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RULE I.

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

EXAMPLES.*

1. ὁ θεός καὶ πατὴρ τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν ........ 9
2. ἦς θεός καὶ πατρὶ ...................... 13
3. Εν τῇ βασιλείᾳ τοῦ Χριστοῦ καὶ θεοῦ ........ 42
4. Κατὰ τὴν χαρίν τοῦ θεοῦ ἡμῶν καὶ
   κυρίου Ιησοῦ Χριστοῦ, ..................... 45
5. ἐνωπίου τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ κυρίου Ιησοῦ
   Χριστοῦ ........................................ 48
6. ἑπιφανείαν τῆς δοξῆς τοῦ μεγαλοῦ θεοῦ καὶ
   σωτηρος ἡμῶν Ιησοῦ Χριστοῦ ................. 35, 55
7. Εν δικαιοσύνη τοῦ θεοῦ ἡμῶν καὶ σωτηρος
   ἡμῶν Ιησοῦ Χριστοῦ .......................... 34, 56
8. Καὶ τὸν μονὸν δεσποτὴν θεοῦ καὶ κυρίον ἡμῶν
   Ιησοῦν Χριστὸν ἀρνούμενοι .................. 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 5:23; example 6- Titus 2:13; example 7-2 Peter 1:1; example 8- Jude 1:4]
Common Version.

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

Corrected 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.

5. Before Jesus Christ, the God and Lord; or, our God and Lord: for, the definite article has sometime 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 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.

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.

RULE IV.

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

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.

RULE VI.

If they are connected by the copulative, and both have the article, they relate also to different persons.
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 1.

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 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.
καὶ ἐθεραπεύεσθαι αὐτοῦ, ὥστε τὸν τυφλὸν
and he healed him. so that the blind
καὶ κωφὸν καὶ λαλεῖν καὶ βλεπεῖν.
and dumb and to speak and to see.

And, again, 2 Cor. 1:3.
Εὐλογητὸς ὁ Θεὸς καὶ Πατὴρ τοῦ
Blessed the God and Father of the
Κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦν Χριστοῦ, ὁ
Lord of us Jesus Christ the
Πατὴρ τῶν οἰκτιρμῶν καὶ Θεὸς πάσης
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 Θεὸς καὶ Πατὴρ τοῦ Κυρίου
the God and Father of the Lord
ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦν Χριστοῦ οἶδην,
of us Jesus Christ knows.

Also in Eph. 6:21,
Τυχίκος ὁ ἀγαπητὸς αδελφὸς καὶ
Tychicus the beloved brother and
πιστος διακωνος εν Κυριω.
faithful minister in Lord.

Also in Heb. 3:1,

Κατανοησατε τον αποστολον και αρχιερεα
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

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

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

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

Also in Philippians, 4:20,

Τω δε Θεω και Πατρι ημων η
to the New God and Father of us the

dοξα glory, etc.

In Rev. 16:15,

μακαριος ο γρηγορον και τηρων τα
blessed the (one) watching and keeping the

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

περιπατη
de 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 ου
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.
And in 1 Thes. 3:11,

**James, 1:27.**

**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 Κυρίος, which had been omitted before Πατήρ. 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.*
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 (περὶ τῆς Θεοτόκου, 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:


καὶ ηγαλλιασε το πνευμα μου επι το
and excited the spirit of me in the

Θεο το Σωτηρ μου
God the Saviour of me

John, 2:26.

καὶ ἦν αὐτῷ κεχρηματισμενον ἵπτο του
and was to him having been communicated by the

Πνεύματος του ἁγιου
Spirit the holy, etc.

John, 1:29.

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

την ἁμαρτιαν του κοσμου
the sin of the world

John, 4:42.

οιδαμεν ὅτι οὗτος εστιν αληθως ὃ
we know that this one is truly the

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

John, 5:23.

ὁ μη τιμων τον Ὕιον ου τιμη
the not honoring the Son not honors

[one]

τον πατερα τον πεμψαντα αυτον
the father the [One] having sent him
Yos 20:31. This verse contains three examples:

1. Ἰησοῦς ὁ Θεός (Jesus the God).
2. Ἰησοῦς ὁ Θεός (Jesus the God).
3. Ἰησοῦς ὁ Θεός (Jesus the God).

These verses are completed with the following:

John 6:27. "In the blood of the sheath..."

This sentence also contains three [sic] examples:

1. Μορφή (Morph).
2. Μορφή (Morph).
3. Μορφή (Morph).

This verse contains three examples:

1. Ἰησοῦς ὁ Θεός (Jesus the God).
2. Ἰησοῦς ὁ Θεός (Jesus the God).
3. Ἰησοῦς ὁ Θεός (Jesus the God).

These verses are completed with the following:

John 6:27. "In the blood of the sheath..."
GENERAL EXCEPTION.

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

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

εἰ δὲ καὶ ἐστὶ κεκαλύμμενον τὸν εὐαγγελίουν ἡμῶν, ἐν τοῖς ἀπολλυμένοις γospel of us, in the perishing.

καὶ ἐστὶ κεκαλύμμενον, ἐν δὶς ὁ Θεὸς it is having been hidden in whom the God.

τὸν αἰῶναν τὸν ἐντυφώσε τὰ νοηματα of the age of this blinded the thoughts

τῶν απιστῶν, εἰς τὸ μὴ σαφέσαι of the unbelieving, to the not to shine forth.

ὁ πρωτεύον τοῦ εὐαγγελίου them the brightness of the gospel

τὸ δόξα τοῦ Χριστοῦ ὁς ἐστιν εἰκὼν the glory of the Christ who is image.

τοῦ Θεοῦ τοῦ αἰωνίου of the God of the invisible

And, again, Coloss. 2:2.

Πεποίθας τε σεαυτόν ὃ πηγὸν εἶναι having persuaded - thyself a guide to be.

τῷ ὁμολογητῷ ὑπὸ τῶν εὐφών, of blind persons a light of the [ones] in darkness.

παιδευτὴν ἀφρόνων, διδασκάλου νηπίων, an instructor of foolish [persons] a teacher of infants.

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.
Tit. 1:1.

Παῦλος, δοῦλος Θεου, ἀποστόλος
Paul, a slave of God, apostle

de Ἰησοῦ
and of Jesus etc.

1 Tim. 1:1.

Παῦλος Ἀποστόλος Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ
Paul, apostle of Jesus Christ

κατ' ἐπιτάγην ἴμων,
according to a command of us

καὶ κυρίου Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ τῆς ἐλπίδος
and of Lord Jesus Christ the hope

ἔμων
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. 8:66 [sic - 8:6], Hebrews 1:2, John 1:3, Col. 1:16) and "by whom all things consist." Col. 1:17.
1 Tim. 1:2.

To Timothy, a true child in faith.

χαρίς, ελεος, εἰρηνη απὸ Θεοῦ
grace, mercy, peace from God.

Πατρὸς ἡμῶν, καὶ Χριστοῦ Ἰησοῦ
Father of us and Christ Jesus.

tου κυρίου ἡμῶν
the Lord of us.

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

εσται μεθ' ἡμῶν χαρίς, ελεος,
will be with us grace, mercy.

εἰρηνη, παρὰ Θεοῦ Πατρὸς,
peace from God, Father.

καὶ παρὰ Κυρίου Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ
and from Lord Jesus Christ.

tου Ὑιοῦ του Πατρὸς, εν αληθείᾳ
the Son of the Father, in truth.

καὶ αγάπη.
and love.

(23)

RULE V.

And also when there is no article before the first noun, the insertion of the copulative kai 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.

Πάσα πικρία, καὶ θυμός, καὶ
All bitterness and anger and

ὁργή, καὶ κραυγή, καὶ βλασφημία.
wrath and clamor and blasphemy.

ὁρθήτω ἄφεν ἡμῶν, σὺν πάσῃ κακίᾳ,
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. Ἰησοῦ Θεοῦ καὶ Κυρίου Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ δοῦλος [Ed. - "James of God and of Lord Jesus Christ a slave"]; For, the author had supposed that the words Θεοῦ καὶ Κυρίου, 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 sixth rules than as an example of the fifth; and he hath,
Except the numerical adjective ἐν precedes the first noun; in which case the copulative καὶ will have the same effect that is has between two nouns where only the first is preceded by the article, agreeably to the first rule; as,

Ephes. 4:6.

Ἐς Ὁ ὅς καὶ πατὴρ πάντων, ὁ
one God and Father of all, the [One]

ἐπὶ πάντων, καὶ διὰ πάντων, καὶ
over all, and through all, and

ἐν πᾶσιν ὅμιν
in all you

**RULE VI.**

And as the insertion of the copulative καὶ 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 νομὸς διὰ Μωσῆς ἐδοθή ἡ χαρίς
the law through Moses was given the grace

καὶ ἡ αληθεία διὰ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ εγενέτο
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 I Thess. 3:11, and Titus 1:1.
John 2:22.

οτέ οὖν ἦγερθη (Ἰησοῦς) ἐκ νεκρῶν,
when then he was raised Jesus out from dead.

ευνήθησαν ὦ μαθηταί αὐτοῦ,
remembered the disciples of him

οτί τούτο εἶλεγεν ἀυτοῖς, καὶ
that this he said to them, and

ἐπιστευσαν τῇ γραφῇ, καὶ τῷ λόγῳ
they believed the scripture, and the word

ὁ εἶπεν ὁ Ἰησοῦς
which said the Jesus

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

φωνῇ μεγάλῃ εκραυγάσε (Ἰησοῦς) Λαζαρε,
voice with a great he cried out (Jesus) Lazarus,

deυρὸ εξῄ. Καὶ ἐξελθὲν ὁ τεθνηκὼς,
come out. And came out the [one] having died.

dεδεμενος τοὺς ποδᾶς καὶ τὰς χειρὰς
having been bound the feet and the hands

κειράς, καὶ ἡ ουσίς αὐτοῦ
with bandages, and the face of him

σουδαρίῳ περιεδέδετο
with a napkin had been bound round

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

eἰς εἰπιγνώσιν τοῦ μυστηρίου τοῦ Θεοῦ
for full knowledge of the mystery of the God

καὶ Πατρὸς, καὶ τοῦ Χριστοῦ, ἐν
and Father, and of the Christ, in

ὡ εἰσί παντες ὁι θησαυροὶ τῆς
whom are all the treasures of the

σοφίας καὶ τῆς γνώσεως αἰποκρυφοί
wisdom and of the knowledge hidden

2 Tim. 1:5

ὑπομνήσιν λαμβάνων τῆς ἐν σοι
recolletion taking of the in thee

ανυποκριτοῦ κιστεως, ἡτὶς ἐνφώσκησε
unseign faith. which indwelt

πρῶτον ἐν τῇ μαμμῇ σοῦ
first in the grandmother of thee

Λωιδί καὶ τῇ μητρὶ σου Ευνεικῆ
Lois and the mother of you Eunice;

πεπεισμαὶ δὲ, ὦτι καὶ ἐν σοι
I have been persuaded and, that also in thee
I Pet. 4:11.

καὶ εὐνοεῖ τὸ δόξαν τοῦ Θεοῦ διὰ τὸν Χριστὸν, ως εστὶν ἡ δόξα τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ ἐος τὸν κράτος εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας τῶν αἰώνων. ἀμήν.

In order may be glorified the God through Christ to whom is the glory and the might unto the ages 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.

εἰς τὴν πιστίν

If the two nouns (viz. ὁ Κυρίος and ὁ Θεὸς) 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]

Then he said to the Thomas, bring the finger of thee here, etc.
καὶ ἀπεκρίθη ὁ Ἰωάννης καὶ εἶπεν
and answers the Thomas and says

αὐτῷ
to him

(that is, without doubt, to Jesus,)

ὁ Κυρίος μου, καὶ ὁ Θεός 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, αὐτῷ [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.

Χριστὸν ὁ Θεός δύναμιν καὶ θεοῦ σοφίαν*
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.

Μὴ φοβοῦ. εἰμὶ ὁ πρῶτος καὶ
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."]

ο ἐσχατος, καὶ ο ζων* καὶ εγενομην
the last, and the living and I became

νεκρὸς, καὶ ἰδοὺ ζων εἰμὶ εἰς τοὺς
dead, and behold living I am unto the

αἰῶνας τῶν αἰωνών αμη. Καὶ εχω
ages of the ages: Amen. And I have

tας κλεις του ἁδου καὶ του θανατου*
the key of the Hades and of the death

These are the words of him whom John saw, ὁμοιον Ἄνθρωπον [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 Λόγος, or word of God, as this declaration alludes plainly to his death and resurrection.

Εγενομην νεκρὸς, καὶ ἰδοὺ ζων εἰμὶ
I became dead, and behold living I am

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

tας ὅ πρῶτος καὶ το 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 εγενοτο νεκρος, καὶ εξησυν [Ed.-"who became dead and he lived"]. Now, though the explanation which Grotius has given us of these titles (ὁ πρῶτος καὶ ὁ 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]


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.


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.


εν δικαιοσύνη τοῦ Θεοῦ ἡμῶν καὶ σωτηρος ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ.

As the article τοῦ 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 Curcellaeus, it appears that in some copies the word ἡμῶν was not repeated after σωτηρος, and I have by me twenty different editions (including those of Erasmus, Stephens, Dr. Mill, Bengelius, etc.) which follow that reading: viz. εν δικαιοσυνη του Θεου ἡμων και σωτηρος Ἰησου 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, Jesus Christ." (fol edit. 1549.)

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

"By the righteousness 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 necessè 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.

επιφάνειαν τῆς δόξης τοῦ μεγαλοῦ Θεοῦ appearance of the glory of the great God

καὶ σωτηρος ἡμων Ἰησου Χριστου and Saviour of us Jesus Christ.
In some few copies a comma is inserted between Θεοῦ 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, [εγώ καὶ ὁ Πατὴρ ἐν ἑσμέν, [Ed. - “I and the Father we are one”] the plural verb ἐσμέν ("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 of this conclusion in his commentary on St Paul’s epistle to Titus, 2:13: “Πῶς δὲ εἰσιν ὁ τοῦ ιῶν ἐλεημονεὶς, καὶ οὐδὲ Θεὸν ἀνεχόμενοι λεγεῖν, ἀκούσας τίς καὶ Θεὸς εστί, καὶ μεγας. ὕστερα μεγας εἰπ Θεοῦ λεγεται, ου και συγκρίνεις την προς αλλου μικρον, αλλ’ απαλλαμμένας, ἢς φοιτει αυτοι αμανγηλου 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 μεγαλον Θεοῦ to our Saviour. His words are: “Here it deserves 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 ἐπιφανεία 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 ἐπιφανεῖν της δόξης του μεγαλου Θεου και σωτηρος ἴμων Ησου 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.
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 τοῦ Θεοῦ, which is the most general reading, the word Κύριου is substituted; but many old MSS have both words, τοῦ Κύριου 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, agreeably to the first rule, as in Romans, 15:6.

τοῦ Θεοῦ καὶ Πατερᾶ

the God and Father

* Note lately added by the Author. [Three of the ancient Greek MSS in the Caesarian Library at Vienna, and 1 Sclavonian 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.

τῶν Θεοῦ καὶ Πατρὸς

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:

ευλογητός δό Θεος καὶ Πατήρ του

Blessed the God and Father of the

Lord τῶν ημῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, δό

Jesus Christ, the Lord of us

πατήρ τῶν οἰκτιρμῶν, καὶ Θεος πασινς

Father of the compassions, and God of all

παρακλησεις.

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; τον Θεον και Πατρος ημων. 2 Thess. 2:16; και δο 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

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.

οὐκ ἔχει κληρονομίαν εν τῇ βασιλείᾳ τοῦ Χριστοῦ καὶ Θεοῦ
not has inheritance in the 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 Θεός, "GOD," though the proof does not appear in the English version. Let it be remarked that the two substantives of personal description, Χριστοῦ and Θεοῦ, are joined by the copulative καὶ, and that the article τοῦ precedes the first, and that there is not article before the word Θεοῦ, 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.

ἡμεῖς γὰρ εσμέν ἡ περιτομὴ, [sic - περιτομὴ] we are the circumcision,

ὁ πνεῦμα τοῦ Θεοῦ λατρευόντες, καὶ the spirit of God worshipping, and

καταχωμένοι εν Χριστῷ Ἰσσου, καὶ boasting (glorying) in Christ Jesus and

οὐκ εν σαρκὶ πεποιθότες.
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 ὅπειραμι Θεω, but in the Alexandrian MS * it is ὅπειραμι Θεον, 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, Θεω, were admitted to be the true reading, unless another word, the preposition εν, be also added to it before πνευματι, 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 εν was really inserted in this text before the dative, πνευματι, as in the two examples before cited; viz. “Qui Spiritu Servimus Deo,” or “Qui Spiritu colimus Deum;” or, as in the Syriac version, “Qui Deo Servimus in Spiritu;” (Syr.) or, as in the common English version, “Which worship God in the Spirit.” But there is no such preposition in the Greek. The difficulty therefore of rendering the common reading, (Θεω,) without supposing this addition of EN to be understood before πνευματι, proves that the reading of the Alexandrian MS in this text is really to be preferred; ὅπειραμι Θεον

* Many other ancient and valuable Greek MSS as Dr. Mill has testified, have this reading, Θεον, 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 Latinis hic habent, qui SPIRITUI DEI servimus. Greci 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 authoritati graviori cedere detrectavit, etc.”

In Wettstein’s edition the word Θεον is subjoined with this mark §, to denote the preferable reading.

λατρευοντες, *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.

Κατὰ τὴν χαριν τοῦ Θεοῦ ἡμῶν καὶ

According to the grace of the God of us and

Κυρίου Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ.

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, πνευματι, 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 case, the very inferior reading πνευματι Θεω 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 κρύτου. 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 ενώπιον του Θεου και
I solemnly witness before the God and

Kυριου Ιησου Χριστου και των
Lord Jesus Christ and the

εκλεκτων αγγελων, ἵνα ταυτα φυλάξην
chosen angels in order 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 Kυριου* is omitted in the Alexandrian MS where the reading is ενώπιον 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 ενώπιον, (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 Kυριου, 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 Kυριου 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 Kυριου, and Kυριου 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 σου εγω εναπτιον του
I solemnly witness then I before of the

Θεου και Κυριου Ιησου Χριστου
God and Lord Jesus Christ

tou mellonton krinein zountas kai nekras,
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 εναπτιον 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.
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, Curzelleus, 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. Capt. Ethiop. Basilius 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 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 Varis Lectionibus,) "notar voces, quibus appositant 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 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) και Κυρίου et Domini, "Articulus non additur, cum tamen moo addaur de angelis. Ergo Dei appellatio et Domini ad unum pertinent 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.]
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 δικαιοσυνή του Θεού ἡμῶν καὶ σωτηρίος
— in righteousness of the God of us and Saviour

Ιησοῦ 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 δικαιοσυνή, 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, Scatteredgood, 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.

— καὶ τοῦ μονοῦ Δεσπότην Θεοῦ
— and the only Master God

καὶ Κυρίου ἡμῶν Ιησοῦ Χριστοῦ ορνουμένοι
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 Θεοῦ is omitted, as in the MS but I did not, at that time, perceive that there was any point or mark after the word Δεσποτήν, 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 Δεσποτήν. 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 Δεσποτήν, (in the middle of the sentence, between the accusative noun and verb,) is utterly inconsistent with grammar and common sense; and though the word Θεοῦ 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 Δεσποτήν,) 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 Δεσποτήν 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 potentae," 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 Θεόν, 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 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 [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.] skepticks 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, (Θεότης,) 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 Aries was the fallen star, are certainly much more applicable to Nestorius, as being an archbishop and metropolitan of the empire, and therefore more fully 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.

† 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!"

* 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, ἐὰν τις Θελή, [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.