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 imeb.iz1. Jaw, and the ‘service [of the sanc- God, and the promises ;   
 k Acts tuary], and the \* promises; 51! whose 5 whose are the and   
 Beat eee are the fathers, and ™of whom as) jes whom as concerning the   
 m‘Like iia. concerning the flesh is Christ, ® who | over all, God blessed for   
 ch, i. ?   
 nJer.xxiii-6. God over all, blessed for ever.   
 John i. 1. 2   
 Acts xx,   
 to come, are here thought of, as the next thus: of whom as concerning the flesh is   
 two clauses place the patriarchs and Christ. Christ. God over all [be] blessed ever.”   
 together without any mention of the pro- This is followed by several among the mo-   
 phets. So Abraham is described, Heb. vii. derns, and generally by Socinians.   
 as “he that had the promises”),—whose tions to this rendering are, (1)   
 are the fathers (probably to be limited to suggested by Socinus himself, and never   
 Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob :—but Stephen yet obviated,—that without one exception   
 gives the appellation a much wider mean- in Hebrew or Greek, wherever an ascrip-   
 ing in Acts vii. 11, 12, 19, 39, 44, and tion of blessing is found, the predicate   
 so apparently St. Paul himself, Acts xiii. blessed precedes the name of God. (2)   
 17. In all those places, however, except That the words who is on this render-   
 Acts vii. 19, “our” is joined with the ing, would be superfluous altogether (see   
 word “fathers,” whereas here it is ab- below). (3) That the doxology would be   
 solute: so that the above limitation may unmeaning and frigid in the extreme. It   
 be true),—and of whom is Christ, so is not the habit of the Apostle to break   
 far as regards the flesh (the expression out into irrelevant ascriptions of praise;   
 implies that He was not entirely sprung and certainly there is here nothing in the   
 from them, but had another nature; ‘on immediate context requiring one. If it   
 His human side’—“as far as pertains be said that the survey of all these privi-   
 to His human body”), who is God over leges bestowed on his people prompts the   
 all (this word all is of uncertain gender doxology,—surely such a view is most   
 in the original, but must be probably unnatural: for the sad subject of the   
 taken as nenter: all things, not “all Apostle’s sympathy, to which he imme-   
 persons: compare ch. xi. 36), for diately recurs again, is the apparent   
 ever. Amon.—The punctuation and ap- inanity of all these privileges in the ex-   
 plication of this doxology have been much clusion from life of those who were dig-   
 disputed. By the early Church it was gene- nified with them. If it be said that the   
 rally rendered and applied to incarnation of Christ is the exciting cause,   
 Passages, it true, have been collected from the words “according to the flesh” come   
 the fathers to shew that they applied the in most strangely, depreciating, as would   
 words “God over all” to the FATHER on that supposition, the greatness of the   
 alone, and protested against their applica- event, which then becomes a source of so   
 tion to the Son ; but these passages them- lofty a thanksgiving. (4) That the ex-   
 selves protest only against the erroneous pression “blessed for ever” is twice   
 Noetian or Sabellian view of the identity besides used by St. Paul, and each time un-   
 the Father and the Son, whereas in Eph. iv. questionably not in an ascription of praise,   
 5, 6, “one Lord,” “one God and Father but in an assertion regarding the subject   
 of all, who is over all,” are plainly dis- of the sentence. The places are, ch. i.   
 tinguished. That our Lord is not, in the 25, and 2 Cor. xi. 31: whereas he uses   
 strict exclusive sense, “the God who is the phrase “Blessed be God” as an   
 over all,” every Christian will admit, that ascription of praise, without joining “for   
 title being reserved for the Father: but ever.” See the rest of the discnssion in   
 ent He is « Co over all” none of the Greek Test. I have shewn there, that the   
 above-mentioned passages to deny.— rendering given in the text is not that   
 The first trace a different interpretation, most agreeable to the usage of the Apostle,   
 if it be one, found in an assertion of the but the only one admissible by the rules of   
 Emperor Julian, who says that our Lord is grammar and arrangement. It also ad-   
 never called God by St. Paul, nor by St. mirably suits the context: for, having   
 Matthew, or St. Mark, but by St. John enumerated the historic advantages of the   
 The next is in the punctuation of two of Jewish people, he concludes by stating one   
 our later manuscripts of the eleventh and which ranks far higher than all,—that   
 twelfth centuries, which from them sprung, according to the flesh,