

REVISED
TEXTS & MARGINS.



BS188
.S64

3.16.21

From the Library of
Professor Benjamin Breckinridge Warfield
Bequeathed by him to
the Library of
Princeton Theological Seminary

514

1901 21/10/1881

20/10/1881

TEXTS AND MARGINS

OF THE

REVISED NEW TESTAMENT

AFFECTING

THEOLOGICAL DOCTRINE

BRIEFLY REVIEWED.

BY
G. VANCE SMITH, B.A.,
THEOL. & PHILOS. DOCT.

LONDON:

37, NORFOLK STREET, STRAND, W.C.

1881.

NOTE.—The British and Foreign Unitarian Association, in accordance with its First Rule, gives publicity to works calculated “to promote Unitarian Christianity by the diffusion of Biblical, theological and literary knowledge, on topics connected with it,” but does not hold itself responsible for every statement, opinion or expression of the writers.

CONTENTS.

	PAGE.
Introductory	i.—iv.
§ 1. 'Holy Ghost'—Holy Spirit	7
§ 2. The name 'Immanuel'	9
§ 3. 'Son of God'—Messiah	9
§ 4. 'the hell of fire'—Gehenna—Hades	10
§ 5. 'the evil <i>one</i> '—The belief in Satan	12
§ 6. 'all authority is given unto me.' 'Master'—Teacher . .	14
§ 7. 'into the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost'	15
§ 8. 'only begotten Son.'—'only begotten God.'—John i. 18— Doctrine of the Logos, its non-Christian origin. . . .	17
§ 9. 'the only God.'—John v. 44	22
§ 10. 'Before Abraham was, I am.'—John viii. 58	24
§ 11. 'the Church of God, which he purchased with his own blood.'—Acts xx. 28	26
§ 12. 'a propitiation, through faith, by his blood.'—Rom. iii. 25	27
§ 13. 'the reconciliation'—Atonement—'for Christ's sake' . .	30
§ 14. 'who is over all, God blessed for ever.' Rom. ix. 5 . . .	32
§ 15. 'in the form of God'	35
§ 16. 'He who was manifested in the flesh.' I Tim. iii. 16 . .	39
§ 17. 'our great God and Saviour Jesus Christ.' Tit. ii. 13; . 2 Pet. i. 1	39
§ 18. The three witnesses. I John v. 7, 8.—I John v. 20. . . .	44
Conclusion—doctrinal results of the Revision	45

APPENDIX.

Note A. Winer on Rom. ix. 5	49
— B. Winer on Tit. ii. 13	49
— C. The <i>Guardian</i> Newspaper on the same	50

INTRODUCTORY.



THE varied criticism to which the revised New Testament has been subjected has gone far to establish a conclusion of considerable importance,—one, too, which has been widely accepted even by persons of the most different theological opinions. It has led to a very general recognition of the substantial accuracy of the new text, regarded as the representative of the Greek original. A few instances may no doubt be pointed out in which this statement is open to question; but on the whole, notwithstanding various inconsistencies of rendering, and some faulty deviations from usual English idiom, it is acknowledged that the work of revision has been well done, and that it places before the modern reader the oldest original text which is now accessible to us more fully and literally than is done by the Authorised Version.

This result was to be anticipated. The revisers, as a body, were men of competent learning, and well acquainted with their subject; nor can they have had any motive in their work but to render their original faithfully to the best of their own understanding. This will probably be allowed by every reader of the corrected version who is at all competent to form an opinion on such a question.

At the same time it may be well to remember that even a body of such men was not infallible. Nor is there any thing improbable in the supposition that they may have been influenced by the bias of their own theological opinions. It was at least natural, perhaps it was inevitable, that they

should have been so. Whether there be any traces of this in their work, we need not at present stop to inquire. The reader will no doubt be able to make his own inferences on the point, as he proceeds with the following pages.

At all events, it will be seen that the changes which have been introduced in the revised version have, in several conspicuous instances, an important bearing upon theological doctrine, as usually derived from the New Testament. It is the design of the present Tract to point out some of these instances, and to offer a few remarks in elucidation of their theological import. I need not add that I wish to say what I have to say with every regard to literary fidelity, and with the desire to present each case honestly and truly, as it is, so far as I can myself appreciate its character. Without *bias*, I suppose I must not claim to be ; but I will at least endeavour not to allow my own private opinions to influence me unduly ; and it will always remain with the reader to judge for himself whether or not I have succeeded in giving a fairly true and impartial account of what I have undertaken here to discuss.

It will be convenient in what follows to take the passages to be noticed, with one or two exceptions, in the order in which they occur in the New Testament books. And it will be understood that it is only certain passages of prominent theological interest that it is proposed to notice.

TEXTS AND MARGINS.



§ 1. Matt. i. 18: 'Holy Ghost;' margin, 'Or, *Holy Spirit*;' and so throughout this book.—This margin is an acknowledgment by the revisers, repeated in several books, to the effect that the original term, rendered 'Ghost,' is the *same* word, which is also rendered 'Spirit.' Such is the case in every instance, without exception.* It requires no argument to show that one and the same rendering of the one original word ought to have been adopted throughout. So obvious a neglect of uniformity in so important a case is the more remarkable, because the revisers, as a rule, have been careful, and profess to be careful, to render the same original word by the same English, so far as possible—as for example in the insignificant case of 'straightway,' many times in the second Gospel. Why then have they not been equally particular in the greater case of Holy Spirit,—one of real interest and importance.†

* In several N. T. books the words Holy Ghost—or Spirit—do not occur at all. In John, the rendering 'Ghost' has been retained once only, viz., in xx. 23.

† One of the revisers has given us a reason which, I must say, too clearly suggests the influence under which the rendering Holy Ghost was retained. He observes, 'England would have risen up and protested against the loss of that most holy name.' And yet 'that most holy name' *does not occur* in the original Scripture, as a word distinct from that which is rendered Spirit!—See Rev. W. G. Humphry's Tract, 'A Word on the Revised Version,' published for the Christian Knowledge Society.

In some instances, again, the Revision has not only retained the old expression, but has gone so far as to alter the pronouns, so as to impart a more distinctly personal character to the rendering—as in Rom. viii. 16, ‘the Spirit himself,’ instead of the Authorised ‘itself,’ which exactly represents the Greek; so in Ephes. iv. 30, which is a similar case. In these places, no doubt it may be urged, a personal meaning is expressed in the context; but then is it not simply a figurative personality, of exactly the same kind as that attributed to other objects of thought, as, for example, to Charity (love) in 1 Cor. xiii. 4, 5. (Here, it must not be overlooked, the Revision has altered the personal pronoun, in the opposite sense, so as to *take away* the personal meaning, and injure the Apostle’s metaphor.) But indeed, as probably all will admit, the expression Holy Spirit denotes the Divine Being himself, especially in His felt influence upon the mind of man. Hence, it is easy to understand, the Spirit may quite intelligibly be spoken of under the personal conception of it, while yet it is unnecessary to go to the length of the popular Creeds and attribute to it a real or separate personality of its own, making it in effect a distinct and separate God—as in the Athanasian Creed. Of this extreme perversion of the idea there is no example within the pages of the New Testament. Accordingly there is nowhere in the Bible to be found any instance of prayer being offered to it, or any ascription of praise or adoration, as there so often is in the case of the Almighty Father.

It ought not to be forgotten that the American revisers (List of Readings, No. III.) express their desire that instead of ‘Holy Ghost,’ the rendering ‘Holy Spirit’ should be uniformly adopted. In this they have shewn themselves more faithful to the original than the English Company: inasmuch as the New Testament has everywhere been contented to express the idea intended by a single word; while also the deep and comprehensive word Spirit is

greatly superior as a rendering to its poor and almost obsolete equivalent.*

§ 2. Matt. i. 23: 'they shall call his name Immanuel; which is, being interpreted, God with us.'—A more careful and impartial regard to the usage of the Greek language (as of the Hebrew also) would have rendered these words differently. In both languages, in simple sentences like this, the verb of existence is constantly unexpressed, although it is to be understood. Remembering this fact we should render, 'God *is* with us;' and the implication is, that, in the child to be born, the promised Christ, God will be with his people to protect and save them. As the words stand, they seem to represent the coming child as God. This cannot possibly be held to be the Evangelist's intention, when all the circumstances of the context are taken into the account. Simple faithfulness, therefore, to his thought requires a further revision of this expression, or at the least, an acknowledgment in the margin of the alternative rendering.—See similar instances, Isaiah viii. 10; Jerem. xxiii. 6, xxxiii. 16; Ezek. xlvi. 35.

§ 3. Matt. iv. 3: 'Son of God.' The old rendering remains, and could not of course be changed. But, in the mouth of the devil, who is here the speaker, the words could only *signify* 'the Messiah':—'If thou art the Messiah.' In the synoptical Gospels, as elsewhere, the Messiah is a Son of God. He is also pre-eminently 'the Son of God'—a phrase by which the protection and love of God for his chosen servant are especially denoted.† It does not, how-

* This is seen in the fact that the word 'Ghost' cannot be used by itself, as the original often is, nor with any adjective except one.

† Compare Mark i. 1, which literally runs, 'the Gospel of Jesus Christ, Son of God.' The latter words (equivalent, as just said, to Messiah) are critically uncertain, and are omitted by Tischendorf.

ever, appear from these three Gospels that any metaphysical meaning was attached to the words. The only instance in which the contrary might be alleged is in Luke i. 35. Here the child to be born is said to be 'Son of God,' because it is born through the immediate agency of the Holy Spirit. This reason for the epithet is nowhere else given; nor indeed is the miraculous birth anywhere else alluded to in the New Testament, except at the commencement of the first and third Gospels. In these Gospels, therefore, as in Mark, 'Son of God' may always be regarded as simply a designation, in Hebraistic phrase, of the Messiah.* This remark does not apply to the fourth Gospel, in which the metaphysical or Logos conception is introduced, as shall be briefly noticed in its proper place.

§ 4. Matt. v. 22 : 'shall be in danger of the hell of fire;'—margin 'Gehenna of fire.' Most probably the words 'of fire' are a Hebraism, after the manner of 'judge of unrighteousness,' rendered 'unrighteous judge,' Luke xviii. 6. Hence the meaning is, the fiery or burning Gehenna. This last word was the proper name of a locality near Jerusalem. In the eyes of the Jews it was a place of abominations, on account of the idolatrous rites there practiced in ancient times. It had therefore been subjected to defilement in various ways, and became in later times the receptacle of refuse and filth from the city. To consume the mass, fires were kept burning, and the valley was accordingly a place of *fire*, of perpetual fire, ever burning. Hence the phrase 'Gehenna of fire.' This phrase, as given in the margin, ought clearly to have stood in the text. On what just principle is the proper name Gehenna rendered by the word

* Compare the exclamation of the centurion (Mark xv. 39), 'Truly this man was Son of God.' Surely he intended this not in the Nicene sense, but in the familiar Hebrew sense of Messiah, in which he may often have heard it used.

‘hell?’ It cannot be shewn that the fearful ideas connected with the latter in our times were associated with Gehenna in the time of Christ. The rich man in the parable in Luke xvi. is not in Gehenna. He is in ‘Hades’ (v. 23), and this parable, it is needless to say, is not a representation of real scenes, but simply a thing of the imagination, designed to embody the great fact of moral retribution. It is true, however, that the name Gehenna had come to be used in New Testament times as a representative word, denoting the place into which the ungodly were to be cast at the coming of the Messiah, there to be burnt up and destroyed. The whole conception belongs nevertheless to the domain of mythology rather than to that of rational theology. It embodies for our time the idea of retribution for sin simply, and hence it is altogether gratuitous and inadmissible to insist upon the details of the expression as representing the actual physical character of the future scenes of woe. It is one of the gravest faults of our systematising theologians and preachers * to persist, as they do, in keeping up ideas of hell, with its devils, and its everlasting flames and torments, which have descended to us from the distant ignorant ages of patristic and mediæval superstition. But apart from these considerations the revised rendering ‘hell of fire’ is unjustifiable, not only on account of the word ‘hell,’ but also as suggesting other hells unknown to the New Testament, and because there is no reason in the nature of the case why the proper name Gehenna (meaning, etymologically, *valley of Hinnom*) should not have been rendered *as* a proper name. This change has been made in the case of the word Hades, though this too was

* See, for example, the Methodist Catechisms, and the allusions in various Hymn-books of the Congregationalists and other bodies. But the reader should not forget Canon Farrar’s admirable volume ‘Eternal Hope,’ which may be set against certain publications of the Religious Tract Society, such as Baxter’s Saint’s Rest.

represented as 'hell' by the revisers of 1611—who, like all the theologians of their time, were eager believers in hell fire, in devils, and in witchcraft. Consistency required that the two proper names should be similarly treated, and they would no doubt have been so, but for long-established and invincible prepossessions. The reader should compare 2 Kings xvi. 3, xxiii. 10, 13, 14, and also some parallel places in Chronicles and other Old Testament books.

§ 5. Matt. vi. 13: 'Deliver us from the evil *one*.' The introduction of Satan into the Lord's Prayer, however unnecessary on exegetical grounds,* and however offensive to the devout feeling of very many readers, cannot be said to affect theological doctrine one way or other. The existence of Satan is abundantly recognised elsewhere in the words of Christ, and it was no doubt admitted by him, as an element derived through his education from the popular belief of his day, as it is well known to have been received by his countrymen long before Christ was born. Those who think that the Christian of modern times should hold the same belief because He did so, should in consistency ask us to recognise the Jewish Sabbath, as well as the continued obligation of circumcision and of worship by sacrifices.

* That the words rendered 'the evil *one*' might grammatically be *neuter*, and denote the abstract and impersonal 'evil,' is admitted on all sides and cannot be denied. The neuter form occurs in Luke vi. 35, Rom. xii. 9. The expression was familiar to Jewish readers of Greek—see 1 Mac. i. 15. The character of the prayer again, and the parallelisms of the context, (debts, temptation, trespasses,) evidently favour the non-personal meaning. But then the Greek Fathers take the words in the personal sense, and this is the great reason for the revised rendering—a very insufficient reason, it must be said, when the credulous and superstitious character of these writers is taken into the account. It may be added that the 'evil' or 'evil *one*' is not determined one way or the other by either the verb or the preposition here used with it—as some have supposed.

There can be no reasonable doubt that these were equally accepted by Christ, in accordance with his own words, that he came not to destroy the law or the prophets but to fulfil. He is also admitted by all to have been a man of ordinary Hebrew training—whatever else beyond this he may have been—and to have conformed, like other Hebrews of his time, to the laws and institutions of his people.

But, while this is true, the better knowledge which has been given to our day renders it impossible to assent to the ancient belief in an all but omnipotent devil. This is surely one of the great points on which men are called upon to admit into their minds the clearer light which, by providential guiding, modern Science has given to the world. This should teach us that what we are accustomed to call the Evils of life and nature, mysterious and sorrowful as they often are, must, in the last resort, be ascribed to the Supreme Will itself, and are not to be attributed to the activity of a malignant Satan, the eternal enemy alike of God and man.

It was clearly a mistake, therefore, so gratuitously to alter the words under notice, as if it were sought to diffuse and strengthen the belief in diabolical agency, by introducing the acknowledgment of it into this prayer, otherwise so comprehensive and beautiful. It may be hoped, nevertheless, that the increasing intelligence and good sense of Christian people will more and more disapprove and reject the doctrine in question, even when thus presented to them—a doctrine, as it is, the practical influence of which can be in no way favourable to the spiritual well-being of those who really hold it, but rather the contrary.

§ 6. Matt. xxviii. 18: 'Jesus . . . spake unto them saying, All authority hath been given unto me in heaven and on earth.'—The change here from 'power' to *authority* is significant. The reader should compare Matt. ix. 6, x. 1, Mark ii. 10, iii. 15. The change has been made in some cases, but not in others, and with the misleading result, that Christ is represented as having *power*, the disciples as having 'authority.' The original word is the *same* everywhere; as indeed is acknowledged by the margin. But why, it must be asked, was not this word, in itself unobjectionable, placed in the text? The original denotes a permitted or delegated power, something that it was lawful to exercise in accordance with some superior will. Such authority is attributed to Jesus in common with his disciples, and the fact ought not to be disguised by placing the right and literal translation in the margin, the less right and less literal in the text, where it will be read, or heard read, by multitudes who will never hear or see the margin, or perhaps attend to it if they do.

Similar remarks may be made respecting the familiar word 'Master' which is so often applied to Jesus in all the Gospels, the alternative (and correct) rendering 'Teacher' being placed in the margin. See Matt. viii. 19, and numerous passages besides. To *teach* the people was evidently a chief function of the Messiah's office, as conceived by the Evangelists and probably by Jesus himself, Accordingly, he is frequently spoken of as engaged in this work, and is constantly called 'the teacher,' and addressed as 'Teacher.' The word Master on the contrary is not applied to him, except in the rare instance or two of the compound term rendered 'master of the house.' The proper Greek word for master, in the sense of power and ownership, Jesus never applies to himself.* It is used of

* The word so constantly rendered 'Lord' might have been correctly translated by Master, in this sense.

him only in two instances, and by the late and unknown writers of 2 Peter and Jude.

These facts are not without their interest, as indicating the character under which Jesus and his work were regarded by the writers of the New Testament. We know that he was familiarly spoken of by the people as 'the prophet Jesus from Nazareth,' see Matt. xxi. 11. Such facts ought not to have been concealed under the translation 'master,' to which it is probable that few ordinary English readers will attach the meaning of Teacher, even though the former word is familiar enough in certain compounds (as school-master) in the sense of teacher.

§ 7. Matt. xxviii. 19: 'baptizing them into the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost.'—The word *into* here takes the place of 'in,' without any marginal note, and materially assists the interpretation. It denotes the transition experienced by the convert to Christianity from one form of belief and confession to another. A Jew or a Gentile, who was brought to recognise Jesus of Nazareth as the expected Christ, underwent the change referred to, from unbelief or denial to positive assent and discipleship. This 'conversion'* the 'eleven disciples' are told to mark and ratify by the ceremony of baptism—an ancient and familiar rite in those days. In 1 Cor. x. 2, Paul speaks figuratively of his people as having been 'baptized into Moses'—an expression which the Revision for some reason has altered, by rendering 'unto' instead of *into*. By this statement the Apostle evidently meant to signify that the people adopted and professed the religion given to them by Moses; in connection with which Moses held so conspicuous a place as leader and legislator. Receiving and following

* Such is the usual import of the word 'convert,' and its cognates as used in the N. T.—though not in the Methodist and other theological vocabularies: see Acts xv. 3.

him, the Israelites were 'baptized into Moses.' Similarly with Christian converts—they received the religion in which God is so specially made known under the sacred name of 'Father,' in which too the acknowledgment of 'the Son,' the Messiah, was an essential element—for a man could not be a Christian disciple without acknowledging Christ—and which again, according to the conception of the primitive age, was illustrated and confirmed to the disciple by the gift of 'the Holy Spirit.' Of this last particular many examples occur in the Book of Acts: See ii. 4, iv. 31, and compare xix. 2, *seq.*

The evangelist's words are usually regarded as an allusion to the doctrine of the Trinity. It would be very reasonable so to understand them, if that doctrine were anywhere else to be found distinctly taught, as a doctrine of the new religion. But there is no instance in which it is so,* and it is incredible that the Teacher, at the very moment of his departure from the earth, in the last words which he addressed to his disciples, should now suddenly speak to them in these terms of a mysterious doctrine, so inconsistent with their own ancient monotheistic faith, and for which he had not in any way prepared their minds. It cannot have been the intention of the evangelist to leave his readers with such an impression. For it is remarkable that all the four Gospels are equally destitute of traces of this great ecclesiastical doctrine, which indeed is known historically to have been the growth of a long subsequent age. Of this statement the reader who will only take the trouble to examine the Gospels for himself will find abundant evidence—abundant evidence, that is to say, in the plain fact that the doctrine of the Trinity is nowhere in the Gospels to be seen,

* The only other text believed and probably intended to express the doctrine, 1 John v. 7, has been removed as spurious by the revisers. See *infra*, § 18.

either expressly stated or even obscurely alluded to. This is equally true of the rest of the New Testament.*

§ 8. John i. 18: 'No man hath seen God at any time; the only begotten Son, which is in the bosom of the Father he hath declared *him*.' Here, the margin informs us that 'many very ancient authorities read *God only begotten*,' for 'only begotten Son.' It may be conjectured that a regard for euphony, or some even stronger motive, suggested the form of translation thus given in the margin. But, as in the original the adjective precedes the noun, the more exact rendering is 'an only begotten God';—just as we say in English *a good man*, not 'a man good.'

An only begotten God!—Such is the incongruous idea to which this margin would lead those who are able to close the eyes of their minds so far as to follow its guidance. It is almost a pity that the words were not taken into the text—a result from which, considering the state of the evidence, there could have been only a narrow escape.† Their insertion in the English Bible might, however, have proved a greater blow than the popular or orthodox theology of our day would have been well able to bear!

A full discussion of this margin would be equivalent to a discussion of the Logos doctrine in which the expression has its origin, and for this, in the present connection, space

* 2 Cor. xii. 12 has been appealed to as an expression of the three-fold personality. But a reasonable interpretation of the words is inconsistent with such a conclusion. There is evidently a *distinction* made in the verse between God and the other subjects named: 'The grace of the Lord Jesus Christ, *and* the love of GOD, *and* the communion (participation) of the Holy Spirit;' the last clause, doubtless, here, as so often in the Acts, denoting those divine gifts of which the Christian might partake, as before noticed (§ 1.)

† The words have been adopted in the new Greek text edited by Messrs. Westcott and Hort.

is wanting. A few facts however belonging to the subject, must be given.

The original adjective rendered 'only-begotten,' in its simple or natural sense, denotes an only child, also one that is dearly beloved, as an only child. In this sense it is found in Luke three times, and it is applied also to Isaac.* Except in these cases, it occurs only in the fourth Gospel and the first Epistle of John, in reference to the Logos (John i. 14, 18), or in connection with Christ (John iii. 16, 18). In the later and metaphysical sense of the term it denoted the relation of the Logos to God; in other words, it was expressive of the intimate and unique connection between the Logos as Son and the Divine Father. In this sense the word is found in the Nicene Creed: 'only begotten of the Father;' with which should be compared the words, 'God of [out of] God;' 'begotten not made, being of one substance with the Father.' The word occurs, as just noted, four times in the Fourth Gospel, but whether intended in this sense exactly may be a question. If so, the fact is indicative of the Alexandrine origin of that Gospel, as well as of its late composition, as compared with the other three.

The word *God*, in the reading 'only begotten God,' is rejected by Tischendorf, who adopts the common reading, giving at the same time an account of the evidence. What appears to have weighed greatly with this eminent authority in so doing, is the fact of the increasing tendency, in the early centuries, to apply the epithet 'God' to Jesus personally, as being the Logos incarnate (John i. 14). This tendency attained its climax and natural result at the Nicene Council (A.D. 325) and in the famous Creed there formulated by men who, as everybody knows, were extremely little qualified for the work of creed-making for

* Luke vii. 12, viii. 42, ix. 38; Heb. xi. 17.

future generations. This was the same century in which the oldest existing manuscripts, Aleph and B, were written; and it may have been simply in accordance with the prevailing tendency of their time that the copiers of those manuscripts thought themselves justified in writing *θεός*, God, instead of *υἱός*, Son. There is another instance of the same alteration to *θεός* in Aleph, which is held to be the oldest of all the New Testament manuscripts. It occurs in Luke viii. 40, where the scribe has written 'they were all waiting for *God*,' instead of 'waiting for him.' This reading stands alone, and has been little noticed by the critics. There it is in Aleph nevertheless, and as it cannot have been accidental, it shows how ready the manuscript copiers were to follow the orthodox feeling of their day. The ancient Fathers who cite John i. 18, or allude to the expression, are greatly divided between the two readings, so that it is a matter of no slight difficulty to decide by their evidence which of the two has the preponderance of critical weight on its side. In all probability manuscripts were extant in the third and fourth centuries, perhaps earlier,* containing both readings; and it was natural that copiers should follow the one or the other, according as their theological zeal dictated. A similar cause would account for other instances in which the term 'God' may have been surreptitiously introduced into the text—as shall be noticed under the proper heads.

To speak of 'an only begotten God, who is in the bosom of the Father,' was altogether in keeping with the character of the fourth Gospel; and therefore there is nothing at all unlikely in the supposition that this may be the true original reading of this verse. Let it be observed, however, that the

* Dr. Scrivener has observed, 'It is no less true to fact than paradoxical in sound, that the worst corruptions to which the N. T. has ever been subjected, originated within a hundred years after it was composed.'—*Introduction to N. T. Criticism*, 2nd Ed., p. 452.

conception of the Word or Logos, introduced in the first verse of this Gospel, *was not in its origin a Christian conception.* It is found fully developed in Philo Judaeus, of Alexandria, who lived and died long before the composition of this Gospel. This eminent Jewish writer speaks repeatedly of the Logos, and says respecting it all that is said by the Evangelist, with much besides. He does not, however, say that it was 'made flesh' in Jesus—a statement which of course Philo, as a Jew and a non-believer, could not have made.

Being then thus familiarly known in philosophy and literature long before Christ or the Christian Gospel was heard of, the conception of the Logos in its most general sense expressed and denoted the outward manifestations of the One, unseen, incomprehensible Deity, in the creation of the world, and in his communications with man. The conception was to the Greek or Hellenistic mind in some respects what that of the Holy Spirit was to a Jew—denoting, not indeed Jehovah himself, whose very name might not be uttered by human lips, but yet the same hidden and unapproachable Divine Spirit in his outward revelation of himself. A great authority, Dr. Liddon, has spoken of the Logos in terms which, in their own subtlety or obscurity, do not much elucidate the subject for his readers.* He calls it 'the Thought of God,' and expressly warns his readers not to conceive of it as 'an independent being, existing externally to the One God.' All the time, therefore, though constantly conceived and spoken of under the personal conception, as a being distinct from God and termed, even by Philo, a 'second God,' yet, nevertheless, it was simply the Infinite himself, or his Energy, acting upon the world according to the purposes of His own divine

* 'The Logos is the Thought of God, not intermittent and precarious like human thought, but subsisting with the intensity of a personal form.'—Bampton Lectures, p. 228 (ed. 1868).

thought. This Logos, then, according to later Christian writers, became flesh in Christ, which was probably, at first, much the same thing as saying that God, whom, in Himself, no man hath seen at any time, revealed Himself to the world in him that 'declared him.' God revealed in Christ, and through Christ, is a prominent idea of the New Testament. But it does not follow that Jesus was personally God, or was intended to be so represented; any more than it follows that a Christian convert was conceived to be God, because the 'Holy Spirit' is said to have been given to him, or to have been in him.

The most important thing to remember is that the doctrine of the Word was not a product of Hebrew theology or of Christianity, but of Greek philosophy; and so, if this doctrine be the most essential and characteristic element of the Christian revelation, as some would tell us, it follows that we are indebted for the 'heart and essence' of the Gospel, *not* to Christ or the Apostles, but to Greek speculation. Except in the fourth Gospel, and in the kindred writing called the first Epistle of John, nothing is said in the New Testament about the Logos being incarnate in Jesus, although the same conception is very probably at the basis of the introductory verses of Colossians, Ephesians, and Hebrews—of the last in particular. It is nowhere, however, to be seen in the three Synoptics, which are without doubt the simplest and earliest historical records of the ministry of Christ now accessible to us.

The same conception accounts for many expressions which are peculiar to the fourth Gospel. Its occurrence in this Gospel, elaborated as it is and accompanied with discourses and other matter evidently composed in accordance with the Logos idea, seems to afford the strongest reason for thinking that the Gospel cannot have come from the pen of an eye-witness of the life of Christ as that life is related in the other Gospels. It should

rather be regarded as the composition of a writer whose mind was deeply imbued with the Logos philosophy in its more advanced form; and this writer, it would appear, even felt himself at liberty to compose the discourses and prayers which he attributes to the subject of his narrative in accordance with, and in subordination to, the characteristic conception of that philosophy.

Many persons, especially those who are committed to the Nicene theology, will no doubt reject and resent this account of the subject. Some critics may be expected to report to their readers the conclusion just stated, and to denounce it as a species of profanity, without taking the trouble to give the reasons by which it is justified. It would be more to the purpose if such persons would examine what has just been said, and shew by reasonable evidence, if they can, that it is untenable; especially if they would explain and account for the remarkable fact, which is undeniable, that the doctrine of the Word is so distinctly traceable, not to Christian sources, but to ancient Gentile philosophy.

§ 9. John v. 44: 'the glory that *cometh* from the only God'—This stands instead of the Authorised 'from God alone,'—which was an extraordinary mistranslation of the Greek. The words should be read in connection with John xvii. 3, which, slightly altered from the older form, runs thus:—'This is life eternal, that they should know thee, the only true God, and him whom thou didst send, even Jesus Christ.' The two expressions, 'the only God,' 'the only true God,' well shew that the writer of this Gospel (probably a Jewish Christian, of the Philo school of thought), although he had so entirely adopted the Logos conception, yet retained a firm hold of his ancient monotheistic faith. It follows, that he could have no real intention of representing Jesus Christ as God, equal to the Father, and consequently no idea of the later Church

doctrine of the Trinity. The Father, in the Evangelist's view, was still 'the only God,' revealed, indeed, by His Logos conceived as coming forth from him in Jesus, and manifesting him to the world, but not regarded as making Jesus Christ identical with Him or His equal. In one instance, it is true, Jesus is represented as saying, 'I and the Father are one;' in which we have the conception virtually repeated that the Logos was with God and was God—as, according to Dr. Liddon's exposition, it was the very 'Thought of God' itself. But if so, we have elsewhere the express words, also attributed to Jesus, 'the Father is greater than I;' and again the words of the risen Jesus, 'I ascend unto my Father and your Father, and my God and your God.' Such words shew us that the Evangelist could have had no real idea of an equality of persons, or of the man Jesus of Nazareth as being God upon earth disguised in a human form, just as the Father was God in heaven, unseen and inaccessible to man, revealed only by an 'only begotten God,' who had 'come down from heaven,' and was conceived by the Holy Ghost of the Virgin Mary. Of conceptions so gross as these there is no trace in this fourth Gospel, which nowhere mentions the miraculous conception. Nevertheless it may be true, that the author's ideas went so far at times as to regard the Logos incarnate as an actual divine existence, distinct and separate from God. The natural development of the Logos idea, tended to this—although it may still be a question whether this Evangelist consistently held the doctrine in the dualistic sense of later times. Dr. Liddon observes of Philo that he speaks of the Logos sometimes as personal and sometimes as non-personal, sometimes as a 'second God' and sometimes as merely a power or manifestation of God, in a way to 'convince any unprejudiced reader that Philo did not know his own mind.' This being the case, is it not probable that we have something of the same kind of indecision in the fourth

Evangelist?—that we have in him too something of the same ebb and flow of thought natural to a mind occupied with an obscure speculative subject such as this?

If such be the case, it will be useless to attempt further to harmonise apparently conflicting statements of this Evangelist. Still, one very important point should not be forgotten. It is a point to which Dr. Liddon expressly invites attention, when he remarks of the Word that it was *not* ‘an independent being, existing externally to the one God;’ and when he tells us that so to conceive if it ‘would be an error at issue with the first truth of monotheism.’ This admission is as weighty as it is just. But then it inevitably provokes the suggestion, that neither ought we to *spea*k of the Word ‘as an independent being,’ possessed of a separate personal existence. And if it reminds us that we ought carefully to avoid thinking of the Word under this polytheistic character, does it not tell us with equal emphasis, that we must not invoke it in prayers and hymns exactly as if it *were* ‘an independent being existing externally to the One God? But nevertheless, is not this exactly what is done by that great national Church of which Dr. Liddon is so conspicuous a member?.*

§ 10. John viii., 58: ‘Verily, verily, I say unto you, Before Abraham was, I am.’—The translation here remains as it was, with the margin on the word ‘was,’ ‘Gr. *was born.*’ There are excellent reasons for holding that the rendering accepted by the Revision gives an inadequate expression of the sense intended by the Evangelist.

The phrase ‘I am’ as here used, occurs repeatedly in the sense ‘I am *he*,’ that is, I am the Messiah. Thus to the woman of Samaria, Jesus declares, ‘I that speak unto thee

* See the Anglican Prayer Book, and also Hymns Ancient and Modern, *passim*.

am," that is (as the context shows), 'I am *he*,' the Christ. So in John viii. 24, 28, xiii. 19. In such expressions the speaker asserts his Messiahship, and this is recognised in these instances by the revisers, who have retained, in each, the interpreting word *he*, to complete the sense. So it is also in Mark xiii. 6, 'Many shall come in my name, saying, 'I am *he*.' The verse under notice is part of a passage in which Jesus is vindicating his Messianic character (John viii. 52, 59) against persons who disbelieved and opposed; and he affirms in the strongest language that he existed and was the Messiah appointed in the divine counsels, even before Abraham was born—'Before Abraham was, 'I am *he*.' A different side of the same thought is expressed in the prayer, in John xvii. 5, 'the glory which I had with thee before the world was.' The Logos in Jesus, as before stated (§ § 8, 9), which was now speaking in him, and which was in the beginning with God, could evidently say, 'Before Abraham was, I am *he*.*' The phrase thus rests upon the primary conception of the Gospel.

The explanation of the words under notice by a reference to Exod. iii. 14, is wholly fallacious. Here we read in the English Bible, 'I am what I am,' and 'I am hath sent me unto you.' But, in reality, the words in the Hebrew are in the Future tense, 'I will be'; and there is no reason in the nature of the case, why they should be otherwise rendered, whatever the intended meaning may be. † They were thus understood by the ancient Jewish-Greek translators

* There may be an allusion to the same idea of pre-existence in John vi. 38, 62. The words of John iii. 13, "the Son of man which is in heaven," may be a parenthetical addition of the Evangelist, as in iv. 2, 8, and various similar cases. But 'which is in heaven' is omitted by many ancient authorities.

† It may be the future faithfulness of Jehovah to his promise of deliverance (Exod. iii. 12); or his future presence with his people for their protection.

Aquila and Theodotian, who are both of them remarkable for the literal character of their renderings. The Oriental versions naturally follow the Hebrew tense form, while Western translators, with some notable exceptions (Luther) have mostly followed the Septuagint and the Vulgate, neither of which is any conclusive authority on the rendering of Hebrew tenses. Thus the explanation of the words of John viii. 58, to the effect that Christ intended to refer to the 'I am' of Exodus is inadmissible. It follows that he is not here represented by the Evangelist as arrogating to himself the title of the self-existent Jehovah. The wonder is that such an understanding of his words should have found favour with any careful expositor.

§ II. Acts xx. 28: 'The Church of God, which he purchased with his own blood.'—The margin informs us that 'many ancient authorities read *the Lord*' instead of 'God.' The two most ancient manuscripts read 'God'; but others of importance, including the Alexandrine, have *Lord*.

As in the case of John i. 18, it is probable that both forms existed in the manuscripts of the fourth century, and that the copiers felt themselves at liberty to follow either. The 'blood' of 'God' is an expression which was no doubt acceptable, if not conceivable, to some early Church Fathers, and it is in evident harmony with the theology of the Nicene Creed. It is more than probable that the higher feeling of the nineteenth century will increasingly revolt against it. If, too, it should appear, as we shall see it does, that St. Paul in his extant Epistles has nowhere spoken of Jesus as 'God,' even in the subordinate or Logos sense, it is altogether unlikely that he should have done so in his speech in Acts xx. to the elders at Ephesus. The reading accepted by the revisers may therefore be dismissed as a mere product of the same period of prolific theological growth and transi-

tion to which we owe various other corruptions of the Christian books—a conclusion which should surely be a relief to the reverent feeling of all thoughtful Christian persons. Any doubt there may be as to the text has been settled by the revisers in accordance, no doubt, with the critical evidence. But that the question of reading is by no means *certain*, may be seen by the fact that Lachmann, Tregelles, and Tischendorf, the most eminent of modern editors of the Greek Testament, preferred the reading 'Lord.' It was natural perhaps, that the revisers should decline to follow them, seeing that there is really a good shew of evidence for the text they have adopted. But, as before said, if the general analogy of the Pauline Epistles had been properly attended to, the received reading could not have been followed.

§ 12. Rom. iii. 25: 'Jesus Christ, whom God set forth *to be* a propitiation through faith, by his blood.' The change here, from the Authorised 'faith in his blood,' is considerable, but the margin retains the old rendering. A great objection to the latter is that the expression is unparalleled in the New Testament. It is without sanction, both in substance and in form. The distinctive 'faith' of the New Testament is faith in Jesus as the Christ, faith that he was the Christ, as will be found in numerous instances.*

The rendering 'by his blood' affords a sense which is natural and suitable to the context. The words no doubt mean *by his death*, and they belong to the verb 'set forth;'—'Jesus Christ, whom God set forth by his death *to be* a propitiation,' 'through faith' to those who believe in him and receive him as the Messiah. This statement of the Apostle should be interpreted, not from modern beliefs or theories, but from a due consideration of the similar

* Such as John xi. 27, xx. 31; Acts ix. 20; 1 John v. 1, 5.

language used elsewhere by Paul, from the known sentiments of the Jews towards the Gentile world, and the controversies to which these gave rise.

Jesus the Christ was a Jew, 'born under the law;' as such he could not be the Messiah to 'sinners of the Gentiles.' This was a first principle with a Jew.* But God allowed his beloved Son, the Messiah, to put away his Jewish character and limitations. This he did by dying; for 'the law hath dominion over a man so long as he liveth'—not when he is dead. Christ then, as now become a spiritual being, could only be approached 'through faith.' The Jews again were 'under sin' as well as the Gentile race; and by their sins they were unfitted for the Messiah's kingdom. But his death removing him from the dominion of the law gave them a new access to him by faith. Thus Christ was 'set forth by his blood' for Jew and Gentile alike. He died for all; for the sins of all; and his death might be spoken of (perhaps only figuratively) as a sacrifice for sin, 'a propitiation.'† This with its result of 'salvation' to all, was not gained by any right of obedience, or of 'works,' but only by the free gift (grace) of God. Ephes. ii. 4, 5.

The mind of the great Apostle was familiar with ideas derived from the sacrificial system of his people, and he naturally uses language and figures framed upon those ideas. With Paul the death of Christ was necessary to make him cease to be a Hebrew, to make him spiritual, and Lord of a spiritual kingdom, open to all men. Paul therefore could speak of that death as undergone for a redeeming purpose, in other words as a sacrifice, and propitiation 'for sin,' because it was the sins of the world, the sins of 'all,' that unfitted them for the kingdom of God. Thus the Christ died for 'all,' and all who had faith in him, becoming

* Compare Matt. xv. 24, 25.

† The same (Greek) word is used for the 'mercy seat,' Heb. ix. 5—as often in the Septuagint.

disciples, were in this sense redeemed by his 'precious blood.'

Still, however, it may be a question how far Paul's language on this subject is wholly figurative; whether he did not, in fact, attach a true expiatory character to the death. If he did so, we should certainly have an easy and natural explanation of many expressions both of the Pauline Epistles and of other portions of the New Testament. Perhaps too the supposition is necessary, in order to account for the remarkable unanimity with which many different New Testament writers express themselves on the subject. Why, they would reflect, should God have permitted the well-beloved Son, the Messiah, to die? It could only have been for some reason of surpassing importance, and this may well have been found in the expiation of the sins of the world, by virtue of that dread sacrifice. If, to a Jewish mind of that day, there could be no remission 'without shedding of blood,' here was the sacrifice graciously provided by the Divine love itself.

Those who think that such an interpretation of the language is demanded by the case, will of course accept it. Those who think that such a view of Christ's death is permanently binding as a part of the Christian teaching will frame their thoughts of Christianity in accordance with it. But will it not be much simpler and more rational to consider the whole as rather the temporary and accidental form which the Gospel necessarily assumed, under the controlling influence of the circumstances and ideas amidst which it grew up into power? In this case, it seems unnecessary to let ancient beliefs about sacrifice and expiation control or supplant those higher conceptions of the spirituality and love of God which have come to us partly as the result of the teaching of Christ himself, partly as the natural development of religious ideas among cultivated and thoughtful men—to say nothing of the wondrous revelation of the Divine character and power given to us in these latter

days by the discoveries of Science. And this too, let us not forget, is of God's doing !

At all events the change of rendering now before us goes far to destroy the old idea that 'faith in the blood,' or in the efficacy of the 'blood' was here meant by the Apostle. It leaves us with the more reasonable thought of that event as simply the *medium* by which Christ was 'set forth *to be* a propitiation,' whether this expression be used in the literal or in the figurative sense.

§ 13. Rom. v. 11.

AUTHORISED.		REVISED.
. . . 'by whom we have now received the atonement.'		. . . 'by whom we have now received the reconciliation.'

Ephes. iv. 32.

. . . 'even as God for Christ's sake hath forgiven you.'		. . . , 'even as God also in Christ forgave you.'
--	--	---

In the former of these passages 'reconciliation' having taken the place of 'atonement,' this familiar word is no longer to be found in the New Testament. Very probably it was used by the translators of 1611 in its older sense of Reconciliation, so that there is no real change of meaning, but only the removal of a term liable to be misunderstood, and the substitution of a new one of more definite signification.

The reconciliation of man to God by faith and penitence is, no doubt, what the Apostle means—not the reconciliation of God by the appeasing of His anger. Hence again the addition in a preceding verse (Rom. v. 9) as made by the Revision is at least doubtful in this context. The words '*of God*' are inserted in italics, and the Apostle is made to speak of men being 'saved from the wrath *of God*' through Christ. But this is inconsistent with the emphatic declaration of other passages, which ascribe the whole scheme of

redemption to the Divine Love—as in Ephes. ii. 4. The wrath intended is probably that of the *law*: ‘for the law worketh wrath,’ as expressed in Rom. iv. 15. The law convicts of sin, and cannot forgive, but must exact the penalty. But the love of God in Christ, says the Apostle, annulled these consequences of transgression. Christ indeed, might be said to have borne the penalty in his own body on the tree—for so the ‘curse of the law’ fell upon him. The main fact is otherwise expressed in the second of the two above cited passages, . . . ‘forgiving one another, even as God also in Christ forgave you.’ This stands instead of the Authorised ‘for Christ’s sake,’ and the meaning is ‘by Christ,’ the ‘in,” here as so often elsewhere, having its instrumental force. Thus the common phrase of the popular theology, ‘for Christ’s sake’ has now, like the word ‘atonement,’ disappeared from the New Testament. It occurs in no other place, and God will nowhere be found spoken of as doing any thing ‘for Christ’s sake,’ but only ‘through’ him and ‘by him,’ as the immediate agent. Indeed, we may well understand, the Almighty Father acts always from his own perfect goodness and justice, alone.

Thus the doctrine of Atonement, at least in its older and grosser forms, widely accepted as it has been and still is, must in time itself disappear from Christian theology, along with the phrases in which it has so long been supposed to find expression. It is a sufficiently curious result of the Revision, that three such expressions as ‘faith in his blood,’ ‘atonement,’ ‘for Christ’s sake,’ should have been obliterated from the Pauline writings, so far as the revised text is concerned.* Their removal, we may well believe, can be only favourable to the diffusion of ideas of the Divine love and

* It should be noted that the expression ‘merits of Christ’ is equally unknown to the N. T.

mercy higher and better than have yet prevailed among the great multitudes of English speaking Christians.

§ 14. Rom. ix. 5: 'Whose are the fathers and of whom is Christ as concerning the flesh, who is over all, God blessed for ever.' In the Greek the article stands before Christ, 'the Christ,' and ought not to have been here omitted in the English. The slight change made by the revisers in the text, though only affecting the order of the words, is not without its significance. The introduction of the words 'as concerning the flesh' between 'Christ,' and the latter part of the verse will prepare the reader to see that the punctuation of the margin has on its face a certain amount of probability. The revisers have not gone further than this disturbance of the verbal order. But they have given a margin which, for the first time in a volume destined to be so widely read, gives notice that the ordinary or orthodox interpretation of this verse is not a certain one. The same thing has been fully acknowledged, or, indeed, the altered interpretation has been adopted and defended by Mr. Beet (a learned and much esteemed Wesleyan commentator) in his recent work on the Epistle to the Romans. The marginal note of the revisers runs thus: 'Some modern interpreters place a full stop after *flesh*, and translate *He who is God over all be (is) blessed for ever*; or *He who is over all is God, blessed for ever*. Others punctuate, *flesh, who is over all. God be (is) blessed for ever.*'* Thus three different modes of punctuation are admissible, the ancient manuscripts being themselves mostly without stops, and having the words written close together without space between. We need not dwell upon the different meanings which result from these different modes of punctuation. But it is necessary to point out two or three facts which the reader will

* Thus, in the new Greek text of Messrs. Westcott and Hort. 1881.

scarcely suspect from the marginal statement of the revisers. ‘*Some* modern interpreters place a full stop after flesh.’ Will it surprise the reader to be informed that nearly all recent interpreters of importance do this? The exceptions are only a few of what may be termed the English school of theology, and these not by any means of the highest authority, even in their own class. It is well known that the two eminent Greek Professors of Oxford and Cambridge respectively adopt this punctuation — Professors Jowett and Kennedy. Of recent English writers who do the same may be mentioned Mr. Beet, as before stated; * and Dr. S. Davidson, in his translation of the New Testament from Tischendorf’s text. Dr. Sanday, and Canon Farrar, though preferring the Authorised punctuation, fully allow that the other is grammatically admissible (*Expositor*, vol. ix. x.). The American revisers accept a margin, but recommend the substitution of a simpler, as well as more just and accurate form. Going beyond the school of English authorities we come at once to a host of scholars of the highest reputation—there are none higher—who adopt and defend one or other of the renderings which the revisers consign to the margin. Among the latter may be enumerated such men as Lachmann, Tischendorf, Winer, Fritzsche, Meyer,

* Mr. Beet observes:—‘This exposition [with the new punctuation] is not found in any of the Fathers; but is adopted by Erasmus and by Winer, Fritzsche, and Meyer, who are by all admitted to be almost unequalled as N. T. grammarians. It is given in the critical editions of Lachmann and Tischendorf. Attention has also been called in the *Expositor* [1880, vol. ix. x] . . . to the fact that in the Vatican, Alexandrian, Ephraim and Claromontane MSS., there are stops marking off the words in question as a doxology to the Father; and, in the last three, spaces which prove clearly that the stop is from the first hand. That the Alex. MS. has the stop from its original scribe, every one can now see for himself in the lately published photograph. The rarity of stops in all these MSS. gives importance to this fact.’ *Commentary on Romans*, 2nd edition, 1881, p. 268.

Ewald, De Wette, and many more. But this is not the whole case. 'Some *modern* interpreters;' but there are ancient authorities, too, which justify the same punctuation. The fact, whatever it may be worth as evidence of interpretation, is this, that *three* out of the four most ancient manuscripts of the New Testament have a stop 'after flesh.' These, as now well known, are the Vatican manuscript (fourth century), the Alexandrine (fifth), the Codex Ephraim (fifth or sixth),* and there are several others of minor importance. It is not by accident that the stop occurs in these documents, although it cannot be taken as actually proving that the scribe who in the fourth or fifth century copied these ancient manuscripts interpreted the words marked off by the stop as a doxology. He *may* in each case have referred them to Christ; but how can this be shewn? Surely the probability is the other way. Even of the Fathers who apply the words to Christ, some of them let us see that they do so in a certain subordinate sense. Christ was 'God over all,' because, they tell us, the Father had delivered all things into his hand; in much the same way as Moses is said to have been 'God,' to Pharaoh, and Aaron his brother to have been his prophet (Exod. vii. 1).

Objection may be made to the word *be* as the verb required to complete the sense. Many prefer 'is,'† but this point is of secondary importance; the main fact is that there is a greatly preponderating weight of evidence and testimony for the new punctuation. This it is too clear, and much to be

* These three MSS. were recently examined by the writer with a particular view to the punctuation of this verse. In the Alexandrine MS. the stop is unquestionably *a prima manu*. In the Ephraim, there is a *space*, of course from the first hand. In the Vatican, the originality of the stop may be doubtful.

† Professor Kennedy (*Occasional Sermons*, Appendix III.), prefers the rendering, 'He who is over all *is* God, blessed for ever.' Compare Rom. i. 25; 2 Cor. xi. 31.

regretted, the revisers have failed to indicate in their marginal note, leaving indeed a contrary impression upon the reader's mind.*

§ 15. Philip. ii. 5-7: 'Jesus Christ; who, being in the form of God, counted it not a prize to be on an equality with God, but emptied himself, taking the form of a servant,' &c.—The new translation certainly introduces something of meaning into an obscure and difficult passage. Yet the rendering is less clear and apposite to the context than it might have been. The term 'prize' is hardly a just rendering of the original, and it is difficult to see the propriety of the word in such a place. The marginal note, '*Gr. a thing to be grasped*' nearly gives the real sense, and inasmuch as this is admitted to be the Greek, why was it not received into the text? Adopting it, we may read, 'who, being in the form of God counted it not a thing to be grasped to be on an equality with God, but emptied himself, taking the form of a servant,' &c.—more literally perhaps, 'counted not the being equal with God a thing to be seized,' (or grasped at.) But the mere translation of the words does not determine their interpretation. This must be sought simply in the feelings and circumstances of the time to which the writer of the words belonged, so far as these are known to us, and in the similar ideas elsewhere expressed by the same writer.†

To St. Paul, Jesus of Nazareth was the long expected Messiah, a personage of surpassing importance to mankind, who had indeed lived for a time upon the earth in the lowliest guise and had been subjected even to ignominy and death, in order to fulfil the Divine purposes concerning him.

* See appendix, note A.

† According to the exegetical rule compendiously laid down by a great authority:—'Interpret grammatically, historically, contextually, and minutely.' Bishop Ellicott, in *Aids to Faith*.

Nevertheless, he would shortly return to the earth in power and glory, to judge the world and to take back with him to heaven his faithful followers. Such was Paul's belief and expectation, as seen in many places in his writings.—(See 1 Thess. iv. 13—18; 2 Thess. i. 6—10; compare James v. 7, 8, with numerous passing allusions in other books, as 1 Cor. i. 7, 8, vii. 29, xv. 23, 51, 52; Philip ii. 20; 2 Pet. iii. 10—13.) Various expressions to the same effect occur in the first three Gospels, while all are illustrated by the entire strain and tenour of the book of Revelation. Paul constantly reminds us that it was the Divine love and mercy which permitted the beloved Son, the Messiah, to pass through a period of humiliation and suffering, for the sake of sinful men. God in his mercy to man gave up his Son to suffer and die, as the Son also himself willingly obeyed the Father's behest. In the first instance, Christ came to call the world to repentance, that all who received or should receive him with the faith of discipleship might be 'saved' in the approaching 'day of the Lord.' Hence therefore the Christ, great Prince and potentate though he was, and, by his position and his rights as the divinely protected and beloved Son, far exalted above every earthly thing, yet for a time had put aside this rightful greatness; 'though he was rich yet for your sakes he became poor' (2 Cor. viii. 9) and submitted 'even to the death of the cross.'

The exposition of the passage which may thus be drawn very directly from a due consideration of historical circumstances and ideas shows us that what the Apostle is alluding to is not any pre-existent state of 'Eternal Godhead,' or prerogatives of Divine Majesty,* These cannot surely be conceived of as laid aside or abandoned by the Infinite. These, therefore, it could not be, but simply the dignities

* As held, for example, by Bishop Lightfoot, in his Commentary on the Epistle to the Philippians.

and rights appertaining to the Messianic office. *These* Jesus did not count as 'a thing to be seized,' so as to be 'on an equality with God' upon the earth,—although, to the belief of his followers, he might have been so, and should hereafter be so, at his second coming. But he divested himself of these his Messianic attributes, and was humble and obedient 'even unto death.' 'Wherefore,' the Apostle adds, God hath highly exalted him and *given* him a name above every other; that 'in' his name (not *at* his name—a mistranslation which the revisers have corrected), that in his name every knee should bow, and every tongue confess that he is Lord, 'to the glory of God the Father.'

The popular interpretation of this passage clearly makes *two* divine beings, each of whom is God; one of whom is for a time humbled and obedient, while the other has undergone no change, but on the contrary exalts and glorifies his fellow God, as a reward for his submission. So gross a conception as this should not be imputed to the Apostle Paul, and is altogether inadmissible and uncalled for, when the nature of the case and the ideas of the time respecting the Messiah are duly considered. Without taking note of such considerations, no just interpretation of this or any other difficult passage can be reasonably expected. Interpretations founded upon modern systems of theology may be comparatively easy and acceptable, in other respects; but surely a proper regard for truth requires something more than this, and dictates thought and care and an earnest effort to attain the original sense, and that alone.

The margin of the text before us mentions that the Greek word rendered 'being' may mean 'being originally.' No doubt it has sometimes this meaning, or one very near to it. But many instances occur in the New Testament, in which it simply means 'being' and can mean nothing more—for example, Rom. iv. 19, 'he being about a hundred years old.' In the present case the sense may be, being

properly, or in reality, in spite of outward appearances—being by virtue of his Messianic office. This expresses something of the alleged shade of meaning, though not precisely the same. But ‘being’ alone is all that is needed, or can be reasonably claimed. ‘In the form of God’ is a difficult phrase, found nowhere else. It might be rendered ‘in the form of a god,’* the allusion being to the dignity and power belonging of right to the Messiah, which would have made him like a god on the earth. The phrase is evidently antithetic to the words ‘form of a servant,’ and ‘likeness of men,’ and these latter suggest the meaning of the former. They cannot therefore denote essential nature, but only outward condition. Naturally, by the dignity of his office, the Messiah was, and might have been, even as a god, ‘in the form of a god;’ but he did not grasp at this as something to be desired. He passed it all by, abandoned these natural rights of his Messianic office, and thus gave an example of humility and self-forgetfulness to which the Apostle could appeal, and which he earnestly calls upon the Philippians to consider and to imitate (verse 4). The turn which the popular theology gives to the passage in supposing it to mean that God, incarnate in Jesus, came down from heaven, and laid his divine majesty aside, and humbled himself to die, is simply incredible, and almost beyond the pale of rational discussion—as much so as the ancient Greek story of Apollo and Admetus. The god served the mortal in a useful capacity for a specified term, and so humbled himself by temporarily resigning his deity. Truly it is time that Christian theology should have done with such fables!

* This lower sense of the word ‘God’ is met with in the Bible, and was perfectly familiar in Paul’s time—Acts xvii. 23, 1 Cor. viii. 8.

§ 16. 1 Tim. iii. 16 :

AUTHORISED.
 ‘God was manifest in the flesh.’

REVISED.
 ‘He who was manifested in the flesh.’

The alteration here is important. The old reading is pronounced untenable by the revisers, as it has long been known to be by all careful students of the New Testament. The margin runs, ‘The word *God*, in place of *He who*, rests on no sufficient ancient evidence.’ It is in truth another example of the facility with which ancient copiers could introduce the word *God* into their manuscripts—a reading which, as we have seen, was itself the natural result of the growing tendency in the early Christian times, and under the influence of the *Logos* philosophy, to look upon the humble Teacher as the incarnate Word, and therefore, in the *Logos* sense, as ‘*God manifested in the flesh.*’ The Alexandrine manuscript is the oldest which contains this reading, if it *be* contained in that manuscript. About this, however, opinions differ singularly, the manuscript text being in such a condition that it is not possible to decide with absolute certainty. The critics differ from one another in a way which suggests that their judgment can hardly depend on eyesight alone.*

§ 17. Titus ii. 13: ‘our great God and Saviour Jesus Christ.’ 2 Pet. i. 1: ‘the righteousness of our God and Saviour Jesus Christ.’—These two verses may be considered together. They present perhaps the most important instance of change contained in the new text—only to be equalled by ‘*God only begotten*’ in the margin of John i. 18. In both places, the margin fairly gives notice that the old translation may after all be correct; and in both places the American committee recommend that the new text and its

* See Dr. Scrivener’s very interesting note on the subject in his *Introduction to N. T. Criticism*, 2nd ed., p. 553.

margin should change places. It is thus clear that the old translation in each case has as much authority as the new one, and the question might properly be asked, Why then did the English revisers alter it?

The revised rendering yields indeed the same theological doctrine which is supposed to be contained in Rom. ix. 5, Acts xx. 28. And moreover, the degree of certainty attaching to it is the same, in kind and amount, as that of the verses just mentioned—certainly no more, if so much. In all the cases, this can afford but little satisfaction to any reasonable mind, for it surely forms a wonderfully slight basis upon which to build the stupendous conclusion of an incarnate Deity.

The meaning of the words depends grammatically on the application of one of the rules respecting the use of the Greek article. This tells us that, when the article stands before two or more terms united by a conjunction and used attributively or as names of office or dignity, such terms preceded by the one article denote one and the same subject, not two different ones. Thus, Tit. ii. 13 literally reads, 'glory of the great God and Saviour of us Jesus Christ.' Here it is alleged the article *the* binds the two following terms together so as to make one subject of them. Similarly in 2 Pet. i. 1, 'Righteousness of the God of us and Saviour Jesus Christ.' In each case, it is alleged, the terms God and Saviour, under the one article can only denote one subject, even Jesus Christ. This seems all very straightforward and very clear. But, if it be so, why then did the revisers append the disturbing alternative rendering, 'Or, *of the great God and our Saviour Jesus Christ,*' in the one case; in the other, 'Or, *our God and the Saviour Jesus Christ*'? Why were they not satisfied with one correct and sufficient rendering, that of their own text? Simply, because this rendering is not *certain*; it is no *more* certainly correct or adequate than the other; nay, when the analogy of the

rest of the Pauline and Petrine Epistles is attended to it is far *less* certain, and in truth, as may be shown, it is arbitrary and inadmissible!

It is well known, and admitted on all hands, that the rule above referred to is open to many exceptions, and that it is not applied with strictness even in classical Greek. Such phrases as the following frequently occur:—"the citizens and strangers," "the cup-bearer and cook and groom," "the commanders of the foot soldiers and horsemen;"*—in each of which the nouns denote, not *one* and the *same* but different subjects, although preceded by the single article.

It is further to be observed that in the case of proper names, or words equivalent to such, it is common enough for one article to stand before two or more nouns which do *not* denote one and the same subject or person—just as we might say 'the king and queen,' though it might be better to say 'the king and the queen.' In the New Testament we have 'the Scribes and Pharisees,' and there are many such cases, like 'the Athenians and Peloponnesians,' at the beginning of Thucydides, Book I.

Now, words like Saviour, Lord, King, of frequent use, so well understood, distinctive meaning, and familiar as belonging to one definite person and no one else, might be used without the article, much as any proper name. So with the word βασιλεύς, king, as found in classical Greek. And where ὁ θεός, God, occurred, denoting, as it always does in the New Testament, the one only Divine Being, how could it ever occur to a Jewish or Christian reader that this noun was to be identified with the subject of a following noun (whether Jesus Christ or any other) simply because of the absence of the article before the latter? If such a rule is to be so strictly applied, it might be easy to show to a reader under

* The references are, Plato, *Apol. Soc.* ix. (ed. Cron.); Herod, iv. 71; Xen. *Memorabilia* vii. 19.

its bondage that GOD and Satan were one and the same being ! For the words $\delta\ \theta\epsilon\acute{o}\varsigma\ \kappa\alpha\iota\ \delta\iota\acute{\alpha}\beta\omicron\lambda\omicron\varsigma$ would doubtless be good Greek, however objectionable in other respects.

It follows that the absence of the article in the second member of the two verses in question affords no sufficient ground for the rendering adopted by the revisers. They give it, indeed, as before noticed, only as one of two alternative renderings, so far admitting the doubt which attaches to the meaning, or at the least disclosing the fact that a minority of the revisers (like the majority of the American Committee) considered the marginal alternative an admissible translation. As good orthodox men it was no doubt quite reasonable on the part of the English revisers to prefer what seemed to be so clearly in harmony with orthodox theology. But faithfulness to the original would have equally justified adherence to the Authorised, especially if the good principle had been followed of making 'as few alterations as possible.' The long descended Authorised therefore, being on the ground, ought to have been left unchanged, and probably it would have been so left by revisers not so strongly under the influence of a foregone conclusion.

To the correctness of this position there is a remarkable testimony under the hand and seal of the revisers themselves ! In 2 Thess. i. 12, we have exactly the same form of expression as in 2 Pet. i. 1. The words and their order are all the *same*, except only that $\kappa\acute{\iota}\rho\iota\omicron\varsigma$, Lord, takes the place of $\sigma\omega\tau\acute{\eta}\rho$, Saviour. Thus:—(a) 2 Pet. i. 1: literally, 'the God of us and Saviour Jesus Christ;' (b) 2 Thess. i. 12: literally, 'the God of us and Lord Jesus Christ.' In (a) the rendering is 'our God and Saviour Jesus Christ;' in (b) it is 'our God and the Lord Jesus Christ.' To which of these inconsistent translations of the same form of words will the revisers adhere as correct?

There is one fact which possibly should be allowed to

modify the conclusion above arrived at, as to the translation of 2 Pet. i. 1. The second Epistle called after Peter is one of the latest writings of the New Testament. On this account it may be that the revised rendering ought to stand. In the second century, it is beyond question, Christ came to be spoken of as personally God—an easy consequence, as before shewn, of the application to him of the Logos doctrine. But this remark does not apply to any writer of the New Testament so early as Paul—nor indeed to any of the New Testament writers, unless it be the fourth Evangelist (John xx. 28) and the writer of 2 Peter, if the latter really meant what is attributed to him.

It may be further observed that the revised text of these two verses not only contradicts the general tenour of the New Testament, in which $\delta \theta\epsilon\omicron\varsigma$ is everywhere distinguished from Jesus Christ, but that this fact is fully recognised by such authorities as Winer,* De Wette, Meyer, Davidson, even Alford, with many more,—except only that Davidson in 2 Pet. i. 1 follows the new rendering—probably on account of the development of doctrine just alluded to. Bishop Ellicott, although on exegetical grounds defending the new rendering ('Pastoral Epistles,' *in loc.*) has yet expressly guarded himself against too servile a deference to the rule of the article above referred to. His words are clear and to the point:—'Lastly, several examples of what is called Granville Sharp's rule, or the inference from the presence of the article only before the first of two substantives connected by $\kappa\alpha\iota$, that they both refer to the same person or class must be deemed very doubtful. The rule is sound in principle, but in the case of proper names or quasi-proper names, cannot safely be pressed.'—*Aids to Faith* (4th. ed.), p. 462.†

* See Appendix, note B.

† See Appendix, Note C.

§ 18. I John v. 7, 8.

AUTHORISED.

7. 'For there are three that bear record in heaven, the Father, the Word, and the Holy Ghost : and these three are one. 8. And there are three that bear witness in earth, the spirit and the water and the blood : And these three agree in one.'

REVISED.

7. 'And it is the Spirit that beareth witness, because the Spirit is the truth. 8. For there are three who bear witness, the Spirit, and the water, and the blood ; and the three agree in one.'

The Revision, it will be observed, has achieved the distinction of adding a new verse to the Bible—that is to say, it has taken the latter part of the Authorised verse 6, and made it count as Revised verse 7. To balance this, the Authorised verse 7 is quietly dropped out of the text, not a word being said about it. Such is the ignominious end of this famous verse—the only verse in the Bible in which the doctrine of the Trinity was stated, and was no doubt intended to be stated. It could scarcely have been differently treated ; for, as the verse is contained in no Greek manuscript whatever worth noticing, there was actually nothing to work upon. Faithful revisers, of course, could only revise what there was to revise ! But yet they might have shewn a little respect for an interpolation so ancient, so wide-spread, so much valued, and doubtless, by many, so much regretted ; and they might certainly have given their readers some sort of notice that it was once there, and is there no more. Better, perhaps, as it is—better at least for the popular creeds, to let the verse pass quietly into oblivion. *Requiescat in pace !* and may no ill-judging defender of discarded texts attempt to disturb its repose.

Near the close of the same chapter there stands a remarkable expression, which although untouched by the Revision is yet deserving of a passing notice. It is I John v. 20 : 'This is the true God and eternal life,' which a hasty reader might suppose to be said of Jesus Christ. But the writer of these Epistles sometimes refers to a remoter, instead of a

nearer, antecedent, and no doubt in this instance he means by 'this,' not the subject last-named, but 'him that is true,' *i.e.*, God (verse 19.) There is a similar construction in the Second Epistle of John, verse 7.—'This is the deceiver and the anti-christ,' where the pronoun evidently refers, not to Jesus Christ, but to the more distant noun, the 'deceivers,' who 'confess not that Jesus Christ cometh in the flesh.'

CONCLUSION.

DOCTRINAL RESULTS OF THE REVISION.

Since the publication of the revised New Testament, it has been frequently said that the changes of translation which the work contains are of little importance from a doctrinal point of view;—in other words, that the great doctrines of popular theology remain unaffected, untouched by the results of the revision. How far this assertion is correct, the careful reader of the foregoing pages will be able to judge for himself. To the writer any such statement appears to be in the most substantial sense contrary to the facts of the case, for the following reasons:—

(1) The only passage in the New Testament which seemed like a statement of the doctrine of the Trinity, has been removed by the revisers as *spurious*. See above § 18, and compare § 7.

(2) The sole Deity of the Father has been re-affirmed in a remarkable case in which the authorised version had singularly misrepresented the original words. 'The only God' of John v. 44, affords evidence equally strong and clear with that of John xvii. 3, that the writer of this Gospel could not have intended to represent Jesus, the Christ, or Messiah, or even the Logos in him, as GOD in the same high

sense of Infinite and Eternal Being in which HE is so. Who is 'the Only True God.' The margin of John i. 18, 'God only begotten,' used of the Logos, in no way lessens the force of this remark, but serves to strengthen it. An 'only begotten God,' a *δευτερος θεός* or 'second God,' could never have been intended by the Evangelist to be represented as *equal* to the Being whom he designates as 'the only God.' Indeed this highest of Names the same Evangelist carefully lets us see that Jesus, or the Logos speaking in him, disclaimed for himself, making himself simply 'Son of God' (John x. 35)—no doubt here in the Logos Messiah sense.

(3) The character of the baptismal formula is greatly altered by the simple substitution of the word 'into' for 'in'—shewing us that there could never have been, as people have commonly supposed, any ecclesiastical magic in the phrase 'In the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost,' seeing that this phrase is not to be found in the New Testament at all,* and that the words simply express a change of mind, on the part of the convert, from disbelief or denial to the profession of the allegiance which constituted discipleship.

(4) One remarkable instance in which the epithet 'God' was given to Christ (1 Tim. iii. 16) has been excluded from the text, and others of similar kind are admitted by the Revision to be uncertain. See above, in Acts xx. 28; Rom. ix. 5; Tit. ii. 13; 1 Pet. i. 1. In both the last named texts the apparent support newly extended to orthodox theology by the change of translation is virtually recalled and nullified by those who offer it; the new rendering being shewn to be doubtful, in other words, worthless, by the marginal admission, that the change was uncalled for and purely arbitrary. See above, §§ 11, 14, 16, 17.

* It should not be forgotten that this threefold formula is nowhere found in use in the N. T. All the baptisms in the Book of Acts are in confession of Christ simply—as Acts ii. 38, viii. 16, xix. 5.

(5) The only instance in the New Testament in which the religious worship or adoration of Christ was apparently implied, has been *altered* by the Revision: 'At the name of Jesus every knee shall bow,' is now to be read 'in the name;—See above, § 15. Moreover, no alteration of text or of translation will be found anywhere to make up for this loss' as, indeed, it is well understood that the New Testament contains neither precept nor example which really sanction the religious worship of Jesus Christ.*

(6) The word 'Atonement' disappears from the New Testament, and so do the connected phrases, 'faith in his blood,' and 'for Christ's sake.' These so commonly used expressions are shewn to be misrepresentations of the force of the original words, such alterations evidently throwing the most serious doubt upon the important popular doctrine of which they have hitherto been a main or indispensable support.

The changes just enumerated are manifestly of great importance, and are they not wholly unfavourable to the popular theology? Many persons will deny this, but it is hard to see on what grounds they do so. Or, if it be true that the popular orthodoxy remains unaffected by *such* changes, the inference is unavoidable that popular orthodoxy must be very indifferent as to the nature of the foundation on which it stands.

But indeed it is easy to see that it is not within the New Testament, but in the traditional creeds and other such documents, that the theology of the day finds its clearest exposition and its true strength. Hence it was hardly to be expected that any revision of the New Testament would be felt to have done it harm, whatever the light thrown from

* Some would find such sanction in the ideal description of the honour paid to the Lamb in the Book of Revelation, Capp. iv. v. But the praises of the Lamb here recorded are evidently not religious worship, in the high sense in which it is offered to 'Him that liveth for ever and ever;' nor can it be shewn that the author of this book intended to recommend the worship of the glorified Jesus to his disciples on earth, even supposing that, had he done so, he ought to be obeyed!

any source upon the interpretation of Scripture. The upholders of orthodox doctrine, Evangelical or Anglican, need not therefore be much troubled by the altered aspect which the Scriptures may assume in consequence. The idea of revising the standards has not yet been seriously entertained. Indeed, legally speaking, an angel from heaven, much less a Revision Company, could not be allowed to touch an Athanasian Creed or a Schedule of doctrines in a chapel trust! But is this a position which those who profess to value the New Testament as the sole fountain of doctrinal truth can feel themselves quite happy to accept?—to be bound so unalterably to the ideas of the past, and unable to change any thing, lest it should contradict, not the New Testament, but the Creed, or the imposed Article, or the chapel trust deed, or the Confession of Faith approved of old by a Church Assembly or a Conference?

It is little then to be wondered at, that the doctrinal results of the Revision should be either lightly estimated, or altogether denied. Nevertheless, of one thing we may be sure: in the light of advancing science and historical research the unlovely dogmatic temper will gradually cease to exist, or be ashamed to shew itself. Those in particular whom that temper inspires to judge others, and even to proclaim that they shall 'perish everlastingly' because they decline to profess what they do not believe—such persons will doubtless become more reticent as time passes, and as knowledge and right feeling increase. Meanwhile it is well that some few, though but a few, should still utter their protest, as occasion requires, against uncharitable assumptions and the manifold perversion of the words and the Spirit of Christ. This it may long be necessary to do. May those to whom it falls to do it discharge their duty faithfully, and so, amidst good or evil report, contribute in some humble measure to the earlier coming, and the surer establishment in the world, of the kingdom of God.

APPENDIX.

NOTE A.—On Rom. ix. 5, the following are Winer's remarks in reply to those who argue from the position of the word *εὐλογητός* (blessed) that the sentence in question cannot be a doxology, but must be referred to Christ:—‘It is natural that in those sentences particularly which have the character of exclamations, as in blessings, the predicate should stand at the head; This remark also applies, as a rule, to the doxologies of the O. T., Gen. ix. 26, 1 Sam. xxvi. 25, 2 Sam. xviii. 28, Ps. cvi. (cv.) 48, al. But it is only by empirical commentators that this arrangement can be regarded as unalterably fixed; for where the subject expresses the main idea and especially where it is antithetical to another subject, the predicate both may and will stand after it: comp. Ps. lxvii. 20 (LXX). Hence in Rom. ix. 5, if the words *ὁ ἐπὶ πάντων θεὸς εὐλογητός κ.τ.λ.* are referred to God, this collocation of the words is perfectly suitable, and indeed necessary.’—Winer, *Grammar of N. T. Greek*, translated by Moulton, pp. 689-90.

NOTE B.—Titus ii. 13:—The following will shew Winer's judgment on this passage:—‘In Tit. ii. 13, *ἐπιφάνεια τῆς δόξης τοῦ μεγάλου θεοῦ καὶ σωτῆρος ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ χριστοῦ*, considerations derived from Paul's system of doctrine lead me to believe that *σωτῆρος* is not a second predicate, co-ordinate with *θεοῦ*,—Christ being first called *ὁ μέγας θεός* and then *σωτήρ*. The article is omitted before *σωτῆρος* because this word is defined by the genitive *ἡμῶν*, and because the apposition precedes the proper name: *of the great God and of our Saviour Jesus*

Christ. Similarly in 2 Pet. i. 1, where there is not even a pronoun with *σωτήρος.* To this Winer adds a note as follows:—‘In the above remarks I had no intention to deny that, in point of *grammar*, *σωτήρος ἡμῶν* may be regarded as a second predicate, jointly dependent on the article *τοῦ*; but the dogmatic conviction derived from Paul’s writings that this Apostle cannot have called Christ *the great God* induced me to shew that there is no grammatical obstacle to our taking the clause *καὶ σωτήρος ἡμῶν Ἰησ. Χρισ.* by itself, as referring to a second subject.’ To this Dr. Moulton, the translator and editor of Winer’s *Grammar*, adds the following words:—‘This passage is very carefully examined by Bishop Ellicott and Dean Alford *in loc.*, and though these writers come to different conclusions (the latter agreeing with Winer, the former rendering the words ‘of our great God and Saviour Jesus Christ’), they are entirely agreed as to the admissibility of both renderings in point of *grammar.*’—Winer, *N. T. Grammar*, p. 162. After this it would seem that little more need be said on the subject.

NOTE C.—A writer in the *Guardian* newspaper (Supplement, August 24, 1881), strongly approving of the new rendering of Tit. ii. 13 and 2 Pet. i. 1, insists upon the identity of the two cases with 2 Pet. i. 11, ‘the kingdom of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ.’ He observes that the sequence of the words is exactly similar, and therefore that the rendering should be similar. This is true as to the sequence, but there is one fundamental *difference* which, along with other essential considerations, is entirely and most strangely left out of sight by the writer referred to.

The difference meant consists in the occurrence of the word *God* in the two cases under discussion, and of *Lord* simply in 2 Pet. i. 11. The rule respecting the article does not hold in cases where the subjects are *already* well understood to be *distinct*. Thus *ὁ φίλιππος καὶ ἀλέξανδρος* do not imply that Philip and Alexander are one and the same per-

son; so neither does ὁ θεὸς καὶ σωτὴρ Ἰησ. χριστοῦ. necessarily imply that God and Christ are one and the same person, inasmuch as they were well known to be two, and are everywhere recognised and spoken of as two. The analogy of the Pauline writings is strongly against their identification, nor can the mere accident of their collocation or sequence under one article be reasonably held to establish it. Paul even speaks of God as ‘the God of our Lord Jesus Christ’ (Ephes. i. 17); how then is it possible to suppose that he really intended to call Christ ‘the great God,’ in Tit. ii. 13? This is quite as incredible as the disputable and unnecessary rendering of Rom. ix. 5, which would make Christ ‘God over all.’ It cannot then be denied that Paul in no instance really identifies God and Christ, but everywhere, without exception, keeps them distinct in his expressions:—‘One Lord, one faith, one baptism, One God and Father of all’ (Ephes. iv. 5, 6); ‘To us there is One God, the Father . . . and one Lord Jesus Christ’ (I. Cor. viii. 6); ‘the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ’ (Ephes. i. 3).

*Books on Sale at the Depository of the British and Foreign
Unitarian Association, 37, Norfolk St., Strand, London.*

POSITIVE ASPECTS of UNITARIAN THOUGHT and DOCTRINE.
Ten Lectures by various Authors. Preface by Dr. Martineau. 3s. 6d.

DITTO, Cheap Edition, 1s.

The PROPHETS and their INTERPRETERS, by Dr. G. Vance
Smith. 6d.

The BIBLE and POPULAR THEOLOGY, by Dr. G. Vance
Smith. 2s. 6d.

The SPIRIT and the WORD of CHRIST, by Dr. G. V. Smith,
Second Edition. 2s. 6d. and 1s.

ETERNAL PUNISHMENT, with Remarks on Dr. Pusey's Defence
of the Doctrine, by Dr. G. V. Smith. 2nd Edition, 2d.

CHANNING, Dr., WORKS of, in one vol., 3s. 6d. or 4s.
American Edition, larger type, 5s.

CHANNING, Dr., MEMOIR of, by W. H. Channing. 2 vols., 5s

A DISCOURSE of MATTERS PERTAINING to RELIGION, by
Theodore Parker. 2s; or 1s. 4d. if 25 copies ordered.

PARKER, THEODORE, LIFE and WRITINGS of, by Dr. Réville.
1s. 3d.

UNITARIANISM DEFENDED. The Liverpool Lectures, by
James Martineau, J. H. Thom, and H. Giles. 5s.

A CRITICAL HISTORY of the DOCTRINE of a FUTURE LIFE,
by Dr. W. R. Alger. With Notes and Indexes of Authors and
Subjects, by Dr. Ezra Abbot. 10s.

The SOUL'S WAY to GOD, and other SERMONS, by Charles
Beard, B.A. Third Edition. 2s. 6d.

REASON in RELIGION, by Dr. F. H. Hedge. 2s. 6d.

HISTORY of the DOGMA of the DEITY of JESUS CHRIST, by
Dr. Réville. 4s.


CHRIST the REVEALER, by J. H. Thom. With Essays on
the Son of God, and on Prayer, by the same Author. 2s. 6d.

HISTORY of the CORRUPTIONS of CHRISTIANITY, by Dr
Priestley. 2s. 6d.

* * Any of these works will be forwarded, carriage paid, at the prices
named, by order to BOOK ROOM, 37, Norfolk Street, Strand, Lon-
don. Catalogues of books and tracts may be obtained on application,
or will be sent post free.



Date Due

FACULTY			
FACULTY			
SEP 28 1994			
OCT 28 1994			
			



BS188 .S64

Texts and margins of the revised New

Princeton Theological Seminary-Speer Library



1 1012 00061 6369