An Inquiry in the Early Creed of Romans 1:3-4: Does the Word ὉΡΙΖΩ Support an Adoptionistic Christianity?

Nicholas Dodson

Brian Scalise

Recommended Citation

AN INQUIRY IN THE EARLY CREED OF ROMANS 1:3-4: DOES THE WORD ὉΡΙΖΩ SUPPORT AN ADOPTIONISTIC CHRISTIANITY?

Nicholas Dodson and Brian Scalise[1]

INTRODUCTION

It is not uncommon to consider Romans 1:3 – 4 to be a creed that predates its appearance in St. Paul's Epistle to the Romans.[2] Designated this way, these verses become a lens to visit what the earliest Christians believed about Jesus Christ. Within this creedal language, the Greek word ὁρίζω (appointed, decided, determined, demarcated) appears ambivalent about what it conveys concerning Jesus' pre-incarnate divinity. This creedal text, from Romans 1:3 – 4 states:

> . . περὶ τοῦ υἱοῦ αὐτοῦ τοῦ γενομένου ἐκ σπέρματος Δαυὶδ κατὰ σάρκα, τοῦ ὁρισθέντος υἱοῦ θεοῦ ἐν δυνάμει κατὰ πνεῦμα ἁγιωσύνης ἐξ ἀναστάσεως νεκρῶν, Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν.

> . . . concerning His Son, Jesus Christ our Lord, who (be)came from the seed of David according to the flesh, *who was appointed* the Son of God in power according to the Spirit of holiness out of [or "by"] the resurrection of the dead.

If the meaning of ὁρίζω (ὁρισθέντος) remains ambivalent,[3] then it is possible that the earliest Christians understood ὁρίζω to mean that, at some point in time, God "decided" to make Jesus

---

[1] Nicholas Dodson is Assistant Professor of Biblical Language and Christian Studies at Truett-McConnell College and Instructor of Religion at Liberty University School of Divinity. Brian T. Scalise is Instructor of Apologetics and Theology at Liberty University School of Divinity

[2] Grant R. Osborne, *Romans*, The IVP New Testament Commentary Series, eds. Grant R. Osborne, D. Stuart Briscoe, Haddon Robinson (Downers Grove: Intervarsity Press, 2004), Part 1, sec. 1, subsec. 2 (vv. 1:2 – 4); James D. G. Dunn, *The Theology of Paul the Apostle* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1998), chap. 4, sec. 7:3; J. A. Fitzmyer, *Romans* (New York: Double Day, 1993), 229 – 230.

[3] The following authors opt to translate for ὁρίζω with the significance of appointed, installed, or established, but without implying the connotation of adoptionism. Anders Nygren, *Commentary on Romans* (London: Augsburg Fortress, 1978); F. R. Fay and Christian Friedrich Kling Lange, *The Epistle of Paul to the Romans* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1976), chap. 1, I, vv. 1:3 – 4; R. C. H. Lenski, *The Interpretation of St. Paul's Epistle to the Romans* (Minneapolis: Augsburg Publishing House, 1961), chap. 1, 4. Lenski prefers "ordained"; *Notes for The NET Bible: a New Approach to Translation, Thoroughly Documented with 60,932 Notes by the Translators and Editors* (Biblical Studies Press, L.L.C., 2005), "Notes on Romans," part 1 ("Notes on Romans 1"), sec. 4 ("Notes for 1:4"). Logos Bible Software. The NET translators observe that Jesus was not just appointed the Son of God, but the Son-of-God-in-power. Royce Gordon Gruenler in *Evangelical Commentary on the Bible* makes the same point; Royce Gordon Gruenler, *Evangelical Commenary on the Bible*, ed. Walter Elwell (Grand Rapids: Baker, 1995),

the Son of God. This would suggest that there was a very early tradition of adoptionism — believing that Jesus was a human who was adopted by God, becoming the Son of God.[4] If, however, ὁρίζω means that God "demarcated" Jesus as the Son of God, then the orthodox position holds true; God merely shows Jesus to be the Son of God, or following a well-represented description, God "marks out" Jesus as the eternal divine Son.[5] To contribute to this conversation, we narrow attention to ὁρίζω's usage in the Old Testament Apocrypha, Pseudepigrapha, and the Septuagint in order to delimit its semantic value for evaluating its meaning in Romans 1:3 – 4. Although the New Testament's usage of ὁρίζω is important, if Romans 1:3 – 4 was part of early Christian worship and therefore predates the New Testament's writing, investigating ὁρίζω's meanings antecedent to its usage in early Christian worship correctly situates the term's usage historically.[6]

"Romans," part I, b; Albert L. Lukaszewski, The Lexham Greek New Testament: Expansions and Annotations, eds. Albert L. Lukaszewski, Mark Dubis, and J. Ted Blakley (Logos Research Systems, 2010), "Romans 1:4."; Dunn, Theology of Paul, chap. 4, sec.10. 3. Dunn argues directly against adoptionism.

[4] Ernst Käsemann, *Commentary on Romans*, trans. Geoffrey W. Bromiley (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1994), 11 – 12; L. Gaston, *Paul and the Torah* (Vancouver: University of British Columbia, 1987), 113, n.1; Bart D. Ehrman, *Did Jesus Exist?: The Historical Argument for Jesus of Nazareth*, (New York: HarperOne, 2012), 111. Paul supposedly corrects the creed when he uses it, which accounts for Paul being consistent in the Book of Romans with his own view of Christ as preincarnately divine but suggests that Paul is subtly trying to change the Roman Christians' mind on the matter with very minute changes: 1) the addition of ἐν δυνάμει, "in power," and 2) the lead, in … περὶ τοῦ υἱοῦ αὐτοῦ, "…concerning God's Son."

[5] Translations and scholars who opt for the denotation of "mark out" or "demarcate" follow. Revised Standard Version; New American Standard Bible; New English Bible; Good News Bible; Edgar J. Goodspeed: *The New Testament: an American Translation* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1923); N. T. Wright, *The Resurrection of the Son of God*, Vol. 3 of *Christian Origins and the Question of God*, (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2003), 243; Leon Morris, *The Epistle to the Romans*, The Pillar New Testament Commentary, ed. D. A. Carson (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1988), I, A, 4. Logos Bible Software; Robert Mounce, *Romans*, Vol. 27 of *The New American Commentary*, eds. Ray Clendenen, Kenneth Matthews, David Dockery, L. Russ Bush, Duane Garrett, Larry Walker, Richard Melick Jr., Paige Patterson, Curtis Vaughan, Linda Scott, and Marc Jolley (Nashville: Broadman & Holman, 1995), I, 1, 1:3 – 4. Logos Bile Software; Barclay Newman and Eugene Nida, *Romans: a Translator's Handbook on Paul's Letter to the Romans* (New York: United Bible Societies, 1973), chap. 1, Rom. 1:3b – 4; Marvin R. Vincent, *Word Studies in the New Testament*, Vol. 3 of 4 (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1985), chap. 1, 4; Grant R. Osborne, *Romans*, Part 1, sec. 1, subsec. 2 (vv. 1:2 – 4). Logos Bible Software; John R. W. Stott, *Romans: Good News for the World*. The Bible Speaks Today (Downers Grove: Intervarsity Press, 1994), 50; Max Zerwick S. J., trans., revised, and adapted by Mary Grosvenor, *Analysis Philologica Novi Testamenti Graeci* [*A Grammatical Analysis of the Greek New Testament*], unabridged, 5th, rev. ed. (Rome: Editrice Pontificio Istituto Biblico Roma, 1996), "Romans," v. 4.

[6] Lk. 22:22, Acts 2:23, 10:42, 11:29, 17:26, 31, Rom. 1:4, Heb. 4:7.

Analyzing ὁρίζω's semantic domain in this extra-canonical literature and the Septuagint along with its syntactical constructions will give a certain range of possibilities, either strengthening or weakening the adoptionistic thesis.[7] This delimiting of ὁρίζω by inquiry into these sources acts as a supplement for what already exists on the topic. In the Old Testament Apocrypha, forms of ὁρίζω appear only in 3 Maccabees. The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha contains seven occurrences: three times in the Sibylline Oracle and once each in 1 Enoch, Apocalypse of Moses, Prayer of Manasseh, and History of the Rechabites. There are nineteen occurrences in the Septuagint (LXX hereafter). Three denotations for ὁρίζω exist in this literature as demonstrable in what follows.

DETERMINING FOR ONESELF

3 MACCABEES 5:42

Ὅθεν ὁ κατὰ πάντα Φάλαρις βασιλεὺς ἐνπληθυνθεὶς ἀλογιστίας, καὶ τὰς γινομένας πρὸς ἐπισκοπὴν τῶν Ἰουδαίων ἐν αὐτῷ μεταβολὰς τῆς ψυχῆς παρ᾽ οὐδὲν ἡγούμενος, ἀτελέστατον βεβαίως ὅρκον *ὁρισάμενος* τούτους μὲν ἀνυπερθέτως πέμψειν εἰς ᾅδην ἐν γόνασιν καὶ ποσὶν θηρίων ᾐκισμένους,

The king, just like another Phalaris, a prey to thoughtlessness, made no account of the changes which his own mind had undergone, issuing in the deliverance of the Jews. He swore a fruitless oath, and *determined* forthwith to send them to Hades, crushed by the knees and feet of the elephants.[8]

Here, the aorist, middle participle, ὁρισάμενος, is functioning as an independent participle (i.e., like a finite indicative verb). Independent verbal participles trace to Semitic influence and, so, it is not impossible that an independent verbal participle would be seen here in 3 Maccabees. However, as they are quite rare, it could be seen as an adverbial participle, rendered, ". . . indeed firmly *determining* with an oath to send them forthwith into Hades . . .

---

[7] Many scholars have increasingly begun to treat the Old Testament Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha as valuable for New Testament research. According to Richard Bauckham, a large range of these works, "whose date and/or provenance remain debatable, have in the last few decades have been treated by many scholars as also of non-Christian Jewish provenance and of sufficiently early date to be relevant to New Testament research." "The Continuing Quest for the Provenance of the Old Testament Pseudepigrapha," in *Pseudepigrapha and Christian Origins : Essays from the Studiorum Novi Testamenti Societas*, Gerbern S. Oegema and James H. Charlesworth, eds. (New York: Continuum International Publishing, 2008), 9.

[8] All Greek translations taken from *The Greek Pseudepigrapha*. Electronic text prepared by Craig A. Evans. Morphologically tagged by Rex A. Koivisto. Copyright © 2008 Craig A. Evans. All English translations from *The Pseudepigrapha* (English), Translated by Craig E. Evans, assisted by Danny Zacharias, Matt Walsh, and Scott Kohler. Copyright © 2008 Craig A. Evans.

(Trans. ours)."[9] In this verse, ὁρισάμενος is translated "determined," but the king here makes a decision, and because this participle is in the middle voice, the true significance of the word is best brought out by rendering it "decided for himself" or "made up his mind."

NUMBERS 30:3

> . . . ἄνθρωπος ἄνθρωπος, ὃς ἂν εὔξηται εὐχὴν κυρίῳ ἢ ὀμόσῃ ὅρκον ἢ *ὁρίσηται* ὁρισμῷ περὶ τῆς ψυχῆς αὐτοῦ, οὐ βεβηλώσει τὸ ῥῆμα αὐτοῦ, πάντα, ὅσα ἐὰν ἐξέλθῃ ἐκ τοῦ στόματος αὐτοῦ, ποιήσει.[10]
>
> . . . a man, a man who would vow a vow or swear an oath or *self-determine* (for himself: with middle significance) by a limitation for his soul, he will not defile his word, all statements as many as should come out of his mouth, he will do.

The Greek of the LXX has a finite verb in the middle voice, ὁρίσηται. There is a new state or circumstance achieved through the swearing that was not there before. The middle voice significance is clear: "self-determines a limitation for his soul." The subject performing the verb is a person and willingly accepts the responsibilities for himself, responsibilities within this person's abilities.

ANALYSIS IN VIEW OF ROMANS 1:4

This meaning for ὁρίζω ("determining for oneself") offers little help with Romans 1:4 because of the middle nature of the examples above. Jesus of Nazareth is neither determining upon Himself new obligations nor determining for Himself, in other words, making up his own mind. In both 3 Maccabees 5:42 and Numbers 30:3, the determination is about taking some action within one's capacity. Therefore, ὁρίζω in both is about conforming achievable action to word.

The middle voice is not of little significance as a problem since the rest of this essay will find ὁρίζω is all three voices with semantic shades. The middle voice certainly extends ὁρίζω's possible semantic domain to "determining for oneself" or "making up one's own mind." This usage could possibly lend itself to the idea of something being determined or declared what was not so before but such ambivalent support is only a meager contribution towards Ehrman's adoptionistic understanding of Romans 1:4.[11] However, it is difficult to overcome the formal difference of the middle voice ("determining for oneself" or "making up one's mind") to apply this significance to the aorist passive participle, ὁρισθεντος, used in Romans 1:4.

---

[9] See Friedrich Blass, Albert Debrunner, and Robert Walter Funk, *A Greek Grammar of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1961), 245-246, and Daniel B. Wallace, *Greek Grammar Beyond the Basics: An Exegetical Syntax of the New Testament*, (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1996), 650-653.

[10] *Septuaginta: With morphology*. 1979 (electronic ed.) (Nu 30:3). Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft. Hereafter LXX.

[11] Some "new" or "different status" appointed, does not denote, let alone connote—and certainly does not demand—an adoptionistic understanding for Jesus of Nazareth.

MADE AS MARKING-OFF & DEMARCATING

3 MACCABEES 6:36

> καὶ κοινὸν *ὁρισάμενοι* περὶ τούτων θεσμόν, ἐπὶ πᾶσαν τὴν παροικίαν αὐτῶν εἰς γενεάς, τὰς προειρημένας ἡμέρας ἄγειν ἔστησαν εὐφροσύνους, οὐ πότου χάριν καὶ λιχνείας, σωτηρίας δὲ τῆς διὰ θεὸν γενομένης αὐτοῖς.

> They *made* a public ordinance to commemorate these things for generations to come, as long as they should be sojourners. They thus established these days as days of mirth, not for the purpose of drinking or luxury, but because God had saved them.

Ὁρισάμενοι is another aorist, middle participial form of ὁρίζω. The translation indicates that this participle is functioning as an adverbial participle of attendant circumstance to ἔστησαν. It is also possible, however, that ὁρισάμενοι is an adverbial temporal participle, which is how the RSV translators understand it. The adverbial temporal function and translation likely portray more accurately the intended meaning here.

In the Old Testament Pseudepigrapha translation by Evans, et al., ὁρισάμενοι is rendered as "made." This translation, however, has more to do with their understanding of the participle as an attendant circumstance rather than the semantic domain of the word. If this is an adverbial temporal participle, then the translation is like the RSV's rendering: "And when they had ordained a public rite . . . ." Whether "made" or "ordained" is the translation of ὁρισάμενοι, the idea is that an ordinance was declared, or demarcated, *for the people* to set aside certain days for remembrance. It is worth noting here as well that the middle voice is being used, and the people are themselves declaring or making this ordinance.

SIBYLLINE ORACLE 1:319-323

> ἀλλ᾽ ὁπόταν ὑδάτων πολλῶν ἀπερείσιον οἶδμα κύματος ὀρνυμένοιο ὑπ᾽ ἄλλυδις ἄλλο ποιήσει ὀργῆς παύεσθαι, εἰς ἄλλα τε βένθεα πόντου μέτρ᾽ ὀλιγώσειεν λιμέσιν καὶ τρηχέσιν ἀκταῖς ἀμφὶ γαίη *ὁρίσας* ὁ μέγας θεὸς ὑψικέραυνος·

> But when the great high-thundering God will cause the boundless swelling of the many waters—with their waves near and there rising high—to cease from wrath, and into other depths of sea their measure lessen, *setting bounds* by harbors and rough headlands round the land.

The aorist, active participle of ὁρίζω, ὁρίσας, is used in this passage. Here it is functioning adverbially, explaining how God will cause the swelling waters to cease and lessen. Though it can be translated contemporaneously with the main verb (as above), it may be better to understand it as occurring before the time of the main verb. So the translation, "having set boundaries," better accounts for the context of the geographic realities since geographic boundaries, like the "rough headlands" and "harbors," remain as they are unless some cataclysmic event happens. It is important to keep in mind that here, as with the passage discussed immediately above concerning the Nile, geographic boundaries are all but immovable: they are not modern geologists after all.

Here ὁρίσας is translated "setting bounds." This idea fits well within the semantic range of the word and clearly shows that the harbors and shores are the bounds set by God to stop the swelling waters and the waves. In the context of this passage the idea is that God, having promised never to destroy evil men by flood again, has set boundaries around the lands and harbors to prevent such a flood from happening again. Ὁρίζω is used similarly in Sibylline Oracle 14:283-286.

NUMBERS 34:6

καὶ *τὰ ὅρια* τῆς θαλάσσης ἔσται ὑμῖν, ἡ θάλασσα ἡ μεγάλη *ὁριεῖ*, τοῦτο ἔσται ὑμῖν τὰ ὅρια τῆς θαλάσσης. (LXX)

And the *demarcations* by the sea will be in regard to you[r] [territory], the great sea *will demarcate*, this will be, in regard to you[r] [territory], the demarcations by the sea (trans. by B. Scalise).

This passage deals with the division of the land. ὁριεῖ is future, active, and indicative of ὁρίζω, used here in the LXX in the sense of "demarcate," that is, "to establish a boundary," which is common to the texts in this section. Here the natural boundary of the "great sea" exists but has not been invested, to the eyes of the Israelites, with the meaning of a territorial boundary marker. That this sea is a boundary marker had to be epistemically made known "for you [Israelites]" by someone else.

The use of the nominal, τὰ ὅρια, is used for the Hebrew, *gᵉvûl,* which means "boundary," "territorial limit," or even "wall."[12] The Hebrew does not affirm any "action" by the role of the "territory limit" as the LXX's use of what appears an action verb, "demarcate." Instead the Hebrew carries the inanimate nature of a natural boundary as a state of being by use of the copulative *hāyâ*: two occurrences in Num. 34:6, *wᵉhāyâ* and *yihyêh*. Because the MT uses the stative verb *hāyâ* here*,* ὁρίζω in the LXX may be considered a weaker stative verb rather than an action verb. The future use of ὁρίζω together with the inanimate and, therefore, non-volitional nature of a sea likewise points in the direction of a stative verb rather than an action. After all, the sea does not have to do anything to "demarcate," it fulfills this function by merely being. Ὁρίζω is used in like manner in the OT texts of Joshua 13:7, 27, 15:12, 18:20, 23:4, and Ezekiel 47:20.

ANALYSIS IN VIEW OF ROMANS 1:4

Like the previous use in 3 Maccabees 5:42 and Numbers 30:3, this usage has the idea of declaring something to be, which had not been before, but with clear emphasis on the status of the thing declared-about: of the day (3 Maccabees 6:36), the Nile river (Sibylline Oracle 14:283-286), the harbors and seas (Sibylline Oracle 1:319 – 323), or the great sea (Num. 34:6). The day will occur year to year but now with new significance for those living on that day, those who are under the "new ordination." The sea (or river, or harbors, or day) is the same but now fulfilling a new function for those humans living in that region. Worth mention is that the active forms in

---

[12] *The Advanced Brown, Driver, Briggs Hebrew and English Lexicon*, s.v. לִגְבוּ.☉

this section do not take direct objects except for Sibylline Oracle 14:283 – 286, which does so only through a zeugma.

The semantic commonality between Numbers 34:6, Sibylline Oracle 1:319 – 323, and 3 Maccabees 6:36 is the investing of significance to some existent. In Numbers 34:6, it is the existent, the "great sea," which is invested with significance as territorial boundary. In Sibylline Oracle 1:3119 – 323, it is the harbors and headlands invested with significance as the waters' retainers. In 3 Maccabees 6:36, the existents, the future days, take on new significance as memorial days. In saying, "investing," "to whom" is implied. In these texts mentioned above, it is the community surrounding either the geographic land-places or following the same calendar *to whom* these days or places take on additional significance: now a place becomes a boundary and days become commemorating days.

This gives the idea that something already in existence—the land and harbors, the river or the sea, or certain days to come—is marked off or has delimitations qualifying its role. Ὁρίζω in these texts may be used of time or place, referring to places functioning as *boundaries* or to certain days being *made—having a new marking on it—*to fulfill a new role in the lives of those under that particular calendar. These texts fit well with the meaning of "demarcating." If a person can be "demarcated," it would suggest that the person remain as he is but be given another function by just being as he is. Just as a headland is a piece of land it is also, with the receding of floodwaters, a boundary between land and sea. It is the environment around the headland that changes, not the headland itself. This would make an adoptionistic understanding unlikely in Romans 1:4. These texts have active and middle voice forms of ὁρίζω, none of which concern a personal being, and so could only contribute marginally to the issue of Romans 1:4.

The rendering "made" in 3 Macc. 6:36 certainly gives the perception that something was created or changed into something different but taking it this way would be a mistake, that is to say one would be guilty of equivocation.[13] Such a confusion could support the possibility of an adoptionistic understanding of Romans 1:4, however, as noted above, 3 Macc. 6:36 contains a middle participle, so the middle voice significance has to be factored into the understanding of this word. Perhaps it should be rendered, "they made/declared for themselves a public ordinance . . . ." This fits well with the middle voice and detracts from the possibility that the passive participle in Romans 1:4 would have a similar meaning.

The above active forms of ὁρίζω are all used to show demarcating, setting bounds, or marking off. The middle voice usually indicates a certain self-vested or self-interested action on behalf of the one performing the action and can expand the potential semantics possibilities to new domains. From the passages considered (3 Maccabees 5:42, 6:36; Numbers 30:3, 34:6; Sibylline Oracle 14:283-286, 1:319-323), ὁρίζω expands its semantic domain and so allows for the possibility of "made" when it is placed in the middle voice (ὁριζομαι). The "making" of the

---

[13] Perhaps an acontextual *prima facie* glance might suggest this but, from an analysis of what is occurring experientially, it is easily seen that "made" here is not making anything except mandating that persons recognize a certain day as special. Thus the "day itself" does not change and is always what it has been but is now invested with new meaning by humans' relationship to that day. The day is the same but persons' comprehension of that day has changed.

ordination (3 Macc 6:36) is done in the self-interest of the people ("for themselves"). The passive participle in Romans 1:4 should not take this significance based on its formal-semantic qualities. And the active voice of ὁρίζω, from the passages thus far considered, indicates a stative occurrence of immovable things—land-places or days—fulfilling new roles rather than ὁρίζω indicating action.

DETERMINED, DECIDED, & APPOINTED

SIBYLLINE ORACLE 13:1-4

> Σιβύλλης λόγος ιγ θεὸν ἀείδειν με λόγον κέλεται μέγαν ἅγιος ἀθάνατος θεὸς ἄφθιτος, ὃς βασιλεῦσιν δῶκε κράτος καὶ ἀφείλατ᾽ ἰδὲ χρόνον *ὥρισεν* αὐτοῖς ἀμφοτέρων, ζωῆς τε καὶ οὐλομένου θανάτοιο.
>
> [A word of Sybil, thirteen] The immortal holy God imperishable again bids me sing a great word divine, who gives power to kings and takes away, and who *determined* for them time both ways, both that of life and that of baneful death.

In this passage ὥρισεν is aorist, active, and indicative. The translation by Evans, et al., has aoristic aspect but this could easily, and probably should, based on context, be seen as an aorist with perfective aspect.[14] In that case, two translations are possible: "and who determines for them" or "and who has determined for them." The latter fits better with the preceding context in this passage where the translators have rendered δῶκε and ἀφείλατ᾽, both aorist indicative, as gnomic with emphasis on the axiomatic nature of these actions.

The translation for ὥρισεν given here is "determined" with the idea of setting boundaries in both directions, time being understood linearly. God is in control of kings and has even set boundaries in time for their birth and death. The idea, like in Sibylline Oracle 1:318 – 323, is one of marking out, though it is here indicating limits of time set on persons rather than the marking off of places. The meaning has to do with taking something in existence and delimitating their life spans. The primary value of this passage in addressing the issue in Romans 1:4 is that it does show a relation between the concept of ὁρίζω and personal beings, though the value is limited because the determining is more directly related to time rather than to the persons, in this case kings.

1 ENOCH 98:5

> καὶ δουλεία γυναικὶ οὐκ ἐδόθη ἀλλὰ διὰ τὰ ἔργα τῶν χειρῶν· ὅτι οὐχ *ὡρίσθη* δούλην εἶναι δούλην· ἄνωθεν οὐκ ἐδόθη ἀλλὰ ἐκ καταδυναστείας ἐγένετο. ὁμοίως οὐδὲ ἡ ἀνομία ἄνωθεν ἐδόθη ἀλλ᾽ ἐκ παραβάσεως. ὁμοίως οὐδὲ στεῖρα γυνὴ ἐκτίσθη ἀλλ᾽ ἐξ ἰδίων ἀδικημάτων ἐπετιμήθη ἀτεκνίᾳ καὶ ἄτεκνος ἀποθανεῖται.
>
> And slavery was not given to a woman, but because of the works of her hand; for it was not *ordained* that a slave should be a slave. It was not given from above, but came about

---

[14] Aoristic aspect is also termed "undefined aspect." This aspect presents the action as seen as a whole with little emphasis on when although when can be contextually derived. Perfective aspect can either emphasize the continuous results of some past action or zone in on the beginning point of that action, which will produce ongoing results.

through oppression. Likewise neither was iniquity given from above, but it came from transgression. Likewise a woman was not created barren, but because of her wrongdoings she was punished with childlessness; [and] childless she will die.

This passage contains ὡρίσθη, which is aorist, passive, and indicative. The aorist here is probably gnomic, as the teaching seems to be axiomatic. This is supported by the use of "it" as the subject of this verb. There is no explicit subject given in this clause so the subject "it" is used: "because *it* is not ordained for a slave to be a slave" (Italics ours).

The rendering of ὡρίσθη in this passage is "ordained." The meaning of ordained here is that of appointed or designated. This is especially clear when one notes that it is apparently being used in parallel with ἐδόθη, which means "it was given/granted." Whether one chooses to use "it is not ordained" to show the gnomic idea or "it was not ordained" to maintain the past time idea of the aorist indicative, it is still easy to see the universality of this truth, which the author has in mind. There is not a common appointment, presumably by God, that slaves should be slaves, or, in this case, for women to be slaves: rather, slavery is brought about by oppression.

This is an interesting case because the idea conveyed here is the marking out of a person for a specific task or role in life, which is especially pertinent for understanding the meaning of Romans 1:4 to the degree that Jesus' demarcation/appointment may be understood as a role or task. Further, ὡρίσθη is passive just as in Romans 1:4. 1 Enoch here uses ὁρίζω in the negative, "it is not ordained for a slave to be a slave," which complicates the relevance for understanding ὁρισθεντος in Romans 1:4. However, the implication is that, if someone is appointed or ordained—in this text, obliquely done by God just as in Romans 1:4—then they would have always been ordained for that purpose.

APOCALYPSE OF MOSES 28:3

τότε ὁ κύριος ἐλάλησεν πρὸς τὸν Ἀδάμ· οὐ λήψῃ νῦν ἀπ᾽ αὐτοῦ· *ὡρίσθη* γὰρ τοῖς Χερουβὶμ καὶ τῇ φλογίνῃ ῥομφαίᾳ τῇ στρεφομένῃ φυλάττειν αὐτὸ διὰ σέ, ὅπως μὴ γεύσῃ δι᾽ αὐτοῦ καὶ ἀθάνατος ἔσῃ εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα, ἔχῃς δὲ τὸν πόλεμον ὃν ἔθετο ὁ ἐχθρὸς ἐν σοί.

"Then the Lord spoke to Adam: 'You will not take of it now, for *I have commanded* the cherubim with the flaming sword that turns (every way) to guard it from you, so that you should not taste of it; but you have the war that the adversary has put into you

In this passage, the author uses ὡρίσθη, the same form of ὁρίζω used in 1 Enoch above— which is aorist, passive, and indicative—translated, "I have commanded." However, since this is a passive voice verb and staying more true to a literal translation, the text may be modified to "it has been appointed to the cherubim . . . ." In this passage ὡρίσθη, then, would have the idea of "appointed" in terms of the cherubim's task of protecting the Garden. "Commanded" neither fits well with the semantic range nor does it convey the passive idea of the verb. "Appointed" shows the idea that the cherubim and the flaming sword have been marked out for a role. At first glance, this seems to be an indication that this word could indicate being appointed to a task for which one was not previously employed, which would be favorable to an adoptionistic understanding. However, it should be noted that this does not indicate a change in the nature of those appointed to this task. The angel was already a minister and servant of God, fitting the

new role within an angel's natural capacities. With that in mind, this passage, with the idea of a personal being's appointment to a role, should be most helpful in the assessment of Romans 1:4

PRAYER OF MANASSEH 1:7

> ὅτι σὺ εἶ κύριος μακρόθυμος, εὔσπλαγχνος, πολυέλεος καὶ μετανοῶν ἐπὶ ταῖς κακίαις τῶν ἀνθρώπων· ὅτι σύ, ὁ θεός, κατὰ τὴν χρηστότητα τῆς ἀγαθωσύνης σου ἐπηγγείλω μετανοίας ἄφεσιν τοῖς ἡμαρτηκόσιν, καὶ τῷ πλήθει τῶν οἰκτιρμῶν σου *ὥρισας* μετάνοιαν ἁμαρτωλοῖς εἰς σωτηρίαν.

> For you are the Lord Most High, of great compassion, long-suffering, and very merciful, and relents over the evils of men. You, O Lord, according to your great goodness have promised repentance and forgiveness to those who have sinned against you; and in the multitude of your mercies you have *appointed* repentance for sinners, that they may be saved.

Here ὥρισας is the aorist, active, and indicative. The second person subject of this verb, "you," is referring back to ὁ θεός. The object is μετάνοιαν, repentance, indicating that God has marked out repentance for sinners. The aorist is here translated "have appointed" by both Evans, et al. and in the RSV, which indicates it is seen as a culminative aorist showing completion.

In this passage ὥρισας is translated "appointed," which fits within the semantic range of the word. However, something to note here is the use of parallelism common in this type of Hebrew poetry. Ὥρισας is used as a parallel to ἐπηγγείλω, which is rendered "promised" in the preceding clause. God, according to his goodness, promised repentance and forgiveness, and he, in his mercy, appointed repentance unto salvation. This indicates that repentance for sinners is something appointed and promised by God based on his mercy, but repentance here is not one thing that is suddenly appointed to something new. It was set out by God and continues to function in that same role, though perhaps with new recognition of its role by the sinners who are saved.

HISTORY OF THE RECHABITES 16:5-7

> ὅτε δὲ ἡ ψυχή τοῦ μάκαρος πεσοῦσα ἐπὶ πρόσωπον προσκυνεῖ τὸν κύριον· τότε καὶ ἡμεῖς πεσόντες προσκυνοῦμεν τῇ αὐτῇ ὥρᾳ τὸν κύριον. ὅτε δὲ ἀναστήσει αὐτὴν ὁ κύριος τότε καὶ ἡμεῖς ἀνιστάμεθα. καὶ ὅτε ἀπέρχεται εἰς τὸν *ὡρισμένον* τόπον, καὶ ἡμεῖς ἀπερχόμεθα ἐν τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ πληροῦντες τὴν εὐχαριστίαν τοῦ κυρίου.

> "But when the soul of the blessed on [sic], having fallen on (its) face, worships the Lord, then we also, having fallen (on our faces), worship the Lord in that hour. "But when the Lord will raise it up, then also we rise up." And when it arrives at the *appointed* place, we also arrived in the church, fulfilling the Eucharist of the Lord.

This author uses ὡρισμένον, the perfect, passive participle of ὁρίζω. Since it is adjectival, has perfect tense, and passive in voice, a good rendering might be something like "the place that has been appointed," which would better show the consummative idea of the perfect tense. Though this form could be either passive or middle in meaning, it is best understood as passive, as it is unlikely that a middle meaning would fit in this context—"places" don't appoint themselves or do appointing for themselves.

These verses are found within a discussion of the soul being taken up to God by angels. This shows, then, the "place that has been appointed" is the place the soul will arrive and is not a place newly appointed for a soul. It is a place that has been marked out for an indeterminate length of time. It is worth noting here that the idea of an appointed place does not carry the idea of a place being newly created for a purpose. The usefulness of this passage for evaluating Romans 1:4 is limited because it is of a place, albeit a presumably non-physical one, rather than of a person.

PROVERBS 16:30

στηρίζων ὀφθαλμοὺς αὐτοῦ λογίζεται διεστραμμένα, *ὁρίζει* δὲ τοῖς χείλεσιν αὐτοῦ πάντα τὰ κακά, οὗτος κάμινός ἐστιν κακίας. (LXX)

The one who fixes his eyes plans perverted things and he *appoints* all types of evil by his lips.

Ὁρίζει is present, active, and indicative. The appointing done here is of evil "things" or perhaps, better, "circumstances." Certainly something new obtains through this "appointing" but this concerns still a singular person actively doing the appointing, although the transitivity found in this text is informing. It can be concluded that "appoints" in the above text has the meaning of "establishes out of some former devising or planning." How "intention" is understood plays significantly into how "some former devising/planning" should be taken. To scheme or to plan is, to some degree, the active working out of thought in the world.

ANALYSIS IN VIEW OF ROMANS 1:4

The usefulness of the Apocalypse of Moses 28:3 for determining whether Romans 1:3-4 is an adoptionistic passage really hangs on whether or not the aorist should be understood as timeless (gnomic) or beginning at some point. If it is gnomic, then the cherubim were always appointed for this task—on a strict deterministic and/or Calvinistic framework—based on the fact that God knew they would be needed for it. The problem, of course, for a non-deterministic stance is that this "it" refers to the protecting of the Garden, which was not timeless but created. If, however, they were appointed to a new task, then it could lend support to a possible adoptionistic meaning for ὁρισθεντος. Though this use is a very important one because it speaks directly of the appointment or ordination of personal beings, the possible gnomic or constative ideas make its value difficult to assess concerning Romans 1:4. Probably the most important factor here, though, is that this ordination or appointment of the cherubim does not, as mentioned above, indicate any change in their essential nature making this less than supportive of an adoptionistic understanding of Jesus of Nazareth, which would certainly involve a change in essential nature.

Perhaps the more useful passages reviewed in this section have been 1 Enoch 98:5 and the History of the Rechabites 16:5-7 because these passages have ὁρίζω in the same voice as Romans 1:4. In this regard, the latter is grammatically most useful because ὁρίζω in both Romans and the History are participles and passive: ὁρισθεντος (aorist passive) in Romans and ὁρισμενον (perfect passive) in the History. In the History, the subject is a place whereas in 1 Enoch 98:5 it is a person's role in life:

History of the Rechabites: ". . . the place that has been appointed . . . ."
1 Enoch 98:5: ". . . it was not ordained that a slave should be a slave."

A real question that arises again and again in this investigation—motivated from thinking hard about places taking on new roles and how that effects their nature—is whether or not Jesus of Nazareth can take on new roles—even a divine role—without essential changes in his nature. This is nevertheless a murky question, obscured by the ambiguities implied in the essence-function discussion. But not such an obscured inquiry is whether or not a human would need new capacities to fulfill what is implied and recorded in the NT as the role of the Son of God. This is an important question and will be returned to in the conclusion.

The grammar of ὁρίζω points away from "change" in both the History and 1 Enoch. The place, in the History, does not change but takes on the role of some sort of "meeting place." In 1 Enoch, the role of being a slave was not brought on by God; the creation of the role of a slave was something brought on by man. Conversely, it was ordained by God that a freeman should be a freeman; but man changed the role for a freeman by making freemen into slaves. It was always intended by God that men be free and so, by inference, can it be said that it was always appointed by God that Jesus be the Son-in-power illustrated by the resurrection? Moreover, a man is a man whether in the role of a freeman or a slave.

What seems truly unique upon reflection to this section is that ὁρίζω is neither used as a synonym for adoption—and there is an explicit word for the verb "adopt" used in the NT (Acts 7:21: ἀνειρεω)—nor is it used to designated a new role for a person/being outside of their innate capacities. Ὁρίζω is used for the appointment of a place only once in this section (History of the Rechabites 16:7) although its grammatical importance, as noted above, cannot be overlooked. Three of the passages reviewed use ὁρίζω to discuss ancient or timeless activities in the mind of God (Sibylline Oracle 13:1 – 4, 1 Enoch 98:5, and Prayer of Manasseh 1:7). God's foreknowing, at least, is implied in God's setting the time of life and death for kings (Sibylline Oracle 13:1 – 4), suggesting, if not confirming, the timelessness of this appointing. God's determining or appointing that humans should not be slaves is overturned by man (1 Enoch 98:5), pointing to God's intention for humanity prior to humanity's ability to impugn it. And the Prayer of Manasseh 1:7's use of ὁρίζω either identifies a timeless decision in God's mind (on a Calvinistic stance), knowing humanity would fall, or to the ancient time of the Garden and the Fall when man sinned and was in need of repentance (on a significant freewill stance).

The "appointing" in Romans 1:4 is not only of circumstances, as in Proverbs 16:30, but would involve a person joining God in the godhead (on adoptionism). The "appointing" in Romans 1:4 connotes taking some intention of the Appointer (God/Spirit) and applying this intention to another person (Jesus of Nazareth). Two things stand out. First, the Appointer's intention forms a new circumstance as it conflates, intermingles, and merges with the circumstances/states of affairs as they are. And, second, in view of Proverbs 16:30, it can be suggested—but only in a very provisional way—that the usage of ὁρίζει implies a measure of shared identity between the Appointer (God/Spirit) and the appointed (Jesus of Nazareth) inasmuch as the schemer's forming of evil circumstances in Proverbs 16:30 can be *identified* with the one who appointed "all types of evil."

CONCLUSIONS

Useful for this discussion but ultimately only peripheral is the use of ὁρίζω concerning locations and time, as illustrated in the section on "Made as Marking off and Demarcating." The question nevertheless arises whether or not this usage could be used of persons. If Jesus of Nazareth could be appointed in this fashion, then it would only indicate a change in the minds of those thinking on Jesus of Nazareth. But this analysis concludes that this usage of ὁρίζω involves investing some place or some time with new significance for some audience, not investing some person in the same manner. The grammatical voice of ὁρίζω included in this section's passages were all either middle or active.

The Apocalypse of Moses 28:3 proved to be significant, both in ὁρίζω's grammatical voice (passive) and its assignment of role to the cherubim. This angel is not fulfilling any role beyond the role of an angel's status as servant and minister and messenger of God. Hopefully, claiming that the angel, standing with a sword and guarding the Garden, is fulfilling a role within the natural capacities of being an angel is not controversial. But this would not be the case if Jesus of Nazareth were adopted as God's Son. Jesus of Nazareth would take roles beyond the role of a human; being worshipped would constitute a role beyond being human or perhaps his special "only-way-mediating-role" (John 14:6). And there are surely more roles that could be offered: saving, delivering, all seeing, and so forth. This passage is strong evidence against taking ὁρίζω as adoptionistic in Romans 1:4.

Similarly and even stronger is the case of 1 Enoch 98:5. God was not the one who changed a person's role in life but humans, in their overruling God's intention, made humans take the role of slaves. The change from freeman to slave is not outside a human's capacity, not a role beyond being human. In the case of Jesus of Nazareth, if he were appointed with the idea of being adopted, he would have roles outside of a human's capacity. An objection can be imagined: but saints will someday have roles "beyond how humans are in this world!" This, however true, will not make them have the same roles as Jesus of Nazareth as the Son of God although saints are sons of God along with the angels. Simply, the roles held by Jesus of Nazareth can be parsed out to show their uniqueness to him, not shared even with saints in the times of glory. Working this out further, though, is a matter of theology and anthropology for another time. Ὁρίζω is passive in this text, deals with the role of a human, and is suggestive of God's either ancient or timeless intention for humanity. This text reconfirms what Apocalypse of Moses 28:3 also demonstrated, that ὁρίζω is not used of beings to show them taking roles beyond their aptitude. Instead, ὁρίζω is used to show the transition of a being from one role to another within that being's capacity and not beyond it.

In both Apocalypse of Moses 28:3 and 1 Enoch 98:5, ὁρίζω is passive and used of beings (human and angel). This is the same as Romans 1:4 where ὁρίζω is passive and used of the person, Jesus of Nazareth. Further, in all three passages, God is the oblique Agent of this appointment.

Apocalypse of Moses 28:3: "τότε ὁ κύριος ἐλάλησεν πρὸς τὸν Ἀδάμ· οὐ λήψῃ νῦν ἀπ᾽ αὐτοῦ· *ὡρίσθη* γὰρ τοῖς Χερουβὶμ . . . [ὑπο θεου]."

"Then the Lord spoke to Adam: 'You will not take of it now, for *it has been appointed* the cherubim . . . [by God]."

1 Enoch 98:5:	"ὅτι οὐχ *ὡρίσθη* δούλην εἶναι δούλην [ὑπο θεου]."
	"For *it has not been appointed* that a slave should be a slave [by God]."
Romans 1:4:	"τοῦ *ὁρισθέντος* υἱοῦ θεοῦ ἐν δυνάμει . . . [ὑπο θεου]."
	". . . *who was appointed* the son of God in power . . . [by God]."

The only other passive occurrence of ὁρίζω is in the History of the Rechabites but concerns a place being appointed and so contributes little to the issue of ὁρίζω's usage concerning persons. The convergence of these passages' matching voices (passive), that they concern the appointment of beings (angel, human, Jesus of Nazareth), and that the roles appointed are within the respective being's capacity provide stout evidence against ὁρίζω being used adoptionistically in Romans 1:4.