

Presented
by Granville Sharp Esq^r
May 10. 1800

R E M A R K S

ON THE USES OF THE DEFINITIVE ARTICLE
IN THE GREEK TEXT OF

THE NEW TESTAMENT.

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, Esq.

TO WHICH IS ADDED
A PLAIN MATTER-OF-FACT ARGUMENT FOR THE DIVINITY
OF CHRIST,
BY THE EDITOR.

DURHAM:

PRINTED AND SOLD BY L. PENNINGTON.

1798.

14

ADVERTISEMENT.

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

To Mr Sharp's Remarks and Supplement he has subjoined a plain historical proof of the divinity of Christ founded on Christ's own testimony of himself attested and interpreted by his living witnesses and enemies,

the Jews,—*on* the evidence of his trial and crucifixion, *and on* the most explicit declarations of the Apostles after the Resurrection of Christ. *What appeared to him to be a substantial and unanswerable argument, he has, in this little exercise on the subject, endeavoured to render an easy and popular proof, of our Saviour's divinity. It was printed separately for the use of the unlearned part of his parishioners, and is subjoined to this treatise for the convenience of other unlearned readers, and such as may not have much considered the subject.*

DURHAM, Nov. 1798.



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 4

EXAMPLES.

- | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|-------|
| 1. Ὁ Θεὸς καὶ πατὴρ κυρίου ἡμῶν, | - | - | - | 5 |
| 2. Τῷ Θεῷ καὶ πατρί, | - | - | - | 22 |
| 3. Ἐν τῇ βασιλείᾳ τοῦ Χριστοῦ καὶ Θεοῦ, | - | - | - | 23 |
| 4. Κατὰ χάριν τοῦ Θεοῦ ἡμῶν καὶ κυρίου Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, | - | - | - | 26 |
| 5. Ἐνώπιον τοῦ Θεοῦ καὶ κυρίου Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, | - | - | - | 29 30 |
| 6. Ἐπιφανείαν τῆς δόξης τοῦ μεγάλου Θεοῦ καὶ σωτῆρος ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, | - | - | - | 34 |
| 7. Ἐν δικαιοσυνῇ τοῦ Θεοῦ ἡμῶν καὶ σωτῆρος ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, | - | - | - | 34 |
| 8. Καὶ τὸν μόνον δεσποτὴν Θεὸν καὶ κύριον ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦν Χριστὸν ἀρ-
νόμενοι, | - | - | - | 35 |

Common Version.

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

Corrected Version.

Common Version.

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

Corrected Version.

Common Version.

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

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

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

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

RULE II.

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

RULE III.

If the first has the article, and the second has not, and there is no copulative, they relate also to the same person, - - - 9

RULE IV.

If the nouns are not personal, they relate to different things, or qualities, - - - 10

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, 11

RULE VI.

If they are connected by the copulative, and both have the article, they relate also to different persons, - - - 12

A
L E T T E R

TO THE

REV. MR —

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

Old Jewry, London 10th June, 1778.

DEAR SIR,

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

fore, 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, has prevented me from complying with your request so soon as I could have wished; but I shall now submit to your consideration and candour, the rules in question; and beg that you will be pleased to favour me with whatever examples may occur in the course of your reading, either as exceptions to invalidate the *first rule*, or as proofs to establish and confirm it. The reasons 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 favour of a fundamental article of our church, which has, of late, been much opposed and traduced, I mean the belief that our Lord Jesus Christ is truly God.

R U L E I.

When the copulative καὶ 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 it's cases, preceeds 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 further description of the first named person, as—*καὶ ἐθεράπευσεν αὐτόν, ὥς τε ΤΟΝ τυφλὸν ΚΑΙ κωφὸν καὶ λαλεῖν καὶ βλέπειν.* Matt. xii. 22. And again *Εὐλογεῖς Ὁ Θεὸς ΚΑΙ Πατὴρ τὰ κυρία ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, Ὁ Πατὴρ τῶν οικτιρμῶν ΚΑΙ Θεὸς πάσης παρακλήσεως.* 2 Cor. i. 3. This last sentence contains two examples of the first rule. See also in 2 Cor. xi. 31, *Ὁ θεὸς ΚΑΙ πατὴρ τὰ κυρία ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ οἶδεν*, &c. Also in Eph. vi. 21, *Τυχικὸς Ὁ ἀγαπῆλος ἀδελφὸς ΚΑΙ πιστὸς διάκονος ἐν κυρίῳ.* Also in Heb. iii. 1, *κατανοήσατε ΤΟΝ ἀποστόλον ΚΑΙ ἀρχιερεὰ τῆς ὁμολογίας ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ*, &c. See also in 2 Pet. ii. 20,—*ἐν ἐπιγνώσει ΤΟΥ κυρία ΚΑΙ σωτήρος Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ*, &c. And again in 2 Pet. iii. 2,—*καὶ τῆς τῶν ἀποστόλων ἡμῶν ἐνέστατης, ΤΟΥ κυρία ΚΑΙ σωτήρος.* And again in 2 Pet. iii. 18,—*Ἀυξάνετε δὲ ἐν χάριτι καὶ γνώσει ΤΟΥ κυρία ἡμῶν ΚΑΙ σωτήρος Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ. αὐτὴ ἡ δόξα καὶ νῦν καὶ εἰς ἡμέραν αἰῶνος, ἀμήν.* Also in Philippians iv. 20,—*τῷ δὲ Θεῷ καὶ πατρὶ ἡμῶν ἡ δόξα*, &c. In Rev. xvi. 15,—*μακαριῶν Ὁ γρηγορῶν ΚΑΙ τηρῶν τὰ ἱμάτια αὐτοῦ, ἵνα μὴ γυμνὸς περιπατῇ*, &c. And in Col. ii. 2,—*εἰς ἐπιγνώσιν τὰ μυστήρια ΤΟΥ θεοῦ ΚΑΙ πατρός καὶ τοῦ Χριστοῦ**, ἐν ᾧ εἰσι πάντες οἱ θησαυροὶ τῆς σοφίας, &c. And in 1 Thes. iii. 11,—*Ἄντες δὲ Ὁ Θεὸς ΚΑΙ πατὴρ*

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

ἡμῶν, καὶ ὁ κυριος ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦς Χριστος, καλεῖσθαι τὴν ὁδὸν ἡμῶν πρὸς ὑμᾶς. This solemn ejaculation for the divine direction is addressed jointly to the God and Father, and to our Lord Jesus* ; (so that here is good authority for offering up prayers to Christ, which some have lately opposed) and the distinction of the persons is preserved (as in the last example) by again inserting the article ὁ before κυριος, which had been omitted before πατηρ. The apostle James also used the same mode of expression—ἀρεσκεία καθαρά καὶ ἀμικτός παρὰ τῷ θεῷ καὶ πατρὶ ἀλήθεια ἐστίν, ἐπισκεπτεῖσθαι ὀρφανὰς καὶ χήρας ἐν τῇ θλίψει αὐτῶν, &c. James i. 27. And there are at least a dozen other places, viz. (Rom. xv. 6. 1. Cor. xv. 24. Gal. i. 4. Ephes. v. 20. Col. i. 3, and 12.† and iii. 17. 1 Thes. i. 3. 1 Thes. iii. 13. 2 Thes. ii. 16. James iii. 9. Rev. i. 6.) wherein “*the God and Father*” is mentioned exactly according to this rule; and there is no exception or instance of the like mode of expression that I know of, which necessarily

* This text is clearly a supplication to Christ for providential assistance; and being addressed to him *jointly* with God the Father, most certainly amounts to *supreme worship*, because the direction of Providence belongs to God alone: so that a prayer for it addressed to Christ, were he merely a minister or 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.

† Some copies have not the words θεῷ καὶ in this twelfth verse, but only τῷ πατρὶ τῷ ἰκανωσαντι, in which last case this verse affords an example only of the second rule.

requires a construction different from what is here laid down; EXCEPT the nouns be *proper names*, or *in the plural number*; in which cases there are many exceptions; though there are not wanting examples, even of plural nouns, which are expressed exactly agreeable to this rule.

As the examples which I have annexed to my first rule consist of texts, wherein the sense is so plain, that there can be no controversy concerning the particular persons, to whom the several nouns are applicable, it will be thought, I hope, that I have already cited a sufficient number of them to authenticate and justify the rule. There are several other texts wherein the mode of expression is exactly similar, and which therefore do necessarily require a construction agreeable to the same rule, though the present English version has unhappily rendered them in a different sense, and has thereby concealed from the mere *English* reader many striking proofs concerning the Godhead (*περι "της Θεότητος,"* Col. ii. 9.) of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ. The rules which follow are intended only to illustrate the *particularity* of the several sentences which fall under the *first rule*, by shewing in *other* sentences, the different senses that are occasioned by adding, omitting, or repeating the article as well *with* the copulative as *without it*.

R U L E, II.

A repetition of the article before the second noun, if the copulative be omitted, will have the same effect and

power: for it also denotes a further description of the same person, property or thing, that is expressed by the first noun; as in the following examples.

—και ηγαλλιατε το πνευμα μου επι τῷ θεῷ τῷ σωτηρι μου
 Luke i. 47.—και ην αὐτῷ κεχρηματισμενον ὑπο τοῦ πνευματος
 τοῦ ἁγίου, &c. Luke ii. 26. ἰδε ὁ ἀμνος τοῦ θεοῦ ὁ αἰρων
 την ἁμαρτιαν τοῦ κοσμου, John i. 29. οἶδαμεν ὅτι οὗτος ἐστιν ἀλη-
 θως ὁ σωτήρ τοῦ κοσμου ὁ Χριστός, John iv. 42.—ὁ μὴ τιμῶν τον
 ὕιον, οὐ τιμᾷ τον πατέρα τον πέμψαντα αὐτον, John v. 23.
 εργαζεθε μὴ την ἔρωςιν την απολλυμενην, ἀλλὰ την ἔρωςιν
 την μενεσαν εἰς ζωὴν αἰωνιον, ἣν ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ὑμῖν δώσει· τὸν
 γὰρ ὁ σωτήρ ἐσφραγισεν ὁ θεός, John vi. 27. This verse
 contains three examples. Ταῦτα δὲ γεγραπται ἵνα πισευσητε,
 ὅτι ὁ Ἰησὺς ἐστιν ὁ Χριστός ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ, &c. John xx. 31.
 —ὁ δὲ θεὸς τῆς εἰρήνης ὁ ἀναγαγων ἐκ νεκρῶν τον ποιμένα των
 προβάτων τον μεγάλον* ἐν αἱματι διαθήκης αἰωνιᾶς, τον κυρίον ἡμῶν

* The apostle, in this text, expressly calls our Lord Jesus Christ
 “the Great SHEPHERD OF THE SHEEP,” τον ποιμένα των προβάτων
 τον μεγάλον; and the apostle Peter entitles him “THE CHIEF SHEP-
 HERD,” —ὁ ἀρχιποιμὴν 1 Pet. v. 4. which compare with Psalm
 xxiii. 1. “JEHOVAH is my SHEPHERD,” and with Isaiah xl. 9, 10,
 11. “O Zion that bringeth good tidings,” &c. “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: behold HIS re-
 “ward is with him, and HIS work before him. HE,” (i. e. the Lord
 JEHOVAH) “shall feed HIS flock like a SHEPHERD: he shall gather the
 lambs with his arm,” &c. &c. To explain this still further, the pro-
 phet Ezekiel foretold that “all shall have one Shepherd,” Ezekiel
 xxxvii. 24. And Christ himself expressly acknowledged that emi-
 nent pastoral character, saying “I am the good Shepherd;” ὁ ποιμὴν ὁ καλός,
 “and I know MY sheep and am known of MINE,” (John x. 14.) And
 a little further (v. 27.) our Lord mentions the true mark by which

Ἰησοῦν καθάρτισαι ὑμᾶς &c. Heb. xiii. 20. This sentence also contains three examples.

(GENERAL EXCEPTION.)

Except when genitive cases depend on one another in succession, as εἰ δὲ καὶ ἐστὶ κεκαλυμμενὸν τὸ εὐαγγέλιον ἡμῶν, ἐν τοῖς ἀππολλυμένοις ἐστὶ κεκαλυμμενὸν, ἐν οἷς ὁ θεὸς τὰ αἰῶνες τὰς ἐτυφλώσε τὰ νοήματα τῶν ἀπίστων, εἰς τὸ μὴ αὐγασαὶ αὐτοῖς τὸν φωτισμὸν τοῦ εὐαγγελίου τῆς δόξης τοῦ Χριστοῦ, ὅς ἐστιν εἰκὼν τοῦ θεοῦ τοῦ ἀοράτου, 2 Cor. iv. 3. And again ἵνα παρακληθῶσιν αἱ καρδίαι αὐτῶν συμβιβασθέντων ἐν ἀγάπῃ καὶ εἰς πάντα πλεον τῆς πληροφορίας τῆς συνέσεως, εἰς ἐπιγνώσιν τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ πατρὸς καὶ τοῦ Χριστοῦ &c. Colos. ii. 2.

R U L E, III.

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

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,*” &c. which power of *giving eternal life* cannot be an attribute of any person that is not truly God, and one with Jehovah, or the heavenly Father; as, in the 30th verse, he is expressly declared to be, “*I and my Father are one,*” ἐν ἑσμέν, *we are one*; in which brief expression, both the plurality and the unity of the two persons are unquestionably asserted;

Πεποιθας τε σεαυτον ὍΔΗΓΟΝ εἶναι τυφλῶν, ΦΩΣ τῶν ἐν σκοτει, ΠΑΙΔΕΥΤΗΝ ἀφρονῶν, ΔΙΔΑΣΚΑΛΟΝ νηπιῶν, ΕΧΟΝΤΑ τὴν μορφωσιν τῆς γνώσεως καὶ τῆς ἀληθείας ἐν τῷ νόμῳ, Rom. ii. 19, 20.

Εὐχαριστῶντες πάντοτε ὑπὲρ πάντων ἐν ὀνόματι τοῦ ΚΥΡΙΟΥ ἡμῶν ΙΗΣΟΥ ΧΡΙΣΤΟΥ, τῷ θεῷ καὶ πατρὶ· ὑποτασσόμενοι ἀλλήλοις ἐν φόβῳ* Χριστοῦ, Ephes. v. 20, 21. ΠΑΥΛΟΣ, ΔΟΥΛΟΣ θεοῦ, ΑΠΟΣΤΟΛΟΣ δὲ ΙΗΣΟΥ ΧΡΙΣΤΟΥ &c. Tit. i. 1. Παῦλος Ἀποστόλος Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ κατ' ἐπιταγὴν† θεοῦ σωτῆρος ἡμῶν καὶ κυρίου Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, τῆς ἐλπίδος ἡμῶν, 1. Tim. i. 1.

R U L E, IV.

Yet it is otherwise when the nouns are not of personal description, or application; for then they denote distinct things or qualities, as Τιμοθεῶ, γνησίῳ τέκνῳ ἐν πίστει, χάρις, ἐλεος, εἰρήνη ἀπὸ θεοῦ Πατρὸς ἡμῶν, καὶ Χριστοῦ Ἰησοῦ τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν.

* ἐν φόβῳ Χριστοῦ. In the modern printed editions the reading is ἐν φόβῳ Θεοῦ, but in the Complutensian and several of the oldest editions it is ἐν φόβῳ χριστοῦ, as also in the Alexandrian and other old MSS. as well as the ancient versions, and the citations of the Fathers; for which see Wetstein's Testimony. Now compare this expression (ἐν φόβῳ Χριστοῦ) with 1 Pet. ii. 17. τὸν θεὸν φοβέσθε, τὸν βασιλεῖα τιμάτε; and also with 2 Kings xvii. 35, and 36. “ye shall not fear” (rendered by the seventy οὐ φοβηθήσεσθε) “other gods;” “but JEHOVAH, who brought you up out of the land of Egypt, &c. him shall ye fear.

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

1 Tim. i. 2. 2 Tim. i. 2. Titus i. 4.* See also 2 John 3, *εσται μεθ' ὑμῶν χάρις, ἐλεος, εἰρήνη, παρὰ θεοῦ Πατρὸς, καὶ παρὰ κυρίου Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ τοῦ ὕιου τοῦ Πατρὸς, ἐν ἀληθείᾳ καὶ ἀγαπῇ.*

R U L E, V.

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

Ἰακωβός, θεοῦ καὶ κυρίου Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ δούλος &c. James i. 1. Πᾶσα ΠΙΚΡΙΑ, καὶ ΘΥΜΟΣ, καὶ ΟΡΓΗ, καὶ ΚΡΑΤΗ, καὶ ΒΛΑΣΦΗΜΙΑ, ἀρθητὰ ἀφ' ὑμῶν, συνπάση κακίᾳ. Ephes. iv. 31.

This last sentence contains four examples of the fifth rule. ΧΑΡΙΣ ὑμῖν καὶ ΕΙΡΗΝΗ ἀπὸ θεοῦ πατρὸς ἡμῶν καὶ κυρίου ἸΗΣΟΥ ΧΡΙΣΤΟΥ. 2 Cor. i. 2. 1 Ephes. i. 2. Gal. i. 3. Philem. 3. ΕΙΡΗΝΗ τοῖς ἀδελφοῖς ΚΑΙ ΑΓΑΠΗ μέγα πλεονεξία ἀπὸ θεοῦ πατρὸς καὶ κυρίου ἸΗΣΟΥ ΧΡΙΣΤΟΥ. Ephes. vi. 23.†

* 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*.

† The supplications for *grace and peace jointly from God the Father, and from the Lord Jesus Christ* in all these five texts last cited, are so many unquestionable instances of *prayer and supreme worship to CHRIST*, as being a free disposer of those divine gifts *jointly* with his Almighty Father, agreeable to what I have already remarked above on 1 Thess. iii. 11, and Titus i. 1.

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

R U L E VI.

*And as the insertion of the copulative καί between nouns of the same case without articles (according to the fifth rule) denotes that the second noun expresses a different person, thing, or quality from the preceding noun, so likewise, the same effect attends the copulative, when each of the nouns are preceded by articles; as in the following examples.—*Ὁ νομῶς διὰ Μωσεως ἐδόθη· Ἡ χάρις ΚΑΙ Ἡ ἀλήθεια διὰ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ ἐγένετο. John i. 17. ὅτε οὐκ ἠγέρθη” (Ἰησοῦς) “ἐκ νεκρῶν, ἐμνησθήσαν οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ, ὅτι ταῦτο εἶπεν αὐτοῖς, καὶ ἐπιστεύσαν τῇ γραφῇ, καὶ τῷ λόγῳ ᾧ εἶπεν ὁ Ἰησοῦς. John ii. 22.—φωνὴ μεγάλη ἐκραυγασε,” (Ἰησοῦς) “Λαζαρε, δευρο ἐξω. Καὶ ἐξῆλθεν ὁ τεθνηκώς, δεδεμένῳ ΤΟΥΣ ΠΟΔΑΣ ΚΑΙ ΤΑΣ ΧΕΙΡΑΣ κειρίαις, καὶ ἡ ὄψις αὐτοῦ σενδαριῷ περιεδεδέτο. John xi. 44. εἰς ἐπιγνώσιν τοῦ μυστηρίου ΤΟΥ ΘΕΟΥ καὶ Πατρὸς, ΚΑΙ ΤΟΥ ΧΡΙΣΤΟΥ, ἐν ᾧ εἰσι πάντες οἱ θησαυροὶ ΤΗΣ ΣΟΦΙΑΣ ΚΑΙ ΤΗΣ ΓΝΩΣΕΩΣ ἀποκρυφοὶ. Col. ii. 2.—ὑπομνησιν λαμβάνων τῆς ἐν σοὶ ἀνυποκρίτου πίστεως, ἣτις ἐνωκίησεν πρῶτον ἐν τῇ μητρὶ σου Λωΐδι καὶ τῇ μητρὶ σου Εὐνεϊκῇ· πεπεισμαι δέ, ὅτι καὶ ἐν σοὶ. 2 Tim. i. 5.—ἵνα ἐν πασὶν δοξάζεται ὁ θεὸς διὰ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, ᾧ εἰσιν Ἡ δόξα ΚΑΙ ΤΟ κράτος εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας τῶν αἰώνων. Ἀμήν. 1 Pet. iv. 11.

EXCEPT distinct and different actions are intended to be attributed to *one and the same person*, in which case if the sentence is not expressed agreeable to the three first rules, but appears as an exception to this sixth rule, or even to the fifth, (for this *exception* relates to both rules) the context must explain, or point out plainly the person to whom the two nouns relate, as in 1 Theff. iii. 6, Ἀρετὴ δὲ ΕΛΘΟΝΤΟΣ ΤΙΜΟΘΕΟΥ πρὸς ἡμᾶς ἀφ' ὑμῶν, ΚΑΙ ΕΥΑΓΓΕΛΙΣΑΜΕΝΟΥ ἡμῖν τὴν πίσιν, &c. And also in John xx. 28, Καὶ ἀπεκρίθη ὁ Θωμᾶς, καὶ εἶπεν αὐτῷ, Ὁ ΚΥΡΙΟΣ ΜΕ ΚΑΙ Ὁ ΘΕΟΣ ΜΕ. If the two nouns (viz. ὁ κυριος and ὁ θεος) were the leading nominative substantives of a sentence, they would express the descriptive qualities or dignities of *two distinct persons* according to the sixth rule; but, in this last text, two distinct divine characters are applied to *one person* only; for the context clearly expresses *to whom the words were addressed by Thomas*; which perspicuity in the address clearly proves, likewise, the futility of that gloss for which the Arians and Socinians contend; viz. that Thomas could not mean that *Christ was his God*, but only uttered, in his surprize, a solemn exclamation or ejaculation to God. The text, however, expressly relates, that our Lord first addressed himself to Thomas: εἰτα λέγει τῷ Θωμᾶ, φερε τὸν δακτυλὸν σὺ ὧδε &c. καὶ ἀπεκρίθη ὁ Θωμᾶς καὶ εἶπεν αὐτῷ (that is without doubt, to JESUS) ὁ κυριος μου, καὶ ὁ θεος μου. So that both these *distinct* titles (for they are plainly mentioned as *distinct*) were manifestly addressed αὐτῷ 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. i. 24, — Χριστον Θεον δυνάμιν και Θεον σοφίαν,* and Acts ii. 36. There are also other examples of this exception, which equally prove that *Christ is God*, as Μη φοβέσθε. ΕΓΩ ειμι Ὁ πρῶτος ΚΑΙ Ὁ ἐσχάτος, ΚΑΙ Ὁ ΖΩΝ.† και εγενομην νεκρος, και ιδε ζων ειμι εις τας αιωνας των αιωνων· αμην. και εχω τας κλεις τε τῆς θανάτου.† Rev. i. 17, 18.

These are the words of him whom John saw ὁμοιον ὄντι ἀνθρώπῳ, with a two edged sword proceeding out of his mouth; which was undoubtedly a representation of the Λόγος, or word of God, as this declaration alludes plainly to his death and resurrection. εγενομην νεκρος, και ιδε ζων ειμι. And again in the second chapter, ver. 8. ταυτε λεγει Ὁ πρῶτος ΚΑΙ Ὁ ἐσχάτος† (and the same infallible mark of distinction is added, to prove which of the divine persons is here to be understood) ὉΣ ΕΓΕΝΕΤΟ ΝΕΚΡΟΣ, και ἐξῆσεν. Now though the explanation which Grotius has given us of these titles (ὁ πρῶτος και ὁ ἐσχάτος) is certainly true when applied to Christ, yet it does not appear to be the *whole truth*, or the full meaning that ought to be attributed to these titles, either in the Revelation or elsewhere; for they have a manifest reference to the supreme titles of *the Almighty* in the first chapter, & 8th verse, (which also contains examples of this excep-

* Example of the exception to the fifth rule.

† Example of the exception to the sixth rule.

tion) ΕΓΩ ΕΙΜΙ ΤΟ Α και ΤΟ Ω,† λέγει Ὁ κυριος, αρχη και τελος*
 Ο ων ΚΑΙ Ὁ ην† και Ὁ ερχομενος, ὁ παντοκρατωρ. And in the
 22d chapter, 13th verse, where these titles, το Α και
 το Ω, are, manifestly by the context, to be under-
 stood as the titles of Christ, we find them explained
 by these other titles ὁ πρωτος και ὁ εσχατος, to which
 Grotius has attributed a much inferior and less com-
 prehensive meaning. Εγω ειμι ΤΟ Α ΚΑΙ ΤΟ Ω,† αρχη και
 τελος, Ὁ πρωτος και Ὁ εσχατος.† And as I have shewn in
 my Tract on *the Law of Nature*, &c. p. 270 and 271
 that these titles, "*the first and the last*," are 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 appli-
 ed to Christ, who was truly *Jehovah*, as a variety of
 texts do demonstrate. [*Law of Nature*, p. 248, to
 345.]

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

THE END OF THE RULES.

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

EXAMPLES

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

Example I. 2 Pet. i. 1.—*εν δικαιοσυνη ΤΟΥ ΘΕΟΥ ἡμῶν ΚΑΙ ΣΩΤΗΡΟΣ ἡμῶν ΙΗΣΟΥ ΧΡΙΣΤΟΥ.* As the Article *τῷ* is not repeated before the next descriptive noun *σωτήρος*, 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 *ἡμῶν* was not repeated after *σωτήρος*, and I have by me twenty different editions (including those of Erasmus, Stephens, Dr. Mill, Bengelius, &c.) which follow that reading ; viz. *εν δικαιοσυνη ΤΟΥ ΘΕΟΥ ἡμῶν ΚΑΙ σωτήρος Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ*; in which case a literal rendering into English will sufficiently express the sense of the Greek, without transposing the *proper name*, viz. “*Through the righteousness of our God and Saviour*” “*Jesus Christ.*” The sense and purport, however,

is exactly the same in both the readings, and, in the old English editions, has generally been expressed in the terms required by my first rule; viz. “*In the righteousness that cometh of our God and Saviour Jesus Christ.*” (fol. edit. 1549.)—“*Through the righteousness of our God and Saviour Jesus Christ.*” (12mo edit. 1595.)—“*By the righteousness of our God and Saviour Jesus Christ.*” (4to edit. 1599.)—“*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 inserted, “*of our God and Saviour,*” manifestly referring both titles to one person. The learned Beza also remarks on the words of this text, “*Ista necesse est conjunctim legamus, quia unicus est articulus, ut copiosius diximus Tit. ii. 13. Itaque continet etiam hic locus manifestum divinitatis Christi testimonium.*” The two nouns are referred to Christ also in the Syriac version. There seems, therefore, to be ample authority for my first rule.

Exam. II. Titus ii. 13.—*ἐπιφανεῖαν τῆς δόξης τοῦ μεγάλου Θεοῦ καὶ σωτῆρος ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ.* In some few copies a comma is inserted between Θεοῦ and καὶ, but without authority. The abovementioned 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 Eng-

lish 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 as they are expressed in *the Greek*, yet the rendering of the said pronoun in *English* ought to be PREFIXED to the said descriptive nouns, in order to 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*, [εἰς
καὶ ὁ Πατήρ ἐν ἐσμεν : the plural verb ἐσμεν (“ *we are*”
marking the plurality, or distinction of more persons
than one, as much as the noun ἐν marks the *unity* of

their existence] he must necessarily be esteemed "*the great God*,"* because there is but ONE GOD. G. S.

* As we believe that three persons exist in one and the same God, we cannot believe any one of them to be less than God, without denying the unity of the Godhead. And as each person is God, it follows, that each must be the great God: Theophylact bears an explicit testimony to this conclusion in his commentary on St. Paul's epistle to Titus, ii. 13. Που δε εισιν (says the learned and venerable commentator, exultingly, on the authority of this passage) που δε εισιν οι τον υιον ελαττουντες, και ουδε Θεον ανεχομενοι λεγειν; Ακουειωσαν, οτι και Θεος εστι, και Μεγας. Το δε μεγας επι Θεου λεγεται, ου κατὰ συγκρισιν την προς αλλον μικρον, αλλ' απολελυμενως, ως φυσει ΑΤΤΟΜΕΓΑΛΟΥ 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 the great God. He is called great 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 re-
" quire this construction, "the appearance of Jesus Christ the
" great God and our Saviour." Secondly, because as God the Fa-
" ther 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. ii. 8. 1 Tim. vi. 14. 2 Tim. i.
" 10. and iv. 1. 8. Thirdly, because Christ is emphatically styled
" *our hope, the hope of our glory*, Col. i. 27. 1 Tim. i. 1. And
" lastly, because not only all the 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, p. 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 favourable 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.

E X A M P L E S

TO THE

G R A M M A T I C A L R U L E S

OF

CONSTRUCTION, &c.

EXAMPLE, I.

ACTS XX. 28.

ΠΡΟΣΕΧΕΤΕ ουν ἑαυτοῖς καὶ παντὶ τῷ ποίμνῳ, ἐν ᾧ ὑμεῖς τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον ἐθετο ἐπισκοποῦς ποιμαίνειν τὴν ἐκκλησίαν τῆς θεοῦ, ἣν περιποιήσατο διὰ τῆς ἰδίας αἱματός.

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 over-
“seers, 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 τῆς θεοῦ, which is the most general reading, the word κυρίῃ is substituted; but many old MSS. have both words, τῆς κυρίῃ καὶ θεοῦ, 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, agreeable to the first rule, as in Romans, xv. 6. *τον θεον και πατερα*. and I. Cor. xv. 24. *τω θεω και πατρι*. both of which are rendered,—“*God, even the father*,” (instead of the literal rendering *the God and father*) that the *identity of person* may be the more obvious. See also II. Cor. i. 3. *ευλογητος ὁ θεος και πατηρ τῶ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, ὁ πατηρ τῶν οὐκτιρμῶν, και θεος πάσης παρακλήσεως*. This sentence contains two successive examples of the first rule, and is rendered “Blessed be God, *even* the father of our Lord Jesus Christ, the father of mercies, and the God of all comfort” See also James iii. 9. *τον θεον και πατερα*. I. Theff. iii. 13. *τῷ θεῷ και πατρί ἡμῶν*. II. Theff. ii. 16. *και ὁ θεος και πατηρ*. Besides these six examples, wherein the word *even*, in the english version, expresses the the copulative, there are also 13* *other examples of*

* viz. 2. Cor. xi. 31. Gal. i. 4. Ephes. i. 3. and 4. 6. and 5. 20. Philip. iv. 20. Col. i. 3. and 2. 2. and 3. 17. I. Theff. i. 3. and 3. 11. James, i. 27. I. Peter, i. 3.

the first rule, in the New Testament : i. e. altogether 19 examples, respecting our *heavenly father* alone ; and therefore the 9 examples of the same mode of expression, produced in this and the following pages, respecting the *son*, and *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, No. II.

EPHESIANS, V. 5.

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

In the common english version the sentence is rendered “ *no whoremonger &c.*” *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 apostacy of the Socinians* in their *denial of divine honour to our Lord the Christ, or Messiah*, who, according to the idiom of the greek Tongue, is in this text expressly entitled θεός, “ *GOD*,” though the proof does not appear in the english version. Let it be remarked that the two substan-

tives of personal description $\chi\rho\iota\varsigma$ and $\delta\epsilon\varsigma$ are joined by the copulative $\kappa\alpha\iota$, and that the article $\tau\omicron$ preceeds the first, and that there is no article before the word $\delta\epsilon\varsigma$, 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 not 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 *Jesu*, which is necessary to be *understood*, might very fairly be inserted in *italics*, or between hooks, to supply the necessary sense of the greek;—as "in the kingdom of (Jesu) the Christ and God:" or else to be rendered—"in the kingdom of *Christ (even) of God*"—as recommended in the first example.

EXAMPLE, III.

PHILIPPIANS iii. 3.

$\eta\mu\epsilon\iota\varsigma$ γὰρ ἐσμὲν ἡ περιτομή, οἱ πνεύματι $\delta\epsilon\varsigma$ λατρεῦοντες, καὶ καυχώμενοι ἐν $\chi\rho\iota\varsigma$ Ἰησοῦ, καὶ οὐκ ἐν σαρκὶ πεποιθότες.

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

In the London Polyglott, and many other valu-

able editions, the reading is $\delta\iota\ \piνευματι\ θεω$, but in the Alexandrian MS. it is $\delta\iota\ \piνευματι\ θεε$, 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, $\thetaεω$, was admitted to be the true reading, unless another word, the preposition $εν$, be also added to it before $\piνευματι$, as in John iv. 23. and Rom. viii. 9. where the sense, which they have applied to this text, was really intended; but, without this addition, (as we may fairly judge by those examples) the literal rendering ought to be, “We are the circumcision, *who worship the spirit God.*” Whereas they have commonly rendered it as if the preposition $εν$ was really inserted in this text before the dative $\piνευματι$, as in the two examples before cited, viz. “*Qui spiritu servimus dec.*” or “*Qui spiritu colimus Deum.*” or as in the Syriac version “*Qui deo servimus in spiritu.*” (fyr.) 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 ($\thetaεω$) without supposing this addition of EN to be understood before $\piνευματι$, proves that the reading of the Alexandrian MS. in this text is really to be preferred, $\delta\iota\ \piνευματι\ ΘΕΟΥ$ *

* Many other ancient and valuable greek MSS. as Dr Mill has testified, have this reading $\thetaεε$, but Augustine testified that, in his

ἀσπασσοντες “*who worship the spirit of God,*” whereby the apostle and Timothy, as an example to the church at Philippi, assert their profession that they pay *divine honour to the spirit of God, and that they glory in Christ.*


EXAMPLE, IV.

II. THESS. i. 12.

κατα την χάριν ΤΟΥ ΘΕΟΥ ἡμῶν ΚΑΙ ΚΥΡΙΟΥ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ.

This, in the common english version, is rendered (very erroneously) as if two distinct persons were mentioned, viz. “*according to the grace of our God, and the Lord Jesus Christ.*” But if two distinct persons had really been intended to be expressed as (by innumerable examples of the grammatical construction of sentences for the accurate distinction of persons peculiar to the greek tongue, used in the greek testament, from which the preceeding 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 κυριῦ. For it is manifest that the

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 graviore cedere detrectavit, &c.*”

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

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

In the Alexandrian MS. the text before us is awkwardly divided by one of these points, placed after the word *ἤμων*, 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 persons; as if *two* persons had been named in the text instead of *one*, in like manner as the comma is added after the word God, in the english version, *without any authority*.

But the necessary grammatical construction of the whole sentence taken together detects the interpolator, and demonstrates the absurdity of supposing, that any such point ever existed in the original text, because the words, which are severed by the supposititious period, cannot form a grammatical sentence (according to the ordinary modes of expression used in the greek tongue) by themselves alone; so that the obvious sense of the context demonstrates their necessary 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.

I. TIM. V. 21.

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

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

The word *χριστ* is omitted in the Alexandrian MS. which, however, agrees in every other particular ; for no *points* whatever are inserted between the substantives ; so that we have the testimony even of this MS. for a clear declaration that *Jesus* is *God*, as well as *Lord* ; 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 Lord’ “Jesus” (or rather ‘before *Jesus the God and Lord, and*’ (before) ‘*the elect angels, that thou observe these things.*’ Thus far the testimony of the Alexandrian MS. But, according to the commonly received text of the greek, it ought to be rendered, in the english idiom,—“ I “ charge (thee) before *Jesus Christ the God and* “ *Lord, and* (before) *the elect angels, &c.*

EXAMPLE, VI.

II. TIM. iv. 1.

Διαμαρτυρομαι ουν εγω ενωπιον ΤΟΥ ΘΕΟΥ ΚΑΙ ΚΥΡΙΟΥ
ΙΗΣΟΥ ΧΡΙΣΤΟΥ ΤΩ ΜΕΛΛΟΝΤΩ ΚΡΙΝΕΙΝ ΖΩΝΤΑΣ ΚΑΙ ΝΕΚΡΩΣ, &c.

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

In the greek of this text, as it is commonly printed, the article *τω* is repeated before *κυριω*, 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 the article *τω* is *not* repeated after the copulative before *κυριω*, so that the expression is exactly similar to the declaration of our Lord's *divine nature* by the same apostle in the preceding example, viz. I. Tim. v. 21. In some printed editions the word *κυριω* is also omitted, but in the Geneva edition of 1620, with Scaliger's Notes, the word *κυριω* is inserted, and the article *τω* omitted, whereby the title *θεω* (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 endeavoured to pervert it, by adding a full period after

the word $\theta\epsilon\gamma$ as $\Theta\upsilon$. 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 personal description, *without an article before it*, joined by a copulative to a preceding substantive of the like nature, and in the same case, *with an article before it*, must necessarily denote a farther description of the same person, expressed by the first substantive, (whenever there is an article before the first substantive and none before the second) so that the insertion of the *period* in the Alexandrian MS. after $\theta\epsilon\gamma$ is utterly vain, because the *copulative* sufficiently proves the *connection* of the two substantives in one clear sentence, and the omission of the article before the second substantive induces the necessity of applying the same grammatical construction whereby alone the due distinction of persons is so peculiarly maintained in the greek tongue, and *not by points*. The text should therefore be rendered, —“I charge (thee) therefore, before the God and “ Lord Jesus Christ, &c.” or rather (to render the doctrine more obvious in the english idiom)—“I “ charge (thee) therefore, before Jesus Christ the “ God and Lord, who shall judge the quick and

“ the dead, &c.” And thus the texts in the two last examples will perfectly accord as the uniform expressions of the same apostle, asserting, in both, the *divinity of his Lord and Saviour*, by whom he had been personally summoned to bear his testimony to the gentiles, as being an eye and ear witness of his *glorious majesty*.

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

EXAMPLE, VII.

TIT. ii. 13.

—Προσδεχομενοι την μακαριαν ελπιδα και επιφανειαν της δοξης ΤΟΥ
μεγαλης ΘΕΟΥ ΚΑΙ ΣΩΤΗΡΟΣ ἡμων ΙΗΣΟΥ ΧΡΙΣΤΟΥ.

The present version of these words, in the english testament, is—“ Looking for that blessed hope,
“ and the glorious appearing of the great God, and
“ our Saviour Jesus Christ.” This text (though the next in order, according to the usual mode of arranging the books of the new testament) has already been produced as the second example in the preceding letter. I have since however examined the Alexandrian MS. and find that it agrees exactly with the above citation of this text, except that a point has been added in the MS. after the word Θεου

or *Θ*. On which it is necessary to observe that the same remarks are obviously applicable to this superfluous and absurd addition of the point, or *period*, that I have made on the texts, II. Theff. i. 12. and II. Tim. iv. 1. in the fourth and sixth examples of this tract. For as the proper effect and purposes of *periods* is to separate words into *distinct sentences*, it is obvious that the words, which follow the supposititious period in this text, are incapable of a grammatical construction without reference to the preceding words, connected by the *copulative*; and therefore the *note of separation* (a period) cannot possibly have been intended by the inspired writer. This testimony therefore of the sacred text in favour of the necessary doctrine of our Lord's *divine nature* ought not to be withheld from the mere english reader.

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

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

“glory of our great God and Saviour Jesus Christ.”

EXAMPLE, VIII.

II. PET. i. 1.

—*ἐν δικαιοσυνῇ* ΤΟΥ ΘΕΟΥ ἡμῶν ΚΑΙ ΣΩΤΗΡΟΣ ΙΗΣΟΥ ΧΡΙΣΤΟΥ.

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

This text, though *the eighth* in order, according to the proper order of the books, was *the first* example cited in my letter; and I have only to remark farther, that the Alexandrian MS. perfectly agrees with the present common approved reading of the greek text. In Dr Woide’s printed copy of the said MS. there is a point inserted after the word *δικαιοσυνῇ*, which is not in the MS. but that is manifestly a merely accidental typographical error.

The Rev. Mr Cruttwell 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 Wiclif, Coverdale, Mathews, Cranmer, in the Bishops (bible) (the) Geneva, (the) Rhemish, (bibles) and by Doddridge, Westley, Scattergood, and Purver; which is altogether a noble testimony of both ancient and modern times against the *Socinian impiety*. The eng-

lish 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, iv.

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

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

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

word ΔΕΣΠΟΤΗΝ. I was very confident that I could not discern any such point, when I examined the MS. and yet, as I entertained the highest respect and esteem for the veracity and accuracy of Dr Woide (of which he was, indeed, truly worthy) it was necessary to have this matter properly explained; and I was rendered perfectly aware by Dr Velthufen's account of his examining an ancient MS. that the feint lines and marks in the very old MSS. are liable to bear different appearances, according to the different degrees of light in which they are seen.

I therefore took the first opportunity, afterwards, of going once more to examine the MS. and on a more close inspection, I perceived, indeed, the *feint* 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 manu-

scripts; and also, concerning the more accurate modes of Grammatical distinction in the greek tongue, which rendered the smaller points, or *particles of time* (such as semicolons and commas) absolutely unnecessary in the *greek scripture*; and, in addition thereto, let him observe, particularly on the text before us, that a point in that place, after ΔΕΣΠΟΤΗΝ (in the middle of the sentence, between the accusative noun and verb) is utterly inconsistent with grammar and common sense; and though the word θεον, 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 ΔΕΣΠΟΤΗΝ) yet, happily, neither of these alterations would at all affect, or injure the manifest testimony of the apostle Jude, *to Christ's almighty power and divinity*, for—“*the only potentate and*” “*Lord of us Jesus Christ,*” is equivalent to a full declaration of *Christ's Divinity*, as well as of his *almighty power*; and with respect to the insertion of the *supposed point*, they must perceive, if they duly consider the text, that the words ΔΕΣΠΟΤΗΝ and κυριον cannot (consistently with the necessary grammatical sense of the greek, and the usual modes of expression, or idiom of that language) be separated either by points or construction, so as to be applied to two different persons, because the article is *not* repeated after the copulative, before κυριον: so that *Christ alone*, was unquestionably that—“*only poten-*

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

But the applying to Christ this *supreme* title, —“*the only potentate God*” (and, also in a former text, the *supreme* title of—“*the great God*”) may perhaps induce some persons to conceive that this grammatical system of construction, if admitted as a rule, for all texts, in which the same mode of expression renders it applicable, will sometimes prove rather too much, and may be liable to favour a modern sect of *Unitarians*, who have adopted the *Sabellian* notions of the late Baron Swedenborg, and who assert, that—“*Jesus Christ is*” “*the only God;*” that is, they understand this in so

peculiar a sense, that they do not seem properly to acknowledge the *personality* of the *holy spirit*, any more than a very opposite sect of *Unitarians* do, the modern Socinians, who impiously assert (in the opposite extreme to that the of *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 honour that is*

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

due to their Lord and Saviour; and to the holy spirit, their —“ other comforter.”

So that both these sects of professed Unitarians (as well as their Unitarian brethern, the Mahome-
 “ generation of vipers ;” and therefore, the knowledge of our own NATURE, and of the principles of action in MAN, what they are, and what they ought to be (which by the scriptures alone is revealed to us) is the first and most essential branch of philosophy, whatsoever our modern sceptical philosophers may think to the contrary; for how should men be on their guard against 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 scepticks whom they opposed—“ a generation of vipers,” (Matthew xii. 34.) and—“ serpents” (Matthew xxiii. 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. &c. Men, therefore, who will not be limited by the two first foundations of English law, are unworthy to be admitted to an equal participation of civil rights in any free christian state whatever; because true liberty cannot be maintained without that perfection of law, which arises only from these 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.

ians) 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 strictly Unitarians* than themselves*) allowed, indeed, that *Christ was God*,

* 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 waters*" (viz. the sources of the nations and the people of the Greek Empire, the *third* great monarchy) was embittered and prepared for the *scorpion-like* scourge of *mahometan* tyranny.

On account of this blasphemous doctrine, *Nestorius* was deposed (by the judgement of a great counsel of his peers the *christian bishops*) from his dignity as *archbishop* of the greatest city (at that time) in christendom, and from being *metropolitan*, as it were, of the *Greek Empire*; (the *third* great monarchy) and, therefore, he might truly be said to have *fallen* from the highest elevation of ecclesiastical dignity; so that no prophetic type could more amply prefigure this rejection, than—"the falling of a star from heaven,"—the hea-

yet they supposed him to be so, in *an inferior heaven* or *firmament* of the then amply *established* episcopal authority throughout the Roman empire. And the *Unitarian* doctrine of this *fallen star* (I mean *Unitarian* in the *Mahometan* and *Socinian* sense of that term) seems also to have been the *very* “*key*” whereby “*the bottomless pit*” was opened to let out the noxious and diabolical vapour of *Mahometanism*, for it is really *the leading*, and first inculcated tenet in all the public professions of that baneful heresy. And it is remarkable that a *Nestorian* monk, *Sergius*, professing the same blasphemous doctrine (this—“*key of the bottomless pit*” forged by *Nestorius*) should actually have been an assistant to *Mahomet* in producing his pretended revelations; and, it is still more remarkable, that all the *scorpion-like* scourges of the *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 *slave-holding* and *slave-dealing*,* which had been happily extinguished by the general influence of *christian* benevolence) should have compleatly 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 BEGOT-*

* 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*!”

gree ; 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* (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 revealed to us, under the title of

TEN SON *which is in the bosom of the father.*" (Johu i. 18. compare with ver. 14. and chap. iii. 16 and 18.)

All the arguments produced by the learned *Vitringa* to prove that *Arius* was the *fallen star*, are certainly much more applicable to *Nestorius*, as being an *archbishop* and *metropolitan 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 very fairly proved by our learned countryman, Joseph Mede.

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

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

Though the apostle Paul asserted to the Colossians (ii. 9.) concerning Christ, that—“*in him dwelleth ALL the fulness of the Godhead* (*της θεότητος*) “*bodily*”—(*σωματικώς*,—a term of indisputable *personality*) yet, surely, this was without the least disparagement to the supreme divinity of the *almighty father*, and of the *holy spirit*, because they are, also, necessarily included in the same *θεότης*, or *Godhead*, as there is but *one God*; and, therefore, as—“*it pleased all fulness to dwell*” in the person of our

* 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.

† Especially when compared with the concurrent reasons and testimonies quoted in the note p. 20. EDITOR.

Lord Jesus, (Col. i. 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 v. 23.) and he also claimed expressly *to be glorified with the father himself.*—“*And now O father*” (said he) “*GLORIFY THOU ME*” “*WITH THINE OWNSELF, with the glory which I*” “*had with thee before the world was,*” (John xvii. 5.) thereby asserting both his *pre-existence* and *supreme dignity*. Christians therefore, who humbly receive these, and the many other revelations of *Christ’s divinity*, have the less difficulty in acknowledging the *doctrines of the 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 enquire, in the *first* place, as he *first* means of progress to the true faith, whether they are really “*willing*” (for this is given as the true proof of *faith*—εαυ τις θελη) to conform themselves to the *will of God*, as revealed in all the most obvious declarations and injunctions of holy scripture, and more particularly to the purity,

which is expressly called—“*the will of God*” viz. the *sanctification of their bodies** which cannot otherwise be capable of becoming—“*Temples of the holy Ghost* ;” an indispensable state both of *body and mind* for all christians to maintain; for, in that case, they may assuredly rely on God’s absolute promise, through Christ, that—“*if any one shall be WILLING to do HIS WILL he shall know of the doctrine whether it be of God ; or whether I speak*” (said our Lord) “*from myself.*” (John vii. 17.)

DEO SOLI GLORIA.

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



A

PLAIN MATTER-OF-FACT ARGUMENT

FOR THE

DIVINITY OF CHRIST,

QUESTION.

FOR what END did Christ COME INTO THE WORLD?

A. Christ was “manifested in the flesh, (that is, was made man,)—TO DIE FOR THE SINS OF MANKIND,—to destroy the works of the devil—to redeem us from all iniquity, and to purify unto himself a peculiar people zealous of good works.” (1 Cor. xv. 3.—1 John iii. 8.—Tit ii. 14.)

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

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

Q. How was his manifestation in the flesh made known to the world?

A. By the message of an angel to Mary his mother, to Joseph, and to certain shepherds.

Q. Under what name was he made known?

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

Q. Who was the mother of Jesus?

A. The Virgin Mary.

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

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

Q. What was Christ put to death for?

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

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

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

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

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

Catechist. Repeat the passage, in which this is said.

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

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

A. He said that “he and his Father are one:” that “the Father hath given all things into his power:” that “what things soever the Father doeth, these also doeth the Son likewise:” that “the Father hath committed all judgment to the Son, that all men should honour the Son, even as they honour the Father.” (John x. 30.—iii. 35.—v. 19.—v. 22.)

Q. Who were the first witnesses, in Christ’s time, in proof of Christ’s divinity?

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

Q. Do you call the unbelieving Jews prior witnesses to the Apostles?

A. Yes: because this great truth, THE DIVINITY OF CHRIST, was hid from the Apostles, as well as the rest of their countrymen, till after Christ’s RESURRECTION FROM THE DEAD. Christ first asserted himself to be God, by calling God his Father, and himself the Son of God, in a sense, which implied,

that he was equal with God, and was God ; for so even his unbelieving hearers understood it :—the Jews condemned him to death for it :—the Apostles preached it.

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

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

Catechist. Repeat the passage.

A. When “ the high priest asked him, and said unto him, art thou the Christ, the Son of the Blessed ? Jesus said, I am : and (as a proof of it,) YE shall (at the last day) see (me) the Son of man sitting on the right hand of power, and coming in the clouds of Heaven.” (Mark xiv. 61, 62.)

Q. If Christ had not been the Messiah, the Son of God, in the sense in which they understood him, would he not have undeceived them ?

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

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

A. I conclude that Jesus Christ really was what

they charged him with calling himself, THE SON OF GOD; and in the sense in which they understood him; that is, that he was EQUAL WITH GOD; and was God.

Q. You say that in the lifetime of Christ the Apostles appeared not to know that Christ was God; what was their opinion after he rose from the dead?

A. Convinced by his resurrection from the dead, according to his promise that he would *raise himself* from the dead, they believed him to be “their Lord and their God”—“the word made flesh;” “God manifested in the flesh;” in whom “dwelt “ALL the fulness of the Godhead bodily;” Emmanuel,” or, “God with us”—“the creator and upholder of all things,” who “in the beginning” of all things “was with God, and was God”—“the true God and eternal life;” and “over all God blessed for ever.” (John xx. 28.—John i. 14. 1 Tim. iii. 16. Col. ii. 9. Matt. i. 23.—John i. 2. Heb. i. 3. John i. 1.—1 John v. 20. Rom. ix. 5.*)

Q. Now tell me in few words, what you collect from Christ's testimony of himself, as attested by the Jews of

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

his own time, condemned by the rulers, but universally propagated by the Apostles?

A. The conclusion to be drawn from it, is, that Christ, the Son of God, is one with God, and equal with God, and is God. Christ asserted it; the Jews condemned him to die for it; he sealed his testimony with his blood. The Apostles, convinced by his resurrection from the dead, believed it, and preached it, and died for it.

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

A. It was in the decrees of God, that Christ should die for the sins of mankind: If the Jews had believed him to be the Son of God, they would not have put him to death:—if he had not been put to death, as he was, he would not have “borne our sins in his own body on the cross,” that is, he would not have died for our sins, THE END, for which he CAME INTO THE WORLD;—he would not have given that great and inestimable proof of the truth of Scripture, and of his own promises, which HE did, by rising from the dead;—and the Apostles would not have given that sure evidence of their own belief in Christ, the ground and confirmation of OURS, which THEY did, by dying for their crucified Lord and Master.

FINIS,