

Messiah] ? The measure<sup>1</sup> of justice is holding it back. But (you will say) seeing that the measure of justice is holding it back, of what use is it for us anxiously to wait for it ? To obtain a reward for this very waiting, for it says, in the same verse of Isaiah, *Blessed are all they that anxiously wait for him.*"

J. RAWSON LUMBY.

### A BIBLICAL NOTE.

ROMANS ix. 5.

THE remarks of Canon Farrar, in the March number of THE EXPOSITOR, on the punctuation of this Verse, are hardly sufficient to place the question at issue fairly before the reader. I avail myself, therefore, of the Editor's permission to offer a few additional words on the subject, and I will endeavour to do so with all practicable brevity, touching only the critical points raised in the article to which I refer (p. 217).

Probably no person of competent knowledge would deny that the Verse may properly be rendered thus : "Whose *are* the fathers, and of whom Christ came, as concerning the flesh. He who is God over all *is* blessed for ever." This is exactly the Greek order of the words, and this rendering is unquestionably quite as admissible, grammatically, as that of the Authorized Version. In favour of the latter, however, it is urged—1. That "it is the most natural way of taking the words." But that depends upon several considerations. Of these I may mention as of much importance the general analogy of St. Paul's Epistles in the use of the word *θεός*. The Apostle employs this word more than five hundred times, and he has never once applied it to Christ, except in this doubtful instance and one other case<sup>2</sup> which is equally disputable. The word *εὐλογητός* too is never applied to Christ in the New Testament, but only to God. Is it then really the "most natural" to think that St. Paul in this case terms Christ, not only God, but "God over *all*," and *εὐλογητός* as well ?

2. The words, we are further told, were understood according to the Authorized punctuation "by the early Church." This statement requires qualification. Tischendorf more justly observes : "Antiquitas

<sup>1</sup> *I.e.*, God's quality of justice.

<sup>2</sup> Titus ii. 13.

Christiana luculenter etiam testatur verba *ο ων επι*, &c., non cum *ο Χριστος* conjungenda esse;" and in illustration of this he quotes two passages from Eusebius, which shew that the words were not uniformly or exclusively applied to Christ. But yet, granting that the Authorized punctuation is that of the ancient Church, still the ancient Church, or rather the Fathers who represent it, were not infallible. With their minds preoccupied with the Logos idea, they could scarcely fail to apply the Verse in that way. But how little value should, in some cases, be attributed to the testimony of the Fathers, Canon Farrar has himself, in this very article, given us the opportunity of judging. He admits, in so many words, that "even the Fathers are often led by theological prejudice to insincere handling of the word of God" (p. 205). In truth, these ancient writers are too often uncritical and credulous; and it is clear that their authority in a question of this kind may be disregarded, provided always that sufficient grounds exist (as in the present case) for disregarding it.

3. It is urged that these words are not a doxology, because of the position of the word *εὐλογητός*. This too may be granted, although doxologies may be found in the Septuagint in which, as here, that word does not stand at the beginning of the sentence. Nevertheless, the words clearly form what may be termed a doxological expression, such as we may find in Romans i. 25, *τὸν κτίσαντα, ὃς ἐστὶν εὐλογητός εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας*, and in 2 Corinthians xi. 31, *ὁ Θεός, . . . ὁ ὢν εὐλογητός εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας*. These two cases are closely parallel to the words now under notice, and they are introduced in exactly the same incidental and parenthetical manner.

Of the evidence of the Manuscripts Canon Farrar observes that "in most uncials there is no punctuation worth speaking of." This is scarcely correct of the uncials in general, and it is far from an adequate account of the Manuscript evidence on this Verse in particular, although it is less meagre and strangely wrong than Dr. Liddon's assertion, that "two cursive Manuscripts of the twelfth century are the first" that have a stop after *σάρκα*.<sup>1</sup> The fact is that of the four most ancient uncials—Aleph, A, B, C—the latter three have the stop, leaving the following words to be read as a separate sentence. A is in the British Museum, where it is easily to be seen. It will be found that the Manuscript has not only a stop, but a small space to make room for it, both space and stop evidently *a primā*

<sup>1</sup> Bampton Lecture, vi. iv. 2, Note u.

*manu.* B (Vaticanus) I have twice had the opportunity of inspecting, having obtained access to the Manuscript mainly for the purpose of looking at this passage. There is a stop, but no space. This has never been noted, so far as I am aware, in the critical editions, nor is the point given in the *facsimile* edition of Vercellone and Cozza. But the stop is there, nevertheless, exactly the same in appearance as that found after the word ἀμήν at the end of the Verse. Whether it is from the first hand or not, I do not venture to say. In C (in the *Bibliothèque Nationale*, at Paris) there is a space with the little cross which frequently stands for a stop in that Manuscript. In the same library there is another Manuscript, D, of Paul's Epistles (Claromontanus), of the sixth century. In this there is a space after σάρκα, that is to say, the stichometrical line terminates with this word, as though the writer intended the succeeding words to be separately taken—in other words, virtually recognizing the stop. Of Aleph I only know that the *facsimile* published by Tischendorf has no stop; but this is scarcely conclusive against its presence, inasmuch as it may have escaped the editor's notice, as in A and B, of which Tischendorf expressly, but incorrectly, says that they have no stop. Assuming, however, that Aleph is without the point, still it remains true that three, perhaps four (D), of the five oldest and most important uncial Manuscripts contain the stop.<sup>1</sup> This fact, taken along with other evidence for the same conclusion, ought, I submit, to be regarded as settling the question of punctuation. The division (and rendering) of the Verse given by Professor Jowett in his "Epistles of St. Paul" is, therefore, correct. And he, I need scarcely add, has here but followed the example of the most eminent modern authorities, including Winer, Meyer, Lachmann, Davidson, Tischendorf, and many more.

The most recent English Commentator on this Epistle, Dr. Sanday (in Bishop Ellicott's *Commentary*), thus fairly sums up his observations on the question which I have discussed. "Weighing the whole of the arguments against each other, the *data* do not seem to be sufficient to warrant a positive and dogmatic conclusion either way. The application to our Lord appears perhaps a little the more probable of the two. More than this cannot be said." I venture to ask, Can even so much as this be said, with a due regard to all the foregoing considerations?

G. VANCE SMITH.

<sup>1</sup> Tischendorf notes also L and some cursives.

I think that any one who will look back to my brief remarks on Romans ix. 5, will see that I did not speak at all so dogmatically or confidently as Dr. Vance Smith's criticism seems to imply; nor can I see that he at all shakes what I said.

1. I said that I believed the view of our English Version to be correct "because it is the most natural way of taking the words." To this Dr. Vance Smith makes a theological objection which I had myself anticipated. But the whole context shews that I was only referring to the most natural *order of the words, and congruity with the context.*

a. As to the *order of the words*, let the reader judge. If the view of the English Version be right, the passage runs—"Who are Israelites, whose is the adoption, and the Shechinah, and the covenants," &c.; . . . "whose are the fathers, and of whom is the Christ after the flesh, who is over all, God blessed for ever. Not as though the word of God had failed."

If Dr. V. Smith and the authorities which he follows be right, the passage runs—"Who are Israelites," &c.; . . . "of whom is the Christ after the flesh. God over all is blessed for ever. Not as though the word of God had failed."

Why this abrupt doxology at the very threshold of the argument, bursting into praise in the midst of a most sad argument, "changing an elegy into a hymn"? Why the perfectly superfluous *ὄν*, unless the reference be to Him who has just been mentioned?

β. *As to the context*, does not the express limitation, "Christ *after the flesh*," naturally lead to the antithesis which recognizes his Divine nature?

But Dr. Smith makes three objections. (1) St. Paul never applies *θεός* to Christ, unless he does so here, and in Titus ii. 13, which is also disputed.

On this point Dr. Smith will see some remarks in my next paper, written before I saw his objection. Supposing his objection to pass unchallenged, we assert quite fearlessly that our Lord's full Divinity is found implicitly and explicitly asserted in every single Epistle of St. Paul, as well as writ large in the Epistles of the Second Imprisonment and the Pastoral Epistles. With 1 Thessalonians iii. 11; Philippians ii. 6; Colossians i. 15; ii. 9; 1 Corinthians iv. 4-6; 2 Corinthians xiii. 14; Ephesians v. 27, &c., before us, who can have one moment's doubt that St. Paul would hesitate to speak of Christ as God?

(2) But *εὐλογητός* is never applied to Christ, only to God.

Why should not Christ be called "blessed"? Why should such a *hapax legomenon* be rejected on this ground, any more than the *hapax legomenon* "spirit of Jesus," which is now all but universally received in Acts xvi. 7?

(3) But Christ is here called "God *over all*."

Why not? Is not "*over all*" the conception of Isaiah ix. 7; Daniel vii. 13, 14; Matthew xxviii. 18; Ephesians i. 20-23; 1 Peter iii. 22; Hebrews i. 8, &c.? The verse is probably an allusion to Psalm lxviii. 19 (LXX.); and if in Ephesians iv. 8 St. Paul quotes the previous verse of this Psalm and applies it to Christ, does it not at once become probable that he refers *this* verse to Christ also? If so, the "*over all*" is at once accounted for by the reference to the rebels in the Psalmist's words. It is in fact an express allusion to the *unbelieving Jews*. So far from telling against the application to Christ, the addition "*over all*" distinctly favours it.

2. I said that the clause was applied to Christ by the early Church.

Dr. Smith says that this "requires qualification." I did not say that it was so applied by *every single writer* of the early Church; but it is so applied by St. Athanasius, St. Gregory of Nyssa, St. Cyril, St. Irenæus, Tertullian, Origen, St. Cyprian, Epiphanius, St. Chrysostom, Theodoret, Theophylact, Œcumenius, St. Augustine, St. Hilary, and Novatian. Bishop Wordsworth—a very high patristic authority—says that "*the entire body of ancient interpreters agree in applying these words to Christ*." Tholuck says that *the early writers all favoured it*, with the single exception of Theodore of Mopsuestia, but it is not certain that even he is an exception, and Tischendorf seems to have been misled by Wetstein. Meyer, who takes Dr. Smith's view, says, "So *keine Väter*."

When Dr. Smith says that the authority of the Fathers is not *decisive*, he says what every one, of course, admits.

3. Dr. Smith admits that in New Testament doxologies εὐλογητός *is never found in the beginning of a sentence, as it is here*; but he says that such "doxologies" may be found in the LXX. Here, then, he claims in his own doctrinal favour a New Testament *hapax legomenon* which in his first argument he rejects. And when he speaks of "doxologies" in the LXX., are there more than the one in Psalm lxviii. 19, a passage which (as we have seen) St. Paul directly refers to Christ?<sup>1</sup> The position of εὐλογητός in Romans i. 25; 2 Corinthians xi. 31, in no wise helps him; and Socinus was so struck with

<sup>1</sup> Passages where the verb is supplied are beside the point. In thirty passages of the LXX. εὐλογητός stands first.

the fact that in *doxologies* εὐλογητός normally precedes θεός, as to be forced, with true candour, to change his view of the passage. Moreover, Dr. Smith's reference to Romans i. 25; 2 Corinthians xi. 31, goes against him, for in those passages St. Paul does indeed call God εὐλογητός εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας, but he never adds εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας in *doxologies*, unless he does so in this passage. The exceptional addition perhaps emphasizes the exceptional application.

4. Dr. Smith says it is "scarcely correct" to say that "in most uncials there is no punctuation worth speaking of." All that I meant by this was that the punctuation of the uncials is exceedingly simple, and in many instances of dubious authenticity; that in  $\aleph$  the single point for punctuation is often absent for pages together; that in A, B, C, the only punctuation is a single point, and in B it has been doubted whether it is ever *primâ manu*; that in F,  $\Delta$ , G, N, &c., the points are often omitted; and that it must often be exceedingly uncertain whether the punctuation is original or subsequently added.

These facts will, I think, be found to be sufficiently attested, though I have never studied the uncials personally. Tischendorf says: "Antiquissimi codices . . . eo rarius solent interpuncti esse quo sunt vetustiores."

As for the uncials in this passage, I followed the authority of Tischendorf and others, who imply that there is no stop at κατὰ σάρκα in  $\aleph$ , A, B, &c. Dr. Smith says that A has a stop, "evidently" (?) *a primâ manu*; that B has a stop, though he cannot pretend to say that it is original; and that there is a little space after σάρκα at the end of a line in D (which does not seem to me very important). But even accepting these conclusions (which in the teeth of patristic evidence it is difficult to do) as a proof that the doxological view of the verse was very early accepted, they do not, I think, counterbalance the weight of the arguments on the other side.

Lastly, I had come to the very same conclusion as that which Dr. Smith approves in Dr. Sanday, only that I had said that I personally believed the reference of the clause to be to Christ, while Dr. Sanday says that "the application to our Lord appears perhaps a little the more probable of the two."

F. W. FARRAR.

I have been asked to offer some remarks on Dr. Smith's "Note," and I do so, though I am not sure that there is very much for me to say. The particulars which Dr. Vance Smith adduces as to the punctuation of the four great uncials are interesting, but add quite infinite-

simally to the weight of the reasoning on the side for which they are quoted. There seems to be a general consent of the best authorities on these matters that very few of the stops in the three oldest MSS., the Vatican, Sinaitic, and Codex Ephraemi, were inserted by the original scribe. In regard to B, the most important of these, there is a presumption from what Dr. Vance Smith says that it was not originally intended to place any stop after *σάρκα*. It is the custom of the writer of this MS. to leave a slight break at the end of a sentence, and from the fact of his not having done so in this instance, it would be fair to infer that he did not suppose the sentence to be finished. It would need, however, something more than a second-hand acquaintance with the MS., which is all that I possess, to know what degree of probability is to be attached to this point. Tischendorf is such a careful observer, that I should imagine his statement respecting Codices Vaticanus and Sinaiticus not to be based upon a mistake, but to be intended (*sub silentio*) to be taken as referring to the first hand. He makes indeed the same statement in regard to A, where it would conflict directly with what has been observed by Dr. Vance Smith. How to reconcile the two statements I do not know, as I am not in a position to test the accuracy of either personally. It may only be worth noting that Tischendorf is quoting evidence *against* the view which he himself holds, which is the same as that maintained by Dr. Vance Smith.

However these points may be, Dr. Vance Smith has cut the ground away from under his own feet when he endeavours to rest an argument upon them. It is important to remember that the evidence of the MSS. in matters of punctuation, *where it represents a tradition at all, represents a much younger and less authoritative tradition than in regard to the text*. There can hardly be a doubt that the apostolic autographs were written *entirely without* punctuation or division of any kind. If then the presence of a stop can be traced up as far back as the fourth century A.D. (which in the present case is very doubtful), even then it will rest not by any means upon a primitive tradition, but only upon the opinion of a nameless scribe, and the value of that opinion Dr. Vance Smith's own remarks tend to reduce quite to a minimum. In the first place it would be strange if, as it would seem that we were intended to suppose, the great majority of patristic writers were on one side and the majority of scribes (whose works those writers used) were upon the other. But, waiving this, if the evidence of the Fathers is, as Dr. Vance Smith thinks, worth but little, that of the scribes must surely be worth still less. Dr.

Vance Smith seems to me to put too low an estimate upon the opinion of the ancient Greek commentators. No doubt they are at times uncritical, but it is often much more remarkable how finely critical they are. They knew at least what was natural, and in accordance with the idiom of the language which they themselves habitually spoke. But if the opinion of Origen, Athanasius, Theodoret, Basil, and Gregory of Nyssa may be safely "disregarded," what shall we say to that of the scribes? The two classes of evidence are precisely the same in kind, whilst that of the Commentators is immensely superior in degree. While I think, then, that Dr. Vance Smith has much underrated the great preponderance of patristic authority, I cannot see that the evidence which he has adduced as turning the scale in his favour is entitled to receive from him any real weight at all.

I hope I shall not be thought to be speaking invidiously—because I am speaking of one whom I am glad to acknowledge as my own superior on ground that I have trodden myself—when I say that more cogent reasoning in favour of Dr. Vance Smith's conclusion is to be found in a work that has only recently come under my notice, "A Commentary on the Romans," by Mr. J. A. Beet (Hodder and Stoughton, 1877). I should like to avail myself of this opportunity to recommend it to readers of THE EXPOSITOR. In spite of its unscholarly appearance (some Greek words accented, but the great majority without either accent or breathing, and the unpleasant effect of this enhanced by an unusual and tiresome system of abbreviation), and in spite of a dry and unattractive style, the work will be found to be that of a really sound, able, and original scholar, who has evidently thought much and worked long at St. Paul's Epistles. It is remarkably independent and impartial in weighing disputed passages like the above, and does so by the strict rules of philological science. It may be worth while to note in passing that Mr. Beet is corrected by Dr. Vance Smith, as he might have been by Tischendorf, in saying that the interpretation which he himself adopts "is found in *none* of the Fathers." I may also add that I cannot quite agree with Mr. Beet in the precise nature of his estimate of the value of the patristic writings on p. 262. Nor, in fact, can I be convinced by the arguments on either side that the passage is one on which it is possible to have a very strong and decided opinion. There is much to be said on both sides, but nothing quite conclusive. W. SANDAY.



When so accomplished and eminent a scholar as Dr. Vance Smith asked me whether I cared to have "the whole truth" concerning Romans ix. 5 placed before the readers of *THE EXPOSITOR*, and assured me that he was in possession of some "facts" relating to it "not known to the theological public," I could only respond to the challenge by saying that, since "the whole truth" was what we all desired, I should be delighted to lay any facts he had discovered before the readers of this Magazine.

At the same time I thought it would conduce to edification, and might bring out "the whole case" more completely, if I asked Canon Farrar, whose conclusion Dr. Vance Smith contested, and Dr. Sanday, whom he had referred to with much respect, to read his "Note," and to append to it their judgment of his facts and pleas. They have been good enough to respond to my invitation. And I have now the pleasure of presenting to the public both the "facts" discovered by Dr. Smith and the comments on them of Canon Farrar and Dr. Sanday. I trust and believe that if not "the whole truth" concerning this much-disputed passage, at least the means of arriving at as much of truth and certainty as can yet be reached, are now placed before the readers of this Magazine. Nor have I much doubt which way their vote will be cast.

EDITOR.

---

### BRIEF NOTICES.

A COMMENTARY ON ST. PAUL'S EPISTLE TO THE ROMANS. *By Joseph Agar Beet.* (London: Hodder and Stoughton.) It is long since we had the pleasure of welcoming the advent of a new and young expositor of such high promise as Mr. Beet. This one work, which we understand to be his first, is of itself, despite certain very obvious drawbacks, sufficient to give him a place in the front rank of Biblical Commentators. Of his scholarship Dr. Sanday, a most competent and impartial judge, has spoken in the present number of this Magazine (see p. 404), and that in terms which render further comment on it unnecessary. His capacity for hard, close, original thinking, is apparent on every page. Nor does he lack the power of eloquent and fervent expression where he cares to use it, as we hope to shew in at least one brief quotation. His interpretations of the great critical passages in the Epistle prove him to belong theologically to the broad Evangelical School; not to the broadest section of that