

THE  
BIBLICAL REPERTORY.

---

APRIL 1837.

---

No. II.

---

---

ART. I. — *The Reformation in Hungary and Transyl-*

*vania.*  
*J. N. Alexander*

By the persecutions carried on against the Albigenses and Waldenses, many of these devoted people were scattered through other countries, where they became a seed of reformation. The followers of John Huss and Jerome of Prague were also numerous and widely dispersed in the eastern parts of Europe, which prepared the way for the dissemination of evangelical doctrines in these regions after the reformation commenced in Germany and Switzerland. This will in some measure account for the rapidity with which the doctrines of the reformation spread through almost every part of Christendom. It is, however, greatly to be lamented that in many places no permanent record was made of the first planting of reformed churches. Those persons who were the instruments of propagating this blessed reformation, and who were capable of writing a correct history of events, were too much occupied with their more important labours to have leisure for things of this kind: and it is generally the fact, that men do not consider the importance of transmitting passing events by means of accurate records to posterity; so that often the witnesses of important transactions in the church and state pass off the stage before the importance of

indefeasible right to worship God according to the dictates of their own consciences.

View the question as we may, the conflict between this theory of divine right, and the natural rights of conscience is inevitable. One must give way to the other. It has been proved in another article, that the *principle of the American constitution is Protestantism*,—that it is in essence irreconcilably hostile to the exclusive pretensions of the Roman see.

[To be continued.]

Charles Hoodge

- ART. V.—1. *The Greek Testament, with English notes, critical, philological, and exegetical, partly selected and arranged from the best commentators, ancient and modern, but chiefly original, &c. &c.* By the Rev. S. T. Bloomfield, D. D. F. S. A., Vicar of Bisbrooke, Rutland. First American, from the second London edition. In two Volumes. Boston: published by Perkins & Marvin. Philadelphia: Henry Perkins. 1837.
2. *The New Testament arranged in Historical and Chronological order, with copious notes on the principal subjects in Theology, &c. &c.* By Rev. George Townsend, M. A., Prebendary of Durham, &c. *The whole revised, divided into paragraphs, &c. &c.* By the Rev. T. W. Coit, D. D., President of Transylvania University. Boston: published by Perkins & Marvin. Philadelphia: Henry Perkins. 1837. 8vo. pp. 455 and 472.

DR. BLOOMFIELD has been long known to biblical students, as the author of a "Critical Digest of Sacred Annotations on the New Testament," in eight volumes, a work of great research and labour. He therefore came to the task of preparing a second edition of his Greek Testament with English notes, with the advantage of having gone repeatedly over the whole ground. Besides this, he is evidently a scholar, familiar with the Greek language and literature, and a man of untiring industry. In this, as in his larger work, he almost uniformly manifests a moderate and unassuming temper; giving himself much less credit than is common among commentators; carefully quoting his predecessors, where others would be content to borrow the substance of their statements,

without the formality of quotation. This habit, though evincing right feeling, our author carries to an excess, so as to give his books a mosaic character and appearance. It is easy to preserve a good conscience in this matter by abstaining from claiming what does not belong to us, and avoiding those forms of expression, which are adapted to make the reader infer that what we state is all the result of our own extensive research. There is a vast mass of exegetical matter which is, as it were, common property, being found more or less in all extended commentaries. This we may fairly use without special acknowledgement, provided we avoid setting up a special claim to it. These materials must pass through the writer's own mind, and be wrought into a consistent and uniform mass, and brought to sustain the particular views he may entertain of the sacred text. And it is easy for the intelligent reader to see when this is done, and when the writer is a mere transcriber. Our author certainly avoids all undue claims to originality, and rather injures the effect of his writings by the frequency of his literal quotations. It is very characteristic of his manner, as is particularly obvious in his prefaces, that instead of expressing the commonest sentiments in his own language, he says, as the learned Dr. A. or Bishop B., or some one else well observes.

The moderation of the writer is evinced not only in the modesty of his claims, but in the general spirit of his work. Though a consistent and decided Episcopalian, he rarely manifests any disposition to polemics. His peculiar opinions are introduced only in those passages where we might justly expect to find them, and are not obtruded with partisan zeal on all occasions. He believes in baptismal regeneration, in the apostolic origin of the prelatical office, and he rejects the doctrines of personal election and perseverance of the saints. But these points are never offensively introduced or discussed.

In addition to learning, moderation, modesty, and industry, Dr. Bloomfield deserves great credit for good judgment in adopting so simple and convenient a form for his present work. The Greek text is given at the top of the page, and the notes are printed in double columns at the bottom. The reader is thus enabled to take in the text and explanation at one view. Another great recommendation of the work is, that it is the only one of the kind. It has no competitor in the English language. This consideration, in addition to the beauty and correctness with which it is printed, will, we

presume, secure for it a wide circulation. Having mentioned the general characteristics of a favourable kind which distinguish the work before us, we must in justice present those of an opposite nature. The writer has not sufficient reliance on his own judgment, or has too much respect for the great names of his own church, and distinguished critics in general. Some of the most objectionable passages in the book are quotations from the dignitaries of the Episcopal church, whose sentiments are often introduced out of respect apparently for their learning or station, when the writer's own views, as far as we can judge, would have led to much better interpretations. The author also seems frequently to get bewildered amidst the multitude of expositions, so as not to know what he thinks himself. He therefore frequently gives inconsistent interpretations of the same passage, or contradicts in one place what he had said in another. He appears to have paid much more attention to classical literature and biblical criticism, than to theology; and his doctrinal views are evidently, on many points, crude and unsettled. We find the most correct and most erroneous statements of the same doctrine scattered through his work. This is particularly the case with regard to the doctrines of justification and election. Another fault is, that a due proportion is not observed between the different parts of the work. Difficult and important passages are often passed over very slightly, while comparatively unimportant ones are discussed at great length. There is almost as much said on the single word *κοσμητός*, Heb. 9: 1, as on the whole of Rom. 5: 12—19. We know it must be very difficult to preserve, in a first attempt, a due proportion between the different portions of such an extended work. But this is in some sort an abridgment of a larger work, and also a second edition. We might therefore reasonably expect that more attention should be paid to this point. The great defect of the book, however, is that it is unsatisfactory. The reader in a multitude of cases having gone through the exposition, feels that he has learned nothing; that he knows no more of the meaning of the passage than he did before. This arises from various sources. The writer has little talent for condensation. He does not seem able to give a clear and concise statement of his opinions and the grounds of them; but is wordy, loose, and general. In many cases too, he makes little attempt at explanation, contenting himself with detached philological remarks. There is, therefore, a vagueness and

want of point characteristic of the whole production, which it is easier to state than to account for.

Having stated thus generally our opinion of this work, we must proceed to give our readers the means of judging for themselves. Dr. Bloomfield's book is both an edition of the text of the New Testament, and a perpetual commentary. It is therefore to be viewed under both of these aspects. The author informs us, with regard to the former of these points, that his object was to form a text so constructed that general readers of the New Testament might see the variations from the *textus receptus* distinctly marked in the text itself, and also to exhibit the state of the evidence, together with the reasons which had induced the editor to adopt any variations from the common text. "A new recension of the text formed on such a plan, however desirable, or even necessary, was not to be found in this country; nor, indeed, in any other, based on sound principles of criticism; the texts for academical and general use on the continent, being little more than reprints of that of Griesbach," p. vii. Again, on p. xi. he says, "The text has been formed (after long and repeated examinations of the whole of the New Testament for that purpose solely) on the basis of the last edition of Robert Stephens, adopted by Mill, whose text differs very slightly from, but is admitted to be preferable to, the common text, which originated in the Elzevir edition of 1624. From this there has been no deviation except on the most preponderating evidence; critical conjecture being wholly excluded, and such alterations only introduced as rest on the united authority of manuscripts, ancient versions, and fathers, and the early printed editions, but especially upon the invaluable *Editio Princeps* [meaning the Complutensian], and which had been already adopted in one or more of the critical editions of Bengel, Wetstein, Matthaei, and Scholz."

We have much doubt as to the wisdom of this whole plan, and much more as to the skill with which it has been executed. The multiplication of texts of the New Testament, all differing more or less from each other, is in itself an evil. To a certain extent it is a necessary evil. The results of the critical labours of editors devoted to this department of biblical study, should, when completely authenticated, be introduced into editions designed for general use. But we think it very undesirable that every commentator should become an editor, and set forth a new text. It would be much better to assume some corrected text, and if in any particular case,

he thought it needed further correcting, let him state his opinion, and the grounds of it, in his notes. The author indeed says, there does not exist a text, either in England or any other country, formed on the plan which he proposed, the texts for general use on the continent being little more than reprints of that of Griesbach. But this is a great mistake. The editions of Tittmann, Knapp, Lachmann, &c. are far from being mere reprints of that of Griesbach. They are all constructed on principles which their authors have carefully exhibited. And that of Knapp is so correct, so well pointed and arranged, and so convenient, that it has obtained almost universal currency both in Europe and in this country. That our author should overlook it, as he does in his preface, is to us a matter of surprise. The edition of Lachmann is in Germany, to some extent, obtaining precedence over Knapp's and all others. This edition, however, from the peculiar plan of its author, is not adapted for general use. He does not profess to give the text which he thinks, all evidence considered, is the best, but simply that which prevailed in the eastern churches within the few first centuries.

Though the formation of a new text, for general use, we think at present uncalled for, yet had the plan been well executed, there would be less reason for regret. We fear this, however, is not the case. We do not object so much to the readings which the author has adopted, as to the mode of proceeding, to the absence of any such statement of his critical principles, or of the evidence in favour of the reading which he adopts, as to give the intelligent reader any satisfaction as to the soundness of his judgment, or the correctness of his decisions. He tells us, indeed, that critical conjecture is discarded, that he departs from the text of Robert Stephens only on the authority of manuscripts, versions, fathers, and early printed editions. But we do not know how he estimates the testimony of the manuscripts, whether by number, antiquity, or families. We are ignorant what weight he assigns to the versions either collectively or singly. He avows "his dissent, though not from the canons of criticism professedly acted upon by Griesbach in his edition of the New Testament, yet altogether from the *system of recensions* first promulgated by him." Yet we find him referring to the Western, Alexandrian and Byzantine recensions, which is precisely Griesbach's classification. In what sense does he use these terms, or what classification does he adopt?

Is it that of Nolan, some of whose terms and characteristic critical opinions we see at times in the annotations? We have not been able to discover, and of course cannot tell what weight is due to his statements that this or that reading is supported "by different recensions." Yet this is the main point. If Griesbach's classification is right, his text is right; if his classification is wrong, as is now almost universally admitted, then his text, so far as it is peculiar, has no authority. As Griesbach has unfolded his plan, the reader can judge of the authority of his readings; but as Dr. Bloomfield has not exhibited his system, we can have no intelligent opinion as to the credit due to his text.\* A few examples will be sufficient to illustrate the nature and force of our objection. In Matt. 8: 28, the author says, "the manuscripts fluctuate between Γεργεσηνῶν, Γαδαρηνῶν, and Γερασηνῶν. The weight of authority, as far as regards number of manuscripts, is in favour of the first mentioned, which is the common reading; but those manuscripts are chiefly of an inferior kind, and of one class; while Γαδαρηνῶν is supported by a not inconsiderable number of manuscripts of great antiquity and different recensions, by the Peschito, Syriac and Persian versions, and some Fathers, as Eusebius, Epiphanius and Chrysostom. As to Γερασηνῶν it is supported almost solely by the Vulgate and a few inferior versions. Now if *external* evidence was alone to be considered we must prefer Γεργεσηνῶν. But *internal* evidence must be taken into account, and that, as we shall see, is strongly in favour of Γαδαρηνῶν." This might do well enough for a commentator, but the statements are altogether too general and loose for an editor. No reader, who understands the subject, could learn the state of the external evidence in relation to the text from the above account. The majority of the manuscripts, he tells us, are in favour of the first reading, but their testimony is set aside because they are of an inferior kind, and of one class. But he neither tells us of what kind nor of what class. The fact is that they are modern manuscripts, and of the Byzantine class: the very class of which the writer says, in his preface, that it

\* We hope we do not unintentionally do the author injustice in these remarks. We find no exhibition of his critical principles on this and other important points either in the preface, or in his annotations, under some of the most important disputed passages. If such exhibition is hidden in some part of his notes, it is more his fault than ours that we have not found it out. These are preliminary matters which must be stated at once, or no judgment can be formed of the correctness of his decisions in any one case.

presents a purer text than the more ancient manuscripts of the Western and Alexandrian recensions.\* The second reading is said to be supported by no inconsiderable number of manuscripts of great antiquity, and of different recensions, by several of the fathers, and the best versions. This being the case, as the author had objected to the manuscripts in favour of the first reading, because they were modern and all of one class, we should expect him to decide that the external evidence was in favour of this second reading. He however makes the opposite decision, and rests his preference of the second reading on internal evidence, and says that the external evidence is in favour of the first, thus making mere number counterbalance antiquity, diversity of class, and the authority of the versions. We very frequently meet with the expression "the best manuscripts," for example, Luke 8: 43. 9: 1. &c. &c.; but we do not know what manuscripts in our author's estimation are the best. Most critics consider the ancient uncial manuscripts as entitled to most authority; but Dr. Bloomfield, as we have seen, says he prefers some modern manuscripts of the Byzantine class. Yet in the cases referred to, as supported by the best manuscripts, it is the ancient uncial manuscripts whose support is relied upon. Again, in a great number of cases, as in Acts 18: 5, we have such general expressions as "some manuscripts, several versions, and a few fathers." Such statements give an editor no authority in the judgment of his readers. We wish to know how many and what manuscripts or versions are for or against a particular passage. In the case referred to, it turns out that the some manuscripts are A, B, D, E, 13, 40, 73, 137, 142; the several versions are both the Syriac versions, the Arabic, Coptic, Sahidic, Ethiopic, and the Vulgate; and the fathers, Chrysostom, Theodoret, and Jerome, who all read *λόγω* instead of *πνεύματι*. This must be admitted to be very weighty evidence: and accordingly Bengel, Pearce, Kuinoel, Griesbach, Knapp, Tittmann, Scholz, prefer *λόγω*. Yet our author, on the loose statement just quoted, says "the external authority for that reading is slender, and the internal by no means strong."

The far more important passage, Acts 20: 28, he discusses

\* "He (i. e. the author) is still firmly persuaded that the most ancient manuscripts of the Western and Alexandrian family do not present so pure a text as that of some comparatively modern ones of the Constantinopolitan family. . . . In short, he has no doubt that the texts of the first mentioned manuscripts were systematically altered, for various reasons, by the early biblical critics," p. xxiv.

E. K. &  
slightly  
Scholz



at much greater length, but we cannot think in a very critical or satisfactory manner. We have no space to enter on the examination of so difficult a question as the true reading in this passage. We shall simply remark on our author's view of the manuscript authority in relation to the case. "Κυρίου is supported," he says, "by thirteen manuscripts, five of them very ancient, and the rest neither ancient nor valuable." [Scholz, however, quotes eighteen, and among them A, C, D, E.] The second reading, "τοῦ κυρίου και θεοῦ is supported by *one* very ancient manuscript, and sixty-three others, none of much antiquity or consequence, but of different families. . . . τοῦ θεοῦ is supported by the most ancient of the manuscripts (the Cod. Vat.) and seventeen others, some of them of the 10th, 11th, and 12th centuries, but most of them more modern." From this statement of the case, our author infers, "It is manifest τοῦ κυρίου is greatly inferior in manuscript authority to τοῦ κυρίου και θεοῦ, and not superior to τοῦ θεοῦ," that is, five very ancient manuscripts, and eight modern ones, are much inferior to *one* ancient one and sixty-three others of not much antiquity or consequence, but of different families; and not superior to *one* ancient and seventeen others. We think this is an inference to which few critics would assent. On the contrary, if manuscript authority alone was to be taken into account, we should reverse the statement. Our author decides, in view of all the evidence, in favour of τοῦ κυρίου και θεοῦ, and remarks that "as τοῦ κυρίου was evidently formed on τοῦ κυρίου και θεοῦ, that is decisive." The force of this remark we cannot perceive. We are inclined to think, in view of the evidence of the versions and fathers, which the reader may find exhibited in Wetstein or Scholz, that the readings should be arranged in regard to their respective claims, τοῦ θεοῦ, τοῦ κυρίου, and last of all τοῦ κυρίου και θεοῦ.

On Rom. 8: 10, our author tells us, "The edd. princ. the textus receptus, and several manuscripts and fathers have τοῦ ἐνοικούντος κτλ. which is adopted by Vater. The other reading τὸ ἐνοικούν κτλ. however, is, with reason, preferred by Griesbach, Knapp, Matthaei, Tittmann, as being the more difficult." Such statements give very little information to the reader as to the real state of the evidence. We know not which manuscripts support the one reading, or which support the other. It is useless to multiply examples. This is our author's method. He scarcely ever so presents the evidence that the reader can judge of the correctness of his decisions. It would require no more space to exhibit the evidence properly, than

the author, in most cases, occupies by his general statements. It would have taken up little room to say that the common text, in Rom. 8: 10, is supported by A, B, among the uncial manuscripts, and eight of the *minuscrit*. and the other reading by D, E, F, G, I, of the one class, and 23, as quoted by Scholz, of the other class. Though our author exhibits a very commendable degree of diligence, yet he has not gone the right way to work. He has formed no correct idea of what is expected of an editor of the sacred text. Neither in his preface nor his notes, does he so state his principles, or so exhibit the grounds of his decision, that the reader can judge of the propriety of the reading which he has adopted. His text therefore cannot be received with confidence. And we must repeat what we said at first, that it would have been much better had he adopted some text, such as that of Knapp, for example, and given it without alteration; and in his notes indicated the few corrections he thought desirable.

It is time however to attend to the exegetical department of the work before us. In our introductory remarks we have already adverted to the general features of the work. We must now refer to specific cases in illustration of the author's manner as an interpreter, and his opinions as a theologian. There is a great difference between the first and second volumes. The former, being devoted to the historical books, is, as might be expected, less full and less minute. The great fault of the first volume is, that the annotations are too much in the form of detached scholia; the discourses as discourses, or narratives as narratives, are not unfolded or explained. Let the reader turn to the exposition of the sermon on the mount, and he will feel the import and justice of our criticism. That important portion of scripture is entered upon without a preliminary remark, and is, for the most part, dispatched with brief grammatical or explanatory observations on particular forms of expression. To the Gospel of John our author devotes more attention. The discourse of our Saviour with Nicodemus is preceded by two long columns of introductory matter, which however consists almost entirely in conjectures as to the character and object of the Jewish ruler. In the exposition of this all-important exhibition of a fundamental truth of the gospel we find very little to commend. We are in a few words told that the expression  $\gammaεννηθῆναι \alpha\nuωθεν$  was a common one among the Jews to signify "*an entire change of heart and life*, though it was almost always connected with baptism as the symbol and pledge of it." But we do not find one word on the ground of the ne-

cessity of this new birth, no explanation of the expressions *to enter into the kingdom of God; to be born of the flesh; is flesh; to be born of the spirit; is spirit;* all these are passed over. And on the phrase γεννηθῆναι ἐξ ὕδατος we are only told that ὕδατος must be understood of baptism is quite plain from Titus 3: 5. Considering the space which our author gives to very subordinate matters, this is a very unsatisfactory degree of brevity. It appears from the little that is said that the writer is a believer in baptismal regeneration. This is not an inference to be drawn from his explaining ὕδατος in v. 5, of baptism, for many, who have no faith in that doctrine, understand our Saviour as there teaching that baptism (i. e. the open profession of his religion by the reception of baptism) and a spiritual new birth are both necessary for admission into the kingdom of heaven. But the reference to Titus 3: 5, and the author's remarks on that passage, make his views clear on this point. On the phrase διὰ λουτροῦ παλιγγενεσίας (Titus 3: 5), he remarks, "The ancient expositors almost universally, (see Chryst. 1. 323,) and all the most eminent modern commentators are agreed that by παλιγγ. is meant *baptismal regeneration*. . . . The term indeed might, without the adjunct λουτρον, mean *moral* regeneration." Had he stopped here we should have inferred that baptismal regeneration was not *moral* regeneration; but he immediately adds, that the following clause of the verse, *by the renewing of the Holy Ghost*, "must, of course, be primarily understood of the renovation proceeding from the regenerating grace of baptism; though it must not be confined to that; but understood of that moral renovation begun in baptism, but requiring the aid of the Holy Spirit through the whole of life." The reader will perceive that this is not an interpretation of the apostle's language, but a statement of the writer's own ideas on the subject. The words λουτρον παλιγγενεσίας mean *a washing which is regeneration*, or, *which is the cause of it*, and they can scarcely mean any thing else. All we have to do is to learn what παλιγγενεσία means. If we are to take our author's word for it, it very rarely means a *moral regeneration*. If so, the passage, even supposing λουτρον to mean *baptism*, teaches nothing about "the regenerating grace of baptism," but merely that we are saved by a washing (baptism), which is not a *moral* new birth, but the means of translation from one state to another. According to all the best means of judging, however, the word in question does in scriptural language mean *moral* regeneration.

As it only occurs elsewhere in the doubtful passage Matt. 19: 28, we must decide its meaning from its etymology, and from the use of cognate and analogous terms. Παλιγγενεσία, then, according to its etymology, is equivalent to τὸ ἐκ δευτέρου γεννηθῆναι and that again to τὸ ἀνωθεν γεννηθῆναι, which of course would lead us to the idea of a moral change. And then again, the cognate or analogous terms γεννάω, ἀναγεννάω, ἀνακαινώνω, ἀνακαινώσις, καινὴ κτίσις, when employed in relation to religious subjects, are always used in reference to a moral change. The word in question, therefore, there can be little doubt, means *regeneration* in the modern and general sense of that term, i. e. a new birth, or change of heart. If this be so, the passage in Titus teaches that we are saved by a washing which is a regeneration, a great moral change; and if λουτρὸν means baptism, then baptism is this moral regeneration, or the cause of it. But who has proved that λουτρὸν does mean baptism? The word itself has not this meaning; the context does not require this interpretation, nor do parallel and analogous passages favour it. On the contrary, it seems very plain that the apostle designed by the very form of expression to guard against such a misconception. He defines the *washing* of which he speaks as a παλιγγενεσία, a great moral change, and explains it by the following clause, "the renewing of the Holy Ghost." In the note on 1 Cor. 6: 11, our author's views on this subject are still more strongly expressed. On the expression "but ye are washed, but ye are sanctified, but ye are justified," &c., he remarks; "In the first of these terms, there is an allusion to baptism; in the second and third, to its effects and benefits, sanctification and justification." He sustains his interpretation by citing from bishop Bull, the following passage, "*Lavatio* significat primam a vitiis per baptismum purgationem; *sanctificatio* praeparationem et quasi formationem hominis per gratiam Spiritus Divini, ad opera bona facienda, vitamque sanctam degendam; *justificatio* denique amorem illum Dei, quo jam sanctam vitam degentes complexitur, eosque in Christo vitae aeternae praemio dignos censet." This is an illustration of the degree to which the leaven of papal theology has found its way into the church of England. Not so much indeed into its articles or liturgy, as into the minds of its dignitaries and theologians. This, as it seems to us, is easily accounted for. The church of England, as far as regards its peculiarities, rests in common with the Romish church, on tradition and the testimony of the fathers,

and not on the scriptures. In defending these peculiarities, therefore, recourse is had to these fathers; they are regarded as great authorities, not merely as to matters of form and government, but as to doctrine; and hence it is that the loose and antisciptural views which soon corrupted the purity of the gospel are constantly reappearing in the writings of the earlier, and even, as we see, the more modern theologians of the church of England. Hence we are told, even in this recent work, that "sanctification and justification are the effects of baptism," and in the language of bishop Bull, that justification is that love of God by which he embraces those who live a holy life.

The note on John 6: 37, *all that the Father giveth me, shall come to me*, is also characteristic of our author's manner of dealing with controverted doctrinal matters. As to the sense in which the Father is said to *give* men to Christ, he says, "expositors differ in opinion. The Calvinistic ones, as may be imagined, understand it of being chosen of the Father to eternal salvation by an absolute decree. But to this view see the unanswerable objections of Grotius, Hammond, and Whitby, as also of Chrysostom, who ascribes the dogma to the Manicheans. The term, therefore, (here and at v. 39 and 65) must signify something compatible with the free agency of man. . . . To *give* men to Christ, is evidently equivalent to *draw* them to Christ: and how irreconcilable that is with the compulsion implied in the Calvinistic interpretation of giving, is obvious." The word ἐλκύειν he tells us, "denotes a power not compulsory, but strongly suasive, meaning to *draw* (not *drag*) any one; i. e. to sway the understanding, or incline the will by all moral means and fit motives as propounded in the revelation of his will in the holy scriptures." This, however, is not all that is meant; the terms used, he says, "undoubtedly point to a most important doctrine—that of the preventing grace of God by his Holy Spirit, indispensably necessary to any one's being given to Christ by God; and also for the co-operating grace of that Spirit after we have been brought to Christ by his preventing grace—proving the truth of what is said in our article, that 'We have no power to do works pleasant and acceptable to God, without the grace of God preventing us, that we may have a good will, and working with us when we have that good will.'" This is very tolerable Calvinism, very much better than the most of that which is taught by some professed Calvinists of the present day.

The note on Acts 13: 48, is very long; more space is devoted to the single clause *καὶ ἐπίστευσαν ὅσοι ἦσαν τεταγμένοι εἰς ζωὴν αἰώνιον*, than to the whole paragraph in Rom. 5: 12—19. Our author of course objects to the ordinary interpretation, and yet neither approves of connecting *εἰς ζωὴν αἰ.* with *ἐπίσ.*, nor is disposed to take *τεταγμένοι*, in a middle sense, “those who had arrayed themselves for salvation.”\* He adopts another sense of *τάσσεσθαι εἰς*, viz. *to be thoroughly disposed for, or purposed for, bent on*, and states the full meaning to be, “whose minds were in a fit state to judge of the evidence of the truth of the gospel, who were seriously concerned about their salvation, and were thoroughly disposed to make all sacrifices to obtain eternal life.” Our author, after all his labour to disprove the Calvinistic interpretation of this passage, and to establish his own, virtually gives up every thing, by adding, “At the same time, while we contend that the doctrine of predestination can by no means be found here, yet it is proper to bear in mind that the *dispositions* of the persons in question could not have been what they were, or have been originally such, from themselves; but must be ascribed to the preventing grace of God, to which it is owing that men are ever disposed to embrace or obey the gospel of Christ.” With regard to the meaning of the passage itself little need be said. Admitting that *τεταγμένοι* may mean *disposed, bent upon*, we have the choice between the simple and ordinary meaning of the word as given by our translators *ordained*, and a very far fetched interpretation. Which is in most accordance with the analogy of the scriptures? Are men said to be called or chosen according to the purpose of God, or because they are in a state of mind to judge of the evidence of the gospel, &c. &c. The passage, though a very plain one, is not necessary for the support of the Calvinistic doctrine, though commentators of all classes admit our right to it.† Some

\* WINER, (Gram. p. 239), after giving several instances in which the perfect and pluperfect passive have the force of the middle, adds in a note, that MARKLAND reckons this passage as another example, and translates it thus, *et fidem professi sunt (quotquot tempus, diem), constituerant in vitam aeternam.* “This explanation,” rather discourteously adds Winer, “is likely to find, with impartial interpreters, about as little favour as most others which proceed from English philologists.”

† WAHL, in his *Clavis*, thus paraphrases the clause, *quos voluit Deus esse inter eos, quibus contingeret vita et felicitas aeterna.* OLSHAUSEN *Com. über das N. T.* “The idea of a *predestinatio sanctorum*, which pervades the whole scriptures, must be acknowledged in these words; and the attempts to obliterate it are to the last degree unnatural.”

of our author's objections to the common interpretation will excite surprise. "It is forbidden," he says, "by the word ἐπίστευσαν, which, under the present circumstances, can mean no more than that they believed in the Lord Jesus, and received the religion which he came to promulgate. Yet it cannot be supposed that *all* who did so were predestined to eternal life. There were doubtless, (as Schoettgen observes), among those believers, many hypocrites and evil livers, who eagerly enough embraced the theoretical truth, but cared not for the practice. These, then, were not predestined." *Valeat quantum.*

With regard to Episcopacy, our author is moderate and modest. He says but little on the subject. In the index, under the word *bishop*, we are referred to the notes on Acts 15: 36. 20: 17. Phil. 1: 1. 1 Thess. 5: 12—14. and 1 Tim. 3: 1. These notes, however, are generally very brief. On Phil. 1: 1, he refers us to "the elaborate note of Whitby, who (inter alia) observes: 'The Greek and Latin fathers, with one consent, declare that the apostle here calls their presbyters their bishops.' . . . Notwithstanding what has been so confidently asserted, that there was no distinction between presbyters and bishops until some time after the apostolic age; the profoundly learned Bingham, in his *Eccl. Antiq.* L. II. 1., seems to have satisfactorily proved the existence of a power in the apostolic age equivalent to that of bishops; and in the next age to the apostolical, both the exercise of the power, and the assumption of the title of bishop." Again, in 1 Tim. 3: 1, he says, "I have fully shown, in the notes on Acts 11: 30. 20: 17. Phil. 1: 1, that originally the terms ἐπισκ. and πρεσβ. denoted the same offices in the church: and I pointed out also how the office of bishop (as we now use the term) was introduced." The note on Acts 20: 17 we believe is specially referred to. The author there remarks on the word πρεσβυτέρους, "As these persons are at v. 28 called ἐπισκόπους, and especially from a comparison of other passages (as 1 Tim. 3: 1), the best commentators have with reason inferred the terms as yet denoted the same thing. . . . Now all πρεσβύτεροι were officially ἐπίσκοποι. Yet we are not therefore to infer that there was no superintending supreme authority in the primitive church; for reason will show that no society can exist without some laws, and consequently persons to administer those laws. There can, then, be no doubt (?) but that one of the presbyters (as there were many at Ephesus) was in such a case, invested with authority over the others, and

consequently was a *bishop* in the modern sense of the term." Such reasoning cannot need refutation.

We proceed to select a few specimens of our author's comments on the Epistles. Rom. 1: 4, as might be expected of a faithful son of the church of England, which has always laid great stress on all the doctrines relating to the person of Christ, he interprets in the usual way, viz. as to his human nature indeed the son of David, but declared by the divine power to be the Son of God, as to his divine nature, by the resurrection from the dead. In v. 17, *δικαιοσύνη γὰρ θεοῦ κτλ.* is rendered, "For the justification which is of God, is therein revealed to be by faith." And the author remarks that "faith here designates the *modus in quo* or the instrument by which, not the *causa causans seu efficiens*, i. e. not either the meritorious or efficient cause or ground of forgiveness." On the construction of the passage *ἤλλαξαν τ. δόξαν τ. θεοῦ ἐν ὁμοιώματι κτλ.* no remark is made. The sense is stated to be, "They dishonoured the glorious nature of the incorruptible God, by representing him under the likeness of," &c. This is inaccurate, the meaning is, "They exchanged the incorruptible God for the likeness," &c. The same mistake is made in v. 25, in regard to the expression *μετήλλαξαν τ. ἀληθειαν τ. θ. ἐν τῷ ψεύδει*, which is made to mean, who change the true God into a lie, i. e. a pretended God, an idol. And *ἐν τῷ ψεύδει* is said to be for *εἰς τὸ ψεῦδος*, a mode of interpretation which we are surprised to find in such a work.

In the beginning of ch. III. we find the following correct remark. After answering certain objections, the writer says, the apostle "draws the conclusion, that the law is insufficient to justify a man before God; and that for that justification, he will need righteousness of God through faith; which will, however, by no means tend to dispense with, but rather to confirm the obligations of the moral law." We make with design such citations as may serve to exhibit the writer's opinions on the leading doctrines of the gospel. On v. 20, where it is said, 'because, by the works of the law no flesh shall be justified,' &c. he argues to prove that *νόμος* here must mean the moral law, whether written or unwritten, i. e. law in general. Verse 21 is explained thus, "But *now* (i. e. under the present dispensation, the gospel) a method of justification appointed by God [rather a different explanation of *δικαιοσύνη θεοῦ* from that which the introductory remark just



would lead us to expect], without reference to obedience to law of any kind, is revealed and promulgated; a method (which is no novelty) whose existence is attested by the law and the prophets." To the word ἀπολύτρωσις, he says, "Most commentators assign the sense *deliverance*, without any reference to ransom paid. There is, however, an *allusion* thereto, and *no more*(?). It here denotes the method of redemption provided by Christ." This is not very exact. In the first place it is not correct that most commentators assign to the word here the mere idea of *deliverance*. On the contrary, the great body even of the neological class of interpreters, give it its true sense, *deliverance by ransom*; see Wahl and Koppe as examples. In the second place, there is much more than a mere *allusion* to the idea of a ransom in the word. And, thirdly, it does not denote the *method* of redemption, but the redemption itself. The word ἱλαστήριον, in verse 25, he understands to mean an expiatory victim, a propitiatory sacrifice; and on v. 26 he quotes with approbation from Bengel the sentence, Summum hic paradoxon evangelicum; nam in lege conspicitur Deus justus et condemnans, in evangelio justus ipse, et justificans peccatores. And on v. 28 he cites, with commendation, Prof. Stuart, who says that passage means "We count it as certain that men are justified in a gratuitous manner through faith in Christ, and not by perfect obedience to the law."

As the concluding verses of this chapter, vs. 21—31, constitute one of the most important portions of the New Testament, we think the reader will consider our author's exposition of them disproportionately short. He devotes very nearly as much space to a single verse in Galatians, ch. 2:20, as he does to the whole of this interesting passage. Brevity however is not the only fault. The passage is not unfolded, nor the relation of its several parts explained; and there is a vagueness in the exposition which leaves the mind unsatisfied.

With regard to chap. IV. our author remarks, "Here commences Part II. of the Epistle (extending from hence to the end of chap. VIII.), in which it is proved, that the gospel doctrine of justification by faith, or gratuitous justification, does not make void any law, whether natural or revealed, but is quite consistent with both." We think this a very erroneous view of the design of this and the following chapters, and, moreover, inconsistent with what the writer himself says immediately afterwards, for he tells us that the apos-

tle proves in this chapter, "1. That Abraham himself was justified by faith, and not by circumcision (4: 1—12): that therefore justification is by faith, i. e. gratuitous, and not by works of law; and belongs to the uncircumcised Gentiles, no less than to the Jews. 2. That the believing Gentiles are part of the true seed of Abraham, intended in the promise, (4: 13—18,) and that therefore the Gentiles, by faith in Jesus Christ, have equal claim with the Jews to justification and all the benefits of the covenant." If this is correct, the design of the chapter is to establish the doctrine of justification by faith, and not to prove that it does not make void the law.

The full sense, he tells us, of the clause *Abraham believed God, and it was counted to him for righteousness*, is, "Abraham placed entire confidence in God and his promises, with respect to offspring, &c., performing all such things as, by the light of nature, reason, and conscience, he supposed would be acceptable to God, though unenlightened by that future revelation of his will which he anxiously anticipated. Therefore God reckoned his pious reliance and devotedness to him for, and took them *instead* of, all those more perfect observances of faith and practice which a future revelation of his will should promulgate and enjoin. So Prof. Stuart, after remarking that the phrase ἐλογίσθη εἰς δικ. being, at v. 4, interchanged with λογίζεται κατὰ χάριν, affords a satisfactory view of its meaning, thinks it must be, that in consequence of Abraham's belief, he was justified or accepted as righteous; i. e. he was gratuitously justified." Whether the author means by this to cite Prof. Stuart in support of his own interpretation of this passage, we do not exactly understand, and with how much justice such citation might be made, we do not pretend to know. The author quotes also from Macknight the following passage, which has at least the merit of being perfectly intelligible, "In judging Abraham, God will place on one side of the account his *duties*, and on the other his *performances*. And on the side of his performances he will place his faith, and by mere favour will value it as equal to a complete performance of his duties, and reward him as if he were a righteous person. But neither here nor in Gal. 3: 6, is Christ's righteousness said to be imputed to Abraham. Farther, as it is no where said in scripture that Christ's righteousness was imputed to Abraham, so neither is it said any where that Christ's righteousness is imputed to believers. In short, the uniform doctrine of scripture is, that the believer's faith is counted to him for righteousness by the mere

grace or favour of God through Jesus Christ, that is, on account of what Christ has done to procure that favour for him. This is all. Nor does the scripture carry the matter farther." Were this all that was said on this subject, our author's views on the subject of justification would be clear. It is not our business to discuss their soundness; we should like to know, however, how they are to be reconciled with some of his previous statements on the subject. On ch. 1: 17, he tells us faith is the *modus in quo*, the instrument by which we are justified: but here we are taught that faith holds a very different relation to justification. It is not the instrument, it is the ground, it is that which is taken *instead* of perfect obedience. It bears the same relation to our acceptance that obedience would do; it is only less in quantity. He had told us also, on ch. 3, that Christ saves us as an expiatory victim. If this be so, it is the merit of that victim, not our acceptance of him, or reliance upon him, which is the ground of acceptance. This placing the ground of our justification in any thing done by us or wrought in us, is a very serious error.

The important and difficult passage ch. 5: 12—19, is past over in a very cursory and unsatisfactory manner. The author professes to agree with Prof. Stuart, and refers to him with great commendation. "So far," he says, "the general scope is plain; but, as Stuart observes, the detail is replete with difficulties, which have, however, been, for the most part, successfully encountered by the learned Professor in his very valuable commentary, which I strongly recommend to all those of my readers who are desirous of understanding the course of reasoning in this important portion of scripture; and must content myself with referring them to his excellent analysis of the contents of these verses." We were surprised after this, to find him differing from Prof. Stuart in points which render it impossible that he should entertain the same opinion with the professor, as to the scope and reasoning of the apostle. He agrees, indeed, with him and most other commentators, in supposing that v. 12 contains the first member of a comparison which is completed in v. 18. He agrees also with him and others, in considering vs. 13, 14 as the proof of the proposition contained in v. 12. It is evident from this, that if he differs from Prof. Stuart as to the meaning of v. 12, he must differ from him in his view of the whole passage. And that he does thus differ, there can be no doubt. On the words ἐφ' ᾧ πάντες ἡμαρτον, after remarking on the different explanations given of ἐφ' ᾧ, he says, "The difficulty is

not such as needs to be removed in so violent a manner; for ἡμαρτον *sinned*, merely implies that they are 'treated as sinners,' 'considered guilty in the sight of God;' i. e. on account of Adam's fall. Thus the expression will be equivalent to ἀμαρτωλοὶ κατεστάθησαν at v. 19." But Prof. Stuart tells us that πάντες ἡμαρτον mean *all have sinned in their own persons, or actually*. This is a radical difference. According to Bloomfield, the comparison is, 'as by one man sin entered into the world, and death by sin, and so death passed on all, because that all are considered guilty in the sight of God on account of the fall of that one man, so all are considered righteous in the sight of God, on account of the obedience of one man.' But according to Stuart, the comparison is, 'As all men have been introduced to sin and death by Adam' (i. e. as he explains him p. 216, 'as sin and death had been introduced into the world by one man, and become universal),' so righteousness and life are provided for all by Christ,' p. 235. According to Bloomfield, the proposition contained in v. 12, which verses 13, 14 are intended to establish is, that all men are considered guilty in the sight of God on account of Adam's fall. According to Prof. Stuart, those verses are designed to prove that all men have sinned in their own persons. It is very obvious that these are radically different views of the whole passage. We think Bloomfield right in this case, and Prof. Stuart wrong. But the marvel is, that the former should think that he agrees with the latter. The wonder is increased when we look at the following verses. Bloomfield says the argument of vs. 13, 14 is well stated by Mr. Holden, thus, "Adam was subjected to death because he violated the law respecting the forbidden fruit; but from his time till that of Moses men were subject to death who had not violated any similar positive and express law; therefore, they must have been subjected to death and treated as sinners, not for their own actual sin, but in consequence of Adam's sin." This is an interpretation which Prof. Stuart rejects with great earnestness (see pp. 218, 19), and maintains that these verses prove that all men are sinners, in their own persons, and therefore death prevailed over them all. Yet in the sentence immediately preceding the one just quoted, Bloomfield says, "The common interpretation of the whole passage (vs. 13, 14), is confirmed by the Greek fathers and commentators. See the details in Stuart." Again, on the clause τοὺς μὴ ἀμαρτήσαντας κτλ. *who had not sinned, &c.*, the writer remarks, "By the persons here adverted to are

meant, as bishop Warburton remarks, those who died before they came to the knowledge of good and evil, namely, infants and idiots." This interpretation, says Prof. Stuart, is generally rejected by distinguished critics of all parties, at the present day." It is very obvious that the author's ideas must be very confused, who can give such interpretations of the details of a passage, and yet imagine himself to agree with a writer as to its design and argument, who adopts views directly the reverse of his own on such essential points.

We remarked above that we thought the writer correctly explains the meaning of the words πάντες ἡμαρτον in saying that they imply, that all men are treated as sinners, or are considered guilty in the sight of God on account of Adam's fall. This no doubt is the *sense* of the passage, though not perhaps the *signification* of the words. That is, it may be doubted whether ἡμαρτάνω has the signification there assigned to it of *peccati culpam sustineo*, as Wahl expresses it, and yet this may be, and we doubt not is, the meaning intended to be expressed by the apostle by the whole context. This idea, however, may be expressed, though the word be translated according to its ordinary signification, provided we adhere to the strict force of the tense which the sacred writer uses. The aorist ἡμαρτον does not mean *have sinned*, but *sinned*. That is, it simply relates to the past, without any reference to any other portion of time; it also expresses that which is momentary in time past, in opposition to what is continuous or frequently repeated.\* Our translation, therefore, of πάντες ἡμαρτον, *all have sinned*, by bringing the action expressed by the verb into relation to the present time, naturally suggests the idea that 'all have sinned and are now sinners,' and on this account death has passed on all. The language of the apostle, however, correctly expresses the very idea demanded by the context, the scope of the passage, and the parallel expressions which occur in the following verses, 'As by one man sin entered into the world, and death by sin, so death passed on all, for all sinned,' i. e. they all once sinned through that one man. The sense in which they sinned through him is explained by what follows; they were constituted sinners on account of his transgression, i. e. they are considered guilty in the sight of God on account of Adam's fall; as they are constituted righteous on account of Christ's righteousness.

\* See WINEYER'S Gram. p. 251, 252. Robinson's Buttmann, p. 378.

The seventh chapter, as might be anticipated, is understood by our author as describing the exercises of an unrenewed man. On v. 14 he remarks, "Augustin, and most of the early modern commentators (especially of the Calvinistic school), maintain that the apostle here speaks of himself, and of regenerate Christians. But the ancient commentators and the later modern ones are of opinion that he speaks of the unregenerate, and consequently *per μετασχηματισμόν*, as before." With the latter our author professes to agree. On v. 17 he has the following passage (quoted from Young), "From both the foregoing instances the apostle draws the same conclusion—that the man thus acting in opposition to his conscience and best resolutions and endeavours, can hardly be considered a free agent; but must labour under some fatal bias, some inbred, indwelling principle of sin." We do not think that writers who are not of the Calvinistic school mend matters much. It is immediately added, "The apostle here, for the purpose of his argument, considers man as having two distinct natures, the *spiritual* and *carnal*. The former he now speaks of as the *real self*, which he calls at v. 17, &c. *I*; at v. 22, *inward man*; v. 23, *the law of the mind*; and describes 8: 1, by *κατὰ πνεῦμα*, &c." This looks like going back to the other interpretation; unless the writer departs so entirely from scriptural usage as to call mere natural conscience *spiritual*, or describe it as *κατὰ πνεῦμα*. That the writer does lose himself and fail to carry out his own hypothesis, we think very plain from his comment on v. 2 of the next chapter. "The νόμος τοῦ πνεύματος and the νόμος τῆς ἁμαρτίας," he tells us, "have reference to the *two principles of action* mentioned in the preceding chapter, by which the carnally minded and the spiritually minded are respectively led. The former is so called, as being implanted by the Spirit, the giver of life." Then, of course, the conflict detailed in the preceding chapter is not a conflict between natural conscience and corrupt inclination, but between a principle of action implanted by the Spirit of God and our corrupt nature, or as our author calls it, on v. 17, *the old man*. We ought perhaps to have quoted from the note on 6: 6 the writer's explanation of the phrase ὁ παλαιὸς ἄνθρωπος, which, he says, "denotes the corrupt disposition, and even nature, which men derive from Adam, and which belongs to them in their unrenewed state. . . . To this is opposed the *new man*, the *holy disposition* and character infused by the Holy Spirit and required by the gospel."

The phrase φρόνημα τῆς σαρκός, in v. 6, is inadequately explained as “the being devoted to the flesh by the medium of the animal propensities.”\* The word δύναται, v. 7, he tells us, “The most enlightened commentators, ancient and modern, are agreed must be taken in a popular sense, as in the next verse, so as not to exclude the liberty of human action, or interfere with man’s free will. See Bp. Bull’s Apolg. pro Harm. p. 74, and Prof. Stuart; the latter of whom shows we are not to resort to any metaphysical subtleties; what the natural and physiological powers of the sinner are, not being under discussion.” In the explanation of vs. 19—21, the author inclines to the old interpretation, making κρίσις to mean the *whole creation*. The general sense of vs. 28—39 he expresses in the language of Prof. Stuart, which clearly ascribes to the apostle the doctrines of predestination and the perseverance of the saints. Yet in the details of the exposition he departs from the view given by the professor. Thus on v. 29, he says, “I see no reason to abandon the common interpretation of οὓς πρόέγνω, *those whom he foreknew would be such*, i. e. lovers of God. . . . The best commentators, ancient and modern, are mostly agreed that πρόέγνω is to be understood *of the prescience of character*, and πρόώρισε, *of determination founded on such prescience*.” On v. 32 he says, ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν does *not* (as the heterodox interpreters make it) signify *for our benefit*, but (as Koppe acknowledges) *in our stead*, and for the expiation of our sins.”

The note on ch. 9: 5 is the most condensed and satisfactory that we have yet met with in the book. We must except, however, one rather singular remark, “Many modern commentators (even Stuart) think that ὁ ὢν ἐπὶ πάντων θεός is equivalent to ὁ ὢν ὁ μέγιστος θεός, *who is the supreme God*, thus making God the Son supreme over God the Father.” Yet to the interpretation itself the writer assents, only requiring that the “epithet *supreme* is not to be understood to imply any superiority over God the Father, but only over all created being, so that the passage shall testify the equality or rather the identity of Christ’s deity with that of the Father.” This is obviously all that was ever intended by the expression to which the exception is taken.

\* The reader will be surprised to notice in this work, among so many indications of scholarship on the part of the author, the almost constant occurrence of the inaccurate or inappropriate use of words, and of awkward expressions, as in the case just cited, “*devoted by the medium*,” and on p. 41, “*preoccupies two objections*,” a latinism almost as bad as “*contort interpretations*,” p. 16.

The notes on vs. 8, 9, 10, are, with some slight exceptions, such as a Calvinist might have written. For example, it is said on v. 8, "Here it is shown whatever difference might exist between Isaac and Ishmael, that was to be ascribed solely to the good pleasure and gracious promise of God." The author, however, would probably understand his own language in a manner somewhat different from that in which we should interpret it. On v. 11 we are told, "The apostle does not mean (as those of the Calvinistic persuasion imagine) that there is destined to all men individually a state either of eternal happiness or eternal misery, not according to the merits of each, but according to a divine decree, or on account of the imputation of Adam's sin." What can this mean, a state of eternal happiness destined to individuals on account of the imputation of Adam's sin? In the course of the extended note which follows, we have the usual objections to the argument derived from these verses, in favour of the doctrine of personal election. As, for example, that the apostle is not speaking of the whole human race; that he does not refer to the state of men in a future life; that he is not speaking of individuals but of the church; that Jacob and Esau are not spoken of as individuals, but as representing two nations, &c. &c. There is no intimation in all this that the writer does not decidedly reject the Calvinistic view of the apostle's argument. Yet he seems to find, when he gets to v. 14, that his own interpretation cannot be carried through, for we there meet with the following singular contradiction of what he had previously stated. "In not having bestowed on *all* the Israelites, but on *some* only, this blessing of faith in Christ [this is not an external privilege, but a saving grace, and a gift to individuals], the greater part being left in unbelief, the apostle shows that God does not act unjustly." And he finally fairly confesses that 'he is inclined to agree with the learned Professor Stuart,' and "to admit that the object of the apostle in this chapter may be not merely to vindicate the divine proceedings, in regard to giving or withholding favours in the present world, or the external privileges of religion; but also in respect to the future lot of saints and sinners in another." And on v. 15 he says, "The meaning is, in conferring privileges or favours, whether upon nations or *individuals*, God acts according to his sovereign pleasure." He appears, however, occasionally to relapse into his former opinion, for in relation to the expression *destined for glory*, v. 23, he says, "The *glory* here mentioned must be under-



stood, with Macknight, not of the glory of eternal life; for, as he observes, the scriptures never speak of *that* as bestowed on nations, or bodies of men complexly (v. 24), but of the glory of being made the church or people of God." This, as far as we can understand, is in direct contradiction to the exposition he had given of vs. 14—23. The remark on v. 29 is rather obscure, "Here we have another passage on the same subject with the preceding; namely, that it is to be ascribed to the singular goodness of God, that a very small part only (to the exclusion of the great bulk of the Jews) possess the promised felicity."

The interesting passage, 1 Cor. 1: 30, *who of him is made unto us wisdom, righteousness, sanctification and redemption*, is not very satisfactorily explained. The author, adopting the interpretation of Bp. Warburton, says, "*Wisdom and righteousness* describe a messenger sent from God with the publication of the eternal law of truth and right(?); *sanctification and redemption* denote the Messiah who was to atone for man's transgression, and restore him to his lost inheritance." Still less satisfactory is the author's exposition of chap. 3: 14, 15. "The ψυχικοί άνθρωποι are those who have the ψυχήν (or animal and sensual principle, which man enjoys in common with the brutes) only, without having, or at least using, the πνεῦμα, or *intellectual faculty*, which is peculiar to man; and who are of course destitute of the illumination of the Holy Spirit; men who are either led by sensual impulses only, or rely solely on the light of nature, slighting every thing which cannot be brought to the evidence of the senses." As though this description could include all the rejecters of the gospel, and as though some of the most intellectual of men have not as much opposed to the 'things of the Spirit,' as the most sensual. It is plain that, according to the apostle's classification, every man who is not πνευματικός, i. e. under the influence of the Holy Spirit, is ψυχικός, i. e. under the guidance of his own natural principles; ψυχή means the whole mind or soul as often as it means the animal principle.

The difficult passage, in ch. 15: 28, respecting baptism for the dead, the author thinks means, 'What will they be doing, i. e. what will they benefit themselves, who are baptized for the sake of, i. e. in hope of, the resurrection of the dead.' In 2 Cor. 5: 14, (*The love of Christ constrained us, thus judging if one die for all, &c.*) the writer correctly considers the phrase *love of Christ* as meaning, his love towards us;

ὕπερ πάντων is paraphrased 'as an expiatory sacrifice for the sins of all.' It is better to abide by the simple meaning of the words as explained by the author on a previous passage, *instead of all*. The words ἄρα οἱ πάντες ἀπέθανον, he says, "almost all translators render, then *were all dead*. But to this version strong and well-founded objections are urged by Prof. Scholef (in his Hints, p. 50), who shows, 1. That it involves a strong confusion of terms; 2. That it is contrary to the *usus loquendi* of the apostle; and, 3. That ἀπέθανον cannot signify *I was dead*, but *I am dead*. I would render 'then are all dead,' as Col. 3: 3. The full meaning is, 'Then are all by nature spiritually dead,' i. e. in a state of condemnation, liable to eternal death; and, as it is implied, need to be brought into a state of salvation by the gospel." But to this interpretation the same objections may be urged; 1. It involves a strange confusion of terms; ἀπέθανον is used in one sense in the first part of the clause and in another in the second; 2. It is contrary to the *usus loquendi* of the apostle, inasmuch as he does not use the word ἀποθνήσκω without any adjunct to express the idea of spiritual death; and, 3. ἀπέθανον means neither *were* dead, nor *are* dead, but *died*. It means in the one member of the clause what it does in the other. 'If one died for all, then all died.' The meaning therefore is precisely what the apostle expresses in Rom. 6: 3—8, and 7: 4—6. 'If one died for all, then (in virtue of their union with him) all died; his death was virtually their death, and therefore as he lives we shall live also.' Comp. Gal. 2: 20, I am crucified with Christ, yet I live, &c.

The criticism on Gal. 2: 17, seems to us very obscure. Of εἰ δὲ ζητοῦντες δικαιωθῆναι ἐν Χρ., &c. he says, "The best commentators, ancient and modern, are agreed the sense is, while we seek to attain justification from Christ, resting all our hopes of it on him; εὗρέθημεν καὶ αὐτοὶ ἁμαρτωλοὶ *we be found sinners*; i. e. it be discovered that we are sinners; namely, by having rejected the Jewish law." After a few remarks on the difference of the words εὗρ. and εἶναι he adds, 'εἰ εὗρ. ἁμαρ. signifies, if we are discovered to be yet in our sins, i. e. by clinging to the law and having recourse to its expiations.' Here are two contradictory explanations of the sense in which Paul uses the expression *found to be sinners*. The author overlooks the words καὶ αὐτοί, which give colour to the thought: *even* we, we in opposition to some other class of persons implied in the context. And that class is either those who do not seek to be justified by Christ, or the Gen-

tiles as distinguished from the Jewish Christians. The sense is then either, 'If seeking to be justified in Christ, even we (i. e. who thus seek, and because we thus seek) are found to be sinners, then is Christ the minister of sin;' or, 'If seeking to be justified in Christ, even we Jews are found to be sinners, i. e. in the same situation with the heathen, then,' &c. The difficult passage in v. 19, "I by the law am dead (*ἀπέθανον* died) to the law," is explained after Calvin, Beza, Winer and others to mean, "by the very nature of the law, with allusion to the extent and extreme minuteness of the law, which left no hope of fulfilling what it required. . . . Ipsa lex mihi causa fuit, ut eam desererem." This interpretation suits the expression itself better than it does the context. The apostle immediately adds, I am crucified with Christ; it is therefore by his being crucified with Christ that he is freed from the law; as he himself more clearly teaches in Rom. 7: 4, 'Ye have died to the law by the body of Christ.' In harmony with this and similar passages, the one before us seems rather to mean, 'I through the law, i. e. through the execution of the law on him with whom I died, am freed from the law.'\*

The expression in Gal. 5: 2, *Christ shall profit you nothing*, is explained, "The Christian religion will be of no avail to your salvation." Which is a mere adulteration of the text, weakening its force without explaining its meaning.

In Ephesians, ch. 1: 4, the phrase *ἐξελέξατο ἡμᾶς ἐν αὐτῷ* *hath chosen us in him* is made to mean, "hath selected us, or shown us marks of peculiar favour by or through him. . . . The best commentators, ancient and modern [a standing formula with our author], are agreed that the election and predestination in question, solely relate to God's eternal purpose of bestowing the privileges of adoption (on which see note on Rom. 8: 15) upon the Ephesians and other sincere believers in Christ. This is confirmed by what is said at v. 3 of spiritual blessings of the highest kind being imparted to

\* "The law has (on account of sin) threatened me with death, condemned me to death; this legal death I have suffered with Christ, who took the punishment upon himself in our stead, since he died for all, all died: in so far, therefore, as I have suffered this death required by the law, the law has lost its authority over me, I through the law have died to the law." USTERI Com. über den Galaterbrief. Those German commentators whose philosophy has effected their thorough emancipation, generally understand the apostles very much as the reformers did. We may hope in time to see the same result realized in our own country. Entire indifference as to what the apostles taught, and a disposition to submit implicitly to their teaching, are found to lead to the same views of their doctrines.

them. Indeed, even candid Calvinistic commentators (see Doddrige) admit that the apostle has here no reference to the personal election of individuals, but to the election of whole communities and nations—even of the Gentiles, whom God was pleased to admit to the benefits of the gospel.” The holiness, however, to which believers are said to be chosen, v. 4, and the ‘spiritual blessings of the highest kind’ spoken of in v. 3, are surely personal favours, i. e. are blessings which pertain to individuals. Whole nations were not chosen to personal holiness and all the blessings of being the sons of God. The writer, we hope, supposes more is intended by *sonship* than the mere external relation in which all Christian nations stand to God. He refers us to Rom. 8: 15, for an explanation of the nature of this adoption, but we find there nothing on the subject, except the remark that *υιοθεσία* means *sonship* rather than adoption, and that *πνεῦμα* means *disposition*, and not the Holy Spirit. This is of itself, however, enough to show that he understands the *υιοθεσία* to be something more than the external relation of nominal Christians to God. Indeed, on this verse he had previously remarked that this adoption was bestowed on sincere believers. If this be the case, the election spoken of must be an election of individuals, for none other than individuals are in fact thus chosen to be personally holy and the sons of God. Besides, by what right does the author restrict the *us* here spoken of, “hath chosen *us*,” “having predestinated *us*,” to the Gentiles? There is not the slightest warrant for this in the context, nor in the form of expression. Paul surely meant to include himself, when he said God hath chosen us that we might be holy; and Paul was no Gentile. We can see no reason for understanding this passage in any other way than our author himself is obliged to understand some of the passages in Rom. 9, i. e. as teaching the doctrine of the personal election of individuals to spiritual and eternal blessings.

The exposition of the very difficult passage in v. 10, is unsatisfactory, both from its disproportionate brevity and its inaccuracy. The preposition *εις* he considers as expressing purpose. “The sense will then be [and this was done] for the purpose of displaying the plan of (or respecting) the fullness of times,” &c. But this includes much not contained in the text. It is much simpler to explain the connexion thus, ‘Having made known the mystery of his will (*εις*) *in* reference to the plan,’ &c. The infinitive *ανακεφαλαιώσασθαι*

he says is in apposition with *οικονομίαν*, and the sense is, *the plan*, “namely, that of bringing together into one body and uniting all beings under one Head, Christ.” Better, again, to make this infinitive exegetical of the *μυστήριον τοῦ θελήματος αὐτοῦ*, which is the dominant subject in the whole passage, ‘His secret purpose to bring all things to a harmonious union.’ By *τὰ πάντα* he understands “all intelligent beings, meaning both Jews and Gentiles;” and he immediately adds, “that by *τὰ ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς* are denoted the angels.” But this is impossible, or rather contradictory. The things in heaven and the things on earth are merely the apostle’s amplification of the *all things*. God purposes to bring together all things, whether in heaven or on earth: if then the *all things* mean Jews and Gentiles, *the things in heaven* cannot mean angels.

The 19th verse he understands as meaning that, “the future resurrection of believers shall be accomplished according to the working of that mighty power which he exerted in Christ when he raised him from the dead.” This we think inconsistent with the context, inasmuch as Paul illustrates our spiritual, and not our natural resurrection, by a reference to the resurrection of Christ; and at variance also with the parallel passage in Col. 2: 12, where our believing is ascribed to the energy of him who raised up Christ from the dead. The word *θελήματα*, in ch. 3: 3, he says, “denotes the *passions*, as *σαρκός* does the appetites of our corrupt nature. This natural corruption is *implied* in *θελ.* (which should be rendered *propensities*), and is *expressed* in the next words, which seem to be added for that very purpose. For though the *φύσει* there is tortured by many learned commentators to yield some such sense as shall exclude the doctrine of the natural corruption of the human heart (namely, either *custom* or *acquired habit*), yet in vain, for in all the passages cited the sense *natural disposition* always peeps forth.” And in the same strain through the note he insists on the usual orthodox interpretation of this passage.

The expression *ὅς ἐστιν εἰκὼν τοῦ θεοῦ*, Col. 1: 15, we cannot think our author has either correctly or consistently explained. He tells us the meaning is, “Christ is (in his human nature) the visible image of the invisible God.” It is not, however, in his human nature, that Christ is the image of God; according to the analogy of the scriptures, and the language of the Jewish and Christian church, the terms *image*, *word*, *son*, are interchangeably used, not indeed as per-

fectly synonomous, but as referring to the divine nature of the Messiah. And this the author himself admits, for in the same note he tells us, "The present passage is manifestly parallel to that of Heb. 1: 3, ὅς ὡν ἀπαύγασμα κτλ. i. e. a true copy, similitude, or delineation of the Father: as fully representing his substance, essence, and attributes, as the impression answers to the seal." All this, of course, can be said only of the divine, and not of the human nature of Christ.

The celebrated passage in 2 Thess. 2: 3—12, relating to the apostacy and Man of Sin, our author considers as relating to events still future. The apostacy, therefore, here spoken of, is not the papacy, nor is the pope the Man of Sin. In these views our author coincides with what is called the 'prophetic school' in England. The almost equally disputed passage in 1 Tim. 3: 15, 16, he of course understands as strongly teaching the deity of Christ. He also regards the apostle as declaring that the church is "the pillar and foundation of the truth;" not however "the church of Rome, or the church of England or Scotland, or any particular church, but Christ's Holy Catholic church (for which we pray in our Liturgy), consisting of all the true churches of Christ throughout the world; i. e. all such churches as hold the essential doctrines of the gospel." We infer from this that our author does not regard the church of England, or churches furnished with prelatical bishops, as constituting the whole church of Christ. As this book is highly commended by some of the high-church Episcopal functionaries in this country, who seem to be fast verging to the papal spirit and principles of archbishop Laud, we hope such passages, from such a source, may serve to enlarge their hearts a little, and to convince them that confirmation (an external rite) is not "of as great importance as repentance, faith, baptism, and the doctrine of future resurrection or eternal judgment."\* This is a monstrous sentiment for a Christian to utter in any age, and a marvellous one for any man living in the nineteenth century to entertain. We do not agree with our author, however, in his view of

\* See the MISSIONARY (published in Burlington, N. J.) for Feb. 25, 1837. If any thing can be more wonderful than the sentiment quoted above, it is the proof of the apostolic origin of the rite of confirmation derived by the writer in the Missionary, from Acts 15: 41, "And Paul went through Syria and Cilicia CONFIRMING the churches." The reader must not overlook the capitals, for therein lies the argument. The only parallel to this specimen of interpretation which we know of, is the appeal made by the Shakers to the exhortation, "Turn ye, turn ye," in defence of their rotary dancing. The Shaker, we think, has the better of it, as the word *turn* occurs twice in his text.

this passage. We do not think that, contrary to the uniform language and mode of representation of the scriptures, Paul represents even the "CHURCH UNIVERSAL" as the pillar and foundation of the truth. Agreeably to the punctuation adopted by Bengel, Griesbach, Knapp, and other editors, the passage gives a very different sense. There should be a full point after *church of the living God*, and a new sentence should commence with *σύλος*. 'A pillar, and foundation of the truth, and confessedly great, is the mystery of godliness. God manifest in the flesh.' The whole structure of the passage is in favour of this interpretation. The words *τὸ τῆς ἐσσεβείας μυστήριον* are the subject of the sentence, and *σύλος, ἐδραίωμα, μέγα*, connected by the conjunction *καί*, and without the article, form the predicate. It is very unnatural to disjoin the words *a pillar and foundation and beyond contradiction great*, &c.

The commentary on the Epistle to the Hebrews appears to be more elaborate than that on most other portions. And here our author, perhaps, will be found to differ less from his brethren of other denominations. His exposition of the first chapter is, as far as we have examined it, in accordance with the common interpretation. With regard to the difficult passage in the second chapter, beginning with v. 5, he does not appear to be very clear. There are three leading views which may be taken of the course of the apostle's argument. The first and most commonly adopted, and as we think, the most natural is, that the apostle here introduces a new consideration in proof of the superiority of Christ to Moses and the angels, derived from his exaltation over ALL THINGS, agreeably to the language of the eighth Psalm. The second view is, that he intends to answer an objection of the Jews against his preceding statement of the superiority of Christ to angels, founded on the fact that he was a man. This is adopted by Heinrichs, Stuart and others. The third is that of Storr, who supposes the apostle designs to show the greatness of the blessedness secured by the gospel, from the consideration that "the world to come" is put in subjection to us men, and not to angels. Our author unites the first and second of these views, which union serves only to produce indistinctness and confusion. In respect to the use and application of Ps. 8, the author adopts a middle course, and says, that "bishop Middleton shows that this psalm is an instance of the existence in the Old Testament, of passages having both a primary and secondary sense, i. e. capable of a

two-fold application, being *directly* applicable to circumstances then past, or present, or soon to be accomplished; and *indirectly* to others which the Divine Providence was about to develope under a future dispensation." At the end of the paragraph, he adds, "see a confirmation of this view in Prof. Stuart's Excursus IV." We suspect the professor will be startled to find himself quoted in behalf of the double sense, which he has always maintained to be tantamount to no sense at all.

On ch. 9: 28 also, he refers to Mr. Stuart, in support of the orthodox interpretation of the phrase ἀνενεγκέν ἁμαρτίας, and in this case with great propriety, for in his commentary, Mr. Stuart says, "*To bear the sins* means *to bear the punishment*, i. e. to suffer the penalty due to sin." And χωρὶς ἁμαρτίας means, "Without again suffering the penalty due to sin." This, considering all that has been written by Prof. Stuart and his followers against the doctrine of the imputation of sin, or the idea that one person can justly suffer the penalty due to the sin of another, or that Christ's sufferings were penal, is certainly very remarkable.

We fear we are extending our remarks to an unreasonable length. It is unnecessary to proceed farther, as enough has been said and quoted to give our readers an idea of the work before us. It is very unequal in its different portions; that devoted to the Epistle to the Hebrews being much the best that we have had time to examine. The elegance and correctness with which this work is printed, its convenient form, the varied learning displayed in the annotations, and the kind and moderate spirit which is characteristic of the author recommend it strongly to the biblical student. But if he look for condensed and clear statements of difficult points, or consistent exhibitions of doctrinal truths, or even skill in the work of exposition, he will be disappointed.

After so minute a notice of Bloomfield's work, we shall hardly be able to do more than mention that of Townsend, which the same liberal and enterprising publishers have placed within the reach of American readers. It is somewhat singular that two productions of the English Episcopal school, both strongly marked with its peculiarities, should be reprinted at the same time, in the capital city of congregational America. Townsend's work differs from Bloomfield's in presenting the English version instead of the Greek text, arranged, according to his judgment, chronologically. His



notes, however, are not exclusively adapted to the English reader. They are chiefly characterized by a variety and abundance, not only of references, but of quotations, within the usual circle of an English theologian. They evince more industry and knowledge of books than originality or depth. As to the plan of the work, there may be cases in which, or persons to whom, it would be highly useful, and as a book of reference, it well deserves a place upon the student's table; but to most, we are persuaded, its complexity will make it nearly useless. However pleasing such a plan in theory may be, there can be little hope of practical utility, when almost every reader feels himself embarrassed in attempting to make use of it. Without a careful study of the plan itself, it is scarcely possible to find what one wants in such a volume. To peruse the Bible once, as thus arranged, with due attention to the principle of arrangement, would no doubt be a profitable exercise to students; but for ordinary use, the original form is immeasurably better. We say this, of course, with special reference to the gospels, but the same remark admits, though in a less degree, of general application. Our own judgment, after all experiments, is still in favour of the Bible as it is. In justice to Townsend, we must add, however, that, unlike Bloomfield, he has furnished very copious analyses, as titles to his sections; and that, so far as we have yet examined, they seem well constructed.

The American reprint, besides the usual revisions and minor improvements, differs from the original edition in two points. In the first place, the distinction of verses is exchanged for that of paragraphs determined by the sense. This is a great improvement in the main. Our only doubt is in relation to that feature of the plan which consists in the metrical arrangement of poetical quotations from the books of the Old Testament. There seems to be a mania for this mode of printing among some of our translators and editors. In commentaries on the poetical parts of scripture, where there is perpetual reference to the parallelism of the clauses as a source of illustration, such a method may be useful. But to print the most familiar texts in blank-verse form, where nothing can be gained in clearness or effect, looks to us like affectation. We doubt whether taste and learning would not be the gainers, if this process were reversed, and even English poetry printed just like prose, after the fashion of the German hymn-books. It would then at least be harder to impose prosaic verse upon the public. But whatever the in-

trinsic merit of the other plan may be, it does not seem to be entirely in keeping with the paragraph system, which proceeds upon the principle of excluding all unnecessary breaks and interruptions. If the division of the text into single lines or clauses is so very useful, there is the less objection to the form adopted in most English Bibles, where the clauses, in a very great majority of instances, are printed two by two. Still, however, our principal objection is to the unnecessary waste of room, and the apparent affectation of printing the most familiar texts as follows:

(Heb. 2: 5.) For unto which of the angels said he at any time,  
 "Thou art my son,  
 This day have I begotten thee?"

And again,

"I will be to him a Father,  
 And he shall be to me a son?"

Instead of enhancing the poetical effect upon the English reader, this method seems more likely to impair it, by exciting the expectation of what we call verse, and then presenting what, in form at least, is prose. We may add, that Dr. Coit could hardly have found a worse occasion for applying this favorite typographical improvement, than in editing Townsend, whose worst fault is the number and complexity of his subdivisions, while the paragraph-arrangement is specifically intended to guard, as far as possible, against that very evil.

The other point of difference between the two editions lies in the style of mechanical execution. There may have been a late reprint in England, which we have not seen; but the old edition has no pretensions to elegance or splendor. The American royal octavo, on the other hand, is one of the best specimens which we have seen of American typography. Its whole appearance is not merely neat, but noble. We understand that the Old Testament is stereotyping and will soon appear.