



"Meditate  
upon these things;  
give thyself  
wholly to them;  
that thy profiting  
may appear unto all"

I Timothy 4:15

---

Journal  
of  
Theology

**Church of the Lutheran Confession**

---

VOLUME 15

MARCH 1975

NUMBER 1

# C O N T E N T S

VOLUME 15

MARCH 1975

NUMBER 1

THE PRIVATE CARE OF SOULS (Conclusion) .....	1
A. Schulz	
THE GREEK ARTICLE AND THE DOCTRINE OF CHRIST'S DEITY (Conclusion) .....	8
C. Kuehne	
FOUR WITNESSES FOR THE DEFENSE OF CHRIST'S DEITY .....	22
Paul Fleischer	
DEVOTIONS FROM THE BOOK OF JOB .....	29
C. M. Gullerud	
BOOK REVIEWS:	
<i>Whatever Became of Sin?</i> .....	34
Paul F. Nolting	
<i>Educational Ideals in the Ancient World</i> .....	39
R. Gurgel	
<i>Bright Wind of the Spirit</i> .....	40
John Lau	

---

The JOURNAL OF THEOLOGY is published at Eau Claire, Wisconsin, by authorization of the Church of the Lutheran Confession.

Subscriptions: \$3.00 per year, \$5.50 for 2 years, payable in advance. The month of subscription expiration is indicated on the address label.

Issues are dated: March, June, September, December.

Editor-in-chief: Prof. C. M. Gullerud  
Immanuel Lutheran College  
Eau Claire, Wisconsin 54701

Managing Editor: Prof. John Lau  
Immanuel Lutheran College  
Eau Claire, Wisconsin 54701

Staff Contributors: A. Schulz, C. Kuehne,  
D. Redlin, P. Nolting.

All correspondence regarding subscriptions, renewals, and changes of address should be directed to the Managing Editor. Correspondence regarding material printed in the JOURNAL should be addressed to the Editor-in-chief.

---

THE GREEK ARTICLE  
AND THE DOCTRINE OF CHRIST'S DEITY

(Conclusion)

II. Colwell's Rule and John 1:1

The preceding six articles in this series have dealt with the Rule of Granville Sharp and its application to several New Testament passages which involve the doctrine of the deity of Christ. In this concluding installment we shall focus our attention particularly upon Colwell's Rule and the interpretation of John 1:1.

This passage reads as follows in the Greek text: 'Εν ἀρχῇ ἦν ὁ λόγος, καὶ ὁ λόγος ἦν πρὸς τὸν θεόν, καὶ θεὸς ἦν ὁ λόγος. Its translation, in the familiar *King James Version*, is as follows: "In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God." Many of our readers, however, realize that this translation has been widely challenged by Unitarians of every age. The Jehovah's Witnesses, for example, translate the last portion of this verse as follows in their official version, the *New World Translation of the Christian Greek Scriptures* (1950): "... the Word was a god." A four-page defense of this rendition is found in an appendix to this version. The Jehovah's Witnesses, of course, make much of the fact that the noun θεός lacks a definite article ὁ (the) in the Greek. Their arguments will be examined later below.

Colwell and His Rule

It is indeed legitimate to ask why the article is not used in this passage, if indeed the meaning of the

Greek is "the Word was God (definite)" rather than "the Word was a god (indefinite)." It is a well-known fact of Greek grammar that an anarthrous (lacking a definite article) noun in Greek may be either definite or indefinite, its definiteness or indefiniteness depending on the context in which it is found. Or, to put it somewhat differently, a noun in Greek does not always require the article even when it is clearly definite. The question confronting us in John 1:1 is whether or not we may in this context interpret the anarthrous  $\theta\epsilon\acute{o}\varsigma$  as definite.

Some of the clearest light to be shed upon this question in recent years appeared in 1933 in an article by Dr. Ernest Cadman Colwell entitled "A Definite Rule for the Use of the Article in the Greek New Testament."<sup>1</sup> Colwell, who was then on the faculty of the University of Chicago, states the rule in brief form early in his presentation (p. 13):

*A definite predicate nominative has the article when it follows the verb; it does not have the article when it precedes the verb.*

Colwell presents a sizable amount of evidence in support of this rule. The passage that first attracted his attention was John 1:49. "In this verse," Colwell observes, "Nathanael ascribes to Jesus two titles; in one of them he uses the article, in the other he does not:  $\sigma\upsilon\ \epsilon\acute{\iota}\ \acute{o}\ \upsilon\acute{\iota}\acute{o}\varsigma\ \tau\omicron\upsilon\ \theta\epsilon\omicron\upsilon$ .  $\sigma\upsilon\ \beta\alpha\sigma\iota\lambda\epsilon\upsilon\varsigma\ \epsilon\acute{\iota}\ \tau\omicron\upsilon\ \text{'Ισραήλ}$  [You are the Son of God; you are the King of Israel]. What reason is there for this difference? When the passage is scrutinized, it appears at once that the variable quantum is not definiteness, but word-order. 'King of Israel' in this context is as definite as 'Son of God.' It seems probable that the article is used with 'Son of God' because it follows the verb, and is not used with 'King of Israel' because it precedes the verb. If this can be established generally in the New Testament, it will of course involve only those sentences in which the copula is expressed." (p. 13)

In his attempt to show that his rule does describe accurately the general usage of the Greek New Testament, Colwell cites several groups of passages, in each of

which a predicate nominative is used now with the article and now without it. Here is one example: "The words 'Son of God' appear approximately thirteen times as a predicate with the article; in each of the thirteen passages they follow the verb. These words also appear ten times as predicate nominatives without the article; in nine of these passages they precede the verb, and in the tenth (Matt. 27:43) it may be significant that θεοῦ precedes the verb." (p. 13f.)<sup>2</sup>

The title "Son of Man," according to Colwell, is used twice in the New Testament as a predicate nominative. In Matt. 13:37 it has the article: ὁ σπεύρων τὸ καλὸν σπέρμα ἐστὶν ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου (The one sowing the good seed is the Son of Man); in John 5:27 it lacks the article: καὶ ἐξουσίαν ἔδωκεν αὐτῷ κρίσιν ποιεῖν, ὅτι υἱὸς ἀνθρώπου ἐστίν (And He gave Him authoritative power to render judgment, because He is the Son of Man). Significantly, in the former passage, where the predicate noun has the article, it follows the verb; in the second, where it is anarthrous, it precedes the verb. This variation in the use of the article, Colwell states, frequently occurs with the same phrase in the same book. Compare John 8:12 with John 9:5. In the former passage we find: ἐγὼ εἰμι τὸ φῶς τοῦ κόσμου (I Myself am the Light of the world). We note that the predicate noun, "the Light of the world," follows the verb and has the article. The second passage reads: ὅταν ἐν τῷ κόσμῳ ᾶ, φῶς εἰμι τοῦ κόσμου (As long as I am in the world, I am the Light of the world). Here the predicate noun precedes the verb and does not have the article. But clearly, the predicate in this latter passage is fully as definite as in the former!

Colwell finds a significant example of the correlation between word order and the use of the article in Matt. 13:37-39, where Jesus gives His interpretation of the parable of the tares. In this passage seven definite predicate nouns are found. The first five of these nouns follow their verbs, and in each case they take the article. The last two predicates precede their verbs, and both of them lack the article. Here is the passage: ὁ σπεύρων τὸ καλὸν σπέρμα ἐστὶν ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου (The one sowing the good seed is the Son of Man); ὁ δὲ ἀγρός ἐστὶν ὁ κόσμος (and the field is the world); τὸ δὲ καλὸν

σπέρμα, οὗτοί εἰσιν οἱ υἱοὶ τῆς βασιλείας (and the good seed, these are the sons of the Kingdom); τὰ δὲ ζιζάνια εἰσιν οἱ υἱοὶ τοῦ πονηροῦ (and the tares are the sons of the evil one); ὁ δὲ ἐχθρὸς ὁ σείρας αὐτὰ ἐστὶν ὁ διάβολος (and the enemy who sowed them is the devil); ὁ δὲ θερισμὸς συντέλεια αἰῶνός ἐστὶν (and the harvest is the end of the world); οἱ δὲ θερισταὶ ἄγγελοὶ εἰσιν (and the reapers are the angels). A similar syntactic arrangement occurs in Matt. 23:8-10. Colwell concludes that Matthew changed from one word order to the other merely for the sake of variety. "In neither of these Matthean passages can it be claimed that the predicates which close the series are less definite or concrete than those which precede; nor are the final clauses of the series less convertible than the others." (p. 14f.)

That Colwell did his research with care appears from the tabulated information which he includes in his article. These tables indicate that while his rule is not without exception in the New Testament, yet it is descriptive of the general usage of the holy writers. He located 367 passages in which the predicate noun was beyond any doubt definite. In 255 cases these definite predicates followed the verb, and 229 or 90% of them had the article, while only 26 or 10% lacked it. In 112 cases the definite predicates preceded the verb, and 97 or 87% of them lacked the article, while only 15 or 13% had it. (p. 17) Colwell cites support for his rule also from such sources as the Septuagint and the Greek church fathers.

On the basis of his findings, Colwell formulates tentatively the following rules to describe the use of the article with definite predicate nouns in sentences in which the verb occurs (p. 20):

- 1) *Definite predicate nouns here regularly take the article.*
- 2) *The exceptions are for the most part due to a change in word-order:*
  - a) *Definite predicate nouns which follow the verb (this is the usual order) usually take the article;*
  - b) *Definite predicate nouns which precede the verb usually lack the article;*
  - c) *Proper names regularly lack the article in*

- the predicate;
- d) *Predicate nominatives in relative clauses regularly follow the verb whether or not they have the article.*

He concludes that "it is in the realm of translation and interpretation that the data presented here have their most valuable application. They show that a predicate nominative which precedes the verb cannot be translated as an indefinite or a 'qualitative' noun solely because of the absence of the article; if the context suggests that the predicate is definite, it should be translated as a definite noun in spite of the absence of the article. In the case of a predicate noun which follows the verb the reverse is true; the absence of the article in this position is a much more reliable indication that the noun is indefinite. Loosely speaking, this study may be said to have increased the definiteness of a predicate noun before the verb without the article, and to have decreased the definiteness of a predicate noun after the verb without the article." (p. 20f.)

#### Reactions to Colwell's Rule

Has Colwell's Rule stood the test of time and further investigation? It is still probably too early to predict whether or not it will become a generally accepted canon of Greek grammar. C. F. D. Moule, in his *Idiom Book of New Testament Greek*, cites it with the comment that Colwell "has made important observations" on the matter of the article.<sup>3</sup> Nigel Turner, in vol. III of the Moulton grammar series, likewise cites the rule and adds: "Obviously if such a rule stands the test, it is valuable for textual decisions and translation."<sup>4</sup>

It must be recognized, of course, that Colwell's Rule is not without exception when an examination is made of New Testament usage. In this respect it differs from Sharp's Rule, which is without a single demonstrable exception. Yet Colwell's Rule does hold in the large majority of cases. Surely we can state without the slightest hesitation that the predicate noun *θεός* in John 1:1 may be definite even though it lacks the article, inasmuch as it is found before the verb in its clause. Whether or not it is indeed definite ("God" rather than "a

god") will be discussed below.

### Application of Colwell's Rule to Exegesis

In the accounts of the temptation of Christ, found in Matt. 4:1-11 and Luke 4:1-13, Satan twice prefaced his temptation with the words: εἰ υἱὸς εἶ τοῦ θεοῦ. Robertson regards the anarthrous predicate noun as indefinite ("if you are a son of God"). He states: "The devil is represented as admitting that Jesus is a son of God, not the Son of God."<sup>5</sup> According to Colwell's Rule, however, the clause may be translated: "if you are the Son of God." This, in fact, seems more probable. The condition is of the first class, one of assumed reality. That is, it assumes that the condition is true, whether or not it is true in actual fact. Thus Satan would, in effect, be saying to Jesus: "Assuming now that you are the Son of God, then ..." The subtlety of such a temptation is readily apparent. Satan hoped that Jesus would feel compelled to prove that He was in fact the very Son of God in whom the heavenly Father was well pleased. In support of this exegesis we have similar syntactic arrangements in passages like Matt. 5:35, ὅτι θρόνος ἐστὶν τοῦ θεοῦ (for it is the throne of God), and John 10:2, ὁ δὲ εἰσερχόμενος διὰ τῆς θύρας πολιμῆν ἐστὶν τῶν προβάτων (but he who enters through the door is the shepherd of the sheep) -- in both of which passages the anarthrous predicate nouns are apparently definite. Compare also John 10:36, where Christ refers to His own claims as to His Person: υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ εἰμι. Here the predicate is surely definite: "I am the Son of God."

In Matt. 27:40 the words of Christ's enemies are recorded, as these enemies stood beneath the cross: εἰ υἱὸς εἶ τοῦ θεοῦ, κατὰβηθι ἀπὸ τοῦ σταυροῦ. Once again the anarthrous predicate noun preceding the verb appears to be definite. It does not seem at all unlikely that these foes were casting Jesus' own words into His face: "If you are the Son of God, come down from the cross." For Jesus had answered affirmatively when at His trial a few hours before He was asked: εἰ σὺ εἶ ὁ χριστὸς ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ (whether you are the Christ, the Son of God). (Matt. 26:63) Here, of course, the article is used with the predicate noun, inasmuch as it follows the verb.



Then we have the words of the centurion beneath the cross after Jesus' death: ἀληθῶς θεοῦ υἱὸς ἦν οὗτος. (Matt. 27:54) According to Colwell's Rule, there is no grammatical reason why one should not put into the Roman officer's mouth the full confession: "Truly this one was the Son of God." Colwell states: "The evidence given in this paper as to the use of the article with predicate nouns strengthens the probability that the centurion recognized Jesus as the Son of God (so Weymouth and the older English translations), rather than as a son of God." (p. 21)

### Colwell's Rule and the Exegesis of John 1:1

Colwell's Rule obviously applies to John 1:1 as well. On this passage he says: "The opening verse of John's Gospel contains one of the many passages where this rule suggests the translation of a predicate as a definite noun. Καὶ θεὸς ἦν ὁ λόγος looks much more like 'And the Word was God' than 'And the Word was divine' when viewed with reference to this rule. The absence of the article does not make the predicate indefinite or qualitative when it precedes the verb; it is indefinite in this position only when the context demands it. The context makes no such demand in the Gospel of John, for this statement cannot be regarded as strange in the prologue of the gospel which reaches its climax in the confession of Thomas [John 20:28, 'My Lord and my God']. " (p. 21)

Turner agrees fully with Colwell's exegesis of John 1:1. He states in his *Grammatical Insights*: "Dr. Moffatt, in a version which is now more generally recognized as brilliant paraphrase than as skilful translation, ... changed St. John's proclamation that 'the Word was God' into an ambiguous assertion that 'the Logos was divine' (John 1:1). The implication is that even human persons may be called divine, in a sense. Dr. Moffatt considered that he had Greek grammar on his side. The word for God, theos, does not have the definite article; therefore theos is not a noun but a kind of adjective; therefore it must be translated 'divine' and not 'God.' The fallacy of this has been exposed since Dr. Moffatt's time, but he has never lacked a following. The one he would doubtless be most anxious to disown is the utterly unsuitable translation of a German ex-Roman priest,

'the Word was a god.' [The Jehovah's Witnesses have adopted this very translation, and cite Moffatt's 'divine' in support of it.] Understandably, unitarians find difficult the apparent contradiction that in the first verse of the gospel 'God' appears to mean the Father, while it is predicated of the Word in the same verse. Christians may be illogical, but they find no difficulty in thinking that this verse refers to God the Son."

Turner continues: "The claim of unitarians to be logical should of course be respected, but the grammarian will resist their attempts to impress grammatical principles in the service of their cause in a way which is not legitimate. The fact that *theos* has no article does not transform the word into an adjective. It is a predicate noun, of which the subject is *Logos*, and it is a fairly universal rule in New Testament Greek that when a predicate noun precedes a verb it lacks the definite article; grammatical considerations therefore require that 'there need be no doctrinal significance in the dropping of the article, for it is simply a matter of word-order.'"<sup>6</sup>

Most older grammarians likewise regard the θεός of John 1:1 as definite, although the reason they give for its being anarthrous differs from that of Colwell and Turner. Robertson, for example, states in his *Short Grammar*: "As a rule the article is not used with the predicate noun even when the subject is definite. ... Thus we can tell subject from predicate. Hence in John 1:1 θεός ἦν ὁ λόγος we translate the Word was God, not God was the Word, for subject and predicate are not here co-extensive."<sup>7</sup> Two of Robertson's pupils, W. H. Davis and W. D. Chamberlain, express themselves in a similar fashion.<sup>8</sup>

In his larger *Grammar*, Robertson suggests furthermore that the article could not have been used with θεός in John 1:1. "It is true also that ὁ θεός ἦν ὁ λόγος (convertible terms) would have been Sabellianism."<sup>9</sup> (My emphasis.) What Robertson means by this he explains at greater length in an article in the *Expositor* magazine: "If both God and Word were articular, they would be co-extensive and equally distributed and so interchangeable. But the separate personality of the Logos is affirmed by

the construction used, and Sabellianism is denied. ... The Logos became flesh (i. 14), and not the Father."<sup>10</sup> To put it simply, Robertson believes that the use of an article with θεός in the phrase θεὸς ἦν ὁ λόγος would identify the Word (Christ) with the Father, who has just been referred to in the phrase πρὸς τὸν θεόν. Such an identification of the Persons of the Father and the Son would, of course, involve the old Sabellian error.

The 19th-century grammarian Simcox would not agree with Robertson at this point. In his *Language of the New Testament* he, too, takes anarthrous θεός as definite, but he denies that the use of the article would have involved heresy. He states: "In Jewish and Christian writers, ... θεός is a name belonging to One only, and so is used like a pr. n., with or without the art. according to its place in the sentence: and beyond one or two broad rules, it seems that there is hardly any principle involved in the retention or omission. In John i. 1 *fin.* ὁ θεὸς ἦν ὁ λόγος would have been much more a solecism [a departure from grammatical principles] than a heresy: θεός is without the art., not because St. John means to teach Arianism (the Word was a divine being), nor because he pointedly does not mean to teach Sabellianism ('God' and 'the Word' were one and the same ...), but simply because ὁ λόγος is subject and θεός predicate, though the latter, as more emphatic, stands first."<sup>11</sup> (My emphasis.)

Dana and Mantey in their *Manual Grammar* carry forward the line of interpretation begun by Robertson. They emphasize, and rightly so, that the basic function of the Greek article is to point out individual identity. When the article is not used with a noun, it may still be definite, but it is the nature or character of the person or thing that is thereby stressed. "When identity is prominent, we find the article; and when quality or character is stressed, the construction is anarthrous."<sup>12</sup> These generalizations concerning the use and nonuse of the Greek article are indeed correct, and can be very helpful in one's exegetical practice. Dana and Mantey choose, now, to apply them also to John 1:1: "Πρὸς τὸν θεόν [the Word was 'with God,' an article is used] points to Christ's fellowship with the person of the Father; θεὸς ἦν ὁ λόγος [the Word was God,' no article] emphasizes Christ's participation in the essence of the divine

nature. The former clearly applies to personality, while the latter applies to character. This distinction is in line with the general force of the article."<sup>13</sup> (My emphases.) This exegesis seems to be reflected in Kenneth S. Wuest's *The Gospels: An Expanded Translation*: "And the Word was as to His essence absolute deity."

The interpretations of Robertson and Dana-Mantey are surely within the analogy of Scripture; they conform fully to sound doctrine. But can these interpretations be defended in view of the findings of Colwell? The present writer believes that they can not. From the examples cited by Colwell, it is probable that the non-use of the article before θεός in our passage is the result of nothing more than the word order chosen by the apostle. To inject doctrinal considerations into the exegesis (Robertson), or to emphasize a qualitative force in the noun θεός (Dana-Mantey), may involve the placing into the text of something that is not actually there.

Surely it must be noted, now, that in our verse the noun θεός is written first in its clause, thereby securing for it a position of emphasis. The holy writer wishes to underscore the fact that this "Word" of whom he has spoken is Himself "God." Several of the newer translations have caught this emphasis. In Charles B. Williams' *The New Testament: A Translation in the Language of the People* and in the Lockman Foundation's *The Amplified New Testament*, we read: "... and the Word was God Himself." *The Living Bible Paraphrased* translates in a similar fashion: "He ... is himself God." Since, now, the word θεός is written first for emphasis, it must of necessity come before the verb. Why it is then written without the article is amply explained by Colwell in his rule. To the present writer this seems to be the simplest and most natural explanation of the anarthrous θεός in our passage.

#### Regarding the Jehovah's Witnesses on John 1:1

Space does not allow a point-by-point refutation of the afore-mentioned defense of the Jehovah's Witnesses for their translation, "the Word was a god." They cite Dana-Mantey in support of their exegesis, but wrongfully so. When these grammarians speak of the anarthrous noun θεός as emphasizing nature or essence, they are surely in

no way suggesting that Christ's deity is in some way subordinate to that of the Father. The Jehovah's Witnesses leap upon Dana-Mantey's translation "and the word was deity," and construe it to mean that Christ was merely "a god." But Dana-Mantey themselves exclude such a perversion of the text by adding: "... nor was the word all of God, as it would mean if the article were also used with θεός. As it stands, the other persons of the Trinity may be implied in θεός."<sup>14</sup>

It is almost beyond belief when this sect cites even the venerable grammarian A. T. Robertson in defense of their exegesis. As we saw above, Robertson found in the fact that θεός is anarthrous a safeguard against an anti-trinitarian interpretation which would regard the Father and the Son as constituting one and the same divine Person. But the Jehovah's Witnesses turn Robertson's words into another type of anti-trinitarianism, namely, the subordination of the divine nature of the Son to that of the Father.

It is strange that this sect cannot see how its particular doctrine involves it in a type of polytheism. Scripture teaches one God in three Persons. But the Jehovah's Witnesses teach that the deity of the Father differs in essence from that of the Son. Only the Father, they assert, is the God; the Son is for them merely a god. But would there not, then, be two deities, a superior and an inferior? Let us recognize well, with Simcox above, that in the holy writers θεός is a name belonging to One only, and so may be used like a proper noun with or without an article. Do the Jehovah's Witnesses recognize how often anarthrous θεός is used of the Father in the same Gospel of John?<sup>15</sup> To be consistent, they should in such passages refer to the Father also as merely "a god."

Bruce Metzger presents a further refutation of the Jehovah's Witnesses' arguments: "In a lengthy Appendix in the Jehovah's Witnesses' translation, which was added to support the mistranslation of John 1:1, there are quoted thirty-five other passages in John where the predicate noun has the definite article in Greek. These are intended to prove that the absence of the article in John 1:1 requires that θεός must be translated 'a god.'

None of the thirty-five instances is parallel, however, for in every case the predicate noun stands after the verb, and so, according to Colwell's rule, properly has the article. So far, therefore, from being evidence against the usual translation of John 1:1, these instances add confirmation to the full enunciation of the rule of the Greek definite article.

"Furthermore, the additional references quoted in the New World Translation from the Greek of the Septuagint translation of the Old Testament, in order to give further support to the erroneous rendering in the opening verse of John, are exactly in conformity with Colwell's rule, and therefore are added proof of the accuracy of the rule. The other passages adduced in the Appendix are, for one reason or another, not applicable to the question at issue."<sup>16</sup>

### The Modern Translations

For the most part, the modern translations have rendered John 1:1 in a satisfactory way, generally with the words "and the Word was God." There are, however, a few notable exceptions. *Good News for Modern Man (Today's English Version)* translates: "... What God was, the Word also was." Perhaps it has here followed the lead of the *NEB*: "... and what God was, the Word was." At best these are very weak paraphrases. Goodspeed's *American Translation* is even more objectionable: "... and the Word was divine."

### III. Some Concluding Remarks

Throughout the centuries Satan has been seeking to destroy the confidence of Christians in the full deity of Christ. His efforts have extended to almost every verse in the New Testament which teaches this doctrine. With the highest degree of subtilty he has tried to set aside the clear testimony of Scripture through misrepresentations of grammar or through rational appeals.

It has been this writer's privilege to explore the meaning of a total of five of these much maligned passages. The result, hopefully, has been a reaffirmation of their Spirit-intended sense, as they give to our Savior

the precious name of "God."

This much we should note well, as we go about our exegetical endeavors in the Scriptures of the New Testament. The holy writers, such as Paul, Peter, and John, do ascribe the name θεός to Christ, contrary to the preconceived notion of only too many expositors. Let us be done, once and for all, with the kind of procedure illustrated by H. C. Dodd in his commentary on Romans 9:5. He rejects the application of the term "God" to Christ in this verse chiefly because "such a direct application of the term 'God' to Christ would be unique in Paul's writings."<sup>17</sup> Unique? Hardly! And even if it were unique, this still would not be adequate reason for rejecting this verse offhand as a proof passage for Christ's deity. The method of Sanday and Headlam in the ICC on Romans is much more commendable. On the basis of grammar and context they conclude that the word "God" in Romans 9:5 most naturally refers to Christ. They regret that "the question has been somewhat obscured on both sides by the attempt to prove that St. Paul could or could not have used these terms ['God,' 'over all,' 'blessed'] of Christ, i.e. by making the difficulty theological and not linguistic."<sup>18</sup>

Perhaps this series of articles has underscored the importance of grammar in the work of an exegete. The words of Bishop Middleton thus form a fitting conclusion: "To the Grammatical interpretation of the N.T. every sensible and unbiased Christian will give his strenuous support. When, indeed, we consider how many there are who seek to warp the Scriptures to their own views and prepossessions, it seems to be the only barrier which can be opposed successfully against heresy and corruption."<sup>19</sup>

C. Kuehne

#### FOOTNOTES

1. Found in the *Journal of Biblical Literature*, vol. 52 (December, 1933), pp. 12-21. Interested readers can probably secure copies of this article through their local libraries.
2. The passages having the article before the predicate are Matt. 16:16; 26:63; Mark 3:11; 15:39; Luke 4:41;

- 22:70; John 1:39, 49; 11:27; 20:31; Acts 9:20; I John 4:15; 5:5. Those lacking it are Matt. 4:3, 6; 14:33; 27:40, 43, 54; Luke 4:3, 9; Mark 15:39; John 10:36.
3. C. F. D. Moule, *An Idiom Book of New Testament Greek* (Cambridge: University Press, 1971), p. 115.
  4. James Hope Moulton, *A Grammar of New Testament Greek*, vol. III *Syntax* by Nigel Turner (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1963), p. 183.
  5. A. T. Robertson, *A Grammar of the Greek New Testament in the Light of Historical Research* (Nashville: Broadman Press, 1934), p. 781.
  6. Nigel Turner, *Grammatical Insights Into the New Testament* (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1965), p. 16f. The inner quotation is from Turner's own *Syntax*, p. 183, cf. footnote 4 above.
  7. A. T. Robertson, *A Short Grammar of the Greek New Testament* (New York: Hodder & Stoughton, 1908), p. 75.
  8. William Hersey Davis, *Beginner's Grammar of the Greek New Testament* (New York: Harper & Row, 1923), p. 63; William Douglas Chamberlain, *An Exegetical Grammar of the Greek New Testament* (New York: Macmillan, 1950), p. 57f.
  9. A. T. Robertson, *Grammar*, p. 767f.
  10. A. T. Robertson, "The Greek Article and the Deity of Christ," *Expositor* (London), series VIII, no. 21 (1921), p. 188.
  11. William Henry Simcox, *The Language of the New Testament* (London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1889), p. 48f.
  12. H. E. Dana and Julius R. Mantey, *A Manual Grammar of the Greek New Testament* (New York: Macmillan, 1955), p. 138. Robertson would, it seems, agree with these generalizations, cf. his *Grammar*, pp. 755f., 794.
  13. *Ibid.*, p. 140.
  14. *Ibid.*, p. 148f.
  15. Cf. John 1:18, θεὸν οὐδεὶς ἑώρακεν πώποτε (No one has seen God at any time).
  16. Bruce M. Metzger, "The Jehovah's Witnesses and Jesus Christ," *Theology Today*, vol. X, no. 1 (April, 1953), p. 75f.
  17. C. H. Dodd, *The Epistle of Paul to the Romans* (London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1949), p. 152. This volume is part of the *Moffatt New Testament Commentary* series.
  18. William Sanday and Arthur Headlam, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans* (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1900), p. 237.



- 19.. Thomas Fanshaw Middleton, *The Doctrine of the Greek Article* (Cambridge: J. & J. J. Deighton, 1833), p. xxxix.

