

XVI.

ON THE CONSTRUCTION OF ROMANS IX. 5.

[From the *Journal of the Society of Biblical Literature and Exegesis* for 1831.]*

WE shall understand better the passage to be discussed, if we consider its relation to what precedes and follows and the circumstances under which it was written.

In the first eight chapters of the Epistle to the Romans, the Apostle has set forth the need and the value of the gospel as "the power of God unto salvation to *every one that believeth*; to the Jew first, and also to the Greek." In view of the present blessings and the glorious hopes of the Christian believer, he closes this part of the Epistle with an exultant song of triumph.

But the doctrine of Paul was in direct opposition to the strongest prejudices of the Jews and their most cherished expectations. It placed them on a level, as to the conditions of salvation, with the despised and hated Gentiles. The true Messiah, the king of Israel, the spiritual king of men, had come; but the rulers of their nation had crucified the Lord of glory, and the great mass of the people had rejected him. They had thus set themselves in direct opposition to God. They had become ἀνάθεμα ἀπὸ τοῦ χριστοῦ, outcasts from the Messiah and his kingdom. Christians, a large majority of them Gentiles by birth, were now the true Israel. No rite of circumcision, no observance of the Jewish Law, was required, as the condition of acceptance with God and the enjoyment of the Messianic blessings; no sacrifice but self-sacrifice: the only condition was *faith*, as Paul uses the term,—a *practical* belief and trust in Christ, and

* [The article by Dr. Dwight, to which Professor Abbot makes frequent reference below, and which defends the opposite opinion to that maintained by Dr. Abbot, may be found in the same number of the above-named journal, pp. 22-55.]

thus in God revealed in his paternal character; a faith that carried with it the affections and will, πίστις δὲ ἀγάπης ἐνεργουμένη.

How could these things be? How was this gospel of Paul to be reconciled with the promises of God to the "holy nation"? how with his justice, wisdom, and goodness? Had God cast off his people, "Israel his servant, Jacob his chosen, the seed of Abraham his friend"? These are the great questions which the Apostle answers in the ninth, tenth, and eleventh chapters of this Epistle. The first five verses are to be regarded as a *conciliatory introduction* to his treatment of this subject, on which he had so much to say that was not only hard for the unbelieving Jews, but for Jewish Christians, to understand and accept.

The unbelieving Jews regarded the Apostle as an apostate from the true religion and as an enemy of their race. Five times already he had received from them forty stripes save one; he had been "in perils from his own countrymen" at Damascus, at Antioch in Pisidia, at Iconium and Lystra, at Thessalonica, Berea, and Corinth,—often in peril of his life. By a great part of the believing Jews, he was regarded with distrust and aversion. (See Acts xxi. 20, 21.) His doctrines were indeed revolutionary. Though he was about to go to Jerusalem to carry a liberal contribution from the churches of Macedonia and Achaia to the poor Christians in that city, he expresses in this Epistle great anxiety about the reception he should meet with (anxiety fully justified by the result), and begs the prayers of the brethren at Rome in his behalf (Rom. xv. 30-32). As the Jews hated Paul, they naturally believed that he hated them.

These circumstances explain the exceedingly strong asseveration of his affection for his countrymen and of his deep sorrow for their estrangement from God, with which this introduction begins. So far from being an enemy of his people, he could make any sacrifice to win them to Christ. They were his brethren, his kinsmen, as to the flesh. He gloried in sharing with them the proud name of Israelite. He delights to enumerate the magnificent privileges by which God had distinguished them from all other

nations,—“the adoption, and the glory, and the giving of the Law, the covenants, the temple service, and the promises.” Theirs were the fathers; and, from among them, as the crowning distinction of all, the Messiah was born, the supreme gift of God’s love and mercy not to the Jews alone, but to all mankind. All God’s dealings with his chosen people were designed to prepare the way, and had prepared the way, for this grand consummation. How natural that, when, in his rapid recital of their historic glories, the Apostle reaches this highest distinction of the Jews and greatest blessing of God’s mercy to men, he should express his overflowing gratitude to God as the Ruler over all; that he should “thank God for his unspeakable gift”! I believe that he has done so, and that the fifth verse of the passage we are considering should be translated, “whose are the fathers and from whom is the Messiah as to the flesh: he who is over all, God, be blessed forever. Amen,” or “he who is God over all be blessed forever. Amen.” The doxology springs from the same feeling and the same view of the gracious providence of God which prompted the fuller outburst at the end of the eleventh chapter, where, on completing the treatment of the subject which he here introduces, the Apostle exclaims: “O the depth of the riches and wisdom and knowledge of God! How unsearchable are his judgments and untracable his ways! . . . For from him, and through him, and to him, are all things: to him be (or is) the glory forever. Amen.”

I believe that there are no objections to this construction of the passage which do not betray their weakness when critically examined; and that the objections against most of the other constructions which have been proposed are fatal.

The passage is remarkable for the different ways in which it has been and may be punctuated, and for the consequent variety of constructions which have been given it. The Greek is as follows:—

... καὶ ἔξ ὧν ὁ χριστὸς τὸ κατὰ σάρκα ὁ ὢν ἐπὶ πάντων θεὸς εὐλογητὸς εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας. Ἀμήν.

It *grammatically* admits of being punctuated and construed in at least seven different ways.

1. Placing a *comma* after *σάρκα*, and also after *θεός*, we may translate the last clause, “who (or he who) is God over all, blessed for ever.”

2. Putting the second *comma* after *πάντων* instead of *θεός*: “who (or he who) is over all, God blessed for ever.”

3. With a *comma* after *πάντων* and also after *θεός*, “who (or he who) is over all, God, blessed for ever.” So Morus, Gess (*Christi Person und Werk*, II. i. 207 f., Basel, 1878).

4. Placing a *comma* after *ὁ ὢν*, and also after *θεός*,—“He who Is, God over all, blessed for ever.” See Wordsworth’s note, which, however, is not consistent throughout; and observe the mistranslation at the end of his quotation from Athanasius (*Orat. cont. Arianos*, i. § 24, p. 338).*

5. Placing a *comma* after *σάρκα* and a *colon* after *πάντων*, the last part of the verse may be rendered: “and from whom is the Messiah as to the flesh, who (or he who) is over all: God be blessed for ever. Amen.”

6. Placing a *colon* after *σάρκα, θεός* may be taken as predicate, thus: “he who is over all is God, blessed for ever”; so Professor B. H. Kennedy, D.D., Canon of Ely; or thus, “he who was over all being (*literally*, was) God, blessed for ever.” So Andrews Norton.

7. With a *colon* after *σάρκα, ὁ ὢν ἐπὶ πάντων θεός* may be taken as the subject, and *εὐλογητός* as predicate, with the ellipsis of *εἶναι* or *ἵσθαι*, making the last part of the verse a doxology, thus: “he who is over all, God, be blessed (or is to be praised) for ever”; or “he who is God over all be blessed (or is to be praised) for ever”; or “God, who is over all, be blessed (or is to be praised) for ever.”

I pass over other varieties of translation and interpretation, depending on the question whether *πάντων* is to be taken as masculine or neuter, and on the wider or narrower application of the word in either case.

In Nos. 1–4 inclusive, it will be seen that the *ὁ ὢν*, with all that follows, including the designation *θεός*, is referred to

* Perhaps I ought to add here as a curiosity a construction proposed in the *Record* newspaper, in an article copied in *Christian Opinion and Revisionist* for March 11, 1882, p. 222. The writer would translate, “Of whom as concerning the flesh Christ came, who is over all, God. Blessed be he for ever! Amen.”

ὁ ἄριστος: in Nos. 6 and 7, ὁ ὢν introduces an independent sentence, and θεὸς denotes God, the Father. No. 5 refers the first part of the sentence in debate to ὁ ἄριστος, the last part to God.

The question of chief interest is whether in this passage the Apostle has called Christ *God*. Among those who hold that he has done so, the great majority adopt one or the other of the constructions numbered 1 and 2; and it is to these, and especially to No. 2, followed both in King James's version and the Revised Version (text), that I shall give special attention. Among those who refer the last part of the sentence to God, and not Christ, the great majority of scholars adopt either No. 5 or No. 7. I have already expressed my preference for the latter construction, and it is generally preferred by those who find here a doxology to God.

I. We will first consider the objections that have been urged against the construction which makes the last part of the sentence, beginning with ὁ ὢν, introduce a doxology to God. I shall then state the arguments which seem to me to favor this construction, and at the same time to render the constructions numbered 1 to 4 each and all untenable. Other views of the passage will be briefly noticed. Some remarks will be added on the history of its interpretation, though no full account of this will be attempted.

1. It is objected that a doxology here is wholly out of place; that the Apostle is overwhelmed with grief at the Jewish rejection of the Messiah and its consequences, and "an elegy or funeral discourse cannot be changed abruptly into a hymn." He is, indeed, deeply grieved at the unbelief and blindness of the great majority of his countrymen; but his sorrow is not hopeless. He knows all the while that "the word of God hath not failed," that "God hath not cast off his people whom he foreknew," that at last "all Israel shall be saved"; and nothing seems to me more natural than the play of mingled feelings which the passage presents,—grief for the present temporary alienation of his countrymen from Christ, joy and thanksgiving at the thought of the priceless

blessings of which Christ was the minister to man and in which his countrymen should ultimately share.

Flatt, Stuart, and others put the objection in a very pointed form. They represent a doxology as making Paul say, in effect: "The special privileges of the Jews have contributed greatly to enhance the guilt and punishment of the Jewish nation; God be thanked that he has given them such privileges!" But they simply read into the passage what is not there. There is nothing in the context to suggest that the Apostle is taking this view of the favor which God has shown the Jewish nation. He is not denouncing his countrymen for their guilt in rejecting the Messiah, and telling them that this guilt and its punishment are aggravated by the privileges they have abused. So tender is he of their feelings that he does not even name the cause of his grief, but leaves it to be inferred. He is assuring his countrymen, who regarded him as their enemy, of the sincerity and strength of his love for them. They are his brethren: the very name "Israelite" is to him a title of honor;* and he recounts in detail, certainly not in the manner of one touching a painful subject, the glorious distinctions which their nation had enjoyed through the favor of God. Calvin, who so often in his commentaries admirably traces the connection of thought, here hits the nail on the head: "Haec dignitatis elogia *testimonia sunt amoris*. Non enim solemus adeo benigne loqui, nisi de iis quos amamus." †

At the risk of being tedious, I will take some notice of Dr. Gifford's remarks in his recent and valuable Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans.‡ He says: "Paul's anguish is deepened by the memory of their privileges, most of all by the thought that their race gave birth to the Divine Saviour, whom they have rejected." But in Paul's enum-

* See ch. xi. 1; 2 Cor. xi. 22.

† The view which I have taken accords with that of Dr. Hodge. He says: "The object of the Apostle in the introduction to this chapter, contained in the first five verses, is to assure the Jews of his love and of his respect for their peculiar privileges." *Comm. on the Ep. to the Romans*, new ed. (1864), note on ix. 4, p. 459; see also p. 463.

‡ [With the paragraphs which follow compare the additional comments in Essay XVII., p. 415 f.]

eration of the privileges of the Jews he has in view not merely their present condition, but their whole past history, illuminated as it had been by light from heaven. Will it be seriously maintained that Paul did not regard the peculiar privileges which the Jewish nation had enjoyed for so many ages as gifts of God's goodness for which eternal gratitude was due? But "his anguish is deepened most of all by the thought that their race gave birth to the Divine Saviour, whom they have rejected"! * Paul's grief for his unbelieving countrymen, then, had extinguished his gratitude for the inestimable blessings which he personally owed to Christ: it had extinguished his gratitude for the fact that the God who rules over all had sent his Son to be the Saviour of the world! The dark cloud which hid the light just then from the mass of his countrymen, but which he believed was soon to pass away, had blotted the sun from the heavens. The advent of Christ was no cause for thanksgiving: he could only bow his head in anguish, deepened most of all by the thought that the Messiah had sprung from the race to which he himself belonged.

"His anguish is deepened by the memory of their privileges." Paul does not say this; and is Dr. Gifford quite sure that this was the way in which these privileges presented themselves to his mind? May we not as naturally suppose that the thought of God's favor to his people in the past, whom he had so often recalled from their wanderings, afforded some ground for the hope that they had not stumbled so as to fall and perish, but that their present alienation from Christ, contributing, as it had done, in the overruling providence of God, to the wider and more rapid spread of the gospel among the Gentiles, was only temporary? If we will let Paul be his own interpreter instead of reading unnatural thoughts between his lines, we shall take this view. "God hath *not* cast off HIS PEOPLE, whom he foreknew;" "whose is the adoption, and the glory, and the covenants, and the promises." "A hardening in part hath befallen Israel," but only "until the fulness of the Gentiles be come in; and so (*or* then) all Israel shall be saved." It

*[The last four words were added by Dr. Abbot subsequently, for reasons apparent on p. 415.]

is not for nothing that "theirs are the fathers"; that they had such ancestors as Abraham, "the friend of God," and Isaac, and Jacob. "As touching the gospel, they are enemies for the sake of the Gentiles, but as touching the election," as the chosen people of God, "they are beloved for the fathers' sake." "If the first fruit is holy, so is the lump; and, if the root is holy, so are the branches." "God doth not repent of his calling and his gifts." "God hath shut up all [Jews and Gentiles] unto disobedience, that he might have mercy upon all." For the ancient prophecy is now fulfilled: the Deliverer hath come out of Zion; and "he shall turn away ungodliness from Jacob." "O the depth of the riches," etc. Such were the thoughts which the past privileges of the Jews, in connection with the advent of Christ, as we see from the eleventh chapter of this Epistle, *actually* suggested to the mind of Paul.*

Can we, then, reasonably say that, when, in his grand historic survey and enumeration of the distinctive privileges of the Jews, the Apostle reaches the culminating point in the advent of the Messiah, sprung from that race, a devout thanksgiving to God as the beneficent ruler over all is wholly out of place? Might we not rather ask, How could it be repressed?

We may then, I conceive, dismiss the *psychological* objection to the doxology, on which many have laid great stress, as founded on a narrow and superficial view of what we may reasonably suppose to have been in the Apostle's mind. And I am happy to see that so fair-minded and clear-sighted a scholar as Professor Dwight takes essentially the same view of the matter. (See *Journ. Soc. Bibl. Lit.*, etc., as above, p. 41.)

2. A second objection to a doxology here is founded on the relation of the first five verses of the chapter to what follows. A doxology, it is thought, unnaturally breaks the connection between the sixth verse and what precedes.

*This appreciative recapitulation of the distinctions of the Jewish people would also serve to check the tendency of the Gentile Christians to self-conceit, and would lead them to recognize the important part of the despised Hebrews in the drama of the world's history. It would virtually say to them, "Glory not over the branches; but if thou gloriest, thou bearest not the root, but the root thee" (Rom. xi. 18).

This argument is rarely adduced, and I should hardly have thought it worthy of notice, were it not that Dr. Dwight seems to attach some weight to it, though apparently not much. (See as above, p. 41 f.)

The first five verses of the chapter, as we have seen, are a conciliatory introduction to the treatment of a delicate and many-sided subject. This treatment begins with the sixth verse, which is introduced by the particle *δέ*, "but." Whether the last part of verse 5 is a doxology to God, or simply the climax of the privileges of the Jews, the *δέ* cannot refer to what *immediately* precedes. In either case, it refers to what is implied in verses 2 and 3, and meets the most prominent objection to the doctrine set forth by the Apostle in the preceding part of the Epistle. The thought is, The present condition of the great mass of my countrymen is indeed a sad one, and not the Jews as a nation, but Christians, are the true people of God; *but* it is not as if the promises of God have failed. (Comp. iii. 3, 4.) This simple statement of the connection of verse 6 with what precedes seems to me all that is needed to meet the objection. The argument that a doxology is inconsistent with the Apostle's state of mind has already been answered.

3. A third objection, urged by many, is founded on the alleged abruptness of the doxology and the absence of any mention of God in what precedes. Some also think that a doxology here would need to be introduced by the particle *δέ*.

I cannot regard this objection as having any force. It is quite in accordance with the habit of Paul thus to turn aside suddenly to give expression to his feelings of adoration and gratitude toward God.* See Rom. i. 25; vii. 25 (where the genuineness of *δέ* is very doubtful); 2 Cor. ix. 15, where note the omission of *δέ* in the genuine text; 1 Tim. i. 17, where the doxology is suggested by the mention of Christ.

* "Ad hæc annotatum est hoc in scriptis beati Pauli, quod aliquoties in medio sermonis cursu veluti raptus orat, aut adorat, aut gratias agit, aut glorificat Deum, præsertim ubi commemoratum est aliquid de mysteriis adorandis, aut ineffabili bonitate Dei."—Erasmus, *Apol. adv. monachos quosdam Hispanos*, Opp. ix. (Lugd. Bat. 1706), col. 1041. On this subject, and on the position of *ἐξ οὗ τὰ πάντα*, see the valuable note of the Rev. Joseph Agar Beet, *Comm. on St. Paul's Ep. to the Romans*, 2d ed. (London, 1881), p. 209 f., 271.

The doxology xi. 36, as has already been noticed (p. 334), is completely parallel in thought. Far more abrupt is the doxology 2 Cor. xi. 31, *ὁ θεὸς καὶ πατὴρ τοῦ κυρίου Ἰησοῦ οἶδεν, ὁ ἄρχειλος ἡμεῖς εἰς ταύτας αἰῶνας, ὅτι οὐ ψευδοῦμαι*, where the ascription of praise is interposed between *οἶδεν* and *ὅτι* in an extraordinary manner.

It is very strange that it should be urged as an argument against the doxology that God is not *mentioned* in the preceding context. The name does not occur, but almost every word in verses 4 and 5 suggests the thought of God. So, to a Jew, the very name "Israelites"; so "the adoption and the glory and the giving of the Law and the covenants and the service and the promises"; and so, above all, *ὁ Χριστός*, the Anointed of God, the Messiah: as to the flesh, sprung from the Jews; but, as to his holy spirit, the Son of God, the messenger of God's love and mercy, not to the Jews alone, but to all the nations of the earth.

That the mention of Christ in such a connection as this should bring vividly to the mind of the Apostle the thought of God and his goodness, and thus lead to a doxology, is simply in accordance with the conception of the relation of Christ to God which appears everywhere in this Epistle, and in all his Epistles. While Christ, *ὅς οὐ τὰ πάντα*, is the medium of communication of our spiritual blessings, Paul constantly views them in relation to God, *ἐξ οὗ τὰ πάντα*, as the original Author and Source. The gospel is "the gospel of God," "a power of God unto salvation"; the righteousness which it reveals is "a righteousness which is of God"; it is God who has set forth Christ as *ἡσθημιον*, who "commendeth his love toward us in that, while we were yet sinners, Christ died for us," who "spared not his own Son, but freely gave him for us all"; it is "God who raised him from the dead"; "what the Law could not do, in that it was weak through the flesh, God, sending his own Son in the likeness of sinful flesh, and on account of sin," has done; the glory to which Christians are destined, as sons and heirs of God and joint heirs with Christ, is "the glory of God"; in short, "all things are of God, who hath reconciled us to himself through Jesus Christ," and "nothing shall separate us from the love of God, which is in Christ Jesus our Lord."

Though no one can doubt that Paul was full of love and gratitude to Christ, so that we might expect frequent ascriptions to him of praise and glory, it is a remarkable fact that there *is* no doxology or thanksgiving to Christ in any of his Epistles except those to Timothy, the genuineness of which has been questioned by many modern scholars. These Epistles, at any rate, present marked peculiarities of style and language, and, if written by Paul, were probably written near the close of his life. And in them there is but one doxology to Christ, and that not absolutely certain, on account of the ambiguity of the word *κίριος* (2 Tim. iv. 18); while the thanksgiving is a simple expression of thankfulness (1 Tim. i. 12), *ἀγρεύω*, *gratias habeo* (not *ago*). One reason for this general absence of such ascriptions to Christ on the part of the Apostle seems to have been that habit of mind of which I have just spoken, and which makes it *a priori* more probable that the doxology in Rom. ix. 5 belongs to God. But this is a matter which will be more appropriately treated in another place.

As to the *καί*, which Schultz insists would be necessary,* one needs only to look fairly at the passage to see that it would be wholly out of place; that a doxology to God involves no *antithetic* contrast between God and Christ, as Schultz and some others strangely imagine. Nor does *καί*, as a particle of transition, seem natural here, much less required. It would make the doxology too formal.

4. It is urged that "*ὁ ὢν*, grammatically considered, is more easily and naturally construed in connection with *χριστός* than as the subject of a new and doxological clause." (See Dr. Dwight's article, as above, pp. 24, 25.)

Much stronger language than this is often used. Dr. Hodge, for example, assuming that *ὁ ὢν* must be equivalent to *ὁ ὢς ἐστι*, says that the interpretation which refers the words to Christ is the only one "which can, with the least regard to the rules of construction, be maintained." (*Comm. in loc.*, p. 472.)

Dr. Dwight, whose article is in general so admirable for

**Jahrbücher für deutsche Theol.*, 1868, xiii. 470 f., 477.

the fairness, clearness, and moderation of its statements, has expressed himself here in such a way that I cannot feel perfectly sure of his meaning. He says, speaking of the connection of *ὁ ὢν* with *ὁ ὑψιστός*: "This construction of *ὁ ὢν*, in cases similar to that which is here presented, is the almost universal one, both in the New Testament and in other Greek." If "cases similar to that which is here presented" means cases in which *ὁ ὢν* (or any participle with the article) is preceded by a noun to which it may be easily joined, while it also admits of being regarded as the subject of an independent sentence, and it is affirmed that, in such grammatically ambiguous cases, it almost invariably *does* refer to the preceding subject,—the argument is weighty, if the assertion is true. But not even *one* such case has ever, to my knowledge, been pointed out. Till such a case, or, rather, a sufficient number of such cases to serve as the basis of a reasonable induction, shall be produced, I am compelled to consider the statement as resting on no evidence whatever. Yet that this is what is meant by "similar cases" seems necessarily to follow from what is said further on (*l. c.*, p. 24) about "the peculiarity of Rom. ix. 5." Cases in which *ὁ ὢν*, grammatically considered, *can* only refer to a preceding subject are certainly not "similar cases to that which is here presented," in which, as Dr. Dwight admits, "there is, at the most, only a presumption in favor of this construction of the clause as against the other" (*l. c.*, p. 25).

But, if Dr. Dwight's statement means, or is intended to imply, that *ὁ ὢν* with its adjuncts, or, in general, the participle with the article, almost universally forms a descriptive or a limiting clause referring to a preceding subject, while its use as the independent subject of a sentence is rare, the assertion is fatally incorrect. The latter use is not only very common, but in the New Testament, at least, is more frequent than the former. We have (*a*) *ὁ ὢν*, or *ὁ ὢς ἐστι*, in the nominative, as the subject of an independent sentence, Matt. xii. 30; Mark xiii. 16 (text. rec.); Luke vi. 3 (t. r., Tisch.); xi. 23; John iii. 31; vi. 46; viii. 47; ix. 40; Acts xxii. 9; Rom. viii. 5, 8. *Contra* (*b*), referring to a preceding subject,

and forming, as I understand it, an *appositional* clause, John i. 18; iii. 13 (text. rec.); (Acts v. 17); 2 Cor. xi. 31; Rev. v. 5 (t. r.); a *limiting* clause, John xi. 31; xii. 17; Acts xi. 1. To these may be added 2 Cor. v. 4, Eph. ii. 13, where the clause is in apposition with or describes *ἡμῶν* or *ἐμῶν*, expressed or understood; and perhaps John xviii. 37 (*πᾶς ὁ ὢν, κ. τ. λ.*)*

It is uncertain whether Col. iv. 11 belongs under (a) or (b). See Meyer *in loc.* For the examples of *ὢν*, I have relied on Bruder's Concordance, p. 255, No. VI. But as there is nothing peculiar in the use of this particular participle with the article so far as the present question is concerned, I have, with the aid of Bruder, † examined the occurrences of the participle in general, in the nominative, with the article, in the Gospel of Matthew, the Epistle to the Romans, and the First Epistle to the Corinthians. I find in Matthew eighty-six examples of its use (a) as the subject, or in very few cases (nine) as the predicate, of a verb expressed or understood, and only thirty-eight of its use (b) in a descriptive or limiting clause, annexed to a preceding subject; in the Epistle to the Romans, twenty-eight examples of the former kind against twelve of the latter; and in the First Epistle to the Corinthians, thirty-nine of the former against four of the latter, one of these being a false reading. ‡

In general, it is clear that the use of the participle with the article as the subject of an independent sentence, instead of being exceptional in the New Testament, is far more common than its use as an attributive. Nor is this strange; for *ὢν* properly signifies not "who is," but "he

* The examples of *ὢν* and other participles with *πᾶς* belong, perhaps, quite as properly under (a). Without *πᾶς*, the *ὢν, κ. τ. λ.* is the subject of the sentence, and the meaning is the same; *πᾶς* only strengthens the *ὢν*. See Krüger, *Gr. Sprachlehre*, 5te Aufl. (1875), § 50, 4, Anm. 1.

† *Concordantiae*, etc., p. 586, No. 2; p. 598, No. VII. (1; comp. p. 603, No. VIII.; p. 604, No. IX.

‡ In this reckoning, to prevent any cavil, I have included under (b) all the examples of *πᾶς ὢν* or *πᾶσι τοῖς ὢν*, of which there are eight in Matthew, two in Romans, and one in 1 Cor.; also, the cases of the article and participle with *σὺ* or *ἐμῶν* as the subject of the verb, expressed or understood, of which there are four in Matthew and seven in Romans. I have not counted on either side Rom. viii. 33, 34, and ix. 33: the first two, translated according to the text of the Revised Version, belong under (a), according to its margin, under (b); Rom. ix. 33, if we omit *πᾶς*, with all the critical editors, would also belong under (a).

who is." The force of the article is not lost.* While in some of its uses it may seem interchangeable with *ὡς ἵσται*, it differs in this: that it is generally employed either in appositional or in limiting clauses, in distinction from descriptive or additive clauses; while *ὡς* with the finite verb is appropriate for the latter. For examples of the former, see John i. 18, xii. 17; of the latter, Rom. v. 14; 2 Cor. iv. 4. To illustrate the difference by the passage before us: if *ὢν* here refers to *ὁ Χριστός*, the clause would be more exactly translated as appositional, not "who is," etc., but "he who is God over all, blessed forever," implying that he was well known to the readers of the Epistle as God, or at least marking this predicate with special emphasis; while *ὡς ἵσται* would be more appropriate if it were simply the purpose of the Apostle to predicate deity of Christ, and would also be perfectly unambiguous.

There is nothing, then, either in the proper meaning of *ὢν* or in its usage which makes it more easy and natural to refer it to *ὁ Χριστός* than to take it as introducing an independent sentence. It is next to be observed that there are circumstances which make the latter construction easy, and which distinguish the passage from nearly all others in which *ὢν*, or a participle with the article, is used as an attributive. In all the other instances in the New Testament of this use of *ὢν* or *οἱ ὄντες* in the nominative, with the single exception of the parenthetical insertion in 2 Cor. xi. 31 (see above, page 341), it *immediately* follows the subject to which it relates. The same is generally true of other examples of the participle with the article. (The strongest cases of exception which I have noticed are John vii. 50 and 2 John 7.) But here *ὢν* is separated from *ὁ Χριστός* by *τὸ κατὰ σάρκα*, which in reading *must* be followed by a pause,—a pause which is lengthened by the special emphasis given to the *κατὰ σάρκα* by the *το*; † and the sentence which precedes is complete in

* "Participles take the article only when some relation already known or especially noteworthy (*is qui, qui ipse qui*) is indicated, and consequently the idea expressed by the participle is to be made more prominent."—Wiener, *Gram.* 7te Aufl., § 20, t. b. a. c. p. 127 (p. 134, Thayer).

† If *ὁ Χριστός* were placed *after κατὰ σάρκα*, the ambiguity would not, indeed, be wholly removed, but it would be much more natural to refer the *ὢν* to Christ than it is now. Perhaps the feeling of this led Cyril of Alexandria to make this transposition as he does in quoting the

itself grammatically, and requires nothing further logically; for it was only as to the flesh that Christ was from the Jews. On the other hand, as we have seen (p. 334), the enumeration of blessings which immediately precedes, crowned by the inestimable blessing of the advent of Christ, naturally suggests an ascription of praise and thanksgiving to God as the Being who rules over all; while a doxology is also suggested by the *ἄλλη* at the end of the sentence.* From every point of view, therefore, the doxological construction seems easy and natural. The ellipsis of the verb *ἵστί* or *εἰν* in such cases is simply according to rule. The construction numbered 6 above (see p. 335) is also perfectly easy and natural grammatically (see 2 Cor. i. 21, v. 5; Heb. iii. 4).

The naturalness of a pause after *ἀλλά* is further indicated by the fact that we find a point after this word in all our oldest MSS. that testify in the case,—namely, A, B, C, L,—and in at least eight cursives, though the cursives have been rarely examined with reference to their punctuation.†

It has been urged, that, if the writer did not intend that *ὁ ὢν* should be referred to Christ, he would have adopted another construction for his sentence, which would be exposed to no such misapprehension. But this argument is a boomerang. Mr. Beet in his recent Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans (2d ed., p. 271 f.) well says, on the other hand:—

Had Paul thought fit to deviate from his otherwise unvarying custom, and to speak of Christ as *God*, he must have done so with a serious and set purpose of asserting the divinity of Christ. And, if so, he would have used words which no one could misunderstand. In a similar

passage against the Emperor Julian, who maintained that “neither Paul dared to call Christ God, nor Matthew nor Luke nor Mark, *ὁ ἄλλ’ ὁ χρηστὸς Ἰωάννης*.” (See Cyril *cont. Julian*. lib. x. Opp. vi. b. p. 328 b. ed. Aubert.) In two other instances, Cyril quotes the passage in the same way: Opp. v. pars ii. b. pp. 118 a, 148 e; though he usually follows the order of the present Greek text.

* In fifteen out of the eighteen instances in the N. T., besides the present, in which *ἄλλυ* at the end of a sentence is probably genuine, it follows a doxology; namely, Rom. i. 25, xi. 36, xvi. 27; Gal. i. 5; Eph. iii. 21; Phil. iv. 20; 1 Tim. i. 17, vi. 16; 2 Tim. iv. 18; Heb. xiii. 21; 1 Pet. iv. 11, v. 11 (2 Pet. iii. 18); Jude 25; Rev. i. 6, vii. 12. *Contra*, Rom. xv. 33; Gal. vi. 18 (Rev. i. 7).

† The MSS. N, D, F, G, cannot be counted on one side or the other: respecting K, we have no information. For a fuller statement of the facts in the case, see Note A at the end of this essay.

case, John i. 1, we find language which excludes all doubt. And in this case the words *ὁ ἵστί*, as in i. 25, would have given equal certainty. . . . Moreover, here Paul has in hand an altogether different subject, the present position of the Jews. And it seems to me much more likely that he would deviate from his common mode of expression, and write once “God be blessed” instead of “to God be glory,” than that, in a passage which does not specially refer to the nature of Christ, he would assert, what he nowhere else explicitly asserts, that Christ is God, and assert it in language which may either mean this or something quite different.

Many writers, like Dr. Gifford, speak of that construction which refers *ὁ ὢν*, etc., to Christ as “the natural and simple” one, “which every Greek scholar would adopt without hesitation, if no doctrine were involved.” It might be said in reply, that the natural and simple construction of words considered apart from the doctrine it involves, and with reference to merely lexical and grammatical considerations, is by no means always the true one. For example, according to the natural construction of the words *ἐστὶς ἐκ τοῦ πατρὸς τοῦ διαβόλου ἐστὶ* (John viii. 44), their meaning is, “you are from the father of the devil”; and probably no Greek scholar would think of putting any other meaning on them, if no question of doctrine were involved. Again, in Luke ii. 38, “she gave thanks unto God, and spake of him to all them that were looking for the redemption of Jerusalem.” How unnatural, it may be said, to refer the “him” to any subject but “God,” there being no other possible antecedent mentioned in this or in the three preceding verses. But I do not make or need to make this reply. We have already considered the grammatical side of the question, and have seen, I trust, that the construction which makes *ὁ ὢν*, etc., the subject of a new sentence is perfectly simple and easy. I only add here that the meaning of words often depends on the way they are read,—on the pauses, and tones of voice. (If we could only have heard Paul dictate this passage to Tertius!) And it is a matter of course that, when a person has long been accustomed, from whatever cause, to read and understand a passage in a particular way, any other mode of reading it will seem to him unnatural. But

this impression will often be delusive. And it does not follow that a mode of understanding the passage which was easy and natural in the third and fourth centuries, or even earlier, when it had become common to apply the name *θεός* to Christ, would have seemed the most easy and natural to the first readers of the Epistle. I waive here all considerations of doctrine, and call attention only to the use of language. When we observe that everywhere else in this Epistle the Apostle has used the word *θεός* of the Father in distinction from Christ, so that it is virtually a proper name,* that this is also true of the Epistles previously written—those to the Thessalonians, Galatians, Corinthians, how can we reasonably doubt that, if the verbal ambiguity here occasioned a momentary hesitation as to the meaning, a primitive reader of the Epistle would naturally suppose that the word *θεός* designated the being everywhere else denoted by this name in the Apostle's writings, and would give the passage the construction thus suggested? But this is a point which will be considered more fully in another place.

The objection that, if we make the last clause a doxology to God, "the participle *ᾧ* is superfluous and awkward," will be noticed below under No. 6.

5. It is further urged that τὸ κατὰ σάρκα requires an antithesis, which is supposed to be supplied by what follows. Some even say that κατὰ σάρκα must mean "according to his human nature," and therefore requires as an antithesis the mention of the divine nature of Christ. But the proper antithesis to κατὰ σάρκα is κατὰ πνεῦμα, not κατὰ τὴν θεότητα, which there is nothing in the phrase itself to suggest: κατὰ σάρκα, as will at once appear on examining the cases of its use in the New Testament, does not refer to a distinction of *natures*, but often denotes a physical relation, such, for example, as depends on birth or other outward circumstances, in contrast with a spiritual relation. We need only refer to the third verse of this very chapter, which certainly does not imply

* It is so used in the first eight chapters about eighty-seven times, and so in the verse which immediately follows the one under discussion.

that Paul or his "kinsmen κατὰ σάρκα" had a divine nature also. The phrase κατὰ σάρκα undoubtedly implies an antithesis: "as to the flesh," by his natural birth and in his merely outward relations, the Messiah, the Son of David, was from the Jews, and in this they might glory; but as Son of God, and in his higher, spiritual relations, he belonged to all mankind. It was not to the Apostle's purpose to describe what he was κατὰ πνεῦμα, as he is speaking of the *peculiar* distinctions of the Jews. Indeed, the antithesis to κατὰ σάρκα is very often not expressed (see, for example, Rom. iv. 1, ix. 3; 1 Cor. i. 26, x. 18; 2 Cor. v. 16; Eph. vi. 5; Col. iii. 22), so that Alford judiciously says: "I do not reckon among the objections the want of any antithesis to κατὰ σάρκα, because that might have well been left to the readers to supply." We have an example strikingly parallel to the present in the Epistle of Clement of Rome to the Corinthians (c. 32), first adduced, so far as I know, by Dr. Whitby, in his *Last Thoughts*, which at least demonstrates that, in a case like this, the expression of an antithesis is not required. Speaking of the high distinctions of the patriarch Jacob, Clement says: "For from him were all the priests and Levites that ministered to the altar of God; from him was the Lord Jesus *as to the flesh* (τὸ κατὰ σάρκα); from him were kings and rulers and leaders in the line of Judah." See also Iren. *Hær.* iv. 4. § 1: ἐξ ὧντων γὰρ τὸ κατὰ σάρκα ὁ χριστὸς ἐκαρποφρήθη, καὶ οἱ ἀποστόλοι (mistranslated in the Ante-Nicene Christian Library); and Frag. xvii. ed. Stieren, p. 836: ἐκ δὲ τοῦ Λευὶ καὶ τοῦ Ἰακώβ τὸ κατὰ σάρκα, ὡς Ἀβραάμης καὶ Ἰερὲμῆ, ἐγεννήθη [ὁ Χριστός].

The eminent Dutch commentator, Van Hengel, maintains in an elaborate note on this passage, citing many examples, that the form of the restrictive phrase here used, τὸ κατὰ σάρκα, with the neuter article prefixed, absolutely requires a pause after σάρκα, and does not admit, according to Greek usage, of the *expression* of an antithesis after it, so that the following part of the verse must be referred to God. (Comp. Rom. i. 15; xii. 18.) He represents his view as supported by the authority of the very distinguished Professor C. G. Cobet

of Leyden, who as a master of the Greek language has perhaps no superior among European scholars.*

It may be true that Greek usage in respect to such restrictive expressions, when *τό* or *τά* is prefixed, accords with the statement of Van Hengel, indorsed by Cobet. In my limited research I have found no exception. The two passages cited by Meyer in opposition (Xen. *Cyr.* 5, 4, 11; Plat. *Min.* 320 C.) seem to me wholly irrelevant: the former, because we have *μία* with the *τό ἐπ' ἐμοί*, which of course requires an antithetic clause with *δέ*; the latter, because the essential element in the case, the *τό* or *τά*, does not stand before *κατά τὸ ἄστυ*. But I must agree with Dr. Dwight (*L. c.* p. 28) that Van Hengel's argument is not conclusive. On the supposition that *ὁ ὢν*, etc., refers to Christ, we have not a formal antithesis, such as would be excluded by Van Hengel's rule, but simply an appositional, descriptive clause, setting forth the exalted dignity of him who as to the flesh sprang from the Jews. I cannot believe that there is any law of the Greek language which forbids this.

We may say, however, and it is a remark of some importance, that the *τό* before *κατὰ σῆμα*, laying stress on the restriction, and suggesting an antithesis which therefore did not need to be expressed, indicates that the writer has done with that point, and makes a pause natural. It makes it easy to take the *ὁ ὢν* as introducing an independent sentence, though it does not, as I believe, make it necessary to take it so.

I admit, further, that, if we assume that the conception of Christ as God was familiar to the readers of the Epistle, and especially, if we suppose that they had often heard him called so by the early preachers of Christianity, the application of the *ὁ ὢν*, etc., to Christ here would be natural, and also very suitable to the object of the Apostle in this passage. I am obliged to say, however, that this is assuming what is not favored by Paul's use of language or by the record of the apostolic preaching in the Book of Acts.

* See Van Hengel, *Interp. Ep. Pauli ad Rom.*, tom. ii. (1859), pp. 348-353, and pp. 804-813. Speaking of his citation, he says (p. 350), "Allatorum unum alterumque mecum communicavit Cometes noster, se multo plura, quibus interpretatio mea confirmaretur, suppeditare posse dicens." [See p. 432 sq.]

On the other hand, there was no need of such an appendage to *ὁ χριστός*. We have only to consider the glory and dignity with which the name of the Messiah was invested in the mind of a Jew, and the still higher glory and dignity associated with *ὁ χριστός* in the mind of a Christian, and especially in the mind of Paul.

6. It is further objected that, in sentences which begin with a doxology or an ascription of blessing, *εὐλογητός* (or *εὐλογημένος*) always precedes the subject; and that "the laws" or "rules of grammar" (Stuart, Alford) require that it should do so here to justify the construction proposed. So, in the N. T., *εὐλογητός* stands first in the doxologies Luke i. 68, 2 Cor. i. 3, Eph. i. 3, 1 Pet. i. 3; and so *εὐλογητός* and *εὐλογημένος* precede the subject in a multitude of places in the Septuagint. (See Trommius's Concordance and Wahl's *Clavis librorum Vet. Test. apocryphorum*.)

Great stress has been laid on this objection by many; but I believe that a critical examination will show that it has no real weight.

We will begin by considering a misconception of the meaning of *ὁ ὢν ἐπὶ πάντων θεός* which has led to untenable objections against the doxological construction, and has prevented the reason for the position of *εὐλογητός* from being clearly seen. It has been assumed by many that the phrase is simply equivalent to "the Supreme God" (so Wahl, *s. v. ἐπί, omnibus superior, omnium summus*),* as if the Apostle was contrasting God with Christ in respect to dignity, instead of simply describing God as the being who rules over all. This misunderstanding of the expression occasioned the chief difficulty felt by De Wette in adopting the construction which places a colon or a period after *σῆμα*. It seemed to him like "throwing Christ right into the shade," without any special reason, when we should rather expect

* Wahl gives a more correct view of the use of *ἐπί* in his *Clavis libr. Vet. Test. apocr.* (1853), p. 218, col. 1, C. b., where *ἐπί* with the genitive is defined, *praesum alicui rei, moderor s. administro aliquam rem*. Comp. Grimm's *Lexicon Gr.-Lat. in libros N. T.*, ed. 2da, *s. v. ἐπί*, A. i. 1, d. p. 160, col. 2; Rost and Palm's *Patrolog.*, vol. 1, p. 5035, col. 1, 3; and the references given by Meyer and Van Hengel *in loc.* See Acts viii. 27, xii. 20; Gen. xiv. 1; Judith xiv. 13, *εἶπαν τῷ ὄντι ἐπὶ πάντων αὐτοῦ*; 1 Mac. x. 69, *τὸν ὄντα ἐπὶ Κοίλης Συρίας*.

something said in antithesis to τὸ κατὰ θεὸν, to set forth his dignity; though he admits that this objection is removed, if we accept Fritzsche's explanation of the passage.* On this false view is founded Schultz's notion (see above, p. 342) that ὁ would be needed here to indicate the antithesis. On it is also grounded the objection of Alford, Farrar, and others, that the ὡν is "perfectly superfluous," as, indeed, it would be, if that were simply the meaning intended. To express the idea of "the God over all," "the Supreme God," in contrast with a being to whom the term "God" might indeed be applied, but only in a lower sense, we should need only ὁ ἐπὶ πάντων θεός—a phrase which is thus used numberless times in the writings of the Christian Fathers; see, for examples, Wetstein's note on Rom. ix. 5. But, as I understand the passage, the ὡν is by no means superfluous. It not only gives an impressive fulness to the expression, but converts what would otherwise be a mere epithet of God into a *substantive* designation of him, equivalent to "the Ruler over All," on which the mind rests for a moment by itself, before it reaches the θεός qualified by it; or θεός *may* be regarded as added by way of apposition or more precise definition. The *position* of this substantive designation of θεός, between the article and its noun, gives it special prominence. Comp. I Cor. iii. 7, οἷτε ὁ φρενῶν ἰστί τε, οἷτε ὁ ποτίων, ἀλλ' ὁ ἀξάνων θεός; Addit. ad Esth. viii. l. 39, ὁ τὰ πάντα διναστεύων θεός, cf. ll. 8, 35, Tisch.; ὁ πάντων διαπόων θεός, Justin Mart. *Apol.* i. 15; ὁ ποιητής τούδε τῶν πάντων θεός, *ibid.* i. 26. In expressions of this kind, the definite article fulfils, I conceive, a double function: it is connected with the participle or other adjunct which immediately follows it, just as it would be if the substantive at the end were omitted; but, at the same time, it makes that substantive definite, so that the article in effect belongs to the substantive as well as to the participle. Thus, ὁ ὡν ἐπὶ πάντων θεός is equivalent to ὁ θεός ὁ ὡν ἐπὶ πάντων in everything except the difference in *prominence* given to the different parts of the phrase in the two expressions. In the latter, ὁ θεός is made prominent by its position: in the former, prominence is

* De Witte, *Kurze Erklärung des Briefes an die Römer*, 4te Aufl. (1847), p. 130.

given to the particular conception expressed by ὁ ὡν ἐπὶ πάντων, "the Ruler over All."*

Let us look now for a moment at the connection of thought in the passage before us, and we shall see that this distinction is important. The Apostle is speaking of the favored nation to which it is his pride to belong. Its grand religious history of some two thousand years passes rapidly before his mind, as in a panorama. Their ancestors were the patriarchs,—Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob. Theirs were "the adoption, and the glory, and the covenants, and the giving of the Law, and the temple service, and the promises." But God's choice and training of his "peculiar people," and the privileges conferred upon them, were all a providential preparation for the advent of the Messiah, whose birth from among the Jews was their highest national distinction and glory; while his mission as the founder of a spiritual and *universal* religion was the crowning manifestation of God's love and mercy to mankind. How could this survey of the ages of promise and preparation, and the great fulfilment in Christ, fail to bring vividly before the mind of the Apostle the thought of God as *the Being who presides over all things*, who cares for all men and controls all events? † Because

* If this account is correct, it follows that neither of the renderings which I have suggested above (p. 334) as expressing my view of the meaning represents the original perfectly. Nor do I perceive that the English idiom admits of a perfect translation. If we render "he who is over all, God, be blessed for ever," we make the word "God" stand in simple apposition to "he who is over all," which I do not suppose to be the *grammatical* construction. If, on the other hand, we translate, "he who is God over all be blessed for ever," we lose in a great measure the effect of the position of the ὡν ἐπὶ πάντων before θεός.

† Erasmus has well presented the thought of the Apostle: "Ut enim haec omnia, quae commemorat de adoptione, gloria, testamentis, legislatione, cultibus, ac promissis, deque patribus, ex quibus Christus juxta carnem ortus est, declarat non fortuito facta, sed admirabili Dei providentia, qui tot modis procuravit salutem humani generis, non simpliciter dicit Deus, sed *is qui rebus omnibus praesert, omnia suo divino consilio dispensans moderansque*, cui dicit deberi laudem in omne aevum, ob insignem erga nos charitatem, cui maledicebant Judaei, dum Filium unicum blasphemis impeterent." Note *in loc.*, in his *Op.* vi. (Lugd. Bat. 1705), col. 611.

So Westcott and Hort, in their note on this passage in vol. ii. of their *Greek Testament*, remarking on the punctuation which places a colon after σίρκου as "an expression of the interpretation which implies that special force was intended to be thrown on ἐπὶ πάντων by the interposition of ὡν," observe: "This emphatic sense of ἐπὶ πάντων (cf. i. 16; ii. 9 f.; iii. 29 f.; x. 12; xi. 32, 36) is fully justified if St. Paul's purpose is to suggest that the tragic apostasy of the Jews (vv. 2, 3) is itself part of the dispensations of 'Him who is God over all,' over Jew and Gentile alike, over past present and future alike; so that the ascription of blessing to him is a homage to his divine purpose and power of bringing good out of evil in the course of the ages (xi. 13-16; 25-36)." Dr. Hort remarks that "this punctuation alone seems adequate to account for the whole of the language employed, more especially when it is considered in relation to the context."

this conception is prominent in his mind, he places the $\delta \omega \nu$ $\epsilon \pi \iota \pi \alpha \nu \tau \omega \nu$ first in the sentence. A recognition of this fact removes all the difficulty about the position of $\epsilon \dot{\iota} \lambda \omicron \gamma \eta \tau \acute{o} \varsigma$. There is no "law of grammar" bearing on the matter, except the law that the predicate, when it is more prominent in the mind of the writer, precedes the subject. In simply exclamatory doxologies, the $\epsilon \dot{\iota} \lambda \omicron \gamma \eta \tau \acute{o} \varsigma$ or $\epsilon \dot{\iota} \lambda \omicron \gamma \eta \mu \acute{\epsilon} \nu \omicron \varsigma$ comes first, because the feeling that prompts its use is predominant, and can be expressed in a single word. But here, where the thought of the overruling providence of God is prominent, the $\delta \omega \nu \epsilon \pi \iota \pi \alpha \nu \tau \omega \nu$ must stand first in the sentence, to express that prominence; and the position of $\epsilon \dot{\iota} \lambda \omicron \gamma \eta \tau \acute{o} \varsigma$ after it is required by the very same law of the Greek language which governs all the examples that have been alleged against the doxological construction of the passage. This thought of God as the Ruler over All reappears in the doxology at the end of the eleventh chapter (xi. 36), where the Apostle concludes his grand Theodicy: "For from him and through him and to him are ALL THINGS: to him is the glory for ever! Amen." Compare also Eph. i. 11, cited by Mr. Beet: "foreordained according to the purpose of him who worketh ALL THINGS after the counsel of his will"; and so in another doxology (1 Tim. i. 17) suggested by the mention of Christ, the ascription is, $\tau \omega \beta \alpha \sigma \iota \lambda \epsilon \dot{\iota} \tau \omega \nu \alpha \dot{\iota} \omega \nu \omega \nu$,—"to the King OF THE AGES."*

I prefer, on the whole, to take $\pi \alpha \nu \tau \omega \nu$ as neuter; but much might be said in favor of the view of Fritzsche, whose note on this passage is especially valuable. He, with many other scholars, regards it as masculine: "*Qui omnibus preest hominibus (i.e. qui et Judaeis et gentilibus consulit Deus, der ueber allen Menschen waltende Gott) sit celebratus perpetuo, amen.*" (C. F. A. Fritzsche, *Pauli ad Rom. Epist.* tom. ii.

* This seems to me the true rendering rather than "to the King eternal," though eternity is implied. Comp. Rev. xv. 3, Westcott and Hort; Sir. xxxvi. 22 (al. xxxiii. 19); Tob. xiii. 6, 10; Ps. cxliv. (cxlv.) 13; Clem. Rom. *Ep. ad Cor.* cc. 35, 3; 55, 6; 61, 2; *Const. Apost.* vii. 34; *Lit. S. Jac.* c. 13. So Ex. xv. 18, $\kappa \epsilon \rho \omega \varsigma \beta \alpha \sigma \iota \lambda \epsilon \dot{\iota} \omega \nu \tau \omega \nu \alpha \dot{\iota} \omega \nu \omega \nu$, as cited by Philo, *De Plaut. Noë*, c. 12, *bis* (Opp. i. 336, 337, ed. Mang.), *De Mundo*, c. 7 (Opp. ii. 608), and read in many cursive MSS.; Joseph. *Ant.* i. 18, § 7, $\delta \epsilon \dot{\iota} \sigma \tau \alpha \tau \alpha \pi \alpha \nu \tau \acute{o} \varsigma \alpha \dot{\iota} \omega \nu \omega \nu$. *Contra*, Test. xii. Patr., *Rubén*, c. 6.

[1839] p. 272.) He refers for the $\pi \alpha \nu \tau \omega \nu$ to Rom. x. 12, xi. 32, iii. 29.

We may note here that, while the Apostle says $\omega \nu \omicron \iota \pi \alpha \tau \acute{\epsilon} \rho \epsilon \varsigma$, he does not say $\omega \nu$, but $\epsilon \xi \omega \nu \delta \omicron \chi \rho \iota \sigma \tau \acute{o} \varsigma$. He could not forget the thought which pervades the Epistle, that the Messiah was for *all* men alike. Nor does he forget that, while by natural descent, $\kappa \alpha \tau \grave{\alpha} \sigma \acute{\alpha} \rho \kappa \alpha$, Christ was "from the Jews," he was $\kappa \alpha \tau \grave{\alpha} \pi \nu \epsilon \dot{\iota} \mu \alpha$, and in all that constituted him the Messiah, "from God," who "anointed him with the Holy Spirit and with power," who "made him both Lord and Christ," who marked him out as his "Son" by raising him from the dead (Acts xiii. 33; Rom. i. 4), and setting him at his right hand in the heavenly places, and giving him to be the head over all things to the Church (Eph. i. 20-22),—that Church in which there is no distinction of "Greek and Jew," "but Christ is all and in all."

That such words as $\epsilon \dot{\iota} \lambda \omicron \gamma \eta \tau \acute{o} \varsigma$, $\epsilon \dot{\iota} \lambda \omicron \gamma \eta \mu \acute{\epsilon} \nu \omicron \varsigma$, $\mu \alpha \kappa \acute{\alpha} \rho \iota \omega \varsigma$, and $\epsilon \pi \kappa \alpha \tau \acute{\alpha} \rho \alpha \tau \omicron \varsigma$ should usually stand first in the sentence in expressions of benediction, macarism, and malediction, is natural in Greek for the same reason that it is natural in English to give the first place to such words as "blessed," "happy," "cursed." It makes no difference, as a study of the examples will show, whether the expression be *optative*, as is usually the case with $\epsilon \dot{\iota} \lambda \omicron \gamma \eta \mu \acute{\epsilon} \nu \omicron \varsigma$, with the ellipsis of $\epsilon \dot{\iota} \eta$ or $\epsilon \dot{\iota} \sigma \tau \omega$, or *declarative*, as in the case of $\mu \alpha \kappa \acute{\alpha} \rho \iota \omega \varsigma$, and usually, I believe, of $\epsilon \dot{\iota} \lambda \omicron \gamma \eta \tau \acute{o} \varsigma$, $\epsilon \dot{\iota} \sigma \tau \iota$ being understood.* The ellipsis of the substantive verb gives rapidity and force to the expression, indicating a certain glow of feeling. But in Greek as in English, if the subject is more prominent in the mind of the writer, and is not overweighted with descriptive appendages,

* I believe that $\epsilon \dot{\iota} \lambda \omicron \gamma \eta \tau \acute{o} \varsigma$ in doxologies is distinguished from $\epsilon \dot{\iota} \lambda \omicron \gamma \eta \mu \acute{\epsilon} \nu \omicron \varsigma$ as *laudandus* is from *laudatus*; and that the doxology in Rom. ix. 5 is therefore strictly a declarative, not an optative one. The most literal and exact rendering into Latin would be something like this: "Ille qui est super omnia Deus laudandus (est) in aeternum!" Where the verb is expressed with $\epsilon \dot{\iota} \lambda \omicron \gamma \eta \tau \acute{o} \varsigma$ (as very often in the formula $\epsilon \dot{\iota} \lambda \omicron \gamma \eta \tau \acute{o} \varsigma \epsilon \dot{\iota} \delta$), it is always, I believe, in the indicative. Here I must express my surprise that Canon Farrar (*The Expositor*, vol. ix. p. 402; vol. x. p. 238) should deny that Rom. i. 25 and 2 Cor. xi. 31 are "doxologies." What is a doxology but a pious ascription of glory or praise? If $\omega \varsigma \epsilon \dot{\iota} \sigma \tau \iota \nu \epsilon \dot{\iota} \lambda \omicron \gamma \eta \tau \acute{o} \varsigma \epsilon \dot{\iota} \varsigma \tau \omicron \dot{\iota} \varsigma \alpha \dot{\iota} \omega \nu \omega \nu$, $\alpha \mu \dot{\eta} \nu$, Rom. i. 25, is "not a doxology at all" on account of the $\epsilon \dot{\iota} \sigma \tau \iota \nu$, then Matt. vi. 13 (text rec.) and 1 Pet. iv. 11 are, for the same reason, not doxologies.

there is nothing to hinder a change of order, but the genius of the language rather requires it.

The example commonly adduced of this variation in the case of *εὐλογητός* is Ps. lxxvii. (Heb. lxxviii.) 20, *Κέρας ὁ θεὸς εὐλογητός, εὐλογητός κέρας ἡμίραν καὶ ἡμίραν*, where we find *εὐλογητός* in both positions. This peculiarity is the result of a misconstruction and perhaps also of a false reading (Meyer) of the Hebrew. The example shows that the position of *εὐλογητός* after the subject violates no law of the Greek language; but, on account of the repetition of *εὐλογητός*, I do not urge it as a parallel to Rom. ix. 5. (See Dr. Dwight as above, p. 32 f. and cf. Essay XVII. p. 436 below.) On the other hand, the passage cited by Grimm (see as above, p. 34) from the Apocryphal Psalms of Solomon, viii. 41, 42, written probably about 48 B.C., seems to me quite to the purpose:—

*αἰνετός κέρας ἐν ταῖς κριμασίαις αὐτῶν ἐν στόματι ὁσίων,
καὶ σὺ εὐλογημένος, Ἰσραὴλ. ἐπὶ κυρίου εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα.**

Here, in the first line, *αἰνετός* precedes, because the predicate is emphatic; but in the second, the subject, *σὺ*, precedes, because it is meant to receive the emphasis. I perceive no antithesis or studied chiasmus here. The sentence is no more a "double" or "compound" one than Gen. xiv. 19, 20; 1 Sam. xxv. 32, 33; Ps. lxxi. (lxxii.) 18, 19; Tob. xi. 13, 16 (Sin.); Judith xiii. 18; Orat. Azar. 2; and I see no reason why the fact that the clauses are connected by *καὶ* should affect the position of *εὐλογητός* here more than in those passages,—no reason why it should affect it at all.

Another example in which the subject precedes *ἐπικατάρατος* and *εὐλογημένος* in an optative or possibly a predictive sentence is Gen. xxvii. 29, *ὁ καταράμενός σε ἐπικατάρατος, ὁ δὲ εὐλογῶν σε εὐλογημένος*. Here the Greek follows the order of the Hebrew, and the reason for the unusual position in both I suppose to be the fact that the contrast between *ὁ καταράμενός* and *ὁ εὐλογῶν* naturally brought the subjects into the foreground. It is true that in Rom. ix. 5, as I understand the passage (though others take a different view), there is no antithesis, as there is here; but the example shows that, when for any reason

* See O. F. Fritzsche, *Libri apoc. V. T. Gr.* (1871), p. 579, or Hilgenfeld, *Messias Judaeorum* (1861), p. 14.

the writer wishes to make the subject prominent, there is no law of the Greek language which imprisons such a predicate as *εὐλογημένος* at the beginning of the sentence.

Another example, in a declarative sentence, but not the less pertinent on that account (the verb not being expressed), is Gen. xxvi. 29, according to what I believe to be the true reading, *καὶ εἶπεν σὺ εὐλογητός ἐπὶ κυρίου*, where the *σὺ* being emphatic, as is shown by the corresponding order in Hebrew, stands before *εὐλογητός*. Contrast Gen. iii. 14; iv. 11; Josh. ix. 29 (al. 23). This reading is supported by *all* the uncial MSS. that contain the passage,—namely, I. Cod. Cotton. (cent. v.), III. Alex. (v.), X. Coislin. (vii.), and Bodl. (viii. or ix.) ed. Tisch. *Mon. Sacr. Ined.*, vol. ii. (1857), p. 234, with at least twenty-five cursives, and the Aldine edition, also by all the ancient versions except the Aethiopic, and the Latin, which translates freely, against the *καὶ εἶπεν εὐλογημένος σὺ* of the Roman edition, which has very little authority here.*

Still another case where in a declarative sentence the usual order of subject and predicate is reversed, both in the Greek and the Hebrew, is 1 Kings ii. 45 (al. 46), *καὶ ὁ Βασιλεὺς Σαλωμών εὐλογημένος*, the ellipsis being probably *ἔσται*. Here I suppose the reason for the exceptional order to be the contrast between Solomon and Shimei (ver. 44).

It is a curious fact that *μακαριστός*, a word perfectly analogous to *εὐλογητός*, and which would naturally stand first in the predicate, happens to follow the subject in the only instances of its use in the Septuagint which come into comparison here,—namely, Prov. xiv. 21; xvi. 20; xxix. 18. The reason seems to be the same as in the case we have just considered: there is a contrast of subjects. For the same reason *ἐπικατάρατος* follows the subject in Wisd. xiv. 8 (comp. ver. 7).

These examples go to confirm Winer's statement in respect to contrasted subjects. And I must here remark, in

* The statement above about the reading of the ancient versions in Gen. xxvi. 29 lacks precision. The versions made directly from the Hebrew, of course, do not come under consideration. Of those made from the Septuagint, the Armenian, the Georgian, and the Old Slavic (Cod. Ostrog.) support *σὺ εὐλόγῃς*; the Aethiopic, *εὐλόγῃς σὺ*; the Old Latin has perished; and the Coptic, as I am informed by Professor T. O. Paine, omits the last clause of the verse.

respect to certain passages which have been alleged in opposition (see Dr. Dwight as above, p. 36), that I can perceive no contrast of subjects in Gen. xiv. 19, 20; 1 Sam. xxv. 32, 33; or in Ps. lxxxviii. (lxxxix.) 53, where the doxology appears to have no relation to what precedes, but to be rather the formal doxology, appended by the compiler, which concludes the Third Book of the Psalms (comp. Ps. xl. (xli.) 14).

It may be said that none of the examples we have been considering is *precisely* similar to Rom. ix. 5. But they all illustrate the fact that there is nothing to hinder a Greek writer from changing the ordinary position of εὐλογητός and kindred words, when from any cause the subject is naturally more prominent in his mind. They show that the *principle* of the rule which governs the position may authorize or require a deviation from the common order. I must further agree with Meyer and Ellicott on Eph. i. 3, and Fritzsche on Rom. ix. 5, in regarding as not altogether irrelevant such passages as Ps. cxii. (cxiii.) 2, εἰς τὸ ὄνομα κυρίου εὐλογημένου, where, though εἰς precedes, as a copula it can have no emphasis; and the position of εὐλογημένου is determined by the fact that the subject rather than the predicate here naturally presents itself first to the mind. The difference between such a sentence and εὐλογημένου τὸ ὄνομα κυρίου is like that in English between "May the name of the Lord be blessed" and "Blessed be the name of the Lord." It is evident, I think, that in the latter sentence the predicate is made more prominent, and in the former the subject; but, if a person does not *feel* this, it cannot be proved. Other examples of this kind are Ruth ii. 19; 1 Kings x. 9; 2 Chron. ix. 8; Job i. 21; Dan. ii. 20; *Lit. S. Jac.* c. 19; *Lit. S. Marci*, c. 20, a. (Hammond, pp. 52, 192). In Ps. cxii. (cxiii.) 2 and Job i. 21, the prominence given to the subject is suggested by what precedes.

I will give one example of the fallacy of merely empirical rules respecting the position of words. Looking at Young's *Analytical Concordance*, there are, if I have counted right, one hundred and thirty-eight instances in which, in sentences like "Blessed be God," "Blessed are the meek," the

word "blessed" precedes the subject in the common English Bible. There is no exception to this usage in the Old Testament or the New. "Here," exclaims the empiric, "is a law of the language. To say 'God be blessed' is not English." But, if we look into the Apocrypha, we find that our translators *have* said it,—namely, in Tobit xi. 17; and so it stands also in the Genevan version, though the Greek reads εὐλογητός ὁ θεός. Why the translators changed the order must be a matter of conjecture. Perhaps it was to make a contrast with the last clause of the sentence.

There is a homely but important maxim which has been forgotten in many discussions of the passage before us, that "circumstances alter cases." I have carefully examined all the examples of doxology or benediction in the New Testament and the Septuagint, and in other ancient writings, as the Liturgies, in which εὐλογητός or εὐλογημένους precedes the subject; and there is not one among them which, so far as I can judge, justifies the assumption that, because εὐλογητός precedes the subject there, it would probably have done so here, had it been the purpose of Paul to introduce a doxology. The cases in which a doxology begins without a previous enumeration of blessings, but in which the *thought* of the blessing prompts an exclamation of praise or thanksgiving,— "Blessed be God, who" or "for he" has done this or that,—are evidently not parallel. All the New Testament doxologies with εὐλογητός, and most of those in the Septuagint, are of this character.* In these cases, we perceive at once that any other order would be strange. The expression of the *feeling*, which requires but one word, naturally precedes the mention of the ground of the feeling, which often requires very many. But there is a difference between εὐλογητός and εὐλογητός εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας. Where it would be natural for the former to precede the subject, it might be more natural for the latter to follow. In the example adduced by Dr. Dwight in his criticism of Winer (see as above,

* See Luke i. 68; 2 Cor. i. 3; Eph. i. 3; 1 Pet. i. 3. Gen. xiv. 20, xxiv. 27; Ex. xviii. 10; Ruth iv. 14; 1 Sam. xxv. 32, 39; 2 Sam. xviii. 28; 1 Kings i. 48, v. 7, viii. 15, 36; 2 Chron. ii. 12, vi. 4; Ezra vii. 27; Ps. xxvii. (Sept.) 6, xxx. 22, lxx. 20, lxxi. 18, cxxiii. 6, cxxxiv. 21, cxliii. 1, Dan. iii. 28 Theodot., 95 Sept.

pp. 36, 37), it is evident that *εὐλογητός* more naturally stands first in the sentence; at the end, it would be abrupt and unrhythmical. But I cannot think that a Greek scholar would find anything hard or unnatural in the sentence if it read, *ὁ διασημῆσαι τῶν ἑαυτοῦ τόπων ἁμάρτων εὐλογητός εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας, ἀμήν.*

To make the argument from usage a rational one, examples sufficient in number to form the basis of an induction should be produced in which, in passages like the present, *εὐλογητός* precedes the subject. Suppose we should read here, *εὐλογητός ὁ ὢν ἐπὶ πάντων θεὸς εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας*, we instantly see that the reference of *εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας* becomes, to say the least, ambiguous, the "for ever" grammatically connecting itself with the phrase "he who is God over all" rather than with "blessed." If, to avoid this, we read, *εὐλογητός εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας ὁ ὢν ἐπὶ πάντων θεός*, we have a sentence made unnaturally heavy and clumsy by the interposition of *εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας* before the subject, — a sentence to which I believe no parallel can be produced in the whole range of extant doxologies. Wherever *εὐλογητός* precedes, the subject *directly* follows. These objections to the transposition appear to me in themselves a sufficient reason why the Apostle should have preferred the present order. But we must also consider that any other arrangement would have failed to make prominent the particular conception of God, which the context suggests, as the Ruler over All. If, then, the blessings mentioned by the Apostle suggested to his mind the thought of God as *εὐλογητός εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας*, in view of that overruling Providence which sees the end from the beginning, which brings good out of evil and cares for all men alike, I must agree with Winer that "the present position of the words is not only altogether suitable, but even necessary." (*Gram.*, 7te Aufl., § 61. 3. e. p. 513; p. 551 Thayer, p. 690 Moulton.) Olshausen, though he understands the passage as relating to Christ, well says: "Rückert's remark that *εὐλογητός*, when applied to God, must, according to the idiom of the Old and New Testament, always precede the noun, is of no weight. Köllner rightly observes that the position of words is altogether [everywhere] not a mechanical thing, but determined, in each par-

ticular conjuncture, by the connexion and by the purpose of the speaker." *

7. The argument founded on the notion that the Apostle here had in mind Ps. lxxvii. (lxxviii.) 20, and was thereby led to describe Christ as *θεὸς εὐλογητός εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας*, is one which, so far as I know, never occurred to any commentator, ancient or modern, before the ingenious Dr. Lange. Its weakness has been so fully exposed by Dr. Dwight (as above, p. 33, note) that any further notice of it is unnecessary.

8. The argument for the reference of the *ὁ ὢν*, etc., to Christ, founded on supposed patristic authority, will be considered below under IV., in connection with the history of the interpretation of the passage.

II. I have thus endeavored to show that the construction of the last part of the verse as a doxology suits the context, and that the principal objections urged against it have little or no weight.

But the construction followed in the common version is also grammatically unobjectionable; and, if we assume that the Apostle and those whom he addressed believed Christ to be God, this construction likewise suits the context.

How then shall we decide the question? If it was an ambiguous sentence in Plato or Aristotle, our first step would be to see what light was thrown on the probabilities of the case by *the writer's use of language elsewhere*. Looking then at the question from this point of view, I find three reasons for preferring the construction which refers the last part of the verse to God.

1. The use of the word *εὐλογητός*, "blessed," which never occurs in the New Testament in reference to Christ. If we refer *εὐλογητός* to God, our passage accords with the doxologies Rom. i. 25; 2 Cor. i. 3; xi. 31; and Eph. i. 3. In Rom. i. 25, we have *εὐλογητός εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας*, as here; and 2 Cor. xi. 31, "The God and Father (*or* God, the Father) of the Lord Jesus knows — he who is blessed for ever! — that I lie

* Olshausen, *Bibl. Comm. on the N. T.*, vol. iv., p. 83, note, Kendrick's trans. The remark cited from Rückert belongs to the first edition of his Commentary (1831). In the second edition (1839), Rückert changed his view of the passage, and adopted the construction which makes the last part of the verse a doxology to God.

not," strongly favors the reference of the εὐλογητός to God.* It alone seems to me almost decisive. The word εὐλογητός is elsewhere in the New Testament used in doxologies to God (Luke i. 68; 1 Pet. i. 3); and in Mark xiv. 61, ὁ εὐλογητός, "the Blessed One," is a special designation of the Supreme Being, in accordance with the language of the later Jews, in whose writings God is often spoken of as "the Holy One, blessed be He!"

I have already spoken (see above, p. 342) of the rarity of doxologies to Christ in the writings of Paul, the only instance being 2 Tim. iv. 18, though here Fritzsche (*Ep. ad Rom.* ii. 268) and Canon Kennedy (*Ely Lectures*, p. 87) refer the κίριος to God. Doxologies and thanksgivings to God are, on the other hand, very frequent in his Epistles. Those with εὐλογητός are given above; for those with δόξα, see Rom. xi. 36, xvi. 27; Gal. i. 5; Eph. iii. 21; Phil. iv. 20; 1 Tim. i. 17 (τιμῇ καὶ δόξῃ); — τιμῇ καὶ κριτίῳ, 1 Tim. vi. 16. (Comp. δόξα, Rom. xv. 6, 9.) Thanksgivings, with χάρις first, Rom. vi. 17, vii. 25 (Lachm., Tisch., Treg., WH.); 2 Cor. viii. 16, ix. 15; τῷ δὲ θεῷ first, 1 Cor. xv. 57; 2 Cor. ii. 14; εὐχαριστῶ, Rom. i. 8; 1 Cor. i. 4 (14), xiv. 18; Eph. i. 16; Phil. i. 3; Col. i. 3, 12; 1 Thess. i. 2, ii. 13; 2 Thess. i. 3, ii. 13; Philem. 4. Note especially the direction, "giving thanks always for all things in the name of our Lord Jesus Christ to God, even the Father," Eph. v. 20; comp. Col. iii. 17, "do all in the name of the Lord Jesus, giving thanks to God the Father through him." These facts appear to me to strengthen the presumption founded on the usage of εὐλογητός, that in this passage of ambiguous construction the doxological words should be referred to God rather than to Christ.

It may be of some interest to observe that, in the Epistle of Clement of Rome to the Corinthians,—probably the earliest Christian writing that has come down to us outside of the New Testament,—there are eight doxologies to God; namely, cc. 32, 38, 43, 45, 58, 61, 64, 65, and none that clearly belong to Christ. Two are ambiguous; namely, cc.

* For the way in which the Rabbinical writers are accustomed to introduce doxologies into the middle of a sentence, see Schoettgen's *Horae Hebraicae* on 2 Cor. xi. 31.

20, 50, like Heb. xiii. 21, 1 Pet. iv. 11, which a majority of the best commentators refer to God as the leading subject; see Dr. Dwight as above, p. 46. The clear cases of doxologies to Christ in the New Testament are Rev. i. 6, 2 Pet. iii. 18 (a book of doubtful genuineness), and Rev. v. 13, "to Him that sitteth upon the throne, and to the Lamb"; comp. vii. 10. But our concern is chiefly with the usage of Paul.

The argument from the exclusive use of the word εὐλογητός in reference to God has been answered by saying that εὐλογητός is also applied to man; and Deut. vii. 14, Ruth ii. 20, and 1 Sam. xv. 13 are cited as examples of this by Dr. Gifford. But he overlooks the fact that εὐλογητός is there used in a totally different sense; namely, "favored" or "blessed" by God. To speak of a person as "blessed" by God, or to pray that he may be so, and to address a doxology to him, are very different things. [See Essay XVII. p. 437.]

Note further that εὐλογημένος ὁ ἐρχόμενος ἐν ὀνόματι κυρίου. Ps. cxvii. (cxviii.) 26, applied to Christ in Matt. xxi. 9 and the parallel passages, is not a doxology. Comp. Mark xi. 10; Luke i. 28, 42.

On the distinction between εὐλογητός and εὐλογημένος, see Note B, at the end of this article.

2. The most striking parallel to ὁ ὢν ἐπὶ πάντων in the writings of Paul is in Eph. iv. 5, 6, where Christians are said to have "one Lord, one faith, one baptism, one God and Father of all, who is over all (ὁ ἐπὶ πάντων), and through all, and in all." Here it is used of the one God, expressly distinguished from Christ.

3. The Apostle's use of the word θεός, "God," throughout his Epistles. This word occurs in the Pauline Epistles, not including that to the Hebrews, more than five hundred times; and there is not a single clear instance in which it is applied to Christ. Alford, and many other Trinitarian commentators of the highest character, find no instance except the present. Now, in a case of ambiguous construction, ought not this uniform usage of the Apostle in respect to one of the most common words to have great weight? To me it is absolutely decisive.

It may be said, however, that Paul has nowhere declared that Christ is *not* God;* and that, even if he has not happened to give him this title in any other passage, he must have believed him to be God, and therefore might have so designated him, if occasion required.

As to the statement that Paul has nowhere expressly affirmed that Christ was *not* God, it does not appear that, supposing him to have believed this, he ever had occasion to say it. It is certainly a remarkable fact that, whatever may have been the teaching of Paul concerning the nature of Christ and the mode of his union with God, it appears, so far as we can judge from his writings, to have raised no question as to whether he was or was not God, jealous as the Jews were of the divine unity and disposed as the Gentiles were to recognize many gods besides the Supreme.

It is important to observe, in general, that in respect to the application to Christ of the *name*: "God" there is a very wide difference between the usage not only of Paul, but of all the New Testament writers, and that which we find in Christian writers of the second and later centuries. There is no clear instance in which any New Testament *writer*, speaking in his own person, has called Christ God. In John i. 18, the text is doubtful; and, in 1 John v. 20, the *ὁ ὢν* more naturally refers to the leading subject in what precedes,—namely, *τοῦ ἁγίου πνεύματος*,—and is so understood by the best grammarians, as Winer and Buttmann, and by many eminent Trinitarian commentators. [See Essay XVIII. Note C. *sub fin.*] In John i. 1, *θεὸς* is the predicate not of the historical Christ, but of the antemundane Logos. The passages which have been alleged from the writings of Paul will be noticed presently. †

But it may be said that, even if there is no other passage in which Paul has called Christ God, there are many in which the works and the attributes of God are ascribed to him, and in which he is recognized as the object of divine

* See Dr. Dwight's Essay, as above, pp. 25, 30, 43.

† On John xx. 28 and Heb. i. 8, 9, which do not belong to the category we are now considering, I simply refer, for the sake of brevity, to Norton's *Statement of Reasons, etc.*, new edition (1850), p. 300 ff., and the note of E. A., or to the note of Lucke on the former passage, and of Professor Stuart on the latter. On 2 Peter i. 1, see Huther.

worship; so that we ought to find no difficulty in supposing that he is here declared to be "God blessed for ever." It may be said in reply, that the passages referred to do not authorize the inference which has been drawn from them; and that, if they are regarded as doing so, the unity of God would seem to be infringed. A discussion of this subject would lead us out of the field of exegesis into the tangled thicket of dogmatic theology: we should have to consider the questions of consubstantiality, eternal generation, the hypostatic union, and the *kenosis*. Such a discussion would here be out of place. But it is certainly proper to look at the passages where Paul has used the clearest and strongest language concerning the dignity of Christ and his relation to the Father, and ask ourselves whether they allow us to regard it as probable that he has here spoken of him as "God over all, blessed for ever," or even as "over all, God blessed for ever."

In the Epistles which purport to be written by Paul there is only one passage besides the present in which any considerable number of respectable scholars now suppose that he has actually called Christ *God*; namely, Titus ii. 13. Here the new Revised Version, in the text, makes him speak of "our great God and Saviour Jesus Christ." But the uncertainty of this translation is indicated by the marginal rendering, "the great God and our Saviour"; and, in another paper, I have stated my reasons for believing the latter construction the true one. [See Essay XVIII.] This latter construction was preferred by a large majority of the American Company of Revisers, and it has the support of many other eminent Trinitarian scholars. Surely, so doubtful a passage cannot serve to render it probable that Christ is called "God blessed for ever" in Rom. ix. 5.

Acts xx. 28 has also been cited, where, according to the *textus receptus*, Paul, in his address to the Ephesian elders, is represented as speaking of "the Church of God, which he purchased with his own blood." This reading is adopted by the English Revisers in their text, and also by Scrivener, Alford, and Westcott and Hort; but its doubtfulness is indi-

cated by the marginal note against the word "God," in which the Revisers say, "Many ancient authorities read *the Lord*." Here, again, the marginal reading is preferred by the American Revisers, as also by Lachmann, Tregelles, Green, Davidson, and Tischendorf. I have given my reasons for believing this the true reading in an article in the *Bibliotheca Sacra* for April, 1876 [see Essay XV.]. And, although Westcott and Hort adopt the reading *God*, Dr. Hort well remarks that "the supposition that by the precise designation *τοῦ θεοῦ*, standing alone as it does here, with the article and without any adjunct, St. Paul (or St. Luke) meant Christ is unsupported by any analogies of language." Calling attention to the fact that the true text has the remarkable form, *διὰ τοῦ αἵματος τοῦ ἰδίου*, he would understand the passage, "on the supposition that the text is incorrupt," as speaking of the Church of God which he purchased "through the blood that was his own," *i.e.*, as being his Son's." "This conception," he remarks, "of the death of Christ as a price paid by the Father is in strict accordance with St. Paul's own language elsewhere (Rom. v. 8; viii. 32). It finds repeated expression in the Apostolic Constitutions in language evidently founded on this passage (ii. 57. 13; 61. 4; vii. 26. 1; viii. [11. 2] 12. 18; 41. 4)." On the supposition that *τοῦ* is the true reading, the passage has been understood in a similar manner not merely by Socinian interpreters, as Wolzogen and Enjedinus, but by Erasmus (in his *Paraphrase*), Pellican,* Limborch (though he prefers the reading *καρπῶν*), Milton (*De Doctrina Christiana*, Pars I. c. v. p. 86, or Eng. trans. p. 148 f.), Lenfant and Beausobre as an alternative interpretation (*Le Nouveau Test.*, note in loc.), Doederlein (*Inst. Theol. Christ.*, ed. 6ta, 1797, § 105, Obs. 4. p. 387), Van der Palm (note in his Dutch translation), Granville Penn (*The Book of the New Covenant*, London, 1836, and *Annotations*, 1837, p. 315), and Mr. Darby (*Trans. of the N. T.*, 2d ed. [1872]). Dr. Hort, however, is disposed to conjecture that *τιος* dropped out after *τοῦ* "at some

* "Erga congregationem dei quae volis oscitanter curanda non est, ut quam deus adeo clarum habuit, ut unigeniti sui sanguine eam paraverit." *Comm.* in loc., Tiguri, 1537, fol.

very early transcription, affecting all existing documents." Granville Penn had before made the same suggestion. It is obvious that no argument in support of any particular construction of Rom. ix. 5 can be prudently drawn from such a passage as this.

A few other passages, in which some scholars still suppose that the name *God* is given to Christ by Paul, have been examined in the paper on Titus ii. 13 (see Essay XVIII. notes to pp. 440, 447; also Dr. Dwight, as above, p. 44).

Let us now look at the passages in which Paul has used the most exalted language respecting the person and dignity of Christ, and ask ourselves how far they afford a presumption that he might here describe him as "God blessed for ever."

The passage in this Epistle most similar to the present is ch. i. vv. 3, 4, where Christ is said to be "born of the seed of David as to the flesh," but "declared to be the Son of God with power as to the spirit of holiness by his resurrection from the dead," or, more exactly, "by the resurrection of the dead." Here the antithesis to *κατὰ σάρκα* is supplied. It is not, however, *κατὰ τὴν θεότητα*, or *κατὰ τὴν θείαν φύσιν*, but *κατὰ πνεῦμα ἁγιωσύνης*, "as to his holy spirit,"—his higher spiritual nature, distinguished especially by the characteristic of *holiness*. There are many nice and difficult questions connected with this passage which need not be here discussed; I will only say that I see no ground for finding in it a presumption that the Apostle would designate Christ as "God blessed for ever." Some, however, suppose that the title "Son of God" is essentially equivalent to *θεός*, and that the resurrection of Christ as an act of his own divine power is adduced here as a proof of his deity. I do not find the first supposition supported by the use of the term in the Old Testament or in the New (see John x. 36); and, as to the second, it may be enough to say that it contradicts the uniform representation of the Apostle Paul on the subject, who everywhere refers his resurrection to the power of "God the Father." See Gal. i. 1; Eph. i. 19, 20; Rom. iv. 24, vi. 4, viii. 11, x. 9; 1 Cor. vi. 14, xv. 15; 2 Cor. iv. 14, xiii. 4; 1 Thess. i. 10; Acts xiii. 30-37, xvii. 31

Another striking passage is Phil. ii. 6-11, where the Apostle says that Christ, "existing in the form of God, counted not the being on an equality with God* a thing to be grasped, but emptied himself, taking the form of a servant, being made in the likeness of men." Without entering into any detailed discussion of this passage, it may be enough to remark that being in the form of God, as Paul uses the expression here, is a very different thing from being God; that the *μορφῆ* cannot denote the nature or essence of Christ, because it is something of which he is represented as emptying or divesting himself. The same is true of the *τὸ ἴσθαι ἰσθῆ*, "the being on an equality with God," or "like God," which is spoken of as something which he was not eager to *seize*, according to one way of understanding *ἄρπαγμα*, or not eager to *retain*, according to another interpretation.† The Apostle goes on to say that, on account of this self-abnegation and his obedience even unto death, "God highly exalted him and gave him the name which is above every name; that in the name of Jesus every knee should bow . . . and that every tongue should confess that Jesus Christ is Lord, to the glory of God the Father." I cannot think that this passage, distinguishing Christ as it does so clearly from God, and representing his present exaltation as a reward bestowed upon him by God, renders it at all likely that Paul would call him "God blessed for ever."

We find a still more remarkable passage in the Epistle to the Colossians, i. 15-20, where it is affirmed concerning the Son that "he is the image of the invisible God, the first-born of all creation; for in him were all things created, things visible and invisible, whether thrones or dominions or principalities or powers; all things have been created through him and unto him; and he is before all things, and in him all things consist [or hold together]. And he is the

*Or, as the Rev. Dr. E. H. Kennedy, Regius Professor of Greek in the University of Cambridge, translates it, "the being like God"; compare Whitby's note on the use of *ἴσθαι*. See Kennedy's *Occasional Sermons preached before the University of Cambridge*, London, 1877, p. 62, or *Ely Lectures* (1882), p. 17 f.

† See Grimm's *Lexicon Novi Testamenti*, ed. 2da (1879), s. v. *μορφῆ*, for one view; for another, Weiss's *Biblische Theol. des N. T.*, § 103 c, p. 432 ff., 3te Aufl. (1880).

head of the body, the Church, who is the beginning, the first-born from the dead; that in all things he might have the pre-eminence [more literally, "become first"]. For it was the good pleasure [of the Father] that in him should all the fulness dwell; and through him to reconcile all things unto himself." In this passage, and in Col. ii. 9, 10, where the Apostle says of Christ "in him dwelleth all the fulness of the Godhead bodily, and in him are ye made full, who is the head of all principality and power," we find, I believe, the strongest language which Paul has anywhere used concerning Christ's position in the universe and his relation to the Church. I waive all question of the genuineness of the Epistle. Does, then, the language here employed render it probable that Paul would, on occasion, designate Christ as "over all, God blessed for ever"?

Here certainly, if anywhere, we might expect that he would call him God; but he has not only not done so, but has carefully distinguished him from the being for whom he seems to reserve that name. He does not call him God, but "the image of the invisible God" (comp. 2 Cor. iv. 4, and 1 Cor. xi. 7). His agency in the work of creation is also restricted and made secondary by the use of the prepositions *in* and *diá*, clearly indicating that the conception in the mind of the Apostle is the same which appears in the Epistle to the Hebrews, i. 3; that he is not the primary source of the power exerted in creation, but the being "through whom God made the worlds," *δι' οὗ ἐποίησεν τοὺς αἰῶνας*; comp. also 1 Cor. viii. 6, Eph. iii. 9 (though here *διὰ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ* is not genuine), and the well-known language of Philo concerning the Logos.* Neither Paul nor any other New Testament writer

* Philo calls the Logos the "Son of God," "the eldest son," "the first-begotten," and his representation of his agency in creation is very similar to that which Paul here attributes to "the Son of God's love" (ver. 13). He describes the Logos as "the image of God, through whom the whole world was framed," *εἰκὼν θεοῦ, δι' οὗ κ. τ. λ.* (*De Monarch.* ii. 5, Opp. ii. 225 ed. Mangey); "the instrument, through which [or whom] the world was built," *ὄργανον δι' οὗ κ. τ. λ.* (*De Cherub.* c. 35, Opp. i. 162, where note Philo's distinction between *τὸ ἴσθαι οὐ, τὸ εἶναι οὐ, τὸ δι' οὐ, and τὸ δι' οὐ*); "the shadow of God, using whom as an instrument he made the world" (*Legg. Alleg.* iii. 31, Opp. i. 106). In two or three places he exceptionally applies the term *θεός* to the Logos, professedly using it in a lower sense (*ἐν κατὰ ἰμῶσιν*), and making a distinction between *θεός*, without the article, "a divine being," and *ὁ θεός*, "the Divine Being." (See *De Somn.* i. 38, Opp. i. 655, and comp. *Legg. Alleg.* iii. 73, Opp. i. 125, l. 43.) In a frag

uses the preposition *ἐν*, "by," in speaking of the agency of the Son or Logos in creation. The designation "first-born of all creation" seems also a very strange one to be applied to Christ conceived of as God. Some of the most orthodox Fathers of the fourth and fifth centuries, as Athanasius, Gregory of Nyssa, Cyril of Alexandria, Theodore of Mopsuestia, and Augustine, were so perplexed by it that they understood the Apostle to be speaking here of the new, spiritual creation;* and the passage has been explained as relating to this by some eminent modern interpreters, as Grotius, Wetstein, Ernesti, Noesselt, Heinrichs, Schleiermacher, Baumgarten-Crusius, Norton, — though, I believe, erroneously. But I shall not discuss here the meaning of *πρωτότοκος πλάσις κτίσεως*. I would only call attention to the way in which the Apostle speaks of the *good pleasure* of God, the Father, as the *source* of Christ's fulness of gifts and powers. "For it was the good pleasure [of God] that in him should all the fulness dwell" (ver. 19).† This declaration explains also Col. ii. 9; comp. Eph. iii. 19, iv. 13, John i. 16. See also John xiv. 10, iii. 34 (?).

It thus appears, I think, first, that there is no satisfactory evidence that Paul has elsewhere called Christ *God*; and, secondly, that in the passages in which he speaks of his dignity and power in the most exalted language he not only seems studiously to avoid giving him this appellation, but represents him as *deriving* his dignity and power from the being to whom, in distinction from Christ, he everywhere gives that name,—the "one God, the Father."

ment preserved by Eusebius (*Præf. Evang.* vii. 13, or *Philonis Opp.* ii. 625) he names the Logos ὁ δὲ δεύτερος θεός, "the second [or inferior] God," distinguished from "the Most High and Father of the universe," "the God who is before [or above, πρῶτος] the Logos." So he applies the term to Moses (comp. Ex. vii. 1), and says that it may be used of one who "procures good (τὸ ἀγαθόν) for others," and is "wise." *De Mat. Nom.* c. 22, Opp. i. 597, 598; see also *De Mos.* i. 23, Opp. ii. 106 [misprinted 108], where Moses is called ὄνομα τοῦ εὐσεβοῦς θεοῦ καὶ σωτηρίου; *Quod det. pot. insid.* c. 41, Opp. i. 222; *De Migr. Abr.* c. 15, Opp. i. 449; *Legg. Alleg.* i. 13, Opp. i. 151; *Quod omni. prob. liber.* c. 7, Opp. ii. 452; *De Decent. Orac.* c. 23, Opp. ii. 201. But, though he speaks of the Logos in language as exalted as Paul uses concerning the Son, he would never have dreamed of calling him ὁ ὢν ἐπὶ πάντων θεός ἐκλογητός εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας.

* See Lightfoot, *St. Paul's Epistles to the Colossians and to Philemon*, p. 214 ff. [p. 148 ff. 7th ed.]

† Ἡ ἀγάπη (or ἡ παρὰ) must be supplied as the subject of ἐκδόξασεν; comp. ver. 20, and Lightfoot's note. So Meyer, De Wette, Alford, Eadie, and the great majority of expositors.

We have considered the strongest passages which have been adduced to justify the supposition that Paul *might* apply this title to Christ. I have already intimated that they do not seem to me to authorize this supposition. But, admitting for the sake of argument that we must infer from these and other passages that he really held the doctrine of the consubstantiality and co-eternity of the Son with the Father, and that on this account he would have been *justified* in calling him God, this does not remove the great improbability that he *has* so designated him, incidentally, in Rom. ix. 5, in opposition to a usage of the term which pervades all his writings. The question still forces itself upon us, What was the ground of this usage? *Why* has he elsewhere avoided giving him this title? In answering this question here, wishing to avoid as far as possible all dogmatic discussion and to confine myself to exegetical considerations, I shall not transgress the limits of recognized orthodoxy. The doctrine of the *subordination* of the Son to the Father, in his divine as well as his human nature, has been held by a very large number, and, if I mistake not, by a majority of professed believers in the deity of Christ. The fourth and last Division or "Section" of Bishop Bull's famous *Defensio Fidei Nicaenae* is entitled *De Subordinatione Filii ad Patrem, ut ad sui originem ac principium*. He maintains and proves that the Fathers who lived before and many, at least, of those who lived after the Council of Nice unequivocally acknowledged this subordination (though the post-Nicene writers were more guarded in their language), and that on this account, while calling the Son *θεός* and *θεὸς ἐκ θεῶν*, as begotten from the substance of the Father, they were accustomed to reserve such titles as ὁ θεός used absolutely, εἰς θεός, and ὁ ἐπὶ πάντων or ἐπὶ παντὶ θεός for the Father alone. The Father alone was "uncaused," "unoriginated," "the fountain of deity" to the Son and Spirit.* Now the word *θεός* was often used by the Fathers of the second and

* "The ancient doctors of the church," as Bishop Pearson remarks, "have not stuck to call the Father 'the origin, the cause, the author, the root, the fountain, and the head of the Son,' or the whole Divinity." *Exposition of the Creed*, chap. i. p. 38, Nichols's ed.

later centuries not as a proper, but as a common name; angels, and even Christians, especially in their beatified state, might be and were called *thei*. It had also a metaphorical and rhetorical use, quite foreign from the style of the New Testament.* All this made it easy and natural, especially for the Fathers who were converts from heathenism, to apply the title in a relative, not absolute, sense to the Son, notwithstanding the pre-eminence which they ascribed to the Father. We find traces of this loose use of the name in Philo, as I have observed (see p. 369, note). But there is no trace of such a use in the writings of Paul. The points, then, which I would make are these: that, even granting that he believed in the deity of the Son as set forth in the Nicene Creed, he yet held the doctrine of the *subordination* of the Son so strongly in connection with it that we cannot wonder if *on this account* he reserved the title *thei* exclusively for the Father; and that the way in which he has expressed this subordination, and the way in which he has used this title, render it incredible that he should in this single instance (Rom. ix. 5) have suddenly transferred it to Christ, with the addition of another designation, "blessed for ever," elsewhere used by him of the Father alone.

I do not see how any one can read the Epistles of Paul without perceiving that, in speaking of the objects of Christian faith, he constantly uses *thei* as a *proper name*, as the designation of the Father in distinction from Christ. See, for example, Rom. i. 1-3, "the gospel of *God*, which he had before promised . . . concerning his Son"; ver. 7, "*God* our Father, and the Lord Jesus Christ"; ver. 8, "I thank my *God*, through Jesus Christ"; ver. 9, "*God* is my witness, whom I serve in my spirit in the gospel of his Son"; and so all through the Epistle; 2 Cor. v. 18, 19, "All things are of

* For proof and illustration of what has been stated, see Norton's *Genuineness of the Gospels*, 2d ed., vol. iii. Addit. Note D, "On the Use of the Words *thei* and *deus*"; *Statement of Reasons*, 12th ed., pp. 113, 114 note, 120 note, 309 f., 314, 319 f., 365 note, 468; Sandius, *Interpretationes Paradoxæ* (1699), p. 227 ff.; Whiston's *Primitive Christianity Reviv'd*, vol. iv. p. 100 ff.; LeClerc (Chenou), *Arts Criticæ*, Pars II. Sect. I. c. III., vol. i. p. 145 ff., 6th ed., 1778; *Account of the Writings and Opinions of Clement of Alexandria*, by John [Kaye], Bp. of Lincoln, 1855, p. 253; Bretschneider, *Handbuch der Dogmatik*, 4te Aufl. (1838), i. 596, note 353.

God, who reconciled us to himself through Christ, and gave unto us the ministry of reconciliation; to wit, that *God* was in Christ reconciling the world unto himself, not reckoning unto them their trespasses"; Eph. v. 20, "giving thanks always for all things, in the name of our Lord Jesus Christ, to *God*, even the Father"; though among the heathen there are gods many and lords many (1 Cor. viii. 6), "to us there is *one God*, the Father, from whom are all things, and we unto him; and one Lord, Jesus Christ, through whom are all things, and we through him"; Eph. iv. 5, 6, There is "one Lord, one faith, one baptism, *one God* and Father of all, *who is over all*, and through all, and in you all"; 1 Tim. ii. 5, "There is *one God*, one mediator also between God and men, [himself] a man, Christ Jesus"; v. 21, "I charge thee before *God*, and Christ Jesus, and the elect angels"; Titus iii. 4-6, "*God* our Saviour" poured out upon us the Holy Spirit "*through* Jesus Christ our Saviour." Observe how strongly the subordination of the Son is expressed in passages where his dignity and lordship are described in the loftiest strain: Eph. i. 16-23, "—in my prayers, that the *God of our Lord Jesus Christ*, the Father of glory, may give unto you a spirit of wisdom and revelation in the knowledge of him; . . . that ye may know what is the exceeding greatness of his power to us-ward who believe, according to that working of the strength of his might which he wrought in Christ when *he raised him from the dead*, and *made him to sit at his right hand* in the heavenly places, far above all rule, and authority, and power, and dominion, and every name that is named, not only in this world, but also in that which is to come: and *he put all things in subjection under his feet*, and *gave him to be head over all things to the Church*"; 1 Cor. iii. 22, 23, "all things are yours; and ye are Christ's; and Christ is *God's*"; xi. 3, "the head of every man is Christ; and the head of the woman is the man; and the head of Christ is *God*"; xv. 24, "Then cometh the end, when he shall deliver up the kingdom to *God*, even the Father"; vv. 27, 28, "But when he saith, All things are put in subjection, it is evident that He is ex-

cepted who did subject all things unto him. And when all things have been subjected unto him, THEN shall the Son also himself be subjected to him that did subject all things unto him, that *God* may be all in all."

Can we believe that he who has throughout his writings placed Christ in such a relation of *subordination* to the Father, and has habitually used the name *God* as the peculiar designation of the Father in distinction from Christ, who also calls the Father the one God, the only wise God (Rom. xvi. 27), the only God (1 Tim. i. 17), and the God of Christ, has here, in opposition to the usage elsewhere uniform of a word occurring five hundred times, suddenly designated *Christ* as "over all, God blessed for ever"? At least, should not the great improbability of this turn the scale, in a passage of doubtful construction?

4. There is another consideration which seems to me to render it very improbable that Paul has here deviated from his habitual restriction of the name *God* to "the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ." If he has spoken of Christ in this passage as "God blessed for ever," he has done it *obiter*, as if those whom he addressed were familiar with such a conception and designation of him. But can this have been the case with the Roman Church at so early a stage in the development of Christian doctrine?

It is the view of many Trinitarians that the doctrine that Christ is God was not *explicitly* taught in the early preaching of the Apostles. We find no trace of such teaching in the discourses of Peter or of Stephen in the Book of Acts, and none in those of the Apostle Paul (the passage Acts xx. 28 has already been examined), as we find none in the Synoptic Gospels, which represent the instruction concerning Christ given by the Apostles and their companions to their converts.* Nor does it appear in the so-called Apostles'

* "There is nothing in St. Peter's sermon upon the day of Pentecost which would not, in all probability, have been acknowledged by every Ebionite Christian down to the time when they finally disappear from history. Yet upon such a statement of doctrine, miserably insufficient as all orthodox churches would now call it, three thousand Jews and proselytes were, without delay, admitted to the Sacrament of Baptism. . . . We must carefully bear in mind what was St. Peter's object. It was to convince the Jews that Jesus Christ was the great appointed Teacher whom

Creed. When we consider further the fact already mentioned above (see p. 364), that Christ is nowhere called God in any unambiguous passage by any *writer* of the New Testament,* and that it is nowhere recorded that he ever claimed this title, we cannot reasonably regard this abstinence from the use of the term as accidental. In reference to the early apostolic preaching in particular, many of the Christian Fathers, and later Trinitarian writers, have recognized a prudent reserve in the communication of a doctrine concerning Christ and the application of a title to him which would at once have provoked vehement opposition on the part of the unbelieving Jews, which would have been particularly liable to be misunderstood by the Gentiles, and must have required much careful explanation to reconcile it with the unity of God and the humanity of Christ.† We nowhere find either in the Acts or the Epistles any trace of the controversy and questionings which the direct announcement of such a doctrine must have excited. The one aim of the early apostolic preaching was to convince first the Jews, and then the Gentiles, that Jesus, whose life and teaching were so wonderful, whom God had raised from the dead, was the Messiah, exalted by God to be a Prince and a Saviour.

God had sent, — the true spiritual Prince whom they were to obey. The Apostle felt that, if they acknowledged these great truths, everything else would follow in due time." T. W. Mossman, B.A., Rector of Torrington, *A History of the Catholic Church of Jesus Christ*, etc., London, 1873, pp. 192, 199. Gess naively asks, "Wie dürfte man von dem galläischen Fischer, welcher der Wortführer der junger Gemeinde war, eine befriedigende Dogmatik erwarten?" *Christi Person und Werk*, ii. i. 13. See also Dr. John Pye Smith's *Scripture Testimony to the Messiah*, Book III. Chap. V. (vol. ii. p. 150 ff., 5th ed.).

† I speak of the historical Christ, which is the subject in Rom. ix. 5. The unique prologue of John's Gospel, in which the *Logos* or Word is once called *θεός* (i. e., comp. ver. 18 in the text of Tregelles and Westcott and Hort), cannot reasonably be regarded as parallel to the present passage. This is candidly admitted by Schulz, who has most elaborately defended the construction which refers the last part of Rom. ix. 5 to Christ. He says, "Nach unseren Prämissen versteht sich von selbst, dass wir nicht etwa daraus, dass der *θεός* *θεός* genannt wird, Beweise ziehen wollen für die Zulässigkeit des Namens *θεός* für den verkündeten Jesus." (*Jahrbücher für deutsche Theol.*, 1868, xiii. 471.) I of course do not enter here into the difficult questions as to what was precisely John's conception of the *Logos*, and in what sense he says "the Word became flesh," language which no one understands literally. We must consider also the late date of the Gospel of John as compared with the Epistle to the Romans.

† For superabundant quotations from the Christian Fathers confirming the statement made above, notwithstanding a few mistakes, see Priestley's *History of Early Opinions concerning Jesus Christ*, Book III. Chap. IV.-VII. (vol. iii. p. 85 ff., ed. of 1786). Or see Chrysostom's Homilies on the Acts, *passim*. How this doctrine would have struck a Jew may be seen from Justin Martyr's *Dialogue with Trypho*.

To acknowledge Jesus as the Christ, or Jesus as Lord, which is essentially the same thing, was the one fundamental article of the Christian faith.* Much, indeed, was involved in this confession; but it is now, I suppose, fully established and generally admitted that the Jews in the time of Christ had no expectation that the coming Messiah would be an incarnation of Jehovah, and no acquaintance with the mystery of the Trinity.† Such being the state of the case, it seems to me that, on the supposition that the Apostles were fully enlightened in regard to the mystery of the Trinity and the hypostatic union, the only tenable ground to be taken is that they wisely left these doctrines to develop themselves gradually in "the Christian consciousness." As Dr. Pye Smith remarks, "The whole revelation of the Christian system was given by an advancing process. It cannot, therefore, be a matter of surprise that the doctrine concerning the person of the Messiah was developed gradually, and that its clearest manifestation is to be found in the latest written books of the New Testament." (*Ut supra*, p. 155.) Canon Westcott observes, "The study of the Synoptists, of the Apocalypse, and of the Gospel of St. John in succession enables us to see under what human conditions the

* See Neander, *History of the Planting and Training of the Christian Church by the Apostles*, Book I. Chap. II. Comp. Matt. xvi. 16; Mark viii. 29; Luke ix. 20; John vi. 69, xx. 31; Acts ii. 36, v. 42, viii. 5, ix. 20, 22, xvii. 3, xviii. 5, 28; Rom. x. 9, *nota bene*; 1 Cor. xii. 3; 2 Cor. iv. 5; 1 John iv. 2, v. 1.

† See the art. *Messias*, by Oehler, in Herzog's *Real-Encyclopädie der prot. Theol. und Kirche*, ix. 437 ff., or in the new ed., vol. ix. (1881), p. 666 ff.; Ferd. Weber, *System der altsynagogalen palästin. Theol.* (1880), p. 146 ff., 339 ff. Passages from the Rabbinical writings are sometimes adduced by commentators on Rom. ix. 5 in which the name Jehovah, or Jehovah our righteousness, is said to be given to the Messiah. But the irrelevance of these citations has been repeatedly exposed; see Fritzsche, *Ep. ad Rom.* ii. 269, note; Weber, *ut supra*, p. 342. Weber says: "Und wenn *Baba bathra* 75^b gesagt wird, der Messias werde nach dem Namen Jehovah's *יהוה צדקתו* genannt, so stehen an dieser Stelle in gleicher Beziehung die Gerechten und Jerusalem." Comp. Jer. xxiii. 6 with xxiii. 16, and on this passage see Oehler, *Theol. des A. T.* ii. 263; Richm., *Messianic Prophecy*, p. 262, note 36; Schultz, *Alttest. Theol.*, 2te Aufl. (1878), p. 740. On Isa. ix. 6, see Schultz, p. 727; Hitzig, *Vorlesungen über bibl. Theol.*, u. s. w. (1880), p. 206 ff., and the commentators, as Gesenius, Knobel, Ewald, Cheyne. That the *Meinra da Yehoa* or "Word of Jehovah" is not identified in the Targums with the Messiah is certain. See Smith's *Dict. of the Bible*, art. "Word," vol. iv. p. 3557 b, Am. ed., and Weber, *ut supra*, p. 339. It is time that the book *Zohar*, which figures so conspicuously in Schoettgen, Bertholdt, and other writers, but is now proved to be a pseudograph of the thirteenth century, should cease to be quoted as an authority for Jewish opinions in the time of Christ. See Ginsburg, *The Kabbala* (London, 1859), p. 78 ff., espec. p. 90 ff. One who is disposed to rely on Hengstenberg's *Christology* in relation to this subject should compare the review of it by Dr. Noyes in the *Christian Examiner* (Boston) for January, May, and July, 1836.

full majesty of Christ was perceived and declared, not all at once, but step by step, and by the help of the old prophetic teaching." (*Introd. to the Gospel of St. John* in the so-called "Speaker's Commentary," p. lxxxvii.) Canon Kennedy even says: "I do not think that any apostle, John or Peter or Paul, was so taught the full *μεσσιμον θεότητος* as that they were prepared to formulate the decrees of Nicæa and Constantinople, which appeared after three hundred years and more, or the Trinitarian exegesis, which was completed after six hundred years and more. But they, with the other evangelists, guided by the Holy Spirit, furnished the materials from which those doctrines were developed." (*Ely Lectures*, p. xix.)

Taking all these facts into consideration, is it probable that at this early day the Jewish Christians and Gentile believers at Rome, who needed so much instruction in the very elements of Christianity, were already so fully initiated into the mysterious doctrine of the deity of Christ that the application of the term God to him, found in no Christian writing that we know of till long after the date of this Epistle, could have been familiar to them? Accustomed to the representation of him as a being distinct from God, would they not have been startled and amazed beyond measure by finding him described as "over all, God blessed for ever"? But if so, if this was a doctrine and a use of language with which they were not familiar, it is to me wholly incredible that the Apostle should have introduced it abruptly in this incidental manner, and have left it without remark or explanation.

Dr. Hermann Schultz, whose elaborate dissertation on Rom. ix. 5 has been already referred to, admits that if *ἰσὶ πάντων θεός* was used here to designate the *λόγος*, the eternal Son of God,—in other words, if *θεός* was used here in reference to the nature of Christ,—"the strict monotheism of Paul would certainly require an intimation that the honor due to God alone was not here trespassed upon" (*beeinträchtigt*).* The expression, he maintains, describes "the dignity con-

* Schultz, *Jahrbücher f. deutsche Theol.*, 1868, xiii. 484.

ferred upon him by God": the *θεός* here is essentially equivalent to *κύριος*. "The predicate *θεός* must be perfectly covered by the subject *Χριστός*, i.e. the Messianic human King of Israel."*

But these concessions of Schultz seem to me fatal to his construction of the passage. If *θεός*, used in the metaphysical sense, describing the *nature* of Christ, would confessedly need explanation, to guard against an apparent infringement of the divine unity, would not Paul's readers need to be cautioned against taking it in this sense,—the sense which it has everywhere else in his writings? Again, if Paul by *θεός* here only meant *κύριος*, why did he not say *κύριος*, this being his constant designation of the glorified Christ (comp. Phil. ii. 9–11)?

This leads me to notice further the important passage, 1 Cor. viii. 6, already quoted (see above, p. 373). It has often been said † that the mention here of the Father as the "one God" of Christians no more excludes Christ from being God and from receiving this name than the designation of Christ as the "one Lord" excludes the Father from being Lord and receiving this name. But, in making this statement, some important considerations are overlooked. In the first place, the title "god" is unquestionably of far higher dignity than the title "lord"; and because godship includes lordship, with all the titles that belong to it, it by

* This view of Schultz appears to be that of Hofmann (*Der Schriftbeweis*, 2te Aufl., 1857, i. 113) and Weiss (*Bibl. Theol. d. N. T.*, 3te Aufl., 1830, p. 283, note 5), as it was formerly of Ritschl (*Die Entstehung der Altkath. Kirche*, 2te Aufl., 1857, p. 79 f.). This is the way, also, in which the old Socinian commentators understood the passage, as Socinus, Crell, Schlichting, Witzgen. They did not hesitate to give the name "God" to Christ any more than the ancient Arians did, understanding it in a lower sense, and referring especially in justification of this to John x. 31–36, and various passages of the Old Testament. So it appears to have been taken by some of the Ante-Nicene Fathers, who referred the last clause of the verse to Christ, as probably by Novatian, who quotes the passage twice as proof that Christ is *Deus* (*De Regula Fidei* or *De Trin.* cc. 13, 30), but who says, "Dominus et Deus constitutus esse reperitur" (c. 20); "hoc ipsum a Patre proprio consensutus, ut omnium et Deus esset et Dominus esset" (c. 22); "omnium Deus, quoniam omnibus illum *Deus Pater praeponit quem genuit*" (c. 31). So Hippolytus (*Cont. Noët.* c. 6) applies the verse to Christ, and justifies the language by quoting Christ's declaration, "All things have been delivered to me by the Father." He cites other passages in the same connection, and says, "If then all things have been subjected unto him with the exception of him who subjected them, he rules over all, but the Father rules over him."

† See, e.g., Chrys. *De incomprehens. Dei nat.* Hom. v. c. 1, Opp. i. 481 L (590), ed. Montf.: *Εἰ γὰρ τὸ ἓνα ἕξεισθαί θεὸν τὸν πατέρα ἐκβάλλει τὸν υἱὸν τῆς θεότητος, καὶ τὸ ἓνα ἕξεισθαί κυριον τὸν εἶον ἐκβάλλει τὸν πατέρα τῆς κυριότητος.*

no means follows that lordship includes godship, and has a right to its titles; in other words, that one who is properly called a *lord* (*κύριος*), as having servants or subjects or possessions, may therefore be properly called a *god* (*θεός*). In the second place, the lordship of Christ is everywhere represented not as belonging to him by *nature*, but as conferred upon him by the one God and Father of all. This lordship is frequently denoted by the figurative expression, "sitting on the right hand of God."* The expression is borrowed from Ps. cx., so often cited in the New Testament as applicable to Christ, and particularly by Peter in his discourse on the day of Pentecost, who, after quoting the words, "The Lord [*Jehovah*] said unto my Lord [*Adoni*], 'Sit thou on my right hand, until I make thy foes thy footstool,'" goes on to say, "Let all the house of Israel therefore know assuredly that God hath MADE him both *Lord* and Christ, this Jesus whom ye crucified" (Acts ii. 35, 36). It is he to whom "all authority was *given* in heaven and on earth," whom "*God exalted* with his right hand to be a Prince and a Saviour"; "the God of our Lord Jesus Christ . . . put all things in subjection under his feet, and gave him to be head over all things to the Church"; "gave unto him the name which is above every name, . . . that every tongue should confess that Jesus Christ is *Lord*, to the glory of God, the Father." Such being Paul's conception of the relation of Christ to God, is it not the plain meaning of the passage that, while the heathen worship and serve many beings whom they call "gods" and "lords," to Christians there is but one God, the Father,—one being to whom they give that name, "from whom are all things" and who is the object of supreme worship; and one being "through whom are all things," through whom especially flow our spiritual blessings, whom "God hath made both Lord and Christ," and whom Christians therefore habitually call "the Lord"? The fact that this appellation of Christ, under such circumstances, does not debar the Supreme Being from receiving

* See Knapp, *De Jesu Christo ad dextram Dei sedente*, in his *Scripta varii Argumenti*, ed. 2da (1823), i. 39–76.

the name "Lord" obviously affords no countenance to the notion that Paul would not hesitate to give to Christ the name "God." As a matter of fact, "the Lord" is the common designation of Christ in the writings of Paul, and is seldom used of God, except in quotations from or references to the language of the Old Testament.* There, in the Septuagint, *ΚΥΡΙΟΣ* is used of God sometimes as a proper name, taking the place of Jehovah (Yahweh) on account of a Jewish superstition, and sometimes as an appellative.

Glancing back now for a moment over the field we have traversed, we may reasonably say, it seems to me, *first*, that the use of *θεός*, elsewhere in the New Testament restricted to God, the Father,—in connection with the exceeding rarity, if not absence, of ascriptions of praise and thanksgiving to Christ in the writings of Paul and their frequency in reference to God,—affords a pretty strong presumption in favor of that construction of this ambiguous passage which makes the last clause a doxology to the Father; *secondly*, that some additional confirmation is given to this reference by the *ὁ θεὸς καὶ πατὴρ πάντων, ὁ ἐπὶ πάντων*, in Eph. iv. 6; and, *thirdly*, that the at first view overwhelming presumption in favor of this construction, founded on the uniform restriction of the designation *θεός*, occurring more than five hundred times, to God, the Father, in the writings of Paul, is not weakened, but rather strengthened, by our examination of the language which he elsewhere uses respecting the dignity of Christ and his relation to God. And, though our sources of information are imperfect, we have seen that there are very grave reasons for doubting whether the use of *θεός* as a designation of Christ belonged to the language of Christians anywhere at so early a period as the date of this Epistle (*viz.* A.D. 58).

Beyond a doubt, all the writers of the New Testament and the early preachers of Christianity believed that God was *united with* the man Jesus Christ in a way unique and

*"On the meaning of ΚΥΡΙΟΣ in the New Testament, particularly on the manner in which this word is employed by Paul in his Epistles," see the valuable article of Professor Stuart in the *Biblical Repository* (Andover) for October, 1831, i. 733-776. His view is that the *κυριότης* which Christ has as the Messiah is a delegated dominion.

peculiar, distinguishing him from all other beings; that his teaching and works and character were divine; that God had raised him from the dead, and exalted him to be a Prince and a Saviour; that he came, as the messenger of God's love and mercy, to redeem men from sin, and make them truly sons of God; that "God was in Christ reconciling the world unto himself." But no New Testament writer has *defined the mode* of this union with God. How much real light has been thrown upon the subject by the councils of Nicæa and Constantinople, Ephesus and Chalcedon, and the so-called Athanasian Creed, is a question on which there may be differences of opinion. The *authority* of councils is another question. But it has been no part of my object, in discussing the construction of the passage before us, to argue against the doctrine of the Nicene Creed. My point is simply the *use of language* at the time when this Epistle was written. The questions of doctrine and language are, of course, closely connected, but are not identical. It seems to me that a believer in the deity of Christ, admitting the fact that we have no clear evidence that the "mediator between God and men" was ever *called "God"* by any New Testament writer, or any very early preacher of Christianity, may recognize therein a wise Providence which saved the nascent Church from controversies and discussions for which it was not then prepared.

III. We will now consider some other constructions of the passage before us. (See above, p. 335.)

I. I refrain from discussing in detail the comparative merits of Nos. 1 and 2. The advocates of No. 1 observe correctly that it describes Christ as only *ἐπὶ πάντων θεός*, not *ὁ ἐπὶ πάντων θεός*, which they say would identify him with the Father. But if the Father is "God over all," and Christ is also "God over all," the question naturally arises how the Father can be "*the* God over all," unless the term "God" as applied to Christ is used in a lower sense. The answers to this question would lead us beyond the sphere of exegesis, and I pass it by. Meyer thinks that, if we

refer the *ὁ ὢν* to Christ, this is the most natural construction of the words; and it seems to have been adopted by most of the ancient Fathers who have cited the passage, at least after the Council of Nicæa, and in nearly all the generally received modern translations, from Luther and Tyndale downwards.

2. Construction No. 2 aims to escape the difficulty presented by No. 1, but involves some ambiguities. Does the sentence mean, "who is over all (Jews as well as Gentiles), and who is also God blessed for ever" (so Hofmann, Kahnis, *Die luth. Dogm.* i. 453 f.)? or does it mean, "celui qui est élevé sur toutes choses, comme Dieu béni éternellement"? as Godet translates it (*Comm.* ii. 256), contending that *ἐπὶ πάντων* is not to be connected with *ὁ ὢν*, but with *ὁ ὢν*, though he had before translated, inconsistently it would seem, "lui qui est Dieu au-dessus de toutes choses béni éternellement" (pp. 248, 254). Lange finds in the last clause "a quotation from the synagogical liturgy," together with "a strong Pauline breviloquence," the ellipsis in which he supplies in a manner that must always hold a high place among the curiosities of exegesis. He says, however, that "every exposition is attended with great difficulties." I cannot discover that "God blessed for ever," as a kind of compound name of the Supreme Being, occurs in Jewish liturgies or anywhere else.

3. Construction No. 3 is defended particularly by Gess, who maintains, in opposition to Schultz and others, that *θεός* here "nicht Christi Machtstellung sondern seine Wesenheit bezeichnet." (*Christi Person und Werk*, II. i. 207.) But on this supposition he admits that the connecting of *θεός* with *ὁ ὢν ἐπὶ πάντων* would present a serious difficulty. "The care with which Paul elsewhere chooses his expressions in such a way that the supreme majesty of the Father shines forth would be given up." Meyer thinks that the punctuation adopted by Morus and Gess makes "die Rede" "noch zerstückter, ja kurzathmiger," than construction No. 5. But this is rather a matter of taste and feeling. The objections which seem to me fatal to all the constructions which refer

the name *θεός* here to Christ have been set forth above, and need not be repeated.

If the view of Westcott and Hort is correct, the construction of this passage adopted by Hippolytus (*Cont. Noët.* c. 6) agrees with that of Gess in finding three distinct affirmations in the clause beginning with *ὁ ὢν*, in opposition to those who would read it *μικρότερος*. But the passage in Hippolytus is obscure. See below under IV.

4. Under No. 4 I have noticed a possible construction, for which, as regards the essential point, I have referred to Wordsworth's note in his *N. T. in Greek*, new ed., vol. ii. (1864). He translates in his note on ver. 5: "He that is existing above all, God Blessed for ever," and remarks: "There is a special emphasis on *ὁ ὢν*. He that *is*; He Who is the *being One*; JEHOVAH. See John i. 18; Rev. i. 4, 8; iv. 8; xi. 17; xvi. 5, compared with Exod. iii. 14, *ἐγώ εἰμι, ὁ ὢν*. And compare on Gal. iii. 20." "He Who *came* of the Jews, according to the *flesh*, is no other than *ὁ ὢν*, the BEING ONE, JEHOVAH." We have an assertion of "His *Existence* from Everlasting in *ὁ ὢν*." He mistranslates the last part of Athanasius, *Orat. cont. Arian.* i. § 24, p. 338, thus: "Paul asserts that He is the splendour of His Father's Glory, and is the Being One, over all, God Blessed for ever." In his note on vv. 4, 5, on the other hand, he translates the present passage: "Christ came, Who is over all, God Blessed for ever."

There is some confusion here. The verb *εἰμι* may denote simple existence; it may (in contrasts) denote *real* in distinction from *seeming* existence; it may be, and commonly is, used as a mere copula, connecting the subject with the predicate. As applied to the Supreme Being in Exod. iii. 14 (Sept.), Wisd. Sol. xiii. 1, etc., *ὁ ὢν*, "He who Is," describes him as possessing not only real, but independent and hence eternal existence. This latter use is altogether peculiar. To find it where *ὢν* is used as a *copula*, or to suppose that the two uses can be combined, is purely fanciful and arbitrary. It was not too fanciful and arbitrary, however, for some of the Christian Fathers, who argue Christ's eter-

nal existence from the use of *ὄν* or *ὁ ὄν* (or *quæ est*) in such passages as John i. 18; iii. 13 (T. R.); vi. 46; Rom. ix. 5; Heb. i. 3. So Athanasius, as above; Epiphanius, *Anconit.* c. 5; Gregory of Nyssa, *Adv. Eunom.* lib. x., Opp. (1638) ii. 680-682; Pseudo-Basil, *Adv. Eunom.* iv. 2, Opp. i. 282 (399); Chrysostom, *Opp.* i. 476 f., viii. 87, ed. Montf.; Hilary, *De Trin.* xii. 24; cf. Cyril. Alex. *Thes.* i. 4. So Proclus of Constantinople, *Ep. ad Armen. de Fide*, c. 14, quoting Rom. ix. 5, says: *ἔπειτα αὐτῶν ἕτα, ἡν ἀρχῶν βροτῶν.* "he spoke of him as *being*, that he might declare in thunder his existence without beginning." (Migne, *Patrol. Gr.* lxxv. 872°.)

5. The construction, "from whom is the Messiah as to the flesh, he who is over all: God be blessed for ever!" has found favor with some eminent scholars (see below under IV.), and deserves consideration. If adopted, I think we should understand *ὁ ὄν ἐπὶ πάντων* not as meaning "he who is superior to all the patriarchs" (Justi and others), which is tame, and would hardly be expressed in this way; nor "he who is over all things," which, without qualification, seems too absolute for Paul; but rather, "who is Lord of *all*" (Jews and Gentiles alike), comp. Acts x. 36; Rom. x. 12, xi. 32; who, though he sprang from the Jews, is yet, as the Messiah, the ruler of a kingdom which embraces all men. (See Wetstein's note, near the end.) The natural contrast suggested by the mention of Christ's relation to the Jews *κατὰ σαρκά*, may justify us in assuming this reference of *πάντων*, which also accords with the central thought of the Epistle. The doxology, however, seems exceedingly abrupt and curt; and we should expect *ὁ θεός* instead of *θεός* as the subject of the sentence, though in a few cases the word stands in the nominative without the article. Grimm compares *θεός πάντων*, 1 Thess. ii. 5, with *μάρτυς ὁ θεός*, Rom. i. 9; also 2 Cor. v. 19; Gal. ii. 6, vi. 7; Luke xx. 38 (?). We should also rather expect *εὐλογῆσθαι* to stand first in the doxology; but the position of words in Greek is so largely subjective, depending on the feeling of the writer, that we cannot urge this objection very strongly. The thought, so frequent in Paul, of God as the *source*, in contrast with, or rather in distinction

from, Christ as the *medium* of the Messianic blessings, may have given the word *θεός* prominence. (See above, p. 356 f., in regard to the position of the subject in contrasts.) Gess accordingly dismisses the objection founded on the position of *εὐλογῆσθαι*, remarking, "die Voranstellung von *θεός* hätte durch den Gegensatz gegen Christum ein zureichendes Motiv" (*ubi supra*, p. 206). Still, on the whole, construction No. 7 seems to me much easier and more natural.

6. The construction numbered 6 was, I believe, first proposed by Professor Andrews Norton, in his review of Professor Stuart's *Letters to Dr. Channing*. This was published in the *Christian Disciple* (Boston) for 1819, new series, vol. i. p. 370 ff.; on Rom. ix. 5, see p. 418 ff. The passage is discussed more fully in his *Statement of Reasons*, etc. (Cambridge and Boston), 1833, p. 147 ff.; new ed. (ster. 1856), p. 203 ff., 470 ff., in which some notes were added by the writer of the present essay. There, after giving as the literal rendering, "He who was over all was God, blessed for ever," Mr. Norton remarks: "'He who was over all,' that is, over all which has just been mentioned by the Apostle." "Among the privileges and distinctions of the Jews, it could not be forgotten by the Apostle, that God had presided over all their concerns in a particular manner."

There is no grammatical objection to this construction of the passage. (See above, p. 346, 1st paragr.) Mr. Norton, in translating vv. 4 and 5, uses the *past* tense in supplying the ellipsis of the substantive verb. This is done by other translators; e.g., Conybeare and Howson. It may be questioned, however, whether this is fully justified here. Canon Kennedy uses the present tense, but seems to take the same general view of the bearing of the passage as Mr. Norton. See his *Occasional Sermons*, pp. 64, 65, and *Ely Lectures*, pp. 88, 89.

As regards this view of the passage, I will only say here that the thought presented in Mr. Norton's translation did not need to be expressed, as it is fully implied in the nature of the privileges and distinctions enumerated. (See above, p. 341.) Taking Professor Kennedy's rendering, I doubt

whether the Apostle would have used this language in respect to the relation existing between God and the Jewish people at the time when he was writing. The Jews gloried in God as their God in a special sense (Rom. ii. 17); but, in Paul's view, it was *Christians*, now, who rightfully gloried in God through our Lord Jesus Christ (Rom. v. 11; comp. iii. 29).

7. I add a single remark, which might more properly have been made before. I have rendered ὁ χριστός here not "Christ," as a mere proper name, but "the Messiah." Not only the use of the article, but the context, seems to me to require this. Westcott and Hort observe in regard to the word χριστός: "We doubt whether the appellative force, with its various associations and implications, is ever entirely lost in the New Testament, and are convinced that the number of passages is small in which Messiahship, of course in the enlarged apostolic sense, is not the principal intention of the word." (*The N. T. in Greek*, vol. ii., *Intro.*, p. 317.)

IV. We will now take notice of some points connected with the *history* of the interpretation of Rom. ix. 5. The fullest account of this is perhaps that given by Schultz in the article already repeatedly referred to; but he is neither very thorough nor very accurate.

The application of the passage by the Christian Fathers will naturally come first under consideration.

The fact that the great majority of the Fathers whose writings have come down to us understood the last part of the verse to relate to Christ has been regarded by many as a very weighty argument in favor of that construction. I have had occasion to consider the value of this argument in connection with another passage. (See *Essay XVIII.*, p. 445.) The remarks there made apply equally to the present case. The fact that the Fathers, in quoting a passage grammatically ambiguous, have given it a construction which suited their theology, does not help us much in determining the true construction. We must remember, also, the looser use of the term *θεός* which prevailed in the latter

part of the second century and later. (See above, p. 371 f.) Those in the second and third centuries who held strongly the doctrine of the inferiority of the Son, and the Arians in the fourth, like the Socinians at a later period, did not hesitate to apply the name "God" to Christ, and would find little difficulty in a construction of the passage which involved this. They might hesitate about the expression "God over all"; but, as we have seen, though natural, it is not necessary to connect the ἐπι πάντων with θεός.

The specimen of patristic exegesis in the construction given to 2 Cor. iv. 4, where so many of the Fathers make the genitive τοῦ αἰῶνος depend not on ὁ θεός, but τῶν ἀπίστων (see *Essay XVIII.*, *ii. s.*), will be sufficient for most persons who wish to form an estimate of their authority in a case like the present. I will only ask further, taking the first examples that occur to me, how much weight is to be attributed to the judgment of Origen, Cyril of Jerusalem, Chrysostom, Theodoret, Isidore of Pelusium, Gennadius, Theodorus Monachus, Joannes Damascenus (?), Photius, Œcumenius (or what passes under his name), and Theophylact, when, in their zeal for the freedom of the will, they explain πρόθεσις in Rom. viii. 28 (τοῖς κατὰ πρόθεσιν κλητοῖς), not as denoting the Divine purpose, but the purpose or choice of the subjects of the call? (Cyril of Alexandria gives the words both meanings at the same time.) What is the value of the opinion of Chrysostom, Joannes Damascenus, Œcumenius, and Theophylact, that διὰ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ in Rom. xvi. 27 is to be construed with στήμιζαι in ver. 25? Shall we accept the exegesis of Chrysostom and Theophylact when they tell us that in the injunction of Christ in Matt. v. 39 not to resist τῷ πονηρῷ, τῷ πονηρῷ means the devil?

Dean Burgon, in his article on "New Testament Revision" in the *Quart. Rev.* for Jan., 1882,* has given (p. 54 ff.) perhaps the fullest enumeration yet presented of ancient Christian writers who have referred the ὁ ὢν, κ. τ. λ. in Rom. ix. 5 to Christ. He counts up "55 illustrious names," forty of Greek writers, from Irenæus in the latter part of the

[* Reprinted in *The Revision Revised* (London, 1883); see p. 212.]

second century to John of Damascus in the eighth, and fifteen of Latin writers, from Tertullian at the beginning of the third century to Facundus in the sixth, "who all see in Rom. ix. 5 a glorious assertion of the eternal Godhead of CHRIST." An examination of his list will show that it needs some sifting. Most of the Latin writers whom he mentions, as Augustine, knew little or nothing of Greek, and their authority cannot be very weighty in determining the construction of an ambiguous Greek sentence. Of his illustrious names, six are unfortunately unknown, being writers "of whom," as Mr. Burgon mildly puts it, "3 have been mistaken for Athanasius, and 3 for Chrysostom." Another is the illustrious forger of the Answers to Ten Questions of Paul of Samosata, fathered upon Dionysius of Alexandria, "certainly spurious," according to Cardinal Newman and the best scholars generally, and marked as pseudonymous by Mr. Burgon himself. Methodius should also have been cited as Pseudo-Methodius (see p. 391 f), and Cæsarius as Pseudo-Cæsarius. Among the other illustrious names, we find "6 of the Bishops at the Council of Antioch, A.D. 269." On looking at the names as they appear in Routh's *Roll. Sacrae*, ed. alt. (1846), iii. 289, I regret my inability to recall the deeds or the occasion that made them "illustrious," unless it is the fact that, as members of that Council, about half a century before the Council of Nicæa, they *condemned* the use of the term *ὁμοούσιος*. "consubstantial," which was established by the latter as the test and watchword of orthodoxy.

Next to the six bishops and "ps.-Dionysius Alex." in Mr. Burgon's list of the illustrious Fathers "who see in Rom. ix. 5 a glorious assertion of the eternal Godhead of Christ," we find "Const. App.," that is, the Apostolical Constitutions, with a reference to "vi. c. 26." He does not quote the passage. It reads as follows: "Some of the heretics imagine the Christ [so Lagarde; or "the Lord," Cotelier and Ueltzen] to be a mere man . . . ; but others of them suppose that Jesus himself is the God over all, glorifying him as his own Father, supposing him to be Son and Para-

plete; than which doctrines what can be more abominable?" Compare Const. Apost. iii. 17: "The Father is the God over all, *ὁ ἐπὶ πάντων θεός*; Christ is the only-begotten God, the beloved Son, the Lord of glory." See also vi. 18.

One is surprised, after this, to find that Mr. Burgon did not cite for the same purpose Pseudo-Ignatius *ad Tars.* cc. 2, 5, and *ad Philip.* c. 7, where it is denied emphatically that Christ is *ὁ ἐπὶ πάντων θεός*; and also Origen, *Cont. Cels.* viii. 14, who says: "Grant that there are some among the multitude of believers, with their differences of opinion, who rashly suppose that the Saviour is the Most High God over all; yet certainly we do not, for we believe him when he said, *The Father who sent me is greater than I.*" The very strong language which Origen uses in many other places, respecting the inferiority of the Son, renders it unlikely that he applied the last part of this verse to Christ. See, e.g., *Cont. Cels.* viii. 15; *De Princip.* i. 3. § 5; *In Ioan.* tom. ii. cc. 2, 3, 6; vi. 23; xiii. 25. Rufinus's Latin version of Origen's Commentary on Romans, which is the only authority for ascribing to Origen the common interpretation of this passage, is no authority at all. He, according to his own account of his work, had so transformed it by omissions, additions, and alterations, that his friends thought he ought to claim it as his own.* It was in accordance with his professed principles to omit or alter in the works which he translated whatever he regarded as dangerous, particularly whatever did not conform to his standard of orthodoxy. His falsification of other writings of Origen is notorious. Westcott and Hort remark that in the Rufino-Origenian commentary on this verse "there is not a trace of Origenian language, and this is one of the places in which Rufinus would not fail to indulge his habit of altering an interpretation which he disapproved on doctrinal grounds." They

* See his *Peroratio* at the end of the Epistle; *Origenis Opp.* iv. 658 f., ed. De la Rue. Matthei remarks: "Rufini interpretatio, quæ parum fidei habet, in epistola ad Romanos, quod quilibet ipse intelligit, non tam pro Origenis opere, quam pro compendio Rufini haberi debet, quod haud dubie alia omisit, alia, sicut in ceteris libris, invito Origene admisit." — *Pauli Epp. ad Thess.*, etc. (Rigae, 1785), Praefatio, sig. b 2. See more fully to the same purpose Redepenning's *Origenes*, ii. 183 ff., who speaks of his "Ausscheidung ganzer Stücke," and "Umgestaltung des Heterodoxen in der Trinitätslehre." See also Cave, *Hist. Lit.*, art. "Origenes."

also remark, "It is difficult to impute Origen's silence to accident in the many places in which quotation would have been natural had he followed the common interpretation."

Origen should therefore be henceforth excluded from the list of Fathers cited in support of the common punctuation. It is even "probable," as Westcott and Hort maintain, though "not certain," that he and Eusebius gave the passage a different construction.*

As regards Eusebius, the presumption is perhaps even stronger than in the case of Origen. He has nowhere quoted the passage; but in very numerous places in his writings he uses ὁ ἐπὶ πάντων θεός as a title exclusively belonging to the Father, and insists upon this against the Sabelians.† I admit that these considerations are not decisive; he and Origen may have given the passage an interpretation similar to that of Hippolytus; but, if they understood it to relate to Christ, it is certainly strange that they have nowhere quoted it in their numerous writings.

The assumption that Irenæus referred the last part of this verse to Christ must be regarded as doubtful. The only place where he has quoted it is *Haer.* iii. 16. (al. 18.) § 3, where his text is preserved only in the Old Latin version, which of course cannot determine the construction which Irenæus put upon the Greek. He does not quote it to prove that Christ is θεός, — the Gnostics gave the name θεός to their Æons, and also to the Demiurgus,—but to prove the unity of the Christ with the man Jesus, in opposition to the Gnostics who maintained that the Æon Christ did not descend upon Jesus till his baptism. He had just before

* I have represented the eminent scholars named above as regarding it as "probable though not certain" that these Fathers understood the last clause as relating to God. Their note does imply that they are inclined to this view; but subsequent examination leads me to suppose that the words quoted were intended to apply to the Apostolic Constitutions and the Pseudo-Ignatius. Westcott and Hort also refer, for the application of the phrase ὁ ἐπὶ πάντων θεός to the Father in distinction from Christ, to "Melito p. 413 Otto," i. e., to his *Apol.* fragm. 2; comp. Routh, i. 118, ed. alt.

† See, for example, *De Eccl. Theol.* i. 3, 7, 8, 11, 20; ii. 1, 4, 5 (pp. 62 c, 65 a, 66 c, 70 d, 93 c, 104 a, 107 c, d), and a multitude of other places, some of which are quoted in Wetstein's note. The apparent exception, *Hist. Eccl.* viii. 11, τὸν ἐπὶ πάντων θεὸν ἡμῶν ἐπιβουλεύμενον (ed. Vales.), is a false reading. Burton, Schwegler, Laemmer, and Dindorf omit ἡμῶν on the authority of important MSS.; on the other hand Henrichen in his recent edition (1865) omits ἐπὶ πάντων θεός, and reads τὸν ἡμῶν simply.

(§ 2) quoted Matt. i. 18 for this purpose (reading τὸν θεὸν ἡμῶν); he now quotes Rom. i. 3, 4; ix. 5; and Gal. iv. 4, 5, for the same purpose. His argument rests on the εἰς ὅσον ὁ ἡριστός τὸ κατὰ αἰῶνα, and not on the last part of the verse, on which he makes no remark. Throughout his work against Heresies, and very often, Irenæus uses the title "the God over all" as the exclusive designation of the Father.*

The passage in which Hippolytus quotes Rom. ix. 5 (*Cont. Noët.* c. 6) has already been noticed. (See above, pp. 378, 383.) The Noëtians and Patripassians, according to him, quoted the text to prove the identity of Christ with the Father. (*Ibid.* cc. 2, 3.) He complains that they treat the words *μονοθεῖος* (or *μονοθεῖα*); comp. Epiph. *Haer.* lvii. 2. Westcott and Hort understand this to mean that they read all the words from καὶ εἰς ὅσον τοὺς αἰῶνας "as a single clause." Semler once took nearly the same view (*Hist. Einl. zu S. J. Baumgarten's Unters. theol. Streitigkeiten*, 1762, i. 217, n. 205), but was afterwards doubtful about it (*ibid.* p. 236, n. 235). Fabricius in his note on the passage, and Salmond in his translation of Hippolytus in the *Ante-Nicene Christ. Library*, ix. 53, give a very different explanation. To discuss the matter here would require too much space, but it seemed well to mention it. Possibly in *Cont. Noët.* c. 6 εὐλογητός is misplaced through the mistake of a scribe, and should stand before εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας.

Dean Burgon refers also to "Phil. 339," that is to the *Philosophumena* or *Ref. omu. Haer.* x. 34, *ad fin.* But ὁ κατὰ πάντων θεός there should not, I think, be alleged as a quotation of Rom. ix. 5 applied to Christ. Bunsen's easy emendation of the passage (*Ann. Ante-Nic.* i. 392; comp. his *Hippolytus*, 2d ed., i. 413) seems to me the true reading, and is supported by x. 33, *ad init.* (p. 334), where οὗτος μοι καὶ κατὰ πάντων θεός is distinguished from the Logos. Hippolytus could hardly have called Christ "the God over all." (See p. 378, note*.)

* Semler (*Ep. ad Griesbachium*, 1770, p. 77 ff.; *Antwort*, etc., 1770, p. 45) and Whitby (*Diag. modestae*, p. 125 f.) take the above view of this passage of Irenæus. For the use of the designation "God over all," see Iren. *Haer.* ii. 5. § 4; 6. (al. 5) §§ 2, 3; 11. (al. 12.) § 1, *ibid.* 13. (al. 18.) § 8; 24. (al. 40.) § 2; 25. (al. 49.) § 8; iii. 8. § 3; iv. 5. (al. 10.) § 1; v. 18. § 1, and many other passages. (Cf. iv. 1. § 1.)

I note in passing that Tischendorf cites incorrectly for the reference of the *ὁ ὢν*, etc., to Christ "Meth. ^{conxiv} 806 (Gall 3)." The passage referred to is not from the *Convincium*, but from the discourse of the Pseudo-Methodius *De Simone et Anna*, c. 1, *ad fin.*, where we have the mere expression *τῆς ἰσότητος δόξης τοῦ ἐπὶ πάντων θεοῦ συγκατάβασιν*. This is also one of Dean Burgon's authorities; but, as the writer explains himself (c. 2, *ad fin.*), he seems to mean by "the glory of the God over all" not the glory of the Son considered by himself, but the glory of the whole Trinity. There is no quotation of Rom. ix. 5 here.

The passage of Amphilochius (Gallandi vi. 409, or Migne xxxix. 101) which Tischendorf adduces, with a *videtur*, as a reference of Rom. ix. 5 to the Father, seems analogous to the above, and hardly proves anything on one side or the other.

In the quotation of Rom. ix. 5 in the Antiochene Epistle to Paul of Samosata (see above, p. 388) it is probable that the six bishops made a slight pause at *πάντων*. The subordination of the Son is very strongly expressed in the Epistle. Among other things it is said, "To think that the God of the universe is called a messenger (*ἄγγελος*) is impious; but the Son is the messenger of the Father, being himself Lord and God." (Routh, *ut supra*, p. 294.)

The Emperor Julian has already been referred to. (See above, p. 346, note.) He was as good a judge of the construction of a Greek sentence as Cyril of Alexandria, or any other of the Fathers, and quite as likely to interpret impartially. Well acquainted with the writings of the Christians, he could hardly have overlooked passages so frequently quoted in the controversies on the nature of Christ as Rom. ix. 5 and Tit. ii. 13. But he did not find the title *θεός* given to Christ in these or any other places (e.g., 1 Tim. iii. 16) in the writings of Paul.

Among the orthodox Greek Fathers, Diodorus (of Antioch and Tarsus) and Photius appear to have understood the *ὁ ὢν*, etc., to refer to God. The comment of Diodorus on this passage is preserved in the important *Catena* on the Epistle

to the Romans published by Cramer from a MS. in the Bodleian Library (Cramer's *Catena in N. T.*, vol. iv., Oxon. 1844). The essential part of it reads: *καὶ τὸ μέγιστον, ἐξ ὧν ὁ χριστός, τὸ κατὰ σάρκα, ἐξ αὐτῶν ὄυσιν ὁ χριστός. Θεός δὲ οὐ μόνον αὐτῶν, ἀλλὰ κοινῇ ἐπὶ πάντων ἐστὶ θεός.* (p. 162.) This appears to mean, "From them, he says, is the Messiah. But God belongs not to them alone, but is God over all men alike." Meyer, Tholuck, Philippi, and Schultz understand it as relating to the Father. I do not perceive that this reference is affected by the fact that Theodore of Mopsuestia, a pupil of Diodorus, who has borrowed much of the language of this comment, gives the last part a different turn: *καὶ τὸ δὴ μέγιστον, ἐξ αὐτῶν καὶ ὁ χριστός τὸ κατὰ σάρκα, ὡς ἐστὶ θεός οὐ μόνον αὐτῶν, ἀλλὰ κοινῇ πάντων.* (Migne, *Patrol. Gr.* lxxvi. 833.) Had it been the purpose of Diodorus to express this meaning, he would probably have inserted *ἐστὶν* after *θεός δέ*, or have written *ὡς ἐστὶν*. The omission of the article before *θεός* creates no difficulty in taking *θεός* as the subject of the sentence. It is often omitted in such a case by these later Greek writers.*

Diodorus, it will be remembered, was the founder of a comparatively rational, grammatico-historical, and logical school of interpretation, in opposition to the arbitrary exegesis of Scripture which had prevailed among the Fathers.

The passage in Photius (*Cont. Manich.* iii. 14) appears to be unequivocal: "He cries with a loud voice,—*whose are the covenants, and the laws (αἱ νομοθεσίαι), and the promises, and the holy services (αἱ λατρίαι)*; and showing most clearly whence these things are and on whose providence they have depended [he adds], *ὁ ὢν ἐπὶ πάντων θεός ἐλλογῆτος εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας. Ἄμην.*" "So the laws and the holy services and the promises, in the observance of which the fathers pleased God, and from whom as to his humanity sprang the Messiah, are from the God over all, *τοῦ ἐπὶ πάντων Θεοῦ.*" (Migne, *Patrol. Gr.* cii. 157.)

Schultz, in the essay so often referred to (p. 480, note 2), says that Theodulus *in loc.* seems to refer the last part of

* See, for example, Theodore of Mopsuestia on Rom. ii. 15: viii. 28; ix. 10, 14 *δὲ*, 22-24, 25; xi. 2. (Migne, lxxvi. coll. 789^b, 832^a, 833^d, 836^c, 840^b, 841^c, 841^d, 852^a.) See also Cramer, p. 11, l. 30; 15, l. 15; 27, l. 24; 54, l. 22, etc.

our verse to God. He misapprehends the meaning of the passage in Theodulus, and does not observe that it is taken from Œcumenius.* The *Enarratio in Ep. ad Romanos*, which, in a Latin translation, passes under the name of Theodulus, does not belong to the presbyter or bishop in Cœle-Syria of that name, who died A.D. 492, but is a very late Catena. (See Cave.)

A few words now respecting the Latin Fathers who have quoted Rom. ix. 5.

Tertullian is the first. He quotes it once as below, and once (*Prax.* c. 15) with *super omnia* before *deus*.† Cyprian simply cites the passage to prove that Christ is *deus* (*qui est super omnia deus benedictus in sæcula*), without remark. (*Testim.* ii. 6.) Novatian has already been spoken of. (See above, p. 378, note *.)

I know of no trace of the reference of the last part of the verse to God among the Latin writers, except what may be implied in the language of the Pseudo-Ambrosius (Ambrosiaster), commonly identified with Hilary the deacon, in his commentary on the Epistle. He remarks: "Si quis autem non putat de Christo dictum, *qui est Deus*, det personam de qua dictum est. De patre enim Deo hoc loco mentio facta non est." This is repeated in the commentary of Rabanus Maurus (Migne, *Patrol. Lat.* cxi. col. 1482). The same in substance appears in the *Quæst. Vet. et Nov. Test.*, qu. 91, formerly ascribed to Augustine, and printed in the Benedictine edition of his works, *Opp.* iii. ii. 2915, ed. Bened. alt.: "Sed forte ad Patris personam pertinere dicatur. Sed

* See *Biblioth. max. vet. Patrum*, viii. 605, or the *Monumenta S. Patrum Orthodoxographia* of Gryncus, ii. 1163.

† After remarking that he never speaks of Gods or Lords, but following the Apostle, when the Father and Son are to be named together, calls the Father God and Jesus Christ Lord, he says: "Solum autem Christum potero deum dicere, sicut idem apostolus. *Ex quibus Christus, qui est*, inquit, *deus super omnia benedictus in ævum omne*. Nam et radium solis seorsum solem vocabo; solem autem nominans, cuius est radius, non statim et radium solem appellabo." (*Prax.* c. 13, ed. Gehler.) This accords with his language elsewhere: "Protulit deus sermonem . . . sicut radix fruticem, et fons fluvium, et sol radium." (*Prax.* c. 8.) "Cum radius ex sole porrigitur, portio ex summa; sed sol erit in radio . . . nec separatur substantia, sed extenditur." (*Apologet.* c. 21.) "Pater tota substantia est; filius vero derivatio totius et portio; sicut ipse pronitur, *Quia pater maior me est*." (*Prax.* c. 9.) "Sermo deus, quia ex deo. . . Quodsi deus dei tanquam substantiva res, non erit ipse deus [*ἀνθρώπος*], sed hactenus deus, qua ex ipsius substantia, ut portio aliqua totius." (*Prax.* c. 26.)

hoc loco nulla est paterni nominis mentio. Ideoque si de Christo dictum negatur, persona cui competat detur." (This work is generally ascribed to the Hilary mentioned above.) The writer seems to have heard of those who interpreted the passage of God; and, relying apparently upon the Latin version, he meets their interpretation of the Greek with a very unintelligent objection.

The Greek Fathers in Mr. Burgon's list who have not already been mentioned are the following: Athanasius, Basil, Didymus, Gregory of Nyssa, Epiphanius, Theodorus Mops., Eustathius, Eulogius, Theophilus Alex., Nestorius, Theodotus of Ancyra, Chrysostom, Theodoret, Gelasius Cyz., Anastasius Ant., Leontius Byz., Maximus. Of the Latins, Ambrose, Hilary, Jerome, Victorinus, the Breviarium, Marius Mercator, Cassian, Alcimius Avit., Fulgentius, Ferrandus.

"Against such a torrent of Patristic testimony," says Mr. Burgon, "it will not surely be pretended that the Socinian interpretation, to which our Revisionists give such prominence, can stand."

But to what does it all amount? Simply to the fact that a mass of writers, to the judgment of most of whom an intelligent scholar would attach very little weight in any question of exegesis, have followed that construction of an ambiguous passage which suited their theological opinions. Out of the whole list, the two, I suppose, who would be most generally selected as distinguished from the rest for sobriety and good sense in interpretation are Chrysostom and Theodoret. Yet both of them adopted that excessively unnatural, if not impossible, construction of 2 Cor. iv. 4 of which I have spoken above. (See p. 387.)

The same general considerations apply to the ancient versions, some of which are ambiguous here, as Westcott and Hort remark, though the translators probably intended to have the last part of the verse understood of Christ.

We will now dismiss the Fathers, and notice some facts belonging to the more recent history of the interpretation of

our passage.* I take up the different constructions in the order in which they are numbered above, p. 335.

The three most important recent discussions of the passage outside of the commentaries, before that of Dr. Dwight, are by Dr. Hermanna Schultz, in the *Jahrbücher f. deutsche Theol.*, 1868, pp. 462-506, who defends constructions Nos. 1-3, with a slight preference for No. 1 (p. 483); Dr. C. L. Wilibald Grimm, in Hilgenfeld's *Zeitschr. f. wiss. Theol.*, 1869, pp. 311-322, who adopts No. 5; and Pastor Ernst Harmsen, *ibid.*, 1872, pp. 510-521, who adopts No. 7. There is a brief discussion of the passage by Dr. G. Vance Smith, Canon Farrar, and Dr. Sanday, in the *Expositor* for May, 1879, ix. 37-405, and September, 1879, x. 232-238. There was a more extended debate in the *Independent* (New York) for Aug. 12, Oct. 14, 21, 28, and Nov. 18, 1858, in which Dr. John Proudfit (anonymously), the Rev. Joseph P. Thompson (the editor), Dr. Z. S. Barstow, and E. A. took part.

1-3. It would be idle to give a list of the supporters of Nos. 1-3, who refer the clause in question to Christ. Among the commentators, perhaps the more eminent and best known are Calvin, Beza, Hammond, LeClerc, Limborch, Bengel, Michaelis, Koppe, Platt, Tholuck, Olshausen, Stuart, Hodge, Philippi, Lange (with Schaff and Riddle), Hofmann, Weiss, Godet, Alford, Vaughan, Sanday (very doubtfully), Gifford. That the Roman Catholic commentators, as Estius, Klee, Stengel, Reithmayr, Maier, Beelen, Bisping (not very positively), Jatho, Klofutar (1880), should adopt this explanation, is almost a matter of course. This construction of the verse is accepted by all the *Fratres Poloni*, who did not hesitate to give the name God to Christ, and to worship him, recognizing of course the supremacy of the Father, to whom they applied the name God in a higher sense; so

* *Literature*. — The older literature is given by Wolf (*Curæ*) and Lüenthal (*Biblicher Archivar*, 1745). For the more recent, see Danz, and especially Schultz in the article so often referred to; also, among the commentators, Meyer and Van Hengel. E. F. C. Oertel (*Christologie*, Hamb. 1732, p. 216 ff.) gives a brief account of the controversy excited by Semler (1769-71); see also the works named by Schultz, especially Hirt's *Orient. u. exeg. Bibliothek*, 1772, 1773. The name Bremer (Schultz, p. 462, note 2) is a misprint for Benner.

Socinus,* *Opp.* ii. 581, 582, 600 a; cf. ii. 377 f.; John Crell, *in loc.* *Opp.* i. 147; also *Respons. ad Grotium*, *Opp.* iv. 230 b; *De Uno Deo Patre*, p. 23 a; *De Deo ejusque Attrib.* p. 35 b; *Eth. Christ.* p. 348 a; Schlichting (*Lat. Slichtingius*), *Comm. post.* i. 254; Wolzogen, *Opp.* i. 710, 712; ii. 301; iii. 5; Sam. Przypcovius or Przkowsky *in loc.*, p. 51. So also the Racovian Catechism, §§ 159, 160.

With a singular disregard of these historical facts, Dean Burgon holds up his hands in holy horror at the marginal renderings of the Revised New Testament at Rom. ix. 5, ascribed to "some modern Interpreters," and stigmatizes them as "the Socinian gloss"! (*Quart. Rev.*, Jan., 1882, p. 54 [*Revision Revised*, p. 211].) The Italics are his. He seems throughout his article to imagine himself to be writing for readers who will take an opprobrious epithet for an argument. The real "Socinian gloss" is adopted, and the arguments for it are repeated, as we have seen, by the latest prominent defender of the construction which Mr. Burgon himself maintains. Among English commentators, compare Macknight on the passage.

A slight qualification or supplement of the above statement is, however, required. Schlichting, though he does not object to the common construction, misled by Erasmus, is inclined to suspect the genuineness of the word *θεος*. It is important, in reference to the history of the interpretation of this passage, to observe that the statement of Erasmus, in regard to the omission of this word in the quotations by some of the Fathers, led many astray; among others, Grotius, who also incorrectly represents the word God as wanting in the Syriac version. Schoettgen misrepresented the case still worse, saying, by mistake of course, "Hoc verbum quamplurimi Codices, quidam etiam ex Patribus, non habent."

* Socinus speaks of the punctuation and construction proposed by Erasmus, a believer in the deity of Christ, which makes the *ὁ υἱ*, etc., a doxology to God, the Father, and says: "Non est ulla causa, cur hæc interpretatio, vel potius lectio et interpunctio Erasmi rejici posse videatur; nisi una tantum, quam Adversarii non afferunt; neque enim illam animadverterunt. Ea est, quod, cum simplex nomen Benedictus idem significat quod Benedictus sit, semper fere solent anteponi ei, ad quem refertur, perraro autem postponi."

Some of those who are so shocked at what they call "Socinian glosses" might perhaps learn a lesson of candor and fairness from this heretic.

Schlichting also suggests, as what "venire alicui in mentem posset," the somewhat famous conjecture of $\acute{\omega}\nu\acute{\iota}$ but *rejects* it. It was taken up afterwards, however, by a man far inferior in judgment, Samuel Crell (not to be confounded with the eminent commentator), in the *Initium Ev. S. Joannis restitutum* (1726), published under the pseudonym of L. M. Artemonius. Its superficial plausibility seems to have fascinated many; among them Whitby (*Last Thoughts*), Jackson of Leicester (*Annot. ad Novat.* p. 341), John Taylor of Norwich, Goadby, Wakefield (*Enquiry*), Bishop Edmund Law (Wakefield's *Memoirs*, i. 447), Belsham (*Epistles of Paul*), John Jones, and David Schulz (so says Baumgarten-Crusius). Even Doddridge and Harwood speak of it as "ingenious," and Olshausen calls it "scharfsinnig." It is quite indefensible.

Among the writers on Biblical Theology, Usteri (*Paulin. Lehrbegr.*, 5te Ausg., 1834, p. 324 f.) refers the clause in question to Christ, but strongly expresses his sense of the great difficulties which this involves. He is influenced especially by Rückert (1831), who afterwards changed his mind. Messner (1856, p. 236 f.) regards this reference as probable, though not certain; somewhat more doubtful is C. F. Schmid (2d ed., 1859, p. 540 f., or p. 475 f. Eng. trans.). Dörner in his recent work, *System der Christl. Glaubenslehre* (1879), i. 345, only ventures to say that the reference to Christ is "the most natural." Schott, August Hahn, De Wette, Reuss, Ritschl, are sometimes cited as supporting this construction; but later they all went over to the other side. See below, under No. 7.

For the most elaborate defences of the construction we are considering, besides those which have already been mentioned, one may consult Dr. John Pye Smith's *Scripture Testimony to the Messiah*, 5th ed. (1859), vol. ii. pp. 370-377, 401-405, and the commentaries of Flatt (from whom Professor Stuart has borrowed largely) and Philippi.

4. Construction No. 4 has already been sufficiently noticed. (See above, p. 383.)

5. The construction which puts a colon or a period after

$\pi\acute{\alpha}\tau\epsilon\rho\varsigma$, making the clause beginning with $\theta\epsilon\acute{\omega}\varsigma$ a doxology to God, seems to have been first suggested by Erasmus in the Annotations to his third edition of the Greek Testament (1522), repeated in the fourth (1527). In his later writings, and in the note in his last edition (1535), while recognizing the possibility of this construction, he gave the preference to No. 7.* It was adopted by Locke in his posthumous *Paraphrase*, etc. (London, 1705, and often): "and of them, as to his fleshly extraction, Christ is come, he who is over all, God be blessed for ever, Amen." Locke's construction was preferred by Wetstein in the important note on the passage in his Greek Testament, vol. ii. (1752), and was adopted by Prof. L. J. C. Justi in Paulus's *Memorabilien*, 1791, St. i. pp. 1-26, treated more fully in his *Vermischte Abhandlungen*, 2te Samml., 1798, pp. 309-346; also by E. F. C. Oertel, *Christologie* (1792), p. 209 f. He has a pretty full discussion of the passage (pp. 195-218). So by G. L. Bauer, *Bibl. Theol. des N. T.*, Bd. iv. (1802), pp. 10-14, and by C. F. Ammon; for though in his *Bibl. Theol.*, 2te Ausg. (1801), pp. 220-222, he does not decide between constructions No. 5 and No. 7, he favors the former in his note on the passage in the third edition of Koppe on Romans (1824). J. J. Stolz adopts it in the fourth edition of his *Uebersetzung des N. T.* (1804), and the third edition of his *Erläuterungen* (1808), iii. 170-191. He gives there an interesting extract from Semler's *Hist. u. krit. Sammlungen über die sogenannten Beweisstellen in der Dogmatik*, St. ii. pp. 284-287. So De Wette in the text of the third edition of his German translation of the Bible (1839), though he gives constructions Nos. 1 and 7 as alternative renderings; in the note in the fourth and last edition of his commentary on the Epistle (1847), though undecided, he seems on the whole rather inclined to No. 7. This construction (No. 5) is supported also by Baumgarten-Crusius, a scholar to be spoken of with high respect, in his *Comm.* on the Epistle (Jena, 1844), comp. his *Grundzüge der bibl. Theol.* (1828), p. 385 f., and his *Exeget. Schriften zum N. T.* ii. i. (Jena, 1844) p. 266, the latter cited

* *Erasmii Opp.*, Lugd. Bat. 1703, ff., vol. vi. 686 f.; ix. 1002 f., 1045 f.

by Ernesti. So by Schumann in his *Christus* (1852), ii. 545, note; H. Fr. Th. L. Ernesti, *Vom Ursprunge d. Sünde nach paulin. Lehrgehalte*, i. (1855) pp. 197-204; Märcker (cited by Meyer), whose work I have not seen; and Reuss, *Les Épîtres Pauliniennes* (1878), ii. 88.

The best defence of this view, perhaps, is to be found in the article of Grimm, referred to above.

6. On construction No. 6, see above, p. 385 f.

7. Erasmus in his *translation* renders the words of the last part of our verse thus: "et ii, ex quibus est Christus quantum attinet ad carnem, qui est in omnibus deus laudandus in secula, amen." His *paraphrase* seems a little ambiguous.* But in the note in his last edition (1535), and in his later writings, he clearly indicates his preference for construction No. 7.† Bucer (or Butzer) *in loc.* (1536?), as quoted by Wetstein, suggests this construction as an alternative rendering. Curcellæus (Courcelles) in his edition of the Greek Testament published in 1658 (also 1675, 1685, 1699) notes that "Quidam addunt punctum post vocem σάρκα, quia si id quod sequitur cum præcedentibus connecteretur, potius dicendum videtur *in carni, vel in deo, quam in carne.*"

Among those who have adopted or favored this construction are Whiston, in his *Primitive Christianity Reviv'd*, vol. iv. (1711), p. 13 ff.; and Dr. Samuel Clarke, in his *Scripture Doctrine of the Trinity*, London, 1712, 3d ed., 1732, p. 85 ff. He gives also as admissible constructions No. 5 and No. 2, but places No. 7 first. He was, as is well known, one of the best classical scholars of his day, as well as one of the ablest metaphysicians and theologians. So John Jackson of Leicester, in his *Annot. ad Novatianum* (1726), p. 341,

* "At Christus sic est homo, ut idem et Deus sit, non huius aut illius gentis peculiaris, sed universorum Deus, et idem cum patre Deus, qui [Christus? pater? or Pater cum Christo?] præsidet omnibus, cuiusque inscrutabili consilio geruntur hæc omnia, cui soli . . . debetur laus," etc. One suggestion of Erasmus is that the word "God" in the last clause may denote the whole Trinity.

† See especially his *Apol. adv. monachos quosdam Hispanos* (written in 1528), Opp. ix. 1043-47: "Ego coram Deo proficere mihi videri Paulum hoc sensisse, quod modo significavimus, nec hunc sermonem proprie ad Christum pertinere, sed vel ad Patrem, vel ad totam Trinitatem" (col. 1045). Comp. *Resp. ad Juvenem Gerontodidascalum* (written 1532), col. 1002: "iis res loquitur, verba Pauli nullum sensum evidenter reddere quam hunc: Deus, qui est super omnia, sit benedictus in secula. Cui precatoni accinitur, Amen." See also above, under No. 5.

though captivated by the specious but worthless conjecture of *ὁ θεός*; Wetstein, as an alternative rendering, but rather preferring to place the stop after *καρνα* (see the end of his note); Semler, *Paraph. Ep. ad Rom.* (1769), p. 114 ff., and in many other writings; on the literature of the Semler controversy, see the references given above, p. 396 n. Semler was not so well acquainted with the writings of the later as with those of the earlier Fathers, and in this part of the field of debate his adversaries had the advantage. But he gave a stimulus to a freer and more impartial treatment of the question. Eckermann adopted the construction we are now considering in the *second* edition (1795) of his *Theologische Beyträge*, Bd. I. St. iii. pp. 160-162, though in the first edition he had opposed it.

Coming now to the present century, we find this construction adopted by the commentators C. F. Boehme (Lips. 1806), and H. E. G. Paulus, *Des Apostels Paulus Lehr-Briefe an die Galater- und Römer-Christen* (Heidelb. 1831), where he translates (p. 102): "Der über alle (Juden und Heiden) seyende Gott sey gepriesen auf (alle) die Zeitalter hinaus"; by Professor J. F. Winzer of Leipzig in a *Programm* on Rom. ix. 1-5 (Lips. 1832), which I have not seen, but find highly praised; and Karl Schrader, *Der Apostel Paulus*, Theil iii. (1833), p. 75, and Theil iv. (1835), p. 355. He translates, "Der über Allcm Seiende (der welcher über Allem ist,) Gott, gelobt (sei gelobt) in Ewigkeit!" It is adopted in three commentaries of remarkable independence and ability which appeared in 1834, namely: those of Professor J. G. Reiche of Göttingen, whose note (Theil ii. pp. 268-278) is one of the fullest and best discussions of the passage, though he makes some mistakes about the Fathers; Professor Eduard Koellner of Göttingen; and Dr. Conrad Glöckler, whom Professor Stuart calls "a Nicenian" as regards his theological position. K. G. Bretschneider, in the fourth edition of his *Handbuch der Dogmatik* (1838), i. 604 f., adopts the same construction, though in the earlier editions of this work he had referred the *θεός* to Christ. He translates: "Der Herr über alles, Gott, sei gepriesen in Ewig-

keit." In 1839, Professor L. J. Rückert of Jena, in the second edition of his elaborate and valuable commentary (vol. ii. pp. 13-17), discusses the passage fully, and though in the first edition (1831) he had strenuously contended for the reference of the last part of the verse to Christ, now pronounces the construction which makes it a doxology to God "far more probable." This year is also signalized in the history of the interpretation of our passage by the publication of vol. ii. of the commentary of Professor C. F. A. Fritzsche of Rostock, who discusses the passage in a masterly manner (pp. 260-275). His translation has been given above, p. 354. In the fourth edition of his Greek Testament with a Latin version, published in 1839, Professor H. A. Schott of Jena adopted the punctuation and construction which make the clause beginning with *ὁ θεός* a doxology to God, though in previous editions he had followed the common construction. In his essay *De Invocatione Jesu Christi Partic. I.* (1843), p. 8, the highly esteemed commentator Dr. Friedrich Lücke, Professor at Göttingen, refers the last part of our verse to God. Professor A. L. G. Krehl, of Leipzig, does the same in his *Der Brief an die Römer ausgelegt*, u. s. w. (1845), p. 322, though in an earlier work, *Neutest. Handwörterbuch* (1843), art. *Christus*, p. 114, he had cited Rom. ix. 5 in proof that Christ is called God.

Baur, who makes the passage a doxology to God, has some valuable remarks upon it in his *Paulus* (1845), p. 624 f., 2te Aufl. (1866-67), ii. 263 f.; comp. his *Lehre von der Dreieinigkeit* (1841), i. 84, note, and *Neutest. Theol.* (1864), p. 194. Zeller agrees with him (*Theol. Jahrbücher*, 1842, p. 55). So J. F. Rabiger, a believer in the divine nature of Christ, in his *De Christologia Paulina contra Baurium Commentatio* (1852), pp. 26-28.

We may notice here the great commentators De Wette and Meyer. De Wette, not perfectly satisfied with any view, yet wavers between constructions Nos. 5 and 7; see above under No. 5. In his *Bibl. Dogmatik*, 3te Aufl. (1831), p. 249, and in the second edition of his translation of the New Testament (1832), he had taken the name "God" here

as a designation of Christ; but in the third edition of his translation (1839) he makes it begin a doxology. Meyer in his *Das N. T. griechisch mit einer neuen deutschen Uebersetzung* (1829) followed the common construction; but in the first edition of his *Comm.* (1836), and all later editions, he makes the passage a doxology to God. His collaborator, Huther, maintains in his note on Titus ii. 13 that the name *θεός* is not given to Christ in any of the New Testament Epistles.

In 1855 appeared the first edition of Jowett's work on four of the Epistles of Paul (2d ed., 1859). He translates: "God, who is over all, is blessed for ever. Amen." So Bishop Colenso, *St. Paul's Ep. to the Romans*, etc., London, 1861; Am. ed., New York, 1863.

Ewald, *Die Sendschreiben des Ap. Paulus*, u. s. w. (1857), translates: "der über allen ist Gott sei gelobet in die ewigkeiten, Amen!" (p. 323; comp. p. 398 f.) See also his *Die Lehre der Bibel von Gott*, Bd. iii. (1874), p. 416, n. 3. Professor J. H. Scholten of Leyden, in his *Dogmatices Christ. Initia*, ed. 2da, Lugd. Bat. 1858, p. 193 f., adopts the same construction. So Athanase Coquerel, *Christologie* (Paris, 1858), i. 76, note. So the celebrated Dutch commentator, Van Hengel, who in tome ii. of his *Interpretatio* (1859), pp. 343-360, discusses the passage very fully. He mentions some Dutch scholars that agree with him, as Vissering and Scheffer (*Godgel. Bijdragen* 1853 and 1854), whose writings I have not seen. The eminent Danish commentator, Dr. H. N. Clausen, *Pauli Brev til Romerne fortolket* (Copenhagen, 1863), p. 124, translates: "Han som er over Alt, Gud, (eller, "Gud, som er over Alt") være priset i Eviighed!" (He is the author of the *Hermeneutik*. The Germans spell his name Klausen.) Holtzmann, in his translation of the Epistle in Bunsen's *Bibelwerk* (1864), vol. iv., gives the same construction to the passage; and so Professor Willibald Beyschlag of Halle, in his *Christologie des N. T.*, Berlin, 1866, p. 209 f.

Professor R. A. Lipsius of Jena, in the *Protestanten-Bibel Neuen Testamentes* (1872-73), p. 572, translates: "Der da

ist über Alles, Gott, sei gelobt in Ewigkeit"; Volkmar, *Römerbrief* (Zürich, 1875), p. 32: "Der über Allen seiende Gott sei gelobt in Ewigkeit!" His comment is (p. 97): "Der Gott, der über *allen* (Völkern) waltet, sei dafür gepriesen, dass er aus Israel den Heiland (für Alle) hervorgehen liess." The Rev. John H. Godwin, "Hon. Prof. New Coll., Lond.," and Congregational Lecturer, translates, "God who is over all be praised for ever. Amen," and has a good note. (*Ep. to Rom.*, London, 1873.) Professor Lewis Campbell, the editor of Sophocles, in the *Contemporary Review* for August, 1876, p. 484, adopts the rendering of Professor Jowett. The Rev. Joseph Agar Beet, Wesleyan Methodist, in a Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans of very marked ability (London, 1877, 2d ed., 1881), defends this view in an excellent note (pp. 267-272, 2d ed.). The same construction is followed in Herm. Bartels's *Exeget. Uebersetzung des Briefes*, etc. (Dessau, 1878), which I mention because Professor Woldemar Schmidt of Leipzig, in a notice of the book (*Theol. Literaturzeitung*, 1879, No. 22), expresses his approval of this. C. Holsten, in an article in the *Jahrbücher f. prot. Theol.*, 1879, p. 683, translates: "Der über allen Völkern waltende Gott (der doch Israels Volk so begnadet hat) sei gepriesen in Ewigkeit!"

Some of the best recent *translations* adopt this construction of the passage; e.g. *Het Nieuwe Testament*, etc. (published by the authority of the General Synod of the Dutch Reformed Church), Amsterdam, 1868: "Hij, die over alles is, God, zij geprezen tot in eeuwigheid!" and the versions by Dr. George R. Noyes (Boston, 1869), Hugues Oltramare (Genève, 1872), "Que celui qui gouverne toutes choses, Dieu, en soit béni éternellement!" Carl Weizsäcker, *Das N. T. uebersetzt*, Tübingen, 1875, and Dr. Samuel Davidson, London, 1875, 2d ed. 1876.

No one who knew the scholarship and the impartiality of the late Dr. Noyes will wonder that I have cited him here. A dispassionate, judicial spirit in the examination of such questions as the one before us is not the exclusive possession of the Dean of Chichester and of "the Church" in

distinction from "the Sects," though there are many noble examples of it in the Church of England.

Among critical *editors* of the Greek Testament who have placed a period after *πάντα*, making the passage a doxology to God, I may mention Harwood (1776), Lachmann (1831-50), Schott (4th ed., 1839), Tischendorf (1841-73), Murali (1846-48), Buttman (1856-67), Aug. Hahn, assisted by his son G. L. Hahn (1861), Kuenen and Cobet (1861), and Westcott and Hort (1881) in their margin, representing the judgment of Dr. Hort.

To these authorities may be added the names of the grammarians Winer and Wilke. See Winer, *Gram.*, 7te Aufl., 1867, §§ 61, 3, e., and 64, 2, b., pp. 513, 545, or 551, 586 Thayer, 690, 733 Moulton; and Wilke, *Hermeneutik* (1844), ii. 88.

It is worthy of notice that many scholars who had already in their publications adopted or even strongly contended for the common construction of this passage, afterwards saw reason to change their minds. Such was the case with Eckermann, De Wette, Meyer, Rückert, Bretschneider, Schott, Krehl, Hahn (perhaps both father and son); and it is so with Ritschl, as I am assured by a very intelligent student (the Rev. Alfred Gooding), who took full notes of his exegetical lectures on Romans in the semester of 1879-80. I know of only one instance of a conversion in the opposite direction, that of Dr. G. V. Lechler, who, in the first edition of his *Das apost. u. das nachapost. Zeitalter* (1851), pp. 38, 39, made the last part of the verse a doxology to God, but in the second edition (1857), p. 63 f. [and 3d ed. (1886), Eng. trans., vol. ii. p. 27 f.], applies it to Christ. He expressly admits, however, as regards the two opposing views, that "sprachlich und logisch sind beide gleichberechtigt."

"The awful blindness and obstinacy of Arians and Socinians in their perversions of this passage," says the Scotch commentator Haldane, "more fully manifest the depravity of human nature, and the rooted enmity of the carnal mind

against God, than the grossest works of the flesh." * "The dishonest shifts," says Dean Burgon, "by which unbelievers seek to evacuate the record which they are powerless to refute or deny, are paraded by our Revisionists in the following terms." † (Here Mr. Burgon quotes the margin of the Revised Version at Rom. ix. 5, regarding these renderings as "not entitled to notice in the margin of the N. T.," and their admission as "a very grave offence.") *Σὺ τις εἶ, ὁ κρῖνων ἀνθρώπων αἰκέτηρ, ὁ κητήτωρ τῶν ἀδελφῶν ἡμῶν.* (Rom. xiv. 4; Rev. xii. 10.)

In contrast with these utterances, not addressed to the reason of men, and not adapted to promote Christian charity or Christian humility, it is refreshing to read a discussion so calm, so clear, so fair, and so able as that of Professor Dwight.

NOTE A. (See p. 346.)

On the Punctuation of Rom. ix. 5 in Ancient MSS.

In regard to the punctuation of this passage in ancient MSS., though the matter is in itself of little importance, it may be well to correct some current errors, especially as the supposed absence of a point after *σάρκα* in the MSS. has been urged as an objection to the construction which makes the *ὁ ὢν, κ. τ. λ.* a doxology to God. For example, Dr. Gifford, the latest commentator, speaks of the stop after *σάρκα* as found simply "in two or three inferior MSS.," while Mr. Burgon, in the *Quarterly Review* for January, 1882, says "the oldest codices, besides the whole body of the cursives [the Italics are his], know nothing about the method of 'some modern Interpreters'" (referring to the margin of the Revised Version); and he remarks in a note, "C alone has a point between *ὁ ὢν ἐπὶ πάντων* and *Θεὸς ἐβλογητὸς εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας*. But this is an entirely different thing from what is noted in the margin." (p. 54.)

The facts of the case do not accord with these statements. In the first place, C, according to Tischendorf's very careful edition of this MS. (Lips. 1843), has no point after *πάντων*, and there can be little doubt that such a stop exists only in Mr. Burgon's very lively imagination; it *does* have, on the other hand, as Tischendorf's edition shows, both a point and a space after *σάρκα*, unquestionably a *prima manu*. The Alexandrian MS. (A) has also a point after *σάρκα*, as appears by Woide's edition (1786), by the recent photograph published by the

* *Exposition of the Ep. to the Romans*, Am. reprint of the fifth Edinburgh edition, p. 454.

† *The Quarterly Review* for January, 1882, p. 54 [see *The Revision Revised*, p. 221]; see also the same for April, 1882, p. 370 [*The Revision Revised*, p. 353 f.].

British Museum (1879), and by the express testimony of Dr. Vance Smith and of Dr. Sanday, who says, "The point is clearly marked, and it is evidently by the first hand." (*The Expositor*, Sept., 1879, x. 235.) This fact has been overlooked both by Tischendorf and by Westcott and Hort. There is, moreover, a point after *σάρκα* in the Vatican MS. (B), which, though it does not appear in the Roman edition, is amply attested by Dr. Vance Smith from personal inspection (*The Expositor*, May, 1879, ix. 399), comp. his *The Spirit and the Word of Christ*, London, 1874, p. 138, and by others. This point also, from the description of it, seems to be probably by the first hand, though more careful examination and comparison may be required to settle the question.* The Clermont MS. (D) ends a stichometric line at *σάρκα*, but this does not determine the construction of what follows. The Sinaitic MS. has only a single point (after *ὅτι*, Rom. ix. 20) in the whole page containing the passage, 4 cols. of 48 lines each, from Rom. viii. 38 *ὅτε ἐνεστώτα ἀγνοοῦντες*, x. 3, inclusive. It is therefore neutral. The same is true for a different reason of F and G, in which the numerous points are distributed in the most arbitrary manner, so that, although they each have a point after *σάρκα*, it counts for nothing. We have no report of K, collated by Matthæi, who does not record the punctuation of MSS. L, the remaining uncial, which has a point after *σάρκα* according to Tischendorf. There is no break between *ὁ ὢν* and *ἀπὸ* in A, B, C.

As to the cursive MSS., their punctuation has been very rarely noted by collators. The sweeping statement of Mr. Burgon is made

* The facts as to the Vatican MS. are these. Tischendorf, who has given the most careful attention to its paleography, states that "ipsam primam manum passim, in nonnullis libris haud raro interpunxisse, sine ulla dubitatione asseverandum est." (*M. T. Vat.* p. xx.; comp. p. xxi.) The later hand, of the tenth or eleventh century, has but rarely supplied points. (*Ibid.*) The original scribe indicates a pause, sometimes by a small space simply; sometimes by such a space with a point, and sometimes by a point with a *very* small space between the letters or none at all. Of the latter (there are two unquestionable examples by the first hand in Tischendorf's fac-similes, made from parts of the MS. which, having been accidentally repeated, were wholly untouched by the corrector and freshener of the ink; namely, after the word *ἀφελήμα* in Rom. iv. 4 (cod. p. 1448), where there is no space, and after *κρίται* in 2 Cor. iii. 15 (cod. p. 1479), where the space is exceedingly small. Tischendorf was unable to examine carefully the punctuation of the MS. beyond the end of the Gospel of Luke, but he observed that punctuation was much more frequent in the Epistles than in the Gospels. I notice that in the Roman edition there are twelve points on the page (p. 1453) that contains Rom. ix. 5, extending from Rom. viii. 23 (*ἵνα*) to *μητις* γὰρ, ix. 11, inclusive. There is no extra space after *σάρκα*, but perhaps that does not diminish the probability that the point is by the first hand. There is no extra space, as we have seen, after *σφείλημα* in Rom. iv. 4; and Tischendorf observes (*Nov. Test. Sin.* p. xis.) that there are points with no space in the Sinaitic MS. after the words *πονηρία κακία πλεονεξία* Rom. i. 29. On the page of B (1453) which contains Rom. ix. 5 there is no extra space in the printed edition with the point after *ἀπεκδέχουθε*, col. 1, l. 12, or after *τρεῖς*, col. 3, l. 28. It will be observed that all the words which have been mentioned end with the letter A, which on account of its peculiar form in the uncial MSS. did not need any extra space for the insertion of a point after it at the top of the line, the shape of the letter necessarily leaving a space there. But the absence of extra space after the letter would render it less likely that the late corrector would insert a point after it.

It is expressly stated by a gentleman who recently examined the MS., and whose letter from Rome I have been permitted to see, that the point after *σάρκα* "is of lighter color than the

entirely at random. But a point after *σάρκα* is found in at least six cursives, namely: No. 5 (collated by Scholz), 47 (by Griesbach), 71, 77, 80, and 89 (by Birch); also in the beautiful Greek Praxapostolos or Lectionary of the twelfth century belonging to the Library of Harvard College (pp. 150, 151), and the fine Lectionary in the Astor Library (p. 117), assigned to the eleventh century (?), formerly in the possession of the Duke of Sussex. In the Harvard Lectionary there is also a point after *θεός*, which is not the case in the Astor Library MS.* A point has also been noted after *θεός* in 17 (Griesb.), and after *πάντων* in 71 (Birch)†

Incorrect statements are often made in regard to the extreme rarity of punctuation in our oldest New Testament MSS. I therefore note the fact that, on the page of the Alexandrian MS. (A) which contains our passage, extending from Rom. viii. 21 *ἀλλὰ δια τῶν ὑποταξάντων τοῦ πρῶτου τοῦ θεοῦ* . . . ix. 11, there are sixty-four points in Woide's edition; in the Ephraem MS. (C) from Rom. viii. 27 *ὁ δὲ ἐρευνῶν τοὺς ἀνθρώπων* ix. 5 in Tischendorf's edition there are forty-five points; for B see above. In the three pages of Paul's Epistles in B published by Tischendorf line for line in his *Appendix codic. celeb. Sin. Vat. Alex.* (1867), p. 1445 (Rom. i. 1-26) has fifteen points which he regards as a *prima manu*; p. 1460 (Rom. xv. 24-xvi. 17) has thirty-five; p. 1506 (Col. iv. 8-1, Thess. i. 8), with more than half a column blank, has seventeen. These pages, however, were selected partly on account of their exceptional frequency of punctuation.

The truth is that this whole matter of punctuation in the ancient MSS. is of exceedingly small importance, which might be shown more fully, had not this paper already extended to an excessive length. In the first place, we cannot infer with confidence the construction given to the passage by the punctuator, the distribution of points even in the oldest MSS. is so abnormal; in the second place, if we could, to how much would his authority amount?

All that I have argued from the point after *σάρκα* in A, B, C, L, etc., is that a pause after that word was felt by ancient scribes to be natural.

adjoining letters," and that it was certainly much fainter than a point in the space after *ἡμῶν* on the same page," which was as black as the touched letters."

Since the above was printed, the point after *σάρκα* has been very carefully examined by Professor Ubaldo Ubaldi, of the Collegio Romano, and Father Cozza, one of the editors of the Vatican MS. They compared it, at my suggestion, with the twelve points represented in the printed edition of the MS. on the same page (1453), and also with the points, unquestionably a *prima manu*, after *ὑποτάξάντων*, Rom. iv. 4, and after *κεῖται*, 2 Cor. iii. 15. The result is that the point after *σάρκα* is undoubtedly by the first hand, the pale ink of the original being only partially covered, as in other cases on the same page, by the black ink of the late scribe who retouched the ancient writing throughout the MS.

* For a careful copy of that part of the Astor Library MS. which contains Rom. ix. 4, 5, I am indebted to the kindness of the Rev. S. M. Jackson.

† It may be added, that out of six cursive MSS. examined for me by Dr. C. R. Gregory, viz., Brit. Mus. Add. 5106, 7112, 11837, 17469, Curzon 71. 6, and Act. 20 (Paul. 25), all but the last have a colon after *σάρκα*, and the last MS. is almost illegible in this place. [See p. 432 below.]

NOTE B. (See p. 363.)

On the Distinction between εὐλογητός and εὐλογημένος.

The distinction between *εὐλογητός* and *εὐλογημένος* is dwelt upon by Philo, *De Migr. Abrah.* c. 19, Opp. i. 453, in his remarks on Gen. xii. 2. The former word, according to him, describes one who by nature or character is *worthy* of praise or blessing, *εὐλογίᾳ ἄξιός*; the latter, one who is in fact praised or blessed, whether rightfully or otherwise. In other words, *εὐλογητός*, in doxologies, would be *laudandus* or *laude dignus*; *εὐλογημένος* *laudatus*. So Theodore of Mopsuestia on Eph. i. 3 explains *εὐλογητός* as *τοῦ ἐπαινεῖσθαι καὶ θαυμάζεσθαι ἄξιός*. (Migne, *Patrol. Gr.* lxi. 912.) It is true that in classical Greek verbals in *-τός*, like the Latin participles in *-tus*, have generally a simply passive signification; but we find exceptions, particularly in the later Greek, and especially in the case of words analogous in meaning to *εὐλογητός*. See in the Lexicons *ἀνετός*, *ἐπαινετός*, *ἐπικρανετός*, *ἐγκρανετός*, *ζήλωτός*, *θαυμαστός*, *μακαριστός* (2 Macc. vii. 24), *μεμπτός*, *ψεκτός*, *μωπητός*, *σπυρητός*, *ἑνωτός*, *ἐπερμηνητός*. On *ἐπαινετός* and *ψεκτός*, see Philo, *ubi supra*. (See also Kühner, *Ausführl. Gram.*, 2te Aufl., i. 716.) This view is confirmed by the fact that we never find *εὐλογητός* used like *εὐλογημένος* with *εἶη* or *ἔστω*; wherever the verb is expressed with *εὐλογητός* it is always in the indicative. For example, in Rom. i. 25, *τὸν κτίσαντα, ὃς ἔστιν εὐλογητός εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας*, it is surely more natural to take *εὐλογητός* as signifying "to be praised," *laudandus*, than actually "praised," *laudatus*. See Fritzsche and Van Hengel *in loc.*, the latter of whom cites the passage of Philo referred to above. So in other doxologies we find the indicative, *εὐλογητός εἶ*, Ps. cxviii. (cxix.) 12; Judith xiii. 17; Tob. iii. 11; viii. 5, 15, 16, 17; xi. 13; Orat. Azar. 2; Cant. trium puer. (Fritzsche), 28, 30-33; 1 Esdr. iv. 60; 1 Macc. iv. 20; Const. Apost. vii. 34, 49; Act. Phil. c. 26; Lit. S. Jac. in Hammond's *Antient Liturgies* (Oxford, 1878), pp. 25, 26, 28, 31, 33, 38, 39, 53, 54; Lit. Const. (Anaph. S. Chrys.), p. 119; (Anaph. S. Basil.) p. 128; Lit. S. Marci, p. 179; and so *ὁ ὢν εὐλογητός*, 2 Cor. xi. 31; Lit. S. Marci, pp. 176, 192. This is the view of many excellent scholars besides Fritzsche and Van Hengel; as Erasmus, Beza (on Mark xiv. 61), Crell on Rom. ix. 5, Tholuck, Rückert, and the lexicographers Schleusner, Wahl, Bretschneider, and Robinson. On the other side there are indeed very eminent names, as Grimm in his *Lex.*, Meyer, De Wette and Philippi on Rom. i. 25, and Harless on Eph. i. 3; but I find no argument in any of them except Harless, and his arguments seem to me of little weight. They rest mainly on the assumption that *εὐλογητός* is taken to mean "one who *must* be praised" instead of "one to whom praise is *due*." That the latter conception of God may naturally be expressed in a doxology is shown by Rev. iv. 11, *ἄξιός εἶ, ὁ κύριος καὶ θεὸς ἡμῶν, λαλοῦν τὴν δόξαν, κ. τ. λ.*; comp. Rev. v. 12. See also Ruinart, *Acta Martyrum*, ed. Galura, ii.

186 (S. Bonifatius, § 12), *ὅτι σοὶ πρέπει τιμῆ, κ. τ. λ.*, and iii. 62 (SS. Tarachus, Probus, etc., § 11), *ὅτι αὐτῷ πρέπει δόξα, κ. τ. λ.*; Const. Ap. vii. 48; Act. Barn. c. 26; Act. Joh. c. 22; Protev. Jac. c. 25, § 2, MSS.; Act. Pil. A. c. 16, § 8, MSS.; Narr. Jos. c. 5, § 4. I accordingly agree with Buttmann, *N. T. Gram.*, p. 120 (137 Thayer), that in doxologies with *εὐλογητός* we are to supply *ἵστω* rather than *εἴη* or *ἴστω*. The sentence is therefore, in these cases, grammatically considered, declarative, not optative, though the whole effect of the original is perhaps better given by rendering "be blessed" than "is to be praised." Compare further 1 Pet. iv. 11; Matt. vi. 13 (Text. Rec.); Clem. Rom. *Ep. ad Cor.* c. 58 (new addit.; *contra*, c. 32); and see Lightfoot's note on Gal. i. 5.

We must notice the difference in meaning, not affecting however the position of the words, between *εὐλογητός* in the Septuagint when applied to men, as in Gen. (xii. 2, variante lectione) xxiv. 31 (v. 1); xxvi. 29 (v. 1); Deut. vii. 14; (xxviii. 6, v. 1; xxxiii. 24, v. 1.); Judges xvii. 2 (v. 1); Ruth ii. 20; 1 Sam. xv. 13 (v. 1); Judith xiii. 18 (v. 1); Tobit xi. 16 (in one text), xiii. 12 (in one text), 18 (do.), and when applied to God. In the former case, it is used in the sense of "prospered," "blessed" (namely, by God), and is to be taken, probably, in a simply passive sense; *εὐλογημένος* often occurs as a various reading. As applied to God, I believe Philo's distinction holds good. In the particular case, however, to which he refers, Gen. xii. 2, where he reads *εὐλογητός* (so many other authorities, see Holmes), applied to Abraham, his exposition is fanciful. In several cases the terms may seem to be intentionally distinguished; see Gen. xiv. 19, 20; 1 Sam. xxv. 32, 33; Tobit xi. 16, Sin.; *contra*, Judith xiii. 18.

One other remark may be made. In speaking of *εὐλογητός* and similar words in "exclamatory doxologies" (see Dr. Dwight as above, pp. 31-39), we must guard against a fallacy. "Exclamatory" as applied to sentences denotes a characteristic which exists in very different degrees in different cases; where one printer would use a mark of exclamation, another would often put a period. Because the placing of such a predicate as *εὐλογητός* first in the sentence gives or tends to give it an exclamatory character, we cannot straightway draw the inference that in *all* doxologies in which the verb is omitted *εὐλογητός*, if used, must have the first place. One may admit that in exclamatory doxologies *εὐλογητός* always stands first, and deny that the doxology in Rom. ix. 5 is exclamatory. The elliptical word I suppose to be *ἴστί*, as in most at least of the clauses immediately preceding.

XVII.

RECENT DISCUSSIONS OF ROMANS IX. 5.

[From the *Journal of the Society of Biblical Literature and Exegesis* for 1883.]

SINCE the publication of the articles on Rom. ix. 5 in the *Journal* of our Society for 1881, there have been several discussions of the passage which seem worthy of notice, especially as in some of them those articles have been quoted with approval or criticised. The venerable pastor and Professor of Theology in the University of Geneva, Hugues Oltramare, has a long and able note upon it in his recent elaborate and valuable *Commentaire sur l'Épître aux Romains* (2 vols., Geneva and Paris, 1881-82). He adopts the doxological construction, placing a period after *σάρκα*. In England, the marginal note of the Revisers appears to have given great offence in certain quarters. "I must press upon every reader," says Canon Cook, "the duty—I use the word 'duty' emphatically—of reading the admirable note of Dr. Gifford [on this passage] in the 'Speaker's Commentary.' I should scarcely have thought it credible, in face of the unanswered and unanswerable arguments there urged, that English divines would venture to have given their sanction to one of the most pernicious and indefensible innovations of rationalistic criticism." (*The Revised Version of the First Three Gospels*, London, 1882, p. 167, note.) Elsewhere he speaks of "the very painful and offensive note on Romans ix. 5, in the margin of the Revised Version" (*ibid.*, p. 194).

It appears that Canon Cook sent a challenge to Canon Kennedy, Regius Professor of Greek in the University of Cambridge, to meet the arguments of Dr. Gifford, and that this led to the publication of the first pamphlet to be

noticed, the title of which is given below.* Dr. Gifford replied to Professor Kennedy in a pamphlet of sixty-six pages; † and Professor Kennedy rejoined in a pamphlet of seventy-two pages, entitled *Pauline Christology*, Part I. ‡ We shall probably have in due time a surrejoinder by Dr. Gifford, and Part II. of Professor Kennedy's *Pauline Christology*.

Professor Kennedy translates the last part of Rom. ix. 5 as follows: "And of whom *is* the Christ as concerning flesh. He who is over all *is* God, worthy to be praised for ever. Amen." (*Sermon*, etc., p. 19.) As was remarked above, pp. 346, 385, there is no grammatical difficulty in this construction. But I cannot adopt the view which Professor Kennedy takes of the passage. He regards the last part of Rom. ix. 5 as added by St. Paul "to win the ear and gain the confidence of the Jews by declaring his adherence to doctrines which they prized, a Jewish Messiah, and one supreme God worthy to be praised for ever" (*Sermon*, p. 21; comp. pp. 20, 25, and *Pauline Christology*, I., p. 61.)

My objections to this view are: (1) that there was no need of Paul's declaring his adherence to doctrines which neither he nor any other Christian of that day was ever charged with questioning, the Jewish origin of the Messiah, and the unity of God; and (2) that the last clause of verse 5, according to Dr. Kennedy's construction, is not a direct affirmation of monotheism in distinction from polytheism, though monotheism is implied in the language.

Were Professor Kennedy's construction of the passage to be adopted, I should rather regard the *ὁ ὢν ἐπὶ πάντων* as having reference to God's providential government of the universe, and especially to his providential dealings with the Jews, in the revelations and privileges granted them with a view to

* *The Divinity of Christ*. A Sermon preached on Christmas Day, 1882, before the University of Cambridge. With an Appendix on Rom. ix. 5 and Tit. ii. 13. By Benjamin Hall Kennedy, D.D. . . . Printed by desire of the Vice-Chancellor. Cambridge, also London, 1883. 8vo. pp. vii, 32.

† . . . A Letter to the Rev. Benjamin Hall Kennedy, D.D., . . . in Reply to Criticisms on the Interpretation of Rom. ix. 5, in "The Speaker's Commentary." By Edwin Hamilton Gifford, D.D. . . . Cambridge, also London, 1883. 8vo. pp. 66.

‡ *Pauline Christology*, Part I. Examination of Romans ix. 5, being a Rejoinder to the Rev. Dr. Gifford's Reply. By Benjamin Hall Kennedy, D.D. Cambridge, etc., 1883. 8vo. pp. 72.

the grand consummation of them all in the advent of the Messiah, as the head of a new spiritual dispensation, embracing all men upon equal terms. The *ὢν*, in this connection, may include the past, present, and future; and we might paraphrase as follows, supplying what may naturally be supposed to have been in the mind of the Apostle: "He who is over all," He who has presided over the whole history of the Jewish nation, and bestowed upon it its glorious privileges; He whose hand is in all that is now taking place, who brings good out of evil, the conversion of the Gentiles out of the temporary blindness and disobedience of the Jews; He whose promises will not fail, who has not cast off his people, and who will finally make all things redound to the glory of his wisdom and goodness, "is God, blessed for ever. Amen."

But with this understanding of the bearing of the *ὁ ὢν ἐπὶ πάντων*, it seems more natural to regard the enumeration of the distinctive privileges of the Jews as ending with *εἰς ὃν ὁ χριστός τὸ κατὰ σάρκα*, and to take the last clause as a doxology, prompted by the same view of the all-comprehending, beneficent providence of God, and the same devout and grateful feeling, which inspired the doxology at the end of the eleventh chapter.

Professor Kennedy is a devout believer in the doctrine of the Trinity, and the deity of Christ; and one cannot help admiring the conscientiousness and sturdy honesty which lead him, in the pure love of truth, to defend an unpopular view of this mooted passage. He speaks feelingly of "that mischievous terrorism, which, like carbonic dioxide in a crowded and closed room, pervades and corrupts with its stifling influence our British theological atmosphere." "Men," he says, "who judge of this verse as I do, and who publish and defend that judgment as I do, know that they have to encounter the open rage of a few, the suppressed displeasure of a great many, and the silence of masses, who, whatever they may think on one side or the other, yet for various private reasons consider 'golden silence' the safe course." (*Pauline Christology*, I., p. 3; comp. pp. 34, 38.)

It is not my purpose to enter into any detailed analysis or criticism of Professor Kennedy's pamphlets. He urges powerfully against Dr. Gifford's view the Pauline usage of *θεός*, and other considerations; but on some minor points takes positions which seem to me untenable, and exposes himself to the keen criticism of his antagonist, who is not slow to take advantage of any incautious expression. In the *Pauline Christology*, I., pp. 22, 23, he presents, though with some hesitation, an extraordinary view of the cause of Paul's grief expressed in Rom. ix. 2, 3; but I will not stop to discuss it. He also takes an indefensible position (*ibid.*, pp. 26, 32) in regard to Cyril of Alexandria, and draws, I conceive, an inference altogether false (pp. 28, 29) from the passages in *Origen against Celsus*, viii. 12 and 72. The former of these will be discussed hereafter in reply to Dr. Gifford: in the latter we have the expression *τοῦ ἐπὶ πᾶσι λόγου καὶ θεοῦ*, where the *ἐπὶ πᾶσι* belongs only to *λόγου*, not to *θεοῦ* also, as Professor Kennedy seems to understand it; comp. *Cont. Cels.* v. 4, *τοῦ . . . ἰσχυροῦ λόγου καὶ θεοῦ*. Christ, according to Origen, is *ὁ ἐπὶ πᾶσι κήρυξ*, and *ὁ ἐπὶ πᾶσι λόγος*, but not *ὁ ἐπὶ πᾶσι θεός*, which is, as Dr. Kennedy elsewhere observes, "the Father's express title, applied by Origen to the supreme God nearly 100 times." (*Pauline Christology*, I., p. 27.)

Professor Oltramare had not seen the articles in our *Journal*, but replies effectively on many points to the arguments of Godet and Dr. Gifford. I only note here that Oltramare, Dr. Gifford, and Professor Kennedy agree in taking *ὁ χριστός*, in ver. 5, not as a proper name, "Christ," but in the sense of "the Christ," "the Messiah," which the definite article suggests and the context requires, or at least favors.

Dr. Gifford's pamphlet is mainly occupied with a reply to Dr. Kennedy; but he bestows some criticisms on my paper in the *Journal* for 1881, of which it seems to me well to take notice. I regret to say that he also makes some complaints, which I must also consider.

He complains, first (*Letter*, p. 27), that in quoting a sentence of his (*Journal*, p. 91 [p. 337 above]) I have omitted

altogether the first part, in which the cause of Paul's anguish is said to be "the fall of his brethren."

I omitted it simply for the sake of brevity. I had already assumed this as the cause of his grief, at the beginning of the discussion (*Journal*, p. 91 [p. 336 f.]). I had expressly mentioned it as such, twice, on the very page (p. 91 [see as above]) containing my quotation from Dr. Gifford; it was implied in the clause "whom they have rejected," which I did quote; and it was a point about which there was no dispute. Every reader would take it for granted that when Paul's anguish was spoken of, it was his anguish on that account. Under these circumstances I fail to perceive how my omission of a part of Dr. Gifford's sentence, in which I had nothing to criticise, has given him any reasonable ground of complaint.

Here I observe that Dr. Gifford passes over without notice the first point of my criticism of his sentence (*Journal*, pp. 91, 92 [pp. 336, 337 above]). I still venture to think that it is not unworthy of attention.

Dr. Gifford next complains that after having once quoted the remainder of his sentence fully, I proceed to criticise it, omitting in my second quotation the words "whom they had rejected." I omitted this clause because, having been just quoted, it seemed unnecessary to repeat it; because it formed no part of the particular *privilege* of the Jews of which Dr. Gifford was speaking, the climax of which was expressed by the words "the *Divine* Saviour"; and because its omission was likely to make the point of my criticism strike the reader somewhat more forcibly. That I have done Dr. Gifford no injustice seems to me clear from the fact that, in the sentence quoted, "his anguish was deepened [not caused] most of all by the fact that their race gave birth to the Divine Saviour," the phrase "his anguish" can only mean "his anguish on account of the rejection of the Messiah by the great majority of his countrymen." This is also clearly implied in the first words of my criticism, "Paul's grief for his unbelieving countrymen, then." Not a word of my criticism, which Dr. Gifford seems to misunder-

stand, would be affected in the least by the insertion of the omitted clause.

Two typographical errors in Dr. Gifford's pamphlet give a false color to his complaint. He calls on the reader to "observe the note of admiration in place of the all-important words 'whom they had rejected.'" It stands *inside* of the quotation-marks in the sentence as he gives it, as if I had ascribed it to *him*, but *outside* in the sentence as printed in the *Journal*. Again, in quoting his own sentence from the Commentary on Romans, he omits the comma before "whom they have rejected," thus making the relative clause an inseparable part of the sentence, and aggravating my supposed offence in omitting it.

In commenting on Dr. Gifford's assertion that "Paul's anguish was deepened most of all by the thought that their race gave birth to the Divine Saviour, whom they have rejected," I had exclaimed, "Paul's grief for his unbelieving countrymen, then, had extinguished his gratitude for the inestimable blessings which he personally owed to Christ; it had extinguished his gratitude for the fact that the God who rules over all had sent his Son to be the Saviour of the world!" (*Journal*, p. 92 [p. 338 above].)

Dr. Gifford remarks, "Another note of admiration at Paul's ingratitude, a pure invention of Professor Abbot" (*Letter*, p. 28).

My critic appears to misunderstand me. I shall be very sorry if, through my unskilful use of irony of which Dr. Gifford speaks, any other reader has failed to perceive that my note of admiration is an expression of wonder that in his reference to the Jewish birth of the Messiah as deepening Paul's grief at the unbelief of his countrymen, and in his whole argument against a doxology, Dr. Gifford ignores the fact that THE ADVENT OF CHRIST, necessarily suggested by the words *καὶ ἐξ ἧν ὁ Χριστὸς τὸ κατὰ σάρκα*, was to the Apostle a cause of joy and gratitude immensely outweighing all temporary occasions of grief, and might well prompt an outburst of thanksgiving and praise to God. That the very language he uses did not suggest this is a marvel. He does not meet at all the point of my objection to his view.

It will be observed that I do not, with many commentators, regard the doxology here as simply or mainly an expression of gratitude for the distinctive privileges bestowed upon the Jews as a nation, and still less for the particular fact that, as Dr. Gifford expresses it (p. 30, and note in his Commentary), "Christ was born a Jew." That gratitude, not sorrow, was the predominant sentiment in the mind of the Apostle in view of these privileges I do not doubt; but these particular occasions for thankfulness were lost, I conceive, in the thought of the actual advent of Christ, incomparably the greatest and most joyful event in the history of the world, and the most glorious expression of God's love and mercy to man, for which eternal gratitude was due. It was this which prompted the song of the angels, "Glory to God in the highest," and which prompted here the doxology which so fitly closes the Apostle's grand historic survey of those privileges of his people, which were the providential preparation for it.

Let us now consider more particularly Dr. Gifford's arguments and criticisms.

JEWISH PRIVILEGES, AND CONNECTION OF THOUGHTS IN ROM. IX. 1-5.

Dr. Gifford assumes that the Apostle, in his enumeration of the privileges which God had bestowed on his nation, names them only as reasons for the deepening of his grief for the fall of his countrymen; and thus finds in vv. 1-5 of the chapter one unbroken strain of lamentation, leaving no room for a doxology.

It appears to me that this is a very narrow view of what was probably in the Apostle's mind, and that there are other aspects of these privileges, which the way in which they are mentioned would more naturally suggest to the reader, and under which it is far more probable that the Apostle viewed them here. As I have elsewhere observed, the *manner* in which he recites them is not that of one touching upon a subject on which it is painful to dwell. To say nothing here of the *οἶκτον*, observe the effect of the repe-

tion of the *et* and the *qui*. Let us consider some of these other aspects.

(1) The privileges of the Jews which the Apostle recounts were the glory of their nation, distinguishing it above all the other nations of the earth. This detailed enumeration of them, so evidently appreciative, was adapted to gratify and conciliate his Jewish readers, and to assure them of the sincerity of his affection for his countrymen. It was also adapted to take down the conceit of his Gentile readers, who were prone to despise the Hebrew race.

(2) These privileges had been the source of inestimable blessings to the Israelites in the course of their long history. (See Rom. iii. 1, 2.) Through them the worship of one God, who rewarded righteousness and punished iniquity, was preserved in their nation.

(3) They were parts of a great providential plan which was to find and had found its consummation in the advent of the Messiah, "the unspeakable gift" of God's love and mercy.

(4) They were tokens of the Divine favor to the Jews as a nation, and especially to their pious ancestors, which gave assurance to Paul that God would not cast off his people, whom he had chosen; that they were still "beloved for the fathers' sake"; that the present unhappy state of things was only temporary, and that, finally, all Israel should be saved.

The first three aspects of these privileges are obvious, and would naturally suggest themselves to every reader of the Epistle; the fourth we have strong reasons for believing to have been also in the mind of the Apostle. (See the eleventh chapter.)

Here I must express my surprise at the manner in which Dr. Gifford has treated my quotations from the eleventh chapter in reference to this last-mentioned aspect of the Jewish privileges. (*Letter*, p. 26 f.) He omits entirely my statement of the purpose for which I introduce them (*Journal*, p. 92 [p. 338 above]), though this is absolutely essential to the understanding of what is meant by "this view" in the

first sentence which he quotes from me; and then, wholly without ground, represents me as teaching two things: (1) "that as we read the simple enumeration of Jewish privileges in vv. 3, 4 [he means vv. 4, 5], we are not to connect it, as is most natural, with the preceding context." How can he say this, when in the whole treatment of the subject (*Journal*, pp. 88 f. [p. 333 f.], 91 [337], 2d paragr., 104, 105 [p. 353 f.]), I have taken particular pains to point out the connection of thought, and to show that my view of vv. 4, 5, agrees with the context? (2) That, "in order to understand the Apostle's meaning at this point, we must anticipate by an effort of our own imagination all the long-sustained argument . . . and the far-reaching prophetic hopes which make up the three following chapters." If Dr. Gifford had not omitted the sentences in which I stated my purpose, it would be at once seen that I did not make these quotations to show what the *reader* of vv. 4, 5, is expected to draw from them by an effort of his own imagination, but what the *Apostle*, together with other things more obvious to the reader, may be reasonably supposed to have had in mind when he wrote. When a person treats at length of a subject on which he must have meditated often and long, meeting objections which he must have been frequently called upon to answer, I have been accustomed to suppose that what he actually says may afford some indication of what was in his mind when he began to write.

I admit that the privileges which the Jews enjoyed as a nation may be regarded as having incidentally aggravated the sin and the shame of their rejection of the Messiah; that the contemplation of them under that aspect would have deepened in some measure the Apostle's grief; and that it is possible, though I see nothing which directly proves it, that he viewed them under this aspect here. Dr. Gifford's error, I conceive, lies in ignoring the other obvious aspects, under which they could be only regarded as occasions of thankfulness; and in not recognizing the well-known psychological fact that the same object of thought often excites in the mind at the same time, or in the most

rapid succession, mingled emotions of grief and joy and gratitude. One knows little of the deeper experiences of life who has not felt this. That this should be true here in the case of the Apostle who describes himself as "sorrowful, yet always rejoicing," who exhorts his Christian brethren to "rejoice evermore," and to "give thanks always for all things to God, the Father, in the name of our Lord Jesus Christ," cannot be regarded as strange or unnatural.

There is no incongruity between sorrow for the misuse of a great privilege, whether by ourselves or by others, and devout thankfulness to God for its bestowal. In a pious mind, these feelings would naturally co-exist. Take, for example, the privilege of having been born and educated in a Christian land, so sadly abused by the majority of those who enjoy it.

I may note here another fallacy which appears to me to lurk in the language Dr. Gifford uses respecting the Jewish privileges. He repeatedly speaks of them as "lost" (pp. 30, 34, 35), inferring that the remembrance of them can only deepen the Apostle's grief. But these privileges were distinctions and glories of the Jewish people which from their very nature could not be lost. They, and the blessings of which they had been the source, were facts of history. Even in the case of the unbelieving Jews, though abused, or not taken advantage of, they were not, properly speaking, "lost." The privileges themselves remained unchanged, a permanent subject of thankfulness to God. In Dr. Gifford's assumption that verses 4 and 5 are only a wail of lamentation, he ignores these obvious considerations.

I will here state briefly my view of the connection of thought between vv. 4, 5, of the ninth chapter, and what precedes.

In vv. 1-5 the purpose of the Apostle was to conciliate his Jewish-Christian readers, and in directly the unbelieving Jews,* by assuring them of his strong affection for his peo-

* Though the Epistle to the Romans was not addressed to unbelieving Jews, one object of it was to meet, and to enable its readers to meet, objections which the unbelieving Jews urged against Christianity, and which many Jewish Christians urged against Paul's view of it. The strength of the prejudice against himself personally which the Apostle of the Gentiles had to encounter is shown by the earnestness of his asseveration in ver. 1.

ple, and his appreciation of their privileges.* His affection is shown (1) by his deep sorrow for the unhappy condition of the great mass of his countrymen in their rejection of the Messiah (ver. 2); and (2) by his readiness to make any sacrifice, even that of his own salvation, were such a thing possible, if thereby he might bring them to Christ. His appreciation of their privileges is indicated by the detailed manner in which they are enumerated, and is distinctly expressed by the *αἰτίαις εἶσιν Ἰσραηλιταῖς* and what follows. The *αἰτίαις* shows that it is not merely because he belongs to the same nation with the Jews that he is ready to make such a sacrifice for them; but because their nation is *such* a nation, distinguished above all the other nations of the earth; a nation dedicated to God, whose whole history had been glorified by extraordinary marks of the Divine favor, a nation to which he is proud and thankful to belong. The *αἰτίαις* introduces the *distinguishing characteristic* of his *συγγενεῖς κατὰ σάρκα*. They are not merely fellow-countrymen, they are ISRAELITES; and as Philippi remarks, "In dem Namen Israelit lag die ganze Würde des Volkes beschlossen." So far as the word *αἰτίαις* indicates a *causal* relation, it strengthens the reason for the affirmation which *immediately precedes* (not directly that in ver. 2, to which Dr. Gifford refers it); it serves, as Tholuck remarks, "zur Begründung eines solchen Grades aufopfernder Liebe." Dr. Gifford's assumption that the memory of these privileges only deepened the Apostle's grief is not proved by the *αἰτίαις*, and really rests on no evidence.

So much for the connection of vv. 4, 5, with what precedes. How naturally the doxology at the end was suggested, and the reason for the position of *ἐνδοχῆτος*, are

* So Theophylact, on vv. 1, 2: *Μέλλει προῶν δεῖξαι, ὅτι ἂν πάντες αἱ ἐξ Ἀβραάμ σπερμα αὐτοῦ εἴσι. Καὶ ἵνα μὴ δόξη κατ' ἐμπάθειαν ταῖτα λέγειν, προλαμβάνει, καὶ λέγει περὶ τῶν Ἑβραίων τὰ χρηστότερα, τὴν ἐπαύριον ταύτην ἀναιμῶν, καὶ ἠμοσχευῖ αὐτοὺς ἕπερ, θαλλόντως φιλεῖν. And on vv. 4, 5: Ἐπαινῶ τοὺς τοῦτοιοῦς ἐν ταῖθα καὶ μεγαλύνει, ἵνα, ὅπερ ἔφην, μὴ δόξη κατ' ἐμπάθειαν λέγειν. Ἰπέρβα δὲ καὶ ἐπαινιττεται, ὅτι ἂ μὲν θεὸς ἠξοῖ ταῦτα αὐτοὺς σωθῆναι, κ.τ.λ. So also, in the main, Theodorct, Calvin, Locke, and especially Flacius Illyricus, whose notes on vv. 1, 3, and 4 are very much to the point. Dr. Hodge has stated his view of the Apostle's purpose in almost the same language as I have used above. (See *Journal*, p. 91, note [p. 337 above]; see also Dr. Dwight, *ibid.*, p. 41.)*

pointed out on pp. 88 f., 90 ff., and 104 f. of the *Journal* [pp. 334, 336 ff., 353 f. above], and I need not repeat what is there said.

ὁ ὢν.

In Dr. Gifford's remarks on ὁ ὢν (p. 46), he speaks of my "gratuitous assumption that ὁ ὢν, in this passage, 'admits of being regarded as the subject of an independent sentence,' and affirms that this "is simply . . . begging the whole question in dispute." It is so if "admits of being regarded" is synonymous with "must be regarded"; not otherwise. That ὁ ὢν, grammatically considered (and it is of this point that I was speaking), may either refer to the preceding ὁ χριστός, or introduce an independent sentence, is simply a thing plain on the face of the passage. If Dr. Gifford denies this, he not only contradicts the authorities he cites, who only contend that it is *more* naturally connected with what goes before, but virtually charges such scholars as Winer, Fritzsche, Meyer, Ewald, Van Hengel, Professor Campbell, Professor Kennedy, Professor Jowett, Dr. Hort, Lachmann, and Kuenen and Cobet, with ignorance or violation of the laws of the Greek language in the construction which they have actually given the passage.

In reply to Dr. Dwight, who admits that the construction of this passage is ambiguous, but makes a statement about "cases similar to that which is here presented," I remark that no similar case of ambiguity from the use of the participle with the article has ever, to my knowledge, been pointed out, so that we have no means of comparing this passage with a similar one. Dr. Gifford seems to argue from this (p. 46) that there is no ambiguity here. But I fail to perceive any coherence in his reasoning. He "concludes" that St. Paul "could not possibly have intended his words to bear" an ambiguous construction "in a passage of the highest doctrinal importance." Certainly. No writer, whose object is to express and not to conceal his thoughts, *intentionally* uses ambiguous language. But how does this prove that the language here is not actually ambiguous?

The fact that it is so is plain; and it is also obvious that, had the Apostle intended to express the meaning conveyed by Dr. Gifford's construction, all ambiguity would have been prevented by using *ὡς ἔστιν* instead of ὁ ὢν.

If Dr. Gifford's proposition, "The reference of ὁ ὢν not ambiguous" (p. 45), denies a *grammatical* ambiguity here, it denies, as I have said, what is plain on the face of the passage, and what is generally, if not universally, admitted by competent scholars; if, on the other hand, conceding the grammatical possibility of two different constructions of ὁ ὢν here, he affirms that there is no *real* ambiguity, because he deems the one he adopts the only one tenable, he simply begs the whole question.

It is true, as Dr. Gifford observes, that in the cases in the New Testament in which ὁ ὢν introduces an independent sentence no other construction is grammatically possible. But it is equally true, on the other hand, that in the cases in which ὁ ὢν refers to a preceding subject no other construction is grammatically possible. It follows that the examples of the use of ὁ ὢν in the New Testament do not help us to decide which of the two possible constructions is the more probable here. There are no "cases similar to that which is here presented." Dr. Gifford's claim that 2 Cor. xi. 31 is similar will be examined presently.

On what ground, then, is it affirmed that the construction which refers ὁ ὢν to ὁ χριστός is "easier" here than that which makes it the subject of an independent sentence? There is not the slightest grammatical difficulty in either. Nor is there the slightest difficulty in the latter construction, on account of the fact that the verb is not *expressed*. In the case of a doxology, which the Ἀμήν naturally suggests, the ellipsis of *ἔστιν* or *εἶναι*, when *εὐλογία* is employed, is the constant usage; nor is there any grammatical difficulty in the construction adopted by Professor Kennedy.

It has indeed been asserted by many, as by Dr. Gifford for example, that the construction of the ὁ ὢν for which he contends here is the "usual" one, and, therefore, more easy and natural. But the examples which I have cited of the

other construction disprove this assertion, and also show that, in general, the construction of the participle with the article in the nominative case, as the subject of an independent sentence, is much more common in the New Testament than that which refers it to a substantive preceding. (See *Journal*, p. 97 [above, p. 344].)

In one respect, and one only, so far as I can see, the construction which refers $\acute{\alpha}\ \acute{\omega}\nu$ to $\acute{\alpha}\ \chi\ \rho\ \iota\ \sigma\ \tau\acute{\omicron}\varsigma$ may be regarded as the more natural. It is the one which naturally presents itself first to the mind. But it has this advantage only for a moment. As the reader proceeds, he perceives at once that $\acute{\alpha}\ \acute{\omega}\nu$ may introduce an independent sentence, and the Ἀμήν suggests a doxology. Even more may be said: the separation of $\acute{\alpha}\ \acute{\omega}\nu$ from $\acute{\alpha}\ \chi\ \rho\ \iota\ \sigma\ \tau\acute{\omicron}\varsigma$ by $\tau\acute{\omicron}\ \kappa\alpha\tau\acute{\alpha}\ \sigma\acute{\alpha}\rho\kappa\alpha$, and the necessary pause after $\sigma\acute{\alpha}\rho\kappa\alpha$, might at once suggest that $\acute{\alpha}\ \acute{\omega}\nu$ (not "who is," but "he who is") may introduce a new sentence. But waiving this possibility, as soon as it is perceived that the passage admits grammatically of two constructions, the question which is the more natural does not depend at all on the fact that the one presented itself to the mind a moment before the other, but must be determined by weighing all the considerations which bear on the subject. One of these considerations, second to no other in importance, is Paul's use of language. In the eight preceding chapters of the Epistle the Apostle has used the word $\theta\ \acute{\epsilon}\ \omicron\varsigma$ as a proper name, designating the "one God, the Father," about eighty-seven times, and has nowhere applied it to Christ. Could anything then be more natural than for the primitive reader of the Epistle to adopt the construction which accords with this *uniform* usage of the writer?

On p. 48 Dr. Gifford claims that 2 Cor. xi. 31 is "exactly similar in form" to Rom. ix. 5, and therefore proves "that the clause $\acute{\alpha}\ \acute{\omega}\nu$ $\acute{\epsilon}\ \pi\acute{\iota}\ \pi\acute{\alpha}\nu\tau\omega\ \kappa\ \tau\ \lambda$. must, according to Paul's usage, be referred to the preceding subject $\acute{\alpha}\ \chi\ \rho\ \iota\ \sigma\ \tau\acute{\omicron}\varsigma$ "; and he again speaks of the "exact correspondence between the two passages." He overlooks two fundamental differences: (1) that in 2 Cor. xi. 31 the construction which refers the $\acute{\alpha}\ \acute{\omega}\nu$ to $\acute{\alpha}\ \theta\ \acute{\epsilon}\ \omicron\varsigma$ $\kappa\ \tau\ \lambda$. is the only one *possible*; and (2) that what precedes

the $\acute{\alpha}\ \acute{\omega}\nu$ does not, as he incorrectly affirms, form a sentence "grammatically complete," as in Rom. ix. 5; but, on the contrary, an essential part of the sentence, the object of the transitive verb $\alpha\ \delta\ \epsilon\ \iota\ \nu$ (namely, $\acute{\omega}\tau\ \epsilon\ \acute{\omega}\nu\ \psi\ \epsilon\ \iota\ \delta\ \omicron\mu\alpha\ \iota$), is separated from the verb which governs it by the clause introduced by $\acute{\alpha}\ \acute{\omega}\nu$.

DISTINCTION BETWEEN $\theta\ \acute{\epsilon}\ \omicron\varsigma$ AND $\kappa\ \epsilon\ \rho\ \iota\ \omicron\varsigma$.

In regard to the distinction between $\theta\ \acute{\epsilon}\ \omicron\varsigma$ and $\kappa\ \epsilon\ \rho\ \iota\ \omicron\varsigma$, which Dr. Gifford charges me with having "asserted in a most inaccurate form" (*Letter*, p. 12), I cannot perceive that he has pointed out any inaccuracy in my statement. That the word $\theta\ \acute{\epsilon}\ \omicron\varsigma$ in general expresses a higher dignity than $\kappa\ \epsilon\ \rho\ \iota\ \omicron\varsigma$ seems to me beyond question. The use of $\kappa\ \epsilon\ \rho\ \iota\ \omicron\varsigma$ in the Septuagint as a proper name, taking the place of Jehovah on account of a Jewish superstition respecting the pronunciation of the *tetragrammaton*, is something wholly exceptional and peculiar. I have not, however, as Dr. Gifford incorrectly represents, "suppressed all reference" to this very frequent use in the Septuagint and occasional use in the New Testament. I note the fact that "it is seldom used of God in the writings of Paul except in quotations from or references to the language of the Old Testament," and then remark upon its twofold use as applied to God in the Septuagint. (See *Journal*, p. 127 f. [above, p. 380].) That as a title of Christ it does not stand for Jehovah is fully shown, I think, by Cremer in his *Biblisches-theol. Wörterbuch der Neutest. Gräcität*, 3te Aufl., p. 483 ff. [4te Aufl., p. 520], or Eng. trans., 2d ed., p. 382 ff. The argument that as a designation of Christ in the writings of St. Paul it is equivalent to Jehovah, because in a very few places he applies to Christ language of the Old Testament in which $\kappa\ \epsilon\ \rho\ \iota\ \omicron\varsigma$ represents Jehovah, loses all its apparent force when we observe the extraordinary freedom with which he adapts the language of the Old Testament to his purpose without regard to its meaning in the connection in which it stands. On this it may be enough to refer to Weiss, *Bibl. Theol. of the N. T.*, 3d ed., § 74. He remarks: "Paul does not inquire into the original meaning of Old Testament expressions; he takes

them in the sense which he is accustomed to give to similar expressions, even in the case of such terms as *πίστις*, *κύριος*, *καυχήσασθε* (Rom. i. 17, ix. 33, x. 13, 15)."

In the passage of the Old Testament (Ps. cx. 1) which Christ himself has quoted (Matt. xxii. 43-45; Mark xii. 35-37; Luke xx. 41-44) as illustrating the meaning of *κύριος* as a designation of the Messiah, the Messiah (if the Psalm refers to him) is clearly distinguished from Jehovah, at whose right hand he sits, as he is everywhere else in the Old Testament.* This very passage is also quoted by the Apostle Peter as proving that "God hath MADE Jesus both Lord and Christ." When these and other facts are adduced to show that the term "Lord" as applied to Christ in the New Testament does not stand for Jehovah, but describes the dignity and dominion conferred upon him by God, Dr. Gifford simply remarks that "this reasoning has been employed again and again in the Arian and Unitarian controversies, and again and again refuted." I wonder how many of his readers would regard this as a satisfactory answer to my quotations (if he had *given* them) from the Apostles Peter and Paul, or are ready to assume, with St. Jerome, that *Dominatio* involves *Deitas*. The "refutations" to which Dr. Gifford refers, "again and again" repeated, do not appear to have been convincing to those to whom they were addressed.

Dr. Gifford refers to Waterland, Pearson, and Weiss. Weiss has already been sufficiently answered by Weiss; see above. Waterland and Pearson cite such passages as Hosea i. 7, "I will save them by Jehovah their God, and will not save them by bow, nor by sword, nor by battle, nor by horses, nor by horsemen," as proving that Jesus Christ is called Jehovah in the Old Testament. (Pearson, *Expos. of the Creed*, p. 217 f., Nichols's ed.) Pearson cites to the same purpose Zech. x. 12; Jer. xxiii. 5, 6 (comp. Jer. xxxiii. 15, 16); Zech. ii. 10, and other passages. Such exegesis might perhaps be pardoned in the time of Pearson and Waterland, though commentators like Calvin, Pocock, Dru-

* See, for example, Micah vi. 4: "And he shall stand and feed in the strength of Jehovah, in the majesty of the name of Jehovah, his God."

sius, Grotius, and LeClerc had rejected this wild interpretation; but it can hardly be supposed that it needs a formal refutation at the present day. It may be enough to refer Dr. Gifford to "The Speaker's Commentary" on the passages mentioned, and the note in the *Journal* for 1881, p. 124 [above, p. 376].

ORIGEN.

Dr. Gifford still appeals to Rufinus's translation of Origen's Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans as proving that Origen "certainly" interpreted the last part of Rom. ix. 5 as he does (*Letter*, pp. 32 ff., 65). His positiveness is not abated by the circumstance that Rufinus so altered, abridged, and interpolated this work of Origen, that for the most part we have no means of determining what belongs to Origen and what to Rufinus, and that his friends thought he ought to claim it as his own.*

Dr. Gifford gives his readers no hint of this important fact, of which he could not have been ignorant, and for which I had cited Matthæi, Redepenning, and Rufinus himself (*Journal*, p. 135). There is perhaps no higher authority in Patrology than Cave, who, in his list of Origen's writings, thus describes the work on which Dr. Gifford relies with so much confidence: "*In Epistolam ad Romanos Commentariorum tomi 20. quos PESSIMA FIDE A SE VERSOS MISERE INTERPOLATOS, DETRUNCATOS et ad mediam fere partem contractos edidit Rufinus, versione sua in 10. tomos distributa.*"—*Hist. Lit. s.v. ORIGENES*, i., 118 ed. Oxon. 1740. Thomasius, in his valuable work on Origen, was more prudent in his use of authorities. He says: "Am wenigsten aber wagte ich den Commentar zu den Römern zu benützen, der nach der *Peroratio Rufini in explanationem Origenis super Epist. Pauli ad Rom.* Vol. iv. eine gänzliche Umgestaltung durch den Uebersetzer erfahren zu haben scheint." (*Origenes* (1837), p. 90.) Even Burton, who, in his very

* "Adversus hanc audaciam excandescit Erasmus, nec immerito quidam Rufinum objurgarunt, quemadmodum ipse sibi objectum fuisse ait in peroratione sue translationis, quod suam potius, quam Origenis nomen hujus operis titulo non inscripsisset. Hinc etiam fit, ut vix Origenem in Origene reperias," etc. Lumper, *Hist. theol.-crit.*, etc., Pars ix. (1792), p. 101.

one-sided *Testimonies of the Ante-Nicene Fathers, etc.*, quotes largely from spurious works ascribed to Hippolytus and Dionysius of Alexandria without giving any warning to the reader, could not bring himself to cite Rufinus's transformation of Origen's Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans. (See *Testimonies, etc.*, 2d ed., p. 339.)

Dr. Gifford's citations from the treatise of Origen against Celsus do not appear to me to answer his purpose. He quotes passages (*Cont. Cels.* i. 60, 66; ii. 9) in which Origen has called Christ *θεός* but in the last one adduced (ii. 9) the words at the end of the sentence, *κατὰ τὸν τῶν ὅλων θεὸν καὶ πατέρα*, as De la Rue remarks, "manifestam continent antithesin ad ista, *ὡς ἄνω ὅσα δίδραμι καὶ θεός, ut pater supra filium exekatur.*"* What is wanted is to show that Origen has not merely given Christ the appellation *θεός*, "a divine being," in contradistinction from *ὁ θεός, ὁ τῶν ὅλων θεός, ὁ ἐπὶ πᾶσι θεός*, by which titles he constantly designates the Father, but that he has called him "God over all," as he is represented as making St. Paul do in this so-called translation of Rufinus. It is the Father alone who in the passages cited by Dr. Gifford (*Cont. Cels.* viii. 4, 12) is termed *ὁ ἐπὶ πᾶσι θεός*; in viii. 14 of the same treatise Origen emphatically denies that the generality of Christians regarded the Saviour as "the God over all"; and in the next section he expressly calls him

* De la Rue understands the *κατὰ* to denote "inferiorem ordinem," and says it is often so used. I doubt this, and, if the word is genuine, should rather take it as meaning "in accordance with the will of," or "by the will of," nearly as in the phrase *κατὰ θεόν* in Plato, Aristotle, and other Greek authors. But it seems to me very probable that the true reading is *μετά*; comp. Origen, *In Joannem*, tom. i. c. 11, τὸν μετὰ τὸν πατέρα τῶν ὅλων θεὸν λαλοῦν; Justin Mart. *Apol.* i. 32, ἢ πρώτη δόξα μετὰ τὸν πατέρα πάντων καὶ δεσπότην θεόν (and similarly *Apol.* i. 42, 13; ii. 13); Euseb. *De Eccl. Theol.* i. 20, p. 93 c, κίριος τῶν ὅλων μετὰ τὸν ἐπὶ πάντων θεόν. The prepositions *κατὰ* and *μετὰ* are very often confounded in MSS. by an error of the scribe, the abbreviations for the two words being similar. (Montfaucon, *Palaeogr. Graecae*, p. 345; Saba, *Specim. Palaeogr.*, Suppl., tabb. xi., xii.) See Bast ad Gregor. Corinth. ed. Schaefer (1814), pp. 89, 405, 825, and Irmisch's Herodian iv. 1638, who gives eight examples. Colet remarks: "Qui codices Graecos triverunt sciunt *κατὰ* et *μετὰ* compendiose sic scribi ut vix oculis discerni possint. Passim confundi solere sciunt omnes."—*Variae Lectiones*, in *Mnemosyne* vii. 391.

Dr. Gifford may prefer Burton's view, who says (*Testimonies, etc.*, 2d ed., p. 293) it "can only mean 'God after the pattern of the God of the universe.'" It would take too much space to give my reasons for differing from him. Martini says (p. 175), "Entweder ist es s. v. a. *per deum* [there is some mistake here, perhaps only a comma omitted] *cuius auctor est summus deus, oder secundum voluntatem summi dei.*" Mosheim renders it *nächst*; Rüssler, *nach*; Crombie and Professor Kennedy, *next to*. These translations rather represent *μετὰ*, but show what the translators thought the context to require, and may thus be regarded as confirming my conjecture.

"inferior" to the Father (*ἰπυδείστερος*), as he elsewhere speaks of him as *ἐλάττω πρὸς τὸν πατέρα* and *δευτεροῦ τοῦ πατρὸς* (*De Princip.* i. 3, § 5), and says that "he is excelled by the Father as much as (or even more than) he and the Holy Spirit excel other beings," and that "in no respect does he compare with the Father" (*οὐ συγκρίνεται κατ' οὐδὲν τῷ πατρί*, *In Joann.* tom. xiii. c. 25, Opp. iv. 235). It is not easy to believe that one who uses such language as this applied the last clause of Rom. ix. 5 to Christ.

In the passage *Cont. Cels.* viii. 4, I perceive no ground for regarding the titles *τὸν ἐπὶ πᾶσι θεόν τῶν θεῶν*, and *τὸν ἐπὶ πᾶσι κίριον τῶν κίριων*, as denoting equal dignity. The latter, high as it is, as applied to Christ, is far from proving that he might be called *ἐπὶ πάντων θεός*. The last sentence quoted by Dr. Gifford shows the distinction. The purport of it is that "he has risen to the GOD OVER ALL who worships HIM undividedly" (this is said in opposition to the worship of the heathen, distributed among many gods), "through him who alone leads men to God, namely, the Son, the God-Logos and Wisdom," etc. The relation of the Son to the Father, from whom he has derived all that makes him an object of worship, and whose image he is, is such, according to Origen, that the relative worship paid to him is all *ultimately* paid to the God over all, the Father, who alone is the Supreme Object of worship.

Still less, if possible, is the quotation from *Cont. Cels.* viii. 12 to Dr. Gifford's purpose. It teaches, he says, "that Christ is to be worshipped as being One with the Supreme God." "One" in what sense? Dr. Gifford omits the words that immediately follow, in which Origen cites Acts iv. 32, "And the multitude of believers were of one heart and one soul," as explaining the meaning of the words, "I and the Father are one."* A little further on Origen says: "We worship, then, the Father of the Truth, and the Son, who is the Truth; † two distinct persons, but one in agree-

* So in his *Comm. in Joann.* tom. xiii. c. 34, Opp. iv. 245, Origen explains John x. 30 as relating to the unity of *will* between the Father and the Son.

† Comp. Origen, *In Joann.* tom. ii. c. 18, Opp. iv. 76^b: ὁ πατήρ τῆς ἀληθείας θεός ἡμεῶν ἐστὶ καὶ μείζων ἢ [we should read, perhaps, ἢ ἢ] ἀληθεία: "the God who is the Father of the Truth is more and greater than the Truth."

ment of thought, and in harmony of feeling, and in sameness of will," ὅτι διὰ τῆ ἰσοστάσεως πράγματα, ἐν δὲ τῇ ἁμονίᾳ, καὶ τῇ συνωνίᾳ, καὶ τῇ παντοκρίᾳ τοῦ θεοῦ ἡμῶν; so that he who has seen the Son . . . has seen in him, who is the image of God, God himself."*

In the view of Origen, the moral union between the Father and the Son was perfect, so that the worship of the Son, regarded as the image of the Father, reflecting his moral perfections, his goodness and righteousness and truth, is virtually the worship of the Father himself; it terminates in him as its ultimate object. (See *Cont. Cels.* viii. 13, *ad fin.*)

Origen's ideas respecting the worship of the Son appear distinctly in what he says of prayer. In his treatise on Prayer, he teaches that prayer, properly speaking, is "perhaps never to be offered to any originated being, *not even to Christ himself*, but only to the God and Father of all, to whom our Saviour himself prayed and teaches us to pray." (*De Orat.* c. 15; *Opp.* i. 222.) There is much more to the same purpose. In his later work against Celsus, he says that "every supplication and prayer, and intercession, and thanksgiving is to be sent up to the GOD OVER ALL, *through* the High Priest, who is above all angels, the living Logos, and God. But we shall also supplicate the Logos himself, and make requests to him, and give thanks and pray, if we are able to distinguish between prayer properly speaking and prayer in a looser sense, ἵνα δυνώμεθα κατακρίνειν τῆς περὶ προσευχῆς κοινότητι, καὶ καταχρήσει." (*Cont. Cels.* v. 4, and see also v. 5, *Opp.* i. 580.) Compare *Cont. Cels.* viii. 26: "We ought to pray only to the GOD OVER ALL; yet it is proper to pray also to the only-begotten, the first-born of the whole creation, the Logos of God, and to request him, as a High Priest, to carry up our prayers which reach him to HIS GOD and our God." So *Cont. Cels.* viii. 13: "We worship the one God,

*It may be well to notice here an ambiguous sentence in this section, which has been translated, incorrectly, I think, "We worship one God, therefore, the Father and the Son, as we have explained." The Greek is, ἵνα ὅν θεόν, ὃν ἀποδεδώκαμεν, τὸν πατέρα [] καὶ τὸν υἱὸν θεοῦ προσκώμεν. We should, I believe, place a comma after πατέρα, and translate, "We worship, therefore, one God, the Father, and the Son." This is confirmed by what follows, cited above, and by the language used in the next section (c. 13): διὸ τὸν ἑνα θεόν, καὶ τὸν ἑνα ὄντα αὐτοῦ καὶ ζῶντα καὶ εἰκόνα . . . σέβουμεν.

and the one Son, who is his Logos and Image, with supplications and petitions as we are able, bringing our prayers to the GOD OF THE UNIVERSE *through* his only-begotten Son, to whom we first offer them; beseeching him, who is the propitiation for our sins, to present, as High Priest, our prayers and sacrifices and intercessions to the GOD OVER ALL."*

I do not see how any one can read these passages and regard it as probable, much less as *certain*, that Origen understood Paul in Rom. ix. 5 to describe Christ as ὁ ὢν ἐπὶ πάντων θεός, εἰς τὸν ἡμεῖς εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας. It is clear, at any rate, that he did not understand the passage as Dr. Gifford does (*Letter*, p. 3), as "a testimony to the CO-EQUAL GODHEAD of the Son."

Dr. Gifford's argument from the *Selecta in Threnos*, iv. 5, rests on a false assumption, which has been already sufficiently remarked upon.

PUNCTUATION IN MANUSCRIPTS.

On p. 36 of Dr. Gifford's *Letter*, speaking of punctuation in MSS., he observes that "it is universally acknowledged that no marks of punctuation or division were in use till long after the days of St. Paul." This remark, if intended to apply to Greek MSS. in general, is inaccurate, and indicates that Dr. Gifford has been misled by untrustworthy authorities. If it is intended to apply to New Testament MSS., I do not see how the fact can be proved, as we possess no MSS. of the New Testament of earlier date than the fourth century. But the essential point in Dr. Gifford's remarks is, that the punctuation in MSS. of the New Testament is *of no authority*. This is very true; and it should have been remembered by the many commentators (including Dr. Gifford) who have made the assertion (very incorrect in point of fact), that a stop after *ἀμήν* is found in only two or three inferior MSS. in Rom. ix. 5, as if that were an argument against a doxology here.

*It may be worth while to note that Origen (*Cont. Cels.* viii. 9) justifies the honor paid to the Son on the ground that he receives it by the appointment of the Father (ὁ πατὴρ ἐξουσιεῖ ὅτι ὑπὸ θεοῦ δέδοται αὐτῷ τὸ τιμᾶσθαι, citing John v. 23), and is declared by God to be ἄξιος τῆς δευτερευούσης μετὰ τὸν θεόν τῶν ἰσῶν . . . τιμῆς. (*Cont. Cels.* v. 57.)

The results of some recent investigation in regard to this matter are given in our *Journal* for 1882, p. 161 [p. 406f. above]. The investigation has since, through the kindness of Dr. C. R. Gregory, been carried somewhat farther. I can now name, besides the uncials A, B, C, L, the first three of which are not "inferior MSS.," at least twenty-six cursives which have a stop after *σάρκα*, the same in general which they have after *αἰῶνας* or *Ἄγιος*. In all probability, the result of an examination would show that three-quarters or four-fifths of the cursive MSS. containing Rom. ix. 5 have a stop after *σάρκα*.

In regard to Codex A, Canon Cook thinks the testimony of Dr. Vance Smith, whom Dr. Gifford cites as saying that the stop after *σάρκα* is "evidently a *prima manu*," is "not verified or likely to be verified." * Many others will question the testimony of a Unitarian heretic. It would have been only fair, therefore, to have added the fact, mentioned on p. 150 of the *Journal* [p. 407 above], that Dr. Sanday agrees with him. I would add that I am informed, on good authority, that Dr. Scrivener has examined the MS. at this place with the same result.

The whole matter is in itself unimportant; but it is important that writers like Dean Burgon should cease imposing upon unlearned readers by making reckless assertions about it.

VAN HENGEL ON THE τὸ κατὰ σάρκα.

As regards the limitation τὸ κατὰ σάρκα (*Letter*, p. 38 f.), the examples cited by Van Hengel from Plato's *Philebus* (c. 7, p. 17^a) and Isocrates (*Ad Nicocl.* c. 29 *al.* 30) in support of his view, and urged by Dr. Gifford in opposition to it, are, I think, not to the purpose on either side. The formulæ "A and also B," and "not only A, but B," into which the quotations, so far as they bear on the matter, may be resolved, do not express "antithesis," but agreement. Dr. Gifford's citation from Demosthenes (*Cont. Eubul.* p. 1229, l. 14) furnishes no analogy to the τὸ κατὰ σάρκα here, and is wholly

* Canon Cook, *Revised Version of the First Three Gospels*, p. 194; comp. p. 167.

irrelevant, for two reasons: (1) because the τὸ κατὰ ἡμᾶς [al. ἡμᾶς] is introduced with a *μὲν*, which of course leads one to expect an antithesis, such as follows, expressed by *δέ*; and (2) because the τὸ κατὰ ἡμᾶς is probably to be regarded as the direct object of the verb *θαρρῆν*, used here, as often, transitively, like its opposite *φοβησθαι*. Van Hengel's rule relates only to clauses like τὸ κατ' ἐμὲ, τὸ ἐξ ἡμῶν, in which the article τὸ with its adjunct is neither the object nor the subject of a verb, or at least of any verb expressed. (See Van Hengel, *Interp. Ep. Pauli ad Rom.* ii. 348.)

IRENÆUS.

As to the quotation of Rom. ix. 5 by Irenæus (*Haer.* iii. 16, § 3), I must still, for the reasons assigned in the *Journal* (p. 390 above), regard it as doubtful whether he referred the last clause of the verse to Christ. In opposition to the Gnostics who held that the Æon *Christ* first descended upon Jesus at his baptism, Irenæus is quoting passages which, like *ἐξ ὧν ὁ χριστός τὸ κατὰ σάρκα*, speak of the *Christ* as *born*. But why, Dr. Gifford asks, does he quote the remainder of the passage, if it had nothing to do with his argument? (*Letter*, p. 42.) I answer, he may well have included it in his quotation, if he regarded it as a doxology, or gave it Dr. Kennedy's construction, for the same purpose as Photius has quoted it in his work against the Manichæans (see *Journal*, p. 138 f. [p. 393 above]); namely, as confirming the doctrine insisted on throughout his book, that the God of the Jews, the God of the Old Testament, was not, as all the Gnostics contended, a being inferior to the Supreme God, but the God over all. So understood, it would agree with the language which Irenæus uses so often elsewhere, describing the Father as the God over all, while he nowhere, to my knowledge, speaks of the Son as God over all. I admit that Irenæus may have applied the last clause to Christ, separating the *θεός* from *ὁ ὧν ἐπὶ πάντων* as a distinct predicate; but I perceive nothing which determines with certainty the construction he gave it. The whole question is of the least possible consequence. One who could treat 2 Cor. iv. 4 as he has done (*Haer.* iii. 7,

§ 1; iv. 29, § 2) is certainly no authority in exegesis in a case where doctrinal prejudice could have an influence.

Dr. Gifford thinks that Irenæus "most probably" refers to Rom. ix. 5 when he says (*Haer.* iii. 12, § 9) that the mystery which was made known to Paul by revelation was that ὁ πατὴρ ἐστὶ θεὸς ὁ μόνος ἀείων κείνος, τῶν πάντων καὶ βασιλεὺς καὶ θεὸς καὶ ἡμεῖς ἴσμεν. He omits the words that *immediately* follow, preserved in the old Latin version: "ab eo qui est omnium Deus accipiens potestatem, quoniam subiectus factus est usque ad mortem, mortem autem crucis," where Christ as θεός is distinguished from him who is "omnium Deus," from whom he received his power. This does not go far towards proving that Irenæus would call *Christ* "God over all." I observe incidentally that Irenæus's explanation of "the mystery which was made known to Paul by revelation" (Eph. iii. 3) differs widely from that which Paul himself gives (Eph. iii. 6 ff.).

CLEMENT OF ROME.

Passing to p. 41 of Dr. Gifford's *Letter*, I remark that if Clement of Rome in the passage cited (*Cor.* c. 32) had Rom. ix. 5 in mind, as he probably did, and regarded the last clause as applicable to Christ, it would have been altogether to his purpose to have added it to the τὸ κατὰ σάρκα, his purpose being to magnify the distinctions bestowed by God on the patriarch Jacob. Dr. Gifford will not, I think, find many who regard the simple expression "the Lord Jesus" as equivalent to "He who is over all, God blessed for ever"; it is rather the equivalent of the Pauline ὁ χριστός, a title which, when it denotes the Messiah, involves lordship. So far, then, from inferring, as Dr. Gifford does, from this passage of Clement, that he "probably" (*Letter*, p. 65) applied the last clause to Christ, I should infer from his omitting it, where, thus understood, it would have been so much to his purpose, that he probably did *not*. This presumption would be confirmed by the way in which he speaks of Christ, and distinguishes him from God, throughout his Epistle.

THE NEWLY DISCOVERED QUOTATION OF ROMANS IX. 5 BY IRENÆUS.

Dr. Gifford (*Letter*, p. 41) adduces a passage from Irenæus, "which no one," he observes, "so far as I know, has hitherto noticed in this connection. Prof. Abbot indeed says (p. 136) that the only place where Irenæus has quoted Rom. ix. 5 is *Haer.* iii. 16 (*al.* 18), § 3. Alas! for the man who ventures on that spirited but dangerous hobby, the universal negative. These are the words of Irenæus in *Fragm.* xvii. (Stieren): ἐξ ὧν ὁ χριστὸς προετυπώθη καὶ ἐπετυπώθη καὶ ἐγενήθη. ἐν μὲν γὰρ τῷ Ἰωσήφ προετυπώθη· ἐκ δὲ τοῦ Δεῦ καὶ τοῦ Ἰούδα τὸ κατὰ σάρκα ὡς βασιλεὺς καὶ ἱερεὺς ἐγενήθη."

Dr. Gifford has fortunately given the Greek of the passage that is to put me to shame, and I have not the slightest apprehension that any reader of his *Letter* will call the fragment of Irenæus which he cites a quotation of Rom. ix. 5; at the very utmost, it could only be termed an *allusion* to that passage. The editor of the *Σεπτά* or *Catena* from which this fragment is taken (Nicephorus Theotoki), and the editors and translators of Irenæus, as Grabe, Massuet, Stieren, Migne, Harvey, Roberts and Rambaut, and Keble, though they all refer in the margin to supposed quotations, have failed to make any reference here to Rom. ix. 5. If it be a quotation, the discovery of the fact belongs probably to Dr. Gifford alone. It will be observed that Dr. Gifford spaces the letters in ἐξ ὧν ὁ χριστὸς as if they must be regarded as *quoted* from Rom. ix. 5. He does not note the fact that this fragment of Irenæus is part of a comment on Deut. xxvii. 12, and is given in a fuller form in a Latin translation by Franciscus Zephyrus or Zephyrius (= Zafiri) in his edition of a *Catena* on Deuteronomy, as cited by Grabe in his edition of Irenæus (p. 469). This reads: "Notandum, benedicti munus in TRIBUBUS demandatum, EX QUIBUS CHRISTUS designatus cognoscitur et generatur," etc., and shows how little the ἐξ ὧν, κ. τ. λ. has to do with Rom. ix. 5, and how groundless is the inference which Dr. Gifford draws from this accidental coincidence of expression.

Long before Dr. Gifford's *Letter* was published I had noted this fragment, together with a similar passage in Irenæus (*Hæc.* iv. 4, § 1), as examples of τὸ κατὰ σάρκα without an antithesis expressed, and had caused them to be printed among the Additions and Corrections in the number of the *Journal* for 1882, p. 160, referring to the *Journal* for 1881, p. 101. So far as they go, they both, I think, favor my view of the controverted passage rather than Dr. Gifford's. If they are to be regarded as *quotations* of Rom. ix. 5, they favor it more than I had supposed.

POSITION OF εὐλογητός.

In Dr. Gifford's remarks on the position of εὐλογητός (*Letter*, p. 54 f.), he maintains that in the text of the Septuagint, in Ps. lxxviii. 20 (Sept. lxxvii. 19), εὐλογητός should be read but once, and connected with what follows. For this, so far as I can ascertain, he has the authority of only two unimportant cursive MSS. (Nos. 183, 202),—in which the omission of one εὐλογητός is readily explained as accidental, on account of the *homotoleuton* or dittography,—in opposition to all the other known MSS. of the Psalms, more than a hundred in number, including the uncials, among them \aleph and B of the fourth century, and the Verona MS. of the fifth or sixth. (The Alexandrian MS. and the Zürich Psalter are mutilated here.) The omission of the first εὐλογητός, moreover, leaves the κίριος ὁ θεός simply hanging in the air, without any construction. To adopt such a reading in the face of such evidence is to do violence to all rational principles of textual criticism. The difference between the LXX and the Hebrew is easily explained by the supposition that in the Hebrew copy used by the translators, the כִּרְיָךְ was repeated (which might easily have happened), or at least that they thought it ought to be.

Dr. Gifford takes no notice of my explanation of the *reason* for the ordinary position of such words as εὐλογητός, εὐλογημένος, ἐπαυτάμενος, etc., in doxologies, benedictions, and maledictions, or of the exceptions which I adduce (save Ps.

lxviii. 20, which I waive), or of my argument that, if we take the last clause as a doxology, the position of εὐλογητός after the subject is not only fully accounted for, but is rather *required by the very same law of the Greek language* which governs all the examples that have been alleged against the doxological construction. (*Journal*, pp. 103-111.) As this view is supported by so eminent a grammarian as Winer, to say nothing of Meyer, Fritzsche, and other scholars, it seems to me that it deserved consideration.

DIFFERENT SENSES OF εὐλογητός.

On p. 56 of Dr. Gifford's *Letter*, he gives as examples of the use and meaning of the word εὐλογητός the expressions "Blessed be God" and "Blessed be thou of the Lord," and remarks that "Dr. Abbot 'overlooks the fact' that, whatever difference there may be, it lies *not in the sense of the word εὐλογητός*, but in the different relations of the persons blessing and blessed." I must confess that I have overlooked the fact, if it be a fact; and must also confess my belief that not a few of Dr. Gifford's readers will be surprised at the proposition that there is no difference in the sense of the word εὐλογητός when, applied to God, it means "praised" or "worthy to be praised," and when, applied to men, it means "prospered" or "blessed" by God. The fact on which Dr. Gifford seems to lay great stress, that εὐλογητός in these different senses represents the same Hebrew word, will not weigh much with those who consider that many words in common use have several very different meanings in Hebrew as well as in other languages. The two meanings are as distinct as those of εὐλογία in the sense of *laus, laudatio, celebratio* (Grimm, *Lec. s.v. εὐλογία*, No. 1), and of *bonum, beneficium* (Grimm, *ibid.*, No. 5).

The very common use of εὐλογητός in doxologies to God seems to have led the Septuagint translators to restrict its application in the sense of "praised," or rather "worthy to be praised," to the Supreme Being. To this perhaps the only exception is in the expression εὐλογητός ὁ γέγονος σου in

1 Sam. xxv. 33. In the New Testament, apart from the passage in debate, its application is restricted to God, "the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ." My point is that whatever force there may be in the argument from this extensive usage in favor of its application to God rather than to Christ in Rom. ix. 5, it is not diminished in the slightest degree by the fact that in a few passages of the LXX the word is applied to men in the very different sense of "prospered" or "recipients of blessings." *i.e.* benefits, from God.

I have now, I believe, taken notice of all the points of importance in which Dr. Gifford has criticised my statements, or statements which he has ascribed to me. I am not without hope that in a future edition of his pamphlet he may see reason for modifying some of his remarks, and for giving more fully the context of some of his quotations.

XVIII.

ON THE CONSTRUCTION OF TITUS II. 13.

[From the *Journal of the Society of Biblical Literature and Exegesis*, 1881.]

The Greek reads as follows: προσδεχόμενοι τὴν μακαρίαν ἐλπίδα καὶ ἐπιφάνειαν τῆς δόξης τοῦ μεγάλου θεοῦ καὶ σωτῆρος ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ (οὐ Χριστοῦ Ἰησοῦ).

Shall we translate, "the appearing of the glory of *our great God and Saviour* Jesus Christ"? or, "the appearing of the glory of *the great God and our Saviour* Jesus Christ"?

It was formerly contended by Granville Sharp, and afterwards by Bishop Middleton, that the absence of the Greek article before σωτήρ in Tit. ii. 13 and 2 Pet. i. 1, and before θεοῦ in Eph. v. 5, is alone sufficient to prove that the two appellatives connected by καὶ belong to one subject.* "It is impossible," says Middleton in his note on Tit. ii. 13, "to understand θεοῦ and σωτήρ otherwise than of one person." This ground is now generally abandoned, and it is admitted that, *grammatically*, either construction is possible. I need

* Sharp applied his famous rule also to 2 Thess. i. 12, but Middleton thinks that this text affords no certain evidence in his favor. Winer disposes of it summarily as merely a case in which κύριος is used for ὁ κύριος, the word κύριος taking, in a measure, the character of a proper name. In 2 Thess. i. 11, ὁ θεὸς ἡμῶν denotes God in distinction from "our Lord Jesus" (ver. 12); it is therefore unnatural in the extreme to take this title in the last clause of *the very same sentence* (ver. 12) as a designation of Christ. We may then reject without hesitation Granville Sharp's construction, which in fact has the support of but few respectable scholars.

As to 1 Tim. v. 24 and 2 Tim. iv. 1, it is enough to refer to the notes of Bishop Middleton and Bishop Ellicott on the former passage. Compare the remarkable various reading in Gal. ii. 20, adopted by Laclunann and Tregelles (text), but not by Tischendorf or Westcott and Hort,— ἐν πίστει ζῶ τῆ τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ Χριστοῦ.

In Eph. v. 5, ἐν τῇ βασιλείᾳ τοῦ Χριστοῦ καὶ θεοῦ, the Χριστοῦ and θεοῦ are regarded as denoting distinct subjects by a large majority of the best commentators, as De Wette, Meyer, Olshausen, Meier, Holzhausen, Flatt, Matthies, Baumgarten-Crusius, Bleek, Ewald, Schenkel, Braune and Riddle (in Lange's *Comm.*, Amer. trans.), Conybeare, Bloomfield, Ellicott, Eadie, Alford, Canon Barry in Ellicott's *N. T. Comm.*, and Prebendary Meyrick in "the Speaker's Commentary" (1881).

In the Revised New Testament, the construction contended for so strenuously by Middleton in Eph. v. 5, and by Sharp in 2 Thess. i. 12, has not been deemed worthy of notice.