

联合圣经协会

《希腊文新约》编辑委员会

罗马书 9 章 5 节的评注

和合本圣经的罗马书 9 章 5 节称基督是那“在万有之上，永远可称颂的神”。这导致许多读者误以为“耶稣是神”是圣经的真理，因为白纸黑字、不容置辩。

一个鲜为人知的事实是，罗马书 9 章 5 节存在着很多翻译上的争议。因为早期手抄本的罗马书 9 章 5 节的标点符号不明确，导致意思模糊不清。正因如此，有些圣经译本将罗马书 9 章 5 节翻译成：“神（不是基督）是在万有之上，永远可称颂的”（RSV、MIT 英译本，吕振中中译本），而不是“他（基督）是在万有之上，永远可称颂的神”（KJV、NIV、ESV 英译本，和合本、新译本中译本）。

直到今天，学者们对这节经文的理解依然有严重分歧。因着这些分歧，学者们都公认不能以罗马书 9 章 5 节来证明耶稣是神。

联合圣经协会《希腊文新约》的编辑委员会针对罗马书 9 章 5 节作出了以下的结论：“……委员会的大部分成员认为，以上的考虑不是决定性的因素，特别是考虑到在其它公认是

出自保罗的书信中，他从来没有称基督是神。其实，根据保罗一贯的神学主旨，他是不可能用‘他是在万有之上的神’来描绘基督的伟大……”。

委员会的结论是很中肯的。我们也可以借着查考形容词 *eulogetos*（可称颂的）在新约的用法得出同样的结论（有关 *eulogetos* 的查考，可以参看“谁是那位永远可称颂的神”一文 <http://fydt.org/sermon/totg07shuishinaweiyongyuankechengsongdeshen>）。

“联合圣经协会”（United Bible Society）的《希腊文新约》（第四版）辅读本《希腊文新约原文注释》（第二版）（*A Textual Commentary on the Greek New Testament, Second Edition*）第 459-462 页对罗马书 9 章 5 节的评注，摘录如下，供认真研读圣经的牧者和神学生作为参考：

9.5 σάρκα, ὁ ὢν ἐπὶ πάντων θεὸς εὐλογητὸς εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας

最早期的新约圣经手稿的标点符号因为缺乏条理，所以文本的编辑和译者必须添加标点符号来使句法和意思表达得合宜。这节经文引起了很多的讨论（注1）：保罗是否刻意用θεός（神）来称呼ὁ Χριστός（基督）。以下是几种不同的理解：

(a) 在 σάρκα 的后面加了一个逗号，指接下来的词语是指 ὁ Χριστός（即“基督是在万有之上的神，是永远可称颂的！”）；

(b) 在 σάρκα 的后面加了一个标点（冒号或句号），把下面的词语作为独立的句子，与 ὁ Χριστός 分开。（这样就会产生了几种翻译：“神是在万有之上，永远可称颂的！”；或者“他是在万有之上的神，是永远可称颂的！”；或者“那在万有之上的，是永远可称颂的神。”）；

(c) 在 σάρκα 后面加一个逗号，在 πάντων 后面加一个标点（冒号或

句号)。**【这是 (b) 的修饰版本，可以翻译成：“……是在万有之上。神是永远可称颂的！”】。**

在决定要使用哪一个标点符号时，委员会的成员都一致同意，尽管教父们几乎一致理解经文指的是 $\acute{\omicron}$ Χριστός，但这个证据并不重要。因为有相反的事实证明，无论是原稿还是随后的校正稿（注 2），四个安色尔字体的手稿(ABCL)和至少二十六个小写字体的手稿中，σάρκα 的后面是有一个标点的。不论是从研究教父著作，还是从研究古文学的角度来看，这两种证据都是源于保罗成书（借着口述，不是亲笔写的，参看罗 16:22）之后。所以证据的可信度是令人质疑的。

另一方面，基于以下的原因，委员会中的少数成员倾向于 (a) 的标点符号方案：

① 之所以认为这节经文是指基督，因为这样的理解适合这句话的结构。但若把这节经文理解为是对父神的颂赞，句子就会显得拗口，很不自然，因为缺少了连接词。就像威斯克特(Westcott)所说：“ $\acute{\omicron}$ Χριστός κατὰ σάρκα 和 $\acute{\omicron}$ ὢν... 的并列似乎令主语无法更改。”（注 3）

② 如果省略连接词的句子 $\acute{\omicron}$ ὢν... 是对父神的称颂，ὢν 一词就是多余的，因为 $\acute{\omicron}$ ἐπὶ πάντων θεός 已经足于表达“那在万有之上的神”了。分词的存在表明这个句子是个关系从句（不是“那位……”而是“他是……”），这样“神在万有之上”指的就是 $\acute{\omicron}$ Χριστός 了。

③ 扎恩(Zahn)指出（注 4），使徒保罗的颂词从来没有省略连接词的，它总是跟之前的词语连接的。例如：连接 ὅς ἐστιν（罗 1:25）；连接 $\acute{\omicron}$ ὢν（林后 11:31）；连接 $\acute{\omicron}$ （加 1:5，提后 4:18；对比希 13:21，彼前 4:11）；连接 αὐτῷ（罗 11:36，弗 3:21；对比彼前 5:11，彼后 3:18）；连接 τῷ δὲ θεῷ（腓 4:20，提前 1:17）。

④ 无论是圣经还是闪米特人(Semitic)的碑文，省略了连接词的颂词的句子结构都各有不同；动词或动词性的形容词（εὐλογητός，希伯来文 יְהוָה בָּרוּךְ 亚兰文 ܕܝܗܘܘܐ ܒܪܘܚ ）都是摆在神的名字之前，而不是之后，正如此

处（注5）。

⑤ 根据上下文，保罗因着以色列人对神的不信，心里极其悲伤，此刻向神发出了颂赞，似乎不合常理。

另一方面，委员会的大部分成员认为，以上的考虑不是决定性的因素，特别是考虑到在其它公认是出自保罗的书信中（注6），他从来没有称 ὁ Χριστός 是 θεός（注7）。其实，根据保罗一贯的神学主旨，他是不可能用“他是在万有之上的神”来描绘基督的伟大。至于标点符号的考虑因素（b）和（c）的选择，大多数人更倾向前者。

委员会的成员也考虑到有可能是在誊写时无意中以 ὁ ὦν 替代了原稿的 ὦν ὁ（对比第4节的“ὦν ἢ υἱοθεσία...”和第5节的“ὦν οἱ πατέρες”），但是他们不愿意在文本中采用出于推测的校正（注8）。

脚注：

1. 我们可以从正反两方的诸多论点中，挑出两个具有代表双方立场的观点。赞成颂词是归属基督的，可以参看威廉·桑迪（William Sanday）和海德·兰姆（A. C. Headlam）的著作 *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans*，第二版（纽约，1896），233-238 页；赞成把颂词与前面的句子分开的，可以参看以斯拉·阿博特（Ezra Abbot）的文章 "On the Construction of Romans ix.5," *Journal of the Society of Biblical Literature and Exegesis*, 1881, 87-154 页，以及 "Recent Discussions of Romans ix.5," *Journal of the Society of Biblical Literature and Exegesis*, 1883, 90-112 页（两篇文章转载在阿博特离世后出版的文集中 *The Authorship of the Fourth Gospel and Other Critical Essays* [波士顿，1888]，332-410 页和 411-438 页）。关于较近期的讨论，可以参看本书撰写者（B. M. Metzger）刊登于《新约里的基督和灵》（*Christ and Spirit in the New Testament; Studies in honour of C.F.D. Moule*），Barnabas Lindars and Stephen S. Smalley 编辑（剑桥，1973），95-112 页的文章；文章再版于 Metzger 的《新约研读》（*New Testament Studies*）（莱登，1980），56-74 页。

2. So Abbot, *op cit.*, 1883, pp. 107f. [=pp. 431f.]. 早期新约手稿的标点符号显得零星和杂

乱无序，人们无法凭借誊写人的标点符号来确定句子的结构。一个例子就是罗9:2-4，亚历山大抄本在2节的μεγάλη后面有一个冒号，一个在Χριστοῦ 和ὑπὲρ之间，一个是在3节的σάρκα之后，还有一个是在4节的Ἰσραηλίται之后。梵蒂冈抄本是在罗9:3的结尾有一个冒号，一个在6节的Ἰσραὴλ第二次出现之后，一个在7节的Ἀβραάμ之后，一个在10节的 Ῥεβέκκα之后，另一个在22节的αὐτοῦ之后！

3. 威斯克特 (B. F. Westcott) 的“阅读随笔”(Notes on Select Readings)，在威斯克特 (Westcott) 和霍特 (Hort) 合著的《希腊原文新约》第二版，介绍和附录，第110页 (*The New Testament in the Original Greek*, [II], Introduction [and] Appendix, 2nd ed. [London, 1896])。奈及尔·特纳 (Nigel Turner) 在《新约的语法见解》第15页也同样认为，将与Χριστός认同的分词拆开，“拆开，再加上强烈的意愿，将主语改为另一个人”，在语法上是不合常规的。(Grammatical Insights into the New Testament, [爱丁堡, 1965])

4. 《保罗致罗马人的信》(Theodor Zahn, *Der Brief des Paulus an die Romer*)，西奥多·扎恩著，(莱比锡, 1910)，433 页，Anm.78)。

5. 唯一的一次，似乎也是一个例外，就是诗68:19-20 (七十士译本是67:19-20)。七十士译本是κύριος ὁ θεὸς εὐλογητός εὐλογητός κύριος ἡμέραν καθ' ἡμέραν。但这节经文的εὐλογητός没有相对应的希伯来字，似乎是个重复的翻译。

6. 提多书2章13节通常认为是第二(非正式)保罗书信 (deutero-Pauline)。

7. 有人会反驳说，如果保罗可以宣称Χριστός Ἰησοῦς是ἴσα θεῶ (腓2:6)，他在其它地方宣称ὁ Χριστός是θεός也不足为奇。

8. 有关这个誊写错误的推测的详细陈述，请参看W. L. Lorimer的著作《新约研读》(*New Testament Studies*)，XIII (1966-67)，385页及其下。

(福音电台翻译组译 www.fydt.org)

英文原稿:

9.5 σάρκα, ὁ ὢν ἐπὶ πάντων θεὸς εὐλογητὸς εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας

Since the earliest manuscripts of the New Testament are without systematic punctuation, editors and translators of the text must insert such marks of punctuation as seem to be appropriate to the syntax and meaning. The present passage has been the object of much discussion¹ as to whether or not Paul intended to refer θεός to ὁ Χριστός. The chief interpretations are the following:

(a) Placing a comma after σάρκα and referring the following words to ὁ Χριστός (“... who is God over all, blessed for ever”).

(b) Placing a point (either a colon or a full stop) after σάρκα and taking the following words as a clause independent of ὁ Χριστός. (Several translations are possible: “God who is over all be blessed for ever!”; or “He who is God over all be blessed for ever!”; or “He who is over all is God blessed for ever.”)

(c) Placing a comma after σάρκα and a point (a colon or a full stop) after πάντων. (This, which is a modification of (b), is to be translated, “... who is over all. God be [or, is] blessed for ever!”)

In deciding which punctuation should be used, the Committee was agreed that evidence from the Church Fathers, who were almost unanimous in understanding the passage as referring to ὁ Χριστός, is of relatively minor significance, as is also the opposing fact that four uncial manuscripts (A B C L) and at least twenty-six minuscule manuscripts have a point after σάρκα, either by the first hand or by subsequent correctors.² In both cases the tradition, whether patristic or palaeographical, originated at a time subsequent to Paul’s writing (i.e.

dictating; cf. 16.22) the passage, and is therefore of questionable authority.

On the one hand, some members of the Committee preferred punctuation (a) for the following reasons:

(1) The interpretation that refers the passage to Christ suits the structure of the sentence, whereas the interpretation that takes the words as an asyndetic doxology to God the Father is awkward and unnatural. As Westcott observes, “The juxtaposition of ὁ Χριστὸς κατὰ σάρκα and ὁ ὢν κ.τ.λ. seems to make a change of subject improbable.”³

(2) If the clause ὁ ὢν κ.τ.λ. is an asyndetic doxology to God the Father, the word ὢν is superfluous, for “he who is God over all” is most simply represented by ὁ ἐπὶ πάντων θεός. The presence of the participle suggests that the clause functions as a relative clause (not “he who is ...” but “who is ...”), and thus describes ὁ Χριστός as being “God over all.”

(3) Pauline doxologies, as Zahn points out,⁴ are never asyndetic but always attach themselves to that which precedes: with ὅς ἐστιν (Ro 1.25); with ὁ ὢν (2 Cor 11.31); with ᾧ (Ga 1.5; 2 Tm 4.18; cf. He 13.21; 1 Pe 4.11); with αὐτῷ (Ro 11.36; Eph 3.21; cf. 1 Pe 5.11; 2 Pe 3.18); with τῷ δὲ θεῷ (Php 4.20; 1 Tm 1.17).

(4) Asyndetic doxologies, not only in the Bible but also in Semitic inscriptions, are differently constructed; the verb or verbal adjective (εὐλογητός, Heb. בָּרַךְ, Aram. בָּרַךְ) always precedes the name of God, and never follows it, as here.⁵

(5) In the light of the context, in which Paul speaks of his sorrow over Israel's unbelief, there seems to be no psychological explanation to account for the introduction of a doxology at this point.

On the other hand, in the opinion of others of the Committee, none of these considerations seemed to be decisive, particularly since nowhere else in his genuine epistles⁶ does Paul ever designate ὁ Χριστός as θεός.⁷ In fact, on the basis of the general tenor of his theology it was considered tantamount to impossible that Paul would have expressed Christ's greatness by calling him God blessed for ever. As between the punctuation in (b) and (c), the former was preferred.

The Committee also considered the possibility that by accident in transcription ὁ ὦν had replaced an original ὦν ὁ (cf. the preceding ver. 4 ὦν ἡ υἰοθεσία ... , ver. 5 ὦν οἱ πατέρες), but was unwilling to introduce a conjectural emendation into the text.⁸

¹ Among many earlier discussions pro and con, two may be singled out for special mention as representative of the two points of view. In favor of taking the words as an ascription to Christ, see William Sanday and A. C. Headlam, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans*, 2nd ed. (New York, 1896). pp. 233–238; in favor of taking the words separately from the preceding clause, see Ezra Abbot, "On the Construction of Romans ix:5," *Journal of the Society of Biblical Literature and Exegesis*, 1881, pp. 87–154, and *idem*, "Recent Discussions of Romans ix:5," *ibid.*, 1883, pp. 90–112 (both articles are reprinted in Abbot's posthumously published volume entitled, *The Authorship of the Fourth Gospel and Other Critical Essays* [Boston, 1888], pp. 332–410, and 411–438). For a more recent discussion, see the present writer's contribution to *Christ and Spirit in the New*

Testament; Studies in honour of C. F. D. Moule, ed. by Barnabas Lindars and Stephen S. Smalley (Cambridge University Press, 1973), pp. 95–112; reprinted in Metzger's *New Testament Studies* (Leiden, 1980), pp. 56–74.

² So Abbot, *op. cit.*, 1883, pp. 107 f. [= pp. 431 f.]. The presence of marks of punctuation in early manuscripts of the New Testament is so sporadic and haphazard that one cannot infer with confidence the construction given by the punctuator to the passage. For example, in Ro 9.2-4 codex Alexandrinus has a colon after μεγάλη in ver. 2, one between Χριστοῦ and ὑπέρ and another after σάρκα in ver. 3, and one after Ἰσραηλῖται in ver. 4. Codex Vaticanus has a colon at the end of Ro 9.3, after both occurrences of Ἰσραήλ in ver. 6, after Ἀβραάμ in ver. 7, Ἐβέκκα in ver. 10, and αὐτοῦ in ver. 22!

³ B. F. Westcott in “Notes on Select Readings,” in Westcott and Hort, *The New Testament in the Original Greek*, [I], *Introduction [and] Appendix*, 2nd ed. (London, 1896), p. 110. Similarly Nigel Turner declares it to be grammatically unnatural that a participle agreeing with Χριστός “should first be divorced from it and then given the force of a wish, receiving a different person as its subject” (*Grammatical Insights into the New Testament* [Edinburgh, 1965], p. 15).

⁴ Theodor Zahn, *Der Brief des Paulus an die Römer* (Leipzig, 1910) p. 433, Anm. 78.

⁵ The only instance that appears to be an exception is Ps 68.19-20 [= LXX 67:19–20], where the Septuagint reads κύριος ὁ θεὸς εὐλογητός, εὐλογητὸς κύριος ἡμέραν καθ’ ἡμέραν. Here, however, the first εὐλογητός has no corresponding word in Hebrew and seems to be a double translation.

⁶ Tt 2.13 is generally regarded as deutero-Pauline.

⁷ In reply it was argued that if Paul could refer to Χριστὸς Ἰησοῦς as Ἰσα θεῶ (Php 2.6), it is not inconceivable that on another occasion he could also refer to ὁ Χριστός as θεός.

⁸ For an account of the history of the conjecture, see W. L. Lorimer in *New Testament Studies*, xiii (1966–67), pp. 385 f.

