ARTICLE VII.

CRITICAL NOTES.

I.

"UNION EFFORTS BETWEEN CONGREGATIONALISTS AND PRESBYTERIANS: RESULTS AND LESSONS."

THIS is the title of a vigorous pamphlet by our esteemed contributor, Dr. A. H. Ross, written with special reference to the question of church union which has been under consideration for some months past in Japan. Both the value of the pamphlet and the eminence of the author make it proper to give a brief summary of it, and to comment upon some of the positions taken, especially since they bear upon the future policy of the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions.

Dr. Ross maintains that church "polity is the great divisive element," striking even deeper than doctrines and rites, and that no bridge can span the chasm between the four main theories of church government into which Christendom is divided. Unity can only come in the triumph of the divinely authorized polity.

As an illustration of the futility of attempting a permanent union on the basis of doctrine in disregard of the principles of church polity, the famous Plan of Union between the Congregationalists and Presbyterians of the United States of America in the early part of this century is adduced. This plan, according to Dr. Ross, "produced strife and often divisions in local churches, the bitterest alienations in wider communities, and the disrupture of the General Assembly. Had it never been devised by Congregational ministers and approved by the Presbyterian Church, but instead, had each denomination, as now, worked separately on its own lines, better work would have been done, and that too without the alienations and separations which marred that half-century of union effort."

This is, we are aware, the rather prevalent opinion at the present time respecting the operation of the Plan of Union, but it rests rather upon the statements of partisans of the one or the other of these forms of government, than upon the judgment of the scientific historian, familiar by his study with the exact facts of the case. It is significant in this connection that the representatives of the two polities involved have combined to declare that the plan was injurious, but each has said that the injury was to his own side. While the Congregationalist has dwelt upon the loss of churches which his denomination has suffered, the Presbyterian has magnified the damage done,

Digitized by Google

within the circle of strict Presbyterian organization, by the Plan of Union, to the theology and the discipline of the church. But we think that the impartial judgment of the future will decide that the Plan was a manful effort to do a thing which needed to be done, viz., to combine the forces of similar evangelical churches in one vigorous extension of the gospel in a region rapidly opening to labor, but too large, and too rapidly opening, for either to attack single-handed. What its results will ultimately be seen to be, we are scarcely yet in a position to know. Some things are tolerably clear. It accomplished a great deal of evangelistic work which without it would probably have been left undone. We may take this territory of Northern Ohio for example. Had it not been for the Plan of Union, the Western Reserve might have been left without missionaries at the most critical moment. True, it was the stupidity and backwardness of the Connecticut Missionary Society which led it to contract its expenditures here, and prevented it from finding men in New England for the work. That society was endeavoring to save up an endowment which should make it independent of the churches, and to maintain the high standard of a full collegiate preparation for all its missionaries. These defects in its policy may have been the natural results of inexperience; but, whether more or less justifiable, they were facts, and facts which at the time were so potent that, if Presbyterian missionaries had not been attainable who could be employed under the Plan, the whole of the present Congregational Ohio would have been left without missionaries of either denomination. It is clear, also, that the results were by no means so unfavorable for Congregationalism in the Western Reserve as has often been represented. The whole evidence upon the subject is not yet in, for the final denominational relations of the churches are not yet decided. The process of adjustment is still going on. Churches which have long been Presbyterian are still occasionally seceding to Congregationalism. But in general it may be said, we believe, with accuracy, that in most cases the churches which by their composition are naturally Congregational are such in formal church connection, and that the churches which are now Presbyterian are such because of immigration into this region from regions where Presbyterianism is predominant, and would be Presbyterian had there never been a Plan of Union.

Dr. Ross makes the paradoxical statement, that ecclesiastical union was itself a cause of church disruptions. Such it undoubtedly was; but this is by no means the whole story. In fact, it may be doubted whether explanation of the failure of the Plan, and the subsequent troubles in the Presbyterian Church, is to be sought in any limited cause like this. Denominational disruption was the order of the day. The Presbyterian Church divided in 1838; but in 1844 the Methodists, and in 1845 the Baptists, divided upon the issue of slavery, which had been a very potent, though not openly professed cause of the Presbyterian division. New denominations were also forming at this time, such as the Campbellites, who became powerful in 1831, and the Millerites, who began to form churches in 1845. All these phenomena receive a partial explanation from the circumstance that Amer-

Digitized by Google

ica was just beginning to be really conscious of her freedom, and in her exuberance of youthful feeling was speculating and creating new theories, and seeking to embody them in new church forms, or was becoming aware of divergent tendencies which she had not the patience and sobriety to attempt to adjust, but sought rather, through separate organizations, a solution by denominational struggle.

Indeed, Dr. Ross's statement, that "polity is the great divisive element," has a strange sound in the presence of the numerous doctrinal divisions characterizing every form of church polity yet devised. The divisions of sentiment in the Episcopal Church are well known. There are the Protestant Episcopal, and the Methodist Episcopal, and the Reformed Episcopal, differing not so much in government as in doctrine, while the Protestant Episcopal Church itself is all the while upon the verge of disruption through the energy of its doctrinal movements. Nor is Congregationalism, with its feeble bond of fellowship, proof against division upon doctrinal points. We have the Orthodox Congregationalists, the Unitarian Congregationalists, the Universalist Congregationalists, the Baptist Congregationalists, who are Calvinistic, and the Free Will Baptist Congregationalists, and we seem in danger of having Continued-Probation Congregationalists. At any rate, there is an incipient sect holding to this doctrine, who declare that the old orthodoxy has become moribund, and who have already sent one missionary to Japan. There are numerous sects of Presbyterians. In Scotland there have been, or are, State Church and Free Church, Burgher and Anti-burgher, Seceders, United Presbyterians, and many others, all identical in polity; and in America, Old School and New School, Cumberland, United, Northern and Southern Presbyterians. And the Lutherans of Germany and America are, in both countries, more divided than they are united. In view of such facts as these, therefore, it seems beyond question that the evils of the Plan of Union have been exaggerated by Dr. Ross. The Plan was not in itself so much a cause of division as he supposes, and the divisions caused were less serious than he would lead us to imagine.

The bearing of this part of the discussion upon the proposed union between the Congregationalists and Presbyterians of Japan is at best remote. Dr. Ross himself says: "It must be confessed that the union efforts given in this paper are not the same as that proposed in Japan. Here, Congregationalists and Presbyterians planned to work together in missions at home and abroad; there, the proposal is to become one, and that one, Presbyterian." It seems to us that the plain distinction made here by our author rules out the method of discussion which he has adopted. His argument is in effect, Congregationalism and Presbyterianism are immiscible as proved by the history of the Plan of Union; therefore Congregationalists and Presbyterians cannot give them both up and unite upon a new system. Or else his conclusion is, Congregationalists cannot become Presbyterian. If the previous discussion of Dr. Ross's paper has proved anything, it has proved that Congregationalists can become Presbyterians, for he says the Plan of Union "transformed over two thousand churches which were in or-

Digitized by Google

igin and usages Congregational into Presbyterian churches." The inference is a *non-sequitur.*

The true question is, and this Dr. Ross discusses somewhat, whether Congregationalists are willing to contemplate the formation of a new and peculiarly Japanese church polity? Are we willing to encourage union among them though it involve sacrificing our own peculiar ideas of church government? Now, unlike Dr. Ross, we say in reply to this question, It may be that we are. But, at the same time, we believe that a full discussion of the subject will lead to a result which, indeed, already seems to be coming about, —the production of the conviction in the minds of Japanese Christians that whatever form the united church may take, they cannot wisely surrender the liberties they now possess. In fact, in the long run, it is only upon the basis of local independence that church union upon any large scale is possible.

The central portion of Dr. Ross's pamphlet relates to the wisdom of the organization of the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions. The founders of this Society, Dr. Ross alleges, "tried the experiment of uniting all American churches in one common society for foreign missions." Careful attention to the facts does not seem to justify this form of statement. The founders of the American Board were not trying any such experiment; they were simply aiming to assist the young men who were offering themselves to go as missionaries. Individuals from the various churches most alike in their doctrinal tenets came forward to help the good work on, but the Baptists never united in this work, and no effort was ever made to secure their co-operation. The change of views on the part of Judson led almost immediately to the organization of a Baptist Board of Missions. The Methodist and Episcopal churches, likewise, never came forward to any prominence in aid of the American Board, nor was any effort made to secure their special co-operation.

It is true that the movement was commenced by the General Association of Massachusetts, which appointed a committee to institute a missionary board, and that the general Association of Connecticut speedily co-operated with it. But whether it would have been wise to endeavor to continue the work by such a confederation of Congregational bodies is a question upon which it is not easy to pronounce judgment. With the facts before us of the remarkable career of the American Board, we are slow to believe that any serious mistake was made in having it organized as a close corporation, as was done upon securing its charter in 1812. Dr. Ross assumes that if the associations had continued their direct control everything would have moved on vigorously and smoothly. Of this we are not by any means convinced. Such are the traits of partially sanctified human nature, that the probabilities are great that, under the plan of direct control, endless strife and alienation would have arisen. It has not been demonstrated that the constitution of our Congregational associations, whether of ministers or of churches, is adapted to carrying on such comprehensive and long-continued work as that undertaken by the American Board. The present plan has

Digitized by Google

worked so admirably, and the present organization is so amenable to the Christian sentiment of the land, that we should be slow to fly from the petty ills we have to what would probably be the more serious evils of the plan proposed by Dr. Ross.

Again, Dr. Ross, with many others, is scarcely aware of the extent to which the American Board of Missions is still a co-operative body. Presbyterians are still on the list of Corporate Members, and the second largest contribution last year from a church was from a Presbyterian church. About one-fifth of the missionaries of the American Board are to-day Presbyterians. For a time in recent years the Cumberland Presbyterians have found it convenient to use the organization of the American Board for the direction of their missionary interest, and the members of the Reformed Episcopal Church are now beginning to do the same thing. We therefore strongly object to the assertion made by Dr. Ross that, hereafter while the conditions remain the same, to assume to be otherwise, that is, undenominational, would be a virtual breach of trust. We do not see how there can be any breach of trust in continuing the work as it is. The contributors to the American Board are now, and always have been, supremely anxious that the lands to which they send their missionaries should become *Christian*, and they will not feel that their efforts have been lost if they should become Presbyterian Christians, but they are confident that in this secondary matter of local church organization the native Christians, with the Bible in their hands and with devoted missionaries as their teachers, will not make any fatal mistake. The success of no form of church government has been so great as to give any body of Christians a monopoly of wisdom upon that subject. High Church Congregationalism is as odious as High Church Presbyterianism or High Church Episcopalianism. We trust that the American Board will deliberate carefully before they surrender themselves to the spirit of High Church Congregationalism.

II.

LINGUISTIC EVIDENCE OF THE DEGENERACY OF SAVAGE TRIBES.

DURING the forty-six years in which I have been laboring among the Ojibway Indians, I have been more and more impressed with the evidence, showing itself in their language, that at some former time they have been in possession of much higher ideas of God's attributes and of what constitutes true happiness, immortality, and virtue, as well as of the nature of the Devil and his influence in the world, than those which they now possess.

Their word for God is *Ke-shay-ma-ne-to*, which literally signifies, "Benevolent Spirit." The whole word for "benevolent" is *ke-shay-wah-te-se*, which includes the idea that the subject is intentionally or heartily benevolent—or, in other words, that benevolence is a part of his nature. Prefix-

Digitized by Google

ing the first two syllables of this word to *ma-ne-to*, which means spirit, and we have, as above, their word for "God." The thing which early in our experience surprised us, and which has not ceased to impress us, is, that, with their present low conceptions of spiritual things, they could have chosen such a word for the Deity. The only satisfactory explanation seems to be that, at an early period of their history, they had higher and more correct ideas concerning God than those which they now possess, and that these have become, as the geologists would say, *fossilized* in their forms of speech, and so preserved.

Independent of what they have learned from the missionaries, the Ojibways had many other ideas concerning God which are really of an exalted character. For example, at the beginning of our work among them we found them in substantial possession of the fundamental ideas concerning God's attributes as described in the Bible. Thus, they believe that God loves all that is good and hates all that is bad. They believe that he comes to the help of those that call upon him. Hence, even in their wild state, they appeal to God in their suffering. Early in our labors with them I was called upon with the doctor to amputate the arm of a young Ojibway. Before the operation was performed, the old chief visited him and made the following remarks: "In all my trouble I call upon the great and good Spirit, and he comes to my help. I commend him to you. Ask him and he will help you in your suffering. From early manhood I have all along called upon this Spirit, and he has helped me." Nor was this chief alone in this. Such remarks were common, especially from the old men. In all cases when the old men are called upon to administer medicine, they ask this good Spirit —*Ke-shay-ma-ne-to*—to bless the medicine. They ask him, further, to conquer the Devil for them, believing that he is the source of their troubles. It should be said, however, that the language which they employ on such occasions is not that in general use, but partakes of the character of a sacred language, which the ordinary traders do not understand.

In their language, also, the Ojibways have words and forms of expression descriptive of a state of happiness beyond anything which they experience in their present condition. For example, *Min-ah-wah-ne-gwain-dum* signifies a high state of mental happiness over against sensual happiness. The word is a verb in the third person, singular number, indicative mood, and the full signification is that he is in this high state of mental happiness. The first derivative from this verb is *Min-ah-wah-ne-gwain-dum-o-win*, which means a high state of mental happiness. In their inflections this word is carried on to twelve syllables, as in *Ke-che-min-ah-wah-ne-gwain-dah-gwah-cum-ic*, which means the very highest degree of ecstatic delight, a condition which it is impossible to suppose they can any of them have ever experienced in their present condition. The word must have come down from a period in their history when their condition was far superior to what it is at the present time. When meeting them in their filthy, desolate wigwams, I have often appealed to their surroundings, called their attention to these words, and reminded them that there was a time in their history when their

Digitized by Google

ancestors had better surroundings than those which they now possess, and that they were in a happier state than is possible in their present conditions; and they have uniformly responded to it, and acknowledged that there was nothing in their present condition out of which such conceptions could have come.

Again, we find language among them expressive of a very high condition of virtue or goodness; for example, *Ke-shay-ma-ne-to-wah-te-ze-win* means "God-benevolence," or "godliness." Another word, *Gwy-uk-wain-dah-goo-see*, means "righteous-minded," or "straight-mindedness." Another word is *Me-no-do-ta-gaish-ke*, which means, "he is always doing good to others." Another word still is, *Sah-ge-e-way*, "he is accustomed to love." All these words indicate a character certainly not common now, and seem to be reminiscences of a golden age in their history when their experiences were far higher than would be possible in their present wild condition.

Again, the same thing appears in their ideas of sin. *Much-e-ma-ne-tong e-zhe-way-ze* signifies one that is just like the devil, or very wicked. Over against this is the word *Ke-shay-ma-ne-tong*, which signifies "just like God" in character. Other words for wickedness are *Much-e-zhe-way-be-ze*—evil-minded or intentionally wicked. And in any other connection the element *Much-e* signifies "evil intent." This word may be intensified by lengthening it out at either end; for example, *Gah-gwa-ne-sah-much-e-zhe-way-be-ze* means literally "always at evil exceedingly." These words descriptive of intense evil as well as of good do not occur, however, in their every-day language, but only in what may be called their sacred dialect, used on important occasions in public addresses. They never would use these words in addressing each other on ordinary occasions.

Their words expressive of the future condition of the soul also illustrate the same point. *O-che-cah-go-mah*, translated "soul," is really a passive verb signifying, "He is constituted soul," with the idea of immortality. The soul is represented as the creation of the benevolent Spirit, i. e., of God.

All the ideas of natural religion find a ready response in their hearts, and also find words expressive of them. It is only when we come to Christianity that words fail them. When we tell them of the necessity of a change of heart to prepare them to meet God, they say: "We have a religion of our own. You have your way; we have ours." They admit that men must have a pure character to meet God, but they say: "We have our way to prepare to meet him; you have yours." One of the earliest converts used to say: "A great deal of your preaching I readily understand, especially what you say about our real characters. We Indians all know that it is wrong to lie, to steal, to be dishonest, to slander, to be covetous, and we always know that the great Spirit hates all these things. All this we knew before we ever saw the white man. I knew these things when I was a little boy. We did not, however, know the way of pardon for these sins. In our religion there is nothing said by the wise men about pardon. We knew nothing of the Lord Jesus Christ as a Saviour."

Digitized by Google

All this convinces me that these tribes of savages with which it has been my lot for so many years to labor are not in a process of evolution upwards, as some would suppose, but that they are far down in a state of degeneracy from a former higher and happier position.

S. G. WRIGHT.

Oberlin, June 1st, 1889.

III.

DR. MACMILLAN AND THE CODEX VATICANUS.

I HAVE very recently made the acquaintance of a work by the Rev. Hugh Macmillan, D. D., entitled "Roman Mosaics." In it he devotes one chapter, in large measure an interesting one, to the Vatican Codex (B). While giving it undoubtedly some personal inspection, he says himself, "I had very little time to inspect, for fear I should exhaust the patience of the librarian." Considering how patiently outsiders have waited for a chance to study B, it seems a pity to spare the librarians who are now authorized to let it be better known. For the greater part of his information, he has obviously relied on others, especially Tischendorf, Scrivener, and Dean Burgon; for the last he obviously has a profound respect, which is not impossibly accorded quite as much to the Dean's unfailing pugnacity as to his not infallible scholarship.

After giving us a minute account of the MS. and its history, and according it the oldest date possible, Dr. Macmillan goes on with this criticism, which of course he did not originate:—

"But though the Vatican Codex is the oldest manuscript of the New Testament in existence, it does not follow from this circumstance that it is the most reliable. Widely different views of its critical value are entertained by scholars. By some it has been accepted as the most authoritative of all versions, while others have regarded it as one of the most corrupt and imperfect. Indeed, the conjecture has been hazarded that the very circumstance of its continued preservation during many centuries is a proof that it was an unreliable copy long laid aside, and therefore exempt from the wear and tear under which genuine copies of the same date have long ago perished. These extreme views, however, are unjust. While it is not free from many gross inaccuracies and faults, it presents upon the whole a very fair idea of the Greek Vulgate of the early church, and is worthy of as much respect, at least, as any single document in existence."

I have copied this passage at length in order to bring out the remarkable use of the words "version" and "Greek Vulgate." One would very much like to know what idea Dr. Macmillan has of a *version*. Does he mean that the New Testament part of B, or any Greek MS. is a *translation*, like the Septuagint, from some other language, into Greek? It is generally, though not universally accepted, that St. Matthew's Gospel was composed

Digitized by Google

in Hebrew; there are those who have held that Latin was the original language of the sacred oracles; and the story is told of a deceased prelate in England who, when the Greek Testament was appealed to, took up King James' version with the remark, "Let us consult the Holy Original." It might be not an improper use of words to say, that A and B give different versions of John i. 18. But to speak of the MS. as a whole as a "version"—the same expression is used elsewhere in this essay—is to misuse a word which has a perfectly recognized and invariable sense in biblical criticism. So of the words "Greek Vulgate;" undoubtedly of themselves they mean "received Greek text;" but since the Latin Vulgate is the recognized expression for a version into Latin, with no more authority than belongs to a translation, Dr. Macmillan's phrase keeps up the erroneous impression given by "version," that Codex B has only the second-rate authority which belongs to translations.

He then goes on: "The chief peculiarity of the Codex is the large number of important omissions in it; so that, as Dr. Dobbin says, it presents an abbreviated text of the New Testament. A few of these omissions were wilfully made; while the large majority were no doubt caused by the carelessness of the writer in transcribing from the copy before him; for there are several instances of his having written the same words or clauses twice over." Now these sentences, including the somewhat doubtful logic of the last, are found entire, almost word for word, in Scrivener's "Introduction" (page 108, second edition), where, however, we do not find the bold statement, "a few of these omissions were wilfully made"! How on earth does Dr. Macmillan, or Dr. Scrivener, or *anybody*, know what a scribe in the fourth century A. D. "wilfully" did? But leaving out this charge, which is nothing but wanton, and taking Scrivener's calmer account, how can anybody assert that the scribe of Codex B *omitted* anything? If, as no one allows more eagerly than Dr. Macmillan, it is the oldest existing MS. of the New Testament, who has seen the older one containing the passages which are not found in it? They may be passages omitted in B,—but we cannot prove that these are not later insertions in the other MSS.,—and the tendency of copyists is all to add rather than to omit.

But to go on: Dr. Macmillan gives us a list of a few of the "important" omissions. Having previously given Burgon's account of the way Mark's Gospel terminates in the Codex, he specifies also, Matthew vi. 13; Luke xxii. 43, 44; part of John i. 27; v. 3, 4; vii. 53—viii. 11; Acts viii. 37; parts of Acts ix. 5, 6; "and the well-known disputed text of the Three Witnesses in Heaven, 1 John v. 7. These omitted passages, which, from internal evidence, apart from the external testimony of the largest number of critical documents, we must acknowledge to be genuine, are the most serious of the lacunae, amounting altogether to the extraordinary number of 2,456. They give the document a very distinctive character."

Now what are scholars, even humble ones,—what are believers who trust their Lord is the Truth, to think of such writing as this? The whole essay is a claim—one does not like to say a pretense—to learning; to in-

Digitized by Google

structing the simple Christian in important facts as to the grounds of his belief. Is it ignorance, appearing as knowledge? or is it disingenuous suppression of knowledge? What does the author mean by "apart from the external testimony of the largest number of critical documents'? Does "apart" mean "against," or "not counting"? Of Matthew vi. 13, Alford says, "It must on all grounds of sound criticism be omitted," and shows at length why this must be so by its universal absence from ancient authorities. Luke xxii. 43, 44, is not only wanting in other good MSS., but is dealt with as not authentic by early commentators of high authority; the last clause of John i. 27 fails us in C, L (which is scarcely distinct from B), ℵ, 1, 33; John v. 3, 4, though the MS. witnesses in its favor are weightier, has abundant arguments against its insertion, internal as well as external; John vii. 53–viii. 11, is a passage giving rise to countless questions; its genuineness as a part of Scripture, and its proper position in the Gospels are not to be settled in a hurry; but if the scribe of B "omitted" it, he has a dozen first-class fellow-sinners to share his condemnation; Acts viii. 37 is so generally absent from the best authorities that it can only be regarded as a very early insertion; Acts *ix.* 5, 6, *occur in no Greek MS. at all*, being simply inserted by the Latin copyists from the other accounts of St. Paul's conversion; and then we are requested, as the end of all this learning, to look at the "disputed" text of the Three Heavenly Witnesses as one of those "which from internal evidence, apart from the external evidence of the greatest number of critical documents, we must regard as genuine." One can hardly suppose Dr. Macmillan has never examined Alford; his own book shows his acquaintance with Scrivener; these are manuals in everybody's hands, but the whole chapter is in a tone which no one who has not gone beyond familiar manuals has a right to use. If he has any, the most elementary scholarship in this line, he knows that 1 John v. 7 is no more "disputed" than Constantine's donation to Sylvester, or Chatterton's ballads; its absolute want of the only authority that can make a passage genuine has forced the most conservative orthodox editor—Bishop Wordsworth for instance—to reject it; and such as think internal evidence can have any place in such a question, are generally of the opinion that it is an awkward insertion, which breaks the argument. It is very hard to avoid the conclusion that Dr. Macmillan does not choose to accept deductions opposed to his earlier prepossessions.

We are not concerned to uphold the authority of the Codex Vaticanus. It is not infallible, or decisive of every doubtful issue. It should seem that Westcott and Hort give it sometimes undue weight, especially in conjunction with the Sinaitic; there are other uncial MSS. of high authority;—the better cursives and the versions have their rights; diplomatic criticism is a science, and when applied to the passages given by Dr. Macmillan, it finds some of them present a task which is not light. But for the others, it may be said emphatically that so far from having its authority weakened by not containing them, B would lose authority if it did contain them. An uncial purporting to be of the 4th century which inserted Acts ix. 5, 6, or 1 John

Digitized by Google

v. 7, would stamp itself as a forgery. When Tischendorf announced the discovery of ℵ, every scholar knew just as well before it was printed that such a MS. as he described would not contain those passages, as he knew it would not contain the name of Justinian or of Augustine. Yet if Dr. Macmillan's paragraph means anything, it means that Christians are bound to maintain these passages as genuine against sceptics ("German critics," he says) who have attacked them, undeterred by the eccentric omissions of the Codex, which stands in opposition to the overwhelming evidence, external as well as internal, which other sources ("critical documents") afford!

It is not easy to exaggerate the harm done by such writing. Dr. Macmillan's position is high in the church; his influence is extensive; his works are popular; the present book contains much valuable matter in an interesting form. Hundreds of readers will peruse this chapter as the production of an authority,—one whom they have a right to quote, on a subject deeply affecting their Christian belief. With much show of learning he handles it in such a way as to throw discredit not merely on sceptics—who yet are men and deserve justice—but on scholars the most devout, humble, and faithful of Christian believers; men who would rather walk from the Vatican to the Colosseum to encounter the lions of Decius than drop one word from the sacred text which truth showed should be there; yet who have persevered to the ruin of their sight, their health, their very lives, against ponderous tradition, arrogant bigotry, flippant ignorance, for years in their work of purifying the words of our Lord and his apostles from the corruptions of ages; and who have delighted to find in this relic of by-gone days, the most efficient aid in their consecrated task. To have the counsel of such men darkened by words without knowledge, is no credit to the learning, the candor, or the honor of either the church or the world.

WILLIAM EVERETT.

Quincy, Mass.

IV.

Ἀγαπάω, φιλέω.

PROFESSOR BALLANTINE'S article "Lovest thou me?" (page 524) seems to make it plain enough, that, in biblical usage, ἀγαπάω and φιλέω occupy the same field, and have no important distinction in meaning. As a pure question of language, however, the discussion suggests some additional points for consideration and investigation.

1. It would help in proving the negative, viz. that there is no difference in meaning, if we could make sure of some other reason for the use of both words instead of one. If, for example, that reason is mere variety, or if there is some grammatical reason, as the use of one or the other in certain forms of the verb, or some rhetorical reason, as the flow of the sentence, then, the existence of any one or all of these reasons being made out by the examples, the case would seem to be decided.

Digitized by Google

2. If the choice between ἀγαπάω and φιλέω was, in biblical usage, a matter of taste, then there was a literary, though not didactic, difference. What was that literary difference?

3. One would like to have the examples from the different writers considered separately. It is certainly supposable that one writer should, always or occasionally, use the two words with discrimination, and others always without.

4. Ought not special importance to be given to passages where both words are used in close connection? Thus the familiar words of Wisdom, "I love them that love me," are in the Septuagint, Ἐγὼ τοὺς ἐμὲ φιλοῦντας ἀγαπῶ (Prov. viii. 17). The Hebrew word for "love" is the same in both cases, and the rhetorical contrast would make for the same word in Greek, as in Matt. v. 46, ἐὰν γὰρ ἀγαπήσητε τοὺς ἀγαπῶντας ὑμᾶς. Could the shade of difference be expressed by "I love them that are fond of me"?—thus suggesting φιλο-σοφία. So in Hos. iii. 1, we find ἀγάπησον.....ἀγαπῶσαν..... ἀγαπᾷ.....καὶ φιλοῦσι.

5. The fact that a word is being superseded by another would not show that it was used without discrimination. Sometimes it is the antique air itself that recommends it, as in the English "quoth" for "said" and "token" for "sign." It seems not unlikely that ἀγαπάω gained an advantage over φιλέω by the rise of the noun ἀγάπη. This was always latent in the verb ἀγαπάω, but does not appear in early literature. Certainly the two words together would be less likely to go into disuse than either alone. Φιλέω is derived from φίλος, and has no noun-duplicate; for φιλία is the abstract of φίλος.

6. When a word after long fluctuation settles down in a narrow corner of its former usage, it is natural to see in its earlier uses a tendency towards the final use. According to that, φιλέω, meaning at last only "to kiss," might during its later previous history express distinctively fondness, tenderness, or devotion.

7. If we assume that the dialogue between our Lord and Peter was not spoken in Greek, does that affect the importance of the discussion of the Greek words?

These remarks are offered not so much in the way of criticism of Professor Ballantine's article, as of suggestion to any who have time and inclination to pursue the matter further.

L. S. POTWIN.

Adelbert College, Cleveland, Ohio.

Digitized by Google