι ΔΙΑΒΟΛΟΣ ΚΑΙ ΣΑΤΑΝΑΣ. These are two different names, or appellatives, attributed (by the explanatory words ὃς εστι) to the same Old Serpent.

#### THE END OF THE RULES.

The various uses of the article and copulative, expressed in the five last rules and their exceptions, must amply illustrate, to every

\* Example of the exception to the sixth rule.

† Example of the exception to the fifth rule.

every attentive reader, the difference and particularity of those sentences which fall under the first and principal rule; and therefore I may now proceed with more confidence to point out several important corrections that ought to be made in our common translation of the New Testament, if the several sentences, which fall under the *first rule*, be duly weighed and considered; — corrections which may be fairly defended, I apprehend, by the authority of the several examples from which those rules were formed.

## EXAMPLES

*Of sentences which fall under the FIRST RULE, and are improperly rendered in the English version.*

EXAMPLE I. 2 Pet. i. 1. — εν δικαιοσυνη ΤΟΥ ΘΕΟΥ ημων ΚΑΙ ΣΩΤΗΡΟΣ ημων ΙΗΣΟΥ ΧΡΙΣΤΟΥ. As the article τὸ is not repeated before the next descriptive noun, σωτηρος, it is manifest that both the nouns are to be referred to one and the same person; and, therefore, in order to turn it into an intelligible English phrase, the *proper name* to which the *two descriptive*

*descriptive nouns* refer ought to be placed first; as, “ By the righteousness of Jesus Christ, OUR GOD and our SAVIOUR.” Among the various readings collected by Curcellæus, it appears that in some copies the word ἡμῶν was not repeated after σωτηρος, and I have by me twenty different editions (including those of Erasmus, Stephens, Dr Mill, Bengelius, &c.) which follow that reading; viz. ἐν δικαιοσυρῇ ΤΟΥ ΘΕΟΥ ἡμῶν ΚΑΙ σωτηρος Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, in which case, a literal rendering into English will sufficiently express the sense of the Greek without transposing the *proper name*; viz. “ *Through the righteousness of our God and Saviour, Jesus Christ.*” The sense and purport, however, is exactly the same in both the readings; and, in the old English editions, has generally been expressed in the terms required by my first rule; viz. “ *In the righteousness that cometh of our God and Saviour, Jesu Christ.*” (fol. edit. 1549.) — “ *Through the righteousness of our God and Saviour, Jesus Christ.*” (12mo edit. 1595.) — “ *By the righteousness of our God and Saviour, Jesus Christ.*” (4to edit. 1599.)

1599.) — “*The righteousness of Jesus Christ, our God and Saviour.*” (margin of the folio edit. 1611.) And even in the margin of our present version the proper reading is “*of our God and Saviour,*” manifestly referring both titles to one person. The learned Beza also remarks, on the words of this text, “*Ista necesse est conjunctim legamus quia unicus est articulus, ut copiosius diximus Tit. ii. 13. Itaque continet etiam hic locus manifestum divinitatis Christi testimonium.*” The two nouns are referred to Christ also in the Syriac version. There seems, therefore, to be ample authority for my first rule.

EXAM. II. Titus, ii. 13. — ΕΠΙΦΑΝΕΙΑΝ ΤΗΣ ΔΟΞΗΣ ΤΟΥ ΜΕΓΑΛΩ ΘΕΩ ΚΑΙ ΣΩΤΗΡΟΣ ΗΜΩΝ ΙΗΣΩ ΧΡΙΣΤΩ. In some few copies a comma is inserted between ΘΕΩ and και, but without authority. The above-mentioned note of Beza, upon this text, is too long to be inserted here at length, and therefore I must refer you to the author himself. He insists, however, that these two titles do not refer to two distinct persons, because the article is omitted before the second. In the present English version it is rendered

rendered — “ *the glorious appearing of the great  
 “ God and our Saviour Jesus Christ:*” but  
 so great is the difference between the idiom  
 of the Greek tongue and that of the English,  
 that a *literal translation* will not always  
 express the same sense without some little  
 transposition in the order of the words; and,  
 therefore, though the pronoun *ἡμῶν* is placed  
 after the two descriptive nouns that are applic-  
 able only to *one* person as they are expressed  
 in *the Greek*, yet the rendering of the said  
 pronoun *in English* ought to be PREFIXED  
 to the said descriptive nouns, in order to ex-  
 press the *same sense* in a proper English  
 phrase; as, — “ *the glorious appearing of OUR  
 “ great God and Saviour, Jesus Christ.*” —  
 This is the rendering of the learned Hugh  
 Broughton, according to a printed English  
 Bible, corrected *with a pen*, in my collection.  
 It might, indeed, be *literally* rendered with-  
 out transposition of the pronoun; viz. “ *the  
 “ great God and Saviour OF us,*” instead of  
 “ *OUR great God and Saviour:*” but the lat-  
 ter is more agreeable to the general mode of  
 expressing that pronoun in English. Thus  
 Christ

Christ is not only entitled *God*, but even the “*great God*,” according to the plainest grammatical construction of the text: and, indeed, if we duly weigh the evidence of his being really *Jehovah*, and *one with the Father*, [εγω και ο Πατηρ εν εσμεν, the plural verb εσμεν (“*we are*”) marking the plurality, or distinction of more persons than one, as much as the noun εν marks the *unity* of their existence,] he must necessarily be esteemed “*the great God*,”\* because there is but ONE GOD.

G. S.

\* As we believe that three persons exist in one and the same God, we cannot believe any one of them to be less than God, without denying the unity of the Godhead. And, as each person is God, it follows that each must be *the great God*. Theophylact bears an explicit testimony to this conclusion in his commentary on St Paul's epistle to Titus, ii. 13. “*Που δε εισιν* (says the learned and venerable commentator, exultingly, on the authority of this passage of Titus) “*που δε εισιν οι τον υιον ελαττουντες, και ουδε Θεον ανεχομενοι λεγειν; Ακουελοσαν, οτι και ΘΕΟΣ εστι, και ΜΕΓΑΣ. Το δε μεγας επι Θεου λεγεται, ου κατα συγκρισιν την προς αλλον μικρον, αλλ' απολελυμένως, ως φυσικι ΑΥΤΟΜΕΓΑΛΟΥ οιτος:*” Now what becomes of their objections, who degrade the dignity of the Son, not allowing him even the name of God? Let them



them learn, from this passage, that he is not only God but our great God. He is called great God, not relatively, by comparison with another inferior God, but, absolutely, from his own native and essential greatness. Whitby, in his note on the same passage of Titus, has given some very solid reasons for applying the terms *μεγαλου Θεου* to our Saviour. His words are: "Here it deserveth to be noted, that it is highly probable, that Jesus Christ is here styled *the great God*; first, because in the original the article is prefixed only before the *great God*, and therefore seems to require this construction, 'the appearance of Jesus Christ the great God and our Saviour.' Secondly, because as God the Father is not said properly to *appear*, so the word *επιφανεσθαι* never occurs in the New Testament, but when it is applied to Jesus Christ, and some coming of his; the places, in which it is to be found, being only these, 2 Theff. ii. 8. 1 Tim. vi. 14. 2 Tim. i. 10. and iv. 1, 8. Thirdly, because Christ is emphatically styled *our hope, the hope of our glory*. Col. i. 27. 1 Tim. i. 1. And, lastly, because not only all the antient commentators on the place do so interpret this text, but the Antenicene fathers also; Hippolytus (*Antichrist. sect. 64*) speaking of 'the appearance of our God and Saviour Jesus Christ;' and Clemens of Alexandria (*ad Gent. p. 5, 6*) proving Christ to be both God and Man, our Creator, and the author of all our good things, from these very words of St Paul." *Vid. tract. de vera Christi deitate*, p. 44, 45. Hammond, also, in his literal marginal version, translates *επιφανειαν της δεξης του μεγαλου Θεου*

καὶ σωτηρος ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, thus, “ the appearance of  
 “ the glory of our great God and Saviour Jesus Christ.”

EDITOR.

*The remainder of this letter is lost. The author had not leisure to copy the original letter before he sent it to the gentleman to whom it was addressed, and therefore he requested him to return it as soon as he had perused and considered it; but the gentleman neglected this request; and the author, after several years solicitation, obtained only a part of the letter, (as far as is here copied,) and the remainder (which was written on a separate half-sheet) he has never yet been able to recover. He had however a short memorandum of the several texts, which were explained in the latter part of the letter; and, having since had favourable opportunities of examining the said texts, and of copying them very accurately from the antient Alexandrian manuscript in the British Museum, he has been enabled to make some short remarks on the versions of all the said texts, which may serve as a sufficient Supplement to this imperfect letter. Some notes have been added to this printed copy which were not in the original letter.*

G. S.



EXAMPLES

---

---

EXAMPLES  
TO THE  
GRAMMATICAL RULES  
OF  
CONSTRUCTION, &c.

---

---

EXAMPLE I.

ACTS, XX. 28.

**Π**ΡΟΣΕΧΕΤΕ ΟΥΝ ΕΑΥΤΟΙΣ ΚΑΙ ΠΑΝΤΙ Τῷ ΠΟΙΜΝΙῳ ΕΝ ᾧ ὙΜΑΣ ΤΟ ΠΝΕΥΜΑ ΤΟ ἍΓΙΟΝ ΕΨΕΤΟ ΕΠΙΣΚΟΠΟΥΣ ΠΟΙΜΑΙΝΕΙΝ ΤΗΝ ΕΚΚΛΗΣΙΑΝ ΤΗΣ ΘΕΟΥ, ἣν ΠΕΡΙΕΠΟΙΗΣΑΤΟ ΔΙΑ ΤΗΣ ΙΔΙΗΣ ΑΙΜΑΤΟΣ.

The warning of the apostle Paul to the presbyters of the church of Ephesus, which is thus rendered in the common English version: “ Take heed therefore unto yourselves, “ and to all the flock over which the *holy* “ *Ghost* hath made you overseers, to feed “ the church of *God*, which he hath purchased “ with his own blood.”

In the Alexandrian MS. and a few other MSS. instead of τὸ Θεῶν, which is the most general reading, the word Κυρίῳ is substituted; but many old MSS. have both words, τὸ Κυρίῳ καὶ Θεῶν,\* whereby the text is brought within the construction of the 1st rule, and should be rendered, — “ To feed the church  
“ of the *Lord, even of God*, which he hath  
“ purchased with *his own blood.*”

Though there is no word in the Greek to correspond with this word “ *even,*” so as that it might be deemed a *literal rendering*, yet this English word is frequently used by our translators to express the *identity of person*, when a copulative, in the Greek text, joins a second substantive (i. e. of *personal* description without an article) to the former substantive, preceded by an article, agreeably  
to

\* Note lately added by the Author. [Three of the ancient Greek MSS. in the Cæsarian Library at Vienna, and 1 Slavonian MS. (cited in the Vienna edition of 1787,) have this reading; and it is inserted in the margin of the elegant 12mo edition of 1553, printed by John Crispin. For the same reading Dr Mill refers to fifteen MSS.]

to the first rule, as in Romans, xv. 6. τον Θεον και Πατερα, and I. Cor. xv. 24. τω Θεω και Πατρι: both of which are rendered, — “ God, *even the Father*, (instead of the literal rendering, *the God and Father*,) that the *identity of person* may be the more obvious. See also II. Cor. i. 3: ευλογητος Ὁ ΘΕΟΣ ΚΑΙ ΠΑΤΗΡ τῶ Κυριῶ ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, Ὁ ΠΑΤΗΡ τῶν οἰκτιρῶν, ΚΑΙ ΘΕΟΣ πάσης παρακλησεως. This sentence contains two successive examples of the first rule, and is rendered, “ Blessed be “ God, *even* the father of our Lord Jesus “ Christ, the father of mercies, and the God “ of all comfort.” See also James, iii. 9; τον Θεον και Πατερα. I. Theff. iii. 13; τῶ Θεῶ και Πατροῦ ἡμῶν. II. Theff. ii. 16; και ὁ Θεος και Πατηρ. Besides these six examples, wherein the word *even*, in the English version, expresses the copulative, there are also 13\* *other examples of the first rule* in the New Testament: i. e. altogether 19 examples respecting our

D 3 *heavenly*

\* Viz. II. Cor. xi. 31. Gal. i. 4. Ephes. i. 3, and iv. 6, and v. 20. Philip, iv. 20. Col. i. 3, and ii. 2, and iii. 17. I. Theff. i. 3, and iii. 11. James, i. 27. I. Peter, i. 3.

*heavenly Father* alone; and therefore the 9 examples of the same mode of expression, produced in this and the following pages, respecting the *son and the holy spirit*, ought certainly to be rendered in a *sense* suitable to the same uniform rule of construction, to express *the identity of persons*, because the same mode of grammatical expression is used in them all.

## E X A M P L E II.

EPHESIANS, V. 5.

— οὐκ ἔχει κληρονομίαν ἐν τῇ βασιλείᾳ τοῦ Χριστοῦ καὶ θεοῦ.

In the common English version the sentence is rendered, “*No whoremonger, &c. bath any inheritance in the kingdom of Christ, and of God.*” As if two persons had been mentioned in the original text; but, as the part of the sentence above cited is the generally-approved reading of the printed *Greek copies*, and as this reading is confirmed by the *Alexandrian MS.* and by all other *Greek MSS.* of known authority, it affords an unquestionable proof against *the apostacy*  
of

of the Socinians in their denial of divine honour to our Lord the Christ, or Messiah, who, according to the idiom of the Greek tongue, is in this text expressly intitled Θεός, "GOD," though the proof does not appear in the English version. Let it be remarked that the two substantives of personal description, Χριστός and Θεός, are joined by the copulative και, and that the article τὸ precedes the first, and that there is no article before the word Θεός, whereby, according to *the first rule*, both titles are necessarily to be applied to *one* and the same person, and (if literally rendered in English) should be, — "hath no inheritance in the kingdom of *the Christ* and God." But this *literal* rendering does not sufficiently express the necessary doctrine of the Greek, that the *Christ* is *also God*: and therefore to help the English idiom, and to accommodate the rendering more strictly to the true meaning of the Greek, the name of *Jesus*, which is necessary to be *understood*, might very fairly be inserted in *italic*, or between hooks, as a parenthesis, to supply the necessary sense of the Greek; as, "in the kingdom  
 " of

“ of (Jesus) the Christ and God:” or else to be rendered, “ *in the kingdom of Christ, (even) of God,*” as recommended in the first example.

### EXAMPLE III.

PHILIPPIANS, iii. 3.

ἡμεῖς γὰρ ἐσμεν ἢ περιτομή, ὅτι πνεύματι Θεῷ λατρεύοντες, καὶ καυχώμενοι ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ, καὶ οὐκ ἐν σαρκὶ πεποιθότες.

This is rendered, in our common version, — “ For we are the circumcision, which worship *God* in the spirit, and rejoice in Christ Jesus, and have no confidence in the flesh.”

In the London Polyglott, and many other valuable editions, the reading is *ὁ* πνεύματι Θεῷ, but in the Alexandrian MS.\* it is *ὁ* πνεύματι Θεῷ, which seems to be the true reading; because the other is so unusual an expression, that the generality of translators have forced

a

\* Note lately added by the Author. [And in the Vienna edition of 1786, and in all the seven Greek MSS. of the Imperial Library, that have been separately collated with it.]



a construction which the context itself cannot fairly bear, even if the dative case, Θεω, were admitted to be the true reading, unless another word, the preposition εν, be also added to it before πνευματι, as in John, iv. 23, and Rom. viii. 9, where the sense, which they have applied to this text, was really intended: but, without this addition, (as we may fairly judge by those examples,) the literal rendering ought to be, “ We are the circumcision, “ *who worship the spirit God.*” Whereas they have commonly rendered it as if the preposition εν was really inserted in this text before the dative, πνευματι, as in the two examples before cited; viz. “ *Qui spiritu servimus Deo,*” or “ *Qui spiritu colimus Deum:*” or, as in the Syriac version, “ *Qui Deo servimus in spiritu:*” (syr.) or, as in the common English version, “ *Which worship God “ in the spirit.*” But there is no such preposition in the Greek. The difficulty therefore of rendering the common reading, (Θεω,) without supposing this addition of EN to be understood before πνευματι, proves that the reading of the Alexandrian MS. in this text

is really to be preferred; οἱ πνευματι θεοῦ\* λατρευοντες, “*who worship the spirit of God,*” whereby the apostle and Timothy, as an example to the church at Philippi, assert their profession, that they pay *divine honour to the spirit of God, and that they glory in Christ.*

## EXAMPLE IV.

II. THESS. i. 12.

Κατα την χαριν του θεου ημων και κυριου  
Ιηου Χριστου.

This, in the common English version, is rendered (very erroneously) as if two distinct

\* Many other antient and valuable Greek MSS. as Dr Mill has testified, have this reading, Θεῷ, but Augustine testified, that, in his time, *all or almost all Greek copies,* and many Latin, had the reading “SPIRITUI DEI.” “*Plures enim Codices etiam Latini sic habent, qui SPIRITUI DEI servimus, GRÆCI autem OMNES, AUT PENE OMNES. In nonnullis autem exemplaribus LATINIS invenimus non SPIRITUI DEI SERVIMUS,*” *sed SPIRITUI DEO SERVIMUS. Sed qui in hoc erravit et auctoritati graviori cedere detrectavit, &c.*”

In Wetstein’s edition the word Θεῷ is subjoined with this mark ∞, to denote the *preferable reading.*

tinct persons were mentioned, viz. “ *according to the grace of our God and the Lord Jesus Christ.*” But, if two distinct persons had really been intended to be expressed, as (by innumerable examples of the grammatical construction of sentences, for the accurate distinction of persons peculiar to the Greek tongue, used in the Greek Testament, from which the preceding rules were formed) may be demonstrated, the article would have been repeated (according to the sixth rule) after the copulative and before the second substantive *κυρις*. For, it is manifest that the insertion of the comma, in some Greek copies, after *ημων*, is a modern interpolation; because the expedient of breaking sentences into small divisions or particles by commas, to preserve the necessary distinctions, was not antiently used (nor likely to have been used) by the antient writers of the Greek tongue, who were accustomed to much more accurate distinctions in their various peculiar modes of grammatical expression, specified in the six preceding rules.

Whole sentences are, indeed, distinguished, in the oldest Greek MSS. by a single point placed at their end, sometimes towards the top of the line, sometimes in the middle, and sometimes towards the bottom; but, apparently, no distinction of *time* has been intended by any of these three different modes of placing the point, for, they are all placed, indiscriminately, to the most obvious and full termination of sentences; and, therefore, we may be assured, that, in all these three different modes of placing them, they were originally intended only as *periods* to conclude the sentences: so that, when we find them in the place of commas, to distinguish merely the parts or particles of a sentence, there is great reason to suspect that they have been the additions of later times.

In the Alexandrian MS. the text before us is awkwardly divided by one of these points, placed after the word *ἡμῶν*, which point, for the reason before given, must necessarily be deemed a *period*, and which did not exist in the original text of the sacred penman.

The

The intention of the transcriber, or interpolator, by adding this point to the text, (for it cannot justly be attributed to the original writer,) has been probably to make a distinction of persons; as if *two* persons had been named in the text instead of *one*, in like manner as the comma is added after the word *God*, in the English version, *without any authority*.

But the necessary grammatical construction of the whole sentence taken together detects the interpolator, and demonstrates the absurdity of supposing that any such point ever existed in the original text, because the words, which are severed by the supposititious period, cannot form a grammatical sentence (according to the ordinary modes of expression used in the Greek tongue) by themselves alone; so that the obvious sense of the context demonstrates their necessary connexion with the preceding words *in one entire sentence*: and demonstrates, also, at the same time, the ignorance and fallacy of the interpolator, who attempted to make two sentences of it by inserting a full period.

E

If

If literally rendered, it ought to be, — “ *ac-*  
*“ cording to the grace of the God and Lord of*  
*“ us, Jesus Christ:”* but, more in the idiom  
of our own language, it might be justly ren-  
dered, “ *according to the grace of Jesus Christ,*  
*“ our God and Lord.”* In either way the  
necessary doctrine of *our Lord’s divine nature,*  
manifestly intended to be expressed in the  
original, is duly retained in the proposed  
version.

## EXAMPLE V.

I. TIM. V. 21.

Διαμαρτυρομαι ενωπιον ΤΟΥ ΘΕΟΥ ΚΑΙ ΚΥΡΙΟΥ  
ΙΗΣΟΥ ΧΡΙΣΤΟΥ και των εκλεκτων αγγελων, ινα  
ταυτα φυλαξης, &c.

This, in the common English version, is  
rendered, — “ I charge (thee) before God, and  
“ the Lord Jesus Christ, and the elect angels,  
“ that thou observe these things, &c.”

The word Κυριε\* is omitted in the Alexan-  
drian MS. where the reading is ενωπιον του Θεου

και

\* Note lately added by the Author. [The *Author*  
acknowledges himself to be under great obligation to a  
judicious

καὶ Χρῆς Ιησ. And, as no points are inserted between the substantives, we have the testimo-

E 2

ny

judicious and learned writer in the *British Critic* for a very important correction of what was written under this fifth example, and also under the 6th, in the former editions of this little book; as well as for his general candour in reviewing, and declaring a decided favourable opinion upon, the whole design of it. (See the *British Critic* for July, 1802; and also Remarks on a former edition of the year 1798, in the 15th vol. of the *British Critic*, p. 70.)

Under this fifth example the *Author* had inadvertently inserted the word Χρῆς instead of Κυρῆς, in his report respecting the omission of a word in the Alexandrian MS. And, in his remarks on the sixth example, he had reversed this mistake by mentioning Κυρῆς instead of Χρῆς. As soon as the *Author* had read, in the *British Critic*, the detection of these two errors, he immediately referred to the original paper on which he at first, many years ago, had carefully delineated the several texts in question from the Alexandrian MS. in the exact form of the letters and length of the lines; and, finding therein the true reading of the MS. as stated in the *British Critic*, he was the more surprized to observe that *he himself* had inadvertently transposed (in his subsequent remarks drawn from that very same paper) the word Χρῆς for Κυρῆς, and Κυρῆς for Χρῆς!

These

ny even of this MS. for a clear declaration that *Jesus is God* as well as *Christ*: and, after the

These were involuntary errors of the *Author himself* alone, for which the very worthy and learned *Editor* (who relied on the *Author's* examination of the MS.) is not at all responsible: and the *Author* himself, though he had so accurate a delineation of the texts, from the MS. in his possession, did not observe this unaccountable transposition that he had made of the two words, in his remarks, until he was apprised of the mistake by the learned writer in the *British Critic*, for which he thinks himself under very great obligation. G. S.

An extract from the *British Critic* is inserted in the Appendix, not only for the better illustration of the subject in question, but, also, more particularly, to set forth, in terms more satisfactory to the *Author* than any expressions he himself could suggest, the indefatigable labour, learning, and judicious criticism, of the Rev. Mr *Chr. Wordsworth*, of Trinity-College, Cambridge, in his six letters to G. S. on the subject of this book; by which the doctrine, particularly of the *first rule*, has been so amply confirmed.

For the same reasons are added extracts also from the ingenious and learned observations on both these works, (the Remarks by G. S. and Mr *Wordsworth's* six letters to him upon them,) which were published in the *Christian Observer* for July, 1802, and in the *Christian Guardian* for December, 1802, and also in the *Orthodox Churchman's Magazine and Review* for February, 1803.]



the next copulative, which connects the mention of different persons, according to the sixth rule, the adverb *ενωπιον*, (*before*,) though not expressly repeated, is plainly to be understood; as, — “*I charge*” (thee), “*before the*” “*GOD and CHRIST, Jesus,*” (or, rather, *before Jesus, the God and Christ,*) “*and*” (before) “*the elect angels, that thou observe these*” “*things.*” Thus far the testimony of the Alexandrian MS. — But, according to the commonly-received text of the Greek, it ought to be rendered, in the English idiom, “*I charge* (thee), *before Jesus Christ, the GOD and LORD, and* (before) *the elect angels,*” “*&c.*”

## EXAMPLE VI.

II. TIM. iv. 1.

Διαμαρτυρομαι ουν εγω ενωπιον ΤΟΥ ΘΕΟΥ ΚΑΙ ΚΥΡΙΟΥ ΙΗΣΟΥ ΧΡΙΣΤΟΥ ΤΩ ΜΕΛΛΟΝΤΩ ΚΡΙΝΕΙΝ ΖΩΝΤΑΣ ΚΑΙ ΝΕΚΡΩΣ, &c. (*Geneva Edit. 1620.*)

In the common English version this is rendered, “*I charge* (thee) therefore before “*God, and the Lord Jesus Christ, who shall*” “*judge the quick and the dead &c.*”

In the Greek of this text, as it is commonly printed, the article  $\tau\epsilon$  is repeated before  $\text{Κυρι}\epsilon\varsigma$ , which, so far, affords an excuse for the present English version in placing the comma after the word *God*, to denote *two* distinct persons, according to the sixth rule; but, in the Alexandrian MS. and several other old copies, \* [where the reading is  $\epsilon\nu\omega\pi\iota\omicron\nu \tau\epsilon \Theta\epsilon\omicron\varsigma \cdot \kappa\alpha\iota \text{Χρι}\epsilon\varsigma \text{Ιη}\sigma\upsilon\varsigma$ ] the article  $\tau\epsilon$  is *not* repeated after the copulative before  $\text{Χρι}\epsilon\varsigma$ : so that the expression is similar, in effect, to the declaration of our Lord's *divine nature*, by the same apostle, in the preceding example, viz. I. Tim. v. 21. In some printed editions the word  $\text{Κυρι}\epsilon\varsigma$  is also omitted, but, in the Geneva edition of 1620, with Scaliger's notes, the word  $\text{Κυρι}\epsilon\varsigma$  is inserted and the article  $\tau\epsilon$  omitted,† whereby the title

$\Theta\epsilon\omicron\varsigma$ ,

\* [ ] Correction and addition by the Author.

† Note lately added by the Author. [The expression being exactly the same as that which is generally allowed to exist in the preceding example, viz.  $\epsilon\nu\omega\pi\iota\omicron\nu \tau\epsilon \Theta\epsilon\omicron\varsigma \kappa\alpha\iota \text{Κυρι}\epsilon\varsigma \text{Ιη}\sigma\upsilon\varsigma \text{Χρι}\epsilon\varsigma$ , I. Tim. v. 21. And the Author has lately discovered several other editions of the Greek Testament which have this reading, and thereby confirm the

the

ΘΕΩ, (God,) must necessarily be construed in such a manner that it may be clearly understood,

the truth of this 6th example; though it must be allowed, at the same time, that *not even one* of the several editors understood the text in its proper *grammatical sense*, because they have all (without any authority) placed commas after ΘΕΩ, in order to distinguish *two persons*, contrary to the necessary grammatical construction of the Greek text. Two of these editions (in the Author's possession) have Montanus's interlineary Latin version. They are both in 8vo; though of different sizes, the one having four more lines in each page than the other; but the title-pages of both being lost their respective dates cannot be known. (There are several other 8vo editions with the same interlineary version, but which have a *different* reading in this place, viz. the common reading with the article inserted in the second place after the copulative; and two such editions are also in the Author's collection.) The fourth printed authority, which the Author has found, in favour of his sixth example, is the Vienna edition of 1787, printed from an antient MS. in the Imperial Library at Vienna. The title of it is, "*Novum Testamentum ad Codicem Vindebonensem Græcè expressum. Varietatem Lectionis addidit Franciscus Carolus Alter Professor Gymnasii Vindebonensis.*" At the end of the second volume (for it consists of two very thick 8vo volumes) are added the various readings of seven other antient Greek MSS.

stood, in all versions, to be expressly applied to *Christ*, as it really is in the original. The transcriber

MSS. all containing the Epistles, (besides the MS. from which the edition was formed,) which have been separately collated with this edition; and the variations are distinctly and separately stated, under the proper titles of each MS. in the Appendix. Two, only, of all these eight MSS. have, in this text, the article  $\tau\upsilon$  repeated in the second place after the copulative, (viz.  $\tau\upsilon$   $\Theta\epsilon\upsilon$   $\kappa\alpha\iota$   $\tau\upsilon$   $\text{Κυρι}\upsilon$ , &c.) Another of them has the same reading exactly as the Alexandrian MS.  $\tau\upsilon$   $\Theta\epsilon\upsilon$   $\kappa\alpha\iota$   $\text{Χρισ}\tau\upsilon$   $\text{Ιησο}\upsilon$ : and, therefore, by the omission of the article in the second place before  $\text{Χρισ}\tau\upsilon$ , doth also, equally with that MS. confirm the doctrine of my sixth example. And all the other five MSS. (which likewise contain this Epistle) must necessarily be allowed to have the other more correct reading for which I contend, viz.  $\tau\upsilon$   $\Theta\epsilon\upsilon$   $\kappa\alpha\iota$   $\text{Κυρι}\upsilon$   $\text{Ιησο}\upsilon$   $\text{Χρισ}\tau\upsilon$ : because no difference or variation from that reading, in the printed edition, is noted in any other of the seven separate collations of antient MSS. that have been distinctly compared with it, except in the three that are first mentioned above.

Though the insertion of the article in the second place is undoubtedly the most common reading in all the printed editions, (for fifty-nine out of sixty-four printed Greek Testaments, in the possession of the Author of this little work, have this reading,) yet several of the most learned  
Editors

transcriber or interpolator of the Alexandrian MS. however, being aware of this doctrine, has

Editors of these fifty-nine editions, that have adopted it, have, at the same time, warned us that there are various readings, in this text, viz. Bishop *Walton*, *Curcellæus*, Bishop *Fell*, Dr *Mill*, *Henry Wetsten*, and *John Jac. Wetsten*. The latter cites no less than six antient MSS. (besides several versions,) which have *not* the reading τϑ Κυριϑ. (N.B. His mark for a deficiency is a short line, thus —; and he has expressed this various reading, in his note on the text, as follows: “ τϑ Κυριϑ. ] — A C D a “ prima manu. F G. 31. *Editio Vulg. Copt. Æthiop. Ba-* “ *filius Eth. 89. Hilarius.*”) And consequently we must understand that all these six MSS. have the same reading as the first of them, A, by which mark he refers to the *Alexandrian* MS. wherein, though the words τϑ Κυριϑ are indeed omitted, yet the proper effect of this omission ought to be at the same time remarked, viz. that the article τϑ is not repeated after the copulative, in the second place, before the next noun Χριϑ: so that the expression, in all these six MSS. must be equally declaratory of our Lord’s divine nature, as in the former example (the fifth) from I. Tim. v. 21. To the evidence of these six MSS. must be added that of *one* of the Imperial MSS. at *Vienna*, mentioned above.

*John Jac. Wetsten* (my authority for the evidence of five of the antient MSS. which agree with the Alexandrian MS.

has endeavoured to pervert it by adding a full period after the word  $\Theta\epsilon\zeta$ , as  $\Theta\upsilon$ . But this  
*period*

MS. in the particular reading of the text last-mentioned) has also acknowledged a very considerable degree of evidence in favour of the other reading, which I have adopted as my sixth example; (though he was, apparently, of a very different opinion from myself respecting the propriety of it;) for, he cites no less than three MSS. (besides the Geneva edition, which I have quoted) wherein the reading, as he asserts, is *without the article in the second place*. See his note, vol. ii, p. 364, viz. “ $\tau\zeta$  secundo loco.] — E. 4. 52. Editio *Genev.* The short line — is his mark, or sign, for a deficiency, as signified in his prolegomena, p. 222; (last line but one;) viz. “— in V. “L.” (i. e. in Variis Lectionibus,) “*notat voces, quibus appositum est, in coda. citatis non legi.*” And E is his mark for the antient *Basil* MS. But he must have made some mistake respecting the two other MSS. 4 and 52, for he has described them in his prolegomena (p. 46 and 51) as containing the *four Gospels*, without making any mention of their having also the *Epistles*; so that these two MSS. have probably been cited, by mistake, instead of some other MSS. which he had known to contain the same reading as the *Basil* MS. and the *Geneva* Edition.

But, even if we set aside these two supposed MSS. yet as it appears that five out of the eight antient MSS. in the Imperial Library at *Vienna*, as well as the antient *Basil* MS.

*period* is unquestionably supposititious, because the words before and after the period are *not two distinct sentences*, but obviously portions only of *one entire sentence*, which must necessarily be construed together, according to the ordinary rules of expression in the Greek tongue, as I have remarked on a preceding example; whereby a second substantive of personal description, *without an article before it*, joined by a copulative to a preceding substantive of the like nature, and in the same case, *with an article before it*, must necessarily denote a farther description of the same person, expressed by the first substantive; (whenever there is an article before the first substantive and none before the second;) so that the insertion of the *period* in the Alexandrian

MS. cited by Wetsten, and also four printed editions, have this reading; and that six other MSS. agree with the Alexandrian MS. in a different reading of this text, which bears equal testimony to *the divinity of Christ*; the Author hopes it will be allowed that all this united evidence affords some reasonable ground of justification for his having cited this text as his sixth example.]

drian MS.\* after Θεῶν is utterly vain, because the *copulative* sufficiently proves the *connection* of the two substantives in one clear sentence, and the omission of the article before the second substantive induces the necessity of applying the same grammatical construction, whereby alone the due distinction of persons is so peculiarly maintained in the Greek tongue, and *not by points*. The text should therefore be rendered, — “ I charge (thee,) therefore, “ before the God and Lord, Jesus Christ, &c.” Or, rather, (to render the doctrine more obvious in the English idiom,) — “ I charge “ (thee,) therefore, before Jesus Christ, the “ God and Lord, who shall judge the quick “ and the dead, &c.” And thus the texts in the two last examples will perfectly accord as the uniform expressions of the same apostle, asserting,

\* Note lately added by the Author. [And also the insertion of commas after Θεῶν, in the four printed editions, is equally vain, and proves only that the Editors were not aware of the proper grammatical construction of the text.]



asserting, in both,\* the *divinity of his Lord and Saviour*, by whom he had been personally summoned to bear his testimony to the gentiles, as being an eye and ear witness of his *glorious majesty*.

Our Socinian Sadducees, who have impiously entitled our Lord “*a mere man*,” and “*nothing but a man*,” and “*simple human nature*,” will not be able to digest this necessary doctrine until they humble themselves to receive instructions from the holy scriptures.

#### F                      EXAMPLE

\* Note lately added by the Author. [This seems to have been the opinion also of the learned *Bengelius*, that both these texts had originally the same mode of expression. For, in his *Gnomon*, he remarks, on the text of the former example, (I Tim. v. 21,) *καὶ Κυρίῳ* et Domini, “*Articulus non additur, cum tamen mox addatur de angelis. Ergo Dei appellatio et Domini ad unum pertinet subjectum. Conf. tamen II. Tim. iv. 1, καὶ* non habet lectio vetusta.” To restore this *ancient reading without the article in the second place*, there seems to be ample authority by the testimony of the MSS. and editions which I have cited, in addition to *the similarity of expression, by the same apostle, in I. Tim. v. 21.*]

## EXAMPLE VII.

TIT. ii. 13.

— Πρὸςδεχομενοι τὴν μακαριαν ἐλπίδα καὶ ἐπιφανείαν τῆς δόξης ΤΟΥ ΜΕΓΑΛΕ ΘΕΟΥ ΚΑΙ ΣΩΤΗΡΟΣ ἡμῶν ΙΗΣΟΥ ΧΡΙΣΤΟΥ.

The present version of these words, in the English testament, is, — “ Looking for  
 “ that blessed hope, and the glorious appearing  
 “ of the great God, and our Saviour Jesus  
 “ Christ.” This text (though the next in order, according to the usual mode of arranging the books of the New Testament) has already been produced as the second example in the preceding letter. I have since, however, examined the Alexandrian MS. and find that it agrees exactly with the above citation of this text, except that a point has been added in the MS. after the word ΘΕΟΣ or ΘΥ. On which it is necessary to observe, that the same remarks are obviously applicable to this superfluous and absurd addition of the point or *period*, that I have made on the texts II. Theff. i. 12, and II. Tim. iv. 1, in the fourth and sixth examples

ples of this tract. For, as the proper effect or purpose of *periods* is to separate words into *distinct sentences*, it is obvious that the words, which follow the supposititious period in this text, are incapable of a grammatical construction without reference to the preceding words connected by the *copulative*: and therefore the *note of separation* (a period) cannot possibly have been intended by the inspired writer. This testimony, therefore, of the sacred text, in favour of our Lord's *divine nature*, ought not to be withheld from the mere English reader.

I am persuaded that our modern Socinians would not have made so much clamour, about *the necessity of a new translation*, had they been aware that a more close and literal rendering of the original text (even in passages which had escaped their calumnious charges of *corruption*, and their arrogant attempts at *imaginary correction*) must necessarily cut up their favourite system by the roots.

The text in question, if the truth of the original be duly regarded, must inevitably be rendered, “ *Expecting the blessed hope and ap-*

“ *pearance of the glory of our great God and  
“ Saviour, Jesus Christ.”*”

## EXAMPLE VIII.

II. PET. i. 1.

— εν δικαιοσυνη ΤΟΥ ΘΕΟΥ ημων ΚΑΙ ΣΩΤΗ-  
ΡΟΣ ΙΗΣΟΥ ΧΡΙΣΤΟΥ.

Which, in the common English version, is thus imperfectly rendered, — “ *through the  
“ righteousness of God and our Saviour, Jesus  
“ Christ.”*”\*

This text, though *the eighth* in order, according to the proper order of the books, was *the first* example cited in my letter; and I have only to remark farther, that the Alexandrian MS. perfectly agrees with the present common approved reading in the Greek text. In Dr Woide’s printed copy of the said MS. there is a point inserted after the word δικαιοσυνη, which

\* Note lately added by the Author. [But in the margin (with the usual mark of reference to the Greek text, viz. Gr. when a more literal version is given) it is properly rendered, — “ *of our God and Saviour.*”]

which is not in the MS. but that is manifestly a merely-accidental typographical error.

The Reverend Mr Crutwell has remarked (in his useful edition of the English Bible with Bishop Wilson's Notes) that the words rendered in our present version, viz. "*of God and our Saviour, Jesus Christ,*" were rendered, "*of our God and Saviour, Jesus Christ,*" in the versions of Wickliff, Coverdale, Matthews, Cranmer, in the Bishops (Bible,) (the) Geneva, (the) Rhemish, (Bibles,) and by Doddridge, Wesley, Scattergood, and Purver; which is altogether a noble testimony of both antient and modern times against the *Socinian impiety*. The *English* reader should undoubtedly be informed of the true meaning of these words in a proper *English* idiom, as — "*Through the righteousness of Jesus Christ, our God and Saviour :*" — which is agreeable to a literal rendering into Latin by the late learned Dr Thomas Mangey, Prebendary of Durham, viz. — "*Jesu Christi Dei et servatoris nostri.*"

## EXAMPLE IX.

JUDE 4.

— και ΤΟΝ ΜΟΝΟΝ ΔΕΣΠΟΤΗΝ ΘΕΟΝ ΚΑΙ ΚΥΡΙΟΝ ἡμῶν ΙΗΣΟΥΝ ΧΡΙΣΤΟΝ ἀρνεμενοι.

This, in the common English version, is imperfectly rendered — “*and denying the only Lord God, and our Lord Jesus Christ.*”

I made a transcript of this text, several years ago, from the Alexandrian MS. which I copied, or rather drew, letter by letter, in size and shape as exactly as the eye could discern. In this transcript the word ΘΕΟΝ is omitted, as in the MS.; but I did not, at that time, perceive that there was any point or mark after the word ΔΕΣΠΟΤΗΝ, and I was therefore much surprised, afterwards, in comparing the said transcript with the elegant edition of my late very worthy and respectable friend, the Rev. Dr Woide, (who printed a copy of the New Testament from the Alexandrian MS. with new types, in imitation of the letters of the MS.) to find that he had inserted a point, in his new edition, after the word ΔΕΣΠΟΤΗΝ. I was very confident that I could not discern any such point, when I examined the MS.; and yet, as I entertained

tertained the highest respect and esteem for the veracity and accuracy of Dr Woide, (of which he was, indeed, truly worthy,) it was necessary to have this matter properly explained; and I was rendered perfectly aware, by Dr Velthufen's account of his examining an antient MS. that the faint lines and marks in the very old MSS. are liable to bear different appearances, according to the different degrees of light in which they are seen.

I therefore took the first opportunity, afterwards, of going once more to examine the MS.; and, on a more close inspection, I perceived, indeed, the *faint* mark which occasioned Dr Woide's insertion of the period in his edition; but being afterwards assisted by the worthy librarian, the Rev. Mr Harper, in a still more attentive and accurate examination of the mark with a magnifying glass, I was satisfied that it had not been intended for a period, but only for a short *line of connection*, because it is nearly three times as long as it is broad.

But if any person, from the authority of Dr Woide's edition, should be still inclined

to

to suppose that it is really a *point*, I must request them carefully to consider what I have before remarked on the fourth, sixth, and seventh, examples in this tract, respecting the addition of *points* in Greek manuscripts; and also concerning the more accurate modes of grammatical distinction in the Greek tongue, which rendered the smaller points, or *particles of time*, (such as semicolons and commas,) absolutely unnecessary in the *Greek scripture*; and, in addition thereto, let him observe, particularly on the text before us, that a point in that place, after ΔΕΣΠΟΤΗΝ, (in the middle of the sentence, between the accusative noun and verb,) is utterly inconsistent with grammar and common sense; and though the word ΘΕΟΥ has been omitted in the Alexandrian M S. (perhaps for the same reason that some men would wish to prove the insertion of the point after ΔΕΣΠΟΤΗΝ,) yet, happily, neither of these alterations would at all affect or injure the manifest testimony of the apostle Jude to *Christ's almighty power and divinity*, for — “*the only potentate and Lord*”  
“*of us, Jesus Christ,*” is equivalent to a full  
declaration



declaration of *Christ's divinity*, as well as of his *almighty power*; and, with respect to the insertion of the *supposed point*, they must perceive, if they duly consider the text, that the words *Δεσποτην* and *κυριον* cannot (consistently with the necessary grammatical sense of the Greek, and the usual modes of expression, or idiom of that language) be separated either by points or construction, so as to be applied to two different persons, because the article is *not* repeated after the copulative, before *κυριον*: so that *Christ alone* was unquestionably that — “*only potentate,*” or *sovereign Lord*, who was denied by the *lascivious persons*, against whom the the apostle Jude bore testimony of their *reprobacy*, and of their having *denied the Lord*, who had *redeemed them*. Dr Hammond's rendering of the text before us may, therefore, be conscientiously maintained, viz. “*our only Master, God, and Lord, Jesus*” “*Christ, \*making*” (says he) “*those three the*” “*several attributes of Jesus Christ.*” — But as the Doctor has been pleased to add,

afterwards,

\* Viz. in the margin of the text; and repeated in his *Annotations*, p. 850, with the remainder of this quotation.

afterwards, — “ *And this interpretation proceeds upon that way of punctuation which is ordinarily retained in our copies, there being no comma after Θεου, &c.*” I am obliged to protest against *that reason, for the other reasons already given; and to insist, that the grammatical construction of the Greek text is, of itself, our sufficient and best warrant to justify that literal rendering.*

But the applying to Christ this *supreme* title, — “ *the only potentate, God*” (and, also, in a former text, the *supreme* title of — “ *the great God*”) may, perhaps, induce some persons to conceive that this grammatical system of construction, if admitted as a rule, for all texts, in which the same mode of expression renders it applicable, will sometimes prove rather too much, and may be liable to favour a modern sect of *Unitarians*, who have adopted the *Sabellian* notions of the late Baron Swedenborg, and who assert, that — “ *Jesus Christ is the only God;*” that is, they understand this in so peculiar a sense, that they do not seem properly to acknowledge the *personality* of *the holy spirit*, any more than a  
 very

very opposite sect of *Unitarians* do, the modern Socinians, who impiously assert (in the opposite extreme to that of the *Swedenborgians*) that “*Jesus Christ was a mere man, and nothing but a man,*” according to one of their teachers, and — “*simple human nature,*” according to another: and some of them have even presumed to charge the members of the church of England with idolatry,\* because they pay  
*the*

\* This unjust charge of *idolatry* against the unquestionable principles of the *antient catholic church*, professed by the *church of England*, affords a notable skreen to the *Latin church*, by indiscriminately confounding all the due distinctions whereby a charge of *idolatry* is applicable; and this should teach us to be aware of what we should have to expect on the removal of all tests and restraints from such indiscriminate teachers; and, likewise, from all other sectaries (as much as from the *pontifical hierarchy*, seated on the *throne of the dragon*) who do *not* regulate their faith and practice by the plain doctrines of the holy Scriptures. For, indeed, no man is justly entitled to have a vote or share in the legislature of this or any other *Christian nation*, unless he (at least) professes to regulate his *principles of action* by the *two first foundations of ENGLISH LAW*, viz. *natural and revealed religion*, to which (as being *two witnesses of God*) *universal obedience* is due, so that no statute  
of

*the divine honour that is due to their Lord and Saviour, and to the holy spirit, their — “ other comforter.*

So

of parliament can be *valid*, nor any other law, custom, or practice, *sufferable*, if it be at all *inconsistent* with either of these *two indispensable foundations*. For, without these, MEN retain, indeed, the form, but not the *dignity*, of MAN; because they are subject to the impulse of *spirits*, inimical to the *nature of man*; and are, thereby, liable to be rendered, in disposition and practice, the most noxious of *beasts*, even — “ *a generation of vipers* ;” and, therefore, *the knowledge of our own NATURE, and of the principles of action in MAN, what they are and what they ought to be*, (which, by the Scriptures alone, is revealed to us,) is the first and most essential branch of *philosophy*, whatsoever our modern sceptical *philosophers* may think to the contrary; for, how should men be on their guard against any *invisible enemies*, of whose very existence they are ignorant? — But by the holy scriptures we are informed, that — “ *the prince of the power of the air worketh in the children of disobedience* ;” — and, certainly, wherever this *Satanical inspiration* manifestly takes place among men, their *descriptive title* cannot be more accurately expressed than in the terms which our Lord himself (as well as John the Baptist, before him) applied to the haughty sceptics whom they opposed, — “ *a generation of vipers*,” (Matthew xii. 34;) and “ *serpents* :” (Matthew, xxiii. 33:) expressly alluding thereby

So that both these sects of *Unitarians* (as well as their *Unitarian* brethren, the *Mahometans*) are, by mistaken notions of the *divine unity*, seduced from perceiving and acknowledging the declarations, throughout the holy Scriptures, of the unquestionable existence of *three* divine persons in *one* only divine nature, or *Godhead*. The old Arians

G

(though

thereby to the *Satanical inspiration* by which they became the *children*, or *generation*, of the *old serpent*, as our Lord plainly warned them at another time: — *Ye are of YOUR FATHER THE DEVIL — and the lusts of YOUR FATHER ye will do: — he was a MURDERER from the beginning, and abode not in the truth, &c.* Men, therefore, who will not be limited by the *two first foundations of English law*, are unworthy to be admitted to an equal participation of *civil rights* in any free *Christian* state whatever; because *true liberty* cannot be maintained without that *perfection of law* which arises *only* from these *indispensible rules of action*.

They are *indispensible*, because we can have no hope that our *constitutional* establishment of *natural* and *religious rights* (to “*the glory of God, peace on earth,*” and *good will towards men*”) can possibly be maintained, if such persons are admitted to a share of *legislative* authority, who do not acknowledge the *only foundations* on which, alone, that happy *constitution* is built.

(though their sect was probably represented by that "*fallen star*" which opened the "*bottomless pit*" for the emission of the *armed locusts* of the Arabian heresy, *more strictly Unitarians* than themselves\*) allowed, indeed,

\* Since I wrote the above remark, respecting the *Mahometans* and *Arians*, a more striking accomplishment of the prophecy, respecting the *fallen star that opened the bottomless pit*, has occurred to me, in the character of *Nestorius*, Archbishop of Constantinople and metropolitan of the Greek church, whose doctrine was, in effect, still "*more Unitarian than*" that of *Arius*; for, the consequences of his denying the miraculous birth of our Lord, and asserting that — "*Christ born of the Virgin Mary was not the son of God*;" must necessarily be, that he was — "*a mere man*," and — "*nothing but a man*," according to the openly-declared notions of our modern Socinians, which, in this point, is strictly *Mahometan*! With this false and *anticristian* doctrine "*the third part of the rivers and fountains of waters*" (viz. the sources of the nations and the people of the Greek Empire, the *third great monarchy*) was embittered and prepared for the *scorpion-like* scourge of *Mahometan* tyranny.

On account of this blasphemous doctrine, *Nestorius* was deposed (by the judgement of a great counsel of his *peers*, the *Christian bishops*) from his dignity as *Archbishop* of the greatest city (at that time) in Christendom, and from  
being

indeed, that *Christ was God*, yet they supposed him to be so, in *an inferior degree*; by which

G 2

they

being *metropolitan*, as it were, of the *Greek Empire*, (the *third* great monarchy;) and, therefore, he might truly be said to have *fallen* from the highest elevation of ecclesiastical dignity; so that no prophetic type could more amply prefigure this rejection than — “*the fallen star*” “*from heaven*,” — the heaven or *firmament* of the then-amply *established* episcopal authority throughout the Roman empire. And the *Unitarian* doctrine of this *fallen star* (I mean *Unitarian* in the *Mahometan* and *Socinian* sense of that term) seems also to have been the *very* “*key*,” whereby “*the bottomless pit*” was opened to let out the noxious and diabolical vapour of *Mahometanism*; for, it is really *the leading* and first inculcated tenet in all the public professions of that baneful heresy. And it is remarkable that a *Nestorian* monk, *Sergius*, professing the same blasphemous doctrine, (this — “*key of the bottomless pit*” forged by *Nestorius*,) should actually have been an assistant to *Mahomet*, in producing his pretended revelations; and it is still more remarkable, that all the *scorpion-like* scourges of *Mahometan* conquest (first, LAWLESS TYRANNY and the suppression of all *popular rights*; secondly, ROBBERY and WAR notoriously sanctioned or authorized by this pretended religion against *all* nations and people that do not receive their doctrine; and, thirdly, the fatal *renewal* of the old *pagan* oppressions of *slaveholding*

they unwarily acknowledged a *superior God*, and an *inferior God*: i. e. *more Gods than one*,  
contrary

*holding and slave-dealing*,\* which had been happily extinguished by the general influence of *Christian benevolence*) should have completely pervaded all those eastern and southern regions of the *third Empire*, wherever the doctrines of *Nestorius* had been previously adopted, and had embittered the *rivers and fountains* of the waters, to prepare them for this signal *retribution*, justly due to such antichristian apostates, who deny the true *rock* on which the *Catholic church* is built, viz. that “*Jesus is the Christ, the son of the living God;*” or, as St John has expressed the *peculiar sonship*, or filiation, of Christ, viz. “*the ONLY BEGOTTEN SON, which is in the bosom of the Father.*” John, i. 18, compare with ver. 14, and chap. iii. 16 and 18.

All the arguments produced by the learned *Vitringa*, to prove that *Arius* was the *fallen star*, are certainly much more applicable to *Nestorius*, as being an *archbishop* and  
*metropolitan*

\* Such diabolical enormities may surely be compared to the dark exhalations of — “*the bottomless pit;*” and, therefore, our English promoters of *slave-holding and slave-dealing* (who have carried these *Mahometan* oppressions to a greater excess even than the *Mahometans* themselves) have ample reason to dread the approaching time of *divine retribution*, when God will — “*destroy the destroyers of the earth,*” and shall cause those that now — “*lead into captivity*” (and, surely, likewise, all their abettors) — “*to be led into captivity!*”



contrary to the *true Unitarian doctrine* of the *primitive churches*, which always held and asserted *the unity of God* (like the church of England to this day) as much as they held it necessary to acknowledge the *three divine persons*: both of which doctrines are inevitable and indispensable while we profess to regulate our faith by the testimonies of the holy Scriptures, as handed down to us, without presuming to exercise the Socinian expedient of lopping off, or altering, (as a supposed *corruption* or *interpolation*,) every text of Scripture that opposes the system or set of notions that we happen to have adopted. And, therefore, the *true Unitarian Christian*, who acknowledges but *one God, one Jehovah, one divine nature*, (Θεοῦς,) or *Godhead*, and at the same time, nevertheless, is convinced, that *three divine persons* are really re-

G 3

vealed

*metropolitan of the empire*, and therefore more fitly prefigured by a *star*. And that the smoke from — “*the bottomless pit*,” which was let out by this *fallen star*, was really the mist or diabolical darkness of *Mahometanism*, seems to have been fairly proved by our learned countryman, Joseph Mede.

vealed to us under the title of *Jehovah*\* in the old testament, and under the title of Θεός, or *God*, in the New Testament; and that the *supreme attributes* of the DIVINE NATURE are applied to each, in both Testaments; will, of course, be aware, also, that each of these divine persons must necessarily be “*the great God*” and “*the only potentate,*” as there is but “*one God,*” *one only supreme power or Godhead.*

So that the effect of my grammatical rule,† when applied to the two particular texts before-mentioned, (viz. Tit. ii. 13, and Jude, 4,) will not (in the opinion of such true Christians) seem to exceed the truth.

Though the apostle Paul asserted to the Colossians, (ii. 9,) concerning Christ, that “*in him dwelleth ALL the fulness of the God-*  
“*head,*”

\* I need not, here, recite the proofs of these assertions because I have already produced a great variety of examples, collected from the Old as well as the New Testament, in my tract on the “*Law of nature and principles of action in man,*” from p. 234 to p. 301.

† Compared with the concurrent reasons and testimonies quoted in the note, p. 24. EDITOR.

“head,” (της Θεότητος,) “bodily,” (σωματικῶς,  
 a term of indisputable *personality*,) yet, surely,  
 this was without the least disparagement to  
 the supreme divinity of the *Almighty Father*,  
 and of the *Holy Spirit*, because they are, also,  
 necessarily included in the same Θεότης, or  
*Godhead*, as there is but *one God*; and, there-  
 fore, as “*it pleased all fulness to dwell*” in the  
 person of our *Lord Jesus Christ*, (Col. i. 19,)  
 we may more easily comprehend why he re-  
 quired, “*that all*” (men) “*should honour*  
 “*the son, EVEN AS they honour the Father;*”  
 that is, undoubtedly, *with supreme honour*,  
 καθως, *EVEN AS, OR according as,* “*they ho-*  
 “*nour the father.* And our Lord said, ex-  
 pressly, “*he that honoureth not the son* (that  
 is, according to the measure before de-  
 clared, “*EVEN AS they honour,*” or *ought to*  
*honour, the father)* “*honoureth not the father*  
 “*which hath sent him;* (John, v. 23;) and  
 he also claimed expressly *to be glorified with*  
*the father himself.* “*And now, O father,* (said  
 he,) “*GLORIFY THOU ME WITH THINE OWN-*  
 “*SELF, with the glory which I had with thee*  
 “*before the world was;*” (John, xvii. 5;)

thereby

thereby asserting both his *pre-existence* and *supreme dignity*. Christians, therefore, who humbly receive these and the many other revelations of *Christ's divinity*, have the less difficulty in acknowledging the *doctrines of the antient catholic churches* and the declarations of our *creeds*. But let all other men, likewise, who profess to believe in the *name of Christ*, earnestly inquire, in the *first* place, as the *first* means of progress to the true faith, whether they are really "*willing*" (for this is given as the true proof of *faith*, εαν τις θελη,)—to conform themselves to the *will of God*, as revealed in all the most obvious declarations and injunctions of holy Scripture, and more particularly to the purity, which is expressly called "*the will of God*," viz. the *sanctification of their bodies*,\* which

\* " For this is the *will of God*, even your sanctification, that you should abstain from fornication: that every one of you should know how to possess his vessel in *sanctification and honour*; not in the lust of concupiscence, even as the Gentiles, which know not God: that no one should go beyond or defraud his brother, &c." I. Thess. iv. 3, 6.

which cannot otherwise be capable of becoming "*temples of the Holy Ghost*:" an indispensable state both of *body* and *mind* for all Christians to maintain; for, in that case, they may assuredly rely on God's absolute promise, through Christ, that "*if any one shall be WILLING to do HIS WILL, he shall know of the doctrine, whether it be of God, or whether I speak*" (said our Lord) "*from myself.*" (John, vii. 17.)

DEO SOLI GLORIA.

The first part of the document  
 discusses the general principles  
 of the law and the various  
 cases that have been decided  
 in the past. It is important  
 to understand the history of  
 the law and the reasons  
 behind the various decisions.  
 This will help you to  
 understand the law better  
 and to apply it to the  
 facts of the case.

THE END OF THE WORLD

## INDEX

To the Texts cited in the preceding Work.

Abbreviations: r. rule. — g. e. general exception. — p. e. particular exception. — n. note.

	II. Kings.		viii.	44 . . . . .	61 n.
xvii.	35, 36 . . . . .	11	x.	14 . . . . .	9 n.
	Psalms.		—	27 . . . . .	9 n.
xxiii.	1 . . . . .	8 n.	—	30 . . . . .	9 n.
xcv.	7 . . . . .	9 n.	xi.	44, r. 6 . . . . .	15
	Isaiah.		xvii.	5 . . . . .	67
xl	9, 10, 11 . . . . .	8 n.	xx.	28, g.e. to r. 6 . . . . .	16
	Ezekiel.		—	31, r. 2 . . . . .	8
xxxvii.	24 . . . . .	9 n.		Acts.	
	Matthew.		ii.	36, g.e. to r. 6 . . . . .	17
xii.	22, r. 1 . . . . .	3	xx.	28 . . . . .	27
—	34 . . . . .	60 n.		Romans.	
xxiii.	33 . . . . .	60 n.	ii.	19, 20, r. 3 . . . . .	10
	Luke.		viii.	9 . . . . .	33
i.	47, r. 2 . . . . .	7	xv.	6, r. 1 . . . . .	5
ii.	14 . . . . .	61 n.	—	— . . . . .	29
—	26, r. 2 . . . . .	8		I. Cor.	
	John.		i.	24, g.e. to r. 6 . . . . .	17
i.	3 . . . . .	11 n.	viii.	66 . . . . .	11 n.
—	17, r. 6 . . . . .	14	xv.	24, r. 1 . . . . .	5
—	14 and 18 . . . . .	64 n.	—	— . . . . .	29
—	29, r. 2 . . . . .	8		II. Cor.	
ii.	22, r. 6 . . . . .	15	i.	2, r. 5 . . . . .	13
iii.	16 and 18 . . . . .	64 n.	i.	3, r. 1 . . . . .	4
iv.	23 . . . . .	33	—	— . . . . .	29
—	42, r. 2 . . . . .	8	iv.	3, g.e. to r. 2 . . . . .	10
v.	23, r. 2 . . . . .	8	xi.	31, r. 1 . . . . .	4
—	23 . . . . .	67	—	— . . . . .	29 n.
vi.	27, r. 2 . . . . .	8		Galatians.	
vii.	17 . . . . .	69	i.	3, r. 5 . . . . .	13

i.	4, r. 1 . . . 6	iii.	11, r. 1 . . . 4, 14 n.
—	— . . . 29 n.	—	— . . . 29 n.
	Ephesians.	—	13, — . . . 6
i.	2, r. 5 . . . 13	—	— . . . 29
—	3, r. 1 . . . 29 n.	iv.	3, 6 . . . 68
ii.	2 . . . . . 60 n.		II. Theff.
iv.	6, g.e. to r. 5, 14	i.	12, r. 1 . . . 34
—	— r. 1 . . . 29 n.	—	— . . . 50
—	— g.e. to r. 5, 14	ii.	8 . . . . . 25 n.
—	31, r. 5 . . . 13	—	16, r. 1 . . . 6
v.	5, r. 1 . . . 30	—	— . . . . . 29
—	20, — . . . 6		I. Tim.
—	— . . . . . 29 n.	i.	1 . . . . . 25 n.
—	20, 21, r. 3 . 10	—	— r. 3 . . . 11
vi.	21, r. 1 . . . 4	—	2, r. 4 . . . 11
—	23, r. 5 . . . 13	v.	21, r. 1 . . . 38
	Philemon.	—	— . . . . . 42
	3, r. 5 . . . 13	—	— . . . . . 45 n.
	Philippians.	—	— . . . . . 49 n.
iii.	3, r. 1 . . . 32	vi.	14 . . . . . 25 n.
iv.	20, r. 1 . . . 4		II. Tim.
—	— . . . . . 29 n.	i.	2, r. 4 . . . 11
	Colossians.	—	5, r. 6 . . . 15
i.	3 and 12, r. 1 . 6	—	10 . . . . . 25 n.
—	3, r. 1 . . . 29 n.	iv.	1, r. 1 . . . 41, 50
—	16 . . . . . 11 n.	—	— . . . . . 49 n.
—	17 . . . . . 11 n.	—	1 and 8 . . . 25 n.
—	19 . . . . . 67		Titus.
—	27 . . . . . 25 n.	i.	1, r. 3 . . . 11
ii.	2, r. 1, . . . 4, 29 n.	—	— . . . . . 15 n.
—	— r. 6, 15 . . . 15	—	4, r. 4 . . . 11
—	— g.e. to r. 2, 10	ii.	13, r. 1 . . . 22
—	9 . . . . . 7	—	— . . . . . 50
—	9 . . . . . 66	—	— . . . . . 66
iii.	17, r. 1 . . . 6	—	— . . . . . 24 n.
—	— . . . . . 29 n.		Heb.
	I. Theff.	i.	2 . . . . . 11 n.
i.	3, r. 1 . . . 6	iii.	1, r. 1 . . . 4
—	— . . . . . 29 n.	xiii.	20, r. 2 . . . 8, 9
iii.	6, g.e. to r. 6, 15		James.



	James.				II. John.	
i.	1 . . . . .	12 n.	iii.	3, r. 4 . . . . .	11	
—	— p.e. to r. 5,	13 n.		Jude.		
—	—	17		4, r. 1 . . . . .	54, 66	
i.	27, r. 1 . . . . .	5		Rev.		
—	— . . . . .	29 n.	i.	6, r. 1 . . . . .	6	
iii.	9, r. 1 . . . . .	6	—	8, g.e. to r. 5,	18	
—	— . . . . .	29	—	— r. 6,	18	
	I. Pet.		—	17, g.e. to r. 6,	17	
i.	3, r. 1 . . . . .	29 n.	ii.	8, ———,	18	
ii.	17 . . . . .	11 n.	viii.	10 to 12 . . . . .	64 n.	
iv.	11, r. 6 . . . . .	15	ix.	1 to 12 . . . . .	62 n.	
v.	4 . . . . .	8 n.	—	2, . . . . .	63 n.	
	II. Pet.		—	2, (2d note)	64	
i.	1, r. 1 . . . . .	20, 52	xvi.	15, r. 1 . . . . .	4	
ii.	20, — . . . . .	4	xx.	2, g.e. to r. 5,	19	
iii.	2, — . . . . .	4	xxii.	13, ———	18	
—	18, — . . . . .	4	—	—, g.e. to r. 6,	19	



---

# I N D E X

## TO THE R E M A R K S.

---

### A.

- ACTS**, xx. 28. A correction from MSS. proposed, p. 28.
- Alexandrian MS. p. 10, 26, 28, 30, 32, 33, 36, 38, 39 n. 40, 41, 42, 43, 45, 46, 47, 48, 50, 54 to 57.
- Ante-Nicene Fathers acknowledged Christ to be the great God, 25.
- Arians, 16, 61, 62 n.

### B.

- Basil MS. 46 n.
- Belief in Christianity, an indispensable requisite in a British member of parliament, 59, 61 n.
- Bengelius, 49 n.
- Beza, 22.
- British Critic, 39 n. 40 n, and 3d Appendix.

### C.

- Christ was truly Jehovah, 18, 19, 66.
- our God and Lord, 34, 38, 41.

Christ our God and Saviour, 50, 52, 53.

— our *great God* and Saviour, 22 to 24, 50, 52.

—, the *great God*, so intitled according to the plain grammatical construction of Tit. ii. 13. 24 n.

—, so acknowledged (as the *gr. God*) by the Ante-Nicene Fathers and all the most antient commentators on the New Testament, 24 n.

Christian Observer, 40 n, and 3d Appendix.

— Guardian, 40 n, and 3d Appendix.

Cruttwell's edition of Wilson's Bible, 53.

#### D.

Divinity of Christ proved

1. From his being an object of supreme worship, 5, n. 11, n. 12, n.

2. From his participation of the same titles with God, the Father, 8, 9, n.

3. From his power of giving eternal life, 9, n.

4. From his being an object of religious fear, 10, 11, n.

5. From the commands of Christ being mentioned by the Apostles jointly with the commands of God, the Father, 11, n.

English

E.

English Law, *see* Law.

G.

Godhead of Christ, many striking proofs of it concealed from the mere English reader by the mis-translations of the common English version, 7.

Godhead, each of the three persons of the Godhead must necessarily be the great God, 66.

Greek language, the idiom of it obliges us, on the authority of the New Testament, to acknowledge Christ to be God, 30.

Grotius, 16.

H.

Hammond, 25, n. 57.

I.

Jehovah, *see* Christ.

Imperial Library, *see* Vienna.

L.

Law, natural and revealed religion the two first foundations of English Law, 59.

M.

Mangey, Rev. Dr, 53.

H 3

Nestorius,

N.

Nestorius, archbishop of Constantinople, the fallen star that opened the bottomless pit, 62, n.

New Testament, a clear and literal translation would cut up the Socinian system by the roots, 51.

O.

Œcumenius, 13 n.

Orthodox Churchman, 40 n, and 3d Appendix.

P.

Parliament, *see* Belief in Christianity.

Persons, *see* Godhead.

Philippians, iii. 3, reading of the Alexandrian MS. preferred, 32 to 34.

Ὁ Πρωτος και ὁ εσχατος, the explanation which Grotius gives of these titles contains the truth, but not the whole truth, 18.

Punctuation of Greek MSS. 35 to 37, 47, 48, 50, 51, 56, 57.

R.

Religion, natural and revealed, the two first foundations of English Law, 59 n.

Reviewers,

Reviewers, (monthly,) *see* British Critic, Christian Observer, Christian Guardian, and Orthodox Churchman.

S.

Slave-holding and slave-dealing compared to the dark exhalations of the bottomless pit, 63, 64, n.

————— Mahometan oppressions, 63, n.

————— carried to a greater excess by the English than even by the Mahometans themselves, 64, n.

Socinians, 49, 51, 53, 59, 63, n.

————— would not have so much urged the necessity of a new translation of the New Testament, if they had seen how opposite to their opinions a close and literal translation would be, 51.

Socinian impiety, a noble testimony of both ancient and modern times against it, 21, 22, 53.

Swedenborgians, 58, 59.

T.

Tests, the necessity of them as restraints on Papists, Sectaries, and Unbelievers, 59, 60.

Theophylact,

Theophylact, 24, n.

Translation, new, of the New Testament, *see*  
New Testament *and* Socinians.

Trinity, the three persons of the Godhead  
revealed in the Old Testament under the  
title of Jehovah, 66.

V.

Velthufen's account of the very faint lines  
and marks in very old MSS. 55.

Vienna edit. of Gr. Test. 28, n. 32, n. 43, n.

——MSS. of ditto, 28, n. 32, n. 44, n.  
46, n.

Unbelievers in Christianity unworthy to be  
admitted to an equal participation of civil  
rights in any free Christian state whatever,  
59 n.

W.

Wetstein, 11, n. 34, n. 45, n.

Whitby, 25, n.

Willingness to obey the will of God the  
first step towards the true faith, 68, 69.

Woide, Rev. Dr. 52, 54, 55, 56.

Wordsworth, Rev. Chr. 12, n. 13, n. 17, n.  
40, n.

---

ERRATUM.

P. 25, l. 6, μεγαλου for μεγαλου.



APPENDIX.

---

---

I.

A TABLE OF EVIDENCES

OF

CHRIST'S DIVINITY,

FROM

Dr WHITBY'S

*COMM. on the NEW TESTAMENT.*

---

---

II.

A PLAIN ARGUMENT,

FROM THE

GOSPEL-HISTORY,

FOR THE

DIVINITY of CHRIST,

BY

THE EDITOR OF THE TWO FIRST EDITIONS.

*Extract from Dr Whitby's third Discourse, sub-  
joined to his Last Thoughts.*

---

“ THAT our Lord Jesus Christ is true God, as having  
“ true dominion over all things in heaven and earth  
“ delivered to him from the Father, and as having all  
“ divine excellencies which are necessary to enable him  
“ to exercise dominion while this world lasts, and at the  
“ close of the world to make manifest the secrets of all  
“ hearts, and to render to every man according as his  
“ works shall be, has been fully proved in my Last  
“ Thoughts, Sect. 4 and 5.”

*Discourse III. p. 143, subjoined to his Last Thoughts.*

---

A TABLE  
OF  
EVIDENCES  
OF  
CHRIST'S DIVINITY.\*

---

THE divine nature of Christ may be proved,  
 I. From John, i. 1, 2, 3. v. 21, 22, 23.  
 viii. 58. x. 30. xii. 41. xvi. 14, 15.  
 xviii. 5. xx. 28. Luke, i. 43.

- |                               |   |  |
|-------------------------------|---|--|
| II. From his titles, he being | { | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Jehovah, Rom. x. 13.</li> <li>2. God, Rom. xiv. 12. I. Cor. x. 9. Heb. i. 8. and iii. 4.</li> <li>3. The true God, I. John, v. 20.</li> <li>4. God manifested in the flesh, I. Tim. iii. 16.</li> <li>5. The great God, Tit. ii. 13.</li> <li>6. God over all, blessed for ever, Rom. ix. 5.</li> <li>7. The Lord of all, Rom. x. 12.</li> </ol> |
|-------------------------------|---|--|

The

\* For the details of these evidences see Dr Whitby's Commentary on the several passages here quoted.

The divine nature of Christ may be proved,

III. From the divine worship ascribed to him, he being the object of religious adoration and invocation, Rom. x. 13. Col. iii. 24. II. Theff. iii. 16. Acts, vii. 59. Acts, ix. 14. Compare Matt. iv. 10, with John, v. 23, and Heb. i. 6.

IV. From the divine actions and attributes ascribed to him, he being

1. Omniscient, John, ii. 25, xxi. 17. The searcher of all hearts, I. Cor. iv. 5.
2. Omnipotent, Philip. iii. 21.
3. The raiser of all men from the dead, Col. i. 19.
4. Who raised himself from the dead, John, ii. 19. x. 18.
5. The Creator of all things, John, i. 3. Col. i. 16. Heb. i. 2, 10,
6. The upholder of all things, Col. i. 17. Heb. i. 3.
7. Who was in the form of God, and was God before he was made man, Philip. ii. 6. John, i. 1.
8. In whom dwelt all the fulness of the Godhead bodily, Col. i. 19. ii. 9.

---

A PLAIN ARGUMENT,\*  
FROM THE  
GOSPEL-HISTORY,  
FOR THE  
DIVINITY of CHRIST.

---

QUESTION.

*FOR* what END did Christ COME INTO THE WORLD?

*A.* "Christ came into the world to save  
"sinners." (I. Tim. i. 15.)

*Q.* How do you mean "to save sinners?"

*A.* To save them from the power of sin  
here, and the everlasting punishment of it  
hereafter.

*Q.* How must we be saved from the everlast-  
ing punishment of sin?

*A.* By Christ's DEATH. He was "mani-  
"fested in the flesh," that is, was made man,  
I to

\* Reprinted from the second Edition of a *Christmas Gift*.

to DIE, and to be "THE PROPITIATION, for  
"the sins of the whole world." "By his own  
"blood Christ obtained eternal redemption for  
"us." (I. Cor. xv. 3. I. John, ii. 2. Heb.  
ix. 12.)

*Q. How must we be delivered from the power of sin here?*

*A.* By "the spirit of Christ." (Rom. viii. 9.) "For he came to destroy the works  
"of the devil, to redeem us from all iniquity,  
"and to purify unto himself a peculiar people  
"zealous of good works." (I. John, iii. 8.  
Tit. ii. 14.)

*Q. Must we not also use our own most earnest endeavours?*

*A.* Yes. We must "watch and pray" against all temptation to sin; (Matt. xxvi. 41. Mark, xiii. 13;) and study God's word that we may be sanctified by it. (John, xvii. 17.)

*Q. Could no one save sinners but Christ?*

*A.* No. "There is none other name under heaven given among men, whereby we  
"must be saved." (Acts, iv. 12.)

*Q. Could not Christ save sinners without dying for their sins?*

*A.*

A. No.

Q. *Why could not man's redemption be accomplished without the death of Christ?*

A. Because it was the will of God, and fore-ordained by God, that Christ should die for the sins of the world.

Q. *How do you know that Christ's death was fore-ordained by God?*

A. Because it was fore-told by the prophets.

Q. *Have you any other reason for believing that Christ's death was necessary for our salvation?*

A. I believe that without Christ's death there could have been no salvation, because we are assured, by the holy spirit, in the words of St Paul, that "without shedding of blood there is no remission" of sins. (Heb. ix. 22.)

Q. *Have you any other reason?*

A. Yes. The INCARNATION of Christ, that is, Christ's *being made man*, and *being born into the world*, seems also to be a proof that his death was necessary for our salvation. For he who "in the beginning was

“with God, and was God,” was “made flesh,” and “took upon him the form,” that is, the nature “and likeness, of man,” on purpose, as it seems, that he might “*become* obedient unto death,” (and thus might *be capable of dying,*) “even the death of the cross.” (John, i. 1. Philipp. ii. 6, 7, 8.)

## §. 2.

*Q. Where was Christ before he came into this world, and was manifested in the flesh?*

*A.* He was in Heaven. “He came down from Heaven. He was with God, his Father, before the world was, before the foundation of the world: he was in the bosom of his Father, and in his Father’s glory.” — (John, iii. 13. — vi. 33, 62. — i. 1. — xvii. 5, 24. — i. 18. — xvii. 5.)

## §. 3.

*Q. How was Christ’s manifestation in the flesh made known to the world?*

*A.* By the message of an angel, who declared to Mary, his mother, and to Joseph, what manner of child it should be that should



should be born of her, and at his birth proclaimed him to certain shepherds.

*Q. Where was Christ born?*

*A.* In Bethlehem of Judea. (Matt. ii. 1, 5, 6.)

*Q. Under what name was he made known?*

*A.* He was called JESUS, a Saviour, the Son of God, the Son of the Highest.

*Q. Who was the mother of Jesus?*

*A.* The Virgin Mary.

*Q. Was any prophecy fulfilled by the birth of Jesus Christ?*

*A.* Yes. "All this was done that it might be fulfilled, which was spoken of the Lord by the prophet, saying, behold a virgin shall be with child, and shall bring forth a son, and they shall call his name EMMANUEL, which, being interpreted, is GOD WITH US." (Matt. i. 22, 23. Isaiah, vii. 14.)

§. 4.

*Q. What was Christ put to death for?*

*A.* For blasphemy, as the Jews thought it, in calling himself the Son of God.

*Q. In what did the Jews say the blasphemy consisted?*

*A.* In this, that he, being, as they supposed, a mere man, called God his own Father, thereby declaring himself to be equal with God, and to be very God. (John, v. 18. x. 33.)

§. 5.

*Q. What did Christ ever say of himself, which implied that he was God?*

*A.* He said that he was one with God, and partook of the glory of God, before the world was, that is, from all eternity.

*Catechist.* Repeat the passage in which he said that he partook of the glory of God before the world was.

*A.* "And now, O Father, glorify thou me with thine ownself, with the glory which I had with thee before the world was." (John xvii. 5.)

*Q. What did Christ ever say of himself, which implied that he was equal with God?*

*A.* He said that "he and his Father are one:" that "the Father had given all things  
" into

“ into his hand:” that “ what things soever  
 “ the Father doeth, these also doeth the Son  
 “ likewise:” that “ the Father hath com-  
 “ mitted all judgement to the Son, that all  
 “ men should honour the Son, even as they  
 “ honour the Father:” (John x. 30.—iii. 35.  
 —v. 19.—v. 22.)

## § 6.

*Q. Where do we find the first evidences of  
 Christ's Divinity?*

*A.* In the antient prophets, *Isaiah*, (vii. 14.) *Jeremiah*, (xxiii. 6.) and *Daniel*, (vii. 14.) where he is called “ *Immanuel*,” that is, *GOD* with us: “ *The Lord*,” that is, “ *JEHOVAH*,” “ *our righteousness*:” and his “ *dominion*” is declared to be an “ *EVER-  
 LASTING dominion*.”

*Q. Who, in Christ's time, first bore testimony  
 to his divinity?*

*A.* The angel, who at his birth proclaimed him to the shepherds, as “ *Christ*,” *THE LORD*:” The shepherds who made known this saying that was told them: And the  
 Demoniacs,

Demoniacks, who acknowledged him to be  
THE SON OF GOD. (Mark, iii. 11.)

*Q. Who were the first witnesses to Christ's own testimony of his divinity?*

*A.* His enemies, the unbelieving Jews, both the people, and their rulers.

*Q. How were the unbelieving Jews witnesses to Christ's testimony of himself?*

*A.* By reporting and interpreting his words.

*Q. Do you call the unbelieving Jews earlier witnesses than the Apostles?*

*A.* Yes: because the apostles appear not to have known that Christ was God, till after his Resurrection and Ascension into heaven.

*Q. In what manner was the Divinity of Christ unfolded to the world in Christ's time?*

*A.* An angel proclaimed it at his birth; the shepherds reported it; the Demoniacs confessed it. Christ afterwards asserted himself to be God, by calling God his own Father, and himself the Son of God, in a sense, which implied, that he was equal with God, and was God;—so even his unbelieving hearers understood him:—the Jews  
condemned

condemned him to death for it : — the Apostles, after his Resurrection and Ascension, preached it to the world.

§ 7.

*Q. As Christ knew that this was the sense in which the Jews understood his testimony of himself, when they first charged him with blasphemy for it, — did he, at his trial, attempt to deny the charge?*

*A.* No: he admitted the charge, and confirmed it, and died for it; and appealed to the day of judgement as their future proof of it.

*Q. What are Christ's words?*

*A.* When “ the high Priest asked him, “ and said unto him, art thou the Son of the “ Blessed? Jesus said, I am; and (*as a proof “ that I am*) ye shall (*at the day of judgement*) “ see (*me*) the Son of Man, sitting at the “ right hand of power, (*that is, at the right “ hand of God.*) and coming in the clouds of “ heaven.” (Mark xiv. 61, 62.)

*Q. If Christ had not been the Messiah, the Son of God, in the sense in which they understood*

*derstood him, would he not have undeceived them?*

*A.* If Christ had not been the Messiah, the Son of God, in the sense in which the Jews understood him, he would have undeceived them, to save his own life, and to free them from a very great delusion.

*Q.* *But Christ was put to Death for calling himself the Son of God; what then do you conclude?*

*A.* I conclude that Jesus Christ really was what they charged him with calling himself, **THE SON OF GOD**; and in the sense in which they understood him; that is, that he was **EQUAL WITH GOD**, and therefore was **VERY GOD**.

§. 8.

*Q.* *You say that in the lifetime of Christ the Apostles appeared not to know that Christ was God: where do you find this?*

*A.* It appears from their expecting a temporal deliverer instead of a spiritual one; and from their not knowing, till after the Resurrection

rection and ascension of Christ, the end of his coming into the world.

*Q. Where do you learn that, before the resurrection and ascension of Christ, his disciples did not know the end of his coming into the world?*

*A. I learn it from Christ's rebuke of St Peter. (Matt. xvi. 23.)*

*Q. Where do you learn that they expected a temporal deliverer?*

*A. I learn it from the acknowledgement of the two disciples, (who were going to Emmaus,) that their hopes of his being their deliverer were disappointed by his death; (Luke xxiv. 21.) and from their inquiring of Christ, soon after his resurrection, if he would, at that time, restore the kingdom to Israel. (Acts i. 6.)*

*Q. What was their opinion of Christ after his resurrection and ascension into heaven?*

*A. Convinced partly by his resurrection from the dead, according to his promise that he would raise himself from the dead, and, fully instructed by the Holy Spirit after his ascension, they believed him to be "their  
" Lord*

“ Lord and their God,” — “ the Word made  
 “ flesh;” “ God manifest in the flesh;” in  
 whom “ dwelt ALL the fulness of the God-  
 “ head bodily;” “ Emmanuel,” or, “ God  
 “ with us,” — “ the creator and upholder of  
 “ all things,” who “ in the beginning” of all  
 things, “ was with God, and was God;” —  
 “ the true God and eternal life;” and “ over  
 “ all God blessed for ever.” (John xx. 28.  
 i. 14. 1 Tim. iii. 16. Col. ii. 9. Matt.  
 i. 23. John i. 3. Col. i. 17. Heb. i. 3.  
 John i. 1. — 1. John v. 20. Rom. ix. 5.\*)

§. 9.

*Q. Now, tell me, in few words, what you  
 conclude from Christ's testimony of himself, as  
 attested by the Jews of his own time, condemned  
 by their rulers, but universally declared by the  
 apostles.*

*A.*

\* Whatever difficulty may be found in the various readings of any of these passages, it must vanish in the full light of their united evidence. To them we may confidently add the very important testimonies, which, in the preceding remarks and examples, Mr Sharp has most happily recovered from the erroneous constructions of the common English version.



*A.* I conclude that Christ, the Son of God, is one with God, and equal with God, both in nature, and power, and in glory, and therefore is very God. Christ asserted it; the Jews condemned him to die for it; he sealed his testimony with his blood. The apostles, partly convinced by his resurrection from the dead, and fully instructed by the Holy Spirit after his ascension into heaven, believed it, and preached it, and died for it.

§. 10.

*Catechist.* *The Jews, then, put Christ to death as an impostor and blasphemer; and yet Christians have believed in him, and worshipped him, as the Son of God, for almost eighteen hundred years. How do you account for this?*

*A.* It was the will of God that Christ should die for the sins of mankind. If the Jews had believed him to be the Son of God they would not have put him to death; — if he had not been put to death as he was he would not have “ borne our sins

“ in his own body on the cross;” that is, he would not have died for our sins, **THE END FOR WHICH HE CAME INTO THE WORLD:**—he would not have given that great and inestimable proof of the truth of Scripture, and of his own promises, which **HE** did, by rising from the dead:—and the Apostles would not have given that sure evidence of their own belief in Christ, (the ground and confirmation of **OURS**,) which **THEY** did, by dying for their crucified Lord and Master.



APPENDIX THE THIRD.

---

---

CONTAINING

EXTRACTS

FROM

THE UNDERMENTIONED REVIEWS.

---

The BRITISH CRITIC for January, 1800.

————— for July, 1802.

The CHRISTIAN OBSERVER for July, 1802.

The CHRISTIAN GUARDIAN for December, 1802.

The ORTHODOX CHURCHMAN for February, 1803.

---

---

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO  
LIBRARY

1950

1950

1950

1950

1950

1950

1950

---

## EXTRACTS, &c.

---

EXTRACT from the BRITISH CRITIC for January, 1800. No. I. of vol. xv p. 70, art. xii.

“ The design of the ——— author, Mr G. Sharp, is to demonstrate the divinity of our Saviour by showing, that, in several passages of the New Testament, translated as they ought to be, according to strict grammatical analogy, that article of our faith is expressly and positively asserted; though that assertion has, in our common version, disappeared for want of a correct rendering of the original. The six rules laid down for this purpose, the accuracy of which is proved in various ways, and particularly by the conduct of our translators on other occasions, we extracted at large in our notice of the Museum Oxoniense; but we shall now recur to them, because, in the table of contents here prefixed, we observe such an abstract of them, and of the examples, as to a scholar almost sufficiently explains the whole argument, its force, and application. The first rule is most important, being more extensive in its application than the rest; to this, therefore, we particularly call the reader's attention. It is thus stated in the table of contents, more briefly, but perhaps more clearly, than in the body of the work,” &c.

After citing several examples of the first rule, the British Critic adds as follows, in p. 72. — “ The examples here cited are by no means all that have the same tendency, but they are the most remarkable; and the remaining rules appear no less solid than the first. It should be observed, also, that, in several instances more than we have mentioned, the version recommended by Mr G. S. has the sanction of several early translators and commentators.

And he concludes, in p. 73, with the following observations on the appendix, viz. "The part subjoined to Mr G. Sharp's remarks by the learned Editor, entitled 'a plain matter-of-fact argument,' &c. turns on this circumstance, that our Saviour was actually condemned to death by the Jews for blasphemy, in asserting his own Godhead; and that, instead of denying the circumstance, he confirmed it, and sealed his testimony with his blood. It is thrown into the form of question and answer, in order to be used in catechetical instruction, and is drawn up with great precision, clearness, and cogency of reason."

Remarks of the BRITISH CRITIC for July, 1802, No. I. of vol. xx. p. 15, art. iv.

*Six Letters to Granville Sharp, Esq. respecting his Remarks on the uses of the Definite Article in the Greek Text of the New Testament.*

"A great accession of authority, and, we trust, a proportionable increase of celebrity, will be given, by these acute and learned letters, to the Remarks of Mr Granville Sharp on the Greek article, which, in our 15th vol. (p. 70,) we introduced to public notice, as of the highest utility and importance.\* Those remarks, it must be recollected, are not merely of a philological nature, as the title might seem to imply; but, by means of a clear idiom and analogy of the Greek language, establish certain texts of the New Testament, as invincible barriers against the doctrines, and subterfuges of Socinian teachers.

"This account applies principally to the first rule laid down in the Remarks, to which also the letters now announced refer; and we must remind or inform our readers, that

---

\* "A second edition of Mr Granville Sharp's Remarks has very recently been published by the original editor, Mr Burgess, Prebendary of Durham, and is sold by Vernor and Hood, Rivingtons, and Hatchard. As, accidentally, we have not the former edition at hand, to make an accurate comparison between them, we shall not at present give a separate article on the new edition, nor at all, unless we find the alterations important."

that by the natural and necessary operation of this rule are produced these texts: 'according to the grace of Jesus Christ, *our God* and Lord;' (2 Theff. i. 12;) 'waiting for the glorious appearance of *our great God and Saviour*, Jesus Christ;' (Titus, ii. 13;) and some others of similar force; in which passages, by the vicious neglect of the rule, God and Christ have been separated into two persons, in our public version, contrary to the intention of the original writer, and the undoubted idiom of the language in which he wrote.\*

"According to our own opinion, formed with the strictest attention to the evidence produced, this rule, as stated by Mr Sharp, appeared perfectly clear, and the deductions from it no less than inevitable. We considered it as founded in truth and demonstrated with ability. But we see, with much additional satisfaction, the explicit testimony of so great a master of Greek literature as Mr Burgess, stated in the second edition of the Remarks. His opinion was before implied in the act of publishing the Remarks, and was otherwise intimated in the first edition; but it is now, in an introductory letter to Mr Sharp, expressed in the strongest terms.

'That you have happily and decisively applied your rule of construction to the correction of the common English version of the New Testament, and to the *perfect establishment* of the great doctrine in question, the DIVINITY of CHRIST, no impartial reader, I think, can doubt, *who is at all acquainted with the original language of the New Testament.*'

"When it is considered that the writer who gives this testimony is Mr Burgess, whose knowledge of the Greek language qualified him, very early in life, to produce a  
much

---

\* "The rule may be thus briefly and closely expressed, though to be strictly accurate it will require, as Mr Sharp has given it, more limitations. "When two nouns descriptive of a person, and united by a conjunction, have only one article prefixed to both, they are both intended to describe the same person." This rule is uniformly followed by all Greek writers."

much improved edition of one of the acutest books we have on Greek literature, *Dawes's Miscellanea Critica*; and who, from that time to this, has distinguished himself by various works illustrative of the Greek language and the authors who have used it, the force and value of the decision may be duly estimated. Speaking farther of the rule in question, the same learned editor says to Mr Sharp, 'I call the rule *yours*; for, though it was acknowledged and applied by Beza and others \* to some of the texts alleged by you, yet never was it so prominently, because singly, or so effectually, as in your Remarks.' This testimony of Theodore Beza, an acknowledged scholar, and a translator of the whole New Testament, is particularly valuable; and, as it has not been given at length, in what has hitherto been published, we shall here insert it. In commenting on the text, Tit. ii. 13, *επιφανειαν της δοξης του μεγαλου Θεου και Σωτηρος ημων Ιησου*

---

\* " Beza is not the only one among the biblical critics who has noticed this idiom; it has occasionally been urged by various writers. Abundant praise is due to Mr Granville Sharp for bringing it forward in the distinct manner he has, and for illustrating it by so great a variety of apposite examples; but we must not, if we would be correct, consider it as his discovery even among the moderns. Wolfius says, 'Articulus *του* præmittendus fuisset voci Σωτηρος (in Tit. ii. 13) siquidem hic a *μεγαλω Θεω* distinguï debuisset.' *In loco*. Drusus, on the same text, says, "Non solum Deus, sed etiam *Deus Magnus*, vocatur hic Christus' (in Crit. Sacro); where, though the rule is not mentioned, it is taken for granted as undeniable. Bishop Bull, Calovius, Vitringa, and Dr Twells, are all referred to by Wolfius, as supporting this sense, on the verse of Titus above-mentioned: and Erasmus, who speaks of that passage as ambiguous, had too much knowledge of Greek not to own, that the omission of the article had some force against that opinion. 'Quamquam *omissus articulus*, in libris Græcis, facit *nonnihil* pro diversa sententiâ. *Μεγαλω Θεω και Σωτηρος*, evidentius distinxisset personas si dixisset, *και του Σωτηρος*.' *Rev.*"



Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, after speaking of the ἐπιφάνεια, which he rightly infers must belong to Christ, and which he translates *adventus*, he thus proceeds: ‘Quod autem ad alterum attinet quum scriptum sit, ε. τὸ μεγαλὸν Θεὸν καὶ Σωτῆρος ἡμῶν I. X. non autem τὸ μεγαλὸν Θεὸν καὶ τὸ Σωτῆρος, dico non magis probabiliter ista posse ad duas distinctas personas referri, quam illam locutionem ὁ Θεὸς καὶ Πάτερ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ. Nam id certe postulat Græci sermonis usus, quum unus tantum sit articulus, duobus istis, nempe Θεὸν καὶ Σωτῆρος, Θεὸς καὶ Πάτερ, communis: quum præsertim, ut antè dixi, nunquam ἐπιφάνεια aut παρουσία nisi uni Filio tribuatur. Itaque sic concludo, Christum Jesum hic apertè Magnum Deum dici, qui et beata illa spes nostra metonymicè vocatur. Illi igitur ut verè magno et æterno Deo, sit gloria et laus omnis, in sæcula sæculorum.’ Here the rule, respecting the article, is distinctly laid down, as by Mr Sharp, and the same conclusion, with equal distinctness, drawn.

“ But the authority of Beza, or of any modern, was not sufficient for the ingenious writer of these Six Letters.\* He thought of a higher appeal, to the Greek Fathers; as men who could not but be competent judges of their native language. ‘If Mr Sharp’s rule be true,’ said he, ‘then will *their* interpretation of those texts be invariably in the same sense in which he understands them,’ p. 3. To these judges, then, he appealed; and, by a most laborious examination of their works, has produced such an additional testimony, in behalf of the rule, as cannot fail to astonish those who are most unwilling to be convinced. When we think of examining, for a few texts, the voluminous works of seventy Greek and near sixty Latin Fathers and other divines, besides theological collections of great magnitude, we think of a labour which resembles rather the indefatigable diligence of former times than the supineness of modern research. Yet such was the origin

---

\* “ This writer we learn, on inquiry, to be Mr C. Wordsworth, of Trinity-college, Cambridge; who, though he modestly withheld his name at first, is not, we understand, anxious to be concealed.”

origin of the present volume," (the 6 letters,) "and such the industry and acuteness employed to furnish the materials.

"In the sequel to Mr Sharp's remarks are nine examples of his first rule, eight of which are such as must, by their genuine application, introduce important alterations in the version, and become, only by being rightly translated, direct assertions of the Divinity of Christ.\* These eight examples, therefore, are made the subject of the present letters, in which they are regularly discussed in order, as to the manner in which they were read and understood by the antient Fathers.† In making this examination, to the extent which we have already mentioned, the most important results were found, as might be expected, in the writings of the Greek Fathers: and, as we have stated the appeal to their accurate knowledge of their own language as the chief object of these letters, we shall, in our report upon them, pay little attention to any other authorities.

"1. The first of these eight examples adduced by Mr Sharp‡ is Acts, xx. 28; but, as this is not applicable unless *τῷ Κυρίῳ καὶ Θεῷ* can be proved to be the genuine reading, which is very doubtful,§ it is passed over in these letters.|| But the question concerning the right reading still remains open.

2. "The second example is Ephes. v. 5, *οὐκ ἔχει κληρονομίαν ἐν τῇ βασιλείᾳ τοῦ Χριστοῦ καὶ Θεοῦ,*¶ rendered, in our common

\* "The remaining example, which is the third in order, has no operation of that kind, and seems to be introduced chiefly for the sake of establishing the reading *πνευμαλὶ Θεῷ*, from the Alexandrian and other MSS. in Philip. iii. 3. See p. 31, 2d edit."

† "They are set down together at p. vi."

‡ "P. 27, second edit."

§ "Bengelius notices this reading, but marks it with ε, one of his signs of disapprobation."

|| "See Letter II. p. 12."

¶ "Sharp, p. 30."

common translation, 'hath any inheritance in the kingdom of Christ and of God;' but, according to the rule of construction laid down by Mr Sharp, 'in the kingdom of the Christ and God;' or, according to an explanatory substitution, usual with our translators in other cases, 'of Christ, *even* of God;' meaning that it is one and the same person who is here called both Christ and God. The examination here taken up \* is, whether this text was so understood by the Greek Fathers, or in any other way. The conclusion is, as this author tells his correspondent, 'that no other interpretation than *yours*, (Mr Sharp's) was ever heard in all the Greek churches.' The passages that most remarkably prove this (for we cannot be expected to cite them all, or to notice the incidental discussions†) are the following: 1. A passage in the fifth Homily of St Chrysostom, on the incomprehensible nature of God, where this text is cited, with three other of the strongest scriptural declarations, to show that Christ is God. 2. A passage from Cyrill of Alexandria, who, after quoting this verse from the Ephesians, says, *Ἴδε παλιν Χριστον ονομασας εϋθως αυτον ειςφερει και Θεον.* 'Observe, again, that, having named Christ, he immediately adds, *that he is also God.*' In other parts of his works, the same Father cites this verse, as denominating our Saviour both Christ and God, *Χριστον αυτον ονομαζε και Θεον Ἐγω λεγων.* 'He calls Christ himself God also, when he thus speaks,' namely, when he writes this verse. 3. The testimony of Theodoret is no less explicit, for he cites this verse, with that to Titus, (ii. 13,) and others, expressly for the sake of proving that Christ is God; and in one of the passages inadvertently substitutes *Χριστη τῷ Θεῳ* as perfectly equivalent to *τῷ Χριστῷ και Θεῳ*. Having given these leading specimens, let us sum up the whole of what is done, respecting this verse, in the words of the letter-writer himself.

'We have referred to twenty-one Greek passages in which the words *εν τη βασιλειᾳ τῷ Χριστῷ και Θεῳ* are quoted. Of

---

\* " Letter II. p. 12."

† " These are numerous, and the extreme candour and caution of the author appear in every instance."

Of these we consider twelve as determining nothing either way with respect to the meaning of those particular words; but then we observe, that it is not for the sake of those words their quotations are made. The remaining nine are, with one voice, clear testimonies for your (Mr Sharp's) interpretation. That is, in fact, all the Greek authorities that do speak at all are on your side.' P. 36.

"Much discussion is also taken up in this letter concerning the comparative value of the Latin writers, and the weight of their testimony when they are contrary to the Greek: but this, which is managed with great judgement, we cannot repeat.

"3. On the next example,\* (2 Theff. ii. 12,) which is the subject of the third letter, it so happens that there are no decisive authorities. The verse appears not in the polemical writings of the Fathers, because it contains nothing decisive against the Arians,† with whom their chief controversies were carried on: and they who wrote continued commentaries saw no occasion to expatiate upon words which to them appeared perfectly clear. This example, therefore, does not long detain the writer of the letters, who is careful, however, to remark, that nothing appears against the proposed interpretation, and that several presumptions strongly favour it.

4. "In the fourth example,‡ (1 Tim. v. 21,) we are again in part deserted by the reading of the text, the citations of the Fathers being made in general without the

\* "The third here, the fourth in Sharp, (p. 34,) translated by him, 'according to the grace of Jesus Christ, our God and Lord.'"

† "Who allowed the Divinity of Christ, which this verse asserts, but conceived his Godhead to be of a secondary kind, against which it says nothing. Had it placed Christ before the Father it would have been often cited."

‡ "The fifth in Sharp, p. 38."

the important word *κυριε*,\* thus removing it from any application of the rule. It still, however, remains to be inquired which is the proper reading of the verse, by means of MSS. and versions; a search which the present author does not fully undertake, (as being foreign to his immediate object,) but touches with great judgement. Mr Sharp says that the word *Χριστε* is omitted in the Alexandrian MS. contrary to the authority of Wettstein and Griesbach, who assert it of *κυριε*. We have examined the MS. itself, and find that Mr S. is in this instance mistaken, and that *κυριε* is the word omitted, the text

being *ενοπιον του ΘΥ και ΧΥ ΙΥ*, which are the undoubted abbreviations of *Θεε και Χριστε Ιηου*." [This error is corrected in the present edition, see note, p. 38 to 40.]

"On this passage also occurs the only apparent contradiction of Mr Sharp's rule which the whole research has produced, in three citations, namely, from Chrysostom, Ecumenius, and Theophylact, in which *τε Θεε και κυριε* is retained, and yet the words are interpreted of two persons. As the only solution of this difficulty, Mr Wordsworth suggests that the MSS. of these writers had not *κυριε*, which, with respect to the two latter, appears probable. But here he does not quite retain his usual acuteness; for, Chrysostom (unless it be an error of the press in this book) must have had *κυριε*, as he has, peculiarly to himself, the additional word *ημων* subjoined. But it may fairly be conjectured that he read it *και του κυριε ημων*, which, by inserting the article again, equally removes it from the influence of our rule. As a collateral proof (and a very strong one it is) that the

L

inconsistency

---

\* "Thus: *ενοπιον τε Θεε και Ιηου Χριστε*, which makes it no longer an example of Mr Sharp's rule. The common reading is *τε Θεε και κυριε* I. X. On looking back to our article on Mr Sharp's book; (vol. xv. p. 71,) we perceive, that, in the hurry of a periodical press, we ourselves have omitted *κυριε*: a most material error. Also *την* before *Χαριν*, in the preceding text.

inconsistency of construction, apparently found in these three passages, could not really belong to them, this author observes that similar phrases in the same three Greek Fathers,\* and the very words ὁ Θεὸς καὶ κύριος, in twenty-six citations from others, are uniformly referred to one person.

“ 5. The fifth example, † (2 Tim. iv. 1,) which is nearly in the same words as the preceding, shares a very similar fate, being removed from the influence of the rule by the repetition of the article τὸ Θεὸν καὶ τὸ κύριον. Mr Sharp, however, alleges that τὸ Θεὸν καὶ κύριον is the reading of the Alexandrian MS. But the text of that

MS. gives, as in the former passage, ΤΟΥ ΘΥ ΚΑΙ ΧΥ ΙΥ, τὸ Θεὸν καὶ Χριστὸν Ἰησοῦν.” [This error is also corrected in the present edition, see note, p. 38 to 40.] “ It remains, therefore, to confirm the reading he supports by other authorities.” [For which see note in 3d edit. p. 42—47.]

“ 6. If we have had difficulties respecting the readings of some of these examples, we shall have none in that to which we are now arrived. ‡ It is that in the Epistle of St Paul to Titus, (ii. 13,) ἐπιφανεῖαν τῆς δόξης τοῦ μεγάλου Θεοῦ καὶ σωτῆρος ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ: a text of which the reading is uniform, and the interpretation of the Fathers exactly consistent with that at present under consideration. The text was urged by them, in general, against the Arians; not to prove that Christ is God, for that was granted by both parties, but to prove that his Godhead is not

---

\* “ It is a very singular and curious proof of diligence that the author of these letters should be able to say (even with the modesty he observes in it) of four small words, ὁ Θεὸς καὶ κύριος, that they occur together but once in the twelve huge folios of Chrysostom. The one passage in that writer is τὸν κοινὸν ἡμῶν Θεὸν καὶ κύριον τὸν Χριστόν. A very strong one in all respects. See p. 56.”

† “ Sharp’s 6th, p. 39.”

‡ “ Mr Sharp’s 7th Ex. p. 42. Of these letters the 5th, p. 65.

not inferior to that of the Father, because the Apostle here calls him the "GREAT GOD." To this argument it was indispensably necessary that the passage should be understood according to Mr Sharp's translation, 'the appearance of the glory of our GREAT GOD and SAVIOUR, JESUS CHRIST;' and not according to our public version, 'the great God, AND our Saviour Jesus Christ.'

"On this text the authorities are so decisive that we shall content ourselves with recounting their numbers instead of estimating their force. The Greek authorities are fifty-four in number, as cited in these Letters,\* and extend from the second century to the twelfth, a period of nearly a thousand years. In this instance, also, the Latin fathers and divines bear the same testimony, with very few and inconsiderable exceptions, and are cited to this effect in about sixty instances. Even the heretics of the Latin church, till very late times, acknowledged the interpretation contended for by Mr Sharp; and that adopted in our public version 'was never once thought of in any part of the Christian world, even when Arianism was triumphant over the Catholic faith. Surely,' adds the author of these Letters, and we heartily add with him, 'this fact might of itself suffice to overturn every notion of an ambiguity in the form of expression.' P. 95. The perfect establishment even of this one text, in the sense here ascribed to it, if that were all that could be done, ought to give the Socinian some apprehension, when he presumes to degrade to the rank of a mere man, him whom the Apostle Paul unequivocally styles 'the GREAT GOD.' We believe, indeed, with the author of the Letters, that even the leaders of the sect have had their secret compunctions on this subject.†

"7. Of the two remaining examples we must expect to find less illustration. The Catholic Epistles were less quoted, and less commented upon, than those of St Paul;

L 2

and

---

\* "And the author shows that he could have increased them."

† "See p. 66."

and even Chrysoſtom, voluminous as he is, deſerts us when we come to the ſecond Epiſtle of St Peter. The ſeventh example\* is taken from that Epiſtle, 2 Pet. i. 1. *Εν δικαιοσυνη τῷ Θεῷ ἡμῶν και Σωτηρος Ἰησοῦ Χριςτου*, that is, in the common verſion, ‘through the righteousneſs of God † and our Saviour Jeſus Chriſt:’ in Mr Sharp’s rendering, ‘through the righteousneſs of *our God and Saviour*, Jeſus Chriſt.’ The authorities of the Fathers, both Greek and Latin, are here neutral; but it is ſomething of importance to our inquiry, (which is noted by Mr Sharp,) that Wickliſſ, Coverdale, Matthews, Cranmer, the Geneva and Rhemiſh Bibles, Doddridge, Scattergood, Weſley, and Purver, all translate the words according to his rule.

“ 8. We come now to the laſt of theſe examples, Jude, ver. 4. *τον μονον δεσποτην, Θεον, και κυριον ἡμων, Ἰησυν Χριςτον, αρνημενοι.* † ‘denying our only Maſter, God, and Lord, Jeſus Chriſt.’ Here is ſome difficulty in the reading, *Θεον* being wanting in many MSS. The chief teſtimony adduced is from ſome ſcholia of the 11th century, published by Profeſſor Matthæi, which conclude *ὅτι εἰς εστιν ὁ παλαιας και νεας διαθηκης Θεος και κυριος, Ἰησους Χριςτος.* ‘That there is one Jeſus Chriſt, the God and Lord of the Old and New Teſtaments.’

We ſhould here finiſh, but that the author of theſe Letters has ſuggeſted a new paſſage as belonging to the ſame interpretation, though not to the ſame rule. § This is James, i. 1, *Ἰακωβος Θεῷ και κυριῷ Ἰησοῦ Χριςτῷ δουλός*, where, though the article is not prefixed to *Θεῷ*, it is thought probable, and by ſome proofs much confirmed, that the Apoſtle meant to ſtyle himſelf, ‘a ſervant of our God and Lord, Jeſus Chriſt.’ The author concludes his collection by

\* “ Sharp 8th, p. 44. Letter VI. p. 103.”

† “ Erroneouſly printed, in Mr Sharp’s remarks, ‘of our God.’ P. 45, 2d edit.” (Corrected 3d edit. p. 51.)

‡ “ Sharp’s Ex. 9, p. 46. Letters, p. 108.”

§ “ See alſo Rev. xix. 17, if the true reading there ſhould turn out to be *δειπνον τῷ μεγαλῷ Θεῷ*, inſtead of *δ. το μεγα τῷ Θ.* See p. 66.”



by various passages, from twenty different Greek writers, exemplifying the alleged use of the article, and many of them strongly declaring the Godhead of Christ.

“ Thus have we completely shown the substance of the information contained in these Letters. It is extremely important; and, though the candour of the letter-writer prevents him from attempting to take advantage of any dubious text or readings, the whole mass of evidence which he has collected is abundantly strong and valuable. The work is rendered of additional value by supplemental tables of the Greek and Latin Fathers, placed in chronological order, with some account of their extent and of the editions used by the author. We cannot conclude without recommending to every diligent student in divinity to read both this book and that of Mr Sharp, to confirm themselves in that doctrine of which the primitive church never entertained a doubt,\* the ‘ DIVINITY of our BLESSED SAVIOUR.’ Nor shall we attempt to conceal, that we view with great pleasure these rational endeavours to support a doctrine so fundamental to our religion.”



Review of G. Sharp's Remarks on the uses of the Definite Article, and on the Six Letters to G. Sharp, in the CHRISTIAN OBSERVER for July, 1802. No. VII. vol. i. p. 438, art. xxvii.

After reciting the first rule proposed by G. Sharp, the learned reviewer remarks,

“ This rule is valuable, not merely in a philological view, but because it enables us to correct the translation of several passages in the New Testament, which, properly understood, afford “ many striking proofs concerning the godhead of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ.” Under this idea we are referred to the following passages. Acts, xx. 28. Eph. v. 5. 2 Theff. i. 12. 1 Tim. v. 21. 2 Tim. iv. i. Titus, ii. 13. 2 Pet. i. 1. Jude, 4.

---

\* “ Notwithstanding the daring assertions that have, in modern times, been made to the contrary.”

“ The Six Letters addressed to G. Sharp, Esq. (which we have heard attributed to the Rev. C. Wordsworth, M. A. and Fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge) may be considered as an important supplement to his work. It seems reasonable to suppose, that, if Mr Sharp’s rule be true, the ancient interpretations of any particular example by the Greek fathers must tend to confirm it. The object of this work, therefore, is to examine, by actual reference, what were the opinions of the early Greek writers upon those eight texts which are mentioned above. In the course of this learned and most laborious investigation, the author not only proves, by a great variety of quotations, in what sense the fathers understood these passages, but shews, farther, at what time and amongst what writers the interpretation began to be ambiguous. To any one at all conversant with the Latin and Greek languages it cannot be a matter of astonishment, if, for want of the definite article, an ambiguity frequently occurs in the Latin translation of a Greek sentence, where there is no difficulty whatever in the original. And to this source the author traces the uncertainty which has so long existed with respect to the true meaning of the texts cited by Mr Sharp. Few of the Latin fathers were conversant with Greek; they quoted in general from their own translations, and therefore generally adopted that sense which, to a mere Latin reader, would appear the most obvious. If, then, the Greek and Latin writers seem to differ with respect to the meaning of a Greek passage, the question to us becomes this: “ Shall we take the explanation of a Greek passage from Greeks or prefer from Latin writers, not the explanation of the Greek, but of a *translation* of it into their language; which translation, though capable of *both* meanings, and so originally not a false translation, would much more naturally lead men to that sense which is contradictory to the common Grecian idiom and the uniform voice of Grecian interpreters?” p. 38. As our limits will not allow us to follow this author through his numerous and truly valuable quotations, let it suffice to state the general result. It appears, then, that where there is no reason to suppose a different reading obtained from that adopted by Mr Sharp, the Greek writers are decisive in support of his

his interpretation; the contradictions and ambiguities rest with the Latin writers. In the second, sixth, and sixth, Letters, the quotations are numerous and highly satisfactory: they prove, incontestably, that words arranged according to the rule never did, from the times of the Apostles, bear any other sense than that assigned by Mr Sharp during the period while the Greek was a native language. This remark is not to be understood as applicable merely to the verses in question, but as extending to this mode of expression wherever it is used. In proof of this assertion, a considerable number of passages is here produced from the earliest fathers down to the thirteenth century: and the author adds, "I have observed more (I am persuaded) than a thousand instances of the form "Ο Χριστος και Θεος," (Ephes. v. 5.); some hundreds of instances of the "Ο μεγας Θεος και Σωτηρ," (Tit. ii. 13.); and not fewer than several thousands of the form "Ο Θεος και Σωτηρ," (2 Pet. i. 1.); while in no single case have I seen (where the sense could be determined) any one of them used, but only of *one* person." p. 132. Nay, the Arians themselves, it should seem, even at a time when their heresy was triumphant, acknowledged this construction, in admitting that Christ is styled, by St Paul, the great God. The words of Maximin, the Arian Bishop, as cited in this work, (p. 95,) are very remarkable: "*A nobis unus colitur Deus, innatus, infectus, invisibilis, qui ad humana contagia, et ad humanam carnem non descendit. Est autem et filius secundum apostolum, non pusillus, sed magnus Deus. Sicut ait beatus Paulus:*" "*Expectantes beatam spem et adventum gloriæ magni Dei et Salvatoris nostri Jesu Christi, &c.*" They did not deny that Christ is here called the great God, but contended that the Father was greater.

Towards the close of his work the author suggests some philological remarks, which well merit attention.

We cannot dismiss this article without offering a few remarks upon the subject which this work is meant to examine. The rule laid down by Mr Sharp was originally proposed by Beza: his words relating to the passage in Titus are the following: "*Quod autem ad alterum attinet, quum scriptum sit,*" "*επιφανειαν τη μεγαλη Θεω και Σωτηρος*

Σωτηρος ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, non autem, “ του μεγαλου Θεου και ΤΟΥ Σωτηρος,” &c. dico non magis probabiliter ista posse ad duas distinctas personas referri, quam illam locutionem, “ ὁ Θεος και πατηρ Ἰησοῦ Χριστου.” Nam id certe postulat Græci sermonis usus, quum unus tantum sit articulus, duobus istis nempe, “ Θεου και Σωτηρος” et “ Θεος και πατηρ” communis.” The rule, however, not being laid down with sufficient accuracy, and a due regard to the exceptions of a proper name and a plural number, Erasmus and Grotius paid little regard to it. Since that period it has often been asserted or denied, according to the preconceived opinions of different writers; it has been generally admitted that it *might* be true, but contended on the other hand that it *might* also be false. Mr Sharp was the first who laid down the rule with clearness and precision, declaring that words thus arranged *must* bear this construction, and *can* bear no other. The public have now been for some years in possession of it; and we believe it has never yet been controverted by any man. The rule must have been known to his learned Editor, Mr Burgess, some time before; yet it seems a fair presumption that no exceptions have come under his notice, for he has lately published a second edition of the same pamphlet.\* The information contained in the Six Letters is calculated to give the strongest support and most ample conformation

---

\* “ We have heard the question advanced, “ Does Mr Sharp’s first rule obtain in the Septuagint and classical Greek writers?” This mode of expression does not often occur in the LXX.; but where it does occur, we believe, all the instances are in favour of this construction; if we mistake not, the first example which can be produced is in Levit. xxi. 10. In the writings of the Greek classics we have noticed hundreds of instances, and have not yet seen one which makes against the rule. Take an example or two: “ Οἱ δὲ, ἀτε οὐ δωροδοκοὶ οντες, καταφρονοῦσιν ἀπαντῶν τούτων, ὡς φησὶν Ὁ Θεὸς ΚΑΙ Θεῶν προφήτης (viz. Homer; Plato’s 2d Alcibiad. Καὶ γὰρ τοὶ πεμφθαρ Ἰππορικὸν Ὁ συμμαχορ ΚΑΙ φίλος αὐτοῖς Φιλιππος. (Demosth. κατὰ Φιλιππων, Δογος γ.)”

to the rule. In this view, therefore, we consider this work as of very great importance; it enlists into the service of the catholic faith several texts which have been frequently claimed by Arians and Socinians, as exclusively in their favour; thus depriving heresy of one of its greatest strong-holds, and affording another proof of the doctrine of the Trinity, which it will not be easy to evade.

“Feeling, as we do, the fullest conviction, that a body of evidence is here brought forward which the adversaries of our faith can neither gainsay nor resist, we challenge them to the examination of it: if Mr Sharp’s rule be false, let them prove it by an appeal to the Greek Testament; if the quotations in these Letters can bear any other construction than that which the Author gives them, let another interpretation be produced. Till this shall be done, and we are persuaded it never can be done, we do most earnestly recommend this learned work to all those who are able to appreciate the value of such evidence, and are desirous to “contend earnestly for that faith which was once delivered to the saints.

“For the sake of the mere English reader, we subjoin a translation of the passages mentioned by Mr Sharp, according to his rule, and the interpretations of the Greek fathers: we omit the first and fifth, because the reading in our common editions of the Greek Testament is different from that adopted by Mr Sharp.

- “Ephes. v. 5. ‘For this ye know, that no whoremonger, &c. hath any inheritance in the kingdom of him who is Christ and God.’
- “2 Thes. i. 12. — ‘according to the grace of Jesus Christ, our God and Lord.’
- “1 Tim. v. 21. ‘I charge thee, before Jesus Christ, the God and Lord,’ &c.
- “Titus, ii. 13. ‘Looking for that blessed hope, and the glorious appearing of Jesus Christ, the great God and our Saviour.’
- “2 Pet. i. 1. ‘Through the righteousness of Jesus Christ, our God and Saviour.’
- “Jude iv. ‘And our only Master, God, and Lord, Jesus Christ.’”

The reader is requested to examine also a very learned; sensible, and candid, review, in answer to Mr Blunt's *Six more Letters to G. S.* on the same subject, in the *Christian Observer* for June, 1803, No. vi. p. 363.

CHRISTIAN GUARDIAN.

Extract from the CHRISTIAN GUARDIAN, for December, 1802, Number XII. p. 348.

“Remarks on the Uses of the Definite Article in the Greek Text of the New Testament, &c by Granville Sharp, Esq.: to which is added an Appendix, containing, 1. A table of evidences of Christ's divinity, by Dr Whitby; 2. A plain argument from the Gospel History of the divinity of Christ, by the editor, the Rev. T. Burgess, Prebendary of Durham. pp. 80.

“The new species of argument which is here so happily adduced, and addressed to the learned world, in support of the doctrine of our Saviour's divinity, not only merits the grateful attention of its friends, but imperiously demands the diligent scrutiny of its most inveterate enemies. It approaches so nearly to mathematical demonstration that we conceive it to be absolutely incapable of confutation. The school of Socinus was never attacked with a more formidable weapon; and it is with pleasure we see this treatise particularly recommended, in the preface, to Mr Wakefield's most deliberate consideration.

It would be impossible for us, in our analysis, to do justice to the elaborate work before us, without transcribing a very considerable portion of its invaluable contents. We will, however, communicate so much as may enable the judicious part of our readers to form a true estimate of the force of the arguments employed, and excite in them a powerful desire of becoming acquainted with it at full length.”

After reciting the rules and referring to the examples, the learned Reviewer makes the following observation, in p. 350, on the Appendix:

“Mr Burgess's plain argument, from the Gospel history, for the divinity of Christ, is drawn up by way of question

question and answer, and forms a kind of catechism on the subject, comprised within the space of fourteen pages. The argument is arranged with such judicious simplicity and perspicuity, as must carry irresistible conviction to the understanding of every man who possesses in his heart a sincere love of truth; and who is not influenced by passion or prejudice to prefer darkness before light”

#### ORTHODOX CHURCHMAN.

Review of G. Sharp's Remarks on the uses of the Definite Article, and on the Six Letters to G. Sharp, in the *ORTHODOX CHURCHMAN'S MAGAZINE AND REVIEW* for February, 1803. No. II. vol. iv. p. 105.

“ These two works we introduce together, to the notice of our readers, on account of their intimate connexion with each other.

“ The principal object of the former is, to deduce from the New Testament an important rule with regard to the structure of the Greek language; and afterwards to apply that rule to the correction of the translation of several passages in our established English version of the Scriptures, which passages will be found, when rendered according to Mr Sharp's ideas, to contain the most express testimonies to the divinity of our Saviour. The rule in question is briefly this: “ whenever two personal nouns come together, (excepting proper names,) which are connected by the particle *καί*, and to the former of which any case of the definite article is prefixed, both those nouns are invariably to be understood of the same person.’ A large collection of passages from the New Testament is here exhibited, to afford sufficient and satisfactory instances of the rule thus laid down. After which Mr S. points out certain other texts, which, containing in the original precisely the same construction, ought, he affirms, (and we apprehend with the fullest justice,) to be so translated as to convey to the English reader that they are to be understood (according to the rule) of the same person. The texts referred to by Mr S. and which bring with them, according to his system, the

the very important doctrinal conclusions which we have briefly mentioned, are the following: Acts, xx. 28. (if we follow the reading, *του Κυριου και Θεου.*) Ephes. v. 5. 2 Thes. i. 12 1 Tim. v. 21. 2 Tim. iv. 1. (if we read *του Θεου και Κυριου.*) Titus, ii. 13. 2 Peter, i. 1. Jude, 4. All of which are, therefore, to be rendered severally in these significations:

- (1.) The Church of him who is Lord and God.
- (2.) In the kingdom of Christ, our God.
- (3.) According to the grace of Jesus Christ, our God and Lord.
- (4.) } Before Jesus Christ, our God and Lord.
- (5.) }
- (6.) The glorious appearing of Jesus Christ, our great God and Saviour.
- (7.) Of our God and Saviour, Jesus Christ.
- (8.) Our only master Jesus Christ, both God and Lord.

“ The importance of this rule, especially on account of the very striking conclusions to which it thus leads us, will we trust sufficiently recommend it to the strictest investigation and scrutiny of the learned world. For ourselves we freely declare, that, having given the subject a considerable portion of our attention, we find, daily, fresh instances and exemplifications of the rule, and as yet have met with nothing which in any respect tends to impeach its certainty and universality. For, it must be observed, that, though Mr S. has drawn all his examples from the New Testament, yet the rule itself he has expressed in general terms; and the application of it, therefore, is by no means to be confined to the books of the New Testament. His reasons for not himself applying it to classical and other Greek writers were, probably, that in so doing he must have greatly extended his work, without any equivalent advantage: whilst, by asserting the rule in general terms, he has boldly submitted it to the scrutiny of all readers of all kinds of Greek books, and has thereby put the public, we apprehend, into a much surer road of attaining a speedy and certain knowledge of its extent and truth, than he could have done by a long, tedious, and after all very unsatisfactory, accumulation of passages from all the wide extent of Grecian literature. Let the



the thousands of readers of Greek produce a few instances<sup>6</sup> to contradict the rule, and then will be the proper time to consider whether or no it must be given up for ever.

“The conclusions, however, which Mr Sharp has drawn with regard to the interpretation of those texts of the New Testament above referred to, seem, in general, to be secured within a second wall by the interesting, and we will say *surprising*, result of the investigation of the laborious author of the “Six Letters.” The general object of which work is, to arrive at those same conclusions by another road; to establish the same truths by a second perfectly distinct train of reasoning. ‘It occurred to me,’ (says this author,) ‘that I should probably find some, at least, of those texts, the vulgar interpretation of which you have called in question, cited and explained by the antient Fathers; not, indeed, as instances of any particular rule, but expounded by them *naturally*, as men would understand any other form of expression in their native language.’ If these interpretations, thus discovered, should differ from Mr Sharp’s interpretation, it would seem to follow that his rule could not be true: if they accorded with his, it would then seem that those conclusions must now for a *second* reason be admitted; and the vulgar interpretation ought of course to be reformed according to the standard of the primitive authorities. This inference, however, would be still farther secured, if we should discover, from our investigation, that those heretics who were most pressed with these passages of Scripture, while Greek was understood as a living language, never devised so ready an expedient of eluding their force as modern ages have perpetually had recourse

---

\* “As we consider the subject which we are now upon as of the very first magnitude, we shall be happy if any of our readers will favour us with communications (should they meet with them) to such effect. And we should be equally glad to insert any additional citations in the Fathers which may have escaped the vigilance of the writer of the “Six Letters;” or any particulars which may tend to supply the deficiencies, or remove the difficulties, still remaining in that investigation.”

to, viz. a pretended ambiguity in the form of expression in the original; — and if it should still farther appear, in other instances, that the orthodox never betook themselves to this alleged ambiguity, even in those cases where it may be shewn they must, from their principles, naturally have been inclined to do so.

“ Upon this simple and unobjectionable ground-work these letters are founded. The remaining five, after the first, are principally occupied in laying before us, in a chronological order, the result of the author’s inquiries on each particular text; and they present an example of well-directed patience and perseverance which has seldom been surpassed. Almost all the vast remains of the Greek Fathers, and a great part of the Latin, appear to have been closely examined; and, what is scarcely of less importance, the labour seems to have been carried on, as the work is written, in a sober, cautious, and candid, temper. We cannot give a more correct general description of the work than by saying that it contains, as far as materials could be found, a history of the interpretation of the texts in question, from the earliest times nearly to the age of the reformation. With regard to more *modern* translators and commentators, Mr S. has given sufficient information in the latter part of his “Remarks.” It is an important advantage of this history that we learn from it not only what is true, but we discover also the origin and progress of the false modern interpretation. The origin is undoubtedly to be traced to the imperfection of the Latin language; and the progress was accelerated and increased by the great number of Latin commentators, by the greater familiarity of our early interpreters with those writers; perhaps, also, by the inclination to heterodoxy in Erasmus and others; and not a little, probably, by the reserve and timorousness of certain orthodox writers, forbearing and fearing to assert the true interpretation, not because they themselves did not hold it, but out of a love of peace, and because they knew it was denied or disliked by others.

“ Having mentioned Mr Sharp’s conclusions, it seems but right that we should point out how far they appear to be established, or otherwise, by this second investigation.

“ In

“ In the first, fourth, and fifth, instances, the readings in the Fathers do not correspond with Mr Sharp’s readings, and therefore the interpretation *is, as it ought to be*, different. In the second it is proved, to our satisfaction, ‘ that no other interpretation than Mr Sharp’s was ever heard in all the Greek churches;’ and, farther, (what may seem strange to those who come to the consideration of the subject only with modern ideas,) that, *if they could*, the Greeks *would*, (as the Latins *did*) have interpreted it otherwise. On the third example the quotations are less numerous and less satisfactory; sufficient, however, when combined with a series of other quotations, given in the fourth letter, to corroborate the general conclusion. The sixth instance, by far the most important of all, is confirmed by a profusion of evidence. The seventh and eighth have again little *direct* evidence; but what we have affirmed of the third is, we apprehend, true of them also.

“ In the last letter a long series of instances is given, tending to shew, that, from the very times of the Apostles, the identical forms of expression used in these texts of St Paul, &c. were applied *perpetually* and *invariably* in the sense which is agreeable to Mr Sharp’s rule; and hence proving sufficiently in what sense even those writers who have not quoted them did understand, and would have explained and interpreted, the passages in question.

“ In this last letter, also, authorities are given which render it probable that the text of St James, c. i. v. 1, is to be added to those in which our Saviour Christ is called God.

“ Having thus given a view of the contents of these publications, we shall conclude with earnestly recommending them to the notice of the public; and especially to those who have imbibed an inclination to Socinianism, to which system a blow seems to be here given which must spread a sickness through the whole frame. And, though far from being prejudiced in favour of novelties in divinity, we cannot but add that these works are, in our estimation, calculated to produce the most remarkable change which has long been witnessed in the theological world; and as constituting together, though of small size,

the most important defence of Christian doctrines which this age, by no means deficient in such, has produced. For, what is here done (if *any thing* be done) will have the remarkable distinction of being done *once for all*, and must be not of a confined and temporary, but a universal and perpetual, efficacy."

In a Letter to the Editors of this Review, the reader will find a very just and sensible censure of Mr *Blunt's* SIX MORE LETTERS TO G. S. The said letter is published in the ORTHODOX CHURCHMAN'S MAGAZINE for June, 1803, No. xxx; being the sixth number of vol. iv. p. 347.

---

## FOURTH APPENDIX,

*In the matter of SHARP and BLUNT:*

Consisting of Notes, with proofs and explanations transferred from the third preface by *G. Sharp*, in reply to the opposite pretensions, titles, and allegations, set up by *G. Blunt*, Esq. alias \*\*\*\*\*, alias \*\*\*\*\*, in his "*Six more Letters to G. Sharp.*"



Note the 2d, transferred from the third preface, p. 1.

"But all the other censures and allegations of Mr *G. Blunt* are so evidently *frivolous* and *groundless*."\*)

\* Of the various remarks, by Mr *Blunt*, which may justly be classed under this head of *frivolous* and *groundless*, those which relate to *the rules of Syntax* seem to demand the first notice in this place. In p. 6 and 7, (after much abuse about "*awkward and confused manner*," — "*inaccuracy*," — "*inveloped in mist and fog*," &c.) Mr *Blunt* thus charges *G. Sharp*: "Thus you sometimes seem to confine

confine your remarks, to what you call nouns of personal description or application, such as Θεός, Πάλη, Κυρίος, Σωτήρ, &c. at other times you extend them, *without giving us any notice*, to nouns which are *mere names of things*, without any reference whatever to *persons*, such as ἀμύς, Βρωσίς, Φως, γραφή, &c. as in pages 8, 10, 12, 13, &c." (referring to the 2d Edition.)

In p. 43, he renews this charge, "now, you, in your practice," (says he,) "have neglected all these limitations, and have brought examples to confirm your rules, which violate every one of them. Thus, many of the examples" (says he) "in your *second, third, and fifth*, rules, and the majority of those in the *sixth*, consist of nouns which are *not personal*."

But these charges are entirely *groundless*, as far as they respect the supposed introduction of nouns, which are not personal, or *mere names of things*, "*without giving any notice*";—because it is expressly declared in the body, both of the 2d and of the 3d rules respectively, that "it denotes a *farther description of the same PERSON, PROPERTY, or THING, that is expressed by the first noun*;" and, in the fifth and sixth rules, not only *persons* but also *things*, are expressly included, so that G. Sharp would really have deserved censure if he had not given some examples of nouns which are "*not personal*," or "*mere names of things*"; and, if Mr *Blunt* himself had not been "*inveloped in the mist and fog*" (to use his own words) of most inveterate prejudices, he certainly would not have made such *groundless* objections.

Concerning the 3d rule, he objects in p. xii. that "it is not specified whether there is, or is not, to be an article before the first noun." — But this omission is of very little consequence, because Mr *Blunt* will find, on examination, (if he does not shuffle from the point by searching for evasions in the *English* version, or by setting up different rules of his own, formed from the *English* syntax, instead of fairly examining G. Sharp's rules by the text of the *Greek Testament*, from whence alone they were formed,) that, in either case, with or without the article before the first noun, the rule has no exception, not even if we include *proper names*,

*names*, which are expressly excluded from the first rule, so that the charge of *not giving notice* is entirely *groundless*.

Respecting the fourth rule, Mr *Blunt* objects in p. viii that it "*is very loosely worded*;"—but, as *nouns of personal description* are expressly excluded from it, there seems to be no need of any farther description.

His imitation of the 5th rule, from the *English* version in p. xiii and xiv, is extremely *frivolous*, not only as being a rule of his own forming, from the perversion of a mere *English* expression, which cannot reasonably be admitted as a proper ground of censure against a rule founded on no other syntax but that of the *Greek* testament; but also because his own example of it, viz. "*God and Father of*" makes directly against himself; for, if "*two different subjects*" were really intended, even the *English* idiom would certainly require the article *the* before the second noun, viz. "*God and THE Father of*."

All this is the more especially *frivolous* and trifling, because he himself was aware that this *English* example of his was *defective*. (—"The *English Example*" (says he, in p. xiv.) "*which I have given as an illustration of this rule, though it exactly corresponds to the description required in the rule, will probably, to an ENGLISH READER conversant with such forms of expression, sound rather as a contradiction to the rule,*") and his only reason for these miserable *evasions* seems, by what follows, to have been a vain endeavour to invalidate *G. Sharp's* example, taken from *Ephes. vi. 23.* which, "*when understood or translated, as it ought to be,*" (says he, referring us "*for the meaning of this Text*" to his note in p. 158,) "*does actually contradict, instead of confirming, his 5th Rule, though he chuses to understand it otherwise.*" But, when we turn, as referred, to p. 158, we find only the bare mention of this *Text*, and *not* his translation of it; for, he leaves us to judge of what *his meaning* of it is by *his gross mistranslation*, in that page, of several other *Texts*, some of which *G. Sharp* had cited (p. 2, 2d Edit.) as examples of manifest supplications "*made to Christ, jointly with God the Father, for grace, mercy, and peace; all divine gifts, &c.*" But Mr *B.* has manifested a *wilful perversion* of all these plain *Testimonies of Scripture* against the Unitarian system, not only by his *ungrammatical*

ical rendering of the first example given us in that page, (κατ' επιλογην Θεου Σωτηρος ημων και κυριου Ιησου Χριστου "Thus," says he, ' 1 Tim. i. 1. should be rendered' — "according to (not by) the commandment of God, Saviour of us, and Lord of Jesus Christ;") but, also, by his having substituted 1 Tim. i. 1. for 1 Tim. i. 2. the former having never been cited by G. Sharp, for any such inference about *joint prayer to Jesus*, as it contains nothing of that kind, but only the latter, 1 Tim. i. 2. Χαρις ελεος ειρηνη απο Θεου πατρος ημων, και Χριστου Ιησου του κυριου ημων, which Text, he was most certainly well aware, would more obviously, than the other, expose the fallacy of his *new system*, if rendered, according to his construction of all the other Texts there cited, viz. his making the second noun to mean the same person as the first noun, though there is no article before the first noun, nor, instead of it, no omission of the Copulative before the second, which would have the same effect; and, therefore, this Text, according to Mr Blunt's curious method of translating all the rest, must necessarily have appeared in the following absurd and *unscriptural* form, to match the rest of his *mistranslated* examples:—"God, Father of us, and Christ of Jesus our Lord." This is a literal specimen of his mode of translating all the other Texts; and it is manifest that he was aware of this absurdity, or else he would not have evaded it by citing, instead of the proper Text, the preceding verse, from which G. Sharp never pretended to draw any inference about, "*joint prayer to Jesus*," for it contains nothing to that purpose.

As to his two other *mistranslated* examples in the same note, p. 158. viz. Tit. i. iv. — *from God, Father and Lord of Jesus*, and 2 Cor. i. ii. — *from God, Father of us, and Lord of Jesus*," — he must very well know, as a Greek scholar, that nothing could justify his attributing, in that manner, the two principal distinguishing nouns in the sentence (Πατρος and Κυριου) to one and the same person, unless either the article had been inserted before Πατρος, or else the Copulative omitted before Κυριου; but, as neither the one nor the other is really the case, his mode of rendering these sentences is not only *frivolous*, but miserably *perverse*, and contrary to the general mode of expression by the sacred writers of the New Testament, from whom alone G. Sharp's rules

rules of Syntax were formed, and contrary also to their most general application of the word *Κυριος* to *Christ* in other Texts, which are clearly independent of any dispute about these Rules of Syntax.

Mr *Blunt* objects farther in p. xiii to the fifth Rule, as follows—"It is not said," (he remarks,) "either in Mr *Sharp's* Table of Contents, or in his Remark, (page 12,) whether there is or is not to be an article before the 2d Noun."—But, certainly, this was not necessary in a Rule intended merely for the *Greek* tongue; for, as there is no article before the 1st Noun, it cannot make any difference in translating, whether there is or is not an article before the 2d noun, and therefore it would have been superfluous to mention it. And, with respect to his other objections about *impersonals* and *want of notice*, &c. before cited, he himself has acknowledged, in p. xiv. that the Rule has "*person and thing*" and he might have added even *name*; so that ample mention and *notice* seems to have been given of the enlargement of this Rule, and, (unless the edge of his literary *penetration* be totally *blunted* by Unitarian prejudices,) it is sufficient, one would suppose, to have prevented his *groundless* censures! but it is *not* sufficiently enlarged, it seems, for the admission of his loose and vague constructions, either of *Greek* or even of his more slippery samples of *English*, which cannot pass or evade it; (so that the *Machine*, as he calls it, really *binds* and *secures* the true meaning of the Text more effectually on this trial of it than the *manufacturer* himself ever expected;) for, indeed, Mr *Blunt's* *English* examples are quite foreign to the subject, so that there can be no pretence for admitting them; and, as to *his translations* of the *Greek*, his samples are not only contrary to the general idiom of the *Greek* tongue, but contrary also to the most general application of the title *Κυριος* throughout the whole *Greek* Testament.

Mr. *Blunt's* objections to the 6th and last Rule, in p. xv, are equally *frivolous* and *groundless*; for, he refers to the *Table of Contents* again, instead of *the Rule itself*, wherein express notice is given, that it includes nouns, either of *person, thing, or quality*; so that the inclusion of *impersonals*, in the examples of it, cannot with justice be condemned as



a deviation from it. Another equally *unjust* censure by Mr *Blunt* of the 6th Rule is in p. 43. “*In your 6th Rule?*” (says he) “*we have an Example from John xi. 44. consisting of two PLURAL nouns; and, again in the 3d Example, in page 31 we have,*” (says Mr *Blunt*) “*two PLURAL nouns taken from Philip. iii. 3. which you mark as a CAPITAL confirmation of your first rule.*” But G. *Sharp* has neither marked or remarked any such thing. G. *Sharp* has said, indeed, in page 6, as Mr *Blunt* himself has remarked, that, “*there are not wanting examples even of PLURAL Nouns, which are expressed exactly agreeably to the first Rule.*” On which Mr *Blunt* again remarks, that it is “*an observation made for no other purpose,*” (says he,) “*that I can discover, but that of insinuating that there is nothing in PLURALITY SO INCOMPATIBLE with your Rule, as to prevent even plural nouns from being some confirmation of its truth.* But G. *Sharp* could not surely have any such purpose, (with due submission to Mr *Blunt*’s penetration,) because he had, just before, and even in the same sentence, expressly excepted nouns that are “*proper names, or in the plural number*” and declared, also, that, in these “*cases, there are many exceptions.*” This was surely an ample reason for excluding them from the 1st rule; so that Mr *Blunt*’s censure on this head, also, is really both *frivolous* and *groundless*, as well as his censures of the first Rule itself, because it does not accord with the common *English* expressions, — *the King and Queen; the Husband and Wife; the Father and Son,*” &c. — nor with his own vain and evasive quotations from the *English* version of the Bible!

And, as he has not been able to produce against the Rules one single example properly applied to confute them from the *Greek* text of the new Testament, (the only true criterion of their truth,) his abusive censure of the Rules and of their Author, in p. xvi. must surely deserve some epithet still more *cutting* and severe than either *frivolous* or *groundless*; for, Mr *Blunt* has no right to take offence at this freedom of expression, which he himself has so liberally bestowed, howsoever *pungent* the retort may be. — “*These Rules and Limitations,*” (says Mr *Blunt*, p. xvi.) “*are delivered and supported by the original Inventor with a haziness, which few foggy, shuffling, Trinitarians have exceeded, and transgressed*

*transgressed with a bold freedom, which few impious, or apostate, Socinian Sadducees have equalled;*" &c.

Mr *Blunt*, perhaps, considers this gross abuse as a mere retort upon *G. Sharp* for having sometimes distinguished the *Socinians* by the name of Sadducees; (for, that descriptive term seems to have penetrated most deeply into the wounded mind of Mr *Blunt*, and whetted up his resentment, if we may judge by the repeated mention he has made of it throughout his work;) but, as the propriety, or otherwise, of all censures ought to be weighed, in the first place, by the consideration—whether or not they are true? and, secondly, whether they have been applied personally, *by name*, to any *known* individual?—or, thirdly, only in a *general way* to the mere errors and false tenets of the persons who profess them? These considerations will enable every attentive and unprejudiced Reader of *G. Sharp's* remarks very easily to judge and decide whether he has really merited any such gross abuse! Though the applying to the *Socinians* the title of *Sadducees* seems to have been particularly offensive to Mr *Blunt*, yet he does not appear to be aware of the true meaning of the term *Sadducee*, or he could not, with the least propriety, have objected to the application of that character to the *Socinians*; because he himself, their boldest and most adventurous champion, has repeatedly, throughout his work, openly and publicly professed the leading principle of the old Jewish *Sadducees*, which has also been notoriously held by many other *Socinians* besides himself; viz. that of denying the *existence of Spirits*, either *good or evil!*—An opinion as entirely inconsistent with the *Christian Faith* as it is with that most important and interesting branch of *natural philosophy*, the study and knowledge of our *own nature*: for, without the protection and guidance of the HOLY SPIRIT, we can neither hope to “*be PARTAKERS of the divine nature,*” (according to *the exceeding great and precious promises*” which we hold “*through the knowledge of him that hath called us to glory and virtue*” 2 Pet. i. 3 & 4,) nor will it be possible for us to resist an otherwise unavoidable PARTICIPATION of the contrary nature of *Demons!*

Note the 3d, transferred from the 3d Preface, p. xix.

(“ Mr Blunt’s unhappy want of *faith* in the doctrine of “ *Christ’s Divinity*,\* &c.”)

\* In p. 153, where Mr *Blunt* is speaking expressly “ of our Saviour’s Divinity,” he calls it a doctrine “ *repugnant to every thing in reason and nature* ;” and, in the next page (p. 154,) he boldly asserts, that it is “ *generally contradicted by the whole tenor of Holy Writ*.” And, in a note in p. 151, Mr *Blunt* very *hardily* plunges on in the same groundless error, asserting “ *that the Divinity of Jesus, upon which the Trinity depends, is denied and declared to be false by the Apostles, in terms as positive, direct, and explicit, as can well be conceived*.” But, the very first text to which he has referred us for this strange assertion, both in this note and in p. 154, (viz. John, xvii. 3,) bears ample evidence to the contrary; for, though our Lord there addresses his heavenly Father as “ *the only true God*,” yet this cannot imply (either in this Text or in any of the other Texts to which Mr *Blunt* has referred) that our Lord himself, though eminently “ *the Son of Man*,” — “ *the Son of David*,” — “ *the Seed of Abraham*,” &c. is not also *truly God*; of the ONE *divine Nature*, “ *Godhead*,” or Θεοτης; because, in the same prayer, plainly and openly, (doubtless for the instruction of his faithful witnesses,) he asks to be *glorified* with his heavenly *Father*; which he could not have done without being liable to the charge of a very criminal presumption, if he had not perfectly known that he himself was *truly God* as well as *Man*! And he demonstrated his *eternal pre-existence* and *divinity* by requiring, in the plainest terms, that the *glory*, which he asked in his *then* lately acquired *Human Nature*, should be the same *Glory* which he had with his heavenly Father “ *before the world was* ;” and yet this is the same identical person whom Mr *Blunt* presumes to call “ *a mere Man*, — *and nothing more, or he was a deception*.” p. 71. Such a contemptuous (and of course impious) declaration against one, who is not only truly “ *man*,” but also, at the same time, so much “ *more*” as to be expressly called παντων Κυριος, “ *Lord of all*.” (Acts x. 36.) and emphatically ο κυριος, — “ *the Lord*,” (equivalent

(equivalent to the *supreme* Title JEHŌVAH, which last is also expressly attributed to him, \*) could not proceed from the ordinary tenets of any Sectaries which still profess to retain the *Faith* and general title of *Christians*; but must be attributed to principles of downright *infidelity*!

In the same contemptuous style, (p. 144, note,) Mr *Blunt* proposes the following question, in answer to a Rev. Advocate for “*the Divinity of Jesu*,” — “Can he believe” (says Mr *Blunt*) “that the Disciples of *Jesús* should converse with him, as a *mere man*, should see him live and die like a man, and afterwards be thus completely settled in the persuasion of his being the *Almighty God*, without leaving behind them so much as a hint of the transition of their minds from one opinion to the other, without taking the least notice of the means by which a change so amazing was produced?” But the proposition is *fallacious*, being founded only on two *groundless* suppositions; — the one, that the Disciples conceived, like Mr *Blunt*, that *the Lord* was “*a mere man and nothing more*;” and the other, that they have not left behind them sufficient testimonies of his *Divine nature*; for this whole quibbling argument hinges upon the required “*hint of the transition of their minds from one opinion to the other.*” The Disciples, indeed, rightly considered their Lord as “*a man*,” but not as “*a mere man and nothing more*;” because they must have known, by the canonical Scriptures of the Jews, that the promised *Messiah* ought to be of much superior dignity; and, therefore, even with respect to the Disciples opinion of his *human nature*, Mr *Blunt* ought to have been aware, that, as proofs gradually occurred of the superior and really *expected* character of the *true Messiah*, the disciples did not neglect to “*leave behind them*” ample and sufficient declarations of their full conviction that he was really “*more than a man*;” for such is their open acknowledgement of his *divine* attributes “*Now are we sure*,” said they “*that thou knowest all things*,” &c. — “*by this we believe that thou camest forth from God.*” (John xvi. 30.) Let Mr *Blunt*, notwithstanding

---

\* G. Sharp proved this many years ago by abundant testimonies of Holy Scripture. — See his Tract on the Law of Nature and Principles of Action in Man, p. 230 to 294.

ing his inveterate prejudices, carefully examine the extraordinary assertion of our Lord himself, in the preceding context, which occasioned this decided conviction of his followers. (See verses 27 and 28.) And so far was the opinion, respecting "*the divinity of Jesus,*" from being "*denied and declared to be FALSE by the Apostles, in terms positive, direct, and explicit,*" as Mr *Blunt* has FALSELY asserted, that, besides their very frequent *express* declarations and testimonies of his *divinity*, throughout the whole New Testament, they actually *worshipped him* after his *resurrection*, (Matth. xxviii. 9 & 17,) and *prayed to him* after his *ascension*, (Acts i. 24 & 25,) when he was *absent* from them: [i. e. *absent* in body, and outward, personal, appearance, but his *spiritual* presence was *always* with them, as promised to all churches, or *congregations* of *faithful* believers, even where two or three *were* gathered together in his name, (Matth. xviii. 20,) a most essential privilege of the *Christian Church*, which is totally inconsistent with the *false* idea of Mr *Blunt*, and other *Socinians*, that he was "*a mere man, and nothing more!*"] And these acts of *worship* and *prayer* to Christ would have been *idolatrous* offences to his *Almighty Father* if the Disciples had not been most certainly convinced, that their *Lord Jesus* was truly *God* as well as *Man*.

---

Notes, No. 4, No. 5, and No. 6, transferred from the third preface, p. xvi.

(——— alluding by frequent repetitions to his (G. Sharp's) being bred as a mere *tradesman*,\* (4th Note) *mechanic*, or *manufacturer*† (5th Note); whereas, on the other hand, Mr *Blunt* himself being sufficiently sensible, no doubt, of his own *superior education*‡ (6th Note), is manifestly *inflated*, &c.)

\* Note, No. 4.—“ But you, Sir, a *dealer in Greek* in “ the small way,” (says Mr *Blunt* in p. 22,) “ seem to “ think more highly of your *stock in trade* than those “ who are more in the *wholesale line*,—no uncommon case, “ —and to imagine, as the *retail dealer* often does, that “ your *little commodity* contains some secret, mysterious, “ and extraordinary, virtues, not to be found elsewhere,

“ or by those who know more of *the article dealt in*. In  
 “ *Greek*, at least, whatever may be the case in *English*,  
 “ you seem to suppose that a man may bid defiance to the  
 “ *reason, and common sense, and experience, of all mankind,*  
 “ and make out any mystery he has a mind for.”

Now G. Sharp will not presume to deny the pre-emi-  
 nence of Mr Blunt, in the whole character of *superiority*  
 here described; for, whether it arose from Mr Blunt’s  
 “ *superior education,*” or whether, as being “ *a dealer in*  
 “ *Greek*” (as Mr Blunt says) “ *in the wholesale line,*”  
 either of *misconstruction*, or of *groundless assertions and*  
*abuse*, he has certainly far exceeded “ *the retail trader*”  
 (G. Sharp himself must allow) in “ *bidding defiance to*  
 “ *reason, common sense, and experience,*” not only in *Greek*,  
 but also in downright, *plain, English*, throughout his whole  
 work, as the several *samples* here cited demonstrate! (See  
 Note the 2d, p. 124 to 130.)

† Note, No. 5. — G. Sharp’s rules are distinguished by  
 Mr Blunt as being “ *wrought goods, or samples of his new*  
 “ *mode of manufacturing a God-man.*” (p. xi.)—*A mecha-*  
 “ *nical power, which shall screw down any writer of*  
 “ *Greek.*” (p. 25.)—“ *Articular Straps,*” (p. 39.) which  
 “ *must be truly singular, if they necessarily and inevitably bind*  
 “ *whatever load you please upon any number of individuals,*  
 “ *making every one of them, as often as you catch him by*  
 “ *himself,*” (which seems to be the unhappy case at present  
 with Mr Blunt,) “ *apart from his fellows, WILLY-NILLY*  
 “ *to submit, and, it may be, to become at once poor, and*  
 “ *maimed, and halt, and blind,*” &c. (still *frivolously*  
*carping upon a mere English phrase, instead of the only*  
*point in question, the syntax of the Greek Testament,)*  
 “ *let him be ever so well fitted*” (meaning, we suppose,  
 by his “ *superior education*”) “ *and disposed, in himself,*  
 “ *and ever so loudly urged to resistance,*” [as he acknow-  
 ledges himself to have been, “ *or I should never,*” says  
 he, in p. 2, “ *have submitted to my friend’s sudorific;*” so that  
 his friend, it seems, the Editor, was the promoter, or  
 father, of “ *the literary bantling,*” according to one of  
 his own *blunt expressions*, p. 1.] “ *by all around him, yea,*  
 “ *though he be as strong as SAMPSON, and have the PHI-*  
 “ LISTINES

“LISTINES upon him to best;” &c. (p. 39.) But, though the rules were formed, indeed, rather in a *mechanical* way, as Mr *Blunt* insinuates, yet, as they were all formed from the *syntax* of *Sacred Scripture*, in the original *Greek* tongue in which they were first written, and not from any other *Greek* books whatever, (not even from the *Greek* Translations of the Old Testament, which have not the authority of the original *inspired* writers, nor from *translations* into a *different* language, like the frivolous quotations from the *English* version, which Mr *Blunt* has absurdly opposed to them,) but from the *syntax* of the *Greek* Testament alone, the more *mechanically exact* they have been drawn, according to the general *examples* of expression in the *original text*, the more *irreprehensible*, surely, and *authoritative*, must the rules be, (according to the most effectual method of judging scripture by scripture,) to guide us in the true interpretation of all other similar expressions, used by the same *inspired* writers, who had frequent promises, from their Lord, of sufficient help, by the guidance of the Holy Spirit:—“He shall teach you all things.” (John xiv. 26.)—“When he, the Spirit of Truth, is come, he shall guide you into all truth.” (John xvi. 13.)—“He shall receive of mine, and shall shew it unto you. (John xvi. 14 & 15.)—“For, the HOLY GHOST shall teach you in the same hour, what ye ought to say.” (Luke xii. 12.)

The repeated objections, therefore, of Mr *Blunt*, to the competency of such *inspired* writers, are not only *frivolous* and *groundless*, like his other arguments cited in a former note, but also *extremely wicked*, having no other foundation than his own *infidelity* and shameful denial of the very existence of the *Holy Spirit*!

Nevertheless, though he is apparently an *infidel*, yet, as he is supposed to be at least a *classical scholar*,—“*trained to grammar from his infancy*,” (p. 27.) his fruitless and vain endeavours to set aside the rules must be considered as a strong evidence in their favour; for, though the first rule has been well established, by the satisfactory proofs of it produced by the learned and candid author of the *first six Letters to G. Sharp*, yet the *manufacturer* of the rules was not completely aware of the importance and real value of *all the other rules*, until he had read the *six*

more *Letters* of Mr *Blunt*, and observed the laboured exertions of all the critical might and strength of this *Socinian Sampson*, to burst away from the rules, and to evade and slip out from the *mechanical* “*straps,—screws,—forcing irons,*” &c. as Mr *Blunt* calls them; for, indeed, all the other *rules*, as well as the *first*, seem necessary to render the general construction of G. *Sharp's* MACHINE completely effectual to “*bind*” and “*hold fast*” all *unreasonable* cavillers, that happen to be caught, through their own vain attempts to oppose it: for, Mr *Blunt* has notoriously manifested, in his own conduct, the same *unreasonable excess* of false zeal, in favour of his own *Socinian* prejudices, that he has attributed, in p. 93, to St. Jerome, in support of an opposite doctrine, viz. that “*he would not scruple to violate all grammar, and to write what he avowed to be barbarous and corrupt, to support*” (not, like Jerome, “*the Divinity of Jesus,*” but, in the opposite extreme of hardened prejudice to that which Mr *Blunt* has attributed to Jerome,) his own *infidelity*, and the *blasphemous* notions which proceed from it, however *accurate* he may be as a *classical* scholar in other matters! All these absurdities are evident marks upon him of his having been (as he says) “*fast bound in misery and grammar:*” (p. 26,) i. e. we must suppose, by the tight fitting of the “*articu- lar straps*” and “*iron screws,*” for which he has expressed so much abhorrence, so that, from his *neck* to his *feet*, (for, his *wandering* head and *vague* understanding have not, indeed, been sufficiently secured,) he must have been grievously held in the “*yoke,*” (p. 38.) *pillory*, (xix.) and “*stocks,*” (p. 29.) of G. *Sharp's* *mechanical* invention:—nay, “*the iron of the discovery*” (seems to have) “*entered into his soul,*” (p. 29.) and “*the forcing irons*” have really been effectual to bind down this *Sampson* of grammatical prowess, not with any help of “*the Philistines upon him to boot,*” as he has suggested in p. 39, but rather (as a much more likely case) with all his *Unitarian* brethren, *Mahometans*, and other *Philistines*, on his side, to assist him! For, he has lustily called out and appealed to the *Unitarian Tracts*, — *Taylor's Ben-Mordecai*, — and other partial and prejudiced combatants, to assist him throughout his whole agonizing conflict!



## NOTES—Continued.



Note, No. 6, transferred from the third preface, p. xvi.

( ——— through a confidence in his own superior education\*.)

\* Superior education, without a sound *natural judgment*, will avail but little. Though Mr *Blunt* was probably “*trained to grammar from his infancy*,” (p. 27,) yet this *classical* scholar occasionally forgets the very first rudiments of grammar, (which “*every schoolboy knows*,” p. 78,) the due distinction between a *substantive* and an *adjective*. For, in his objections, in p. 73, to one of G. *Sharp*’s examples of the 1st Rule, viz. Ephes. v. 5, he asserts, that the word  $\chi\rho\iota\sigma\omicron\varsigma$  “*is an adjective* :” for, he had forgot to distinguish this Text from some other Texts, wherein the word  $\chi\rho\iota\sigma\omicron\varsigma$  has the *proper name*  $\lambda\omicron\upsilon\sigma\omicron\varsigma$  added to it ; in which case it may indeed be called a *verbal adjective* ; but, in this Text, and in a great multitude of other Texts, where the *proper name* is wanting, the word  $\chi\rho\iota\sigma\omicron\varsigma$  undoubtedly stands as a *substantive* ; which any little schoolboy, even one that is bred for trade and mechanics, could have told, from the very first page of his *accidence*, or English grammar, viz. “*A noun substantive is that standeth by himself, and requireth not another word to be joined with him, to shew his signification*,”—which is manifestly the case with the noun  $\chi\rho\iota\sigma\omicron\varsigma$ , in Ephes. v. 5, and in most other Texts where it occurs ; and, 2dly, (*Accidence*, p. 2,) That “*a noun-adjective is that cannot stand by itself, in reason or signification, but requireth to be joined with another word*,” &c. So that Mr *Blunt*’s curious remark upon this Text, in p. 73, that  $\chi\rho\iota\sigma\omicron\varsigma$  “*by the bye, is an adjective*,” is surely a notable proof, against himself, of that very perverseness which he has attributed to Jerome, in p. 93, that “*he would not scruple to violate all grammar, and to write what he avowed to be barbarous*”

“barous and corrupt, in order to support” his own unscriptural prejudices!

He contends, repeatedly, that Θεός is a *proper name*, (p. 86, l. 25; p. 88, l. 10; p. 100 & 101; p. 111, l. 12;) though he himself clearly proves, in p. 132, that it is *not a proper name*, by its being applied to several different persons as an appellation.—“The title of GOD” (has he) “is an appellation, which even Socinians” (be pleased to remark,) “without reading it in your texts, have admitted, that the scriptures have bestowed, not only upon Jesus, but upon many other human beings.” Nay, it is so far from being a *proper name*, that he might have shewn that it is applied, also, to the Devil himself; (*the God of this world*, 2 Cor. iv. 4;)—nay, even to the bellies of voluptuous sinners; (whose GOD is their belly;) and, in his vain exertions to evade the rules, in p. 41, he requests G. Sharp to shew, that Χριστός, Κυριός, and Σωτήρ, as applied to Jesus, differ less widely from ὁ Θεός and ὁ μέγας Θεός than one *proper name* does from another;—and he informs us that Dr. Clarke calls “these nouns *characteristical* and *equivalent* (as it were) to *proper names*.” To all which, a plain answer readily occurs, viz. That they are all, indeed, “*nouns characteristical*,” i. e. nouns descriptive of *personal qualities*, as G. Sharp has before asserted, but certainly not *proper names*, and, therefore, not *equivalent* to them; which is proved by the regular distinction made between such *characteristical nouns* and *proper names* by all the writers of the Greek Testament without exception; and Dr. Clark, had he not been *darkened* by his own prejudices as well as Mr Blunt, must have known the due distinctions between appellations (arising from personal qualities, rank, or condition,) and *proper names*: and, though Mr Blunt himself has, also, repeatedly asserted that Θεός is a *proper name*, he has not yet been able to produce the least proof that it is so; and, therefore, G. Sharp must still consider it as a *personal noun*, descriptive of *quality*, or rank, as well as the rest, differing only in the degree of quality; and, of course, he must still “maintain, that *personal nouns*, EVEN OF THIS SORT, are differently affected by the article and conjunction from *proper names*,” (G. B.’s Rem. p. 42;) especially as G. Blunt has

has not been able, with all his most zealous exertions, to produce a single example from the Greek Testament to the contrary. But, with respect to the *proper name* of G. BLUNT himself, G. Sharp, though only a *manufacturer*, perceives much more difficulty; for, though it is obvious that *Blunt* is not, really, his *proper name*, so as “to mark an identity” (as he says, in p. 38,) in the ordinary sense and use of *proper names*, yet, in another sense, the word *Blunt* may be considered, perhaps, as a *descriptive noun*, whether of his ungracious manners and rough address, or whether, with reference to his *visual organs*, which he calls upon G. Sharp “to PURGE with (his) *euphrasy*, “and make them more SHARP-sighted than they are at present;” or whether, still, by “a diversity of references,” (as he says,) it may allude to the *unpenetrating* defects of a mind, unhappily clouded, at present, by the darkest prejudices of dangerous errors; (for, we do not presume to arraign his *natural mind*; but, only, those perverted properties of it, for which he himself alone is most awfully accountable;) so that, with respect to both these points,—of “Identity” and “Diversity of References,” Mr *Blunt* has afforded us very considerable proofs, that *Blunt* is the *proper name* for such a writer; though we are convinced, at the same time, that he has assumed this name of *Blunt* merely for the present occasion. And, though Mr *Blunt* declares, in p. 37,—“I CANNOT SEE” (says he) what reason or authority you have for “making these *fanciful limitations*, or for exempting such “*nouns* (nouns not *personal*, or *proper names*,) any more “than others, from the operation of your rules.” Yet, as Mr *Blunt* cannot produce a single example from the Greek Testament, which can fairly be set in opposition to these *limitations*, he has, surely, no right to call them *fanciful*; because the facts described in the rules, respecting *nouns personal* and *proper names*, are really true, throughout the *general syntax* of the Greek Testament; and, though Mr *Blunt* CANNOT SEE them, G. SHARP is, surely, under no obligation either to “*purge his visual organs*,” (as he says,) “to make them more SHARP-sighted,” to perceive the futility of his opposition to them, and the gross absurdity of his having recourse to mere  
*English*

*English* examples, for want of better proofs, against G. Sharp's rules: as, for instance, "*The king and queen; the husband and wife,*" &c. (p. 19,) as if these *English* expressions could afford him any just argument against the usual *Greek* syntax, explained by the 1st rule; and, though he cites the same *English* nouns, in p. 41, without the article before the 1st noun, to "*express diversity*" (says he) "*as strongly and as necessarily as any proper names what-ever can possibly do;*" yet, as he has here omitted the article before each of the two first *English* nouns, he cannot any longer oppose them to the 1st rule, because he has here expressed *the diversity*, strictly, according to the terms of the 5th rule, which requires two distinct persons to be understood. But, as both these *pairs* are, respectively, only *one flesh* in law, his *diversity* is, surely, very defective. But what has this to do with the *diversity*, really required, between the *Greek* and *English* syntax, though he refers, by an *et cætera*, to all those examples which (says he) "*I mentioned in my former letter, and many more that might be mentioned are as different* (says he) *as SHARP and BLUNT.*"—DIFFERENT, indeed; for, when we "*compare the enormity of Mr Blunt's conclusions with the weakness of (his) premises,*" we "*can have no other alternative*" (as he says, p. 137) "*but to suppose, either a total want of reflection,*" or that his mind is so clouded by the *habitual persuasion* of his own Unitarian prejudices, "*that, as to inquiries of this sort; it is become* (according to his own expression, p. 137 & 138) *like the consciences Paul speaks of, perfectly seared with a hot iron, and (has) lost all sense of feeling for any thing but (his) own prepossessions upon the subject:*" and, therefore, until he can recover a little more of the natural *acumen* and *penetration*, both of his mind and eyes, every attempt must be ineffectual to convince him, that all the other examples, to which he has referred in his former letter, are equally impertinent as these to the subject in question, and that mere *English* examples cannot afford any reasonable proofs against the *Greek* syntax.

In his third letter (p. 45) he says, — "*I now proceed to lay before you some further examples of your rule, from*  
 " which

“ which you will see more of the many admirable consequences  
 “ of your discovery, than, perhaps, you were fully aware  
 “ of. By the application of your rule (probably meaning  
 “ the first) to the Greek text of the following passages, you  
 “ may shew that there is no difference, not only between A  
 “ STREET and A LANE, (Luke xiv. 2.) but between A  
 “ HIGHWAY and A HEDGE,” (ibid. v. 23,) &c. &c.

And he cites a great number of other texts in the two following pages, 46 & 47, which are quite as foreign to the purpose of affording the least *just ground* of censure against any of the rules, because he has totally disregarded *all the circumstances of syntax* described in the rules, agreeable to his own notable resolution, professed in the beginning of that letter, viz. To “ *set aside those limitations* “ which (says he) I have PROVED to be futile and ground-  
 “ less.” But of his manner of PROVING I have already given a sufficient number of notable examples, under the head of “ *frivolous and groundless;*” so that, through this notorious *want of foundation* in all that he has advanced, Mr *Blunt* is in danger of sinking over head and ears in the *quagmire* of his own *groundless* censures and absurdities.

Not a single text of all that he has cited affords the least ground of *just* argument against the rules, unless the same absurd liberties be admitted, of “ *setting aside all limitations,*” according to his professed resolution; and he himself seems sensible of this; for, in the last of the above cited pages (47), he adds, “ *but I shall content myself*” (says he) “ *with mentioning ONLY ONE;*” so that all the rest that he *has mentioned* just before are manifestly superfluous, even in his own estimation. The text he thus particularly mentions is I Tim. vi. 13, where “ ΘΕΟ; and ΧΡΙΣΤΟΣ being “ *connected*” (says he) “ *in the way your rule requires,*” the “ *former with, and the latter without the article, MUST* “ *NECESSARILY be descriptive of one and the same person.*” But, on the contrary, it turns out, that Mr *Blunt* has condescended to furnish G. *Sharp* with an ample reason why it MUST NOT “ *be descriptive of one person and the same person,*” viz. A *peculiarity of expression*, which withdraws it entirely from the case described and intended by the 1st rule: see the text, — Παράγγελλω σοι ενωπιον του

ΔΕΙΞ ΤΗ ΖΩΟΠΟΙΟΥΝΤΟΣ ΤΑ ΠΑΝΤΑ, ΚΑΙ ΧΡΗΣΗ ΙΝΟΥ ΤΗ ΜΑΞΙΟΥΝΤΑΙΟΣ  
 ΕΠΙ ΠΟΛΙΩ ΠΙΛΑΙΩ ΤΗΝ ΚΑΛΗΝ ΟΜΟΛΟΓΙΑΝ, &c. For, Mr Blunt,  
 very properly, in *this one single instance*, remarks, that,  
 “ *since each of these nouns is attended by a participle, and*  
 “ *since the article, which is prefixed to the first participle,*  
 “ *is repeated before the second, THE TWO nouns must, on*  
 “ *that account, be descriptive of different persons.* In which  
 remark G. Sharp perfectly agrees with Mr Blunt; being  
 sensible, that the intervention of the participle and its ar-  
 ticle, and the repetition of the article, also, before the 2d  
 participle, must render the sentence completely *different*  
 from the common mode of expression, described by the 1st  
 rule, and sufficiently explained by the first examples cited  
 for it, from whence the rule was drawn, and of which the  
 true interpretation has never been called in question, as  
 they are not texts that are favourable to any particular  
 controversy; and, therefore, the *very different form of*  
*expression*, above described, proves that this text of 1 Tim.  
 vi. 3, (the “ *only one*” text that Mr Blunt relied on, as a  
 proof, to subvert the rule,) really affords no just argument  
 or exception against it; and, consequently, demonstrates,  
 that the conclusion he has drawn from it, about *identity*  
 and *diversity*, is not only absurd, but (as it includes the  
 mention of *God* and *Christ*) is extremely wicked!

---

Notes, No. 7 and No. 8, transferred from the third  
 preface, p. xviii..

( ——— as well as the more antient canonical writings of  
 their *Israelitish* countrymen,\* are of so *superior* a nature,  
 in comparison with all other writings, even with those  
 that are deemed most eminently *classical*, and are so very  
 different in their general idiom and peculiarity of ex-  
 pression, that *rules*, drawn from the syntax of these sacred  
 writings† — &c.)

Note, No. 7. \* The first promulgation or delivery of  
 the oracles, or true revelations, of God belongs in a  
 peculiar manner, it seems, to the *Jewish*, or (more pro-  
 perly)

perly) the *Israelitish*, nation; for, it is a very extraordinary circumstance, that all the true *prophets*, mentioned both in the Old and New Testaments, [except *Balaam*, who, as a stranger and enemy to *Israel*, was held under a very different and peculiar restriction and compulsion of God's power over him, to enforce his strict obedience to the *revealed* truth during the time he prophesied,] from *Moses* down to the last authentic, prophetic, Revealer of God's will, *John*, the beloved disciple of our Lord, were *all Israelites!* This extraordinary mark of favour to the Jews was declared by St. Paul, when, in answer to his own question—"What advantage, then, hath the Jew?" he said—"Much, every way: CHIEFLY, because that "unto them were committed the oracles of God." (Rom. iii. 1 & 2.)

This was, therefore, the *chief* and most *valuable inheritance* of the Jewish nation; because, the *possession*, or, rather, now, the *re-possession*, even of their former *temporal inheritance*, depends upon their attention and obedience to *these divine oracles and revelations* of their countrymen, in the *last* or *New Testament*, as well as in the *First*, by *Moses*, who, speaking of this very privilege, claimed it as their "*inheritance for ever!*" "The secret things (said he) belong unto the Lord our God; but those *things which are revealed belong* unto us and our children "for ever, that we may do all the words of this law." (Deut. xxix. 29.)

Note, No. 8.

† All the sacred writings have an unusual style of expression, peculiar to the sacred books, and different from all other writings: but the *Hebrew* Scriptures are remarkable for an idiom or style still more particularly different than the rest from all other writings.

A little tract, to demonstrate this point, (written by the Author of these Remarks,) is now in the press, containing *Rules of Construction*, carefully proved by examples, drawn from the general syntax of the *Hebrew* Scriptures.

The *unusual style* of the Holy Scriptures, and the preference that is due to them, on the comparison with any other writings, howsoever learned and generally approved, is strongly marked in a sensible *French* work, printed at  
Paris,

Paris, in 1626, entitled "Les Diversitez Naturelles de l'Univers, de la Création et Origin de toutes choses." p. 40 and 41. "Car, si nous voulons porter reverence aux auteurs; — auxquels je vous prie en faut il porter d'avantage, ou à l'Aristote, Averrois, Epicore, et leurs semblables, qui luisent seulement d'un petit flambeau de doctrine humaine, ou bien à Moyse, aux Prophetes, a Salomon, le plus sage de tous ccux de son siècle, — aux Evangelistes et aux Apôtres, lequel tous en sapience, en sagesse, en mœurs, en propheties, en oracles, et en toute sorte de saincteté, esclairent et flamboyent comme torches ardentes, qui assurent, D'UN STYLE INUSITÉ, ce qu'ils disent des choses divines, le prouvent au peril de leur vie, et le confirment par prodiges?" &c.

---

Note, No. 9, transferred from the 3d Preface, p. xxi.

(That Holy Men of God spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost, (2 Pet. xx. 21,) and not according to *their own will*, as Mr *Blunt* seems to suppose, by his quotation from Dr *Whitby*, "*Scriptisset ergo Judas si hoc voluisset,*"† &c.)

† So little does Mr *Blunt* regard the information we receive from the Holy Scriptures, — as cited above, and elsewhere, respecting the *Guidance of the Inspired Writers by the Holy Ghost*, — that, as he could not find *real* texts in the *Greek Testament* to oppose to *G. Sharp's* rules, (the only fair method of confuting them if they had been wrong,) Mr *Blunt's* dark prejudices have prompted him, in p. 55, to urge the *supposed* consequences that *would* arise to confute *G. Sharp*, if some particular texts *had been* written differently from what *they are!* for, indeed, all his objections are founded, in like manner, on *false suppositions!*

In p. 46, he says, — "*From Luke viii. 1, 2, You might shew, by your rule, that the twelve Apostles were women,*" &c. &c. But this, surely, is *not* by *G. Sharp's* rule, but only by Mr *Blunt's* own absurd manner of treating it; through the *unreasonable* resolution he had previously declared,



clared, in p. 44, viz. "Looking upon myself, therefore, as quite at liberty, in arguing against your rule, (says he,) to disregard limitations, which I have shewn to be destitute of all foundation, and which you yourself have disregarded in your attempts to establish your rule, I shall now go on to give you the remainder of those examples," &c. This single sentence abounds with false suppositions: (1st,) That he, Mr *Blunt*, has shewn the limitations to be destitute of all foundation; a supposition which could only be founded on another supposition equally false, viz. (2dly,) that rules for the Greek syntax ought to be examined by mere English examples, (for, he has produced no others in his first letter;) and (3dly,) that *G. Sharp* himself has disregarded his own limitations, an assertion, which Mr *Blunt*, with all his grammatical sophistry, cannot maintain; for, it is obvious that all the texts which he has cited in his second and third letters, as objections to the rules, are rendered so merely by his wilfully "setting aside those limitations." See the first line of his third letter, p. 45.

In p. 48, he says, — "It makes no difference, I apprehend, in this reasoning, that the 'substantive of personal description,' as you call  $\chi\rho\iota\sigma\tau\omicron\varsigma$ , (p. 30,) is followed by the proper name *Jesus*; since  $\chi\rho\iota\sigma\tau\omicron\varsigma$  HERE" (he must mean in the text cited at p. 30) "does not make any part of the proper name, but is merely an epithet, like the similar personal noun  $\nu\rho\epsilon\iota\omicron\varsigma$ , in a similar situation." All this argument is on the erroneous supposition that the text cited by *G. Sharp*, in p. 30, has the proper name *JESUS*, as well as "the substantive of personal description,"  $\chi\rho\iota\sigma\tau\omicron\varsigma$ , (which, unluckily for his careless and groundless argument, happens not to be the case :) nevertheless, he adds, "But what if it were, unavoidably, a proper name?" But, without any *if* or other imaginary supposition, Mr *Blunt*, by his own fruitless attempts to make it a proper name, has proved that it is, unavoidably, otherwise, (and he has cited, in a note at p. 73, very ample authority, which he cannot reasonably gainsay, that it is NOT a proper name.) And yet he adds again, in p. 48, — "Or, lastly," (says he, reserving his clinching argument for a conclusion, we will hope, of his vain suppositions,) "what IF Paul had THOUGHT FIT to have omitted the word *JESUS* altogether, which he might  
O  
have

have done if he had chosen it, for any thing that I can see to the contrary?" — Thus Mr *Blunt* is thoroughly prepared to controvert whatever Paul may have written, by a *vain supposition* that he "might have" wrote otherwise "if he had chosen it!" — But, in this particular text, cited by *G. Sharp*, (p. 30, 2d edit.) to which he refers, Paul really has "thought fit" to omit the word *JESUS* altogether. And yet Mr *Blunt's* argument is equally futile and vain; for, he had neglected to examine Paul's *Greek* as he ought, and unluckily formed his ideas, as usual, from a mere *English* version of it, and that even by *G. Sharp* himself, the *manufacturer*, who had supplied the word *Jesus*, in a parenthesis, merely for the sake of explication! Oh! Mr *Blunt*! Mr *Blunt*!

But, in other *suppositions* which he has taken, even from the *Greek* text, his endeavours have been equally fruitless; for, in p. 55, he seriously warns us of several *supposed* consequences, that would arise from some particular texts: — IF *Mark*, for instance, in one text, had omitted "the article before the second noun;" or, IF *John*, in another, "had omitted both preposition and article before the second noun;" or, IF *Paul*, in another, "had inserted the article before the first noun," &c.; or, "Suppose" (says he) "Luke had told us——" i. e. something different from what he really did write,—&c. &c. But, in drawing proofs from the *Greek* Testament, we cannot surely have any business with such *idle suppositions* and trifling inconsistencies; for, as neither *Mark* nor *John* have omitted, nor *Paul* inserted, nor *Luke* expressed, any thing at all like his own *vain suppositions*, of course, all the texts that he has cited from them, as pretended *proofs* against *G. Sharp's* Rules, (for, this is a true *sample* of Mr *Blunt's* method of *showing* that the *limitations* are *destitute of all foundation*,) are completely contrary to his purpose, and impertinent to the business in question; because the rules convey the testimony of what the Apostles and Evangelists *really did write*, in full answer to all Mr *Blunt's* absurd *suppositions*! So that if *G. Sharp's* second "correspondent had paid more attention to this circumstance," (i. e. the testimony of what the Apostles and Evangelists *really did write*, instead of his *suppositions* of what they *might* have written, *if* they had chosen it,) "he would have understood more," (according to his own

own polite observation, p. 84,) “ and misapplied leſs, of the rubbish he has raked together!”

Note, No. 10, transferred from the third preface, p. xxxvi.

(—— “ Drunk with the blood of the Saints, and with the blood of the Martyrs of Jeſus.\* )

\* This is a prophetical mark against the Roman church, (the adopted ally of the Socinians,) a mark too peculiar to be mistaken! especially as the farther mark of her nearly-approaching judgement is already come; viz. That the Royal Horns of the Beast, her supporters, “ shall hate THE WHORE, and shall make her desolate, and naked, and shall eat HER FLESH,” &c. (Rev. xvii. 16; a judgement which was first begun by our English Horn, K. Henry VIII. (whom she had intituled “ Defender of the Faith:” i. e. of her faith against the persecuted Saints:) yet he set the first example of “ eating her flesh” by the sequestration of Ecclesiastical Estates and Revenues to the Royal Exchequer. This precedent, for fulfilling the prediction, was not followed by the other Popish Horns of the Beast, until the dissolution of the Order of Jesuits, in our own times, (about 1763 or 1766,) when all the other Popish Kings of the Roman Empire, the Kings of France, Spain, Portugal, Sardinia, Naples, and the Emperor and King, Joseph the 2d, &c. all followed the example; and, lastly, since the Treaty of Amiens, the remainder of her flesh seems to have occasioned a notable Royal scramble among the remaining Royal Horns, under the general title of Ecclesiastical Indemnities; so that, as the sign of the approaching vengeance is so notoriously fulfilled, the judgement itself cannot be far distant, to punish her apostacy, and that of her presumptuous second husband, Pontifex Maximus, ὁ ἀρχιεπίσκοπος τῆς ἀμαρτίας, (2 Theſſ. ii. 3,) called also, “ the Little Horn,” as being less in temporal power, than all her other paramours, the Horns of the Beast, and which, nevertheless, the adulterous church blasphemously addresses, by the divine title, of “ Sanctissimus Dominus;” though  
her

her first Lord and Master still reigns, in Heaven, and on Earth,—“*The Lord of Lords, and King of Kings!*” (Rev. xvii. 14, and xix. 16.) So that he cannot be “*a mere man*” and “*nothing but a man,*” according to Mr Blunt’s contemptuous assertions, in p. 151 and 173!

But the time is just at hand, when *Great Babylon* must come “*in remembrance before God, to give unto her the cup of the wine of the fierceness of his wrath.*” (Rev. xvi. 19.) For, all the awful signs described in this very text, the 19th verse, though not yet *completely* fulfilled, are most evidently approaching to their completion. The *ten* greater divisions (called *horns*, or *kings*) of the fourth and last great kingdom, the *Roman* empire, are now so *wounded* and, subdued, as to have an apparent tendency to be “*divided into three parts*” only, instead of *ten* parts or *horns*: and as to the other *sign*, respecting the fall of “*the cities of the nations,*” mentioned in the same verse, (and necessarily to be understood as an *inferior* distinction for the *lesser* governments or states of the empire, which were not *regal* monarchies, or *horns* of the beast, but were deemed only *republics* and *hanse towns* of the empire, therefore, properly, “*the cities of the nations,*”) they are surely *already fallen!* Where now exist the *late* noble and independent states of *Venice, Genoa, Switzerland, Holland, Belgium, Parma, Florence, (Etruria, or Tuscany,) or even Ragusa!* because none but the *piratical states* exist, (reserved, perhaps, for a more dreadful vengeance!) for, even *Bremen* and *Hamburg* have been lately seized. So that the “**THIRD WOE**” really “*cometh quickly.*” O! that all *virtuous individuals* of the *Roman* communion (for many such undoubtedly there are) may sincerely, and in due time, obey the divine warning,—“*Come out of her, my people, that ye be not partakers of her sins, and that ye receive not of her plagues:*” for, “*in her was found the blood of prophets, and of saints, and of all that were slain upon the earth.*” Rev. xviii. 4 and 24.

---

FINIS.

---

---

---

## ERRATA.



Page line

- xxv. 15, — *after the word altering, add †, a reference to a note in p. xxxviii.*
- 8, 12, — *for Ιησϋ ρεϑιν read Ιησϋς εϑιν.*
- 25, 6, — *for μεγαλου read μεγαλου.*
- 32, 7, — *for περιτονη read περιτομη.*
- 141, 32, — *for Θεο read Θεος.*
- , 38, — *dele perfon.*
- 145, 34, — *for attempes read attempts.*
- 146, 39, — *before suppositions add vain.*
- 147, 31, — *after Pontifex Maximus add Sponfus Ecclefiæ.*
- 
-

**RETURN CIRCULATION DEPARTMENT**  
**TO → 202 Main Library**

LOAN PERIOD 1 <b>HOME USE</b>	2	3
4	5	6

**ALL BOOKS MAY BE RECALLED AFTER 7 DAYS**  
 Renewals and Recharges may be made 4 days prior to the due date.  
 Books may be Renewed by calling 642-3405

**DUE AS STAMPED BELOW**

<b>SENT ON ILL</b>		
<b>APR 03 1995</b>		
<b>U. C. BERKELEY</b>		
<b>OCT 19 1995</b>		
<b>RECEIVED</b>		
<b>OCT 07 1995</b>		
<b>CIRCULATION DEPT.</b>		

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, BERKELEY  
 BERKELEY, CA 94720

YB 72239

U. C. BERKELEY LIBRARIES



051408531

