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 AUTHORIZED VERSION. AUTHORIZED VERSION REVISED.   
 power, when he had by holding the universe by the word   
 himself purged our sins, of his power, ‘when he had + made '%- 7.4   
 sat down on the right hand purification of sins, \* sa F   
 KPsex1. Eph.i.20, eh, vill +h   
 ‘our ancient down on solfonnd   
 ite, THT:   
 —the peculiar essence of an object. And demonstrative pronouns is by no means   
 this last seems to be the best meanin: observed in the Now Test., e.g. Eph. i   
 in our plaice: His essential being, His 20, 22, “And placed Him at His right   
 substance. For in regarding the history hand (of the Father), .... and put all   
 of the word, we find that the well-known things under His fect” (of the Son). In   
 theological meaning ‘person, was not by every such ease the reference must be   
 any means generally reccived during the determined by the circumstances, and the   
 first four centuries. The Nicene Council things spoken of, And applying that test   
 itself uses “Aypostasis” and “ essence” here, we find that in onr former clause it is   
 in the same sense, and condemns the de- quite out of the question that his should   
 riving the Son from another hypostasis or be reflective, as it clearly to   
 essence from the Father: and so usually another than the subject of the sentence.   
 Athanasius. The fact was, that the E But when we proceed to our second clause,   
 most commonly used the term to di we find no such bar to the ordinary re-   
 the three separate Persons: whereas the flective sense of his, but every reason to   
 Westerns continued to regard it as equi- adopt it as the most obvious. For we   
 valent to essence, and assumed but one have here an action performed by the Son,   
 hypostasis: aud the Western bishops, as- who upholds the universe. Whereby ? By   
 sembled with Athanasius at the council of the word of His power: where we may   
 Sardica in 3:47, distinctly pronounced the certainly say 1) that had another than the   
 assumption of three Aypostases heretical, subject of the sentence been intended, such   
 ie, Arian, Subsequently, however, to this, iutention would have beeu expressed: and   
 in the Synod assembled at Alexandria in 362, 2) that the assertion would be after all a   
 at which Athanasius, and bishops of Italy, strange and unexampled one, that the Son.   
 Arabia, Egypt, and Libya were prescut, upholds all things by the word of the   
 the Kasterns ‘and Westerns agreed, on Father's power, So that, on all accounts,   
 examination of one another's meaning, this second his seems better to be re-   
 to acknowledge one another as orthodox, ferred to the Son) power (not to be   
 and to allow indifferently of the use of weakened into the comparatively unmean-   
 three hypostases, signifying ‘ Persons,’ and ing “his powerful word.” His Power is   
 one hypostasis, signifying substance, es- an inherent attribute, whether uttered or   
 sence. Onall grounds it will safer here not: the werd is that utterance, which He   
 to hold to the primitive meaning of the has been pleased to give of it. It is a   
 word, and not to introduce into the Ian- “powerful word,” but much more is here   
 guage of the apostolic age a terminology stated—that it is word of, proceeding   
 which was long subsequent to it), and from, giving utterance to, His power),   
 upholding (hearing up. The Rabbinical having (or, when He had) made (the   
 writings speak of God as carrying all the vulgate, \* making,” is an unfortunate m   
 worlds by His strength) the universe (the translation, tending to obscure the truth   
 nieaning attempted to be given by some of the completion of the one Sacrifice of   
 Socinian expositors, “the whole kingdom the Lord. The words “by Himself” can   
 of grace,” is wholly beside purpose : hardly be retained in the text, in the face   
 see Col. 1.17; Job. viii. 35 Rev. iv. 11) of their omission in the most ancient MSS.,   
 hy the werd (expressed command: com- joined to their internal character as an   
 pare ch. xi. 3) of his (Whose? His own, explanatory gloss. Meanwhile, the gloss   
 or the Fathers? ‘The latter is held by is a good and true one. It was by Him-   
 Cyril of Alexandria. And so Grotius an self, in the fullest sense) purification of   
 others, But Chrysostom and the great sins (as Bleck observes, there is no ocea-   
 body of Commentators understand his to sion to suppose the genitive here equivalent   
 refer to the Son. The strict parallelism of to “from sins,” seeing that we may say,   
 the clanses would seem to require, that Ris “the sins of a man are purified,” as we   
 here shonld designate the same person, as read, Matt. viii. “his leprosy was   
 it does before in this same verse. But such cleansed.” Sin was the great unclean-   
 parallelism aud consistency of reference of ness, of which Ic has eflected the purga-