is said of the *purpose*), **denying** (not,  
‘having denied’) **ungodliness and the  
lusts of the world** (*‘all* worldly lusts.’  
**Worldly**, belonging to that world which  
lieth in the wicked one, and is without,  
God: see 1 John ii. 15—17), **we might  
live soberly, and justly** (better than  
*‘righteously*, —‘righteous,’ by its forensic  
objective sense in St. Paul, introducing a  
confusion, where the question is of moral  
rectitude), **and godly, in the present life**  
(as St. Bernard says, *soberly* respects *ourselves*,—*justly*, our neighbour,—*godly*, our  
God.—These three comprising our *discipline* in faith and love, he now comes to  
*hope*); **looking for the blessed hope** (here,  
as in Gal. v. 5, Col. i. 5 al., nearly objective,—the hope, as embodying the thing  
hoped for), **and manifestation** (*hope and  
manifestation* belong together) **of the  
glory** (Chrysostom says, ‘He speaks here  
of two manifestations ; the former of grace,  
the latter of glory.” Nothing could be more  
unfortunate than the rendering of the  
A. V., “*glorious appearing*,” by which  
the whole sense is obscured) **of the great  
God** (the Father: see below) **and of our  
Saviour Jesus Christ** (as regards the  
sense, an exact parallel is found in Matt.  
xvi. 27, “*The Son of man is about to  
come in the glory of His Father*,” compared with Matt. xxv. 31, “*When the Son  
of man shall come in His glory.*” See  
also 1 Pet. iv. 13. The glory which shall  
be revealed at the appearing of our Saviour  
Jesus Christ is *His own* glory, *and* that  
*of His Father* [John xvii, 3; 1 Thess. iii.  
13]. This sense has been obscured by  
the foolish rendering of the A.V. see  
above. And we now come to consider the  
meaning of the words *the great God and  
our Saviour Jesus Christ*. Two views have  
been taken of them: (1) that **the great  
God and our Saviour** are to be taken  
together as the description of **Jesus Christ**,  
—‘*of Jesus Christ, the great God and  
our Saviour*: (2) that, as given above, **the great God** describes the Father, and  
**our Saviour Jesus Christ** the Son. It is  
obvious that in dealing with (1), we shall  
be deciding with regard to (2) also. (1) has  
been the view of the Greek orthodox Fathers,  
and of most ancient and modern Commentators. That the former so interpreted  
the words, is obviously not [as it has been  
considered] decisive of the question, if  
they can be shewn to bear legitimately  
another meaning, and that meaning to be  
the one most likely to have been in the  
mind of the writer. The passage must  
be argued primarily on its own ground,  
not primarily on the consensus of the  
Greek Fathers. No one disputes that it  
*may* mean that which they have inter-  
preted it: and there were obvious reasons  
why they, having licence to do so, should  
choose this interpretation. But it is our  
object, not being swayed, in this or any  
other interpretation, by doctrinal considerations one way or the other, to enquire, not what the words *may* mean, but  
what they *do* mean, as far as we may be  
able to ascertain it.—I have in my Greek  
‘Test. argued first from the construction  
of the sentence, and then from the Apostle’s  
usage of the expression “God our Saviour:”  
and from both of these considerations I  
have deduced that it is not probable he  
meant to apply the whole of this to our  
Lord, but the former portion to the  
Father, and the latter to the Son. The  
reasoning on the second point may be intelligible to the English reader. The  
expression “*God our Saviour*” occurs six  
times in these Epistles, once in Luke  
(i. 47], and once in the Epistle of  
Jude. If the writer *here* identities this  
expression, ‘the great God and our Saviour,’  
with the Lord Jesus Christ, calling Him  
\*God and our Saviour,’ it will be at least  
probable that in other places where he  
speaks of “God our Saviour,” he also  
designates our Lord Jesus Christ. Now  
is that so? On the contrary, in I Tim.i. 1,