ROMANS. 3   
 2—5.   
   
 AUTHORIZED VERSION. AUTHORIZED VERSION REVISED.   
 clared to be the Son of |the Spirit of holiness, by the resur=   
 God with power, according rection of the dead, even Jesus Christ   
 to the Spirit of holiness, our Lord; 5   
 by the resurrection the ceived grace through apostleship, we unto ¢1¢or   
 dead: \* by whom we have ‘phy   
   
   
 Christ, keeping His Son as the great seem to wish to include the notion of sane-   
 subject of both clauses, and thus making tifying in the term holiness, which, how-   
 them, not contrasts to one another, but ever true, is than strictly belongs to   
 correlative parts of the same great whole. the words. by] as indicating the   
 And (2) the Apostle, dwelling here on source, out of which the demonstration   
 patent facts,—the announcements of pro- proceeds. the resurrection of the   
 pliecy,—the history of the Lord’s Hu- dead] not, “the resurrection from the   
 manity, does not deal with the essential dead,”’—which, besides that it is not the   
 subsistent Godhead of Christ, but with rendering of the words of the original,   
 that manifestation of it which the great would be a weakening of the strong ex~   
 fact of the Resurrection had made to men. pression of the Apostle, who takes here   
 Also (3) by amplifying the Spirit into the summarily and by anticipation the Re-   
 Spirit of holiness, he characterizes the surrection of Jesus as being, including,   
 Spirit of Christ as one of holiness, involving (“ Iam the Resurrection,’ John   
 i.e.as divine, and partaking of the God- xi. 25) the (whole) Resurrection of the   
 head : see below. with power] This dead. So that we must not render as   
 qualifying clause belongs to declared,—not A. V. “the resurrection from the dead,”   
 to the words “the Son of God,”—nor but the resurrection of the dead, regarded   
 again is it a parallel to “according as accomplished in that of Christ. It was   
 to the Spirit of holiness,” to “by the re- the full accomplishment of this, which   
 surrection,” &c. (as St. Chrysostom, who more than any thing declared Him to be   
 interprets it “by means of the miracles the Son of God: see John v. 25—29.   
 which He did”), manifested with power Thus in these words lies wrapped up the   
 (to be) the Son of God. The rendering argument of ch. vi. ff. even Jesus   
 then is, which was with power declared Christ our Lord] This is the place of   
 to be the Son of God. declared] these words in the original, aud to this   
 before men. It is not the objective ap- place they ought to be kept. For the   
 pointment of Christ as the of God, that. Apostle having given this description   
 is spoken of, but the subjective manifesta- of the Person and dignity of the Son   
 tion in men’s minds that He is so: not of God, very Man and very God, now   
 of Christ’s being what He is, but of the identifies this divine Person with Jesus   
 proof of that fact by His Resurrection. Curist, the Lord and Master of Chris-   
 according to the Spirit of holi- tians,—the historical object of their   
 ness] The Spirit of holiness is not equi- and (see words following) the Appointer   
 valent to “the Holy Spirit :” this of himself to the apostolic office.   
 would be inapplicable here, for it would 5. through whom] As in Gal. i. 1; 1   
 point out the Third Person in the Blessed Cor. i. 9, designating the Lord Himself as   
 Trinity, whereas it is the Spirit of Christ the Agent in conferring the grace and   
 Himself, in distinction from His Flesh, Apostleship. we received] not ‘all   
 which is spoken of. And this Spirit is Christians, —but we, the Apostle himself   
 designated by the gen. of quality, of holi- as he not unfrequently speaks. No others   
 ness, to shew that it is not a human, but need be here included in the word. Those   
 a divine Spirit which is attributed here to to whom he is writing cannot be thus   
 Christ,—a Spirit to which holiness belongs included, for they are specially contrasted   
 as its essence. The other interpretations with the subject of the verb received by   
 certainly miss the mark, by overlooking the following verse. Nor can this verb   
 the terms, according to the flesh and B2 received (not, A. V., “have received”)   
 according to the Spirit, the two sides of refer to any general bestowal of this kind,   
 the Person of Christ here intended to be indicating, as it a definite past   
 brought out. Such are that of Theodoret : viz. the reception of the Apostleship by   
 «through the might wrought in Him by himself. grace] It is hardly to be   
 means of the Holy Spirit,”— Chrysostom : understood, as Augustine explains, that