Recent Discussions of Romans ix. 5.

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

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

It appears that Canon Cook sent a challenge to Canon Kennedy, Regius Professor of Greek in the University of Cambridge, to meet the arguments of Dr. Gifford, and that this led to the publication of the first pamphlet to be noticed, the title of which is given below.[1] Dr. Gifford replied to Professor Kennedy in a pamphlet of 66 pages,[2]

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

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

and Professor Kennedy rejoined in a pamphlet of 72 pages, entitled *Pauline Christology*, Part I.[1] We shall probably have in due time a surrejoinder by Dr. Gifford, and Part II. of Professor Kennedy's *Pauline Christology*.

Professor Kennedy translates the last part of Rom. ix. 5 as follows: "And of whom *is* the Christ as concerning flesh. He who is over all *is* God, worthy to be praised for ever. Amen." (*Sermon*, etc., p. 19.) As was remarked in our *Journal* for 1881, pp. 99, 132, there is no grammatical difficulty in this construction. But I cannot adopt the view which Professor Kennedy takes of the passage. He regards the last part of Rom. ix. 5 as added by St. Paul "to win the ear and gain the confidence of the Jews by declaring his adherence to doctrines which they prized, a Jewish Messiah, and one supreme God worthy to be praised for ever." (*Sermon*, p. 21; comp. pp. 20, 25, and *Pauline Christology*, I., p. 61.)

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

Were Professor Kennedy's construction of the passage to be adopted, I should rather regard the ὁ ὢν ἐπὶ πάντων as having reference to God's providential government of the universe, and especially to his providential dealings with the Jews, in the revelations and privileges granted them with a view to the grand consummation of them all in the advent of the Messiah, as the head of a new, spiritual dispensation, embracing all men upon equal terms. The ὤν, in this connection, may include the past, present, and future; and we might paraphrase as follows, supplying what may naturally be supposed to have been in the mind of the Apostle: "He who is over all," He who has presided over the whole history of the Jewish nation, and bestowed upon it its glorious privileges; He whose hand is in all that is now taking place, who brings good out of evil, the conversion of the Gentiles out of the temporary blindness and disobedience of the Jews; He whose promises will not fail, who has not cast off his people, and who will

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

finally make all things redound to the glory of his wisdom and goodness, "is God, blessed for ever. Amen."

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

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

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

Origen to the supreme God nearly 100 times." (*Pauline Christology*, I., p. 27.)

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

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

He complains, first (*Letter*, p. 27), that in quoting a sentence of his (*Journal*, p. 91), I have omitted altogether the first part, in which the cause of Paul's anguish is said to be "the fall of his brethren."

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

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

Dr. Gifford next complains that after having once quoted the remainder of his sentence fully, I proceed to criticise it, omitting in my second quotation the words "whom they had rejected." I omitted this clause, because, having been just quoted, it seemed unnecessary to repeat it; because it formed no part of the particular *privilege* of the Jews of which Dr. Gifford was speaking, the climax of which was expressed by the words "the *Divine* Saviour"; and because its omission was likely to make the point of my criticism strike the reader somewhat more forcibly. That I have done Dr. Gifford no injustice seems to me clear from the fact that, in the sentence quoted, "his anguish was deepened [not caused] most of all by the fact that their race gave birth to the Divine Saviour," the phrase "his anguish" *can* only mean

"his anguish on account of the rejection of the Messiah by the great majority of his countrymen." This is also clearly implied in the first words of my criticism, "Paul's grief for his unbelieving countrymen, then." Not a word of my criticism, which Dr. Gifford seems to misunderstand, would be affected in the least by the insertion of the omitted clause.

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

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

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

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

It will be observed that I do not, with many commentators, regard the doxology here as simply or mainly an expression of gratitude for the distinctive privileges bestowed upon the Jews as a nation, and still

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

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

Jewish Privileges, and Connection of Thoughts in Rom. ix. 1–5.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Here I must express my surprise at the manner in which Dr. Gifford has treated my quotations from the eleventh chapter in reference to this last-mentioned aspect of the Jewish privileges. (*Letter*, p. 26 f.) He omits entirely my statement of the purpose for which I introduce them (*Journal*, p. 92), though this is absolutely essential to the understanding of what is meant by "this view" in the first sentence which he quotes from me; and then, wholly without ground, represents me as teaching two things: (1) "that as we read the simple enumeration of Jewish privileges in vv. 3, 4 [he means vv. 4, 5], we are not to connect it, as is most natural, with the preceding context." How can he say this, when in the whole treatment of the subject (*Journal*, pp. 88 f., 91, 2d paragr., 104, 105), I have taken particular pains to point out the connection of thought, and to show that my view of vv. 4, 5 agrees with the context? (2) That "in order to understand the Apostle's meaning at this point, we must anticipate by an effort of our own imagination all the long-sustained argument . . . and the far-reaching prophetic hopes which make up the three following chapters." If Dr. Gifford had not omitted the sentences in which I stated my purpose, it would be at once seen that I did not make these quotations to show what the *reader* of verses 4, 5 is expected to draw from them by an effort of his own imagination, but what the *Apostle*, together with other things more obvious to the reader, may be reasonably supposed to have had in mind when he wrote. When a person treats at length of a subject on which he must have meditated often and long, meeting objections which he must have been frequently called upon to answer, I have been accustomed to suppose that what he actually says may afford some indication of what was in his mind when he began to write.

I admit that the privileges which the Jews enjoyed as a nation may be regarded as having incidentally aggravated the sin and the shame of their rejection of the Messiah; that the contemplation of them under that aspect would have deepened in some measure the Apostle's grief; and that it is possible, though I see nothing which directly proves it, that he viewed them under this aspect here. Dr. Gifford's error, I conceive, lies in ignoring the other obvious aspects, under which they could be only regarded as occasions of thankfulness; and in not recognizing the well-known psychological fact that the same object of thought often excites in the mind at the same time, or in the most rapid succession, mingled emotions of grief and joy and gratitude. One knows little of the deeper experiences of life who has not felt this. That this should be true here in the case of the Apostle who describes himself as "sorrowful, yet always rejoicing"; who exhorts his Christian brethren to "rejoice evermore," and to "give thanks always for all things to God, the Father, in the name of our Lord Jesus Christ," cannot be regarded as strange or unnatural.

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

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

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

In vv. 1–5 the purpose of the Apostle was to conciliate his Jewish-Christian readers, and indirectly, the unbelieving Jews,[1] by assuring

[1] Though the Epistle to the Romans was not addressed to unbelieving Jews,

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

So much for the connection of vv. 4, 5 with what precedes; how naturally the doxology at the end was suggested, and the reason for

---

one object of it was to meet, and to enable its readers to meet, objections which the unbelieving Jews urged against Christianity, and which many Jewish Christians urged against Paul's view of it. The strength of the prejudice against himself personally which the Apostle of the Gentiles had to encounter, is shown by the earnestness of his asseveration in ver. 1.

[1] So Theophylact, on vv. 1, 2: — Μέλλει προϊὼν δεῖξαι, ὅτι οὐ πάντες οἱ ἐξ Ἀβραὰμ σπέρμα αὐτοῦ εἰσι. Καὶ ἵνα μὴ δόξῃ κατ' ἐμπάθειαν ταῦτα λέγειν, προλαμβάνει, καὶ λέγει περὶ τῶν Ἑβραίων τὰ χρηστότερα, τὴν ὑπόνοιαν ταύτην ἀναιρῶν, καὶ ὁμολογεῖ αὐτοὺς ὑπερβαλλόντως φιλεῖν. And on vv. 4, 5: — Ἐπαινεῖ τούτους ἐνταῦθα καὶ μεγαλύνει, ἵνα, ὅπερ ἔφην, μὴ δόξῃ κατ' ἐμπάθειαν λέγειν. Ἠρέμα δὲ καὶ ἐπαινίττεται, ὅτι ὁ μὲν θεὸς ἠβούλετο αὐτοὺς σωθῆναι κ.τ.λ. So also, in the main, Theodoret, Calvin, Locke, and especially Flacius Illyricus, whose notes on vv. 1, 3, and 4 are very much to the point. Dr. Hodge has stated his view of the Apostle's purpose in almost the same language as I have used above. (See *Journal*, p. 91, note; see also Dr. Dwight, *ibid.*, p. 41.)

the position of εὐλογητός, are pointed out on pp. 88 f., 90 ff., and 104 f. of the *Journal*, and I need not repeat what is there said.

ὁ ὤν.

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

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

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

he deems the one he adopts the only one tenable, he simply begs the whole question.

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

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

It has indeed been asserted by many, as by Dr. Gifford for example, that the construction of the ὁ ὤν, for which he contends here, is the "usual" one, and, therefore, more easy and natural. But the examples which I have cited of the other construction disprove this assertion, and also show that, in general, the construction of the participle with the article in the nominative case, as the subject of an independent sentence, is much more common in the New Testament than that which refers it to a substantive preceding. (See *Journal*, etc., p. 97.)

In one respect, and one only, so far as I can see, the construction which refers ὁ ὤν to ὁ χριστός may be regarded as the more natural. It is the one which naturally presents itself first to the mind. But it has this advantage only for a moment; as the reader proceeds, he perceives at once that ὁ ὤν may introduce an independent sentence, and the Ἀμήν suggests a doxology. Even more may be said: the separation of ὁ ὤν from ὁ χριστός by τὸ κατὰ σάρκα, and the necessary pause after σάρκα, might at once suggest that ὁ ὤν (not "who is," but "he who is") may introduce a new sentence. But waiving this possibility, as soon as it is perceived that the passage admits grammatically of two constructions, the question which is the more natural does

not depend at all on the fact that the one presented itself to the mind a moment before the other, but must be determined by weighing all the considerations which bear on the subject. One of these considerations, second to no other in importance, is Paul's use of language. In the eight preceding chapters of the Epistle the Apostle has used the word θεός as a proper name, designating the "one God, the Father," about eighty-seven times, and has nowhere applied it to Christ. Could anything then be more natural than for the primitive reader of the Epistle to adopt the construction which accords with this *uniform* usage of the writer?

On p. 48 Dr. Gifford claims that 2 Cor. xi. 31 is "exactly similar in form" to Rom. ix. 5, and, therefore, proves "that the clause ὁ ὢν ἐπὶ πάντων κ.τ.λ. must, according to Paul's usage, be referred to the preceding subject ὁ χριστός"; and he again speaks of the "exact correspondence between the two passages." He overlooks two fundamental differences: (1) that in 2 Cor. xi. 31 the construction which refers the ὁ ὤν to ὁ θεός κ.τ.λ. is the only one *possible;* and (2) that what precedes the ὁ ὤν does not, as he incorrectly affirms, form a sentence "grammatically complete," as in Rom. ix. 5; but on the contrary, an essential part of the sentence, the object of the transitive verb οἶδεν (namely, ὅτι οὐ ψεύδομαι), is separated from the verb which governs it by the clause introduced by ὁ ὤν.

Distinction between θεός and κύριος.

In regard to the distinction between θεός and κύριος, which Dr. Gifford charges me with having "asserted in a most inaccurate form" (*Letter*, p. 12), I cannot perceive that he has pointed out any inaccuracy in my statement. That the word θεός in general expresses a higher dignity than κύριος seems to me beyond question. The use of κύριος in the Septuagint as a proper name, taking the place of Jehovah on account of a Jewish superstition respecting the pronunciation of the *tetragrammaton*, is something wholly exceptional and peculiar. I have not, however, as Dr. Gifford incorrectly represents, "suppressed all reference" to this very frequent use in the Septuagint, and occasional use in the New Testament. I note the fact that "it is seldom used of God in the writings of Paul except in quotations from or references to the language of the Old Testament," and then remark upon its two-fold use as applied to God in the Septuagint. (See *Journal*, pp. 127, 128.) That as a title of Christ it does not stand for Jehovah is fully shown, I think, by Cremer in his *Biblisch-theologisches Wörterbuch der Neutest. Gräcität*, 3te Aufl., p. 483 ff., or

Eng. trans., 2d ed., p. 382 ff. The argument that as a designation of Christ in the writings of St. Paul it is equivalent to Jehovah, because in a very few places he applies to Christ language of the Old Testament in which κύριος represents Jehovah, loses all its apparent force when we observe the extraordinary freedom with which he adapts the language of the Old Testament to his purpose without regard to its meaning in the connection in which it stands. On this it may be enough to refer to Weiss, *Bibl. Theol. of the N. T.*, 3d ed., § 74. He remarks: "Paul does not inquire into the original meaning of Old Testament expressions; he takes them in the sense which he is accustomed to give to similar expressions, even in the case of such terms as πίστις, κύριος, εὐαγγελίζεσθαι (Rom. i. 17, ix. 33, x. 13, 15)."

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

Dr. Gifford refers to Waterland, Pearson, and Weiss. Weiss has already been sufficiently answered by Weiss; see above. Waterland and Pearson cite such passages as Hosea i. 7, "I will save them by Jehovah their God, and will not save them by bow, nor by sword, nor by battle, nor by horses, nor by horsemen," as proving that Jesus Christ is called Jehovah in the Old Testament. (Pearson, *Expos.*

[1] See, for example, Micah v. 4: "And he shall stand and feed in the strength of Jehovah, in the majesty of the name of Jehovah, HIS GOD."

of the Creed, p. 217 f., Nichols's ed.) Pearson cites to the same purpose Zech. x. 12; Jer. xxiii. 5, 6 (comp. Jer. xxxiii. 15, 16); Zech. ii. 10, and other passages. Such exegesis might perhaps be pardoned in the time of Pearson and Waterland, though commentators like Calvin, Pocock, Drusius, Grotius, and Le Clerc had rejected this wild interpretation; but it can hardly be supposed that it needs a formal refutation at the present day. It may be enough to refer Dr. Gifford to "The Speaker's Commentary" on the passages mentioned, and the note in the *Journal* for 1881, p. 124.

Origen.

Dr. Gifford still appeals to Rufinus's translation of Origen's Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans as proving that Origen "certainly" interpreted the last part of Rom. ix. 5 as he does (*Letter*, pp. 32 ff., 65). His positiveness is not abated by the circumstance that Rufinus so altered, abridged, and interpolated this work of Origen, that for the most part we have no means of determining what belongs to Origen and what to Rufinus, and that his friends thought he ought to claim it as his own.[1]

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

[1] "Adversus hanc audaciam excandescit Erasmus, nec immerito quidam Rufinum objurgarunt, quemadmodum ipse sibi objectum fuisse ait in peroratione suæ translationis, quod suum potius, quam Origenis nomen hujus operis titulo non inscripsisset. Hinc etiam fit, ut vix Origenem in Origene reperias," etc. — Lumper, *Hist. theol.-crit.*, etc. Pars ix. (1792), p. 191.

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

Dr. Gifford's citations from the treatise of Origen against Celsus do not appear to me to answer his purpose. He quotes passages (*Cont. Cels.* i. 60, 66; ii. 9) in which Origen has called Christ θεός, but in the last one adduced (ii. 9) the words at the end of the sentence, κατὰ τὸν τῶν ὅλων θεὸν καὶ πατέρα, as De la Rue remarks, "manifestam continent antithesin ad ista, μεγάλην ὄντα δύναμιν καὶ θεόν, *ut pater supra filium evehatur*."[1] What is wanted is to show that Origen has not merely given Christ the appellation θεός, "a divine being," in contradistinction from ὁ θεός, ὁ τῶν ὅλων θεός, ὁ ἐπὶ πᾶσι θεός, by which titles he constantly designates the Father, but that he has called him "God over all," as he is represented as making St. Paul do in this so-called translation of Rufinus. It is the Father alone who in the passages cited by Dr. Gifford (*Cont. Cels.* viii. 4, 12) is termed ὁ ἐπὶ πᾶσι θεός; in viii. 14 of the same treatise Origen emphatically denies that the generality of Christians regarded the Saviour as "the God over all"; and in the next section he expressly calls him "inferior" to the Father (ὑποδεέστερος), as he elsewhere speaks of him as ἐλάττων πρὸς τὸν πατέρα and δεύτερος τοῦ πατρός (*De Princip.* i. 3, § 5), and says that "he is excelled by the Father as much as (or even more than) he and the Holy Spirit excel other beings," and that "in no respect does he compare with the Father" (οὐ συγκρίνεται κατ' οὐδὲν τῷ πατρί, *In Joan.* tom. xiii. c. 25; Opp. iv. 235). It is not easy to believe that one who uses such language as this applied the last clause of Rom. ix. 5 to Christ.

---

[1] De la Rue understands the κατά to denote "inferiorem ordinem," and says it is often so used. I doubt this, and if the word is genuine, should rather take it as meaning "in accordance with the will of," or "by the will of," nearly as in the phrase κατὰ θεόν in Plato, Aristotle, and other Greek authors. But it seems to me very probable that the true reading is μετά; comp. Orig. *In Joannem* tom. i. c. 11, τὸν μετὰ τὸν πατέρα τῶν ὅλων θεὸν λόγον; Justin Mart. *Apol.* i. 32, ἡ πρώτη δύναμις μετὰ τὸν πατέρα πάντων καὶ δεσπότην θεόν (and similarly *Apol.* i. 12, 13; ii. 13); Euseb. *De Eccl. Theol.* i. 20, p. 93 c., κύριος τῶν ὅλων μετὰ τὸν ἐπὶ πάντων θεόν. The prepositions κατά and μετά are very often confounded in MSS. by an error of the scribe, the abbreviations for the two words being similar. (Montfaucon, *Palaeogr. Graeca*, p. 345; Sabas, *Specim. Palaeogr.*, Suppl., tabb. xi., xii.) See Bast ad Gregor. Corinth. ed. Schaefer (1811), pp. 69, 405, 825, and Irmisch's Herodian iv. 1638, who gives eight examples. Cobet remarks:

who has seen the Son . . . has seen in him, who is the image of God, God himself." [1]

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

Origen's ideas respecting the worship of the Son appear distinctly in what he says of prayer. In his treatise on Prayer, he teaches that prayer, properly speaking, is "perhaps never to be offered to any originated being, *not even to Christ himself*, but only to the God and Father of all, to whom our Saviour himself prayed and teaches us to pray." (*De Orat.* c. 15; Opp. i. 222.) There is much more to the same purpose. In his later work against Celsus, he says that "every supplication and prayer, and intercession, and thanksgiving is to be sent up to the GOD OVER ALL, *through* the High Priest, who is above all angels, the living Logos, and God. But we shall also supplicate the Logos himself, and make requests to him, and give thanks and pray, if we are able to distinguish between prayer properly speaking and prayer in a looser sense, ἐὰν δυνώμεθα κατακούειν τῆς περὶ προσευχῆς κυριολεξίας καὶ καταχρήσεως." (*Cont. Cels.* v. 4, and see also v. 5; Opp. i. 580.) Compare *Cont. Cels.* viii. 26: "We ought to pray only to the GOD OVER ALL; yet it is proper to pray also to the only-begotten, the first-born of the whole creation, the Logos of God, and to request him, as a High Priest, to carry up our prayers which reach him to HIS GOD and our God." So *Cont. Cels.* viii. 13: "We worship the one God, and the one Son, who is his Logos and Image, with supplications and petitions as we are able, bringing our prayers to the GOD OF THE UNIVERSE *through* his only-begotten Son, to whom we first offer them; beseeching him, who is the propitiation for our sins, to present, as High Priest, our prayers and sacrifices and intercessions to the GOD OVER ALL." [2]

---

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

[2] It may be worth while to note that Origen (*Cont. Cels.* viii. 9) justifies the

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

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

Punctuation in MSS.

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

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

In regard to Codex A, Canon Cook thinks the testimony of Dr. Vance Smith, whom Dr. Gifford cites as saying that the stop after

---

honor paid to the Son on the ground that he receives it by the appointment of the Father (ἀποδείξομεν ὅτι ἀπὸ θεοῦ δέδοται αὐτῷ τὸ τιμᾶσθαι, citing John v. 23), and is declared by God to be ἄξιον τῆς δευτερευούσης μετὰ τὸν θεὸν τῶν ὅλων . . . τιμῆς. (*Cont. Cels.* v. 57.)

σάρκα is "evidently *a prima manu*," is "not verified or likely to be verified."[1] Many others will question the testimony of a Unitarian heretic. It would have been only fair, therefore, to have added the fact, mentioned on p. 150 of the *Journal*, that Dr. Sanday agrees with him. I would add that I am informed, on good authority, that Dr. Scrivener has examined the MS. at this place with the same result.

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

Van Hengel on the τὸ κατὰ σάρκα.

As regards the limitation τὸ κατὰ σάρκα (*Letter*, p. 38 f.), the examples cited by Van Hengel from Plato's Philebus (c. 7, p. 17[c]) and Isocrates (*ad Nicocl.* c. 29 *al.* 30) in support of his view, and urged by Dr. Gifford in opposition to it, are, I think, not to the purpose on either side. The formulæ "A and *also* B," and "not only A, but B," into which the quotations, so far as they bear on the matter, may be resolved, do not express "antithesis," but agreement. Dr. Gifford's citation from Demosthenes (*cont. Eubul.* p. 1229, l. 14) furnishes no analogy to the τὸ κατὰ σάρκα here, and is wholly irrelevant, for two reasons: (1) because the τὸ καθ' ὑμᾶς [al. ἡμᾶς] is introduced with a μέν, which of course leads one to expect an antithesis, such as follows, expressed by δέ; and (2) because the τὸ καθ' ὑμᾶς is probably to be regarded as the direct object of the verb θαρρεῖν, used here, as often, transitively, like its opposite φοβεῖσθαι. Van Hengel's rule relates only to clauses like τὸ κατ' ἐμέ, τὸ ἐξ ὑμῶν, in which the article τὸ with its adjunct is neither the object nor the subject of a verb, or at least of any verb expressed. (See Van Hengel, *Interp. Ep. Pauli ad Rom.* ii. 348.)

Irenæus.

As to the quotation of Rom. ix. 5 by Irenæus (*Hær.* iii. 16, § 3), I must still, for the reasons assigned in the *Journal* (p. 136), regard it as doubtful whether he referred the last clause of the verse to Christ. In opposition to the Gnostics who held that the Æon *Christ* first descended upon Jesus at his baptism, Irenæus is quoting passages which, like ἐξ ὧν ὁ χριστὸς τὸ κατὰ σάρκα, speak of the *Christ* as *born*. But why, Dr. Gifford asks, does he quote the remainder of the passage if it had nothing to do with his argument? (*Letter*, p. 42.) I answer, he may well have included it in his quotation, if he regarded it as a

[1] Canon Cook, *Revised Version of the first three Gospels*, p. 194; comp. p. 167.

doxology, or gave it Dr. Kennedy's construction, for the same purpose as Photius has quoted it in his work against the Manichæans (*see Journal*, p. 138 f.), namely, as confirming the doctrine insisted on throughout his book, that the God of the Jews, the God of the Old Testament, was not, as all the Gnostics contended, a being inferior to the Supreme God, but the God over all. So understood, it would agree with the language which Irenæus uses so often elsewhere, describing the Father as the God over all, while he nowhere, to my knowledge, speaks of the Son as God over all. I admit that Irenæus *may* have applied the last clause to Christ, separating the θεός from ὁ ὢν ἐπὶ πάντων as a distinct predicate; but I perceive nothing which determines with certainty the construction he gave it. The whole question is of the least possible consequence. One who could treat 2 Cor. iv. 4 as he has done (*Hær.* iii. 7, § 1; iv. 29, § 2), is certainly no authority in exegesis in a case where doctrinal prejudice could have an influence.

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

Clement of Rome.

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

caused them to be printed among the Additions and Corrections in the number of the *Journal* for 1882, p. 160, referring to the *Journal* for 1881, p. 101. So far as they go, they both, I think, favor my view of the controverted passage rather than Dr. Gifford's. If they are to be regarded as *quotations* of Rom. ix. 5, they favor it more than I had supposed.

Position of εὐλογητός.

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

Dr. Gifford takes no notice of my explanation of the *reason* for the ordinary position of such words as εὐλογητός, εὐλογημένος, ἐπικατάρατος, etc., in doxologies, benedictions, and maledictions, or of the exceptions which I adduce (save Ps. lxviii. 20, which I waive), or of my argument that if we take the last clause as a doxology, the position of εὐλογητός after the subject is not only fully accounted for, but is rather *required by the very same law of the Greek language*, which governs all the examples that have been alleged against the doxological construction. (*Journal*, pp. 103–111.) As this view is supported by so eminent a grammarian as Winer, to say nothing of Meyer, Fritzsche, and other scholars, it seems to me that it deserved consideration.

Different Senses of εὐλογητός.

On p. 56 of Dr. Gifford's *Letter*, he gives as examples of the use and meaning of the word εὐλογητός the expressions "Blessed be God"

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

The very common use of εὐλογητός in doxologies to God seems to have led the Septuagint translators to restrict its application in the sense of "praised," or rather "worthy to be praised," to the Supreme Being. To this perhaps the only exception is in the expression εὐλογητὸς ὁ τρόπος σου in 1 Sam. xxv. 33. In the New Testament, apart from the passage in debate, its application is restricted to God, "the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ." My point is that whatever force there may be in the argument from this extensive usage in favor of its application to God rather than to Christ in Rom. ix. 5, it is not diminished in the slightest degree by the fact that, in a few passages of the LXX the word is applied to men in the very different sense of "prospered" or "recipients of blessings," *i.e.* benefits, from God.

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