

THE SOUTHERN
PRESBYTERIAN REVIEW,

VOL. XXXI.—NO. 2.

APRIL, MDCCCLXXX.

ARTICLE I.

LECKY'S HISTORY OF EUROPEAN MORALS.

History of European Morals. From Augustus to Charlemagne.
By WM. EDWARD HARTPOLE LECKY, M. A. Third Edition,
revised, in two volumes. New York: D. Appleton & Co.

It may seem rather late in the day to notice this work of Mr. Leckie—a work which has been for years before the public, and has passed through several editions in this country as well as in England. But the fact that new editions are demanded is evidence that the book continues to be read, and if still read, its statements and arguments ought still to be subjected to critical examination.

Certainly it is no light undertaking which Mr. Lecky sets before himself. His history extends over a vast tract of time; and whilst it passes by changes merely political or social, it presents that aspect of the European world, the faithful portraiture of which requires of the historian the exercise of some of the noblest and rarest qualities of intellect and heart. To be satisfactory, such a history must embrace an accurate delineation of the moral facts which gave its own character to each of the successive periods constituting the whole term surveyed; and what involves far greater difficulty—it must explain these facts, bring-

the zeal of the early Church revived. What does it matter if we suffer trial? Our present sufferings are not to be compared with the glory which shall be revealed in us at the coming of the Lord. What does it matter if millions of treasure be soon spent and thousands of precious lives surrendered in heralding the gospel? The coming of the glorious day will be hastened. Those who long for the time when, not the mixed glories of a millennium, but when the transcendant blessedness of the eternal reign of Christ shall be realised, will surely give and work and pray for the fulfilment of the only antecedent conditions, viz.: on the Church's part the evangelisation of the nations; and on God's part the gathering of the elect out of every kindred and tongue, of which the preaching of the gospel is the divinely appointed means.

E. C. GORDON.

ARTICLE V.

CLASSICAL REVISION OF THE GREEK NEW TESTAMENT.

Classical Revision of the Greek New Testament, Tested and Applied on Uniform Principles, with Suggested Alterations of the English Version. By W. MILLAR NICOLSON, M. A., D. Sc. (Edin.), once Fellow and Tutor, and lately Classical Examiner in the University of Edinburgh. Πάντα δοκιμάζετε· το καλὸν κατέχετε. 1 Thess. v. 21. Williams & Norgate, 14 Henrietta Street, Covent Garden, London; and 20 South Frederick Street, Edinburgh. 1878. XI., pp. 148, slender duodecimo.

It is not to be doubted that the translation of the original Scriptures by William Tindale into the vernacular English, noble as it was, admitted of improvement, and in point of fact was on the whole greatly improved by subsequent revision. This improvement reached its maximum in what is known as the Authorised Version of King James, and which remains, altogether aside from its virtues as a translation, the glory and crown of English

literature. As a mere version it is, like every other human product, in some respects defective; yet as combining the seemingly opposite excellences of a version and of a vernacular classic, it is unrivalled and unapproached in any tongue. As a mere version, however, its peculiar merits and felicities have been recognised by scholars of different ages and various nationalities. Even its apparent mistakes are apt to be due to a change in the language, or else to the superior erudition or subtle suggestiveness of the venerable scholars who are responsible for the work. No one in his senses would blame these learned men for saying that David (1 Sam. xvii. 22) left his "carriage" in the hands of his armor-bearer; or that Paul shook (Acts xxviii. 5) off the venomous "beast" into the fire at Melita. It is not known to so large a class of readers, perhaps, that "good man of the house," in Luke xii. 39, is merely old English for "householder." A much smaller number are acquainted with the fact that *ἔγνων τί ποιῶω* in Luke xvi. 4, which evidently conveys the idea, "Eureka! I have hit upon it. I see now what I ought to do," is correctly rendered in the idiom of the day by the words, "I am *resolved* what to do"; a form of expression which might appear to mean, "I have made up my mind," but in reality means "my *doubts* are resolved," and is so used repeatedly by the contemporaries of Shakespeare. We have often known the A. V. to be taken sharply to task for translating the phrase *μὴ γένοιτο*, which occurs so often in Paul's writings, "God forbid." And yet a glance at the Septuagint and Hebrew, by the light of Gesenius's Lexicon, would go far to show that there are two sides to that question. We repeatedly find ourselves coming back to King James, after weary excursions in other quarters, for that rendering of a hard word or knotty sentence which after much discussion and long dubiety wins our approval as the best solution of the difficulty. A notable instance in point is that of Philip. i. 7, from the word "because"; where the connexion of the clauses is the one advocated by Erasmus, Calvin, Alford, and Bishop Lightfoot, in preference to that favored by the Greek Commentators and Meyer, and where the word "inasmuch" happily determines the relation of the principle.

After all, however, it must be conceded that even if not
VOL. XXXI., NO. 2—15.

“faulty” (p. 3) to the degree some imagine, the version, considered as a mere version of the Greek, may be amended and ought to be amended. It does not follow that it would be worth while to substitute such an amended version for the one already in the hands of the people. The differences are for the most part so minute that they would in many cases pass unnoticed, if attention was not specially called to them. Professor Nicolson's work is marked by sound scholarship and the manifest results of patient industry. The author is no novice (as his title shows), though, as we chance to know, a comparatively young man. He is a valued pastor of the Free Church, and has travelled and resided in Italy, Greece, and Palestine. Everything betrays the practised “Grecian” and the man of reverential piety.

This book is the result of twelve years of strictly independent study. All merely theological prepossessions have been held in abeyance. During the progress of the research the author deliberately refused to avail himself of the side-lights furnished by the other revisers and the critical commentators; though afterwards, and before going to the press, he sometimes consulted their volumes. With the large body of eminent men who are now engaged in the effort to better the work of the translators appointed by King James, Dr. Nicolson has no connexion whatever, and is in entire ignorance as to their results. He was for some time a pupil of Dr. Leonard Schmitz, the erudite rector of the High School of Edinburgh, and early imbibed from that eminent man a taste for exact philological studies. We have accidentally learned that Dr. Nicolson is a fast friend too of that great Greek scholar, Dr. Veitch, and that this marvel of accuracy read the proofs of this volume. Somewhat more than twelve years ago, on returning from a year's tour (and sojourn) in the classic and sacred territories, and after paying close attention to the spoken Romaic and Arabic, as well as the Italian, such questions as these suggested themselves: “How far were the writers of the New Testament influenced by the rules of classic syntax? Would it be possible to apply the rules of the Greek prose which Thucydides, or Xenophon, or Plato wrote, to writings of the first century of the Christian era? How far can signs of decay and deterioration

be traced in their style and vocabulary? What light does the modern Greek dialect, as spoken at Athens, throw on any peculiarities of diction in the Greek Testament? Would it be possible, and if so, advantageous, to search out and classify the departures on the part of the several translators from the exact and literal translation of moods and tenses, etc.; and, at the same time, to discover and collect instances in which they have accurately rendered those same forms of expression, so that the latter might serve as foundations on which to base the corrections of the former?"

The work now under examination embodies the fruits of these twelve years of microscopic study. The upshot (as might have been augured) is the same announced by the highest scholarship of our time as the upshot of still more profound and extensive labors, viz., that the difference between the Old Greek and the New Testament from the Hellenistic idiom (or dialect) is considerable, but yet surprisingly less than "dull fools suppose." This is especially true in the use of the moods and tenses, and also of the cases, and the prepositions, and other particles, though there is a marked absence of forms of speech which are familiar in the older usage. Mr. Nicolson, it will be seen, is much more of a purist than a Hebraist; albeit in strictness he is neither, and occupies a position not far removed from the middle ground taken by Ernesti and so tenaciously held by Winer. In the admirable "Grammatik" of Alexander Buttman there is a discernible tendency towards a Hebraistic reaction, though it is controlled within the limits of good sense and sound learning. We do not remember having noticed in the pages of Mr. Nicolson any references or allusions to Buttman or to Winer, or even to T. S. Green; although the Grammars of Clyde, Schmitz, Donaldson, Curtius, and Madvig, were thoroughly consulted on certain points. The following remarks, however, show a competence to deal with the so-called deterioration in New Testament Greek:

"It is not really inconsistent with my main contention to admit that there *are* signs of deterioration in New Testament Greek. But these have been unduly exaggerated in number and importance. The web of the language used is fair, though a stray thread here and there may be out of harmony. With a collection before me of aberrations from the pure

classical standard, which I have vigorously sought out and classified, I reiterate the position laid down at the outset, that the Greek of the New Testament is in the main of a high order, and conforms for the most part to the rules of classical Greek. . . . Were any one to trust to dictionaries merely, or glossaries of foreign words, and lists of aberrations from the Saxon standard, he might maintain that the ordinary English of to-day is mainly and almost exclusively foreign. The Saxon element would be regarded as swamped by the immensely greater number of words of foreign extraction. . . . In a similar way I would seek to guard against a corresponding fallacy in respect of the Greek of the New Testament. No doubt it must be conceded that it is not *throughout* up to the mark of the Greek of the golden age of Greek literature. But much less is it to be summarily treated as merely on a level with late Hellenistic, or with the modern Greek or Romaic. Further, it is superior to the Greek of the Septuagint. In this, as in every other such case, it is unfair to take advantage of sundry blemishes, and parade them as though they were characteristic of the whole—

‘Velut si

Egregio inspertos reprehendas corpore naevos.’”

If we take Attic Greek as our standard of excellence, these words need little qualification. Viewed, however, not only as the vehicle of divine thought—and divine thought in its amplest and clearest expression—but also simply as a literary vehicle that has become itself ennobled by the very thought which it was fashioned to express, the Greek of the New Testament may be justly regarded as superior to that of Thucydides or Plato.

This book is rich in tabular views of the conditional forms, the prepositions, etc. The form *εάν* with the subjunctive is for some reason omitted, and *εἰ* with the optative is taken too much *au sérieux*. The meaning of *εἰς* is altogether too much restricted.

After his Introduction, the author reviews the deflections of the A. V. from literal accuracy in the matter of the tenses. Instances are adduced where the Greek Present is misrendered by the English Perfect: where the Greek Present is wrongly rendered, as an Aorist; where the Greek Perfect is correctly rendered in King James; where the Greek Perfect is confounded with the Present; where the Greek Perfect is confounded with the Aorist; where the Greek Aorist is rendered by the Perfect, the Pluperfect, etc.; where the Greek Aorist is correctly rendered; where

the Greek Aorist is rendered by the Perfect; and by the Present. An interesting chapter is devoted to the Imperfect Tense, and a brief one to Hypothetical Sentences: The Imperative Mood comes in for a due share of attention. The ambiguity of the version in relation to the Genders of Adjectives, etc., is considered. A chapter is given to the cases of Nouns, and another to the Definite Article; and instances are cited where the article is wrongly omitted in the A. V., and others where the article is wrongly inserted. Paronomasia is finely treated under the head of "Play upon Words." The Greek Prepositions are severely and somewhat stringently analysed. They are conveniently classified and tabulated by the author under five heads. Careful notice is taken, too, of the use of Pronominal Adjectives and Adverbs; and of Conjunctions and Particles. Regard is paid to the alleged misrendering of Attributes and Predicates, and to alleged mistakes or failures in the way of Apposition. The signs of deterioration in the New Testament Greek are here taken up and dealt with in the manner already pointed out. Particular instances of deterioration are discovered in the Tenses and forms of Verbs; in Accentual Pronunciation; in approximations to modern Greek; in Latin words; and in Hebraisms. Donaldson's distinctions between Primary, Secondary, and Tertiary Predicates, are clearly expounded, and there are some curious observations on the subject of Itacism. The Appendix is made up of seven valuable Excursuses; and there is an Index at the end of the book of the passages referred to during the course of the investigation. Excursus A is a very learned and ingenious, rather than convincing interpretation of 1 Cor. xv. 29—"Baptism for the dead." Excursus B is an able exposition "of some passages in which the Relations of Death to the Christian are described, but whose meaning is obscured by inaccuracies of translation." The result is the vicarious theory contended for by Haldane and Shedd, on the sixth of Romans. Excursus C is a short and interesting disquisition on the Superscriptions on the Cross. The view is that they were written by a Greek, a Roman, and a Jew; and that it is the Jewish form which reads, "Jesus the Nazarene." Excursus D discusses Mark ii. 26; answers Alford, and illustrates the

view that Abiathar was not then *priest* by imaginary (or real) parallels from the lives of Wellington and Nelson. Excursus E is a rather unsatisfactory explanation of Col. i. 24. Excursus F is a little monograph on the use in the New Testament of the Native Dialect in Palestine, containing some charming words about *Talitha Koumi*. Excursus G is an erudite and very persuasive commentary on the terms *μυστήριον*, *τελειοῦσθαι*, etc.

There is no occasion to give examples of the proposed translations where we agree to their exactness. While some of them are altogether new, most of them do not differ materially from those suggested by Trench, Ellicott, J. B. Lightfoot, Eadie, and the other accepted revisers. In many instances we feel called upon to take exception to the proffered novelties. This, however, is only because we have to take exception in such instances to the Procrustean rigor of the criterion applied, as well as to the austere literality of the method of the criticism. It must be borne in mind, too, that the author sets out with a query as to the probable fruits of an inquiry conducted under such narrowing restraints. With this concession, we must still maintain that a large number of Mr. Nicolson's strictures on the translations of the Aorist are at once superseded, if we recollect the latitude of reference which is accorded to that tense by the highest scholarship of the age; and further, that the deviations are in many cases mere accommodations on the part of the A. V., for the sake of familiarity or elegance, to the genius of the English tongue. Mr. Nicolson, and others besides him, seem to have forgotten that *if* one aim of King James's commissioners was to make a just version, another was to furnish the English-speaking world an incomparable classic. A rigid literal and verbal nicety in all cases would in some cases have defeated that object by marring the characteristic raciness of the idiom.

The same general strain of remark will apply to the treatment of *eis*, of the article, etc. In many cases the author's indictment against the Version as to the these points is unquestionably made out; but in such cases, he will commonly be found to have been anticipated by other revisers. The force of the Greek *Imperfect* is finely shown in many passages where the A. V. is at

fault; yet in other passages the felicity of the older rendering could not be surpassed. Thus the blind man seems to have *kept on* begging (Luke xviii. 35). There is a graphic word-painting of the Ascension in Luke xxiv. 5. The Jews *kept on* persecuting Jesus (John v. 16). Pilate *kept on* seeking (John xix. 12). The gaze referred to in 2 Cor. iii. 7 was a *fixed* gaze. So the prayer and praise of Paul and Silas in the dungeon was less or more *protracted* (Acts xvi. 25). The *contemporaneous* betrayal of our Lord may perhaps be suggested in 1 Cor. xi. 23. So in Luke xiv. 42, the tense showed that the hinderers *failed*. (Compare Gal. i. 23.) The *persistence* of the thief on the cross is indicated at Mark v. 32; and, it may be, the *pressure* of the Pharisees in Luke vii. 36. The boat of the fishermen was not "filled" but "*filling*", in Luke xiii. 23. The hunger and want of the prodigal may have been of some *duration* (Luke xv. 16); and the father have expostulated *earnestly* with the elder brother (Luke xv. 28). The author aptly says (on p. 35) that "what might be termed the Pre-Raphaelite minuteness of word-painting in the original often disappears, and is replaced by a prosaic indefiniteness in our version." It must be remembered, however, that in such an expression as "he beat the boy," the word "beat" in English might be intended in the sense of the Imperfect or of the Aorist. Rightly understood, it is fully as graphic as "was beating." Mr. Nicolson would have done well, too, if he had more distinctly recognised the practice of Greek writers of freely interchanging the Aorist (the tense of relation) and the Imperfect (the tense of description) in narrative prose. It does not always do in such cases to insist much on the idea of *continuance* in the past tense. The analytical or paraphrastic imperfect, as it has been called, is much more frequent in the New Testament than in the classics, and had come to be used to put stress on the idea of duration, where that was needed. The reluctance of the demons may be referred to in Mark v. 10, and the extended distribution of the bread in Mark viii. 6.

We think our author has failed to appreciate the precise shade of difference between the bare imperfect in verbs of wishing and the optative with α . (Compare Acts xxv. 22; xxvi. 26; John xix.

29; Philemon 13, and Rom. ix. 3.) It has been marvellously overlooked by writers on both sides of this vexed question that in Acts xxvii. 29 the key of the passage is set, so to speak, in past time; whereas in Romans ix. 3 the key is in present time. A reference to past time in the place in Romans would doubtless have been indicated by a *πότε*, or still more probably by a simple Aorist. (Compare Chrysostom on Heb. xi., quoted on p. 41: "*Τάχα τις ὑμῶν ἕκαστος ἐβόηλετο εἶναι τοιοῦτος ὥστε*—infinitive.")

The definite article should have been given in the A. V. at Luke xviii. 5—"the little children; at John xii. 13—"the branches of the palm-trees" ("*i. e.*, which lined the way in profusion"); at v. 24—"the grain of the corn;" at xii. 36—"the light;" at ch. xiii. 11—"he knew the betrayer," *i. e.*, the one who was betraying him; at xiv. 2—"the Iscariot;" at xx. 1—"the Magdalene;" at xviii. 3—"the band;" at John viii. 5—"the Nazarene;" at Rom. iii. 8—"the access" [rather, the introduction (which we have)]; at Tim. i. 7—"the good warfare;" at vi. 12, 13—"the good warfare;" at Heb. xi. 8—"the good fight;" at v. 8—"the crown of righteousness;" at James iii. 6—"the world of iniquity;" and at 1 Peter v. 4—"the amaranthal crown." (Compare 1 Peter iv. 11, John [*passim* in his Epistles—the Antichrist], Jude 10, Rev. xii. 14 ["the great tribulation"], ii. 10, xxi. 1 ["and the sea no longer exists"], and Luke viii. 41 [perhaps] where the article may be omitted in the Greek merely because it would stand in the predicate.) The article in Luke vii. 1, possibly points to the white marble synagogue of which the ruins were recently discovered by Lieut. Wilson, and inspected just afterwards by Mr. Nicolson. "The cloud" mentioned at Luke xii. 3, is the well-known cloud that rises from the Mediterranean and was seen by Elijah's servant from the top of Carmel. "The account" in xi. 2, was the one regularly demanded (or expected) in such cases. "The everlasting habitations," at v. 9, in contrast with the transient ones opened to the steward. Luke xvii. 17, ought to have been rendered "were not the ten healed?" The Pharisee, at xviii. 11, contrasts himself with "the rest of mankind." The English at Matt. i. 23, should be "the origin." At Matt. xxvi. 5, and Luke xxiv. 26 etc., read "the Christ" (*i. e.*

the Messiah); and at Matt. xxiv. 32 (compare Mark xiii. 28), "learn *the* parable from the fig-tree." In Mark, at ix. 23, the phrase "*the* 'if thou canst'" takes up the words the man had just used himself. The version of 1 John v. 19, should probably be "In *the* wicked one" (Compare verses 18 and 19). So too, it is most likely, should be the rendering at John xvii. 15, and in the Lord's Prayer. We cannot accept the view tentatively put forward in this book that "*the* sea" in Rev. xx. 1 is the one mentioned before, at iv. 6, or that "*the* brother" at Rom. xvi. 23 may be the brother of Erastus. We have long been somewhat inclined to our author's view of the article before *μεσίτης* at Gal. iii. 20, viz., that it should be rendered "*the* Mediator." He does not seem to allow any option; whereas we regard the authorised version at this place impregnable from the attack of mere grammarians. We do not favor the allegorical view of Luke xi., 21, 22, which is urged by Alford, and argued plausibly from the definite articles by Dr. Nicolson. The literal version of *τῷ ἁμαρτωλῷ* at Luke xviii. 13 is "*the* sinner;" but we incline towards the meaning, "sinner that I am," rather than "the chief of sinners," (as in 1 Tim. 15). We are surprised the learned author did not call attention to the unfortunate omission of the articles in the fifth of Romans, where we should be careful in several instances to translate "*the* one," "the many," etc. In Luke v. 32 (and the parallels) he justly remarks we should render the word *δικαίους* simply "righteous" [persons, or beings]. In Matt. xxvi. 74, Mark xiv. 68, 72, and in the best text at Luke xxii. 40, to be exact we must read, "*a* cock crew." He might have added Luke ii. 12, where the rendering of *βρέφος* should be "*a* babe;" contrast verse 16, where *τὸ βρέφος* is correctly rendered "*the* babe." So in Luke xviii. 36, it should be "*a* crowd;" in John xiv. 27, "*a* woman;" at 1 Cor. x. 4, "continued to drink out of *a* rock." We must demur, however, to the remainder of the sentence which our author accepts from the authorised version, "*which* followed them," where the anarthrous participle would rather suggest "as it followed them." A curious inconsistency is pointed out at the top of p. 59. We venture to think that both Mr. Nicolson and Bishop Lightfoot have

been misled by classical models in their view of νόμον without the article, in such places as Romans ii. 13, v. 12, and xiii. 10. Ellicott, Meyer, and Winer may be consulted with advantage *in locis*. Romans xx. 12 should read simply "books were opened." Our author differs from Alford and the authorised version, and agrees with Ellicott and Meyer in pressing the rule about the anarthrous πᾶς at Eph. iii. 15. Will he, unlike Ellicott, do the same with the approved text at Eph. ii. 21? We have found nothing to require a more delicate handling than the use of the article in the New Testament, and, for the matter of that, in Greek generally. The author does not seem to be aware that proper names (*i. e.*, of persons), and words used like proper names, in the New Testament do not *require* the article, though they are very often found with the article. Indeed, Madvig* extends this rule even into the domain of the classics. Its application to the New Testament, though sometimes practically neglected by J. B. Lightfoot, is insisted on by Winer, A. Buttmann, Meyer, and Ellicott, and relied on by Lee on Inspiration, and West on the *descensus ad inferos*. Alford holds a kind of intermediate view as to νόμος with or without the article, at least as occurring in the book of Romans.

The authorised version is sometimes at fault in the matter of *the genders*; and, indeed, the Greek is by no means always unambiguous. In John vi. 60 [not "6"] αὐτοῦ, after ἀκούειν, would refer in the classic Greek to Jesus, who had just uttered the σκληρὸς λόγος. In the latter idiom, however, ἀκούειν it would seem may take the genitive either of a person or of a thing. This is a mere question of pronominal reference, and does not, as it happens in this instance, raise a doubt as to the gender. The question in 1 Cor. iv. 13, as to πάντων turns upon the gender of that word. The point is more uncertain there, and in Titus i. 8, than at Romans xii. 16, where the author rightly prefers the neuter gender; the *reference*, we think, may notwithstanding be, at least in part, to men: "Not minding the lofty things, but carried away with (attracted by) the humble things' (or *lot*)." Tischendorf's reading at Col. iii. 6 (for which there is a formidable

* Madvig, *Syntax*, p. 14, § 13, (a). Rivingtons, London, Oxford and Cambridge, 1873.

weight of authority) would determine the gender of *οἱ* in verse 7 to be neuter and not masculine. We are half disposed to yield to the author's rendering at Col. i. 18—"that he might have the preëminence among all." We are not equally prepared to give in to the new, though conjectural, version at James i. 13, "neither can he be tempted of evil *men*."

We do not remember to have seen the hint anywhere that the *τις* in 1 Tim. v. 8 is *feminine*, and refers to the *τις χήρα* in verse 4. The idea has occurred to us in reading the naked text, and sheds a new and curious light on the passage.

Mistranslations of case are not infrequent. Several familiar examples are given on p. 47. At Jude 14 our author would render, "Enoch prophesied *to* these." We differ from Dr. Nicolson in the impression he has that in Gal. v. 5, 16, 25, *πνεύματι* is an ethical dative—"unto the Spirit." We incline to the view (not mentioned in this book) which takes *πνευματικοῖς* in 1 Cor. ii. 13 as a masculine form. Compare iii, 1. Dr. Nicolson understands Acts xxvi. 28 in the sense of the authorised version; this, we need not say, is extremely doubtful. We do not coincide in the opinion which makes *ταπεινός* "humble" in James i. 9, etc., as it is almost certainly in Matt. xi. 29. The author is tenacious of the strict meaning of *γίνεσθαι* throughout the New Testament (see pp. 68 and 69). The mistake is again pointed out of translating "this *fold*" instead of "this *flock*," in John x. 16. The remark on p. 70 as to the latitude of expression allowed the sacred writers to convey their meaning, must be rigorously explained, and accepted even then with caution.

The author very properly renders the word "exodus," and not "decease" in Luke ix. 31; and refers to the exodus of Moses but not to that of Elijah [in the LXX]. Why not, too, he queries, have it "transfigured," in 2 Cor. iii. 10 and Rom. xii. 2 (compare Exodus xxxiv. 30), as well as in Matt. xvii. 2 and Mark ix. 2? He also felicitously brings together the *κατακνήσεις* in Luke ix. 58 with the *σκηνᾶς* of verse 33; and so in the parallels. And he renders Acts ii. 26, where the cognate verb is used, "My soul shall encamp (or nestle?) in hope." He is clearly right in rendering *ὁ λύχνος* in Luke xi. 33, "the *lamp* (or candle)": "the

lamp of the body is the eye." With Dr. Samuel Cox, and a host more, he prefers to read at John iii. 3, "begotten *from above*." Much of the point is missed by translating "labor not," at John vi. 27, instead of "*work not*." Our author intimates a fine nexus between Luke xii. 50, Acts xviii. 5, 2 Cor. v. 14, and Phil. i. 23, by translating in all the passages *συνέχω* "constrain."

Shades of meaning, *nuances*, suggested by the context, are yet inevitably sacrificed by so uniform a procedure. Dr. Nicolson contends, and with justice, that "the two thieves" at the crucifixion were two *robbers*; but does not stop to remember that the English word had a wider acceptation early in the seventeenth century than it has now, and that the authorised version should not be blamed. Neither does he disclose acquaintance with the fact that the mistake in Matt. xxiii. 24 of rendering *δεδίχοντες* "straining *at*" instead of straining *off*" (or *out*) was a misprint in the original edition, for which the revisers should not be held responsible until it can be shown that they were also the final proof-readers.

We were much gratified to perceive that precisely the view of the word *δοῦλος* and its cognates, for which Dr. Dabney was so roundly scored by a deceased minister of Canada in the pages of the *Catholic Presbyterian*, is quietly taken by Dr. Nicolson in this volume, as will be evident from his translation "enslaved and slave" at John viii. 33, and similarly in Gal. iv. 18, and 9, and the other places. (See p. 63.) The same view, so obviously the true and only one, is and always has been taken by all scholars who cared for their reputation, unless, perhaps, by some in Caledonia and British America. We are pleased to see that the accomplished and gifted author of this masterly treatise is hemmed in by no insular or continental prejudices in matters of pure philology.

H. C. ALEXANDER.

ARTICLE VI.

THE SACRAMENTS OF THE NEW TESTAMENT.

The Sacraments of the New Testament, as Instituted by Christ.

By GEORGE D. ARMSTRONG, D. D., Pastor of the First Presbyterian Church, Norfolk, Va. New York: A. C. Armstrong & Son, 714 Broadway. 1880. Part I., pp. 232; Part II., pp. 314. 12mo.

This is a timely discussion. Twenty years ago the author published that part which is entitled "*The Doctrine of Baptisms,*" except the portion appropriated to the subject of Baptismal Regeneration. He has now presented also the careful examination of the other "Sacrament," the "Lord's Supper as set forth in the Word of God."

The author gives three features of the "aim" which he has proposed in this publication: (1) That it shall be thoroughly *scriptural*; (2) That it shall be adapted to the present state of the controversies in Christian Churches; (3) That it shall be adapted to the comprehension of the average English reader. With this brief statement of the "aim" proposed by the author, may be added a more extended explanation of each aspect of the discussion, as presented in the work itself, including in this the author's own views.

1. The subject discussed is eminently scriptural. "Sacraments" are of divine institution and revelation. They belong to the scheme of redemption. They have no basis in natural religion as a scheme of doctrine or a teacher of duty. Hence any discussion based on expediencies, or the fitness of things, or the results of speculations on the relations of God and man—any *a priori* process of reasoning, suggesting what *man* thinks God ought to have instituted or revealed, the modes and subjects, the nature and benefits of sacraments, according to the teachings of human reason—are all simply outside the purpose and plan of such a discussion. The authority of the "primitive Church," as set forth even in the "Ante-Nicene Fathers," is a mere human teaching, not especially valuable by antiquity or proximity of its

expounders to the time of the apostles; for during that time while Paul yet lived, not only had the gospel itself been so corrupted that the teaching of some was pronounced "another gospel, which is not another," but a perversion (Gal. i. 6, 7); but the holy sacrament of the Lord's Supper itself had been grossly misapprehended and corrupted. Dr. Armstrong has fully verified his "aim" in this aspect. He has collected and presented, under appropriate headings, the entire teachings of Scripture on both sacraments. Of course others may possess equal reverence for Scripture and make as full quotations, and yet so interpret the sacred revelation as to mislead the reader. Hence our author has not only given his own interpretations and sustained them by trustworthy critical examinations of the terms used in the original languages, but he has also subjected the language, in which opposing views are presented, whether on personal responsibility or that of ecclesiastical organisations by their symbols, to careful and searching investigation. How fully and ably he has done this, can be only ascertained by an examination of the volume. He has thus sustained his claim to teach only what the Scriptures teach, either in express terms or by fair inference. True, many not only of his own, but other churches, may except to some of his "inferences," as for example his view of John's baptism. There may also be some question raised as to the correctness of his views on the question whether baptism necessarily precedes the access of a believer to the Lord's table. But we apprehend there will be decided satisfaction as to all his teachings, which are fundamental on the doctrines of baptisms, by all not wedded to what Dr. Dale calls "The System." Without any pedantic or other offensive display of learning, Dr. Armstrong has showed a clear perception of the right use of language in his full illustrations of the senses which words acquire in passing from a usage to describe *secular* things to that which describes *sacred*. Especially is this true, and generally accepted as such by scholars, as to those words adopted from classic Greek to present subjects of purely divine revelation, and of which the heathen writers had no conceptions; such as "church" by a word before used only to mean "assembly." "Martyr," in Church History, is a sufferer

in Christ's cause; formerly it only meant "witness." "Presbyter" or "elder" is a church officer; formerly only an "old man." As "old men" in the patriarchal times were rulers, then, when tribal and national organisations emerged from patriarchal, the same word was employed to denote a ruler. And this occurred in civil government as well as ecclesiastical. Thus, "senator" from Latin "senex," "old man"; and from the same we have in modern languages "seigneur" and "signor." "Pastor" in Greek and Latin means a shepherd, but in ecclesiastical language a church officer. These illustrations might be much extended, but enough have been given. Now "circumcise" and "baptize" are words of the same history. In ancient languages *circumcise* meant only to *cut around*; then in religious use to denote a rite which symbolised purifications. Hence "to circumcise the heart," "circumcision of the spirit," "the circumcision" for the people who practised the rite. So *baptize*, in literal use, to overwhelm with water; then tropically, to express the act of being *subject to an influence*, and then especially of subjection to purifying agencies, and so *baptism* expressing *purifications*. Thus the dispute of the disciples of John and the Pharisees (John iii. 22-26) "about purification" is mentioned in connexion with the record of John's baptizing; and the "vessels of water" (John ii. 6) are mentioned as connected with "the manner," or literally, "according to the purification" of the Jews; evidently (for the contents were insufficient for immersion) for the use of those needing water for the various religious purifications prescribed by Moses' law and in constant practice in our Saviour's time. The foregoing abstract of Dr. Armstrong's method of argument is a pertinent specimen of the plain and direct mode of discussing the "Doctrine of Baptisms" which everywhere characterises his work, and is as clearly exhibited in the able discussion of the other sacrament, the Lord's Supper.

2. The first sentence in this article is suggestive of the second aspect of Dr. Armstrong's "aim," as fully carried out as that just presented. He proposes a discussion "adapted to our times"—*timely*. However fully the "Doctrine of Baptisms" has been presented, both in the interests of Immersionists and Affusionists,

it is eminently true that new arguments of assault on Pædobaptist views and new grounds of defence are continually presented. Discussions, thorough and exhaustive a century ago, do not fully meet the necessities of our time. Dr. Dale's voluminous and learned work, in four octavo volumes, might seem ample to cover the entire ground of defence, and conclusive in its able exposure of the one-sided scholarship, the prejudices, and the perverse misapplication of Scripture, which have for years distinguished the advocates of "The System." But this work is not *popular*. It does not reach the modes of thought and the sentiments of the masses. If properly studied by all our ministers and its methods presented in a popular style, it is calculated to be indefinitely applicable to all phases of the Baptist controversy and extensively useful. Dr. Armstrong, however, by different and shorter methods, has done for the masses what Dr. Dale has done for scholars. His discussion is fully abreast with our times, and it would be an interesting spectacle to witness how those who are ever ringing the changes on "Baptize means to dip, always to dip, and nothing else but dip" of Dr. Carson, can meet the arguments and illustrations of Dr. Armstrong to show, that in its *religious* sense, it means "to purify, always to purify, and nothing else but to purify"—*i. e.*, to express the act of putting one in a typically or symbolically purified state, suggestive, in mode and scripturally sustained exemplification, of the *religious purifying* of which the Holy Spirit is the agent and the man receiving "the washing of regeneration and the renewing of the Holy Ghost" is the recipient.

3. Equally pertinent to our times is Dr. Armstrong's brief but conclusive refutation of the idle prating, whether of Campbellites, Ritual Episcopalians, or the example and ally of both, the Papists. If "the blood of bulls and of goats, and the ashes of a heifer, sprinkling the unclean," could only avail to "the purifying of the flesh," but had no power "to purge men's consciences from dead works to serve the living God," how shall the sprinkling of a spoonful of water now "purge men's consciences"—aye, renew and sanctify the "heart deceitful above all things and desperately wicked"?

4. In his discussions with Christians who differ conscientiously from himself, and even with the Papists, our author is ever scrupulous in his courtesy. Towards the advocates of immersion we cannot but think he goes farther than any rights they can claim would entitle them, in uniformly conceding to them the name they arrogate to themselves exclusively of "Baptists." We confess that here we should be less amiable and yielding than Dr. Armstrong. These Christians object strongly to "baptize" as a rendering of the Greek term; they insist that it means nothing but "immerse;" an influential part of them have even insisted on a new English Bible, in order to get rid of this naughty and ambiguous word, "baptize." We should say to them, "Nay, gentlemen, you cannot 'eat your cake and have it, too.' If 'immerse' is the word, then you should be called 'Immersionists,' or if it suits you better, 'Dippers,' all 'through the chapter.'" They have no right to expect us to concede the name "Baptists" to them; because the very name is an assumption of the position that immersion alone is baptism; and that all undipped persons are wholly unbaptized. But *that is the very thing in dispute*. We cannot seem to concede it without stultifying ourselves. The policy of the Immersionists, in arrogating the name, is as shrewd as it is unfair. By its perpetual and admitted use, they make the impression on the unthinking that they are the only denomination of Christians which really obeys the Saviour's command to baptize. Is this just to ourselves? Nay, we are the true Baptists, and they are the Immersionists or Dippers.

Dr. Armstrong is peculiarly strong, while fair and courteous, upon the topic of "close communion." Here he meets the Immersionists on their own ground, and inflicts on them a total overthrow. He shows that they do not, as is so often assumed, reason from their premises as Presbyterians do from theirs. Immersionists often endeavor to break the force of the just feeling against the uncharitableness of "close communion" by saying: "We cannot be blamed for merely reasoning consistently from our premises"! True: but they *are to be blamed* for taking up premises which are neither true nor just; and which, when consistently carried out, lead to unchristian conclusions. The Jews

presumed that Jesus of Nazareth was guilty of religious imposture and blasphemy. From this presumption it followed most logically, that by the law of Moses he should be punished capitally. Yet these Jews were murderers! Their guilt was not that they reasoned consistently from their premises, but that they took up wicked premises to reason from.

“No unbaptized person should approach the Lord’s table.” “Nothing but immersion is valid baptism.” Let it be granted, for argument’s sake, that the regular inference hence must be close communion: so Immersionists say. But there is another set of premises, from which no Christian mind or heart can dissent, as Dr. Armstrong has shown. From these it follows inevitably, that he whom God accepts in Christ should not be excluded by the ministers of Christ’s Church. To the gigantic and sanctified intellects of a Mason and a Robert Hall this argument was irresistible. Now, when one argues regularly to two irreconcilable conclusions, this is the clearest proof that his positions were in part wrong. So it is here; immersion is not the only valid baptism; Christ himself disclaims it by giving every mark and blessing of the visible Church to us Baptists who are not dipped.

Wise men have often said that logical results, however disclaimed and deprecated, will always work themselves to the surface in the end, where their premises are obstinately held. It is obvious that the dogma, “Nothing is valid baptism but immersion,” logically unchurches every Church and every Christian in the world, except the dipped. This is the uncharitable and odious position which some years ago was known as “Old Landmarkism,” held by a few bigoted Immersionists, deprecated and disclaimed with an amiable inconsistency by the more pious and enlightened of that denomination. But the natural fruit of the evil root is rapidly growing. Their journals now say, that not one-fourth of their churches or preachers would recognise the ordination of the holiest, most learned, and useful Pædobaptist. The logic is perfectly regular from its false starting place: that “nothing but immersion is valid baptism.” Then, none but the dipped are baptized. Baptism regularly and ordinarily initiates church membership. When all the members are unchurched, no church

is left. No man can be an officer in a commonwealth of which he is not even a member. Hence there is no candidate capable of ordination, and no church to ordain him. Yes, the shocking, the unchristian conclusion is inexorable. While sorry that any Christians should thus pervert Christian truth, we are yet glad for the sake of the truth that Immersionism is thus unmasking itself. It is our just policy to invite it to do so, for then the Christian world will see the bald enormity of the result. It is this: that here, in all parts of Christendom, are societies of undipped Christians, who are indisputably on the road to heaven, who are doing more than the whole immersed world to lead others to heaven; who exhibit every Christian grace; (except zeal for dipping!) whom Christ himself has owned as his by giving them every endowment and blessing which he bestows on his dipped churches; from whose bosom a continuous stream of ransomed souls is ascending to the Church on high; but yet they are not Churches at all, because they have not seen the force of the dipping logic, forsooth! Has Popery itself done anything more sectarian, more uncharitable, except when she burned her dissenters? The first principle which leads good men like the Immersionists regularly to this monstrous issue cannot but be evil.

5. In his discussion of the sacraments, both of baptism and the Lord's Supper, our author attacks and refutes the doctrine of the Papacy, that the sacraments confer grace *ex opere operato*, by the act performed. Dr. Armstrong, however, gives a fuller and more complete refutation of this great error of Rome, whether as indicated and held within the pale of the Romish Church or by those who follow her, though not, by profession, of her. This discussion is preceded by a definition of the *mass*, both of the word as a derivation from *missa*, a formula used for dismissing assemblies, and then as applied to denote the religious service itself. Afterwards it came to mean the observance of the Lord's Supper as an expiatory service; that constituting the central part of the whole service of worship, and so "by excellence" taking the name. This definition opens the way to discuss the nature of the sacrament as held to present (not *re-present*) "the body, blood, and divinity of our Lord." This discussion is both schol-

arly and able, and the author, while bringing the subject to the comprehension of the popular mind, draws successfully on Papal authorities and clear interpretations of Scripture to refute the whole scheme which Romanists of this century have been endeavoring to render palatable to the common sense and culture of English speaking people. He refers to and quotes ten or twelve authorised expositions of Papal doctrines, from the "Catechism of the Council of Trent" to the "Faith of our Fathers" by Archbishop Gibbons of Baltimore, published in 1879. It is impracticable in the limits of this article to present even a brief intelligible outline of the argument. But it is exceedingly desirable that our ministers and elders and the private members of the Protestant Churches in our country, should avail themselves of this excellent summary of the true way to make an "end of controversy" with Romanists in this day, when that Church is changing its tactics, and instead of approaching men with fire and faggot, preparing to cajole and win by fair speeches and sophistical reasoning. "The Word of God is still 'quick and powerful.'" With a free pulpit and a free press, and an open Bible, it is lamentable to notice how poorly many of our people are informed of the teachings of their own Protestant Confessions, and how inadequately "well read" and properly "learned in the Scriptures" to meet the emissaries of the apostate Church. With such means as our religious liberty gives us, we have only to know and love the truth and zealously unite in diffusing it to others, to defy the arts, as our fathers did, the power of Rome. B. M. SMITH.