



The Princeton Theological Review

APRIL, 1919

HADADEZER OR BEN-HADAD

Ben-hadad of Damascus warred with Ahab of Israel and shortly afterwards Hadadezer of Damascus had the aid of Ahab against the Assyrian invaders. Historians commonly regard Ben-hadad and Hadadezer as in all probability one and the same person,¹ and they look upon the two names as mere variations of one original form.

The identity of person, however, has not been placed beyond the possibility of doubt; and the counter theory of diversity of person is entertained, the view that Ben-hadad was the predecessor of Hadadezer on the throne of Damascus. This counter theory introduces no confusion into the story. The Hebrew, Assyrian and other historical data arrange themselves naturally and render a consistent account of the course of events in northern Israel and at Damascus during an entire century.

The story is this: About the year 896 B. C. Baasha of Israel and a king of Damascus named Ben-hadad entered into an alliance (1 Kin. xv. 19^b), and Baasha advanced against Judah (verse 17). Thereupon Asa, king of Judah, reminded Ben-hadad of an ancient league already existing between him and Ben-hadad, and between his father and Ben-hadad's father, and by a gift of treasure he persuaded Ben-hadad to break his alliance with Baasha (verse 19). Ben-hadad accordingly seized a number of fortified towns in northern Israel along the caravan route between Damascus and the port of Akko on the Mediterranean sea (verse 20).

In the year 886 Omri as general had command of the army of Baasha's son and successor (1 Kin. xvi. 8, 16), and in

¹ "Benhadad II ist vermuthlich, wenn nicht sicher, identisch mit dem keilinschriftlichen auf der Monolithinschrift Salmanassar's II . . . erwähnten Dad-'id-ri," i.e. Hadadezer (Schrader, KAT², 1883, p. 200).

THE COMMENT ON JOHN IX. 38 IN THE AMERICAN REVISED VERSION

In the "Resolutions" of the Joint Committee of the Convocation of Canterbury, the adoption of which in 1870 marked the first definite step toward the revision of the Authorized Version, it is stipulated "that the revision be so conducted as to comprise both marginal renderings and such emendations as it may be necessary to insert in the text of the Authorized Version."¹ This action was in accordance with precedent. The AV² as published in 1611 contained not merely marginal notes, but also chapter summaries and cross-references—a by no means inconsiderable addition to the biblical text, notwithstanding the fact that at the time of its publication these "helps" seemed so inadequate to the lovers of the Geneva Bible.³

In the Preface to the ERV it is pointed out that the AV translators were governed by the following general rule in the matter of the marginal notes: "No marginal notes at all to be affixed but only for the explanation of the Hebrew and Greek words which cannot without some circumlocution so briefly and fitly be expressed in the text." It is further pointed out in the Preface that this "negative rule," as it is called, was not strictly construed by those for whose guidance it was formulated, since "out of more than 760 marginal notes originally appended to the Authorized Version of the New Testament, only a seventh part consists of explanations or literal renderings; the great majority of the

¹ The "Resolutions" are given in full in Schaff's *Companion to the Greek Testament and English Version* (1883), p. 382; and in the *Documentary History of the American Committee of Revision* (1885), p. 8.

² The following abbreviations will be used in the course of this article; AV, ERV, and ARV, to designate the Authorized Version of 1611, the English Revision of 1881, and the American Revision of 1901; RV to designate both the ERV and the ARV as distinguished from the AV; LXX to denote the Septuagint Version of the Old Testament.

³ See the preface to the *Westminster Annotations* (1645), a volume which was intended to supply the need of more extended comment.

notes being devoted to the useful and indeed necessary purpose of placing before the reader alternative renderings which it was judged that the passage or the words would fairly admit."⁴

With regard to their own notes, which are much more numerous in the RV than in the AV, it is stated in the Preface to the ERV, that "these notes fall into four main groups: first, notes specifying such differences of reading as were judged to be of sufficient importance to require a particular notice; secondly, notes indicating the exact renderings of words to which, for the sake of the English idiom, we were obliged to give a less exact rendering in the text; thirdly, notes very few in number, affording some explanation which the original seemed to require; fourthly, alternative renderings in difficult and debateable passages." And it is added: "The notes of this last group are numerous, and largely in excess of those which were admitted by our predecessors."

Owing to the fact that a number of the suggestions made by the American revisers affecting both the text and the margin of the Revision, were not accepted by their British brethren,⁵ it was agreed that their preferences should be added to the ERV as an "Appendix." This "Appendix" though by no means complete shows that it was not the desire of the American Company to increase the number of the marginal notes materially⁶ and that they were in sub-

⁴ The Preface adds the further statement, "The notes referring to variations in the Greek Text amount to about thirty-five."

⁵ A list of the changes proposed by the American, and adopted by the English, NT Company is given as an Appendix to Schaff's *Companion*. This list which is described as "far from complete" was prepared by Bishop Alfred Lee of the NT Company.

⁶ The main reasons that the marginal notes (as distinguished from the cross-references, which are not found in the ERV) seem so much more numerous in the ARV than in the ERV are these: In the case of citations from the O. T., the reference is placed with the foot-notes, in order to distinguish these citations "for which the sacred writer is responsible," from the cross references which have only the authority of the revisers (both are omitted in the ERV). The second is that the ARV repeats the same comment much more frequently than is the

stantial agreement with the members of the British Company as to the general form which they should assume.

When the ARV finally appeared in 1901, a period of twenty years had elapsed since the publication of the ERV. In view of this long interval, during which all but three of the members of the American NT Company had passed away,⁷ it was specially emphasized in the Preface of the ARV New Testament that it was the purpose of the survivors to make this revision as published in 1901 substantially the volume which would have been published in 1881 had the suggestions of the American revisers been accepted at that time.⁸

Among the notes which appear in the "Appendix" to the policy of the ERV; e.g., in the ARV "gospel" is explained as "good tidings" either directly or by cross-reference, wherever it occurs (about 70 times); in the ERV it is explained only once viz., at Mt. iv. 23, its first occurrence.

⁷ Of the 17 members who actually took part in the work of Revision (Drs. Crooks and Warren were unable to attend any sessions and resigned), four died before the appearance of the ERV in 1881 (Hadley in 1872; Hackett in 1875; H. B. Smith, who only attended one session and then resigned, in 1877; Hodge, who merely corresponded with the NT Company, in 1878). Six more died before 1891 (Washburn, in 1881; Burr, in 1882; Abbot, in 1884; Short, in 1886; Lee, in 1887; Woolsey, in 1889); four more died before 1901, the year of the publication of the ARV (Crosby, in 1891; Chase, in 1892; Schaff, in 1893; Kendrick, in 1895). Drs. Dwight, Riddle and Thayer have since passed away; Thayer, in 1901, Dwight and Riddle, in 1916.

⁸ The statement in the Preface may well be quoted: "In the preparation of this edition no attempt has been made to preserve a full record of the other readings and renderings than those that appeared in the work as published in 1881 which were preferred by the American révisers. The Appendix of that edition, however, was not only hastily compiled under pressure from the University Presses, but its necessarily limited compass compelled, as the original heading intimated, the exclusion of many suggestions that the American Company held to be of interest and importance. These, amounting in their aggregate to a considerable number, have been incorporated in the present edition. The opportunity has been taken also to introduce not a few alterations, individually of slight importance, yet as a body contributing decidedly to the perfection of the work. But the survivors of the New Testament Company have not felt at liberty to make new changes of moment which were not favorably passed upon by their associates at one stage or another of the original preparation of the work."

ERV and which were later incorporated—in this instance, in a somewhat different form—in the ARV, there is one which is quite noteworthy. It is obviously one to which the American revisers attached considerable importance. It is placed in the first group of changes (those which affect the entire NT) and in this list it is given a conspicuous place, being fourth in a list of fourteen. The note reads as follows: “At the word ‘worship’ in Matt. ii. 2, etc., add the marginal note ‘The Greek word denotes an act of reverence, whether paid to man (see chap. xviii. 26) or to God (see chap. iv. 10).’” This comment is noteworthy not merely because of the unwillingness of the English revisers to approve it, although this fact is not without significance in this instance, but especially because of its exceptional character, its frequent occurrence (in one form or another it appears thirty-five times in the ARV margin) and most of all because of the peculiarly offensive form which it assumes in the margin of John ix. 38. That verse which is the climax of the story of the healing of the man born blind, and which tells us that in answer to the Lord’s question, “Dost thou believe on the Son of God?” the man replied, “Lord, I believe” and worshipped him, receives this form of the comment upon the word “worship”: “The Greek word denotes an act of reverence, whether paid to a creature (as here) or to the Creator (see ch. 4. 20).” The words “as here” of the parenthesis constitute a positive, dogmatic assertion that our Lord was a creature and set him in this most important respect in definite contrast to the Creator—an assertion which can be admitted by no evangelical Christian. It is with this form of the comment that we are especially concerned. But before entering upon a discussion of the comment upon the word “worship” as it appears at John ix. 38 or in the other forms in which it occurs in the margin of the NT, it will be well for us first of all to ascertain the data which it is intended to explain. We shall therefore consider three topics:

- I. Προσκυνεῖν and its proper English equivalent (p. 245 f.);
- II. The comment on the word "worship" in the ARV (p. 268 f.);
- III. The special form of this comment at John ix. 38 (p. 284 f.).

I

Προσκυνεῖν AND ITS PROPER ENGLISH EQUIVALENT

Our first concern is to ascertain the meaning and usage of the words, *προσκυνεῖν* and "worship." For it is the alleged inadequacy of the latter as a rendering of the former, which is the occasion of the marginal comment in the ARV. We will consider first the Greek word and then the English.

A. *προσκυνεῖν*; ITS MEANING AND USAGE.

This word is found in the Greek literature of practically every period, from the 5th century B.C. to the present time. We shall examine briefly: the classical and general extra-biblical usage; the usage of the LXX; and the usage of the New Testament.

a) The Classical and General Extra-Biblical Usage. *Προσκυνεῖν*⁹ denotes the act of prostrating oneself (*proskynesis*) before one who is, who claims to be, or who is regarded as being, (greatly) one's superior. The ancient Greeks used it to describe an act of worship rendered to the gods and also of an act of respect paid to a human superior. The word is not found in Homer, and according to Cremer it "first appears among the Greeks after their contact with the Persians." But its usage at that period, the fact that we find it then employed to describe an act of worship rendered to the gods indicates that the word itself is considerably older and that it is good Greek.¹⁰ At the same time the fact that *προσκυνεῖν* describes this act of worship only

⁹ In classical Greek this verb is construed with the accusative. The use of the dative is late and less correct. Cf. footnotes 37 and 43.

¹⁰ Cremer (*Biblico-Theological Lexicon of NT Greek*,⁴ p. 755 f.) regards this word as one which "originally was simply a Greek expression

from a purely external standpoint, i. e., as an act of prostration,¹¹ made it natural that it should be used to describe the act even under those circumstances in which no act of worship could be regarded as intended. Hence we find the word used of an act of homage paid to a mortal, and especially of the homage paid by the Persians to their king and to persons of rank.

That this wider employment of the act of prostration and of the word describing it was not in entire harmony with Greek ideas, is clear from statements which we find in the Classics. The Greeks seem to have disapproved of this Oriental custom of offering the *proskynesis* to mere men however highly placed for the following reasons. They felt that—

1) To prostrate oneself before a human being is derogatory to a freeman: barbarians and slaves may grovel, not men. Thus, Xenophon in the *Anabasis* speaks of the fact that the Greeks “worship no man as master¹² but the gods” as the most important evidence of that liberty which their fathers had maintained through their victories over

for an observance of Oriental life.” But this view hardly seems tenable. It is improbable that if this were the case, an Athenian would use such an Oriental (Anatolian) dialecticism which might imply merely respect, in speaking of *worship* offered to the gods. Yet Xenophon uses it in this sense in the *Anabasis*. The fact that it does not appear in the literature of the earlier period does not warrant the inference that it was unknown before the 5th century. It seems to have been a rare word in classical Greek. (It occurs less than a dozen times in the Tragic Poets, only rarely in Plato and Aristotle, never in Thucydides.) This suggests at least that it may have been used even as early as Homer, although no examples of its use are known. When we remember that *σέβειν* (or, *σεβίζειν*) occurs only once in Homer, four times in Pindar, and not at all in Hesiod (*σέμνος* is found a few times in Homer and more frequently in Pindar), the fact that *προσκυνεῖν* has not been found in the extant literature of the early period, is a very precarious argument for the view that it must be of later origin.

¹¹ Cf. footnote 44.

¹² Trench (*Synonyms of the NT*) points out that the Greeks in the days of their freedom “refused the title of *δεσπότης* to any but the gods.”

the Persians at Marathon and Salamis.¹³ Demosthenes declares that if the result of standing up for one's rights is to be merely the suffering of still more injustice, the best thing to do will be to "bow oneself humbly (*προσκυνεῖν*) before brutal men as is customary among the barbarians and not to oppose them."¹⁴ Isocrates speaks of the cowardly servility of the Persians who "worship a mortal man and address him as a divine being (*δαίμονα*)."¹⁵ Callisthenes in arguing against Alexander's intention to claim for himself the honor of prostration from his subjects asks the king whether he intends to compel the Greeks "who are men most devoted to freedom" to offer him the *proskynesis* or whether he will require it merely of his own subjects, the Macedonians, or of his Oriental subjects alone.¹⁶

2) For a mortal to accept such homage would expose him to the envy of the gods and make him the fit object of their vengeance. This appears from the manner in which Agamemnon receives the obsequious welcome of false Clytemnestra, as described by Aeschylus: "For the rest offer no womanish luxuries to me, nor before me, as before a king of the East, grovel with open-mouthed acclaim (*χαμαιπετές βόαμα προσχάνης ἐμοῖ*) nor with vestments strown draw jealous eyes upon my path. To the gods these honors belong. To tread, a mortal, upon fair fineries is to my poor thoughts a thing of fear. Give me, I say, the worship not of thy god but of thy lord (*λέγω κατ' ἄνδρα μὴ θεὸν σέβειν ἐμέ*)."¹⁷ That the gods were looked upon as guarding zealously their prerogatives and as regarding man and his upward strivings with a watchfulness by no means free from suspicion and jealousy is one of the clearest teachings of the familiar Prometheus legend. If a god (Titan) were to be so severely punished for bestowing one of the 'peculiar possessions' of

¹³ *Anabasis*, III. 2, 13.

¹⁴ Κατὰ Μειδίου, 549.

¹⁵ Πανηγύρικος, 151 (Beuseler's edition, 1854).

¹⁶ Arrian, *Anabasis*, IV, 12; Chinnock's Translation.

¹⁷ Agamemnon, 911; Verrall's translation. Dean Plumptre thinks that in this passage Aeschylus is definitely referring to the Persian custom.

the gods upon men, what terrible consequences must be awaiting the mortal who would dare to usurp them!

3) The offering of the *proskynesis* to mortals as well as to the gods must inevitably result in the obliterating of the proper distinction between them. Thus Isocrates in the passage cited above speaks of the Persians as "making the gods of less account than men." Callisthenes in opposing the view that it would be proper to offer the *proskynesis* to Alexander points out "that men have made distinctions between those honors which are due to men and those due to the gods in many different ways"; that "the greatest distinction is made by the custom of prostration (*προσκύνησις*)"; and that "it is not therefore reasonable to confound all these distinctions without discrimination, exalting men to a rank above their condition by extravagant accumulation of honours, and debasing the gods, as far as lies in human power, to an unseemly level, by paying them honours only equal to those paid to men."¹⁸ Nevertheless, Alexander prevailed and divine honors were accorded him.¹⁹ And the blasphemous confusion and perversion of acts, words and ideas resulting from such a practice, ancient though it was in the Orient, found its climax later on in Rome in the person of a Roman emperor who, to quote what Dean Farrar calls that "terrible phrase" of Gibbon, was at once a priest, an atheist, and a god.²⁰

It is for this last reason especially that it is difficult for us to form a clear conception of the meaning and usage of the word *προσκυνεῖν*. The Greeks undoubtedly held the Persian king to be a man, a mere mortal like themselves, and considered it a servile act to prostrate oneself before him. The two heroic Spartans of whom Herodotus writes²¹ were

¹⁸ Arrian, *loco cit.*

¹⁹ Callisthenes' words found an echo centuries later in Jamblichus, who in the interests of Neo-Platonism protests against this confusing of things which are essentially different, by offering the same rites to mortals and the gods; and he cites the *proskynesis* as an example (Taylor, *Jamblichus on the Mysteries*, p. 80).

²⁰ *Early Days of Christianity*, p. 4.

²¹ Book VII, 136.

ready to die for their country but not to demean themselves by grovelling at the feet of a man, though he were the king of Persia. Yet the Greeks also recognized that the Persians considered their king a divine being and that consequently the act of homage which they paid him might be regarded as an act of worship. Aeschylus speaks of him as the "god of the Persians."²² And in Plutarch's account of the visit of Themistocles to the Persian court, we have the following statement of the Persian view of the matter as it purports to be expressed by their spokesman: "Now you Hellenes are said to admire liberty and equality above all things; but in our eyes, among many fair customs, this is the fairest of all, to honor the king and to pay obeisance (*προσκυνεῖν*) to him as the image (*εἰκόνα*) of that god who is the preserver of all things."²³ Thus it is clear that the Greeks both despised the Persians for worshipping a man and at the same time admitted that the Persians themselves looked upon him as a god. Perhaps they despised them all the more on that account.

But, while the instances just cited show how difficult it is at times to decide whether the word *προσκυνεῖν* is properly to be regarded as having a religious content or not, the inference must not be drawn that when used of homage paid to human beings the idea of worship may always be thought of as present in the word, both when used of the Persian

²² Cf. The article on "The Title 'King of Persia' in the Scriptures," by Prof. R. D. Wilson, published in this *Review*, January 1917, p. 135. The title occurs three times in the "Persae" together with several other titles of similar import.

²³ "Themistocles," 27,2 (Perrin's translation). That Plutarch gives us a correct account of the Persian standpoint seems probable, although the dearth of first-hand information introduces an element of uncertainty. But in view of the positive assertions of Greek writers that the Persians worshipped their king and the convincing evidence that this practice prevailed from an early period in Egypt, which Alexander had already conquered, Ed. Meyer's contention that Alexander's assumption of deity was the direct result of the "Hellenic theories of the state" propounded by Plato and Aristotle, rather than of personal egotism influenced by Oriental custom, seems most questionable. Cf. art., "Persia" (p. 213a). *Encyc. Brit.*, 11th ed.

custom and also in passages where no such allusion is involved. Herodotus does not imply that the *proskynesis* was reserved by the Persians for the king alone, but merely that it was rendered by one of a much lower rank.²⁴ And when Xenophon in speaking of the ignominious fate of the traitor Orontas tells us that as he was being led away to death "as many as formerly were wont to pay him homage (*προσεκύνουν*), paid him homage (*προσεκύνησαν*) even then,"²⁵ it can hardly be supposed that this was anything more than an act of respect on the part of the Persians. And in the passage in Euripides' *Orestes*, where the Phrygian pleading for his life at the hands of the blood-crazed hero cries out: "Crouching to thee, in barbaric wise, I grovel (*προσκυνῶ*), O my lord,"²⁶ it does not seem probable that the dramatist intends to describe anything more than an act of cowardly and servile submission, an abject truckling such as might be expected of an Oriental and a barbarian. Similarly in the *Oedipus Rex*, a drama of Sophocles which does not deal with Asia at all, in the scene where the king pleads with Tiresias to disclose his baleful secret we are told that it is as a suppliant (*ικτήριος*) that he kneels (*προσκυνεῖν*) before him.²⁷ There is clearly no act of worship intended.

It is thus apparent that as early as the 5th century B.C., and this is as far back as we can trace the word, *προσκυνεῖν* was used in both the narrow and the broad sense; of worship offered to the gods, and also of homage rendered to men. And this ambiguity seems to cling to it throughout all of its subsequent history. Thus *προσκύνημα* was for centuries the technical term applied to the prayers offered (and inscribed) in the temple of Serapis at Alexandria. It is mentioned repeatedly on the inscriptions²⁸ and papyri²⁹ of

²⁴ Book I, 134.

²⁵ Book I, 7, 10.

²⁶ Line 1507.

²⁷ Line 327.

²⁸ Cf. e.g., Dittenberger, *Orientalis Graeci Inscriptiones Selectae* (1903).

²⁹ Examples can be found in the publications of Mitteis, Milligan, Grenfell and Hunt, Kornemann and Meyer, etc.

the Graeco-Roman period. Yet we find it also used as an expression of greeting or salutation. This ambiguity is strikingly illustrated in a letter of the fourth century A.D.,³⁰ in which a man in writing to his mother informs her that he is offering the customary prayer for her to the gods (τὸ προσκύνημά σοι ποιῶ) and then toward the close of the same brief epistle he expresses the hope that he may soon be able to come and greet³¹ them³² (καὶ ἐν τάχει ἔλθω πρὸς ὑμᾶς ἵνα ὑμᾶς προσκυνήσω).³³ Among the papyri we find letters written to high ecclesiastics of the Christian Church in which this word appears in the greeting. It was because of the frequent use of προσκυνεῖν as a honorific word that the Second Council of Nicea (8th century) decreed that προσκυνεῖν should designate the veneration given to human superiors and to sacred objects, and that λατρεύειν should be used specifically of worship offered to God.³⁴ Other instances³⁵ of this

³⁰ Mitteis, *Griechische Urkunden* I. Nr. III.

³¹ The difference in use is striking; but no more remarkable than in such words as "adorable," "awfully," and "absolutely," in the vocabulary of the school-girl of today. "Adorable" may mean "cute"; "awfully" is the same as "very"; and "absolutely" may mean "yes."

³² I.e. his family and friends?

³³ This is the only letter I have found in which the word is used in both senses, but a number of letters could be cited in which it occurs in one or the other.

³⁴ The warrant for this is sought of course in the broad use of προσκυνεῖν in the OT. It is significant that of the examples which are cited of the offering of "veneration" (προσκύνησις) to human beings or sacred objects only one is taken from the NT, viz Heb. xi. 21, which is rendered, "he revered the head of his staff." The argument for the distinction between *dulia* (προσκύνησις) and *latria* (λατρεία) is a curious example of false exegesis (*The Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers, 2d Series, Vol. XIV, p. 572 f.*).

³⁵ Suidas apparently knew it only in the religious sense; he illustrates it by the example καὶ σὲ προσκυνεῖν τὸν ἥλιον τῆς δικαιοσύνης, which is apparently a biblical illusion, i.e. to Christ, or God as the Sun of righteousness. Du Fresne in his *Glossarium* (1688) gives both senses in the case of words from this root. He cites the decree in the Canons of the 16th Carthaginian Synod (418 A.D.) that the readers (οἱ ἀναγνώσαι) are not to greet (προσκυνεῖν) the laity (τὸν δῆμον). Prof. Sophocles gives examples of both usages in his *Greek Lexicon of the Roman and Byzantine Periods* (from B.C. 146 A.D. 1100).

ambiguous usage might be cited, and it is important to note that we find the word used in both senses in Modern Greek.³⁶ These examples will however suffice to show the general usage of the word in classical and post-classical Greek, and we turn now to the one source which has the most direct bearing upon the usage of the New Testament, the Septuagint.

b) The Usage of the Septuagint. The witness of the LXX regarding the use of the word *προσκυνεῖν* is of the first importance, not merely because of the close connection which naturally exists between the two parts of the Greek Bible, but also because the frequency of its occurrence in the Greek of the OT stands in favorable contrast to the scattered and in some respects meagre data which have come down to us through extra-biblical sources.

Προσκυνεῖν occurs in the Canonical Books of the Greek OT about 175 times.³⁷ It is with but very few—about half a dozen—exceptions the regular rendering of two verbs in the OT, שָׁחָה³⁸ which occurs 160 in the Hebrew Bible, and

³⁶ Cf. *Contopoulos, Modern Greek and English Dictionary.*

³⁷ In the LXX *προσκυνεῖν* is usually construed with the dative, and only a very few times with the accusative. The dative is generally regarded as an attempt to render the preposition ל with which שָׁחָה is usually construed in Hebrew. We find the verb also with a prep. e.g., ἐνώπιον (= לפני) and also used absolutely. Cf. footnote 43.

³⁸ The verb שָׁחָה is somewhat peculiar. Despite the frequency of its occurrence in the OT, it does not seem to be used in this sense in any other of the principal cognates (we find it in New Hebrew). It is apparently related to the verbs שָׁחָה and שָׁחָה. The closest parallel to it is found in the verb *šahāhu* in letters of the Amarna collection written by the governors of Akko, Megiddo, Askelon and Lakish; we find it usually in the fulsome and effusive greeting which is characteristic of most of these letters. The following may serve as an example:—"To the King, my lord, my gods [plural of Majesty], my Sun-god, the Sun from heaven,—thus (saith) Widia, the man from Askelon, thy servant, the dust of thy feet, the groom of thy horses:—at the feet of my lord, seven times and seven times do I prostrate myself (*iš-ta-ḥa-ḥi-in*) backward and forward." (Then follows the communication.) The word *iš-ta-ḥa-ḥi-in* is apparently the Hithpael of the verb שָׁחָה; the ending *-in* (occasionally written *-en*) being most probably the energetic or cohortative ending, which in Arabic appears as *-an*, and in Hebrew as *-en* (before suffixes), shortened in the regular co-

דַּנַּךְ³⁹ which is practically restricted to the Aramaic portions of Daniel. Indeed, it is so clearly the full equivalent of these words that it is not necessary for us to go back of the LXX to determine the meaning of *προσκυνεῖν* in OT Greek. We find this word used of the worship of God about sixty times; of worship of false gods, or of the prohibition of the same, about sixty times; of homage paid to the king or to a person of rank, about forty-five times; while in about a dozen instances the objects of the act are: angelic or divine visitants, the Messianic king, or glorified Israel.

In the Apocrypha the usage is practically the same as in the Canonical Books. We find *προσκυνεῖν* used most frequently of worship paid to God. But it is also used of the worship of idols; we find it twice used of homage paid to human beings,⁴⁰ and it is once used of respecting, in the sense of accepting, proffered advice.⁴¹

It is thus apparent that in the LXX as in extra-biblical

hortative (first person) to *-ā*. The word is most probably Canaanite, despite the fact that it nowhere has a Babylonian gloss as do some of the other Canaanite words occurring in these letters. Still the fact that it is only found in letters written from Canaan; that it takes the place of the usual Babylonian word *amkuṭ* from *makātu* (the governor of Megiddo uses it only once and *amkuṭ* several times) when taken in connection with the fact that this word so closely resembles the word commonly used in Hebrew to describe an act of this nature, but does not apparently occur elsewhere in Babylonian, makes it very probably that *ištahāḥin* should be treated as genuine Canaanite. It is also possible that this Canaanite form may help to explain the other marked peculiarity of the Hebrew verb, the unique Hithpa'el form. But the connection—if such there be—between the two verbs is far from clear.

³⁹ The fact that דַּנַּךְ is the regular word in the Aramaic portions of the OT for "worship" and that it is used in the same sense in Syriac (*e.g.*, in the Peshitto version) should not lead us to infer at once that in the four passages in Isaiah in which it is found it is to be regarded as an Aramaism. For it is quite a common word in Arabic as well. It is more likely that it was a common Semitic word.

⁴⁰ Judith x. 23, xiv. 7.

⁴¹ 4Macc. v. 12. Cf. the edict published by Grenfell and Hunt (*Tebtunis Papyri* II, No. 286) where we read "we are bound to respect (*προσκυνεῖν*) the rescript of the deified (*θεοῦ*) Trajan and of our lord Hadrian Caesar Augustus."

Greek *προσκυνεῖν* is a broad term which may be employed both with and without religious implication. That in the LXX it is usually employed with that implication is clear from the data given above. It is a decided advantage that the strong monotheistic tenor of the OT in most instances prevents us from being in any doubt as to the nature of the reverence offered to human beings. The classical usage as we have seen is not always clear upon this point. But when in the OT we read for example that Abraham "bowed himself" to the children of Heth, or that Moses "made obeisance" to Jethro, or David to Saul, or that the sons of the prophets "bowed themselves" to Elisha (in all of which the Greek has *προσκυνεῖν*), it is perfectly obvious that an act of worship cannot in the nature of the case be intended.

As would be expected, the usage of Josephus is the same as that of the OT.

c) *Προσκυνεῖν* in the New Testament. In the New Testament *προσκυνεῖν* occurs sixty times,⁴² or about one-third as often as in the LXX.⁴³ It is found chiefly in the Gospels (Mt. and Jn.) and in the book of Revelation. In about half of these instances (26 times) it describes an act⁴⁴ rendered

⁴² Including the noun *προσκυνήτης* (Jn. iv. 23).

⁴³ In the NT *προσκυνεῖν* usually, though not nearly as uniformly as in the LXX, governs its object in the dative (we find the dative 30 times; accusative, 12 times; case uncertain, 2 times; a preposition used, 4 times; verb used absolutely, 11 times). No difference in meaning is apparent. In Jn. iv., the verb is followed twice by the acc., twice by the dative, twice by a relative pronoun whose antecedent may be in either case, and it is three times used absolutely; in every case it is used of worship of God. On the other hand in Revelation, of the 11 times in which it is used of false worship in six it is followed by the acc., in the other five by the dat. Mt. iv. 10 and Lk. iv. 8 are quotations from the OT and the acc. is used there as in the LXX because in the Hebrew the verb is יָרָא (fear), which is followed by a direct object. Dr. Edwin A. Abbott (*Johannine Synonyms*) has endeavored to find a distinction in usage in the NT—a Jewish and a Gentile usage—based on the variation in the case governed by *προσκυνεῖν*. But his conclusions not merely set the Synoptics and John in direct conflict with the LXX and Rev. as regards the usage, but also necessitate an interpretation of Jn. iv. and Mt. iv. 10 (Lk. iv. 8) which is forced and fanciful, and in some respects utterly impossible.

⁴⁴ The posture assumed is indicated by the synonyms employed in

(or to be rendered) to God;⁴⁵ 14 times, to false gods (Satan or his representatives);⁴⁶ 15 times, to our Lord;⁴⁷ 3 times, to human or angelic beings (who refuse it as due to God alone);⁴⁸ once, to "a certain king"; and once, to the Church at Philadelphia.⁴⁹

This shows at the outset that in the NT as in the LXX the word is usually at least employed in the religious sense. Where offered to God or to false gods, the act is clearly one of worship, a religious act. The Bible makes no distinction between true worship and false worship as far as the act or idea of worship is concerned. It does not intimate that worship given to idols is not worship. It does not describe it as something less than worship. It is wor-

the NT. Thus Mk. i. 40 has *γωνυπετεῖν* and Lk. v. 12 *πίπτειν ἐπὶ πρόσωπον*, where Mt. viii. 2 has *προσκυνεῖν*. Mt. xxvii. 29, on the other hand, has *γωνυπετεῖν* and Mk. xv. 19 *προσκυνεῖν*. Mk. vii. 25 has *προσπίπτειν*, while Mt. xv. 25 has *προσκυνεῖν*. Hesychios of Alexandria (see Schmidt's Ed.) explains *προσκυνεῖν* by *προσπίπτειν*. Cf. also the expression 'to fall on the face and worship' (Rev. xi. 16). It would seem most natural on the basis of these passages to suppose that the *proskynesis* involved kneeling and bowing the head to or toward the ground. Perhaps in some cases even throwing oneself prostrate is implied. The act is frequently spoken of as performed 'at the feet' of the one to whom it is rendered and in Mt. xxviii. 9 we find the expression "they came and held him by the feet," where the act is clearly a *proskynesis*.

⁴⁵ The passages are: Mt. iv. 10; Lk. iv. 8; Jn. iv. 20,² 21, 22,² 23,³ 24,² xii. 20; Acts viii. 27, xxiv. 11; 1 Cor. xiv. 25; Heb. xi. 21; Rev. iv. 10, v. 14, vii. 11, xi. 1, 16, xiv. 7, xv. 4, xix. 4, 10. Heb. xi. 21, which is slightly ambiguous because the verb is used absolutely, seems certainly to be included in this group. That worship of God (as an expression of thankfulness and trust) is a natural interpretation of the OT passage (Gen. xlvii. 31) is certain, and the use made of it in Heb. xi. clearly implies that it was so understood by the NT writer. In the NT *προσκυνεῖν* when used absolutely refers to God 9 times and to Jesus twice; being apparently always used of a religious act. This is not true of the LXX, where it may also be used absolutely when implying mere respect.

⁴⁶ Mt. iv. 9; Lk. iv. 7; Acts vii. 43; Rev. ix. 20, xiii. 4,² 8, 12, 15, xiv. 9, 11, xvi. 2, xix. 20, xx. 4.

⁴⁷ Mt. ii. 2, 8, 11, viii. 2, ix. 18, xiv. 33, xv. 25, xx. 20, xxviii. 9, 17; Mk. v. 6, xv. 19; Lk. xxiv. 52; Jn. ix. 38; Heb. i. 6.

⁴⁸ Acts x. 25; Rev. xix. 10, xxii. 8.

⁴⁹ Mt. xviii. 26; Rev. iii. 9.

ship misapplied, perverted to false ends; but it is worship. The Bible uses the same words to designate the one as the other and teaches that the sin of idolatry—and Paul stamps covetousness as idolatry—consists in giving to the creature the worship due the Creator. The fact that the creature has no right to receive it does not outweigh the fact that it is to the creature that fallen, unregenerate man is sure to render it (cf. Rom. i). Similarly the fact that even when offered to God it may fall far short of the ideal of true worship, or may be regarded as a direct perversion of it (e.g., Jer. vii, 2 ff.) does not prevent its being called worship. Consequently, we are able to speak of these forty instances where the *proskynesis* is offered to God or to false gods, with practical certainty as examples of the *religious* use of the word. The most likely exception is the case in the Temptation narrative, where Satan asks it of Jesus. But even there it is probable that “worship” is intended.⁶⁰ This disposes at once of two-thirds of the instances.

In the three instances where it is refused by human or angelic beings, the refusal is explained as due to the fact that the one to whom it is offered is a fellow creature and

⁶⁰ Some scholars hold that it is preposterous to suppose that Satan really demanded “worship” of Jesus. Thus, Kitto (*Bible Illustrations*) tells us: “The homage he asked was not that of Divine worship. Even the devil would not have been mad enough to ask that of Jesus.” And the Roman Catholic theologians cite this passage as illustrating the distinction which they draw between *dulia* and *latria*. It is a very plausible view that Satan was merely asking for a certain amount of recognition, for the homage to which as prince of this world he might in a sense be regarded as entitled. But it is difficult and even impossible to harmonize such an interpretation with the answer which Jesus made unless that answer were taken to mean that the *proskynesis* must never be offered to any but Deity; i.e. as a definite prohibition of the broader usage as sanctioned in the OT. But this would be an interpretation which would prove too much, at least from the standpoint of those who find the broader usage of the word sanctioned elsewhere in the NT. It is far more natural to take the view that Satan’s request was for worship. Dr. Riddle expresses the matter very succinctly, when he says: “That religious worship is meant, appears from the next verse” (*Commentary on Luke*). Cf. also Urwick, *On the Worship of Christ*, p. 78.

in two of them we find the injunction added, "worship [using the same word] God." This implies of course that those to whom it was rendered saw in it an act which was, or at least might readily be understood as, or mistaken for, an act of worship, and which was consequently inappropriate to a creature—a fact which gives prominence to the religious implication of the word.

In the instances in which the *proskynesis* is offered to our Lord the exact nature of the act is not at once apparent, and the question naturally arises whether it is in these instances also to be regarded as an act of worship. In deciding its character there are two matters especially which should be carefully noted:

First, in view of the ambiguity which, as has been repeatedly pointed out, always attaches to the word itself apart from a determining context, it is particularly important to remember that it is this very ambiguity which was responsible for the refusal to accept the proffered prostration in at least one and perhaps in all of the three instances just referred to in which it was offered to a creature. The argument seems to be a sound one that the fact of Cornelius' being spoken of as "a devout man and one that feared God" makes it decidedly improbable that when he prostrated himself before Peter he intended to worship him. It is of course possible that the pagan superstitions and usages in which he had probably grown up and by which he was still to some extent surrounded reasserted themselves in this moment of excitement,⁵¹ or that in view of the vision which he had received he regarded Peter as a superhuman being. But it is by no means certain that this was the case. And Peter may have refused the homage simply because it was an act of doubtful import, which might imply on the part of the one offering it, and which might be understood as implying by

⁵¹ The argument that Peter refused it because Cornelius was a Roman and might consequently be expected to attach a deeper significance to the act than a Jew, accustomed to Oriental prostrations, would do, seems at least questionable and would have no bearing upon the interpretation of the two passages in Rev.

those witnessing it, a kind of homage which it would be unlawful for him to receive. At any rate Peter's refusal to accept it points clearly to his recognition of the religious implication latent in the word. And this would be a sufficient explanation in itself of his refusal to accept it.

Secondly, in view of this attitude of the apostle, the attitude of the Lord becomes strikingly significant. As an act of doubtful import, it must, if capable of interpretation as a religious act when offered to Peter, have admitted of similar interpretation when offered to Peter's Master. Yet Jesus did not hesitate to receive it. On the lowest view this implies that Jesus had no such scruples as had his followers as to the propriety and permissibility of his accepting an act which might be understood as an act of worship. On the higher and scriptural view it implies a recognition and claim on his part that he was fully entitled to receive it not merely as an act of respect but also in its highest significance as an act of adoration and worship.⁵² And the Bible declares that Jesus claimed this right⁵³ and also spoke of the time then future when all men would recognize it. To all who are willing to admit that this is so, the question becomes merely one as to the intention of those who offered the *proskynesis* to him.

The *intention* of the "worshipper" is a matter which it is difficult to determine. Our view regarding it will be influenced by a number of different considerations: the character of the national Messianic expectation, the probable amount and correctness of the information on this point possessed by the individuals who offered this act to Jesus, their knowledge of, or about, Jesus and their attitude toward him, their conception of the act which they rendered and their motive in offering it. These and other considerations are responsible for the differences in the views which

⁵² This view has been ably presented by Hackett in his *Commentary on Acts* (at x. 25). It is a very old view. We find it *e.g.* in Athanasius.

⁵³ *Cf.* for example Jn. v. 23, "That all may honor the Son even as they honor the Father."

have been expressed. And it is by no means remarkable that scholars of widely divergent opinions should hesitate to assert that this act as offered to our Lord was in every instance worship. Urwick holds that it was; Liddon apparently is not certain.⁵⁴ On the other hand there are many scholars who feel that passages such as Matt. viii. 2 and ix. 18 hardly warrant the view that the petitioner had sufficient knowledge of Jesus to justify us in asserting that he intended to worship him. And it must be admitted that cogent arguments can be advanced in support of such a view and that when we think of all that was involved and implied in the act considered as a definite recognition of the deity of Christ, we are tempted to feel that it is improbable that these apparent strangers could have realized a truth which Jesus' own disciples were so slow to understand. Such being the case it is important to notice carefully the circumstances under which the *proskynesis* was offered to our Lord and the manner in which he was addressed. This latter is especially important. Thus we find him addressed not merely as Lord (an ambiguous title which may mean little or much);⁵⁵ but also as "King of the Jews" and as "Son of God" and three times it is offered to him as the risen Christ. In a majority of the fifteen instances the circumstances seem to imply that the homage offered was of so unusual a character that it would be hazardous to assert that the religious significance of the act was entirely lacking; while in several (cf. especially Matt. xiv. 33, xxviii. 9, 17; Lk. xxiv. 52) it is clearly present. And when we remember that the language is that of the inspired writer, that in the NT the word is usually employed in the religious sense, and that Jesus was entitled to receive worship, it certainly is better to assume that it was worship (even though at times of an imperfect sort) than to assert that it was not. It is not necessary to prove that it was always a high type of worship or that the full implication of the act as worship was understood by the

⁵⁴ Urwick, *On the Worship of Christ*; Liddon, *Bampton Lectures* of 1866.

⁵⁵ Cf. page 274.

one who offered it, to justify our calling it worship. We know only too well that this cannot be said of many acts which we today call worship. In our religious worship there is much that is at times perfunctory and mechanical; our singing and our praying have sometimes far more of "vain repetition" and "lip service" than of true worship. Yet we would hesitate to call it something else than worship. And while we cannot prove that in all the instances in which the *proskynesis* was offered to Jesus the act was one of worship, we are equally unable to deny that it may have been.⁵⁶ And in view of the fact that of our Lord it can certainly be said that nothing less than worship was his due, it seems better to assume that it was worship and to speak of it as such. Hesitation to call it worship may seem to imply (even if the inference is utterly without warrant) an unwillingness on our part to admit that Jesus was entitled to receive worship, i.e. as a denial of his deity. And surely it would be far worse to convey such a *false* impression than to run the risk of attributing to these persons a deeper insight into the *truth* than we can be sure that they really possessed. This procedure would be in accord with the rule laid down for the AV translators which required that in doubtful cases of this kind, the "propriety of the place and the analogy of the faith" should be consulted.⁵⁷

Two passages remain to be considered: the case of the "certain king" of Matt. xviii. 26 and of the "Church of Philadelphia," Rev. iii. 9.

In Matt. xviii. 26 we read that the "unmerciful servant," when charged by his lord with his misdeeds "fell down and

⁵⁶ In the case of the soldiers (Mk. xv. 19) it was a mockery of course, but may equally well have been a mockery of worship, as a mockery of homage.

⁵⁷ Rule 4 of the "Instructions given to the Translators" reads in full as follows: "When a word hath divers significations, that to be kept which hath been most commonly used by the most of the ancient fathers, being agreeable to the propriety of the place and the analogy of the faith." The opinions of some of the ancient fathers, insofar as they bear upon Jn. ix. 38 are referred to on p. 290 f.

worshipped⁵⁸ him, saying, Lord, have patience with me, and I will pay thee all." It would seem at first glance that this act of homage being offered to a human being must be regarded as a clear example of *προσκυνεῖν* used in the non-religious sense of an act which denoted nothing more than abject submission and imploring supplication. It cannot be denied that there is good and perhaps sufficient warrant for such an interpretation. At the same time it must not be overlooked that this is not the only possible view. Who was this "certain king"? We are not told. The imagery certainly suggests a despotic monarch. Was he the Roman emperor? The reference to the culprit, who was evidently a high official, as a "servant," and the immense sum owed by him, would favor this view.⁵⁹ But if this supposition is correct we must bear in mind that the doctrine of *divus Caesar* was at this time already firmly established and that the emperor was accustomed to be accorded divine honors.⁶⁰ We must also remember that this doctrine was a very ancient one in the Orient and satisfied a widely felt popular need.⁶¹ Had it been a custom which was hateful to and resented by the vast majority of the subjects of the emperor it would not have been the Christians alone who were brought by it into irreconcilable conflict with the Roman empire. Her-

⁵⁸ AV, RV, text; the AV margin has "or, besought him."

⁵⁹ It is not necessary of course to think of one of the satellities of the Roman emperor. In the OT we find Solomon spoken of as the servant (נַעַר; LXX δοῦλος) of his father David (cf. 1 Kgs. i. 19).

⁶⁰ The Greek reads ἀνθρώπῳ βασιλεῖ (lit. a man, a king), an expression which is rendered by "certain" in the ARV only here and in xxii. 2. It is possible, but hardly probable, that ἀνθρωπος is here used to emphasize the fact that the king was a mere man and consequently as a protest against emperor-worship. In Jn. viii. 40 ἀνθρωπος obviously means merely "person"; and the same may be true of this passage. The words "and worshipped him" belong of course merely to the details of the picture and we have no right to assume that the act was approved by our Lord as worship, or on the contrary that being used by him it is to be inferred that nothing more than homage can have been intended.

⁶¹ It has been pointed out above that it was current in Egypt and Persia. We find evidence of it in Syria and Palestine in the Amarna period and also in the time of the Seleucids and later.

od's terrible death and the occasion of it as recorded in the book of Acts supply us with a good example of this debasing custom. Such being the case it is impossible to assert that *προσκυνεῖν* is used in this passage in a non-religious sense.⁶² It is possible, perhaps not improbable, that this is the case. But it is far from certain. And to use it as a proof-text to prove that the *proskynesis* may be offered to a "creature" as is done in the ARV margin is to make a definitely dogmatic use of this narrative; an unwarranted use, since philology and history alike prove that it might be an act of worship paid to the king regarded as a god by one to whom the distinction between creature and Creator, as we use the terms, was unknown or only vaguely appreciated.

In Rev. iii. 9 the reference is to the coming of the synagogue of Satan to worship (*προσκυνεῖν*) before the feet of the church at Philadelphia. Here also the non-religious use of the word seems at first to be more suitable under the circumstances. Certainly it is natural to suppose that this persecuted church might be rewarded by receiving the respectful and submissive homage of those who had persecuted her; and the broad usage of the LXX and the close relation between this passage and Isa. xlix. 23, lx. 14 should cause us to hesitate before rejecting this interpretation. Yet here too it must be admitted that this is not the only possible interpretation. The church at Philadelphia may here be occupying a representative or mediatorial capacity, and while the words "before thy feet" may, as Rev. xxii. 8 and several passages in the OT indicate, be equivalent to a simple accusative (i.e., "worship at thy feet" may be the same as "worship thee"), it is also possible that the verb is used here absolutely and hence of the worship of God: "and worship (God) at thy feet"; i.e., in the presence, and through the

⁶² On the other hand, Urwick's, comment on this passage, "But this is, obviously, no exception, inasmuch as it was the custom of orientals to approach and address the sovereign as a god" (p. 58), is rather stronger than is warranted. A Jew might readily think of David or Solomon as the "certain king." But it shows how impossible it is to deny that the word *may* here be used in the religious sense.

mediation, of the very church which they have persecuted and despised, these one time servants of Satan shall worship God (cf. Isa. xlv. 14, lxvi. 23). This interpretation would suit the context equally well; and the only objection to it would be that it would introduce into the expression "worship before the feet of" an element of ambiguity for which there is perhaps scarcely sufficient warrant in the Scriptures.⁶³ On this account it might be better to interpret the passage as referring to homage to be offered directly to the Church at Philadelphia and not of worship of God. But none the less it is by no means certain that the word is here used in the lower sense.⁶⁴ And the emphatic declarations of Rev. xix. 10 and xxii. 9, declarations recorded in the same book and penned by the same hand, would certainly seem to favor the view that "worship" here is a religious act.

Were *προσκυνεῖν* never used in the non-religious sense, it would be possible, and, in view of what has just been said, fairly easy to justify the interpretation of the word in both of the passages just considered as describing a religious act. But, although Acts x. 25 and Rev. xix. 10, xxii. 8 f. clearly point to an effort on the part of the apostles to restrict the usage of the word, and while a similar inference might be based on Matt. iv. 10, still the broader usage of the LXX makes it questionable whether in the NT we should insist on this narrow usage in every instance, and it might be better to admit that in these two passages and perhaps even more probably in Acts x. 25 the word is used in the non-religious sense.

⁶³ Heb. xi. 21 = Gen. xlvii. 32 is however a very close parallel, since as has been pointed out above (footnote 45) the verb is there most naturally to be understood as used absolutely of worship of God, (cf. also Ps. v. 7), a construction which is not infrequent in both the OT and NT.

⁶⁴ Urwick (p. 66) thinks of the church as a sanctuary and remarks, "Now, clearly, the divine presence which was to fill the sanctuary, and not the sanctuary itself, was the ground and object of the homage to be manifested toward it." This is perhaps a little fanciful; but the "representative view" is certainly a possible one.

Our conclusion may then be summarized as follows: First, in the majority of instances *προσκυνεῖν* is clearly used in the religious sense, of an act of worship offered to God or to a being regarded as God; secondly, there is not a single passage of which it can be affirmed with entire certainty that the religious implication is lacking from the word; thirdly, the two or three instances in which it is most probable that this is the case are passages where it is certain that the one to whom it was offered was not really entitled to receive it and where we cannot be sure that worship was really intended by the offerer; fourthly, in the cases which describe the act as offered to our Lord, it is clear that he claimed, and was entitled to receive, worship from men, and that he accepted without hesitation, an act which might and in some instances at least clearly did imply worship; hence while we cannot affirm that in all cases where it was offered to him, worship was intended, it is better, all things considered, more reverent and more fitting, to assume that it was worship than to assert that it was not.

B. IS "WORSHIP" THE CORRECT EQUIVALENT OF *προσκυνεῖν*?

Having examined briefly, but we hope adequately, the use of *προσκυνεῖν* in extra-biblical Greek, in the LXX, and in the New Testament, we must now consider the question of its proper English equivalent. In the AV New Testament it is uniformly⁶⁵ rendered "worship."⁶⁶ Against the suitability of this rendering it is alleged that "worship" is now used in a too restricted sense to be accepted as the true equivalent of *προσκυνεῖν*. Our attention is called to the fact that in English of the Elizabethan period, "worship" was a broad word which could be used both in the religious and the non-

⁶⁵ At Mt. xviii. 26 the margin reads "or, besought him"; at Luke iv. 7, "or, fall down before me."

⁶⁶ "Worship" in the AV and also in the RV renders *εὐσεβεῖν* (once); *σεβάζεσθαι* (once); *σέβεσθαι* (six times); *σέβασμα* (AV text, once, margin, once; RV text, twice). It also renders *λατρεύειν* (four times, in two instances changed to "serve" in RV); *θεραπεύειν*, (once; RV, "serve"); the noun *δόξα* (once; RV, "glory"); *θηρησκεία* (once); *νεοκόρος* (once; RV, "temple-keeper"). Cf. Schaff, *Companion*, p. 364.

religious sense. As examples of the latter usage such expressions as, "Your Worship," "Worshipful Sir," and the quaint saying in the old Anglican Marriage Service, "with my body I thee worship" are cited, and it is argued that "worship" is now used too exclusively⁶⁷ in the religious sense to be considered a proper translation of so ambiguous a word as *προσκυνεῖν*. Three centuries ago it was a proper rendering, because it was then just as ambiguous as *προσκυνεῖν*. But it is now too closely restricted to the expressing of the idea of religious adoration to permit of its employment here unless it be explained.

There is considerable truth in this view of the matter; but it is not the whole truth. It is correct to say that "worship" (*worship*) was in the days of the AV translators a broad and ambiguous word, which might have religious implication and might not. And it is undeniable that the non-religious use was more *correct* then than now. Thus, Thomas Wilson in his *Christian Dictionarie* (first edition, 1612) states that "worship" may denote "civil reverence" and cites Matt. ix. 18 as an example;⁶⁸ and also, "immoderate reverence toward the creature" as in the case of Cornelius and of John. And in the *Westminster Annotations* (1645) there are several NT passages which are similarly explained. It is questionable, however, whether this broad usage is recognized to any extent in the AV and whether the word as there employed is really an ambiguous term. We have seen that in the LXX the word *προσκυνεῖν* is clearly used both in a religious and in a non-religious sense. It is used, without distinction, of worship offered to God or to false gods, and of homage offered to men. How is it rendered in the AV? If "worship" as used by the AV transla-

⁶⁷ "Worship" and its derivatives are still used to some extent in England in official titles. And we still meet it frequently in the highly colored diction of poetry, romance, and social intercourse. It would be decidedly an overstatement to speak of this word as now exclusively used in the religious sense.

⁶⁸ Kitto (*Bible Illustrations*) apparently cites from the 3d edition of this work which appeared in 1622, the year of Wilson's death. I have only had access to the 8th edition (1678).

tors covered both these senses and hence was the full equivalent of *προσκυνεῖν*, we might have expected them to employ it in both of these senses in the OT as the uniform rendering of the one word *προσκυνεῖν*. But such is not the case. *Προσκυνεῖν* is rendered "worship" regularly⁶⁹ where the act is offered to God, usually where it is offered to false gods,⁷⁰ but never where it is offered to men as men.⁷¹ In the latter instances the AV renders by "bow," "bow down," "make (or, do) obeisance," etc. This difference in the rendering may of course be due in part to the preference which the AV translators frequently show for various renderings of the same word. But the fact that they used "worship" only in the religious sense is very significant. It shows that the signification of "worship" recognized in the OT, where the usage is plainest, was the one to which we are most accustomed today—the religious sense. It implies that in the New Testament "worship," which is the uniform rendering of *προσκυνεῖν*,⁷² was likewise used by the AV translators in the religious sense.⁷³ And as we have seen the data fur-

⁶⁹ 2 Kgs. xvii. 36 is an exception (*cp.* Gen. xlvii. 31; 1 Kgs. i. 47.) The fact that it is not so rendered in Gen. xviii. 2, xix. 1 implies that it is merely a salutation. In Ps. xlv. 11 and Isa. xlix. 7 the rendering "worship" probably indicates that the AV translators clearly recognized the Messianic reference of these passages.

⁷⁰ In 2 Kgs. v. 18 "bow(down)" is used of Naaman's act as a purely perfunctory one, devoid of worship.

⁷¹ In Dan. ii. 46 the rendering "worship" implies that Nebuchadnezzar, a polytheist, gave Daniel 'divine homage.' This view is highly probable in view of the command to offer sacrifice to Daniel which is spoken of in the immediate contact. It is worthy of note that the rendering "worship" is retained in the ARV. 1 Chron. xxix. 20 "and worshipped the LORD and the king" is of course a pregnant expression. Josh. v. 14 is clearly regarded as describing a theophany.

⁷² The AV translators had good warrant for confining themselves to the use of a single word in the translation of *προσκυνεῖν* in the NT. It is regularly rendered in the Peshitto NT by the single word *segedh*. (Rev. xiii. 4 is corrupt and the verb only occurs once in the Syriac text). At Jn. ix. 38 the Peshitto has, "he fell down (and) worshipped him." In the Vulgate the word is always *adoro* except in Mt. xviii. 26. There it is *orabat*. (Does *orabat* represent the corruption of an original *adorabat*?)

⁷³ The appointment of a special committee to oversee the work of the AV translators for the express purpose of removing such inconsisten-

nished by the NT itself support this view to no inconsiderable extent. For it is undeniable that in the NT "worship" is usually employed in the religious sense; and it is at least possible as we have seen that where it renders *προσκυνεῖν* it is always so used. The only certain example of its use in the lower sense is Lk. xiv. 10, where as the rendering of the noun *δόξα* it is, as Wilson points out, clearly used in the sense of "fame, glory, praise."

This implies that it is not so much the biblical usage which has changed in the course of the last three centuries, as the common usage. "Worship" in the AV apparently meant almost exactly what "worship" means in the RV. It was there used, at least in the vast majority of instances, in the religious sense and it is now used in the religious sense. It may of course be argued that the verb "worship" was uniformly employed in the NT because the AV translators knowing the difference of opinion among scholars regarding the use of *προσκυνεῖν* in the NT, allowed for, and in rendering another word definitely recognized, the wider meaning of "worship." This may be so. But if they were clear in their own minds that there were passages in the NT in which *προσκυνεῖν* merely implied "reverence" it would be natural to expect that they would in such instances have rendered it by another word, as is done in similar passages in the OT; and this for the reason that in the AV "worship" is so generally employed in the obviously religious sense.

It seems clear then that insofar as the usage has changed—by becoming more closely restricted to the religious sense—this is to be attributed to the influence of the AV. For whatever may be said of the difference between the

cities as were almost certain to be found in the work of six companies working at three different places (see, Schaff's *Companion*, p. 318, rules 4 and 15), would lead us to expect that in the case of a word of as frequent occurrence as *προσκυνεῖν* an inconsistency in rendering which was at all marked would have been detected and removed. The fact that in the AV of Isa. xlv. 14, xlix. 23, lx. 14 the rendering is "fall down," "bow themselves down," while in Rev. iii. 9 we have "worship"—the same applies to Gen. xlvii. 31 = Heb. xi. 21—is in view of what has been said above, hardly a proof of a broader usage in the NT.

popular use of the word "worship" in the 17th century and at present, the change has been toward the usage of the AV, not away from it, and this change, furthermore, has been due to the AV. For the prominence of the religious idea in the word "worship" as used in the AV could not fail to influence the readers of this version. Consequently, while it is true that as generally employed "worship" is now less closely equivalent to *προσκυνεῖν* than it was three centuries ago, it is also true that it now corresponds more closely to the sense in which it was employed in the AV than it did at the time when that version was prepared. And since the AV translators used this word preferably—perhaps all but exclusively—in a religious sense, we may well hesitate to base our objection to it on the ground that it is now so generally restricted to that sense.

II

THE MARGINAL COMMENT UPON THE WORD "WORSHIP" IN THE ARV

In the preceding discussion the effort has been not so much to show that there is abundant warrant for the claim that the word *προσκυνεῖν* is an ambiguous term—to do that is not difficult—but more especially to call attention to the nature of that ambiguity and to the extent to which it appears in the Bible and particularly in the NT. We have seen that it is a word which may mean relatively little or vastly much; that the act of prostration may imply religious adoration, or merely the respect or homage which might be properly offered to a human superior; that it may be offered to God, to idols, or to men; that it may be the expression of real emotion and that it may also be nothing more than an outward form, a perfunctory and perhaps an unwilling act. It has also been pointed out that while the word "worship" as used in the early 17th century, had both the broad and narrow meanings which are fundamental in the Greek word and which it still retains to some extent, the AV translators used it preferably in the narrow, i.e. religious sense—

a policy which determined the biblical usage of the word and of which the more restricted popular usage of today is probably the direct result.

As we take up now the question of the advisability or necessity of explaining the word "worship" by a marginal comment we will be concerned of course primarily with the comment standing in the margin of the ARV. But before considering this comment in particular it will be wise for us to consider first the question whether a comment is actually needed and what must be the nature of such a comment if it is to be really helpful or at least unobjectionable; and also to examine in some detail the policy of the revisers with reference to the addition of such comments with a view to ascertaining whether they pursued a consistent policy in this important matter. Then we will be ready to consider the objections to the comment which appears in the ARV. We will, therefore, consider the following three topics: the need of a comment and the comment, if any, needed; the policy of the revisers with regard to explanatory comments; and the objections to the comment in the ARV margin.

A. THE NEED OF A COMMENT.

Since the only valid reason for the adding of an explanatory comment to the word "worship" is to explain the ambiguity of this word or of the word which it renders, it is important that in considering the need of a comment we should keep constantly before us the exact nature of the ambiguity to be explained. This is, as has been indicated, of two kinds; it has to do with the act itself in the *intention* of the one performing it and with the *status* of the one to whom it is rendered. The *act* may be one of *worship* or of *homage*; the *recipient* may be a *creature* or the *Creator*. The question arises, Is it necessary to explain both of these characteristics?

In answering this question, we observe that the second of these distinctions, the fact that the object of the act may be the creature as well as the Creator, is one which is clearly indicated in the Bible; for it is one of the plainest declara-

tions of Scripture that, because of the fallen state of man, "worship" is not reserved as it should be for the Deity alone. Not merely does man worship demons and idols; he even worships his fellow-man and the brute creation. The OT is full of condemnation of, and warning against, the sin of worshipping any but God. And it is manifest that it was a sin to which the Israelites were peculiarly susceptible. It would seem then to be superfluous to point out that "worship" might as a matter of fact—not, of course, as a matter of right—be offered to the creature as well as to the Creator. Anyone who is at all familiar with the Bible ought to know this and should be able to draw the natural and necessary inference that the fact of worship being rendered to a person is not in itself any convincing or adequate proof of his right to receive it and hence of his deity. The OT speaks of *worship* of God and of idols and tells us that Nebuchadnezzar *worshipped* Daniel. The Epistle to the Romans speaks of the awful state of the heathen world in this particular and the Apostle frequently warns the Christian to beware of such practices. Certainly the *status* of the one receiving^o the *proskynesis* hardly needs special comment or emphasis in view of these facts.

It is somewhat different when we consider the question of the *significance* of the act and the *intention* of the one performing it. It might be argued that Matt. xviii. 26, and Rev. iii. 9 (perhaps also Acts x. 25)⁷⁴ make it sufficiently obvious that "worship" may be used in the lower and non-religious sense to render a comment unnecessary, so that we might content ourselves with adding at most a cross-reference to one or all of these passages. An objection to this lies in the fact that, as has been pointed out above, the word "worship" is in the OT so rigidly restricted to the rendering of *προσκυνεῖν* when used in the *religious* sense, that one unfamiliar with Greek and with the LXX usage would be far less likely to recognize and admit the possibility of the

⁷⁴ Lk. xiv. 10 cannot be cited, since in the ARV "glory" has been substituted for "worship."

word represented by "worship" in the NT being used in the non-religious sense than he would be were he acquainted with all the facts. Consequently there is considerable justice in the contention that the "plain man," the student of the English NT, should have his attention called to the fact, well known to the student of Greek, that the word under discussion may be used in a non-religious as well as in a religious sense. This is not only the chief and fundamental ambiguity of the word; it is also the one which the reader is less likely to think of.

If we admit that to explain the word "worship" would be a help to the reader—and we are prepared to do this, while at the same time unable to admit that it is necessary—the question as to the *form* of the margin and the method of *insertion* becomes at once of vital importance. As regards its form, this comment should concern itself chiefly if not exclusively with the fundamental ambiguity of the word explained—with the fact that the word may be used both in a religious and non-religious sense. And it should indicate this if possible by means of a *variant rendering*, e.g. "Gk. *to prostrate oneself*." This would be the simplest way to call attention to this ambiguity. This variant would direct attention to the act as fundamentally physical—an act of *prostration*—and would thus connect it with the same act so often referred to in the OT as indicative of homage or worship. If this were not regarded as adequate, the margin might receive the form: "The Greek word denotes an act of worship or homage." This would call attention to the main ambiguity and the word "homage" by pointing to the non-religious use of the word should make it superfluous to say anything about the *status* of the one to whom it is offered.

The problem of the *insertion* of such a note is not an easy one. "Worship" occurs about seventy-five times in the NT, being in sixty of these instances the rendering of *προσκυνῆν*. Since, in a large majority of these passages it is perfectly manifest that a religious act is described, it would seem to be

unnecessary and a useless cumbering of the margin to insert the comment or even to refer to it by a cross-reference at every occurrence of the word. On the other hand it should be clearly recognized that it is impossible to insert it at some passages and to omit it at others without incurring the risk of being misunderstood and of being charged with inconsistency and even with dogmatic bias. The fact that only about half of the instances where the word "worship" occurs in the NT are commented upon in the ARV implies that the passages in which the word is not explained do not have the same word in the original, but another word which is not ambiguous and which is used only in the religious sense; and the fact that the comment is omitted in all the passages in John which speak of "worship" of God and inserted in the one passage which speaks of "worship" of Christ looks very much like dogmatic bias. If the comment is not to be inserted every time—the need of economy of space would oppose this—the only way in which it can be consistently inserted would be to place it in the margin of the *first* occurrence of the word in the NT (as is done in the case of "Gentiles," Matt. iv. 17)—if it be considered especially important that it be not overlooked, it might be repeated at the first occurrence in every book of the NT in which the word is found—with the words "*and so elsewhere,*" or, "*etc.*" added. And it might be still better to leave it out of the margin altogether and simply place it in the Preface.⁷⁵

B. THE POLICY OF THE ARV WITH REFERENCE TO EXPLANATORY COMMENTS.

Since it is but a commonplace to say that the ambiguity and non-equivalence of words and phrases is the *crux interpretum*, the thing above all others which makes the perfect translation a *pium desideratum*, and since there are obviously many other ambiguous words in the NT besides προσκυνεῖν,

⁷⁵ The ARV discusses a number of difficult words in the "Preface." And in the "Corrected English NT" (1905) the ARV margin (*not* in the form given at Jn. ix. 38) is referred to with approval in the Preface, but no comment appears in the margin.

the question we have been considering, viz. the advisability of adding a comment to the word "worship" cannot be divorced from the larger question as to the propriety of admitting any marginal comments, which cannot be strictly classed as variant readings or renderings. The AV and RV adopted the policy of admitting such comments. We are not concerned at present with the correctness of the decision, but the manner in which it was applied is a matter which is of vital importance. Did they pursue a consistent policy in the matter?

It has been already pointed out that the rule, "No marginal notes at all to be affixed but only for the explanation of the Hebrew and Greek words, which cannot without some circumlocution so fitly and briefly be expressed in the text" was broadly interpreted by the AV translators and also by the English and American revisers. Both in the AV and the RV the marginal comments are in the main *variant readings* or *variant renderings*. The variant rendering may be merely a literal rendering; it may be one intended to bring out a shade of meaning wanting in the rendering given in the text; it may even give a widely different though still possible rendering. Such being the case it would have been natural to expect that the marginal comment to this word would have the form "Gk. *to prostrate oneself.*" Such a variant rendering as intimated above would call attention to the primary significance of the word—to the fact that it designated an external, a physical act. It would also suggest the broader meaning of the word and connect it with the Oriental prostrations frequently referred to in the OT. And if consistently employed, it could hardly be regarded as objectionable, unless the policy of the AV and RV with regard to variant renderings is to be rejected *in toto*. It might of course be regarded as unnecessary and attention might be directed to the fact there are other words which have no variant.⁷⁶ But the policy of the revisers with regard

⁷⁶ Thus we have seen that it is only in Mt. xviii. 23 and xxii. 2 that "certain" is the rendering of *ἀνθρῶπος*, in the expression "certain king,"

to variant renderings is in the main sufficiently clear and consistent to justify such a variant rendering if they desired to insert it.

On the other hand the group of *explanatory* comments is quite a small one. There are comparatively few words whose meaning or usage is *explained*. Most of these are names of coins, titles of officers or officials, etc., comments which are of a purely objective character and might be classed as definitions, and it is obvious that this group should, if admitted at all, be kept as small as possible.⁷⁷

The general policy followed by the revisers in the matter of marginal explanations to the text can best be illustrated and ascertained by citing a few instances of other words which present very much the same difficulties to the translator as does the word *προσκυνεῖν*.

Κύριος.—One of the best examples in point is the word *κύριος*. This word is found more than 700 times in the NT⁷⁸ and is at least a dozen times as frequent in the LXX. It is perhaps the one word of which *προσκυνεῖν* can most appropriately be called the correlative. Except that this title is apparently not given to false gods, the two words are equally broad and ambiguous in meaning.⁷⁹ Any being who may be called *κύριος* may properly receive the homage of prostration. The title is applied to God, to the Messiah, to Jesus, to earthly kings, rulers, masters, husbands; in short to anyone whose position entitles him to worship or respect. In the English NT when applied to God, to our Lord, or to the Holy Spirit, it is written "Lord," but when applied to men

and that in the former passage it has an important bearing upon the interpretation. Yet there is no variant (literal) rendering added in the margin. Similarly in John xvi. 21 "man" is *ἄνθρωπος* (human being) not *ἄνθρω*. Yet there is no comment.

⁷⁷ This is apparently the reason that *e.g.* "publican" and "wine-skins" receive comments, but "centurion," "pentecost" and "synagogue" do not.

⁷⁸ It is about a dozen times rendered "master" and less frequently "sir," "lord" appearing a few times in the margin.

⁷⁹ Adenay, *Hasting's Dictionary*, art. "Worship" speaks of the "two senses" in which the Greek word *proskunein* is used, and of the "ambiguous usage" of the title *kurios*.

(except when the word stands in the vocative, cf. e.g. Matt. xxv) it is written "lord," a distinction which, from the standpoint of the revisers' comment on "worship," with its insistence on the distinction between creature and Creator, is far from adequate. The title "Lord" as given to Jesus might and sometimes does imply recognition of his Deity. Yet the revisers have nowhere added a comment to remind us that *κύριος* is a title which may be given alike to the creature or to the Creator, despite the fact that in this country, "Lord" is a title which is practically reserved for the Deity.^{79a}

OTHER WORDS FOR "WORSHIP." It has been pointed out that although *προσκυνεῖν* is the word in the NT most frequently rendered "worship," it is not the only word so rendered. Let us glance at these other words. Several compounds of the root ΣΕΒ occur in the NT. *Σέβεισθαι* is used of worship of God and also of worship of an idol. *Σεβάζεισθαι* is used of worship paid to the creature, instead of to the Creator. *Ἐνσεβειν* is used of worshipping an idol, and also of caring for one's family. *Σεβαστός* is a title given to the Roman emperors; it also appears in the NT in the form *Σεβαστή*, as the name of a Roman legion. *Σέβασμα* denotes an object of worship. *Σέμνος* and *σεμνότης* are used of qualities or conduct proper and appropriate to men (Phil. iv. 8 is perhaps an exception). *Ἄσεβής*, "godless" is perhaps more correctly "impious" or "wicked" in view of the fact that in the LXX it renders *עַשָׂר*; it does not necessarily involve the religious notion. In fact, there is not one of the derivatives of this root occurring in the NT except *θεοσεβής* (and here it is the *θεο-* that determines the usage) which cannot be used in both the religious and

^{79a} How difficult is the task of deciding whether a comment is needed—assuming that, as in the case of the ARV, marginal comments are to be admitted—is shown by even a cursory consultation of Cruden's *Concordance*, a book which has passed through unnumbered editions and is still one of the most widely used 'Bible-helps.' In Cruden "worship" receives no explanation, but "lord" is explained under two heads and ten subheads.

the non-religious sense. Yet not one of them is explained by a marginal comment. There are several other words which present about the same general ambiguity.⁸⁰ Yet in none of them is the ambiguity of the word indicated. The only word other than *προσκυνεῖν* in the case of which this ambiguity is explained is *θρησκεία* (Col. ii. 18) and we are strongly inclined to question the correctness of the view that it ever means anything else than *worship*.

Other examples of words which by virtue of their meaning and usage are ambiguous might easily be cited.^{80a} But these will suffice to establish our contention that it is not the policy of the ARV to explain words which are ambiguous in the sense that they may contain a religious notion and may not. The question may, then, naturally be asked, Why did the American revisers make this one noteworthy exception? This question we will seek to answer more fully later on. It will suffice at present to call attention to the fact that none of these unexplained words which are rendered "worship" are ever used of our Lord prior to his resurrection.

Looked at from a broad and general standpoint it may be said that, aside altogether from doctrinal questions, there are two serious objections to the addition of marginal comments. It is difficult and almost impossible to be consistent in the matter; and to single out this or that word for comment and leave others unexplained is open to misunderstanding. Besides this it is scarcely less difficult to

⁸⁰ *Λατρεύειν*, usually rendered by the colorless "serve" is in two places (Lk. ii. 37; Phil. iii. 3) rendered "worship," and *λατρεία*, "service" is in Heb. ix. 1 rendered "divine service"; while in Rom. xii. 1 the margin reads "worship."—*Λειτουργεῖν*, *λειτουργία*, *λειτουργός* are used both of ministering to God and to man.—*Δοξάζειν*, "to glorify" is generally used of glorifying God or Christ, less frequently of glorifying men (*e.g.* Rom. viii. 30).—Yet no marginal note calls attention to the difference in usage.

^{80a} An especially good example is the word "fear." It is a word which gravitates between abhorrence and love, between craven terror and reverent and adoring worship. Certainly if the policy of the revisers were to be consistently applied, 1 Pet. ii. 17, Eph. v. 33 and 1 Jn. iv. 18 suffice to prove that this word is sufficiently ambiguous to require explanation. Cruden gives about one third of a column to it.

make the comment both adequate and unobjectionable, without unduly cumbering the margin.

A good illustration of this difficulty is furnished by the comment on certain verses in John xxi which tells us that "*Love* in these places represents two different Greek words." This is a perfectly correct statement of fact. But there are these two serious objections to it: First, it is utterly inadequate. It does not state what the two words are, which are referred to, or what is the difference in meaning or in usage between them. As it stands the note is almost meaningless. Secondly, it is misleading because it is exceptional. A man unfamiliar with the facts might readily infer that everywhere else in the NT "love" is represented by a single word. This is of course not the case. *Φιλῆν* occurs about 25 times (rendered three times by "kiss") and *ἀγαπᾶν* about five times as frequently. And it is not even the case that this is the only passage in which these two verbs occur in the same immediate context. We find a striking example of the same phenomenon in John xi, where *φιλεῖν* occurs in v. 3 and *ἀγαπᾶν* in v. 5; similarly in John xv the one verb is used once, the other 5 times; and in Rev. iii. each of the verbs is used once. The same is true of many other words.⁸¹

⁸¹ In Lk. i. we have *three* different words rendered by "blessed," *εὐλογημένος* (v. 42), *μακάριος* (v. 45), *εὐλογητός* (v. 68).—In Lk. vii. 42, 43, "forgive" is *χαρίζεσθαι* (in v. 21 it is rendered "bestow"), a word not elsewhere used in the Gospels, but found in Acts and the Pauline Epistles. It is a much stronger word than *ἀφίημι* (the word usually rendered "forgive") which is used in vs. 47, 48 of the same chapter.—*Καινός* and *νέος* "new," both occur in Mt. ix. 17 (*cf.* || *pass.* in Mk. and Lk.); and in the expression "new (man)" (Eph. ii. 15, iv. 24 and Col. iii. 10) the adjective is *καινός* in Eph. and *νέος* in Col.—In Jn. xix. 35 and 1 Jn. ii. 8, "true" appears twice in each verse, but is in each represented by two Greek words *ἀληθής* and *ἀληθινός*.—In 1 John, "life" is the rendering of three different words. *Ψυχὴ* and *βίος* occur but twice each (in iii. 17, *βίος* is rendered by "the world's goods"); *ζωή* occurs twelve times. In iii. 14, 15 it is *ζωή*; in iii. 16 it is *ψυχὴ* (twice); in ii. 16 it is *βίος*, in ii. 25 *ζωή*. But there is no comment in the margin of 1 Jn. In view of this fact the comment at Jn. xii. 25 "*life* in these places represents two different Greek words" is incomprehensible. Like the similar one in John xxi, it means little or

Examples such as these serve to show that in a Bible intended for general use it would be wise to omit all such comments. Certainly to comment on one passage and leave similar passages without explanation; to expound one word and pass over other words of the same character is inconsistent and is likely to lead to misapprehension by giving the version the appearance of a minute scholarly exactness and thoroughness, which in the very nature of the case—the ARV is not a commentary—is out of the question. To avoid inconsistency in the insertion and omission of comments; to make the comments adequate and comprehensible without unduly cumbering the margin or usurping the legitimate function of grammar, lexicon, and commentary; and to avoid the intruding of personal preference and dogmatic bias—this is a task the difficulty of which can hardly be exaggerated; and the fact that the ARV which is in many respects so scholarly and highly commendable a version should show such manifest failure to accomplish it,⁸² goes a long way toward vindicating the wisdom of the decision long ago reached by the American, and by the British and Foreign, Bible Societies that they would circulate the Bible “without note or comment.”

nothing to the English reader. And to insert it at John xii. 25 alone is most inconsistent in view of the data just given regarding 1 John and the further fact that in Jn. x. 10, 11 the same two words (ζωή and ψυχή) occur as in xii. 25, the only difference being that they are not in the same verse.

⁸² The comment, “The Greek word here used signifies both *covenant* and *testament*” which is inserted in the margin of Heb. ix. 15 f., is plainly intended to explain why *διαθήκη* is rendered “covenant” in vs. 15 and 20, but “testament” in vs. 16 and 17. But the expression “here used” certainly suggests and implies that a different word is used here than in the thirty other cases where “covenant” occurs in the NT, about half of which are in Hebrews, and this is of course not the case.—The mention of the fact that in 2 Tim. ii. 26 “In the Greek the two pronouns are different” may lead to misapprehension. The use of *ἐκείνος* after *αὐτός* may denote a change of subject (it would be very natural to infer that the note was intended to point this out); yet in Thayer’s *Lexicon* this very text is cited as a case where the subject remains the same.

C. THE COMMENT OF THE REVISERS ON "WORSHIP."

In discussing the comment upon the word "worship," which is inserted in the margin of the ARV, there are two points to be considered: the comment itself and the manner of its insertion. We will take them up in inverse order.

a) The Manner of Insertion. In the "Appendix" to the ERV the comment is stated as follows: "At the word 'worship' in Matt. ii. 2, etc., add the marginal note 'The Greek word denotes an act of reverence, whether paid to man (see chap. xviii. 26) or to God (see chap. iv. 10)'.⁸³" The "etc." would seem to imply that the revisers intended the comment to apply equally to all passages in which the word "worship" occurs in the NT and either to be inserted, referred to by cross-reference, or omitted, in all subsequent passages alike.

In the ARV we do not find any such consistent policy as is indicated in the "Appendix" carried into effect. Apparently no rule has been strictly followed in the insertion or omission of the note. It is added to only one word besides *προσκυνεῖν*—*θρησκεία*—and only once to it,⁸³ although, as we have seen, there are five other words which are sometimes so rendered in the NT and equally deserving of the comment. In the case of *προσκυνεῖν*, it is not inserted or referred to by a cross-reference at every occurrence of the word; it is not confined to the first occurrence of this word in the NT or in the individual books; it is not restricted to the passages where it might be most naturally regarded as really required by the context. Instead we find it in thirty-four of the sixty passages in which "worship" is the rendering of *προσκυνεῖν*. Thus, it is appended to four passages in Rev.,⁸⁴ which speak of true worship as plainly as do any passages in the entire Bible; yet it is omitted in all the other NT passages (16 in all, 5 of which are in Rev.⁸⁵), in which worship

⁸³ *θρησκεία* is only once (Col. ii. 18) rendered "worship." In three other passages it is translated "religion." *θρησκός* (religious) appears only once.

⁸⁴ Rev. v. 14, xiv. 7, xv. 4, xix. 10 (end).

⁸⁵ Rev. iv. 10, vii. 11, xi. 1, 16, xix. 4.

of God is referred to. On the other hand we find it inserted or referred to in every instance which relates to worship of false gods (the devil, the beast, etc.), except Acts vii. 43. It appears at all the other passages in the NT except Matt. ii. 11 (perhaps an oversight) and Heb. i. 6.

This system or rather lack of system as regards the inserting or omission of the comment is decidedly unfortunate, especially in view of the fact that "worship" renders several words in the Greek. When the reader finds "worship," when used of adoration offered to God, five times in Rev. without the note and four times with it, he is entitled to infer that at least two different Greek words occur in this book. If he knows Greek, he will be all the more likely to infer this.⁸⁶ But the only word used for "worship" in Rev. is *προσκυνεῖν*. He is also entitled to infer that the word which is not annotated is a stronger because unambiguous word than the one which is commented upon. But this is not true of any of these other words and as a matter of fact the word without comment is a little more likely than not to be *προσκυνεῖν*, since it has no note twenty-six times, while the other words are rendered by "worship" only a dozen times in all. The fact that when used of the worship of the devil and the beast, "worship" is almost always annotated, might lead him to think that a lower form of worship, something less than worship, is involved in these latter instances. Such an inference would be false and unwarranted. The Greek uses the same word in nearly all passages⁸⁷ and the Bible clearly teaches that it is because it involves the giving to the creature of that glory and honor which is due to the Creator alone,

⁸⁶ The fact that in Acts xvi. 14, xviii. 7, 13, xix. 27 where "worship" receives no comment the word in the Greek is *σέβεσθαι* would naturally lead one to expect that in vii. 43 the same word is to be found, but there it is *προσκυνεῖν*. And one who knew that in these four places in Acts the verb is *σέβεσθαι* might suppose that in the five passages in Rev., which have no comment, it is *σέβεσθαι*, but no, it is *προσκυνεῖν*. This shows that the comment is as confusing and misleading to the man who knows Greek as to the one who does not.

⁸⁷ *Σέβεσθαι* is rare in both NT and OT and can hardly be said to be stronger than *προσκυνεῖν*; and certainly *λατρεύειν* is not).

that the sin of idolatry is so peculiarly heinous a sin. And the fact that the note is sometimes added to passages which describe the worship of God simply adds to the confusion. If added in some of the passages which refer to worship of God, consistency demands that it should appear in all. If omitted where the worship of God is mentioned, it should also be omitted where worship of false gods is spoken of. If omitted where worship of God or of false gods is referred to, it cannot be inserted where worship of the Lord is described, without involving or implying dogmatic bias and unjust discrimination. And to insert it at Matt. xviii. 26 and Rev. iii. 9 (perhaps also at Acts x. 25 and Rev. xix. 10, xxii. 8) alone, although hardly open to objection on dogmatic grounds, would unless carefully guarded be misleading and imply that different words are used in these passages. Such a comment must either be inserted every time or else inserted in such a way that it cannot fail to be understood as referring equally to every occurrence of the word, or it will inevitably lead to misconstruction and error.

b) The Comment Itself. In the Appendix to the ERV it reads as follows: "At the word 'worship' in Matt. ii. 2, etc., add the marginal note 'The Greek word denotes an act of reverence, whether paid to man (see chap. xviii. 26) or to God (see chap. iv. 10).'" In the ARV, at Mt. ii. 2, it reads, "The Greek word denotes an act of reverence whether paid to a creature (see ch. 4.9; 18. 26) or to the Creator (see ch. iv. 10)". This may be regarded as the standard form of the comment in the ARV margin. It is to be noticed, however, that it occurs both with and without the parentheses. The form with the parentheses (as it appears at Mt. ii. 2) is referred to by cross-reference 10 times in Matt. (all except ii. 11 and iv. 10). And the same proof-texts are given in Mk. v. 6, and referred to at Mk. xv. 25. The form without parentheses is found in Lk. iv. 7 (where Matt. ii. 2 is referred to by cross-reference), Act. x. 25 and Rev. iii. 9 and is referred to by cross-reference in Lk. xxiv. 52 and 17 times in Rev., i.e., in more than half of the anno-

tated passages. The only other form of the comment is that found at Jn. ix. 38, which substitutes for the proof-texts appearing after the word "creature" the words "as here." There are no cross-references to this form of the comment.

Let us look first at the statement itself and then at the parentheses or proof-texts.

1) The *Form* of the Comment. It is obvious that the substitution of the word "creature" for "man" avoids a very noticeable defect in the form of statement contained in the "Appendix." "Man" and "Creator" are mutually exclusive, it is true, but they are not all inclusive categories. The devil and the beast are certainly not men; but they are creatures. The categories "creature" and "Creator" are mutually exclusive and taken together are all inclusive; and the former is obviously the proper correlative of the latter. The only objection which can be made to this part of the explanation as corrected is that it has to do solely with, and in view of its antithetic form lays especial emphasis upon, the *status* of the one to whom the act is rendered, not upon the act itself, although as we have argued the latter is the more important and less obvious feature.

The other significant word is "reverence." It is the only word which bears upon the character of the act in itself, upon the fact that *προσκυνεῖν* may denote either an act of respect or of worship. So considered, it can hardly be regarded as satisfactory. There are several objections to it. The first is that the word itself is one which does not occur with sufficient frequency in the Bible to be appropriate. In the AV it only occurs about a dozen times and is apparently no more frequently used in the ARV. A comment of this kind should be expressed in as nearly biblical phraseology as possible.⁸⁸ The second is that the word "rever-

⁸⁸ The problem of phraseology came up in connection with the 'running headlines.' And in the Preface to the ARV New Testament, we read: "In preparing them it has been the constant aim to avoid as far as possible all pre-commitments, whether doctrinal or exegetical; and with this object in view, the forms of statement employed have been drawn in the main from the Biblical text." What applies to the running headlines, applies no less to the marginal notes.

ence," while admittedly an ambiguous word, only hints at the ambiguity of *προσκυνεῖν*, but cannot be said to indicate it clearly. And it is perhaps fair to say that it does more justice to the non-religious than to the religious meaning of the word which it explains. "Reverence" is in the ARV certainly more nearly a synonym of "respect" or "honor" than it is of "worship."⁸⁹

It is clear that the comment itself is so worded as to centre the attention rather upon the *status* of the recipient of the act than upon the character of the act itself, upon the secondary rather than upon the primary ambiguity of the word. This characteristic is still further accentuated by the proof-texts.

2) The Proof-Texts. The proof-texts cited or referred to in all but one instance (Jn. ix. 38) are these: Matt. iv. 9, xviii. 26, cited as instances of the act as paid to a creature, and Matt. iv. 10, of the act as paid to the Creator. We have already examined these passages in another connection. It is only necessary to point out that they emphasize the importance of the status of the recipient of the act in a way which is likely to lead to misapprehension. Thus the fact that in citing the Temptation narrative (Matt. iv), verse 9 is referred to as an example of reverence paid to a creature and verse 10 as an example of the same act paid to the Creator, would seem to imply that worship does not mean the same in both verses; that Satan did not ask for worship—being a creature he would not be entitled to that—but only for a certain amount of recognition. This would read into the narrative a subtle distinction which is, as has been indicated above, at least questionable and we believe decidedly improbable. For the reply of the Lord makes it very plain that Satan was asking for worship; i.e., that he was

⁸⁹ In Esther iii. 2, 5; Mt. xxi. 37; Mk. xii. 6; Lk. xx. 13; Heb. xii. 9, it is used of respect to a human being. In Lev. xix. 30, xxvi. 2 it is used of respecting the "sanctuary." Only in Ps. cxi. 9 and Heb. xii. 28 (*cf.* Ps. xlv. 11) is it used apparently of the proper attitude to be assumed by the devout toward God and not even in these passages is worship clearly implied.

asking to be treated as one entitled to receive divine honors from the Lord. And it seems obvious to us that to cite a passage in which Satan was apparently demanding for himself the recognition of his claim to 'equality with God' as an example of 'reverence offered to a creature' is decidedly out of place and misleading.

The same is perhaps true of Matt. xviii. 26, with reference to which it has already been pointed out that we cannot infer with certainty from the fact that the "certain king" was in all probability a man, that he would not expect or demand that he be worshipped as a god.

In neither of these passages is the actual status of the one to whom the act is rendered or by whom it is demanded a matter of prime importance, and for the reason that it cannot determine for us the character of the act. In both of these passages it may have been and in the first of them it probably was an act of worship which was referred to. And as has already been pointed out, the fact that the devil is accustomed to receive worship from his devotees is one which is so clearly taught in the NT, especially in Rev., that it certainly should not need to have special attention directed to it.

Matt. iv. 10 refers of course to worship of the Creator. But even this example does not quite fill the requirement as a proof-test. For the fact of its being ostensibly offered to God would not prove the prostration in every instance to be an act of true worship. Like Naaman's worship in the temple of Rimmon the act might be perfunctory and less than worship, just as in Matt. xviii. 26, the act might be worship though offered to a mere mortal.

III

THE COMMENT ON JOHN IX. 38.

We pass now to the third form of the note, that given in explanation of Jn. ix. 38, the one verse in John in which the revisers regarded "worship" as standing in need of marginal comment. The verse forms the climax of Jesus' interview with the man born blind: "And he said, Lord, I

believe, and he worshipped Him." There the note has the following form: "The Greek word denotes an act of reverence, whether paid to a creature (as here) or to the Creator (see ch. 4. 20)." Not only is this the only one of the twelve passages in John which is commented on, but this form of the comment occurs in the NT only here. Of all the forms of the note this is the most noteworthy for the reason that the objections which bear against it are the most serious.

We observe then, first of all, that this note is of an *undeniably dogmatic* character. It has been pointed out that the comment and its proof-texts emphasize the *status* of the one worshipped, instead of the *nature* of the act, and that they do this in a way which suggests a dogmatic rather than a philological and historical explanation. Here this is carried to an extreme.

This comment is a clear cut and positive assertion that the one to whom the blind man offered the *proskynesis* was a creature. The parenthesis, "as here," affirms this of Jesus in exactly the same way that the proof-texts which appear in the usual form of the first parenthesis are made to assert it of the "certain king" and of the devil. This is the only possible meaning which can be gathered from the words "as here," which follow immediately on the word "creature" in the statement: "The Greek word denotes an act of reverence, whether paid to a creature (as here), or to the Creator (see ch. 4. 10)." And it is all the more necessary to draw this inference because it is as we have seen the actual, not the putative, status of the recipient which is especially emphasized in these other proof-texts. An emphatic denial of the deity of Christ could hardly be more concisely and positively stated than by the insertion of the two words contained in this parenthesis. The 'text' states that the *proskynesis* was paid to Jesus; the 'margin' states that the person to whom it was paid was a creature and sets him in sharp contrast to the Creator. The inference is unavoidable that Jesus is here affirmed to be a

creature. That such a comment has no place in a version of the New Testament intended for the use of evangelical Christians, is too obvious to need any proof. It would be acceptable to Jews. It expresses the belief of Ebionites, Gnostics, Arians, Socinians and Unitarians, who at different times in the history of the Church have assailed the deity of Christ. But the Church has always opposed such a view and has at times endured the bitterest persecution on this account. The doctrine of the consubstantiality of the Son with the Father, that he was begotten and not created, very God of very God, One with the Father in all the attributes of deity, has been and is today the belief of the Christian Church. And it is this that is definitely denied in the note under discussion.

It will be objected that this is too strict a construction of the words, "as here," that they are not intended to state things as they are, but rather to indicate the (probable) mental attitude of the man born blind in offering the prostration to Jesus. Dr. Riddle has definitely stated that this was the case, that the revisers merely intended to indicate what they believed to be the standpoint (as described by the Evangelist) of the man who had received his sight, and not to imply that his attitude was a correct one.⁹⁰

This explanation cannot be regarded as satisfactory, and chiefly for two reasons. First, whatever may have been the intention of the revisers in the matter, the statement itself can have only one meaning. It purports to tell us who the person *was* whom the blind man worshipped, not whom the blind man *supposed* him to be. There are no quotation marks or other indications to show the reader that this note is intended to express the view of the blind man and not that of the revisers, or rather that it was meant to express the revisers' opinion regarding the intention of the blind man and not their opinion regarding the person of the Lord. And the analogy of the proof-texts already discussed inclines us to regard this as a dogmatic, rather than a purely philo-

⁹⁰ Cf. p. 304 f. where Dr. Riddle's statement is given in full.

logical or historical, explanation. Yet a distinction such as this, slight as it may seem to be, makes of necessity a tremendous difference. When the rulers of the Jews said to Pilate: "Write not, the King of the Jews; but, that he said, I am King of the Jews," they were practically asking no more than that the title, King of the Jews, be put in quotation marks that it might be clearly understood as expressing the claim of Jesus, instead of being baldly stated as a fact. Only a slight change was suggested; but the implications of that change were vastly significant. They might have said: "What difference does it make? It is only intended to state his audacious claim. There is no real truth in it" But they were not content with this. They demanded that it be changed, because on its face it clearly maintained what they emphatically denied, that Jesus was in reality King of the Jews. And the same applies here. These words are a positive affirmation that the one who claimed in this very context to be the Messiah, the Son of God, was a creature. Language could hardly affirm it more plainly. We are told that it merely represents the opinion of the blind man. But it does not say so; there is nothing to indicate that such is the case; and the analogy of the other proof-texts is strongly against this construction of it. As it stands it is an offence to every true Christian, because it is a clear denial of the deity of his Lord.

Secondly, if it was the revisers intention merely to describe the state of mind of this man, as Dr. Riddle assures us was the case, we are confronted with the question, Why were the revisers so concerned to inform us that the blind man saw in Jesus only a creature? Why were they not content with the usual form of the comment? Any statement which they could make would be at the best nothing more than an opinion. They could not possibly know what this man, who had been granted this peculiarly unique experience of the power of Jesus to heal, thought about his Healer. They could not possibly know that he saw in him "a creature." Their statement even if taken as representing the

opinion of the healed man is unparalleled; they have made no effort to sound the mental processes and test the spiritual insight of any of the other confessors of Jesus, e.g. of Peter at Caesarea Philippi, or Thomas in the Upper Room. It leads us to ask whether the narrative itself or the consensus of scholarship—to use a popular, but much overworked phrase—either warrants or requires such a comment.

A. THE TESTIMONY OF THE NARRATIVE.

Does the NT narrative indicate that the blind man saw in Jesus a man, a creature? The narrative tells us that in the course of his controversy with the Pharisees and as a result of it, this man who had received his sight reached the conclusion and stated it publicly, that Jesus was a “prophet,” and that his exercise of power proved him to be “from God.” For this bold defiance of the authoritative explanation—“we know that this man is a sinner”—he was “cast out.” And this verdict taken in connection with the reason given for the reticence of his parents—the threat that anyone who should confess Jesus to be Christ should be put out of the synagogue—may be regarded as implying that his confession came within the terms of this threat; it may also be thought of as merely a punishment for his obstancy and presumption. The record then tells us that Jesus found him subsequently and asked him definitely whether he believed on the Son of God,⁹¹ and that when Jesus, in answer to a further question of the blind man, declared that he himself was that one to whom he had just referred, the blind man “worshipped” him. Then Jesus in pointed language contrasted the unbelief of the rulers with the faith of the

⁹¹ The reading “Son of man” is preferred by Tischendorf and by Westcott and Hort, and has been accepted by many scholars—von Soden, however, prefers the other reading. The question of the reading is not of very great importance, since “Son of man” is a Messianic title, used by our Lord himself as equivalent to the title “Son of God” (cp. especially Mt. xxvi. 63 ff). Zahn thinks that “Son of God” can easily be accounted for as an early substitute for “Son of man,” “because the combination *πιστεύειν εἰς* occurs nowhere else in the entire NT with this self-designation of Jesus.”

ignorant man. It is evident that unless as a result of this second meeting the blind man came to see in Jesus one who was much more than a prophet, the interview cannot be said to have added much, if at all, to his spiritual insight or to his knowledge of Jesus. It is also evident that the greater the faith, the clearer the spiritual vision, of this man, the more manifest would be the contrast to which Jesus alluded between his sight and their blindness. They had said, "As for this man (τοῦτον), we know not whence he is"; the blind man accepted Jesus' claim to be the "Son of God" and "worshipped" him. Thus the narrative clearly favors the interpretation of "worshipped" as a religious act. And this is confirmed by the fact—often referred to by the commentators; and recognized by the revisers, who add the comment nowhere else in this Gospel—that in John *προσκυνεῖν* is regularly used in the religious sense. And it should be remembered that it is John the Apostle, the author of the Gospel, who describes this act as a *proskynesis*.⁹²

The marginal note seems therefore very doubtful even when considered, not as what it is, but as what Dr. Riddle tells us it was intended to be, a statement of the mental attitude and intent of the blind man. Not merely is there no evidence in the narrative to show that this man regarded the Lord to be a creature. There is good ground for maintaining that with Thomas he was able to say to him, my Lord and my God. That such is the obvious implication of the narrative is shown by the fact that from early times the blind man's word and act have been held up as typical of a true Christian confession. And even if this were, not demonstrably the case, would it not be better, more reverent, more truly Christian, to attribute to the blind man a true conception of Christ rather than to assert positively that he had a false one?

⁹² If it were certain that Rev. was written before the Gospel, Rev. xix. 10 and xxii. 8 f. would argue strongly for the religious interpretation. The Gospel is however usually regarded as the earlier. But aside from this the view that in the Gospel, John regularly used the word in this sense is very generally accepted.

B. THE VIEWS OF COMMENTATORS AND THEOLOGIANS.

We turn now to consider the opinions regarding this passage which have been expressed by Christian scholars. It might naturally be inferred from the explanation of the comment on John ix. 38 given by Dr. Riddle that the majority of biblical scholars or at least those best qualified to express an opinion are agreed that the blind man saw in our Lord a creature, a created being, and rendered to him an act of homage and not of worship. This is emphatically not the case. On the contrary the view that this man accepted without question Jesus' statement and worshipped him as the divine Messiah has always been the prevailing one in the Church. It will not of course be possible to give, and it is unnecessary to attempt, anything like an exhaustive review of the history of opinion. But the following brief survey should suffice to convince the reader that the high view of the passage has been and is the one most generally accepted.

We find it clearly advocated in the Early Church. It is set forth by Augustine and Cyril of Alexandria in their Commentaries and by Chrysostom in his Homily.⁹³ The use made of this or similar passages shows clearly that it was also the view of Tertullian, and Jerome; Origen and Athanasius.⁹⁴ The view of Augustine has been especially frequently quoted.

⁹³ Since the authorities quoted in the following survey are in the main commentators whose opinions can easily be ascertained by turning to their exposition of this passage, the reference is in most instances omitted. Only in those cases in which the statement of opinion is not easily verifiable is its source given.

⁹⁴ Tertullian argues that Jesus revealed himself to the blindman as that Son whom he had announced to him as the right object of faith (*quem credendum esse dixerat*). Cf. Adv. Praxean, xxii (Ante-Nicene Christian Library, Vol. XV)—Jerome in his *Comment. on Ezekiel* (Migne, XXV. p. 87) assert that the heretics who declare the Son of God to be a creature and yet worship (*adoro*) him, by their own confession worship a creature, but that the Christians worship the Son of righteousness. This certainly implies that his rendering of John ix. 38 *At ille ait: credo, Domine. Et proci dens adoravit eum*, should be taken as indicating that he saw in the words and act of the blindman a recognition of the deity of Christ.—It is unfortunate that the section

In the Mediaeval Period we find it in the Commentaries of Bede (who follows Augustine, but does not mention him), Alcuin (who apparently follows both Augustine and Bede; but mentions only the former), Walafrid Strabo, Theophylact, Bruno, Rupert of Dietz, Thomas Aquinas (in his *Cate-na Aurea*, he quotes both Bede and Chrysostom), Cardinal Hugo and Nicholas de Lyra.⁹⁵

In the Reformation and Post-Reformation period, we find it held by Aretius, Brentius, Faber Stapulensis, Flacius Illyricus, Marloratus and Piscator and apparently by Erasmus and Oecolampadius.⁹⁷ It is the view of Drusius, Grotius, Cocceius and Calovius. We find it apparently in the Westminster Annotations (1645). It is advocated by John Owen, Robert South, Bengel, Wm. Burkitt, Doddridge, and Lampe; by Trapp, Matthew Poole, Matthew Henry, Gill, Guyse, Scott and Adam Clarke; by Bishop Huntingford and by Richard Watson.⁹⁶

If we turn to the commentaries which have appeared since about 1850, we find that this view is advocated by many

of Origen's *Commentary* which expounds this passage is wanting. His treatment of Matt. xv. 21f. seems, however, clearly to imply that he would have interpreted this passage in the high sense.—Athanasius in his *Letter to Adelphius* argues in opposition to the Arians that the fact of our Lord's having come in the flesh did not prevent his being worshipped as God and he refers to the leper (Mt. viii. 2) as having so worshipped him. Cf. also the *2nd Discourse against the Arians*, where he contrasts Peter's action (Acts x. 25) with the attitude of Jesus.—Kitto (*Bible Illustrations*) in commenting on Mt. ii. 2 f. says: "it is certain that the Christians from a very early date deduced, either from this adoration, or from the gifts offered, or from both, an argument even then that Christ was God." And he adds the footnote: "so Irenaeus, Justin Martyr, Tertullian, Origen, etc."

⁹⁵ It is the view of the standard Roman Catholic expositors Maldonatus and A Lapide; of Calmet, La Haye (who quotes Menochius and Tirenus), Haneberg and Schanz. It is held by the Abbé Fouard, by Schegg and by a number of recent writers—as also by such 'heretics' at Corn. Jansen, Quesnel and A. Loisy.

⁹⁶ For Drusius and Grotius, cf. Pearson's *Critici Sacri* (1660); for Owen, his *On the Person and Glory of Christ*, p. 170; for South, the *Sermon* on "The Misapplication of God's Judgments"; for Guyse, the *Paraphrase*; for Huntingford, *Thoughts on the Trinity* (1832); for Watson, his *Theological Institutes*, chap. xv. in Vol. X of his "Works."

of the foremost biblical scholars. Among them there are certainly few if any which are more generally regarded as standard or have been more widely used by ministers than those of Godet, Lange, Meyer, Milligan and Moulton, H. Olshausen and Westcott. Yet every one of these scholars asserts that the blind man *worshipped* Jesus. Thus, Godet: "In these circumstances, in which there was neither pardon to ask for, nor supplication to present, the genuflexion could be only a homage of worship, or at least of profound religious respect. The term *προσκυνεῖν* to *prostrate oneself*, is always applied in John to divine worship (iv. 20 ff., xii. 20)"; Lange (Schaff): "The *προσκυνεῖν* denoted adoring worship"; Meyer: "John uses *προσκυνεῖν* solely of *divine* worship, iv. 20 ff., xii. 20"; Milligan and Moulton:⁹⁷ "The simple and immediate answer shows how little remained to be done to make his faith complete. Not with bodily sense only, but in his heart, he has seen Jesus; he has heard His word; he believes and worships the Son of man, the Messiah, his Lord"; Olshausen (Kendrick) argues that the narrative shows that the blind man must have seen in Jesus more than a prophet and that he accepted Jesus' claim to be Son of God without question and worshipped him. He refers in this connection to John x. 30 ff. and in discussing that passage points out how clearly it asserts the *essential deity* of the Lord; Westcott: "In St. John 'worship' (*προσκυνεῖν*) is never used of the worship of mere respect (iv. 20 ff., xii. 20)."

⁹⁷ Professor Milligan and Dr. Moulton were members of the English Company of Revisers. At the request of Dr. Philip Schaff, the President of the American Committee, they prepared the Commentary on John, which appeared in the "International Revision Commentary on the New Testament" (1883) and in the "International Illustrated Commentary" (1888), both of which Dr. Schaff edited. In the Preface to the former Dr. Schaff writes: "The authors were among the most active and influential members of the New Testament Revision Company, and helped to make the authoritative changes of reading and rendering in the Jerusalem Chamber which are here explained and vindicated. Bishop Lightfoot told me I could not have selected two better scholars for this work in all England and Scotland."

We find much the same view in the commentaries of Astié, Besser, David Brown, Dean Burgon, Butler (Bible Work), G. W. Clark (A People's Commentary), Hengstenberg, Hovey (American Commentary), Keil, Jacobus, McClymount (New Century Com.), Plummer (Cambridge Bible for Schools), Reynolds (Pulpit Com.), Rice (Peoples Com.), Ryle, Sadler, Watkins (Handy Com.), Whitelaw, and in the recent devotional expositions of Erdman, Foulkes, A. T. Robertson, and Speer. It is advocated by such preachers as Simeon, Spurgeon, Joseph Parker, Moody and Alexander Maclaren. It is the view of Cunningham Geikie, Ellicott and Liddon and is especially strongly defended by Edersheim.⁹⁸

In view of this strong array of witnesses Rice's statement: "However widely the views of evangelical scholars may differ as to the true reading 'Son of God' or 'Son of Man'; they generally agree that it is here said that the man offered divine worship to Jesus," can hardly be regarded as too strong.

It must not be supposed however that there is entire agreement even among the scholars just referred to as to the exact character of the worship paid to Jesus. Some of them, e.g. David Brown and Hovey, are of the opinion that the man did not fully appreciate the significance of his act. And there are a good many who hesitate on this account to *assert* that it was an act of worship. Calvin, with his customary caution hesitates in view of the ambiguous character of the word to specify how much was implied in the act of the blind man: yet he believes that it "denotes something rare and exceptional"; that the man was "convinced that Jesus was *the Son of God*," but did not realize that "he was God manifested in the flesh." He calls it an act of "rapturous admira-

⁹⁸ For Robertson, cf. *The Divinity of Christ in the Fourth Gospel*; for Simeon, the *Horae Homileticae*; for Spurgeon, *Sermon of Aug. II, 1872*; for Parker, *The People's Bible*; for Moody, *Men of the Bible*, VI, p. 103; for Maclaren, *Expositor's Dict. of Texts*; for Ellicott, the *Hulsean Lectures of 1859*; for Liddon, the *Bampton Lectures of 1866*.

tion." Similarly Trench⁹⁹ argues that we need not suppose that the man "knew all that was contained in that title Son of God"; yet Trench tells us that the man "fell down at the feet of Jesus as of one more than man, with a deep religious reverence and fear and awe." Similarly Zahn is of the opinion that the man at this point had come to "adoring faith in the grace of God which had manifested itself to him in Jesus." These and other views which might be quoted show a certain hesitation to assert that the man had come to a clear realization of the deity of his Healer. But these expressions are utterly different from the emphatic denial in the form of a positive assertion which we have in the margin of the ARV.

There is also quite a considerable group of scholars of whom Holtzmann and Bernhard Weiss may be regarded as representative who take what might be called a *non liquet* attitude. They hold that it cannot be proved that the healed man intended to "worship" Jesus. And in view of the importance which has been attached to the Johannine usage by Westcott and many others who hold the high view, they assert that the fact that John elsewhere uses *προσκυνεῖν* only in the religious sense, does not necessarily prove that such must be the case in this instance also. But their argument is negative rather than positive and they take a cautious, non-committal attitude. That they should feel obliged to do this is only to be expected in view of the fact that the entire trend of the narrative is against them. For even as radical a scholar as A. Loisy does not hesitate to assert that the context shows that it means true adoration, and that this may be also inferred from the Johannine usage.

In view of this the comment in the ARV is all the more remarkable. It is not as we have seen a statement of the man's probable opinion regarding the One who healed him, but a dogmatic statement as to the actual status of Jesus. But even as an interpretation of the healed man's attitude it represents an extreme view, which it is difficult to duplicate.

⁹⁹ *Notes on the Miracles*, p. 248.

Not merely does it conflict with the "high view" which as has been indicated has, to say the least, too strong backing to be ignored in a "standard version," but it goes beyond the negative view of Weiss and definitely *asserts* that the healed man saw in his healer a mere man. This is an extreme of dogmatism which is it hard to account for.

If we would find in the statements of commentators or theologians any such definite assertion that the healed man merely paid homage to a creature, as the one which stands in the margin of the ARV, we must turn to avowed Unitarians.¹⁰⁰ Channing, in his "Discourse on Christian Worship," after referring to the broader meaning of *προσκυνεῖν*—he does this in a way which would seem to imply that Trinitarians wilfully conceal the fact—makes the statement, "We are sure that the worship paid to Christ during his public ministry was rendered to him as a divine messenger and not as God." Similarly Ezra Abbot in his elaborate essay *On the Construction of Romans ix. 5*, affirms: "There is no clear instance in which any New Testament *writer* speaking in his own person, has called Christ God."¹⁰¹ And he continues a few sentences further on: "But it may be said that, even if there is no other passage in which Paul has called Christ God, there are many in which the works and attributes of God are ascribed to him, and in which he is recognized as the object of divine worship; so that we ought to find no difficulty in supposing that he is here declared to be 'God blessed for ever.' It may be said in reply, that the passages referred to do not authorize the inference which has been drawn from them; and that if they are re-

¹⁰⁰ Such a statement as the following: "Nor does it appear that those who worshipped Christ [prior to his resurrection] had any appreciation of his being God; they only considered him as the Messiah, or as some eminent prophet" (cf. Bishop Burnett's *Exposition of the Thirty-nine Articles*, Article II), is certainly very exceptional coming as it does from the pen of a convinced Trinitarian. (Cf. John Wilson, *Unitarian Principles confirmed by Trinitarian Testimonies*, p. 459, where this and several other similar statements are quoted, only one of which however bears directly upon John ix. 38.)

¹⁰¹ *Critical Essays*, p. 364.

garded as doing so, the unity of God would seem to be infringed."

C. THE OPINIONS OF THE REVISERS.

The significance of the statement just quoted, coming as it does from a member of the NT Company, can hardly be exaggerated. The reader has probably been asking himself how, in spite of the evidence which has been cited in favor of the view that the healed man intended to worship Jesus, a comment came to be inserted in the margin of the ARV which cannot mean less than that he looked upon Jesus as a "creature" and which strictly construed certainly indicates that the revisers intended to assert that such was Jesus' actual status. The fact that Dr. Abbot was a Unitarian¹⁰² is therefore of the first importance. How objectionable the rendering "worship" of the AV and RV must have been to him on *dogmatic* grounds, is evident from the above quotation. Since, as is well known, Dr. Abbot was an influential member of the American NT Company, it would be natural to regard him as largely responsible for the comment as it appears in the Appendix of the ERV; and this for two reasons. He was as has been just indicated the one member of the NT Company to whom the rendering "worship" was seriously objectionable on dogmatic grounds. For, as ordinarily understood, it implied a view of the Person of Christ, which he regarded as infringing the doctrine of the unity of God. Besides this the comment is as has been pointed out so phrased as to meet the very objection raised by Dr. Abbot, by emphasizing the fact that the *status* of the one worshipped may be that of "a

¹⁰² It is worthy of note that it was because of the attitude of the English revisers that the choice of members for the American Committee was not restricted to the "leading evangelical denominations of the United States." Dr. Schaff suggested that it should be thus restricted (see *Doc. Hist.*, p. 3) and the name of Dr. Abbot is not contained in the list suggested by him (p. 32). But in the list proposed by Dr. Angus of the British Committee Dr. Abbot's name appears. And Dean Stanley in a letter to Dr. Schaff emphasized the point that scholarship was to be "the sole qualification desired" (p. 45).

creature." Equally obvious is it that although as will appear later he cannot be held directly responsible for it, the comment in the form found in the margin of John ix. 38 would in its plain and obvious sense correctly express his views.

Dr. Thayer was evidently closely associated with and a great admirer of Dr. Abbot. He drew up the Minute adopted by the NT Company at Dr. Abbot's death; became his successor at Harvard; edited his *Critical Essays*. That Dr. Thayer was a Trinitarian, I am assured on good authority.¹⁰³ But that he had strong sympathy with Unitarianism is undeniable. In his translation of Grimm's *Clavis*, a work which was his greatest contribution to theological learning, and which is usually spoken of as "Thayer's *Lexicon*," he not infrequently refers to opinions at variance with those expressed by Grimm.¹⁰⁴ But although in his treatment of *προσκυνεῖν* Grimm has only two heads: "Homage shown to men of superior rank" and "homage rendered to God and the ascended Christ, to heavenly beings and to demons," and places all of the instances in which the *proskynesis* was offered to Jesus prior to his resurrection, including John ix. 38, under the first head, Dr. Thayer adds no note or comment to indicate that he differed with Grimm upon this point and did not share the latter's theological views. Certainly if strongly opposed to the Unitarian position he might have been expected to take definite issue with the views expressed under the heads *ἰδὸς τοῦ θεοῦ* and *πνεῦμα*. So also in editing the volume of Dr. Abbot's *Critical Essays*, Dr. Thayer apparently felt under no obligation to make it clear that he did not share the views so strongly advocated by Dr. Abbot.

¹⁰³ In the "Minute," just referred to we find the statement, "Differing from the rest of us as he [Dr. Abbot] did in some of his theological tenets, his Christ-like temper rendered him a brother beloved, and lends a heavenly lustre to his memory." The reference to "the rest of us" seems clearly to imply that in his Unitarian views Dr. Abbot stood alone. Dr. Schaff (*Companion*, pp. 387, 395) states that there was one Unitarian on the British, and one on the American, Committee. The American was of course Dr. Abbot.

¹⁰⁴ Cf. Preface, p. viii.

It is certainly difficult to understand how a convinced Trinitarian could have been willing to edit the *Critical Essays*. For it would be hard to find a volume in which the Unitarian position is more ably defended than by Dr. Abbot in some of these essays. And in the case of a scholar so highly esteemed for intellectual honesty and integrity as Dr. Thayer, such an action could only mean that he was far from sure that Dr. Abbott's view was not the correct one.

It is thus apparent that there was one and quite an influential member of the NT Company, Dr. Ezra Abbot, who would have regarded this comment in its obvious significance, i.e. as a denial of the deity of Christ, a correct statement of fact. It is also clear that Dr. Thayer, whatever his personal views, entertained great respect for the Unitarian position and treated it with marked consideration, and that this comment is entirely in accord with a statement in the *Lexicon* which bears his name and to which he takes no exception.

On the other hand it can be clearly shown that this comment as it stands in the margin of John ix. 38 could not have been acceptable to the members of the NT Company as a whole.

That this comment could not have been acceptable to at least a *considerable minority* can be safely inferred from the action of the revisers regarding the reading "Son of God" in vs. 35 of the same chapter. This reading is retained in the ARV text, although Tischendorf, and Westcott and Hort both prefer "Son of man." And its retention is significant because one of the arguments which have been used by those who hold the view that the blind man paid divine adoration to Jesus is the fact that the Lord in this very passage styled himself "the Son of God":—"Dost thou believe on the Son of God?" It is true that there are scholars of the first rank who hold that as used by Jesus and as understood by the Jews the title "Son of man" implied as much as "Son of God." This may be inferred from the fact that in answering the high priest Jesus used the one

title though the high priest had used the other. Still the circumstance that in laying his trap for the Lord that he might charge him with blasphemy, the high priest used the title "Son of God" is strong evidence for the view that it was regarded by the rabbis as the strongest and clearest Messianic title. It is at least clear that taken by itself it emphasizes the thought of the deity rather than of the humanity of Christ. Thus Holtzmann, who as we have seen argues that the Johannine usage does not suffice to prove that the blind man worshipped Jesus, adds this remark: "But if υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ were the correct reading, the man who had been blind might be regarded as having attained to full spiritual sight, just because he had recognized Jesus as the Son of God in a higher sense." There is considerable force in this argument. The question of the reading is not vital to the interpretation if the high view is held, but it has an important bearing on the adoption of the low view. It is a little hard to say the least to see how men who believed that this man saw in Jesus only a creature and accorded him the homage due to a "superior human being" could have preferred the reading "Son of God" to the reading "Son of man" in verse 35, especially when as Edersheim points out the testimony of the Mss. is so equally divided. Certainly men who intended to insert the marginal comment which stands in the ARV at John ix. 38 and asserts that the blind man paid homage to a creature would not likely have stultified themselves by retaining that reading in the text which was the less favorable of the two to the view they adopted. This is certainly a very definite indication that this comment never received the approval of the members of the NT Company as a whole. It would imply much more but for the fact that "Son of God" was the reading of the AV text and therefore could not be changed without a two-thirds vote. It does show, however, that a considerable minority must have been opposed to it.

That this comment could not have been carefully considered and approved by even a *majority* of the members of the

NT Company is clear when we acquaint ourselves with their views upon the doctrine involved. The following data will suffice to establish the correctness of this statement.

Dr. BURR has furnished us with abundant evidence with regard to his view on this important question in his article "Incarnation" which appeared in McClintock and Strong's *Cyclopaedia*. This article leaves no room for doubt that he was a firm believer in the essential deity of Christ.

Dr. CROSBY'S view is clearly set forth in his *True Humanity of Christ*. He tells us that Jesus' "tacit reception of the title 'King of Israel' from the mass of Israelites, was the assumption of divine honors" (p. 18); that "the Christ of the Bible is God over all" (p. 22); and that "Christ's essential deity existed necessarily at all times and in all places" (p. 41). And in his *Annotated New Testament* while maintaining that the title "Son of man" was one "which Jesus used for himself to impress the fact of his humanity on men," he does not state in commenting on John ix. 38 that the act of the blind man was less than worship, although we do find a statement to that effect regarding the act of Cornelius (Acts x. 25).

Dr. DWIGHT'S opinion can be learned negatively from the fact that in his notes to the American edition of Godet's *Commentary*, he takes no exception to the high view therein expressed; and positively from his elaborate discussion of Rom. ix. 5¹⁰⁵ in which he maintains the view that Christ is there declared to be "God over all."

Dr. HACKETT (*Commentary on Acts*) in discussing the nature of the *proskynesis* offered by Cornelius to Peter calls attention to the fact that "Our Saviour, on the contrary, never repressed the disposition of his disciples to think highly of his rank and character. . . . This different procedure on the part of Christ we can ascribe only to his consciousness of a claim to be acknowledged as divine."

Dr. HODGE has given us the data necessary to the determining of his view regarding this passage in the chapters on

¹⁰⁵ *Journ. Soc. Bib. Lit.*, Vol. 1, pp. 22-52.

“The Divinity of Christ” and “The Person of Christ” in his *Systematic Theology*. It is evident that he believed that Christ was the object of religious worship while on earth. And in his *Commentary on Romans* he takes the last part of ix. 5 as referring to Christ.

Dr. KENDRICK in commenting on Heb. i. 6 and xi. 21 in his *Commentary* on that Epistle takes “worship” in the religious sense. In his translation of Olshausen’s *Commentary* he takes no exception to the view there advocated that in Jn. ix. 38 the blind man on the basis of Jesus’ statement that he was the “Son of God” worshipped him as such, nor to the exposition of Jn. x. 30-36 where this title is explained as asserting the “essential equality of the Son with the Father.” That this view was shared by Dr. Kendrick there can be no question.

Dr. ALFRED LEE was for nearly half a century bishop of the diocese of Delaware of the Protestant Episcopal Church. That he was entirely in accord with the doctrinal teachings of his denomination cannot be questioned. How pre-eminent was the place which our Lord occupied in all his thinking and teaching is well illustrated by the closing words of his little treatise *On Baptism*. “Let each doctrine and each precept, each truth and each duty, occupy its proper place, as taught by Apostles and exhibited on the sacred page. And then all will point to Jesus, all will converge in Christ crucified, and whatever be the immediate text or subject, men will be summoned to ‘behold the Lamb of God who taketh away the sins of the world.’ They will be brought to ‘believe in the Son of God, and believing, they will have life through his name.’”

Dr. RIDDLE has expressed his trinitarian views very clearly in his *Commentary on Romans*. In expounding chap. ix, verse 5, he sides with Drs. Burr, Crosby, Dwight, Hodge and Smith in referring the closing words of the verse to Christ. In his *Commentary on Luke* he asserts that the devil asked “religious worship” of Jesus. Consequently the comment on xxiv. 52 “As he went up: hence a

more exalted worship than the homage accorded Him during His ministry," cannot, as will presently be shown, be regarded as supporting the marginal comment as it stands at John ix. 38.

Dr. SCHAFF in his *Companion* asserts that the revisers did right in insisting on the comment which is found in the "Appendix" to the ERV. Yet Dr. Schaff there says of Matt. ii. 2 "probably here in the sense of religious adoration." In his *Commentary on Matthew* he says that in ii. 2 "worship" is "no doubt used in the sense of religious adoration." On the other hand in commenting on viii. 2 he says of the leper, "He performed an act of homage which was not necessarily religious worship." There is no comment on this word at xviii. 26. Dr. Schaff's belief in the deity of Christ is clearly set forth in his *The Person of Christ; The Perfection of His Humanity viewed as a Proof of His Divinity*.

Dr. H. B. SMITH has stated his view in his *System of Christian Theology*. He argues that Jesus is God, that while on earth he claimed and received divine worship from men, and that he is called "God" in the NT—Romans ix. 5 must he holds be understood as referring to him (cf. p. 57 ff.).

Dr. WASHBURN as appears clearly in his *Epochs in Church History* was in some respects a theological liberal. But it is perfectly plain that while he believed that there had been development in Christian doctrine from the very beginning, he was no less sure that the fundamental creed of the Church was the creed of the Apostles. Thus he says of the Nicene creed: "The faith in such a Christ [i.e. the Christ of the Incarnation] as it is cited by St. Paul, contains all that the Nicene symbol expresses" (p. 37). "Undoubtedly the argument of Athanasius was true. There was and is no middle ground in theology between the acceptance of the essential divinity of Christ, and that of his pure humanity. The faith in the God-Man could only be in harmony with the unity of God by the faith in the eternal, uncreated, ever-living Logos. Theology declared in scientific form what

lay in the original faith" (p. 48). His strong trinitarianism appears in other statements in this volume and equally unmistakably in his *Social Law of God; Sermons on the Ten Commandments*.

Dr. WOOLSEY has given us in *The Religion of the Present and the Future* and especially in the last sermon in that volume which is entitled "The Religion of the Future" a very definite statement as to what he considered to be the essentials of Christianity and the permanent value of the Christian system. This sermon makes it certain that Dr. Woolsey should be regarded as a pronounced Trinitarian. He argues that "it is the doctrine of the NT that the dispensation which was introduced by Christ is to continue until the end of the world" (p. 373); he cites "the doctrine that the Word became flesh, that God sent His Son to redeem men from sin" as an example of what is "especially Christian, as distinguished from natural religion and from the conclusions of human reason" (p. 387). His whole aim is to prove that unless the "religion of the future" is the Christian religion, the religion which accepts Christ as divine Savior and Lord "the world of the future will be doomed" (p. 402).

Drs. CHASE, HADLEY and SHORT were laymen whose studies were mainly along secular lines. Dr. Chase was an Orthodox Friend; Dr. Hadley was a Congregationalist; Dr. Short was an Episcopalian. I have not been able to obtain any information with regard to their views upon this particular comment.

These data make it clear that it *could not* have been the intention of the members of the NT Company to deny the deity of the Lord. That doctrine was far too precious to them and they were much too loyal to the historic faith. It implies that insofar as the majority of the revisers had anything to do with it, it must be regarded as merely expressing their opinion regarding the conception which the healed man had of his Healer. But this is obviously not enough. To prove that the members of the NT Company could not

have intended to deny the deity of Christ is one thing; to prove that this comment is so phrased as to make it impossible to place such a construction upon it is a very different matter. And it is the fact that the comment is so phrased as to make it not only natural, but in our opinion necessary, to place such a construction upon it, which constitutes the strongest reason for its removal. For it may be regarded as certain that most of the NT Company would have desired to avoid the possibility of such a mistaken interpretation at all costs. Furthermore it is clear that, however we regard it, whether as expressing the opinion of the revisers regarding the opinion of the healed man concerning the person of Christ, or their opinion regarding the opinion of the Evangelist concerning the person of Christ or concerning the healed man's opinion, or as expressing their own opinion regarding the person of Christ—in any case the comment must be admitted to be a *dogmatic* comment. As a dogmatic comment it can have no right or place in the margin of the ARV. As a dogmatic comment it is ruled out by the definite policy of the revisers as stated in the Preface. For if in the matter of the cross-references and running head lines it was their "constant aim to avoid as far as possible all pre-commitments, whether doctrinal or exegetical," we certainly should be entitled to expect an even greater effort to avoid dogmatic bias in the matter of the marginal notes, to which they attached still greater importance.

D. DR. RIDDLE'S EXPLANATION OF THIS COMMENT.

It was pointed out above that at the time of the publication of the ARV in 1901—and indeed since the death of Dr. Kendrick in 1895—there were but three of the members of the American NT Company surviving, Drs. Dwight, Riddle and Thayer. It has also been stated that these three survivors—Dr. Riddle speaks of them as editors—definitely claimed for the ARV New Testament as published in 1901 the authority and sanction of the NT Company as a whole, declaring that they had "not felt at liberty to make new

changes of moment which were not favorably passed upon by their associates at one stage or another of the original preparation of the work." This statement has been very properly made use of by the publishers, who have naturally sought to combat the notion that the ARV of 1901 was "only the work of those who were alive when the work was published." Not merely is it emphatically asserted that this notion is utterly without foundation in fact; but the names of all the seventeen members of the NT Company are definitely connected with the volume published in 1901.¹⁰⁶ Such being the case it was not only proper and advisable, but even necessary for us to determine the opinions of as many of the revisers as possible, with a view to ascertaining whether or to what extent this comment can properly be attributed to them and is therefore entitled to claim their authority. And we have found that taken in its plain and obvious sense it is directly opposed to the expressed opinions of a considerable majority of them, a conclusion which it is

¹⁰⁶ On the inside of a folder issued by Nelson and Sons and intended to give definite and authoritative information with regard to the ARV, we have a brief catechism as it were with 23 questions and answers. The 17th question and answer read as follows:

"Q.—Is the American Revised Version the work of the whole Committee, or only the work of those who were alive when the work was published?

A.—The American Revised Version is the work of the whole Committee, because the survivors themselves declare that no changes were made by them that were not considered and agreed upon by the whole Committee. A careful and minute record was kept of the discussions and decisions from the very beginning of the work, so that at any time reference could be made to this and the opinion of each individual member known on every question."

On the fourth page of the folder, the names of the members of the Revision Committee (both Companies) are given, and the following note is appended to the list of the members of the NT Company:—"Note—By Dr. Philip Schaff—The American New Testament Company lost by death Prof. James Hadley (who attended the first session), d. 1872; Dr. Henry Boynton Smith (who attended one session, and resigned from ill health), d. 1877; Dr. Horatio B. Hackett, d. 1876; Dr. Charles Hodge (who never attended the meetings but corresponded with the committee), d. 1878." It is to be observed that this note makes no reference to the losses suffered by the NT Company subsequent to the publication of the ERV in 1881.

difficult to reconcile with the policy of the editors as stated by them in the Preface.

In view of this apparent *impasse* we are fortunate in being able to refer to a definite statement by Dr. Riddle bearing upon this very point. We owe this statement to the following circumstances. About ten years ago Bishop Burton of Lexington, Ky., wrote to Nelson and Sons protesting against this comment as it appears at John ix. 38. This letter was referred to Dr. Riddle with the request that he reply to it through them. Nelson and Sons have kindly supplied the present writer with a copy of this, and also of another, letter and in view of their importance they are here quoted in full:

April 28, 1909.

Rt. Rev. and Dear Sir:

Your note of inquiry to Messrs. Nelsons was referred to me by them, with the request that a reply be sent to you through them.

Personally, I should have preferred to omit "(as here)" in the marginal note to John 9: 38 but my colleagues in the preparation of the American Revised New Testament were influenced so far as I can recollect, by the various reading in V. 35 where the oldest authorities have "The Son of Man" instead of "The Son of God," so Westcott and most critical editors. Hence while the Greek word rendered "worshipped" as you rightly say, in the other instances in this Gospel, refers to the worship of God, it is highly probable that this healed man prostrated himself at the feet of Jesus without any full apprehension of his Deity or Divinity even.

I admit the justice of your remark in regard to "taking sides" but from the point of view of my associate editors, the note was deemed a statement of fact not of opinion. For myself, as already stated, I preferred the omission of the phrase you criticise.

In commenting on this verse in the Sunday School Times I stated (March 1, 1908) "while the Marginal Note in the Revised Version is in general correct, in this Gospel every other instance points to the worship of God."

With assurance of respect for your candor in this inquiry, I am

Very truly yours,

(signed) M. B. RIDDLE.

P.S.—I may add that Doctrinal prejudice did not enter into the question, for the three editors were Pres. Dwight, of Yale and Prof. Thayer, both of them Congregationalists, and myself, Trinitarian.

In the case of the second letter the name of the addressee has apparently not been preserved. It does not appear in the letter.

Nov. 14, 1910.

Dear Sir:

A copy of your notes to Messrs. Nelson has been sent by them to me. In reply would say that the Marginal note at John 9:38 in the Standard New Testament refers exclusively to the restored blind man's estimate of our Lord, whom he, according to this note, regarded as a "creature." It has no reference—or was not intended to have—to the Evangelist's view of the Person of Christ, and should not be used as a proof-text in any discussion on that question.

For myself, I would have preferred to omit the words "as here," since there is a doubt as to how much the healed man meant in his "worship." The question in verse 35 (with the answer in verse 38) may imply a fuller recognition of our Lord's Person, but in that verse the reading "Son of Man" is found in three of the oldest and best Greek manuscripts, and is accepted by Tischendorf, Westcott and Hort and other Editors. If that is the true reading, the answer "I believe" does not necessarily imply a higher view of our Lord's Person than that indicated in the Marginal Note, and my colleagues in editing this version who were Trinitarians, were probably influenced by this reading.

I trust this reply will satisfy your mind as to the purpose of the American Revisers, and will guard against a misuse of the marginal note.

Yours truly,

(signed) M. B. RIDDLE.

(of the American Revisers)

The following points are especially deserving of notice:

- 1) Dr. Riddle makes the editors and not the NT Company as a whole directly responsible for this comment.
- 2) He states that its insertion was largely due to a preference for the reading "Son of man" in verse 35.
- 3) He tells us that "the note was deemed a statement of fact not of opinion."
- 4) He asserts that doctrinal prejudice did not enter into the question, since the three editors were Trinitarians.
- 5) He states that it was not intended as a statement regarding the Evangelist's view of the person of Christ, and that such a use of it would be a misuse.

Taking up these points in order we observe:

1) If as Dr. Riddle implies the peculiar form of the comment at John ix. 38 is directly attributable to the editors, we must then regard it as representing the opinion of only two of the revisers, Drs. Dwight and Thayer, since Dr. Riddle expressly states in both letters that he was opposed to its insertion. Unless then it can be shown that this form of the comment was acceptable to the body of revisers as a whole—we have argued that it is impossible that this could have been the case—it must be recognized that the editors violated their own general rule which bound them to make no “new changes of moment which were not favorably passed upon by their associates at one stage or another of the original preparation of the work.” It may be of course that they did not regard this change as “of moment.” If so, we are forced to differ with them.

2) If as Dr. Riddle indicates the reading “Son of man” was largely responsible for the insertion of this comment by the editors, it is important to notice that this is the reading of the margin, not of the text. The text reads “Son of God.” This implies as has been pointed out above that at least a considerable minority of the revisers preferred the reading of the AV. It is certainly questionable, then, whether the editors were justified in inserting a comment in the margin of the ARV, when the chief argument for its insertion was a variant reading which could not command a two-thirds vote in the NT Company and consequently had itself to be placed in the margin. Certainly the comment on the word “worship” in verse 38 is all the more striking and objectionable because of the presence of the reading “Son of God” in verse 35. And Dr. Riddle himself states that but two men are responsible for the former, while the latter has the sanction of the Company as a whole.

3) It is difficult to see how in the face of the body of opinion which has been cited in favor of the view that the man who was born blind recognized Jesus’ claim to be the Son of God and worshipped him as such, two as able schol-

ars as Dr. Dwight and Dr. Thayer, could have ventured to assert that it was a matter not of *opinion* but of *fact* that this man merely intended to offer homage to a creature. Certainly if their contention were correct we might expect that the *fact* would be more generally recognized.

4) That doctrinal prejudice did not enter into the question as Dr. Riddle claims, does not follow from the fact that all three of the editors were Trinitarians. We have seen that there were several reasons which might have influenced Dr. Thayer to favor this comment. He was in a sense committed to it by the statement in the *Lexicon* which speaks of this act as "homage rendered to a superior human being." He was a great admirer of and probably to a considerable degree influenced by Dr. Abbot; and Dr. Abbot was undoubtedly opposed to the rendering "worship" on *doctrinal* grounds.

5) The fact that Dr. Riddle in stating that the comment has no reference to the Evangelist's view of the Person of Christ, was forced to add the qualification, "or was not intended to have," and also felt called upon to utter a warning against its use "as a proof-text in any discussion of that question" supports our contention that the comment does not imply what he said it was intended to imply. Dr. Riddle did not say, he could not say, that the comment could not fairly be regarded as a statement of the Evangelist's opinion, and therefore, as a true statement regarding the Person of Christ; he did not say that it would most naturally be understood as the editors intended. He did not say this because he could not. It is too obvious to every candid mind that such a claim simply cannot be maintained.

It has been a trying task which the writer has been engaged upon in the preparation of this article. To attack a version of the Bible which I have myself used more or less continuously for a decade and a half and which I have come in many ways to value highly, is not pleasant. To attack the work of a considerable body of eminent scholars after

they have all been called away by death and there is not one left to defend himself or his brethren is doubly unpleasant. Two considerations, however, have served to relieve the situation to some extent. The first is the fact that it was not until within about a year that I noticed this marginal comment. I cannot therefore be accused of waiting until all the principal witnesses in the case were gone before bringing this charge against their work. The second is the settled conviction that in attacking this pernicious note and calling for its excision, I am really representing most of the revisers. I find myself utterly unable to believe that it would have been possible to get the members of the NT Company to accept the comment as it appears at John ix. 38; and Dr. Riddle's own statement fails to claim their authority for it. That they were willing to admit the desirability of indicating in some way the ambiguity of the word *προσκυνεῖν* is of course clear from the fact that such a comment appears in the "Appendix" of the ERV. More than this, the fact that they locked horns with the British revisers on this point, shows that they considered it important that it should be added. This cannot be questioned. But between the comment as it appears in the "Appendix" to the ERV and the form which it assumes at John ix. 38 in the margin of the ARV there is a vast difference. And it is plainly inconceivable in view of the facts already referred to that this latter form of the comment could have been carefully considered and approved by the NT Company of the American Revisers. Consequently I feel that in attacking this note I am representing the NT Company as a whole; for I am convinced that they would have strenuously opposed the insertion in the margin of the Revision for which they were responsible of a comment which could not but be most obnoxious to them.

Before completing the preparation of this article, I decided to take up the matter personally with the publishers (Thos. Nelson & Sons, New York) with a view to ascertaining their attitude in the matter. I had a very pleasant

conversation with the president of the company, Mr. Thomson, who informed me that my complaint was not the first that they had received and showed me the letters from Dr. Riddle referred to above. He intimated that he felt himself placed in an awkward position, owing to the fact that the publishers were bound by contract with the American Revision Committee to "protect the version in its integrity," and could not be released from that contract because the Committee is no longer in existence, all its members having passed away. With this in mind, and in the hope of convincing the publishers and their advisers—both theological and legal—that this comment is contrary to the best thought and the assured conviction of the Church of every age; that it is opposed to the expressed belief of most of the revisers themselves; that its insertion by the editors was inconsistent with their definite policy "to introduce no changes of moment" and "to avoid as far as possible all pre-commitments, whether doctrinal or exegetical"; that in a volume which bears as its title, *The New Testament of Our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ*, there is no place for a comment which flatly denies his deity; and that its removal would do no more than justice to the deepest convictions both of the men whose work they are pledged to preserve unaltered, and of the Christian Church for whose edification they prepared it, this article has been written.

Princeton.

OSWALD T. ALLIS.