

REMARKS

ON THE USES OF THE

DEFINITIVE ARTICLE

IN THE

GREEK TEXT OF THE NEW TESTAMENT,

Containing many New Proofs

OF THE

DIVINITY OF CHRIST,

From Passages which are wrongly translated
in the

COMMON ENGLISH VERSION.

BY GRANVILLE SHARP.

CONTENTS.

RULE I.

When two personal nouns of the same case are connected by the copulative και, if the former has the definitive article, and the latter has not, they both relate to the same person page 8

EXAMPLES.*

1. Ὁ Θεος και πατηρ του κυριου ἡμων 9
2. Τῷ Θεῷ και πατρι 13
3. Εν τη βασιλεια του Χπιστου και Θεου 42
4. Κατα την χαριν του Θεου ἡμων και
κυριου Ιησου Χριστου, 45
5. Ενωπιον του Θεου και κυριου Ιησου
Χριστου 48
6. Επιφανειαν της δοξης του μεγαλου Θεου και
Σωτηρος ἡμων Ιησου Χριστου 35, 55
7. Εν δικαιοσυνη του Θεου ἡμων και Σωτηρος
ἡμων Ιησου Χριστου 34, 56
8. Και τον μονον δεσποτην Θεον και κυριον ἡμων
Ιησουν Χριστον αρνουμενοι 57

* [Ed. note: KJV translations of these examples appear on the next page. For reference, example 1- 2 Corinthians 1:3; example 2- James 1:27; example 3- Ephesians 5:5; example 4- 2 Thessalonians 4:12; example 5- 1 Timothy 5:21; example 6- Titus 2:13; example 7- 2 Peter 1:1; example 8- Jude 1:4]

(4)

Common Version.

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

Corrected Version.

Common Version.

- | | |
|--|--|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 3. In the kingdom of Christ, even of God 4. According to the grace of Jesus Christ, our God and Lord. 5. Before Jesus Christ, the God and Lord; <i>or</i>, our God and Lord: <i>for</i>, the definite article has sometime the power of a passive [sic: possessive] pronoun. 6. The glorious appearing of our great God and Saviour Jesus Christ. 7. Through the righteousness of Jesus Christ, our God and Saviour. 8. And denying our only Master, God, and Lord, Jesus Christ. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> In the kingdom of Christ, and of God. According to the grace of our God, and the Lord Jesus Christ. Before God, and the Lord Jesus Christ. The glorious appearing of the great God, and our Saviour Jesus Christ. Through the righteousness of God, and our Saviour Jesus Christ. And denying the only Lord God, and our Lord Jesus Christ. |
|--|--|

(5)

RULE II.

If both nouns have the article, but not the copulative, they relate to the same person page 14

RULE III.

If the first has the article, and the second has not, and there is no copulative, they relate also to the same person . . .19

RULE IV.

If the nouns are not personal, they relate to different things or qualities 21

RULE V.

If personal nouns, of the same case, are connected by the copulative, and the first has not the article, they relate to different persons 23

RULE VI.

If they are connected by the copulative, and both have the article, they relate also to different persons 25

A
LETTER

TO THE

Rev. Mr -----,

CONCERNING THE USES OF THE GREEK ARTICLE

ὁ IN THE NEW TESTAMENT.

Old Jewry, London, 10th June, 1778.

Dear Sir,

WHEN I look upon the date of your last obliging letter, I am much ashamed that I have so long neglected to acknowledge the receipt of it. The truth is, I began a letter a few days afterwards; but, recollecting that I had written on the same subject (viz. the use of the Greek article ὁ and copulative καὶ) to a very learned friend, at a great distance in the country, I was willing to wait for his answer, lest it should oblige me to make any alterations in my rules; and so, indeed, it has proved; for, he objected to my first rule, (as it was then stated,) and has cited several exceptions to it, which he thought sufficient to set it entirely aside: but this, I am convinced, is going too far, and would be an injury to truth. The use, therefore, which I have made of my friend's objections, has been, to correct my rule, and add to it such limitations as might include the several exceptions cited by my learned friend, as well as others that are similar to them.

The waiting for my friend's answer, and the necessary corrections in consequence of it, together with a variety of other engagements, have prevented me from complying with your request so soon as I could have wished; but I shall now submit to your consideration and candor the rules in question, and beg that you will be pleased to favor me with whatever example may occur in the course of your reading, either as exceptions to invalidate the *first rule*, or as proofs to establish and confirm it. The reason of my recommending the first rule more particularly to your attention, is, because it is of much more consequence than any of the rest, as it will enable us (if the truth of it be admitted) to correct the translation of several important texts in the present English version of the New Testament, in favor of a fundamental article of our church, which has, of late, been much opposed and traduced; I mean the belief that our Lord Jesus Christ is truly God.

RULE I.

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

[Ed. note: an interlinear has been added to Sharp's original Greek text to assist the reader; underlining has been added to replace the upper case letters used by Sharp for emphasis.]

Mat. 12:22.

και	εθεραπευσεν	αυτον,	ωστε	τον	τυφλον
and	he healed	him,	so that	the	blind
<u>και</u>	κωφον	και	λαλειν	και	βλεπειν.
and	dumb	and	to speak	and	to see.

And, again, 2 Cor. 1:3.

Ευλογητος	ὁ	Θεος	και	Πατηρ	του
Blessed	the	God	and	Father	of the
Κυριου	ἡμων	Ιησου	Χριστου,	ὁ	
Lord	of us	Jesus	Christ	the	
Πατηρ	των	οικτιρμων	και	Θεος	πασης
Father	of the	compassions	and	God	of all

παρακλησεως.
comfort

This last sentence contains two examples of the first rule. See also in 2 Cor. 11:31,

ὁ	Θεος	και	Πατηρ	του	Κυριου
the	God	and	Father	of the	Lord
ἡμων	Ιησου	Χριστου	οιδεν,		etc.
of us	Jesus	Christ	knows,		

Also in Eph. 6:21,

Τυχικος	ὁ	αγαπητος	αδελφος	και
Tychicus	the	beloved	brother	and

(10)

πιστος διακονος εν Κυριω.
faithful minister in Lord.

Also in Heb. 3:1,

Κατανοησατε τον αποστολον και αρχιερα
Consider the apostle and high priest

της ομολογιας ημων Ιησουν Χριστον,
of the confession of us Jesus Christ, etc.

See also in 2 Pet. 2:20,

εν επιγνωσει του Κυριου και Σωτηρος
In (by) a full knowledge of the Lord and Saviour

Ιησου Χριστου
Jesus Christ, etc.

And again, in 2 Pet. 3:2,

και της των αποστολων ημων εντολης,
and the of the apostles of you command

του Κυριου και Σωτηρος.
of the Lord and Saviour.

And again, in 2 Pet. 3:18,

Αυξανετε δε εν χαριτι και γνωσει
grow ye But in grace and knowledge

του Κυριου ημων και Σωτηρος Ιησου
of the Lord of us and Saviour Jesus

(11)

Χριστου. αυτω η δοξα και νυν και
Christ. To him the glory and now and

εις ημεραν αιωνος, αμην.
unto a day of age amen.

Also in Philippians, 4:20,

τω δε Θεω και Πατρι ημων η
to the Now God and Father of us the

δοξα
glory, etc.

In Rev. 16:15,

μακαριος ο γρηγορων και τηρων τα
blessed the [one] watching and keeping the

ιματια αυτου, ινα μη γυμνος
garments of him, in order that not naked

περιπατη
he walk, etc.

And in Col. 2:2, [Col. 2:2,3]

εις επιγνωσιν του μυστηριου του Θεου
for full knowledge of the mystery of the God

και Πατρος και του Χριστου*, εν ω
and Father and of the Christ in whom

* The distinction of persons mentioned in this sentence is preserved by the insertion of the article του before Χριστου, which had been omitted before Πατρος.

(12)

εισι παντες οι [sic-οι] θησαυροι της σοφιας
 are all the treasures of the wisdom, etc.

And in 1 Thes. 3:11,

Αυτος δε ο Θεος και Πατηρ
 [Him] self Now the God and Father

ημων και ο Κυριος ημων Ιησους
 of us and the Lord of us Jesus

Χριστος, κατευθυναι την οδον ημων προς
 Christ may he direct the way of us to

υμας.
 you.

This solemn ejaculation for the divine direction is addressed jointly to the God and Father, and to our Lord Jesus;* (so that here is good authority for offering up prayers to Christ, which some have lately opposed;) and the distinction of the persons is preserved (as in the last example) by again inserting the article ο before Κυριος, which had been omitted before Πατηρ. The apostle James also used the same mode of expression,

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

(13)

James, 1:27.

θρησκεια καθαρα και αμιανος παρα
 Religion clean and undefiled before

τω Θεω και Πατρι αυτη εστιν,
 the God and Father this is,

επισκεπτεται ορφανους και χηρας εν
 to visit orphans and widows in

τη θλιψει αυτων
 the affliction of them, etc.

And there are at least a dozen other places, (viz. Rom. 15:6, 1 Cor. 15:24, Gal. 1:4, Ephes. 5:20, Col. 1:3, and 12* and 3:17, 1 Thes. 1:3, 1 Thes. 3:13, 2 Thes. 2:16, James 3:9, [and] Rev. 1:6) wherein "*the God and Father*" is mentioned exactly according to this rule; and there is no exception or instance of the like mode of expression, that I know of, which necessarily requires a construction different from what is here laid down, EXCEPT the nouns be *proper names*, or *in the plural number*; in which cases there are many exceptions; though there are not wanting examples, even of plural nouns, which are expressed exactly agreeable to this rule.

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

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

authenticate and justify the rule. There are several other texts wherein the mode of expression is exactly similar, and which therefore do necessarily require a construction agreeable to the same rule; though the present English version has unhappily rendered them in a different sense, and has thereby concealed, from the mere *English* reader, many striking proofs *concerning the Godhead* (περι "της Θεοτητος," Col. 2:9) of our Lord and Saviour, Jesus Christ. The rules which follow are intended only to illustrate the *particularity* of the several sentences which fall under *the first rule*, by showing, in *other* sentences, the different senses that are occasioned by adding, omitting, or repeating, the article, as well *with* the copulative as *without* it.

RULE II.

A repetition of the article before the second noun, if the copulative be omitted, will have the same effect and power: for, it denotes a farther description of the same person, property, or thing, that is expressed by the first noun; as in the following examples:

Luke, 1:47.

και	ηγαλλιασε	το	πνευμα	μου	επι	τω
and	exulted	the	spirit	of me	in	the
					[upon]	

Θεω	τω	Σωτηρι	μου
God	the	Saviour	of me

Luke, 2:26.

και	ην	αυτω	κεχρηματισμενον	υπο	του
and	was	to him	having been communicated	by	the

Πνευματος	του	αγιου
Spirit	the	holy, etc.

John, 1:29.

ιδε	ο	αμνος	του	Θεου	ο	αιρων
behold	the	lamb	of the	God	the	taking

την	αμαρτιαν	του	κοσμου
the	sin	of the	world

John, 4:42.

οιδαμεν	οτι	ουτος	εστιν	αληθως	ο
we know	that	this one	is	truly	the

Σωτηρ	του	κοσμου,	ο	Χριστος
Saviour	of the	world,	the	Christ

John, 5:23.

ο	μη	τιμων	τον	Υιον	ου	τιμα
the	not	honoring	the	Son	not	honors
[one]						

τον	πατερα	τον	πεμψαντα	αυτον
the	father	the [One]	having sent	him

John, 6:27.

εργαζεσθε μη την βρωσιν την
Work not [for] the food the

απολλυμενην, αλλα την βρωσιν την
perishing, but the food the

μενουσαν εις ζωνν αιωνιον, ην ο
remaining to life eternal, which the

Υιος του ανθρωπου υμιν δωσει τουτον
Son of the man you will give: this [one]

γαρ ο Πατηρ εσφραγισεν ο Θεος
for the Father sealed the God

This verse contains three examples.

John, 20:31.

Ταυτα δε γεγραπται ινα πιστευσητε
these But has[ve] been written in order that ye may believe

οτι ο Ιησους εστιν ο Χριστος ο
that the Jesus is the Christ the

Υιος του Θεου, etc.
Son of the God, etc.

Heb. 13:20.

ο δε Θεος της ειρηνης ο
the Now God of the peace the [one]

αναγαγων εκ νεκρων τον ποιμενα
having led up out of [the] dead the shepherd

των προβατων τον μεγαν* εν αιματι
of the sheep the great in blood

διαθηκης αιωνιου, τον κυριον ημων
covenant of an eternal, the lord of us

Ιησουν καταρτισαι υμας, etc.
Jesus may he adjust you, etc.

This sentence also contains three [sic] examples.

* The apostle, in this text, expressly calls our Lord Jesus Christ "the Great SHEPHERD OF THE SHEEP," τον ποιμενα των προβατων τον μεγαν: and the apostle Peter entitles him "THE CHIEF SHEPHERD," ο αρχιποιμην, 1 Pet. 5:4, which compare with Psalm 23:1, "JEHOVAH is my SHEPHERD," and with Isaiah, 40:9,10,11; "O Zion that bringeth good tidings," etc., "say unto the cities of Judah, behold YOUR GOD! Behold the Lord JEHOVAH will come in mighty (power), and HIS arm shall rule for him. He" (i.e. the Lord JEHOVAH) "shall feed HIS flock like a SHEPHERD: he shall gather the lambs with his arm," etc., etc. To explain this still farther, the prophet Ezekiel foretold that "all shall have one Shepherd," Ezekiel, 37:24. And Christ himself expressly acknowledged that eminent pastoral character, saying, "I am the good Shepherd;" ο ποιμην ο καλος, "and I know MY sheep and am known of MINE." (John, 10:14.) And a little farther (v. 27) our Lord mentions the true mark by which his flocks are known, viz. that of hearing his voice: (compare with 95th Psalm.) "My sheep" (said our Lord) "hear my voice, and I know them; and they follow me, and I give unto them eternal life," etc., which power of giving eternal life cannot be an attribute of any person that is not truly God, and one with Jehovah or the heavenly Father, as in the 30th verse he is expressly declared to be "I and my Father are one," εν εσμεν, we are one; in which brief expression both plurality and the unity of the two persons are unquestionably asserted.

GENERAL EXCEPTION.

Except when genitive cases depend on one another in succession; as,

2 Cor. 4:3. [2 Cor. 4:3,4]

ΕΙ ΔΕ ΚΑΙ ΕΣΤΙ ΚΕΚΑΛΥΜΜΕΝΟΝ ΤΟ
if But and is having been hidden the

ΕΥΑΓΓΕΛΙΟΝ ΗΜΩΝ, ΕΝ ΤΟΙΣ ΑΠΟΛΛΥΜΕΝΟΙΣ
gospel of us. in the [ones] perishing

ΕΣΤΙ ΚΕΚΑΛΥΜΜΕΝΟΝ, ΕΝ ΟΙΣ Ο ΘΕΟΣ
it is having been hidden in whom the God

ΤΟΥ ΑΙΩΝΟΣ ΤΟΥΤΟΥ ΕΤΥΦΛΩΣΕ ΤΑ ΝΟΗΜΑΤΑ
of the age of this blinded the thoughts

ΤΩΝ ΑΠΙΣΤΩΝ, ΕΙΣ ΤΟ ΜΗ ΑΥΓΑΣΑΙ
of the unbelieving, to the not to shine forth

ΑΥΤΟΙΣ ΤΟΝ ΦΩΤΙΣΜΟΝ ΤΟΥ ΕΥΑΓΓΕΛΙΟΥ
them the brightness of the gospel

ΤΗΣ ΔΟΞΗΣ ΤΟΥ ΧΡΙΣΤΟΥ ΟΣ ΕΣΤΙΝ ΕΙΚΩΝ
the glory of the Christ who is image

ΤΟΥ ΘΕΟΥ ΤΟΥ ΑΟΡΑΤΟΥ
of the God of the invisible

And, again, Coloss. 2:2.

ΙΝΑ ΠΑΡΑΚΛΗΘΩΣΙΝ ΑΙ ΚΑΡΔΙΑΙ ΑΥΤΩΝ
in order that may be comforted the hearts of them

ΣΥΜΒΙΒΑΣΘΕΝΤΩΝ ΕΝ ΑΓΑΠΗ ΚΑΙ ΕΙΣ
being joined together in love and for

ΠΑΝΤΑ ΠΛΟΥΤΟΝ ΤΗΣ ΠΛΗΡΟΦΟΡΙΑΣ
all riches of the full assurance

ΤΗΣ ΣΥΝΕΣΕΩΣ, ΕΙΣ ΕΠΙΓΥΩΣΙΝ ΤΟΥ
the of understanding for full knowledge of the

ΜΥΣΤΗΡΙΟΥ ΤΟΥ ΘΕΟΥ ΚΑΙ
mystery of the God and

ΠΑΤΡΟΣ ΚΑΙ ΤΟΥ ΧΡΙΣΤΟΥ
Father and of the Christ, etc.

RULE III.

And the omission of the copulative between two or more nouns (of the same case) of personal description or application, even without the article before the second noun, will have the same effect: viz. will denote a farther description of the same person, property, or thing, that is expressed by the first noun; as in the following examples.

Rom. 2:19,20.

ΠΕΠΟΙΘΑΣ ΤΕ ΣΕΑΥΤΟΝ ΟΔΗΓΟΝ ΕΙΝΑΙ
having persuaded - thyself a guide to be

ΤΥΦΛΩΝ, ΦΩΣ ΤΩΝ ΕΝ ΣΚΟΤΕΙ,
of blind [persons] a light of the [ones] in darkness

ΠΑΙΔΕΥΤΗΝ ΑΦΡΟΝΩΝ, ΔΙΔΑΣΚΑΛΟΝ ΝΗΠΙΩΝ,
an instructor of foolish [persons] a teacher of infants

(20)

εχοντα την μορφοσιν της γνωσεως
having the form of the knowledge

και της αληθειας εν τω νομω
and of the truth in the law

Ephes. 5:20, 21.

Ευχαριστουντες παντοτε υπερ παντων εν
giving thanks always for all things in

ονοματι του Κυριου ημων Ιησου
name of the Lord of us Jesus

Κριστου, τω Θεω και Πατρι
Christ to the God and Father;

υποτασσομενοι αλληλοις εν φοβω *
being subject to one another in fear

Χριστου
of Christ

* Εν φοβω Χριστου. In the modern printed editions the reading is εν φοβω Θεου, but in the Complutensian and several of the oldest editions it is εν φοβω Χριστου; as also in the Alexandrian and other old MSS as well as the ancient versions, and the citations of the Fathers: for which see Wetstein's Testimony. Now compare this expression (εν φοβω Χριστου) with 1 Pet. 2:17. τον θεον φοβεισθε, τον βασιλεα τιματε: and also with 2 Kings, 17:35 and 36. "Ye shall not fear" (rendered by the seventy ου φοβηθησεσθε) "other gods; but JEHOVAH, who brought you out of the land of Egypt, etc., him shall ye fear."

(21)

Tit. 1:1.

Παυλος, δουλос Θεου, αποστολος
Paul a slave of God, apostle

δε Ιησου
and of Jesus etc.

1 Tim. 1:1.

Παυλος Αποστολος Ιησου Χριστου
Paul apostle of Jesus Christ

κατ' επιταγην * θεο σωτηρος ημων,
according to a command of God saviour of us

και κυριου Ιησου Χριστου της ελπιδος
and of Lord Jesus Christ the hope

ημων
of us

RULE IV.

Yet it is otherwise when the nouns are not of personal description or application; for, then they denote distinct things or qualities: as,

* Here the *command of Christ* is mentioned jointly with the command of *God* himself; which is a mode of expression never used concerning any other man, but the *Man Christ Jesus* our Lord, "by whom are all things: (1 Cor. 8:6 [sic - 8:6], Hebrews 1:2, John 1:3, Col. 1:16) and "by whom all things consist." Col. 1:17.

(22)

1 Tim. 1:2.

Τιμοθεω, γνησιω τεκνω, εν πιστει,
To Timothy a true child in faith.

χαρις, ελεος, ειρηνη απο Θεου
grace, mercy, peace from God

Πατρος ημων, και Χριστου Ιησου
Father of us and Christ Jesus

του κυριου ημων
the Lord of us

2 Tim. 1:2; Titus 1:4 *; see also 2 John 3.

εσται μεθ' υμων χαρις, ελεος,
will be with us grace, mercy,

ειρηνη, παρα Θεου Πατρος,
peace from God Father

και παρα Κυριου Ιησου Χριστου
and from Lord Jesus Christ

του Υιου του Πατρος, εν αληθεια
the Son of the Father, in truth

και αγαπη.
and love.

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

(23)

RULE V.

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

Ephes. 4:31.

Πασα πικρια, και θυμος, και
All bitterness and anger and

οργη, και κραυγη, και βλασφημια,
wrath and clamor and blasphemy

αρθητω αφ' υμων, συν παση κακια,
let it be removed from you with all evil,

This last sentence contains four examples of the fifth rule.

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

2 Cor. 1:2.

Χαρις ὑμιν και ειρηνη απο Θεου
Grace to you and peace from God

Πατρος ἡμων και Κυριου Ιησου Χριστου
Father of us and Lord Jesus Christ

Ephes. 1:2, Gal. 1:3, Philem. 3.

Ephes. 6:23*

Ειρηνη τοις αδελφοις και αγαπη
Grace to the brothers and love

μετα πιστεως απο Θεου Πατρος
with faith from God Father

και Κυριου Ιησου Χριστου
and Lord Jesus Christ

[Cont.] therefore, withdrawn it from the examples, notwithstanding that Mr. Wordsworth hath produced (in p. 120) the authority even of an ancient Greek writer for that example, in the same sense that was first cited in this place as denoting two distinct persons, contrary to Mr. Wordsworth's own opinion of it. "But there is *one* Greek writer" (says he) "who has clearly adopted the other interpretation. It is Æcumenius, in his commentary. *Ιακωβος Θεου και Κυριου Ιησου Χριστου δουλος ταις δωδεκα κ.τ.λ. Θεου μεν του Πατρος, Κυριου δε του υιου, etc.* Vol ii. p. 441.]

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

Except the numerical adjective *εις* precedes the first noun; in which case the copulative *και* will have the same effect that it has between two nouns where only the first is preceded by the article, agreeably to the first rule; as,

Ephes. 4:6.

Ἔις Θεος και πατηρ παντων, ὁ
one God and Father of all, the [One]

επι παντων, και δια παντων, και
over all, and through all, and

εν πασιν ὑμιν
in all you

RULE VI.

And as the insertion of the copulative και between nouns of the same case, without articles, (according to the fifth rule,) denotes that the second noun expresses a different person, thing, or quality, from the preceding noun, so, likewise, the same effect attends the copulative when each of the nouns are preceded by articles: as in the following examples.

John 1:17.

ὁ νομος δια Μωσεως εδοθη ἡ χαρις
the law through Moses was given the grace

και ἡ αληθεια δια Ιησου Χριστου εγενετο
and the truth through Jesus Christ became

[Cont.] being a free disposer of those divine gifts *jointly* with his Almighty Father; agreeably to what I have already remarked above on 1 Thess. 3:11, and Titus 1:1.

(26)

John 2:22.

ότε ουν ηγερθη (Ιησους) εκ νεκρων,
when then he was raised Jesus out from dead.

εμνησθησαν οι μαθηται αυτου,
remembered the disciples of him

οτι τουτο ελεγεν αυτοις, και
that this he said to them, and

επιστευσαν τη γραφη, και τω λογω
they believed the scripture, and the word

ω ειπεν ο Ιησους
which said the Jesus

John 11:44 [Ed.- John 11:43-44]

φωνη μεγαλη εκραυγασε (Ιησους) Λαζαρε,
voice with a great he cried out (Jesus) Lazarus,

δευρο εξω. Και εξηλθεν ο τεθνηκως,
come out. And came out the [one] having died,

δεδεμενος τους ποδας και τας χειρας
having been bound the feet and the hands

κειριαις, και η οψις αυτου
with bandages, and the face of him

σουδαριω περιεδεδετο
with a napkin had been bound round

(27)

Col. 2:2. [Ed.- Col. 2:2-3]

εις επιγνωσιν του μυστηριου του Θεου
for full knowledge of the mystery of the God

και Πατρος, και του Χριστου, εν
and Father, and of the Christ, in

ω εισι παντες οι θησαυροι της
whom are all the treasures of the

σοφιας και της γνωσεως αποκρυφοι
wisdom and of the knowledge hidden

2 Tim. 1:5

υπομνησιν λαμβανων της εν σοι
recollection taking of the in thee

ανυποκριτου πιστεως, ητις ενωκησε
unfeigned faith, which indwelt

πρωτον εν τη μαμη σου
first in the grandmother of thee

Λωιδι και τη μητρι σου Ευνικη
Lois and the mother of you Eunice:

πεπεισμαι δε, οτι και εν σοι
I have been persuaded and, that also in thee

1 Pet. 4:11.

ἵνα ἐν πανσι δοξαζῆται ὁ Θεὸς δια
 in order in all may be glorified the God through
 that

Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, ᾧ ἐστὶν ἡ δόξα
 Jesus Christ to whom is the glory

καὶ τὸ κράτος εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας
 and the might unto the ages

τῶν αἰώνων. Ἀμήν.
 of the ages. Amen.

Except distinct and different actions are intended to be attributed to *one and the same person*; in which case, if the sentence is not expressed agreeably to the three first rules, but appears as an exception to this sixth rule, or even to the fifth, (for, this *exception* relates to both rules,) the context must explain or point out plainly the person to whom the two nouns relate: as in 1 Thess 3:6.

Ἄρτι δε ἐλθόντος Τιμοθεοῦ πρὸς ἡμᾶς
 now But coming Timothy to us

ἀφ' ὑμῶν καὶ εὐαγγελισαμένου ἡμῖν
 from you and announcing good news to us

τὴν πίστιν
 of the faith, etc.

And also in John 20:28.

Καὶ ἀπεκριθὴ ὁ Θωμᾶς, καὶ εἶπεν
 and answered the Thomas and said

αὐτῷ ὁ Κύριος μου καὶ ὁ
 to him the Lord of me and the

Θεὸς μου
 God of me

If the two nouns (viz. ὁ Κύριος and ὁ Θεός) were the leading nominative substantives of a sentence, they would express the descriptive qualities or dignities of *two distinct persons*, according to the sixth rule; but, in this last text, two distinct divine characters are applied to *one person* only; for, the context clearly expresses *to whom the words were addressed by Thomas*: which perspicuity in the address clearly proves, likewise, the futility of that gloss for which the Arians and Socinians contended; viz. that Thomas could not mean that *Christ was his God*, but only uttered, in his surprise, a solemn exclamation or ejaculation to God. The text, however, expressly relates that our Lord first addressed himself to Thomas:

[Ed.- John 20:27-28]

εἶτα λέγει τῷ Θωμᾶ, φερε τὸν
 then he said to the Thomas, bring the

δακτυλὸν σου ὧδε,
 finger of thee here, etc.

(30)

και απεκριθη ο Θωμας και ειπεν
and answers the Thomas and says

αυτω
to him

(that is, without doubt, to Jesus,)

ο Κυριος μου, και ο Θεος μου
the Lord of me and the God of me

So that both these *distinct* titles (for, they are plainly mentioned as *distinct*) were manifestly addressed, αυτω [Ed.- "to him"], to that *one person, Jesus*, to whom *Thomas replied*, as the text expressly informs us. The language is so plain, when the whole context is considered, that the Socinian perversion of it is notorious. See also 1 Cor. 1:24.

Χριστον Θεου δυναμιν και Θεου σοφιαν*
Christ of God power and of God wisdom

and Acts 2:36. † There are also other examples of this exception which clearly prove that *Christ is God*: as

Rev. 1:17,18.

Μη φοβου. εγω ειμι ο πρωτος και
Not fear I am the first and

* Example of the exception to the fifth rule.

† Note lately added by the Author. [See also James 1:1, the text withdrawn from the examples of the fifth rule for the reasons assigned by the learned and Rev. Mr. Chr. Wordsworth, in his six letters to the author, p. 114 to 120.] [Ed.- see Extracts for reviews of "Six Letters."]

(31)

ο εσχατος, και ο ζων.* και εγενομην
the last, and the living and I became
[one]

νεκρος, και ιδου ζων ειμι εις τους
dead, and behold living I am unto the

αιωνας των αιωνων. αμην. Και εχω
ages of the ages: Amen. And I have

τας κλεις του αδου και του θανατου*
the key of the Hades and of the death

These are the words of him whom John saw, *ομοιον* 'Υιω ανθρωπου [Ed. - Rev. 1:13: "one like a son of man"], with a two-edged sword proceeding out of his mouth; which was undoubtedly a representation of the Λογος, or word of God, as this declaration alludes plainly to his death and resurrection.

εγενομην νεκρος, και ιδου ζων ειμι
I became dead, and behold living I am

And again in the second chapter, ver. 8 [Ed. - Rev. 2:8]:

ταδε λεγει ο πρωτος και ο εσχατος,*
These things says the first and the last.

(and the same infallible mark of distinction is added to prove which of the divine persons is here to be understood,) ΟΣ εγενετο νεκρος, και εξησεν [Ed.- "who became dead and he lived"]. Now, though the explanation which Grotius has given us of these titles (ο πρωτος και ο εσχατος) is

* Example of the exception to the sixth rule.

certainly true when applied to Christ, yet it does not appear to be the *whole truth*, or the full meaning that ought to be attributed to these titles, either in the Revelation or elsewhere; for, they have a manifest reference to the supreme titles of *the Almighty* in the first chapter and eight verse, (which also contains examples of this exception,) [Ed.- Rev. 1:8]

εγω ειμι το Α και το Ω,* λεγει
I am the Alpha and the Omega says

ο κυριος, αρχη και τελος,† ο ων
the Lord, beginning and ending, the [one] being

και ο ην,* και ο ερχομενος, ο
and the [one] was, and the [one] coming, the

παντοκρατωρ.
Almighty.

And, in the 22nd chapter, 13th verse, where these titles, το Α και το Ω, and manifestly, by the context, to be understood as the title of Christ, we find them explained by these other titles, ο πρωτος και ο εσχατος, [Ed.- "the first and the last"] to which Grotius has attributed a much inferior and less comprehensive meaning. [Ed.- Rev. 22:13]

Εγω ειμι το Α και το Ω,* αρχη
I am the Alpha and the Omega, beginning

και τελος,† ο πρωτος και ο εσχατος.*
and ending, the first and the last.

* Example of the exception to the sixth rule.

† Example of the exception to the fifth rule.

And as I have shown in my Tract on *the Law of Nature*, etc. p. 270 and 271, that these titles, "*the first and the last*," are ancient titles of *Jehovah*, in the Old Testament, to declare his *eternal existence*, there can be no just reason for giving them an inferior sense when they are applied to Christ, who was truly *Jehovah*, as a variety of texts demonstrate. [*Law of Nature*, p. 248 to 345.]

Another example of the exception to the fifth rule occurs in the Rev. 20:2.

τον οφιν τον αρχαιον, ος εστι
the serpent the old, who is

διαβολος και σατανας
Devil and Satan

These are two different names, or appellatives, attributed (by the explanatory words ος εστι) to the same Old Serpent.

THE END OF THE RULES.

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

EXAMPLES.

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

EXAMPLE I. 2 Pet. 1:1.

εν δικαιοσυνη του Θεου ημων και σωτηρος
 in righteousness of the God of us and Saviour

ημων Ιησου Χριστου.
 of us Jesus Christ.

As the article του is not repeated before the next descriptive noun, σωτηρος, it is manifest that both the nouns are to be referred to one and the same person; and, therefore, in order to turn it into an intelligible English phrase, the *proper name* to which the *two descriptive nouns* refer ought to be placed first, as, "By the righteousness of Jesus Christ, OUR GOD and OUR SAVIOUR." Among the various readings collected by Curcellæus, it appears that in some copies the word ημων was not repeated after σωτηρος, and I have by me twenty different editions (including those of Erasmus, Stephens, Dr. Mill, Bengelius, etc.) which follow that reading: viz. εν δικαιοσυνη του Θεου ημων και σωτηρος Ιησου Χριστου, in which case, a literal rendering into English will sufficiently express the sense of the Greek without transposing the proper name; viz. "*Through the righteousness of our God and Saviour, Jesus Christ.*" The sense and purport, however, is exactly the same in both the readings; and, in the old English editions, has generally been expressed in the terms required by my first rule; viz.

"In the righteousness that cometh of our God and Saviour, Jesu Christ." (fol edit. 1549.)

"Through the righteousnesse of our God and Saviour, Jesus Christ." (12 mo edit. 1595.)

"By the righteousnesse of our God and Saviour, Jesus Christ." (4to edit. 1599.) [Ed.- quarto edit. 1599.]

"The righteousness of Jesus Christ, our God and Saviour." (margin of the folio edit. 1611.)

And even in the margin of our present version the proper reading is "of our God and Saviour," manifestly referring both titles to one person. The learned Beza also remarks, on the words of this text,

"Ista necesse est conjunctim legamus quia unicus est articulus, ut copiosius diximus Tit. ii.13. Itaque continet etiam hic locus manifestum divinitatis Christi testimonium."

The two nouns are referred to Christ also in the Syriac version. There seems, therefore, to be ample authority for my first rule.

EXAM. II. Titus, 2:13.

επιφανειαν της δοξης του μεγαλου Θεου
 appearance of the glory of the great God

και σωτηρος ημων Ιησου Χριστου.
 and Saviour of us Jesus Christ.

In some few copies a comma is inserted between Θεου and και, but without authority. The above-mentioned note of Beza, upon this text, is too long to be inserted here at length, and therefore I must refer you to the author himself. He insists, however, that these two titles do not refer to two distinct persons, because the article is omitted before the second. In the present English version it is rendered — "*the glorious appearing of the great God and our Saviour Jesus Christ:*" but so great is the difference between the idiom of the Greek tongue and that of the English, that a *literal translation* will not always express the same sense without some little transposition in the order of the words; and, therefore, though the pronoun ἡμῶν is placed after the two descriptive nouns that are applicable only to *one* person and they are expressed in the Greek, yet the rendering of the said pronoun *in English* ought to be PREFIXED to the said descriptive nouns, in order to express the *same sense* in a proper English phrase; as, — "*the glorious appearing of OUR great God and Saviour, Jesus Christ.*" — This is the rendering of the learned Hugh Broughton, according to a printed English Bible, corrected with a pen, in my collection. It might, indeed, be literally rendered without transposition of the pronoun; viz. "*the great God and Saviour OF US,*" instead of "*OUR great God and Saviour:*" but the latter is more agreeable to the general mode of expressing that pronoun in English. Thus Christ is not only entitled God, but even the "*great God*" according to the plainest grammatical construction of the text: and, indeed, if we duly weigh the evidence of his being really *Jehovah*, and *one with the Father*, [εγω και ο Πατηρ εν εσμεν, [Ed.- "I and the Father we are one"] the plural verb εσμεν ("we are") marking the plurality, or distinction of more persons than one, as much as the noun εν marks the *unity* of their existence,] he must necessarily be esteemed "*the great*

God," * because there is but ONE GOD.

G. S.

* As we believe that three persons exist in one and the same God, we cannot believe any one of them to be less than God, without denying the unity of the Godhead. And, as each person is God, it follows that each must be the *great God*. Theophylact bears an explicit testimony of this conclusion in his commentary on St Paul's epistle to Titus, 2:13 "Που δε εισιν οι τον υιον ελαττουντες, και ουδε Θεον ανεχομενοι λεγειν; Ακουσετοσαν, οτι και Θεος εστι, και μεγας. Το δε μεγας επι Θεου λεγεται, ου κατα συγκρισιν την προς αλλον μικρον, αλλ' απολελυμενος, ως φυσει αυτομεγαλου οντος." *Now what becomes of their objections, who degrade the dignity of the Son, not allowing him even the name of God? Let them learn from this passage, that he is not only God but our great God. He is called great God, not relatively, by comparison with another inferior God, but, absolutely, from his own native and essential greatness.* Whitby, in his note on the same passage of Titus, has given some very solid reasons for applying the terms μεγαλου Θεου to our Saviour. His words are: "Here it deserveth to be noted, that it is highly probable, that Jesus Christ is here styled the *great God*; first, because in the original the article is prefixed only before the *great God*, and therefore seems to require this construction, 'the appearance of Jesus Christ the great God and our Saviour.' Secondly, because as God the Father is not said properly to *appear*, so the word επιφανεια never occurs in the New Testament, but when it is applied to Jesus Christ, and some coming of his; the places, in which it is to be found, being only these, 2 Thess. 2:8, 1 Tim. 6:14, 2 Tim. 1:10, and 4:1,8. Thirdly, because Christ is emphatically styled *our hope, the hope of our glory*. Col. 1:27, 1 Tim. 1:1. And, lastly, because not only all the ancient commentators on the place do so interpret this text, but the Ante-Nicene fathers also; Hippolytus (Antichrist. Sect. 64) speaking of 'the appearance of our God and Saviour Jesus Christ;' and Clemens of Alexandria (ad Gent. p. 5,6) proving Christ to be both God and Man, our Creator, and the author of all our good things, from these very words of St Paul." *Vid. tract. de vera Christi deitate*, pp. 44, 45. Hammond, also, in his literal marginal version, translates επιφανειαν της δοξης του μεγαλου Θεου και σωτηρος ημων Ιησου Χριστου, thus, "the appearance of the glory of our great God and Saviour Jesus Christ."

EDITOR.

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

G. S.



EXAMPLES

TO THE

GRAMMATICAL RULES

OF

CONSTRUCTION, &c.

EXAMPLE I.

ACTS, 20:28.

Προσεχετε ουν εαυτοις και παντι τω
 Take heed therefore to yourselves kai to all the

ποιμνιω εν ω υμας το πνευμα το
 flock in which you the Spirit the

αγιον εθετο επισκοπους ποιμαινει την
 Holy placed overseers to shepherd the

εκκλησιαν του Θεου, ην περιποιησατο
 church the God, which he purchased

δια του ιδιου αιματος.
 through of the own blood.

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

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

Though there is no word in the Greek to correspond with this word "*even*," so as that it might be deemed a *literal rendering*, yet this English word is frequently used by our translators to express the *identity of person*, when a copulative, in the Greek text, joins a second substantive (i.e. of *personal* description without an article) to the former substantive, preceded by an article, agreeably to the first rule, as in Romans, 15:6.

τον Θεον και Πατερα
the God and Father

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

and 1 Cor. 15:24.

τω Θεω και Πατρι
the God and Father

both of which are rendered, — "*God, even the Father*, (instead of the literal rendering, *the God and Father*,) that the *identity of person* may be the more obvious. See also 2 Cor 1:3:

ευλογητος ο Θεος και πατηρ του
Blessed the God and Father of the

Κυριου ημων Ιησου Χριστου, ο
Lord of us Jesus Christ, the

πατηρ των οικτιρων, και Θεος πασης
Father of the compassions, and God of all

παρακλησεως.
comfort.

This sentence contains two successive examples of the first rule, and is rendered, "Blessed be God, *even* the father of our Lord Jesus Christ, the father of mercies, and the God of all comfort." See also James, 3:9; τον Θεον και Πατερα. 1 Thess. 3:13; του Θεου και Πατρος ημων. 2 Thess. 2:16; και ο Θεος και Πατηρ. Besides these six examples, wherein the word *even*, in the English version, expresses the copulative, there are also 13* *other examples of the first rule* in the New Testament: i.e., altogether 19 examples respecting our *heavenly Father* alone; and therefore the 9 examples of

* Viz. 2 Cor. 11:31. Gal. 1:4. Ephes. 1:3 and 4:6, and v. 20. Philip, 4:20. Col. 1:3, and 2:2, and 3:17. 1 Thess. 1:3, and 3:11. James, 1:27. 1 Peter, 1:3.

the same mode of expression, produced in this and the following pages, respecting the *Son and the holy Spirit*, ought certainly to be rendered in a *sense* suitable to the same uniform rule of construction, to express the *identity of persons*, because the same mode of grammatical expression is used in them all.

EXAMPLE II.

EPHESIANS, 5: 5.

— ΟΥΚ εχει κληρονομιαν εν τη
— not has inheritance in the

βασιλεια του Χριστου και Θεου
kingdom of the Christ and God

In the common English version the sentence is rendered, "*No whoremonger, etc., hath any inheritance in the kingdom of Christ, and of God.*" As if two persons had been mentioned in the original text; but, as the part of the sentence above cited is the generally-approved reading of the printed *Greek copies*, and as this reading is confirmed by the Alexandrian MS and by all other Greek MSS of known authority, it affords an unquestionable proof against the *apostasy of the Socinians* in their *denial of divine honor to our Lord the Christ, or Messiah*, who, according to the idiom of the Greek tongue, is in this text expressly entitled **ΘΕΟΣ**, "GOD," though the proof does not appear in the English version. Let it be remarked that the two substantives of personal description, **Χριστου** and **Θεου**, are joined by the copulative **και**, and that the article **του** precedes the first, and that there is not article before the word **Θεου**, whereby,

according to the *first rule*, both titles are *necessarily* to be applied to *one* and the same person, and (if literally rendered in English) should be, — "hath no inheritance in the kingdom of *the Christ and God.*" But this literal rendering does not sufficiently express the necessary doctrine of the Greek, that the *Christ is also God*: and therefore to help the English idiom, and to accommodate the rendering more strictly to the true meaning of the Greek, the name of *Jesus*, which is necessary to be *understood*, might very fairly be inserted in *italic*, or between hooks, as a parenthesis, to supply the necessary sense of the Greek; as, "in the kingdom of (Jesus) the Christ and God:" or else to be rendered, "in the kingdom of Christ, (even) of God," as recommended in the first example.

EXAMPLE III.

PHILIPPIANS, [*sic* - PHILIPPIANS,] 3:3.

ἡμεεις γαρ εσμεν ἡ περιτονη, [*sic*-περιτομη,]
we For are the circumcision,

οἱ πνευματι Θεου λατρευοντες, και
the spirit of God worshipping, and
[ones]

καυχωμενοι εν Χριστω Ιησου, και
boasting [glorying] in Christ Jesus and

ουκ εν σαρκι πεποιθοτες.
not in flesh trusting.

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

In the London Polyglott, and many other valuable editions, the reading is $\acute{\omicron}\iota$ $\pi\nu\epsilon\upsilon\mu\alpha\tau\iota$ $\Theta\epsilon\omega$, but in the Alexandrian MS * it is $\acute{\omicron}\iota$ $\pi\nu\epsilon\upsilon\mu\alpha\tau\iota$ $\Theta\epsilon\upsilon\varsigma$, which seems to be the true reading; because the other is so unusual an expression, that the generality of translators have forced a construction which the context itself cannot fairly bear, even if the dative case, $\Theta\epsilon\omega$, were admitted to be the true reading, unless another word, the preposition $\epsilon\nu$, be also added to it before $\pi\nu\epsilon\upsilon\mu\alpha\tau\iota$, as in John, 4:23, and Rom. 8:9, where the sense, which they have applied to this text, was really intended: but, without this addition, (as we may fairly judge by those examples,) the literal rendering ought to be, "We are the circumcision, *who worship the Spirit God.*" Whereas they have commonly rendered it as if the preposition $\epsilon\nu$ was really inserted in this text before the dative, $\pi\nu\epsilon\upsilon\mu\alpha\tau\iota$, as in the two examples before cited; viz. "*Qui Spiritu Servimus Deo,*" or "*Qui Spiritu colimus Deum:*" or, as in the Syriac version, "*Qui Deo Servimus in Spiritu:*" (Syr.) or, as in the common English version, "*Which worship God in the Spirit.*" But there is no such preposition in the Greek. The difficulty therefore of rendering the common reading, ($\Theta\epsilon\omega$), without supposing this addition of EN to be understood before $\pi\nu\epsilon\upsilon\mu\alpha\tau\iota$, proves that the reading of the Alexandrian MS in this text is really to be preferred; $\acute{\omicron}\iota$ $\pi\nu\epsilon\upsilon\mu\alpha\tau\iota$ $\Theta\epsilon\upsilon\varsigma$ *

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

In Wetstein's edition the word $\Theta\epsilon\upsilon\varsigma$ is subjoined with this mark §, to denote the preferable reading.

$\lambda\alpha\tau\tau\epsilon\upsilon\omicron\nu\omicron\tau\epsilon\varsigma$, "*who worship the spirit of God,*"¹ whereby the apostle and Timothy, as an example to the church at Philippi, assert their profession, that they pay *divine honor to the spirit of God, and that they glory in Christ.*

EXAMPLE IV.

2 THESS. 1:12.

Κατα την χαριν του Θεου ημων και
According to the grace of the God of us and

Κυριου Ιησου Χριστου .
Lord Jesus Christ.

This, in the common English version, is rendered (very erroneously) as if two distinct persons were mentioned, viz.

¹ [Ed. note- The dative, $\pi\nu\epsilon\upsilon\mu\alpha\tau\iota$, is viewed by some as an instrumental as "by spirit" thus the translation "*the ones worshipping by the Spirit of God . . .*" or as a locative as, "in spirit" thus "*worshipping in the Spirit of God . . .*" However, R.C.H. Lenski in *The Interpretation of St Paul's Epistles to the Galatians, to the Ephesians, and to the Philippians*, (*Minneapolis: Augsburg Publishing House, 1961*), p. 831, supports Sharp's translation. Lenski writes, "The correct reading is 'God's Spirit' and not the dative 'God' (A.V.). But the dative 'God's Spirit' is not instrumental, the means 'by' which *we* worship (R.V.). If that were the force, the very inferior reading $\pi\nu\epsilon\upsilon\mu\alpha\tau\iota$ $\Theta\epsilon\omega$ would be preferable: worship God with (our) spirit (compare A.V.), John 4:24: 'in spirit and truth.' The Scriptures never say that we use the Holy Spirit as a means for worship or for anything else. On the other hand, we challenge the statement that the Scriptures never present the Holy Spirit as the object of our worship; this is sometimes extended to include also our Lord Jesus Christ. This claim is Arian. Right here Paul writes: 'We are the ones worshipping God's Spirit.'"]

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

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

In the Alexandrian MS the text before us is awkwardly divided by one of these points, placed after the word ἡμῶν,

which point, for the reason before given, must necessarily be deemed a *period*, and which did not exist in the original text of the sacred penman.

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

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

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

EXAMPLE V.

1 Tim. 5:21.

Διαμαρτυρομαι ενωπιον του Θεου και
I solemnly witness before the God and

Κυριου Ιησου Χριστου και των
Lord Jesus Christ and the

εκλεκτων αγγελων, ινα ταυτα φυλαξης
chosen angels in order that these things thou guard, etc.

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

The word Κυριου* is omitted in the Alexandrian MS where the reading is ενωπιον του Θεου και Χριστου Ιησου. And, as no points are inserted between the substantives, we have the testimony even of this MS for a clear declaration that *Jesus* is God as well as *Christ*: and, after the next copulative, which connects the mention of different persons, according to the sixth rule, the adverb ενωπιον, (*before*,) though not expressly repeated, is plainly to be understood; as, -- "*I charge*" (thee), "*before the GOD and CHRIST, Jesus*," (or, rather, *before Jesus, the God and Christ*,) "*and*" (before) "*the elect angels, that thou observe these things*." Thus far the testimony of the Alexandrian MS. -- But, according to the commonly-received text of the Greek, it ought to be rendered, in the English idiom, "*I charge* (thee), *before Jesus Christ, the GOD and LORD, and* (before) *the elect angels, etc.*"

* Note lately added by the Author. [The Author acknowledge himself to be under great obligation to a judicious and learned writer in the

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

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

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

An extract from the *British Critic* is inserted in the Appendix, not only for the better illustration of the subject in question, but, also, more particularly, to set forth, in terms more satisfactory to the *Author* than any expressions he himself could suggest, the indefatigable labor, learning, and judicious criticism, of the Rev. Mr. Chr. Wordsworth, of Trinity-College, Cambridge, in his six letters to G.S. on the subject of this book; by which the doctrine, particularly of the *first rule*, has been so amply confirmed. For the same reasons are added extracts also from the ingenious and learned observations on both these works, (the Remarks by G.S. and Mr. Wordsworth's six letters to him upon them,) which were published in the *Christian Observer* for July, 1802, and in the *Christian Guardian* for December, 1802, and also in the *Orthodox Churchman's Magazine and Review* for February, 1803.]

EXAMPLE VI.

2 Tim. 4:1.

Διαμαρτυρομαι ουν εγω ενωπιον του
I solemnly witness then I before of the

Θεου και Κυριου Ιησου Χριστου
God and Lord Jesus Christ

του μελλοντος κρινειν ζωντας και νεκρους,
the being about to judge living and dead. etc.
[one]

(Geneva Edit. 1620.)

In the common English version this is rendered, "I charge (thee) therefore before God, and the Lord Jesus Christ, who shall judge the quick and the dead, etc."

In the Greek of this text, as it is commonly printed, the article του is repeated before Κυριου, which, so far, affords an excuse for the present English version in placing the comma after the word *God*, to denote *two* distinct persons, according to the sixth rule; but, in the Alexandrian MS and several other old copies, *[where the reading is ενωπιον του Θεου και Χριστου Ιησου] the article του is *not* repeated after the copulative before Χριστου: so that the expression is similar, in effect, to the declaration of our Lord's *divine nature*, by the same apostle, in the preceding example, viz. 1 Tim. 5:21. In some printed editions the word Κυριου is also omitted, but, in the Geneva edition of 1620, with Scaliger's notes, the word Κυριου is inserted and the article

* [] Correction and addition by the Author.

του omitted,* whereby the title Θεου, (God,) must necessarily be construed in such a manner that it may be clearly understood, in all versions, to be expressly applied to *Christ*, as it really is in the original. The transcriber or interpolator of the Alexandrian MS however, being aware of this doctrine, has endeavored to pervert it by adding a full period after the word Θεου, as Θυ. But this *period* is unquestionably supposititious, because the words before and after the period are *not two distinct sentences*, but obviously portions only of *one entire sentence*, which must necessarily be construed together, according to the ordinary rules of expression in the Greek tongue, as I have remarked on a preceding example; whereby a second substantive of

* Note lately added by the Author. [The expression being exactly the same as that which is generally allowed to exist in the preceding example, viz. ενωπιον του Θεου και Κυριου Ιησου Χριστου, 1 Tim. 5:21. And the Author has lately discovered several other editions of the Greek Testament which have this reading, and thereby confirm the truth of this 6th example; though it must be allowed, at the same time, that *not even one* of the several *editors* understood the text in its proper *grammatical sense*, because they have all (without any authority) placed commas after Θεου, in order to distinguish *two persons*, contrary to the necessary *grammatical* construction of the Greek text. Two of these editions (in the Author's possession) have Montanus's interlineary Latin version. They are both in 8vo, though of different sizes, the one having four more lines in each page than the other; but the title-pages of both being lost their respective dates cannot be known. (There are several other 8vo editions with the same interlineary version, but which have a *different* reading in this place, viz. the common reading with the article inserted in the second place after the copulative; and two such editions are also in the Author's collection.) The fourth printed authority, which the Author has found, in favor of his sixth example is the Vienna edition of 1787, printed from an ancient MS in the Imperial Library at Vienna. The title of it is, "*Novum Testamentum ad Codicem Vindebonensem Græce expressum. Varietatem Lectionis addidit Franciscus Carolus Alter Professor Gymnasii Vindebonensis.*" At the end of the second volume (for it consists of two very thick 8vo volumes) are added the various readings of seven other ancient Greek MSS all containing the Epistles, (besides the MS from which the edition was formed,) which have been separately collated with

personal description, *without an article before it*, joined by a copulative to a preceding substantive of the like nature, and in the same case, *with an article before it*, must necessarily denote a farther description of the same person, expressed by the first substantive; (whenever there is an article before the first substantive and none before the second;) so that the insertion of the *period* in the Alexandrian

[cont.] this edition; and the variations are distinctly and separately stated, under the proper titles of each MS in the Appendix. Two, only, of all these eight MSS have, in this text, the article *του* repeated in the second place after the copulative, (viz. *του Θεου και του Κυριου*, etc.) Another of them has the same reading exactly as the Alexandrian MS *του Θεου και Χριστου Ιησου*: and, therefore, by the omission of the article in the second place before *Χριστου*, doth also, equally with that MS confirm the doctrine of my sixth example. And all the other five MSS (which likewise contain this Epistle) must necessarily be allowed to have the other more correct reading for which I contend, viz. *του Θεου και Κυριου Ιησου Χριστου*: because no difference or variation from that reading, in the printed edition, is noted in any other of the seven separate collations of ancient MSS that have been distinctly compared with it, except in the three that are first mentioned above.

Though the insertion of the article in the second place is undoubtedly the most common reading in all the printed editions, (for fifty-nine out of sixty-four printed Greek Testaments, in the possession of the Author of this little work, have this reading,) yet several of the most learned Editors of these fifty-nine editions, that have adopted it, have, at the same time, warned us that there are various readings in this text, viz. *Bishop Walton, Curcellæus, Bishop Fell, Dr. Mill, Henry Wetsten, and John Jac. Wetsten*. The latter cites no less than six ancient MSS (besides several versions,) which have not the reading *του Κυριου*. (N.B. His mark for a deficiency is a short line thus —; and he has expressed this various reading, in his note on the text, as follows: "*του Κυριου*."] — A C D a prima manu. F G. 31. *Editio Vulg. Copt. Æthiop. Basilii* Eth. 89 *Hilarius*.) And consequently we must understand that all these six MSS have the same reading as the first of them, A, by which mark he refers to the *Alexandrian* MS wherein, though the words *του Κυριου* are indeed omitted, yet the proper effect of this omission ought to be at the same time remarked, viz. that the article *του* is not repeated after the copulative, in the second place, before the next noun *Χριστου*: so that the

MS* after *Θεου* is utterly vain, because the *copulative* sufficiently proves the *connection* of the two substantives in

[cont.] expression, in all these six MSS must be equally declaratory of our Lord's divine nature, as in the former example (the fifth) from 1 Tim. 5:21. To the evidence of these six MSS must be added that of *one* of the Imperial MSS at *Vienna*, mentioned above.

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

But, even if we set aside these two supposed MSS yet as it appears that five out of the eight ancient MSS in the Imperial Library at *Vienna*, as well as the ancient *Basil* MS cited by *Wetsten*, and also four printed editions, have this reading; and that six other MSS agree with the Alexandrian MS in a different reading of this text, which bears equal testimony to *the divinity of Christ*; the Author hopes it will be allowed that all this united evidence affords some reasonable ground of justification for his having cited this text as his sixth example.]

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

one clear sentence, and the omission of the article before the second substantive induces the necessity of applying the same grammatical construction, whereby alone the due distinction of persons is so peculiarly maintained in the Greek tongue, and *not by points*. The text should therefore be rendered, — "I charge (thee,) therefore, before the God and Lord, Jesus Christ, etc." Or, rather, (to render the doctrine more obvious in the English idiom,) — "I charge (thee,) therefore, before Jesus Christ, the God and Lord, who shall judge the quick and the dead, etc." And thus the text in the two last examples will perfectly accord as the uniform expressions of the same apostle asserting, in both* the *divinity of his Lord and Saviour*, by whom he had been personally summoned to bear his testimony to the gentiles, as being an eye and ear witness of his *glorious majesty*.

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

* Note lately added by the Author. [This seems to have been the opinion also of the learned *Bengelius*, that both these texts had originally the same mode of expression. For, in his *Gnomon*, he remarks, on the text of the former example, (1 Tim. 5:21) *καὶ Κυρίου* et *Domini*, "*Articulus non additur, cum tamen mox addatur de angelis. Ergo Dei appellatio et Domini ad unum pertinet subjectum. Conf. tamen II. Tim. iv. I, κυρίου non habet lectio vetusta.*" To restore this *ancient reading without the article in the second place*, there seems to be ample authority by the testimony of the MSS and editions which I have cited, in addition to the *similarity of expression*, by the *same apostle*, in 1 Tim. 5:21.]

EXAMPLE VII.

TIT. 2:13.

— Προσδεχομενοι την μακαριαν ελπιδα και
— expecting the blessed hope and

επιφανειαν της δοξης του μεγαλου Θεου
appearance of the glory of the great God

και σωτηρος ημων Ιησου Χριστου
and saviour of us Jesus Christ

The present version of these words, in the English testament, is, — "Looking for that blessed hope, and the glorious appearing of the great God, and our Saviour Jesus Christ." This text (though the next in order, according to the usual mode of arranging the books of the New Testament) has already been produced as the second example in the preceding letter. I have since, however, examined the Alexandrian MS and find that it agrees exactly with the above citation of this text, except that a point has been added in the MS after the word Θεου or Θυ. On which it is necessary to observe, that the same remarks are obviously applicable to this superfluous and absurd addition of the point or *period*, that I have made on the texts 2 Thess. 1:12; and 2 Tim. 4:1, in the fourth and sixth examples of this tract. For, as the proper effect or purpose of *periods* is to separate words into *distinct sentences*, it is obvious that the words, which follow the supposititious period in this text, are incapable of a grammatical construction without reference to the preceding words connected by the *copulative*: and therefore the *note of separation* (a period) cannot possibly have been intended by the inspired writer. This testimony, therefore, of the sacred text, in favor of our Lord's *divine nature*, ought not to be withheld from the mere English

reader.

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

The text in question, if the truth of the original be duly regarded, must inevitably be rendered, "*Expecting the blessed hope and appearance of the glory of our great God and Saviour, Jesus Christ.*"

EXAMPLE VIII.

2 Pet. 1:1

— ΕΝ ΔΙΚΑΙΟΣΥΝΗ ΤΟΥ ΘΕΟΥ ἡμῶν ΚΑΙ ΣΩΤΗΡΟΣ
— in righteousness of the God of us and Saviour

Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ
Jesus Christ

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

This text, though the *eighth* in order, according to the proper order of the books, was *the first* example cited in my

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

letter; and I have only to remark farther, that the Alexandrian MS perfectly agrees with the present common approved reading in the Greek text. In Dr. Woide's printed copy of the said MS there is a point inserted after the word *δικαιοσύνη*, which is not in the MS but that is manifestly a merely-accidental typographical error.

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

EXAMPLE IX.

Jude 4.

— ΚΑΙ ΤΟΝ ΜΟΝΟΝ ΔΕΣΠΟΤΗΝ ΘΕΟΝ
— and the only Master God

ΚΑΙ ΚΥΡΙΟΝ ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦν Χριστὸν ἀρνούμενοι.
and Lord of us Jesus Christ denying.

This, in the common English version, is imperfectly rendered — "*and denying the only Lord God, and our Lord*

Jesus Christ."

I made a transcript of this text, several years ago, from the Alexandrian MS which I copied, or rather drew, letter by letter, in size and shape as exactly as the eye could discern. In this transcript the word $\Theta\epsilon\omicron\nu$ is omitted, as in the MS but I did not, at that time, perceive that there was any point or mark after the word $\Delta\epsilon\sigma\pi\omicron\tau\eta\nu$, and I was therefore much surprised, afterwards, in comparing the said transcript with the elegant edition of my late very worthy and respectable friend, the Rev. Dr. Woide, (who printed a copy of the New Testament from the Alexandrian MS with new types, in imitation of the letters of the MS) to find that he had inserted a point, in his new edition, after the word $\Delta\epsilon\sigma\pi\omicron\tau\eta\nu$. I was very confident that I could not discern any such point, when I examined the MS; and yet, as I entertained the highest respect and esteem for the veracity and accuracy of Dr. Woide, (of which he was, indeed, truly worthy,) it was necessary to have this matter properly explained; and I was rendered perfectly aware, by Dr. Velthusen's account of his examining an ancient MS that the faint line and marks in the very old MSS are liable to bear different appearances, according to the different degrees of light in which they are seen.

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

But if any person, from the authority of Dr. Woide's edition, should be still inclined to suppose that it is really a *point*, I must request them carefully to consider what I have before remarked on the fourth, sixth, and seventh, examples in this tract, respecting the addition of *points* in Greek manuscripts; and also concerning the more accurate modes of grammatical distinction in the Greek tongue, which rendered the smaller points, or *particles of time*, (such as semicolons and commas,) absolutely unnecessary in the *Greek scripture*; and, in addition thereto, let him observe, particularly on the text before us, that a point in that place, after $\Delta\epsilon\sigma\pi\omicron\tau\eta\nu$, (in the middle of the sentence, between the accusative noun and verb,) is utterly inconsistent with grammar and common sense; and though the word $\Theta\epsilon\omicron\nu$ has been omitted in the Alexandrian MS (perhaps for the same reason that some men would wish to prove the insertion of the point after $\Delta\epsilon\sigma\pi\omicron\tau\eta\nu$,) yet, happily, neither of these alterations would at all affect or injure the manifest testimony of the apostle Jude to *Christ's almighty power and divinity*, for — "the only potentate and Lord of us, Jesus Christ," is equivalent to a full declaration of *Christ's divinity*, as well as of his almighty power; and, with respect to the insertion of the *supposed point*, they must perceive, if they duly consider the text, that the words $\Delta\epsilon\sigma\pi\omicron\tau\eta\nu$ and $\kappa\upsilon\rho\iota\omicron\nu$ cannot (consistently with the necessary grammatical sense of the Greek, and the usual modes of expression, or idiom of that language) be separated either by points or construction, so as to be applied to two different persons, because the article is not repeated after the copulative, before $\kappa\upsilon\rho\iota\omicron\nu$: so that *Christ alone* was unquestionably that — "*only potentate*," or *Sovereign Lord*, who was denied by the *lascivious persons*, against whom the apostle Jude bore testimony of their *reprobacy*, and of their having *denied the Lord*, who had *redeemed them*. Dr. Hammond's rendering of the text before us may, therefore, be conscientiously maintained, viz. "*our only Master, God, and*

Lord, Jesus Christ,* making" (says he) "*those three the several attributes of Jesus Christ.*" — But as the Doctor has been pleased to add, afterwards, — "*And this interpretation proceeds upon that way of punctuation which is ordinarily retained in our copies, there being no comma after ΘΕΟΥ, etc.*" I am obliged to protest against *that reason, for the other reasons* already given; and to insist, that the grammatical construction of the Greek text is, of itself, our sufficient and best warrant to justify that *literal rendering.*

But the applying to Christ this Supreme title, — "*the only potentate, God*" (and, also, in a former text, the *Supreme* title of — "*the great God*") may, perhaps, induce some persons to conceive that this grammatical system of construction, if admitted as a rule, for all texts, in which the same mode of expression renders it applicable, will sometimes prove rather too much, and may be liable to favor a modern sect of *Unitarians*, who have adopted the *Sabellian* notions of the late Baron Swedenborg, and who assert, that — "*Jesus Christ is the only God;*" that is, they understand this in so peculiar a sense, that they do not seem properly to acknowledge the *personality of the holy spirit*, any more than a very opposite sect of *Unitarians* do, the modern *Socinians*, who impiously assert (in the opposite extreme to that of the *Swedenborgians*) that "*Jesus Christ was a mere man, and nothing but a man,*" according to one of their teachers, and — "*simple human nature,*" according to another: and some of them have even presumed to charge the members of the church of England with idolatry† because they pay *the divine honor that is due* to their Lord and Saviour, and to the *holy spirit*, their — "*other comforter.*"

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

† This unjust charge of idolatry against the unquestionable principles of the *ancient catholic church*, professed by the *church of England*, affords

So that both these sects of *Unitarians* (as well as their *Unitarian* brethren, the *Mahometans*) are, by mistaken notions of the *divine unity*, seduced from perceiving and acknowledging the declarations, throughout the holy Scriptures, of the unquestionable existence of *three* divine persons in *one* only divine nature, or *Godhead*. The old *Arians* (though their sect was probably represented by that "*fallen star*" which opened the "*bottomless pit*" for the emission of the *armed locusts* of the Arabian heresy, *more*

[cont.] a notable screen to the Latin church, by indiscriminately confounding all the due distinctions whereby a charge of *idolatry* is applicable; and this should teach us to be aware of what we should have to expect on the removal of all tests and restraints from such indiscriminate teachers; and, likewise, from all other sectaries (as much as from the *pontifical hierarchy*, seated on the *throne of the dragon*) who do *not* regulate their faith and practice by the plain doctrines of the holy Scriptures. For, indeed, no man is justly entitled to have a vote or share in the legislature of this or any other *Christian* nation, unless he (at least) professes to regulate his *principles of action* by the *two first foundations* of ENGLISH LAW, viz. *natural* and *revealed religion*, to which (as being *two witnesses of God*) *universal obedience* is due, so that no statute of parliament can be *valid*, nor any other law, custom, or practice, *sufferable*, if it be *at all* inconsistent with either of *these two indispensable foundations*. For, without these, MEN retain, indeed, the form, but not the *dignity*, of MAN; because they are subject to the impulse of *spirits*, inimical to the *nature of man*; and are, thereby, liable to be rendered, in disposition and practice, the most noxious of *beasts*, even — "*a generation of vipers;*" and, therefore, *the knowledge of our own NATURE, and of the principles of action in MAN, what they are and what they ought to be*, (which, by the Scriptures alone, is revealed to us,) is the first and most essential branch of *philosophy*, whatsoever our modern skeptical *philosophers* may think to the contrary; for, how should men be on their guard against any *invisible enemies*, of whose very existence they are ignorant? — But by the holy Scriptures we are informed, that — "*the prince of the power of the air worketh in the children of disobedience;*" — and, certainly, wherever this *Satanical inspiration* manifestly takes place among *men*, their *descriptive title* cannot be more accurately expressed than in the terms which our Lord himself (as well as John the Baptist, before him) applied to the haughty

strictly Unitarians than themselves*) allowed, indeed, that *Christ was God*, yet they supposed him to be so, in an *inferior degree*; by which they unwarily acknowledged a *superior God*, and an *inferior God*: i.e., *more Gods than one*, contrary to the *true Unitarian doctrine of the primitive churches*, which always held and asserted *the unity of God*

[cont.] skeptics whom they opposed, — "*a generation of vipers,*" (Matthew 12:34;) and "*serpents.*" (Matthew, 23:33;) expressly alluding thereby to the *Satanical inspiration* by which they became the *children*, or *generation*, of the *old Serpent*, as our Lord plainly warned them at another time: — *Ye are of YOUR "FATHER THE DEVIL — and the lusts of YOUR FATHER ye will do: — he was a MURDERER from the beginning, and abode not in the truth, etc."* Men, therefore, who will not be limited by the *two first foundations of English law*, are unworthy to be admitted to an equal participation of *civil rights* in any free *Christian state* whatever; because *true liberty* cannot be maintained without that *perfection of law* which arises *only* from these *indispensable rules of action*.

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

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

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

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

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

[cont.] *slaveholding* and *slave-dealing*,† which had been happily extinguished by the general influence of *Christian* benevolence) should have completely pervaded all those eastern and southern regions of the *third* Empire, wherever the doctrines of *Nestorius* had been previously adopted, and had *embittered* the *rivers* and *fountains* of the waters, to prepare them for this signal retribution, justly due to such antichristian apostates, who deny the true *rock* on which the *Catholic church* is built, viz. that "*Jesus is the Christ, the Son of the living God*;" or, as St. John has expressed the *peculiar sonship*, or filiation, of Christ, viz. "*the ONLY BEGOTTEN SON, which is in the bosom of the Father*." John, 1:18, compare with ver. 14, and chap. 3:16 and 18.

All the arguments produced by the learned *Vitringa*, to prove that *Arius* was the *fallen star*, are certainly much more applicable to *Nestorius*, as being an *archbishop* and *metropolitan of the empire*, and therefore more fitly prefigured by a *star*. And that the smoke from — "the bottomless pit," which was let out by this *fallen star*, was really the mist or diabolical darkness of *Mahometanism*, seems to have been fairly proved by our learned countryman, Joseph Mede.

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

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

So that the effect of my grammatical rule,* when applied to the two particular texts before-mentioned, (viz. Tit. 2:13, and Jude, 4) will not (in the opinion of such true Christians) seem to exceed the truth.

Though the apostle Paul asserted to the Colossians, (2:9,) concerning Christ, that "*in him dwelleth ALL the fullness of the Godhead*," (της Θεοτητος,) "*bodily*," (σωματικως, a term of indisputable personality,) yet, surely, this was without the least disparagement to the supreme divinity of the *Almighty Father*, and of the *Holy Spirit*, because they are, also, necessarily included in the same Θεοτης, or *Godhead*, as there is but *one* God; and, therefore, as "*it pleased all fullness to dwell*" in the person of our *Lord Jesus Christ*, (Co. 1:19,) we may more easily comprehend why he required, "*that all*" (men) "*should honour the Son, EVEN AS they honour the Father*;" that is, undoubtedly, with *Supreme honour*, καθως, *EVEN AS*, or *according as*, "*they honour the father*." And our Lord said, expressly, "*he that honoureth not the Son* (that is, according to the measure before declared, "*EVEN AS they honour*," or *ought to honour, the father*) "*honoureth not the father which hath sent him*; (John, 5:23;) and he also claimed expressly *to be glorified with the father himself*. "*And now, O father*, (said he,) "*GLORIFY THOU ME WITH THINE OWNSELF, with the glory which I had with thee before the world was*;" (John, 17:5;) thereby asserting both his *pre-existence* and *supreme dignity*. Christians, therefore, who humbly receive these and many other revelations of *Christ's divinity*, have the less difficulty in acknowledging the *doctrines of the ancient catholic churches* and the declarations of our *creeds*. But let all other men, likewise, who profess to believe in the *name of Christ*, earnestly inquire, in the *first* place, as the

* Compared with the concurrent reasons and testimonies quoted in the note, p. 35. EDITOR.

first means of progress to the true faith, where they are really "willing" (for this is given as the true proof of *faith*, εὐχ τῆς Θελῆ, [Ed.- "unless a person wills"]) to conform themselves to the *will of God*, as revealed in all the most obvious declarations and injunctions of holy Scripture, and more particularly to the purity, which is expressly called "*the will of God*," viz. *the sanctification of their bodies*,* which cannot otherwise be capable of becoming "*temples of the Holy Ghost*:" an indispensable state both of *body and mind* for all Christians to maintain; for, in that case, they may assuredly rely on God's absolute promise, through Christ, that "*if any one shall be WILLING to do HIS WILL, he shall know of the doctrine, whether it be of God, or whether I speak*" (said our Lord) "*from myself*." (John, 7:17.)

DEO SOLI GLORIA.

* "For this is the *will of God*, even your sanctification, that you should abstain from fornication: that every one of you should know how to possess his vessel in *sanctification and honour*; not in the lust of concupiscence, even as the Gentiles, which know not God: that no one should go beyond or defraud his brother, etc." 1 Thess. 4:3, 6.