

Darbyism and its New Bible.*

(Communicated.)

IN the *London Quarterly Review* of October 1866, there was a long and able article on the rise and progress of Plymouthism. The writer traces back some of its features to Walkerism, which began with Mr. Walker, a fellow of Trinity College, Dublin, some thirty years before. To these were added the chief doctrines of Edward Irving respecting the church as the body of Christ; the presence of the Holy Ghost in the church; justification in virtue of union with Christ in resurrection; the coming of the Lord a second time, and the rapture of the church. The last was handled by De Burgh at the time with much earnestness. De Burgh was a clergyman of the Church of England, and in his latter years Professor of Hebrew in Trinity College, Dublin. These doctrines were adopted by a body of Christians calling themselves "Brethren," afterwards styled "Plymouth Brethren," Plymouth having become their chief centre in England. As a body, they adopted the main principles and doctrines of Walker, Irving, and De Burgh, in respect to the above subjects, and so continue to this day.

But, singular to say, when Irving and De Burgh brought up those doctrines to the front, and when much enthusiasm was manifested about them, both in England and in Europe, between the years 1820 and 1830, these very men began to let go the foundations of Christianity itself, and speculated on the nature and person and experiences of our Lord, and on eternal judgment, to the extent of involving the faith itself. Not very long after, some of the chief teachers amongst the Plymouth Brethren, puffed up likewise by having got hold of those exalted doctrines without a corresponding "thorn in the flesh" to preserve humility, fell into the same snare of the enemy, and a division ensued. Mr. Newton, of Plymouth, in seeking to combat some of the errors of Irving fell himself into error; and Mr. Darby, in seeking to combat the errors of Newton, fell himself into error again.

It is with this last gentleman and the party or section of the Plymouth Brethren which he has attracted to himself that we are now dealing. Mr. Darby has written a commentary on the whole Bible, and tracts innumerable, and has made three translations of the New Testament into the three principal languages of Europe, German, French and English. In short, he has been most assiduous and indefatigable in his writings, his teachings, and his labours. The title given to the last work referred to, is—

"*The Gospels, Acts, Epistles, and Book of Revelation, commonly called The New Testament: A New Translation from a revised text of the Greek original.*"
Morrish: London.

The recently published edition is set forth with a new preface, in which there is a flourish of learning to show that Mr. Darby, whilst using the "helps" furnished by Tischendorf, Scrivener, and Tregelles, has collated MSS. for himself and adopted a Greek text of his own, the English version of which is given to the reader; so that the reader has the translation of a better text than any other in existence. Such at least is the drift of the preface. But any one acquainted with the subject of the collation of MSS., must know that all these assertions are simply learned flourishes and gasconading, for it would take the labour of a life to collate for oneself and determine thus the text of the New Testament so as to give the product any weight whatever. And Mr. Darby has a quantity of other things on hand. However it is with the translation of known texts, of which no question exists, that we now have to do, and

* The following observations and criticisms will be found to take in several parts of Scripture, and will be, with the Lord's blessing, both useful and interesting to those who wish to investigate and search into the true force of the inspired words of the New Testament on some most important subjects.

mean to prove, by evidence, to any reader of ordinary intelligence, that with all its pretensions, it is a faulty and pitiable translation of the sacred Book.

We shall in doing this try to preserve some order, and commencing with matters of lesser moment ascend up to those of the greatest moment. The arrangement then will be as follows:—

1. Where the Authorised Version is needlessly changed, and for it a harsh and uncouth phraseology substituted.
2. Where the force of the original verb, in that which professes to be a revised translation, is wholly disregarded, even in places where special stress should be laid upon it.
3. Where interpretations are put for translations even in vital passages; and supported by the aid of false renderings of Scripture.

These are serious charges, particularly the last, but we mean to support them by direct evidence.

I. To begin however with the lesser, and examine some of those passages in which the authorised version is needlessly changed, and for it a harsh and uncouth diction put, the following taken from many others may be sufficient. We cannot see what advantage an English reader gains in having 'Politarchs' put for 'City Magistrates' (Acts xvii. 8), or 'Eparchy' put for 'Province,' (Acts xxiii. 34), or 'Chiliarchs' put for 'Chief Captains' (Acts xxi. 37). The Anglicising of Greek words thus is unintelligible to most readers. Or in translating the words of Demetrius who made silver shrines for the goddess Diana, 'Men, you know that our well-living arises from this work' instead of the beautiful and technical rendering of the common English text, 'Sirs, ye know that by this craft we have our wealth' (Acts xix. 25). 'Our well-living' is rather uncouth, is it not? Or in making Paul at Athens say, 'Being therefore the offspring of God we ought not to think that which is divine to be like gold or silver,' etc., instead of, 'That the Deity is like unto gold or silver,' etc. 'That which is divine' Mr. D. substitutes. Here, indeed, the word 'Godhead' might be corrected, for it is too abstract; but instead of that it is made more abstract. The Greek *To Theion* is not 'the Godhead,' nor 'that which is divine,' but simply 'the Deity.' The apostle is not reasoning with the Athenians on an abstraction, but placing before them a personal God who bore resemblance not to the lower animals, nor to inanimate things, but to 'his offspring.' Hence he uses the term *To Theion*, a term familiar to the Greeks for expressing a personal God, 'the Deity.' See *Liddell and Scott's Lexicon*. Collective nouns in Greek are often thus found—to *evantion*, the enemy; to *navitikon*, the naval force. The term used is concrete, not an abstraction; were it 'Godhead' it would be *theotes*, as in Col. ii. 9. It is altogether a mistake, therefore, to make the apostle Paul represent God to his audience at Athens as an entire abstraction, and men as the offspring of that entire abstraction.

Again, in the account of the tumult at Ephesus, it is said according to the idiom of our language, 'Some therefore cried one thing and some another.' Instead of this Mr. Darby has the harsh sounding words 'Different persons therefore cried a different thing.' (Acts xix. 32.) As it happens the Greek word is *allos*, not *eteros*. So that this revised rendering neither suits the Greek nor the English. The authorised rendering is far preferable. Now the word 'different' (*eteros*) does occur in a remarkable passage referring to Joseph and Pharaoh, where it is said, 'Another king arose who knew not Joseph.' Here it should be 'a different (*eteros*) king arose,' etc.; for the Greek language has two words for this expression. There may be 'some' and 'other' of the same kind, or of different kinds; and the king, who knew not Joseph, was not another king merely like the former king but another king of a different kind. The word *eteros* is overlooked, but noted in the former case, where it does not exist. (Acts vii. 18.)

Then 'the boy Jesus' (Luke ii. 47), and 'Herod's grandees and chiliarchs' (Mark vi. 21) does not seem to have any advantage over 'the child Jesus' and 'Herod's lords and high captains,' except that one sounds less reverent, and

the other more pedantic than the common version. And we confess to our dulness in not being able to appreciate the excellency over the old version of the following passage known to every one: 'Nor do men put new wine into old skins, otherwise the skins burst and the wine is poured out, and the skins will be destroyed: but they put new wine into new skins, and both are preserved together.' (Matt. ix. 17.)

As it happens the Greek word *askoi* does not mean skins, which would be *dermata*, but bottles made of skins or leather; and it might be supposed that readers who had such words before them as *eparchy*, and *politarchs*, and *chiliarchs*, would have been able to understand that bottles in old time were made of leather, without being obliged to use the bare word 'skins,' in order to inform them of it.

Again, in the Lord's Prayer (John xvii.) instead of 'I pray for them, I pray not for the world,' etc.; 'neither pray I for these alone,' etc. we have the harsh expression, 'I demand concerning them; I do not demand concerning the world,' etc., and 'I do not demand for these only,' etc. Verses 2—20. Now, how would this word sound in the mouth of the nobleman who 'besought' the Lord to come and heal his child? (John iv. 47.) It should be, 'demanded' (*erote*) him to come; or when the Lord says, 'and I will pray (*eroteso*) the Father, and he shall give you another comforter,' he should say 'I will demand of the Father,' etc. The word in each case is the same, yet Mr. Darby shrinks from rendering, it so in the last passage (John xiv. 16) where he has—'and I will beg the Father' etc.—a much more proper rendering than that given in Chap. xvii., where prayer itself is made. But what the advantage is that these and such like renderings have over the common English version we confess ourselves at a loss to conceive. The language is needlessly changed, and a harsh and wholly wrong diction substituted for it by way of improvement.

And now before proceeding to the examples of misconstruction of the Greek tenses under the next heading, we may say that Mr. Darby's remarks in his preface on the Greek aorist are correct enough. It is easy however to learn rules; the difficulty is in applying them: and in numberless important cases Mr. Darby does not apply the rules and principles derived from the 'helps' to which he refers, such as Meyer, De Wette, and other German thinkers; but perpetuates the antiquated method condemned to oblivion by Winer, of putting one preposition or tense, etc. for another, even the very opposite, a method which the great grammarian calls 'unscientific assumption.'

II. Under the second heading we shall consider some of the passages where the force of the original verb is wholly disregarded, even in places where special stress should be laid upon it. For instance, the imperfect tense and not the aorist, is constantly used by the writers of the New Testament to show not merely the fact that such and such a thing took place, but to view the circumstances as happening, as in their course, and not yet brought to the intended accomplishment, hence it may be rendered by 'used to,' or 'in the habit of.'—(Donaldson.)

It gives great vividness to the narrative, throwing the reader back on the events as if they were happening before him. The force of this tense Mr. Darby habitually disregards, rendering it by the historic aorist as if it was merely a past fact that the Evangelist was narrating. A few examples will illustrate what we mean better than any explanation of it. When the Lord is before the High Priest and the witnesses accusing him, and the High Priest asks, 'What is it which these witness against thee?' it is added, 'But Jesus kept silent (*esiopa*) not merely the fact that he 'was silent' (Mr. D.) but that all through the examination he 'was remaining silent,' such is the force of the imperfect tense. (Matt. xxvi. 63.)

Then, at the Cross it is not merely presented as an historic fact that they which passed by 'reviled him,' but 'they kept reviling him,' Matt. xxvii. 39; or, that the chief priests and scribes and elders 'said,' 'He saved others,' &c., but 'they kept saying (*elegon*), 'He saved others,' &c., Matt. xxvii. 42.

The Evangelist wants to point to the persistency and continuity with which they persecuted the Lord, not merely the fact that they did so, hence he uses the imperfect tenses for that purpose. Again in Mark Mr. Darby has, 'And in private he explained all things to his disciples.' It should be, 'But in private he was in the habit of explaining (*epeluen*) all things to his disciples, (Mark iv. 34.) The Evangelist is careful to show that the Lord not merely on a certain occasion explained things to his disciples, but was in the habit of doing so, and consequently uses the imperfect tense. And, at the burial, it is not merely that Mary Magdalen and Mary the mother of Joseph 'saw' where he was 'put,' but were observing 'where he is laid,' (*etheorom pou totheitaki*) (Mark xv. 47). The Evangelist using the present and imperfect tenses and employing a striking verb not merely to tell the fact that they saw a transaction most dear to their hearts, but were observing and contemplating it whilst it was happening. And in Luke, when the seventy disciples were sent out and returned, saying that the demons are subject to us 'through thy name.' 'And he said unto them, I beheld Satan as lightning falling out of heaven,' (Mr. D.) It should be, 'I was beholding (*etheorom*) Satan as lightning fall (*pasonta*) from heaven,' (Luke x. 18). The Evangelist, by using the imperfect, connects these two matters together. That is, whilst the devils were being subjected to them through his name during their mission, the Lord was beholding Satan, as lightning, fall from heaven, and thus the chain and connection of the passage is preserved. Jesus was beholding him as if already fallen.

Then, at the Cross, where the force of the imperfect should be strictly preserved, they are all turned into historic past tenses; e.g., the people and rulers 'sneered,'—the soldiers 'made game of him,' and the malefactor 'spoke insultingly to him.' (Mr. D.) It should be the people and rulers 'kept sneering' or deriding. The soldiers kept or continued mocking him. 'And the malefactor kept railing at him.' The verbs are *exemulterizon*, *enepaizon*, and *ekblasphemai*—all imperfects, giving vividness and continuity to the sad scene. They are not merely historic aorists or past tenses, as if the Evangelist were telling us facts and leaving them there, but vivid pictures of things going on, presented to the mind, (Luke xxiii. 35, 36, 39). And in the touching conversation on the way to Emmaus, the disciples say, not merely that we 'had hoped,' but 'we were hoping' (*elpizonen*) that it is 'he who should have redeemed Israel,' (Luke xxiv. 21). Thus emphasis is laid on the continuity of their expectations up to the time of his death at Jerusalem, not merely the fact that they had such expectations.

Again, in John, a beautiful passage is lost by disregarding the verb. The Lord himself changes the verb twice in the same sentence, which in itself were sufficient to call attention to it: 'Judge not according to sight but judge righteous judgment,' (Mr. D.) should be, 'Judge not habitually (*krinate*) according to sight, but judge for once (*krinate*) righteous judgment,' (John vii. 24). The present imperative marking the habit, the aorist the definite act, and so two different tenses in the same sentence. Mark this difference, the force of which is lost by rendering both in the same way. Of course our language being analytic it is to be done by a periphrasis, but in a synthetic language, like the Greek, by changing a letter only. One more example, and we pass on to the Epistles. But it is an example of putting the aorist for the imperfect to the loss of the whole passage. Mr. Darby here misses the idea. In Luke x. when the ships were standing by the lake of Genesaret, 'but the fishermen having come down from thence were washing their nets, and getting into one of the ships, &c., &c., he asked them to draw out a little from the land. . . draw out into the deep, &c.' (Mr. D.) It should be, 'they had washed (*eplunon*) their nets,' and then the Lord getting into one of the ships asked to "launch out again into the deep," (*epanagein*). The point of the passage here is in the force of the verbs. The fishermen had already washed their nets, not 'were washing' them—the work was finished—yet Jesus says, 'Launch out again into the deep,' &c. Then Peter says, 'We

have toiled all the night and have taken nothing, nevertheless, at thy word I will let down the net.' Their faith is sharply tested. If it were merely that they were in the act of washing their nets, and the Lord said, 'draw out into the deep water,' (Mr. D.) there would be in it little to remark, but the word comes after they had washed their nets and finished off. Jesus said, 'launch back again into the deep,' and they do so. Here a beautiful passage loses its main instructive force by disregard of the verbs.

To give one or two illustrations from the Epistles, there is in Peter a remarkable passage elucidated by attention to the verb, a passage also on which there has been no little controversy. It refers to the Lord in life and death, as follows: 'Who, when he was reviled, reviled not again; when suffering, threatened not; but gave [himself] over into the hands of him who judges righteously: who himself bore our sins in his body on the tree.' (Mr. Darby.) It should be, 'Who, when reviled, used not to revile; when suffering, used not to threaten; but was in the habit of committing himself to the care of him who judgeth righteously: who himself bore our sins in his body on the tree, etc.' (1 Peter ii. 23, 24.) The last not continuous but a single act.

The apostle here uses four verbs; the first three are in the imperfect tense, referring to the habit of the life of Him who left us an example, that we should 'follow His steps.' The last verb is in the aorist tense, referring to the definite single act of the sacrifice on the cross; the apostle himself changing the tense purposely in the same sentence. Thus the exquisite beauty and accuracy of this lovely Scripture is in measure lost by disregarding the verb, and nothing gained over the authorised version.

The other passage to which we refer in the Epistles is one to the Church of Ephesus, where the apostle says, according to Mr. Darby, 'In whom ye also are built together for a habitation of God in the Spirit.' It should be, 'In whom ye also are, being builded together to be (*oikodomesthe eis*) a settled dwelling-place of God in the Spirit.' (Ephes. ii. 21.) The verb is the present indicative passive, 'are being builded together, etc.' and so Alford; but Mr. Darby puts it for the past, are built together, by the antiquated method of putting one tense for another, even the very opposite, to which Winer refers. But there was an object in thus changing it, for it is the standing text of Darbyism to prove that the church on earth is perfect, even 'as perfect as the Holy Ghost himself,' to use the language of one of their school (Mr. Patterson), which is very evil indeed! Be this as it may, the real language of the text states the opposite. It looks at the church as a whole in process of formation, and going on unto completion at the day of glory, and Ephesus a structure (*oikodomē*) forming unto that great end, but not as a thing already built or completed. To change and put the past tense here for the present is interpretation, not translation; yet on this false translation is built almost the entire edifice of Darbyism.

III. We come now to the gravest part of the subject, viz., where vital passages are interpreted, not translated, and supported by the aid of false renderings of Scripture. We shall begin with the fundamental subject of justification by faith.

There is in the New Testament a number of passages bearing upon this point, and it now receives a meaning in this 'New Translation' which it never before received from the time the New Testament was written. The reader is told that 'by faith' is to be rendered 'on the principle of faith.' For instance, where it is said that in the gospel 'the righteousness of God is revealed from faith to faith,' it is rendered in the 'New Translation,' 'The righteousness of God is revealed on the principle of faith,' etc. Now, it is quite true as doctrine that God does justify on the principle of faith, and that sinners are justified on the principle of faith, but that is not the meaning of the term 'by faith,' or 'from faith' (*ek pisteos*). This rendering therefore refers it back to God, viz., that God is dealing with men on a principle; but the term 'by faith' refers to the man himself, and it means, from faith, as the subjective origin or source whence a man is justified, not merely that a man is justified on principle. To

translate (*ek pisteos*) 'by faith' as 'on the principle of faith,' is interpretation, not translation, and wrong interpretation too. It reverses the meaning of all the passages. We shall now give a list of them that the reader may judge for himself of Mr. Darby's emendations and false renderings.

1. "For righteousness of God is revealed therein on the principle of faith, to faith: according as it is written. But the just shall live by faith.—Rom. iii. 17.
2. Since indeed it is one God who shall justify the circumcision on the principle of faith, etc.—Rom. iii. 30.
3. For law works wrath, but where no law is neither is there transgression. Therefore it is on the principle of faith, that it might be according to grace.—Rom. iv. 16.
4. Therefore having been justified on the principle of faith, we have peace toward God, etc.—Rom. v. 1.
5. What then shall we say, that they of the nations who did not follow after righteousness, have attained righteousness, but the righteousness that is on the principle of faith. But Israel pursuing after righteousness has not attained to that law. Wherefore? Because it was not on the principle of faith, but as of works.—Rom. ix. 30—32.
6. We also have believed on Christ Jesus, that we might be justified on the principle of the faith of Christ and not of works of law; because on the principle of works of law no flesh shall be justified.—Gal. ii. 16.
7. Know then that they that are on the principle of faith, these are Abraham's sons. And the Scripture foreseeing that God would justify the nations on the principle of faith, announced beforehand the glad tidings to Abraham, etc. etc. So that they who are on the principle of faith are blessed with believing Abraham.—Gal. iii. 7—9.
8. But that by law no one is justified with God is evident, because the just shall live on the principle of faith, but the law is not on the principle of faith.—Gal. iii. 11, 12.
9. But the Scripture has shut up all things under sin, that the promise on the principle of faith of Jesus Christ should be given to those that believe.—Gal. iii. 22.
10. So that the law has been our tutor up to Christ, that we might be justified on the principle of faith.—Gal. iii. 24.
11. For we by the Spirit on the principle of faith await the hope of righteousness.—Gal. v. 5.
12. Ye see that a man is justified on the principle of works, and not on the principle of faith only."—James ii. 24.

Such are Mr. Darby's renderings of all these verses in which the common version reads 'by faith,' *ex fide*, Lat.; *ek pisteos*, Greek.

The above list will show that all these passages, treating on a most vital subject, are perverted and changed. They are applied to God—God dealing with man on a principle. Were they applied to man they would be equally perverted and changed, for man does not merely turn to God on a principle. There is one passage, and only one as far as we know, in which the expression might be 'on the principle of faith.' It is Heb. xi. 13. 'According to the principle of faith died all these,' etc.—*Kata pistin apethanon outoi pantes*. But here the words are quite different. However when we look at No. 12, in the above list, the absurdity of the rendering is at once seen. There Mr. Darby informs us that a man is 'justified on the principle of works and not on the principle of faith only'!

We wonder where Mr. Darby learnt this meaning of the Greek words. With Irving the doctrine of justification which is adopted by Darbyism began—that it is in virtue of the new man in union with Christ in resurrection. And whether the above renderings be meant to carry out this view or not we cannot say. However, on no subject have Mr. Darby and his followers written more profusely than on that of justification; and as their writings are a piecing

together of the thoughts of other thinkers nothing is explained or defined. In fact, not one of them from Mr. Darby downward seems to understand the subject, nor to have thought out the subject. When men write on such a text as 'Christ is the end of the law for righteousness to everyone that believeth,' and deliberately illustrate it by saying 'That the end of the law for a culprit guilty of death is the rope,' it is plain they understand not the subject on which they write; and their mode of treating it is as open to objection as the one they combat. Indeed, Mr. Darby himself in answer to *The Record* uses the following remarkable words. After having, as he thinks, exhausted the subject in expounding it, he says: "This is not *properly* justification, but it is the justification we have got, seeing how we have obtained the justification."—*Letter to the Record*, p. 49; *Morrish: London*. Now, these are striking words, very striking! and if Mr. Darby had the humility to say, 'This my interpretation of the subject is not *properly* justification,' etc., we should quite agree with him; for indeed it is not! But Mr. Darby puts it absolutely as 'the justification we have got,' and as if Paul and he were one on the doctrine.

What Mr. Darby's notions are of inspiration we cannot tell, but unless he thinks his own inspiration equal to Paul's he must have a very strange notion of it. For in this case Paul is represented as treating a subject that lies at the very foundation of Christianity in a way and manner in which it would not be '*properly*' justification at all! So it appears according to Mr. Darby's words, and the *italics* are his own. But the empiricism and crude assumption of such speeches are quite characteristic of the system.

However Mr. Darby's language in this case may be well applied to the above renderings, viz., that justification on 'the principle of faith' is not '*properly*' justification 'by faith' at all! Such is the confused maze of Darby teaching on this vital subject. It is all wrong from first to last, renderings, interpretations and all. Moreover it is not very obvious that if the apostle in all these places was speaking of the principle on which God justifies sinners he would confine himself to the 'principle of faith,' and make no mention of the principle of righteousness, goodness, or love. One would suppose that God was dealing with man on those principles as well as on the principle of faith, if that indeed be the meaning of the inspired words.

Our next observations will be on the manner in which the worship of Christ our Lord is treated throughout this new translation of Mr. Darby.

(To be continued.)

A New Interpretation of Pilgrim's Progress.

BY G. ROGERS.—(Continued.)

THE DELECTABLE MOUNTAINS.

THAT was a noble, hardy, stalwart, brave, and manly race of Christians that flourished amidst the storms of the Puritan age. They were men of great stature. We are in our sight as grasshoppers, and so we should have been in theirs. Outward trials deepen inward experience. The changes without and within are upon the same magnificent scale. High pressure gives more speed. The strength of grace is in proportion to the resistance to be overcome. The more it is needed, the more it is sought; and the more it is sought, the more it is obtained. Can the race of Christians degenerate? Certainly it can; not in birth, but in organic vigour, in intensity of purpose, and in daring exploits. Its constitution is affected by a bracing or a relaxing climate. Where storms are more frequent, the air is more pure.

Darbyism and its New Bible.

(Communicated.)

[SECOND PAPER.]

THE important subject of the worship of Christ as given, or rather as taken from the New Bible of Darbyism, with Mr. Darby's reasons in the preface and notes why it should be so, comes next under review.

Mr. Darby says in his preface, "I have not a doubt of the justness of the change, and just because in *modern* English worship is used for what is rendered to God only. When the English translation was made it was not, and the use of it now falsifies the sense in three quarters of the passages it is used in. It is quite certain that in the vast majority of instances of persons coming to the Lord they had not the least idea of owning him as God. And it falsifies the sense in a material point to use the word now."—*Preface*.

This is Mr. Darby's language, and it is clear enough at all events, nor could anything more decided on the subject be said by the most advanced Unitarian minister in London. He says, 'In modern English worship is used for God only.' This is one statement; and then, 'In the vast majority of instances they had not the least idea of owning Christ as God.' This the next statement; and further, 'It falsifies the sense in a material point so to use the word now.' This is the third; and, consequently, as worship is for God only, and in the vast majority of cases they had not the least idea of owning Christ as God, Christ did not get worship at all, but only homage; and so Mr. Darby was quite right in putting in his Bible homage and not worship—for 'it falsifies the sense in a material point to use the word now.'

From henceforth let none of Mr. Darby's followers tell us that 'these are only different words to express the same thing,' or that 'the people were not regenerate,' etc. The reason is that 'worship is for God only,' and not having 'the least idea of owning Christ as God, he got homage only, in the vast majority of instances.' If this is not outspoken what is? And what next? Verily if Gilbert Wakefield, Priestly, or Belsham were alive, these leading Unitarian ministers would say, 'Let us shake hands, brother!' Yet these are the grounds on which Mr. Darby thinks proper to sweep the worship of Christ out of the New Testament! But happily not one of these statements is true.

The first question we have to ask Mr. Darby is, Was the Messiah, when He appeared, to get true divine worship or not? Did the Scriptures of the Old Testament proclaim or not the deity of the Messiah and claim worship for Him? These are primary questions, and for the sake of the poor Christians duped by these sophisms, and caught in the snare of this kind of rationalism, one is called upon to unravel them; for here, as in Irvingism, high transcendental truths are found side by side with an irreverent handling of the claims of Christ our Lord, and a shaking of the very foundations. There is but one answer to these questions. The Old Scriptures styled Him Emmanuel—God with us (Isa. vii., Matt. i.); The One whose goings have been from of old, from everlasting (Mic. v. 2); 'The wisdom of God' (Prov. viii.); 'The Son in whom the nations were to trust' (Ps. ii. 12); and both Jews and Gentiles to worship (Ps. xcvi. 7, Isa. xlix. 7); all worship being forbidden at the same time to any but God (See Matt. iv. 10, with Heb. i. 6). Consequently, whenever the Messiah came to Israel these were his claims, and whoever that Messiah was had the title to them, for he was Jehovah's fellow (Zech. xiii. 7). When, therefore, Jesus of Nazareth came, and was from his birth announced as the Emmanuel, God in flesh with men, all who believed in His claims gave Him the divine worship due to Him, and which was forbidden to all other except to God. It resolved itself then into the question of who believed Jesus to be the Messiah and who did not. We shall see presently how far it 'falsifies the sense in a material point

of view to use the word 'in reference to the Lord Jesus throughout the New Testament!

There are fifteen cases mentioned in which worship is used, both in the authorised version, and in Dean Alford's new version. In all these cases, except one (Heb. i. 6), Mr. Darby has '*homage*' in his '*new Translation*.' Even that one is excluded in the French version of Mr. Darby; and it would be edifying, no doubt, in accordance with the marked distinction made between *worship* and *homage* to know why Heb. i. 6 should be translated in *English*, 'Let all the angels of God worship him,' and in *French*, 'Give him homage (*Lui rendent homage*). If this be right in *French*, then in the *English*, according to his own showing, it must be 'falsified!' Again, why does Mr. D. not allow the capital letters to remain as before to the names of our Lord and of the Holy Ghost? These words in the common French version begin with capital letters, but Mr. Darby expunges the capitals and puts small letters instead. Thus in his version *seigneur*, Lord, is printed with a small s, and *saint esprit*, Holy Ghost, with a small s. All this observe, is done coolly and deliberately. But let us now reckon up the fifteen cases of worship to Christ. (1.) When the wise men of the East, guided by the star foretold by Balaam, was it merely a great King only that these eastern wise men sought to worship, or the Messiah King of Israel? (Matt. ii.) (2.) And when Herod proposed to worship him, was it not under pretence of doing what the Magi did? (Matt. ii.) (3.) The next case of worship is that of the leper, whose evidence is not sufficient to conclude one way or the other as to his believing Jesus to be the Messiah (Matt. viii. 2). (4.) But Jairus the ruler of the synagogue certainly believed Him to be the Messiah when he worshipped (the Jews being so opposed to worship any who was not as God), and said his daughter was dead, 'but come and lay thy hands upon her and she shall live' (Matt. ix. 18), and in proof of this the Lord takes him with the three disciples and shows him the evidence (Mark v. 40). (5.) And when the disciples saw him walking on the sea as the One that had power over the waves thereof, did they not worship him? (Matt. xiv. 33.) (6.) And the Syrophenician woman did she not 'worship' Him as the Messiah when she said, "Truth, Lord: yet the dogs under the table eat of the crumbs," etc.; and he said, "O woman, great is thy faith," etc. (Matt. xv. 25.) (7.) And the holy women who held Him by the feet after His resurrection and worshipped Him, did they not believe him to be the Messiah? (Matt. xxviii. 9); and (8), the eleven disciples in the same chapter (verse 17)? (9.) And when the legion cried and said, "Jesus, thou Son of the most high God, and worshipped him." (Mark v. 6, 7,) did he or did he not in so saying look on him as co-equal with God, and give him in a Jewish sense the honour that belonged to God? For in a spiritual, true sense it would be as foreign to the demons to give the Lord homage as worship, but they gave Him what He gets from them as God in glory. (10.) And when the disciples see the Lord go away into heaven, do they not worship him? (Luke xxiv. 52.) (11.) And when the mother of Zebedee's children comes to ask that her sons may sit one on his right hand and the other on his left in his kingdom, did she not worship the Messiah? (Matt. xx.) (12.) And when Jesus asked the man blind from his birth whom he had healed, 'Dost thou believe on the Son of God?' . . . And he said, Lord, I believe. And he worshipped him.' (John ix. 38.) Did this man believe the Lord to be the Messiah or not? (13.) The next is Heb. i. 6. 'Let all the angels of God worship him,' of which we have already spoken. (14.) The elders on thrones fall down and worship the Lamb. No! says Mr. Darby's version, they give him homage. (Rev. v. 14.) (15.) The soldiers bow the knee and worship the self-styled Messiah, in derision (Mark xv. 19), doing in mockery what 'the kingdoms of the nations were to do in reality, viz., 'worship before thee.' (Ps. xxii: 27.)

We scarcely reckoned on being obliged to prove this doctrine to evangelical people. But here are all the instances that occur in the New Testament, and

instead of 'the vast majority of persons who had not the least idea of owning Him as God,' there is only one solitary case in which the evidence is not sufficient to prove the matter one way or the other—all the rest either worshipped Him as the Messiah, God with us Emmanuel—and did it in sincerity, or else pretended in mockery to give what they knew belonged to the true Messiah. In most cases it was both worship and adoration, but in no case was it homage only, to the exclusion of worship, except possibly in the one already mentioned, and even that is doubtful. Such is clearly the teaching of Scripture, and it is remarkable that the greatest number of worshippers appears in St. Matthew's Gospel; this Evangelist being careful to present the Messianic claims of Jesus before Israel, as is usual with him.

And now we have to call attention to the following facts: When persons attempted to worship Peter (Acts x. 25); and the angel (Rev. xx. 8, 9), they at once forbade them: that is, when they did to Peter and the angel what they did to Jesus, Peter and the angel at once refuse. Why? Because they were not 'as God'—and the greatest sin known to the Old Testament was the worship of the creature. But Jesus, who comes to fulfil the law, receives worship and accepts it, and never refuses it, although 'in the vast majority of instances of persons coming to him they had not the least idea of owning him as God.' (Mr. D.) How on earth, then, is our Lord cleared of encouraging people to commit the greatest sin known to the law? 'O no,' says Mr. Darby, 'they only gave him homage and not worship!' Very well; then, in that case those who fell down before Peter, and before the angel to worship them, thought them worthy of adoration, whilst those who came and fell down before Jesus did not think Him worthy of worship, and only gave Him homage which He accepted! Does Mr. Darby believe this? and do any of his followers believe it? Here, then, are two horns of a dilemma, they may choose the one or the other. But they are shut up to either, and there is no escape. The language in all the cases is the same. The words of the original are the same.

Such are the contradictions in which the spirit of rationalism lands those who indulge in it, and let him that thinketh he standeth take heed lest he fall, for no amount of information on any subject can compensate for shaking the foundations of the faith itself.

But we have not yet done with Mr. Darby, who says that the explanation he gives of *worship* and *homage* 'would not be worth mentioning but for simple souls.' No doubt the souls must certainly be very simple to accept the explanation given.

And we suppose that it is also 'for simple souls' that he gives an explanation of the original words in the note on Matt. iv. 10, where we find the following extraordinary explanation of the Greek word for *worship* (*proskuneo*.) On this word Mr. D. says, 'The LXX vary. The word is used alike for men and for God, see I Chron. xxix. 20; and is all but always an act of personal reverence and homage. What in modern language is called worship is *latreuo*. The nearest approach to this in the use of *proskuneo* is in John iv. 23, 24.'

So, according to this, the Evangelists throughout the New Testament designedly used the lower word to show that the Lord only got homage and not worship, but that the nearest approach to the higher word (*latreuo*) is in John iv. 23, 24,—this last being, so far as the word goes, an exceptional use of it in the 'modern' or highest sense of 'worship'! according to Mr. D.

We are sorry to have to say that nothing can be further from the truth than this explanation.

Of course every one knows that the word for *worship*, whether in Greek or in English is 'used alike for men and for God.' When for men it means homage and honour; when for God, adoration, but the word homage is never used for worship in the sense of adoration, but means honour only, when given to men.

Now, if the reader takes up a 'Cruden's Concordance' and looks at the word *worship*, and then gets some friend who has a Greek Bible (if he has not one himself) he will find that this word for *worship* (*proskuneo*) occurs upwards of

fifty-six times in the Old Testament. It is the highest word used in the whole of the Greek Bible for worship, as the following instances will prove:—(1) 'For thou shalt worship (*proskuneſete*) no other God,' (Ex. xxxiv. 14.) (2) 'Thou shalt not bow down thyself to them (*proskuneſeis*) nor serve them (*latreueis*);' (Ex. xx. 5.) (3) 'Thou shalt not bow down (*proskuneſeis*) to their Gods, nor serve (*latreueis*) them,' (Ex. xxiii. 24.) (4) 'And this man went up out of his city yearly to worship (*proskunein*) and to sacrifice to the Lord of Hosts in Shiloh,' (1 Sam. i. 3.) (5) 'Turn again with me that I may worship (*proskuneseo*) the Lord,' (1 Sam. xv. 25.) (6) 'And in thy fear will I worship (*proskuneseo*) toward thy holy temple,' (Ps. v. 7.) (7) 'Worship (*proskuneseo*) the Lord in the beauty of holiness,' (Ps. xxix. 2.) These references are sufficient to show that instead of the LXX merely using the word to express 'all but always an act of personal reverence and homage,' as Mr. Darby affirms, it is used to express the act of worship always in the highest sense.

On the other hand, *latreuo* or *latreia* never used in the Greek Scriptures for personal adoration. They signify to *serve*, and *religious service*—whether in connection with a ritual or for self-dedication. The word appears twice in the above quotations in the sense of religious service, also in the following:—

- (1) 'Ye shall serve God in this mountain,' *latreusate*. (Ex. iii. 12.)
- (2) 'Ye shall keep this service,' *latreia*, viz., the Passover. (Ex. xii. 25.)
- (3) 'To do the service of the tabernacle of the Lord, and to stand before the congregation to minister unto them' *latreuin*. (Num. xv. 9.)
- (4) 'We have an altar whereof they have no right to eat who serve the tabernacle,' *Hot latreuontes*. (Heb. xiii. 10.)
- (5) 'The worshippers (*tois latreuontas*) once purged should have had no more conscience of sin.' (Heb. x. 2.) Here the word is the same as last, and means by *worshippers* those who performed religious service in the house of God. Even in Phil. iii. 3, the word does not mean worship in the sense of personal adoration, but in the sense of self-dedication, as indeed the Apostle himself explains in the succeeding verses.

The difference between the two words *proskuneeo* and *latreuo* seems to be this:—That which is done personally and cannot be done vicariously, as the personal adoration of an object, is rendered by the first, *proskuneeo*; its derivation signifying prostration before that object. But that which belonged to the religious service of the sanctuary and the ritual of the old law, and in Christianity to the self-dedication and *service* of the believer is rendered by the second word *latreuo*. The one referred to what was done by the people themselves, and could not be transferred to another or done vicariously by the priest, and was accompanied by devotion of the heart: hence it was personal. This gave the term the highest characteristic of worship, consequently, it is the word used toward the Lord. The other referred to the ritual of the sanctuary of old, and the fulfilment of the ceremonial: in Christianity to the self-dedication and spiritual service of the Christian. Both words now especially belong to the vitality of religion, but they do not mean the same thing. This is plain from the references; and the conclusion is that both terms signify just the very opposite of what Mr. Darby affirms. So far from *latreuo* signifying the highest kind of worship in the 'modern English sense' it does not signify worship at all, except by implication; and so far from *proskuneeo* signifying 'all but always personal reverence and homage,' it is the word always used for the very highest kind of worship that can be given to the Lord.

We see, alas! how easy it is to give prominence to a few transcendental truths, and let go the foundations of Christianity at the same time (as did Irvingism), and consent to a miserable and pitiable translation of the Bible that goes a long way in its renderings towards a denial of the Lord that bought us. We think, now, that examples sufficient have been given to prove (1) that the diction of the authorised version has been in many places needlessly changed, and a harsh and uncouth phraseology substituted for it; and (2) that the force of the Greek verb is habitually disregarded, even in passages where it were

most important that stress should be laid upon it; and (3) that interpretations rather than translations have been given, even of vital passages, and supported by the aid of false renderings of Scripture and by false reasoning.

There are other findings as bad as any that have been noticed, but there is no need of overtaxing the reader with more at present; for if his attention has been sustained in perusing the proofs now put before him, he will be enabled from the evidence to estimate how far Darbyism and its new Bible are likely to advance the truer knowledge of real Christianity.

The Lord deliver his people from the perils of these last days, in which light is so often mingled with much that is darkness itself.

A New Interpretation of Pilgrim's Progress.

BY G. ROGERS.—(Concluded.)

THE LAND OF BEULAH.

THE enchanted ground led immediately to the country of Beulah. Come when it may, a country so delightful becomes an almost overwhelming contrast with all that has preceded it; but it is doubly grateful at the close of a long and tiresome pilgrimage. Pilgrim's toil has now ceased, his dangers are passed, his sorrows are ended. One more trial, at least, and all is over; every sigh, and tear, and doubt, and fear is gone, and gone for ever. The days of his mourning are ended. His happiness is as great as in the present state he can bear. This is the land of Beulah. It is border land. It is neither earth nor heaven, but midway between them. It is a transition state between faith and sight, between grace and glory. Such joys and glories have been known to many, and probably have been experienced by all for some period, however short, before they have exchanged earth for heaven. In this land of Beulah the Celestial City may be seen, the air is filled with its odours, its melodies may be heard, and its fruits may be tasted, and its ministering spirits are on every side. The following words of Dr. Payson, in his last days, will have a response in the hearts of some:—"When I formerly read Bunyan's description of the land of Beulah, where the sun shines and the birds sing day and night, I used to doubt whether there was such a place: but now my own experience has convinced me of it, and it infinitely transcends all my previous conceptions." Such instances, it is to be feared, are more rare now than formerly. With the life of Bunyan's Pilgrim we have lost the experience of his death. High hills are accompanied by deep valleys, and great victories follow severe conflicts. "He that soweth sparingly shall reap also sparingly, and he which soweth bountifully shall reap also bountifully."

Bunyan's pilgrim is here supposed to be alone in the land of Beulah with Hope, without which it would be no Beulah to him. If they were two separate Pilgrims they were far more alike in all their thoughts and feelings than any two Christians could reasonably be supposed to be, and especially at the same time. When "Christian with Desire fell sick, Hopeful also had a fit or two of the same disease." They talked alike in their sleep, and spoke of having had the same comforts and pleasures in the way. Is this the experience of one Christian, or of two? If of two, what learn we more from them than if they had been one? From a Christian accompanied by Hope, much more may be learned than if accompanied by another called Hopeful; and this we shall see still further illustrated in the separating flood. Let Dr. Payson, for instance, be Christian in the land of Beulah, and some other one be Hopeful in precisely the same circumstances and having precisely the same experience, at the same time, how improbable it would seem, and how impossible that they should have