On the Construction of Romans ix. 5.

BY PROF. EZRA ABBOT, D. D., LL. D., CAMBRIDGE, MASS.

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

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 glowed 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 Mes-
siah as to the flesh: he who is over all, God, be blessed for ever. Amen.,” or, “he who is God over all be blessed for ever. 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 untraceable 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 ἐξ ὅν ὁ χριστὸς τὸ κατὰ σάρκα ὁ ὅν ἐπὶ πάντων θεὸς εὐλογητὸς εἷς τῶν 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 θεὸς, 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 θεὸς:—“who (or he who) is over all, God blessed for ever.”

3. With a comma after πάντων and also after θεὸς:—“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 ὅν, and also after θεὸς:—“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.”

*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.”
6. Placing a colon after σάρξ, 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 σάρξ, ὁ ὄν ἐπὶ πάντων θεός may be taken as the subject, and ἐνθιγητός as predicate, with the ellipsis of ἔτη or ἔστω, 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 ὄν with all that follows, including the designation θεός, is referred to ὁ Χριστός; in Nos. 6 and 7, ὁ ὄν introduces an independent sentence, and θεός denotes God, the Father. No. 5 refers the first part of the sentence in debate to ὁ Χριστός, 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 ὄν, 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 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 had 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 solemnus adeo benignae 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

*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. 469; see also p. 462.
enumeration 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 was deepened most of all by the thought that their race gave birth to the Divine Saviour"! 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 was 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 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 firstfruit 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," &c. 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 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 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 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 ver. 6 with what precedes seems to me all that is needed to meet the objection. The argument that a

*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 gloryest, thou bearest not the root, but the root thee." (Rom. xi. 18.)
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 ἀδίκα. 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 ἀδίκα is very doubtful); 2 Cor. ix. 15, where note the omission of ἀδίκα in the genuine text; 1 Tim. i. 17, where the doxology is suggested by the mention of Christ. The doxology xi. 36, as has already been noticed (p. 89), is completely parallel in thought. Far more abrupt is the doxology 2 Cor. xi. 31, ὁ θεός καὶ πατήρ τοῦ κυρίου Ἰησοῦ ολίγης, ὁ δὲ εὐλογητὸς εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας, δότα ὦ χάζώαμαι, where the ascription of praise is interposed between ὁλίγης and δότα 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 χριστὸς, 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, ὁ χριστὸς οὗ τὰ πάντα, is the medium of communication of our spiritual blessings, Paul constantly views them in relation to God, ἐξ ὦ 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 ἡλεστὴριον, 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 χωρίος (2 Tim. iv. 18); while the thanksgiving is a simple expression of thankfulness (1 Tim. i. 12), ξάρειν ἐζω, 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 δέ, 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 δέ as a particle of transition seem natural here, much less required. It would make the doxology too formal.

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

Much stronger language than this is often used. Dr. Hodge, for

*Jahrbücher für deutsche Theol., 1868, xiii. 470 ff., 477.
example, assuming that ὁ ἀνε must be equivalent to ὁ ἡστι, 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 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 ἀνε with ὁ χριστὸς, "This
construction of ὁ ἀνε, 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 ἀνε (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 (p. 24) about
"the peculiarity of Rom. ix. 5." Cases in which ὁ ἀνε, 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" (p. 25).

But if Dr. Dwight's statement means, or is intended to imply, that
ὁ ἀνε with its adjuncts, or, in general, the participle with the article,
aMOST universaIY 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 ἀνε, or ὁ ἡστι, 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 ἡμείς or ὑμείς.
expressed or understood; and perhaps John xviii. 37 (πᾶς ὁ ὁπὸ τ. λ.).

It is uncertain whether Col. iv. 11 belongs under (a) or (b); see Meyer in loc. For the examples of ὁπὸ 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 86 examples of its use (a) as the subject, or in a very few cases (g) as the predicate, of a verb expressed or understood, and only 38 of its use (b) in a descriptive or limiting clause, annexed to a preceding subject; in the Epistle to the Romans 28 examples of the former kind against 12 of the latter; and in the First Epistle to the Corinthians 39 of the former against 4 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 ὁπὸ properly signifies not "who is," but "he who is." The force of the article is not lost.

*The examples of ὁπὸ and other participles with πᾶς belong perhaps quite as properly under (a). Without πᾶς, the ὁπὸ τ. λ. is the subject of the sentence, and the meaning is the same; πᾶς only strengthens the ὁπὸ. 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.; 604, No. IX.

‡ In this reckoning, to prevent any cavil, I have included under (b) all the examples of πᾶς ὁ or πᾶς τ. ὁ, of which there are 8 in Matthew, 2 in Romans, and 1 in 1 Cor.; also the cases of the article and participle with ὁμι or ὁμι τ. as the subject of the verb, expressed or understood, of which there are 4 in Matthew and 7 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).

§ "Participles take the article only when some relation already known or especially noteworthy (is qui, quippe qui) is indicated, and consequently the idea expressed by the participle is to be made more prominent."—Winer, Gram. 7te Aufl., § 20, 1. b. a. c. p. 127 (p. 134 Thayer).
in some of its uses it may seem interchangeable with ὃς ἔστιν, it differs in this, that it is generally employed either in appositional or in limiting clauses, in distinction from descriptive or additive clauses, while ὃς 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 ὃ ὅν here refers to ὁ χριστός, the clause would be more exactly translated as appositional, not "who is," &c., but "he who is God over all, blessed for ever," implying that he was well known to the readers of the Epistle as God; or at least marking this predicate with special emphasis; while ὃς ἔστιν 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 ὃ ὅν, 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 ὃ ὅν, or a participle with the article, is used as an attributive. In all the other instances in the New Testament of this use of ὃ ὅν or ὁ ὅν ἐστιν in the nominative, with the single exception of the parenthetic insertion in 2 Cor. xi. 31 (see above, page 94), 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 ὃ ὅν 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 τῷ;* and the sentence which precedes is complete in 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. 88) the enumeration of blessings which imme-

* 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 ὃ ὅν 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 passage against the Emperor Julian, who maintained that "neither Paul dared to call Christ God, nor Matthew, nor Luke, nor Mark, ἀλλ' ὁ χριστός 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. b. pp. 118 a, 148 c; though he usually follows the order of the present Greek text.
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 'Ἀ dikánde at the end of the sentence.* From every point of view, therefore, the doxological construction seems easy and natural. The ellipsis of the verb ἐπιτε or ἐγνή in such cases is simply according to rule. The construction numbered 6 above (see p. 90) is also perfectly easy and natural grammatically; see 2 Cor. i. 21; v. 5; Heb. iii. 4.

The naturalness of a pause after ἀρμακα 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 (see above, p. 24), that if the writer did not intend that ὅ ὅν 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 Θεός, 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 case, John i. 1, we find language which excludes all doubt. And in this case the words Ἰερ ἴτιν, 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

*In 15 out of the 18 instances in the N. T., besides the present, in which Ἀ dikánde at the end of a sentence is probably genuine, it follows a doxology; viz.: 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. 8 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 article.
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 δανύ &c., 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 διεστέκαστε ἐκ τοῦ πατρὸς τοῦ διαβόλου ἐστε (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 οὐ &c. 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 ων is superfluous and awkward," will be noticed below
under No. 6.

5. It is further urged that το χατά σάρκα requires an antithesis,
which is supposed to be supplied by what follows. Some even say
that χατά 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 χατά σάρκα is χατά πνεύμα, not
χατά τήν θεότητα, which there is nothing in the phrase itself to sug-
gest: χατά 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 rela-
tion. We need only refer to the 3d verse of this very chapter, which
certainly does not imply that Paul or his "kinsmen χατά σάρκα" had a
divine nature also. The phrase χατά 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 χατά πνεύμα, as he is speaking
of the peculiar distinctions of the Jews. Indeed, the antithesis to
χατά 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 χατά 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 Cor-
inthians (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 dis-
tinctions 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 (το χατά σάρκα); from him were
kings and rulers and leaders in the line of Judah."

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, το χατά 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, endorsed by Cobet. In my limited research I have found no exception. The two passages cited by Meyer in opposition (see above, p. 27) seem to me wholly irrelevant; the former, because we have μόν with the τό ἐκ τοῦ, which of course requires an antithetic clause with ήτα; the latter, because the essential element in the case, the τό or τά, does not stand before κατὰ τό ἄνω. But I must agree with Dr. Dwight (p. 28) that Van Hengel's argument is not conclusive. On the supposition that ὁ ἄνω, &c., 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 σάρκα, 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 ἄνω 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 ἄνω, &c., 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.

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 δ 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 εὐλογημένος precede the subject in a multitude of places in the Septuagint. (See Tromm'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 δ 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. θεός, 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 θεός; it seemed to him like "throwing Christ right into the shade," without any special reason, when we should rather expect something said in antithesis to αὐτῷ πάντων, 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. 95) that δε would be needed here to indicate the antithesis. On it is also grounded the objection of Alford, Farrar, etc.

* Wahl gives a more correct view of the use of εἰς in his Clavis libr. Vet. Test. apocr. (1853), p. 218, col. 1, C. b., where εἰς with the genitive is defined, prae sum alicui rei, moderor s. administro alicuam rem. Comp. Grimm's Lexicon Gr.-Lat. in libros N. T., ed. 2da, s. v. εἰς, A. i. d. p. 160, col. 2; Rost and Palm’s Passow, vol. i. p. 1033, col. 1, 3; and the references given by Meyer and Van Hengel in loc. See Acts viii. 27; xii. 20; Gen. xlv. 1; Judith xiv. 13, εἰπὼν τῷ ὄντι εἰς πάντων αὐτῶν.

† De Wette, Kurze Erklärung des Briefes an die Kömer, 4te Aufl. (1847), p. 130.
and others, that the istringstream 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 θεὸς, a phrase which is thus used numberless times in the writings of the Christian Fathers; see, for example, Wetstein's note on Rom. ix. 5. But, as I understand the passage, the ὁν 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 θεὸς qualified by it; or θεὸς may be regarded as added by way of apposition or more precise definition. The position of this substantive designation of θεὸς, between the article and its noun, gives it special prominence. Comp. 1 Cor. iii. 7, οὗτε ὁ φυτεύων ἐστὶ τι, οὗτε ὁ ποτίζων, ἀλλ' ὁ αὐξάνων θεὸς; Addit. ad Esth. viii. 1. 39, ὁ τὰ πάντα δυνατεύων θεὸς, cf. ll. 8, 35, Tisch.; ὁ πάντων δυσποτῖων θεὸς, Justin Mart. Ἀρι. i. 15; ὁ ποιητὴς τοῦτο τοῦ παντὸς θεὸς, 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 ὁν ἐπὶ πάντων θεὸς is equivalent to ὁ θεὸς ὁ ὁν 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 θεὸς is made prominent by its position; in the former, prominence is given to the particular conception expressed by ὁ ὁν 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

*If this account is correct it follows that neither of the renderings which I have suggested above (p. 89) 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 ὁν ἐπὶ πάντων before θεὸς.
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 this conception is prominent in his mind he places the ὃ ὁν τί πάντων first in the sentence. A recognition of this fact removes all the difficulty about the position of εὐλογητός. 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 εὐλογητός or εὐλογημένος 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 ὃ ὁν τί πάντων must stand first in the sentence, to express

*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 praest, omnia suo divino consilio dispensans moderansque, cui dicit debere laudem in omne aevum, ob insignem erga nos charitatem, cui maledicebant Judaei, dum Filium unicum blasphemiis impeterent."—Note in loc., in his Ὄμη. 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 σάρκα as "an expression of the interpretation which implies that special force was intended to be thrown on τί πάντων by the interposition of ὁν," observe:—"This emphatic sense of τί 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 apostacy 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."
that prominence; and the position of εὐλογητός 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 re-appears 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 τῷ βασιλεί τῶν αἰώνων, “to the King of the ages.”

I prefer, on the whole, to take πάντων 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 praest hominibus (i. e. qui et Judaeis et gentilibus consultit Deus, der ueber allen Menschen waltende Gott) sit celebratus perpetuo, amen.” (C. F. A. Fritzsche, Pauli ad Rom. Epist., tom. ii. [1839], p. 272.) He refers for the πάντων to Rom. x. 12; xi. 32; iii. 29.

We may note here, that while the Apostle says ὅν οἱ πάτερες, he does not say ὅν, but ἐκ ὅν ὁ χριστός. 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, ξατα όδρα, Christ was “from the Jews,” he was ξατα πνεύμα, 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 εὐλογητός, εὐλογητέως, μακάριος, and ἐπι-ξατάφρατος should usually stand first in the sentence in expressions of benediction, macarism, and malediction, is natural in Greek for the

---

*This seems to me the true rendering, rather than “to the King eternal,” though eternity is implied. Comp. Rev. xv. 3 Westc. 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 Exod. xv. 18, κύριος βασιλέων τῶν αἰώνων, as cited by Philo, De Plant. Noè, 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, § 6, δόξατα παντός αἰώνας. Contra, Test. xii Patr., Ruben, c. 6.
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 εὐλογητός, with the ellipsis of έτι or ἐστι, or declarative, as in the case of μακάριος, and usually, I believe, of εὐλογητός, ἐστι: 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, 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. lxvii. (Heb. lxviii.) 20, Κύριος ὁ θεός εὐλογητός, εὐλογητός Κύριος ήμέραν καθ’ ήμέραν, 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 above, p. 32 f.). On the other hand, the passage cited by Grimm (see 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:

>aινετῶς Κύριος ἐν τοῖς χρήμασιν αὐτοῦ ἐν στίματι ὑσίων,

καὶ σὺ εὐλογημένος, Ἰσραήλ, ὅπου κυρίου εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα. †

Here, in the first line, aινετῶς 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. lxvi.

*I believe that εὐλογητός in doxologies is distinguished from εὐλογημένος 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 εὐλογητός (as very often in the formula εὐλογητός εἰ) 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 ἦτε ἐστιν εὐλογητὸς εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας, άμη, Rom. i. 25, is "not a doxology at all" on account of the ἐστιν, then Matt. vi. 13 (text rec.) and 1 Pet. iv. 11 are, for the same reason, not doxologies.

Another example in which the subject precedes ἐπικατάρατος and εὐλογημένος in an optative or possibly a predictive sentence is Gen. xxvii. 29, ὁ καταράμενος σε ἐπικατάρατος, ὁ δὲ εὐλογών 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 καταράμενος 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 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 νῦν σὺ εὐλογητός ὅπως χυρίζω, 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 uncials MSS. that contain the passage, viz., 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 25 cursives, and the Aldine edition, also by all the ancient versions except the Ethiopic, and the Latin, which translates freely, against the καὶ νῦν 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 ὁλωμὼν 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, viz.: 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. xii. 8 (comp. ver. 7).
These examples go to confirm Winer’s statement in respect to contrasted subjects. And I must here remark, in respect to certain passages which have been alleged in opposition (see above, p. 36), that I can perceive no contrast of subjects in Gen. xiv. 19, 20; 1 Sam. xxv. 32, 33; and still less 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, εἰ ὁ θεὸς τὸ υἱὸν κυρίου εὐλογητένων, where, though εἰ precedes, as a copula it can have no emphasis, and the position of εὐλογητένων 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 εὐλογητένων τὸ υἱὸν 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, 138 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 εὐλογημένος 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 all 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 εὐλογημένος 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 above, pp. 36, 37), it is evident that εὐλογημένος more naturally stands first in the sentence; at the end it would be abrupt and un rhythical. But I cannot think that a Greek scholar would find anything hard or unnatural in the sentence if it read, οὐδὲν ἐπὶ πάντων θεοῦ εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας, ὁμήρων.

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 Ὁν ἐπὶ πάντων θεοῦ 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 Ὁν

*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, 56; 2 Chr. ii. 12; vi. 4; Ezr. vii. 27; Ps. xxvii. (Sept.) 6; xxx. 22; lxv. 20; lxxi. 18; cxxiii. 6; cxxxiv. 21; cxxiii. 1; Dan. iii. 28 Theodot., 95 Sept.
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\[ \text{επὶ πάντων θεῶς, we have a sentence made unnaturally heavy and} \]
\[ \text{clumsy by the interposition of \( eις τοὺς αἰῶνας \) before the subject, a} \]
\[ \text{sentence to which I believe no parallel can be produced in the whole} \]
\[ \text{range of extant doxologies. Wherever \( εὐλογητὸς \) precedes, the sub-} \]
\[ \text{ject \textit{directly} follows. These objections to the transposition appear to} \]
\[ \text{me in themselves a sufficient reason why the Apostle should have} \]
\[ \text{preferred the present order. But we must also consider that any other} \]
\[ \text{arrangement would have failed to make prominent the particular con-} \]
\[ \text{ception of God, which the context suggests, as the Ruler over All.} \]
\[ \text{If, then, the blessings mentioned by the Apostle suggested to his} \]
\[ \text{mind the thought of God as \( εὐλογητὸς εις τοὺς αἰῶνας \), in view of that} \]
\[ \text{overruling providence which sees the end from the beginning, which} \]
\[ \text{brings good out of evil and cares for all men alike, I must agree with} \]
\[ \text{Winer that "the present position of the words is not only altogether} \]
\[ \text{suitable, but even necessary." (Gram., 7te Aufl., § 61. 3. e. p. 513;} \]
\[ \text{p. 551 Thayer, p. 690 Moulton.) Olshausen, though he under-} \]
\[ \text{stands the passage as relating to Christ, well says:—"Rückert's} \]
\[ \text{remark, that \( εὐλογητὸς \), when applied to God, must, according to the} \]
\[ \text{idiom of the Old and New Testament, always precede the noun, is of} \]
\[ \text{no weight. Köllner rightly observes, that the position of words is} \]
\[ \text{altogether [everywhere] not a mechanical thing, but determined, in} \]
\[ \text{each particular conjuncture, by the connexion, and by the purpose} \]
\[ \text{of the speaker."} \]

7. The argument founded on the notion that the Apostle here had in mind Ps. lxvii. (lxviii.) 20, and was thereby led to describe Christ as \( \thetaεὸς \varepsilon\upsilon\
\varepsilon\upsigma τούς \alpha\iota\omicron\omega\nu\alpha\varsigma \), is one which so far as I know never occurred to any commentator ancient or modern before the ingenious Dr. Lange. It is evidently so fanciful, and has been so completely demolished by Dr. Dwight (see above, p. 33, note), that any further notice of it would be a waste of words.

8. The argument for the reference of the \( \dot{\omicron} \alpha\nu \), &c., 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.

* Olshausen, \textit{Bibl. Comm. on the N. T.}, vol. iv. p. 88, 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.
But the construction followed in the common version is also grammatically objectionable; 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 εὐλογητὸς, “blessed,” which never occurs in the New Testament in reference to Christ. If we refer εὐλογητὸς 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 εὐλογητὸς 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 not,” strongly favors the reference of the εὐλογητὸς to God.* It alone seems to me almost decisive. The word εὐλογητὸς is elsewhere in the New Testament used in doxologies to God (Luke i. 68; 1 Pet. i. 3); and in Mark xiv. 61, ὥ εὐλογητὸς, “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. 95) 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 κύριος to God. Doxologies and thanksgivings to God are on the other hand very frequent in his Epistles. Those with εὐλογητὸς are given above; for those with δοξα, see Rom. xi. 36; xvi. 27; Gal. i. 5; Eph. iii. 21; Phil. iv. 20; 1 Tim. i. 17 (τιμὴ καὶ δόξα);—τιμὴ καὶ χάρις, 1 Tim. vi. 16. (Comp. δοξάζω, 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 θαυμᾷ 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

*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.
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, viz. cc. 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 above, p. 46. The clear cases of doxologies to Christ in the N. T. 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, viz. "favor" 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.

Note further that εὐλογητος ὁ ἡγεμόνας ἐν ὅψυχαι τῷ Κυρίῳ 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 εὐλογητος see Note B, at the end of this article.

2. The most striking parallel to ὁ ᾠν ἐπὶ πάντων in the writings of Paul is in Eph. iv. 5, 9, 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 500 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 beside 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 i John v. 20 the ὁ ἄληθεν more naturally refers to the leading subject in what precedes, namely, τὸν ἄληθεν ὄν, and is so understood by the best grammarians, as Winer and Buttmann, and by many eminent Trinitarian commentators (see above, p. 19). In John i. 1 ὁ ἄληθεν 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 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

*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, &c., new edition (1856), p. 300 ff., and the note of E. A., or to the note of Lücke on the former passage, and of Prof. Stuart on the latter.
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 a former paper I have stated my reasons for believing the latter construction the true one. (See above, p. 3 ff.) 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 indicated 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, pp. 313-352. And although Westcott and Hort adopt the reading God, Dr. Hort well remarks that "the supposition that by the precise designation τῷ θεῷ, 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 ιδίου, 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. [ii. 2.] 12. 18; 41. 4).” On the supposition that \( \theta\varphi\alpha\sigma\vartheta\circ\nu \) 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 \( xu\pi\iota\nu\circ\nu \)), 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 \( T\varphi\rho\iota\eta \) dropped out after \( T\varphi\rho\iota\lambda\Delta\iota\iota\eta \) “at some 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 \( \alpha\dot{\alpha} \) is given to Christ by Paul have been examined in the paper on Titus ii. 13; see above, notes to pp. 3, 10, also 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. ver. 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 \( x\alpha\tau\alpha \tau\alpha \) is supplied. It is not, however, \( x\alpha\tau\alpha \tau\eta \tau\varepsilon \), or \( x\alpha\tau\alpha \tau\eta \tau\vartheta\iota \alpha \varphi\iota\alpha\nu\), but \( x\alpha\tau\alpha \pi\nu\iota\sigma\iota\mata \ \alpha\acute{\nu} \iota\lambda\sigma\sigma\omicron\omicron\nu \), “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 desig-
nate 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 Thes. 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 μορφή 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 είσαγ. οὰ θεός, "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 ἀπαίγοντας, 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

* Or, as the Rev. Dr. B. 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 ἰσα. 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. 2 da (1879), s. v. μορφή, for one view; for another, Weiss's Biblische Theol. des N. T., § 103 c, p. 432 ff., 3te Aufl. (1880).
is the image of the invisible God, the firstborn 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 head of
the body, the Church, who is the beginning, the firstborn from the
dead; that in all things he might have the pre-eminence [more liter­
ally, "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 used
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 distin­
guished 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 en and dia, 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:;
di’ od εποιησεν τους αἰῶνας;” comp. also 1 Cor. viii. 6, Eph. iii. 9
(though here dia Ἰερου Χριστου is not genuine), and the well-known
language of Philo concerning the Logos.* Neither Paul nor any

*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,” εἰκών θεοῦ, di’ od x. τ. λ. (De Monarch.
ii. 5, Opp. ii. 225 ed. Mangey); “the instrument, through which [or
whom] the world was built,” ὄργανον δι’ od x. τ. λ. (De Cherub. c. 35,
Opp. i. 162, where note Philo’s distinction between τὸ ὄρ’οδ, τὸ ἔξ οδ, τὸ
ὅτ’ οδ, and τὸ δ’ ὕδ); “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 καταχροσετ), and making a distinction be­
tween θεός, without the article, “a divine being,” and δ θεός, “the
other New Testament writer uses the preposition ὑπὸ, "by," in speaking of the agency of the Son or Logos in creation. The designation "firstborn 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 πάσης 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; compare 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."

Divine Being." (See De Somn. i. 38, Opp. i. 655, and comp. Legg. Alleg. iii. 73, Opp. i. 128, l. 43.) In a fragment preserved by Eusebius (Praep. Evang. vii. 13, or Philonis Opp. ii. 625) he names the Logos ὁ ἐν οὐρανῷ θεὸς, "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. Exod. vii. 1,) and says that it may be used of one who "procures good (τὸ ἄραθιον) for others," and is "wise." De Mut. Nom. c. 22, Opp. i. 597, 598; see also De Mos. i. 28, Opp. ii. 106 [misprinted 108], where Moses is called δὲν τὸν ἐθνῶν θεὸν καὶ βασιλέως; Quod del. pot. insid. c. 44, Opp. i. 222; De Migr. Abr. c. 15, Opp. i. 449; Legg. Alleg. i. 13, Opp. i. 151; Quod omn. prob. liber, c. 7, Opp. ii. 452; De Decem. 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 ἐν οὐρανῷ θεὸς εὐλογημένος εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνατον.

*See Lightfoot, St. Paul's Epistles to the Colossians and to Philemon, p. 214 ff.

†ὁ θεὸς (ὁ ὁ πατὴρ) must be supplied as the subject of εὐλογηθέντων; 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 Nicaeae 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 θεός ἐκ θεοῦ, as begotten from the substance of the Father, they were accustomed to reserve such titles as ὁ θεός used absolutely, εἰς θεός, and ὁ ἐκ πάντων or ἐκ πάντων 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 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 θεός. It had also a metaphorical and rhetorical use, quite foreign from the style of the New Testament.† All this made it easy and natural,  

* "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, Nicholas's ed.  
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. 118, 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 *οὐδὲν* 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 *οὐδὲν* 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 *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"; Tit.

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; ver. 27, 28, "But when he saith, All things are put in subjection, it is evident that He is excepted 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 500 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' Creed. When we consider further the fact already mentioned above (see p. 114) 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.

* "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 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 Cath. Church of Jesus Christ, etc., Lond. 1873, pp. 192, 190. Gess naively asks, "Wie dürfte man von dem galiläischen 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. Cap. V. (Vol. II. p. 151, 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. 1, 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 Schultz, 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 λόγος θεός genannt wird, Beweise ziehen wollen für die Zulässigkeit des Namens θεός für den verklärten Jesus." (Jahrbücher für deutsche Theol., 1868, xiii. 491.) 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.
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. 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

*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. 86 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.

†See Neander, Hist. 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-Encyklopädie der prot. Theol. und Kirche, ix. 437 ff., or in the new ed. of Herzog and Plitt, 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 Fritzsch, Ep. ad Rom. ii. 269, note; Weber, ut supra, p. 342. Weber says:—“Und wenn Baba bathra 75s gesagt wird, der Messias werde nach dem Namen Jehovah’s genannt, so stehen an dieser Stelle in gleicher Beziehung die Gerechten und Jerusalem.” Comp. Jer. xxiii. 6 with xxxii. 16, and on this passage see Oehler, Theol. des A. T., ii. 263; Riehm, Messianic Prophecy, p. 262, note 36; Schultz, Altest. Theol., 2te Aufl. (1878), p. 740. On Is. ix. 6 see Schultz, p. 727; Hitzig, Vorlesungen über bibli. Theol., u. s. w. (1880), p. 206 ff., and the commentators, as Gesenius, Knobel, Ewald, Cheyne. That the Memra da Yeya 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, Amer. 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
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
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 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 μουστήριον θεότητος as that they
were prepared to formulate the decrees of Nicaea and Constantinople,
which appeared after 300 years and more, or the Trinitarian exegesis,
which was completed after 600 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
eyearly 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 doc­
trine 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 εἰς πάντας θεός was used

authority for Jewish opinions in the time of Christ. See Ginsburg, The
Kabbalah (Lond. 1865), 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 (Bos­
ton) for Jan., May, and July, 1836.
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 trenched upon" (beinträchtigt).* The expression, he maintains, describes "the dignity conferred upon him by God"; the θεός here is essentially equivalent to χριστός. "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 χριστός, why did he not say χριστός, 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. 121). 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

*Schultz, Jahrbiicher f. deutsche Theol., 1868, xiii. 484.
†This view of Schultz appears to be that of Hofmann (Der Schriftbeweis, 2te Aufl., 1857, i. 143) and Weiss (Bibl. Theol. d. N. T., 3te Aufl., 1880, p. 283, note 5), as it was formerly of Ritschl (Die Entstehung der alikath. 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, Wolzogen. 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. 34-36, 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 consecutus, ut omnium et Deus esset et Dominus esset" (c. 22); "omnia Deus, quoniam omnibus illum Deus Pater praefosuit 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."
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 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 [Adon]i, '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 subject 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 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

*See Knapp, De Jesu Christo ad dextram Dei sedente, in his Scripta varii Argumenti, ed. 2da (1823), l. 39-76.
language of the Old Testament.* There, in the Septuagint, Κύριος 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 εὐλωγητός, 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 εἰς θεός 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 (cir. 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 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 Nicea 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

---

*"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 Prof. Stuart in the Biblical Repository (Andover) for Oct. 1831, i. 733-776. His view is that the τυφώκτης which Christ has as the Messiah is a deleg.
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. 89 f.)

1. 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 εἰς τὸν θεόν, not ὁ εἰς τὸν θεόν, 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 ὁν 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 εἰς τὸν θεόν is not to be connected with θεόν, but with ὁν, 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 synagogal 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 \( \theta \varepsilon \varphi \gamma \) 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 \( \theta \varepsilon \varphi \gamma \) with \( \psi \omega \varepsilon \pi \pi \alpha \tau \iota \varepsilon \) 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 \( \theta \varepsilon \varphi \gamma \) 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. Nöst. c. 6) agrees with that of Gess in finding three distinct affirmations in the clause beginning with \( \psi \omega \varepsilon \pi \pi \alpha \tau \iota \varepsilon \), in opposition to those who would read it \( \mu \nu \alpha \nu \chi \varepsilon \lambda \psi \varepsilon \varepsilon \sigma \varepsilon \). 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 \( \psi \omega \varepsilon \pi \pi \alpha \tau \iota \varepsilon \). 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, \( \varepsilon \gamma \omega \varepsilon \iota \mu \iota \), \( \psi \omega \varepsilon \pi \pi \alpha \tau \iota \varepsilon \). And compare on Gal. iii. 20." . . . "He Who came of the Jews, according to the flesh, is no other than \( \psi \omega \varepsilon \pi \pi \alpha \tau \iota \varepsilon \), the BEING ONE, JEHOVAH." . . . We have an assertion of "His Existence from Everlasting, in \( \psi \omega \varepsilon \pi \pi \alpha \tau \iota \varepsilon \)." He mis translates 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 ver. 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 \( \varepsilon \iota \mu \iota \) 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., \( \psi \omega \varepsilon \pi \pi \alpha \tau \iota \varepsilon \), "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 \( \psi \omega \varepsilon \pi \pi \alpha \tau \iota \varepsilon \) 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 eternal existence from the use of ων or ον (or qui 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, Ancorat. c. 5; Gregory of Nyssa, Adv. Eunom. lib. x., Opp. (1638) ii. 680–82; Pseudo-Basil, Adv. Eunom. iv. 2, Opp. i. 282 (399); Chrysostom, Opp. i. 476 f., viii. 87, ed. Montf.; Hilary, De Trin. xii. 24. So Proclus of Constantinople, Ep. ad Armen. de Fide c. 14, quoting Rom. ix. 5, says: ειπεν αυτω ὑντα, ἧ ν αυτοκεφαλητής; "he spoke of him as being, that he might declare in thunder his existence without beginning." (Migne, Patrol. Gr. lxv. 872c.)

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 ον οτι 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 xατα σάρκα, 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 θεός instead of θεότης as the subject of the sentence, though in a few cases the word stands in the nominative without the article. Grimm compares θεός μάρτυς, 1 Thess. ii. 5, with μάρτυς ο θεός, Rom. i. 9; also 2 Cor. v. 19; Gal. ii. 6; vi. 7; Luke xx. 38 (?). We should also rather expect εὐλογητός 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. 108 f., in regard to the position of the subject in contrasts.) Gess accordingly dismisses the objection founded on the position of εὐλογητός, 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 Prof. 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*, &c. 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. 99, 1st paragr.) Mr. Norton, in translating ver. 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. 94.) 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 ὃ κυριστός 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 κυριστός: "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., Introd., 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 natur­
ally 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 before had occasion to consider the
value of this argument in connection with another passage. (See
above, p. 8.) 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.
120f.) 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 con­
struction 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 επί 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 του θεος
depend not on θεός, but του ιεριστου (see above, p. 8), will be suf­
cient 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, ÓEcumenius (or what passes under his
name), and Theophylact, when, in their zeal for the freedom of the
will, they explain προθεσις in Rom. viii. 28 (νοις πατερ του χληνβοις),
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, ÓEcumenius, and Theophylact
that διὰ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ in Rom. xvi. 27 is to be construed with στρι-πήσα; 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 Quarterly Review for January, 1882, has given perhaps the fullest enumeration yet presented of Christian writers who have referred the ὁ ὁς ἐν τῇ ὁ. in Rom. ix. 5 to Christ. He counts up “55 illustrious names,” 40 of Greek writers from Irenæus in the latter part of the second century to John of Damascus in the eighth, and 15 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 6 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. Caesarius should also have been cited as Pseudo-Caesarius. 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 Rell. 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 “Constt. 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 Paraclete; than which doctrines what can be more abominable?” Compare Const.
Apost. iii. 17:—"The Father is the God over all, δ ἐπὶ πάντων θεοῖς; 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. Burgan 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 δ ἐπὶ πάντων θεοῖς; 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 Commentaries 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 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.

*See his Peroratio at the end of the Epistle; Origenis Opp. iv. 688 f., ed. Delarue. Matthaei remarks: “Rufini interpretatio, quem 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 omisisit, alia, sicut in ceteris libris, invitio Origene admisit.”—Pauli Eppl. ad Thess., etc. (Rigas, 1785), Praefatio, sig. b 2. See more fully to the same purpose Redepenning’s Origenes, ii. 189 ff., who speaks of his “Ausscheidung ganzer Stücke,” and “Umgestaltung des Heterodoxen in der Trinitätstelehre.”
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 "ἐπὶ πάντων θείως" as a title exclusively belonging to the Father, and insists upon this against the Sabellians.* 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 θείως; the Gnostics gave the name θείως to their Αἴωνς, and also to the Demiurgus; but to prove the unity of the Χριστός with the man Jesus, in opposition to the Gnostics who maintained that the Αἴων Christ did not descend upon Jesus till his baptism. He had just before (§ 2) quoted Matt. i. 18 for this purpose (reading τὸν δὲ γραμμοῦ); he now quotes Rom. i. 3, 4; ix. 5; and Gal. iv. 4, 5, for the same purpose. His argument rests on the ἐξ ὧν ἐκ τοῦ γραμμοῦ τὸ κατὰ σάρξ, 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. Nöet. c. 6) has already been noticed. (See above, pp. 126, 130.) The Noetians 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 μονοκόλως (or μονόκλως); comp. Epiph. Haer. lvii. 2. Westcott and Hort understand this to mean

*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, τῶν ἐπὶ πάντων θείον χριστόν εἰπεμένους (ed. Vales.), is a false reading: Burton, Schwegler, Læmmer and Dindorf omit χριστον on the authority of important MSS.; on the other hand Heinichen in his recent edition (1868) omits ἐπὶ πάντων θείον, and reads τῶν χριστόν simply.

†Semler, Ep. ad Griesbachium, 1770, p. 77 ff.; Antwort etc. 1770, p. 45), and Whitby (Disq. modestæ, 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 bis; 13. (al. 18.) § 8; 24. (al. 41.) § 2; 28. (al. 49.) § 8; iii. 8. § 3; iv. 5. (al. 10.) § 1; v. 18. § 1, and many other passages.
that they read all the words from \( \text{xii} \, \varepsilon \, \text{iv} \, \text{aivovas} \) "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. Noe. c. 6 \( \text{eulogizit} \) is misplaced through the mistake of a scribe, and should stand before \( \text{eis tov} \, \text{aivovas} \).

Dean Burgon refers also to "Phil. 339," that is to the Philosophumena or Ref. omn. Haer. x. 34, ad fin. But \( \text{ou} \, \text{xat} \, \text{pavton} \, \theta \varepsilon \) there should not, I think, be alleged as a quotation of Rom. ix. 5 applied to Christ. Bunsen’s easy emendation of the passage (Anal. 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 \( \text{obdov} \, \mu \varepsilon \varepsilon \) \( \text{xat} \, \text{xat} \, \text{pavton} \, \theta \varepsilon \) is distinguished from the Logos. Hippolytus could hardly have called Christ "the God over all."

I note in passing that Tischendorf cites incorrectly for the reference of the \( \text{ou} \, \text{ov} \, \&c. \) to Christ "Meth. conviv 805 (Gall 3)." The passage referred to is not from the Convivium, but from the discourse of the Pseudo-Methodius De Simeone et Anna, c. 1 ad fin., where we have the mere expression \( \text{eis} \, \text{astekton} \, \delta \varepsilon \varepsilon \) \( \text{tov} \, \text{eis} \, \text{pavton} \, \theta \varepsilon \) \( \text{svxat} \, \text{ta} \, \text{sa} \). 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 Amphiloctius (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. 134) it is probable that the six Bishops made a slight pause at \( \text{pavton} \). 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 (\( \text{aggelov} \)) 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. 98, 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 ὐ ὀν, &c., 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, ἐκ ὤν ὁ χριστός, τὸ λατά σάρξα, ἐκ αὐτῶν, φατίν, ὁ χριστός, θεὸς δὲ ὡς μόνων αὐτῶν, ἀλλὰ κοινῆ 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, ἐκ αὐτῶν καὶ ὁ χριστός τὸ λατά σάρξα, δὲ ἐστὶ θεός ὡς μόνων αὐτῶν, ἀλλὰ κοινῆ πάντων. (Migne, Patrol. Gr. lxvi. 833.) Had it been the purpose of Diodorus to express this meaning, he would probably have inserted ἐστιν after θεός δὲ, or have written δὲ ἐστιν. 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 λατρείαι); and showing most clearly whence these things are, and on whose providence they have depended [he adds], ὡς ὀν ἐπὶ πάντων θεός εὐλογητὸς εἰς τῶν αἰώνων, Ἀμήν." "So the laws and the holy services and the promises, in the observance of which the fathers pleased God,

*See, for example, Theodore of Mopsuestia on Rom. ii. 15; viii. 28; ix. 10, 14 bis, 22–24, 25; xi. 2. (Migne, lxvi. coll. 789b, 832b, 833d, 836c, 840b, 841c, 841d, 852b.) See also Cramer, p. 11, l. 39; 15, l. 15; 27, l. 24; 54, l. 22, etc.
and from whom as to his humanity sprang the Messiah, are from the God over all, τῷ ἐξ θαυμασμοῦ 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 our verse to God. He misapprehends the meaning of the passage in Theodulus, and does not observe that it is taken from Οὐκομενίου.* 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 Cæle-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 benedicit in saecula*), without remark. (*Testim.* ii. 6.) Novatian has already been spoken of. (See above, p. 126.)

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 *Quaest. Vet. et Nov. Test.*, qu. 91, formerly ascribed to Augustine, and printed in the Benedictine edition of his

*See Biblioth. max. vet. Patrum, viii. 605, or the Monumenta S. Patrum Orthodoxographa of Grynæus, 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 benedicit in saeculum* omn. Nam et radius solis seorsum seolum vocabo; solem antem nominans, cuius est radius, non statim et radius solem appellabo." (Prax. c. 13, ed. Oehler.) This accords with his language elsewhere:—"Protulit deus sermonem . . . sicut radix fruticem, et fons fluent, et soli radius." (Prax. c. 8.) "Cum radius ex sole porrigitur, portio ex summa; sed sol erit in radio . . . nec separatum substantia, sed extenditur." (Apologel. c. 21.) "Pater tota substantia est; filius vero derivatio totius et portio; sicut ipse profitetur, *Quia pater maior me est.*" (Prax. c. 9.) "Sermo deus, quia ex deo . . . Quodsi deus dei tanquam substantiva res, non erit ipse deus [αὐτόθεος], sed hactenus deus, qua ex ipsius substantia, ut portio aliqua totius." (Prax. c. 26.)
works, *Opp. III. ii. 2915*, ed. Bened. alt.: "Sed forte ad Patris personam pertinere dicatur. Sed 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, Amphilochius, Gelasius Cyz., Anastasius Ant., Leontius Byz., Maximus.

Of the Latins, Ambrose, Hilary, Jerome, Victorinus, the Breviariurn, Marius Mercator, Cassian, Alcimus 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. 8, also p. 133 f.)

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.

(I now observe, too late for correction in the printed sheet, that, in citing the opinion of the eminent scholars just named respecting the construction given to Rom. ix. 5 by Origen and Eusebius, I have represented them 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 I now 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 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.

We will now dismiss the Fathers, and notice some facts belonging to the more recent history of the interpretation of our passage.* I notice the different constructions in the order in which they are numbered above, pp. 89, 90.

The three most important recent discussions of the passage outside of the commentaries, before that of Dr. Dwight, are by Dr. Hermann 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. Willibald 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. 397-405, and Sept., 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, Le Clerc, Limborch, Bengel, Michaelis, Koppe, Flatt, 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, Bising (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;

*Literature.—The older literature is given by Wolf (Curae) and Lilenthal (Bibliischer Archivarius, 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. 1793, 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. exeget. Bibliothek, 1772, 1773. The name Bremer (Schultz, p. 462, note 2) is a misprint for Benner.
so 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. Przpicovius or Przpkowsky 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"! (Quar. Rev., Jan., 1882, p. 54.) 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 θεός. 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."

Schlichting also suggests, as what "venire alicui in mentem posset," the somewhat famous conjecture of ῥω ὅ for ῥ ῥω, 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

---

*Socinus speaks of the punctuation and construction proposed by Erasmus, a believer in the deity of Christ, which makes the ῥ ῥω, etc., a doxology to God, the Father, and says:—"Non est ulla causa, cur haec interpretatio, vel potius lectio et interpunctio Erasmi rejici posset 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 solet anteponi ei, ad quem reletur, 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.
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 does not deserve the slightest consideration.

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 Ruckert (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.). Dorner in his recent work, System der chirstl. 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 Prof. Stuart has borrowed largely) and Philippi.

4. Construction No. 4 has already been sufficiently noticed. (See above, p. 130.)

5. The construction which puts a colon or a period after πάντων, making the clause beginning with θεῷ a doxology to God, seems to have been first suggested by Erasmus in the Annotations to his 3d edition of the Greek Testament (1522), repeated in the 4th (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. (Lond. 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 Memorbilien, 1791, St. i. pp. 1-26; treated more fully in his Vermischte Abhandlungen, 2te Samml., 1798, pp. 329-346; also by E. F. C.


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. 132.

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," which he perhaps intended for an ambiguous rendering, as est might be supplied after laudandus. His paraphrase also seems ambiguous.* Be this as it may, in the note in his last edition (1535), and in his later writings, he clearly indicates his preference for construction No. 7.†

*" 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?] praesidet omnibus, cuiusque inscrutabilis consilio geruntur haec omnia, cui soli . . . debetur laus" &c. 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 profiteor 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 Juvencum Germanodidascalam* (writ-
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, 85, 99) notes that "Quidam addunt punctum post vocem σάρξ, quia si id quod sequitur cum precedentibus conccrctetur, potius dicendum videatur ἃς ἐστιν, vel ἃς ὄν, quam ὃ ὄν.

Others who have adopted or favored this construction are Whiston, in his Primitive Christianity Reviv'd, vol. iv. (1711), p. 13 ff.; Dr. Samuel Clarke, in his Scripture Doctrine of the Trinity, Lond. 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 metaphysicains and theologians. So John Jackson of Leicester, in his Annot. ad Novatianum (1727), p. 341, though capitvated by the specious but worthless conjecture of ὃ ὄ; Wetstein, as an alternative rendering, but rather preferring to place the stop after παῦλων (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. 141. 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 Galaler- und Römer-Christen (Heidelberg. 1831), where he translates (p. 102): "Der über alle (Juden und Heiden) seyende Gott sey gepriesen auf (alle) die Zeitalter hinaus"; by Prof. J. F. Winzer of Leipzig in a Programm a 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 Altem Seiende (der welcher über Altem ist,) Gott, gelobt (sei gelobt) in Ewigkeit!" It is adopted in three commentaries of remarkable independence and ability which appeared in 1834, namely ten 1532), col. 1002:—"ipsa res loquitur, verba Pauli nullum sensum evidentius reddere quam hunc: Deus, qui est super omnia, sit benedictus in secula. Cui precationi accinitur, Amen." See also above, under No. 5.
those of Prof. 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; Prof. Eduard Köllner of Göttingen, and Dr. Conrad Glöckler, whom Prof. Stuart calls "a Nicenian" as regards his theological position. In the 4th edition of K. G. Bretschneider's Handbuch der Dogmatik (1838) i. 604 f., he adopts our construction, though in the earlier editions of this work he had referred the ὄνομα to Christ. He translates: "Der Herrüber alles, Gott, sei gepriesen in Ewigkeit." In 1839, Prof. L. J. Rückert of Jena, in the 2d 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 Prof. C. F. A. Fritzsche of Rostock, who discusses the passage in a masterly manner (pp. 260–275). His translation has been given above, p. 106. In the 4th edition of his Greek Testament with a Latin version, published in 1839, Prof. H. A. Schott of Jena adopted the punctuation and construction which make the clause beginning with ὅνομα a doxology to God, though in previous editions he had followed the common construction. In his essay De Invocazione 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, Neuest. Handwörterbuch (1843) art. Christus, p. 114, he had cited Rom. ix. 5 in proof that Christ is called God.


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 2d ed. of his translation of the N. T., he had taken the name "God" here as a
designation of Christ; but in the 3d ed. of his translation he makes it begin a doxology. MEYER in his *Das N. T. griechisch mit einer neuen Deutschen Übersetzung* (1829) followed the common construction; but in the first edition of his *Comm.* (1836), and all later eds., he makes the passage a doxology to God. His collaborator, HUTHER, maintains in his note on Tit. ii. 13 that the name θεος is not given to Christ in any of the New Testament Epistles.


Prof. J. H. SCHOLTEN of Leyden, in his *Dogmatics Christ. Initia*, ed. 2da, Lugd. Bat. 1858, p. 193 f., adopts our construction. So Athanase COQUEREL, *Christologie* (Paris, 1858), i. 76, note. So the celebrated Dutch commentator, VAN HENGEL, who in tom. 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 Evighed!" (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 Prof. WILLIBALD BEYCHLAG of Halle, in his *Christologie des N. T.*, Berl. 1866, p. 209 f.

Prof. 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 seienende 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., Lond. 1873.) Prof. Lewis CAMPBELL, the editor of Sophocles, in the *Contemp. Rev.* for Aug., 1876, p. 484, adopts the rendering of Prof. Jowett. The Rev. Joseph Agar BEET, Wesleyan Methodist, in a Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans of very marked ability (Lond. 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. Übersetzung des Briefs,* etc. (Dessau, 1878), which
I mention because Prof. 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. prof. 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), Amst., 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 béní éternellement!" Carl Weizsäcker, Das N. T. übersetzt, Tübingen, 1875, and Dr. Samuel Davidson, Lond., 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 σάρξα, making the passage a doxology to God, I may mention Harwood (1776), Lachmann, (1831-50), Schott (4th ed., 1839), Tischendorf (1841-73), Von Muralt (1846-48), Buttmann (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, è, and 64, 2, b., pp. 513, 545, or 551, 586 Thayer, 690, 733 Moulton; and Wilke, Hermeneutik (1844), ii. 88.

It is interesting to 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
nachaposl. Zeitaller (1851). pp. 38, 39, made the last part of the verse a doxology to God, but in the second edition (1857), p. 63 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.")

Σὲ τὰς εἰς, ὁ χρίνων ἀλλότριοι οἰκήτην, ὁ κατήγωρ τῶν ἀδελφῶν ἡμῶν;

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.

† The Quarterly Review for January, 1882, p. 54; see also the same for April, 1882, p. 370.

NOTE A.—(See p. 99.)

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

In regard to the punctuation of this passage in ancient manuscripts, 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 σύρξα in the manuscripts has been urged as an objection to the construction which makes the ὑ ὀντιν τ. λ. a doxology to God. For example, Dr. Gifford, the latest commentator, speaks of the stop after σύρξα 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 ὧν ἐπὶ πάντων and θέως εὐλογητὸς εἰς τῶς 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 σάρξα, unquestionably a prima manu. The Alexandrian manuscript (A) has also a point after σάρξα, as appears by Woide's edition (1786), by the recent photograph published by the 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 σάρξα in the Vatican manuscript (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, Lond., 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 σάρξα, but

*The facts as to the Vatican MS. are these. Tischendorf, who has given the most careful attention to its palæography, states that "ipsam primam manum passim, in nonnullis libris haurd rario interpunxisse, sine ulla dubitatione asseverandum est." (N. 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 facsimiles, 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 ὀφειλήμα in Rom. iv. 4 (cod. p. 1448), where there is no space, and after εὐστατο 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 12 points on the page (p. 1453) that contains Rom. ix. 5, extending from Rom. viii. 23 (ἐχον)τες to μητίῳ γαρ ix. 11, inclusive. There is no extra space after σάρξα, 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 ὀφειλήμα in Rom. iv. 4; and Tischendorf observes (Nov. Test. Sin. p. xix.) that there
this does not determine the construction of what follows. The Sinaitic MS. has only a single point (after οὐσίως Rom. ix. 20) in the whole page containing the passage, 4 cols. of 48 lines each, from Rom. viii. 38 οὐσίως εὐστῶντα to αγαθονοῦσις 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 σάρξα, it counts for nothing. We have no report of K, collated by Matthaei, who does not record the punctuation of MSS. L, the remaining uncial, has a point after σάρξα according to Tischendorf. There is no break between ο οντ and αἱμα 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 entirely at random. But a point after σάρξα is found in at least six cursive, viz. 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 θείως, which is not the case in the Astor Library manuscript.* A point has also been noted after θείως 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 N. T. MSS. I therefore note the fact, that on the page of the Alexandrian MS. (A) which contains our passage, extending from Rom. viii. 21 γὰρ διὰ τοῦ οὐσιαζόντος τῷ θυ μεν .. ix. 11, there are 64 points in Woide’s edition; in the Ephrem MS. (C) from Rom. viii. 27 ο ο εἰρημνῶν αἱμα ix. 3 in Tischendorf’s edition there are 45 points; for B see above. In the three pages of Paul’s Epistles in B published by Tischendorf line for line in his

are points with no space in the Sinaitic MS. after the words πονὴμα ταῖς τὴν αναπνεύσια 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 ἀπεκδεχομέθα, col. 1, l. 12, or after τεχνα, 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 σάρξα “is of lighter color than the adjoining letters,” and that it was certainly much fainter than a point in the space after ημῶν on the same page, “which was as black as the touched letters.”

*For a careful copy of that part of the Astor Library manuscript which contains Rom. ix. 4, 5, I am indebted to the kindness of the Rev. S. M. Jackson.
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Appendix codd. celeb. Sin. Val. Alex. (1867), p. 1445 (Rom. i. 1-26) has 15 points which he regards as a prima manus; p. 1460 (Rom. xv. 24—xvi. 17) has 35; p. 1506 (Col. iv. 8—1 Thess. i. 8, with more than half a column blank, has 17. 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, &c., is that a pause after that word was felt by ancient scribes to be natural.

NOTE B. (See p. 112.)

On the Distinction between ἐυλογητός and ἐυλογημένος.

The distinction between ἐυλογητός and ἐυλογημένος 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, ἐυλογίας ἄξιος; the latter one who is in fact praised or blessed, whether rightfully or otherwise. In other words, ἐυλογητός, in doxologies, would be laudandum or laude dignus; ἐυλογημένος laudatus. So Theodore of Mopsuestia on Eph. i. 3 explains ἐυλογητός as τῶν ἐπαινεῖσθαι καὶ θαυμάζεσθαι ἄξιος. (Migne, Patrol. Gr. lxvi. 912.) It is true that in classical Greek verbals in -τός, like the Latin participles in -tus, have generally a simply passive significance; but we find exceptions, particularly in the later Greek, and especially in the use of words analogous in meaning to ἐυλογητός. See in the Lexicons ἁγιαστός, ἑπανευρετός, ἐγκωμιαστός, ὑμαμαστός, μακαριστός (2 Macc. vii. 24), μεμυτός, θεσσός, διαθητός, στορικτός, δημοκτός, ἑπικομικτός. On ἐπαινετός and ψευτός see Philo, ubi supra. (See also Kühner, Ausführl. Gram., 2te Aufl., i. 716.) This view is confirmed by the fact that we never find ἐυλογητός used like ἐυλογημένος with εἰς or ἐστώ; wherever the verb is expressed with ἐυλογητός it is always in the indicative. For example, in Rom. i. 25, τὸν κτίσεως, ὃς ἠτίνα εὐλογητός εἰς τῶν ἁμών, it is surely more natural to take εὐλογητός as signifying "to be praised," laudandum, 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 ἢ, 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, 31, 32, 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 δὲ 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 Schlesner, 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 "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, ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ, ὁ κόσμος καὶ θεὸς ἡμῶν, ἀληθεία τῆς δόξας, x. τ. λ.; comp. Rev. v. 12. See also Ruinart, Acta Martyrum, ed. Galura, ii. 186 (S. Bonifatius, § 12), διὸ οὐάρ πρέπει τιμηθεῖν τῷ τ. λ., and iii. 62 (SS. Tarachus, Probus, etc. § 11), διὸ οὕτω πρέπει δοξαθεῖν τῷ 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 ἐστὶν rather than ἢ or ἐστὶ. 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. l.); xxvi. 29 (v. l.); Deut. vii. 14; (xxviii. 6, v. l.; xxxiii. 24, v. l.); Judg. xviii. 2 (v. l.); 1 Sam. xv. 13 (v. l.); Judith xiii. 18 (v. l.); Tob. xi. 16 (in one text), and when applied to God. In the former case it is used in the sense of "prospered," "blessed" (viz. 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; Tob. xi. 16 Sin.; contra, Judith xiii. 18.
One other remark may be made. In speaking of εὐλογητός and similar words in “exclamatory doxologies” (see 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 ἐστι, as in most at least of the clauses immediately preceding.

CORRECTION.

The statement on p. 108 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 εὐλογ.; the Ethiopic, εὐλογ. σὺ; the Old Latin has perished; and the Coptic, as I am informed by Prof. T. O. Paine, omits the last clause of the verse.