

“that any one should be satisfied to rest in the conclusion that Christ was represented by the Apostle ‘as God over all’ on the small amount of probability which, it appears, is all that can be claimed for that proposition, so far as this Verse is concerned.” If I had wished to affirm any such proposition (and I am not aware that I did affirm it), I certainly should not have rested it on this Verse alone. But the surprise which Dr. Vance Smith, I think rather unnecessarily, expresses here, I cannot help reciprocating at a statement of his own—the statement, I mean, that St. Paul “does not appear to have held the Logos doctrine.” I should have thought it quite incredible that a fair-minded critic could say this, except, of course, in the purely verbal sense that St. Paul does not actually use the technical term Logos. Not to speak of other passages, Colossians i. 15-19 seems unmistakeable.

W. SANDAY.

It always seems to me a most unprofitable waste of time to continue a controversy after both sides have clearly said what they have to say. I cannot see that Dr. Vance Smith, in the above remarks, has added one iota of fresh evidence to the solution of the question; nor can I see how they help his position at all, except by shifting the real grounds of the controversy, and by giving him the benefit of the “last word,” which I should always be happy to concede to any controversialist who attached much importance to it. I had not the slightest intention, therefore, to add anything to what I had previously said, and it is only at the request of the Editor that for one moment I revert to the subject.

1. I find this reply of Dr. Vance Smith singularly intangible. Its shape—

If shape it might be called, that shape had none
Distinguishable in member, joint, or limb,
Or substance might be called that shadow seemed—

is too vague to admit of any firm grasp. The sole point of any importance in his first criticism on my paper was his evidence as to the punctuation in one or two of the Uncials. This has been quite sufficiently examined and appraised in the June number of *THE EXPOSITOR*, and in his first paragraph Dr. Vance Smith admits that he “attributed too much weight to the stop.”

2. In his second paragraph he maintains that the existence of the stop in these Manuscripts proves that the doxologic interpretation of the clause is *grammatically admissibile*; but there is nothing to say on this point, because, “a little to his surprise” (*why* to his surprise?),

both Dr. Sanday and I had already stated our opinion that such is the case. Other scholars hold very strongly that the position of *εὐλογητός* late in the clause proves that it *cannot* be a doxology, and among them is Dean Alford, one of the most competent scholars in Hellenistic Greek who ever lived. The authority of one or two fifth-century scribes on the grammatical question has exceedingly little weight, and although I cannot go quite so far as Dean Alford does when he says that the rendering of our English Version is "*the only one admissible* by the rules of grammar and arrangement," yet if the interpretation of Erasmus, followed by Dr. Vance Smith, be barely *tenable*, it is confessedly an *isolated instance*, and Dr. Smith has barely so much as touched the arguments of usage, order, sense, and position, which tell so powerfully against it.

3. In his third paragraph, Dr. V. Smith asks what is the value of the unanimity of the Fathers in favour of the attributive meaning of the clause as adopted in the English Version, if that unanimity can only be regarded as adding a slight probability to the view which they accept. I pass over the fact that he felt inclined at first to dispute this all but absolute unanimity, and I will only say that, while no one dreams of accepting the unanimity of the Fathers as decisive on a critical question (and it must be remembered that it was on a purely critical question that this discussion arose), it must be, at any rate, vastly more weighty than the by no means indisputable evidence of three or four nameless copyists. The rest of this third paragraph is a purely irrelevant *argumentum ad hominem*, and transfers the question from critical to theological grounds. The doctrine of the Divinity of our Lord is not one which can be discussed as an open question in the pages of THE EXPOSITOR; but Dr. V. Smith must be well aware that when he talks of our "so readily *following the Fathers* in our doctrine of the Incarnate Logos," he is using language the accuracy of which we should entirely repudiate. Our doctrine of the Incarnate Logos is derived, not from *the Fathers*, but from St. John, and the Apostles, and our Lord Himself.

4. In his fourth and fifth paragraphs, Dr. V. Smith returns to his excessively attenuated tittle of evidence about the Uncials, which, as we have already seen, mainly resolves itself into the existence of a stop, asserted to be original, in the Alexandrine Manuscript. On this point more than enough has been said already.

5. In his sixth paragraph, admitting the indecisiveness of his diplomatic evidence, Dr. V. Smith restates what he had stated already, and what the Emperor Julian asserted fifteen centuries

before him, that St. Paul nowhere calls Christ God. On this point I have said enough. It is quite true that (although even Socinus was compelled to admit that the clause which we are discussing refers to Christ) this and the other passage in which Christ is distinctly *called* God (as Tit. ii. 13; Acts xxi. 28) are grammatically or critically disputable, nor would any one readily quote them in the controversy with Unitarians, because

Nil agit exemplum quod litem lite resolvit.

But, while declining here to discuss that question, I simply refer to the passages which I quoted in my last paper, and once more answer Dr. V. Smith that our faith in the Divinity of the Eternal Son by no means rests on two or three isolated texts, but on the witness of History to the truth of all that is written of Christ Jesus, from the beginning to the end of the New Testament. Dr. Smith says that St. Paul "does not appear to have held the Logos doctrine." It would be truer to say that, for sufficient reasons, St. Paul does not *use the word* Logos. How any one can read the Epistles to the Colossians and the Ephesians (to say nothing of the Pastoral Epistles) without seeing that St. Paul believed in the essential Divinity of Christ is more than I can pretend to understand.

6. In his last paragraph Dr. Smith tries to shake my subordinate argument about the *abruptness* of a doxology in Romans ix. 5 by the exceedingly weak analogy of Romans i. 25. This latter Verse is not a doxology at all, and any one who will thoughtfully compare the two passages will see how totally they differ. I refrain from any reiteration of those strong arguments in favour of our Authorized rendering, which Dr. Smith has not so much as touched; and if any one will again read what has been said on both sides, I shall be surprised if he considers that Dr. Smith, with all his learning, has rendered any appreciable assistance to the view which he maintains.

F. W. FARRAR.

BRIEF NOTICE.

THE REALISTIC ASSUMPTIONS OF MODERN SCIENCE EXAMINED. *By Thomas Herbert, M.A.*, late Professor of Philosophy and Church History in the Lancashire Independent College, Manchester. (Macmillan and Co. 1879.) This is an admirable piece of philosophical criticism—calm, subtle, incisive, thorough. It appears, indeed, with all the disadvantages of a posthumous work, without the revision, condensation, amplification the author alone could have