

THE EXPOSITOR'S  
GREEK TESTAMENT

EDITED BY THE REV.

W. ROBERTSON NICOLL, M.A., LL.D.

EDITOR OF "THE EXPOSITOR," "THE EXPOSITOR'S BIBLE," ETC.

VOLUME II.

LONDON  
HODDER AND STOUGHTON

27 PATERNOSTER ROW

1900

ABERDEEN UNIVERSITY PRESS

# THE EXPOSITOR'S GREEK TESTAMENT

I

## THE ACTS OF THE APOSTLES

BY THE REV.

R. J. KNOWLING, D.D.

PROFESSOR OF NEW TESTAMENT EXEGESIS, KING'S COLLEGE, LONDON

II

## ST. PAUL'S EPISTLE TO THE ROMANS

BY THE REV.

JAMES DENNEY, D.D.

PROFESSOR OF SYSTEMATIC AND PASTORAL THEOLOGY, FREE CHURCH COLLEGE, GLASGOW

III

## ST. PAUL'S FIRST EPISTLE TO THE CORINTHIANS

BY THE REV.

G. G. FINDLAY, B.A.

PROFESSOR OF BIBLICAL LITERATURE, EXEGESIS AND CLASSICS, HEADINGLEY COLLEGE

LONDON

HODDER AND STOUGHTON

27 PATERNOSTER ROW

1900

ST. PAUL'S EPISTLE

TO THE

ROMANS

## INTRODUCTION.

### CHAPTER I.

#### ORIGIN OF THE CHURCH AT ROME.

OF the beginnings of Christianity in Rome nothing whatever is known on direct evidence. The tradition which assigns the founding of the Church there to Peter cannot possibly be maintained. In one form it assumes that Peter, on the occasion referred to in Acts xii. 17, travelled to Rome, and there propagated the Church from the synagogue as a centre. As this departure of Peter from Jerusalem took place, on the usual reckoning, about 42 A.D., there would be time for his twenty-five years' episcopate of Rome, which was once the accepted Romish idea, though now given up even by Romish scholars. But it is clear from the book of Acts (chap. xv.) that Peter was in Jerusalem ten years after this, and it is equally clear from the Epistle to the Romans that he had not been in Rome when this letter was written, seven years later still. In face of a passage like chap. xv. 20 it is impossible to suppose that the Church of Rome had already been the scene of another Apostle's labours. Three years later, when Paul at length arrived in Rome, it had still been unvisited by Peter, to judge from what we read in Acts xxviii.; and even when he wrote the Epistle to the Philippians, towards the close of his first imprisonment, there is no indication that his brother Apostle had yet seen the capital. The earliest tradition represents Peter and Paul as in Rome together, and, indeed, as suffering together, in the Neronian persecution. All the evidence for this will be found in Euseb., *Hist. Eccl.*, II., xxv. What the worth of it is, it is not easy to say. It is not incredible that Peter may have been in Rome about the date in question, especially if Babylon in 1 Peter v. 13 means Rome, as it does in the Apocalypse. But in any case Peter can have had no direct part in founding the Church. In Iren., iii., 1, 2, Peter and Paul are spoken of as "preaching the Gospel in Rome, and founding the Church," at the time that Matthew published his gospel.

That Christianity was there long before this time is indubitable, but the Roman Christians, it has been suggested (see Harvey's note on Iren. *ad loc.*), "appear neither to have had an ecclesiastical polity nor to have been under the regular regimen of the Church. . . . Several expressions in the epistle seem to indicate a crude, unsettled state of things there. . . . They are spoken of as depending rather upon mutual exhortation and instruction than upon any more authoritative communication of evangelical truth (xv. 14) . . . and the Apostle expresses his intention to visit them, according to a purpose entertained ἀπὸ πολλῶν ἐτῶν [ἱκανῶν is the true reading] with the hope that he might come ἐν πληρώματι εὐλογίας (τοῦ εὐαγγελίου) τοῦ Χριστοῦ, *i.e.*, in the collation of spiritual gifts which as yet they had not, and in the establishment of that Apostolical order and government among them which should complete their incorporation with the Body Catholic of Christ's Church." It is quite true that the epistle reveals nothing of the organisation of the Church at Rome, but it reveals just as little of any intention on Paul's part to bestow on the Church the supposed benefits of "Apostolical order and government". The assumption underlying this expression is quite unhistorical. There was no uniform legal organisation of the Church in the apostolic age; and the Christians in Rome not only depended upon mutual exhortation and instruction, but, as Paul acknowledges, were well able to do so. They had *χαρίσματα* differing according to the grace given to them, and if they had no legal organisation, they had a vital and spiritual differentiation of organs and functions, for which the other is but a makeshift (chap. xii. 3-8). Sanday and Headlam think that though the Church did not, in the strict sense, owe its origin to Peter and Paul, it may well have owed to them its first existence as an organised whole (Commentary, p. xxxv.). This may be, for it was Paul's habit to appoint elders in all the churches he planted (Acts xiv. 23, Tit. i. 5); but, as the gospel was known at Rome, and believers were baptised there, and no doubt observed the Lord's Supper, it is clear that no particular organisation was wanted either to ensure or to perfect their standing as Christians.

Where tradition fails, we can only fall back on conjecture—conjecture to be verified by its coherence with what the epistle itself reveals. In this connection it has long been customary to refer to Acts ii. 10 (οἱ ἐπιδημοῦντες Ῥωμαῖοι). There were Roman Jews in Jerusalem on the day of Pentecost, and even if they were domiciled there and did not return to Rome, there must have been many visitors who did. The Jews in Rome were numbered by thousands; they occupied a large ward of the city, beyond the

Tiber, by themselves, and they had ceaseless communications with Jerusalem. Hence many have supposed that Christianity came to Rome by some such channel as this. If it did, we should expect it to have originated in the synagogues, the existence of nine of which is definitely attested (Sanday and Headlam, p. xxiv.). The epistle itself gives no direct evidence of any such connection : if the Church originated in the synagogue at Rome, the connection had been completely severed by the time Paul wrote. It has been supposed that the well-known sentence in Suetonius, *Claud.*, 25 ("Iudaeos impulsore Chresto assidue tumultuantes Roma expulit": see also Acts xviii. 2) refers to conflicts which arose in the synagogues over the alleged Messiahship of Jesus, and that the separation of the Church and the synagogue, and even a change in the prevailing complexion of the Church, which from Jewish-Christian became mainly Gentile-Christian, date from this event ; but no stress can be laid on this. It is clear from Acts xxviii. 17-22 that when Paul came to Rome the leaders of the synagogue either knew nothing or affected to know nothing about the new sect which was growing up beside them. This makes it at least improbable, whatever its actual origin, that the Christian Church at Rome can have had strongly Jewish sympathies. Besides, even if the Church had originated in the synagogue, it is practically certain, from the analogy of other places whose history is known, that the mass of the members would not be Jews by birth, but of the class of proselytes (εὐσεβεῖς, φοβούμενοι τὸν θεόν), whose attachment to Judaism was less rigid, and whose spiritual receptivity was as a rule greater.

Many scholars, impressed by these considerations, have sought rather a Gentile-Christian origin for the Church. Communication, they point out, was constant, not only between Rome and Jerusalem, but between Rome and all the East, and especially all the great towns. There was constant coming and going between Rome and such cities as Antioch, Corinth and Ephesus, not to mention others which had been the scene of Paul's labours. Early Christianity, too, was largely self-propagating. "They that were scattered abroad went everywhere preaching the word" (Acts viii. 4). Hort (*Romans and Ephesians*, p. 9) speaks of "a process of quiet and as it were fortuitous filtration"; and it was probably by such a process, initiated, suspended, and renewed on different occasions, that the new religion was introduced to Rome. To conceive the matter in this way is no doubt to conceive it very indefinitely, but it is hardly possible to go further. Attempts have been made to do so. Assuming, for instance, that chap. xvi. is in its right place, and really formed part of

the Epistle to the Romans, it has been argued that the large number of friends and acquaintances Paul had in the Church, and especially the conspicuous place given to his old associates Prisca and Aquila, prove that the Christianity of the Romans was essentially of the Pauline type, and that the Church therefore owed its origin and its character, indirectly no doubt, to him. The epistle certainly does not bear this on its face ; Paul never says a word which implies that the Romans owed anything, even remotely, to him ; there is rather an impression of regret that they did not. Besides, it is a mistake to assume that all Paul's friends were necessarily "Paulinists" —an expression which neither he nor they could have understood. Among those at Rome, and among the most important, as we should judge by the honourable terms in which they are mentioned (xvi. 7), were some who had been Christians longer than he ; and "the quiet and as it were fortuitous filtration" was that of Christianity, undoubtedly of some universal type, but not distinctively of Paulinism.



## CHAPTER II.

### CHARACTER OF THE CHURCH AT ROME.

HARDLY any question in New Testament criticism has been more elaborately discussed than this. The traditional opinion was that the Church consisted of Gentile Christians. The idea that it consisted of Jewish Christians, first broached apparently by Koppe in 1824, gained currency through Baur, and for a generation after his essay (1836) commanded wide assent among critics. A strong protest in favour of the old opinion was kept up all the time, but it was not till 1876 that Weizsäcker produced a decisive reaction in its favour. The great mass of the Church, he argued, must have been Gentile-Christian, though there was no doubt a Jewish-Christian minority. An attempt to construct a theory answering more closely to the facts presented by the epistle is that of Beyschlag. He supposes that the Church consisted mainly of proselytes—that is, of persons who were Gentiles by birth, but had passed through the Jews' religion. This would explain the great difficulty of the epistle, that Paul addresses his readers as if they were Gentiles, but argues with them as if they were Jews. Schürer, again, conceives of the Church as non-Jewish, and at the same time non-Pauline; the Hellenistic Jews of the *diaspora* would make Christians comparatively free in their relations to the ceremonial law, but with no adequate comprehension of the Pauline freedom, in principle, from law in every sense; it is an audience like this Paul is trying to elevate to his own standpoint. That such an audience could be found is not to be denied; whether it is to be found here we can only ascertain by comparing this theory with the facts of the epistle. Finally, Holtzmann gives up the attempt to realise the character of the Church. St. Paul had never been in Rome, did not really know the situation there, and has no distinct idea of his audience. When he finds it necessary to explain why he writes to them at all he thinks of them as Gentiles; when their previous culture and spiritual history, their sympathies, antipathies, and mode of reacting toward the Gospel generally, are in question, they are Jews. All this

shows that the problem is a complex one; and there is no means of doing anything to solve it but to examine the facts once more. They are all contained in the epistle itself, and it will be convenient to adduce the evidence (1) for the Gentile-Christian character of the readers; (2) for the Jewish-Christian character; and then to ask what conception covers and combines all the facts.

1. Evidence for the Gentile-Christian character of the Church.

(a) Chap. i. 5 f. Paul writes: "We received grace and Apostleship, with a view to obedience of faith ἐν πάσιν τοῖς ἔθνεσιν . . . ἐν οἷς ἔστε καὶ ὑμεῖς". Paul's conception of himself as Apostle of the Gentiles (Gal. ii. 8), and his appeal to this vocation in the salutation of his letter, put it beyond doubt that ἔθνη here means Gentiles, as opposed to Israel, and not nations generally. He is exercising his calling as Apostle to the Gentiles in writing to the Romans; for they, too, are in that class. Those who take the Jewish-Christian view argue that Paul would have had no need to tell a Church consisting of Romans by birth that they were included within the scope of his calling as Apostle to the Gentiles. But surely the Apostle's expression is perfectly natural; whereas if ἐν πάσιν τοῖς ἔθνεσιν means "among all the nations," it becomes perfectly meaningless.

(b) Chap. i. 13. "I purposed often to come to you, . . . ἵνα τινὰ καρπὸν σχῶ καὶ ἐν ὑμῖν καθὼς καὶ ἐν τοῖς λοιποῖς ἔθνεσιν." This case is quite unambiguous. The Roman Christians are put on a level with the rest of the ἔθνη, and it agrees with this that the distinction of classes in ver. 14 (Greek and barbarian, wise and unintelligent) belongs to the pagan world.

Of course it is not meant here that Paul was Apostle of the Gentiles in such a sense that he would not have preached the Gospel to the Jews; but as far as he has a special vocation—and it is on a special vocation, and not on the duty of preaching the Gospel to every creature, that he bases his right to address the Romans—it is to the Gentile world. The Roman Church, therefore, belonged to that world.

(c) Chap. xi. 13. ὑμῖν δὲ λέγω τοῖς ἔθνεσιν. Here the whole Church is addressed in its character as Gentile. To this it has been replied that the whole Church is not addressed here; with ὑμῖν δὲ Paul expressly turns aside to address only a part of the Church. If the words stood alone, this might be maintained, but the context is decisive in favour of the former meaning. In the continuation of the passage (see especially xi. 25-28) the Church as a whole is warned against contempt for the Jews; it is addressed in the second person (xi. 25, 28, 30 f.), without any suggestion of distinctions in it, whereas the

Jews are spoken of throughout in the third. Further, when Paul speaks of the Jews in chaps. ix.-xi., it is as “*my brethren*,” “*my kinsmen according to the flesh*,” not *ours* nor *yours*, as would have been the case had the bulk of the Church been of Jewish origin.

(*d*) Chap. xv. 15 f. *τολμηροτέρως δὲ ἔγραψα ὑμῖν κ.τ.λ.* Here Paul justifies himself, in closing, for writing as he has done—especially, perhaps, for writing so decidedly in chap. xiv.-xv. 13—to the Romans. The reason he gives is unmistakable. He is a minister of Jesus Christ, a priest in the service of the Gospel; the offering he has to lay on the altar is the Gentiles, and he writes to the Romans because they are Gentiles, to further them in their faith, that when they are presented to God it may be an acceptable offering, sanctified in the Holy Spirit. There is no evading this argument; to say that in vers. 17-20 Paul’s justification of this presentation of himself as minister of Jesus Christ *εἰς τὰ ἔθνη* is directed against Jewish-Christian suspicions and insinuations (*cf.* 2 Cor. x. 12-18, xii. 11, 12) may or may not be true, but is quite irrelevant; even if there were such suspicions, and even if they had begun to find acceptance in Rome, the Gentile character of the Church at Rome as a whole is here put beyond question.

(*e*) Less stress can be laid on passages like vi. 17 f. (*ἦτε δοῦλοι τῆς ἁμαρτίας*), though they have undoubtedly something which recalls the *ἐξ ἔθνων ἁμαρτωλοὶ* of Gal. ii. 15. By the time he has reached chap. vi. Paul is quite entitled to assume that his readers were once slaves of sin, without suggesting anything about their nationality. Neither do the suggestions of particular sins (*e.g.*, in vi. 12-14) throw any real light on the question. All kinds of bad things are done both by Gentiles and Jews. But discounting weak and uncertain arguments, there is a plain and solid case for maintaining that the great bulk of the Church at Rome was of Gentile origin.

## 2. Evidence for the Jewish-Christian character of the Church.

(*a*) There are passages in which Paul includes himself and his readers in the first person plural; now no one, it is to be observed, is included with him in the superscription, so that “*we*” must mean “*you and I*”. Thus iii. 9 *προεχόμεθα*; are we (Jews) surpassed? But it is very natural to suppose that Paul here, as is his rule, allows his opponents (real or imaginary) to state their own objections in their own person, the “*we*” neither including himself nor his readers; or if he speaks in his own person, it is the *national* consciousness of the Jew, which Paul of course shared, and not the *joint* consciousness of Paul and his readers, which is conveyed by the plural. Another passage of the same kind is iv. 1: *Ἄβραάμ τὸν*

προπάτορα ἡμῶν κατὰ σάρκα. Here also the explanation is the same. Paul says "our" forefather because he has no choice. He could speak of his fellow-countrymen as "*my* kinsmen according to the flesh"; but it would have been obviously absurd for him to speak of Abraham as "*my*" forefather. It is only through his relation to the nation that he can claim a connection with Abraham, and hence the "our" in iv. 1 is national, not individual, and has nothing to do with the Romans. Cf. the precisely similar case in ix. 10 (Isaac *our* father). The same use of the first person plural is found in 1 Cor. x. 1 (All *our* fathers were under the cloud), which no one doubts was written to a thoroughly Gentile Church. As far therefore as passages like these are concerned, they do not invalidate in the least the evidence adduced for the Gentile character of the Church at Rome.

(b) Not so simple are those passages which speak either in the first or second person plural of the relation of the readers, or of Paul and his readers alike, to the law. The most important of these is chap. vii. 1-6. Paul here speaks to his readers as persons γινώσκουσι νόμον, knowing what law is. Even if we admit—which is not necessary, nor I believe right—that the reference is to the Mosaic law, it does not follow that the readers were Jews. Indeed the explicit recalling of the law to mind, while he assumes it to be known, might plausibly be alleged as an argument against a Jewish origin. But to pass that by, does not vii. 4, it is argued—So then, my brethren, *ye also were made dead to the law* by the body of Christ—imply that the persons addressed had lived under the law as well as the writer?—in other words, that they were Jews? And is this not confirmed, when we read in ver. 5 f., "When we were in the flesh, the sinful passions, which were *through the law*, wrought in our members to bring forth fruit unto death. But now *we have been discharged from the law*"? Have we not here, in relation to the law, an experience common to Paul and those whom he addressed, and does not this imply that antecedent to their conversion they and he had lived under the law—that is, were Jews by birth? It is natural, at first sight, to think so, but it is certainly wrong. There *is* an experience common to Paul and to all Christians, whatever their birth; if it were not so, they would not be Christians. It is possible also for him to describe that experience in relation to the law; once *all* Christians were under it, now they are so no more. *All* Christians were under it, for all were under sin, and to the Apostle sin and law are correlative terms. The law, indeed, did not take precisely the same form for Jew and Gentile; the one had an objective revelation, the other had a substitute, if not an equiva-

lent for this, written on his heart ; but in both it wrought to the same issues. There is nothing in the world less Jewish, there is nothing more human, than Rom. vii. 7-24 ; but that is Paul's description of life under the law, and of the working of the law in that life. We understand it only too well, though we are not Jews ; and so, no doubt, did those to whom it was first addressed. Hence Paul could quite well say to a Gentile Church : Ye were made dead to the law through the body of Christ ; and could associate himself with them to say, We were discharged from the law by dying to that in which we were held. A perfectly clear case of this is to be found in Gal. iii. 13-iv. 9. No one imagines that the Galatians were Jews, yet Paul vindicates for them the very thing which he says of the Romans here. God sent forth His Son, he writes, made of a woman, made under law, *to redeem those that are under law*, that *we* might receive the adoption of sons. And because *ye* are sons, God sent forth the spirit of His Son into *our* hearts, etc. The alternation of the first and second persons here shows how Paul could conceive of Jew and Gentile alike as under law in their pre-Christian days, and how in their emancipation from this in Jesus Christ one experience was common to them all. In truth, "sin," "the law," "the curse of the law," "death," are names for something which belongs not to the Jewish but to the human conscience ; and it is only because this is so that the Gospel of Paul is also a Gospel for us. Before Christ came and redeemed the world, all men were at bottom on the same footing : Pharisaism, legalism, moralism, or whatever it is called, it is in the last resort the attempt to be good without God, to achieve a righteousness of our own without an initial all-inclusive immeasurable debt to Him ; in other words, without submitting, as sinful men must submit, to be justified by faith apart from works of our own, and to find in that justification, and in that only, the spring and impulse of all good. It was because Paul's Jewish experience was digested into a purely and perfectly human experience that he was able to transcend his Judaism, and to preach a universal gospel ; and the use of such expressions as we have in vii. 1-6 is no proof that those to whom they applied were Jews too. They apply to us.

(c) The character of the argumentation in the epistle has been adduced in support of the Jewish origin of the readers. It is quite true that in the dialectical development of his gospel in Romans Paul often states and answers such objections as would naturally occur to one representing the historical and legal standpoint of the Jews' religion. Cf. iii. 1 (What advantage then hath the Jew ?), vi. 1 (Are we to continue in sin that grace may abound ?), vi. 15

(Are we to sin, because we are not under law, but under grace?), vii. 7 (What shall we say then? Is the law sin?), xi. 1 (I say then, Hath God cast off His people?). There are two obvious reasons why Paul should have developed his gospel by this dialectical process apart from the assumption that he is meeting the anticipated objections of his readers. One is, that he was a Jew himself, and justified his gospel instinctively, as he went along, against the *primâ facie* objections to it which arose in his own mind. Here, again, however, we must remember that though Paul was a Jew he was a man; and it does not strike one as rigorously historical, but as somewhat absurd, to characterise as Jewish or as Jewish-Christian the criticism of grace which comes natural to every human being. The other reason is, that Paul had heard already in other places most of the objections to his gospel which he answers in this epistle. There is only one express reference to this, in iii. 8 (As we are slandered, and as some affirm that we say, Let us do evil that good may come: for τὸν ἑσθλὸν here, cf. 2 Cor. iii. 1, Gal. ii. 12); but that Paul's gospel was assiduously and energetically counterworked we know quite well, and he may have heard (through some of his friends in the city) that his adversaries were forestalling him at Rome. These reasons fully explain the nature of his arguments; and in view of the direct evidence for the Gentile character of the Church they prove nothing on the other side.

(d) Great stress was laid by Baur on chaps. ix.-xi. in this connection. These, it was argued, were the real kernel of the epistle—the part for the sake of which it was really written, and by relation to which the rest has to be explained; and these, moreover, have no interest, or none worth speaking of, for a Gentile Church. It was only to a Jewish-Christian consciousness that this vindication of God's wonderful ways in the history of redemption required to be or could be addressed. Plausible as this may sound, the facts are against it. For whatever reason, it is precisely and unambiguously to the Gentiles that all this section is addressed. In ix. 1 f., x. 1 f. Paul speaks of the Jews in the third person (my prayer to God for *them*, etc.). He calls them *my* kinsmen, not *yours* or *ours*. He quotes himself, but not his readers (xi. 1), as proof that God has not cast off His people, which he would hardly have done had they also been Christian Jews (but see note on this verse). He uses the fate of the Jews, the natural branches, to warn his readers, grafted into the tree of life contrary to nature, against contempt, pride, and unbelief. Whatever the motive of these chapters may have been, it cannot have been that the bulk of the Romish Church was Jewish in

origin, or strongly Jewish in sympathy. The apostle's own application of their teaching in xi. 17-24 proves exactly the reverse.

(e) Still less can anything be made of an appeal to xiii. 1-7. The Jews were certainly a rebellious and turbulent race, and inherited theocratic ideas which might make them doubt the lawfulness of paying tribute to Cæsar (Deut. xvii. 15, Mark xii. 13-17); but Christianity too in all its forms is an idealism which necessarily raises the question of the relation of God's Kingdom to the kingdoms of this world, and so gives occasion to such explanations as those of Paul in chap. xiii. 1-7. It has been pointed out, too, that echoes of this passage occur in the public prayer of the Roman Church in Clem., *ad. Cor.*, i., lxi., at a period when the Gentile character of the Church is not questioned.

(f) As for the use of the Old Testament in this epistle, it has no bearing whatever on the nationality of the readers. To all the New Testament writers the Old Testament was revelation, and in a sense Christian revelation; and they used it in the same way no matter to whom they wrote.

None of these passages is sufficient to prove that the Church as a whole was Jewish-Christian, or even that it was strongly influenced by Jewish ideas. On the other hand, the passages quoted under 1 prove conclusively that the bulk of the Church was Gentile, so that one writing to it as a body thought of it as a Gentile Church. This, of course, would not preclude the existence in it of a minority of Jewish origin. We can hardly conceive, in the lifetime of the Apostles, a Church without such an element. The Apostles themselves were all Jews, and it was their rule—it was even Paul's rule—to preach to the Jew first. But apart from this general presumption, we have a distinct indication in the epistle itself that there was in the Roman Church a Jewish-Christian element. In chap. xiv. Paul speaks of dissensions between "the strong" and "the weak," and though it would be wrong simply to identify these with Gentile and Jewish Christians, it is a safe inference from xv. 7-13, taken in connection with what precedes, that the difference between "strong" and "weak" was not unrelated to that between Gentile and Jew (see notes *ad loc.*). Hence the prevailing tendency of scholars is to recognise that the Church was Gentile as a whole, but had a minority of Jewish origin. To what extent the Gentile mass was influenced by Jewish ideas—how far the Gentile members of the Church had been originally proselytes, and were therefore appreciative of the Jewish-Christian consciousness or in sympathy with it—is another question. As we have seen above, under 2, *b*, *c*, no special assumption of this kind is needed to explain the manner in which Paul vindicates his gospel to them.

## CHAPTER III.

### CHARACTER OF THE EPISTLE—ITS OCCASION AND PURPOSE.

THE character of the epistle has been a subject of as much discussion as the character of the readers, and the discussion is less likely ever to be closed. A writing of such vitality, which is always being in part lost, and always rediscovered in new power—a writing of such comprehensive scope and such infinite variety of application—a writing at once so personal and historical, and so universal and eternal, is not easily reduced to a formula which leaves nothing to be desired. The definitions of its purpose which have been given by scholars strike one rather as all right than as all wrong. But before entering on an examination of these it will be proper to investigate the occasion of the letter, as it may have some bearing on its purpose.

Paul's intention to visit Rome is first mentioned in Acts xix. 21, and, as Hort remarks, it is expressed with curious emphasis. "After these things were ended, Paul *purposed in the spirit* (ἔθετο ἐν τῷ πνεύματι), when he had passed through Macedonia, and Achaia, to go to Jerusalem, saying, After I have been there, I must also see Rome." He passed through Macedonia and Achaia, as he proposed, and it was during his stay in Corinth (which, according to the usual chronology, was in the winter of 58-59), and towards the close of it, that he wrote this letter. This is a point on which all scholars are agreed. When he wrote, he was on the point of starting, or perhaps had started, on his journey to Jerusalem, with the collection for the poor saints there which had been made in the Churches of Galatia, Macedonia and Achaia (chap. xv. 25 ff., 1 Cor. xvi. 1-4, 2 Cor. viii. ix.). He had with him Timothy and Sosipater, or Sopater (chap. xvi. 21), whom we know otherwise to have been in his company (Acts xx. 4), when he started on that journey. Gaius, his host at the moment (xvi. 23), is probably the same as the Gaius whom he had himself baptised at Corinth (1 Cor. i. 14). The time and place, therefore, at which the Epistle to the Romans was written are beyond question. But we ought to notice these not only formally, as points of geography and chronology, but in their significance in Paul's life. The time was one at which he felt that his work in the



East was done. From Jerusalem and round about unto Illyricum he had fully preached the gospel of Christ. He had no more place in these parts (xv. 19, 23). His eye was turned westward, and rested inevitably on Rome. He had wished to visit it for a good many years (xv. 23), perhaps ever since he had first met Prisca and Aquila in Corinth (Acts xviii. 2), and he had often formed the purpose, though it had been as often disappointed (i. 13). But now it had a definiteness which it had never had before. He did not indeed look on Rome as the goal of his journey; he meant only to stay there till he had been somewhat satisfied with the Church's fellowship, and then to be convoyed by them toward Spain (xv. 24). But he was a Roman citizen, and must have been conscious, as an expression in i. 8 shows ("Your faith is proclaimed in all the world"), of the supreme importance of the Church which had its seat in the capital of the empire. He would not only wish a point of support there for his further operations in the West; he must have been more than commonly anxious that Christianity there should appear as what it truly was, and that the Romans should be firmly established in it. If Paul was going to write to the Romans at all, no matter from what immediate impulse—though it should only have been to announce his approaching visit—it would be natural that his communication, in proportion as he realized the place and coming importance of the Church at Rome, should assume a catholic and comprehensive character. We can hardly imagine the man who was conscious of his own vocation as Apostle of the Gentiles, and conscious at the same time of the central significance of this Church, writing anything of a merely formal character to such a community. When *he* introduced himself to *them*, it was a great occasion, and the epistle is the best evidence that he was sensible of its greatness.

There are other considerations which would tell on Paul's mind in the same direction. When he wrote, he was setting out on a journey the issue of which was doubtful and perilous. At the very outset he had to change his course, because of a plot formed against him by the Jews (Acts xx. 3). He dreaded what these same relentless enemies might do in Judæa; he was not sure that even the Christians in Jerusalem would receive graciously the offering which his love and zeal had raised among the Gentiles on their behalf (chap. xv. 31). He was setting out in readiness not only to be bound, but to die at Jerusalem for the name of the Lord Jesus (Acts xxi. 13). In a sense, therefore, this epistle might be called his testament (Weiss). He puts into it, not merely what is suggested to him by special circumstances of which he is aware in the Church at Rome—*e.g.*, the discussion of the relations between "the strong" and "the weak"—but all that his

own situation and that of the Church, looking at both in the largest aspect, determine to be of interest. He has achieved a great work in the East. By carrying the charity of the Gentile Christians to Jerusalem, and fraternising once more with the primitive Church, he hopes to secure and perfect that work, and to effect a more cordial union between the two great branches of Christendom, which so imperfectly understood each other. He has passed through great conflicts, but his mind has only been made clearer by them, and established in firmer possession of the fundamental principles of the Christian life ; he can define it without misgiving in relation to all previous modes of human experience and all earlier stages of religion, whether in Greek or Jew. His heart is set on further labours, but he is profoundly conscious of the uncertainties of the future. Such are the outward and the spiritual conditions under which Paul writes. Is it not manifest that when we give them all the historical definiteness of which they are capable, there is something in them which rises above the casualness of time and place, something which might easily give the epistle not an accidental or occasional character, but the character of an exposition of principles? Be the immediate motive what it may, it is not incredible that the epistle should have something in it which is rather eternal than historical, and that it should require for its interpretation, not a minute acquaintance with opinion in the apostolic age, but some sense of God and man.

The various opinions as to the purpose of the letter have been classified by almost all writers on Introduction under similar heads: it is only necessary to premise that such opinions do not in fact (whatever their authors may think) necessarily exclude one another.

1. The purpose of the letter, according to some, is *dogmatic*. It is a systematic and formal exposition of the Gospel according to Paul. It is a doctrinal treatise, to which only accident gave the form of a letter ; in other circumstances it might have been a book. This was the opinion which ruled at the time of the Reformation. Luther calls the epistle *absolutissima epitome evangelii*. Melancthon calls it *doctrinæ Christianæ compendium*. No one can say that these descriptions are inept. Luther did find the Gospel in Romans, and found it in a power which made him the greatest conductor of spiritual force since Paul, which directly regenerated one half of Christendom, and indirectly did much to reform the other half. Melancthon made the epistle the basis of his Loci. He was delighted to find a theology which did not philosophise about the mysteries of the Trinity, or the modes of incarnation, or active and passive creation ; but through sin and law and grace gave the know-

ledge of Christ and His benefits. The dogmatic conception of the epistle has held its ground even in modern times, and among writers who pride themselves in giving the historical its due. Thus Hausrath describes it as "the essential content of what he otherwise preached by word of mouth". Hilgenfeld calls it "a complete presentation of the Gospel which Paul preaches among the Gentiles". Pfleiderer, more dogmatically still, speaks of it as "an objective development of the truth of the Gospel, drawn from the nature of the Gospel itself". And certainly, whatever the writer's motive may have been, the letter *has* a systematic character. There is no analogy in any other of his epistles to the connected train of thought which runs from i. 16 to viii. 39 or even to xi. 36. There is indeed a break between chaps. viii. and ix., but there is no unbridgeable gulf. Holtzmann gives, as specimens of the way in which they can be connected, the opinions of Mangold (in i.-viii. Paul justifies his doctrine of salvation, in ix.-xi. his action as a missionary), of Holsten (in i.-viii. he justifies the content, in ix.-xi. the result, of his preaching), and of Pfleiderer (in i.-viii. there is the dogmatic, in ix.-xi. the historical aspect of his gospel). This last agrees pretty much with Godet, who makes the subject of the whole eleven chapters salvation by faith, chaps. i.-viii. treating this in relation to the individual, and chaps. ix.-xi. in relation to its development in history. The systematic character of this part, therefore, is beyond doubt. Those who insist upon it are not of course blind to the parts of the epistle (chaps. xiv. and xv.) in which incidental matters affecting the Church at Rome are touched upon; but it is not in these, they would say, but in the formal presentation of the truth in chaps. i.-xi. that the purpose of the letter is revealed. Granting this, however, the question arises whether the systematic character of the epistle is equivalent to a dogmatic character. In other words, is Paul simply expounding, in a neutral, unprejudiced, objective fashion, the whole scope and contents of his gospel, or is he expounding it in relation to something present to his mind, and to the mind of his readers, which gives the exposition a peculiar character?

2. The latter alternative is affirmed by those who hold that the purpose of the epistle is *controversial*. It is an exposition of Paul's gospel indeed, but not a purely dogmatic one, which in an epistle would be gratuitous and out of place. The exposition is throughout conducted with reference to an attack such as would, be made on Pauline Christianity from the point of view of Judaism, or even of Jewish Christianity. It is not so much an exposition as a defence and a vindication. Practically this idea governs many interpretations, *e.g.*, that of Lipsius. That there is

an element of truth in it is not to be denied. Paul does not write *in vacuo*, in no concrete relations at all. In iii. 8 there is a hint of actual adversaries and their criticisms on the Pauline gospel ; in xvi. 17-20 there is another hint of at least possible ones. It may be, as has been noticed above (p. 566), that Jews or Jewish Christians were attempting to create prejudice against the Apostle in Rome ; but we cannot, on the ground that this is a letter, and must therefore have its character explained by the circumstances of the readers, conclude for certain (with Weizsäcker), that this was the case. In expounding his gospel systematically to the Romans, Paul defines it, not necessarily against enemies who were forestalling him in Rome, but against the criticism which had followed him all through his missionary work. And we must remember, as has also been referred to already, that part of that criticism was not so much Jewish as human. It is not the Jewish or Jewish-Christian consciousness in particular—it is the consciousness of the natural man at a certain stage of moral development—which thinks that forgiveness is an immoral doctrine, and is shocked at the idea of a God “who justifies the ungodly,” or on the other hand, indulges the idea that pardon procures licence to sin. Though the opposition Paul encountered everywhere was headed by Jews or by Christians of Jewish birth, what it represented was by no means exclusively Jewish ; and in an epistle of this unique character, standing where it stands in the Apostle’s life, and making so little express reference to actual Jewish adversaries (contrast it in this respect with Galatians or 2 Cor. x.-xiii.), we must not limit too narrowly the kind of opposition he has in view. He is stating the case of gospel against law—against all that is pre-Christian, infra-Christian, and anti-Christian ; and his polemic has not a temporary but a permanent significance. It is addressed not to Jews of the first century, but to men, and to Christians, of all time. Nothing so conclusively proves its necessity as the fact that it so soon ceased to be understood. It is not easy to live at the spiritual height at which Paul lived. It is not easy to realise that religion begins absolutely on God’s side ; that it begins with a demonstration of God’s love to the sinful, which man has done nothing and can do nothing to merit ; and that the assurance of God’s love is not the goal to be reached by our own efforts, but the only point from which any human effort can start. It is not easy to realise that justification, in the sense of an initial assurance of God’s love, extending over all our life, is the indispensable pre-supposition of everything which can be called Christianity. It is not easy to realise that in the atoning death of Christ and the gift of the Holy Ghost there are the only and the adequate securities

for Christian morality ; that the only good man is the forgiven man, and that he is good, not because he is under law, but because he is not under law but under grace. There must have been many men who were practically Christian, and that, too, in the broad sense, which gave no advantage to the Jew over the Gentile, but who were far from realising their Christianity in principle like Paul. In his heroic sense, indeed, Christianity hardly survived him ; it was recovered in something like its native power, attested even by a recrudescence of its original perils, at the time of the Reformation ; and it always requires to be rediscovered again. But this is only another way of saying that the polemic of the Epistle to the Romans is not narrowly anti-Jewish ; it is anti-legal ; and whenever legalism establishes itself in the Church anew, whether as mere custom, or as a dogmatic tradition, or as a clerical order claiming to be essential to the constitution of the Church, the Christian conscience will find in this polemic the sword of the spirit to strike it down. We admit, therefore, that the epistle has a controversial aspect ; but probably the controversy is not so much with definite adversaries at work in Rome as with those principles and instincts in human nature which long experience as a preacher had made familiar to St. Paul.

3. A third view of the epistle defines its purpose as *conciliatory*. This, again, by no means excludes either of the views already commented on. Even controversy may be conducted in a conciliatory tone, and with a conciliatory purpose. When Paul wrote, he was extremely anxious about the unity of Jew and Gentile in the Church. His journey to Jerusalem had mainly that in view. In the epistle, while there is much that is trenchant in argument, there is nothing that is personal in feeling. There is no contemptuous irony, such as we have in 2 Cor. x.-xiii. ; no uncontrolled passion such as flashes out here and there in Galatians. Although the law works wrath and stimulates sin, he describes it as holy, spiritual, and ordained unto life. He speaks with passionate affection of the Jews (ix. 1 ff.), always recognises their historical prerogatives (iii. 1 ff., ix. 1 ff.), warns the Gentiles against self-exaltation over them, and anticipates the salvation of Israel as a whole. In chaps. xiv.-xv. also his generosity to "the weak," though his judgment is unequivocally with the strong, may be regarded in the same light ; the weak are certainly connected with the Jews, and his aim in the whole passage is the peace and unity of the Church. All this confirms us in thinking that the controversial aspect of the epistle should not be urged with special severity against Jewish Christians, or their modes of thought : Paul has no desire to exasperate any one, but in the position in which he stands, "the greatest moving power in the enlargement

and building up of the universal Church" (Hort), about to visit Jerusalem at once, and Rome, if he can, immediately afterwards, his desire is to win and to unite all.

From this point of view it is possible to form a conception of the purpose of the epistle which will do something like justice to it as a whole. It is an epistle, not a book. Paul wrote to Rome, not simply to clear up his own mind, not as a modern writer might do, addressing the world at large; he wrote to this particular community, and under a particular impulse. He knew something about the Church, as chaps. xiv. and xv. show; and while he might have acquired such information from members of it whom he met in Corinth, Ephesus, or elsewhere, it is quite probable, from chap. xvi., that he had friends and correspondents at Rome itself. He wrote to the Roman Christians because it was in his mind to visit them; but the nature of his letter is determined, not simply by consideration of their necessities, but by consideration of his own position. The letter is "occasional," in the sense that it had a historical motive—to intimate and prepare for the coming visit; but it is not occasional in the sense in which the first Epistle to the Corinthians is so. It is not a series of answers to questions which the Romans had propounded; it is not a discussion, relevant to them only, of points either in doctrine or practice which had incidentally come to be of critical importance in Rome. Its character, in relation to St. Paul's mind, is far more central and absolute than this would imply. It is in a real sense a systematic exposition of what he distinctively calls "my gospel" (ii. 16), such an exposition as makes him thoroughly known to a community which he foresaw would have a decisive importance in the history of Christianity. It is not an impromptu note, nor a series of unconnected remarks, each with a motive of its own; it is the manifesto of his gospel, by means of which the Apostle of the Gentiles, at a great crisis and turning point in his life, establishes relations with the Christian community in the capital of the Gentile world. It can be dated, of course, but no writing in the New Testament is less casual; none more catholic and eternal. It is quite true that in expounding his gospel Paul proceeds by a certain dialectical process; he advances step by step, and at every step defines the Christian truth as against some false or defective, some anti-Christian or infra-Christian view; in this sense it is controversial. But we have seen already the limitations under which alone a controversial character can be ascribed to it; Paul is not so much controverting anybody in particular as vindicating the truth he expounds against the assaults and misconstructions to which he had found it give rise. There is no animosity against the

Jews in it; no sentence such as 1 Thess. ii. 15 f. or Gal. v. 12. It is an establishment of principles he aims at; except in iii. 8, xvi. 17-20 there is no reference to persons. Even in chaps. ix.-xi. (see the introduction at chap. ix.) the whole tone is conciliatory; the one thing which tries our faith in them is Paul's assurance of the future of his own people. But as an interpretation of the actual working out in human history of that method of salvation which he has expounded in the first eight chapters—as an exhibition of the process through which the rejection of the Jews and the calling of the Gentiles alike contribute eventually to the universality of the Gospel—these chapters are an essential part of the epistle. They are mainly but not exclusively apologetic: they belong to that whole conception of the Gospel, and of the mode in which it becomes the inheritance of the world, which was of one substance with the mind of St. Paul. No one who read the first eleven chapters of the epistle could meet the Apostle as a stranger on anything essential in Christianity as he understood it. No doubt, as Grafe has remarked, it does not contain an eschatology like 1 Cor. xv. or 2 Cor. v., nor a Christology like Col. i. But it establishes that which is fundamental beyond the possibility of misconception. It vindicates once for all the central facts, truths and experiences, without which Christianity cannot exist. It vindicates them at once in their relation to the whole past of mankind, and in their absolute newness, originality and self-sufficiency. It is an utter misapprehension to say that “just the most fundamental doctrines—the Divine Lordship of Christ, the value of His death, the nature of the Sacraments—are assumed rather than stated or proved” (Sanday and Headlam, p. xli.). There can be only one fundamental doctrine, and that doctrine for Paul is the doctrine of justification by faith. That is not part of his gospel, it is the whole of it: there Luther is his true interpreter. If legalists or moralists object, Paul's answer is that justification regenerates, and that nothing else does. By its consistency with this fundamental doctrine, we test everything else that is put forward as Christian. It is only as we hold this, on principle, with the clearness with which Paul held it, that we can know what Christian liberty is in the sense of the New Testament—that liberty in which the will of God is done from the heart, and in which no commandments or ordinances of men, no definitions or traditions, no customs or “orders,” have any legal authority for the conscience. And in the only legitimate sense of the word this liberty does not make void, but establishes the law. That is the paradox in the true religion which perpetually baffles those who would reduce it to an institution or a code.

## CHAPTER IV.

### INTEGRITY OF THE EPISTLE.

THE integrity of the Epistle to the Romans has been called in question mainly in connection with chaps. xv. and xvi. Partly on the ground of textual phenomena, partly on internal grounds, the authenticity of these chapters has been denied, in whole or in part; and even among those who recognise chap. xvi. as Pauline, many are unable to recognise Rome as the place to which it was addressed. It will be convenient to consider (1) the questions raised by the position of the doxology, and the various endings; (2) questions raised by the internal character of chap. xv.; and (3) questions connected with the character and destination of chap. xvi.

1. The position of the doxology, and the various endings. The facts in regard to the doxology are as follows:—

(a) It is given at xvi. 25-27, and there only, by **NBCDE**, Vulgate, Syriac, Memphitic, Aethiopic and Latin Fathers. This is by far the best attested position for it, and that which, owing to the respect of Erasmus for the Vulgate, it occupies in the received text.

(b) At xiv. 23, and there only, it is found in **L**, most cursives, Greek lectionaries, and Greek commentators except Origen. Possibly the lectionaries explain its appearance at this point. The matter in chaps. xv. and xvi. being of a more personal or temporary interest was not likely to be chosen for reading in church. But in order that the great doxology, which was too short for a lesson by itself, might not be lost in public worship, it was appended to the last lesson before chap. xv.

(c) It is found both after xiv. 23 and at xvi. 25-27 in **AP 17 arm.**

(d) It is omitted in both places in **FG**, but **F** has space left after xvi. 24, in which **f** (the Latin of this bi-lingual MS.) has the doxology, while **G** has space left between chaps. xiv. and xv.

Besides this variety of MS. attestation, there are certain other facts to take into consideration. (a) There is the evidence of Origen (in his translator Rufinus) to the text in his time. It runs as follows (ed. Lommatzsch, vii., p. 453): *Caput hoc Marcion, a quo*



*Scripturæ evangelicæ et apostolicæ interpolatæ sunt, de hac epistola penitus abstulit; et non solum hoc sed et ab eo loco, ubi scriptum est: omne autem quod non est ex fide peccatum est: usque ad finem cuncta dissecuit. In aliis vero exemplaribus, id est, in his quæ non sunt a Marcione temerata, hoc ipsum caput diversè positum invenimus; in nonnullis etenim codicibus post eum locum quem supra diximus hoc est: omne autem quod non est ex fide peccatum est: statim cohærens habetur: ei autem qui potens est vos confirmare. Alii vero codices in fine id, ut nunc est positum, continent.* This remark is made at xvi. 25, and *caput hoc* means, of course, this passage, i.e., the doxology. Marcion wholly omitted it there. But what do the following words mean? What strikes one at first is that he not only omitted it there, but omitted everything standing after "whatsoever is not of faith is sin"—in other words, not only the doxology, but the whole of chaps. xv. and xvi. But Dr. Hort (*vide* Appendix, p. 112), who reads (with what he says seems to be the best MS.) *in eo loco* instead of *ab eo loco*, and changes *hoc* into *hic*, only finds the statement that Marcion cut off the whole of the doxology at xiv. 23, as well as at xvi. 25. But *usque ad finem cuncta dissecuit* is a very misleading way to express this to readers whose copies of the epistle would all contain chaps. xv. and xvi., and it is hardly open to doubt that the first impression of the meaning is the correct one, and that Marcion ended his Epistle to the Romans at xiv. 23. Thus, as Gifford puts it, "we have evidence of a *diversity of position* before Origen's time, and regarded by him as independent of Marcion's mutilated copies. But we have no evidence of *omission* before Marcion, who was at Rome propagating his views about A.D. 138-140."

(b) There is the evidence of the "capitulations," or division of the epistle into sections, in some MSS. of the Latin Bible, especially the two best codices of the Vulgate, Codex Amiatinus and Codex Fuldensis, both sixth century MSS. In Codex Amiatinus there are fifty-one sections. The fiftieth, entitled *De periculo contristante fratrem suum esca sua, et quod non sit regnum Dei esca et potus sed justitia et pax et gaudium in Spiritu Sancto*, evidently answers to chap. xiv. 15-23; the fifty-first, which is entitled *De mysterio Domini ante passionem in silentio habito, post passionem vero ipsius revelato*, as plainly corresponds to the doxology. The capitulations therefore were drawn up for a Latin MS. which omitted chaps. xv. and xvi. In another way the capitulations in Codex Fuldensis point to the same conclusion.

(c) There is the appearance, at least, of different endings. 1. When the doxology stands at xiv. 23, it indicates an ending at that

point, though otherwise it is a very unnatural one, as the subject and sense of chap. xiv. run on unbroken to xv. 13. 2. There is at xv. 33 what has sometimes been taken as another ending: "The God of peace be with you all. Amen." 3. There is the benediction at xvi. 20: "The grace of our Lord Jesus Christ be with you". This is genuine, and is an ordinary Pauline formula at the close of a letter. 4. There is the benediction at xvi. 24: "The grace of our Lord Jesus Christ be with you all. Amen." Most editors regard this as spurious; it has been transferred in Western texts from verse 20 to this place, and finally established itself in both. Gifford, however, regards it as genuine in both places. 5. There is the doxology at xvi. 25-27.

(d) In G all mention of Rome is wanting: see critical note on i. 7, 15.

This complicated combination of facts has not yet been clearly explained, and perhaps never will be. Renan's theory was that Romans is really a circular letter, and that it was sent in various directions, with different endings, which were afterwards combined. Lightfoot thought the facts adduced amounted to irresistible evidence that in early times shorter copies of the epistle existed, containing only chaps. i.-xiv., with or without the doxology; and the theory by which he explained these facts was this, that "St. Paul, at a later period of his life, reissued the epistle in a shorter form with a view to general circulation, omitting the last two chapters, obliterating the mention of Romans in the first chapter, and adding the doxology, which was no part of the original epistle". This tempting theory was expounded in the *Journal of Philology*, 1871, in a review of M. Renan; and this review, along with a minute criticism of Dr. Hort, and a reply by Lightfoot, can be studied in Lightfoot's *Biblical Essays*, pp. 285-374. An acute statement of the objections to it is also given by Gifford in the introduction to his commentary (p. 23 f.); yet when all is said, it remains the most satisfying hypothesis that has yet been suggested for the colligation of the facts. Sanday and Headlam think that Paul could not possibly have made the break at xiv. 23—he must have been too conscious that the sense ran on unbroken to xv. 13; it was probably to Marcion, therefore, to whom the references to the Jews and the Old Testament in xv. 1-13 were objectionable, that the imperfect copies of the epistle owed their existence. This is hardly convincing. If there is not a break at xiv. 23, there is at least a pause in the thought, and Paul may as easily have made a division there as the author of our present division into chapters. Besides, as Gifford points out (see above,

p. 577), there is evidence that the doxology stood in different positions (at xiv. 23 for one) before Origen's time, and independently of Marcion's mutilated copies. Hence some one must have felt that xiv. 23 was not an impossible place to stop at, and that for other than Marcion's reasons; and if some one, why not Paul himself? But in the absence of any direct evidence as to how the textual phenomena originated, it is very improbable that any certainty on the subject will ever be attained.

2. Questions raised by the internal character of chap. xv.

The Tübingen school, or at least some of its more vigorous adherents, followed Baur in finding chap. xv. too moderate in tone for Paul. Baur regarded the last two chapters as the work of some one "writing in the spirit of the Acts of the Apostles, seeking to soothe the Judaists and to promote the cause of unity, and therefore tempering the keen anti-Judaism of Paul with a milder and more conciliatory conclusion to the epistle". An argument like this rests on a general impression of what it was possible for Paul to write, and can only be met by another general impression of a different sort. It is sufficient to say that later scholars are practically at one in finding that there is nothing in the chapter inconsistent with Pauline authorship. The Paul by whom Baur measured all things in the epistles is really not the Paul of history, but of a more or less arbitrary theory; and his picture has to be corrected by taking into account precisely such revelations of his true attitude to the questions of his time as are found in this chapter. Lipsius, who thinks the fifteenth chapter as a whole genuine, nevertheless holds that it has been interpolated. He omits the latter part of verse 19—*ὥστε με ἀπὸ Ἱερουσαλὴμ καὶ κύκλῳ μέχρι τοῦ Ἰλλυρικῆς πεπληρωκέναι τὸ εὐαγγέλιον τοῦ Χριστοῦ*—as inconsistent with Gal. i. 18-24, and unsupported by any accredited historical evidence. But he admits that it is supported by Acts ix. 28 f.; and if we compare i. 8, Col. i. 23, and remember that what we have before us is not sworn evidence but a broad rhetorical description of the Apostle's missionary labours, we shall probably think the expression characteristically Pauline rather than the reverse. In verse 20 Lipsius omits *οὐχ ὅπου ἄνομάσθη Χριστός, ἵνα μὴ ἐπ' ἀλλότριον θεμέλιον οἰκοδομῶ, ἀλλά.* The words, he argues, are suggested by 2 Cor. x. 15; but the purpose expressed in them, of not preaching the Gospel in Rome, because Rome is a mission-field belonging to others (who have introduced Christianity there already), is incompatible with i. 5, 13-15, xii. 3, xv. 15. It is enough to answer that the purpose of not preaching the Gospel at Rome is not expressed here at all. Paul tells the principle on which he has always acted—the principle

of breaking new ground. It is the principle on which he will act still, for he takes Rome only *en route* for Spain ; but that is not inconsistent with anything he purposes to do at Rome in the way of Christian work, nor with anything he does in this epistle. On the same principle Lipsius omits also verses 23 and 24 ; but with equal groundlessness. The very facts to which he refers, that the plan of travel announced in these verses is nowhere else referred to either in Acts or in the Epistles, and that it was (as he thinks) never carried out, are conclusive evidence of the genuineness of the passage. What motive could a late interpolator have for putting into Paul's mind a projected voyage, of which there was no purpose on record, and which was never actually made ? The unanimous testimony of all sources guarantees the integrity of the text ; and there is no reason whatever to doubt that it is Paul's.

3. Questions connected with the character and destination of chap. xvi.

When we come to this chapter the situation is changed. It is not its genuineness, but its destination, that is called in question. Since 1829, when David Schulz suggested that it was a fragment of an epistle to the Ephesians, this opinion has been widely received. The exact extent of the fragment, indeed, is disputed. Schulz made it consist of verses 1-20 ; Weizsäcker says verses 1-23 ; others, verses 3-20, or 1-15, or 1-16 and 21-23, or 3-16 only. Whatever its limits, the arguments on behalf of it can only be estimated by going over the chapter, and considering them as they emerge.

(a) The suggestion is made that Phoebe, sailing from Cenchreæ, would naturally have Ephesus rather than Rome as her goal. But there is no reason to believe that she was sailing from Cenchreæ, though she lived there. Paul may have met her in Corinth on her way to Rome.

(b) At first sight there may seem more reason to believe that Aquila and Priscilla point to Ephesus. They had gone thither with Paul at an earlier date (Acts xviii. 19), and they had a church in their house there, which joined them in a greeting to Corinth, when Paul wrote his first Epistle to the Corinthians (1 Cor. xvi. 19) ; and they were there also some years later (2 Tim. iv. 19). The question is whether these facts, in the circumstances, outweigh the fact that the greeting is found here in a letter addressed to Rome. If we look at the whole situation, this is at least doubtful. As fellow-workers of Paul, it is plain that they shared to a large extent his wandering life, and we know that they had originally a connection with Rome (Acts xviii. 2). There is nothing in the least improbable

in the idea that though they were in Ephesus, say in 54 and 57 A.D., and again say in 66, they should have been in Rome in 58. Paul must have had his information about the Church in Rome from some one; and nothing is so likely as that he had it from his old and intimate associates, Aquila and Priscilla, who had themselves a connection of old standing with the capital.

(c) There remains the case of Epænetus, who is described as the first fruits of Asia unto Christ. The received text has Achaia, but that is an error. One fails to see, however, why this Epænetus, though the first Christian convert in the province of Asia, should be bound to remain there always. There is no difficulty in supposing that he was at Rome, and that Paul, who knew him, was aware of the fact, and introduced his name to multiply for himself points of contact with the Roman Church.

These are the only definite matters of fact on which the theory of an Ephesian destination of the chapter has been based. They do not amount to anything against the weight of all the external evidence which makes them part of a letter to Rome. Nor is their weight increased by pointing out in the verses which follow the large number of persons with whom Paul had been in personal relations — persons whom he calls “my beloved,” “my fellow-labourers,” “my fellow-captives”; “who bestowed much labour on us”; “his mother and mine”. Paul’s life as a missionary brought him into contact with persons in all the great towns of the East, and though he had not yet visited Rome, it cannot be doubted that many of those with whom in the course of his twenty years’ ministry he had established such relations as are referred to here, had for one cause or other found their way to the great city. Paul would naturally, in preparing for his own visit, make all that he could of such points of attachment with the Roman Church as he had. It is, as Gifford points out, a very strong, indeed a conclusive argument for the Roman destination of the letter, that of the twenty-two persons named in verses 6-15, not one can be shown to have been at Ephesus; while (1) Urbanus, Rufus, Ampliatus, Julia and Junia are specifically Roman names, and (2) besides the first four of these names, “ten others, Stachys, Apelles, Tryphaena, Tryphosa, Hermes, Hermas, Patrobas (or Patrobios), Philologus, Julia, Nereus are found in the sepulchral inscriptions on the Appian Way as the names of persons connected with ‘Cæsar’s household’ (Phil. iv. 22), and contemporary with St. Paul”. Hence, in spite of the difficulty of Paul’s knowing so many people in a Church he had never visited, and the equally great

difficulty that none of all these people are mentioned in the letters the Apostle afterwards wrote from Rome (see Col. iv. 10 f.), scholars like Lightfoot, Gifford and Sanday find no reason to give up the historical tradition which makes this chapter an integral part of the epistle addressed to Rome. There is really more reason to question verses 17-20 than any other part of the chapter. Words like those in verse 19—ἐφ' ὑμῶν οὖν χαίρω, θέλω δὲ ὑμᾶς κ.τ.λ.—certainly strike one as in better keeping if addressed to a Church with which Paul had had such previous relations as entitled him to take a personal tone than if addressed to strangers. But we cannot tell *a priori* how the consciousness of an Apostle towards a Christian community he had never yet seen was determined; it may, with all the disclaiming of titles to interfere, have involved precisely that authoritativeness and sense of responsibility to and for the Church which is expressed in this passage.

As for the doxology, it stands by itself. Lightfoot thought it no part of the original epistle. Neither did Alford. "Probably," says the latter, "on reperusing his work either at the time, or, as the altered style seems to import, in after years at Rome, he subjoins the fervid and characteristic doxology with which it closes." Opinions on the genuineness of the doxology vary in part (but not exclusively) as opinions vary on the genuineness of the pastoral epistles. In spite of the vindication of the style word by word, the impression it leaves on the mind is hardly Pauline. It seems artificial rather than inspired. It is defended by Gifford, Hort, and Sanday and Headlam; by Weiss (who thinks Paul may have added it with his own hand), Godet, and many others: rejected by Delitzsch, Pfeleiderer, Schultz and Lipsius. In substance it recapitulates the main ideas of the epistle.

#### TEXT.

The text printed in this commentary is the *Textus Receptus*, but that which is commented upon is practically that of Westcott and Hort. Various readings, of any importance, have been carefully noted in the *apparatus criticus*, with such an indication of the authorities for them as will be sufficient for those who do not aspire to be experts in this department: care has been taken to give the evidence for those readings in which critical editors depart from the received text. It is impossible here to do more than note the MSS. and other authorities which have been cited; information as to their characteristics and value must be sought from such sources as the *Prolegomena* to Tischendorf's *Novum Testamentum Graecum*,

or Scrivener's *Introduction to the Textual Criticism of the New Testament*, or Westcott and Hort's *Introduction*, vol. ii. An easier book to begin with is Hammond's *Textual Criticism applied to the New Testament*. In Sanday and Headlam's *Commentary* (pp. lxxiii.-lxxiv.), there is a lucid account of the chief sources of evidence for the text of Romans, and of their relations to one another; while B. Weiss, in his great work, *Das Neue Testament: Textkritische Untersuchungen und Textherstellung*, gives weight to considerations of a kind that more purely "diplomatic" constructors of texts are apt to overlook.

The principal MSS. of Romans are those which also contain the gospels, viz.,  $\aleph$ ABC.  $\aleph$  and B belong to the fourth century, A and C to the fifth. The MSS. next in importance, DEFG, are different from those which are called by the same names in the gospels: they are all Graeco-Latin MSS. D is the Codex Claromontanus which Tischendorf assigns to the sixth century. It wants Romans i. 1-7, 27-30. Tregelles describes it as "one of the most valuable MSS. extant". E is the Codex Sangermanensis, now at St. Petersburg. It is probably not older than the ninth or tenth century, and is described by Sanday and Headlam as "nothing more than a faulty copy of D". F is the Codex Augiensis, now in the library of Trinity College, Cambridge. It is of the ninth century, and wants Romans i. 1-iii. 19 ἐν τῷ νό[μῳ]. G is the Codex Boernerianus, now in Dresden, and is a little later than F. It wants Romans i. 1 ἀφωρισμένος . . . i. 5 πίστεως, and ii. 16 τὰ κρυπτὰ . . . ii. 25 νόμου ἡ̅ς̅. These four all belong to the type of text which Westcott and Hort call Western. Other uncials of less importance are K, Codex Mosquensis; L, Codex Angelicus; and P, Codex Porphyrianus, all of about the same age, i.e., the ninth century. Of cursive MSS. those quoted in this work are 17 (the same as 33 in the Gospels, and 13 in Acts), "the queen of cursives"; 47, of the eleventh or twelfth century, now in the Bodleian Library; and 67, of the eleventh century, now at Vienna. The marginal corrector of this MS., quoted as 67\*\*, gives many peculiar and ancient readings. The versions referred to are the Latin Vulgate, especially as given in Codex Amiatinus circa 514 A.D. and Codex Fuldensis, also of sixth century; the old Latin contained in DEFG (see above); the Syriac versions, one of which (the Peshitto) was "certainly current much in its present form early in the fourth century" (Sanday and Headlam), while the other dates from the sixth: an occasional reference is also made to the Egyptian versions, and to the Armenian: the last was made in the fifth century.

To estimate the value of any reading it is necessary to consider the relations to each other of the authorities which support it. In the Epistle to the Romans, as elsewhere in the New Testament, these authorities tend to fall into groups. Thus **NB** form one; **DEFG** a second; and **NACLP** a third. **NB** form what Westcott and Hort describe as "neutral" authorities; **DEFG** are "Western"; **NACLP** include what they call "Alexandrian," but are not identical with it. Sanday and Headlam, after giving an account of the authorities for the text, define the "specific characteristics of the textual apparatus of Romans" as these: (i.) the general inferiority in boldness and originality of the Western text; (ii.) the fact that there is a distinct Western element in **B**, which therefore when it is combined with authorities of the Western type is diminished in value; (iii.) the consequent rise in importance of the group **NAC**; (iv.) the existence of a few scattered readings either of **B** alone or of **B** in combination with one or two other authorities which have considerable intrinsic probability, and may be right. By a little practice on the readings for which the authority is given in the *apparatus criticus*, the student can familiarise himself with the facts, and exercise his own judgment on them.

---

In the notes, Winer means Moulton's edition of Winer's Grammar; **W.** and **H.** stands for Westcott and Hort; **S.** and **H.** for Sanday and Headlam's Commentary on Romans.



## ΠΑΤΛΟΥ ΤΟΥ ΑΠΟΣΤΟΛΟΥ

### Η ΠΡΟΣ

### ΡΩΜΑΙΟΥΣ ΕΠΙΣΤΟΛΗ.

Ι. Ι. ΠΑΥΛΟΣ δούλος Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ,<sup>a</sup> κλητὸς ἀπόστολος, ἀφωρισμένος α ἰ Cor. i. εἰς εὐαγγέλιον Θεοῦ, 2. (ὁ προεπηγγέλατο διὰ τῶν προφητῶν αὐτοῦ<sup>1, 2.</sup>

CHAPTER I.—Vv. 1-7. The usual salutation of the Apostle is expanded, as is natural in writing to persons whom he has not seen, into a description both of himself and of his Gospel. Both, so to speak, need a fuller introduction than if he had been writing to a Church he had himself founded. The central idea of the passage is that of the whole epistle, that the Gospel, as preached by Paul to the Gentiles, was not inconsistent with, but the fulfilment of, God's promises to Israel.

Ver. 1. Paul's description of himself. **δοῦλος ἰ. Χ.** The use of the same expression in James, Jude, 2 Pet., shows how universal in the Church was the sense of being under an obligation to Christ which could never be discharged. It is this sense of obligation which makes the **δουλεία**, here referred to, perfect freedom. **κλητὸς ἀπόστολος** is an Apostle by vocation. No one can take this honour to himself, any more than that of a saint (ver. 7), unless he is called by God. In the N.T. it is always *God* who calls. It is as an Apostle—*i.e.*, with the sense of his vocation as giving him a title to do so—that Paul writes to the Romans. **ἀπόστολος** is here used in the narrower sense, which includes only Paul and the twelve, see on xvi. 7. **ἀφωρισμένος εἰς εὐαγγέλιον θεοῦ**: for **καλεῖν** and **ἀφορίζειν** similiarly combined, see Gal. i. 15. The separation is here regarded (as in Gal.) as God's act, though, as far as it had reference to the Gentile mission, it was carried out by an act of the Church at Antioch (Acts xiii. 2, **ἀφορίσατε δὴ**

**μοι κ.τ.λ.**). What it means is "this one thing I do". **εὐαγγέλιον θεοῦ** is the Gospel which comes from God, the glad tidings of which He is the source and author. As a name for the Christian religion, or the proclamation of it, it had a great fascination for an evangelist like Paul, who uses it out of all proportion oftener than any other N.T. writer.

Ver. 2. **ὁ προεπηγγέλατο**. The Gospel is not in principle a new thing, a subversion of the true religion as it has hitherto been known to the people of God. On the contrary, God promised it before, through his prophets in the Holy Scriptures. It is the fulfilment of hopes which God Himself inspired. **διὰ τῶν προφητῶν** does not restrict the reference to the prophets in the strict sense of the word. The O.T., as a whole, is prophetic of the New, and it is in the law (Abraham) and the Psalms (David), as much as in the prophets (Isaiah, Hosea), that Paul finds anticipations and promises of the Gospel: see chap. iv. The omission of the article with **ἐν γραφαῖς ἁγίαις** (*cf.* xvi. 26) is probably significant, for as against these two passages there are over forty in which **αἱ γραφαὶ** or **ἡ γραφή** occurs: it emphasises the Divine character of these as opposed to other writings. That is **ἅγιον** which belongs to God, or is connected with Him: **ἅγιοι γραφαὶ** is the O.T. as God's book.

Ver. 3 f. **περὶ τοῦ υἱοῦ αὐτοῦ**: the subject of the Gospel of God is His Son. For the same conception, see 2 Cor. i. 19: **ὁ τοῦ θεοῦ γὰρ υἱὸς Χ. ἰ. ὁ ἐν ὑμῖν δι' ἡμῶν κηρυχθεὶς**. Taken

ἐν γραφαῖς ἀγίαις.) 3. περὶ τοῦ υἱοῦ αὐτοῦ, (τοῦ γενομένου ἐκ σπέρματος Δαβὶδ κατὰ <sup>b</sup>σάρκα, 4. τοῦ ὀρισθέντος υἱοῦ Θεοῦ ἐν δυνάμει <sup>c</sup>κατὰ πνεῦμα ἁγιωσύνης, ἐξ ἀναστάσεως νεκρῶν,) Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ τοῦ Κυρίου ἡμῶν, 5. (δι' οὗ ἐλάβομεν χάριν καὶ ἀποστολήν <sup>e</sup>εἰς ὑπακοήν

by itself, "the Son of God" is, in the first instance, a title rather than a name. It goes back to Ps. ii. 7; the person to whom it is applied is conceived as the chosen object of the Divine love, God's instrument for accomplishing the salvation of His people. (Weiss.) The description which follows does not enable us to answer all the questions it raises, yet it is sufficiently clear. "The Son of God" was born of the seed of David according to the flesh. For γενομένου, cf. Gal. iv. 4; for David, 2 Tim. ii. 8, where, as here, the Davidic descent is an essential part of the Pauline Gospel. That it was generally preached and recognised in the primitive Church is proved by these passages, as well as by Heb. vii. 14 and the genealogies in Matthew and Luke; yet it seems a fair inference from our Lord's question in Mk. xii. 35 ff. that for Him it had no real importance. Those who did not directly see in Jesus one transcendently greater than David would not recognise in Him the Saviour by being convinced of His Davidic descent. This person, of royal lineage, was "declared Son of God, with power, according to the spirit of holiness, in virtue of resurrection from the dead". The word ὀρισθέντος is ambiguous; in Acts x. 42, xvii. 31, it is used to describe the appointment of Christ to judge the living and the dead, and is rendered in A.V. "ordained". If to be Son of God were merely an office or a dignity, like that of judge of the world, this meaning might be defended here. There is an approximation to such an idea in Acts xiii. 33, where also Paul is the speaker. "God," he says, "has fulfilled His promise by raising up Jesus; as it is written also in the second Psalm, Thou art My Son, this day have I begotten Thee." Here the resurrection day, strictly speaking, is the birthday of the Son of God; sonship is a dignity to which He is exalted after death. But in view of passages like Gal. iv. 4, 2 Cor. viii. 9, Phil. ii. 5 f., it is impossible to suppose that Paul limited his use of Son of God in this way; even while Jesus lived on earth there was that in Him which no connection with David could explain, but which rested on a relation

to God; the resurrection only declared Him to be what He truly was—just as in the Psalm, for that matter, the bold words, This day have I begotten Thee, may be said to refer, not to the right and title, but to the coronation of the King. In virtue of His resurrection, which is here conceived, not as from the dead (ἐκ νεκρῶν), but of the dead (ἀναστάσεως νεκρῶν—a resurrection exemplifying, and so guaranteeing, that of others), Christ is established in that dignity which is His, and which answers to His nature. The expression κατὰ πνεῦμα ἁγιωσύνης characterises Christ ethically, as κατὰ σάρκα does physically. Not that it makes the sonship in question "ethical" as opposed to "metaphysical": no such distinctions were in the Apostle's thought. But the sonship, which was declared by the resurrection, answered to (κατὰ) the spirit of holiness which was the inmost and deepest reality in the Person and life of Jesus. The sense that there is that in Christ which is explained by his connection with mankind, and that also which can only be explained by some peculiar relation to God, is no doubt conveyed in this description, and is the basis of the orthodox doctrine of the two natures in the one Person of the Lord; but it is a mistake to say that that doctrine is formulated here. The connection of the words ἐν δυνάμει is doubtful. They have been joined to ὀρισθέντος (cf. 2 Cor. xiii. 4: ἤν ἐκ δυνάμει Θεοῦ): declared to be Son of God "by a miracle," a mighty work wrought by God; and also with υἱοῦ Θεοῦ = Son of God, not in humiliation, but "in power," a power demonstrated by the gift of the Spirit and its operations in the Church. "Jesus, Messiah, Our Lord," summarises all this. "Our Lord" is the most compendious expression of the Christian consciousness. (A. B. Bruce, *Apologetics*, 398 ff.) "The whole Gospel of Paul is comprehended in this historical Jesus, who has appeared in flesh, but who, on the ground of the πνεῦμα ἁγιωσύνης, which constitutes His essence, has been exalted as Christ and Lord." (Lipsius.) Ver. 5. Through Christ Paul received χάριν κ. ἀποστολήν. The plural, ἐλάβομεν, may mean no more than the

<sup>d</sup>πίστεως ἐν πᾶσι τοῖς ἔθνεσιν, ὑπὲρ τοῦ ὀνόματος <sup>e</sup> αὐτοῦ, β. ἐν οἷς <sup>d</sup> Ch. xvi. 26; Acts  
 ἔστε καὶ ὑμεῖς, κλητοὶ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ·) 7. πᾶσι τοῖς οὖσιν ἐν Ῥώμῃ, <sup>e</sup> vi. 7.  
 ἀγαπητοῖς Θεοῦ,<sup>1</sup> κλητοῖς ἁγίοις, χάρις ὑμῖν καὶ εἰρήνη ἀπὸ Θεοῦ <sup>e</sup> Acts v. 41.  
 πατρὸς ἡμῶν καὶ Κυρίου Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ. ix. 16, xv. 26.

8. Πρῶτον μὲν εὐχαριστῶ τῷ Θεῷ μου διὰ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ ὑπὲρ <sup>2</sup>  
 πάντων ὑμῶν, ὅτι ἡ πίστις ὑμῶν καταγγέλλεται ἐν ὅλῳ τῷ <sup>f</sup> κόσμῳ. <sup>f1</sup> Thess. i. 8

<sup>1</sup> For *πασιν τοις οἰσιν εν Ρωμη αγαπητοις θεου* G reads *πασι τοις οἰσιν εν αγαπη θεου*. The same MS. also omits *τοις εν Ρωμη* in ver. 17. This is part of the evidence on which Lightfoot relied to show that Paul had issued chaps. i.-xiv. of this Epistle as a circular letter with all local allusions (such as these, and the many in chaps. xv. and xvi.) omitted. See Introduction, p. 578.

<sup>2</sup> For *υπερ* read *περι* with  $\aleph$ BACD<sup>1</sup>, etc.

singular, or may proceed from the latent consciousness that the writer is not the only person entitled to say this; it is not expressly meant to include others. *χάρις*, grace, is common to all Christians; *ἀποστολή* rests upon a specialised *χάρις* and implies competence as well as vocation. But in the N.T. these are hardly distinguished; it is a man's *χάρισμα* which constitutes his "call" to any particular service in the Church. *εἰς ὑπακοὴν πίστεως*: the object of the apostleship received through Christ is obedience of faith, *i.e.*, the obedience which consists in faith (but *cf.* Acts vi. 7) among all the Gentiles. *Cf.* chap. x. 16, 2 Thess. i. 8. The meaning of *ἔθνεσιν* (Gentiles, not nations) is fixed by ver. 13 and by Paul's conception of his own vocation, Gal. i. 16, ii. 8, Eph. iii. 1 ff. *ὑπὲρ τοῦ ὀνόματος αὐτοῦ*: the final purpose of his vocation is that Christ's name may be above every name.

Ver. 6. The Romans, as well as others, are included among the Gentiles, and described as Jesus Christ's called. They belong to Him, because they have heard and obeyed the Gospel. "Calling" in Paul always includes obedience as well as hearing. It is effectual calling, the *κλητοὶ* being those who have accepted the Divine invitation.

Ver. 7. The salutation proper. It is addressed to *all* who are in Rome, etc., to include Christians of Jewish as well as Gentile origin. They are *ἀγαπητοὶ θεοῦ*, God's beloved, because they have had experience of His redeeming love in Jesus Christ; and they are *κλητοὶ ἅγιοι*, saints, in virtue of His calling. See on *κλητὸς ἀπόστολος* above. The word *ἅγιος* did not originally describe character, but only a certain relation to God; the *ἅγιοι* are God's people. What this means depends of course on what God

is; it is assumed in scripture that the character of God's people will answer to their relation to Him. It is worth mentioning that, as a synonym for Christian, it is never applied in the N.T. to an individual: no person is called *ἅγιος*. Phil. iv. 21 (*ἀσπάσασθε πάντα ἅγιον ἐν Χ. ἰ.*) is not an exception. The ideal of God's people cannot be adequately realised in, and ought not to be presumptuously claimed by, any single person. (Hort's *Christian Ecclesia*, 56.) Paul wishes the Romans grace and peace (the source and the sum of all Christian blessings) from God our Father, and from the Lord Jesus Christ. The greeting is followed by a thanksgiving, which passes over insensibly into an introduction of a more personal character, in which Paul explains his desire to visit the Romans and to work among them (vers. 8-15).

Ver. 8. *πρῶτον μὲν*. Nothing can take precedence of thanksgiving, when Paul thinks of the Romans, or indeed of any Christian Church in normal health. *πρῶτον μὲν* suggests that something is to follow, but what it is we are not told; Paul's mind unconsciously leaves the track on which it started, at least so far as the linguistic following out of it is concerned. Perhaps the next thing was to be the prayer referred to in ver. 10. (Weiss.) *διὰ ἰ. Χ.* Jesus Christ must be conceived here as the mediator through whom all our approaches to God are made (Eph. ii. 18), not as He through whom the blessings come for which Paul gives thanks. *περὶ πάντων ὑμῶν*: the "all" may have a certain emphasis when we remember the divisions to which reference is made in chap. xiv. *ἡ πίστις ὑμῶν* is "the fact that you are Christians". The very existence of a Church at Rome was

g Phil. iii. 3. ἡ μάρτυς γὰρ μου ἐστὶν ὁ Θεός, ᾧ ἡ λατρεύω ἐν τῷ πνεύματί μου ἐν τῷ εὐαγγελίῳ τοῦ υἱοῦ αὐτοῦ, ὡς ἀδιαλείπτως μνεῖαν ὑμῶν ποιούμαι, h Eph. i. 16; πάντοτε ἐπὶ τῶν ἡ προσευχῶν μου δεόμενος, 10. εἰ πως ἦδη ποτὲ εὐδοθήσομαι ἐν τῷ θελήματι τοῦ Θεοῦ, ἔλθειν πρὸς ὑμᾶς. 11. i 1 Thess. ἐπιποθῶ γὰρ ἰδεῖν ὑμᾶς, ἵνα τι ἡ μεταδῶ χάρισμα ὑμῖν ἡ πνευματικόν, ii. 8. k 1 Cor. xii. εἰς τὸ σπρηιχθῆναι ὑμᾶς, 12. τοῦτο δὲ ἐστὶ, συμπαρακληθῆναι ἐν ὑμῖν ἡ, 4. διὰ τῆς ἐν ἀλλήλοις πίστεως ὑμῶν τε καὶ ἐμοῦ. 13. οὐ θέλω δὲ ὑμᾶς 1 ἄχρι τ. δ. ἀγνοεῖν, ἀδελφοί, ὅτι πολλάκις προσθέμην ἔλθειν πρὸς ὑμᾶς, (καὶ here only. m Phil. i. 22. ἐκωλύθη ἄχρι τοῦ ἡ δεύρο,) ἵνα ἡ καρπὸν τινα σχῶ καὶ ἐν ὑμῖν, καθὼς

something to be thankful for. ἐν ἄλλω τῷ κόσμῳ is, of course, hyperbole, but a Church in Rome was like "a city set on a hill".

Ver. 9 f. μάρτυς γὰρ μου ἐστὶν ὁ Θεός (Phil. i. 8): at a distance the Apostle cannot directly prove his love, but he appeals to God, who hears his ceaseless prayers for the Romans, as a witness of it. λατρεύω in the LXX is always used of religious service—worship, whether of the true God or of idols. ἐν τῷ πνεύματί μου: Paul's ministry is spiritual and rendered with his spirit—not like that of the ministers in the ἅγιον κοσμικόν at Jerusalem. ἐν τῷ εὐαγγελίῳ: in preaching the glad tidings of His Son. ὡς ἀδιαλείπτως: the ὡς may either be "how" or "that": looking to 1 Thess. ii. 10, "how" seems more probable. μνεῖαν ὑμῶν ποιούμαι: I remember you. Cf. Job xiv. 13 (O that Thou wouldst appoint me χρόνον ἐν ᾧ μνεῖαν μου ποιήσῃ). ἐπὶ τῶν προσευχῶν μου: at my prayers. (Winer, p. 470.) For εἰ πως, see Acts xxvii. 12 and Burton, *Moods and Tenses*, § 276. ἦδη is "now at length," "now, after all this waiting". (S. and H.) The ποτὲ, which can hardly be conveyed in English, marks the indefiniteness which even yet attaches in the writer's mind to the fulfilment of this hope. εὐδοθήσομαι: the R.V. gives "I may be prospered"; the A.V. "I might have a prosperous journey". The latter brings in the idea of the ὁδός, which was no doubt present to consciousness when the word εὐδοῦσθαι was first used; but it is questionable whether any feeling for the etymology remained in the current employment of the word. The other N.T. examples (1 Cor. xvi. 2, 3 John ver. 2), as well as the LXX, suggest the contrary. Hence the R.V. is probably right. ἐν τῷ θελήματι τοῦ Θεοῦ: his long cherished and often disappointed hope had taught Paul to say, "if the Lord will" (Jas. iv. 15).

Ver. 11. ἵνα τι μεταδῶ χάρισμα πνευματικόν. The χαρ. πν. may be understood by reference to 1 Cor. chaps. xii.-xiv. or Rom. chap. xii. No doubt, in substance, Paul imparts his spiritual gift through this epistle: what he wished to do for the Romans was to further their comprehension of the purpose of God in Jesus Christ—a purpose the breadth and bearings of which were yet but imperfectly understood.

Ver. 12. τοῦτο δὲ ἐστὶν: an explanatory correction. Paul disclaims being in a position in which all the giving must be on his side. When he is among them (ἐν ὑμῖν) his desire is that he may be cheered and strengthened with them (the subject of συμπαρακληθῆναι must be ἐμὲ in the first instance, though widening, as the sentence goes on, into ἡμᾶς) by the faith which both they and he possess (ὑμῶν τε καὶ ἐμοῦ), and which each recognises in the other (ἐν ἀλλήλοις). The ἐν here is to be taken as in 2 Tim. i. 5.

Ver. 13. οὐ θέλω δὲ ὑμᾶς ἀγνοεῖν: a phrase of constant recurrence in Paul, and always with ἀδελφοί (1 Thess. iv. 13, 1 Cor. x. 1, xii. 1, 2 Cor. i. 8). Some emphasis is laid by it on the idea that his desire or purpose to visit them was no passing whim. It was grounded in his vocation as Apostle of the Gentiles, and though it had been often frustrated he had never given it up. ἐκωλύθη ἄχρι τοῦ δεύρο: probably the main obstacle was evangelistic work which had to be done elsewhere. Cf. chap. xv. 22 f. The purpose of his visit is expressed in ἵνα τινα καρπὸν σχῶ: that I may obtain some fruit among you also. καρπός denotes the result of labour: it might either mean new converts or the furtherance of the Christians in their new life. καθὼς καὶ ἐν τοῖς λοιποῖς ἔθνεσιν: nothing could indicate more clearly that the Church at Rome, as a whole, was Gentile.

καὶ ἐν τοῖς λοιποῖς ἔθνεσιν. 14. Ἑλλησί τε καὶ βαρβάροις, σοφοῖς  
 τε καὶ ἀνόητοις ὀφειλέτης εἰμί· 15. ἢ οὕτω τὸ κατ' ἐμὲ πρόθυμον καὶ ἢ Rev.iii.16.  
 ὑμῖν τοῖς ἐν Ῥώμῃ<sup>1</sup> εὐαγγελίσασθαι. 16. Οὐ γὰρ ἐπαισχύνομαι τὸ  
 εὐαγγέλιον τοῦ Χριστοῦ<sup>2</sup>. ὁ δὲ δύναμις γὰρ Θεοῦ ἐστὶν εἰς σωτηρίαν παντὶ<sup>ο</sup> 1 Cor. i.  
 18, 24.

<sup>1</sup> τοῖς ἐν Ῥώμῃ om. G; see on ver. 7.

<sup>2</sup> του Χριστου om. ΞACDKL. πρῶτον is omitted here in BG g and Tert. It is inserted in ΞACDKL. The combination of B with "Western" authorities lessens its weight in Paul's epp., where B itself has an infusion of Western readings to which this omission may belong; possibly it may be due to Marcion, who is known to have omitted both πρῶτον and the quotation in ver. 17. Weiss retains it; W. and H. bracket.

Ver. 14 f. These verses are naturally taken as an expansion of the thought contained in the preceding. Paul's desire to win fruit at Rome, as among the rest of the Gentiles, arises out of the obligation (for so he feels it) to preach the Gospel to all men without distinction of language or culture. If it depended only on him, he would be exercising his ministry at Rome. The Romans are evidently conceived as Gentiles, but Paul does not indicate where they would stand in the broad classification of ver. 14. It is gratuitous, and probably mistaken, to argue with Weiss that he meant to describe them as βάρβαροι, when we know that the early Roman Church was Greek speaking. In τὸ κατ' ἐμὲ πρόθυμον, the simplest construction is to make τὸ κατ' ἐμὲ subject and πρόθυμον predicate, supplying ἐστι: all that depends on me is eager, i.e., for my part, I am all readiness. But it is possible to take τὸ κατ' ἐμὲ πρόθυμον together, and to translate: the readiness, so far as I am concerned, (is) to preach the Gospel to you also who are in Rome. The contrast implied is that between *willing* (which Paul for his part is equal to) and *carrying out* the will (which depends on God (ver. 10)). With this Paul introduces the great subject of the epistle, and, in a sense, of the Gospel—that which he here designates δικαιοσύνη θεοῦ. The connection is peculiar. He has professed his readiness to preach the Gospel, even at Rome. Anywhere, no doubt, one might have misgivings about identifying himself with a message which had for its subject a person who had been put to death as a criminal; anywhere, the Cross was to Jews a stumbling block and to Greeks foolishness. But at Rome, of all places, where the whole effective force of humanity seemed to be gathered up, one might be ashamed to stand forth

as the representative of an apparently impotent and ineffective thing. But this the Gospel is not; it is the very reverse of this, and therefore the Apostle is proud to identify himself with it. "I am not ashamed of the Gospel; for it is a power of God unto salvation to every one that believeth. It is such because there is revealed in it δικαιοσύνη θεοῦ—the very thing men need to ensure salvation; and that in such a manner—from faith to faith—as to make it accessible to all. And this, again, only answers to what stands in the O.T.—It is written, the righteous shall live by faith."

Ver. 16 f. δύναμις γὰρ θεοῦ ἐστὶν: for it is a power of God. It does no injustice to render "a Divine power". The conception of the Gospel as a force pervades the epistles to the Corinthians; its proof, so to speak, is dynamical, not logical. It is demonstrated, not by argument, but by what it does; and, looking to what it can do, Paul is proud to preach it anywhere. εἰς σωτηρίαν: σωτηρία is one of a class of words (to which ζῶη, δόξα, κληρονομία belong) used by Paul to denote the last result of the acceptance of the Gospel. It is the most negative of them all, and conceives of the Gospel as a means for rescuing men from the ἀπώλεια which awaits sinners at the last judgment. In παντὶ τῷ πιστεύοντι Ἰουδαίῳ τε πρῶτον καὶ Ἑλληνι another of the main interests of the writer in this epistle is brought forward; the Gospel is for all, the same Gospel and on the same terms, but without prejudice to the historical prerogative of the Jew. Ver. 17 shows how the Gospel is a Divine saving power. It is such because there is revealed in it δικαιοσύνη θεοῦ. Plainly, δικαιοσύνη θεοῦ is something without which a sinful man cannot be saved; but what is it? The expression itself is of the utmost generality, and the various definite

τῷ πιστεύοντι, Ἰουδαίῳ τε πρώτον καὶ Ἕλληνι. 17. δικαιοσύνη γὰρ  
 p<sup>2</sup> Cor. v. 21. p<sup>2</sup> Θεοῦ ἐναντῷ<sup>q</sup> ἀποκαλύπτεται ἐκ πίστεως εἰς πίστιν, καθὼς γέγραπται,  
 q Ch. xvi. 25 f.  
 r Hab. ii. 4. “Ὁ δὲ δίκαιος ἐκ πίστεως ἔζησεται.”

meanings which have been assigned to it attempt to justify themselves as relevant, or inevitable, by connecting themselves with the context as a whole. There can be no doubt that the fundamental religious problem for the Apostle—that which made a Gospel necessary, that the solution of which could alone be Gospel—was, How shall a sinful man be righteous before God? To Luther, who had instinctive experimental sympathy with the Pauline standpoint, this suggested that δικαιοσύνη θεοῦ meant a righteousness valid before God, of which a man can become possessed through faith; for such a righteousness (as the condition of salvation) is the first and last need of the sinful soul. In support of this view reference has been made to ver. 18, where ἀσέβεια and ἀδικία ἀνθρώπων are represented as the actual existing conditions which the δικ. θεοῦ has to replace. No one can deny that a righteousness valid before God is essential to salvation, or that such a righteousness is revealed in the Gospel; but it is another question whether δικ. θεοῦ is a natural expression for it. The general sense of scholars seems to have decided against it; but it seems quite credible to me that Paul used δικ. θεοῦ broadly to mean “a Divine righteousness,” and that the particular shade of meaning which Luther made prominent can be legitimately associated even with these words. Until lately, scholars of the most opposite schools had agreed in finding the key to the expression δικ. θεοῦ in two other Pauline passages, where it is contrasted with something else. Thus in chap. x. 3 δικ. θεοῦ is opposed to man’s ἰδίᾳ δικαιοσύνη; and in Phil. iii. 9 the opposition is more precisely defined: μὴ ἔχω ἐμὴν δικαιοσύνην τὴν ἐκ νόμου, ἀλλὰ τὴν διὰ πίστεως Χριστοῦ, τὴν ἐκ θεοῦ δικαιοσύνην ἐπὶ τῇ πίστει. If this contrast were allowed to tell here, the righteousness of which Paul speaks would be one of which God is the source or author; we do not bring it to Him, He reveals it for our acceptance. And this also, of course, answers to the facts: Gospel righteousness is a gift, not an achievement. But then, it is said, there is nothing in the passage to suggest such a contrast; there is not any emphasis

whatever on θεοῦ to bring before the mind the idea of a righteousness *not* due to God, but a work of man’s own. To this it may fairly be answered that the contrast did not *need* to be specially suggested; if it had not presented itself instinctively to those to whom Paul wrote, they would not only have missed the point of this expression, they would not have understood three lines anywhere. We must assume, upon the whole, in the recipients of Paul’s epistles, a way of conceiving the Gospel answering broadly to his own; the invisible context, which we have to reproduce as best we can, may be more important sometimes than what we have in black and white. The broad sense of “a Divine righteousness” covers this second, which may be called the historical Protestant interpretation, as well as Luther’s; and the fact seems to me an argument for that broader rendering. In view, however, of the undoubted difficulty of the phrase, new light would be welcome, and this has been sought in the O.T. use of δικαιοσύνη (דִּקְיֻטָּה), especially in the Psalms and in Is. xl. lxvi. See, e.g., Ps. xxxv. 24, 28, li. 14; Is. lvi. 1, lxii. 1; Ps. xcvi. 2. In the last of these passages we have a striking analogy to the one before us: ἐγγώρισε κύριος τὸ σωτήριον αὐτοῦ, ἐναντίον τῶν ἐθνῶν ἀπεκάλυψε τὴν δικαιοσύνην αὐτοῦ; and in others we cannot but be struck with the parallelism of “righteousness” and “salvation,” sometimes as things which belong to God (Ps. xcvi. 2), sometimes as things which belong to His people. On the strength of facts like these, Theod. Häring, in a stupendous programme entitled *Δικ. θεοῦ bei Paulus* (Tübingen, 1896), argues that δικαιοσύνη θεοῦ means the judicial action of God in which He justifies His people and accomplishes their salvation. This fits into the context well enough. Put as Paul puts it—how shall man be just with God?—the religious problem is a judicial one, and its solution must be judicial. If the Gospel shows how God justifies (for of course it must be God, the only Judge of all, who does it), it shows everything: salvation is included in God’s sentence of justification. Häring himself admits that this interpretation is

18. ἘΠΟΚΑΛΥΠΤΕΤΑΙ γὰρ ὀργὴ Θεοῦ ἀπ' οὐρανοῦ ἐπὶ πᾶσαν ἀσέβειαν καὶ ἀδικίαν ἀνθρώπων τῶν τὴν ἀλήθειαν ἐν ἀδικίᾳ <sup>2</sup>κατεχόν-  
6, 7.

rather of philological than of religious import; this "rechtfertigendes Walten Gottes" cannot but have as its consequence "the justification of man, a righteousness which proceeds from God and is valid before God" (Δικ. θεοῦ bei Paulus, S. 68); that is, this meaning leads by immediate inference to the other two. But it can by no means be carried through (any more than either of the other two) in all places where the phrase occurs; in iii. 5, e.g., Häring himself admits this; in iii. 25, 26, where he insists on the same sense as in i. 17, he does not so much as refer to the clause διὰ τὴν πάρεσιν τῶν προγεγονότων ἁμαρτημάτων ἐν τῇ ἀνοχῇ αὐτοῦ, which, it is not too much to say, necessitates a different shade of meaning for δικαιοσύνη θεοῦ there: see note. The advantage of his rendering is not so much that it simplifies the grammar, as that it revives the sense of a connection (which existed for the Apostle) between the Gospel he preached, and even the language he preached it in, and the anticipations of that Gospel in the O.T., and that it gives prominence to the saving character of God's justifying action. In substance all these three views are Biblical, Pauline and true to experience, whichever is to be vindicated on philological grounds. But the same cannot be said of another, according to which righteousness is here an attribute, or even the character, of God. That the Gospel is the supreme revelation of the character of God, and that the character of God is the source of the Gospel, no one can question. Certainly Paul would not have questioned it. But whether Paul conceived the righteousness which is an eternal attribute of God (cf. iii. 5) as essentially self-communicative—whether he would have said that God justifies (δικαιοῦ) the ungodly because he is himself δικαίος—is another matter. The righteousness of God, conceived as a Divine attribute, may have appeared to Paul the great difficulty in the way of the justification of sinful man. God's righteousness in this sense is the sinner's condemnation, and no one will succeed in making him find in it the ground of his hope. What is wanted (always in consistency with God's righteousness as one of His inviolable attributes—the great point elaborated in chap. iii. 24-26) is a righteousness which, as man cannot produce it, must be from

God, and which, once received, shall be valid before God; and this is what the Apostle (on the ground of Christ's death for sin) announces. But it introduces confusion to identify with this the conception of an eternal and necessarily self-imparting righteousness of God. The Apostle, in chap. iii. and chap. v., takes our minds along another route. See Barmby in *Expositor* for August, 1896, and S. and H. *ad loc.* ἀποκαλύπτεται intimates in a new way that the Divine righteousness spoken of is from God: man would never have known or conceived it but for the act of God in revealing it. Till this ἀποκαλύπτειν it was a μυστήριον: cf. xvi. 25 f. ἐκ πίστεως εἰς πίστιν. Precise definitions of this (e.g., Weiss's: the revelation of the δικ. θεοῦ presupposes faith in the sense of believing acceptance of the Gospel, i.e., it is ἐκ πίστεως; and it leads to faith in the sense of saving reliance on Christ, i.e., it is εἰς πίστιν) strike one as arbitrary. The broad sense seems to be that in the revelation of God's righteousness for man's salvation everything is of faith from first to last. Cf. 2 Cor. ii. 16, iii. 18. This N.T. doctrine the Apostle finds announced before in Hab. ii. 14. ἐκ πίστεως in the quotation is probably to be construed with ἤσεται. To take it with δικαίος (he who is righteous by faith) would imply a contrast to another mode of being righteous (viz., by works) which there is nothing in the text to suggest. The righteous who trusted in Jehovah were brought by that trust safe through the impending judgment in Habakkuk's time; and as the subjective side of religion, the attitude of the soul to God, never varies, it is the same trust which is the condition of salvation still.

The Gospel of God's righteousness is necessary, because the human race has no righteousness of its own. This is proved of the whole race (i. 18-iii. 20), but in these verses (18-32) first of the heathen. The emphasis lies throughout on the fact that they have sinned against light.

Ver. 18 f. The revelation of the righteousness of God (ver. 17) is needed in view of the revelation of His wrath, from which only δικ. θεοῦ (whether it be His justifying sentence or the righteousness which He bestows on man) can deliver. ὀργὴ in the N.T. is usually

t Neuter in τῶν. 19. διότι τὸ ἄγνωστον τοῦ Θεοῦ φανερόν ἐστιν ἐν αὐτοῖς · ὁ γὰρ  
 N.T. here  
 and in  
 Acts only  
 (11 times)  
 u Only here  
 and Jude  
 vers. 6.  
 v Here only  
 in N.T.  
 w 1 Cor. iii.  
 x 1 Cor. i. 20.  
 Θεὸς αὐτοῖς ἐφανερώσεται · 20. τὰ γὰρ ἀόρατα αὐτοῦ ἀπὸ κτίσεως  
 κόσμου τοῖς ποιήμασι νοούμενα καθαράται, ἥ τε " αἰδῖος αὐτοῦ δύναμις  
 καὶ ἡθειότης, εἰς τὸ εἶναι αὐτοὺς ἀναπολογήτους. 21. διότι γινόντες  
 τὸν Θεόν, οὐχ ὡς Θεὸν ἐδόξασαν ἢ εὐχαρίστησαν, ἀλλ' ἐματαιώθησαν  
 ἐν τοῖς \* διαλογισμοῖς αὐτῶν, καὶ ἐσκοτίσθη ἡ ἀσύνετος αὐτῶν καρδία ·  
 20.  
 22. φάσκοντες εἶναι σοφοὶ \* ἐμωράνθησαν, 23. καὶ ἥλλαξαν τὴν δόξαν  
 τοῦ ἀφθάρτου Θεοῦ ἐν ὁμοιώματι εἰκόνης φθαρτοῦ ἀνθρώπου καὶ

eschatological, but in 1 Thess. ii. 16 it refers to some historical judgment, and in John iii. 36 it is the condemnation of the sinner by God, with all that it involves, present and to come. The revelation of wrath here probably refers mainly to the final judgment: the primary character of Jesus in Paul's Gospel being ὁ ῥυόμενος ἡμᾶς ἐκ τῆς ὀργῆς τῆς ἐρχομένης, 1 Thess. i. 10, Rom. v. 9; but it is not forcing it here to make it include God's condemnation uttered in conscience, and attested (ver. 24) in the judicial abandonment of the world. The revelation of the righteousness of God has to match this situation, and reverse it. ἀσέβεια is "positive and active irreligion": see Trench, *Syn.*, § lxvi. τῶν ἀλήθειαν ἐν ἀδικίᾳ κατεχόντων may mean (1) who possess the truth, yet live in unrighteousness; or (2) who suppress the truth by, or in, an unrighteous life. In the N.T. ἀλήθεια is moral rather than speculative; it is truth of a sort which is held only as it is acted on: cf. the Johannine expression ποιεῖν τὴν ἀλήθειαν. Hence the latter sense is to be preferred (see Wendt, *Lehre Jesu*, II., S. 203 Anm.). διότι τὸ γνωστόν τοῦ θεοῦ κ.τ.λ. There is no indisputable way of deciding whether γνωστόν here means "known" (the usual N.T. sense) or "knowable" (the usual classic sense). Cremer (who compares Phil. iii. 8 τὸ ὑπερέχον τῆς γνώσεως, Heb. vi. 17 τὸ ἀμετάθετον τῆς βουλῆς, Rom. ii. 4 τὸ χρηστόν τοῦ θεοῦ, and makes τοῦ θεοῦ in the passage before us also gen. poss.) favours the latter. What is meant in either case is the knowledge of God which is independent of such a special revelation as had been given to the Jews. Under this come (ver. 20) His eternal power, and in a word His (eternal) divinity, things inaccessible indeed to sense (ἀόρατα), but clear to intelligence (νοούμενα), ever since creation (ἀπὸ κτίσεως κόσμου: for ἀπὸ thus used, see Winer, 463),

by the things that are made. God's power, and the totality of the Divine attributes constituting the Divine nature, are inevitably impressed on the mind by nature (or, to use the scripture word, by creation). There is that within man which so catches the meaning of all that is without as to issue in an instinctive knowledge of God. (See the magnificent illustration of this in Illingworth's *Divine Immanence*, chap. ii., on The religious influence of the material world.) This knowledge involves duties, and men are without excuse because, when in possession of it, they did not perform these duties; that is, did not glorify as God the God whom they thus knew.

Ver. 21 ff. εἰς τὸ εἶναι αὐτοὺς ἀναπολογήτους would naturally express purpose: to make men inexcusable is one, though not the only or the ultimate, intention of God in giving this revelation. But the διότι almost forces us to take the εἰς τὸ as expressing result: so that they are inexcusable, because, etc. (see Burton's *Moods and Tenses*, § 411). In vers. 21-23 the wrong course taken by humanity is described. Nature shows us that God is to be glorified and thanked, i.e., nature reveals Him to be great and good. But men were not content to accept the impression made on them by nature; they fell to reasoning upon it, and in their reasonings (διαλογισμοί, "perverse self-willed reasonings or speculations," S. and H.) were made vain (ἐματαιώθησαν); the result stultified the process; their instinctive perception of God became confused and uncertain; their unintelligent heart, the seat of the moral consciousness, was darkened. In asserting their wisdom they became fools, and showed it conspicuously in their idolatries. They resigned the glory of the incorruptible God (i.e., the incorruptible God, all glorious as He was, and as He was seen in nature to be), and took instead



πειτηνῶν καὶ τετραπόδων καὶ ἐρπετῶν. 24. διὸ καὶ <sup>1</sup> παρέδωκεν ὁ Θεὸς ἐν ἐφ. iv. 19. αὐτοὺς ὁ Θεὸς ἐν ταῖς ἐπιθυμίαις τῶν καρδιῶν αὐτῶν εἰς ἀκαθαρσίαν, τοῖ ἀτιμάζεσθαι τὰ σώματα αὐτῶν ἐν ἑαυτοῖς · 25. οὔτινες μετέλλαξαν τὴν ἀλήθειαν τοῦ Θεοῦ ἐν τῷ ψεύδει, καὶ <sup>2</sup> ἐσεβάσθησαν καὶ ἐλάτρευσαν <sup>z</sup> Here only, cf. Acts xvii. 23; 2 Thess. ii. 4. τῇ κτίσει παρὰ τὸν κτίσαντα, ὅς ἐστιν εὐλογητὸς εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας. ἀμήν. 26. διὰ τοῦτο παρέδωκεν αὐτοὺς ὁ Θεὸς εἰς πάθη ἀτιμίας · αἱ τε γὰρ θήλειαι αὐτῶν μετέλλαξαν τὴν φυσικὴν χρῆσιν εἰς τὴν παρὰ φύσιν · 27. ὁμοίως τε <sup>2</sup> καὶ οἱ ἄρσενες, ἀφέντες τὴν φυσικὴν χρῆσιν τῆς θηλείας, ἐξεκαύθησαν ἐν τῇ ὀρέξει αὐτῶν εἰς ἀλλήλους, ἄρσενες ἐν ἄρσεσι τὴν ἀσχημοσύνην κατεργαζόμενοι, καὶ τὴν <sup>a</sup> ἀντι- <sup>2</sup> Cor. vi. 13. μισθίαν ἦν ἔδει τῆς πλάνης αὐτῶν ἐν ἑαυτοῖς ἀπολαμβάνοντες. 28. Καὶ καθὼς οὐκ ἐδοκίμασαν τὸν Θεὸν ἔχειν ἐν ἐπιγνώσει, παρέδωκεν αὐτοὺς ὁ Θεὸς εἰς ἀδόκιμον νοῦν, ποιεῖν τὰ μὴ <sup>b</sup> καθήκοντα, <sup>b</sup> Acts xxii. 22.

<sup>1</sup> διο και : om. και  $\aleph$ ABC; insert DGKL. εαυτοῖς D<sup>3</sup>EKG; αυτοῖς  $\aleph$ ABCD<sup>1</sup>.

<sup>2</sup> For τε which is found in  $\aleph$ BD<sup>3</sup>KL, δε is read by AD<sup>1</sup>G; C has neither.

of Him some image of a corruptible, even of a vile creature. The expression ἤλλαξαν τὴν δόξαν κ.τ.λ. is borrowed in part from Ps. cv. 20 (LXX): ἠλλάξαντο τὴν δόξαν αὐτῶν ἐν ὁμοιώματι μύσχου ἔσθοντος χόρτον. The reduplication of the same idea in ἐν ὁμοιώματι εἰκόνας shows the indignant contempt with which the Apostle looked on this empty and abject religion in which God had been lost. The birds, quadrupeds and reptiles could all be illustrated from Egypt.

With ver. 24 the Apostle turns from this sin to its punishment. Because of it (διὸ) God gave them up. To lose God is to lose everything; to lose the connection with Him involved in constantly glorifying and giving Him thanks, is to sink into an abyss of darkness, intellectual and moral. It is to become fitted for wrath at last, under the pressure of wrath all the time. Such, in idea, is the history of humanity to Paul, as interpreted by its issue in the moral condition of the pagan world when he wrote. Exceptions are allowed for (ii. 10), but this is the position as a whole. παρέδωκεν in all three places (ver. 24, εἰς ἀκαθαρσίαν; ver. 26, εἰς πάθη ἀτιμίας; ver. 28, εἰς ἀδόκιμον νοῦν) expresses the judicial action of God. The sensual impurity of religions in which the incorruptible God had been resigned for the image of an animal, that could not but creep into the imagination of the worshippers and debase it, was a Divine judgment. τοῦ ἀτιμάζεσθαι τὰ σώματα αὐτῶν ἐν αὐτοῖς,

in accordance with the conception of a judicial act, expresses the Divine purpose—that their bodies might be dishonoured among them. For gen. of purpose, see Winer, 408 ff. (where, however, a different construction is given for this passage, τοῦ ἀτιμάζεσθαι being made to depend immediately on ἀκαθαρσίαν).

Ver. 25. οὔτινες μετέλλαξαν κ.τ.λ.: being as they were persons who exchanged the truth of God for the lie. "The truth of God" (cf. ver. 23, "the glory of God") is the same thing as God in His truth, or the true God as He had actually revealed Himself to man. τὸ ψεῦδος, abstract for concrete, is the idol or false God. The ἐν (cf. ver. 23) answers to Hebrew  $\text{בְּ}$ , παρὰ τὸν κτίσαντα: to the passing by, i.e., disregard or contempt of the Creator. For this use of παρὰ, see Winer, 503 f. ὅς ἐστιν εὐλογητός: the doxology relieves the writer's feelings as he contemplates such horrors.

Ver. 26 f. With the second παρέδωκεν the Apostle proceeds to a further stage in this judicial abandonment of men, which is at the same time a revelation of the wrath of God from heaven against them. It issues not merely like the first in sensuality, but in sensuality which perverts nature as well as disregards God. The πλάνη, error or going astray (ver. 27), is probably still the original one of idolatry; the ignoring or degrading of God is the first fatal step out of the way, which ends in this slough.

29. πεπληρωμένους πάση ἀδικίᾳ, πορνείᾳ,<sup>1</sup> πονηρίᾳ, πλεονεξίᾳ, κακίᾳ · μεστοὺς φθόνου, φόνου, ἔριδος, δόλου, κακοθηθείας · 30. ψιθυριστὰς, καταλάλους, θεοστυγεῖς, ὑβριστὰς, ὑπερηφάνους, ἀλαζόνας, ἐφευρετὰς κακῶν, γονεῦσιν ἀπειθεῖς, 31. ἀσυνέτους, ἀσυνθέτους, ἀστόργους, ἀ-  
 c Ch. ii. 26; πόνδους,<sup>2</sup> ἀνελεήμονας · 32. οἵτινες τὸ °δικαίωμα τοῦ Θεοῦ ἐπιγνόντες,  
 Luke i. 6. ὅτι οἱ τὰ τοιαῦτα πράσσοντες ἄξιοι θανάτου εἰσίν, οὐ μόνον αὐτὰ  
 d Acts viii. 1, xxii. 20. ποιοῦσιν, ἀλλὰ καὶ <sup>d</sup>συνευδοκοῦσι τοῖς πράσσοις.<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup> πορνεία om. with  $\aleph$ ABCK.

<sup>2</sup> ασπονδους CD<sup>3</sup>KL, vulg., Syr., is omitted by  $\aleph$ <sup>1</sup>ABD<sup>1</sup>G fuld.<sup>1</sup> Probably a gloss on ασυνθετους.

<sup>3</sup> Westcott and Hort suppose some primitive error probable here; see their *N. T.*, vol. 2, Appendix, p. 108. For ποιουσιν . . . συνευδοκουσιν B reads ποιουντες . . . συνευδοκουντες; and the construction is then completed by various additions, such as ουκ ενοησαν D, ουκ εγνωσαν G, non intellexerunt Orig. int.

Ver. 28 ff. In vers. 28-30 we have the third and last *παρέδωκεν* expanded. As they did not think fit, after trial made (*ἐδοκίμασαν*), to keep God in their knowledge, God gave them up to a mind which cannot stand trial (*ἀδόκιμον*). The one thing answers to the other. Virtually, they pronounced the true God *ἀδόκιμος*, and would have none of Him; and He in turn gave them up to a *νοῦς ἀδόκιμος*, a mind which is no mind and cannot discharge the functions of one, a mind in which the Divine distinctions of right and wrong are confused and lost, so that God's condemnation cannot but fall on it at last. *νοῦς* is not only reason, but conscience; when this is perverted, as in the people of whom Paul speaks, or in the Caananites, who did their abominations *unto their Gods*, the last deep of evil has been reached. Most of the words which follow describe sins of malignity or inhumanity rather than sensuality, but they cannot be classified. *τὰ μὴ καθήκοντα* covers all. *καθήκοντα* is the Stoic word which Cicero renders *officia*. *κακοθηθία*, the tendency to put the worst construction on everything (Arist. Rh. ii. 13), and *κακία* are examined in Trench's *Synonyms*, § xi., and *ὑβριστής*, *ὑπερήφανος*, *ἀλάζων* in § xxix. *θεοστυγεῖς* appears to be always passive in the classics, not God hating, but God hated: *Deo odibiles*, Vulg. The characters are summed up, so to speak, in ver. 32: *οἵτινες τὸ δικαίωμα τοῦ θεοῦ ἐπιγνόντες κ.τ.λ.*: such persons as, though they know the sentence of God, that those who practise such things are worthy of death, not only do them, but give a whole-hearted complacent assent to those who follow the same practice.

*τὸ δικαίωμα τοῦ θεοῦ* is that which God has pronounced to be the right, and has thereby established as the proper moral order of the world. *θάνατος* is death, not as a natural period to life, but as a Divine sentence executed on sin; it is not to be defined as physical, or spiritual, or eternal; by all such abstract analysis it is robbed of part of its meaning, which is as wide as that of life or the soul. *ἀλλὰ καὶ συνευδοκοῦσιν*: to be guilty of such things oneself, under the impulse of passion, is bad; but it is a more malignant badness to give a cordial and disinterested approval to them in others.

It is a mistake to read these verses as if they were a scientific contribution to comparative religion, but equally a mistake to ignore their weight. Paul is face to face with a world in which the vices he enumerates are rampant, and it is his deliberate judgment that these vices have a real connection with the pagan religions. Who will deny that he was both a competent observer and a competent judge? Religion and morality in the great scale hang together, and morality in the long run is determined by religion. Minds which accepted the religious ideas of Phœnicia, of Egypt or of Greece (as represented in the popular mythologies) could not be pure. Their morality, or rather their immorality, is conceived as a Divine judgment upon their religion; and as for their religion, nature itself, the Apostle argues, should have saved them from such ignorance of God, and such misconceptions of Him, as deformed every type of heathenism. A converted pagan (as much as Paul) would be filled with horror as he re-

II. 1. ΔΙΟ <sup>a</sup> ἀναπολόγητος εἶ, ὦ ἄνθρωπε πᾶς ὁ κρίνων· ἐν ᾧ γὰρ <sup>a</sup> Ch. i. 20. κρίνεις τὸν ἕτερον, σεαυτὸν κατακρίνεις· τὰ γὰρ αὐτὰ πράσσεις ὁ κρίνων. 2. οἶδαμεν δὲ <sup>1</sup> ὅτι τὸ κρίμα τοῦ Θεοῦ ἐστὶ κατὰ ἀλήθειαν ἐπὶ τοὺς τὰ τοιαῦτα πράσσοντας. 3. Λογίζῃ δὲ τοῦτο, ὦ ἄνθρωπε ὁ κρίνων τοὺς τὰ τοιαῦτα πράσσοντας καὶ ποιῶν αὐτὰ, ὅτι σὺ ἐκφεύξῃ τὸ κρίμα τοῦ Θεοῦ; 4. ἢ τοῦ <sup>b</sup> πλούτου τῆς χρηστότητος αὐτοῦ καὶ <sup>b</sup> Ch. ix. 23, xi. 33. τῆς ἀνοχῆς καὶ τῆς μακροθυμίας καταφρονεῖς, ἀγνοῶν ὅτι τὸ χρηστὸν τοῦ Θεοῦ εἰς μετάνοιάν σε ἄγει; 5. κατὰ δὲ τὴν <sup>c</sup> σκληρότητά σου καὶ <sup>c</sup> Here only. ἀμετανόητον καρδίαν θησαυρίζεις σεαυτῷ ὄργην ἐν ἡμέρα ὄργῆς καὶ

<sup>1</sup> δε ABDGKL, γαρ NC d, vulg. A full statement of the evidence in S. and H. whose verdict is: "an even balance of authorities, both sides drawing their evidence from varied quarters".

flected on the way in which he had once thought of God; he would feel in himself that he ought to have known better, and that everything in the world cried shame upon him. Now to recognise this fact is to accept the premises of the Apostle's argument, and the use to which he puts it. "Once we went after dumb idols; our very worship led us into sin, and sometimes even consecrated it; now we can only see in this our own blindness and guilt, and God's judgment upon them"—so we can fancy the converted pagan speaking. Such a world, then, as the Apostle describes in this chapter, with this terrible principle of degeneration at work in it, and no power of self-regeneration, is a world which waits for a righteousness of God.

For an interesting attempt to show Paul's indebtedness for some of the ideas and arguments of vers. 18-32 to the book of Wisdom, see S. and H., p. 51 f.

CHAPTER II.—Vers. 1-16. The Apostle has now to prove that the righteousness of God is as necessary to the Jew as to the pagan; it is the Jew who is really addressed in this chapter from the beginning, though he is not named till ver. 9. In vers. 1-10 Paul explains the principle on which God judges all men, without distinction.

Ver. 1. διό: The Jew is ready enough to judge the Gentile. But he forgets that the same principle on which the Gentile is condemned, *viz.*, that he does evil in spite of better knowledge (i. 32), condemns himself also. His very assent to the impeachment in chap. i. 18-32 is his own condemnation. This is the force of διό: therefore. ἐν ᾧ = in that in which. τὰ αὐτὰ πράσσεις, not, you do the identical actions, but your conduct is the same, *i.e.*, you sin against light.

The sin of the Jews was the same, but their sins were not.

Ver. 2. κατὰ ἀλήθειαν is predicate: God's judgment squares with the facts—this is the whole rule of it. τοὺς τὰ τοιαῦτα πράσσοντας: those whose conduct is such as has been described. For the text, see critical note.

Ver. 3. σὺ has strong emphasis. The Jew certainly thought, in many cases, that the privilege of his birth would of itself ensure his entrance into the kingdom (Mt. iii. 8, 9): this was his practical conviction, whatever might be his proper creed. Yet the σὺ indicates that of all men the Jew, so distinguished by special revelation, should least have fallen into such an error. He is "the servant who knew his Lord's will," and whose judgment will be most rigorous if it is neglected.

Ver. 4. ἢ states the alternative. Either he thinks he will escape, or he despises, etc. χρηστότης is the kindness which disposes one to do good; ἀνοχή (in N.T. only here and in iii. 26) is the forbearance which suspends punishment; μακροθυμία is patience, which waits long before it actively interposes. τὸ χρηστὸν τοῦ θεοῦ summarises all three in the concrete. It amounts to contempt of God's goodness if a man does not know (rather, ignores: cf. Acts xiii. 27, 1 Cor. xiv. 38, Rom. x. 3) that its end is, not to approve of his sins, but to lead him to repentance.

Ver. 5. The δὲ contrasts what happens with what God designs. θησαυρίζεις σεαυτῷ ὄργην: contrast our Lord's many sayings about "treasure in heaven" (Mt. vi. 19 ff., xix. 21). ἐν ἡμέρα ὄργῆς = in the day of wrath. The conception was quite definite: there was only one day in view, what is elsewhere called "the day of the Lord" (2 Cor. i. 14), "the

d Here only. ἀποκαλύψωσ <sup>1</sup>δικαιοκρισίας τοῦ Θεοῦ, 6. ὃς ἀποδώσει ἐκάστῳ κατὰ τὰ ἔργα αὐτοῦ · 7. τοῖς μὲν καθ' ὑπομονὴν ἔργου ἀγαθοῦ δόξαν καὶ  
 e 1 Cor. xv. τιμὴν καὶ <sup>2</sup>ἀφθαρσίαν ζητοῦσι, ζωὴν αἰώνιον · 8. τοῖς δὲ ἐξ <sup>1</sup>ἐριθείας,  
 42; 2 Tim. καὶ ἀπειθοῦσι μὲν <sup>1</sup>τῇ ἀληθείᾳ, πειθομένοις δὲ τῇ ἀδικίᾳ, θυμὸς καὶ  
 1. 10. καὶ ἀπειθοῦσι μὲν <sup>1</sup>τῇ ἀληθείᾳ, πειθομένοις δὲ τῇ ἀδικίᾳ, θυμὸς καὶ  
 f Phil. ii. 3; ὀργή, 9. θλίψις καὶ στενοχωρία, ἐπὶ πᾶσαν ψυχὴν ἀνθρώπου τοῦ  
 Jas. iii. 14, ὀργή, 9. θλίψις καὶ στενοχωρία, ἐπὶ πᾶσαν ψυχὴν ἀνθρώπου τοῦ  
 16. κατεργαζομένου τὸ κακόν, Ἰουδαίου τε πρώτον καὶ Ἕλληνας · 10.  
 δόξα δὲ καὶ τιμὴ καὶ εἰρήνη παντὶ τῷ ἐργαζομένῳ τὸ ἀγαθόν,

<sup>1</sup> ἀπειθοῦσι μὲν AD<sup>3</sup>KLN<sup>3</sup>; om. μὲν B<sup>1</sup>BDG<sup>1</sup>.

day of judgment" (Mt. xi. 22), "the last day" (John vi. 39), "the day of God" (2 Pet. iii. 12), "that day" (2 Tim. i. 12), even simply "the day" (1 Cor. iii. 13, Heb. x. 25). This great day is so defined in the Apostle's imagination that the article can be dispensed with. But see Ps. cx. 5. (cix. LXX.) It is a day when God is revealed as a righteous judge, in the sense of Psalm lxi. 13 (LXX).

Ver. 6. The law enunciated in the Psalm, that God will render to every one according to his works, is valid within the sphere of redemption as well as independent of it. Paul the Christian recognises its validity as unreservedly as Saul the Pharisee would have done. The application of it may lead to very different results in the two cases, but the universal moral conscience, be it in bondage to evil, or emancipated by Christ, accepts it without demur. Paul had no feeling that it contradicted his doctrine of justification by faith, and therefore we are safe to assert that it did not contradict it. It seems a mistake to argue with Weiss that Paul is here speaking of the *Urnorm* of the Divine righteousness, *i.e.*, of the way in which the destiny of men would be determined *if there were no Gospel*. The Gospel does not mean that God denies Himself; He acts in it according to His eternal nature; and though Paul is speaking to men as under the law, the truth which he is insisting upon is one which is equally true whether men are under the law or under grace. It is not a little piece of the leaven of a Jewish or Pharisaic conception of God, not yet purged out, that is found here; but an eternal law of God's relation to man.

Ver. 7. καθ' ὑπομονὴν ἔργου ἀγαθοῦ: *cf.* the collective ἔργον—"life-work": S. and H.—in ver. 15: "by way of steadfastness in well-doing". δόξαν = the glory of the future life, as revealed in the Risen Saviour. τιμὴν = honour with

God. ἀφθαρσίαν "proves that the goal of effort is nothing earthly" (Lipsius). ζωὴ αἰώνιος comprehends all these three: as its counterpart, θάνατος in ver. 31, involves the loss of all. ζωὴν is governed by ἀποδώσει.

Ver. 8. τοῖς δὲ ἐξ ἐριθείας: for the use of ἐκ, *cf.* iii. 26, τὸν ἐκ πίστεως Ἰησοῦ; Gal. iii. 7, οἱ ἐκ πίστεως; Ch. iv. 14, οἱ ἐκ νόμου. Lightfoot suggests that it is better to supply πρόσσουσι, and to construe ἐξ ἐριθείας with the participle, as in Phil. i. 17 it is construed with καταγγέλλουσιν: but it is simpler not to supply anything. By "those who are of faction" or "factiousness" (Gal. v. 20, 2 Cor. xii. 20, Phil. i. 16 f., ii. 3, Jas. iii. 14, 16) the Apostle probably means men of a self-willed temper, using all arts to assert themselves against God. The result of this temper—the temper of the party man carried into the spiritual world—is seen in disobedience to the truth and obedience to unrighteousness. See note on ἀλήθεια, i. 18. The moral import of the word is shown by its use as the counterpart of ἀδικία. *Cf.* the same contrast in 1 Cor. xiii. 6. To those who pursue this course there accrues indignation and wrath, etc.

Ver. 9. ὀργή is wrath within; θυμὸς wrath as it overflows. θλίψις and στενοχωρία, according to Trench, *Synonymis*, § 55, express very nearly the same thing, under different images: the former taking the image of pressure, the latter that of confinement in a narrow space. But to draw a distinction between them, based on etymology, would be very misleading. In both pairs of words the same idea is expressed, only intensified by the reduplication. Supply ἔσται for the changed construction. κατεργαζομένου τὸ κακόν: who works at evil and works it out or accomplishes it. The Jew is put first, because as possessor of an express law this is conspicuously true of him.

Ver. 10 f. εἰρήνη is probably =

Ἰουδαίῳ τε πρῶτον καὶ Ἑλληνι· 11. οὐ γὰρ ἔστι προσωποληψία παρὰ τῷ Θεῷ. 12. ὅσοι γὰρ ἀνόμως ἤμαρτον, ἀνόμως καὶ ἀπολοῦνται· καὶ ὅσοι ἐν νόμῳ ἤμαρτον, διὰ νόμου κριθήσονται, 13. (οὐ γὰρ οἱ ἄκροαταὶ τοῦ νόμου<sup>1</sup> δίκαιοι παρὰ τῷ Θεῷ, ἀλλ' οἱ ποιηταὶ<sup>g</sup> Jas. i. 22f., 25, iv. 11. τοῦ νόμου δικαιωθήσονται. 14. Ὅταν γὰρ ἔθνη τὰ μὴ νόμον ἔχοντα<sup>h</sup> φύσει τὰ τοῦ νόμου ποιῇ,<sup>2</sup> οὗτοι νόμον μὴ ἔχοντες ἑαυτοῖς εἰσι νόμος· h Gal. ii. 15, iv. 8; Eph. ii. 3. 15. οἵτινες ἐνδείκνυται τὸ ἔργον τοῦ νόμου<sup>i</sup> γραπτὸν ἐν ταῖς καρδίαις αὐτῶν, συμμαρτυρούσης αὐτῶν τῆς συνειδήσεως, καὶ μεταξύ ἀλλήλων<sup>i</sup> Here only in N.T.

<sup>1</sup> ἀκροαταὶ τοῦ νομοῦ KL 17, other cursives, Marcion; om. τοῦ ΞABDG. παρὰ τῷ θεῷ ΞAD<sup>3</sup>GKL; om. τῷ BD<sup>1</sup>. W. and H. bracket τῷ. ποιηταὶ τοῦ νομοῦ D<sup>3</sup>KL 17, other cursives, Marcion; om. τοῦ ΞABD<sup>3</sup>G.

<sup>2</sup> For ποιη D<sup>3</sup> (a grammatical correction) ποιῶσιν is found in ΞAB.

οἷψ, a comprehensive term, rather = salvation, than peace in any narrower sense. The Jew still comes first, but it is only order that is involved: the same principle underlies the judgment for Jew and Gentile. It would amount to προσωποληψία in God, if He made a difference in the Jew's favour because of his birth, or because he possessed the law. This is expanded in vers. 12-16: mere possession of the law does not count. Men are judged according to their works, whether they have or have not had such a special revelation of the Divine will as was given to Israel.

Ver. 12. ἀνόμως means "without law," not necessarily "without the law". In point of fact, no doubt, there was only one law given by God, the Mosaic, and Paul is arguing against those who imagined that the mere possession of it put them in a position of privilege as compared with those to whom it was not given; but he expresses himself with a generality which would meet the case of more such revelations of God's will having been made to man. As many as sin "without law" shall also perish "without law". Sin and perdition are correlative in Paul. ἀπόλεια (ix. 22, Phil. i. 28, iii. 19) answers to ζωὴ αἰώνιος: it is final exclusion from the blessedness implied in this expression; having no part in the kingdom of God. Similarly, as many as sin "in law" shall be judged "by law". The expression would cover any law, whatever it might be; really, the Mosaic law is the only one that has to be dealt with. The use of the aorist ἤμαρτον is difficult. Weiss says it is used as though the writer were looking back from the judgment day, when sin is simply past.

Burton compares iii. 23 and calls it a "collective historical aorist": in either case the English idiom requires the perfect: "all who have sinned".

Ver. 13. This is the principle of judgment, for not the hearers of law (the Mosaic or any other) are just with God, but the law doers shall be justified. ἀκροαταὶ tends to mean "pupils," constant hearers, who are educated in the law: see ver. 18. But no degree of familiarity with the law avails if it is not done. The forensic sense of δικαιοῦσθαι is apparent in this verse, where it is synonymous with δίκαιοι εἶναι παρὰ τῷ θεῷ: the latter obviously being the opposite of "to be condemned". Whether there are persons who perfectly keep the law, is a question not raised here. The futures ἀπολοῦνται, κριθήσονται, δικαιωθήσονται all refer to the day of final judgment.

Ver. 14. There is, indeed, when we look closely, no such thing as a man absolutely without the knowledge of God's will, and therefore such a judgment as the Apostle has described is legitimate. Gentiles, "such as have not law" in any special shape, when they do by nature "the things of the law"—i.e., the things required by the law given to Israel, the only one known to the Apostle—are in spite of not having law (as is the supposition here) a law to themselves. ἔθνη is not "the Gentiles," but "Gentiles as such"—persons who can be characterised as "without law". The supposition made in τὰ μὴ νόμον ἔχοντα is that of the Jews; and the Apostle's argument is designed to show that though formally, it is not substantially true.

Ver. 15. οἵτινες ἐνδείκνυται: the relative is qualitative: "inasmuch as

τῶν λογισμῶν κατηγορούντων ἢ καὶ ἀπολογουμένων), 16. ἐν ἡμέρᾳ  
 k Ch. xvi.25; ὅτε<sup>1</sup> κρινεῖ ὁ Θεὸς τὰ κρυπτὰ τῶν ἀνθρώπων, κατὰ τὸ εὐαγγέλιόν<sup>κ</sup> μου,  
<sup>2</sup> Tim. ii.8. διὰ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ.

<sup>1</sup> ἐν ἡμέρᾳ σπε NDGKL, vulg., Syr. ἐν ἡμέρᾳ B (this is one of the cases in which W. and H. suppose that B unsupported has preserved the true reading, though they give a place in their margin both to ἐν ἡμέρᾳ σπε and to ἐν ἡμέρᾳ η, which is found in A and the Memph. (Egyptian) version).

they shew". τὸ ἔργον τοῦ νόμου is the work which the law prescribes, collectively. "Written on their hearts," when contrasted with the law written on the tables of stone, is equal to "unwritten"; the Apostle refers to what the Greeks called ἄγραφος νόμος. To the Greeks, however, this was something greater and more sacred than any statute, or civil constitution; to the Apostle it was less than the great revelation of God's will, which had been made and interpreted to Israel, but nevertheless a true moral authority. There is a triple proof that Gentiles, who are regarded as not having law, are a law to themselves. (1) The appeal to their conduct: as interpreted by the Apostle, their conduct evinces, at least in some, the possession of a law written on the heart; (2) the action of conscience: it joins its testimony, though it be only an inward one, to the outward testimony borne by their conduct; and (3) their thoughts. Their thoughts bear witness to the existence of a law in them, inasmuch as in their mutual intercourse (μεταξὺ ἀλλήλων) these thoughts are busy bringing accusations, or in rarer cases (ἢ καὶ) putting forward defences, *i.e.*, in any case, exercising moral functions which imply the recognition of a law. This seems to me the only simple and natural explanation of a rather perplexed phrase. We need not ask for what Paul does not give, the object to κατηγορούντων or ἀπολογουμένων: it may be any person, act or situation, which calls into exercise that power of moral judgment which shows that the Gentiles, though without the law of Moses, are not in a condition which makes it impossible to judge them according to their works. The construction in ix. 1 suggests that the συν views the witness of conscience, reflecting on conduct, as something added to the first instinctive consciousness of the nature of an action. συνείδησις does not occur in the Gospels except in John viii. 9; twice only in Acts, xxiii. 1, xxiv. 16, both times in speeches of St. Paul; twenty times in the Pauline epistles. It

occurs in the O.T. only in Ecc. x. 20 (curse not the King, ἐν συνειδήσει σου = ne in cogitatione quidem tua): the ordinary sense is found, for the first time in Biblical Greek, in Sap. xvii. 11. It is a quasi-philosophical word, much used by the Stoics, and belonging rather to the Greek than the Hebrew inheritance of Paul.

Ver. 16. The day meant here is the same as that in ver. 5. Westcott and Hort only put a comma after ἀπολογουμένων, but a longer pause is necessary, unless we are to suppose that only the day of judgment wakes the conscience and the thoughts of man into the moral activity described in ver. 15. This supposition may have some truth in it, but it is not what the Apostle's argument requires. The proof he gives that Gentiles are "a law to themselves" must be capable of verification now, not only at the last day. Hence ver. 16 is really to be taken with the main verbs of the whole paragraph, ἀπολούνται, κριθήσονται, δικαιοθήσονται: the great principle of ver. 6—ἀποδώσει ἐκάστῳ κατὰ τὰ ἔργα αὐτοῦ—will be exhibited in action on the day on which God judges the secret things of men through Christ Jesus. A final judgment belonged to Jewish theology, and perhaps, though this is open to question, one in which the Messiah acted as God's representative; but what Paul teaches here does not rest merely on the transference of a Jewish Messianic function to Jesus. If there is anything certain in the N.T. it is that this representation of Jesus as judge of the world rests on the words of our Lord Himself (Mt. vii. 22 f., xxv. 31 ff.). To assert it was an essential part of the Gospel as preached by Paul: cf. Acts xvii. 31. (Baldensperger, *Das Selbstbewusstsein Jesu*, S. 85 f., thinks that in the circles of Jewish Pietism, in the century before Christ, the Messiah was already spoken of as the Divine judge, and as sharing the titles and attributes of Jehovah.)

In vers. 17-24 the Apostle brings to a point the argument for which he has been clearing the way in vers. 1-16.

17. ἴδε<sup>1</sup> σὺ Ἰουδαίος ἑπονομάζει, καὶ ἐπαναπαύῃ τῷ νόμῳ, καὶ <sup>in N.T.</sup> Here only  
 καυχᾶσαι ἐν Θεῷ, 18. καὶ γινώσκεις τὸ θέλημα, καὶ δοκιμάζεις τὰ  
<sup>m Phil. i. 10.</sup> διαφέροντα, <sup>n i Cor. xiv.</sup> κατηχούμενος ἐκ τοῦ νόμου. 19. πέποιθᾶς τε σεαυτὸν <sup>19</sup>  
 ὀδηγὸν εἶναι τυφλῶν, φῶς τῶν ἐν σκότει, 20. ὁ παιδευτὴν ἀφρόνων, <sup>19</sup>  
 διδάσκαλον νηπίων, ἔχοντα τὴν μόρφωσιν τῆς γνώσεως καὶ τῆς <sup>o Heb. xii. 9.</sup>

<sup>1</sup> εἰ δε ΞABD<sup>1</sup>K; ἰδε D<sup>3</sup>L Syr. εἰ δε has probably been changed into ἰδε (Alford) to avoid the anacoluthon. ἐπαναπαυῃ τῷ νομῷ D<sup>3</sup>KL 17; om. τῷ ΞABD<sup>1</sup>.

The Jew makes much of the possession of the law, but when we pass from possession to practice, he is not a whit better than the "lawless" Gentile. The construction is not quite regular, but the meaning is clear. The natural order would be: If thou bearest the name of Jew, and retest upon the law, and yet in thy conduct settest the law at nought, art not thou equally under condemnation with sinners of the Gentiles? But the construction is interrupted at the end of ver. 20, and what ought in logic to be part of the protasis—if in thy conduct thou settest the law at nought—is made a sort of apodosis, at least grammatically and rhetorically: dost thou, in spite of all these privileges, nevertheless set the law at nought? The real conclusion, which Paul needs for his argument, Art not thou then in the same condemnation with the Gentiles? is left for conscience to supply.

Ver. 17. Ἰουδαίος ἐπονομάζει: bearest the name of "Jew". The ἐπὶ in the compound verb does not denote addition, but direction: Ἰουδαίος is not conceived as a surname, but a name which has been imposed. Of course it is implied in the context that the name is an honourable one. It is not found in the LXX, and in other places where Paul wishes to indicate the same distinction, and the same pride in it, he says Ἰσραηλείται (ix. 4, 2 Cor. xi. 22). The terms must have had a tendency to coalesce in import, though Ἰουδαίος is national, and Ἰσραηλείτης religious; for the religion was national. ἐπαναπαύῃ νόμῳ: grammatically νόμῳ is law; really, it is the Mosaic law. The Jew said, We have a law, and the mere possession of it gave him confidence. Cf. Mic. iii. 11, ἐπὶ τὸν Κύριον ἐπανεπαύοντο. καυχᾶσαι ἐν Θεῷ: boast in God, as the covenant God of the Jews, who are His peculiar people. καυχᾶσαι = καυχᾶ: the longer form is the usual one in the κοινή.

Ver. 18. τὸ θέλημα is God's will. Lipsius compares the absolute use of

δόδος, θύρα and ὄνομα. Cf. Acts ix. 2, xix. 9, 23, xiv. 27, v. 41. Also 1 Cor. xvi. 12, where God's will is meant, not the will of Apollos. The words δοκιμάζεις τὰ διαφέροντα κατηχούμενος ἐκ τοῦ νόμου are to be taken together. In virtue of being taught out of the law (in the synagogue and the schools) the Jew possesses moral discernment: he does not sink to the νοῦς ἀδόκιμος, the mind which has lost all moral capacity (i. 28). But a certain ambiguity remains in δοκιμάζειν τὰ διαφέροντα: it may mean either (1) to distinguish, by testing, between things which differ—i.e., to discriminate experimentally between good and evil; or (2) to approve, after testing, the things which are more excellent. There are no grounds on which we can decide positively for either.

Ver. 19 f. πέποιθᾶς τε κ.τ.λ. The τε indicates that this confidence is the immediate and natural result of what precedes: it is not right, in view of all the N.T. examples, to say that πέποιθᾶς suggests an unjustifiable confidence, though in some cases, as in the present, it is so. Cf. 2 Cor. x. 7, Lk. xviii. 9. The blind, those in darkness, the foolish, the babes, are all names for the heathen: the Jew is confident that the Gentiles must come to school to him. παιδευτῆς has reference to moral as well as intellectual discipline: and ἀφρονες are, as in the O.T. (Ps. xiii. 1, LXX), persons without moral intelligence. For the other figures in this verse, cf. Mt. xv. 14, Is. xlix. 6, 9, xlii. 6. The confidence of the Jew is based on the fact that he possesses in the law "the outline of knowledge and truth". Lipsius puts a strong sense upon μόρφωσιν—die leibhaftige Verkörperung: as if the Jew conceived that in the Mosaic law the knowledge and the truth of God were incorporated bodily. Possibly he did, and in a sense it was so, for the Mosaic law was a true revelation of God and His will: but the only other instance of μόρφωσις in the N.T. (2 Tim. iii. 5:

ἀληθείας ἐν τῷ νόμῳ. 21. ὁ οὖν διδάσκων ἕτερον, σεαυτὸν οὐ διδάσκεις; ὁ κηρύσσων μὴ κλέπτειν, κλέπτεις; 22. ὁ λέγων μὴ μοιχεύειν, μοιχεύεις; ὁ βδελυσσόμενος τὰ εἰδωλα, ἱεροσυλεῖς; 23. ὃς ἐν νόμῳ καυχᾶσαι, διὰ τῆς παραβάσεως τοῦ νόμου τὸν Θεὸν ἀτιμάζεις; 24. “τὸ γὰρ ὄνομα τοῦ Θεοῦ δι’ ὑμᾶς βλασφημεῖται  
 p Is. lii. 5. ἐν τοῖς ἔθνεσι,” καθὼς ἠγγραπται. 25. Περιτομὴ μὲν γὰρ ὠφέλει, ἂν νόμον πράσσης· ἂν δὲ παραβάτης νόμου ᾖς, ἡ περιτομὴ σου

ἔχοντες μὀρφωσιν εὐσεβείας) rather suggests the same disparaging note which here belongs to *πέποιθας*. The *μὀρφωσις τῆς γνώσεως* is in point of fact only a form: valuable as the outline or definition of truth was, which the Jew possessed in the law, it was in reality ineffective, so far as the practical authority of the law in the Jew's conduct was concerned.

Ver. 21. Here the grammatical apodosis begins, the οὖν resuming all that has been said in vers. 17-20. *κηρύσσων* and *λέγων* are virtually verbs of command: hence the infinitives. The rhetorical question implies that the Jew does *not* teach himself, and that he *does* break the law he would enforce on others.

Ver. 22. *βδελυσσόμενος* properly expresses physical repulsion: thou that shrinkest in horror from idols. Cf. Dan. ix. 27, Mk. xiii. 14. *ἱεροσυλεῖς*: dost thou rob temples, and so, for the sake of gain, come in contact with abominations without misgiving? This is the meaning, and not, Dost thou rob the temple, by keeping back the temple dues? as has been suggested. The crime of *ἱεροσυλία* is referred to in Acts xix. 37, and according to Josephus, *Ant.*, iv., 8, 10, it was expressly forbidden to the Jews: *μὴ σὺλᾶν ἱερὰ ξενικά, μηδ' ἂν ἐπωνομασμένον ἢ τινὲ θεῶ κειμήλιον λαμβάνειν*.

Ver. 23. Here again the construction is changed, and probably the use of the relative instead of the participle suggests that the sentence is to be read, not as interrogative, but as declaratory. “Thou who makest it thy boast that thou possessest a law, by the transgressing of that law dishonourest God: that is the sum of the whole matter, and thy sole distinction in contrast with the heathen.”

Ver. 24. And this is only what Scripture bids us expect. The Scripture quoted is Is. lii. 5, LXX. The LXX interpret the Hebrew by inserting δι’ ὑμᾶς and ἐν τοῖς ἔθνεσιν. Both insertions are in the line of the original

meaning. It was owing to the misery and helplessness of the people of God, in exile among the nations, that the heathen scoffed at the Divine name. “The God of Israel is not able to deliver His people: He is no God.” Paul here gives the words quite another turn. God, he says, is now blasphemed among the nations because of the inconsistency between the pretensions of the Jews and their behaviour. As if the heathen were saying: “Like God, like people; what a Divinity the patron of this odious race must be”. It is surely not right to argue (with Sanday and Headlam) that the throwing of the formula of quotation to the end shows that Paul is conscious of quoting freely: “it is almost as if it were an after-thought that the language he has just used is a quotation at all”. The quotation is as relevant as most that the Apostle uses. He never cares for the context or the original application. When he can express himself in Scripture language he feels that he has the Word of God on his side, and all through this epistle he nails his arguments so, and insists on the confirmation they thus obtain. What the closing of the sentence with *καθὼς ἠγγραπται* suggests is not that it occurred to Paul after he had finished that he had almost unconsciously been using Scripture: it is rather that there is a challenge in the words, as if he had said, Let him impugn this who dare contest the Word of God.

In vers. 25-29 another Jewish plea for preferential treatment in the judgment is considered. The μὲν in ver. 25 (*περιτομὴ μὲν γὰρ ὠφέλει*) implies that this plea has no doubt something in it, but it suggests that there are considerations on the other side which in point of fact make it inapplicable or invalid here. It is these considerations which the Apostle proceeds to explain, with a view to clenching the argument that the wrath of God revealed from heaven impends over Jew and Gentile alike.

Ver. 25. *περιτομὴ*: the absence of the article suggests that the argument may



ἀκροβυστία γέγονεν. 26. ἐὰν οὖν ἡ ἀκροβυστία τὰ δικαίωμα του νόμου φυλάσση, οὐχὶ ἡ ἀκροβυστία αὐτοῦ εἰς περιτομὴν λογισθήσεται; 27. καὶ κρινεῖ ἡ ἐκ φύσεως ἀκροβυστία τὸν νόμον <sup>9</sup>τελοῦσα <sup>q</sup> Jas. ii. 8. σὲ τὸν <sup>1</sup>διὰ γράμματος καὶ περιτομῆς παραβάτην νόμου. 28. οὐ γὰρ <sup>1</sup> Ch. iv. 11, <sup>14</sup> οὐδὲ ἡ ἐν τῷ φανερωῦ Ἰουδαίος ἐστιν, οὐδὲ ἡ ἐν τῷ φανερωῦ ἐν σαρκὶ <sup>xiv. 20.</sup> περιτομῆ. 29. ἀλλ' ὁ ἐν τῷ κρυπτῷ Ἰουδαίος, καὶ περιτομῆ καρδίας ἐν πνεύματι, οὐ γράμματι. οὐ ὁ <sup>8</sup> ἔπιανος οὐκ ἐξ ἀνθρώπων, ἀλλ' ἐκ <sup>1</sup> Cor. iv. 5.

be extended to everything of the same character as circumcision. **ἴσχυει**: Circumcision was the seal of the covenant, and as such an assurance given to the circumcised man that he belonged to the race which was the heir of God's promises. That was undeniably a great advantage, just as it is an advantage now to be born a Christian; but if the actual inheriting of the promises has any moral conditions attached to it (as Paul proceeds to show that it has), then the advantage of circumcision lapses unless these are fulfilled. Now the persons contemplated here have not fulfilled them. **ἐὰν νόμον πράσσης**: the habitual practice of the law is involved in this expression: as Vaughan says, it is almost like a compound word, "*if thou be a law doer*". Similarly **παραβάτης νόμου** a law-transgressor. The law, of course, is the Mosaic one, but it is regarded simply in its character as law, not as being definitely this law: hence the absence of the article. **γέγονε**: by the very fact becomes and remains.

Ver. 26 f. Here the inference is drawn from the principle laid down in ver. 25. This being so, Paul argues, if the uncircumcision maintain the just requirements of the law, shall not his uncircumcision be accounted circumcision, *sc.*, because it has really done what circumcision pledged the Jew to do? Cf. Gal. v. 3. **ἡ ἀκροβυστία** at the beginning of the verse is equivalent to the Gentiles (**ἔθνη** of ver. 14), the abstract being put for the concrete: in **ἡ ἀκροβυστία αὐτοῦ**, the **αὐτοῦ** individualises a person who is conceived as keeping the law, though not circumcised. As he has done what circumcision bound the Jew to do, he will be treated as if in the Jew's position: his uncircumcision will be reckoned as circumcision. **λογισθήσεται** may be merely a logical future, but like the other futures in vers. 12-16 it is probably more correct to refer it to what will take place at the last judgment. The order of the words in ver. 27 indicates that the question is not continued: "and

thus the uncircumcision shall judge thee," etc. **κρινεῖ** is emphatic by position: the Jew, in the case supposed, is so far from being able to assert a superiority to the Gentile that the Gentile himself will be his condemnation. Cf. Mt. xii. 41 f. **ἡ ἐκ φύσεως ἀκροβυστία** should properly convey one idea—"those who are by nature uncircumcised". But why should nature be mentioned at all in this connection? It seems arbitrary to say with Hofmann that it is referred to in order to suggest that uncircumcision is what the Gentile is born in, and therefore involves no guilt. As far as that goes, Jew and Gentile are alike. Hence in spite of the grammatical irregularity, which in any case is not too great for a nervous writer like Paul, I prefer to connect **ἐκ φύσεως**, as Burton does (*Moods and Tenses*, § 427), with **τελοῦσα**, and to render: "the uncircumcision which by nature fulfils the law": cf. ver. 14. **τὸν διὰ γράμματος καὶ περιτομῆς παραβάτην νόμου**. The **διὰ** is that which describes the circumstances under which, or the accompaniment to which, anything is done. The Jew is a law-transgressor, in spite of the facts that he possesses a written revelation of God's will, and bears the seal of the covenant, obliging him to the performance of the law, upon his body. He has an outward standard, which does not vary with his moral condition, like the law written in the pagan's heart; he has an outward pledge that he belongs to the people of God, to encourage him when he is tempted to indolence or despair; in both these respects he has an immense advantage over the Gentile, yet both are neutralised by this—he is a law-transgressor.

Ver. 28 f. The argument of the foregoing verses assumes what is stated here, and what no one will dispute, that what constitutes the Jew in the true sense of the term, and gives the name of Jew its proper content and dignity, is not anything outward and visible, but something inward and spiritual. And

τοῦ Θεοῦ. III. 1. Τί οὖν τὸ περισσὸν τοῦ Ἰουδαίου, ἢ τίς ἡ ὠφέλεια τῆς περιτομῆς; 2. πολὺ, κατὰ πάντα τρόπον. πρῶτον μὲν γὰρ<sup>1</sup> ὅτι

<sup>1</sup> γαρ om. BD<sup>3</sup>G vulg.; ins.  $\aleph$ AD<sup>3</sup>KL Syr. It is bracketed by Westcott and Hort, omitted by Lachmann and Tregelles, inserted by Tischdf.

the same remark applies to circumcision itself. The most natural way to read the Greek seems to me to be this. "Not he who is so outwardly (ὁ ἐν τῷ φανερῷ) is a Jew (in the true sense), nor is that which is outward, in flesh, the true circumcision; but he who is inwardly a Jew (is the true Jew), and heart circumcision, in spirit, not in letter (is the true circumcision)." Thus in the first pair of clauses there is not anything, strictly speaking, to be supplied; the subject is in each case involved in the article. But in the second pair the predicate has in both cases to be supplied from the first—in the one case, Ἰουδαίος; in the other, περιτομή. Heart circumcision is an idea already familiar to the O.T. From the Book of Deuteronomy (x. 16, for the meaning comp. xxx. 6) it passed to the prophetic writings: Jer. iv. 4. The contrary expression—uncircumcised in heart and in flesh—is also found: Jer. ix. 26, Ez. xlv. 7. A difficulty is created by the expression ἐν πνεύματι οὐ γράμματι. After ver. 28 we rather expect ἐν πνεύματι οὐ σαρκί: the circumcision being conceived as in one and not another part of man's nature. Practically it is in this sense most commentators take the words: thus Gifford explains them by "a circumcision which does not stop short at outward conformity to the law, but extends to the sphere of the inner life". But there is no real correspondence here, such as there is in ἐν πνεύματι οὐ σαρκί; and a comparison of 2 Cor. iii., a chapter pervaded by the contrast of πνεῦμα and γράμμα, suggests a different rendering. πνεῦμα and γράμμα are not the elements in which, but the powers by which, the circumcision is conceived to be effected. "Heart circumcision," without any qualifying words, expresses completely that contrast to circumcision in the flesh, which is in Paul's mind; and what he adds in the new words, ἐν πνεύματι οὐ γράμματι is the new idea that heart circumcision, which alone deserves the name of circumcision, is achieved by the Spirit of God, not by the written law. Whether there is such a thing as this heart circumcision, wrought by the Spirit, among the Jews, is not explicitly considered; but it is not

a refutation of this interpretation to point out that πνεῦμα in 2 Cor. is characteristically the gift of the New Covenant. For the very conclusion to which Paul wishes to lead is that the New Covenant is as necessary for the Jew as for the Gentile. οὗ ὁ ἔπαινος κ.τ.λ. The οὗ is masculine, and refers to the ideal Jew. The name Ἰουδαίος (from Judah = praise, Gen. xxix. 35) probably suggested this remark. οὐκ ἐξ ἀνθρώπων: the love of praise from each other, and religious vanity, are Jewish characteristics strongly commented on by our Lord (John v. 44, xii. 42 f.).

CHAPTER III.—Vers. 1-8. It might easily seem, at this point, as if the Apostle's argument had proved too much. He has shown that the mere possession of the law does not exempt the Jew from judgment, but that God requires its fulfilment; he has shown that circumcision in the flesh, seal though it be of the covenant and pledge of its promises, is only of value if it represent inward heart circumcision; he has, it may be argued, reduced the Jew to a position of entire equality with the Gentile. But the consciousness of the Jewish race must protest against such a conclusion. "Salvation is of the Jews" is a word of Christ Himself, and the Apostle is obliged to meet this instinctive protest of the ancient people of God. The whole of the difficulties it raises are more elaborately considered in chaps. ix.-xi.; here it is only discussed so far as to make plain that it does not invalidate the arguments of chap. ii., nor bar the development of the Apostle's theology. The advantage of the Jew is admitted; it is admitted that his unbelief may even act as a foil to God's faithfulness, setting it in more glorious relief; but it is insisted, that if God's character as righteous judge of the world is to be maintained—as it must be—these admissions do not exempt the Jew from that liability to judgment which has just been demonstrated. The details of the interpretation, especially in ver. 7 f., are somewhat perplexed.

Ver. 1 f. τὸ περισσὸν τοῦ Ἰουδαίου is that which the Jew has "over and above" the Gentile. τίς ἡ ὠφέλεια τῆς

ἐπιστεύθησαν τὰ ἁ λόγια τοῦ Θεοῦ. 3. τί γὰρ, εἰ ἠπίστησάν τινες; a Acts vii. 48; Heb. v. 12; 1 Pet. iv. 11.  
 μὴ ἢ ἀπιστία αὐτῶν τὴν πίστιν τοῦ Θεοῦ καταργήσει; 4. μὴ γένοιτο γινέσθω δὲ ὁ Θεὸς ἀληθής, πᾶς δὲ ἄνθρωπος ψεύστης, καθὼς<sup>1</sup> γέγραπται, "Ὅπως ἂν δικαιοθῆς ἐν τοῖς λόγοις σου, καὶ νικῆσης ἐν τῷ

<sup>1</sup> For καθὼς  $\aleph$ B read καθάπερ. νικῆσης BGKL, etc., νικῆσεις  $\aleph$ ADE. For the distribution of authorities here, see note on πρῶτον, page 589, note <sup>2</sup>. The combination of B with such later Western authorities as G here also lessens its weight; its reading is probably part of that Western element which it contains, i.e., B and G here represent practically one authority. But the other group of MSS. represents at least two groups of witnesses, the "neutral" in  $\aleph$ A, and the Western in D, and its reading is therefore to be preferred. Weiss, however (*Textkritik der paulinischen Briefe*, S. 46), would reject the indicative both here and in 2 Cor. xii. 21. The change of εἰ and ἦ he regards as accidental; in KLP it occurs some sixty times.

περιτομῆς; = "What good does his circumcision do him?" πολὺν goes with τὸ περισσόν. κατὰ πάντα τρόπον: however you choose to view the position. πρῶτον μὲν suggests that such an enumeration of Jewish prerogatives might have been made here as is given at length in ix. 4 f. In point of fact, Paul mentions one only, in which the whole force of the Jewish objection to the arguments of chap. ii. is contained, and after disposing of it feels that he has settled the question, and passes on. The first, most weighty, and most far-reaching advantage of the Jews, is that "they were entrusted with the oracles of God". They were made in His grace the depositaries and guardians of revelation. τὰ λόγια τοῦ θεοῦ must be regarded as the contents of revelation, having God as their author, and at the time when Paul wrote, identical with the O.T. Scriptures. In the LXX the word λόγιον occurs mainly as the equivalent of  $\text{נְבִיאָה}$ , which in various passages (e.g., Ps. cxix. 38) has the sense of "promise"; in ordinary Greek it means "oracle," the Divine word given at a shrine, and usually referring to the future; hence it would be natural in using it to think of the prophetic rather than the statutory element in the O.T., and this is what is required here. The O.T. as a whole, and as a revelation of God, has a forward look; it anticipates completion and excites hope; and it is not too much to say that this is suggested by describing it as τὰ λόγια τοῦ θεοῦ. The sum of it was that God had promised to His people "a future and a hope" (Jer. xxix. 11: see margin, R.V.), and this promise seemed threatened by the argument of the last chapter.

Ver. 3 f. τί γὰρ; For how? i.e.,

Well then, how stands the case? Cf. Phil. i. 18. εἰ ἠπίστησάν τινες = if some *did* disbelieve. It is not necessary to refer to this, with reference to ἐπιστεύθησαν in ver. 2, "if some proved faithless to their trust". What is in Paul's mind is that "the oracles of God" have had their fulfilment in Christ, and that those to whom they were entrusted have in some cases (whether few or many he does not here consider) refused their faith to that fulfilment. Surely it is no proper inference that their unbelief must make God's faithfulness of no effect. *He* has kept His promise, and as far as it lay with Him has maintained the original advantage of the Jews, as depositaries and first inheritors of that promise, whatever reception they may have given to its fulfilment. Away with the thought of any reflection upon Him! When the case is stated between God and man there can only be one conclusion: let God come out (γινέσθω) true, and every man a liar; let Him be just, and every man condemned. This agrees with the words of Scripture itself in Ps. li. (1.) 6, which Paul quotes exactly after the LXX: the Hebrew is distinctly different, but neither it nor the original context are regarded. ἐν τοῖς λόγοις σου is a translation of Hebrew words which mean "when Thou speakest," i.e., apparently, when Thou pronouncest sentence upon man; here the sense must be, "that Thou mayest be pronounced just in respect of what Thou hast spoken," i.e., the λόγια, the oracles or promises entrusted to Israel. νικῆσεις: win thy case (see note on text). Burton, *Moods and Tenses*, §§ 198, 199. ἐν τῷ κρίνεσθαί σε: Probably the infinitive is passive: "when thou art judged"; not middle, "when thou submittest thy case to the

b Ch. v. 8; κρίνεσθαί σε". 5. εἰ δὲ ἡ ἀδικία ἡμῶν Θεοῦ δικαιοσύνη<sup>b</sup> συίστησι,  
 2 Cor. vi. τί ἐρούμεν; μὴ ἀδικος ὁ Θεὸς ὁ ἐπιφέρων τὴν ὀργὴν; κατὰ ἄνθρωπον  
 4, vii. 11; λέγω. 6. μὴ γένοιτο· ἐπεὶ πῶς κρινεῖ ὁ Θεὸς τὸν κόσμον; 7. εἰ  
 Gal. ii. 18. γὰρ<sup>1</sup> ἡ ἀλήθεια τοῦ Θεοῦ ἐν τῷ ἐμῷ ψεύσματι ἐπερίσσευσεν εἰς τὴν  
 δόξαν αὐτοῦ, τί ἔτι κἀγὼ ὡς ἁμαρτωλὸς κρίνομαι; 8. καὶ μὴ καθὼς  
 c 1 Cor. x. 30. ὁ βλασφημούμεθα, καὶ<sup>2</sup> καθὼς φασὶ τινες ἡμᾶς λέγειν, "Ὅτι ποιήσωμεν  
 τὰ κακὰ ἵνα ἔλθῃ τὰ ἀγαθὰ; ὣν τὸ κρίμα ἐνδικὸν ἔστι.

<sup>1</sup> εἰ γὰρ BDEGKLP, etc.; εἰ δε ΞA vulg. (some MSS., though others *si enim*). This case is to be decided by the same considerations as the last. Tischdf. and W. and H. put εἰ δε in their text; W. and H. put εἰ γὰρ in marg. On the strange but frequent exchange of δε and γὰρ see Weiss, *Textkritik*, 66 f.

<sup>2</sup> καὶ καθὼς; om. καὶ BK. W. and H. bracket.

judge". The quotation from Ps. cxvi. 12, πᾶς ἄνθρωπος ψεύστης, is not important: the main thing, as the formal quotation which follows shows, is the vindication of God from the charge of breach of faith with the Jews in making Christianity the fulfilment of His promises to them.

Ver. 5 f. Here another attempt is made to invalidate the conclusion of chap. ii., that the Jew is to be judged "according to his works," exactly like the Gentile. If the argument of ver. 3 f. is correct, the unbelief of the Jews actually serves to set off the faithfulness of God; it makes it all the more conspicuous; how then can it leave them exposed to judgment? This argument is generalised in ver. 5 and answered in ver. 6. "If our unrighteousness" (in the widest sense, ἀδικία being generalised from ἀπιστία, ver. 3) demonstrates (*cf.* v. 8) God's righteousness (also in the widest sense, δικαιοσύνη being generalised from πίστις, ver. 3), what shall we say? *i.e.*, what inference shall we draw? Surely not that God, He who inflicts the wrath due to unrighteousness at the last day (i. 18), is Himself unrighteous, to speak as men speak. Away with the thought! If this were so, how should God judge the world? That God *does* judge the world at last is a fixed point both for Paul and those with whom he argues; hence every inference which conflicts with it must be summarily set aside. God could not judge at all if He were unjust; therefore, since He does judge, He is not unjust, not even in judging men whose unrighteousness may have served as a foil to His righteousness. It is not thus that the conclusions of chap. ii. can be evaded by the Jew. ὁ ἐπιφέρων τὴν ὀργὴν: the "attributive participle equivalent to a relative clause,

may, like a relative clause, convey a subsidiary idea of cause, purpose, condition or concession" (Burton, *Moods and Tenses*, § 428, who renders here: is God unrighteous, who (because He) visiteth with wrath?). κατὰ ἄνθρωπον λέγω: *cf.* Gal. iii. 15, Rom. vi. 19, 1 Cor. ix. 8. There is always something apologetic in the use of such expressions. Men forget the difference between God and themselves when they contemplate such a situation as that God should be unrighteous; obviously it is not to be taken seriously. Still, in human language such suppositions are made, and Paul begs that in his lips they may not be taken for more than they really mean.

Ver. 7 f. These verses are extremely difficult, and are interpreted variously according to the force assigned to the τί ἔτι κἀγὼ of ver. 7. Who or what supplies the contrast to this emphatic "I also"? Some commentators, Gifford, for instance, find it in God, and God's interest in the judgment. If my lie sets in relief the truth of God, and so magnifies His glory, is not that enough? Why, after God has had this satisfaction from my sin, "why further am I also on my side brought to judgment as a sinner?" It is a serious, if not a final objection to this, that it merely repeats the argument of ver. 5, which the Apostle has already refuted. Its very generality, too—for any man, as Gifford himself says, may thus protest against being judged,—lessens its relevance: for Paul is discussing not human evasions of God's judgment, but Jewish objections to his previous arguments. Lipsius finds the contrast to κἀγὼ in the Gentile world. A Jew is the speaker, or at all events the Apostle speaks in the character of one: "if my unbelief does magnify His faithfulness,

9. Τί οὖν ; προεχόμεθα ; οὐ πάντως · προησιασάμεθα γὰρ Ἰουδαίους d Ch. vi. 14,  
 τε καὶ Ἑλλήνας πάντας ἄ ὄφ' ἁμαρτίαν εἶναι, καθὼς γέγραπται, 10. 15; Gal.  
 iii. 10.

is not that all that is required? Why am I, too, like the rest of the world, whose relation to God is so different, and whose judgment is so necessary, still brought into judgment?" This would be legitimate enough, probably, if it were not for what follows. But the slander of ver. 8, which forms part of the same question as *τί ἔτι κἀγὼ κ.τ.λ.*, and to which reference is made again in chap. vi. 1, 15, had not the Jews, but the Apostle in his Christian character, for its object; hence it seems preferable to take the *κἀγὼ* as referring strictly to himself. That Paul would come into judgment, in spite of the fact that *his* faithlessness in becoming a Christian had only set off the faithfulness of God to Israel, no unbelieving Jew questioned; and Paul turns this conviction of theirs (with which, of course, he agrees, so far as it asserts that he will be judged) against themselves. If he, for his part, cannot evade judgment, on the ground that his sin (as they think it) has been a foil to God's righteousness, no more can they on their part: they and he are in one position, and must be judged together: to condemn him is to expose themselves to condemnation; that is his point. The argument of ver. 7 is both an *argumentum ad hominem* and an *argumentum ad rem*: Paul borrows from his opponents the premises that he himself is to be judged as a sinner, and that his lie has set off God's truth: there is enough in these premises to serve his purpose, which is to show that these two propositions which do not exclude each other in his case do not do so in their case either. But, of course, he would interpret the second in a very different way from them. The question is continued in ver. 8, though the construction is changed by the introduction of the parentheses with *καθὼς* and the attachment to *λέγειν ὅτι* of the clause which would naturally have gone with *τί μῆ*; if judgment could be evaded by sinning to the glory of God, so Paul argues, he and other Christians like him might naturally act on the principle which slander imputed to them—that of doing evil that good might come. No doubt the slander was of Jewish origin. The doctrine that righteousness is a gift of God, not to be won by works of law, but by faith in Jesus Christ, can always be misrepresented as immoral: "sin the more, it

will only the more magnify grace". Paul does not stoop to discuss it. The judgment that comes on those who by such perversions of reason and conscience seek to evade all judgment is just. This is all he has to say.

Vers. 9-20. In these verses the Apostle completes his proof of the universality of sin, and of the liability of all men, without exception, to judgment. The *τί οὖν* of ver. 9 brings back the argument from the digression of vers. 1-8. In those verses he has shown that the historical prerogative of the Jews, as the race entrusted with the oracles of God, real and great as it is, does not exempt them from the universal rule that God will reward every man according to his works (ii. 6): here, according to the most probable interpretation of *προεχόμεθα*, he puts himself in the place of his fellow-countrymen, and imagines them asking, "Are we *surpassed*? Is it the Gentiles who have the advantage of us, instead of our having the advantage of them?"

Ver. 9. *Τί οὖν*; What then? *i.e.*, how, then, are we to understand the situation? It is necessary to take these words by themselves, and make *προεχόμεθα* a separate question: the answer to *τί* could not be *οὐ*, but must be *οὐδέν*. The meaning of *προεχόμεθα* has been much discussed. The active *προέχειν* means to excel or surpass. Many have taken *προεχόμεθα* as middle in the same sense: So the Vulg. *præcellimus eos?* and the A.V. "Are we better than they?" But this use, except in interpreters of this verse, cannot be proved. The ordinary meaning of the middle would be "to put forward on one's own account, as an excuse, or defence". This is the rendering in the margin of the R.V. "Do we excuse ourselves?" If *τί οὖν προεχόμεθα* could be taken together, it might certainly be rendered, What then is our plea? but it is impossible to take *προεχόμεθα* in this sense without an object, and impossible, as already explained, to make this combination. The only alternative is to regard *προεχόμεθα* as passive: What then? are we excelled? This is the meaning adopted in the R.V. "Are we in worse case than they?" It is supported by Lightfoot. Wetstein quotes one example from Plut. *de Stoic. contrad.*, 1038 D.: *τοῖς ἀγαθοῖς πᾶσι προσήκει,*

“Ὅτι οὐκ ἔστι δίκαιος οὐδὲ εἷς· ἸΙ. οὐκ ἔστιν ὁ συνίων,<sup>1</sup> οὐκ ἔστιν ὁ ἐκζητῶν τὸν Θεόν. Ἰ2. πάντες ἐξέκλιναν, ἅμα ἠχρειώθησαν<sup>2</sup>· οὐκ

<sup>1</sup> ο συνίων; om. ο ABG vulg.; ins. **NDKL**. The ο before ἐκζητῶν is also omitted BG, and in both places, in text though not in marg., by W. and H. (marg., ο ζητων). This ζητων is the reading in B.

<sup>2</sup> ηχρεώθησαν **NA<sup>B</sup>D<sup>3</sup>G**. οὐκ ἐστιν ποιων, so ABG; but **ND** have ο ποιων. W. and H. put the former in text, the latter in marg. The second οὐκ ἐστιν is om. in B 67<sup>2</sup> and in the marg. of W. and H.

κατ' οὐδὲν προεχομένοις ὑπὸ τοῦ Διός: “who are in nothing surpassed by Zeus”. The word would thus express the surprise of the Jew at seeing his prerogatives disappear; “if this line of argument be carried further,” he may be supposed to say, “the relative positions of Jew and Gentile will turn out to be the very reverse of what we have believed”. This is the idea which is negated in οὐ πάντως. Strictly speaking, the οὐ should modify πάντως, and the meaning be “not in every respect”: in some respects (for instance, the one referred to in ver. 2), a certain superiority would still belong to the Jew. But to allude to this seems irrelevant, and there is no difficulty in taking the words to mean, “No: not in any way”. See Winer, p. 693 f. “We are not surpassed at all, we who are Jews, for we have already brought against Jews and Greeks alike the charge of being all under sin.” ὑπὸ ἁμαρτίαν, cf. vii. 14, Gal. iii. 22. The idea is that of being under the power of sin, as well as simply sinful: men are both guilty and unable to escape from that condition.

Ver. 10. The long series of quotations, beginning with this verse, has many points of interest. The καθὼς γέγραπται with which it is introduced, shows that the assertion of indiscriminate sinfulness which the Apostle has just made, corresponds with Scripture testimony. It is as if he had said, I can express my opinion in inspired words, and therefore it has God upon its side. The quotations themselves are taken from various parts of the O.T. without distinction; no indication is given when the writer passes from one book to another. Thus vv. 10-12 are from Ps. xiv. 1-3; ver. 13 gives the LXX of Ps. v. 9; ver. 14 corresponds best to Ps. x. 7; in vv. 15-17 there is a condensation of Is. lix. 7 f.; and in ver. 18 we have part of the first verse of Ps. xxxvi. No attention whatever is paid to the context. The value of the quotations for the Apostle's purpose has been disputed. It has been

pointed out that in Ps. xiv., for instance, there is mention of a people of God, “a generation of the righteous,” as well as of the godless world; and that in other passages only the contemporaries of the writer, or some of them, and not all men in all times, are described. Perhaps if we admit that there is no possibility of an empirical proof of the universality of sin, it covers the truth there is in such comments. Paul does not rest his case on these words of Scripture, interpreted as modern exegetical science would interpret them. He has brought the charge of sin against all men in chap. i. 17, in announcing righteousness as the gift of the Gospel; in chap. i. 18-32 he has referred to the facts which bring the charge home to Gentile consciences; in chap. ii. he has come to close quarters with evasions which would naturally suggest themselves to Jews; and in both cases he has counted upon finding in conscience a sure ally. Hence we do not need to lay too heavy a burden of proof on these quotations: it is enough if they show that Scripture points with unmistakable emphasis in the direction in which the Apostle is leading his readers. And there can be no doubt that it does so. As Gifford well says on ver. 18: “In the deep inner sense which St. Paul gives to the passage, ‘the generation of the righteous’ would be the first to acknowledge that they form no exception to the universal sinfulness asserted in the opening verses of the Psalm”.

Ver. 10. Οὐκ ἔστιν δίκαιος οὐδὲ εἷς. There is something to be said for the idea that this is Paul's thesis, rather than a quotation of Ps. xiv. 3. Ps. xiv. 3 is correctly quoted in ver. 12, and the Apostle would hardly quote it twice: δίκαιος, too, seems chosen to express exactly the conclusion to which he means to come in ver. 20. Still, the words come after καθὼς γέγραπται: hence they must be Scripture, and there is nothing they resemble so much as a free rendering of Ps. xiv. 3.

ἔστι πωδῶν χρηστότητα, οὐκ ἔστιν ἕως ἑνός." 13. "τάφος ἀνευγ-  
 μένος ὁ λάρυγξ αὐτῶν, ταῖς γλώσσαις αὐτῶν ἐδολιούσαν." "ἰδὸς  
 ἀσπίδων ὑπὸ τὰ χεῖλη αὐτῶν". 14. "ὦν τὸ στόμα<sup>1</sup> ἀράς καὶ πικρίας  
 γέμει." 15. "ὄξείς οἱ πόδες αὐτῶν ἐκχέαι αἷμα." 16. σύντριμμα  
 καὶ τάλαιπωρία ἐν ταῖς ὁδοῖς αὐτῶν. 17. καὶ ὁδὸν<sup>e</sup> εἰρήνης οὐκ ε Luke i.  
 ἔγνωσαν." 18. "οὐκ ἔστι φόβος Θεοῦ ἀπέναντι τῶν ὀφθαλμῶν<sup>79</sup>  
 αὐτῶν." 19. οἶδαμεν δὲ ὅτι ὅσα ὁ νόμος λέγει, τοῖς<sup>f</sup> ἐν τῷ νόμῳ f Ch. iv. 10.  
 λαλεῖ. ἵνα πᾶν στόμα<sup>g</sup> φραγῆ, καὶ<sup>h</sup> ὑπόδικος γένηται πᾶς ὁ κόσμος h Here only.

<sup>1</sup> στόμα; after στόμα B 17 read αὐτων. This Hebr. idiom may be right, and W. and H. put αὐτων in marg.

Ver. 11. οὐκ ἔστιν συνίων. For the form (συνίων or συνίων), see Winer, p. 97. If we read ὁ συνίων the meaning is, There is no one to understand: if the article (as in the LXX) be omitted, There is no one who has sense.

Ver. 12. ἠχρεώθησαν is the LXX rendering of  $\text{הָיָה לְחַמְצָה}$ , which means "to become sour," "to turn" (of milk): one and all they have become good for nothing. χρηστότητα usually signifies kindness, and so it is rendered in 2 Cor. vi. 6, Eph. ii. 7, Col. iii. 12, Tit. iii. 4 (cf. Rom. ii. 4, xi. 22: goodness): here it answers to Hebrew  $\text{טוֹב}$  and means "good". οὐκ ἔστιν ἕως ἑνός, non est usque ad unum (Vulg.), which may be even more exactly given in the Scottish idiom: there is not the length of one.

Ver. 13. τάφος . . . ἐδολιούσαν is an exact quotation of Ps. v. 10 (LXX). The original seems to describe foreign enemies whose false and treacherous language threatened ruin to Israel. For the form ἐδολιούσαν, see Winer, p. 91 (f.). The termination is common in the LXX: Wetstein quotes one grammarian who calls it Boeotian and another Chalcidic; it was apparently widely diffused. The last clause, ἰδὸς ἀσπίδων κ.τ.λ., is Ps. cxxxix. 4, LXX.

Ver. 14. Ps. ix. 28, LXX, freely quoted: (Ps. x. 7, A.V.). αὐτῶν after στόμα (W. and H., margin) is a Hebrew idiom which the LXX has in this passage, only in the singular: οὐ τὸ στόμα αὐτοῦ.

Vers. 15-17. These verses are rather a free extract from, than a quotation of, Is. lix. 7, 8. They describe the moral corruption of Israel in the age of the prophet. According to Lipsius, σύντριμμα καὶ τάλαιπωρία refer to the

spiritual misery which comes upon the Jews in the path of self-righteousness. But it is much more natural to suppose that the Apostle is pointing to the destruction and misery which human wickedness inflicts on others, than to any such spiritual results of it. It is as if he had said, "Wherever they go, you can trace them by the ruin and distress they leave behind". The same consideration applies to ver. 17. It does not mean, "They have failed to discover the way of salvation," but "they tread continually in paths of violence".

Ver. 18. Ps. xxxv. 2, LXX, with αὐτῶν for αὐτοῦ. This verse at once sums up and explains the universal corruption of mankind.

Ver. 19. At this point the first great division of the epistle closes, that which began with chap. i. 18, and has been occupied with asserting the universal prevalence of sin. "We know that whatever the law says, it says to those who are in the law," i.e., to the Jews. For the distinction of λέγειν (in which the object is the main thing) and λαλεῖν (in which the speaker and the mode of utterance are made prominent), see Trench, *Synonymus*, § lxxvi., and commentary on John viii. 43. It is most natural to suppose that by "the things the law says" Paul means the words he has just quoted from the O.T. These words cannot be evaded by the very persons to whom the O.T. was given, and who have in it, so to speak, the spiritual environment of their life. In this case, ὁ νόμος is used in the wider sense of the old revelation generally, not specifically the Pentateuch, or even the statutory part of Scripture. For this use of the word, cf. 1 Cor. xiv. 21, where ἐν τῷ νόμῳ introduces a quotation from Is. xxviii. 11: and John x. 34 (*your law*), xv. 25 (*their law*), both prefacing quota-

τῷ Θεῷ. 20. διότι ἐξ ἔργων νόμου οὐ δικαιοθήσεται πᾶσα σὰρξ ἐνώπιον αὐτοῦ· διὰ γὰρ νόμου ἐπίγνωσις ἁμαρτίας.

tions from Psalms (lxxxii. 6, xxxv. 19). At first sight there seems a disparity between the two parts of the verse. How does the fact that those who are under the law are impeached and condemned by such utterances of the law as those just quoted subserve the Divine intention to stop every mouth and make all the world answerable to God? We must suppose that all other men—that is, the Gentiles, who are not under the law—are convicted already; and that what is needed to prepare the way for the universal Gospel of grace is that those who have been under law should admit concerning themselves, what they are prompt enough to assert of all others (“sinners of the Gentiles”: Gal. ii. 15), that they have not a word to say, and are liable to God’s judgment. ὑπόδικος is a classical word, found here only in the N.T. Sanday and Headlam remark its “forensic” character.

Ver. 20. διότι means “because,” not “therefore,” as in A.V. The rendering “therefore” is perhaps due to the difficulty which the translators had in putting an intelligible meaning into “because”. The sense seems to be: Every mouth must be stopped, and all the world shown to be liable to God’s judgment, because by works of law no flesh shall be justified before Him. This last proposition—that no flesh shall be justified in this way—is virtually an axiom with the Apostle: it is a first principle in all his spiritual thinking, and hence everything must be true which can be deduced from it, and everything must take place which is required to support it. *Because* this is the fundamental certainty of the case, every mouth *must* be stopped, and the strong words quoted from the law stand where they do to secure this end. The explanation of this axiom is to be found in its principal terms—flesh and law. Flesh primarily denotes human nature in its frailty: to attain to the righteousness of God is a task which no flesh has strength to accomplish. But flesh in Paul has a moral rather than a natural meaning; it is not its weakness in this case, but its strength, which puts justification out of the question; to justify is the very thing which the law cannot do, and it cannot do it because it is weak owing to the flesh (*cf.* viii. 3). But the explanation of the axiom lies not only in “flesh,” but in “law”. “By the law

comes the full knowledge of sin.” (ἐπίγνωσις, a favourite Pauline word: fifteen times used in his epistles.) This is its proper, and indeed its exclusive function. There is no law given with power to give life, and therefore there are no works of law by which men can be justified. The law has served its purpose when it has made men feel to the full how sinful they are; it brings them down to this point, but it is not for it to lift them up. The best exposition of the passage is given by the Apostle himself in Gal. ii. 15 f., where the same quotation is made from Ps. cxliii. 2, and proof given again that it applies to Jew and Gentile alike. In ἐξ ἔργων νόμου, νόμος, of course, is primarily the Mosaic law. As Lipsius remarks, no distinction is drawn by the Apostle between the ritual and the moral elements of it, though the former are in the foreground in the epistle to the Galatians, and the latter in that to the Romans. But the truth would hold of every legal dispensation, and it is perhaps to express this generality, rather than because νόμος is a technical term, that the article is omitted. Under no system of statutes, the Mosaic or any other, will flesh ever succeed in finding acceptance with God. Let mortal man, clothed in works of law, present himself before the Most High, and His verdict must always be: Unrighteous.

Vers. 21-26. The universal need of a Gospel has now been demonstrated, and the Apostle proceeds with his exposition of this Gospel itself. It brings what all men need, a righteousness of God (see on i. 17); and it brings it in such a way as to make it accessible to all. Law contributes nothing to it, though it is attested by the law and the prophets; it is a righteousness which is all of grace. Grace, however, does not signify that moral distinctions are ignored in God’s procedure: the righteousness which is held out in the Gospel is held out on the basis of the redemption which is in Christ Jesus. It is put within the sinner’s reach at a great cost. It could never be offered to him—it could never be manifested, or indeed have any real existence—but for the propitiatory virtue of the blood of Christ. Christ a propitiation is the inmost soul of the Gospel for sinful men. If God had not set Him forth in this character, not only must we



21. Νυνὶ δὲ χωρὶς νόμου δικαιοσύνη Θεοῦ πεφανέρωται, μαρτυρου-  
 μένη ὑπὸ τοῦ νόμου καὶ τῶν <sup>1</sup>προφητῶν · 22. δικαιοσύνη δὲ Θεοῦ διὰ <sup>i</sup>Matt.v. 17;  
 πίστεως Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, εἰς πάντας καὶ ἐπὶ πάντας<sup>1</sup> τοὺς πιστεύοντας · <sup>k</sup>Ch. x. 12;  
 οὐ γὰρ ἐστὶ <sup>k</sup>διαστολή. 23. πάντες γὰρ ἡμαρτον, καὶ ὑστεροῦνται <sup>1</sup>Cor.xiv.  
 7.

<sup>1</sup> καὶ ἐπὶ πάντας; so  $\aleph^3$ DFGKL, but om.  $\aleph^1$ ABC. The words are omitted by Lachm., Tischdf., Tregelles, W. and H., but retained by Weiss, who explains the omission by homœoteleuton. As ἐπὶ πάντας alone is found in very good MSS. of the vulg. and in John of Damascus, the received text may be a combination of this and the true reading.

despair for ever of attaining to a Divine righteousness; all our attempts to read the story of the world in any consistency with the character of God must be baffled. Past sins God seemed simply to ignore: He treated them apparently as if they were not. But the Cross is "the Divine theodicy for the past history of the world" (Tholuck); we see in it how seriously God deals with the sins which for the time He seemed to pass by. It is a demonstration of His righteousness—that is, in the widest sense, of His consistency with His own character,—which would have been violated by indifference to sin. And that demonstration is, by God's grace, given in such a way that it is possible for Him to be (as He intends to be) at once just Himself, and the justifier of those who believe in Jesus. The propitiatory death of Jesus, in other words, is at once the vindication of God and the salvation of man. That is why it is central and fundamental in the Apostolic Gospel. It meets the requirements, at the same time, of the righteousness of God and of the sin of man.

Ver. 21. νυνὶ δὲ: but now. All time is divided for Paul into "now" and "then". Cf. Eph. ii. 12 f., τῷ καιρῷ ἐκέλευσεν . . . νυνὶ δὲ; 2 Cor. v. 16, ἀπὸ τοῦ νῦν: the reception of the Gospel means the coming of a new world. χωρὶς νόμου: legal obedience contributes nothing to evangelic righteousness. It is plain that in this expression νόμος does not signify the O.T. revelation or religion as such, but that religion, or any other, conceived as embodied in statutes. It is statutory obedience which (as Paul has learned by experience) cannot justify. Hence νόμος has not exactly the same sense here as in the next clause, ὑπὸ τοῦ νόμου κ. τῶν προφητῶν, where the whole expression is equal to the O.T., and the meaning is that the Gospel is not alien to the religion of Israel, but really finds attestation there. This is worth remarking, because there is a similar variation

in the meaning of δικαιοσύνη between vv. 21 and 25, and in that of ἡ δόξα τοῦ Θεοῦ between iii. 23 and v. 2. To deny that words which mean so much, and are applied so variously, can convey different shades of meaning, even within the narrow limits of a few verses, is to deny that language shares in the life and subtlety of the mind. πεφανέρωται: once for all the righteousness of God has been revealed in the Gospel. Cf. xvi. 26, Col. i. 26, 2 Tim. i. 10, 1 Peter i. 20, Heb. ix. 8, 26.

Ver. 22. δικαιοσύνη δὲ Θεοῦ. The δὲ is explicative: "a righteousness of God (see on chap. i. 17) [ver. 21], and that a righteousness of God through faith in Jesus Christ". In the Epistle to the Hebrews Jesus Christ is undoubtedly set forth as a pattern of faith: ἀφορῶντες εἰς τὸν τῆς πίστεως ἀρχηγὸν καὶ τελειωτὴν Ἰησοῦν, Heb. xii. 2. Cf. Heb. ii. 13; but such a thought is irrelevant here. It is the constant teaching of Paul that we are justified (not by sharing Jesus' faith in God, as some interpreters would take it here, but) by believing in that manifestation and offer of God's righteousness which are made in the propitiatory death of Jesus. εἰς πάντας καὶ ἐπὶ πάντας: the last three words are omitted by  $\aleph^1$ ABC and most edd. If genuine, they add no new idea to εἰς πάντας; see Winer, p. 521. For διαστολή, cf. x. 12. The righteousness of God comes to all on the terms of faith, for all alike need it, and can receive it only so.

Ver. 23. ἡμαρτον must be rendered in English "have sinned"; see Burton, *Moods and Tenses*, § 54. ὑστεροῦνται expresses the consequence—and so come short of the glory of God. To emphasise the middle, and render "they come short, and feel that they do so," though suggested by the comparison of Mt. xix. 20 with Lk. xv. 14 (Gifford), is not borne out by the use of the N.T. as a whole. The most one could say is that *sibi* is latent in

1 Matt. x. 8; τῆς δόξης τοῦ Θεοῦ, 24. δικαιοῦμενοι <sup>1</sup> δωρεὰν τῆ αὐτοῦ χάριτι, διὰ  
2 Cor. xi. 7; Rev. τῆς ἀπολυτρώσεως τῆς ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ, 25. ὃν προέθετο ὁ Θεὸς  
xxi. 6, xxii. 17.

the middle: to their loss (not necessarily to their sensible or conscious loss) they come short. The present tense implies that but for sin men might be in enjoyment of "ἡ δόξα τοῦ θεοῦ". Clearly this cannot be the same as the future heavenly glory of God spoken of in v. 2: as in John v. 44, xii. 43, it must be the approbation or praise of God. This sense of δόξα is easily derived from that of "reputation," resting on the praise or approval of others. Of course the approbation which God would give to the sinless, and of which sinners fall short, would be identical with justification.

Ver. 24. δικαιοῦμενοι: grammatically, the word is intractable. If we force a connection with what immediately precedes, we may say with Lipsius that just as Paul has proved the universality of grace through the universality of sin, so here, conversely, he proves the universal absence of merit in men by showing that they are justified freely by God's grace. Westcott and Hort's punctuation (comma after τοῦ θεοῦ) favours this connection, but it is forced and fanciful. In sense δικαιοῦμενοι refers to πάντας τοὺς πιστεύοντας, and the use of the nominative to resume the main idea after an interruption like that of ver. 23 is rather characteristic than otherwise of the Apostle. δωρεὰν is used in a similar connection in Gal. ii. 21. It signifies "for nothing". Justification, we are told here, costs the sinner nothing; in Galatians we are told that if it comes through law, then Christ died "for nothing". Christ is all in it (1 Cor. i. 30): hence its absolute freeness. τῆ αὐτοῦ χάριτι repeats the same thing: as δωρεὰν signifies that we contribute nothing, τῆ αὐτοῦ χάριτι signifies that the whole charge is freely supplied by God. αὐτοῦ in this position has a certain emphasis. διὰ τῆς ἀπολυτρώσεως τῆς ἐν Χ. ἰ. The justification of the sinful, or the coming to them of that righteousness of God which is manifested in the Gospel, takes effect through the redemption that is in Christ Jesus. Perhaps "liberation" would be a fairer word than "redemption" to translate ἀπολύτρωσις. In Eph. i. 7, Col. i. 14, Heb. ix. 15, it is equal to forgiveness. Ἀπολύτρωσις itself is rare; in the LXX there is but one instance, Dan. iv. 29, in which ὁ χρόνος μου τῆς ἀπολυτρώσεως signifies

the time of Nebuchadnezzar's recovery from his madness. There is here no suggestion of price or cost. Neither is there in the common use of the verb λυτροῦσθαι, which in LXX represents לְחַטָּא and לְקַדְּשׁ, the words employed to describe God's liberation of Israel from Egypt (Is. xliii. 3 does not count). On the other hand, the classical examples favour the idea that a reference to the cost of liberation is involved in the word. Thus Jos., *Ant.*, xii. 2, 3: πλείονον δὲ ἢ τετρακοσίων ταλάντων τὰ τῆς ἀπολυτρώσεως γενήσεσθαι φημένον κ.τ.λ.; and Philo, *Quod omnis probus liber*, § 17 (of a Spartan boy taken prisoner in war) ἀπογνοὺς ἀπολύτρωσιν ἄσμενος ἑαυτὸν διεχρήσατο, where it is at least most natural to translate "having given up hope of being held to ransom". In the N.T., too, the cost of man's liberation is often emphasised: 1 Cor. vi. 20, vii. 23, 1 Pet. i. 18 f., and that especially where the cognate words λύτρον and ἀντίλυτρον are employed: Mc. x. 45, 1 Tim. ii. 6. The idea of liberation as the end in view may often have prevailed over that of the particular means employed, but that some means—and especially some cost, toil or sacrifice—were involved, was always understood. It is implied in the use of the word here that justification is a liberation; the man who receives the righteousness of God is set free by it from some condition of bondage or peril. From what? The answer is to be sought in the connection of i. 17 and i. 18: he is set free from a condition in which he was exposed to the wrath of God revealed from heaven against sin. In Eph. i. 7, Col. i. 14, ἀπολύτρωσις is plainly defined as remission of sins: in Eph. i. 14, Rom. viii. 23, 1 Cor. i. 30, it is eschatological.

Ver. 25 f. But the question whether the word ἀπολύτρωσις involves of itself a reference to the cost at which the thing is accomplished is after all of minor consequence: that cost is brought out unambiguously in ver. 25. The ἀπολύτρωσις is in Christ Jesus, and it is in Him as One whom God set forth in propitiatory power, through faith (*or*, reading διὰ τῆς πίστεως, through the faith referred to), in His blood. προέθετο in Eph. i. 9 (*cf.* Rom. i. 13) is "purposed"; but here the other meaning, "set forth" (*Vulg. proposuit*) suits the context much

ἰλαστήριον διὰ τῆς πίστεως<sup>1</sup> ἐν τῷ αὐτοῦ αἵματι, εἰς ἔνδειξιν τῆς μαζ Cor.viii. δικαιοσύνης αὐτοῦ, διὰ τὴν πάρεσιν τῶν προγεγονότων ἁμαρτημάτων<sup>24</sup>; Phil. i. 28.

<sup>1</sup> δια τῆς πίστεως; so BC<sup>3</sup>D<sup>8</sup>KL 17, but om. τῆς H<sup>3</sup>C<sup>1</sup>D<sup>1</sup>F, Origen. Most critical edd. omit, but W. and H. give it a place in marg. Weiss puts it in text, and emphasises it with ref. to ver. 22.

better. ἰλαστήριον has been taken in various ways. (1) In the LXX it is the rendering of רַחֲמֵי, (A.V.) "mercy-seat". In one passage at least, Ex.

xxv. 16, רַחֲמֵי is rendered ἰλαστήριον ἐπίθεμα, which is possibly a combination of two translations—a literal one, a "lid" or "covering"; and a figurative or spiritual one, "a propitiatory". Many scholars argue that Paul's use must follow that of the LXX, familiarity with which on the part of his readers is everywhere assumed. But the necessity is not quite apparent; and not to mention the incongruities which are introduced if Jesus is conceived as the mercy-seat upon which the sacrificial blood—His own blood—is sprinkled, there are grammatical reasons against this rendering. Paul must have written, to be clear, τὸ ἰλαστήριον ἡμῶν, or some equivalent phrase. Cf. 1 Cor. v. 8 (Christ *our* passover). A "mercy-seat" is not such a self-evident, self-interpreting idea, that the Apostle could lay it at the heart of his gospel without a word of explanation. Consequently (2) many take ἰλαστήριον as an adjective. Of those who so take it, some supply θῦμα or ἱερίον, making the idea of sacrifice explicit. But it is simpler, and there is no valid objection, to make it masculine, in agreement with δν: "whom God set forth in propitiatory power". This use of the word is sufficiently guaranteed by Jos., *Ant.*, xvi. 7, 1: περιφόβος δ' αὐτὸς ἐξήκει καὶ τοῦ θεοῦ ἰλαστήριον μνήμα . . . κατεσκευάσατο. The passage in 4 Macc. xvii. 22 (καὶ διὰ τοῦ αἵματος τῶν εὐσεβῶν ἐκέλευεν καὶ τοῦ ἰλαστηρίου [τοῦ] θανάτου αὐτῶν ἢ θεία πρόνοια τὸν

Ἰσραὴλ προκακῶθέντα διέσωσεν) is indécisive, owing to the doubtful reading.\* Perhaps the grammatical question is insoluble; but there is no question that Christ is conceived as endued with propitiatory power, in virtue of His death. He is set forth as ἰλαστήριος(ν) ἐν τῷ αὐτοῦ αἵματι. It is His blood that covers sin. It seems a mere whim of rigour to deny, as Weiss does, that the death of Christ is here conceived as sacrificial. It is in His blood that Christ is endued with propitiatory power; and there is no propitiatory power of blood known to Scripture unless the blood be that of sacrifice. It is not necessary to assume that any particular sacrifice—say the sin offering—is in view; neither is it necessary, in order to find the idea of sacrifice here, to make ἰλαστήριον neuter, and supply θῦμα; it is enough to say that for the Apostle the ideas of blood with propitiatory virtue, and sacrificial blood, must have been the same. The precise connection and purpose of διὰ (τῆς) πίστεως is not at once clear. Grammatically, it might be construed with ἐν τῷ αὐτοῦ αἵματι; cf. Eph. i. 15, Gal. iii. 26 (?), Mk. i. 15; but this lessens the emphasis due to the last words. It seems to be inserted, almost parenthetically, to resume and continue the idea of ver. 22, that the righteousness of God which comes in this way,—namely, in Christ, whom God has set forth in propitiatory power in virtue of His death—comes only to those who believe. Men are saved freely, and it is all God's work, not in the very least their own; yet that work does not avail for any one who does not by faith accept it. What God has given to the world in Christ, infinitely great and absolutely free as it is, is literally nothing unless it is

\* Seeberg, *Der Tod Christi*, S. 185, adduces it with the reading τοῦ θανάτου, to support the view that in ἰλαστήριον (as a substantive) Paul is thinking not of the concrete *Kapporeth*, but only of that on account of which this sacred article received its name; in other words, of a covering by which that is hidden from God's eyes on account of which He would be obliged to be angry with men. It is possible to take ἰλαστήριον as a substantive = a means of propitiation (as this passage from 4 Macc. shows, if we read τοῦ θανάτου), without special allusion to the רַחֲמֵי. But see Deissmann, *Bibelstudien*, S. 121 ff.

ἐν τῇ ἀνοχῇ τοῦ Θεοῦ, 26. πρὸς ἔνδειξιν τῆς δικαιοσύνης αὐτοῦ ἐν  
n Ch.viii.18,  
xi. 5. τῷ νῦν <sup>n</sup> καιρῷ, εἰς τὸ εἶναι αὐτὸν δίκαιον καὶ δικαιοῦντα τὸν ἐκ πίστεως

taken. Faith must have its place, therefore, in the profoundest statement of the Gospel, as the correlative of grace. Thus διὰ (τῆς) πίστεως, though parenthetical, is of the last importance. With εἰς ἔνδειξιν τῆς δικαιοσύνης αὐτοῦ κ.τ.λ. we are shown God's purpose in setting forth Christ as a propitiation in His blood. It is done with a view to demonstrate His righteousness, owing to the passing by of the sins previously committed in the forbearance of God. God's righteousness in this place is obviously an attribute of God, on which the sin of the world, as hitherto treated by Him, has cast a shadow. Up till now, God has "passed by" sin. He has "winked at" (Acts xvii. 30) the transgressions of men perpetrated before Christ came (προ-γεγονότων), ἐν τῇ ἀνοχῇ αὐτοῦ. The last words may be either temporal or causal: while God exercised forbearance, or because He exercised it, men sinned, so to speak, with impunity, and God's character was compromised. The underlying thought is the same as in Ps. l. 21: "These things hast Thou done, and I kept silence: *Thou thoughtest that I was altogether such an one as Thyself*". Such had been the course of Providence that God, owing to His forbearance in suspending serious dealing with sin, lay under the imputation of being indifferent to it. But the time had now come to remove this imputation, and vindicate the Divine character. If it was possible once, it was no longer possible now, with Christ set forth in His blood as a propitiation, to maintain that sin was a thing which God regarded with indifference. Paul does not say in so many words what it is in Christ crucified which constitutes Him a propitiation, and so clears God's character of the charge that He does not care for sin: He lays stress, however, on the fact that an essential element in a propitiation is that it should vindicate the Divine righteousness. It should proclaim with unmistakable clearness that with sin God can hold no terms. (The distinction between πάρεσις, the suspension, and ἀφεσις, the revocation, of punishment, is borne out, according to Lightfoot, *Notes on Ep. of St. Paul*, p. 273, by classical usage, and is essential here.) In ver. 26 this idea is restated, and the significance of a propitiation more fully brought out. "Yes, God set Him forth in this charac-

ter with a view to demonstrate His righteousness, that He might be righteous Himself, and accept as righteous him who believes in Jesus." The words ἐν τῷ νῦν καιρῷ refer to the Gospel Age, the time in which believers live, in contrast to the time when God exercised forbearance, and men were tempted to accuse Him of indifference to righteousness. πρὸς, as distinguished from εἰς, makes us think rather of the person contemplating the end than of the end contemplated; but there is no essential difference. τῇν ἔνδειξιν: the article means "the ἔνδειξις already mentioned in ver. 25". But the last clause, εἰς τὸ εἶναι αὐτὸν κ.τ.λ., is the most important. It makes explicit the whole intention of God in dealing with sin by means of a propitiation. God's righteousness, compromised as it seemed by His forbearance, might have been vindicated in another way; if He had executed judgment upon sin, it would have been a kind of vindication. He would have secured the first object of ver. 26: "that He might be righteous Himself". But part of God's object was to justify the ungodly (chap. iv. 5), upon certain conditions; and *this* could not be attained by the execution of judgment upon sin. To combine both objects, and at once vindicate His own righteousness, and put righteousness within reach of the sinful, it was necessary that instead of executing judgment God should provide a propitiation. This He did when He set forth Jesus in His blood for the acceptance of faith. (Häring takes the ἔνδειξις of God's righteousness here to be the same as the "revelation" of δικαιοσύνη θεοῦ in i. 17, or the "manifestation" of it in iii. 21; but this is only possible if with him we completely ignore the context, and especially the decisive words, διὰ τῇν πάρεσιν τῶν προγεγονότων ἁμαρτημάτων.) The question has been raised whether the righteousness of God, here spoken of as demonstrated at the Cross, is His judicial (Weiss) or His penal righteousness (Meyer). This seems to me an unreal question; the righteousness of God is the whole character of God so far as it must be conceived as inconsistent with any indifference about sin. It is a more serious question if we ask what it is in Christ set forth by God in His blood which at once vindicates

Ἰησοῦ. 27. Ποῦ οὖν ἡ καύχησις; ἐξεκλείσθη. διὰ<sup>ο</sup> ποίου νόμου; ο Acts iv. 7. τῶν ἔργων; οὐχὶ, ἀλλὰ διὰ νόμου πίστεως. 28. λογιζόμεθα οὖν<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> οὖν; so BCD<sup>3</sup>KL 17, but γαρ  $\aleph$ AD<sup>1</sup>F, Origen-interp. The division of authorities here is like that in ver. 25, and the edd. decide in the same way. W. and H. put γαρ in text, οὖν in marg. Weiss puts οὖν in text. πιστεῖ δικαιοῦσθαι  $\aleph$ <sup>3</sup>KL 17, but δικαιουσθαι πιστεῖ  $\aleph$ <sup>1</sup>ABCD.

God's character and makes it possible for Him to justify those who believe. The passage itself contains nothing explicit—except in the words ἐν τῷ αὐτοῦ αἵματι. It is pedantic and inept to argue that since God could have demonstrated His righteousness *either* by punishment *or* by propitiation, therefore punishment and propitiation have no relation to each other. Christ was a propitiation *in virtue of His death*; and however a modern mind may construe it, *death to Paul was the doom of sin*. To say that God set forth Christ as a propitiation *in His blood* is the same thing as to say that God made Him to be sin for us. God's righteousness, therefore, is demonstrated at the Cross, because there, in Christ's death, it is made once for all apparent that He does not palter with sin; the doom of sin falls by His appointment on the Redeemer. And it is possible, at the same time, to accept as righteous those who by faith unite themselves to Christ upon the Cross, and identify themselves with Him in His death: for in doing so they submit in Him to the Divine sentence upon sin, and at bottom become right with God. It is misleading to render εἰς τὸ εἶναι αὐτὸν δίκαιον κ. δικαιούντα, "that He might be just and yet the justifier," etc.: the Apostle only means that the two ends have equally to be secured, not that there is necessarily an antagonism between them. But it is more than misleading to render "that He might be just and therefore the justifier": there is no conception of righteousness, capable of being clearly carried out, and connected with the Cross, which makes such language intelligible. (See Dorner, *System of Christian Doctrine*, iv., 14, English Translation.) It is the love of God, according to the consistent teaching of the New Testament, which provides the propitiation, by which God's righteousness is vindicated and the justification of the ungodly made possible. τὸν ἐκ πίστεως Ἰησοῦ is every one who is properly and sufficiently characterised as a believer in Jesus. There is no

difficulty whatever in regarding Ἰησοῦ as objective genitive, as the use of πιστεύειν throughout the N.T. (Gal. ii. 16, e.g.) requires us to do: such expressions as τῷ ἐκ πίστεως Ἀβραάμ (iv. 16) are not in the least a reason to the contrary: they only illustrate the flexibility of the Greek language. See on ver. 22 above.

Vers. 27-31. In these verses the positive exposition of the righteousness of God as offered to faith through the redemption in Christ Jesus, is concluded. The Apostle points out two inferences which can be drawn from it, and which go to commend it to religious minds. The first is, that it excludes boasting. A religious constitution under which men could make claims, or assume anything, in the presence of God, must necessarily be false; it is at least one mark of truth in the Christian doctrine of justification that by it such presumption is made impossible. The second is, that in its universality and its sameness for all men, it is consistent with (as indeed it flows from) the unity of God. There can be no step-children in the family of God: a system which teaches that there are, like that current among the Jews, must be wrong; a system like the Christian, which excludes such an idea, is at least so far right. In ver. 31 an objection is raised. The whole system just expounded may be said to make Law void—to stultify and disannul all that has ever been regarded as in possession of Divine moral authority in the world. In reality, the Apostle answers in a word, its effect is precisely the reverse: it establishes law.

Ver. 27. ποῦ οὖν; where, since this is the case, is boasting? ἐξεκλείσθη: for the use of the tense, cf. ἐβλήθη and ἐξηράνθη in John xv. 6; it is equivalent to, "is peremptorily, or once for all, shut out". διὰ ποίου νόμου; By what kind of law? In other words, How is the "law," the divinely appointed spiritual order, or constitution, which excludes boasting, to be characterised? Is it by "the works" which it prescribes, and which those who live under it per-

πίστει δικαιοῦσθαι ἄνθρωπον, χωρὶς ἔργων νόμου. 29. ἡ Ἰουδαίων  
 ὁ Θεὸς μόνον<sup>1</sup>; οὐχὶ δὲ καὶ ἔθνῶν; ναὶ, καὶ ἔθνῶν· 30. ἐπέπερ<sup>2</sup> εἰς  
 p<sup>1</sup> Tim. ii. ὁ ὁ Θεὸς, ὃς δικαιοῦσει περιτομὴν ἐκ πίστεως, καὶ ἀκροβυστίαν διὰ τῆς  
 4 ff. πίστεως. 31. νόμον οὖν καταργούμεν διὰ τῆς πίστεως; μὴ γένοιτο·  
 ἀλλὰ νόμον ἰσθῶμεν.<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup> μονον  $\Sigma$ ACFKL 17; μωνων B (W. and H. marg.). δε om.  $\Sigma$ ABCD<sup>2</sup>FK.

<sup>2</sup> For ἐπέπερ  $\Sigma$ <sup>1</sup>ABCD<sup>2</sup> read εἰπερ, and so most editors; but Weiss regards ἐπέπερ (which is not found elsewhere in the N.T.) as the true reading.

<sup>3</sup> For ἰσθῶμεν,  $\Sigma$ <sup>1</sup>ABCD<sup>2</sup>F, etc., read ἰστανόμεν.

form? No: its character is given when we call it a constitution or law of "faith". *Nómos* in these brief questions is evidently used in a wide sense to denote the religious order or system under which men live, regarded as established by God, and having His authority; the O.T. religion and the N.T. religion, unlike, and in some ways opposed, as they are, are alike *νόμος*—divine institutes.

Ver. 28. *λογιζόμεθα γάρ*: see critical note. In *λογιζόμεθα* there is no idea of an uncertain conclusion: it rather suggests the confident self-consciousness of the reasoner. *Ἐνθρῶπον* is not "any human being," as if beings of another sort could be justified otherwise: it is like the German "man" or "one". Cf. 1 Cor. iv. 1, vii. 1, xi. 28, Gal. ii. 16. The sharp distinction drawn between faith and works of law, as characterising two different religious systems, shows that faith must not itself be interpreted as a work of law. In principle it is a renunciation of all such confidence as legal obedience inspires.

Ver. 29 f. *ἡ Ἰουδαίων ὁ θεὸς μόνον*; The only way to evade the conclusion of ver. 28 would be to suppose—as is here presented by way of alternative—that God is a God of Jews only. But the supposition is impossible: there is only one God, and therefore He must be God of all, of Gentiles and Jews alike. This is assumed as an axiom by the Apostle. *εἴπερ* is the best attested reading, but the argument seems to require that it should "approximate to the sense of *ἐπέπερ*" (Simcox, *Language of the N.T.*, p. 171), which is a variant: "if, as is the fact".\* It is simplest to read ver. 30 as explaining and confirming what precedes: He is God of the Gentiles also, if as is the fact God is

one; and (consequently) He will justify the circumcision on the ground of faith and the uncircumcision by means of faith. *δικαιοῦσει* is probably logical, rather than temporal, whether the reference be made to the last judgment, or to each case, as it arises, in which God justifies. Lightfoot insists on drawing a distinction between *ἐκ πίστεως* and *διὰ τῆς πίστεως* in this passage. "The difference," he says, "will perhaps best be seen by substituting their opposites, *οὐ δικαιοῦσει περιτομὴν ἐκ νόμου, οὐδὲ ἀκροβυστίαν διὰ τοῦ νόμου*: when, in the case of the Jews, the falsity of their starting-point, in the case of the Gentiles, the needlessness of a new instrumentality, would be insisted on." (*Notes on Epistles of St. Paul*, p. 274.) But a comparison of ii. 26, v. 1, ix. 30, Gal. iii. 8 (Weiss), shows that Paul does not construe the prepositions so rigorously: and in point of fact, what he does insist upon here is that justification is to be conceived in precisely the same way for Jew and Gentile. The *ἐκ πίστεως* and *διὰ τῆς πίστεως* serve no purpose but to vary the expression.

Ver. 31. *νόμον οὖν καταργούμεν διὰ τῆς πίστεως*; Do we then annul "law" through the faith we have been discussing? Perhaps if Law were written with a capital letter, it would suggest the true meaning. The Apostle speaks as from the consciousness of a Jewish objector: is all that we have ever called Law—the whole Jewish religion—that divinely established order, and everything of the same nature—made void by faith? God forbid, he answers: on the contrary, Law is set upon a secure footing; for the first time it gets its rights. To prove this was one of the main tasks lying upon the Apostle of the New Covenant. One species of proof is given in chap iv.,

\* But *εἴπερ* = if God is indeed one (which no Jew, the supposed interlocutor, would deny).

IV. 1. ΤΙ οὖν ἐροῦμεν Ἀβραὰμ τὸν πατέρα ἡμῶν εὐρηκέναι κατὰ σάρκα<sup>1</sup>; 2. εἰ γὰρ Ἀβραὰμ ἐξ ἔργων ἐδικαιώθη, ἔχει καύχημα, ἀλλ' οὐ πρὸς τὸν Θεόν.<sup>2</sup> 3. τί γὰρ ἡ γραφή λέγει; “Ἐπίστευσε δὲ Ἀβραὰμ τῷ Θεῷ, καὶ ἐλογίσθη αὐτῷ εἰς δικαιοσύνην. 4. τῷ δὲ ἐργαζομένῳ ὁ μισθὸς οὐ λογίζεται κατὰ ἄχαριν, ἀλλὰ κατὰ τὸ ὄφει- a Ver. 16.

<sup>1</sup> The T.R. Ἀβρααμ τον πατερα ημων ευρηκεναι is found in KLP, Theodoret and later fathers. For πατερα, προπατορα is read in Ξ<sup>1</sup>ABC<sup>1</sup>, etc. ευρηκεναι stands before Ἀβρααμ in ΞACDFG lat. and Egypt. versions, etc. In B 47<sup>1</sup> ευρηκεναι is omitted. The omission (see commentary) gives the easiest and most suitable text. W. and H. omit it from their text but put it in marg. after ερωμεν. The R.V. omits it in marg., inserting it in text. Weiss retains it.

<sup>2</sup> προς τον θεον; om. τον ΞABCD<sup>1</sup>F.

where he shows that representative saints under the Old Dispensation, like Abraham, were justified by faith. That is the Divine order still, and it is securer than ever under the Gospel. Another kind of proof is given in chaps. vi.-viii., where the new life of the Christian is unfolded, and we are shown that “the just demands of the law” are fulfilled in believers, and in believers only. The claim which the Apostle makes here, and establishes in these two passages, is the same as that in our Lord’s words: I came not to destroy (the law or the prophets), but to fulfil.

CHAPTER IV.—Vers. 1-8. The justification of Abraham, considered in relation to the doctrine just expounded in iii. 21-31. The point to be made out is that the justification of Abraham does not traverse but illustrates the Pauline doctrine.

Ver. 1 The force of οὖν seems to be that the case of Abraham, as commonly understood, has at least the appearance of inconsistency with the Pauline doctrine. “What, then, *i.e.*, on the supposition that vers. 21-31 in chap. iii. are a true exposition of God’s method, shall we say of Abraham, our forefather according to the flesh? Does not his case present a difficulty? For if he was justified by works (as one may assume), he has ground for boasting (whereas boasting, according to the previous argument, iii. 27, is excluded).” This seems to me by far the simplest interpretation of the passage. The speaker is a Jewish Christian, or the Apostle putting himself in the place of one. κατὰ σάρκα goes with τὸν προπάτορα ἡμῶν, because the contrast with another kind of fatherhood belonging to Abraham is already in the Apostle’s thoughts: see ver. 11. If the reading

εὐρηκέναι be adopted (see critical note), no change is necessary in the interpretation. To take κατὰ σάρκα with εὐρηκέναι, as though the question were: What shall we say that our forefather Abraham found in the way of natural human effort, as opposed to the way of grace and faith? is to put a sense on κατὰ σάρκα which is both forced and irrelevant. The whole question is, What do you make of Abraham, with such a theory as that just described?

Ver. 2 f. With ἀλλ’ οὐ πρὸς τὸν θεόν the Apostle summarily repels the objection. “You say he has ground of boasting? On the contrary, he has no ground of boasting in relation to God, For what does the Scripture say? Abraham *believed* God, and it was imputed to Him for righteousness.” The quotation is from Gen. xv. 6, and is exactly as in the LXX, except that Paul writes ἐπίστευσεν δὲ τῷ θεῷ instead of καὶ ἐπίστευσεν τῷ θεῷ, which serves partly to bring out the contrast between the real mode of Abraham’s justification, and the mode suggested in ver. 2, partly to give prominence to *faith*, as that on which his argument turned. The reading ἐπίστευσεν δὲ is also found in Jas. i. 23, Philo i., 605 (Mangey), as well as Clem. Rom., I., x., 6, and Just. Martyr, *Dial.*, 92: so that it was probably current, and not introduced by Paul. It is assumed that something not in itself righteousness was reckoned to Abraham as righteousness; only on this assumption is boasting in his case excluded.

Ver. 4 f. The faith of Abraham, in whatever way it may be more precisely determined by relation to its object, agrees with Christian faith in the essential characteristic, that it is not a work. To him who works—der mit Werken umgeht: Luther—the reward

b Ver. 24; λημμα · 5. τῷ δὲ μὴ ἐργαζομένῳ, πιστεύοντι δὲ <sup>b</sup> ἐπὶ τὸν δικαιοῦντα  
 Acts ix. τὸν ἀσεβῆ, <sup>1</sup> λογίζεται ἡ πίστις αὐτοῦ εἰς ° δικαιοσύνην. 6. καθάπερ  
 c Ch. ii. 26, καὶ Δαβὶδ λέγει τὸν μακαρισμὸν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου, <sup>φ</sup> ὁ Θεὸς λογίζεται  
 ix. 8. δικαιοσύνην, χωρὶς ἔργων, 7. “Μακάριοι ὧν ἀφέθησαν αἱ ἀνομίαι,  
 καὶ ὧν ἐπεκαλύφθησαν αἱ ἁμαρτίαι. 8. μακάριος ἀνὴρ <sup>φ</sup><sup>2</sup> οὐ μὴ

<sup>1</sup> ἀσεβῆ; for this  $\Sigma^D{}^1FG$  have the form ἀσεβην, on which see Winer, p. 76.

<sup>2</sup> For  $\Psi^3ACD^2FKL$  ου is found in  $\Sigma^1BD^1G$  (so LXX in  $\Sigma^1AB$ ). W. and H. put ου in text, φ in marg. ου is the better supported reading, but φ “naturally established itself as the more euphonious” (S. and H.).

is reckoned, not by way of grace (as in Abraham's case), but by way of debt. But to him who does *not* work, *i.e.*, who does not make works his ground of hope toward God—but believes on Him who justifies the ungodly, his *faith* is reckoned for righteousness. Ver. 5 describes the category under which Abraham falls, but is not a generalisation from his case. The ἀσεβῆς (Gen. xviii. 23, Prov. xi. 31, chap. v. 6) is a person who has no *claim* to justification: if he is justified, it must be not on the ground of works, but freely, by God's grace, on which he relies through faith. Of course to believe in this grace of God is to do something; in that sense it is a work; but it is to do something which involves a complete renunciation of hope in anything we can do without God. It excludes merit, boasting, justification ἐξ ἔργων. Cf. Philo, i., 486 (quoted in Mayor on Jas. i. 21): δικαιοῦν γὰρ οὕτως οὐδὲν ὡς ἀκράτῳ καὶ ἀμυγῆ τῇ πρὸς θεὸν μόνον πιστεῖ κεχρησθαι . . . τὸ ἐπὶ μόνῳ τῷ ὄντι βεβαίως καὶ ἀκλινῶς ὀρμεῖν . . . δικαιοσύνης μόνον ἔργον. The whole Pauline gospel could be summed up in this one word—God who justifies the ungodly. Under that device, what room is there for any pretensions or claims of man? It is sometimes argued (on the ground that all God's actions must be “ethical”) that God can only pronounce just, or treat as just, those who actually are just; but if this were so, what Gospel would there be for sinful men? This “ethical” gospel is identical with the Pharisaism in which Paul lived before he knew what Christ and faith were, and it led him to despair. It leads all men either to despair or to a temper which is that of the Pharisee rather than the publican of Luke xviii. What it can never beget is the temper of the Gospel. The paradoxical phrase, Him that justifieth the ungodly, does not suggest that justification is a fiction, whether legal or

of any other sort, but that it is a miracle. It is a thing that only God can achieve, and that calls into act and manifestation all the resources of the Divine nature. It is achieved through an unparalleled revelation of the judgment and the mercy of God. The miracle of the Gospel is that God comes to the ungodly, with a mercy which is righteous altogether, and enables them through faith, in spite of what they are, to enter into a new relation to Himself, in which goodness becomes possible for them. There can be no spiritual life at all for a sinful man unless he can get an *initial assurance* of an unchanging love of God deeper than sin, and he gets this at the Cross. He gets it by believing in Jesus, and it is justification by faith. The whole secret of New Testament Christianity, and of every revival of religion and reformation of the Church is in that *laetum et ingens paradoxon*, θεὸς ὁ δικαίων τὸν ἀσεβῆ.

Ver. 6 ff. καθάπερ καὶ Δαβὶδ: David is not a new illustration of this doctrine, but a new witness to it. The argument just based on Gen. xv. 6 is in agreement with what he says in the 32nd Psalm. The quotation exactly reproduces the LXX. λέγει τὸν μακαρισμὸν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου: “pronounceth blessing upon the man,” etc. (R.V.): or, speaks the felicitation of the man. He does so in the exclamation with which the Psalm opens. Obviously to impute righteousness without works, and freely to forgive sins, are to Paul one and the same thing. Yet the former is not a merely negative idea: there is in it an actual bestowment of grace, an actual acceptance with God, as unlike as possible to the establishment of an unprejudiced neutrality between God and man, to which the forgiveness of sins is sometimes reduced.

Vers. 9-12. In these verses the justification of Abraham appears in a new light. In virtue of its ground in his faith, he is not only a forefather *κατὰ*



λογίσθαι Κύριος ἁμαρτίαν.” 9. Ὁ ἁ μακαρισμὸς οὖν οὗτος, ἐπὶ τὴν d Gal. iv. 15. περιτομὴν, ἢ καὶ ἐπὶ τὴν ἀκροβυστίαν; λέγομεν γὰρ ὅτι ἐλογίσθη τῷ Ἀβραὰμ ἡ πίστις εἰς δικαιοσύνην. 10. πῶς οὖν ἐλογίσθη; ἐν περιτομῇ ὄντι, ἢ ἐν ἀκροβυστίᾳ; οὐκ ἐν περιτομῇ, ἀλλ’ ἐν ἀκροβυστίᾳ. 11. καὶ σημειῶν ἔλαβε περιτομῆς,<sup>1</sup> ὁ σφραγίδα τῆς δικαιοσύνης e 2 Cor. i. 22; τῆς πίστεως τῆς ἐν τῇ ἀκροβυστίᾳ· εἰς τὸ εἶναι αὐτὸν πατέρα πάντων Eph. i. 13; τῶν πιστευόντων ἰ δι’ ἀκροβυστίας, εἰς τὸ λογισθῆναι καὶ αὐτοῖς τὴν f Ch. ii. 27.

<sup>1</sup> περιτομῆς NBC<sup>2</sup>DFKL, etc.; περιτομῆν AC<sup>1</sup>, etc.

σάρκα (*i.e.*, the natural ancestor of the Jews), but he is the spiritual ancestor of all believers. The faith which was imputed to him for righteousness constitutes him such; it is the same in essence as Christian faith; and so it is a vital bond between him and all who believe, whether they be Jews or Gentiles. God’s method has been the same through all history.

Ver. 9. ὁ μακαρισμὸς οὖν οὗτος: This felicitation, then, what is its extent? Does it apply to the circumcision only, or to the uncircumcision also? Just as vers. 1-8 correspond to iii. 27 f., so do vers. 9-12 correspond to iii. 29-31. God is not the God of the Jews only, but of the Gentiles also, and the Apostle’s purpose here is to show that the felicitation of the justified in Ps. xxxii. is not limited by circumcision. λέγομεν γὰρ κ.τ.λ.: for our proposition is, that his faith was reckoned, etc.

Ver. 10. πῶς οὖν ἐλογίσθη; To say that his faith was reckoned as righteousness, without mentioning circumcision, suggests that the latter was at least not indispensable; still it is not decisive, and so the further question must be asked, How—*i.e.*, under what conditions—was his faith thus reckoned to him? Was it when he was circumcised or when he was uncircumcised? History enables Paul to answer, Not when he was circumcised, but when he was uncircumcised. Abraham’s justification is narrated in Gen. xv., his circumcision not till Gen. xvii., some fourteen years later: hence it was not his circumcision on which he depended for acceptance with God.

Ver. 11 f. On the contrary, he received a sign in circumcision, a seal of the righteousness of the faith which he had while uncircumcised. Both sign (σημεῖον) and seal (σφραγίς) are frequently used by Rabbinical writers to

describe circumcision as a symbol or pledge that one is in covenant with God. So even of heathens: “Og was circumcised, and Moses feared מפני אורח שלך בריית שלך”, *propter signum foederis ejus*”. But usually of Jews: “Jonah shewed Leviathan sigillum (חותמו) Abrahami patris nostri”. See Schoettgen, Wetstein, or Delitzsch, *ad loc.* περιτομῆς (for which W. and H. have in margin περιτομῆν) must be a genitive of apposition. With εἰς τὸ εἶναι the Divine purpose in this relation of circumcision to justification in the case of Abraham is explained. Things were ordered as has been described that he might be father of all that believe while uncircumcised (as he himself did)—that the righteousness in question might be imputed to them; and father of circumcision (*i.e.*, of persons circumcised) in the case of those who are not only circumcised, but also walk in the steps of the faith which he had while not circumcised. It was God’s intention that Abraham should be the representative and typical believer, in whom all believers without distinction should recognise their spiritual father; the Divine method of justification was to be inaugurated and illustrated in him, as it should hold good for all who were to be justified: accordingly the whole process took place antecedent to his circumcision, and in no circumstances has circumcision any essential relation to this great blessing. For its true meaning and advantage see on ii. 25. On οὐκ ἐκ περιτομῆς μόνον, see Simcox, *Language of the N.T.*, 184. The grammar in ver. 12 is faulty, and Westcott and Hort suspect a primitive error. Either τοῖς before στοιχοῦσιν must be omitted, or it must be changed, as Hort suggests, into αὐτοῖς, if we are to express the meaning correctly. The sense required by the context is not open to doubt. For

δικαιοσύνην· 12. καὶ πατέρα περιτομῆς τοῖς οὐκ ἐκ περιτομῆς μόνοι, ἀλλὰ καὶ τοῖς στοιχοῦσι<sup>1</sup> τοῖς ἴχνεσι τῆς ἐν τῇ ἀκροβυστίᾳ πίστεως  
 ὁ Ch. ix. 4; Gal. iii. 17 ἢ ; Eph. ii. 12; iii. 6; τοῦ πατρὸς ἡμῶν Ἀβραάμ. 13. Οὐ γὰρ διὰ νόμου ἡ ἑπαγγελία τῷ Ἀβραάμ ἢ τῷ σπέρματι αὐτοῦ, τὸ κληρονόμον αὐτὸν εἶναι τοῦ<sup>2</sup> κόσμου, ἀλλὰ διὰ δικαιοσύνης πίστεως. 14. εἰ γὰρ οἱ ἐκ νόμου κληρονόμοι, κεκένωται ἡ πίστις, καὶ κατήργηται ἡ ἑπαγγελία· 15. ὁ γὰρ νόμος

<sup>1</sup> τοῖς στοιχοῦσιν is found in all MSS. but cannot be right; see note in commentary below. Om. τῇ before ἀκροβυστία ΞABCD<sup>1</sup>F.

<sup>2</sup> Om. του before κόσμου ΞABCD, etc.

δι' ἀκροβυστίας cf. ii. 27. For the dative τοῖς ἴχνεσιν see Philipp. iii. 16, Gal. v. 16, 25. But cf. also Winer, p. 274.

Vers. 13-15. The argument of vers. 9-12 is reiterated and confirmed here in other terms. Abraham is the father of all believers: for it is not through law that the promise is given to him or his seed, that he should be heir of the world—a condition which would limit the inheritance to the Jews, but through the righteousness of faith—a condition which extends it to all who believe. We might have expected a quasi-historical proof of this proposition, similar to the proof given in 10 f. that Abraham's justification did not depend on circumcision. But the Apostle takes another and more speculative line. Instead of arguing from the O.T. narrative, as he does in Gal. iii. 14-17, that the promise was given to a justified man before the (Mosaic) law was heard of, and therefore must be fulfilled to all independently of law, he argues that law and promise are mutually exclusive ideas. For (ver. 14) if those who are of law, *i.e.*, Jews only, as partisans of law, are heirs, then faith (the correlative of promise) has been made vain, and the promise of no effect. And this incompatibility of law and promise in idea is supported by the actual effect of the law in human experience. For the law works wrath—the very opposite of promise. But where there is not law, there is not even transgression, still less the wrath which transgression provokes. Here, then, the other series of conceptions finds its sphere: the world is ruled by grace, promise and faith. This is the world in which Abraham lived, and in which all believers live; and as its typical citizen, he is father of them all.

Ver. 13. ἡ ἑπαγγελία is the Divine promise, which is identical with salvation in the widest sense. The word implies that the promise is held out by God

of his own motion. The peculiar content here assigned to the promise, that Abraham should be heir of the world, is not found in so many words in the O.T. Schoettgen, on ver. 3, quotes *Mechilta*, fol. 25, 2. "Sic quoque de Abrahamo legimus, quod mundum hunc et mundum futurum non nisi ea de causa consecutus sit, quia in Deum credidit, *q.d.*, Gen. xv. 6. And Wetstein, *Tan-chuma*, 165, 1: Abrahamo patri meo Deus possidendum dedit cælum et terram. These passages prove that the idea was not unfamiliar, and it may be regarded as an extension of the promises contained in Gen. xii. 7, xvii. 8, xxii. 17. But what precisely did it mean? Possibly participation in the sovereignty of the Messiah. Abraham and his seed would then be heirs of the world in the sense of 1 Cor. vi. 2, 2 Tim. ii. 12. So Meyer and many others. In the connection in which the words stand, however, this seems strained; and the "rationalising" interpretation, which makes the world Abraham's inheritance through the spread of Abraham's faith, and the multiplication of his spiritual children, is probably to be preferred. The religion which is conquering the world is descended from him, its power lies in that faith which he also had, and in proportion as it spreads he inherits the world. τῷ σπέρματι αὐτοῦ: not Christ, as in Gal. iii. 16, but Abraham's descendants in the widest sense. διὰ δικαιοσύνης πίστεως: it was not as one under law, but as one justified by faith, that Abraham had the promise given to him. In the narrative, indeed, the promise (Gen. xii. 7) antedates the justification (Gen. xv. 6), but it is repeated at later periods (see above): and as ver. 14 argues, promise, faith and justification are parts of one spiritual whole.

Ver. 14. κεκένωται cf. 1 Cor. i. 17, ix. 15, 2 Cor. ix. 3. κατήργηται: a

ὄργην κατεργάζεται· οὐ γὰρ<sup>1</sup> οὐκ ἔστι νόμος, οὐδὲ παράβασις. 16.  
 διὰ τοῦτο ἐκ πίστεως, ἵνα κατὰ<sup>h</sup> χάριν, εἰς τὸ εἶναι βεβαίαν τὴν ἔπαγ-<sup>h</sup> Ver. 4.  
 γελίαν παντὶ τῷ σπέρματι, οὐ τῷ ἐκ τοῦ νόμου μόνον, ἀλλὰ καὶ  
 τῷ ἐκ πίστεως Ἀβραάμ, ὅς ἐστι πατὴρ πάντων ἡμῶν, 17. (καθὼς i Gen. xvii.  
 ἰ γέγραπται, “Ὅτι πατέρα πολλῶν ἐθνῶν τέθεικά σε,”) κατέναντι οὐ<sup>k</sup> ὅτι  
 ἐπίστευσε Θεοῦ, τοῦ<sup>k</sup> ζῶποιοῦντος τοὺς νεκροὺς, καὶ καλοῦντος τὰ<sup>5</sup> vi. 13.

<sup>1</sup> ου γαρ; so  $\aleph^3$ DFKLP, but  $\aleph^1$ ABC ου δε.

favourite word of Paul, who uses it twenty-five times.

Ver. 15. ὄργην: wrath, *i.e.*, the wrath of God. See on i. 18. Under a legal dispensation sin is stimulated, and brought into clear consciousness: men come under the wrath of God, and know that they do. This is the whole and sole result of “the law,” and hence law cannot be the means through which God administers His grace, and makes man the heir of all things. On the contrary, to attain this inheritance man must live under a regime of faith. οὐ δὲ: δὲ is the true reading (see critical note), not γάρ: *but* where law is not, neither is there παράβασις. It would not have been true to say οὐδὲ ἁμαρτία, for Paul in chap. ii. recognises the existence and guilt of sin even where men live ἄνομος; but in comparison with the deliberate and conscious transgression of those who live ἐν νόμῳ, such sin is comparatively insignificant and venial, and is here left out of account. The alternative systems are reduced to two, Law and Grace (or Promise).

Vers. 16-22. The Apostle can now develop, without further interruption or digression, his idea of the representative (and therefore universal) character of Abraham's justification. The New Testament cannot be said to subvert the Old if the method of justification is the same under both. Nay, it establishes the Old (iii. 31). This is the point which is enforced in the closing verses of chap. iv.

Ver. 16 f. Διὰ τοῦτο: because of the nature of law, and its inability to work anything but wrath. ἐκ πίστεως: the subject is the promise, considered in reference to the mode of its fulfilment. ἵνα κατὰ χάριν: χάρις on God's part is the correlative of πίστις on man's. εἰς τὸ εἶναι βεβαίαν κ.τ.λ. This is the Divine purpose in instituting the spiritual order of grace and faith: it is the only one consistent with universalism in religion. οὐ τῷ ἐκ τοῦ νόμου μόνον ἀλλὰ καὶ τῷ ἐκ πίστεως Ἀβραάμ: there seems

to be some inexactness in expression here. The seed which is “of the Law” ought to mean the Jews, as partisans of law in distinction from faith: then the seed which is “of the faith of Abraham” would mean the Gentiles. But the promise did not belong at all to the seed which was “of the law,” *i.e.*, to the Jews, as Abraham's natural descendants; even in them, faith was required. And the seed which is “of the faith” of Abraham is not quite appropriate to describe Gentile believers exclusively; the very point of the argument in the passage is that the faith of Abraham is reproduced in all the justified, whether Gentile or Jew. Still there seems no doubt that the persons meant to be contrasted in the two clauses are Jewish and Gentile believers (Meyer), not Jews and Christians (Fritzsche, who supplies σπέρματι before Ἀβραάμ): the difficulty is that the words do not exactly suit either meaning.

ὅς ἐστιν πατὴρ πάντων ἡμῶν. The πάντων is emphatic, and ἡμῶν expresses the consciousness of one who has seen in Abraham the spiritual ancestor of the new Christian community, living (as it does), and inheriting the promise, by faith. *Opponuntur haec verba Judaeis, qui Abrahamum non nominant nisi cum adjecto אביון pater noster* (Schoettgen).

When Paul speaks out of his Jewish consciousness, he shares this pride (“whose are the fathers,” ix. 5); when he speaks as a Christian, to whom the Church is “the Israel of God” (Gal. vi. 16), and who can even say “we are the circumcision,” he claims all the Jews boasted of as in reality the property of believers: it is Christians, and not Jews by birth, who can truly say “We have Abraham to our father.” The earliest indication (an indirect one) of the Jewish pride in Abraham is perhaps seen in Is. lxiii. 16. That Abraham is the father of us all agrees with Scripture: Gen. xvii. 5 LXX. The ὅτι belongs to the quotation. If there is any parenthesis, it should only

μη ὄντα ὡς ὄντα. 18. Ὅς παρ' ἐλπίδα ἐπ' ἐλπίδι ἐπίστευσεν, εἰς τὸ γενέσθαι αὐτὸν πατέρα πολλῶν ἐθνῶν, κατὰ τὸ εἰρημένον, "Οὕτως

l Here only ἔσται τὸ σπέρμα σου" · 19. καὶ μὴ ἀσθενήσας τῇ πίστει, <sup>1</sup>οὐ <sup>1</sup>κατε-  
 in Paul.  
 m Heb. xi. νόησε τὸ ἑαυτοῦ σῶμα ἦδη <sup>m</sup>νεκρωμένον, ἑκατονταετῆς που ὑπάρχων,  
 12.  
 n Eph. vi. 10; 2 Tim. ii. καὶ τὴν νέκρωσιν τῆς μήτρας Σάρρας · 20. εἰς δὲ τὴν ἐπαγγελίαν  
 1; Heb. τοῦ Θεοῦ οὐ διεκρίθη τῇ ἀπιστίᾳ, ἀλλ' <sup>n</sup>ἐνεδυναμώθη τῇ πίστει, δούς  
 xi. 34. δόξαν τῷ Θεῷ, 21. καὶ πληροφορηθεὶς ὅτι ὁ ἐπηγγέλται, δυνατὸς

<sup>1</sup> οὐ κατενοήσεν; so DFKLP, Syr. and lat. Om. ου NABC, best MSS. of vulg., etc. All the critical edd. omit ου, though both readings are widely and early attested; though the sense is quite good either way, the authorities for the omission are undoubtedly stronger. ἦδη NACDKLP; om. BF 47, etc. W. and H. bracket. Weiss omits.

be from καθὼς to σέ. As Abraham has this character in Scripture, so he has it before God: the two things are one and the same; it is his true, historical, Divine standing, that he is father of all believers. The attraction in κατέναντι οὐ ἐπίστευσεν θεοῦ is most simply resolved into κ. θεοῦ ᾧ ἐπίστευσε: but see Winer, p. 204, 206. In characterising the God whom Abraham believed, the Apostle brings out further the correspondence between the patriarch's faith and that of Christians. He is "God who makes the dead alive and calls things that are not as though they were". Such a reference to Isaac as we find in Heb. xi. 19 (λογισάμενος ὅτι καὶ ἐκ νεκρῶν ἐγείρειν δυνατὸς ὁ θεός) is not suggested here (yet see ver. 24), and hence it is better to take ζωοπ. τοὺς νεκροὺς of restoring vitality to Abraham, whose body was as good as dead. In the application, the things that are not are the unborn multitudes of Abraham's spiritual children. God speaks of them (hardly, issues his summons to them) as if they had a being. Faith in a God who is thus conceived comes nearer than anything else in Paul to the definition given in Heb xi. 1. On τὰ μὴ ὄντα, see Winer, p. 608.

Ver. 18 ff. Abraham's faith described. It was both contrary to hope (as far as nature could give hope), and rested on hope (that God could do what nature could not). εἰς τὸ γενέσθαι αὐτὸν πατέρα κ.τ.λ. (cf. ver. 11) is most properly taken to express the Divine purpose—that he might become father, etc. (see Moulton's note in Winer, p. 414); not result—so that he became. κατὰ τὸ εἰρημένον, Οὕτως κ.τ.λ., Gen. xv. 5: the passage is familiar, and the οὕτως is supposed to suggest its own interpretation—the stars of the heaven.

μη ἀσθενήσας . . . κατενόησεν, without becoming weak in faith, he considered his own body. "The participle ἀσθενήσας, though preceding the verb, is most naturally interpreted as referring to a (conceived) result of the action denoted by κατενόησεν." Burton, *Moods and Tenses*, § 145. This remark holds good only with the reading κατενόησεν: if we read οὐ κατ. the meaning is, He considered not his body *quippe qui non esset imbecillus* (Winer, p. 610). ἑκατονταετῆς που (circiter) ὑπάρχων: his great age was the primary and fundamental fact in the situation: this seems to be the suggestion of ὑπάρχων as distinct from ὄν. In ver. 20 (εἰς δὲ τὴν ἐπαγγελίαν) the δὲ contrasts with becoming weak, as he considered his body, the actual conduct of Abraham. "He did not waver in relation to the promise, in unbelief; on the contrary, he was strengthened in faith." On διεκρίθη, cf. Mt. xxi. 21, Jas. i. 6, Rom. xiv. 23. τῇ ἀπιστίᾳ: instrum. dative; because of unbelief. It is simplest to take τῇ πίστει as dative of respect, though Heb. xi. 11 can be adduced by those who would render: "he became strong, recovered his bodily vigour, by faith". The participles in ver. 21 are loosely attached to the principal verbs, and are really equivalent to co-ordinate clauses with καί. In his whole conduct on this occasion Abraham glorified God, and demonstrated his own assurance of His power. See Burton, § 145. δούς δόξαν τῷ Θεῷ: for this Hebraism see Josh. vii. 19, Jer. xiii. 16, John ix. 24, Acts xii. 23. For πληροφορηθεὶς xiv. 5, Col. iv. 12.

Ver. 22. διδ: because of this signal faith, evinced so triumphantly in spite of all there was to quell it. ἐλογίσθη: i. e., his faith was reckoned to him as

ἐστι καὶ ποιῆσαι. 22. διὸ καὶ ἐλογίσθη αὐτῷ εἰς δικαιοσύνην.  
23. Οὐκ ἐγράφη δὲ δι' αὐτὸν μόνον, ὅτι ἐλογίσθη αὐτῷ. 24. ἀλλὰ  
καὶ δι' ἡμᾶς, οἷς μέλλει λογιῆσθαι, τοῖς πιστεύουσιν ἐπὶ τὸν ἔγει-

righteousness. That which needs to be reckoned as righteousness is not in itself righteousness—on this the Apostle's argument rests in vers. 1-8; yet it is not arbitrarily that faith is so reckoned. The spiritual attitude of a man, who is conscious that in himself he has no strength, and no hope of a future, and who nevertheless casts himself upon, and lives by, the word of God which assures him of a future, is the necessarily and eternally right attitude of all souls to God. He whose attitude it is, is at bottom right with God. Now this was the attitude of Abraham to God, and it is the attitude of all sinners who believe in God through Christ; and to him and them alike it is reckoned by God for righteousness. The Gospel does not subvert the religious order under which Abraham lived; it illustrates, extends, and confirms it.

Vers. 23-25. Conclusion of the argument. Οὐκ ἐγράφη δὲ δι' αὐτὸν μόνον: cf. xiv. 4, 1 Cor. ix. 10, x. 6, 11, Gal. iii. 8. The formula for quoting Scripture is not ἐγράφη but γέγραπται: i.e., Scripture conveys not a historical truth, relating to one person (as here, to Abraham), but a present eternal truth, with some universal application. δι' ἡμᾶς: to show the mode of our justification. οἷς μέλλει λογιῆσθαι: to whom it (the act of believing) is to be imputed as righteousness. μέλλει conveys the idea of a Divine order under which things proceed so. τοῖς πιστεύουσιν is in apposition to οἷς: "believing as we do". (Weiss.) The object of the Christian's faith is the same as that of Abraham's, God that giveth life to the dead. Only in this case it is specifically God as He who raised Jesus our Lord. Cf. 1 Pet. i. 21, where Christians are described as those who through Christ believe in God who raised Him from the dead. In Abraham's case, "God that quickeneth the dead" is merely a synonym for God Omnipotent, who can do what man cannot. In Paul, on the other hand, while omnipotence is included in the description of God—for in Eph. i. 19, in order to give an idea of the greatest conceivable power, the Apostle can do no more than say that it is according to that working of the strength of God's might which He wrought in Christ

when He raised Him from the dead—omnipotence is not the sole object of the Christian's faith. His spiritual attitude toward God is the same as Abraham's, but God is revealed to him, and offered to his faith, in a character in which Abraham did not yet know Him. This is conveyed in the description of the Person in relation to whom the Omnipotence of God has been displayed to Christians. That Person is "Jesus our Lord, who was delivered up for our offences, and raised for our justification". The Resurrection of Jesus our Lord entitles us to conceive of God's Omnipotence not as mere unqualified power, but as *power no less than infinite engaged in the work of man's salvation from sin*. In the Resurrection of Jesus, omnipotence is exhibited as *redeeming power*: and in this omnipotence we, like Abraham, believe. παρεδόθη is used in LXX, Is. liii. 12, and its N.T. use, whether God or Christ be the subject of the παραδίδόναι (Rom. viii. 32; Gal. ii. 20, Eph. v. 2), may be derived thence. There is considerable difficulty with the parallel clauses διὰ τὰ παραπτώματα ἡμῶν, and διὰ τὴν δικαιοσύνην ἡμῶν. It is safe to assert that Paul did not make an abstract separation between Christ's Death and His Resurrection, as if the Death and the Resurrection either had different motives, or served ends separable from each other. There is a sort of mannerism in the expression here, as there is in xiv. 9, which puts us on our guard against over-precision. This granted, it seems simplest and best to adopt such an interpretation as maintains the same meaning for διὰ in both clauses. This has been done in two ways. (1) The διὰ has been taken retrospectively. "He was delivered up because we had sinned, and raised because we were justified"—sc. by His death. But though Paul writes in v. 9, δικαιοθέντες νῦν ἐν τῷ αἵματι αὐτοῦ, it is impossible to believe that he would have written—as this interpretation requires him to do—that we were justified by Christ's death, and that Christ was *therefore* raised from the dead by God. Justification is not only an act of God, but a spiritual experience; it is dependent upon faith (iii. 25); and it is realised in men as one by one, in

παντα Ἰησοῦν τὸν Κύριον ἡμῶν ἐκ νεκρῶν, 25. ὅς παρεδόθη διὰ τὰ  
 ° Ch. v. 18. παραπτώματα ἡμῶν, καὶ ἡγέρθη διὰ τὴν ° δικαιοσύναν ἡμῶν.

the time determined by Providence, they receive the Gospel. Hence διὰ τὴν δικαιοσύναν ἡμῶν at least must be prospective.\* (2) The διὰ has been taken in both clauses prospectively. "He was delivered up on account of our offences—to make atonement for them; and he was raised on account of our justification—that it might become an accomplished fact." That this interpretation is legitimate, so far as the language goes, cannot be questioned; and if we avoid unreal separations between things that really form one whole, it is thoroughly Pauline. Paul does ascribe expiatory value to the death or the blood of Christ; in that sense it is true the work of Christ was finished on the Cross. But Paul never thought of that by itself; *he knew Christ only as the Risen One who had died, and who had the virtue of His atoning death ever in Him*; this Christ was *One*, in all that He did and suffered—the Christ who had evoked in him the faith by which he was justified, the only Christ through faith in whom sinful men ever could be justified; and it is natural, therefore, that he should conceive Him as raised with a view to our justification. But it would have been equally legitimate to say that He died for our justification. It is only another way of expressing what every Christian understands—that we believe in a living Saviour, and that it is faith in Him which justifies. But then it is faith in Him as One who not only lives, but was delivered up to death to atone for our offences. He both died and was raised for our justification; the work is one and its end is one. And it is a mistake to argue, as Beyschlag does (*Neutest. Theologie*, ii., 164), that this reference of faith to the Risen Christ who died is inconsistent with the vicarious nature of His expiatory sufferings. That His sufferings had this character is established on independent grounds; and to believe in the Risen Christ is to believe in One in whom the power of that propitiatory vicarious suffering abides for ever. It is indeed solely because the virtue of that suffering is in Him that faith in the Risen Lord does justify. For an exposition of the passage, in which the retrospective force

is given to διὰ, see Candlish in *Expositor*, Dec., 1893. See also Bruce, *St. Paul's Conception of Christianity*, p. 160 ff. The identity in principle of Abrahamic and Christian faith is seen in this, that both are faith in God. But Abraham's is faith in a Divine promise, which only omnipotence could make good; the Christian's is faith in the character of God as revealed in the work of redemption wrought by Christ. That, too, however, involves omnipotence. It was the greatest display of power ever made to man when God raised Christ from the dead, and set Him at His own right hand in the heavenly places; and the Christ so raised was one who had been delivered to death for our offences. That is only another way of saying that the ultimate power in the world—the omnipotence of God—is in the service of a love which provides at infinite cost for the expiation of sin. The only right attitude for any human being in presence of this power is utter self-renunciation, utter abandonment of self to God. This is faith, and it is this which is imputed to men in all ages and under all dispensations for righteousness.

CHAP. V.—VERS. 1-11. The blessings of Justification. The first section of the epistle (chap. i. 18-iii. 20) has proved man's need of the righteousness of God; the second (chap. iii. 21-30) has shown how that righteousness comes, and how it is appropriated; the third (chap. iii. 31-iv. 25) has shown, by the example of Abraham, and the testimony of David, that it does not upset, but establishes the spiritual order revealed in the O.T. The Apostle now, like David, enlarges on the felicity of the justified, and especially on their assurance of God's love and of future blessedness. We may describe the contents of vers. 1-11 in the words which he himself applies (iv. 6) to the 32nd psalm: λέγει τὸν μακαρισμὸν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ᾧ ὁ θεὸς λογίζεται δικαιοσύνην χωρὶς ἔργων.

Ver. 1. δικαιοθένης takes up emphatically the δικαιοσύναν of iv. 25: Christ's death and resurrection have not been in vain: there are those who have actually been justified in consequence.

\* This, however, does not prevent us from conceiving of the resurrection of Christ as His public vindication, and the sign of God's acceptance of the work which He achieved in His death: in a certain sense, therefore, as His justification.

V. 1. ΔΙΚΑΙΩΘΕΝΤΕΣ οὖν ἐκ πίστεως, εἰρήνην ἔχομεν<sup>1</sup> πρὸς τὸν Θεὸν διὰ τοῦ Κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, 2. δι' οὐ καὶ τὴν προσαγωγὴν ἐσχάκαμεν τῇ πίστει<sup>2</sup> εἰς τὴν χάριν ταύτην ἐν ᾗ ἐστήκαμεν.

<sup>1</sup> ἔχομεν is found in correctors of  $\aleph$  and B, in FG (not in the Latin of these bilingual MSS.) and many cursives; ἐχωμεν in  $\aleph^1$ AB<sup>1</sup>CDKL cursives, vulg., Syr., etc. The authority for the latter seems therefore overwhelming; but besides the exegetical reasons which have led interpreters to prefer the former, and which are noticed in the commentary, we have to consider the frequency with which  $\omega$  and  $\omicron$  are confused even in the best MSS. Thus Weiss (*Textkritik*, S. 44 f.) gives the following instances in which  $\omega$  is certainly wrong, and is not adopted by any editor: ἀφωρισας, Gal. i. 15 in B; ἦν ὡς ἀγκυραν ἐχωμεν, Heb. vi. 19 in DE; δι' ἧς ἐγγιζόμεν, Heb. vii. 19 in A 31; διαταξομαι, 1 Cor. xi. 34 in ADEFG 37, 44, 47; προεχωμεθα, Rom. iii. 9 in AL; θερисωμεν, 1 Cor. ix. 11 in CDEFGLP and many cursives; αἰρησωμαι, Phil. i. 22 in B; εισερχομεθα, Heb. iv. 3 in AC 17, 37; συνβασιλευσωμεν, 2 Tim. ii. 12 in ACLP 109; θερисωμεν, Gal. vi. 9 in  $\aleph$ CFGLP cursives. These are only samples, and though the attestation is more divided in these and similar cases than in Rom. v. 1, they are quite enough to show that in a variation of this kind no degree of MS. authority could support a reading against a solid exegetical reason for changing  $\omega$  into  $\omicron$ . That such solid reason can be given here I agree with the expositors named below.

<sup>2</sup> τῇ πίστει  $\aleph^1$ CKLP, vulg., Syr. Om. BDF old lat. W. and H. bracket.

Having, therefore, been justified (the Apostle says), εἰρήνην ἔχομεν πρὸς τὸν θεόν. The MSS. evidence is overwhelming in favour of ἔχωμεν, so much so that W. and H. notice no other reading, and Tischdf. says "ἔχωμεν cannot be rejected unless it is altogether inappropriate, and inappropriate it seemingly is not". But this last statement is at least open to dispute. There is no indication that the Apostle has finished his dogmatic exposition, and is proceeding to exhortation. To read ἔχωμεν, and then to take καυχώμεθα as subjunctive both in ver. 2 and ver. 3 (as the R.V.), is not only awkward, but inconsistent with οὐ μόνον δέ, ver. 3. If the hortative purpose dominated the passage throughout, the Apostle must have written μῆ: see Gifford, p. 122. It is better (reading ἔχωμεν) to take καυχώμεθα in ver. 2 with δι' οὐ, and co-ordinate it with τὴν προσαγωγὴν: "through whom we have had our access, and rejoice, etc". Then the οὐ μόνον is in place. But the uninterrupted series of indicatives afterwards, the inappropriateness of the verb ἔχειν to express "let us realise, let us make our own," the strong tendency to give a paraenetic turn to a passage often read in church, the natural emphasis on εἰρήνη, and the logic of the situation, are all in favour of ἔχομεν, which is accordingly adopted by Meyer, Weiss, Lipsius, Godet and others, in spite of the MSS., see critical note. The justified have peace with God: *i.e.*, His wrath (i. 18)

no longer threatens them; they are accepted in Christ. It is not a change in their feelings which is indicated, but a change in God's relation to them.

Ver. 2. δι' οὐ καί: through whom *also*. To the fact that we have peace with God through our Lord Jesus Christ corresponds this *other* fact, that through Him we have had (and have) our access into this grace, etc. προσαγωγὴ has a certain touch of formality. Christ has "introduced" us to our standing as Christians: *cf.* Eph. ii. 18, 1 Pet. iii. 18. τῇ πίστει: by the faith referred to in ver. 1. Not to be construed with εἰς τὴν χάριν ταύτην: which would be without analogy in the N.T. The grace is substantially one with justification: it is the new spiritual atmosphere in which the believer lives as reconciled to God. καυχώμεθα, which always implies the *expression* of feeling, is to be co-ordinated with ἔχομεν. ἐπ' ἐλπιδι τῆς δόξης τοῦ θεοῦ: on the basis of hope in the glory of God, *i.e.*, of partaking in the glory of the heavenly kingdom. For ἐπ' ἐλπιδι, *cf.* iv. 18: the construction is not elsewhere found with καυχᾶσθαι.

Ver. 3. οὐ μόνον δὲ ἀλλὰ καὶ καυχώμεθα: and not only (do we glory on that footing), but we also glory in tribulations. *Cf.* Jas. i. 2 ff. ἐν ταῖς θλίψεσιν does not simply mean "when we are in tribulations," but also "because we are": the tribulations being the ground of the glorying: see ii. 17, 23, v. 11, 1 Cor. iii. 21, 2 Cor. xii. 9, Gal. vi. 14.

a Ch.viii.18, καὶ καυχώμεθα ἐπ' ἐλπίδι τῆς ἁ δόξης τοῦ Θεοῦ. 3. οὐ μόνον δέ,  
21.  
ἀλλὰ καὶ καυχώμεθα<sup>1</sup> ἐν ταῖς θλίψεσιν, εἰδότες ὅτι ἡ θλίψις ὑπομονὴν  
b2 Cor.ii.9, κατεργάζεται, 4. ἡ δὲ ὑπομονὴ<sup>b</sup> δοκιμὴν, ἡ δὲ δοκιμὴ ἐλπίδα, 5. ἡ  
xiii 3;  
Phil.ii.22; δὲ ἐλπίς οὐ καταισχύνει, ὅτι ἡ ἀγάπη τοῦ Θεοῦ ὁ ἐκκέχυται ἐν ταῖς  
c Acts ii. 17  
i, 33, x.45. καρδίαις ἡμῶν διὰ Πνεύματος Ἁγίου τοῦ δοθέντος ἡμῖν. 6. Ἔτι  
dMatt.xxvi.  
41. γὰρ<sup>2</sup> Χριστὸς ὄντων ἡμῶν<sup>d</sup> ἀσθενῶν, κατὰ καιρὸν ὑπὲρ ἄσεβῶν ἀπέθανε.

<sup>1</sup> καυχώμεθα  $\Sigma$ ADFKP; καυχώμενοι BC, Origen (twice). The participle is hardly open to suspicion on the ground of being conformed to ver. 11 (S. and H.); it is much rather the indicative (subjunctive?) that is open to suspicion as a "mechanical repetition" (Alford) from the preceding verse. W. and H. put καυχώμεθα in text, καυχώμενοι in marg. By the rule *proclivi lectioni praestat ardua* Alf. and Treg. are rather justified for putting καυχώμενοι in the text.

<sup>2</sup> ἐτι γὰρ  $\Sigma$ ACD<sup>1-3</sup>KP; εἰς τι γὰρ D<sup>2</sup>F; *ut quid enim* lat. Iren.-interp.; εἰ δε L Syr.; εἰ γε B. For a full discussion of the readings here, see S. and H. *ad loc.*, or W. and H., Appendix, p. 108. W. and H. suspect some primitive error; while holding the text of B to give a more probable sense than any of the other variants, Hort thinks εἰπερ would better explain all the variations and be equally appropriate. ἐτι after ἀσθενῶν  $\Sigma$ ABCD<sup>1</sup>F.

Ver. 4. ὑπομονὴν κατεργάζεται: has as its fruit, or effect, endurance. ὑπομονὴ has more of the sense of bravery and effort than the English "patience": it is not so passive. ἡ δὲ ὑπομονὴ δοκιμὴν: endurance produces approvedness—its result is a spiritual state which has shown itself proof under trial. Cf. Jas. i. 12 (δόκιμος γενόμενος = when he has shown himself proof). Perhaps the best English equivalent of δοκιμὴ would be *character*. This in its turn results again in hope: the experience of what God can do, or rather of what He does, for the justified amid the tribulations of this life, animates into new vigour the hope with which the life of faith begins.

Ver. 5. ἡ δὲ ἐλπίς οὐ καταισχύνει: and hope, *i.e.*, the hope which has not been extinguished, but confirmed under trial, does not put to shame. Ps. xxii. 6. *Spes erit res* (Bengel). Here the *aurea catena* comes to an end, and the Apostle points to that on which it is ultimately dependent. All these Christian experiences and hopes rest upon an assurance of the love of God. ὅτι ἡ ἀγάπη τοῦ Θεοῦ κ.τ.λ. That the love of God to us is meant, not our love to Him, is obvious from ver. 6 and the whole connection: it is the evidence of God's love to us which the Apostle proceeds to set forth. ἐκκέχυται ἐν ταῖς καρδίαις ἡμῶν (cf. Joel iii. 1, ii. 28, LXX, Acts x. 45): has been poured out in, and still floods, our hearts. διὰ πνεύματος ἁγίου τοῦ δοθέντος ἡμῖν: the aorist τοῦ δοθέντος can hardly refer to Pentecost, in which case ἡμῖν would express the consciousness of the

Christian community: the spirit was given to Christians in virtue of their faith (Gal. iii. 2), and normally on occasion of their baptism (1 Cor. xii. 13, Acts xix. 1 ff.); and it is this experience, possibly this event, to which the participle definitely refers. What the spirit, given (in baptism) to faith, does, is to flood the heart with God's love, and with the assurance of it.

Ver. 6. The reading εἴ γε is well supported, and yields a good sense ("so surely as": Evans), though the suggestion is made in W. and H. that it may be a primitive error for εἴ περ (see note on iii. 30). The assurance we have of the love of God is no doubt conditioned, but the condition may be expressed with the utmost force, as it is with εἴ γε, for there is no doubt that what it puts as a hypothesis has actually taken place, *viz.*, Christ's death for the ungodly. Although he says εἴ γε, the objective fact which follows is in no sense open to question: it is to the Apostle the first of certainties. Cf. the use of εἴ γε in Eph. iii. 2, iv. 21, and Ellicott's note on the former. ἀσθενῶν: the weakness of men who had not yet received the Spirit is conceived as appealing to the love of God. ἔτι goes with ὄντων ἡμ. ἀσθενῶν: the persons concerned were no longer weak, when Paul wrote, but strong in their new relation to God. κατὰ καιρὸν has been taken with ὄντων ἡ. ἀ. ἔτι: "while we were yet without strength, as the pre-Christian era implied or required": but this meaning is remote, and must have been more clearly suggested. The anal-



7. <sup>ο</sup> μόλις γὰρ ὑπὲρ δικαίου τις ἀποθανεῖται · ὑπὲρ γὰρ τοῦ ἀγαθοῦ <sup>e Acts xxvii.</sup>  
<sup>7 ε., 16; 1</sup>  
<sup>1</sup> τάχα τις καὶ τολμᾷ ἀποθανεῖν · 8. συνίστησι δὲ τὴν ἑαυτοῦ ἀγάπην <sup>Pet. iv. 18.</sup>  
<sup>f Philem.</sup>  
 εἰς ἡμᾶς ὁ Θεός,<sup>1</sup> ὅτι ἐτι ἁμαρτωλῶν ὄντων ἡμῶν Χριστὸς ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν <sup>15.</sup>  
 ἀπέθανε. 9. πολλῶ οὖν μᾶλλον, δικαιοθέντες νῦν ἐν τῷ αἵματι

<sup>1</sup> ο θεος om. B.

ogy of Gal. iv. 4, Eph. i. 10, supports the ordinary rendering, "in due time," *i.e.*, at the time determined by the Providence of God and the history of man as the proper time, Christ died. ὑπὲρ: in the interest of, not equivalent to ἀντί, instead of: whether the interest of the ungodly is secured by the fact that Christ's death has a substitutionary character, or in some other way, is a question which ὑπὲρ does not touch.

Ver. 7. Christ's death for the ungodly assures us of God's love; for the utmost that human love will do is far less. ὑπὲρ δικαίου: for a righteous man. Some make both δικαίου and τοῦ ἀγαθοῦ neuter: some who take δικαίου as masculine take τοῦ ἀγαθοῦ as neuter (so Weiss and Godet—"pour un juste, pour le bien"): but as Jowett says, the notion of dying for an abstract idea is entirely unlike the N.T., or the age in which the N.T. was written, while the opposition to Christ's dying for sinful persons requires that persons should be in question here also. The absence of the article with δικαίου corresponds to the virtually negative character of the clause: it is inserted before ἀγαθοῦ because the exceptional case is definitely conceived as happening. ἀποθανεῖται, gnomic; see Burton, § 69. Unless ἀγαθός is meant to suggest a certain advance upon δίκαιος, it is impossible to see in what respect the second clause adds anything to the first. Of course the words are broadly synonymous, so that often they are both applied to the same person or thing (Lk. xxiii. 50, Rom. vii. 12); still there is a difference, and it answers to their application here; it is *difficult* to die for a just man, it has been found *possible* (one may venture to affirm) to die for a good man. The difference is like that between "just" and "good" in English: the latter is the more generous and inspiring type of character. Cf. the Gnostic contrast between the "just" God of the O.T. and the "good" God of the N.T., and the passages quoted in Cremer, *s.v.* ἀγαθός. καὶ τολμᾷ: even prevails upon himself, wins it from himself.

Ver. 8. How greatly is this utmost

love of man surpassed by the love of God. He commends, or rather makes good, presents in its true and unmistakable character (for συνίστησιν, cf. iii. 5, 2 Cor. vi. 4, vii. 11; Gal. ii. 18), His own love toward us, in that while we were yet sinners, etc. ἐαυτοῦ is an emphatic His: His, not as opposed to Christ's (as some have strangely taken it), but as opposed to anything that we can point to as love among men: His spontaneous and characteristic love. ἐτι ἁμαρτωλῶν ὄντων ἡμῶν: they are no longer such, but justified, and it is on this the next step in the argument depends.

Ver. 9 f. πολλῶ οὖν μᾶλλον: The argument is from the greater to the less. The supreme difficulty to be overcome in the relations of man and God is the initial one: How can God demonstrate His love to the sinner, and bestow on him a Divine righteousness? In comparison with this, everything else is easy. Now the Apostle has already shown (iii. 21-30) how the Gospel meets this difficulty; we obtain the righteousness required by believing in Jesus, whom God has set forth as a propitiation through faith in His blood. If such grace was shown us *then*, when we were in sin, much more, justified as we have now been by His blood, shall we be saved from wrath through Him. ἀπὸ τῆς ὀργῆς: the wrath to come: see note on i. 18. This deliverance from wrath does not exhaust Paul's conception of the future (see ver. 2), but it is an important aspect of it, and implies the rest. Verse 10 rather repeats, than grounds anew, the argument of ver. 9. εἰ γὰρ ἐχθροὶ ὄντες: this is practically equivalent to ἐτι ἁμαρτωλῶν ὄντων ἡμῶν. The state of sin was that in which we were ἐχθροί, and the whole connection of ideas in the passage requires us to give ἐχθροί the passive meaning which it undoubtedly has in xi. 28, where it is opposed to ἀγαπητοί. We were in a real sense objects of the Divine hostility. As sinners, we lay under the condemnation of God, and His wrath hung over us. This was the situation which had to be faced: Was

g 1 Thess. i αὐτοῦ, σωθησόμεθα δι' αὐτοῦ ἀπὸ τῆς ἑδραγῆς. IO. εἰ γὰρ ἐχθροὶ  
 10. ὄντες κατηλλάγημεν τῷ Θεῷ διὰ τοῦ θανάτου τοῦ υἱοῦ αὐτοῦ, πολλὰ  
 μᾶλλον καταλλαγέμεν σωθησόμεθα ἐν τῇ ζωῇ αὐτοῦ. II. οὐ μόνον  
 h 1 Cor. i. 31. δέ, ἀλλὰ καὶ καυχώμενοι ἐν τῷ ἡ Θεῷ διὰ τοῦ Κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ  
 i 2 Cor. v. 18. Χριστοῦ, δι' οὗ νῦν τὴν καταλλαγὴν ἐλάβομεν.  
 f.

there love in God equal to it? Yes, when we were enemies we were reconciled to God by the death of His Son. *κατηλλάγημεν* is a real passive: "we" are the objects, not the subjects, of the reconciliation: the subject is God, 2 Cor. v. 19-21. Compare ver. 11: τὴν καταλλαγὴν ἐλάβομεν. To represent *κατηλλάγημεν* by an active form, e.g., "we laid aside our hostility to God," or by what is virtually one, e.g., "we were won to lay aside our hostility," is to miss the point of the whole passage. Paul is demonstrating the love of God, and he can only do it by pointing to what God has done, not to what we have done. That we on our part are hostile to God before the reconciliation, and that we afterwards lay aside our enmity, is no doubt true; but here it is entirely irrelevant. The Apostle's thought is simply this: "if, when we lay under the Divine condemnation, the work of our reconciliation to God was achieved by Him through the death of His Son, much more shall the love which wrought so incredibly for us in our extremity carry out our salvation to the end". The subjective side of the truth is here completely, and intentionally, left out of sight; the laying aside of our hostility adds nothing to God's love, throws no light upon it; hence in an exposition of the love of God it can be ignored. To say that the reconciliation is "mutual," is true in point of fact; it is true, also, to all the suggestions of the English word; but it is not true to the meaning of *κατηλλάγημεν*, nor to the argument of this passage, which does not prove anything about the Christian, but exhibits the love of God at its height in the Cross, and argues from that to what are comparatively smaller demonstrations of that love. ἐν τῇ ζωῇ αὐτοῦ: the ἐν is instrumental: cf. ver. 9 ἐν τῷ αἵματι αὐτοῦ. The Living Lord, in virtue of His life, will save us to the uttermost. Cf. John xiv. 19.

Ver. 11. *καυχώμενοι* is the best attested reading, but hard to construe. It is awkward (with Meyer) to supply *καταλλαγέμεν* with οὐ μόνον δέ, and retain *σωθησόμεθα* as the principal verb:

and not only (as reconciled shall we be saved), but also rejoicing, etc. There is no proportion between the things thus co-ordinated, and it is better to assume an inexact construction, and regard *καυχώμενοι* as adding an independent idea which would have been more properly expressed by the indicative (*καυχώμεθα*). But see Winer, 441. The Christian glories in God; for though "boasting is excluded" from the true religion (iii. 27), yet to make one's boast in God is the perfection of that religion. Yet the believer could not thus glory, but for the Lord Jesus Christ; it is in Him, "clothed in the Gospel," that he obtains that knowledge of God's character which enables him to exult. δι' οὗ νῦν τὴν καταλλαγὴν ἐλάβομεν. Nothing could show more unmistakably that the *καταλλαγή* is not a change in our disposition toward God, but a change in His attitude toward us. We do not give it (by laying aside enmity, distrust, or fear); we receive it, by believing in Christ Jesus, whom God has set forth as a propitiation through faith in His blood. We take it as God's unspeakable gift. Cf. 2 Macc. ii. 50. ὁ καταλειφθεὶς ἐν τῇ τοῦ παντοκράτορος ὀργῇ πάλιν ἐν τῇ τοῦ μεγάλου δεσπότητος καταλλαγῇ μετὰ πάσης δόξης ἐπανωρθώθη. For an examination of the Pauline idea of reconciliation, see especially Schmiedel on 2 Cor. v. 21, *Excursus*.

Vers. 12-21. The treatment of the righteousness of God, as a Divine gift to sinners in Jesus Christ, is now complete, and the Apostle might have passed on to his treatment of the new life (chaps. vi.-viii.). But he introduces at this point a digression in which a comparison—which in most points is rather a contrast—is made between Adam and Christ. Up to this point he has spoken of Christ alone, and the truth of what he has said rests upon its own evidence; it is not affected in the least by any difficulty we may have in adapting what he says of Adam to our knowledge or ignorance of human origins. The general truth he teaches here is that there is a real unity of the human race, on the one hand in sin and

12. Διὰ τοῦτο ὡσπερ δι' ἐνὸς ἀνθρώπου ἡ ἁμαρτία εἰς τὸν κόσμον εἰσῆλθε, καὶ διὰ τῆς ἁμαρτίας ὁ θάνατος, καὶ οὕτως εἰς πάντας

death, on the other in righteousness and life; in the former aspect the race is summed up in Adam; in the latter, in Christ. It is a distinction, apparently, between the two, that the unity in Adam is natural, having a physical basis in the organic connection of all men through all generations; whereas the unity in Christ is spiritual, being dependent upon faith. Yet this distinction is not specially in view in the passage, which rather treats Adam and Christ in an objective way, the transition (morally) from Adam's doom to that of man being only mediated by the words πάντες ἥμαρτον in ver. 12, and the connection between Christ and the new humanity by οἱ τὴν περισσείαν τῆς χάριτος λαμβάνοντες in ver. 17.

Ver. 12. διὰ τοῦτο refers to that whole conception of Christ's relation to the human race which is expounded in chaps. iii. 21-v. 11. But as this is summed up in v. 1-11, and even in the last words of v. 11 (through Him we received the reconciliation) the grammatical reference may be to these words only. ὡσπερ: the sentence beginning thus is not finished; cf. Mt. xxv. 14. There is a virtual apodosis in the last clause of ver. 14: ὅς ἐστιν τύπος τοῦ μέλλοντος; the natural conclusion would have been, "so also by one man righteousness entered into the world, and life by righteousness". Cf. Winer, p. 712 f. By the entrance of sin into the world is not meant that sin began to be, but that sin as a power entered into that sphere in which man lives. Sin, by Divine appointment, brought death in its train, also as an objective power; the two things were inseparably connected, and consequently death extended over all men (for διήλθεν, cf. Ps. lxxxvii. 17, Ez. v. 17) ἐφ' ᾧ πάντες ἥμαρτον. The connection of sin and death was a commonplace of Jewish teaching, resting apparently on a literal interpretation of Gen. iii. Cf. Sap. ii. 23 f. ὁ θεὸς ἐκτίσεν τὸν ἄνθρωπον ἐπ' ἀφθαρσίᾳ . . . φθόνῳ δὲ διαβόλου θάνατος εἰσῆλθεν εἰς τὸν κόσμον. Cf. also Sir. xxv. 24, Rom. vi. 23, 1 Cor. xv. 56. Paul no doubt uses death to convey various shades of meaning in different places, but he does not explicitly distinguish different senses of the word; and it is probably misleading rather than helpful to say that in one sentence (here,

for example) "physical" death is meant, and in another (chap. vii. 24, e.g.) "spiritual" death. The analysis is foreign to his mode of thinking. All that "death" conveys to the mind entered into the world through sin. The words ἐφ' ᾧ πάντες ἥμαρτον, in which the πάντες resumes πάντας of the preceding clause, give the explanation of the universality of death; it rests upon the universality of sin. ἐφ' ᾧ means propterea quod as in 2 Cor. v. 4 and perhaps in Phil. iii. 12. Winer, 491. But in what sense is the universality of sin to be understood? In other words, what precisely is meant by πάντες ἥμαρτον? Many interpreters take the aorist rigorously, and render: because all sinned, i.e., in the sin of Adam. Omnes peccarunt, Adamo peccante (Bengel). This is supported by an appeal to 2 Cor. v. 14, εἰς ὑπὲρ πάντων ἀπέθανεν ἄρα οἱ πάντες ἀπέθανον: the death of one was the death of all; so here, the sin of one was the sin of all. It seems to me a final objection to this (grammatically quite sound) interpretation, that it really makes the words ἐφ' ᾧ πάντες ἥμαρτον meaningless. They are evidently meant to explain how the death which came into the world through Adam's sin obtained its universal sway, and the reason is that the sin of which death is the consequence was also universally prevalent. The sense in which this was so has been already proved in chap. iii., and the aorist is therefore to be taken as in iii. 23: see note there. Because all men were, in point of fact, sinners, the death which is inseparable from sin extended over all. To drag in the case of infants to refute this, on the ground that πάντες ἥμαρτον does not apply to them (unless in the sense that they sinned in Adam) is to misconceive the situation: to Paul's mind the world consists of persons capable of sinning and of being saved. The case of those in whom the moral consciousness, or indeed any consciousness whatever, has not yet awakened, is simply to be disregarded. We know, and can know, nothing about it. Nothing has been more pernicious in theology than the determination to define sin in such a way that in all its damning import the definition should be applicable to "infants"; it is to this we owe the moral atrocities that have disfigured most

ἀνθρώπους ὁ θάνατος διήλθεν, ἐφ' ᾧ πάντες ἥμαρτον. 13. ἄχρι  
 k Philem. γὰρ νόμου ἁμαρτία ἦν ἐν κόσμῳ· ἁμαρτία δὲ οὐκ ἔλλογείται, μὴ  
 18  
 1 V. 17, 21; ὄντος νόμου· 14. ἀλλ' ἔβασίλευσεν ὁ θάνατος ἀπὸ Ἀδάμ μέχρι  
 Ch. vi. 12. Μωσέως καὶ ἐπὶ τοὺς μὴ ἁμαρτήσαντας<sup>1</sup> ἐπὶ τῷ ὁμοιώματι τῆς

<sup>1</sup> τοὺς μὴ ἁμαρτήσαντας, so  $\Sigma$ ABCD<sup>2</sup>G<sup>3</sup>K<sup>2</sup>L<sup>2</sup>; the μὴ was wanting in some MSS. known to Origen and in "most Latin MSS." known to Augustine: see W. and H., Appendix. However the omission may have originated, μὴ is undoubtedly the true text.

creeds, and in great part the idea of baptismal regeneration, which is an irrational unethical miracle, invented by men to get over a puzzle of their own making.

Ver. 13 f. These two verses are rather obscure, but must be intended (γὰρ) to prove what has been asserted in ver. 12. ἄχρι γὰρ νόμου = ἀπὸ Ἀδάμ μέχρι Μωσέως, ver. 14, the law meant being the Mosaic. The sin which was in the world before the law is not the guilt of Adam's fall imputed to the race as fallen in him, but the actual sin which individuals had committed. Now if law has no existence, sin is not imputed. Cf. iv. 15. The natural inference would seem to be that the sins committed during this period could not be punished. But what was the case? The very opposite of this. Death reigned all through this period. This unrestrained tyranny of death (observe the emphatic position of ἐβασίλευσεν) over persons whose sins cannot be imputed to them, seems at variance with the explanation just adopted of πάντες ἥμαρτον. Indeed Meyer and others use it to refute that explanation. The reign of death, apart from imputable individual sin, implies, they argue, a corresponding objective reign of sin, apart from individual acts: in other words, justifies the interpretation of ἐφ' ᾧ πάντες ἥμαρτον according to which all men sinned in Adam's sin, and so (and only so) became subject to death. But the empirical meaning of ἥμαρτον is decidedly to be preferred, and we must rather fill out the argument thus: "all sinned. For there was sin in the world before Moses; and though sin is not imputed where there is no law, and though therefore no particular penalty—death or another—could be expected for the sins here in question, yet all that time death reigned, for in the act of Adam sin and death had been inseparably and for ever conjoined." καὶ ἐπὶ τοὺς μὴ ἁμαρτήσαντας ἐπὶ τῷ ὁμοιώματι κ.τ.λ.—even over those who

did not sin after the likeness of Adam's transgression. For ἐπὶ, cf. Winer, p. 492. This describes not some, but all of those who lived during the period from Adam to Moses. None of them had like Adam violated an express prohibition sanctioned by the death penalty. Yet they all died, for they all sinned, and in their first father sin and death had been indissolubly united. And this Adam is τύπος τοῦ μέλλοντος sc. Ἀδάμ. In the coming Adam and his relations to the race there will be something on the same pattern as this. 1 Cor. x. 6, 11, Heb. ix. 14, 1 Cor. xv. 22, 45, 49. Parallels of this sort between Adam and the Messiah are common in Rabbinical writings: e.g., Schöttgen quotes *Neve Schalom*, f. 160-2. "Quemadmodum homo primus fuit unus in peccato, sic Messias erit postremus, ad auferendum peccatum penitus;" and 9, 9 has "Adamus postremus est Messias". Cf. Delitzsch: *Brief an die Römer*, p. 82 f. The extent to which the thoughts of this passage on sin and death, and on the consequences of Adam's sin to his descendants, can be traced in Jewish writers, is not quite clear. As a rule (see above on ver. 12) they admit the dependence of death on sin, though Schöttgen quotes a Rabbi Samuel ben David as saying, "Etiam si Adamus primus non peccasset, tamen mors fuisset". On the unity and solidarity of the race in sin and its consequences, they are not perfectly explicit. Weber (*Die Lehren des Talmud*, p. 217) gives the following summary: "There is an inherited guilt, but not an inherited sin; the fall of Adam has brought death upon the whole race, not however sinfulness in the sense of a necessity to commit sin; sin is the result of each individual's decision; it is, as far as experience goes, universal, yet in itself even after the Fall not absolutely necessary". This seems to agree very closely with the Apostle's teaching as interpreted above. It is the appeal to *experience* in Paul (πάντες ἥμαρτον),

παραβάσεως Ἀδάμ, ὅς ἐστι τύπος τοῦ μέλλοντος. 15. Ἄλλ' οὐχ ὡς τὸ παράπτωμα, οὕτω καὶ τὸ χάρισμα. εἰ γὰρ τῷ τοῦ ἐνὸς παραπτώματι οἱ πολλοὶ ἀπέθανον, πολλῶ μᾶλλον ἢ χάρις τοῦ Θεοῦ καὶ ἡ<sup>m</sup> δωρεὰ ἐν χάριτι τῇ τοῦ ἐνὸς ἀνθρώπου Ἰησοῦ<sup>m</sup> Χριστοῦ εἰς τοὺς πολλοὺς ἐπέρισσευσε. 16. καὶ οὐχ ὡς δι' ἐνὸς ἁμαρτήσαντος, τὸ δῶρημα· τὸ μὲν γὰρ κρίμα ἐξ ἐνὸς εἰς κατάκριμα, τὸ δὲ χάρισμα ἐκ πολλῶν παραπτωμάτων εἰς δικαίωμα. 17. εἰ γὰρ τῷ τοῦ ἐνὸς<sup>1</sup> παραπτώματι ὁ θάνατος ἐβασίλευσε διὰ τοῦ ἐνὸς, πολλῶ μᾶλλον οἱ<sup>o2</sup> τὴν<sup>o</sup> περισσεΐαν τῆς χάριτος καὶ τῆς δωρεᾶς τῆς δικαιοσύνης λαμβά-

<sup>1</sup> τω του ενος BCKLPD lat.; εν τω ενι D-gr.; εν ενος 47, W. and H. marg.; εν ενι παραπτωματι AFG and Weiss. της δωρεας om. B 49, Origen twice; W. and H. bracket. Ιησου Χριστου; but X. I. in B, Origen.

crossing with a transcendent view of the unity of the race in Adam, which gives rise to all the difficulties of interpretation; but without this appeal to experience (which many like Bengel, Meyer and Gifford reject) the whole passage would hang in the air, unreal. There must be something which involves the individual in Adam's fate; that something comes into view in πάντες ἡμαρτον, and there only; and without it our interest dies. A sin which we commit in Adam (and which never becomes ours otherwise) is a mere fancy to which one has nothing serious to say.

Ver. 15. At this point the parallel of Adam and Christ becomes a contrast: not as the παράπτωμα (the word implies the Fall), so also is the χάρισμα (the gift which is freely provided for sinners in the Gospel, i.e., a Divine righteousness and life). οἱ πολλοὶ means "all," but presents the "all" as a great number. πολλῶ μᾶλλον: the idea underlying the inference is that God delights in mercy; if under His administration one man's offence could have such far-reaching consequences, much more reasonably may we feel sure of the universal influence of one Man's righteous achievement. This idea is the keynote of the whole chapter: see vers. 9, 10, 17. ἡ δωρεὰ ἐν χάριτι is to be construed together: to repeat the article before ἐν χάριτι is not essential, and ἡ δωρεὰ is awkward standing alone. God's χάρις is shown in the gift of His Son, Christ's in His undertaking in obedience to the Father the painful work of our salvation. εἰς τοὺς πολλοὺς like οἱ πολλοὶ is not opposed to "all," but to "one": it is indeed equivalent to "all," and signifies that the "all" are not few. The world

is the subject of redemption; if the race suffered through the first Adam, much more may we argue that what has been done by the Second will benefit the race. ἐπέρισσευεν: the word is prompted by Paul's own experience: the blessedness of the Christian life far outwent the misery of the life under condemnation.

Ver. 16. A fresh point of contrast. That which God bestows (for δῶρημα, see Mayor on James I. 17) is not as through one that sinned: the analogy with Adam breaks down here. For the Divine judgment (κρίμα neutral) starting from one (person) resulted in condemnation (for all); whereas the free gift, starting from many offences (which appealed to the mercy of God), has resulted in a sentence of justification (for all). This abstract way of looking at the matter disregards what the Apostle insists on elsewhere, that this "sentence of justification" only takes effect for the individual on the condition of faith. The ἐκ πολλῶν παραπτωμάτων in this verse is a decisive argument for the meaning given above to πάντες ἡμαρτον: redemption is not inspired merely by the fall of the race in Adam, but by its actual and multiplied offences, and this is its glory. ἐξ ἐνὸς: ἐνὸς is masculine, resuming the ἐνὸς ἁμαρτήσαντος of the previous clause; not neuter, with παραπτώματος anticipated from the following clause.

Ver. 17. This verse confirms the preceding. The argument is the same in kind as in ver. 15. The effects of the Fall are indubitable: still less open to doubt are the effects of the work of Christ. With οἱ τὴν περισσεΐαν τῆς χάριτος καὶ [τῆς δωρεᾶς] τῆς δικαιοσύνης λαμβάνοντες we again touch experience, and an empirical condition is attached

νοντες ἐν ζωῇ βασιλεύσουσι διὰ τοῦ ἐνὸς Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ. 18. Ἄρα οὖν ὡς δι' ἐνὸς παραπτώματος, εἰς πάντας ἀνθρώπους, εἰς κατακρίμα·  
 p Ch. iv. 25. οὕτω καὶ δι' ἐνὸς δικαιώματος, εἰς πάντας ἀνθρώπους, εἰς ἡ δικαιοσύνην  
 ζωῆς. 19. ὥσπερ γὰρ διὰ τῆς παρακοῆς τοῦ ἐνὸς ἀνθρώπου ἁμαρ-  
 ρ Heb. v. 8. τωλοὶ κατεστάθησαν οἱ πολλοί, οὕτω καὶ διὰ τῆς ἡ ὑπακοῆς τοῦ ἐνὸς

to the abstract universality suggested by ver. 12. The abundance of the grace and of (the gift which consists in) righteousness has to be received by faith. But when by faith a connection is formed with Christ, the consequences of that connection, as more agreeable to what we know of God's nature, can be more surely counted upon than the consequences of our natural connection with Adam. Part of the contrast is marked by the change from "death reigned" to "we shall reign in life," not "life shall reign in or over us". The future in **βασιλεύσουσιν** is no doubt logical, but it refers nevertheless to the consummation of redemption in the Messianic kingdom in the world to come. Cf. viii. 17, 21, Col. iii. 3 f., 2 Tim. ii. 12.

Ver. 18. With **ἄρα οὖν** (cf. vii. 3, 25, and often in Paul) the conclusion of the argument is introduced. It is simplest to take **ἐνὸς** in both clauses as neuter. "As through one offence the result for all men was condemnation, so also through one righteous act the result for all men is justification of life." The result in both cases is mediated; in the former, by men's actual sin; in the latter, by their faith in Christ. It has been questioned whether **δικαίωμα** can mean a "righteous act,"—that which Christ achieved in His death, conceived as one thing commanding the approval of God. This sense seems to be required by the contrast with **παράπτωμα**, but Meyer and others argue that, as in ver. 16, the meaning must be "a sentence of justification". "Through one justifying sentence (pronounced over the world because of Christ's death) the result for all men is justification of life." But this justifying sentence *in vacuo* is alien to the realism of Paul's thinking, and no strain is put upon **δικαίωμα** (especially when we observe its correspondence with **παράπτωμα**) in making it signify Christ's work as a thing in which righteousness is, so to speak, embodied. Lightfoot (*Notes on Epistles of St. Paul*, p. 292) adopts this meaning, "a righteous deed," and quotes Arist., *Rhet.*, i., 13, τὰ ἀδικήματα πάντα καὶ τὰ δικαιώματα, and *Eth. Nic.*, v., 7 (10): καλεῖται δὲ μᾶλλον

**δικαιοπράγμα τὸ κοινόν: δικαίωμα δὲ τὸ ἐπανόρθωμα τοῦ ἀδικήματος.** This sense of an act by which an injustice is rectified is exactly suitable here. Through this the result for all men is **δικαίωσις ζωῆς**: for the genitive, see Winer, p. 235. Simcox, *Language of the N.T.*, 85. When God justifies the sinner, he enters into and inherits life. But Lightfoot makes it *gen. appos.*

Ver. 19. The sense of this verse has been determined by what precedes. The **γὰρ** connects it closely with the last words of verse 18: "justification of life; for, as through, etc.". **ἁμαρτωλοὶ κατεστάθησαν**: "were constituted sinners". For the word **κατεστ.** cf. Jas. iv. 4, 2 Pet. i. 8. It has the same ambiguity as the English word "constituted" (S. and H.); but we cannot say, from the word itself, whether the many constituted sinners, through the one person's disobedience, are so constituted immediately and unconditionally, or mediately through their own sin (to be traced back, of course, to him); this last, as has been argued above, is the Apostle's meaning. **οὕτως καὶ διὰ τῆς ὑπακοῆς τοῦ ἐνὸς**: the application of **τῆς ὑπακοῆς** has been disputed. By some (Hofmann, Lechler) it is taken to cover the whole life and work of Jesus conceived as the carrying out of the Father's will: cf. Phil. ii. 8. By others (Meyer) it is limited to Christ's death as the one great act of obedience on which the possibility of justification depended: cf. chap. iii. 25, v. 9. Both ideas are Pauline, but the last seems most congruous to the context and the contrast which pervades it. **δίκαιοι κατασθιθήσονται**: "shall be constituted righteous"; the future shows again that Paul is dealing with experience, or at least with possible experience; the logic which finds the key to the passage in Bengel's formula, *Omnes peccarunt Adamo peccante*, would have written here also **δίκαιοι κατεστάθησαν**. It is because Paul conceives of this justification as conditioned in the case of each of the πολλοί by faith, and as in process or taking place in one after another that he uses the future. A reference to the Judgment Day (Meyer) is forced: it is

δίκαιοι κατασταθήσονται οἱ πολλοί. 20. Νόμος δὲ παρεισῆλθεν, ἵνα πλεονάσῃ τὸ παράπτωμα. οὐ δὲ ἐπλεόνασεν ἡ ἁμαρτία, ὑπερεπερίσσευσεν ἡ χάρις. 21. ἵνα ὡσπερ ἐβασιλεύσεν ἡ ἁμαρτία ἐν τῷ θανάτῳ, οὕτω καὶ ἡ χάρις βασιλεύσῃ διὰ δικαιοσύνης εἰς ζωὴν αἰώνιον, διὰ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ τοῦ Κυρίου ἡμῶν.

not then, but when they believe in Christ, that men are constituted δίκαιοι.

Ver. 20 f. "The comparison between Adam and Christ is closed. But in the middle, between the two, stood the law" (Meyer). Paul must refer to it in such a way as to indicate the place it holds in the order of Providence, and especially to show that it does not frustrate, but further, the end contemplated in the work of Christ. παρεισῆλθεν: see ver. 12 above. Sin entered into the world; the Law entered into the situation thus created as an accessory or subordinate thing; it has not the decisive significance in history which the objective power of sin has. Words in which the same prepositions have a similar force are παρεισάγω, 2 Pet. ii. 1; παρεισδύνω, Jude 4; παρεισφέρω, 2 Pet. i. 5: cf. Gal. ii. 4. There is often in such words, though not necessarily, the idea of stealth or secrecy; we might render "the law slipped in". ἵνα πλεονάσῃ τὸ παράπτωμα: the purpose expressed by ἵνα is God's: Winer, p. 575. The offence is multiplied because the law, encountering the flesh, evokes its natural antagonism to God, and so stimulates it into disobedience. Cf. Gal. iii. 19 ff., and the development of this idea in chap. vii. 7 ff. As the offence multiplied, the need of redemption, and the sense of that need were intensified. οὐ δὲ ἐπλεόνασεν ἡ ἁμαρτία: ἁμαρτία seems used here, not παράπτωμα, because more proper to express the sum total of evil, made up of repeated acts of disobedience to the law. "Sin" bulked larger, as "offence" was added to "offence". οὐδὲ might seem to refer to Israel only, for it was there that the law had its seat; but there is something analogous to this law and its effects everywhere; and everywhere as the need of redemption becomes more pressing grace rises in higher power to meet it. ὑπερεπερίσσευσεν: "the ἐπλεόνασεν had to be surpassed" (Meyer). Cf. 2 Cor. vii. 4. Paul is excessively fond of compounds with ὑπέρ. The purpose of this abounding manifestation of grace is, "that as sin reigned in death, so also should grace reign through righteousness unto eternal life through

Jesus Christ our Lord". ἐν τῷ θανάτῳ: it is more natural to oppose this to ζωὴ αἰώνιος, and regard death as "a province which sin had won, and in which it exercised its dominion" (Gifford), than to make it parallel (with Meyer) to διὰ δικαιοσύνης, and render "in virtue of death" (*dat. instr.*). Grace has not yet attained to its full sovereignty; it comes to this sovereignty as it imparts to men the gift of God's righteousness (διὰ δικαιοσύνης); its goal, its limit which is yet no limit, is eternal life. Some, however, construe εἰς ζωὴν αἰώνιον with διὰ δικαιοσύνης: through a righteousness which ends in eternal life: cf. εἰς δικαίωσιν ζωῆς, ver. 18. διὰ Ἰ. Χ. τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν: this full rhetorical close has almost the value of a doxology.

CHAPTER VI.—VERS. 1-14. In the fifth chapter, Paul has concluded his exposition of the "righteousness of God" which is revealed in the Gospel. But the exposition leaves something to be desired—something hinted at in iii. 8 ("Let us do evil that good may come") and recalled in v. 20 f. ("Where sin abounded, grace did superabound"). It seems, after all, as if the gospel *did* "make void the law" (iii. 31) in a bad sense; and Paul has now to demonstrate that it does not. It is giving an unreal precision to his words to say with Lipsius that he has now to justify his gospel to the moral consciousness of the Jewish Christian; it is not Jewish Christians, obviously, who are addressed in vi. 19 ff., and it is not the Jewish-Christian moral consciousness, but the moral consciousness of all men, which raises the questions to which he here addresses himself. He has to show that those who have "received the reconciliation" (v. 11), who "receive the abundance of the grace and of the gift of righteousness" (v. 17), are the very persons in whom "the righteous requirement of the law" is fulfilled (viii. 4). The libertine argument is rather Gentile than Jewish, though when Paul speaks of the new religion as establishing Law, it is naturally the Mosaic law of which he thinks. It was the one definite embodiment of the concept. The justification, to the moral consciousness, of the

a Ch. xi. 22 VI. 1. ΤΙ οὖν ἐροῦμεν; \* ἐπιμενοῦμεν<sup>1</sup> τῇ ἁμαρτίᾳ, ἵνα ἡ χάρις  
 f.; Col. i. πλεονάσῃ; 2. μὴ γένοιτο. οἵτινες ἀπεθάνομεν τῇ ἁμαρτίᾳ, πῶς ἔτι  
 23; 1 ζήσομεν ἐν αὐτῇ; 3. ἡ ἀγνοεῖτε ὅτι ὅσοι ἐβαπτίσθημεν εἰς Χριστὸν  
 Tim. iv. 16. ἡσοῦν,<sup>2</sup> εἰς τὸν θάνατον αὐτοῦ ἐβαπτίσθημεν; 4. <sup>b</sup>συνετάφημεν οὖν  
 αὐτῷ διὰ τοῦ βαπτίσματος εἰς τὸν θάνατον· ἵνα, ὡς περ ἠγέρθη  
 Χριστὸς ἐκ νεκρῶν διὰ τῆς δόξης τοῦ πατρὸς, οὕτω καὶ ἡμεῖς ἐν

<sup>1</sup> For ἐπιμενοῦμεν read ἐπιμενωμεν with ABCDF.

<sup>2</sup> ἡσοῦν om. B and some cursives; W. and H. bracket. But this kind of omission is frequent; see Weiss, *Textkritik*, S. 88.

Gospel in which a Divine righteousness is freely held out in Jesus Christ to the sinner's faith, fills the next three chapters. In chap. vi. it is shown that the Christian, in baptism, dies to sin; in chap. vii., that by death he is freed from the law, which in point of fact, owing to the corruption of his nature, perpetually stimulates sin; in chap. viii., that the Spirit imparted to believers breaks the power of the flesh, and enables them to live to God.

Ver. 1. Τί οὖν ἐροῦμεν; What inference then shall we draw, *i.e.*, from the relations of sin and grace expounded in v. 20 f.? Are we to continue in sin (*cf.* xi. 22 f.) that grace may abound? Light-foot suggests "the sin" and "the grace" just referred to. The question was one sure to be asked by some one; Paul recognises it as a natural question in view of his doctrine, and asks it himself. But he answers it with an indignant negative.

Ver. 2. μὴ γένοιτο, *cf.* iii. 4. οἵτινες ἀπεθάνομεν τῇ ἁμαρτίᾳ: the relative is qualitative: "we, being as we are persons who died to sin". For the dative, see vers. 10, 11, and Winer, p. 263. To have died to sin is to be utterly and forever out of any relation to it. πῶς ἔτι ζήσομεν; how after that shall we live in it? impossible.

Ver. 3. But this death to sin, on which the whole argument turns, raises a question. It is introduced here quite abruptly; there has been no mention of it hitherto. *When*, it may be asked, did this all-important death take place? The answer is: It is involved in baptism. ἡ ἀγνοεῖτε ὅτι κ.τ.λ.: the only alternative to accepting this argument is to confess ignorance of the meaning of the rite in which they had been received into the Church. ὅσοι ἐβαπτίσθημεν: we all, who were baptised into Christ Jesus, were baptised into His death. The ὅσοι is not partitive but distributive: there is

no argument in the passage at all, unless all Christians were baptised. The expression βαπτισθῆναι εἰς Χριστὸν does not necessarily mean to be baptised into Christ; it may only mean to be baptised Christward, *i.e.*, with Christ in view as the object of faith. *Cf.* 1 Cor. x. 2, and the expression βαπτισθῆναι εἰς τὸ ὄνομα τοῦ Κυρίου Ἰησοῦ. In the same way βαπτισθῆναι εἰς τὸν θάνατον αὐτοῦ might certainly mean to be baptised with Christ's death in view as the object of faith. This is the interpretation of Lipsius. But it falls short of the argumentative requirements of the passage, which demand the idea of an actual union to, or incorporation in, Christ. This is more than Lipsius means, but it does not exclude what he means. The baptism in which we are united to Christ and to His death is one in which we confess our faith, looking to Him and His death. To say that faith justifies but baptism regenerates, breaking the Christian life into two unrelated pieces, as Weiss does—one spiritual and the other magical—is to throw away the Apostle's case. His whole point is that no such division can be made. Unless there is a necessary connection between justification by faith and the new life, Paul fails to prove that faith establishes the law. The real argument which unites chaps. iii., iv. and v. to chaps. vi., vii. and viii., and repels the charge of antinomianism, is this: justifying faith, looking to Christ and His death, really unites us to Him who died and rose again, as the symbolism of baptism shows to every Christian.

Ver. 4. This symbolism interpreted. συνετάφημεν οὖν αὐτῷ κ.τ.λ.: Therefore we were buried with Him (in the act of immersion) through that baptism into His death—burial being regarded as the natural sequence of death, and a kind of seal set to its reality. *Cf.* 1 Cor. xv. 3 f. It introduces a false abstraction to say



καινότητι ζωῆς περιπατήσωμεν. 5. Εἰ γὰρ ὁ σύμφυτοι γεγόναμεν <sup>c</sup> Here only, τῷ <sup>d</sup> ὁμοιώματι τοῦ θανάτου αὐτοῦ, ἀλλὰ καὶ τῆς ἀναστάσεως ἐσόμεθα · <sup>e</sup> cf. Luke viii 7; d Ch. i. 23; v. 14, viii. 3; Phil. ii. 7; Rev. ix. 7. 6. τοῦτο γινώσκοντες, ὅτι ὁ παλαιὸς ἡμῶν ὁ ἄνθρωπος συνεσταυρώθη, ἵνα καταργηθῇ τὸ σῶμα τῆς ἁμαρτίας, τοῦ μηκέτι δουλεύειν ἡμᾶς τῇ ἁμαρτίᾳ. 7. ὁ γὰρ ἀποθανὼν δεδικαίωται ἄπο τῆς ἁμαρτίας. 8. Εἰ δὲ ἀπεθάνομεν σὺν Χριστῷ, πιστεύομεν ὅτι καὶ συζήσομεν αὐτῷ; <sup>e</sup> Eph. iv. 22; Col. iii. 9. f Acts xiii. 9. 9. εἰδότες ὅτι Χριστὸς ἐγερθεὶς ἐκ νεκρῶν οὐκ ἔτι ἀποθνήσκει · θάνα- <sup>39</sup>

(with Meyer) that εἰς τὸν θάνατον means "unto death," not "unto His death": death in the whole context is perfectly definite. διὰ τῆς δόξης τοῦ πατρὸς: in nothing was the splendour of God's power revealed so much as in the resurrection of Jesus, Eph. i. 19 f. ἐν καινότητι ζωῆς: in life of a new quality; cf. vii. 6, 1 Tim. vi. 17: the construction makes the new quality of the life prominent. Winer, p. 296.

Ver. 5. This verse proves the legitimacy of the reference to a new life in the preceding one: union with Christ at one point (His death) is union with Him altogether (and therefore in His resurrection). εἰ γὰρ σύμφυτοι γεγόναμεν τῷ ὁμοιώματι τοῦ θανάτου αὐτοῦ: it is simplest to take συμφ. and τῷ ὁμοιώματι together—if we have become vitally one with the likeness of His death; i.e., if the baptism, which is a similitude of Christ's death, has had a reality answering to its obvious import, so that we have really died in it as Christ died, then we shall have a corresponding experience of resurrection. τῆς ἀναστάσεως is also dependent on ὁμοίωματι: baptism, inasmuch as one emerges from the water after being immersed, is a ὁμοίωμα of resurrection as well as of death. It does not seem a real question to ask whether the ἀνάστασις is ethical or transcendent: one cannot imagine Paul drawing the distinction here. (On the word ὁμοίωμα, see Cremer.)

Ver. 6. All this can be asserted, knowing as we do that "our old man" = our old self, what we were before we became Christians—was crucified with Him. Paul says συνεσταυρώθη simply because Christ died on the cross, and we are baptised into that death, not because "our old man" is the basest of criminals for whom crucifixion is the proper penalty. The object of this crucifixion of the old man was "that the body of sin might be brought to nought". τὸ σῶμα τῆς ἁμαρτίας is the body in which we live: apart from the crucifixion of the old self it can be characterised as "a body of

sin". It may be wrong to say that it is necessarily and essentially sinful—the body, as such, can have no moral predicate attached to it; it would be as wrong to deny that it is invariably and persistently a seat and source of sin. The genitive is perhaps qualitative rather than possessive, though "the body of which sin has taken possession" (S. and H.) is a good paraphrase. See Winer, p. 235, 768. This body is to be reduced to impotence τοῦ μηκέτι δουλεύειν ἡμᾶς κ.τ.λ. "that we may no longer be slaves to sin". The body is the instrument we use in the service of sin, and if it is disabled the service must cease. For the gen. inf., see Burton, § 397.

Ver. 7. ὁ γὰρ ἀποθανὼν κ.τ.λ. Here we have the general principle on which the foregoing argument rests: death annuls all obligations, breaks all ties, cancels all old scores. The difficulty is that by the words ἀπὸ τῆς ἁμαρτίας Paul introduces one particular application of the principle—the one he is concerned with here—as if it were identical with the principle itself. "Death clears men of all claims, especially (to come to the case before us) it clears us, who have died with Christ, of the claim of sin, our old master, to rule over us still." Weiss would reject the introduction into this clause of the idea of dying *with Christ*, on the ground that the words σὺν Χριστῷ bring it in as a new idea in the following verse. But it is no new idea; it is the idea of the whole passage; and unless we bring it in here, the quittance *from sin* (and not from any obligation in general) remains inexplicable. Weiss, in fact, gives it up.

Ver. 8. The Apostle now resumes his main thought. συζήσομεν: see note on ἀνάστασις ver. 5: there is no conscious separation of ethical and transcendent life with Christ—to Paul it is one life.

Ver. 9. εἰδότες . . . οὐκέτι ἀποθνήσκει: The new life with Christ will be the same which Christ Himself lives, a life inaccessible to death. The post-resurrection life of Jesus was not His old life over

τος αὐτοῦ οὐκ ἔτι κυριεύει. 10. ὁ γὰρ ἀπέθανε, τῇ ἁμαρτίᾳ ἀπέθανεν ἐφάπαξ· ὁ δὲ ζῆ, ζῆ τῷ Θεῷ. 11. οὕτω καὶ ὑμεῖς λογιζέσθε ἑαυτοὺς νεκροὺς μὲν εἶναι<sup>1</sup> τῇ ἁμαρτίᾳ, ζῶντας δὲ τῷ Θεῷ, ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ τῷ Κυρίῳ ἡμῶν.<sup>2</sup> 12. Μὴ οὖν βασιλευέτω ἡ ἁμαρτία ἐν τῷ θνητῷ

<sup>1</sup> νεκροὺς μὲν εἶναι  $\aleph^3$ KLP; εἶναι νεκροὺς μὲν  $\aleph^1$ BC; om. ADF 17.

<sup>2</sup> τῷ κυρίῳ ἡμῶν; om. ABDF, and edd.; ins.  $\aleph^3$ CKLP.

again; in that life death had dominion over Him, because He made Himself one with us in all the consequences of sin; but now the dominion of death has expired. The principle of ver. 7 can be applied to Christ also: He has died, and the powers which in the old relations had claims upon Him—death, *e.g.*—have such claims no more.

Ver. 10. This is expanded in ver. 10.  $\delta$  γὰρ ἀπέθανε, τῇ ἁμαρτίᾳ ἀπέθανεν ἐφάπαξ; the  $\delta$  is 'cognate' accus. Winer, p. 209. "The death that He died, He died to sin once for all." The dative τῇ ἁμαρτίᾳ must be grammatically the same here as in vers. 2, 11, but the interpretation required seems different. While He lived, Christ had undoubtedly relations to sin, though sin was foreign to His will and conscience (2 Cor. v. 21); but after He died these relations ceased; sin could never make Him its victim again as at the Cross. Similarly while *we* lived (*i.e.*, before we died with Christ), we also had relations to sin; and these relations likewise, different as they were from His, must cease with that death. The difference in the reference of the dative is no doubt an objection to this interpretation, and accordingly the attempt has been made to give the same meaning to dying to sin in Christ's case as in ours, and indeed to make our dying to sin the effect and reproduction of His. "The language of the Apostle seems to imply that there was something in the mind of Christ in dying for us that was *the moral equivalent* [italics ours] to that death to sin which takes place in us when we believe in Him, something in its very nature fitted to produce the change in us." Somerville, *St. Paul's Conception of Christ*, p. 100 f. He died, in short, rather than sin—laid down His life rather than violate the will of God; in this sense, which is an ethical one, and points to an experience which can be reproduced in others under His influence, He died to sin. "His death on the Cross was the final triumph of His holiness over all those desires of the flesh that furnish to

man unregenerate the motive power of His life." But though this gives an ethical meaning to the words in both cases, it does not give exactly the same ethical meaning; a certain disparity remains. It is more in the line of all Paul's thoughts to say with Holtzmann (*N. T. Theol.*, ii., 118), that Christ by dying paid to sin that tribute to which in virtue of a Divine sentence (κρίμα, v. 16) it could lay claim, and that those therefore who share His death are like Himself absolved from all claims of sin for the future. For ἐφάπαξ, see Heb. vii. 27, ix. 12, x. 10. The very idea of death is that of a summary, decisive, never-to-be-repeated end.  $\delta$  δὲ ζῆ κ.τ.λ. "The life that He lives He lives to God".

Ver. 11. In this verse the application is made of all that precedes. The death with Christ, the life with Christ, are real, yet to be realised. The truth of being a Christian is contained in them, yet the calling of the Christian is to live up to them. We may forget what we should be; we may also (and this is how Paul puts it) forget what we *are*. We are dead to sin in Christ's death; we are alive to God in Christ's resurrection; let us regard ourselves as such in *Christ Jesus*. The essence of our faith is a union to Him in which His experience becomes ours. This is the theological reply to antinomianism.

Ver. 12 f. Practical enforcement of vers. 1-11. The inner life is in union with Christ, and the outer (bodily) life must not be inconsistent with it (Weiss). ἐν τῷ θνητῷ ἡμῶν σώματι: the suggestion of θνητός is rather that the frail body should be protected against the tyranny of sin, than that sin leads to the death of the body. μηδὲ παρισπάνετε . . . ἀλλὰ παραστήσατε: and do not go on, as you have been doing, putting your members at the service of sin, but put them once for all at the service of God. For the difference between pres. and aor. imper., see Winer, p. 393 f. ὄπλα ἀδικίας: the gen. is of quality, *cf.* Luke xvi. 8, 9. ὄπλα in the N.T. seems always to mean weapons, not instruments: see

ὁμῶν <sup>g</sup> σώματι, εἰς τὸ ὑπακούειν αὐτῇ ἐν<sup>1</sup> ταῖς ἐπιθυμίαις αὐτοῦ · 13. g Ch.viii.11. μηδὲ παριστάνετε τὰ μέλη ὑμῶν ὅπλα ἀδικίας τῇ ἁμαρτίᾳ · ἀλλὰ παραστήσατε ἑαυτοὺς τῷ Θεῷ ὡς<sup>2</sup> ἐκ νεκρῶν ζῶντας, καὶ τὰ μέλη ὑμῶν ὅπλα <sup>h</sup> δικαιοσύνης τῷ Θεῷ. 14. ἁμαρτία γὰρ ὑμῶν οὐ κυριεύσει · <sup>h</sup> Ch.xiii.12. οὐ γὰρ ἐστε ὑπὸ νόμον, ἀλλ' ὑπὸ χάριν.

15. Τί οὖν; ἁμαρτήσομεν,<sup>3</sup> ὅτι οὐκ ἐσμὲν ὑπὸ <sup>i</sup> νόμον, ἀλλ' ὑπὸ <sup>i i</sup> 1 Cor. ix. χάριν; μὴ γένοιτο. 16. οὐκ οἴδατε ὅτι ᾧ παριστάνετε ἑαυτοὺς δούλους εἰς ὑπακοήν, δοῦλοί ἐστε ᾧ ὑπακούετε, ἦτοι ἁμαρτίας εἰς θάνατον, ἢ ὑπακοῆς εἰς δικαιοσύνην; 17. χάρις δὲ τῷ Θεῷ, ὅτι ἦτε

<sup>1</sup> αὐτῇ ἐν C<sup>3</sup>KLP; om. NABC<sup>1</sup> 47, vulg.; αὐτῇ only, DF, Orig.-inter. The received reading is apparently an attempt to combine the other two.

<sup>2</sup> ὡς DFKLP 17; but ὡσει NABC 47.

<sup>3</sup> For ἁμαρτήσομεν NABCDKLP read ἁμαρτησομεν.

2 Cor. x. 4, 6, 7, and cf. ὀψώνια, ver. 23. ὡσεὶ ἐκ νεκρῶν ζῶντας: they were *really* such; the ὡσεὶ signifies that they are to think of themselves *as* such, and to act accordingly.

Ver. 14. They can obey these exhortations, for sin will not be their tyrant now, since they are not under law, but under grace. It is not restraint, but inspiration, which liberates from sin: not Mount Sinai but Mount Calvary which makes saints. But this very way of putting the truth (which will be expanded in chaps. vii. and viii.) seems to raise the old difficulty of iii. 8, vi. 1 again. The Apostle states it himself, and proceeds to a final refutation of it.

Ver. 15. ἁμαρτήσομεν; deliberative: are we to sin because our life is not ruled by statutes, but inspired by the sense of what we owe to that free pardoning mercy of God? Are we to sin because God justifies the ungodly at the Cross?

Ver. 16. οὐκ οἴδατε: It is excluded by the elementary principle that no man can serve two masters (Matt. vi. 24). The δούλους is the exclusive property of *one*, and he belongs to that one εἰς ὑπακοήν, with obedience in view; nothing else than obedience to his master alone is contemplated. The masters here are ἁμαρτία whose service ends in death, and ὑπακοή (cf. v. 19) whose service ends in righteousness. δικαιοσύνη here cannot be "justification," but righteousness in the sense of the character which God approves. ἦτοι here only in N.T. = *of course* these are the *only* alternatives.

Ver. 17. Paul thanks God that his readers have already made their choice, and made it for obedience. ὅτι ἦτε . . . ὑπηκούσατε δὲ: the co-ordination seems

to imply that Paul is grateful (1) that their servitude to sin is *past*—ἦτε having the emphasis; (2) that they have received the Gospel. Yet the two things are one, and it would have been more natural to subordinate the first: "that though ye were slaves of sin, ye obeyed," etc. ὑπηκούσατε εἰς δὲ παρεδόθητε τύπον διδασχῆς must be resolved into ὑ. τῷ τύπῳ τῆς διδασχῆς εἰς δὲ παρεδόθητε. The alternative is εἰς τὸν τύπον τῆς διδασχῆς δὲ παρεδόθη ὑμῖν (Κυρκε). But ὑπακούειν εἰς τι only means to be obedient with respect to something, not to be obedient *to* some one, or some thing, which is the sense required here. A true parallel is Cyril of Jerus. Catechet. lect. iv., § iii.: πρὸ δὲ τῆς εἰς τὴν πίστιν παραδόσεως; the catechumens were handed over to the faith. But what is the τύπος διδασχῆς to which the converts at Rome were handed over? Many, in the line of these words of Cyril, conceive of it as a "type of doctrine," a special mode of presenting the Gospel, which had as catchwords, e.g., "not under law but under grace," or "free from sin and slaves to righteousness," or more probably, "dying with Christ and rising with Him". In other words, Paulinism as modern theology conceives it. But this is an anachronism. It is only modern eyes that see distinct doctrinal types in the N.T., and Paul, as far as he knew (1 Cor. xv. 3-11), preached the same Gospel as the other Apostles. It is unnecessary, also, to the argument. In whatever form the Gospel won the obedience of men, it was inconsistent with their continuance in sin. Hence it seems nearer the truth to take τύπος διδασχῆς in a more general sense;

δοῦλοι τῆς ἀμαρτίας, ὑπηκούσατε δὲ ἐκ καρδίας εἰς δῑ παρεδόθητε τύπον διδασχῆς. 18. ἐλευθερωθέντες δὲ ἀπὸ τῆς ἀμαρτίας, ἐδουλώθητε τῇ δικαιοσύνῃ. 19. Ἀνθρώπινον λέγω διὰ τὴν ἀσθένειαν τῆς σαρκὸς ἡμῶν. ὥσπερ γὰρ παρεστήσατε τὰ μέλη ἡμῶν δοῦλα τῇ ἀκαθαρσίᾳ καὶ τῇ ἀνομίᾳ εἰς τὴν ἀνομίαν, οὕτω νῦν παραστήσατε τὰ μέλη ἡμῶν δοῦλα τῇ δικαιοσύνῃ εἰς ἁγιασμόν. 20. ὅτε γὰρ δοῦλοι ἦτε τῆς ἀμαρτίας, ἐλεύθεροι ἦτε τῇ δικαιοσύνῃ. 21. τίνα οὖν καρπὸν εἶχετε τότε, ἐφ' οἷς νῦν ἐπαισχύνεσθε; τὸ γὰρ τέλος ἑκείνων θάνατος. 22. νυνὶ δὲ ἐλευθερωθέντες ἀπὸ τῆς ἀμαρτίας, δουλωθέντες δὲ τῷ Θεῷ, ἔχετε τὸν καρπὸν ἡμῶν εἰς ἁγιασμόν, τὸ δὲ τέλος ζωῆν αἰώνιον. 23. τὰ γὰρ ὀψώνια τῆς ἀμαρτίας θάνατος· τὸ δὲ χάρισμα τοῦ

<sup>k</sup> Matt. xxvi. 41.

1 i Thess. iv. 3 f., 7; Heb. xii. 14.

m Luke iii. 14; 1 Cor. ix. 7; 2 Cor. xi. 8.

<sup>1</sup> το γαρ τελος Ἰ<sup>1</sup>ACD<sup>3</sup>KLP; το μεν γαρ τελος Ἰ<sup>2</sup>BD<sup>1</sup>F, Syr. As the reasons for omitting are obvious—the art. is already separated from the substantive, and there is really nothing to balance it—the *μεν* is probably original, and is retained by Lachmann, Weiss, and Tregelles (marg.), though omitted by W. and H.

it is teaching, of course in a definite form, but regarded chiefly in its ethical requirements; when received, or when men were handed over to it, it became a moral authority. Cf. Hort, *Romans and Ephesians*, p. 32 f. What is the time referred to in the aorists ὑπηκούσατε and παρεδόθητε? It is the time when they became Christians, a time really fixed by their acceptance of the Gospel in faith, and outwardly marked by baptism. Baptism is the visible point of separation between the two servitudes—to sin and to God.

Ver. 18. There is no absolute independence for man; our nature requires us to serve *some* master.

Ver. 19. ἀνθρώπινον λέγω διὰ τὴν ἀσθένειαν τῆς σαρκὸς ἡμῶν. Cf. iii. 5, Gal. iii. 15. Paul apologises for using this human figure of the relation of slave to master to convey spiritual truths. But what is “the weakness of the flesh” which makes him have recourse to such figures? Weiss makes it moral. The Apostle speaks with this unmistakable plainness and emphasis because he is writing to morally weak persons whose nature and past life really made them liable to temptations to libertinism. This seems to me confirmed by the reference, which immediately follows, to the character of their pre-Christian life. Others make the weakness rather intellectual than ethical, as if Paul said: “I condescend to your want of spiritual intelligence in using such figures”. But this is not a natural meaning for “the weakness of your flesh,” and does not yield so good a connection with what follows.

δοῦλα τῇ ἀκαθαρσίᾳ καὶ τῇ ἀνομίᾳ: ἀκαθαρσία defiling the sinner, ἀνομία disregarding the will of God. If εἰς τὴν ἀνομίαν should remain in the text, it may suggest that this bad life never gets beyond itself. On the other hand, to present the members as slaves to righteousness has ἁγιασμός in view, which is a higher thing. ἁγιασμός is sanctification, primarily as an act or process, eventually as a result. It is unreal to ask whether the process or the result is meant here: they have no meaning apart.

Ver. 20. In every state in which man lives, there is a bondage and a liberty. In the old state, it was bondage to sin, and liberty in relation to righteousness. For τῇ δικαιοσύνῃ see Winer, 263.

Ver. 21 f. To decide which of the two lives, or of the two freedoms, is the true, Paul appeals to their fruits. The marked contrast between τότε and νῦν is in favour of those who put the mark of interrogation after τότε. “What fruit therefore had you then? Things of which you are now ashamed.” The construction ἐφ' οἷς ἐπαισχύνεσθε is found also in Isa. i. 29: ἤσχηθησαν ἐπὶ τοῖς κήποις. If the point of interrogation is put after ἐπαισχύνεσθε, the answer “none” must be interpolated: and ἐκείνων supplied as antecedent to ἐφ' οἷς. νυνὶ δέ: But now, now that the situation is reversed, and you have been freed from sin and made slaves to God, you have your fruit εἰς ἁγιασμόν. He does not say what the fruit is, but we know what the things are which contribute to and result in ἁγιασμός: see ver. 19.

Ver. 23. The γὰρ introduces the

Θεοῦ ζωῆ αἰώνιος ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ τῷ Κυρίῳ ἡμῶν. VII. 1. Ἡ ἀγνοεῖτε, ἀδελφοί (γινώσκουσι γὰρ νόμον λαλῶ,) ὅτι ὁ νόμος κυριεύει τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ἐφ' ὅσον χρόνον ζῆ; 2. ἡ γὰρ ὑπανδρος γυνὴ τῷ ζῶντι ἀνδρὶ δέδεται νόμῳ· ἐὰν δὲ ἀποθάνῃ ὁ ἀνὴρ, κατήργηται ἀπὸ τοῦ ἀνδρός. 3. ἄρα οὖν ζῶντος τοῦ ἀνδρός μοιχαλὶς χρηματίζει, ἐὰν γένηται ἀνδρὶ ἐτέρῳ· ἐὰν δὲ ἀποθάνῃ ὁ ἀνὴρ, ἐλευθέρα ἐστὶν ἀπὸ τοῦ νόμου, τοῦ μὴ εἶναι αὐτὴν μοιχαλίδα, γενομένην ἀνδρὶ ἐτέρῳ. 4. ὥστε, ἀδελφοί μου, καὶ ὑμεῖς ἐθανατώθητε τῷ νόμῳ διὰ τοῦ σώματος τοῦ Χριστοῦ, εἰς τὸ γενέσθαι ὑμᾶς ἐτέρῳ, τῷ ἐκ νεκρῶν

general truth of which what has been said of the Romans in ver. 21 f. is an illustration. "All this is normal and natural, for the wages of sin is death," etc. *δψώνια* 1 Macc. iii. 28, xiv. 32. The idea of a warfare (see *δπλα*, ver. 13) is continued. The soldier's pay who enlists in the service of sin is death. τὸ δὲ *χάρισμα*: but the free gift, etc. The end in God's service is not of debt, but of grace. Tertullian (quoted in S. and H.) renders *χάρισμα* here *donativum* (the largess given by the emperor to soldiers on a New Year's Day or birthday), keeping on the military association; but Paul could hardly use what is almost a technical expression with himself in a technical sense quite remote from his own. On *ζωῆ αἰώνιος ἐν Χ. Ἰ. τῷ κυρίῳ ἡμῶν*, see on v. 21.

CHAPTER VII. The subject of chap. vi. is continued. The Apostle shows how by death the Christian is freed from the law, which, good as it is in itself and in the Divine intention, nevertheless, owing to the corruption of man's nature, instead of helping to make him good, perpetually stimulates sin. Vers. 1-6 describe the liberation from the law; vers. 7-13, the actual working of the law; in vers. 14-25 we are shown that this working of the law is due not to anything in itself, but to the power of sin in the flesh.

Vers. 1-6. For *ἡ ἀγνοεῖτε*, cf. vi. 3. Chap. vi. contains the argument which is illustrated in these verses, and the question alludes to it: not to accept the argument that the Christian is free from all legal obligations leaves no alternative but to suppose the persons to whom it is addressed ignorant of the principle by which the duration of all legal obligations is determined. This they cannot be, for Paul speaks *γινώσκουσι νόμον* = to people who know what law is. Neither Roman nor Mosaic law is specially referred to: the argument rests on the nature of law in general. Even in

ὁ νόμος, though in applying the principle Paul would think first of the Mosaic law, it is not exclusively referred to.

Ver. 2 f. An illustration of the principle. It is the only illustration in which death liberates a person who yet remains alive and can enter into new relations. Of course there is an inexactness, for in the argument the Christian is freed by his own death, and in the illustration the wife is freed by the husband's death; but we must discount that. Paul required an illustration in which both death and a new life appeared. *κατήργηται ἀπὸ*: cf. ver. 6, Gal. v. 4: she is once for all discharged (or as R.V. in Gal. "severed") from the law of the husband: for the genitive *τοῦ ἀνδρός*, see Winer, 235. *χρηματίζει* = she shall be publicly designated: cf. Acts xi. 26. *τοῦ μὴ εἶναι αὐτὴν μοιχαλίδα κ.τ.λ.*: grammatically this may either mean (1) *that she may not be an adulteress*, though married to another man; or (2) *so that she is not*, etc. Meyer prefers the first; and it may be argued that in this place, at all events, the idea of forming another connection is essential: cf. *εἰς τὸ γενέσθαι ὑμᾶς ἐτέρῳ*, ver. 4 (Gifford); but it is difficult to conceive of innocent remarriage as being formally the purpose of the law in question, and the second meaning is therefore to be preferred. Cf. Burton, *Moods and Tenses*, § 398.

Ver. 4. *ὥστε καὶ ὑμεῖς ἐθανατώθητε τῷ νόμῳ*: the inference is drawn rather from the principle than from the example, but *καὶ ὑμεῖς* means "you as well as the woman in the illustration," not "you Gentiles as well as I a Jew". The last, which is Weiss's interpretation, introduces a violent contrast of which there is not the faintest hint in the context. The meaning of *ἐθανατώθητε* is fixed by reference to chap. vi. 3-6. The aorist refers to the definite time at which in their baptism the old life (and with it all its legal obligations)

a Matt. xiii. 23; Col. i. 6, 10.  
b Gal. v. 24.

ἐγερθέντι, ἵνα <sup>a</sup> καρποφορήσωμεν τῷ Θεῷ. 5. ὅτε γὰρ ἦμεν ἐν τῇ σαρκί, τὰ <sup>b</sup> παθήματα τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν τὰ διὰ τοῦ νόμου ἐνηργεῖτο ἐν τοῖς μέλεσιν ἡμῶν, εἰς τὸ καρποφορήσαι τῷ θανάτῳ. 6. νυνὶ δὲ κατηργήθημεν ἀπὸ τοῦ νόμου, ἀποθανόντες ἐν ᾧ κατειχόμεθα, ὥστε δουλεύειν ἡμᾶς<sup>1</sup> ἐν καινότητι πνεύματος, καὶ οὐ παλαιότητι γράμματος.

7. Τί οὖν ἐροῦμεν; ὁ νόμος ἁμαρτία; μὴ γένοιτο· ἀλλὰ τὴν ἁμαρτίαν οὐκ ἔγνω, εἰ μὴ διὰ νόμου· τὴν τε γὰρ ἐπιθυμίαν οὐκ

<sup>1</sup> ημος om. BFG. Most edd. (W. and H., Lachm., and Treg.) bracket it; Weiss omits, but allows that the case is disputable.

came to an end. διὰ τοῦ σώματος τοῦ Χριστοῦ: Weiss rejects as opposed to the context the "dogmatic" reference to the sacrificial death of Christ as a satisfaction for sin; all the words imply, according to him, is that the Christian, in baptism, experiences a ὁμοίωμα of Christ's death, or as it is put in vi. 6 is crucified with Him, and so liberated from every relation to the law. But if Christ's death had no spiritual content—if it were not a death "for our sins" (1 Cor. xv. 3), a death having the sacrificial character and atoning virtue described in iii. 25 f.—there would be no reason why a sinful man should be baptised into Christ and His death at all, and in point of fact no one would be baptised. It is because Christ's death is what it is, a sin-expiating death, that it draws men to Him, and spiritually reproduces in them a reflex or counterpart of His death, with which all their old relations and obligations terminate. The object of this is that they may belong to another, a different person. Paul does not say ἐτέρῳ ἀνδρὶ: the marriage metaphor is dropped. He is speaking of the experience of Christians one by one, and though Christ is sometimes spoken of as the husband or bridegroom of the Church, there is no Scripture authority for using this metaphor of His relation to the individual soul. Neither is this interpretation favoured by the use of καρποφορήσωμεν; to interpret this of the fruit of the new marriage is both needless and grotesque. The word is used frequently in the N.T. for the outcome of the Christian life, but never with this association; and a reference to vi. 21 shows how natural it is to the Apostle without any such prompting. Even the change from the second person (ἐθανατώθητε) to the first (καρποφορήσωμεν) shows that he is contemplating the end of the Christian life quite apart from the suggestions of the metaphor. Christ is

described as τῷ ἐκ νεκρῶν ἐγερθέντι, because we can only belong to a living person. τῷ θεῷ is dat. comm. God is the person interested in this result.

Ver. 5. Contrast of the earlier life. "ἐν τῇ σαρκί" is materially the same as "ὑπὸ τὸν νόμον"; the same state of the soul is described more from within and more from without. The opposite would be ἐν τῷ πνεύματι, or ὑπὸ χάριτι. τὰ παθήματα τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν are the passions from which acts of sin proceed: Gal. v. 24. τὰ διὰ τοῦ νόμου: it is through the law that these passions become actualised: we would never know them for what they are, if it were not for the law. εἰς τὸ καρποφορήσαι τῷ θανάτῳ: there is no allusion to marriage here any more than in ver. 4. Death is personified here as in v. 17: this tyrant of the human race is the only one who profits by the fruits of the sinful life.

Ver. 6. νυνὶ δὲ but as things stand, considering what we are as Christians. κατηργήθημεν: cf. ver. 2. We are discharged from the law, by our death to that in which we were held. But what is this? Most expositors say the law; Philippi even makes τοῦ νόμου the antecedent of ἐν ᾧ, rendering, we have been delivered, by dying, from the law in which we were held. This construction is too artificial to be true; and if we supply τούτῳ with ἀποθανόντες, something vaguer than the law, though involving and involved by it (the old life in the flesh, for instance) must be meant. ὥστε δουλεύειν κ.τ.λ.: "enabling us to serve" (S. and H.): for ὥστε with inf. in N.T., see Blass, *Gramm. des N.T. Griech.*, § 219. ἐν καινότητι πνεύματος κ.τ.λ. = in a new way, which only the possession of the spirit makes possible, not in the old way which alone was possible when we were under the letter of the law. For the Pauline contrast of πνεῦμα and γράμμα, see 2 Cor. iii.; for οὐ in this expression, see Burton, § 481.

ἦδειν, εἰ μὴ ὁ νόμος ἔλεγεν, “Οὐκ ἐπιθυμήσεις”. 8. ° ἀφορμὴν <sup>c 2 Cor. xi. 12; Gal. v. 13; 1 Tim. v. 14.</sup>  
 δὲ λαβοῦσα ἡ ἀμαρτία διὰ τῆς ἐντολῆς κατειργάσατο <sup>1</sup> ἐν ἐμοὶ πᾶσαν

<sup>1</sup> κατειργάσατο  $\aleph$ ACFGKL; κατηργάσατο B<sup>1</sup>DP. In chap. xv. 18 all editors with  $\aleph$ ABCP read κατειργάσατο, and this is preferred here by Lachm., W. and H., and by Weiss in all places; but here Tischdf., Treg. and Alford read κατηργάσατο. Variations in the treatment of the augment are very frequent in the MSS.

Vers. 7-13. The actual working of the law. A very close connection between the law and sin is implied in all that has preceded: especially in vi. 14, and in such an expression as τὰ παθήματα τῶν ἀμαρτιῶν τὰ διὰ τοῦ νόμου in vii. 5. This connection has to be examined more closely. The object of the Apostle, according to Weiss, is not to answer a false inference from his teaching, *viz.*, that the law is sin, but to conciliate for his own mind the idea of liberation from the law with the recognition of the O.T. revelation. But the difficulty of conciliating these two things is not peculiar to the Apostle; it is because we all feel it in some form that the passage is so real to us. *Our* experience of law has been as tragic as his, and we too ask how this comports with the idea of its Divine origin. The much discussed question, whether the subject of this passage (vers. 7-24) is the unregenerate or the regenerate self, or whether in particular vers. 7-13 refer to the unregenerate, and vers. 14-24 to the regenerate, is hardly real. The distinction in its absolute form belongs to doctrine, not to experience. No one could have written the passage but a Christian: it is the experience of the unregenerate, we may say, but seen through regenerate eyes, interpreted in a regenerate mind. It is the Apostle's spiritual history, but universalised; a history in which one stage is not extinguished by the next, but which is present as a whole to his consciousness, each stage all the time determining and determined by all the rest. We cannot date the things of the spirit as simply as if they were mere historical incidents. τί οὖν ἐροῦμεν, *cf.* vi. 1: What inference then shall we draw? *sc.* from the relations of sin and law just suggested. Is the law sin? Paul repels the thought with horror. ἀλλὰ τὴν ἀμαρτίαν οὐκ ἔγνων: ἀλλὰ may continue the protest = On the contrary, I should not have known sin, etc.; or it may be restrictive, abating the completeness of the negation involved in the protest. The law is not sin—God forbid; but, for all that, there is a connection: I should

not have known sin but by the law. The last suits the context better: see ver. 21. On οὐκ ἔγνων without ἄν, see Winer, 383: it is possible, however (Gifford), to render simply, I did not know sin except through the law; and so also with οὐκ ἦδειν. διὰ νόμου: of course he thinks of the Mosaic law, but the absence of the article shows that it is the legal, not the Mosaic, character of it which is in view; and it is this which enables us to understand the experience in question. τὴν τε γὰρ ἐπιθυμίαν κ.τ.λ.: the desire for what is forbidden is the first conscious form of sin. For the force of τε here see Winer, p. 561. Simcox, *Language of the N.T.*, p. 160. In the very similar construction in 2 Cor. x. 8 Winer suggests an anacoluthon: possibly Paul meant here also to introduce something which would have balanced the τε (I should both have been ignorant of lust, unless the law had said, Thou shalt not lust, and ignorant of other forms of sin unless the law had prohibited them). But the one instance, as he works it out, suffices him. It seems impossible to deny the reference to the tenth commandment (Exod. xx. 17) when the words οὐκ ἐπιθυμήσεις are quoted from “the law”; but the special modes of ἐπιθυμία prohibited are of no consequence, and it is beside the mark to argue that Paul's escape from pharisaism began with the discovery that a feeling, not an outward act only, might be sinful. All he says is that the consciousness of sin awoke in him in the shape of a conflict with a prohibitive law, and to illustrate this he quotes the tenth commandment. Its generality made it the most appropriate to quote.

Ver. 8. ἀφορμὴν λαβοῦσα means “having received,” not “having taken” occasion. ἡ ἀμαρτία is sin as a power dwelling in man, of the presence of which he is as yet unaware. How it “receives occasion” is not stated; it must be by coming face to face with something which appeals to ἐπιθυμία; but when it has received it, it avails itself of the commandment (*viz.*, the one prohibiting ἐπιθυμία) to work in us ἐπιθυμία of

ἐπιθυμίαν· χωρὶς γὰρ νόμου ἁμαρτία νεκρά· 9. ἐγὼ δὲ ἔζων χωρὶς νόμου ποτέ· ἐλθούσης δὲ τῆς ἐντολῆς, ἡ ἁμαρτία <sup>1</sup> ἀνέζησεν, 10. ἐγὼ δὲ ἀπέθανον· καὶ εὗρέθη μοι ἡ ἐντολὴ ἢ εἰς ζωὴν, αὕτη εἰς θάνατον.

e Ver. 8. 11. ἡ γὰρ ἁμαρτία <sup>2</sup> ἀφορμὴν λαβοῦσα διὰ τῆς ἐντολῆς ἐξηπάτησέ με, καὶ δι' αὐτῆς ἀπέκτεινεν. 12. ὥστε ὁ μὲν νόμος ἅγιος, καὶ ἡ ἐντολὴ ἅγια καὶ δικαία καὶ ἀγαθή. 13. Τὸ οὖν ἀγαθὸν ἐμοὶ γέγονε <sup>1</sup> θάνατος; μὴ γένοιτο· ἀλλὰ ἡ ἁμαρτία, ἵνα φανῇ ἁμαρτία, διὰ τοῦ ἀγαθοῦ μοι κατεργαζομένη θάνατον, ἵνα γένηται καθ' <sup>1</sup> ὑπερβολὴν <sup>f</sup> 1 Cor. xii. <sup>31</sup>; <sup>2</sup> Cor. <sup>1</sup> 8; <sup>iv</sup>. ἁμαρτωλὸς ἡ ἁμαρτία διὰ τῆς ἐντολῆς. 14. Οἶδαμεν γὰρ <sup>2</sup> ὅτι ὁ <sup>f</sup> 17; Gal. i. <sup>13</sup>. νόμος πνευματικὸς ἐστίν· ἐγὼ δὲ σαρκικός <sup>3</sup> εἰμι, πεπραμένος ὑπό

<sup>1</sup> γέγονε KL; εγενετο NABCD.

<sup>2</sup> γαρ NBCFK; δε AD (Greek) L. See note <sup>1</sup> page 604.

<sup>3</sup> σαρκικός N<sup>3</sup>LP; but σαρκινός NABCDF. The two words are constantly confused (Alford), but the change may have been made intentionally here with the idea that an ethical word was wanted.

every sort. It really *is* the commandment which it uses, for without law sin is dead. Cf. iv. 15, v. 13: but especially 1 Cor. xv. 56. Apart from the law we have no experience either of its character or of its vitality.

Ver. 9. ἐγὼ δὲ ἔζων χωρὶς νόμου ποτέ: this is ideal biography. There is not really a period in life to which one can look back as the happy time when he had no conscience; the lost paradise in the infancy of men or nations only serves as a foil to the moral conflicts and disorder of maturer years, of which we are clearly conscious. ἐλθούσης δὲ τῆς ἐντολῆς κ.τ.λ. In these words, on the other hand, the most intensely real experience is vividly reproduced. When the commandment came, sin "came to life again"; its dormant energies woke, and "I died". "There is a deep tragic pathos in the brief and simple statement; it seems to point to some definite period full of painful recollections" (Gifford). To say that "death" here means the loss of immortality (bodily death without the hope of resurrection), as Lipsius, or that it means only "spiritual" death, is to lose touch with the Apostle's mode of thought. It is an indivisible thing, all doom and despair, too simply felt to be a subject for analysis.

Ver. 10. The result is that the commandment defeats its own intention; it has life in view, but it ends in death. Here also analysis only misleads. Life and death are indivisible wholes.

Ver. 11. Yet this result is not due to the commandment in itself. It is in-

dwelling sin, inherited from Adam, which, when it has found a base of operations, employs the commandment to deceive (cf. Gen. iii. 13) and to kill. "Sin here takes the place of the Tempter" in Genesis (S. and H.).

Ver. 12. The conclusion is that the law is holy (this is the answer to the question with which the discussion started in ver. 7: ὁ νόμος ἁμαρτία;), and the commandment, which is the law in operation, holy and just and good. ἅγια means that it belongs to God and has a character corresponding; δικαία that its requirements are those which answer to the relations in which man stands to God and his fellow-creatures; ἀγαθή that in its nature and aim it is beneficent; man's weal, not his woe, is its natural end. There is no formal contrast to ὁ μὲν νόμος, such as was perhaps in the Apostle's mind when he began the sentence, and might have been introduced by ἡ δὲ ἁμαρτία; but a real contrast is given in ver. 13.

Ver. 13. The description of the commandment as "good" raises the problem of ver. 7 in a new form. Can the good issue in evil? Did that which is good turn out to be death to me? This also is denied, or rather repelled. It was not the good law, but sin, which became death to the Apostle. And in this there was a Divine intention, *viz.*, that sin might appear sin, might come out in its true colours, by working death for man through that which is good. Sin turns God's intended blessing into a curse; nothing could more clearly show what it



τὴν ἁμαρτίαν. 15. ὁ γὰρ κατεργάζομαι, οὐ γινώσκω· οὐ γὰρ ὁ θέλω, τοῦτο πράσσω· ἀλλ' ὁ μισῶ, τοῦτο ποιῶ. 16. εἰ δὲ ὁ οὐ θέλω, τοῦτο ποιῶ, ἡ σύμφημι τῷ νόμῳ ὅτι καλός. 17. νυνὶ δὲ οὐκ-<sup>g</sup>Here only.

is, or excite a stronger desire for deliverance from it. The second clause with ἵνα (ἵνα γένηται καθ' ὑπερβολὴν ἁμαρτωλὸς ἢ ἁμαρτία) seems co-ordinate with the first, yet intensifies it: personified sin not only appears, but actually turns out to be, beyond measure sinful through its perversion of the commandment.

Vers. 14-25. The last section of the chapter confirms the argument in which Paul has vindicated the law, by exhibiting the power of sin in the flesh. It is this which makes the law weak, and defeats its good intention. "Hitherto he had contrasted himself, in respect of his whole being, with the Divine law; now, however, he begins to describe a discord which exists within himself" (Tholuck).

Ver. 14. ὁ νόμος πνευματικός: the law comes from God who is Spirit, and it shares His nature: its affinities are Divine, not human. ἐγὼ δὲ σάρκινός εἰμι, πεπραμένος ὑπὸ τὴν ἁμαρτίαν: I, as opposed to the law, am a creature of flesh, sold under sin. σάρκινος is properly material = *carneus*, consisting of flesh, as opposed to *σαρκικός*, which is ethical = *carnalis*. Paul uses it because he is thinking of human nature, rather than of human character, as in opposition to the Divine law. He does not mean that there is no higher element in human nature having affinity to the law (against this see vers. 22-25), but that such higher elements are so depressed and impotent that no injustice is done in describing human nature as in his own person he describes it here. Flesh has such an exclusive preponderance that man can only be regarded as a being who has no affinity for the spiritual law of God, and necessarily kicks against it. Not that this is to be regarded as his essential nature. It describes him only as πεπραμένος ὑπὸ τὴν ἁμαρτίαν: the slave of sin. To speak of man as "flesh" is to speak of him as distinguished from God who is "Spirit"; but owing to the diffusion of sin in humanity, and the ascendancy it has acquired, this mere distinction becomes an antagonism, and the mind of "the flesh" is enmity against God. In σάρκινος there is the sense of man's weakness, and pity for it; σαρκικός would only have expressed condemnation, perhaps a shade of disgust or con-

tempt. Weiss rightly remarks that the present tense εἰμι is determined simply by the ἔστιν preceding. Paul is contrasting the law of God and human nature, of course on the basis of his own experience; but the contrast is worked out ideally, or timelessly, as we might say, all the tenses being present; it is obvious, however, on reflection, that the experience described is essentially that of his pre-Christian days. It is the unregenerate man's experience, surviving at least in memory into regenerate days, and read with regenerate eyes.

Ver. 15. Only the hypothesis of slavery explains his acts. For what I do οὐ γινώσκω, *i.e.*, I do not recognise it as my own, as a thing for which I am responsible and which I can approve: my act is that of a slave who is but the instrument of another's will. οὐ γὰρ ὁ θέλω κ.τ.λ. There is "an incomprehensible contradiction in his action". κατεργάζομαι is to effect, to bring about by one's own work; πράσσειν is to work at, to busy oneself with, a thing, with or without success, but with purpose; ποιεῖν is simply to make or produce.

Ver. 16. ὁ οὐ θέλω takes up ὁ μισῶ: the negative expression is strong enough for the argument. In doing what he hates, *i.e.*, in doing evil against his will, his will agrees with the law, that it is good. καλός suggests the moral beauty or nobility of the law, not like ἀγαθὴ (ver. 12) its beneficial purpose.

Ver. 17. Νυνὶ δὲ οὐκέτι ἐγὼ κατεργάζομαι αὐτό. ἐγὼ is the true I, and emphatic. As things are, in view of the facts just explained, it is not the true self which is responsible for this line of conduct, but the sin which has its abode in the man: contrast viii. 11 τὸ ἐνοικοῦν αὐτοῦ πνεῦμα ἐν ὑμῖν. "Paul said, 'It is no more I that do it, but sin that dwelleth in me,' and 'I live, yet not I, but Christ that liveth in me'; and both these sayings of his touch on the unsayable" (Dr. John Duncan). To be saved from sin, a man must at the same time own it and disown it; it is this practical paradox which is reflected in this verse. It is safe for a Christian like Paul—it is not safe for everybody—to explain his failings by the watchword, Not I, but indwelling sin. That might be antinomian, or manichean, as well as euan-

ἐτι ἐγὼ κατεργάζομαι αὐτό, ἀλλ' ἡ οἰκοῦσα<sup>1</sup> ἐν ἐμοὶ ἁμαρτία. 18. Οἶδα γὰρ ὅτι οὐκ οἰκεῖ ἐν ἐμοὶ (τουτέστιν ἐν τῇ σαρκί μου), ἀγαθόν·  
<sup>h</sup> Only here τὸ γὰρ θέλειν <sup>h</sup> παράκειται μοι, τὸ δὲ κατεργάζεσθαι τὸ καλὸν οὐχ  
 and ver. 21. εὐρίσκω.<sup>2</sup> 19. οὐ γὰρ ὁ θέλω ποιῶ ἀγαθόν· ἀλλ' ὁ οὐ θέλω κακόν,  
 τοῦτο πράσσω. 20. εἰ δὲ ὁ οὐ θέλω ἐγὼ,<sup>3</sup> τοῦτο ποιῶ, οὐκ ἔτι ἐγὼ  
 κατεργάζομαι αὐτό, ἀλλ' ἡ οἰκοῦσα ἐν ἐμοὶ ἁμαρτία. 21. Εὐρίσκω  
 ἄρα τὸν νόμον τῷ θέλοντι ἐμοὶ ποιεῖν τὸ καλόν, ὅτι ἐμοὶ τὸ κακὸν  
 i Here only. παράκειται. 22. <sup>i</sup> σινηδομαι γὰρ τῷ νόμῳ τοῦ Θεοῦ κατὰ τὸν ἔσω

<sup>1</sup> For οἰκοῦσα **SB** read **νοικοῦσα**, which is right.

<sup>2</sup> οὐχ ευρισκω **DFKLP**; οὐ alone without ευρισκω **SABC**.

<sup>3</sup> θελω εγω **SAKLP, Syr.**; om. εγω **BCDEFG**. W. and H. omit εγω from text but put it in marg. Weiss thinks if it had been inserted after the apodosis had been written it would have been before οὐ θελω, and as it might easily be omitted to conform to ver. 16, the first clause of which is verbally the same, he counts it genuine, though admitting that the case is difficult.

gelical. A true saint may say it in a moment of passion, but a sinner had better not make it a principle.

Ver. 18. It is sin, and nothing but sin, that has to be taken account of in this connection, for "I know that in me, that is in my flesh, there dwells no good". For τούτ' ἔστιν see on i. 12. ἐν ἐμοὶ = ἐν τῇ σαρκί μου = in me, regarded as a creature of flesh, apart from any relation to or affinity for God and His spirit. This, of course, is not a complete view of what man is at any stage of his life. τὸ γὰρ θέλειν παράκειται μοι: θέλειν is rather *wish* than *will*: the want of will is the very thing lamented. An inclination to the good is at his hand, within the limit of his resources, but not the actual effecting of the good.

Ver. 19. In this verse there is a repetition of verse 15, but what was there an abstract contrast between inclination and action is here sharpened into the moral contrast between good inclination and bad action.

Ver. 20. The same conclusion as in ver. 17. If the *first* ἐγὼ is right, it must go with οὐ θέλω: Paul distinguishes himself sharply, as a person whose inclination is violated by his actions, from the indwelling sin which is really responsible for them.

Vers. 21-23 summarise the argument. εὐρίσκω ἄρα τὸν νόμον . . . ὅτι: most commentators hold that the clause introduced by ὅτι is the explanation of τὸν νόμον. The law, in short, which Paul has discovered by experience, is the constant fact that when his inclination is to do good, evil is present with him. This sense of law approximates

very closely to the modern sense which the word bears in physical science—so closely that its very modernness may be made an objection to it. Possibly Paul meant, in using the word, to convey at the same time the idea of an outward compulsion put on him by sin, which expressed itself in this constant incapacity to do the good he inclined to—authority or constraint as well as normality being included in his idea of the word. But ὁ νόμος in Paul always seems to have much more definitely the suggestion of something with legislative authority: it is questionable whether the first meaning given above would have occurred, or would have seemed natural, except to a reader familiar with the phraseology of modern science. Besides, the subject of the whole paragraph is the relation of "the law" to sin, and the form of the sentence is quite analogous to that of ver. 10, in which a preliminary conclusion has been come to on the question. Hence I agree with those who make τὸν νόμον the Mosaic law. The construction is not intolerable, if we observe that εὐρίσκω ἄρα τὸν νόμον τῷ θέλοντι ἐμοὶ κ.τ.λ. is equivalent to εὐρίσκειται ἄρα ὁ νόμος τῷ θέλοντι ἐμοὶ κ.τ.λ. "This is what I find the law—or life under the law—to come to in experience: when I wish to do good, evil is present with me." This is the answer he has already given in ver. 7 to the question, Is the law sin? No, it is not sin, but nevertheless sin is most closely connected with it. The repeated ἐμοὶ has something tragic in it: *me*, who am so anxious to do otherwise.

Ver. 22 f. Further explanation: the

<sup>k</sup> ἄνθρωπον· 23. βλέπω δὲ ἕτερον νόμον ἐν τοῖς μέλεσί μου ἀντιστρα- <sup>k</sup> 2 Cor. iv.  
 τευόμενον τῷ νόμῳ τοῦ νοός μου, καὶ <sup>1</sup> αἰχμαλωτίζοντά με <sup>1</sup> τῷ νόμῳ. <sup>16</sup>; Eph.  
 τῆς ἁμαρτίας τῷ ὄντι ἐν τοῖς μέλεσί μου. 24. ταλαίπωρος ἐγὼ <sup>12</sup> Cor. x. 5.  
 ἄνθρωπος· τίς με ῥύσεται ἐκ τοῦ σώματος τοῦ θανάτου τούτου; <sup>2</sup> Tim. iii.  
 6.  
 25. εὐχαριστῶ <sup>2</sup> τῷ Θεῷ διὰ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ τοῦ Κυρίου ἡμῶν. ἄρα  
 οὖν αὐτὸς ἐγὼ τῷ μὲν νοῖ <sup>3</sup> δουλεύω νόμῳ Θεοῦ· τῇ δὲ σαρκὶ νόμῳ

<sup>1</sup> αἰχμαλωτίζοντά με ἐν τῷ νόμῳ **ΣBDFKP**; om. ἐν **ACL**, most cursives, Syr. and many fathers. The omission, according to Weiss, is manifestly made to simplify the expression. Lachm. omits; W. and H. bracket.

<sup>2</sup> εὐχαριστῶ **ΣAKLP**, most cursives and fathers; W. and H. in marg. **χαρις** B., Sah., Orig. 1. This is the reading adopted in all the crit. edd. as the one from which the variants are most easily deduced (*e.g.*, ἡ **χαρις** του θεου D, vulg.; ἡ **χ. τ. κυριου** F; **χαρις δε τῷ θεῷ** **Σ1C2**).

<sup>3</sup> τῷ μὲν νοί, om. μὲν **ΣFG**, vulg., and Lat. fathers. The omission must be accidental, and all edd. except Tischdf. keep **μὲν**.

incongruity between inclination and action has its roots in a division within man's nature. The law of God legislates for him, and in the inner man (Eph. iii. 16) he delights in it. The inner man is not equivalent to the new or regenerate man; it is that side of every man's nature which is akin to God, and is the point of attachment, so to speak, for the regenerating spirit. It is called inward because it is not seen. What *is* seen is described in ver. 23. Here also νόμος is not used in the modern physical sense, but imaginatively: "I see that a power to legislate, of a different kind (different from the law of God), asserts itself in my members, making war on the law of my mind". The law of my mind is practically identical with the law of God in ver. 22: and the νοῦς itself, if not identical with ὁ ἔσω ἄνθρωπος, is its chief organ. Paul does not see in his nature two normal modes in which certain forces operate; he sees two authorities saying to him, Do this, and the higher succumbing to the lower. As the lower prevails, it leads him captive to the law of Sin which is in his members, or in other words to itself: "of whom a man is overcome, of the same is he brought in bondage". The end therefore is that man, as a creature of flesh, living under law, does what Sin enjoins. It is the law of Sin to which he gives obedience.

Ver. 24. ταλαίπωρος ἐγὼ ἄνθρωπος· τίς με ῥύσεται; "a wail of anguish and a cry for help". The words are not those of the Apostle's heart as he writes; they are the words which he knows are wrung from the heart of the man who realises that he is himself in the state

just described. Paul has reproduced this vividly from his own experience, but ταλαίπωρος ἐγὼ ἄνθρωπος is not the cry of the Christian Paul, but of the man whom sin and law have brought to despair. ἐκ τοῦ σώματος τοῦ θανάτου τούτου: "This death" is the death of which man is acutely conscious in the condition described: it is the same as the death of ver. 9, but intensely realised through the experience of captivity to sin. "The body of this death" is therefore the same as "the body of sin" in chap. vi. 6: it is the body which, as the instrument if not the seat of sin, is involved in its doom. Salvation must include deliverance from the body so far as the body has this character and destiny.

Ver. 25. The exclamation of thanksgiving shows that the longed-for deliverance has actually been achieved. The regenerate man's ideal contemplation of his pre-Christian state rises with sudden joy into a declaration of his actual emancipation as a Christian. διὰ Ἰ. Χ. τοῦ Κυρίου ἡμῶν: Christ is regarded as the mediator through whom the thanksgiving ascends to God, not as the author of the deliverance for which thanks are given. With ἄρα οὖν αὐτὸς ἐγὼ the Apostle introduces the conclusion of this whole discussion. "So then I myself—that is, I, leaving Jesus Christ our Lord out of the question—can get no further than this: with the mind, or in the inner man, I serve a law of God (a Divine law), but with the flesh, or in my actual outward life, a law of sin." We might say the law of God, or of sin; but the absence of the definite article emphasises the

ἀμαρτίας. VIII. 1. Οὐδὲν ἄρα νῦν κατάκριμα τοῖς ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ  
 a John viii. 32-36; Ch. μὴ κατὰ σάρκα περιπατοῦσιν, ἀλλὰ κατὰ πνεῦμα.<sup>1</sup> 2. ὁ γὰρ νόμος  
 vi. 18, 22; Gal. v. 1. τοῦ πνεύματος τῆς ζωῆς ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ ἠλευθέρωσέ με<sup>2</sup> ἀπὸ τοῦ

<sup>1</sup> μὴ κατὰ σάρκα περιπατοῦσιν ἀλλὰ κατὰ πνεῦμα om.  $\aleph^1$ BCD<sup>1</sup>F 47, Egypt. and Ethiopic versions, Orig. and Athan. and all crit. edd. The first part of the addition, μὴ . . . περιπατοῦσιν, is found in AD<sup>2</sup>, vulg., Syr.; the rest, ἀλλὰ κατὰ πνεῦμα, in  $\aleph^2$ D<sup>2</sup>KLP and most later authorities.

<sup>2</sup> ἠλευθέρωσεν με ACDKLP, vulg., Syr. For με, σε is found  $\aleph$ BFG, and also in Latin and Syriac authorities. ἡμᾶς is supported by Egypt. and Aeth. versions. The case is a very difficult one. σε is the harder reading, and Weiss, who adopts it, argues that it was changed into με under the influence of the preceding paragraphs in which the first person rules. Sanday and Headlam think σε can hardly be right because it is nowhere suggested in the context. W. and H. suspect a primitive error. "The distribution of documents, combined with internal evidence, favours the omission of both pronouns, which is supported by some MSS. of Arm(enian version), and perhaps by Orig. *loc.*, Ruf. com.; σε, a very unlikely reading, is probably only an early repetition of -σε" (Appendix to N.T., p. 108).

character of law. αὐτὸς ἐγὼ: see 2 Cor. x. 1, xii. 13.

CHAPTER VIII. For the place of this chapter in the argument see chap. vi., *ad init.* The general subject is the life in the spirit, by which the power of sin is broken, and the believer enabled to live to God. It falls into three parts (1) vers. 1-11, in which the spirit as opposed to the flesh is described as the principle of righteousness and life; (2) vers. 12-27, in which it is regarded as a spirit of adoption, the first fruits of a heavenly inheritance for the children of God; and (3) vers. 28-39, in which Paul concludes the argument, glorying in the assurance of God's immutable love in Jesus Christ.

(1) Vers. 1-11. The Spirit as the principle of righteousness and life.

Ver. 1. οὐδὲν ἄρα νῦν κατάκριμα τοῖς ἐν Χ. Ἰ. The οὐδὲν is emphatic: condemnation is in every sense out of the question. νῦν is temporal: it distinguishes the Christian from the pre-Christian period of life. The bold assertion is an inference (ἄρα) from what is implied in the thanksgiving to God through Jesus Christ (vii. 25). The description of Christians as "those who are in Christ Jesus" goes back to the words of Jesus Himself in John xv.

Ver. 2. There is no condemnation, for all ground for it has been removed. "The law of the spirit of the life which is in Christ Jesus made me [thee] free from the law of sin and death." It is subjection to the law of sin and death which involves condemnation; emancipation from it leaves no place for condemnation. For the meaning of "the law" see on vii. 23. The spirit which

brings to the believer the life which is in Christ Jesus brings with it also the Divine law for the believer's life; but it is now, as Paul says in Gal. iii. 21, a "νόμος ὁ δυνάμενος ζωοποιῆσαι," not an impotent law written on tables of stone, and hence righteousness comes by it; it proves more than a match for the authority exercised over man by the forces of sin and death. Paul would not have called the Divine law (even as a series of statutes) a law of sin and death, though he says τὸ γράμμα ἀποκτείνει; Sin and Death are conceived objectively as powers which impose their own law on unredeemed men.

Ver. 3. He now explains how this was done. It was not done by the law: that is the first point. If τὸ ἀδύνατον is active (= "the inability" of the law) we must suppose that Paul meant to finish the sentence, "was overcome," or "was removed" by God. If it is passive (= "that which is impossible" for the law), we must suppose he meant to finish it, "was achieved" or "accomplished" by God. There is really no way of deciding whether ἀδύνατον is active or passive, and the anacoluthon makes it impossible to tell what construction Paul had in his mind, *i.e.*, whether ἀδύνατον is nominative or accusative. For the best examination of the grammar see S. and H. ἐν ᾧ probably refers to ἀδύνατον: the point at which the law was impotent, *in which* it was weak through the flesh. This is better than to render ἐν ᾧ "in that," or "because". For the meaning *cf.* vii. 18. What the law could not do, God did by sending τὸν ἑαυτοῦ υἱὸν *His own Son*. With the coming of so great a Person,

νόμου τῆς ἁμαρτίας καὶ τοῦ θανάτου. 3. Τὸ γὰρ ἀδύνατον τοῦ νόμου, ἐν ᾧ ἡσθένει διὰ τῆς σαρκός, ὁ Θεὸς τὸν ἑαυτοῦ υἱὸν πέμψας ἐν ὁμοιώματι σαρκός ἁμαρτίας καὶ περὶ ἁμαρτίας κατέκρινε τὴν <sup>b See Ch. vi. v.</sup>

uniquely related to God (for this is implied both here and in ver. 32, as contrasted with ver. 14), a new saving power entered the world. God sent His Son ἐν ὁμοιώματι σαρκός ἁμαρτίας. The connection implies that sending Him thus was in some way related to the end to be secured. But what do the words mean? ὁμοίωμα occurs in Rom. i. 23, v. 14, vi. 5, and also in Phil. ii. 7. This last passage, in which Christ is described as ἐν ὁμοιώματι ἀνθρώπων γενόμενος, is the one which is most akin to Rom. viii. 3, and most easily illustrates it. There must have been a reason why Paul wrote in Philippians ἐν ὁμοιώματι ἀνθ. γενόμενος instead of ἀνθρώπος γενόμενος, and it may well have been the same reason which made him write here ἐν ὁμοιώματι σαρκός ἁμαρτίας instead of ἐν σαρκὶ ἁμαρτίας. He wishes to indicate not that Christ was not really man, or that His flesh was not really what in us is σὰρξ ἁμαρτίας, but that what for ordinary men is their natural condition is for this Person only an assumed condition (Holtzmann, *N.T. Theol.*, ii., 74). But the emphasis in ὁμοίωμα is on Christ's likeness to us, not His unlikeness; "flesh of sin" is one idea to the Apostle, and what he means by it is that God sent His Son in that nature which in us is identified with sin. This was the "form" (and "form" rather than "likeness" is what ὁμοίωμα signifies) in which Christ appeared among men. It does not prejudice Christ's sinlessness, which is a fixed point with the Apostle *ab initio*; and if any one says that it involves a contradiction to maintain that Christ was sinless, and that He came in a nature which in us is identified with sin, it may be pointed out that this identification does not belong to the essence of our nature, but to its corruption, and that the uniform teaching of the N.T. is that Christ is one with us—short of sin. The likeness and the limitation of it (though the former is the point here urged) are equally essential in the Redeemer. But God sent His Son not only ἐν ὁμ. σ. ἁ. but καὶ περὶ ἁμαρτίας. These words indicate the aim of the mission. Christ was sent in our nature "in connection with sin". The R.V. renders "as an offering for sin". This is legitimate, for περὶ ἁμαρτίας is used

both in the LXX (Lev. iv. 33 and *passim*, Ps. xl. 6, 2 Chr. xxix. 24) and in the N.T. (Heb. x. 6, 8) in the sense of "sin-offering" (usually answering to Heb. ἁθωπῆ, but in Isa. liii. 10 to **דוֹשָׁן**); but it is not formally necessary. But when the question is asked, In what sense did God send His Son "in connection with sin"? there is only one answer possible. He sent Him to expiate sin by His sacrificial death. This is the centre and foundation of Paul's gospel (iii. 25 ff.), and to ignore it here is really to assume that he used the words καὶ περὶ ἁμαρτίας (which have at least sacrificial associations) either with no meaning in particular, or with a meaning alien to his constant and dearest thoughts. Weiss says it is impossible to think here of *expiating* sin, because only the removal of the *power* of sin belongs to the context. But we cannot thus set the end against the means; the Apostle's doctrine is that the power of sin cannot be broken *except by expiating it*, and that is the very thing he teaches here. This fixes the meaning and the reference of κατέκρινεν. It is sometimes interpreted as if Christ were the subject: "Christ by His sinless life in our nature condemned sin in that nature," *i.e.*, showed that it was not inevitable, and in so doing gave us hope; and this sense of "condemned" is supported by reference to Mt. xii. 41 f. But the true argument (especially according to the analogy of that passage) would rather be, "Christ by His sinless life in our nature condemned our sinful lives, and left us inexcusable and without hope". The truth is, we get on to a wrong track if we ignore the force of περὶ ἁμαρτίας, or fail to see that God, not Christ, is the subject of κατέκρινεν. God's condemnation of sin is expressed in His sending His Son in our nature, and in such a connection with sin that He died for it—*i.e.*, took its condemnation upon Himself. Christ's death exhibits God's condemnation of sin in the flesh. ἐν τῇ σαρκὶ is to be construed with κατέκρινεν: the flesh—that in which sin had reigned—was also that in which God's condemnation of sin was executed. But Paul does not mean that by His sinless life in our nature Christ had broken the power of

- c Ch. ii. 26. ἀμαρτίαν ἐν τῇ σαρκί. 4. ἵνα τὸ δικαίωμα τοῦ νόμου πληρωθῇ ἐν ἡμῖν, τοῖς μὴ κατὰ σάρκα περιπατοῦσιν, ἀλλὰ κατὰ πνεῦμα. 5. Οἱ
- d Ch. xii. 3. γὰρ κατὰ σάρκα ὄντες τὰ τῆς σαρκὸς ἠφρονοῦσιν· οἱ δὲ κατὰ πνεῦμα, 16; Phil. ii. 5; Col. τὰ τοῦ πνεύματος. 6. τὸ γὰρ φρόνημα τῆς σαρκὸς θάνατος· τὸ δὲ iii. 2.
- e Only in this ch. φρόνημα τοῦ πνεύματος ζωὴ καὶ εἰρήνη. 7. διότι τὸ φρόνημα τῆς σαρκὸς ἔχθρα εἰς Θεόν· τῷ γὰρ νόμῳ τοῦ Θεοῦ οὐχ ὑποτάσσεται, f 1 Thess. οὐδὲ γὰρ δύναται· 8. οἱ δὲ ἐν σαρκὶ ὄντες Θεῷ ἄρέσαι οὐ δύναται. ii. 4; iv. 1; Gal. i. 10. 9. Ὑμεῖς δὲ οὐκ ἐστέ ἐν σαρκί, ἀλλ' ἐν πνεύματι, εἴπερ πνεῦμα g 1 Cor. vii. Θεοῦ οἰκεῖ ἐν ὑμῖν. εἰ δὲ τις πνεῦμα Χριστοῦ οὐκ ἔχει, οὗτος οὐκ 40. ἔστιν αὐτοῦ. 10. εἰ δὲ Χριστὸς ἐν ὑμῖν, τὸ μὲν σῶμα νεκρὸν δι'

sin at one point for the human race; he means that in the death of His own Son, who had come in our nature to make atonement for sin, God had pronounced the doom of sin, and brought its claims and its authority over man to an end. This is the only interpretation which does not introduce elements quite alien to the Apostle's mode of thought.

Ver. 4. All this was done ἵνα τὸ δικ. τοῦ νόμου πληρωθῇ ἐν ἡμῖν: that the just requirement of the law (*i.e.*, a righteous life) might be fulfilled in us. See note on iii. 31. ἐν ἡμῖν (not ὑφ' ἡμῶν), for it is not our doing, though done in us (Weiss). τοῖς μὴ κατὰ σάρκα κ.τ.λ. = inasmuch as we walk not, etc. This is the condition under which the Divine purpose is fulfilled: there is no physical necessity in it. κατὰ σάρκα: the flesh meant is our corrupt human nature. κατὰ πνεῦμα: the spirit is the Divine spirit which is given to those who are in Christ Jesus. It is in them "both law and impulse".

Ver. 5. The meaning of the sentence "is not contained in the repetitions of γὰρ by which it is hooked together" (Jowett). οἱ κατὰ σάρκα ὄντες are those whose nature is determined simply by the flesh; their "mind," *i.e.*, their moral interest, their thought and study, is upon τὰ τῆς σαρκὸς: for which see Gal. v. 19 f. οἱ κατὰ πνεῦμα are those whose nature is determined by the spirit: for τὰ τοῦ πνεύματος see Gal. v. 22.

Ver. 6. τὸ γὰρ φρόνημα τῆς σαρκὸς θάνατος: this does not so much mean that a man living after the flesh is without the life of God, as that death is the end of this line of conduct, chap. vi. 23, Gal. vi. 8. ζωὴ καὶ εἰρήνη: these on the other hand are conceived as present results involved in "the mind of the spirit". It is not arbitrary to distinguish thus: θάνατος in Paul is essentially the

doom awaiting a certain life, ζωὴ and εἰρήνη possessions and experiences of the believer.

Ver. 7 f. The reason why the mind of the flesh terminates so fatally: it is hostility to God, the fountain of life. Alienation from Him is necessarily fatal. It is the flesh which does not (for indeed it cannot) submit itself to God; as the seat of indwelling sin it is in permanent revolt, and those who are *in* it (a stronger expression, yet substantially identically with those who are *after* it, ver. 5) cannot please God.

Ver. 9. Paul applies to his readers what he has said in vers. 5-8. ὑμεῖς is emphatic. You can please God, for you are not in the flesh, etc. εἴπερ has its proper force: "if, as is the fact": *cf.* iii. 30, viii. 17; and the excellent examination of other N.T. instances in Simcox, *Language of the N.T.*, 171 f. Yet the possibility of the fact being otherwise in isolated cases, is admitted when he goes on: εἰ δὲ τις πνεῦμα Χριστοῦ οὐκ ἔχει κ.τ.λ. For εἰ followed by οὐ see Winer, 599 f. οὗτος οὐκ ἔστιν αὐτοῦ: only the indwelling of Christ's spirit proves a real relation to Him.

Ver. 10. Consequences of this indwelling of Christ in the Christian. In one respect, they are not yet so complete as might be expected. τὸ μὲν σῶμα νεκρὸν: the body, it cannot be denied, is *dead* because of sin: the experience we call death is inevitable for it. τὸ δὲ πνεῦμα ζωή: but the spirit (*i.e.*, the human spirit, as is shown by the contrast with σῶμα) is life, God-begotten, God-sustained life, and therefore beyond the reach of death. As death is due to sin, so is this life to δικαιοσύνη. It is probably not real to distinguish here between "justification" and "moral righteousness of life," and to say that the word means either to the exclusion of the other. The

ἀμαρτίαν, τὸ δὲ πνεῦμα ζωὴ διὰ δικαιοσύνην. 11. εἰ δὲ τὸ πνεῦμα τοῦ ἐγγείραντος Ἰησοῦν<sup>1</sup> ἐκ νεκρῶν οἰκεῖ ἐν ὑμῖν, ὁ ἐγγείρας τὸν Χριστὸν ἐκ νεκρῶν<sup>2</sup> ζωοποιήσει καὶ τὰ θνητὰ σώματα ὑμῶν, διὰ τοῦ ἐνοικούντος h Ch. iv. 17. αὐτοῦ πνεύματος ἐν ὑμῖν.

12. ἌΡΑ οὖν, ἀδελφοί, ὀφειλέται ἔσμεν οὐ τῇ σαρκί, τοῦ κατὰ σάρκα ζῆν· 13. εἰ γὰρ κατὰ σάρκα ζῆτε, μέλλετε ἀποθνήσκειν· i Col. iii. 9. k Gal. v. 18. εἰ δὲ πνεύματι τὰς ἰ πράξεις τοῦ σώματος θανατοῦτε, ζήσεσθε. 14. l Ver. 19; Gal. iii. 26, iv. 6 f. Ὅσοι γὰρ πνεύματι Θεοῦ<sup>k</sup> ἄγονται, οὗτοί εἰσιν υἱοὶ Ἰ Θεοῦ.<sup>2</sup> 15. οὐ

<sup>1</sup> Ἰησοῦν  $\aleph^3$ CDFKLP. τον Ἰησοῦν  $\aleph^1$ AB, W. and H., Weiss, Tdf., etc. τον before Χριστὸν is om. in  $\aleph^1$ ABCD<sup>1</sup>, 2F and all edd. Χριστὸν is the reading of BD<sup>3</sup>FKLP, but Χριστὸν Ἰησοῦν is found in  $\aleph$ AD 31, 47, and many fathers, and is adopted by W. and H., not by Weiss. ζωοποιήσει καὶ; om. καὶ  $\aleph$ A 47; W. and H. bracket; Treg. brackets it in marg. δια το ἐνοικουν αυτου πνευμα BDEFGKLP it. vg. δια του ἐνοικούντος αυτου πνεύματος  $\aleph$ AC, many cursives, Copt., Arm., Aeth. This is a very old variant; Clem. Alex. has the gen., Iren., Tert. and Orig. the accus. The genitive (according to Weiss) probably owes its wide diffusion, though not its origin, to the interest taken in it by the orthodox in connection with the Macedonian controversy. It may have originated in an emendation conforming the structure to that of vi. 4 (δια της δοξης του πατρος). Edd. are divided. Lachm., Treg., and Weiss adopt the accusative, Tischdf. and W. and H. the genitive, but W. and H. put accusative in marg.

<sup>2</sup> For εἰσιν υἱοι θεου  $\aleph$ ACD read υἱοι θεου εἰσιν.

whole argument of chaps. vi.-viii. is that neither can exist without the other. No man can begin to be good till he is justified freely by God's grace in Christ Jesus, and no one has been so justified who has not begun to live the good life in the spirit.

Ver. 11. But though the present results of the indwelling of the spirit are not all we might desire, the future is sure. The indwelling spirit is that of Him who raised Jesus from the dead, and as such it is the guarantee that our mortal bodies also (as well as our spirits) shall share in immortality. The same argument, in effect, is used in Eph. i. 18-20. "The power that worketh in us" is the same with which "God wrought in Christ when He raised Him from the dead and set Him at His own right hand in the heavenly places"; and it will work to the same issue in us as in Him. The reading in the last clause is very doubtful, but whether we take the accus. (according to which the indwelling of the spirit is the ground on which God raises our mortal bodies to undying life) or the genit. (according to which the spirit is itself the agent in this resurrection—a conception not found elsewhere in Scripture), in either case a share in the Christian resurrection is conditioned by the possession of the Spirit of Christ. It is clear from the alternation of πνεῦμα

θεοῦ and πνεῦμα χριστοῦ in ver. 9 that the Spirit of Christ is the same as the Spirit of God, and the use of χριστός alone in the next verse shows that this same spirit is the *alter ego* of Christ. Cf. Phil. i. 19; Gal. iv. 6; Eph. iii. 17. This is one of the passages in which the presuppositions of the Trinitarian conception of God come out most clearly.

(2) Vers. 12-27. The Spirit as a spirit of adoption, the first-fruits of the inheritance of the children of God.

Ver. 12 f. The blessed condition and hopes of Christians, as described in these last verses, lay them under obligations: to whom, or to what? Not (ver. 12) to the flesh, to live according to it; to it they owe nothing. If they live after the flesh they are destined to die—the final doom in which there is no hope; but if by the spirit (*i.e.*, God's Spirit) they put to death the doings of the body, they shall live—the life against which death is powerless. We might have expected τῆς σαρκὸς instead of τοῦ σώματος, but in the absence of the spirit the body in all it does is only the tool of the flesh: the two are morally equivalent.

Ver. 14. Ye shall live, for as many as are led by God's Spirit are God's sons, and life is congruous to such a dignity. υἱὸς suggests the rank and privileges of the persons in question; τέκνον (in ver. 16 f.) their kinship in nature to God. Yet

γὰρ ἐλάβετε πνεῦμα δουλείας πάλιν εἰς φόβον, ἀλλ' ἐλάβετε πνεῦμα  
<sup>m</sup> Ver. 23; <sup>n</sup> υἰοθεσίας, ἐν ᾧ κράζομεν, Ἄββᾶ, ὁ πατήρ. 16. αὐτὸ τὸ πνεῦμα  
 Gal. iv. 5; Eph. i. 5  
<sup>n</sup> συμμαρτυρεῖ τῷ πνεύματι ἡμῶν, ὅτι ἐσμέν τέκνα Θεοῦ. 17. εἰ δὲ  
 (ch. ix. 4).  
<sup>n</sup> Ch. ii. 15; τέκνα, καὶ κληρονόμοι· κληρονόμοι μὲν Θεοῦ, συγκληρονόμοι δὲ  
 ix. i.  
<sup>o</sup> 2 Tim. ii. Χριστοῦ· εἶπερ συμπάσχομεν, ἵνα καὶ ὁ συνδοξασθῶμεν. 18. λογί-  
 11 f.  
<sup>p</sup> Ch. iii. 26. ζῶμαι γὰρ ὅτι οὐκ ἄξια τὰ παθήματα τοῦ νῦν ἢ καιροῦ πρὸς τὴν

this cannot everywhere be urged in the N.T.

Ver. 15. Sons, οὐ γὰρ ἐλάβετε πνεῦμα δουλείας. The aorist refers to the time of their baptism, when they received the Spirit. It was not the Spirit proper to slaves, leading them again to shrink from God in fear as they had done when under the law of sin and death, but πνεῦμα υἰοθεσίας, a spirit proper to those who were being translated from the servile to the filial relation to God. υἰοθεσία is a word used in the N.T. by Paul only, but "no word is more common in Greek inscriptions of the Hellenistic time: the idea, like the word, is native Greek" (E. L. Hicks, quoted in S. and H.), see Gal. iv. 5, Eph. i. 5. The word serves to distinguish those who are made sons by an act of grace from the only-begotten Son of God: τὸν ἑαυτοῦ υἱὸν ver. 3, τοῦ ἰδίου υἱοῦ ver. 32. But the act of grace is not one which makes only an outward difference in our position; it is accomplished in the giving of a spirit which creates in us a new nature. In the spirit of adoption we cry Abba, Father. We have not only the status, but the heart of sons. κράζομεν (often with φωνῇ μεγάλῃ) is a strong word: it denotes the loud irrepressible cry with which the consciousness of sonship breaks from the Christian heart in prayer. The change to the first person marks Paul's inclusion of himself in the number of those who have and utter this consciousness; and it is probably this inclusion of himself, as a person whose native language was "Hebrew" (Acts xxi. 40), to which is due the double form Ἄββᾶ ὁ πατήρ. The last word certainly interprets the first, but it is not thought of as doing so: "we cry, Father, Father".

Ver. 16. The punctuation in W. and H. margin deserves notice. "In that we cry, Abba, Father, the Spirit itself beareth witness with our spirit," etc. Our own spirit tells us we are God's children, but the voice with which it speaks is, as we know, prompted and inspired by the Divine Spirit itself. For similar distinctions Gifford compares ii. 15 and ix. i. τέκνα θεοῦ: τέκνα, not υἱοί,

is used with strict propriety here, as it is the reality of the filial nature, not the legitimacy of the filial position, which is being proved.

Ver. 17. Yet this last is involved, for "if children, also heirs". Cf. Gal. iv. 7 where κληρονόμος is relative to υἱός; and all the passages in which the Spirit is regarded as "the earnest" of an inheritance: 2 Cor. i. 22, v. 5, Eph. i. 14. It is from God the inheritance comes, and we share in it with Christ (Mark. xii. 7). For what it is, see 1 Cor. ii. 9 f. The inheritance attached to Divine sonship is attained only on the condition expressed in the clause εἶπερ συμπάσχομεν ἵνα καὶ συνδοξασθῶμεν. On εἶπερ, see ver. 9. "Rom. viii. 17 gains in pathos, when we see that the share of the disciples in the Master's sufferings was felt to be a fact of which there was no question." Simcox, *Language of N.T.*, p. 171. Paul was sure of it in his own case, and took it for granted in that of others. Those who share Christ's sufferings now will share His glory hereafter; and in order to share His glory hereafter it is necessary to begin by sharing His sufferings here.

Ver. 18. The passage extending from this verse to ver. 27 is described by Lipsius as a "threefold testimony to the future transfiguration which awaits suffering believers". In vers. 19-22 there is the first testimony—the sighing of creation; in vers. 23-25 the second, the yearning hope of Christians themselves, related as it is to the possession of the first fruits of the Spirit; and in vers. 26 f. the third, the intercession of the Spirit which helps us in our prayers, and lends words to our longing. λογίζομεθα γὰρ κ.τ.λ. λογίζομαι is a favourite word with Paul: the instance most like this is the one in iii. 28. It does not suggest a more or less dubious result of calculation; rather by litotes does it express the strongest assurance. The insignificance of present suffering compared with future glory was a fixed idea with the Apostle, 2 Cor. iv. 17 f. For οὐκ ἄξια . . . πρὸς see Winer, 505 (d). With τὴν μέλλουσαν δόξαν ἀποκαλυφθῆναι cf. in Gal. iii. 23



μέλλουσιν δόξαν ἀποκαλυφθῆναι εἰς ἡμᾶς. 19. Ἡ γὰρ ἀποκαρ-  
δοκία τῆς κτίσεως τὴν ἀποκάλυψιν τῶν υἱῶν τοῦ ἁ Θεοῦ ἀπεκδέχεται. 20. Ἡ Ver. 14  
τῆ γὰρ ἡ ματαιότητι ἡ κτίσις ὑπετάγη, οὐχ ἐκούσα, ἀλλὰ διὰ τὸν ὑπο- Γ Eph. iv. 17.  
τάξαντα, ἐπ' ἐλπίδι,<sup>1</sup> 21. ὅτι<sup>2</sup> καὶ αὐτὴ ἡ κτίσις ἐλευθερωθήσεται ἀπὸ  
τῆς δουλείας τῆς φθορᾶς εἰς τὴν ἐλευθερίαν τῆς δόξης τῶν τέκνων τοῦ

<sup>1</sup> ἐπ ἐλπίδι. In ΞBDFG we find ἐφ ἐλπίδι, and this is printed by Tischdf. and W. and H. The same mistake (?) occurs Rom. iv. 18 in CDFG, Rom. v. 2 in DFG, and Tit. i. 2 in D; cf. also ἀφελπικότες in FG Eph. iv. 19. In these circumstances it seems doubtful whether ἐφ' ἐλπίδι should be put in the text.

<sup>2</sup> For ὅτι ΞBDFG read διότι. The δι may easily have been omitted after ἐλπίδι, and therefore Tischdf. and Weiss read διότι, though most edd. ὅτι.

τῶν μέλλ. πίστιν ἀποκαλ. The unusual order emphasises the futurity. εἰς ἡμᾶς = toward and upon us. The glory comes from without, to transfigure them. It is revealed at the ἀποκάλυψις (1 Cor. i. 7, 2 Th. i. 7, 1 Pet. i. 7, 13, iv. 13), the glorious second coming, of Christ, and is indeed His glory of which they are made partakers.

Ver. 19. First testimony to this glorious future: creation sighs for it. In some sense the hope and promise of it is involved in the present constitution of the world. For a fine speculative interpretation see E. Caird's *Evolution of Religion*, ii., 124 f. In Paul, however, the spirit of the passage is rather poetic than philosophical. Its affinities are with Gen. iii. 17, where the ground is cursed for man's sake: he conceives of all creation as involved in the fortunes of humanity. But this, if creation be personified, naturally leads to the idea of a mysterious sympathy between the world and man, and this is what the Apostle expresses. Creation is not inert, utterly unspiritual, alien to our life and its hopes. It is the natural ally of our souls. What rises from it is the music of humanity—not apparently so still and sad to Paul as to Wordsworth, but with a note of hope in it rising triumphantly above all the pain of conflict. ἀποκαρδοκία (Phil. i. 20) denotes absorbed, persistent expectation—waiting, as it were, with uplifted head. ἡ κτίσις is the world and all that it contains, animate and inanimate, as distinguished from man. τὴν ἀποκ. τῶν υἱῶν τοῦ θεοῦ: cf. 1 John iii. 2. With the revelation of the sons of God humanity would attain its end, and nature too.

Ver. 20. For creation was subjected to vanity, etc. ματαιότης is not classical, but is often used in the LXX, especially for לַבְּזוּתָא. The idea is that of look-

ing for what one does not find—hence of futility, frustration, disappointment. ματαιότης ματαιότητων is the "vanity of vanities" in Eccl., the complaint of the utter resultlessness of life. Sin brought this doom on creation; it made a pessimistic view of the universe inevitable. ὑπετάγη: the precise time denoted is that of the Fall, when God pronounced the ground cursed for man's sake. Creation came under this doom οὐχ ἐκούσα ἀλλὰ διὰ τὸν ὑποτάξαντα: the last words seem best referred to God: it was on account of Him—that His righteousness might be shown in the punishment of sin—that the sentence fell upon man, carrying consequences which extended to the whole realm intended originally for his dominion. The sentence on man, however, was not hopeless, and creation shared in his hope as in his doom. When the curse is completely removed from man, as it will be when the sons of God are revealed, it will pass from creation also; and for this creation sighs. It was made subject to vanity on the footing of this hope; the hope is latent, so to speak, in the constitution of nature, and comes out, in its sighing, to a sympathetic ear.

Ver. 21. Contents of the hope. It makes no difference in meaning, whether we read ὅτι or διότι. αὐτὴ ἡ κτίσις: creation as well as man. ἡ δουλεία τῆς φθορᾶς: a system in which nothing continues in one stay, in which death claims everything, in which there is not even an analogy to immortality, is a system of slavery—in subjection to "vanity," with no high eternal worth of its own. From such a condition creation is to be emancipated; it is to share in the liberty which belongs to the glory of the children of God. When man's redemption is complete, he will find himself in a new world matching with his new condition (Isa. lxx. 17, 2 Pet. iii. 13, Rev. xxi. 1): this is

s Mark xvi. Θεοῦ. 22. οἶδαμεν γὰρ ὅτι πᾶσα ἡ κτίσις συσπενάζει καὶ συνωδίνει  
 15; Col. i.  
 15, 23. ἄχρι τοῦ νῦν· 23. οὐ μόνον δέ, ἀλλὰ καὶ αὐτοὶ τὴν ἀπαρχὴν τοῦ  
 Πνεύματος ἔχοντες, καὶ ἡμεῖς<sup>1</sup> αὐτοὶ ἐν ἑαυτοῖς σπενάζομεν, υἰοθεσίαν  
 11 Cor. i. 7; ἄπεκδεχόμενοι τὴν ἀπολύτρωσιν τοῦ σώματος ἡμῶν. 24. τῇ γὰρ  
 Gal. v. 5; Phil. iii. ἐλπίδι ἐσώθημεν. ἐλπίς δὲ βλεπομένη οὐκ ἔστιν ἐλπίς· ὁ γὰρ  
 20; Heb. βλέπει τις, τί καὶ ἐλπίζει<sup>2</sup>; 25. εἰ δὲ ὁ οὐ βλέπομεν ἐλπίζομεν.  
 ix. 28.

<sup>1</sup> ἡμεῖς om. B 31, 73, 93, vulg. The rec. text is that of DFKLP. In  $\mathfrak{N}^a$  C 47 the order of the words is *εχοντες ημεεις και αυτοι*. This is followed by Tischdf. Lachm., Treg. and W. and H. bracket *ημεεις* in this position; Weiss omits it altogether.

<sup>2</sup> The reading of B is *ο γαρ βλεπει τις ελπιζει*. This is adopted by W. and H., Weiss. Of the received text—*ο γαρ βλεπει τις τι και ελπιζει—τι* is wanting in  $\mathfrak{N}^a$ ; and *και* in DFG, vulg., Pesh. The reading of B is difficult, and seems to have been partially amended in different ways which are combined in the received text. For *ελπιζει*  $\mathfrak{N}^a$  A 47, marg., have *υπομενει*, and W. and H. give a place to this, as well as to the received text, in their margin.

Paul's faith, and the sighing of creation attests it.

Ver. 22. οἶδαμεν γὰρ κ.τ.λ.: How Christians know this Paul does not say. Perhaps we may say that the Christian consciousness of sin and redemption is in contact with the ultimate realities of the universe, and that no interpretation of nature can be true but one which, like this, is in essential harmony with it. The force of the preposition in *συσπενάζει* and *συνωδίνει* is not that *we* sigh and are in pain, and creation along with us; but that the whole frame of creation, all its parts together, *unite* in sighing and in pain. Weiss is right in saying that there is no reference to the *dolores Messiae*; but in *συνωδίνει* there is the suggestion of the travail out of which the new world is to be born. ἄχρι τοῦ νῦν means up till now, without stopping, ever since the moment of ὑπετάγη.

Ver. 23. Second testimony to the glorious future. οὐ μόνον δὲ sc. ἡ κτίσις—not only all creation, but we Christians: we ourselves, τὴν ἀπαρχὴν τοῦ πνεύματος ἔχοντες. τοῦ πνεύματος is gen. of apposition: the spirit which Christians have received is itself the first fruits (elsewhere, the earnest: see on ver. 17) of this glory; and *because* we have it (not *although*: it is the foretaste of heaven, the heaven begun in the Christian, which intensifies his yearning, and makes him more vehemently than nature long for complete redemption), we also sigh in ourselves υἰοθεσίαν ἀπεκδεχόμενοι, τὴν ἀπολύτρωσιν τοῦ σώματος ἡμῶν. The key to these words is found in i. 4. Christ was Son of God always, but was only declared to be so in power ἐξ ἀναστάσεως νεκρῶν, and so it is with

believers. They have already received adoption, and as led by the spirit are sons of God; but only when their mortal bodies have been quickened, and the corruptible has put on incorruption, will they possess all that sonship involves. For this they wait and sigh, and the inextinguishable hope, born of the spirit dwelling in them, guarantees its own fulfilment. Cf. Phil. iii. 21; 1 Cor. xv. 51; 2 Cor. v. 2; and for ἀπολύτρωσις in this sense, 1 Cor. i. 30.

Ver. 24 f. This sentence explains why Paul can speak of Christians as *waiting* for adoption, while they are nevertheless in the enjoyment of sonship. It is because salvation is essentially related to the future. "We wait for it: for we were saved in *hope*." The dat. τῇ ἐλπίδι is that of mode or respect. Our salvation was qualified from the beginning by reference to a good yet to be. Weiss argues that the sense of ἐλπίς in the second clause (*res sperata*) makes it "absolutely necessary" to take it so in the first, and that this leaves no alternative but to make τῇ ἐλπίδι dat. *comm.* and translate: "for, for this object of hope—eternal life and glory—were we delivered from eternal destruction". But the "absolute necessity" is imaginary; a word with the nuances of ἐλπίς in a mind with the speed of Paul's need not be treated so rigorously, especially as the resulting construction is in itself extremely dubious. Hope, the Apostle argues, is an essential characteristic of our salvation; but hope turned sight is hope no more, for who hopes for what he sees? We do *not* see all the Gospel held out to us, but it is the object of our Christian hope nevertheless; it is as true

δι' ὑπομονῆς ἀπεκδεχόμεθα. 26. Ἐσαύτως δὲ καὶ τὸ Πνεῦμα  
 "συναντιλαμβάνεται ταῖς ἀσθενείαις<sup>1</sup> ἡμῶν· τὸ γὰρ τί προσευξώμεθα <sup>u Luke x.40.</sup>  
 καθὸ δεῖ, οὐκ οἶδαμεν, ἀλλ' αὐτὸ τὸ Πνεῦμα ὑπερεντυγχάνει ὑπὲρ <sup>v Here only</sup>  
 ἡμῶν στεναγμοῖς ἀλαλήτοις· 27. ὁ δὲ ἐρευνῶν τὰς καρδίας οἶδε τί <sup>in N.T.</sup>  
 τὸ φρόνημα τοῦ πνεύματος, ὅτι κατὰ Θεὸν ἐντυγχάνει ὑπὲρ ἁγίων.  
 28. Οἶδαμεν δὲ ὅτι τοῖς ἀγαπῶσι τὸν Θεὸν πάντα συνεργεῖ<sup>2</sup> εἰς ἀγαθόν,

<sup>1</sup> For ταῖς ἀσθενείαις **Σ**ABCD have τη ἀσθενεία. ὑπερ ἡμῶν CKLP; but om. **Σ**ABDF.

<sup>2</sup> After συνεργεῖ, ο θεος is found in AB. W. and H. bracket it, but Lachm. and Weiss regard it as the true text. It was omitted as cumbersome and unnecessary. Cf. i. 28, where ο θεος is omitted in **Σ**A in much the same way; here it is wanting in **Σ**ACDFKL.

and sure as the love of God which in Christ Jesus reconciled us to Himself and gave us the spirit of adoption, and therefore we wait for it in patience. For διὰ cf. ii. 27. ὑπομονή: in 1 Thess. i. 3 we have ἡ ὑπομονὴ τῆς ἐλπίδος ὑμῶν used of a suffering but steadfast Church: ὑπομονή is the constancy which belongs to and characterises hope in dark days. In the pastoral epistles (1 Tim. vi. 10; Tit. ii. 2) instead of the πίστις, ἀγάπη, ἐλπίς, of earlier letters, Paul writes πίστις, ἀγάπη, ὑπομονή, as if he had discovered by experience that in this life "hope" has mainly to be shown in the form of "patience".

Ver. 26. Third testimony to the glorious future: the sighing of creation, our own sighing, and this action of the Spirit, point consistently to one conclusion. συναντιλαμβάνεται, cf. Luke x. 40. The weakness which the Spirit helps is that due to our ignorance: τὸ γὰρ τί προσευξώμεθα καθὸ δεῖ οὐκ οἶδαμεν. The article makes the whole clause object of οἶδαμεν: Winer, p. 644. Broadly speaking, we do know what we are to pray for—the perfecting of salvation; but we do not know what we are to pray for καθὸ δεῖ—according as the need is at the moment; we know the end, which is common to all prayers, but not what is necessary at each crisis of need in order to enable us to attain this end. ἀλλὰ αὐτὸ τὸ πνεῦμα ὑπερεντυγχάνει στεναγμοῖς ἀλαλήτοις. ὑπερεντυγχάνει is found here only in N.T., but ἐντυγχάνει in this sense in vers. 27, 34, Heb. vii. 25. In Rom. xi. 2 with κατὰ = to make intercession against. ἀλαλήτοις does not mean "unspoken" but "unutterable". The στεναγμοῖ of believers find expression, adequate or inadequate, in their prayers, and in such utterances as this very passage of Romans, but there

is a testimony to the glory awaiting them more profound and passionate than even this. It is the intercession of the Spirit with στεναγμοὶ ἀλάλητοι—groanings (or sighs) that baffle words. αὐτὸ τὸ πνεῦμα is undoubtedly God's Spirit as distinguished from ours, yet what is here affirmed must fall within Christian experience, for Paul says in the next verse that He Who searches the hearts knows what is the mind of the Spirit in this unutterable intercession. It is in the heart, therefore, that it takes place. "The whole passage illustrates in even a startling manner the truth and reality of the 'coming' of the Holy Ghost—the extent to which, if I may venture to say it, He has separated Himself—as Christ did at His Incarnation—from His eternal glory and blessedness, and entered into the life of man. . . . His intercession for us—so intimately does He share all the evils of our condition—is a kind of agony" (R. W. Dale, *Christian Doctrine*, p. 140 f.).

Ver. 27. This intercession, with which our heart goes, though it is deeper than words, the Heart Searcher understands. τί τὸ φρόν. τοῦ πνεύματος: what the Spirit is set upon, the whole object of its thought and endeavour. ὅτι, viz., that He intercedes κατὰ θεόν in agreement with God's will, see 2 Cor. vii. 9-11. ὑπὲρ ἁγίων on behalf of those who are God's. Both the intercession of Christ and the intercession of the Spirit are represented in the N.T. as made on behalf of those who are in Christ—saints, the Church, not mankind in general.

Vers. 28-39. Conclusion of the argument: the Apostle glories in the assurance of God's eternal and unchangeable love in Jesus Christ.

οἶδαμεν δὲ = further, we know: in a sense this is one ground more for be-

w Eph. i. 5, τοὺς κατὰ πρόθεσιν κλητοῖς οὖσιν. 29. ὅτι οὖς προέγνω, καὶ ᾠ προώρισε  
 11; 1 Cor. ii. 7. x συμμόρφους τῆς εἰκόνος τοῦ υἱοῦ αὐτοῦ, εἰς τὸ εἶναι αὐτὸν πρωτότοκον  
 x Phil. iii. 21 (10). ἔν πολλοῖς ἀδελφοῖς· 30. οὖς δὲ προώρισε, τούτους καὶ ἐκάλεσε·  
 καὶ οὖς ἐκάλεσε, τούτους καὶ ἐδικαίωσεν· οὖς δὲ ἐδικαίωσε, τούτους  
 καὶ ἐδόξασε. 31. Τί οὖν ἐροῦμεν πρὸς ταῦτα; εἰ ὁ Θεὸς ὑπὲρ

believing in the glorious future: God is ever with us, and will not abandon us at last. πάντα συνεργεῖ (ὁ θεός): συνεργεῖ is naturally neuter, and if ὁ θεός is the true reading, it is probably best to render "God co-operates for good in all things (πάντα accus. of ref. as in 1 Cor. ix. 25, x. 33) with those," etc. τοὺς ἀγαπ. τὸν θεὸν describes the persons in question from the human side; τοὺς κατὰ πρόθεσιν κλητοῖς οὖσιν describes them from the Divine side. It is in pursuance of a purpose of God (for πρόθεσις with reference to the eternal purpose of redemption, see ix. 11, Eph. i. 11, iii. 11, 2 Tim. i. 9) that they are called. "Calling" in Paul never means "invitation"; it is always "effectual calling".

Ver. 29 f. These verses give the proof that God in all things co-operates for good with the called. They show how His gracious purpose, beginning with foreknowledge and foreordination perfects all that concerns them on to the final glory. οὖς προέγνω: those whom He foreknew—in what sense? as persons who would answer His love with love? This is at least irrelevant, and alien to Paul's general mode of thought. That salvation begins with God, and begins in eternity, are fundamental ideas with him, which he here applies to Christians, without raising any of the problems involved in the relation of the human will to the Divine. He comes upon these in chap. ix., but not here. Yet we may be sure that προέγνω has the pregnant sense that γινώσκω (γν) often has in Scripture: e.g., in Ps. i. 6, Amos iii. 2: hence we may render, "those of whom God took knowledge from eternity" (Eph. i. 4). καὶ προώρισε κ.τ.λ., "he also foreordained to be conformed to the image of His Son". This conformity is the last stage in salvation, as προέγνω is the first. The image is in import not merely spiritual but eschatological. The Son of God is the Lord who appeared to Paul by Damascus: to be conformed to His image is to share His glory as well as His holiness. The Pauline Gospel is hopelessly distorted when this is forgotten. εἰς τὸ

εἶναι αὐτὸν πρωτότοκον ἐν πολλοῖς ἀδελφοῖς: the end in all this is the exaltation of Christ. It is implied in πρωτότοκον that He also is regarded as only having attained the fulness of His Sonship through the resurrection (cf. i. 4, and Col. i. 18 πρωτότοκος ἐκ τῶν νεκρῶν). The idea of Christ's dignity as firstborn among many brethren who all owe their salvation to Him is sublimely interpreted in Heb. ii. 10-13. The Apostle now resumes the series of the Divine acts in our salvation. οὖς δὲ προώρισε, τούτους καὶ ἐκάλεσεν. The eternal foreordination appears in time as "calling," of course as effectual calling: where salvation is contemplated as the work of God alone (as here) there can be no breakdown in its processes. The next stages are summarily indicated. ἐδικαίωσεν: God in Jesus Christ forgave our sins, and accepted us as righteous in His sight; ungodly as we had been, He put us right with Himself. In that, everything else is included. The whole argument of chaps. vi.-viii. has been that justification and the new life of holiness in the Spirit are inseparable experiences. Hence Paul can take one step to the end, and write οὖς δὲ ἐδικαίωσεν, τούτους καὶ ἐδόξασεν. Yet the tense in the last word is amazing. It is the most daring anticipation of faith that even the N.T. contains: the life is not to be taken out of it by the philosophical consideration that with God there is neither before nor after.

Ver. 31. τί οὖν ἐροῦμεν πρὸς ταῦτα; the idea underlying all that precedes is that of the suffering to be endured by those who would share Christ's glory (ver. 17). The Apostle has disparaged the suffering in comparison with the glory (ver. 18); he has interpreted it (vers. 19-27) as in a manner prophetic of the glory; he has in these last verses asserted the presence through all the Christian's life of an eternal victorious purpose of love: all this is included in ταῦτα. For ὑπὲρ and κατὰ, cf. 2 Cor. xiii. 8.

Ver. 32. The Christian's faith in providence is an inference from redemption. The same God who did not spare His own Son will freely give us all things.

ἡμῶν, τίς καθ' ἡμῶν; 32. ὅς γε τοῦ ἰδίου υἱοῦ οὐκ ἐφέισατο; ἀλλ' ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν πάντων παρέδωκεν αὐτόν, πῶς οὐχὶ καὶ σὺν αὐτῷ τὰ πάντα ἡμῖν ἠχαρίσεται; 33. τίς ἐγκαλέσει κατὰ ἐκλεκτῶν Θεοῦ; γ 1 Cor. ii. Θεὸς ὁ δικαίων. 34. τίς ὁ κατακρίνων; Χριστὸς<sup>1</sup> ὁ ἀποθανών, 12; Gal. iii. 18. μᾶλλον δὲ καὶ ἐγερθεῖς, ὅς καὶ ἔστιν ἐν δεξιᾷ τοῦ Θεοῦ, ὅς καὶ

<sup>1</sup> Χριστος alone BDEK, most cursives, and Treg. Χριστος Ἰησους  $\aleph$ ACFL 17, vulg., etc. Weiss puts X. I. in text, thinking the omission in B, etc., accidental; W. and H., and Lachm. bracket Ἰησους. The καὶ before ἐγερθεῖς is wanting in  $\aleph$ ABC. The καὶ before ἐστιν is wanting in  $\aleph$ AC but is found in  $\aleph^2$ BDFKL. It is omitted by W. and H., and Tischdf., bracketed by Lachm., but retained by Weiss. After ἐγερθεῖς  $\aleph^1$ AC insert ἐκ νεκρῶν; W. and H. bracket this, but all other crit. edd. omit, with  $\aleph^2$ BDFGKL, etc.

οὐκ ἐφέισατο, *cf.* Gen. xxii. 12, οὐκ ἐφέισω τοῦ υἱοῦ σου τοῦ ἀγαπητοῦ δι' ἐμέ. It vivifies the impression of God's love through the sense of the sacrifice it made. ὑπὲρ πάντων ἡμῶν: none were worthy of such a sacrifice (Weiss). παρέδωκεν *sc.* to death; iv. 25. πῶς οὐχὶ καί: the argument of selfishness is that he who has done so much need do no more; that of love, that he who has done so much is certain to do more. σὺν αὐτῷ τὰ πάντα: τὰ πάντα has a collective force. It is usually taken to mean *the whole* of what furthers the Christian's life, the whole of what contributes to the perfecting of his salvation; all this will be freely given to him by God. But why should it not mean "all things" without any such qualification? When God gives us His Son He gives us the world; there is nothing which does not work together for our good; all things are ours. *Cf.* 1 Cor. iii. 22 f.

Ver. 33 f. The punctuation here is a very difficult problem: see the text and margin of R.V. The reminiscence of Is. I. 8 f. in verse 33 makes it more difficult; for it suggests that the normal structure is that of an affirmation followed by a question, whereas Paul begins with a question to which the affirmation (with at least a trace of Isaiah's language in it) is an answer. It is even possible to read every clause interrogatively, though that is less effective. τίς ἐγκαλέσει κατὰ ἐκλεκτῶν Θεοῦ; who shall bring a charge against persons who are God's chosen? The absence of the article (*cf.* ὑπὲρ ἁγίων, ver. 27) brings out the character in which the persons in question figure, not their individual personality. For the word see Col. iii. 12; 2 Tim. ii. 10; Tit. i. 1; for the thing *cf.* 1 Thess. i. 4; Eph. i. 4; John xv. 16. It describes Christians as persons who owe their standing as such to the act of

God's grace. All Christians are conscious that this is the truth about their position: they belong to God, because He has taken them for His own. To say that the word designates "not those who are destined for final salvation, but those who are 'summoned' or 'selected' for the privilege of serving God and carrying out His will" (S. and H.), is to leave the rails of the Apostle's thought altogether. There is nothing here (vers. 28-30) about the privilege of serving God and carrying out His will; the one thing Paul is concerned with is the security given by the eternal love of God that the work of salvation will be carried through, in spite of all impediments, from fore-knowledge to final glory. The ἐκλεκτοὶ Θεοῦ are those who ought to have such security: they should have a faith and an assurance proportioned to the love of God. Paul is one of them, and because he is, he is sure, not that he is called to serve God, but that nothing can ever separate him from God's love in Christ. The question τίς ἐγκαλέσει is best answered by taking both the following clauses together: "It is God that justifieth: who is he that shall condemn?" (*cf.* Is. I. 8 f.). But many make τίς ὁ κατακρίνων a new question, and find the answer in verse 34: Χριστὸς [Ἰησοῦς] ὁ ἀποθανών = the only person who can condemn is the Judge, *vis.*, Christ, but He is so far from condemning that He has done everything to deliver us from condemnation. What Christian, Paul seems to ask, can speak of κατὰ κρίμα with his eye on Christ, who died for our sins? μᾶλλον δὲ ἐγερθεῖς [ἐκ νεκρῶν]: *cf.* Gal. iv. 9; and chap. iv. 25. The correction in μᾶλλον is formal (Weiss): Paul does not mean that the resurrection is more important than the cross; he improves upon an expression which has not conveyed all that was in his mind.

z Ver. 27; <sup>Heb. vii.</sup> 25. ἔντυγχάνει ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν· 35. τίς ἡμᾶς χωρίσει ἀπὸ τῆς ἀγάπης τοῦ Χριστοῦ<sup>1</sup>; θλίψις, ἢ στενοχωρία, ἢ διωγμός, ἢ λιμός, ἢ γυμνότης, ἢ κίδυνος, ἢ μάχαιρα; 36. (καθὼς γέγραπται, “Ὅτι ἔνεκά σου θανατούμεθα ἅλην τὴν ἡμέραν· ἐλογίσθημεν ὡς πρόβατα σφα-

<sup>1</sup> τοῦ Χριστοῦ; so most MSS. But  $\aleph$ B, with some cursives and fathers, have τοῦ θεοῦ. This is usually regarded as a change made to agree with ver. 39, because B, after τοῦ θεοῦ, adds τῆς ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ. But this may have been added, as Weiss remarks, for the very reason that B already read τοῦ θεοῦ; and as  $\aleph$  has τοῦ θεοῦ without this addition, and it was very natural to change it (with an eye to vv. 34 and 37) into τοῦ Χριστοῦ, it seems probable that τοῦ θεοῦ is the original reading. Weiss adopts it, and W. and H. put it in marg.

Our position depends upon Jesus Christ who died, nay rather, over whom death no more has dominion (vi. 9), who is at God's right hand (this phrase, which describes Christ's exaltation as a sharing in the universal sovereignty of God, is borrowed from Ps. cx. 1, and is oftener used in the N.T. than any other words of the Old), who also makes intercession on our behalf. ὁς καὶ ἐντυγχάνει: a solemn climax is marked by the repetition of ὁς, and by the καὶ which deliberately adds the intercession to all that has gone before. The Christian consciousness, even in an apostle, cannot transcend this. This is Paul's final security—the last ground of his triumphant assurance: Jesus Christ, at God's right hand, with the virtue of His atoning death in Him, pleads His people's cause. Cf. Heb. ix. 24, vii. 25, 1 John ii. 1 f.

Ver. 35 f. τίς ἡμᾶς χωρίσει ἀπὸ τῆς ἀγάπης τοῦ Χριστοῦ; If this verse is to be most closely connected with ver. 34, τοῦ Χριστοῦ will appear the more probable reading, for there Christ is the subject throughout; but at vers. 28, 31, 39 the love of God is the determining idea, and at this point it seems to be caught up again in view of the conclusion—facts which favour the reading τοῦ θεοῦ. In any case it is the Divine love for us which is meant. With the list of troubles cf. 2 Cor. vi. 4-10, xi. 26 f., xii. 10. They were those which had befallen Paul himself, and he knew that the love of God in Jesus Christ could reach and sustain the heart through them all. The quotation from Ps. xlv. 23 is peculiar. It exactly reproduces the LXX, even the ὅτι being simply transferred. The καθὼς implies that such experiences as those named in ver. 35 are in agreement with what Scripture holds out as the fortune of God's people. Possibly the mention of the sword recalled to the Apostle's memory the θανατούμεθα of the psalm,

and suggested the quotation. The point of it, both in the psalm and in the epistle, lies in ἔνεκεν σοῦ. This is what the Psalmist could not understand. That men should suffer for sin, for infidelity to God, was intelligible enough; but he and his countrymen were suffering because of their faithfulness, and the psalm is his despairing expostulation with God. But the Apostle understood it. To suffer for Christ's sake was to enter into the fellowship of Christ's sufferings, and that is the very situation in which the love of Christ is most real, near, and sure to the soul. Cf. chap. v. 3, 2 Cor. i. 5, Col. i. 24. Instead of despairing, he glories in tribulations.

Ver. 37. ὑπερνικῶμεν: a word probably coined by Paul; who loves compounds with ὑπέρ. The Vulg. gives *superamus*, with which Lipsius agrees (*obsiegen*, like *over-power*): but Cyprian *supervincimus*. Later Greek writers distinguish νικᾶν and ὑπερνικᾶν (see Grimm, *s.v.*), and justify the happy rendering “we are more than conquerors”. Perhaps it is a mistake to define in what the “more” consists; but if we do, the answer must be sought on the line indicated in the note on ἔνεκεν σοῦ: these trials not only do not cut us off from Christ's love, they actually give us more intimate and thrilling experiences of it. διὰ τοῦ ἀγαπήσαντος ἡμᾶς: the aorist points to Christ's death as the great demonstration of His love: cf. Gal. ii. 20, also Rev. xii. 11.

Ver. 38 f. The Apostle's personal conviction given in confirmation of all that has been said, especially of ver. 37. πέπεισμαι cf. 2 Tim. i. 12. οὔτε θάνατος οὔτε ζῶη: death is mentioned first, either with ver. 36 in mind, or as the most tremendous enemy the Apostle could conceive. If Christ's love can hold us in and through death, what is left for us to fear? Much of the N.T. bears on this

γῆς.") 37. ἀλλ' ἐν τούτοις πᾶσιν ὑπερρικῶμεν διὰ τοῦ ἀγαπήσαντος ἡμᾶς. 38. πέπεισμαι γὰρ ὅτι οὔτε θάνατος οὔτε ζωή, οὔτε ἄγγελοι οὔτε ἀρχαί οὔτε δυνάμεις, οὔτε ἐνεστῶτα οὔτε μέλλοντα, 39. οὔτε ὕψωμα οὔτε βάθος, οὔτε τις κτίσις ἑτέρα δυνήσεται ἡμᾶς χωρῖσαι ἀπὸ τῆς ἀγάπης τοῦ Θεοῦ, τῆς ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ τῷ Κυρίῳ ἡμῶν.

very point, cf. John viii. 51, x. 28, xi. 25 f., 1 Thess. iv. 13-18, 1 Cor. xv., 2 Cor. iv. 16-v. 5, Rom. xiv. 8, Heb. ii. 14 f. The blank horror of dying is annihilated by the love of Christ. Neither death nor life is to be explained: explanations "only limit the flight of the Apostle's thoughts just when they would soar above all limitation" (Gifford). οὔτε ἄγγελοι οὔτε ἀρχαί: this, according to the best authorities, forms a second pair of forces conceivably hostile to the Christian. As in every pair there is a kind of contrast, some have sought one here also: either making ἄγγελοι good and ἀρχαί evil powers, though both spiritual; or ἄγγελοι heavenly, and ἀρχαί (as in Lc. xii. 11, Tit. iii. 1) earthly powers, in which case either might be either good or bad. But this is arbitrary: and a comparison of 1 Cor. xv. 24, Eph. i. 21 favours a suggestion in S. and H. that possibly in a very early copy οὔτε δυνάμεις had been accidentally omitted after οὔτε ἀρχαί, and then added in the margin, but reinserted in a wrong place. The T.R. "neither angels nor principalities nor powers" brings together all the conceptions with which the Apostle peopled the invisible spiritual world, whatever their character, and declares their inability to come between us and the love of Christ. οὔτε ἐνεστῶτα οὔτε μέλλοντα: cf. 1 Cor. iii. 22. οὔτε ὕψωμα οὔτε βάθος: no dimensions of space. Whether these words pictured something to Paul's imagination we cannot tell; the patristic attempts to give them definiteness are not happy. οὔτε τις κτίσις ἑτέρα: nor any created thing of different kind. All the things Paul has mentioned come under the head of κτίσις; if there is anything of a different kind which comes under the same head, he includes it too. The suggestions of "another world," or of "aspects of reality out of relation to our faculties," and therefore as yet unknown to us, are toys, remote from the seriousness and passion of the Apostle's mind. Nothing that God has made, whatever be its nature, shall be able to separate us ἀπὸ τῆς ἀγάπης τοῦ θεοῦ τῆς ἐν Χ. Ἰ. τοῦ κ. ἡμῶν. The love of Christ is God's love,

manifested to us in Him; and it is only in Him that a Divine love is manifested which can inspire the triumphant assurance of this verse.

CHAPTERS IX.-XI. With the eighth chapter Paul concludes the positive exposition of his gospel. Starting with the theme of i. 16 f., he showed in i. 18-iii. 20 the universal sinfulness of men—Gentile and Jew; in iii. 21-v. 21 he explained, illustrated and glorified the gospel of justification by faith in Christ, set forth by God as a propitiation for sin; in vi. 1-viii. 39 he has vindicated this gospel from the charge of moral inefficiency, by showing that justification by faith is inseparably connected with a new life in the Spirit, a life over which sin has no dominion and in which the just demands of God's law are fulfilled. He has even carried this spiritual life on, in hope, to its consummation in glory: and no more remains to be said. With chap. ix. a new subject is introduced. There is no formal link of connection with what precedes. Structurally, the new division of the epistle stands quite apart from the earlier; it might have been written, and probably was written, after a break. But though no logical relation between the parts is expressed, a psychological connection between them is not hard to discover. The new section deals with a problem which presented great difficulty to the early Church, and especially to men of Jewish birth, a problem which haunted the Apostle's own mind and was no doubt thrust on his attention by his unbelieving countrymen, a problem all the more painful to him as he realised more completely the greatness and glory of the Christian salvation. This was the problem constituted by the fact that the Jews as a whole did not receive the Gospel. They were God's chosen people, but if the Christian Gospel brought salvation they had no share in it. The Messiah was to spring from them, but if Jesus was the Messiah this privilege meant not redemption but condemnation, for they rejected Him almost with one consent. In short, if the birth of the Christian Church and the gathering of

a 1 Tim. ii. IX. 1. ἈΛΗΘΕΙΑΝ λέγω ἐν Χριστῷ, οὐ<sup>a</sup> ψεύδομαι, συμμαρτυροῦσας  
7. μοι τῆς συνειδήσεώς μου ἐν Πνεύματι Ἁγίῳ, 2. ὅτι λύπη μοι ἐστὶ

Gentiles into it represented the carrying out of God's purpose to bless and save men, God must have turned His back upon Himself; He must have broken His promise to Israel, and cast off His chosen people. But as this must seem impossible, the Jewish inference would be that the Gospel preached by Paul could not be of God, nor the Gentile Churches, as Paul asserted, God's true Israel. This is the situation to which the Apostle addresses himself in the ninth and the two following chapters. It is a historical problem, in the first instance, he has to deal with, not a dogmatic one; and it is necessary to keep the historical situation in view, if we are to avoid illegitimate inferences from the arguments or illustrations of the Apostle. After the introductory statement (ix. 1-5), which shows how deeply his heart is pledged to his brethren after the flesh, he works out a solution of the problem—or an interpretation of the position—along three lines. In each of these there are many incidental points of view, but they can be broadly discriminated. (1) In the first, chap. ix. 6-29, Paul asserts the absolute freedom and sovereignty of God as against any claim, made as of right, on the part of man. The Jewish objection to the Gospel, to which reference is made above, really means that the Jewish nation had a claim of right upon God, giving them a title to salvation, which God must acknowledge; Paul argues that all God's action, as exhibited in Scripture, and especially in the history of Israel itself—to say nothing of the essential relations of Creator and creature—refutes such a claim. (2) In the second, chap. ix. 30-x. 21, Paul turns from this more speculative aspect of the situation to its moral character, and points out that the explanation of the present rejection of the Jews is to be found in the fact that they have wilfully and stubbornly rejected the Gospel. Their minds have been set on a righteousness of their own, and they have refused to submit themselves to the righteousness of God. (3) In the third, chap. xi., he rises again to an absolute or speculative point of view. The present unbelief of the Jews and incoming of the Gentiles are no doubt, to a Jew, disconcerting events; yet in spite of them, or rather—which is more wonderful still—by means of them, God's promises to

the fathers will be fulfilled, and all Israel saved. Gentile Christianity will provoke the unbelieving Jews to jealousy, and they too will enter the Messianic Kingdom. In the very events which seem to throw the pious Jewish mind out of its reckoning, there is a gracious providence, a depth of riches and wisdom and knowledge which no words can express. The present situation, which at the first glance is heart-breaking (ix. 2), is only one incident in the working out of a purpose which when completed reveals the whole glory of God's mercy, and evokes the loftiest and most heartfelt praise. "He shut up all unto disobedience that He might have mercy on all. . . . Of Him and through Him and to Him are all things. Unto Him be glory for ever." Since Baur's time several scholars have held that the mass of the Roman Church was Jewish-Christian, and that these three chapters, with their apologetic aim, are specially addressed to that community, as one which naturally felt the pressure of the difficulty with which they deal. But the Roman Church, as these very chapters show (*cf.* ix. 3, *my kinsmen*, not *our*; xi. 13, ἡμῖν δὲ λέγω τοῖς ἔθνεσιν), was certainly Gentile, whatever influence Jewish modes of thought and practice may have had in it; and it was quite natural for the Apostle, in writing what he evidently meant from the first should be both a systematic and a circular letter, to include in it a statement of his thoughts on one of the most difficult and important questions of the time. The extraordinary daring of chap. xi. *ad fin.* is not unrelated to the extraordinary passion of chap. ix. *ad init.* The whole discussion is a magnificent illustration of the aphorism, that great thoughts come from the heart.

CHAPTER IX.—Vv. 1-5. The intense pain with which Paul contemplates the unbelief of his countrymen.

Ver. 1. ἀλήθειαν λέγω ἐν Χριστῷ, οὐ ψεύδομαι. The solemn asseveration is meant to clear him of the suspicion that in preaching to the Gentiles he is animated by hostility or even indifference to the Jews. Yet *cf.* 2 Cor. xi. 31, Gal. i. 20. ἐν Χριστῷ means that he speaks in fellowship with Christ, so that falsehood is impossible. For συμμαρτ. *cf.* ii. 15, viii. 16. The μοι is governed by συν: conscience attests what he says, and that ἐν πνεύματι ἁγίῳ—the spirit of



μεγάλη, καὶ ἀδιάλειπτος<sup>b</sup> ὀδύνη<sup>c</sup> τῇ καρδίᾳ μου, 3. ἠύχόμην γὰρ <sup>b2 Tim. i. 3.</sup> <sup>c1 Tim. vi. 10.</sup> αὐτὸς ἐγὼ ἀνάθεμα εἶναι<sup>1</sup> ἀπὸ τοῦ Χριστοῦ ὑπὲρ τῶν ἀδελφῶν μου, <sup>d Gal. iv. 24;</sup> τῶν συγγενῶν μου κατὰ σάρκα· 4. οὔτινές εἰσιν Ἰσραηλίται, ὧν ἡ <sup>e Cf. Heb. vii. 11.</sup> <sup>viii. 6.</sup> υἰοθεσία, καὶ ἡ δόξα, καὶ αἱ διαθήκαι,<sup>2d</sup> καὶ ἡ νομοθεσία,<sup>2d</sup> καὶ ἡ λατ-

<sup>1</sup> αὐτος ἐγὼ ἀνάθεμα εἶναι, so CKL; but in ΞABDF ἀνάθεμα εἶναι αὐτος ἐγὼ.

<sup>2</sup> αἱ διαθήκαι ΞCK and versions; ἡ διαθήκη BDF; see note <sup>2</sup> (on πρῶτον), page 589. The plural is no doubt right here, and was mechanically changed as standing between two singulars. At the end of the verse DEFG also read ἡ ἐπαγγελία instead of αἱ ἐπαγγελίαι.

God, in which all the functions of the Christian life are carried on: so that assurance is made doubly and trebly sure.

Ver. 2. The fact of Paul's sorrow is stated here; the cause of it is revealed in ver. 3. Weiss remarks on the triple climax: λύπη being intensified in ὀδύνη, μεγάλη in ἀδιάλειπτος, and μοι in τῇ καρδίᾳ μου. Paul cannot find words strong enough to convey his feeling.

Ver. 3. ἠύχόμην γὰρ ἀνάθεμα εἶναι κ.τ.λ. For I could wish that I myself were anathema, etc. For the omission of ἄν see Acts xxv. 22, Gal. iv. 20. Paul could wish this if it were a wish that could be realised for the good of Israel. The form of expression implies that the wish had actually been conceived, but in such sentences "the context alone implies what the present state of mind is" (Burton, *Moods and Tenses*, § 33). ἀνάθεμα is to be construed with ἀπὸ τοῦ Χριστοῦ: the idea of separation from Christ, final and fatal separation, is conveyed. For the construction cf. Gal. v. 4 (κατηργήθητε ἀπὸ Χριστοῦ). ἀνάθεμα Gal. i. 8 f., 1 Cor. xii. 3, xvi. 22 is the equivalent of the Hebrew אָנָּה, Deut. vii. 26,

Josh. vii. 12—that which is put under the ban, and irrevocably devoted to destruction. It is beside the mark to speak of such an utterance as this as unethical. Rather might we call it with Dorner "a spark from the fire of Christ's substitutionary love". There is a passion in it more profound even than that of Moses' prayer in Ex. xxxii. 32. Moses identifies himself with his people, and if they cannot be saved would perish with them; Paul could find it in his heart, were it possible, to perish for them. τῶν συγγενῶν μου κατὰ σάρκα distinguishes these from his Christian brethren.

Ver. 4 f. The intensity of Paul's distress, and of his longing for the salvation of his countrymen, is partly explained in this verse. It is the greatness of his

people, their unique place of privilege in God's providence, the splendour of the inheritance and of the hopes which they forfeit by unbelief, that make their unbelief at once so painful, and so perplexing. οὔτινές εἰσιν Ἰσραηλίται: being, as they are, Israelites. Israelites is not the national but the theocratic name; it expresses the spiritual prerogative of the nation, cf. 2 Cor. xi. 22, Gal. vi. 16. ὧν ἡ υἰοθεσία: this is not the Christian sonship, but that which is referred to in such passages as Ex. iv. 22, Hos. xi. 1. Yet it may be wrong to speak of it as if it were merely national; it seems to be distributed and applied to the individual members of the nation in Deut. xiv. 1, Hos. i. 10 (ii. 1 Heb.). ἡ δόξα: the glory must refer to something definite, like the pillar of cloud and fire, the יְהוָה יְהוָה of the O.T., the

יְהוָה of later Jewish theology; there is probably reference to it in Acts vii. 2, Heb. ix. 5. αἱ διαθήκαι: in other places Paul speaks of the O.T. religion as one covenant, one (legal) administration of the relations between God and man (e.g., in 2 Cor. iii.): here, where αἱ διαθήκαι is expressly distinguished from ἡ νομοθεσία (the great Sinaitic legislation: 2 Macc. vi. 23), the various covenants God made with the patriarchs must be meant. Cf. Wisd. xviii. 22, Sir. xlv. 11, 2 Macc. viii. 15. ἡ λατρεία is the cultus of the tabernacle and the temple, the only legitimate cultus in the world. αἱ ἐπαγγελίαι are the Messianic promises: in the Israelitish religion "the best was yet to be," as all the highest minds knew. Ver. 5. ὧν οἱ πατέρες: Abraham, Isaac and Jacob. The greatness of its ancestry ennobled Israel, and made its position in Paul's time harder to understand and to endure. Who could think without the keenest pain of the sons of such fathers forfeiting everything for which the fathers had been called?

f Ch. xii. 1. **ρεία,**<sup>f</sup> **καὶ αἱ ἐπαγγελίαι,**<sup>g</sup> 5. **ὧν οἱ πατέρες,**<sup>h</sup> **καὶ ἐξ ὧν ὁ Χριστὸς τὸ**  
 g Ch. xv. 8; **κατὰ σάρκα, ὁ ὧν ἐπὶ πάντων Θεοῦ εὐλογητὸς**<sup>i</sup> **εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας.** ἀμήν.  
 Gal. iii. 16; 21; Heb. vi. 12. h Ch. xi. 28. i Ch. i. 23; 2 Cor. xi. 31.

But the supreme distinction of Israel has yet to be mentioned. **ἐξ ὧν ὁ Χριστὸς τὸ κατὰ σάρκα, ὁ ὧν ἐπὶ πάντων θεοῦ εὐλογητὸς εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας.** Ἀμήν. The only point in the interpretation of this verse, in which it can be said that interpreters are wholly at one, is the statement that of Israel the Messiah came, according to the flesh. The words **τὸ κατὰ σάρκα** define the extent to which the Messiah can be explained by His descent from Israel; for anything going beyond **σάρξ**, or ordinary humanity, the explanation must be sought elsewhere. The limitation suggests an antithesis, and one in which the spiritual or Divine side of the Messiah's nature should find expression, this being the natural counterpart of **σάρξ**; and such an antithesis has been sought and found in the words which follow. He who, according to the flesh, is of Israel, is at the same time over all, God blessed for ever. This interpretation, which refers the whole of the words after **ἐξ ὧν τὸ ὁ Χριστὸς**, is adopted by many of the best scholars: Gifford, Sanday, Westcott (see *N.T.*, vol. ii., app., p. 110), Weiss, etc., and has much in its favour. (1) It *does* supply the complementary antithesis which **τὸ κατὰ σάρκα** suggests. (2) Grammatically it is simple, for **ὁ ὧν** naturally applies to what precedes: the person who is over all is naturally the person just mentioned, unless there is decisive reason to the contrary. (3) If we adopt another punctuation, and make the words **ὁ ὧν ἐπὶ πάντων θεοῦ εὐλογητὸς εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας** a doxology—"God Who is over all be blessed for ever"—there are grammatical objections. These are (a) the use of **ὧν**, which is at least abnormal. "God Who is over all" would naturally be expressed by **ὁ ἐπὶ πάντων θεοῦ** without **ὧν**: the **ὧν** suggests the reference to Christ. (b) The position of **εὐλογητὸς** is unparalleled in a doxology; it ought, as in Eph. i. 3 and the LXX., to stand first in the sentence. But these reasons are not decisive. As for (1), though a complementary antithesis to **τὸ κατὰ σάρκα** is suggested, it is not imperatively demanded here, as in i. 3 f. The greatness reflected upon Israel by the origin of the person in question is sufficiently conveyed by **ὁ Χριστὸς**, without any expansion. As for (2), it is true to say that **ὁ ὧν** naturally refers to what precedes: the only question is, whether

the natural reference may not in any given case be precluded. Many scholars think it is precluded here. Meyer, for instance, argues that "Paul has *never* used the express **θεοῦ** of Christ, since he has not adopted, like John, the Alexandrian form of conceiving and setting forth the Divine essence of Christ, but has adhered to the popular concrete, strictly monotheistic terminology, not modified by philosophical speculation even for the designation of Christ; and he always accurately distinguishes God and Christ". To this he adds the more dubious reasons that in the genuine apostolic writings (he excludes 2 Tim. iv. 18, 2 Pet. iii. 18, Heb. xiii. 21, and Rev.) there is no doxology to Christ in the form usual in doxologies referring to God, and that by **ἐπὶ πάντων** the Son's subordination is denied. To these last arguments it may be answered that if the words in question do apply to Christ they are not a doxology at all (Gifford), but a declaration of deity, like 2 Cor. xi. 31, and that Christ's subordination is not affected by His being described as **ὁ ὧν ἐπὶ πάντων** any more than by His own claim to have all authority in heaven and on earth. But the first of Meyer's arguments has a weight which it is impossible not to feel, and it becomes the more decisive the more we realise Paul's whole habit of thought and speech. To say with Dr. Gifford, "When we review the history of the interpretation it cannot but be regarded as a remarkable fact that every objection urged against the ancient interpretation rests ultimately on dogmatic presuppositions," hardly covers such a position as Meyer represents. For the "dogmatic presuppositions" are not arbitrary, but merely sum up the whole impression made on the mind by the study of Paul's writings, an impression by which we cannot but be influenced, especially in deciding delicate and dubious questions like this. If we ask ourselves point blank, whether Paul, as we know his mind from his epistles, would express his sense of Christ's greatness by calling Him God blessed for ever, it seems to me almost impossible to answer in the affirmative. Such an assertion is not on the same plane with the conception of Christ which meets us everywhere in the Apostle's writings; and though there is some irregularity in the grammar, and perhaps some

6. Οὐχ οἶον δὲ ὅτι ἐκπέπτωκεν<sup>k</sup> ὁ λόγος τοῦ Θεοῦ. οὐ γὰρ πάντες<sup>k</sup> οἱ ἐξ Ἰσραήλ, οὗτοι Ἰσραήλ. 7. οὐδ' ὅτι εἰσι σπέρμα<sup>l</sup> Ἀβραάμ, πάντες τέκνα, ἀλλ' ἐν Ἰσαὰκ κληθήσεται σοι σπέρμα. 8. τοῦτ' ἔστιν, οὐ τὰ τέκνα τῆς σαρκός, ταῦτα τέκνα τοῦ Θεοῦ· ἀλλὰ τὰ τέκνα τῆς ἐπαγγελίας<sup>m</sup> λογιέται εἰς σπέρμα. 9. ἐπαγγελίας γὰρ ὁ λόγος οὗτος, "Κατὰ τὸν καιρὸν τοῦτον" ἐλεύσομαι, καὶ ἔσται τῇ

<sup>k</sup> Here only;  
Jas. i. 11;  
1 Pet. i.

<sup>l</sup> Ch. xi. 1; 2  
Cor. xi. 22;  
John viii.

<sup>m</sup> Gal. iv. 28.  
n Gen. xviii.  
10.

difficulty in seeing the point of a doxology, I agree with those who would put a colon or a period at **σάρκα**, and make the words that follow refer not to Christ but to the Father. This is the punctuation given in the margin by W. and H., and "alone seems adequate to account for the whole of the language employed, more especially when considered in relation to the context" (Hort, *N.T.*, vol. ii., app., p. 110). The doxology is, indeed, somewhat hard to comprehend; it seems at the first glance without a motive, and no psychological explanation of it yet offered is very satisfying. It is as if Paul, having carried the privileges of Israel to a climax by mentioning the origin of the Messiah as far as regards His humanity, suddenly felt himself face to face with the problem of the time, how to reconcile these extraordinary privileges with the rejection of the Jews; and before addressing himself to any study or solution of it expressed in this way his devout and adoring faith, even under the pressure of such a perplexity, in the sovereign providence of God. The use of **ὄν**, which is in itself unnecessary, emphasises **ἐπὶ πάντων**; and this emphasis is "fully justified if St. Paul's purpose is to suggest that the tragic apostasy of the Jews (vers. 2, 3) is itself part of the dispensations of Him Who is God over all, over Jew and Gentile alike, over past, present and future alike; so that the ascription of blessing to Him is a homage to His Divine purpose and power of bringing good out of evil in the course of the ages (xi. 13-16, 25-36)": W. and H., ii., app., p. 110. Full discussions of the passage are given in Meyer, S. and H., and Gifford; also by Dr. Ezra Abbot in the *Journal of the Society of Biblical Exegesis*, 1883. With this preface Paul proceeds to justify the ways of God to men: see the introductory remarks above. The first section of his argument (ix. 6-29) is in the narrower sense a theodicy—a vindication of God's right in dealing as He has dealt with Israel. In the first part of this (vers. 6-13) he shows that the rejection of the mass of Israel from the Messianic Kingdom involves no breach

or failure of the Divine promise. The promise is not given to all the natural descendants of Abraham, but only to a chosen seed, the Israel of God.

Ver. 6. **οὐχ οἶον δὲ ὅτι**: this unique expression is explained by Buttman (*Grammar*, p. 372, Thayer's Transl.) as a blending of two formulas—**οὐχ οἶον** followed by a finite verb, and **οὐχ ὅτι**, which is common in the *N.T.* The meaning is, But, in spite of my grief, I do not mean to say any such thing as that the Word of God has come to nothing. For not all they that are of Israel, *i.e.*, born of the patriarch, are Israel, *i.e.*, the people of God. This is merely an application of our Lord's words, That which is born of the flesh is flesh. It is not what we get from our fathers and mothers that ensures our place in the family of God. For the use of **οὗτοι** in this verse to resume and define the subject see Gal. iii. 7.

Ver. 7. Nor because they are Abraham's seed, are they all **τέκνα**, *i.e.*, children in the sense which entitles them to the inheritance, iv. 11, viii. 17. God from the very first made a distinction here, and definitely announced that the seed of Abraham to which the promise belonged should come in the line of Isaac—not of Ishmael, though he also could call Abraham father. **Ἐν Ἰσαὰκ κληθήσεται σοι σπέρμα** = Gen. xxi. 12, LXX. The words literally mean that in the line of Isaac Abraham should have the posterity which would properly bear his name, and inherit the promises made to him by God. Isaac's descendants are the true Abrahamidae.

Ver. 8 f. **τοῦτ' ἔστιν**: the meaning of this action of God is now made clear. It signifies that not mere bodily descent from Abraham makes one a child of God—that was never the case, not even in Abraham's time; it is the children of the promise who are reckoned a seed to Abraham, for the word in virtue of which Isaac, the true son and heir, was born, was a word of promise. He was born, to use the language of the Gospel, from above; and something analogous to this is necessary, whenever a man (even a

ο Gen. xviii. Σάρρα υἱός".<sup>ο</sup> ΙΟ. οὐ μόνον δέ, ἀλλὰ καὶ ῥεβέκκα ἐξ ἐνὸς κοίτην"<sup>ο</sup>  
 10.  
 P Ch. xiii. 13; ἔχουσα, Ἰσαὰκ τοῦ πατρὸς ἡμῶν· ΙΙ. μήπω γὰρ γεννηθέντων, μηδὲ  
 Heb. xiii.  
 4; Luke πραξάντων τι ἀγαθὸν ἢ κακόν,<sup>1</sup> ἵνα ἡ κατ' ἐκλογὴν<sup>α</sup> τοῦ Θεοῦ πρόθεσις  
 xi. 7.  
 α Ch. xi. 5, μένη, οὐκ ἐξ ἔργων, ἀλλ' ἐκ τοῦ καλοῦντος,<sup>2</sup> 12. ἐρρήθη αὐτῇ, "Ὅτι  
 7, 28; Acts  
 ix. 15; 1 Th. i. 4. 1 Gal. v. 8.

<sup>1</sup> κακον DFKL; φαυλον ΞAB. του θεου προθεσις; all the best MSS., ΞABDFKL and edd. read προθεσις του θεου.

descendant of Abraham) claims to be a child of God and an heir of His kingdom. From Gal. iv. 28 (Now we, brethren, like Isaac, are children of promise) we see that the relation to God in question here is one open to Gentiles as well as Jews: if we are Christ's, then we too are Abraham's seed, and heirs according to promise. The argumentative suggestion in vers. 6-9 is that just as God discriminated at the first between the children of Abraham, so He is discriminating still; the fact that many do not receive the Gospel no more proves that the promise has failed than the fact that God chose Isaac only and set aside Ishmael.

Ver. 10 ff. But the argument can be made more decisive. A Jewish opponent might say, "Ishmael was an illegitimate child, who naturally had no rights as against Isaac; we are the legitimate descendants of the patriarch, and our right to the inheritance is indefeasible". To this the Apostle replies in vers. 10-13. Not only did God make the distinction already referred to, but in the case of Isaac's children, where there seemed no ground for making any distinction whatever, He distinguished again, and said, The elder shall serve the younger. Jacob and Esau had one father, one mother, and were twin sons; the only ground on which either could have been preferred was that of priority of birth, and this was disregarded by God; Esau, the elder, was rejected, and Jacob, the younger, was made heir of the promises. Further, this was done by God of His sovereign freedom: the decisive word was spoken to their mother while they were as yet unborn and had achieved neither good nor evil. Claims as of right, therefore, made against God, are futile, whether they are based on descent or on works. There is no way in which they can be established; and, as we have just seen, God acts in entire disregard of them. God's purpose to save men, and make them heirs of His kingdom—a purpose which is characterised as κατ' ἐκλογὴν, or involving a choice—is not determined at all by consideration of

such claims as the Jews put forward. In forming it, and carrying it out, God acts with perfect freedom. In the case in question His action in regard to Jacob and Esau agrees with His word in the prophet Malachi: Jacob I loved but Esau I hated; and further than this we cannot go. To avoid misapprehending this, however, it is necessary to keep the Apostle's purpose in view. He wishes to show that God's promise has not broken down, though many of the children of Abraham have no part in its fulfilment in Christ. He does so by showing that there has always been a distinction, among the descendants of the patriarchs, between those who have merely the natural connection to boast of, and those who are the Israel of God; and, as against Jewish pretensions, he shows at the same time that this distinction can be traced to nothing but God's sovereignty. It is not of works, but of Him Who effectually calls men. We may say, if we please, that sovereignty in this sense is "just a name for what is unrevealed of God" (T. Erskine, *The Brazen Serpent*, p. 259), but though it is unrevealed we must not conceive of it as arbitrary—*i.e.*, as non-rational or non-moral. It is the sovereignty of God, and God is not *exlex*; He is a law to Himself—a law all love and holiness and truth—in all His purposes towards men. So Calvin: "ubi mentionem gloriae Dei audis, illic justitiam cogita". Paul has mentioned in an earlier chapter, among the notes of true religion, the exclusion of boasting (iii. 27); and in substance that is the argument he is using here. No Jewish birth, no legal works, can give a man a claim which God is bound to honour; and no man urging such claims can say that God's word has become of no effect though his claims are disallowed, and he gets no part in the inheritance of God's people.

οὐ μόνον δέ: cf. v. II, viii. 23.—Not only is this so, but a more striking and convincing illustration can be given. ἀλλὰ καὶ ῥεβέκκα: the sentence thus begun is never finished, but the sense is

ὁ μείζων δουλεύσει τῷ ἐλάσσονι." 13. καθὼς<sup>1</sup> γέγραπται, "Τὸν Ἰακώβ ἠγάπησα, τὸν δὲ Ἰσαὺ ἐμίσησα".

14. Τί οὖν ἐροῦμεν; μὴ ἀδικία παρὰ τῷ Θεῷ;<sup>a</sup> μὴ γένοιτο. 15. s. Ch. ii. 11. τῷ γὰρ Μωσῆ λέγει, "Ἐλεήσω ὃν ἂν ἐλεῶ, καὶ οἰκτειρήσω ὃν ἂν

<sup>1</sup> καθαπερ B, Orig. 1 (instead of καθως) is read by Weiss and W. and H., though the latter put καθως in marg. Cf. iii. 4, xi. 8, and 1 Cor. x. 10.

continued in ver. 12. Ἰσαὰκ τοῦ πατρὸς ἡμῶν: Paul speaks here out of his own consciousness as a Jew, addressing himself to a problem which greatly exercised other Jews; and calls Isaac "father" as the person from whom the inheritance was to come. Ver. 11. μήπω γὰρ γεννηθέντων μηδὲ πραξάντων: "the conditional negatives (μήπω, μηδὲ) represent the circumstances not as mere facts of history, but as conditions entering into God's counsel and plan. The time of the prediction was thus chosen, in order to make it clear that He Who calls men to be heirs of His salvation makes free choice of whom He will, unfettered by any claims of birth or merit" (Gifford). πρόθεσις in this theological sense is a specially Pauline word. The purpose it describes is universal in its bearings, for it is the purpose of One who works all things according to the counsel of His will, Eph. i. 11; it is eternal, a πρόθεσις τῶν αἰώνων, Eph. iii. 11; it is God's ἰδία πρόθεσις, 2 Tim. i. 9, a purpose, the meaning, contents, and end of which find their explanation in God alone; it is a purpose κατ' ἐκλογὴν, i. e., the carrying of it out involves choice and discrimination between man and man, and between race and race; and in spite of the side of mystery which belongs to such a conception, it is a perfectly intelligible purpose, for it is described as πρόθεσις ἣν ἐποίησεν ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ, and what God means by Christ Jesus no one can doubt. God's eternal purpose, the purpose carried out κατ' ἐκλογὴν, yet embracing the universe, is clearly revealed in His Son. The permanent determining element, wherever this purpose is concerned, is not the works of men, but the will and call of God; and to make this plain was the intention of God in speaking as He did, and when He did, to Rebecca about her children. If we look to Gen. xxv. 23, it is indisputably the nations of Israel and Edom that are referred to: "Two nations are in thy womb, and two manner of peoples shall be separated from thy bowels; and the one people shall be stronger than the other people, and the elder shall serve the younger". The

same is true also of Mal. i. 2: "I loved Jacob, but Esau I hated, and made his mountains a desolation," etc. Yet it would not be right to say that Paul is here considering merely the parts assigned by God to nations in the drama of providence; He is obviously thinking of Jacob and Esau as individuals, whose own relation to God's promise and inheritance (involving no doubt that of their posterity) was determined by God before they were born or had done either good or ill. On the other hand, it would not be right to say that Paul here refers the eternal salvation or perdition of individuals to an absolute decree of God which has no relation to what they are or do, but rests simply on His inscrutable will. He is engaged in precluding the idea that man can have claims of right against God, and with it the idea that the exclusion of the mass of Israel from the Messiah's kingdom convicts God of breach of faith toward the children of Abraham; and this He can do quite effectually, on the lines indicated, without consciously facing this tremendous hypothesis.

Vv. 14-21. In the second part of his theodicy Paul meets the objection that this sovereign freedom of God is essentially unjust.

Ver. 14. τί οὖν ἐροῦμεν; cf. vi. 1, vii. 7, viii. 31. It is Paul who speaks, anticipating, as he cannot help doing, the objection which is sure to rise, not only in Jewish minds, though it is with them he is directly concerned, but in the mind of every human being who reads his words. Yet he states the objection as one in itself incredible. μὴ ἀδικία παρὰ τῷ θεῷ; surely we cannot say that there is unrighteousness with God? This is the force of the μὴ, and Paul can answer at once μὴ γένοιτο: away with the thought! God says Himself that He shows mercy with that sovereign freedom which Paul has ascribed to Him; and the principle of action which God announces as His own cannot be unjust.

Ver. 15. τῷ Μωυσεὶ γὰρ λέγει. τῷ Μωυσεὶ is emphatic by position: the person to whom this declaration was

t Gal. v. 7. οἰκτεῖρω". 16. ἄρα οὖν οὐ τοῦ θέλοντος, οὐδὲ τοῦ τρέχοντος,<sup>1</sup> ἀλλὰ τοῦ ἐλεούντος<sup>1</sup> Θεοῦ. 17. λέγει γὰρ ἡ γραφή τῷ Φαραῶ, "Ὅτι εἰς u 1 Tim. i. αὐτὸ τοῦτο ἐξήγειρά σε, ὅπως ἐνδείξωμαι<sup>1</sup> ἐν σοὶ τὴν δύναμίν μου, 16. v Luke ix. καὶ ὅπως διαγαλῆ<sup>v</sup> τὸ ὄνομά μου ἐν πάσῃ τῇ γῆ". 18. ἄρα οὖν ὃν 60; Acts xxi. 26. θέλει, ἐλεεῖ· ὃν δὲ θέλει, σκληρύνει. 19. Ἐρεῖς οὖν μοι,<sup>2</sup> τί ἔτι

<sup>1</sup> For ἐλεούντος read ἐλεωντος with  $\Sigma$ AB<sup>2</sup>DF.

<sup>2</sup> For οὖν μοι  $\Sigma$ ABP 47 read μοι οὖν. τι ἐπι μεμφεται  $\Sigma$ AKLP, but τι οὖν ἐπι μεμφεται BDFG, Orig.-inter. This οὖν is inserted by Lachm. and Weiss, bracketed in marg. by Treg., simply omitted (on the principle of judging referred to in note <sup>2</sup>, page 589) by W. and H.

made, as well as the voice which made it, render it peculiarly significant to a Jew. The words (exactly as LXX, Exod. xxxiii. 19) occur in the answer to a prayer of Moses, and may have been regarded by Paul as having special reference to him; as if the point of the quotation were, Even one who had deserved so well as Moses experienced God's mercy solely because God willed that He should. But that is not necessary, and is not what the original means. The emphasis is on ὃν ἄν, and the point is that in showing mercy God is determined by nothing outside of His mercy itself. οἰκτεῖρειν is stronger than ἐλεεῖν; it suggests more strongly the emotion attendant on pity, and even its expression in voice or gesture.

Ver. 16. Conclusion from this word of God. It (namely, the experience of God's mercy) does not depend on man's resolve or effort (for τρέχειν cf. 1 Cor. ix. 24 ff.), but on God's merciful act. This, of course, merely repeats vers. 12, 13, buttressing the principle of God's sovereign freedom in the exercise of mercy by reference to His own word in Exod. xxxiii. 19.

Ver. 17 f. But Paul goes further, and explains the contrary phenomenon—that of a man who does not and cannot receive mercy—in the same way. λέγει γὰρ ἡ γραφή: it is on Scripture the burden of proof is laid here and at ver. 15. A Jew might answer the arguments Paul uses here if they were the Apostle's own; to Scripture he can make no reply; it must silence, even where it does not convince. τῷ Φαραῶ: All men, and not those only who are the objects of His mercy, come within the scope of God's sovereignty. Pharaoh as well as Moses can be quoted to illustrate it. He was the open adversary of God, an avowed, implacable adversary; yet a Divine purpose was fulfilled in his life, and that

purpose and nothing else is the explanation of his very being. εἰς αὐτὸ τοῦτο ἐξήγειρά σε. The LXX in Exod. ix. 16 read: καὶ ἔνεκεν τούτου διετηρήθης, the last word, answering to the Hebrew תִּיִתְרַוּיָהּ, being used in the sense of "thou wast kept alive"—the sense adopted by Dillmann for the Hebrew; probably Paul changed it intentionally to give the meaning, "for this reason I brought thee on the stage of history": cf. Hab. i. 6, Zec. xi. 16, Jer. xxvii. 41 (S. and H.). The purpose Pharaoh was designed to serve, and actually did serve, on this stage, was certainly not his own; as certainly it was God's. God's power was shown in the penal miracles by which Pharaoh and Egypt were visited, and his name is proclaimed to this day wherever the story of the Exodus is told.

Ver. 18. From the two instances just quoted Paul draws the comprehensive conclusion: So then on whom He will He has mercy, and whom He will He hardens. The whole emphasis is on θέλει. The two modes in which God acts upon man are showing mercy and hardening, and it depends upon God's will in which of these two modes He actually does act. The word σκληρύνει is borrowed from the history of Pharaoh, Ex. vii. 3, 22; viii. 19; ix. 12; xiv. 17. What precisely the hardening means, and in what relation God's hardening of Pharaoh's heart stood to Pharaoh's own hardening of it against God, are not unimportant questions, but they are questions which Paul does not here raise. He has one aim always in view here—to show that man has no claim as of right against God; and he finds a decisive proof of this (at least for a Jew) in the opposite examples of Moses and Pharaoh, interpreted as these are by unmistakable words of God Himself.

μέμφεται<sup>1</sup>; τῷ γὰρ βουλήματι<sup>x</sup> αὐτοῦ τίς ἀνθέστηκε; 20. μενούγγε, ὧ<sup>w</sup> Heb. viii. 8. ἄνθρωπε,<sup>1y</sup> σὺ τίς εἶ ὁ ἀνταποκρινόμενος<sup>x</sup> τῷ Θεῷ; μὴ ἐρεῖ τὸ πλάσμα<sup>x</sup> Actsxxviii. 43; 1 Pet. τῷ πλάσαντι, Τί με ἐποίησας οὕτως; 21. ἢ οὐκ ἔχει ἐξουσίαν ὁ<sup>y</sup> iv. 3. κεραμεύς<sup>z</sup> τοῦ πηλοῦ, ἐκ τοῦ αὐτοῦ φυράματος ποιῆσαι ὁ μὲν εἰς<sup>z</sup> Luke xiv. 6. a Jer. c. 18; Isaiah xlv. 9; Sir. xxxvi. (xxxiii.) 13; Sap. xv. 7.

<sup>1</sup> ὧ ἄνθρωπε stands before μενούγγε in  $\mathfrak{N}^1$ AB (B omits γε), and so in all crit. edd.

It was through God, in the last resort, that Moses and Pharaoh were what they were, signal instances of the Divine mercy and the Divine wrath.

Ver. 19 ff. But human nature is not so easily silenced. This interpretation of all human life, with all its diversities of character and experience, through the will of God alone, as if that will by itself explained everything, is not adequate to the facts. If Moses and Pharaoh alike are to be explained by reference to that will—that is, are to be explained in precisely the same way—then the difference between Moses and Pharaoh disappears. The moral interpretation of the world is annulled by the religious one. If God is equally behind the most opposite moral phenomena, then it is open to any one to say, what Paul here anticipates will be said, τί ἔτι μέμφεται; why does he still find fault? For who withstands his resolve? To this objection there is really no answer, and it ought to be frankly admitted that the Apostle does not answer it. The attempt to understand the relation between the human will and the Divine seems to lead of necessity to an antinomy which thought has not as yet succeeded in transcending. To assert the absoluteness of God in the unexplained unqualified sense of verse 18 makes the moral life unintelligible; but to explain the moral life by ascribing to man a freedom which makes him stand in independence over against God reduces the universe to anarchy. Up to this point Paul has been insisting on the former point of view, and he insists on it still as against the human presumption which would plead its rights against God; but in the very act of doing so he passes over (in ver. 22) to an intermediate standpoint, showing that God has not in point of fact acted arbitrarily, in a freedom uncontrolled by moral law; and from that again he advances in the following chapter to do full justice to the other side of the antinomy—the liberty and responsibility of man. The act of Israel, as well as the will of God, lies behind the painful situation he is trying to understand.

Ver. 20. ὧ ἄνθρωπε is not used con-

temptuously, but it is set intentionally over against τῷ Θεῷ: the objector is reminded emphatically of what he is, and of the person to whom he is speaking. It is not for a man to adopt this tone toward God. For μενούγγε cf. x. 18, Phil. iii. 8; the idea is, So far from your having the right to raise such objections, it is rather for me to ask, Who art thou? etc. Paul, as has been observed above, does not refute, but repels the objection. It is inconsistent, he urges, with the relation of the creature to the Creator. μὴ ἐρεῖ κ.τ.λ. Surely the thing formed shall not say, etc. The first words of the quotation are from Isa. xxix. 16: μὴ ἐρεῖ τὸ πλάσμα τῷ πλάσαντι αὐτό Οὐ σὺ με ἐπλάσας; ἢ τὸ πῶμα τῷ ποιῆσαντι Οὐ συνετῶς με ἐποίησας; The fact that the words originally refer to Israel as a nation, and to God's shaping of its destiny, does not prove in the least that Paul is dealing with nations, and not with individuals, here. He never pays any attention to the original application of the O.T. words he uses; and neither Moses nor Pharaoh nor the person addressed as ὧ ἄνθρωπε is a nation. The person addressed is one who feels that the principle enunciated in ver. 18 must be qualified somehow, and so he makes the protest against it which Paul attempts in this summary fashion to repress. A man is not a thing, and if the whole explanation of his destiny is to be sought in the bare will of God, he will say, Why didst Thou make me thus? and not even the authority of Paul will silence him.

Ver. 21. ἢ οὐκ ἔχει ἐξουσίαν ὁ κεραμεύς τοῦ πηλοῦ κ.τ.λ. The ἢ puts this as the alternative. Either you must recognise this absoluteness of God in silence, or you must make the preposterous assertion that the potter has not power over the clay, etc. The power of the potter over the clay is of course undoubted: he takes the same lump, and makes one vessel for noble and another for ignoble uses; it is not the quality of the clay, but the will of the potter, that decides to what use each part of the lump is to be put. True, the objector might say, but irrelevant. For man is

- b<sup>2</sup> Tim. ii. 20 f. **22.** *τιμὴν σκεύος, ὃ δὲ εἰς ἀτιμίαν;* <sup>b</sup> **22.** *εἰ δὲ θέλων ὁ Θεὸς ἐνδείξασθαι* <sup>c</sup>  
 Verse 17. *τὴν ὀργήν, καὶ γνωρίσαι τὸ δυνατόν* <sup>d</sup> αὐτοῦ, ἤνεγκεν <sup>e</sup> ἐν πολλῇ μακρο-  
 Here only; *cf.* **23.** *καὶ ἵνα γνωρίση*  
 ch. viii. 3. **23.** *καὶ ἵνα γνωρίση*  
 Heb. xii. 3. **23.** *τὸν πλουτοῦ τῆς δόξης αὐτοῦ ἐπὶ σκευῆ ἐλέους, ἃ προητοιμάσεν* <sup>f</sup> εἰς  
 Matt. vii. 13; John xvii. 12; Phil. iii. 19. <sup>g</sup> Eph. ii. 10.

<sup>1</sup> *καὶ ἵνα γνωρίση*; the *καὶ* is omitted by W. and H. following B 37, 39, 47, vulg., Copt., etc. Treg. brackets it in marg. Weiss thinks it was omitted because the transcriber could not see the point of it, and felt it easy to connect *ἵνα* with the principal verb.

not clay, and the relation of God to man is not that of the potter to dead matter. To say that it is, is just to concede the objector's point—the moral significance. is taken out of life, and God has no room any longer to pronounce moral judgments, or to speak of man in terms of praise or blame.

Vv. 22-29. Paul's argument, to speak plainly, has got into an *impasse*. He is not able to carry it through, and to maintain the sovereign freedom of God as the whole and sole explanation of human destiny, whether in men or nations. He does, indeed, assert that freedom to the last, against the presumptuousness of man; but in this third section of his theodicy, he begins to withdraw from the ground of speculation to that of fact, and to exhibit God's action, not as a bare unintelligible exercise of will, which inevitably provokes rebellion, but as an exercise of will of such a character that man can have nothing to urge against it. *εἰ δὲ*: the *δὲ* marks the transition to the new point of view. It is as if Paul said: You may find this abstract presentation of God's relations to man a hard doctrine, but if His actual treatment of men, even of those who are *σκευὴ ὀργῆς κατ. εἰς ἀπώλειαν*, is distinguished by longsuffering and patience, what can you say against that? *θέλων* has been rendered (1) because it is His will; (2) although it is His will. In the former case, God bears long with the vessels of wrath in order that the display of His wrath and power may be more tremendous at last. But (a) such an idea is inconsistent with the contrast implied in *δὲ*: it is an aggravation of the very difficulty from which the Apostle is making his escape; (b) it is inconsistent with the words *ἐν πολλῇ μακροθυμίᾳ*; it is not longsuffering if the end in view is a more awful display of wrath; there is no real longsuffering unless the end in view is to give the sinner place for repentance. Hence the other view (2) is substantially right. Although it is

God's will to display His wrath and to show what He can do, still He does not proceed precipitately, but gives ample opportunity to the sinner to repent and escape. We are entitled to say "the sinner," though Paul does not say so explicitly, for *ἡ ὀργή*, the wrath of God, is relative to sin, and to nothing else: except as against sin, there is no such thing as wrath in God. In *σκευὴ ὀργῆς* the word *σκευὴ* is perhaps prompted by the previous verse, but the whole associations of the potter and the clay are not to be carried over: they are expressly precluded by *ἤνεγκεν ἐν πολλῇ μακροθυμίᾳ*. Paul does not say how the *σκευὴ ὀργῆς* came to be what they are, the objects upon which the wrath and power of God are to be revealed; he only says that such as they are, God has shown great patience with them. It seems a mistake in W. and H. to print *σκευὴ ὀργῆς* as a quotation from Jer. l. (LXX xxvii.) 25; for there the words mean "the instruments by which God executes His wrath," *les armes de sa colère* (Reuss). *κατηρτισμένα εἰς ἀπώλειαν*: *ἀπώλεια* (Phil. i. 28, iii. 19) means perdition, final ruin; by what agency the persons referred to have been fitted for it Paul does not say; what he does say is, that fitted for such a doom as they are, God has nevertheless endured them in much longsuffering, so that they at least cannot say, Why dost thou find fault? For *κατηρτισμένος* = perfected, made quite fit or ripe, see Luke vi. 40, 1 Cor. i. 10: *cf.* also 2 Tim. iii. 17.

Ver. 23 f. The sentence beginning with *εἰ δὲ θέλων* is not grammatically completed, but ver. 23 is an irregular parallel to ver. 22. God's purpose is regarded as twofold. It is on the one hand to show His wrath and make known His power; it is on the other hand to make known the riches of His glory (*cf.* Eph. iii. 16). The first part of it is carried out on those who are *σκευὴ ὀργῆς*, the latter on those who are *σκευὴ ἐλέους*; but, in carrying out both parts



δόξαν· 24. οὓς καὶ ἐκάλεσεν ἡμᾶς οὐ μόνον ἐξ Ἰουδαίων, ἀλλὰ καὶ ἐξ ἐθνῶν· 25. (ὡς καὶ ἐν τῷ Ὠσηῆ λέγει, “Καλέσω τὸν οὐ λαόν μου, λαόν μου· καὶ τὴν οὐκ ἠγαπημένην, ἠγαπημένην”. 26. “Καὶ ἔσται, ἐν τῷ τόπῳ οὐ ἐβρόθήθη αὐτοῖς,<sup>1</sup> Οὐ λαός μου ὑμεῖς, ἐκεῖ κληθήσονται υἱοὶ Θεοῦ ζῶντος.” 27. Ἡσαΐας<sup>h</sup> δὲ κράζει ὑπὲρ<sup>i</sup> τοῦ Ἰσραὴλ, h Is. x. 22 f. “Ἐὰν ἦ ὁ ἀριθμὸς τῶν υἱῶν Ἰσραὴλ ὡς ἡ ἄμμος τῆς θαλάσσης, τὸ<sup>i 2 Cor. i. 6</sup> (end).

<sup>1</sup> **αὐτοῖς** is wanting in BFG and the best MSS. of the vulg. As no reason can be suggested for its omission, if it were original, Weiss supposes it was added in conformity with the LXX. He therefore omits it altogether; W. and H. bracket.

alike, God acts in a way which is so far from giving man room to complain that it commands his wonder and adoration; for the **σκευὴ ὄργῆς** there is much long-suffering, for the **σκευὴ ἐλέους** a preparation and a calling in which God's free unmerited mercy is conspicuous. **καὶ ἵνα γνωρίσῃ**: This is mentioned as a principal purpose of God. **ἐπὶ σκευὴ ἐλέους**: the glory is conceived as something shed upon the persons concerned; they are irradiated with the Divine brightness. Cf. 2 Thess. i. 10. **δόξα** in such connections has usually a super-sensible eschatological meaning; its content was fixed for Paul by his vision of Christ as Lord of Glory. The end of God's ways with the vessels of mercy is to conform them to the image of His exalted Son. **ἃ προητοίμασεν εἰς δόξαν**: Paul does not shrink from introducing God as subject here. The vessels of mercy, in whom the Divine glory is to be revealed, are such as God prepared before for that destiny. That Paul is not speaking here abstractly, as in his discussion of the relations of creature and Creator in ver. 21 f., but on the basis of experience, is shown by the words which immediately follow: **οὓς καὶ ἐκάλεσεν ἡμᾶς** = whom he also called *in us*. The **σκευὴ ἐλέους**, in other words, are not a mere theological conception = “God's elect”: they are the actual members of the Christian Church, Jew and Gentile; and it is not a deduction from the necessities of the Divine nature, but an account of real experiences of God's goodness, which is given both in **προητοίμασεν** and in **ἐκάλεσεν**. How much is covered by **προητοίμασεν** is not clear, but the text presents no ground whatever for importing into it the idea of an unconditional eternal decree. Those who are called know that the antecedents of their calling, the processes which lead up to and prepare for it, are of God. They know that in all these processes, even in the

remote initial stages of them, to the significance of which they were blind at the time, glory was in view. The fact that both Jews and Gentiles are called shows that this preparation is not limited to any one nation; the fact that the called are *from among* both Jews and Gentiles shows that no one can claim God's mercy as a right in virtue of his birth in some particular race.

Ver. 25 f. This result of God's ways with man—His calling not only from the Jews but from the Gentiles—agrees with His own declarations in Scripture. Ver. 25 answers roughly to Hos. ii. 23, LXX: I will love her who was not beloved, and will say to that which was not My people, Thou art My people. Not My people (= Lo-ammi) and Not beloved (= Loruhamah) were the names of a son and a daughter of Hosea, who symbolised the kingdom of Israel, rejected of God but destined to share again in His favour. Paul here applies to the calling of the Gentiles words which spoke originally of the restoration of Israel—an instance which shows how misleading it may be to press the context of the other passages quoted in this chapter. Ver. 26 is also a quotation from Hos. i. 10 (LXX): the **ἐκεῖ** is supplied by Paul. The application of it is similar to that of ver. 25. In Hosea the promise is that the Israelites who had lost their standing as God's people should have it given back to them, in all its dignity. This also Paul reads of the calling of the Gentiles. They were once no people of God's, but now have their part in the adoption. But what is the meaning of “in the place where . . . there shall they be called”? It is not certain that in Hosea there is any reference to a place at all (see margin of R.V.), and it is not easy to see what Paul can mean by the emphatic **ἐκεῖ**. The ordinary explanation—the Gentile lands—is as good as any, but seems hardly equal to the stress laid on **ἐκεῖ**.

<sup>k</sup> Here only (and so also of υπόλειμμα).  
 1 Mark xiii. 4; Luke iv. 2, 13.  
 m Here only in N. T.

κατάλειμμα <sup>1k</sup> σωθήσεται · 28. λόγον γὰρ συντελῶν<sup>1</sup> καὶ συντέμων<sup>m</sup> ἐν δικαιοσύνῃ · ὅτι λόγον συντετημένον<sup>2</sup> ποιήσει Κύριος ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς".  
 29. Καὶ καθὼς προείρηκεν Ἡσαΐας, "Εἰ μὴ Κύριος Σαβαῶθ ἐγκατέλιπεν ἡμῖν σπέρμα, ὡς Σόδομα ἂν ἐγενήθημεν, καὶ ὡς Γόμορρα ἂν

<sup>1</sup> For καταλειμμα (which is the reading of the LXX) DFKLP, read with <sup>N</sup>1AB υπολειμμα.

<sup>2</sup> ἐν δικαιοσυνῇ ὅτι λόγον συντετημένον om. <sup>N</sup>1AB 47. "Western and Syrian" authorities have the words, in agreement with the LXX. But the γὰρ after the first λόγον makes the whole sentence, in this case, untranslatable; and though Weiss and Alford defend the received text, and Treg. brackets the words in question in marg., most edd. omit them.

Ver. 27 f. From the calling of the Gentiles, as foretold in prophecy, Paul passes now to the partial, but only partial, calling of Israel, as announced by the same authority. The Jews cannot quarrel with the situation in which they find themselves when it answers so exactly to the Word of God. ὑπὲρ is here indistinguishable from περί: it is not a loud intercession on Israel's behalf, but a solemn declaration concerning Israel, that the prophet makes; see Grimm, s.v., i., 5. The quotation in ver. 27 is from Isa. x. 22 f., but the opening words are modified by recollection of Hos. i. 10 just quoted. The LXX reads καὶ ἂν γένηται ὁ λαὸς Ἰσραὴλ ὡς ἡ ἄμμος τῆς θαλάσσης, τὸ κατάλειμμα αὐτῶν σωθήσεται. λόγον συντελῶν καὶ συντέμων [ἐν δικαιοσύνῃ, ὅτι λόγον συντετημένον] κύριος ποιήσει ἐν τῇ οἰκουμένῃ ὅλη. The words bracketed are omitted by most editors, but the sense is not affected. τὸ ὑπόλειμμα has the emphasis: *only* the remnant shall be saved. This doctrine Paul apparently finds confirmed by the words λόγον γὰρ συντελῶν καὶ συντέμων ποιήσει κύριος ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς. It is doubtful whether any one could assign meaning to these words unless he had an idea beforehand of what they ought to or must mean. Cheyne renders the Hebrew to which they answer, "For a final work and a decisive doth the Lord execute within all the land"; and there is the same general idea in Sanday and Headlam's version of Paul: "For a word, accomplishing and abridging it, that is, a sentence conclusive and concise, will the Lord do upon the earth". Weiss, who retains the words bracketed, makes λόγον = God's promise: God fulfils it indeed (συντελῶν), but He at the same time limits or contracts it (συντέμων), i.e., fulfils it to some of Israel, not to all. This, no doubt, is the sense required, but can any

one say that the words convey it? We should rather say that Paul put his own thought into the words of the LXX, in which a difficult passage of Isaiah was translated almost at haphazard, and in doing so lent them a meaning which they could not be said to have of themselves.

Ver. 29. But his last quotation is in verbal agreement with the LXX Isa. i. 9, and transparently clear. The σπέρμα or seed which God leaves is the same as the ὑπόλειμμα. The figure is not to be pressed. The remnant is not the germ of a new people; Paul expects Israel as a whole to be restored.

With this the theodicy proper closes. The unbelief of the Jews was a great problem to the Apostolic age, and one which easily led to scepticism concerning the Gospel. The chosen people without a part in the kingdom of God—impossible. This chapter is Paul's attempt to explain this situation as one not involving any unrighteousness or breach of faith on the part of God. It is not necessary to resume the various stages of the argument as they have been elucidated in the notes. The point of greatest difficulty is no doubt that presented by vers. 22 and 23. Many good scholars, Meyer and Lipsius for example, hold that Paul in these verses is not withdrawing from, but carrying through, the argument from God's absoluteness stated so emphatically in ver. 21. They hold that the σκευὴ ὀργῆς κατηρτισμένα εἰς ἀπόλειαν would not be σκευὴ ὀργῆς at all, if their repentance and amendment were conceivable; and although God bears long with them—that is, defers their destruction—it is only in order that He may have time and opportunity to manifest the riches of His glory on the vessels of mercy. But the answer to this is plain. It assumes that human life, in its relation to God, *can* be inter-

ὡμοιωθῆμεν".) 30. Τί οὖν ἐροῦμεν; ὅτι ἔθνη τὰ μὴ ἠ διώκοντα<sup>ο</sup> n Ch. ii. 14.  
 δικαιοσύνην κατέλαβε<sup>ρ</sup> δικαιοσύνην, δικαιοσύνην δὲ τὴν ἐκ πίστεως<sup>ο</sup> Ch. xii. 13.  
 31. Ἰσραὴλ δὲ διώκων νόμον δικαιοσύνης εἰς νόμον δικαιοσύνης<sup>1</sup> οὐκ<sup>ο</sup> xiv. 19; 1  
 ἔφθασε.<sup>1</sup> 32. διατί; ὅτι οὐκ ἐκ πίστεως, ἀλλ' ὡς ἔξ ἔργων νόμου<sup>2</sup>.<sup>1</sup> Cor. xiv. 1  
 1: 1 Tim.  
 vi. 11; 2  
 Tim. ii. 22.  
 p 1 Cor. ix.  
 24; Phil. iii. 12, 17. q Phil. iii. 16. r Philem. ver. 14.

<sup>1</sup> Om. second δικαιοσύνης  $\Sigma^1$ ABDG, all edd.

<sup>2</sup> νόμον om.  $\Sigma^1$ ABF 47, vulg., and most edd. Alf. is doubtful.

preted by the analogy of clay in its relation to the potter; in other words, that moral and spiritual experiences can be construed and made intelligible through what are merely physical categories. But this is not the case. And if it be said that justice is not done, by the interpretation given in this commentary, to the expression *σκεύη ὄργης*, it may also be said that justice is not done, by the interpretation of Meyer and Lipsius, to the expression *ἐν πολλῇ μακροθυμίᾳ*. Each of these allegations may be said to neutralise the other—that is, neither is decisive for the interpretation of the passage; and the Apostle's meaning remains to be determined by the general movement of his thought. In spite of the great difficulties of the section as a whole, I cannot hesitate to read it as above.

CHAPTER IX.—Ver. 30-X. 21. We come now to the second main division of that part of the epistle in which Paul discusses the problem raised by the relation of the Jews to the Gospel. He has shown in chap. ix. 6-29 that they have no claim as of right to salvation: their whole history, as recorded and interpreted in the Scriptures, exhibited God acting on quite a different principle; he now proceeds to show more definitely that it was owing to their own guilt that they were rejected. They followed, and persisted in following, a path on which salvation was not to be found; and they were inexcusable in doing so, inasmuch as God had made *His* way of salvation plain and accessible to all.

Ver. 30 f. τί οὖν ἐροῦμεν; usually, as in ver. 14, this question is followed by another, but here by an assertion. The conclusion of the foregoing discussion is—not that God has been faithless or unjust, but—this paradoxical position: Gentiles (ἔθνη, not τὰ ἔθνη) that did not follow after righteousness attained righteousness, the righteousness which comes of faith; while Israel, which followed after a law of righteousness, did not attain that law. διώκειν and καταλαμβάνειν are correlative terms: see

Wetstein. The repetition of δικαιοσύνη is striking: it is the one fundamental conception on which Paul's gospel rests; the questions at issue between him and the Jews were questions as to what it was, and how it was to be attained. τὰ μὴ διώκοντα δικαιοσύνην is not an unfair description of the pagan races as contrasted with the Jews; how to be right with God was not their main interest. δικαιοσύνην δὲ τὴν ἐκ πίστεως: for the form of the explanatory clause with δὲ cf. iii. 22, 1 Cor. ii. 6. It is not surprising that a righteousness of this sort should be found even by those who are not in quest of it; its nature is that it is brought and offered to men, and faith is simply the act of appropriating it. Ἰσραὴλ δὲ κ.τ.λ.: this is the astonishing thing which does need explanation. διώκων νόμον δικαιοσύνης. The idea is not that Israel was in quest of a law of righteousness, in the sense of a rule by the observance of which righteousness would be attained: every Israelite believed himself to be, and already was, in possession of such a law. It must rather be that Israel aimed incessantly at bringing its conduct up to the standard of a law in which righteousness was certainly held out, but was never able to achieve its purpose. The νόμος δικαιοσύνης, the unattained goal of Israel's efforts, is of course the Mosaic law; but it is referred to, not definitely, but in its characteristic qualities, as law, and as exhibiting and enjoining (not bestowing) righteousness. εἰς νόμον οὐκ ἔφθασεν: did not attain to, arrive at, that law—it remained out of their reach. Legal religion proved a failure.

Ver. 32. διὰ τί; Why? A result so confounding needs explanation. ὅτι οὐκ ἐκ πίστεως ἀλλ' ὡς ἔξ ἔργων: it seems too precise to supply with Weiss ἐδίδωξεν νόμον δικαιοσύνης. The reason of Israel's religious failure was that its whole religious effort and attitude was not of faith, but (so they conceived the case) of works. By inserting ὡς Paul dissociates himself from this conception, and leaves it to Israel; he does not believe (having

προσέκοψαν γὰρ <sup>1</sup> τῷ λίθῳ τοῦ προσκόμματος, 33. καθὼς γέγραπται,  
 “ ἰδοὺ, τίθημι ἐν Σιών λίθον προσκόμματος, καὶ πέτραν σκανδάλου ·  
 καὶ πᾶς <sup>2</sup> ὁ πιστεύων ἐπ’ αὐτῷ οὐ καταισχυρήσεται ”.

<sup>1</sup> γὰρ  $\aleph^3 D^3 KLP$ ; om.  $\aleph^1 ABD^1 F$ .

<sup>2</sup> πᾶς om.  $\aleph ABDF 47$  and all edd.

learned the contrary by bitter experience) that there is any outlet along this road. Everything in religion depends on the nature of the start. You may start ἐκ πίστεως, from an utter abandonment to God, and an entire dependence on Him, and in this case a righteousness is possible which you will recognise as δικαιοσύνη θεοῦ, God's own gift and work in you; or you may start ἐξ ἔργων, which really means in independence of God, and try to work out, without coming under obligation to God, a righteousness of your own, for which you may subsequently claim His approval, and in this case, like the Jews, all your efforts will be baffled. Your starting-point is unreal, impossible; it is not truly ἐξ ἔργων, but only ὡς ἐξ ἔργων; it is an idea of your own, not a truth on which life can be carried out, that you are in any sense independent of God. Such an idea, however, rooted in the mind, may effectually pervert and wreck the soul, by making the Divine way of attaining righteousness and life offensive to it; and this is what happened to the Jews. Because of that profoundly false relation to God προσέκοψαν τῷ λίθῳ τοῦ προσκόμματος. The stone on which they stumbled was Christ, and especially His Cross. The σκάνδαλον of the Cross, at which they stumbled, is not simply the fact that it is a cross, whereas they expected a Messianic throne; the Cross offended them because, as interpreted by Paul, it summoned them to begin their religious life, from the very beginning, at the foot of the Crucified, and with the sense upon their hearts of an infinite debt to Him, which no “works” could ever repay.

Ver. 33. Yet paradoxical as this may seem, it agrees with the words of Scripture. The quotation is a mixture of Isa. xxviii. 16 and viii. 14: and it is interesting to remark that the same passages are quoted in conjunction, though they are not mixed as here, in 1 Pet. ii. 6-8. The original reference of them is not exactly Messianic. The stone laid in Zion (Isa. xxviii. 16) is indeed interpreted by Delitzsch of the kingdom of promise as identified with its Sovereign Head, but the stone of

stumbling (Isa. viii. 14) is unequivocally God Himself: all who do not give Him honour are broken against His government as on a stone, or caught in it as in a snare. Paul inserts ἐπ’ αὐτῷ after ὁ πιστεύων (as Peter also does), and applies the figure of the stone in both cases to Christ, and to the contrary relations which men may assume to Him. Some stumble over Him (as the Jews, for the reasons just given); others build on Him and find Him a sure foundation, or (without a figure) put their trust in Him and are not put to shame. Cf. Ps. cxviii. 22, Mt. xxi. 42, 1 Cor. iii. 11, Acts. iv. 12, Eph. ii. 20.

CHAPTER X.—Ver. 1. The Apostle cannot enlarge on this melancholy situation without expressing once more the deep grief which it causes him. Since the Jews are referred to in the third person (ὕπερ αὐτῶν) it is clear that the persons addressed are a Gentile Church. ἀδελφοί: Paul's heart seems drawn to his spiritual kindred as he feels the deep gulf which separates him meanwhile from his kinsmen according to the flesh. ἡ μὲν εὐδοκία τῆς ἐμῆς καρδίας: the meaning of εὐδοκία must be gathered from such examples as Mt. xi. 26, Eph. i. 5, 9, Phil. i. 15, ii. 13, 2 Thess. i. 11. His heart's εὐδοκία is that in which his heart could rest with complacency; that which would be a perfect satisfaction to it. This is virtually the same as “desire,” and an “Etymologicum ineditum” quoted in Schleusner explains it by βούλημα, γνώμη, προαίρεσις, ἐπιθυμία. His inmost desire and his supplication to God are in their interest, with a view to their salvation. The μὲν has no corresponding δέ; the sad reality which answers to it does not need again to be expressed.

Ver. 2. Their good qualities compel his affection. ζῆλον θεοῦ ἔχουσιν: they have a zeal for God, are intensely (though mistakenly) religious. Cf. Gal. i. 14. An unbelieving Jew could interpret his opposition to the lawless gospel of Paul as zeal for the divinely-given rule of life, and his opposition to the crucified Messiah as zeal for the divinely-given promises. It was God's honour for which he stood in refusing the Gos-

X. 1. Ἰ. ἌΔΕΛΦΟΙ, ἡ μὲν εὐδοκία τῆς ἐμῆς καρδίας, καὶ ἡ δέησις ἡ<sup>1</sup> α<sup>2</sup> 2 Cor. xi. πρὸς τὸν Θεὸν ὑπὲρ τοῦ Ἰσραὴλ ἐστὶν εἰς σωτηρίαν. 2. μαρτυρῶ<sup>b</sup> Acts xvii. γὰρ αὐτοῖς ὅτι ζῆλον Θεοῦ<sup>c</sup> ἔχουσιν, ἀλλ' οὐ κατ' ἐπίγνωσιν. 3. ἀγνοοῦντες<sup>b</sup> γὰρ τὴν τοῦ Θεοῦ δικαιοσύνην, καὶ τὴν ἰδίαν<sup>c</sup> δικαιοσύνην<sup>d</sup> ζητοῦντες στήσαι, τῇ δικαιοσύνῃ τοῦ Θεοῦ οὐχ ὑπετάγησαν. 4. τέλος<sup>e</sup> Heb. vii. 3.

<sup>1</sup> η before *προς τον θεον* om. *Σ*ABDF. For *του Ισραηλ εστιν* read *αυτων* with *Σ*ABDFP 47, etc.

<sup>2</sup> *την ιδιαν δικαιοσυνην* *Σ*FGKL and most cursives, is adopted by Tischdf., but most edd. with *ABDP* 47, vulg. omit *δικαιοσυνην*.

pel. ἀλλ' οὐ κατ' ἐπίγνωσιν: this religious earnestness is not regulated by adequate knowledge. For ἐπίγνωσις see Eph. iv. 13, Phil. i. 9, Col. i. 9, 10, ii. 2, 1 Tim. ii. 4, 2 Tim. ii. 25; it is especially used of religious knowledge, and suggests attainment in it (ἄρτι γινώσκω ἐκ μέρους, τότε δὲ ἐπιγνώσομαι, 1 Cor. xiii. 12).

Ver. 3. This verse goes to the root of the matter, and explains the failure of the Gospel among the Jews. It was due to their ignorance of the righteousness of God. All men need and crave righteousness, and the Jews, in their ignorance of God's, sought to establish a righteousness of their own. *Their own* is the key to the situation. Their idea was that they could be good men without becoming God's debtors, or owing anything at all to Him. Such an idea, of course, shows complete ignorance of the essential relations of God and man, and when acted on fatally perverts life. It did so with the Jews. When the Gospel came, revealing the righteousness of God—that for which man must be absolutely indebted to God's grace, and which he can never boast of as "his own"—it cut right across all the habits and prejudices of the Jews, and they did not submit themselves to it. Paul interprets the position of his nation through the recollection of his own experience as a Pharisee—no doubt rightly on the whole. For ὑπετάγησαν in middle sense see viii. 7, xiii. 1, Heb. xii. 9, Jas. iv. 7, 1 Pet. ii. 13.

Ver. 4. Further proof that the pursuit of a righteousness of one's own by legal observances is a mistake, the act of men "in ignorance", τέλος γὰρ νόμου χριστός εἰς δικαιοσύνην παντὶ τῷ πιστεύοντι: For Christ is law's end, etc. The sense required—a sense which the words very naturally yield—is that with Christ in the field law as a means of attaining righteousness has ceased and

determined. The moment a man sees Christ and understands what He is and what He has done, he feels that legal religion is a thing of the past: the way to righteousness is not the observance of statutes, no matter though they have been promulgated by God Himself; it is faith, the abandonment of the soul to the redeeming judgment and mercy of God in His Son. The meaning is virtually the same as that of our Lord's words in Luke xvi. 16. νόμου without the article is "law" in the widest sense; the Mosaic law is only one of the most important instances which come under this description; and it, with all statutory conceptions of religion, ends when Christ appears. It is quite true to say that Christ consummates or fulfils the law (hence Calvin would prefer *complémentum* or *perfectio* to *finis* as a rendering of τέλος); quite true also that He is the goal of the O.T. dispensation, and that it is designed to lead to Him (cf. Mt. v. 17, Gal. iii. 24); but though both true and Pauline, these ideas are irrelevant here, where Paul is insisting, not on the connection, but on the incompatibility, of law and faith, of one's own righteousness and the righteousness of God. Besides, in limiting νόμος to the Mosaic O.T. law, this interpretation does less than justice to the language, and misses the point of παντὶ τῷ πιστεύοντι: there is no believer, *Gentile* or *Jew*, for whom law, *Mosaic* or *other*, retains validity or significance as a way to δικαιοσύνη, after the revelation of the righteousness of God in Christ.

In ver. 5 ff. Paul describes more fully, and in O.T. terms, the two ways of attaining δικαιοσύνη—law and faith. His aim is to show that they are mutually exclusive, but that the latter is open and accessible to all.

Ver. 5. Μωσῆς γὰρ γράφει: Moses' authority is unimpeachable on this point. The righteousness that comes from law

γὰρ νόμου Χριστὸς εἰς δικαιοσύνην παντὶ τῷ πιστεύοντι. 5. Μωσῆς γὰρ γράφει τὴν δικαιοσύνην τὴν ἐκ τοῦ νόμου,<sup>1</sup> “Ὅτι ὁ ποιήσας αὐτὰ  
 f Ch. ix. 30; ἄνθρωπος ζήσεται ἐν αὐτοῖς”. 6. ἡ δὲ ἐκ<sup>1</sup> πίστεως δικαιοσύνη οὕτω  
 Gal. iii. 8. λέγει, “Μὴ εἶπης ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ σου, Τίς ἀναβήσεται<sup>2</sup> εἰς τὸν οὐρανόν;”  
 g Cf. Eph. iv. 8 f. τοῦτ’ ἔστι<sup>3</sup> ἡ Χριστὸν καταγαγεῖν. 7. “ἦ, Τίς καταβήσεται εἰς τὴν

<sup>1</sup> τὴν ἐκ τοῦ νόμου DFKLP; om. του ΝΒ (Α). οτι stands after γράφει, not before ὁ ποιήσας, in Ν<sup>1</sup>AD<sup>1</sup> 17, vulg. It stands as in the received text in Ν<sup>3</sup>BD<sup>3</sup>FGKL, etc. Most edd. put it after γράφει, but not Weiss, who argues that it was removed from its proper place after νόμου in order to provide an object for ποιήσας after αὐτα had been dropped. He reads Μ. γὰρ γράφει τὴν δ. τ. ἐκ νόμου οτι ο π. αὐτα α. ζ. εν αυτη. According to W. and H. the original text was οτι τὴν δικαιοσύνην τὴν ἐκ νόμου ο ποιήσας ἄνθρωπος ζήσεται εν αυτη. Possibly this best explains the variants, but it strikes one as too artificially grammatical for Paul. αὐτα om. Ν<sup>1</sup>AD-gr., vulg. For εν αυτοις (from LXX), which is found in DFKLP, Ν<sup>1</sup>AB 17, 47, vulg. read εν αυτη; and so all edd.

must be an achievement: the man who has done it shall live in it, Lev. xviii. 5. Paul writes ἐν αὐτῇ with reference to δικαιοσύνην: the ἐν αὐτοῖς of the LXX refers to πάντα τὰ κρίματα which precedes. Moses, of course, in writing thus did not mock his people; the O.T. religion, though an imperfect, was a real religion, under which men could be right with God. To keep the law of God and live by doing so (Mt. xix. 17) was the natural aim and hope of a true Israelite; only, in this case, the law was not a collection of statutes, but a revelation of God's character and will, and he who sought to keep it did so not alone, but in conscious dependence on God whose grace was shown above all things else by His gift of such a revelation. Paul, however, is writing with Pharisees and legalists in his eye, and with the remembrance of his own experience as a Pharisee in his heart; and his idea no doubt is that this road leads nowhere. Cf. Gal. iii. 10-12. To keep the law thus is an impossibility.

Ver. 6 f. ἡ δὲ ἐκ πίστεως δικαιοσύνη οὕτως λέγει. It is remarkable that Paul does not make Moses his authority here, though he is about to express himself in words which certainly go back to Deut. xxx. 12-14. It is the righteousness of faith itself which speaks, describing its own character and accessibility in words with a fine flavour of inspiration about them. But it is not so much a quotation we find here, as a free reproduction and still freer application of a very familiar passage of the O.T. It is irrelevant to point out that what the writer in Deuteronomy means is that the law (ἡ ἐντολὴ αὐτῆ ἣν ἐγὼ ἐπέλλομαι σοι σήμερον) is not oppressive nor imprac-

ticable (as Paul in ver. 5 tacitly assumes it to be); the Apostle is not thinking in the least what the writer of Deuteronomy meant; as the representative of the righteousness of faith, he is putting his own thoughts—his inspired conviction and experience of the Gospel—into a free reproduction of these ancient inspired words. μὴ εἶπης ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ σου: = do not think, especially thoughts you would be ashamed to utter. τίς ἀναβήσεται εἰς τὸν οὐρανόν; . . . ἡ καταβήσεται εἰς τὴν ἄβυσσον; There is no impossible preliminary to be accomplished before the true religion is got under way; we have neither to scale heaven nor descend into the abyss. ἄβυσσος (in N.T.) only in Lc. viii. 31 and seven times in Rev. But cf. Ps. cvi. 26, lxx. 20. The passage in Deuteronomy has εἰς τὸ πέραν τῆς θαλάσσης. These two indefinite proverbial expressions for the impossible are interpreted by Paul. With τοῦτ’ ἔστιν (vers. 6, 7), he introduces a *midrash* upon each. The first means (in his mind) bringing Christ down; the second, bringing Christ up from the dead. Evidently the righteousness of faith is concerned with a Christ of whom both these things are true—a descent from heaven, and a rising from the dead, Incarnation and Resurrection. We could not bring about either by any effort, but we do not need to; Christ incarnate and risen is here already, God's gift to faith.

Ver. 8. ἐγγύς σου τὸ ῥῆμά ἐστιν . . . τοῦτ’ ἔστιν τὸ ῥῆμα τῆς πίστεως ὃ κηρύσσομεν. What is in the lips of the preacher is near to all who hear. In Deut. the word is of course the Mosaic law; here it is the Gospel, the word which deals with that πίστις on which

ἄβυσσον;” τοῦτ' ἔστι Χριστὸν ἐκ νεκρῶν ἀναγαγεῖν.<sup>1</sup> 8. ἀλλὰ τί ἡ λέγει; “Ἐγγύς σου τὸ ῥῆμά<sup>k</sup> ἔστιν, ἐν τῷ στόματί σου καὶ ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ σου.” τοῦτ' ἔστι τὸ ῥῆμα<sup>1</sup> τῆς πίστεως ὁ κηρύσσομεν. 9. ὅτι ἐὰν ὁμολογήσῃς ἐν τῷ στόματί σου Κύριον Ἰησοῦν,<sup>1</sup> καὶ πιστεύσῃς ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ σου ὅτι ὁ Θεὸς αὐτὸν ἤγειρεν ἐκ νεκρῶν, σωθήσῃ. 10. καρδίᾳ γὰρ πιστεύεται εἰς δικαιοσύνην, στόματι δὲ ὁμολογεῖται εἰς σωτηρίαν. 11. λέγει γὰρ ἡ γραφή, “Πᾶς ὁ πιστεύων ἐπ' αὐτῷ οὐ

<sup>1</sup> ὁμολογήσῃς ἐν τῷ στόματι σου Κύριον Ἰησοῦν: this is the reading of most MSS., and is retained by Weiss and on the marg. by W. and H. For *Κυριον Ἰησουν* B and Clem. Alex. have *ὅτι Κυριος Ἰησους*, which W. and H. put in their text, and Lachm. and Treg. on margin. But B. and Clem. Alex. also insert *το ρημα* before *ἐν τῷ στόματι σου*, and this also W. and H. put in text. Weiss regards it as a thoughtless repetition from ver. 8, to give an object to *ὁμολογήσῃς*; whether the further change of *Κυριον Ἰησουν* into *ὅτι Κυριος Ἰησους* (to conform to the parallel clause) took place before or after this can hardly be decided.

the righteousness of God depends. τῆς πίστεως is objt. gen. The whole idea of the verses is that righteousness has not to be achieved, but only appropriated.

Ver. 9. Apparently this verse gives the content of what the Apostle describes as “the word of faith which we preach”. ὅτι = viz. The reference both to heart and mouth in Deut. suits his purpose, and he utilises it; the closing words in the LXX (καὶ ἐν ταῖς χερσὶ σου ποιεῖν αὐτό) he disregards. ἐὰν ὁμολογήσῃς τὸ ῥῆμα . . . ὅτι Κύριος Ἰησοῦς: the putting of the confession before the faith which inspires it, and of which it is the confession, seems to be due simply to the fact that in the O.T. passage present to the Apostle's mind ἐν τῷ στόματί σου precedes ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ σου. τὸ ῥῆμα is virtually = the Gospel, as God's word concerning His Son and faith in Him. We confess it when we say, Jesus is Lord. Cf. 1 Cor. xii. 3, Phil. ii. 11. The exaltation of Jesus is the fundamental Christian confession, and presupposes the resurrection; and it is this exaltation which here (as in the other passages referred to) is meant by His Lordship. It is mechanical to say that the first part of ver. 9 (Jesus is Lord) refers to the doubting question in ver. 6, and therefore means a confession of the incarnation; and the second part of it (God raised Him from the dead) to the doubting question of ver. 7. Paul nowhere connects the Lordship of Christ with His incarnation, and there is certainly no reference to His Divine nature here. The confession of the first part of the verse answers to the faith in the second; he who believes in his heart that God raised Christ from the dead can

confess with his mouth (on that ground and in that sense) that Jesus is Lord. On the basis of such mutually interpreting faith and confession he is saved. This does not deprive the death of Christ of the significance which Paul ascribes to it elsewhere. Christ could not be raised unless He had first died, and when He is raised it is with the virtue of His sin-atonement death in Him. His exaltation is that of one who has borne our sins, and the sense of this gives passion to the love with which believers confess Him Lord.

Ver. 10. καρδίᾳ γὰρ πιστεύεται εἰς δικαιοσύνην, στόματι δὲ ὁμολογεῖται εἰς σωτηρίαν. The parallelism is like that in the previous verse, though the order of the clauses is reversed. To be saved one must attain δικαιοσύνη, and this depends on heart-faith; such faith, again, leading to salvation, must confess itself. To separate the two clauses, and look for an independent meaning in each, is a mistake; a heart believing unto righteousness, and a mouth making confession unto salvation, are not really two things, but two sides of the same thing. The formalism which seems to contrast them is merely a mental (perhaps only a literary) idiosyncrasy of the writer. It is true to say that such a confession as is meant here was made at baptism; but to limit it to baptism, or to use this verse to prove baptism essential to salvation, is, as Weiss says, *unerhörter Dogmatismus*.

Ver. 11. This verse proves from Scripture the main idea in the preceding, viz., that faith saves. It is a quotation from Is. xxviii. 16 (see ix. 33) with the addition of *πάς*, to which nothing corre-

<sup>1</sup> Heb. xiii. 20.  
<sup>k</sup> Acts x. 37; verse 17;  
 Eph. v. 7;  
 26, vi. 17;  
 Acts x. 37;  
 1 Pet. i. 25.

m Ch. iii. 22. κατασχυνθήσεται". 12. οὐ γὰρ ἐστὶ διαστολή<sup>m</sup> Ἰουδαίου τε καὶ  
 1 Cor. xiv. 7. Ἕλληνος· ὁ γὰρ αὐτὸς Κύριος πάντων, πλουτῶν εἰς πάντας τοὺς  
 ἐπικαλουμένους αὐτόν. 13. "Πᾶς γὰρ ὃς ἂν ἐπικαλέσῃται τὸ ὄνομα  
 Κυρίου, σωθήσεται." 14. Πῶς οὖν ἐπικαλέσονται<sup>1</sup> εἰς ὃν οὐκ ἐπίσ-  
 τευσαν; πῶς δὲ πιστεύουσιν οὐ οὐκ ἤκουσαν; πῶς δὲ ἀκούουσι

<sup>1</sup> ἐπικαλέσονται KLP; ἐπικαλεσώνται  $\aleph$ ABDF, all edd. So for πιστεύουσιν AKL, read πιστευσῶσιν with  $\aleph$ BDF. The received ακουσουσι of L has been corrected into the classical ακουσονται in  $\aleph$ <sup>1</sup>DFK; the true reading ακουσωσι is preserved only in B (with correctors of  $\aleph$  and A) and some cursives.

sponds either in Hebr. or LXX. Yet oddly enough it is on this πᾶς that the rest of the Apostle's argument turns. The way of righteousness and salvation by faith, he goes on to show, is meant for all.

Ver. 12. οὐ γὰρ ἐστὶ διαστολή Ἰουδαίου τε καὶ Ἕλληνος: this has been proved in one sense in chap. iii.—there is no distinction between them in point of sin; it is now asserted in another sense—there is no distinction between them in that the same Lord is waiting to save all on the same conditions. κύριος πάντων is best taken as predicate: the same Lord is Lord of all: cf. Acts x. 36, Phil. ii. 10 f. Christ is undoubtedly meant: in His presence, in view of His work and His present relation to men, all differences disappear; there can be only one religion. πλουτῶν εἰς πάντας: abounding in wealth toward all. Christ can impart to all men what all men need—the righteousness of God. Cf. v. 15-17, Eph. iii. 8, τὸ ἀνεξιχνίαστον πλοῦτος τοῦ Χριστοῦ. τοὺς ἐπικαλουμένους αὐτόν: cf. 1 C. i. 2 where Christians are described as οἱ ἐπικαλούμενοι τὸ ὄνομα τ. Κ. ἡμῶν I. X. The formula, as the next verse shows, is borrowed from the Old Testament; and as Weiss remarks, verse 13 sets aside every idea of a distinction between the invocation of God and that of Christ. To a Christian, as Paul conceives him, Christ has at least the religious value of God; the Christian soul has that adoring attitude to Christ which (when shown in relation to Jehovah) was characteristic of O.T. religion. See Acts ix. 14, 21, Acts xxii. 16 (Paul's conversion), 2 Tim. ii. 22. It is a fair paraphrase of the words to say that salvation depends on this: whether a sinful man will make appeal for it to Christ in prayer, as to One in whom all God's saving judgment and mercy dwell bodily. It rests with Christ, so appealed to, to make a man partaker in the righteousness of God and eternal life.

Ver. 13. For every one who invokes the name of the Lord shall be saved. The words are from Joel iii. 5 (= ii. 32 LXX). "The Lord" in the original is Jehovah; here, manifestly, Christ—a proof how completely Christ stands in God's place in all that concerns salvation.

Ver. 14 f. It is difficult to trace very clearly the line of the Apostle's thought here. Many scholars (including W. and H. and Lipsius) connect vers. 14 and 15 closely with what precedes, and mark a break between ver. 15 and ver. 16. It is as if Paul were expanding the πᾶς of ver. 13 and justifying that universal preaching of the Gospel which was itself a stumbling block to the Jews. *Every one* who invokes the name of the Lord shall be saved, and therefore the conditions of such invocation must be put within reach of *every one*. It is no argument against this interpretation that the ideas it introduces are not essential to the main purpose of the chapter, which is to prove the culpability of the Jews: the eager fulness of Paul's mind often carries him on thus. Others read vers. 14-21 continuously, and mark a break at ver. 13 (e.g., Weiss, Sanday and Headlam). They lay stress on the οὖν in ver. 14 (cf. ix. 14, ix. 30, xi. 1, 11) as indicating that a paragraph has ended, and that the writer is facing the consequences which flow from it, the objections which can be made to it, etc. In this case the connection would be something like this. Salvation depends upon invoking Christ; but to invoke Christ depends upon certain conditions which *the Jews* may say it has been beyond their power to fulfil; let us inquire into the conditions, and see whether such a plea holds good. The first of these connections seems to me much the simpler, and it has the advantage of covering the second. For if the invocation of Christ, which is the sole and universal condition of salvation, has been made possible for *all* men, it



χωρὶς κηρύσσοντος; 15. πῶς δὲ κηρύξουσιν,<sup>1</sup> ἐὰν μὴ ἀποσταλῶσι; καθὼς γέγραπται, “Ὡς ὠραῖοι οἱ πόδες τῶν εὐαγγελιζομένων εἰρήνην,<sup>2</sup> τῶν εὐαγγελιζομένων τὰ ἀγαθὰ”. 16. Ἄλλ’ οὐ πάντες ὑπήκουσαν ἢ Acts vi. 7. τῷ εὐαγγελίῳ· Ἡσαΐας γὰρ λέγει, “Κύριε, τίς ἐπίστευσε τῇ ὁ ἀκοῇ οἱ Thess. ii. 13; Heb. ἡμῶν;” 17. Ἄρα ἡ πίστις ἐξ ἀκοῆς, ἢ δὲ ἀκοῇ διὰ ῥήματος Θεοῦ.<sup>3</sup> iv. 2.

<sup>1</sup> For κηρυξουσιν read κηρυξωσιν with  $\aleph$ ABDKLP. For καθως read καθαπερ with B. See note <sup>1</sup>, page 598.

<sup>2</sup> εὐαγγελιζομένων εἰρήνην των om.  $\aleph$ <sup>1</sup>ABC 47; ins.  $\aleph$ <sup>2</sup>DFKLP. The omission may be due to homœoteleuton. Weiss thinks it is, and keeps these words in the text; Treg. thinks it possible, and brackets them in margin. On the other hand, they may have been inserted to make the quotation agree better (it does not even then agree closely) with the LXX. The MSS. authority by itself is decisive for the omission, τα ἀγαθα  $\aleph$ <sup>1</sup>D<sup>2</sup>KL; om. τα  $\aleph$ <sup>3</sup>ABCD<sup>1</sup>F (and LXX). W. and H. read ως ωραιοι οἱ ποδες των ευαγγελιζομενων αγαθα.

<sup>3</sup> θεου AD<sup>2</sup>3 (gr.) KL; Χριστου  $\aleph$ <sup>1</sup>BCD 47 and all edd.

has been made possible for the Jews. The special application to them, in which the argument of the chapter is clinched, is not made till ver. 19; here they are only involved with the rest of the world which has heard the Gospel. πῶς οὖν ἐπικαλέσονται: sc. τοῦτον. πῶς δὲ πιστεῦσωσιν οὐ οὐκ ἤκουσαν; It is simplest to render, How are they to believe on Him *Whom* they have not heard? identifying the voice of the preachers with that of Christ. Winer, p. 249. Cf. Eph. ii. 17. The rendering, Him of *Whom* they have not heard, would be legitimate in poetry. πῶς δὲ ἀκούσωσιν: this deliberative form is in all probability right: see critical note and Blass, *Gramm. des Neut. Griech.*, 205. ἐὰν μὴ ἀποσταλῶσιν: viz., by the Lord *Whom* they preach, and *Who* is heard speaking when they speak. Cf. 1 Cor. i. 17, ἀπέστειλέν με Χριστὸς . . . εὐαγγελίζεσθαι. To find here the idea of an official ministry, as something belonging essentially to the constitution of the Church, is grotesque. “St. Paul argues back from effect to cause, through the series of Prayer, Faith, Hearing, Preaching, Sending; thus the last link in his argument must be the first in the realisation from which the rest follow; this one therefore he confirms by the prophetic announcement in Isa. lii. 7” (Gifford). ὡς ὠραῖοι: the true text of Romans greatly abbreviates the prophet’s words, but the joy with which the deliverance from Babylon was foreseen is in keeping with that with which Paul contemplates the universal preaching of the Gospel.

Ver. 16. The fact remains, however, in spite of this universal preaching, that

there has not been a universal surrender to the Gospel. οὐ πάντες: the Jews are present to the writer’s mind here, though the words might apply more widely; hence the compassionate mode of statement. Cf. iii. 3: εἰ ἠπίστησάν τινες. Yet this quantum of unbelief does not discomfit the Apostle; for it also, as well as the proclamation of the Gospel, is included in the prophecy. τίς ἐπίστευσεν τῇ ἀκοῇ ἡμῶν is a lament over practically universal unbelief. ἡ ἀκοῇ ἡμῶν in Isaiah means “that which we heard,” but who the “we” are is not clear. If a representative prophet speaks, ἀκοῇ will mean that which he and other prophets heard from God: = Who hath believed the revelation made to us? Cf. Isa. xxviii. 9, 19. If a representative of repenting Israel speaks, ἀκοῇ will mean that which he and his countrymen have heard from the prophets: = Who hath believed the message delivered to us? Assuming that Paul as a preacher instinctively used the words to express his own thought and experience in his vocation, they will mean here, Who has believed the message delivered by us Apostles?

Ver. 17. This verse is really parenthetic: Paul’s logical mind cannot let slip the chance of showing how this quotation confirms the connection of ideas in ver. 14. Ἄρα suits a rapid passing inference better than the more deliberate ἄρα οὖν which is much more frequent in Romans. Cf. 1 Cor. xv. 18, 2 Cor. v. 14, Gal. ii. 17. So then faith comes from a message (that which is received by the hearer of the Gospel), and the message διὰ ῥήματος Χριστοῦ through the Word concerning Christ.

18. ἀλλὰ λέγω, Μὴ οὐκ ἤκουσαν; μενούγγε “εἰς πᾶσαν τὴν γῆν ἐξῆλθεν ὁ φθόγγος αὐτῶν, καὶ εἰς τὰ πέρατα τῆς οἰκουμένης τὰ ῥήματα αὐτῶν”. 19. Ἄλλὰ λέγω, Μὴ οὐκ ἔγνω Ἰσραὴλ<sup>1</sup>; πρῶτος Μωσῆς λέγει, “Ἐγὼ ἠ παραζηλώσω ὑμᾶς ἐπ’ οὐκ ἔθνει, ἐπὶ ἔθνει

<sup>1</sup> Ch. xi. 14;  
<sup>1</sup> Cor. x.  
22.

<sup>1</sup> Ἰσραὴλ before οὐκ ἔγνω ζ ABCD<sup>1</sup> F.

That which when heard is ἀκοή is when spoken ῥήμα, and it is the condition of faith. The construction in ῥήμα Χριστοῦ is the same as in τὸ ῥήμα τῆς πίστεως in ver. 8. The words could not signify Christ's command.

Ver. 18. The process of convicting the Jews is now under way, and ἀλλὰ λέγω introduces a plea on their behalf. It is Paul who speaks; hence the form of the question μὴ οὐκ ἤκουσαν suggests *his* opinion as to the answer. To *hear* is necessary in order to believe; you do not mean to say they did *not* hear? Cf. 1 Cor. ix. 4, 5, xi. 22. μενούγγε is *immo vero*. The contrary is so clearly the case that there is a touch of derision in the word with which Paul introduces the proof of it. Cf. ix. 20. The Gospel has been preached in all the world: the words of Ps. xix. 4 (exactly as in LXX) are at once the expression and the proof of this. Of course they refer to the revelation of God in nature, but their use will seem legitimate enough if we remember that Paul *knew* the extent to which the Gospel had been proclaimed in his day. Cf. Col. i. 6, 23. It was as widely diffused as the Diaspora, and the poetic inspired expression for this had a charm of its own.

Ver. 19. ἀλλὰ λέγω: another attempt to introduce a plea on behalf of Israel. You cannot say, “they did not hear”; surely you do not mean to say, then, *Israel did not understand*? At first sight there seems an unnatural emphasis here on *Israel*, but this is not the case. The generality of the argument must be abandoned now, for the passages next to be quoted, which are already present to Paul's mind, contrast Israel with the Gentiles, and so bring it into prominence; and it is in the case of Israel, of all nations, that the plea of not understanding is most out of place. Above all nations Israel ought to have understood a message from God: Israel, and in-

ability to understand God's Word, ought to be incompatible ideas. πρῶτος Μωσῆς λέγει, Deut. xxxii. 21. πρῶτος suggests the beginning of a line of witnesses to this effect: virtually it means, even Moses, at the very beginning of their history. The point of the citation is not very clear. Like the passages quoted in ix. 25, 26, it might have been adduced by Paul as a proof that the Gentiles were to be called into God's kingdom, and called in order to rouse the Jews to jealousy; but to be in place here, there must be also the latent idea that if peoples beyond the covenant (who were not peoples at all), and unintelligent peoples (*i.e.*, idol worshippers) could understand the Gospel, a privileged and religiously gifted people like the Jews was surely inexcusable if it failed to understand it. The same idea seems to be enforced again in ver. 20. Ἡσαΐας δὲ ἀποτολμᾷ: “breaks out boldly” (Gifford). It was an act of great daring to speak thus to a nation with the exclusive temper of Israel, and Paul who needed the same courage in carrying the Gospel to the Gentiles was the man to see this. οἱ ἐμὲ μὴ ἐπερωτῶντες means those who put no question to me, *sc.*, about the way of salvation. In Isa. lxxv. 1 the clauses occur in reverse order. What the prophet has in view is God's spontaneous unmerited goodness, which takes the initiative, unsolicited, in showing mercy to faithless Jews who made no appeal to Him and never sought Him; the Apostle applies this, like the similar passages in ix. 25 f., to the reception of the Gospel by the Gentiles.\* If God was found and recognised in His character and purposes, where all the conditions seemed so much against it, surely Israel must be inexcusable if it has missed the meaning of the Gospel. The very calling of the Gentiles, predicted and interpreted as it is in the passages quoted, should itself

\* The part of Isa. lxxv. 1 which is not quoted here (I said, Behold Me, behold Me, unto a nation that was not called by My name) is meant, as usually pointed, to refer to the Gentiles, and this tradition of its application Paul may have learned from Gamaliel (Cheyne); but the pointing is wrong: see Cheyne.

ἀσυνέτω παροργιῶ ὑμᾶς". 20. Ἡσαίας δὲ ἄποτολμᾷ καὶ λέγει, ὅτι Here only.  
 "Εὐρέθην τοῖς<sup>1</sup> ἐμὲ μὴ ζητοῦσιν, ἐμφανῆς ἐγεγόνουν τοῖς ἐμὲ μὴ  
 ἐπερωτῶσι". 21. πρὸς δὲ τὸν Ἰσραὴλ λέγει, "Ὁλην τὴν ἡμέραν<sup>r</sup>  
 ἐξεπέτασα τὰς χειρὰς μου πρὸς λαὸν ἀπειθοῦντα καὶ ἄντιλεγόντα".  
<sup>r</sup> Luke ii.  
<sup>34</sup>; Acts  
<sup>xliii.</sup> 45;  
<sup>xxviii.</sup> 22.

<sup>1</sup> ευρεθην τοις NACD<sup>2</sup> LP; but εν τοις BD<sup>1</sup>FG. Sanday and Headlam call this  
 "a Western reading which has found its way into B". W. and H. put εν in marg.

have been a message to the Jews, which they could not misunderstand; it should have opened their eyes as with a lightning flash to the position in which they stood—that of men who had forfeited their place among the people of God—and provoked them, out of jealousy, to vie with these outsiders in welcoming the righteousness of faith.

Ver. 21. πρὸς δὲ τὸν Ἰσραὴλ λέγει: That is what he says of the Gentiles, but as for Israel, he says, etc., Isa. lxx. 2. For πρὸς = with reference to, see Heb. i. 7 f., Luke xii. 41. The arms outstretched all the day long are the symbol of that incessant pleading love which Israel through all its history has consistently despised. It is not want of knowledge, then, nor want of intelligence, but wilful and stubborn disobedience, that explains the exclusion of Israel (meanwhile) from the Kingdom of Christ and all its blessings. This is not inconsistent with ver. 3, if we go to the root of the matter. For the ignorance there spoken of is one which has its root in the will, in the pride of a heart which is determined to have a righteousness of its own without coming under any obligation to God for it, and which therefore cannot assume the attitude to which the Gospel becomes credibly Divine; while the ignorance suggested as a plea for unbelief is that of men to whom the Gospel has never been presented at all. The latter ignorance might annul responsibility; the former gives its full significance to guilt.

CHAPTER XI. On the place of this chapter in the argument, see introduction to chap. ix. above. Briefly, the ninth chapter means, God is sovereign, and the tenth chapter means, Israel has sinned. Both of these are presented in relative independence as explanations of the perplexing fact which confronted the Apostle, namely, that the Jews did not receive the Gospel, while the Gentiles did; in this chapter, the two are brought into relation to each other, and we are shown (to some extent) how in the sovereign providence of God even the sin of Israel is made to contribute to the

working out of a universal purpose of redemption—a redemption in which Israel also shares, in accordance with the inviolable promise of God. The chapter can be naturally divided into three sections: (1) vers. 1-10, in which the question immediately arising out of chap. x. is discussed, *viz.*, whether the unbelief of which Israel as a whole has been convicted involves God's rejection of the chosen people; (2) vers. 11-24, in which the result to be attained by the partial and temporary exclusion of the Jews from the Messianic kingdom is enlarged upon, and the Gentiles warned against self-exaltation; and (3) vers. 25-30, in which Paul magnifies the unsearchable wisdom, love and faithfulness of God, as revealed in securing by a common method the salvation alike of Israel and the Gentiles.

(1) Vv. 1-10. Λέγω οὖν: the οὖν intimates that it is with the conclusion reached in chap. x. before his mind that Paul puts the following question: the unbelief of Israel naturally suggested it. μὴ ἀπόσωτα ὁ θεὸς τὸν λαὸν αὐτοῦ; For the words, *cf.* Ps. xciv. 14 (xciii. LXX), 1 Sam. xii. 22. In both places the promise is given οὐκ ἀπόσεται ὁ Κ. τ. λ. αὐτοῦ, and the familiar words give the effect of asking, Has God broken His express and repeated promise? μὴ suggests the negative answer, which is expressed more passionately in μὴ γένοιτο. *Cf.* iii. 6, ix. 14. Israel may be faithless to Him, but He abides faithful. καὶ γὰρ ἐγὼ Ἰσραηλῆτης εἰμί: This is often read as if it were an argument in favour of the negative answer; as if Paul meant, God has *not* cast off His people, I myself am a living proof to the contrary. But this is hardly conciliatory, to say the least; and it is better to take the words as explaining why Paul puts the question with μὴ (suggesting the negative answer), and why he then gives the denial with such vehemence. "I, too, an Israelite, to whom the very idea of God's rejection of His people is an impious and incredible idea, to be repelled with horror." ἐκ σπέρ. Ἀβραάμ:

XI. 1. ΛΕΓΩ οὖν, Μὴ ἀπόσωτο ὁ Θεὸς τὸν λαὸν αὐτοῦ; μὴ γένοιτο.  
 a Phil. iii. 5. καὶ γὰρ ἐγὼ Ἰσραηλίτης εἰμὶ, ἐκ σπέρματος Ἀβραάμ, φυλῆς<sup>a</sup> Βενιαμίν.  
 2. οὐκ ἀπόσωτο ὁ Θεὸς τὸν λαὸν αὐτοῦ, ὃν προέγνω. ἢ οὐκ οἴδατε  
 ἐν Ἠλίᾳ τί λέγει ἡ γραφή; ὡς ἐντυγχάνει τῷ Θεῷ κατὰ τοῦ Ἰσραὴλ,  
 λέγων,<sup>1</sup> 3. “Κύριε, τοὺς προφῆτας σου ἀπέκτειναν, καὶ<sup>2</sup> τὰ θυσιασ-  
 τήριά σου κατέσκαψαν· ἀγῶν ὑπελείφθην μόνος, καὶ ζητοῦσι τὴν  
 ψυχὴν μου”. 4. ἀλλὰ τί λέγει αὐτῷ ὁ χρηματισμός; “Κατέλιπον  
 ἐμαυτῷ ἑπτακιχιλίου ἀνδρας, οἵτινες οὐκ ἔκαμψαν γόνυ τῇ Βάαλ.”  
 b Ch. iii. 26.  
 c Ch. ix. 11. 5. οὕτως οὖν καὶ ἐν τῷ νῦν<sup>b</sup> καιρῷ λείμμα κατ’<sup>c</sup> ἐκλογὴν χάριτος

<sup>1</sup> λεγων N<sup>1</sup>L; om. N<sup>3</sup>ABCDF.

<sup>2</sup> καὶ before τα θυσιαστηρια N<sup>3</sup>DL; om. N<sup>1</sup>ABCF 17.

no proselyte. φυλῆς Βενιαμίν: the one tribe which with Judah mainly represented the post-exilic theocratic people.

Ver. 2 f. οὐκ ἀπόσωτο: formal denial of what the heart has indignantly protested against in ver. 1. ὃν προέγνω must contain a reason which makes the rejection incredible or impossible. This excludes the interpretation of Weiss, who thinks that Paul means to say that God knew what Israel was before He chose it, and therefore cannot cast it off as if its unbelief had disappointed Him; He knew from the first what it would be. To plead thus for God is too paltry. We must take προέγνω as in viii. 29: the meaning is, Israel stood before God's eyes from eternity as His people, and in the immutableness of the sovereign love with which He made it His lies the impossibility of its rejection. The idea is the same as in ver. 29 below. ἢ οὐκ οἴδατε: this is the alternative. He who says, God has cast off Israel, must be ignorant of what Scripture says ἐν Ἠλίᾳ in the passage which gives the history of Elijah. The sections of the Bible were designated, not as now by chapter and verse, but by some descriptive phrase: cf. ἐπὶ τῆς βάρου, Mark xii. 26: and in Philo ἐν ταῖς ἀραῖς = Gen. iii. 15. Many references are made in this form by Hebrew writers. For ἐντυγχάνειν κατὰ cf. 1 Macc. viii. 32: it means to plead (not intercede) with God against Israel. τὰ θυσιαστήρια is one of the indications that in Elijah's time there was no law requiring only one altar for Jehovah. The words are quoted from 1 Kings xix. ver. 10 or 14. In Elijah's mood, Paul might have said something similar of his own time, for their circumstances were, not alike. The Apostle, like the prophet, was lonely and perse-

cuted, and Israel as a whole seemed to have abandoned God or been abandoned by Him. But he understands God's way (and His faithfulness) better.

Ver. 4. ὁ χρηματισμός: the word is related to χρηματίζω (Mt. ii. 12, 22, Acts x. 22, Heb. viii. 5) as χρησμός to χρώ: it means the oracle, or answer of God. Here only in N.T., but see 2 Macc. ii. 4, xi. 17. The quotation is from 1 Kings xix. 18 with ἐμαυτῷ added, by which Paul suggests God's interest in this remnant, and the fact that He has a purpose of His own identified with them. God has reserved the seven thousand; He has reserved them for Himself; it is on this the proof depends that He has not cast off His people. The seven thousand are Israel to Him. Yet His unchanging faithfulness in keeping a people is not represented as a merely unconditional decree, having no relation to anything but His own will, for the seven thousand are described by their character: οἵτινες οὐκ ἔκαμψαν γόνυ τῇ Βάαλ. οἵτινες is qualitative: such were those whom God reserved for Himself, men who never bowed knee to Baal. Βάαλ takes the fem. art. because it was often replaced in reading by ΒΑΒ (LXX αἰσχύνη).

Ver. 5. Application of the principle of ver. 4 to the present. ὁ νῦν καιρὸς is the present regarded not merely as a date, but as in some sense a crisis. λείμμα γέγονεν: a remnant has come to be—this is the fact which has emerged from the general unbelief of Israel. κατ’ ἐκλογὴν χάριτος: on these words the emphasis lies. The existence of the remnant is due to an election of grace, a choice on the part of God the motive of which is to be sought in His unmerited

γένονεν. 6. εἰ δὲ χάριτι, οὐκ ἔτι ἐξ ἔργων· ἐπεὶ ἡ χάρις οὐκ ἔτι γίνεται χάρις. εἰ δὲ ἐξ ἔργων, οὐκ ἔτι ἐστὶ χάρις· ἐπεὶ τὸ ἔργον οὐκ ἔτι ἐστὶν ἔργον.<sup>1</sup> 7. Τί οὖν; ὃ ἐπιζητεῖ Ἰσραὴλ, τούτου<sup>2</sup> οὐκ ἐπέτυχεν, ἡ δὲ ἐκλογὴ ἐπέτυχεν· οἱ δὲ λοιποὶ ἐπωρώθησαν 8. (καθὼς<sup>3</sup> γέγραπται, “Ἐδωκεν αὐτοῖς ὁ Θεὸς πνεῦμα κατανύξεως, ὀφθαλμοὺς τοῦ μὴ βλέπειν, καὶ ὄτα τοῦ μὴ ἀκοῦειν”), ἕως τῆς σήμερον<sup>4</sup> ἡμέρας. d 2 Cor. iii. 9. καὶ Δαβίδ λέγει, “Γενθῆτω ἡ τράπεζα αὐτῶν εἰς παγίδα καὶ εἰς<sup>14</sup>

<sup>1</sup> εἰ δὲ ἐξ ἔργων οὐκ ἐτι ἐστι χάρις ἐπεὶ τὸ ἔργον οὐκ ἐτι ἐστὶν ἔργον. All this is omitted in  $\aleph^1$ ACDEFG, vulg., Egypt. verss., Orig. lat. and Latin fathers; inserted with some variations (for the last ἔργον B has χάρις, by a slip, surely) in  $\aleph^3$ BL and later MSS. According to Sanday and Headlam, there can be no doubt that the addition is a gloss; B is not sufficient to justify a Western addition of this kind against such preponderating authority. The words are omitted by most edd., but Alf. brackets them, and Weiss retains them in the text; the χάρις in B for ἔργον at end only makes the omission by homœot. easier.

<sup>2</sup> For τούτου read τούτο with  $\aleph$ ABCDFL.

<sup>3</sup> καθὼς; read with  $\aleph$ B καθάπερ. See note <sup>1</sup>, page 673.

love alone. The idea is the same as in chap. ix. 6-13: but cf. note on ver. 4.

Ver. 6. Expansion of χάριτος in ver. 5: grace and works are mutually exclusive. Nothing a man can do gives him a claim as of right against God to be included in the remnant. ἐπεὶ: otherwise. Cf. ver. 22, iii. 6. *Gratia nisi gratis sit gratia non est.* Aug. The fact that there is a remnant, and one owing its existence to God's grace, is the proof that (in spite of the wholesale defection of Israel) God has not cast off His people.

Ver. 7. τί οὖν; What then? How are we to describe the present situation, if not in the painful language of verse 1? Thus: ὃ ἐπιζητεῖ Ἰσραὴλ κ.τ.λ. What Israel is in quest of is δικαιοσύνη: the present conveys more sympathetically than the impft. of some MSS. the Apostle's sense of the ceaseless and noble (though misdirected) efforts of his countrymen. ἐπέτυχεν: Jas. iv. 2, Heb. vi. 15. ἡ δὲ ἐκλογὴ = οἱ ἐκλεκτοί = τὸ λείμμα. ἐπωρώθησαν: were hardened, 2 Cor. iii. 14, John xii. 40, Mc. vi. 52, viii. 17. Paul does not say how they were hardened or by whom: there is the same indefiniteness here as in κατηρτισμένα εἰς ἀπόλειαν in ix. 22. It may be quite possible to give a true sense to the assertion that they were hardened by God (cf. the following verse), although the hardening in this case is always regarded as a punishment for sin, that is, as a confirming in an obduracy which originally was not of God, but their own; as if the idea were, first they would not, and then, in

God's just reaction against their sin, they could not; but it is a mistake to import into the text a definiteness which does not belong to it. It is rather essential to Paul's argument that he should not be bound down to one-sided interpretations of what he has intentionally left vague.

Ver. 8 ff. This hardening (at the present day ver. 5) agrees with God's action toward Israel in the past, as exhibited in Scripture. The words from the O.T. can hardly be called a quotation; Deut. xxix. 4, Is. xxix. 10, Is. vi. 9, 10, all contributed something to them. The πνεῦμα κατανύξεως is from Is. xxix. 10, and answers to the Heb.

רוּחַ תְּרִדָּה, a spirit of deep sleep

or torpor. Virtually it is defined by what follows—unseeing eyes, unhearing ears: a spirit which produces a condition of insensibility, to which every appeal is vain. κατανύξις only occurs in LXX, Is. xxix. 10, Ps. lix. 4 (οἶνον κατανύξεως); but the verb κατανύσσομαι is used by Theod. in Dan. x. 15 to translate רִדְדָה

(cognate to תְּרִדָּה), and in other places of any overpowering emotion: see Fritzsche *ad loc.* Winer, p. 117. It is God Who sends this spirit of stupor, but He does not send it arbitrarily nor at random: it is always a judgment. ἕως τῆς σήμερον ἡμέρας: in Deut. xxix. 4 ἕως τῆς ἡ. ταύτης. The change emphasises the fact that what Israel had been from the beginning it was when Paul wrote,

θήραν, καὶ εἰς σκάνδαλον καὶ εἰς ἀνταπόδομα αὐτοῖς· ἰο. σκοτισ-  
θήτωσαν οἱ ὀφθαλμοὶ αὐτῶν τοῦ μὴ βλέπειν, καὶ τὸν νῶτον αὐτῶν  
e Ps. lxxviii. δια παντὸς ὁ σύγκαμψον". ἸΙ. Λέγω οὖν, Μὴ ἔπταισαν ἵνα πέσωσι ;  
22 f. μὴ γένοιτο ὁ ἀλλὰ τῷ αὐτῶν ἰ παραπτώματι ἢ σωτηρίᾳ τοῖς ἔθνεσιν,  
(LXX). f Ch. iv. 25. εἰς τὸ ἰ παραζηλώσαι αὐτούς. Ἰ2. εἰ δὲ τὸ παράπτωμα αὐτῶν πλοῦτος  
g Ch. x. 19. κόσμου, καὶ τὸ ἡττημα αὐτῶν πλοῦτος ἔθνων, πόσω μᾶλλον τὸ πλή-

and that God had acted toward it from the beginning on the same principle on which He was acting then. Cf. Acts vii. 51 f. καὶ Δαυεὶδ λέγει: another proof of ἐπωρόθησαν, though strictly speaking a wish or an imprecation cannot prove anything, unless it be assumed that it has been fulfilled, and so can be taken as the description of a fact. Paul takes it for granted that the doom invoked in these words has come upon the Jews. γενηθήτω ἢ τράπεζα αὐτῶν κ.τ.λ. Their table in the psalm is that in which they delight, and it is this which is to prove their ruin. παγίς, θήρα, and σκάνδαλον are all variations of the same idea, that of snare or trap—i. e., sudden destruction. What the Jews delighted in was the law, and the law misunderstood proved their ruin. In seeking a righteousness of their own based upon it they missed and forfeited the righteousness of God which is given to faith in Christ. καὶ εἰς ἀνταπόδομα αὐτοῖς: this does not exactly reproduce either the Heb. or the LXX, but it involves the idea that the fate of the Jews is the recompense of their sin—not a result to be simply referred to a decree of God. Their perverse attitude to the law is avenged in their incapacity to understand and receive the Gospel. τοῦ μὴ βλέπειν: for this Gen. both in ver. 8 and ver. 10, see Buttmann, *Gram. of N.T. Greek*, p. 267 (E. tr.). τὸν νῶτον αὐτῶν διὰ παντὸς σύγκαμψον: keep them continually in spiritual bondage, stooping under a load too heavy to be borne: cf. Acts xv. 10.

This is the condition in which by God's act, requiting their own sins, and especially their self-righteous adherence to the law as a way of salvation, the Jews find themselves. It is a condition so grievous, and so remote from what one anticipates for a people chosen by God, that it confronts Paul again with the difficulty of ver. 1, and obliges him to state it once more—this time in a way which mitigates its severity, and hints that the fall of Israel is not the last thing concerning them to be taken into account. What if God's purpose includes and uses their fall? What if it is not final? It is

with new ideas of this sort, introduced to take the edge from the stern utterances of vers. 8-10, that Paul deals in vers. 11-24.

Ver. 11. λέγω οὖν: I say then, taking up the problem again. μὴ ἔπταισαν ἵνα πέσωσιν; surely they did not stumble so as to fall? The subject is the mass of the Jewish nation, all but the elect remnant. The contrast here between stumbling and falling shows that the latter is meant of an irremediable fall, from which there is no rising. This is one of the cases in which ἵνα is loosely used; it cannot possibly be translated "in order that". For similar examples cf. 1 Thess. v. 4, 1 Cor. vii. 29, Gal. v. 17. ἀλλὰ: on the contrary, by their (moral) fall salvation has come to the Gentiles to provoke them (the unbelieving Israelites) to jealousy. The fact stated here is illustrated at every point in Paul's own ministry; he turned to the Gentiles because the Jews would not hear him. See Acts xiii. 46 ff., xviii. 6, xxviii. 25-28. The end in view in it (cf. x. 19) is his proof that the stumbling of the Jews is not to be interpreted in the sense of a final fall. A recovery is in prospect.

Ver. 12. Both ἡττημα and πλήρωμα are difficult words, but it is not necessary to suppose that they answer mathematically to one another, though Wetstein explains them by — and +. ἡττημα may mean (as in Is. xxxi. 8) defeat, or (as in 1 Cor. vi. 7) loss; it can hardly mean *diminutio eorum*, or *paucitas Judaeorum credentium*; τὸ πλήρωμα αὐτῶν must mean the making up of them to their full numbers. There is an exhaustive study of the word πλήρωμα by Prof. J. Armitage Robinson in *The Expositor*, April, 1898. His paraphrase of this verse is very good. "If the Gentiles have been enriched in a sense through the very miscarriage and disaster of Israel, what wealth is in store for them in the great Return, when all Israel shall be saved—when God hath made the pile complete!" The enrichment referred to is in both cases that which comes through participating in the blessings of the Gospel.

ρωμα αὐτῶν; 13. Ὑμῖν γὰρ<sup>1</sup> λέγω τοῖς ἔθνεσιν· ἐφ' ὅσον μὲν εἰμι ἐγὼ ἔθνῶν ἀπόστολος, τὴν διακονίαν μου δοξάζω, 14. εἴ πως παραζηλώσω μου τὴν σάρκα, καὶ σώσω τινὰς ἐξ αὐτῶν. 15. εἰ γὰρ ἡ<sup>b</sup> ἀποβολὴ αὐτῶν καταλλαγὴ κόσμου, τίς ἡ<sup>i</sup> πρόσληψις, εἰ μὴ ζωὴ ἐκ<sup>h</sup> Acts xxvii. νεκρῶν; 16. εἰ δὲ ἡ ἀπαρχὴ ἁγία, καὶ τὸ φύραμα· καὶ εἰ ἡ ῥίζα<sup>i</sup> Ch. xiv. 3.

<sup>1</sup> ὑμιν γαρ DFL; ὑμιν ουν C; ὑμιν δε ΞABP 47, all edd. ἐφ ὅσον μιν L, vulg., D<sup>3</sup> lat. For μιν ΞABCP have μιν ουν, and so all edd.

Ver. 13 f. ὑμῖν δὲ λέγω τοῖς ἔθνεσιν. Paul does not here address a new class of readers. He has been speaking all along to a Gentile church, and speaking to it in that character (see above, pp. 561 ff.); and he feels it necessary to show the relevance, in such circumstances, of bestowing so much attention on the condition and prospects of the Jews. His mission to the Gentiles has an indirect bearing on his own countrymen; the more successful he can make it, the greater is the prospect that some of the Jews also may be provoked to jealousy and saved. Every Jew, again, who is saved, goes to make up the πλήρωμα of ver. 12, and so to bring on a time of unimaginable blessing for the Gentile world. ἐφ' ὅσον Mt. xxv. 40. μὲν οὖν is printed in all the critical editions, but Sanday and Headlam would read μενούν as one word, and discount the restrictive force of the μὲν, which suggests that apostleship to Gentiles was but one part of Paul's mission. ἐγὼ: the pronoun expresses not merely a noble consciousness of vocation, but Paul's feeling that in his particular case at all events a mission to the Gentiles could not but include this ulterior reference to the Jews. His devotion, accordingly, to his Gentile ministry, never let them fall out of view. "As far then as apostleship to Gentiles is represented by *me* (as no doubt it is) I glorify my ministry (by faithful discharge of it), if by any means I may save some of the Jews." For the interpretation of δοξάζω see 2 Thess. iii. 1, John xvii. 4. For εἴ πως see Buttman, p. 255 f. τινὰς ἐξ αὐτῶν: disenchanting experience taught him to speak thus. Cf. 1 Cor. ix. 22.

Ver. 15 f. From the personal explanation of ver. 13 f., which interrupts the argument, Paul reverts to the ideas of ver. 12. To save any Jew was a great object, even with an apostle of the Gentiles: εἰ γὰρ ἡ ἀποβολὴ αὐτῶν κ.τ.λ. Their ἀποβολὴ is their rejection by God on the ground of unbelief. καταλλαγὴ κόσμου: a world's reconciliation. In 2

Cor. v. 19 the world's reconciliation is the act of God in Christ; but it was an act which for the mass of mankind only took effect when Jewish unbelief diverted the Gospel to the Gentiles. ἡ πρόσληψις: the assumption of the Jews into God's favour. ζωὴ ἐκ νεκρῶν. Modern expositors almost all find in these words a reference to the resurrection; the restoration of the Jews at once brings on the end; the dead are raised, and the Messiah's kingdom is set up, glorious and incorruptible. It is quite true that in Jewish apocalyptic literature the resurrection introduces the new era, and that Paul shared in the apocalyptic ideas current in his time; but it does not follow that he was thinking of the resurrection here. ζωὴ ἐκ νεκρῶν would certainly be a singular way to describe it, and it is not enough to say with Weiss that Paul used this expression instead of ἀνάστασις in order to carry the mind beyond the fact of resurrection to the state which it introduced. It seems better to leave it undefined (cf. ἄπειρα ἀγαθὰ Theophyl.), and to regard it as an ordinary English reader regards "life from the dead," as a description of unimaginable blessing. This is more impressive than to bind the original and daring speculation of a passage like this by reference to apocalyptic ideas, with which Paul was no doubt familiar, but which are not suggested here, and could least of all control his thoughts when they were working on a line so entirely his own. "Words fail him, and he employs the strongest he can find, thinking rather of their general force than of their precise signification" (Jowett). εἰ δὲ ἡ ἀπαρχὴ ἁγία, καὶ τὸ φύραμα. This explains Paul's assurance that Israel has a future. For ἄπ. and φύρ. see Num. xv. 19-21. By the offering of the first fruits the whole mass, and the whole produce of the land, were consecrated. Both this figure, and that of the root and the branches, signify the same thing. As the application in ver. 28 proves, what is presented in both is the relation of the

ἀγία, καὶ οἱ κλάδοι. 17. εἰ δέ τινες τῶν κλάδων ἐξεκλάσθησαν, σὺ  
 k Ver. 24 δὲ ἄγριέλαιος ὢν ἠνεκεντρίσθης ἐν αὐτοῖς, καὶ συγκαινωνὸς τῆς ῥίζης  
 only in N. T.  
 1 Sep. xvi. καὶ τῆς πιότητος ἑξ ἑλίας ἐγένου, 18. μὴ κατακαυχῶ τῶν κλάδων·  
 11. εἰ δὲ κατακαυχᾶσαι, οὐ σὺ τὴν ῥίζαν βασταάζεις, ἀλλ' ἡ ῥίζα σέ.  
 m Jas. ii. 13, 19. Ἐρεῖς οὖν, Ἐξεκλάσθησαν οἱ κλάδοι, ἵνα ἐγὼ ἕγκεντριθῶ. 20.  
 iii. 14. καλῶς τῇ ἀπιστίᾳ ἐξεκλάσθησαν, σὺ δὲ τῇ πίστει ἔστηκας. μὴ

<sup>1</sup> και της πισοτητος  $\aleph^3$ ALD<sup>2,3</sup>P; om. και  $\aleph^1$ BCD<sup>1</sup>F. It is om. by W. and H., Weiss, Alf. and Tischdf.

<sup>2</sup> Om. οι before κλαδοι with  $\aleph$ ABCD<sup>3</sup>FLP.

<sup>3</sup> ἐξεκλασθησαν  $\aleph$ ACD<sup>3</sup>LP; εκλασθησαν BD<sup>1</sup>F. Lachm. and Treg. prefer the latter, but all other edd. the former. Weiss (*Textkritik*, S. 34) gives many similar examples in which the preposition in compounds is dropped by oversight. For *υψηλοφρονει*  $\aleph$ AB read *υψηλα φρονει*; and so most edd.

patriarchs to the people as a whole. As chosen by God, the fathers were *ἄγιοι*, i.e., God's people, and this standing (in spite of the arguments in chap. ix., and in spite of the hard facts of the situation when Paul wrote) belongs inalienably to their children. They are God's, and it will yet become apparent that they are.

Vers. 17-24. In these verses, which in a sense are a long parenthesis, Paul anticipates an objection which Gentile readers might take to his use of the last figure, the root and the branches; and he draws from it two special lessons—one, of humility, for the objectors; the other, of hope, for Israel.

Ver. 17. A Gentile Christian might feel that the very fact that Jews were rejected and Gentiles accepted qualified the assurance with which Paul had just spoken of the future of Israel. It is the disposition to think so, and to presume on one's own favoured position, which the Apostle rebukes in *μὴ κατακαυχῶ τῶν κλάδων*. *εἰ δέ τινες τῶν κ. ἐξεκλάσθησαν*: *τινες* puts the case mildly: cf. iii. 3. *ἐξεκλάσθησαν*, sc., as fruitless. *σὺ δὲ ἄγριέλαιος ὢν*: *σὺ* is the presumptuous individual before the Apostle's mind, not the Gentile Church collectively. The *ἄγριέλαιος* is the olive in its natural uncultivated state. *ἠνεκεντρίσθης ἐν αὐτοῖς*, sc., among the native branches of the cultivated olive. The process here supposed is one that in horticulture is never performed. The cultivated branch is always engrafted upon the wild stock, and not *vice versâ*. This Paul knew quite well (see *παρὰ φύσιν*, ver. 24), and the force of his reproof to the presuming Gentile turns on the fact that the process was an unnatural one. [*Ordine commutato res magis causis quam causas*

*rebus aptavit* (Origen).] It gave the Gentile no room to boast over the rejected Jews. *συγκαινωνὸς τῆς ῥίζης τῆς πιότη. τῆς ἐλίας*: there is an argument in *συν*. At the best, the Gentile only *shares* with Jews in the virtues of a root which is not Gentile, but Jewish: he has his part in the consecration of the patriarchs, the one historical root of the people of God, and in the blessings God attached to it. For *πιότης* cf. Jud. ix. 7. The accumulation of genitives is apparently an imitation of such Hebrew constructions as Isa. xxviii. 1, 16: the meaning is, a partaker in the root of the fat olive tree.

Ver. 18. *μὴ κατακαυχῶ τῶν κλάδων*: for the genitive see Buttm., 185. Between "if thou boastest," and "thou bearest not the root," there is no formal connection: for such breviloquence, which requires us to supply "consider" or "remember," see Winer, p. 773. The sense is, You owe all you are proud of to an (artificially formed) relation to the race you would despise.

Ver. 19. *ἐρεῖς οὖν*: the presumptuous Gentile persists. "It is not to the root I compare myself, but branches were broken off that I might be engrafted: that surely involves some superiority in me."

Ver. 20. *καλῶς*: "a form of partial and often ironical assent" (Gifford). Paul does not think it worth while to dispute the assertion of ver. 19, though as it stands it is by no means indisputable; he prefers to point out what it overlooks—the moral conditions of being broken off and of standing secure—and to urge them on the conscience. *τῇ ἀπιστίᾳ*: an account of unbelief, cf. Gal. vi. 12, Winer, p. 270. *τῇ πίστει*



ὑψηλοφρόνει, ἀλλὰ φοβοῦ· 21. εἰ γὰρ ὁ Θεὸς τῶν κατὰ φύσιν κλάδων οὐκ ἐφείσατο· μή πως<sup>1</sup> οὐδὲ σοῦ φείσῃται. 22. Ἴδε οὖν χρηστότητα καὶ<sup>2</sup> ἀποτομίαν Θεοῦ· ἐπὶ μὲν τοὺς πεσόντας ἀποτομίαν· ἐπὶ δὲ σὲ<sup>3</sup> Here only in N.T. χρηστότητα,<sup>2</sup> ἐὰν ἐπιμείνης τῇ χρηστότητι· ἐπεὶ καὶ σὺ ἐκκοπήσῃ· 23. καὶ ἐκεῖνοι δὲ, ἐὰν μὴ ἐπιμείνωσι<sup>3</sup> τῇ ἀπιστίᾳ, ἐγκεντρισθήσονται· δυνατὸς γὰρ ἔστιν ὁ Θεὸς πάλιν ἐγκεντρίσαι αὐτούς. 24. εἰ γὰρ σὺ ἐκ τῆς κατὰ φύσιν ἐξεκόπης ἀγριελαίου, καὶ παρὰ<sup>ο</sup> φύσιν ἐνεκεν-ο Ch. i. 26. τρίσθης εἰς<sup>ρ</sup> καλλιέλαιον, πόσῳ μᾶλλον οὔτοι οἱ κατὰ φύσιν ἐγκεν-ρ Here only.

<sup>1</sup> Om. *μήπως* NABCP 47. For *φείσῃται* NBCDFL read *φείσεται*. All crit. edd. read *φείσεται*, but while most edd. omit *μήπως* it is retained by Weiss (with DEFG, most majusc. and fathers) and bracketed by Alford. Weiss finds it impossible to regard it as an insertion, since it makes an easy text irregular and difficult; but its omission, he thinks, need not have been intentional; it may be a mere overlook of the transcriber's.

<sup>2</sup> *χρηστότητα* the second time D<sup>3</sup>FL; but *χρηστότης θεοῦ* ABCD<sup>2</sup>, and so all edd. For *ἐπιμείνης* NBD<sup>1</sup> read *ἐπιμενης*, and so most edd. but not Alf.

<sup>3</sup> For *ἐπιμείνωσιν* N<sup>1</sup>BD<sup>1</sup> read *ἐπιμενωσιν*; see also last verse.

**ἔσθηκος**: the security of the Gentiles depended on faith, and it is the most elementary principle of a religion of faith (iii. 27) that it excludes boasting. *μὴ ὑψηλὰ φρόνει*: cf. xii. 16. 1 Tim. vi. 17 has *μὴ ὑψηλοφρονεῖν*. Neither is classical. **φοβοῦ**: consistent with *πίστις*. *Timor opponitur non fiducia sed supercilio et securitati* (Bengel).

Ver. 21. As far as comparisons can be made at all in such things, the Jews had been more securely invested in the kingdom than the Gentiles. They were, in the language of the figure, not artificially grafted, but native branches, on the tree of God's people; yet even that did not prevent Him from cutting off those who did not believe. And if He did not spare them, He will not spare Gentiles either, if in pride they fall from faith. On *εἰ . . . οὐκ ἐφείσατο* see Winer, 599 f. The true reading of the last word is *φείσεται* (not *φείσῃται*), but Weiss would retain *μήπως* (see crit. note) even with this future, and supply the missing link of thought from *φοβοῦ*: one may fear that he will not, etc. The ironical reserve of this (though the future makes the thing to be feared as certain as possible) is quite Pauline, and the *μήπως* (DFGL) may be genuine.

Ver. 22. Behold then God's goodness and severity, *sc.*, in the case of the Gentiles and Jews as now before us. **ἀποτομία**: here only in N.T. The moral idea is that of peremptoriness, inexorableness; in Greek writers it is contrasted with *ἡμερότης*, τὸ ἐπιεικές, πραότης.

Cf. 2 Cor. xiii. 10. *ἐὰν ἐπιμείνης τῇ χρηστότητι*: if you remain on in the goodness, *i.e.*, continue to be indebted to it, and to it alone, for your religious position. This excludes presumption, and in general all such temper as is betrayed in taking an attitude of superiority to the Jews. The Jews lost their standing because they had come to believe that it was indefectible, and independent of moral conditions; and if the Gentiles commit the same mistake they will incur the same doom. It is not to Israel only God may say, The kingdom is taken from you, and given to a nation bringing forth the fruits thereof. *ἐπεὶ*, otherwise: see ver. 6.

Ver. 23. *κακένοι δέ*: and they too, they on the other hand, *viz.*, the unbelieving Jews. *ἐὰν μὴ κ.τ.λ.*, unless they remain on in their unbelief. It is assumed that they need not do this. The hardening spoken of in vers. 7-10, though it is a judgment upon sin, and may seem from the nature of the case to be irremediable, is not to be so absolutely taken. Even in the most hardened rejector of the Gospel we are not to limit either the resources of God's power, or the possibilities of change in a self-conscious, self-determining creature. All things are possible to him that believeth, and we are not to say that in this man or that, Jew or Gentile, unbelief is final, and belief an impossibility. If the Jews give up their unbelief *ἐγκεντρισθήσονται* they will be incorporated again in the true people of God. *δυνατὸς γὰρ ἔστιν*

τρισηθίσονται τῇ ἰδίᾳ ἐλαίᾳ; 25. Οὐ γὰρ θέλω ὑμᾶς ἀγνοεῖν,

q Ch. xv. 15, ἀδελφοί, τὸ μυστήριον τοῦτο (ἵνα μὴ ᾗτε παρ' ἐαυτοῖς<sup>1</sup> φρόνιμοι), ὅτι  
24; 2 Cor.  
i. 14; ii. 5. πῶρως ἂπο<sup>9</sup> μέρους τῷ Ἰσραὴλ γέγονεν, ἄχρισ οὐ τὸ πλήρωμα τῶν

<sup>1</sup> παρ' εαυτοῖς NSDL; εν εαυτοῖς AB. Weiss, W. and H., Treg. and Alf. put εν in text, apparently on the ground that παρ' has been conformed to xii. 16; but W. and H. give παρ' a place in marg.

ὁ θεός κ.τ.λ. The phrase implies not only the possibility but the difficulty of the operation. Cf. xiv. 4. With man it is impossible, but not with God. Nothing less than the thought of God could keep Paul from despairing of the future of Israel.

Ver. 24. God's power to engraft the Jews again into the stock of His people proved *a fortiori* by comparison with what He has done for the Gentiles. To restore His own is more natural, conceivable, and one may even say easy, than to call those who are not His own. The Gentile Christian (x) was cut ἐκ τῆς κατὰ φύσιν ἀγριελίου, from what is in its own nature an uncultivated olive, with no suitability for the uses which the olive is intended to subserve, and (2) παρὰ φύσιν in violation of nature was engrafted into a good olive; in comparison with this doubly unnatural process one may well argue πόσῳ μᾶλλον κ.τ.λ. how much more shall these, the Jews who κατὰ φύσιν (in their own nature) belong to the good tree, have their connection with it re-established? Weiss takes ἐγκεντρισηθίσονται as a logical future, and it may be so; but Paul believes in his logic, and has probably in view in the word that actual restoration of the Jews of which he now proceeds to speak.

Vv. 25-32. In this concluding section Paul abandons the ground of argument for that of revelation. He has discussed the problems arising out of the rejection of Israel and the calling of the Gentiles, when taken in connection with the promises of God to His people; and he has tried to make it clear that in all His dealings with His people, God has acted righteously, that for all that has befallen them the Jews have full responsibility, and that a Divine purpose, with blessing in it to both Jew and Gentile, has indirectly been getting itself carried into effect through this perplexing history. The rejection of the Jews has led to the calling of the Gentiles, and the calling of the Gentiles, by provoking the Jews to jealousy, is eventually to lead to their conversion too. All this, it may be said, is matter of argument; it is more or less

convincing as the argument appeals with less or greater force to our minds. It is Paul's construction and interpretation of the facts before him, and his anticipation of the result in which they are likely to issue; but it has no greater authority than the reasoning by which he supports it, or the motives which suggest one line of reasoning upon the facts rather than another. We can understand how patriotism, and religious faith in God's promise, and insight into the psychological influences which determine human conduct, all contribute some weight to his argument; but he is not content to rest upon argument alone the central truth he has been expounding—that the hardening of Israel is temporary as well as partial, and that when "the fulness of the Gentiles" has come in the hardening will cease, and all Israel be saved. He expressly puts this truth forward as a revelation (μυστήριον, ver. 25). What this means psychologically we cannot tell, but it is clear that for Paul it was an essential part of the true religion, so far as he could make out the manner of its working in the world. He might try to lead the mind up to it along various lines of argument, or to confirm it by considerations of various kinds; but for him it had a Divine authority, antecedent to argument and independent of it. He sought arguments to make it credible and intelligible, not for his own sake, but for the sake of others. How much a revelation of this kind will weigh with the modern reader depends on the extent to which on general grounds he can recognise in Paul an inspired interpreter of Christianity. History, it must be admitted, throws no light on his words. The Gentiles are not fully gathered in; the time to say whether Israel as a whole is to have any distinct or decisive place in the final fulfilment of God's gracious purpose is therefore not yet. One feels as if the nationalism of the passage fell short of Paul's great word, There is neither Greek nor Jew; but there the Jews are, a problem to unbelief as well as to faith; think what we will of it, it is

ἔθνῶν εἰσέλθῃ· 26. καὶ οὕτω πᾶς Ἰσραὴλ σωθήσεται, καθὼς γέγραπται, “Ἦξει ἐκ Σιών ὁ ῥυόμενος, καὶ<sup>1</sup> ἀποστρέψει ἀσεβείας ἀπὸ

<sup>1</sup> καὶ before ἀποστρέψει om.  $\aleph$  ABCD<sup>1</sup> F.

of them salvation comes; and it is at least as credible as the reverse (without considering Paul's arguments at all) that Providence is not preserving them for nothing, and that in some such way as is here indicated there is a close connection between their salvation and the salvation of the world.

Ver. 25. οὐ γὰρ θέλω ὑμᾶς ἀγνοεῖν: cf. i. 13, 1 Cor. x. 1, xii. 1, 2 Cor. i. 8, but especially 1 Thess. iv. 13, where as here it is used to introduce a revelation. An often-repeated phrase tends to be formal, but the thing of which Paul would not have his readers ignorant is usually important. As the phrase is invariably followed by ἀδελφοί, the latter also tends to be formal: it is at least a mistake to see anything of peculiar intimacy or affection in it in such connections. As ver. 28 and ver. 30 prove, in which they are contrasted with the Jews, the ἀδελφοί are Gentiles, and they are practically identical with the Roman Church. τὸ μυστήριον τοῦτο: the word μυστήριον only occurs once in the Synoptical Gospels (Mark iv. 11 and parallels) and not at all in John; but Paul uses it often (twenty-one times, including two in 1 Tim.). It always refers to something which though once hidden, or in its nature a secret, is now revealed. In some passages it is applied to the Christian revelation as a whole (e.g., in Rom. xvi. 25, 1 Cor. ii. 1, Eph. i. 9, Col. ii. 2: in the last it is identified *simpliciter* with Christ). In others it is applied to the Christian revelation as a whole, but with some special aspect of it in view: thus in Eph. iii. 3 the special aspect of “revelation” or “mystery”—for it is all one—in the Gospel is the destined inclusion of the Gentiles among the people of God, while in Col. i. 26 f. it is the indwelling Christ, as the pledge of immortality. In others, again, any particular element in the great revelation is called a “mystery”. Thus in 1 Cor. xv. 51 the truth communicated about those who live to see the second advent is described by this name, and it might have been used in the similar passage in 1 Thess. iv. 15, where Paul says instead that he speaks ἐν λόγῳ κυρίου. This is merely to claim for his words the authority of revelation in

another way. The passage before us comes under this last head. It is a piece of revelation—something which has been communicated to Paul ἐν ἀποκαλύψει for the good of the Church—that hardening in part has come upon Israel until the fulness of the Gentiles has come in. The *new* ideas in this revelation are the limits in extent (ἀπὸ μέρους) and in time (ἄχρι οὗ). ἵνα μὴ ᾗτε ἐν ἑαυτοῖς φρόνιμοι: it would tend to self-conceit if the Gentiles in ignorance of this Divine appointment concluded off-hand that the Jews could never be converted as a whole, and that they themselves therefore were in a place of permanent and exclusive privilege. For ἐν ἑαυτοῖς (AB) παρ' ἑαυτοῖς is found in  $\aleph$  CDL, etc. Both occur in LXX but the former is much more likely to have been changed. τὸ πλήρωμα τῶν ἔθνῶν = the full number, totality, of the Gentiles. It does not mean a number pre-determined beforehand, which has to be made up, whether to answer to the blanks in Israel or to the demands of a Divine decree, but the Gentiles in their full strength. When the Gentiles in their full strength have come in, the power which is to provoke Israel to jealousy will be fully felt, with the result described in ver. 26.

Ver. 26. καὶ οὕτως = and thus; not merely temporal, but = under the influence of the jealousy so excited—under the impression produced on the Jews by the sight of the Gentiles in their fulness peopling the kingdom—all Israel shall be saved. This is an independent sentence. For πᾶς Ἰσραὴλ see 1 Kings xii. 1, 2 Chron. xii. 1. It means Israel as a whole. Paul is thinking of the historical people, as the contrast with Gentiles shows, but he is not thinking of them one by one. Israel a Christian nation, Israel as a nation a part of the Messianic kingdom, is the content of his thought. To make πᾶς Ἰσραὴλ refer to a “spiritual” Israel, or to the elect, is to miss the mark: it foretells a “conversion of the Jews so universal that the separation into an ‘elect remnant’ and ‘the rest who were hardened’ shall disappear” (Gifford). καθὼς γέγραπται Isa. lix. 20 f., but the last words ὅταν ἀφέλωμαι κ.τ.λ. from Isa. xxvii. 9. The prophet says ἐνεκεν

Ἰακώβ· 27. καὶ αὕτη αὐτοῖς ἢ παρ' ἐμοῦ διαθήκη, ὅταν ἀφελωμαι  
 r Ch. v. 10. τὰς ἀμαρτίας αὐτῶν". 28. Κατὰ μὲν τὸ εὐαγγέλιον, ἔχθροὶ δι'  
 s Ch. ix. 5. ὑμᾶς· κατὰ δὲ τὴν ἐκλογὴν, ἀγαπητοὶ διὰ τοὺς ἁπατέρας. 29.  
 ἀμεταμέλητα γὰρ τὰ χαρίσματα καὶ ἡ κλήσις τοῦ Θεοῦ. 30. Ὡσπερ  
 γὰρ καὶ ἡμεῖς ποτε ἠπειθήσατε τῷ Θεῷ, νῦν δὲ ἠλεήθητε τῇ τούτων

<sup>1</sup> και before υμεις om.  $\aleph$  corr. ABCD<sup>1</sup>F. For νυν, which is found in ACDEFG<sup>L</sup>, νυνι is read in B. W. and H. put νυν in text, νυνι in marg. Weiss puts νυνι in text, thinking that the double νυν in ver. 31 may have induced the dropping of the ι. For other cases, see *Textkritik*, S. 62.

**Σίων :** Paul's ἐκ Σίων is probably a lapse of memory, due to the impression of passages like Ps. xiv. 7, liii. 7, Isa. ii. 3, though Philippi thinks it intentional—the object being to emphasise the title of the Jews, as against the Gentiles, to a share in the kingdom. It is then as if he said: Salvation is of the Jews, and surely therefore for them. It is impossible to say that ἦξει refers to the first or to the second advent: the distinction is not present to Paul's mind as he writes; all he is concerned with is the fact that in prophetic scripture language is used which implies that Israel as a people is to inherit the Messianic salvation. ὁ ῥυόμενος, Hebrew מָשִׁיחַ is the Messiah. ἀποστρέψει ἀσεβείας. Cf. Bar. iii. 7, 1 Macc. iv. 58.

Ver. 27. καὶ αὕτη κ.τ.λ. This is My covenant with them = this is the constitution which I give them to live under. Weiss interprets this by what follows, making the αὕτη prospective, but this is somewhat forced. The διαθήκη is not equivalent to the removal of sins, though it is based upon it: it covers the whole condition introduced by that removal. Cf. Jer. xxxi. 31 ff. The deliverance referred to in vers. 26 and 27, though promised to Israel as a whole, is a religious and ethical one. It has no political significance, and nothing to do with any assumed restoration of the Jews to Canaan. This is obvious even apart from the argument of Weiss that the deliverance in question is to be immediately followed by the resurrection; an argument which depends on a doubtful interpretation of ζωὴ ἐκ νεκρῶν ver. 15.

Ver. 28. κατὰ μὲν τὸ εὐαγγέλιον. In both clauses κατὰ defines the rule by which God's relation to Israel is determined. When He looks at the Gospel, which they have rejected, they are ἔχθροὶ, objects of His hostility, and that δι' ὑμᾶς, for the sake of the Gentiles, to whom the

Gospel in this way comes; when He looks at the ἐκλογὴ, the choice which He made of Israel to be His people, they are ἀγαπητοὶ, objects of His love, and that διὰ τοὺς πατέρας, on account of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob, with whom He made an everlasting covenant (cf. Gen. xvii. 19, Luke i. 54 f.). The passive meaning of ἔχθροὶ is fixed by the contrast with ἀγαπητοὶ, as well as by the logic of the passage: cf. v. 10.

Ver. 29. Proof that the Israelites, in virtue of their relation to the fathers, are objects of God's love. ἀμεταμέλητα cf. 2 Cor. vii. 10: it may mean either what is not or what cannot be repented of: here the latter. God's gifts of grace, and His calling, are things upon which there is no going back. The χαρίσματα are not the moral and intellectual qualifications with which Israel was endowed for its mission in the world (Godet), but the privileges of grace enumerated in chap. ix. 4 f. Neither is the κλήσις of God a "calling" in the modern sense of a vocation or career assigned to any one by Him; it is His authoritative invitation to a part in the Messianic kingdom. From Israel these things can never be withdrawn.

Vv. 30-32. There is the less need, too, that they should be withdrawn, because God makes the very misuse of them contribute to the working out of His universal purpose of redemption. The past unbelief of the Gentiles and the mercy they presently enjoy, the present unbelief of the Jews and the mercy they are destined to enjoy in the future—these things not only correspond to each other, but they are interwoven with each other; they are parts of a system which God controls, and in which every element conditions and is conditioned by all the rest: there is a Divine necessity pervading and controlling all the freedom of men—a Divine purpose mastering all the random activity of human wills; a purpose which is read

ἀπειθεία· 31. οὕτω καὶ οὗτοι νῦν ἠπείθησαν, τῷ ὑμετέρῳ ἐλέει ἵνα  
καὶ αὐτοὶ<sup>1</sup> ἐλεθῶσιν· 32. συνέκλεισε γὰρ ὁ Θεὸς τοὺς πάντας εἰς  
ἀπειθειαν, ἵνα τοὺς πάντας ἐλεήσῃ. 33. Ὡ βᾶθος πλοῦτου καὶ  
σοφίας καὶ γνῶσεως Θεοῦ! ὡς ἀνεξερεύνητα τὰ κρίματα αὐτοῦ, καὶ

<sup>1</sup> After αὐτοὶ **NBD**<sup>1</sup> ins. νῦν; and so Tischdf. and W. and H., not Weiss, who regards it as a mere mechanical repetition. Some cursives have ὕστερον.

out by the Apostle in verse 32: God shut them all up into disobedience that He might have mercy upon them all. Ver. 30. ποτὲ: once, in the past, chap. i. 18-32. τῆ τούτων ἀπειθεία = owing to their disobedience. Cf. vers. 11, 15. Ver. 31. τῷ ὑμετέρῳ ἐλέει is to be construed with ἵνα καὶ αὐτοὶ νῦν ἐλεθῶσιν. For the order cf. Gal. ii. 10, 2 Cor. xii. 7. It seems pedantic to make the construction strictly parallel to τῆ τούτων ἀπειθεία, and to translate: "that owing to the mercy shown to you—i.e., owing to the jealousy to which the Jews would be stirred at seeing the Gentiles the objects of Divine mercy—they also may obtain mercy"; the simpler construction is to take the dative as explanatory of the verb, and to translate: "that they may be made the objects of the very same mercy which has been shown to you". This is really the point which the Apostle wishes to be at; though the idea brought out in the former rendering is essential in the passage, it is not essential, nor obvious, in these particular words. The second νῦν (wanting in AD\*\*FGL) is probably genuine (**NB**), but cannot be forced to mean more than "now in their turn". The imminence of the result is not in view. Ver. 32. συνέκλεισεν γὰρ ὁ θεὸς τοὺς πάντας εἰς ἀπειθειαν: this is the nearest approach made in the N.T. to putting the sin of man into a direct and positive relation to the act and purpose of God. But it would be a mistake to draw inferences from the concrete historical problem before the Apostle—viz., God's dealings with Jew and Gentile, and the mutual relations and influence of Jew and Gentile in the evolution of God's purpose—and to apply them to the general abstract question of the relation of the human will to the Divine. Paul is not thinking of this question at all, and his authority could not be claimed for such inferences. Salvation, he sees, as he looks at the world before him, is to come to Jew and Gentile alike by the way of free grace; and it answers to this, that in the providence of God, Jew and Gentile alike have been made to feel the need of

grace by being shut up under disobedience. It is within Paul's thought to say that the sin of Jews and Gentiles, to whom he preached the Gospel, did not lie outside the control, or outside the redeeming purpose, of God; but it does not seem to me to be within his thought to say that God ordains sin in general for the sake of, or with a view to, redemption. This is a fancy question which an apostle would hardly discuss. God subordinates sin to His purpose, but it is not a subordinate element in His purpose. The same order of considerations ought to guide us in the interpretation of τοὺς πάντας. "Them all" certainly refers in the first instance to Jews and Gentiles. It is not the same as τοὺς ἀμφοτέρους, "both parties"; but it differs from it in its present connection only by giving emphasis to the fact that both parties consist of numbers, to all of whom the truth here stated applies. To find here a doctrine of universal salvation—a dogmatic assertion that every man will at last receive mercy—is simply to desert the ground on which the Apostle is standing. It is to leave off thinking about the concrete problem before his mind, and to start thinking about something quite different. It is gratuitous to contrast, as, e.g., is done by Lipsius, this passage with others in which Paul speaks of ἀπολλύμενοι as well as σωζόμενοι, and to say that they represent irreconcilable view-points—the Apostle speaking in the present instance from the standpoint of Divine teleology; in the other, from that of actual experience. The truth is, as Weiss puts it, there is not a word here to show how far, when the history of man has reached its term, Paul conceived God's saving purpose to be realised. συνέκλεισεν answering to רָסַגְתָּ is frequent in LXX: the συν does not refer to the fact that Jews and Gentiles are shut up together, but indicates that those who are shut up are shut up on all sides, so that they cannot escape: cf. con-cludo and examples in Gal. iii. 22, Ps. xxx. 9 LXX. ἐλεήσῃ:

t Eph. iii. 8. ἴ ἀνεπιχρίαστοι αἱ ὁδοὶ αὐτοῦ. 34. “τίς γὰρ ἔγνω νοῦν Κυρίου; ἢ τίς σύμβουλος αὐτοῦ ἐγένετο;” 35. ἢ “τίς προέδωκεν αὐτῷ, καὶ ἀνταποδοθήσεται αὐτῷ;” 36. ὅτι ἐξ αὐτοῦ καὶ δι’ αὐτοῦ καὶ εἰς αὐτὸν τὰ πάντα· αὐτῷ ἢ δόξα εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας. ἀμήν.

“to have mercy upon” means “to make partakers of that ‘common salvation’ (Jude 3) which is emphatically a dispensation of mercy” (Gifford).

Ver. 33. ὁ βάθος πλοῦτου κ.τ.λ. In ver. 32 the content of the chapter is no doubt condensed, but it is more natural to regard the doxology as prompted by the view of God’s Providence which pervades the whole discussion than by the one sentence in which it is summed up. **βάθος**: a universal figure for what is immeasurable or incalculable: cf. 1 Cor. ii. 10, Apoc. ii. 24, Eph. iii. 18. The genitives **πλοῦτου**, **σοφίας** and **γνώσεως** are most simply construed as co-ordinate. For **πλοῦτος** used thus absolutely see Eph. iii. 8, Phil. iv. 19. Perhaps the key to the meaning here is to be found in x. 12: what Paul adores is the unsearchable wealth of love that enables God to meet and far more than meet the appalling necessities of the world; love less deep would soon be bankrupt at the task. In **σοφία** and **γνώσις** the intellectual resources are brought into view with which God has ordered, disposed and controlled all the forces of the world and of man’s history so as to make them subservient to His love. The world, with its conflict of races, religions, passions and even vices, may seem to be a realm of chaos; but when we see it in the light of God as Paul did, we see the signs of wisdom and knowledge, of a conscious purpose transcending human thought, and calling forth adoring praise. For the distinction of **σοφία** and **γνώσις**, which especially in relation to God is to be felt rather than defined, see Trench, *N.T. Synonymy*, § 1xxv. **τὰ κρίματα αὐτοῦ**: except 1 Cor. vi. 7 which is different, this is the only example of **κρίματα** (plural) in the N.T. It is probably used not in the narrower sense (which would be illustrated by reference, e.g., to the “hardening” of Israel), but in the wider sense of the Hebrew **דִּיּוּשָׁן**, to which it often answers in the LXX. In Ps. xxxvi. 6 we have **τὰ κρίματά σου ἄβυσσος πολλή**: where Cheyne’s note is, “Thy judgments—in their various effects of destruction and salvation”. This is Paul’s thought; hence **τὰ κρίματα αὐτοῦ** and **αἱ ὁδοὶ αὐτοῦ** are prac-

tically the same. As Moses says (Deut. xxxii. 4), *All His ways are judgment*.

Ver. 34. Proof from Scripture of the unsearchableness of God’s ways: He has had no confidant. Isa. xl. 13, 1 Cor. ii. 16. It is mere pedantry to refer half the verse to **σοφία** and the other half to **γνώσις**.

Ver. 35. ἢ τίς προέδωκεν αὐτῷ, καὶ ἀνταποδοθήσεται αὐτῷ; see Job xli. 11 (A.V.). The translation of Job xli. 3, Hebrew, is perhaps Paul’s own, as the LXX is entirely different and wrong. The point of the quotation has been variously explained. If it continues the proof of ver. 33, the underlying assumption is that God’s ways *would* be finite and comprehensible if they were determined by what men had done, so as merely to requite that. It seems better, however, to read the words in the largest sense, and then they express the fundamental truth of religion as Paul understood it—*viz.*, that the initiative in religion belongs to God; or as he puts it elsewhere, that we have nothing we did not receive, and that boasting is excluded. The relation of man to God in these conditions is one which naturally expresses itself in doxology.

Ver. 36. ὅτι ἐξ αὐτοῦ κ.τ.λ. Strictly speaking, the **ὅτι** confirms the last truth—man’s absolute dependence on God—by making it part of a wider generalisation. **ἐξ αὐτοῦ**: from Him, as their source; **δι’ αὐτοῦ**: through Him, as the power by whose continuous energy the world is sustained and ruled; **εἰς αὐτὸν**: unto Him, as their goal, for whose glory they exist. A reference of any kind to the Trinity is out of the question. It is a question, however, whether **τὰ πάντα** means “all things” in the sense of the universe (cf. 1 Cor. viii. 6, Col. i. x6, Heb. ii. 10) or whether it is not limited by the article to all the things which have just been in contemplation, the whole marvellous action of God’s riches and wisdom and knowledge, as interpreted by the Apostle in regard to the work of redemption (for an example of **τὰ πάντα** in this sense see 2 Cor. v. 18). I incline to the last view. The universe of grace, with all that goes on in it for the common salvation of Jew and Gentile, is of God and through God and to

XII. 1. ΠΑΡΑΚΑΛΩ οὖν ὑμᾶς, ἀδελφοί, ἅδιὰ τῶν οἰκτιρμῶν τοῦ Θεοῦ, παραστήσαι τὰ σώματα ὑμῶν θυσίαν ζῶσαν, ἁγίαν, εὐάρεστον

<sup>a</sup> Ch. xv. 30 ;

<sup>2</sup> Cor. x. 1.

God. To Him be the glory which such a display of wisdom and love demands.

CHAPTER XII. The distinction of doctrinal and practical is not one that can be pressed anywhere in the N.T., and as little in Paul as in any other writer. It is under practical compulsion of some kind that he develops most of his characteristic doctrines, and he has no doctrines which do not imply a corresponding practice. Yet the distinction does exist, and the remainder of this epistle, especially chaps. xii. 1-xv. 13, may be properly described as the practical part of it. Not that it is independent of the other. On the contrary, it is nothing but the application of it. (οὖν ver. 1.) Christian ethics are relative to the Christian revelation. It is the relations in which we stand that determine our duties, and the new relations in which we are set both to God and to other men by faith in Jesus Christ have a new morality corresponding to them. There is such a thing as a Christian ethic with a range, a delicacy, a flavour, all its own. There is no formal exposition of it here, though perhaps the nearest approach to such a thing that we have in the N.T., but a comprehensive illustration of it in a variety of bearings. Paul starts (xii. 1 f.) with a general exhortation, covering the whole Christian life. From this he proceeds to the spirit and temper which ought to characterise Christians as members of the same society, dwelling especially on the graces of humility and love (xii. 3-21). In the following chapter he discusses the duties of the individual to his legal superiors (xiii. 1-7); his duties to his neighbour, as comprehended in the love which fulfils the law (xiii. 8-10); and the urgent duty of sanctification in view of the Parousia. With chap. xiv. he comes to a different subject, and one apparently of peculiar interest in Rome at the time. It is one of those questions in which the claim of Christian liberty has to accommodate itself to the social necessity created by the weakness of brethren, and the discussion of it extends from xiv. 1-xv. 13, and concludes the "practical" part of the epistle.

Ver. 1. παρακαλῶ οὖν: the reference is to all that has been said since i. 16, but especially to what more closely precedes. Cf. Eph. iv. 1, 1 Tim. ii. 1, 1 Cor. iv. 16. The οὖν connects the two

parts of the epistle, not formally but really, and shows the dependence of the "practical" upon the "doctrinal". It is the new world of realities to which the soul is introduced by the Christian revelation on which Christian morality depends. It is relative to that world, and would become unreal along with it. διὰ τῶν οἰκτιρμῶν: for the substantive see 2 Cor. i. 3 (= **יְהוָה**, which has no singular). διὰ in such expressions (cf. 1 Cor. i. 10, 2 Cor. x. 1) indicates that in which the motive is found: Winer, p. 477. The mercies are those which God has shown in the work of redemption through Christ. παραστήσαι is not *per se* sacrificial: in chap. vi. 13, 16, 19 it is used of putting the body at the disposal of God or of sin: see also 2 Cor. iv. 14, xi. 2, Col. i. 22, 28, Eph. v. 27. τὰ σώματα ὑμῶν is not exactly the same as ὑμᾶς αὐτούς, yet no stress is to be laid on the words as though Paul were requiring the sanctification of the body as opposed to the spirit: the body is in view here as the instrument by which *all* human service is rendered to God, and the service which it does render, in the manner supposed, is not a bodily but a spiritual service. θυσίαν ζῶσαν: "living," as opposed to the slain animals offered by the Jews. This seems to be the only case in which the new life as a whole is spoken of by Paul as a sacrifice—a thank offering—to God. A more limited use of the idea of θυσία is seen in Phil. ii. 17, iv. 18; cf. also Heb. xiii. 15 f., 1 Pet. ii. 5. ἁγίαν: contrast i. 24. εὐάρεστον according to all analogy (see concordance) should go with τῷ θεῷ, and this is secured by the order of the words in A<sup>95</sup> vulg. τὴν λογικὴν λατρείαν ὑμῶν: in apposition not to τὰ σώματα ὑμῶν but to the presenting of the body as a living sacrifice. For other examples see Winer, 669. λατρεία (ix. 4, Heb. ix. 1, 6, John xvi. 2) is *cultus*, ritual service, worship; and such a presentation of the body, as the organ of all moral action, to God, is the only thing that can be characterised as λογικὴ λατρεία, spiritual worship. Any other worship, any retention of Jewish or pagan rites, anything coming under the description of *opus operatum*, is foreign to the Christian θυσία; it is λατρεία which is *not* λογικὴ, not appropriate to a being whose essence is λόγος, *i.e.*, reason or spirit.

b<sup>1</sup> Pet. ii. 1. τῷ Θεῷ,<sup>1</sup> τὴν<sup>b</sup> λογικὴν<sup>c</sup> λατρείαν ὑμῶν · 2. καὶ μὴ συσχηματίζεσθε τῷ  
 c Ch. ix. 4.  
 d Matt. xvii. αἰῶνι τούτῳ, ἀλλὰ<sup>d</sup> μεταμορφοῦσθε<sup>2</sup> τῇ ἀνακαινώσει τοῦ νοῦς ὑμῶν, εἰς  
 2; 2 Cor.  
 iii. 18. τὸ δοκιμάζειν ὑμᾶς τί τὸ θέλημα τοῦ Θεοῦ τὸ ἀγαθὸν καὶ εὐάρεστον  
 καὶ τέλειον. 3. Λέγω γὰρ, διὰ τῆς χάριτος τῆς δοθείσης μοι, παντὶ  
 τῷ ὄντι ἐν ὑμῖν, μὴ ὑπερφρονεῖν παρ' ὃ δεῖ φρονεῖν, ἀλλὰ φρονεῖν εἰς

<sup>1</sup> τῷ θεῷ before *εὐάρεστον*  $\Sigma^1$ AP, vulg. So W. and H. text, but marg. as rec. Weiss. on the ground that τῷ θεῷ is to be construed with *παραστησαι*, keeps these words to the end.

<sup>2</sup> *συσχηματίζεσθε* . . . *μεταμορφοῦσθε*; so BLP, W. and H. text; but *συσχηματίζεσθαι* and *μεταμορφοῦσθαι* in AB<sup>2</sup>D<sup>1</sup> (gr.) F. The infin. is read by Lachm. and in marg. by Treg. and W. and H., but is obviously an alteration of the imperative to have it construed with *παρακαλῶ* (Weiss). *υμῶν* after *νοῦς* is om. by ABD<sup>1</sup> (gr.) F 47 and all edd.

Vers. 2. καὶ μὴ *συσχηματίζεσθε*: the imperative is better supported (BLP) than the infinitive (ADFG). For the word cf. 1 Pet. i. 14. The distinctions that have been drawn between *συσχηματίζεσθε* and *μεταμορφοῦσθε*—on the ground of other distinctions assumed between *σχῆμα* and *μορφή*—though supported by distinguished scholars, remind one of the shrewd remark of Jowett, that there is a more dangerous deficiency for the commentator than ignorance of Greek, namely, ignorance of language. In the face of such examples as are quoted by Weiss (Plut., *Mor.*, p. 719 B: τὸ μεμορφωμένον καὶ ἐσχηματισμένον: Eur., *Iph. T.*, 292, *μορφῆς σχήματα*) and Wetstein (Sext. Emp., ἡ μένει μὲν ἐν τῇ οἰκείᾳ ὑποστάσει, εἰς ἄλλο δὲ εἶδος ἀντ' ἄλλο μεταλαμβάνον γενῶνται, ὡς ὁ μετασχηματιζόμενος κηρός, καὶ ἄλλοτε ἄλλην μορφήν ἀναδεχόμενος) it is impossible not to regard the distinctions in question as very arbitrary. For the best supported and most relevant, reflected in Sanday and Headlam's paraphrase ("do not adopt the *external and fleeting fashion* of this world, but be ye transformed *in your inmost nature*"), see Lightfoot on Phil. ii. 7, or Gifford on the same passage (*The Incarnation*, pp. 22 ff., 88 ff.). τῷ αἰῶνι τούτῳ: "This world" or "age" is opposed to that which is to come; it is an evil world (Gal. i. 4) of which Satan is the God (2 Cor. iv. 4). Even apparent or superficial conformity to a system controlled by such a spirit, much more an actual accommodation to its ways, would be fatal to the Christian life. By nature, the Christian is at home in this world (cf. Eph. ii. 2); such as it is, its life and his life are one; and his deliverance is accomplished as he is transformed τῇ ἀνακαινώσει τοῦ νοῦς, by the renewing

of his mind. *νοῦς* in the Apostle's usage (see chap. vii.) is both intellectual and moral—the practical reason, or moral consciousness. This is corrupted and atrophied in the natural man, and renewed by the action of the Holy Spirit. The process would in modern language be described rather as sanctification than regeneration, but regeneration is assumed (Tit. iii. 5). *εἰς τὸ δοκιμάζειν*: this is the purpose of the transforming renewal of the mind. It is that Christians may prove, *i.e.*, discern in their experience, what the will of God is. Cf. ii. 18. An unrenewed mind cannot do this; it is destitute of moral discernment—has no proper moral faculty. τὸ ἀγαθὸν καὶ εὐάρεστον καὶ τέλειον: these words may either qualify τὸ θέλημα τοῦ θεοῦ as in A.V., or be in apposition to it, as in R.V. margin. The last agrees better with the rhythm of the sentence. The will of God is identified with what is ἀγαθόν, good in the moral sense; εὐάρεστον well pleasing, *sc.*, to God (so in all the nine cases of the adjective and three of the verb εὐάρεστεῖν which are found in the N.T.); and τέλειον ethically adequate or complete: Dt. xviii. 13, Mt. v. 48. No one discovers the line of action which from possessing these characteristics can be identified as the will of God unless he is transformed from his native affinity to the world by the renewing of his mind by the Holy Spirit.

Vers. 3-8. The duties of members of the Church as such: avoidance of self-exaltation, and mutual service in the measure of the gift bestowed on each. λέγω γὰρ: the γὰρ indicates that "humility is the immediate effect of self-surrender to God" (Gifford). διὰ τῆς χάριτος κ.τ.λ. Paul illustrates in his own person, in giving this advice, the



τὸ ὁσφρονεῖν, ἐκάστῳ ὡς ὁ Θεὸς ἐμέρισε<sup>1</sup> μέτρον πίστεως. 4. Καθάπερ ε 2 Cor. v. 13; γὰρ ἐν ἐνὶ σώματι μέλη πολλὰ<sup>1</sup> ἔχομεν, τὰ δὲ μέλη πάντα οὐ τὴν ἰ Eph. iv. 7, αὐτὴν ἔχει πρᾶξιν· 5. οὕτως οἱ πολλοὶ ἐν σώμα ἔσμεν ἐν Χριστῷ, 13, 16. ὁ<sup>2</sup> δὲ καθ' εἰς ἀλλήλων μέλη, 6. ἔχοντες δὲ χαρίσματα κατὰ τὴν χάριν τὴν δοθεῖσαν ἡμῖν διάφορα· εἴτε προφητεῖαν, κατὰ τὴν

<sup>1</sup> For *μελη πολλα* ALP read *πολλα μελη* with  $\aleph$ BDF latt. and most edd; but W. and H. give *μελη πολλα* a place in marg.

<sup>2</sup> For *ο δε* (altered to agree with *εις*?) read *το δε*  $\aleph$ ABD<sup>1</sup>F gr. P. 47.

rule he is laying down for the Church. He speaks "through the grace given him," and therefore without presumption; but he does speak, and so puts his wisdom and love at the service of the Church. *παντι τῷ ὄντι ἐν ἡμῖν*: everybody in the Church needed this word. To himself, every man is in a sense the most important person in the world, and it always needs much grace to see what other people are, and to keep a sense of moral proportion. *μη ὑπερφρονεῖν*: *ὑπερφρονεῖν* here only in N.T., but a common word. *παρ' ὃ δεῖ φρονεῖν*: beyond the mind or habit of thought one ought to have. For this use of *παρὰ* see xiv. 5, Lc. xiii. 2, Heb. i. 9. *φρονεῖν εἰς τὸ ὁσφρονεῖν*: to cherish a habit of thought tending to sobriety of mind. *σωφροσύνη* is described by Jos., *Macc.* 2 f., as giving man dominion not only over bodily *ἐπιθυμίαι* but also over those of the soul, such as *φιλαρχία*, *κενοδοξία*, *ἀλαζονεία*, *μεγαλαυχία*, *βασκανία*. These are precisely the qualities to which Paul opposes it here. *φρονεῖν* and its cognates are favourite words with Paul: what they all suggest is the importance to character, especially to Christian character, of the prevailing mood of the mind—the moral temper, as it might be called. It should always tend to sobriety; but he gives a special rule for it in *ἐκάστῳ ὡς ὁ θεὸς ἐμέρισεν μέτρον πίστεως*. *ἐκάστῳ* is governed by *ἐμέρισεν*: its place makes it emphatic. Cf. 1 Cor. iii. 5. Whatever the characteristic of any individual may be, it is due to the discriminating act of God in measuring out faith to him in greater or less degree. Taken in connection with what precedes, the idea seems to be: There are *various* degrees of self-estimation proper, for God gives one more and another less; but all are fundamentally regulated by humility, for no one has anything that he has not received. 1 Cor. iv. 7.

Ver. 4 f. *καθάπερ γὰρ*: For language

and figure cf. 1 Cor. xii. 12. Also Eph. iv. 15 f., Col. i. 18. The comparison of the community to a body—the social organism—is very common in classical writers: see Wetstein and Jowett here. *πρᾶξιν*: viii. 13. It is that at which the member works—in modern language, its function. Every member has its gift, but it is limited by the fact that it is no more than a member: it is not the whole body. 1 Cor. xii. 17. *οἱ πολλοὶ ἐν σώμα ἔσμεν ἐν Χριστῷ*: many as we are, we are one body in Christ; it is the common relation to Him which unites us. In the later passages in which Paul uses this figure (Eph., Col.), Christ is spoken of as the Head of the body; but both here and in 1 Cor. xii. it would agree better with our instinctive use of the figure to speak of Him as its soul. His own figure of the vine and the branches combines the advantages of both. *τὸ δὲ καθ' εἰς ἀλλήλων μέλη*: this qualifies the unity asserted in *ἐν σώμα ἔσμεν*. It is not a unity in which individuality is lost; on the contrary, the individuals retain their value, only not as independent wholes, but as members one of another. Each and all exist only in each other. 1 Cor. xii. 27. For *τὸ καθ' εἰς* see Winer, 312.

Ver. 6 ff. At this point an application, apparently, is made of what has been said in vers. 4 and 5, but the grammar is very difficult. Both A.V. and R.V. supply what is needed in order to read the verses as an exhortation; thus in ver. 6, "*let us prophesy*"; in ver. 7, "*let us wait*"; and in ver. 8, answering to the change of construction in the Greek, "*let him do it*". This is the simplest way out of the difficulty, and is followed by many scholars (Meyer, Lipsius, Gifford). But it is not beyond doubt, and there is something to say for the more rigorous construction adopted by Weiss and others, who put only a comma after *μέλη* at the end of ver. 5, and construe *ἔχοντες* with *ἔσμεν*. In either case, there is an apo-

g Here only. <sup>g</sup> ἀναλογίαν τῆς πίστεως · 7. εἶτε διακονίαν, ἐν τῇ διακονίᾳ. εἶτε ὁ διδάσκων, ἐν τῇ διδασκαλίᾳ · 8. εἶτε ὁ παρακαλῶν, ἐν τῇ παρακλήσει · ὁ μεταδιδούς, ἐν ἀπλότητι · ὁ προϊστάμενος, ἐν σπουδῇ · ὁ ἐλεῶν, ἐν ἰλαρότητι.

dosis to be supplied; but while in the former case it is hinted at in the second half of every clause (as is seen in our English Bibles), in the latter it is simply forgotten. It is as if Paul had said, "We are members one of another, and have gifts differing according to the grace given to us; our gift may be prophecy, prophecy in the proportion of our faith; it may be *διακονία* in the sphere appropriate for that; another instance would be that of the teacher in *his* department, or of the exhorter in *his*; or again you may have the distributor, whose gift is in the form of *ἀπλότης*; or the ruler, who is divinely qualified for his function by the gift of *σπουδή*, moral earnestness; or the man who to show mercy is endowed with a cheerful disposition". All this *requires* an apodosis, but partly because of its length, partly because of the changes in construction as the Apostle proceeds, the apodosis is overlooked. Its import, however, would not vary, as in the A.V., from clause to clause, but would be the same for all the clauses together. Even with the ordinary punctuation, which puts a period at the end of ver. 5, I prefer this reading of the passage. The varying apodoses supplied in the English Bible to the separate clauses are really irrelevant; what is wanted is a common apodosis to the whole conception. "Now having gifts differing according to the grace given to us—as one may see by glancing at the phenomena of church life—let us use them with humility (remembering that they *are* gifts) and with love (inasmuch as we are members one of another)." It is easier to suppose that the construction was suspended, and gradually changed, with some general conclusion like this before the mind from the beginning, than that it broke down, so to speak, as soon as it began; which we must suppose if we insert *προφητεύωμεν* in ver. 6. But it is not a question which can be infallibly decided. It ought to be observed that there is no hint of anything official in this passage; *all* ministry is a function of membership in the body, and *every* member has the function of ministry to some intent or other. *χαρίσματα*: i. 11, i. Cor. i. 7, xii. 4, 9, 31, i. P. iv. 10.

With the exception of i. P. iv. 10 (which is not without relation to this passage) Paul alone uses *χάρισμα* in the N.T. Every *χάρισμα* is a gift of the Holy Spirit given to the believer for the good of the Church. Some were supernatural (gifts of healings, etc.), others spiritual in the narrower sense: this passage is the best illustration of the word. *τὴν δοθεῖσαν*, *sc.*, when we believed. *προφητείαν κατὰ τὴν ἀναλογίαν τῆς πίστεως*. *προφητεία* is the highest of *χαρίσματα*, i. Cor. xiv. 1 ff. When one has it, he has it *κατὰ τὴν ἀναλογ. τῆς πίστεως* = in the proportion of his faith. The faith meant is that referred to in ver. 3, the measure of which is assigned by God: and since this is the case, it is obviously absurd for a man to give himself airs—*ὑπερφρονεῖν*—on the strength of being a *προφήτης*: this would amount to forgetting that in whatever degree he has the gift, he owes it absolutely to God. The expression *προφητείαν κατὰ τὴν ἀναλογίαν τῆς πίστεως* implies that the more faith one has—the more completely Christian he is—the greater the prophetic endowment will be. [In theology, "the analogy of the faith" is used in quite a different sense, though it was supposed to be justified by this passage. To interpret Scripture, *e.g.*, according to the analogy of the faith meant to interpret the parts, especially difficult or obscure parts, in consistency with the whole. The scope of the whole, again, was supposed to be represented in the creed or rule of faith; and to interpret *κατὰ τ. ἀ. τ. πίστεως* meant simply not to run counter to the creed. In the passage before us this is an anachronism as well as an irrelevance. There was no rule of faith when the Apostle was thinking out the original interpretation of Christianity contained in this epistle; and there is no exhortation or warning, but only a description of fact, in the words.] *διακονία* as opposed to *προφητεία* and the other functions mentioned here probably refers to such services as were material rather than spiritual: they were spiritual however (though connected only with helping the poor, or with the place or forms of worship) because prompted by the Spirit and done in it. One who has this

9. Ἡ ἀγάπη ἡ ἀνυπόκριτος. ἀποστυγούντες τὸ πονηρὸν, κολλώμενοι ἡ 2 Cor. vi. 6; 1 Tim. τῷ ἀγαθῷ. 10. τῇ φιλαδελφίᾳ εἰς ἀλλήλους φιλόστοργοι. τῇ τιμῇ 11; 5; Jas. iii. 17.

gift has it ἐν τῇ διακονίᾳ, *i.e.*, in the qualities and in the sphere proper to it: it is in its own nature limited; it is what it is, and nothing else, and fits a man for this function and no other. This is not "otiose," and it provides a good meaning without importing anything. ὁ διδάσκων ἐν τῇ διδασκαλίᾳ: it is in his teaching that the διδάσκαλος possesses the gift peculiar to him: 1 Cor. xiv. 26. ὁ παρακαλῶν ἐν τῇ παρακλήσει: so again with the exhorter, the man who speaks words of encouragement: *cf.* xv. 4, 5; Acts iv. 36, ix. 31, xiii. 15. It is in his παράκλησις, and not in something else, that his χάρισμα lies. Thus far Paul has not defined the quality of the *χάρισμα*, or shown in what they consist; the functionary is merely said to have his gift in his function—teaching, exhorting, or service. But in the cases which follow, he tells us what the gift, proper to the special functions in view, is; in other words, what is the spiritual quality which, when divinely bestowed, capacitates a man to do this or that for the Church. Thus there is ὁ μεταδιδούς (*cf.* Eph. iv. 28, Luc. iii. 11), the man who imparts of his means to those who need; he has his *χάρισμα* in ἀπλότης. *Cf.* 2 Cor. ix. 11, 13; James i. 5. It is not exactly "liberality," though in these passages it approaches that sense: it is the quality of a mind which has no *arrière-pensée* in what it does; when it gives, it does so because it sees and feels the need, and for no other reason; this is the sort of mind which is liberal, and God assigns a man the function of *μεταδιδόναι* when He bestows this mind on him by His Spirit. ὁ προϊστάμενος is the person who takes the lead in any way. He might or might not be an official (1 Thess. v. 12, 1 Tim. v. 17, 1 Tim. iii. 4, 5, 12: *cf.* also *πρόστατις* xvi. 2, and Hort, *The Christian Ecclesia*, p. 126 f.); but in any case he had the *χάρισμα* which fitted him for his special function in σπουδή, moral earnestness or vigour. A serious masculine type of character is the pre-supposition for this gift. Finally ὁ ἐλεῶν, he who does deeds of kindness, has his *charisma* in ἐλαρότης. A person of a grudging or despondent mood has not the endowment for showing mercy. He who is to visit the poor, the sick, the sorrowful, will be marked out by God for His special ministry by this endowment

of brightness and good cheer. *Cf.* 2 Cor. ix. 7 = Prov. xxii. 8 and Sir. xxxii. (xxxv.) 11: ἐν πάσῃ δώσει ἰλαρώσων τὸ πρόσωπόν σου, καὶ ἐν εὐφροσύνῃ ἁγίαςον δεκάτην.

Vv. 9-21. As far as any single idea pervades the rest of the chapter it is that of the first words in ver. 9: ἡ ἀγάπη ἀνυπόκριτος. The passage as a whole has a strong affinity to 1 Cor. xiii., and along with what may be a reminiscence of our Lord's words, it has something intensely and characteristically Christian. Whatever the grammatical construction may be—and all through the chapter Paul displays an indifference in this respect which is singular even in him—the intention must be supposed to be hortatory, so that it is most natural to supply imperatives (ἔστω or ἐστὲ) with the numerous participles.

Ver. 9. ἡ ἀγάπη ἀνυπόκριτος: see 2 Cor. vi. 6, 1 Pet. i. 22. Probably the following clauses ἀποστυγούντες . . . κολλώμενοι κ.τ.λ. are meant to explain this. Love is undissembled, it is the unaffected Christian grace, when it shrinks, as with a physical horror, from that which is evil (even in those whom it loves), and cleaves to that which is good. *στυγείν* according to Eustath. in *Il. a*, p. 58 (quoted by Wetstein) adds the idea of *φρίσσειν* to that of *μισεῖν*: the *ἀπο* intensifies the idea of aversion or repulsion. Love is not a principle of mutual indulgence; in the Gospel it is a moral principle, and like Christ Who is the only perfect example of love, it has always something inexorable about it. *He* never condoned evil. τῷ ἀγαθῷ is neuter, like τὸ πονηρὸν, though κολλᾶσθαι can be used of persons (1 Cor. vi. 16 f.) as well as things.

Ver. 10. τῇ φιλαδελφίᾳ = in point of brotherly love, *i.e.*, your love to each other as children in the one family of God. *Cf.* 1 Thess. iv. 9, Heb. xiii. 9, 1 Pet. i. 22, 2 Pet. i. 7, 1 Pet. iii. 8. ἀδελφὸς in the apostolic writings does not mean fellow-man, but fellow-Christian; and φιλαδελφία is the mutual affection of the members of the Christian community. In this they are to be φιλόστοργοι, "tenderly affectioned". The moral purity required in ver. 9 is not to be the only mark of Christian love; since they are members of one family, their love is to have the characters of strong natural

i Here only. ἀλλήλους<sup>1</sup> προηγούμενοι · 11. τῇ σπουδῇ μὴ<sup>k</sup> ὀκνηροί, τῷ πνεύματι<sup>k</sup> <sup>Mat. xxv.</sup> <sup>26.</sup> ζέοντες, τῷ Κυρίῳ<sup>1</sup> δουλεύοντες · 12. τῇ ἐλπίδι χαίροντες, τῇ θλίψει ὑπομένοντες, τῇ προσευχῇ προσκαρτεροῦντες · 13. ταῖς χρεῖαις<sup>2</sup> τῶν

<sup>1</sup> For κυριω ἡ ABD<sup>2</sup> LP, etc., some Western authorities (D<sup>1</sup> F gr. G lat.) read **καιρω**, and this appears in the received text, though not in the A.V. The confusion may have arisen from a contraction of the one word being mistaken for that of the other; but was “probably supported by a sense of the difficulty of so comprehensive a clause as τῷ κυρίῳ δουλεύοντες in the midst of a series of clauses of limited sense” (W. and H., Appendix, p. 110).

<sup>2</sup> ταῖς χρεῖαις ἡ ABD<sup>3</sup> LP is no doubt the correct reading, but there is a curious variant ταῖς μνείαις in DFG, some MSS. known to Theod. Mops., and in the Lat. transl. of Origen, where, after *usibus* (= χρεῖαις) *sanctorum communicantes*, we read *Memini in latinis exemplaribus magis haberi, memoris sanctorum communicantes*. Evidently, as S. and H. remark, this must have arisen at a time when the **αγιοι** were no longer the members of the community and fellow-Christians whose bodily wants required to be relieved, but the “saints” of the past whose lives were to be commemorated.

affection (**στοργή**); it is to be warm, spontaneous, constant. τῇ τιμῇ ἀλλήλους προηγούμενοι: “in honour preferring one another”. This, which is the rendering of both our English versions, is a good Pauline idea (Phil. ii. 3), but gives προηγούμενοι a meaning not found elsewhere. Hence others render: “in showing honour—i. e., to those whose **χαρίσματα** entitle them to respect in the Church—giving each other a lead”: each, so to speak, being readier than the other to recognise and honour God’s gifts in a brother. In this sense, however, προηγούμενοι would rather take the genitive (see Liddell and Scott, who seem, nevertheless, to adopt this rendering); and probably the former, which involves only a natural extension of the meaning of the word, is to be preferred.

Ver. 11. τῇ σπουδῇ μὴ ὀκνηροί: σπουδῇ occurs twelve times in the N.T., and is translated in our A.V. seven different ways. It denotes the moral earnestness with which one should give himself to his vocation. In this Christians are not to be backward: Acts ix. 38. τῷ πνεύματι ζέοντες: the same figure is frequent in the classics, and we still speak of the blood “boiling”. The spiritual temperature is to be high in the Christian community: cf. 1 Thess. v. 20, Acts xviii. 25. If we are to distinguish at all, the πνεῦμα meant is the Spirit of God, though it is that spirit as bestowed upon man. τῷ κυρίῳ δουλεύοντες: we can point to no special connection for this clause. Perhaps the thought is on the same lines as in 1 Cor. xii. 4 f.: there are spiritual gifts of all kinds, but one service in which they are all ex-

hausted—the service of Christ—and in that we must be constantly engaged.

Ver. 12. τῇ ἐλπίδι χαίροντες: the hope in which they are to rejoice is that of Christians: cf. v. 2. The meaning is practically the same as in that passage, but the mental representation is not. τῇ ἐλπίδι is not = ἐπ’ ἐλπίδι there, but in a line with the other datives here: in point of hope, rejoicing. τῇ θλίψει ὑπομένοντες: ὑπομ. might have been construed with the accusative (τὴν θλίψιν), but the absolute use of it, as here, is common (see Mt. x. 22, Jas. v. 11, 1 Pet. ii. 20), and its employment in this instance enables the writer to conform the clause grammatically to the others. τῇ προσευχῇ προσκαρτεροῦντες: cf. Col. iv. 2, Acts i. 14, ii. 42. The strong word suggests not only the constancy with which they are to pray, but the effort that is needed to maintain a habit so much above nature.

Ver. 13. ταῖς χρεῖαις τῶν ἁγίων κοινωνοῦντες: “the saints” as in viii. 27, 1 Tim. v. 10 are Christians generally. The curious variant ταῖς μνείαις—“taking part in the commemorations of the saints”—dates from an age at which “the saints” were no longer Christians in general, but a select few, as a rule martyrs or confessors in the technical sense. Weiss asserts that the active sense of κοινωνεῖν, to communicate or impart, is foreign to the N.T., but it is difficult to maintain this if we look to such examples as this and Gal. vi. 6, and also to the use of κοινωνία in 2 Cor. ix. 13 (where ἀπλότητι τῆς κοινωνίας εἰς αὐτοὺς means the liberality of your contribution to them), and Heb. xiii. 16, where κοινωνία is a synonym of εὐποιία,

ἀγίῳ κοινωνοῦντες, τὴν φιλοξενίαν διώκοντες. 14. εὐλογεῖτε τοὺς διώκοντας ὑμᾶς· εὐλογεῖτε, καὶ μὴ<sup>1</sup> καταρᾶσθε. 15. Χαίρειν μετὰ<sup>1</sup> χαιρόντων, καὶ<sup>1</sup> κλαίειν μετὰ κλαιόντων. 16. τὸ αὐτὸ εἰς ἀλλήλους φρονοῦντες· μὴ τὰ ὑψηλὰ φρονοῦντες, ἀλλὰ τοῖς ταπεινοῖς συναπαγόμενοι. μὴ γίνεσθε φρόνιμοι παρ' ἑαυτοῖς· 17. μηδενὶ κακὸν ἀντὶ κακοῦ ἀποδίδόντες. προνοοῦμενοι καλὰ ἐνώπιον πάντων ἀνθρώπων·

<sup>1</sup> καὶ before κλαίειν om.  $\delta$ BD<sup>1</sup>F; ins. AD<sup>3</sup>LP 47. W. and H. put in marg.; Weiss in text, regarding its omission as merely accidental.

and certainly active. τὴν φιλοξενίαν διώκοντες: to devote oneself to entertaining them when they were strangers was one chief way of distributing to the needs of the saints. Hospitality, in the sense of the N.T. (Heb. xiii. 2, 1 Pet. iv. 9), is not akin to "keeping company," or "open house"; it is a form of charity much needed by travelling, exiled, or persecuted Christians. The terms in which it is spoken of in Clem. Rom. (quoted in S. and H.: διὰ πίστιν καὶ φιλοξενίαν ἐδόθη αὐτῷ—i.e., Abraham—υἱὸς ἐν γῆρᾳ: or, διὰ φιλοξενίαν καὶ εὐσέβειαν Ἰωτ ἐσώθη) may seem extravagant; but the key to them, and to all the apostolic emphasis on the subject, is to be found in Matt. xxv. 34-36.

Ver. 14. εὐλογεῖτε τοὺς διώκοντας, εὐλ. κ. μὴ καταρᾶσθε: not a quotation of Mt. v. 44, but probably a reminiscence of the same saying of Jesus. The change in construction from participle to imperative, the participle being resumed in the next sentence, suggests that the form of the sentence was given to Paul—i.e., he was consciously using borrowed words without modifying them to suit the sentence he had begun on his own account. It may be that when Paul said διώκοντες in ver. 13, the other sense of the word passed through his mind and prompted ver. 14; but even if we could be sure of this (which we cannot) we should not understand either verse a whit better.

Ver. 15. χαίρειν μετὰ χαιρόντων κ.τ.λ. The infinitives give the expression the character of a watchword (see Hofmann in Weiss). For the grammar see Winer, 397, n. 6. To weep with those that weep is easier than to rejoice with those who rejoice. Those who rejoice neither need, expect, nor feel grateful for sympathy in the same degree as those who weep.

Ver. 16. τὸ αὐτὸ εἰς ἀλλήλους φρονοῦντες: here the Apostle returns to his own grammar (or disregard of

grammar), and holds to it till ver. 19, when he changes to the imperative (μὴ δότε) with which he concludes (ver. 21 μὴ νικῶ, νικά). τὸ αὐτὸ φρονεῖν, xv. 5, is a favourite expression, best explained by reference to Phil. ii. 2, iv. 2, 2 Cor. xiii. 11. The idea is that of loving unanimity, and the εἰς ἀλλήλους points to the active manifestation of this temper in all the mutual relations of Christians. "Let each so enter into the feelings and desires of the other as to be of one mind with him" (Gifford). It is a more abstract expression of the Golden Rule, Mt. vii. 12. The negatives which follow introduce explanatory clauses: they forbid what would destroy the unanimity of love. μὴ τὰ ὑψηλὰ φρονοῦντες: see on ver. 3 above and xi. 21. Selfish ambition in the Church is fatal to perfect mutual consideration. τοῖς ταπεινοῖς συναπαγόμενοι. Elsewhere in the N.T. (seven times) ταπεινός is only found in the masculine, and so some would render it here: condescend to men of low estate; let yourself be carried along in the line of their interests, not counting such people beneath you. Cf. Gal. ii. 13, 2 Pet. iii. 17. The bad connotation of συναπάγεσθαι in both these places is due not to itself, but to the context. The contrast with τὰ ὑψηλὰ leads others to take τοῖς ταπεινοῖς as neuter: and so the R.V. has it, condescend to things that are lowly. Certainty on such points must always be personal rather than scientific; the first of the two alternatives impresses me as much more in harmony with the nature of the words used than the other. For the idea cf. Wordsworth's sonnet addressed to Milton . . . "and yet thy heart the lowliest duties on herself did lay". μὴ γίνεσθε φρόνιμοι κ.τ.λ. Prov. iii. 7. Be not men of mind in your own conceit. It is difficult to put our judgment into a common stock, and estimate another's as impartially as our own; but love requires it, and without it there is no such thing as τὸ αὐτὸ εἰς ἀλλήλους φρονεῖν.

- m Matt. 18. εἰ <sup>xxiv. 24;</sup> δυνατὸν, τὸ ἐξ ὑμῶν, μετὰ πάντων ἀνθρώπων εἰρηνεύοντες.  
Gal. iv. 15. 19. Μὴ ἑαυτοὺς ἐκδικοῦντες, ἀγαπητοί, ἀλλὰ δότε τόπον τῇ ὀργῇ·  
γέγραπται γάρ, “Ἐμοὶ ἐκδίκησις, ἐγὼ ἀναπαδώσω, λέγει Κύριος”.  
20. εἰ ἂν οὖν <sup>1</sup> πεινᾷ ὁ ἐχθρὸς σου, ψάμμιζε αὐτόν. εἰ ἂν διψᾷ, πότιζε  
n 2 Tim. iii. αὐτόν· τοῦτο γὰρ ποιῶν, ἄνθρακας πυρὸς <sup>6</sup> σωρεύσεις ἐπὶ τὴν κεφαλὴν  
αὐτοῦ. 21. μὴ νικῶ ὑπὸ τοῦ κακοῦ, ἀλλὰ νίκα ἐν τῷ ἀγαθῷ τὸ κακόν.

<sup>1</sup> εἰ ἂν οὖν D<sup>3</sup> gr. L, etc.; εἰ alone D<sup>1</sup>FD<sup>3</sup> lat.; ἀλλὰ εἰ ἡ ABP vulg. and all edd. For τὴν κεφαλὴν Weiss would read with B alone τῆς κεφαλῆς.

Ver. 17. From this point the subject treated is chiefly the Christian's attitude to enemies. *μηδενὶ κακὸν ἀντὶ κακοῦ ἀποδ.* *μηδενὶ* is emphatic: to no one, Christian or un-Christian. Nothing can ever justify revenge. Cf. 1 Pet. iii. 9, but especially Matt. v. 38-48. *προνοούμενοι καλὰ ἐνώπιον κ.τ.λ.* Prov. iii. 4, LXX. 2 Cor. viii. 21. What the words mean in Prov. iii. 4 is not clear; they are not a translation of the Hebrew. In 2 Cor. viii. 21 the idea is that of taking precautions to obviate possible slanders; here it is apparently that of living in such a way as not to provoke enmity, or give any occasion for breach of peace. *ἐνώπιον*: construed with *καλὰ*. *πάντων* has the same kind of emphasis as *μηδενὶ*: Requite evil to *no* one; let your conduct be such as *all* must approve.

Ver. 18. *εἰ δυνατὸν*: cf. Matt. xxiv. 24. *τὸ ἐξ ὑμῶν*: for what depends on you. Cf. i. 15. Over others' conduct we have no control; but the initiative in disturbing the peace is never to lie with the Christian.

Ver. 19. *μὴ ἑαυτοὺς ἐκδικοῦντες, ἀγαπητοί*. Even when the Christian has been wronged he is not to take the law into his own hand, and right or vindicate himself. For *ἐκδικεῖν* see Lc. xviii. 3, 5. *ἀγαπητοί* is striking, and must have some reason; either the extreme difficulty, of which Paul was sensible, of living up to this rule; or possibly some condition of affairs in the Church at Rome, which made the exhortation peculiarly pertinent to the readers, and therefore craved this affectionate address to deprecate, as it were, the “wild justice” with which the natural man is always ready to plead his cause. *ἀλλὰ δότε τόπον τῇ ὀργῇ*: the wrath spoken of, as the following words show, is that of God; to give place to God's wrath means to leave room for it, not to take God's proper work out of His hands. For the expression cf. Lc. xiv. 9, Sir. xiii. 22, xix. 17, xxxviii. 12, Eph. iv. 27.

For *ἡ ὀργή* used thus absolutely of God's wrath cf. v. 9, 1 Thess. ii. 16. The idea is not that instead of executing vengeance ourselves we are to abandon the offender to the more tremendous vengeance of God; but this—that God, not injured men or those who believe themselves such, is the maintainer of moral order in the world, and that the righting of wrong is to be committed to Him. Cf. especially 1 Pet. ii. 23. *γέγραπται γάρ*: Deut. xxxii. 35. Paul gives the sense of the Hebrew, not at all that of the LXX, though his language is reminiscent of the latter (*ἐν ἡμέρᾳ ἐκδίκησεως ἀναπαδώσω*). It is singular that Heb. x. 30 has the quotation in exactly the same form as Paul. So has the Targum of Onkelos; but whether there is any mutual dependence of these three, or whether, independent of all, the verse was current in this form, we cannot tell. The *λέγει κύριος* (cf. xiv. 11) is supplied by Paul.

Ver. 20. *ἀλλὰ*: On the contrary, as opposed to self-avenging, and even to the merely passive resignation of one's case to God. *εἰ ἂν πεινᾷ κ.τ.λ.* Prov. xxv. 21 f. exactly as in LXX. The meaning of “heaping burning coals on his head” is hardly open to doubt. It must refer to the burning pain of shame and remorse which the man feels whose hostility is repaid by love. This is the only kind of vengeance the Christian is at liberty to contemplate. Many, however, have referred to 4 Esdr. xvi. 54 (*Non dicat peccator se non peccasse; quoniam carbones ignis comburent super caput ejus, qui dicit: non peccavi coram Domino Deo et gloria ipsius*), and argued that the coals of fire are the Divine judgments which the sinner will bring on himself unless he repents under the constraint of such love. But (1) there is nothing said here about the essential condition, “unless he repents”; this is simply imported; and (2) the aim of the Christian's love to his enemy is thus

XIII. 1. ΠΑΣΑ ψυχὴ ἐξουσίαις ὑπερχούσαις ὑποτασέσθω. οὐ γὰρ ἔστιν ἐξουσία εἰ μὴ ἀπὸ<sup>1</sup> Θεοῦ· αἱ δὲ οὐσαι ἐξουσίαι ὑπὸ τοῦ

<sup>1</sup> εἰ μὴ ἀπο θεοῦ D<sup>1</sup>F, Orig. For ἀπο **NS**ABD<sup>3</sup>LP read ὑπο; and so all edd. ἐξουσίαι after οὔσαι om. **NS**ABD<sup>1</sup>F and all edd. ὑπο του θεου; om. του **N**<sup>1</sup>ADFP and all edd.

made to be the bringing down of Divine judgment on him — which is not only absurd in itself, but in direct antagonism to the spirit of the passage.

Ver. 21. μὴ νικῶ: the absence of any connecting particle gives the last verse the character of a summary: in a word, be not overcome by evil. ὑπὸ τοῦ κακοῦ = by the evil your enemy inflicts. The Christian would be overcome by evil if it were able to compel him to avenge himself by repaying it in kind. Wrong is not defeated but doubly victorious when it is repelled with its own weapons; we can only overcome it ἐν τῷ ἀγαθῷ through the good we do to our adversary, turning him so from an enemy into a friend. *Vincit malos*, says Seneca, *peritina bonitas*: Wetst. accumulates similar examples from classical writers. The ἐν in ἐν τῷ ἀγαθῷ is probably =  $\ddot{\text{v}}$ : it might be explained as instrumental, or rendered "at the cost of".

CHAPTER XIII. There is not a word to indicate how the transition is made from the discussion of the duties of Christians as members of one body, especially the duties of humility and love in chap. xii., to the special subject which meets us in chap. xiii. — the duty of Christians in relation to the civil authorities. There is nothing exactly like vers. 1-7 elsewhere in Paul's epistles, and it is difficult not to believe that he had some particular reason for treating the question here. The Christians in Rome, though mainly Gentile, as this epistle proves, were closely connected with the Jews, and the Jews were notoriously bad subjects. Many of them held, on the ground of Deut. xvii. 15, that to acknowledge a Gentile ruler was itself sinful; and the spirit which prompted Pharisees to ask, Is it lawful to give tribute to Cæsar or not? Shall we give or shall we not give? (Mark xii. 14) had no doubt its representatives in Rome also. As believers in the Messiah, "in another King, one Jesus" (Acts xvii. 7), even Christians of Gentile origin may have been open to the impulses of this same spirit; and unbalanced minds, then as in all ages, might be disposed to find

in the loyalty which was due to Christ alone, an emancipation from all subjection to inferior powers. There is here an apparent point of contact between Christianity and anarchism, and it may have been the knowledge of some such movement of mind in the Church at Rome that made Paul write as he did. There is perhaps nothing in the passage which is not already given in our Lord's word, "Render to Cæsar the things that are Cæsar's, and to God the things that are God's"; yet nothing can be more worthy of admiration than the soberness with which a Christian idealist like Paul lays down the Divine right of the state. The use made of the passage to prove the duty of "passive obedience," or "the right divine of kings to govern wrong," is beside the mark; the Apostle was not thinking of such things at all. What is in his mind is that the organisation of human society, with its distinction of higher and lower ranks, is essential for the preservation of moral order, and therefore, one might add, for the existence of the Kingdom of God itself; so that no Christian is at liberty to revolt against that organisation. The state is of God, and the Christian has to recognise its Divine right in the persons and requirements in which it is presented to him: that is all. Whether in any given case—say in England in 1642—the true representative of the State was to be found in the king or in the Commons, Paul, of course, does not enable us to say. Neither does he say anything bearing on the Divine right of insurrection. When he wrote, no doubt, Nero had not yet begun to rage against the Christians, and the imperial authorities had usually protected the Apostle himself against popular violence, whether Jewish or pagan; but even of this we must not suppose him to be taking any special account. He had, indeed, had other experiences (Acts xvi. 37, 2 Cor. xi. 25 ff.). But the whole discussion presupposes normal conditions: law and its representatives are of God, and as such are entitled to all honour and obedience from Christians.

Ver. 1. πᾶσα ψυχὴ is a Hebraism:

Θεοῦ τεταγμένοι εἰσίν. 2. ὥστε ὁ ἀντιπασσόμενος τῇ ἐξουσίᾳ, τῇ τοῦ Θεοῦ <sup>a</sup> διαταγῇ ἀνθέστηκεν· οἱ δὲ ἀνθεστηκότες, ἑαυτοῖς κρίμα λήψονται. 3. οἱ γὰρ ἄρχοντες οὐκ εἰσὶ φόβος τῶν ἀγαθῶν ἔργων, ἀλλὰ τῶν κακῶν.<sup>1</sup> θέλεις δὲ μὴ φοβεῖσθαι τὴν ἐξουσίαν; τὸ ἀγαθὸν ποιεῖ, καὶ ἔξεις ἔπαινον ἐξ αὐτῆς· 4. Θεοῦ γὰρ διάκονός ἐστι σοὶ εἰς τὸ ἀγαθόν. ἔὰν δὲ τὸ κακὸν ποιῆς, φοβοῦ· οὐ γὰρ εἰκὴ τὴν μάχαιραν φορεῖ· Θεοῦ γὰρ διάκονός ἐστιν, ἔκδικος εἰς ὄργην τῷ τῷ

<sup>1</sup> τῶν ἀγαθῶν ἔργων ἀλλὰ τῶν κακῶν D<sup>3</sup> gr. L, etc.; τῶ ἀγαθῶ ἔργῳ α. τῶ κακῶ NABD<sup>3</sup>F. The vulg. and lat. fathers have *non sunt timori boni operis*, from which W. and H. deduce another reading τοῦ ἀγαθοῦ ἔργου. They suspect a primitive error, and Hort favours the correction τῶ ἀγαθοεργῶ, comparing 1 Tim. vi. 18.

cf. Acts ii. 43, iii. 23, and chap. ii. 9. For ἐξουσίαις cf. Luke xii. 11: it is exactly like "authorities" in English—abstract for concrete. ὑπερεχούσαις describes the authorities as being actually in a position of superiority. Cf. 1 P. ii. 13, and 2 Macc. iii. 11 (ἄνδρὸς ἐν ὑπεροχῇ κειμένου). οὐ γὰρ ἐστὶν ἐξουσία εἰ μὴ ὑπὸ θεοῦ: ὑπὸ is the correct reading (NAB), not ἀπὸ. Weiss compares Bar. iv. 27. ἔσται γὰρ ὑμῶν ὑπὸ τοῦ ἐπάγοντος μνεῖα. It is by God's act and will alone that there is such a thing as an authority, or magistrate; and those that actually exist have been appointed—set in their place—by Him. With αἱ δὲ οὐσαι the Apostle passes from the abstract to the concrete; the persons and institutions in which for the time authority had its seat, are before his mind—in other words, the Empire with all its grades of officials from the Emperor down. In itself, and quite apart from its relation to the Church, this system had a Divine right to be. It did not need to be legitimated by any special relation to the Church; quite as truly as the Church it existed *Dei gratia*.

Ver. 2. ὥστε cf. vii. 4, 12. The conclusion is that he who sets himself against the authorities withstands what has been instituted by God: διαταγῇ (Acts vii. 53) recalls τεταγμένοι, ver. 1. The κρίμα, i.e., the judgment or condemnation which those who offer such resistance shall receive, is of course a Divine one—that is the nerve of the whole passage; but most commentators seem to regard it as coming through the human authority resisted. This is by no means clear; even a successful defiance of authority, which involved no human κρίμα, would according to Paul ensure punishment from God. For λήψονται κρίμα cf. Mark xii. 40, Jas. iii. 1: where also God's judgment alone is in

view. But to say that it is God's judgment only is not to say that it is eternal damnation. There are many ways in which God's condemnation of sin is expressed and executed.

Ver. 3. οἱ γὰρ ἄρχοντες κ.τ.λ. The γὰρ can only be connected in a forced and artificial way with the clause which immediately precedes; it really introduces the reason for a frank and unreserved acceptance of that view of "authorities" which the Apostle is laying down. It is as if he said: Recognise the Divine right of the State, for its representatives are not a terror—an object of dread—to the good work, but to the bad. φόβος as in Isa. viii. 13. It is implied that those to whom he speaks will always be identified with the good work, and so have the authorities on their side: it is taken for granted also that the State will not act in violation of its own idea, and identify itself with the bad. θέλεις δὲ μὴ φοβεῖσθαι κ.τ.λ. This is most expressive when read as an interrogation, though some prefer to take it as an assertion: that is, to regard Paul as assuming that the reader does not want to be afraid of the magistrate, rather than as inquiring whether he does or not. To escape fear, τὸ ἀγαθὸν ποιεῖ: do what is (legally and morally) good.

Ver. 4. θεοῦ γὰρ διάκονός ἐστιν σοὶ εἰς τὸ ἀγαθόν. διάκονός is feminine agreeing with ἐξουσία, which is "almost personified" (Sanday and Headlam). The σοὶ is not immediately dependent on διάκονός, as if the State were conceived as directly serving the person; the State serves God, with good in view as the end to be secured by its ministry, viz., the maintenance of the moral order in society; and this situation is one the benefit of which redounds to the individual. ἔὰν δὲ τὸ κακὸν ποιῆς, φοβοῦ: only when the individual does that which



κακὸν πράσσοντι. 5. διὸ ἀνάγκη ὑποτάσσεσθαι, οὐ μόνον διὰ τὴν ὀργὴν, ἀλλὰ καὶ διὰ τὴν <sup>b</sup> συνείδησιν. 6. διὰ τοῦτο γὰρ καὶ φόρους <sup>b</sup> ἰ Cor. x. 25, 27; ἰ Pet. ii. 19. τελεῖτε· λειτουργοὶ γὰρ Θεοῦ εἰσιν, εἰς αὐτὸ τοῦτο προσκαρτεροῦντες. 7. ἀπόδοτε οὖν<sup>1</sup> πᾶσι τὰς ὀφειλάς· τῷ τὸν φόρον, τὸν φόρον. τῷ

<sup>1</sup> ἀποδοτε οὖν  $\aleph^s D^s FLP$ ; om. οὖν  $\aleph^1 ABD^1$  and all edd.

is contrary to the end set before the State by God—commits τὸ κακὸν, which frustrates τὸ ἀγαθὸν—need he fear: but then he must fear. οὐ γὰρ εἰκῆ: for not for nothing, but for serious use, does the ruler wear the sword. For εἰκῆ cf. 1 Cor. xv. 2, Gal. iii. 4. φορεῖ is wear, rather than bear: the sword was carried habitually, if not by, then before the higher magistrates, and symbolised the power of life and death which they had in their hands. "The Apostle in this passage," says Gifford, "expressly vindicates the right of capital punishment as divinely entrusted to the magistrate". But "expressly" is perhaps too much, and Paul could not deliberately vindicate what no one had assailed. He did, indeed, on a memorable occasion (later than this) express his readiness to die if his life had been forfeited to the law (Acts xxv. 11); but to know that if an individual sets himself to subvert the moral order of the world, its representatives can proceed to extremities against him (on the ground, apparently, that *it*, as of God's institution, is of priceless value to mankind, whereas he in his opposition to it is of no moral worth at all) is not to vindicate capital punishment as it exists in the law or practice of any given society. When the words θεοῦ γὰρ διάκονός ἐστιν are repeated, it is the punitive ministry of the magistrate which is alone in view. ἐκδικος εἰς ὀργὴν: an avenger for wrath. ὀργή in the N.T. almost always (as here) means the wrath of God. It occurs eleven times in Romans: always so. The exceptions are Eph. iv. 31, Col. iii. 8, 1 Tim. ii. 8, Jas. i. 19 f. τῷ τὸ κακὸν πράσσοντι = to him who works at evil. The process is presented in πράσσειν rather than the result. Cf. i. 32.

Ver. 5 f. διὸ ἀνάγκη ὑποτάσσεσθαι: there is a twofold necessity for submission—an external one, in the wrath of God which comes on resistance; and an internal one, in conscience. Even apart from the consequences of disobedience conscience recognises the Divine right and function of the ἐξουσία and freely submits to it. διὰ τοῦτο γὰρ καὶ φόρους

τελεῖτε. διὰ τοῦτο seems to refer to the moral necessity to which appeal has been already made in διὰ τὴν συνείδησιν. It is because conscience recognises the moral value of the State as an ordinance of God that we pay taxes. φόρος is often used of the tribute paid by a subject nation: Neh. v. 4, 1 Macc. viii. 4, Lc. xx. 22; but here is probably used indefinitely of any imposts made for the support of the Government. λειτουργοὶ γὰρ θεοῦ εἰσιν: the use of λειτουργοὶ here instead of διάκονοι emphasises the official character of the service which they render. In the LXX λειτουργεῖν is the regular rendering of  $\text{לָּוָה}$ , and therefore refers frequently to the service of the priests and Levites, a usage the influence of which is seen in chap. xv. 16 and Phil. ii. 17; but this was by no means exclusively the case in the O.T. (2 Sam. xiii. 18, 2 Kings x. 5) nor is it so in the New (chap. xv. 27, Phil. ii. 25, 30). It is not a priestly character that the word assigns to the magistracy, but only an official character; they are in their place by God's appointment for the public good. εἰς αὐτὸ τοῦτο means "to this very end"—the end described in vers. 3 and 4. As προσκαρτεροῦντες is elsewhere construed with the dative (Acts i. 14, vi. 4, chap. xii. 12) it seems necessary here to take εἰς τὸ αὐτὸ with what precedes, and προσκ. by itself as, e.g., in Num. xiii. 21: spending all their time on the work.

Ver. 7. At this point Weiss begins a new paragraph, but W. and H. make ver. 7 the conclusion of the first part of this chapter. In view of the close connection between vers. 7 and 8 (cf. ὀφειλάς, ὀφείλετε) it is better not to make too decided a break at either place. All the words in ver. 7, φόρος, τέλος, φόβος, τιμὴ, do indeed imply duties to superiors, and seem therefore to continue and to sum up the content of vers. 1-6; but ver. 8, in which μηδεὶν μηδὲν ὀφείλετε seems expressly written as the negative counterpart to ἀπόδοτε πᾶσι τὰς ὀφειλάς in ver. 7, introduces at the same time a wider subject—that of the duties of all

c Matt. xvii. τὸ ὁ τέλος, τὸ τέλος· τῷ τὸν φόβον, τὸν φόβον· τῷ τὴν τιμὴν, τὴν τιμὴν. 8. Μηδεὶ μηδὲν ὀφείλετε,<sup>1</sup> εἰ μὴ τὸ ἀγαπᾶν ἀλλήλους· ὁ γὰρ ἀγαπῶν τὸν ἕτερον, νόμον πεπλήρωκε. 9. τὸ γὰρ, "Οὐ μοιχεύσεις, οὐ φονεύσεις, οὐ κλέψεις, οὐ ψευδομαρτυρήσεις," οὐκ ἐπιθυμήσεις," καὶ εἴ τις ἕτερα ἐντολή, ἐν τούτῳ τῷ λόγῳ ἀνακεφαλαιούται, ἐν τῷ, "Ἀγαπήσεις τὸν πλησίον σου ὡς ἑαυτόν". 10. ἡ ἀγάπη τῷ πλησίον κακὸν οὐκ ἐργάζεται· πλήρωμα οὖν νόμου ἡ ἀγάπη.

<sup>1</sup> οφείλετε seems the only possible reading, yet is not given by any authority. οφείλατε  $\Sigma^2$ ; οφείλοντες  $\Sigma^1$ , Orig.; οφιλετε B. For ἀγαπᾶν ἀλλήλους  $\Sigma$ ABDFP read ἀλλήλους ἀγαπᾶν; so all edd.

<sup>2</sup> οὐ ψευδομαρτυρήσεις om. ABDFL and all edd. The insertion is made by  $\Sigma$ SP, etc., to complete the reference to the decalogue. ἐν τῷ before ἀγαπήσεις is ins. by  $\Sigma$ ADLP; om. by BF latt., Orig.-interp. It is bracketed by Lachm., Treg., Alf., and W. and H.; omitted entirely by Weiss. Instead of ἑαυτόν FLP read σεαυτόν with  $\Sigma$ ABD.

individuals toward each other. τῷ τὸν φόρον τὸν φόρον: this is quite intelligible, but nothing can make it grammatical: see Winer, p. 737. For the distinction of φόρος and τέλος see Trench, *Syn.*, p. 392. For φόβος and τιμή 1 Pet. ii. 17.

Ver. 8. εἰ μὴ τὸ ἀλλήλους ἀγαπᾶν = except mutual love. This is the *debitum immortale* of Bengel; *hoc enim et quotidie solvere et semper debere expedit nobis* (Origen). ὁ γὰρ ἀγαπῶν τὸν ἕτερον: he who loves his neighbour, the other with whom he has to do. Cf. ii. 1, 21 (Weiss). νόμον πεπλήρωκεν = has done all that law requires. From what follows it is clear that Paul is thinking of the Mosaic law; it was virtually the only thing in the world to which he could apply the word νόμος, or which he could use to illustrate that word. The relation of chaps. xii. and xiii. to the Gospels makes it very credible that Paul had here in his mind the words of our Lord in Matt. xxii. 34 ff.

Ver. 9. τὸ γὰρ Οὐ μοιχεύσεις. Cf. viii. 26. The order of the commandments here is different from that in Exod. xx. or Deut. v. (Hebrew), but it is the same as in Luke xviii. 20, and (so far) in James ii. 11. This order is also found in Cod. B. of the LXX in Deut. v. καὶ εἴ τις ἕτερα ἐντολή: this shows that the enumeration does not aim at completeness, and that the insertion in some MSS. of οὐ ψευδομαρτυρήσεις, to complete the second table, is beside the mark. ἀνακεφαλαιούται: it is summed up—the scattered particulars are resumed and brought to one. The only other instance of this word in the N.T. (Eph. i. 10) illustrates the present one, though

the meaning is not exactly the same. ἀγαπήσεις τὸν πλησίον σου κ.τ.λ. In Lev. xix. 18 this is given as a summary of various laws, mostly precepts enjoining humanity, in various relations; by our Lord (in Matt. xxii. 39) and by Paul (here and in Gal. v. 14) an ampler, indeed an unlimited range, is given to it. Its supreme position too seems to be what is indicated in James ii. 8 by calling it νόμος βασιλικός.

Ver. 10. ἡ ἀγάπη . . . κακὸν οὐκ ἐργάζεται. This is all that is formally required by the law as quoted above (οὐ μοιχεύσεις, etc.): therefore love is πλήρωμα νόμου, law's fulfilment. Of course love is an inspiration rather than a restraint, and transcends law as embodied in merely negative commandments; but the form in which the law actually existed determines the form in which the Apostle expresses himself. It is apparent once more that νόμος is the Mosaic law, and not law in general; it is from it the prohibitions are derived on the ground of which the Apostle argues, and to it therefore we must apply his conclusion, πλήρωμα οὖν νόμου ἡ ἀγάπη.

Vv. 11-14. In the closing verses of the chapter Paul enforces this exhortation to mutual love as the fulfilling of the law by reference to the approaching Parousia. We must all appear (and who can tell how soon?) before the judgment-seat of Christ, that every one may receive the things done in the body: if the awe and the inspiration of that great truth descend upon our hearts, we shall feel how urgent the Apostle's exhortation is. καὶ τοῦτο: cf. 1 Cor. vi. 6, 8. In classical writers καὶ ταῦτα is commoner. It

11. ΚΑΙ τοῦτο, εἰδότες τὸν καιρὸν, ὅτι ὥρα ἡμᾶς<sup>1</sup> ἦδη ἐξ ὑπνοῦ ἐγερθῆναι. νῦν γὰρ ἐγγύτερον ἡμῶν ἢ σωτηρία, ἢ ὅτε ἐπιστεύσαμεν.  
 12. ἢ νῦν προέκοιψεν, ἢ δὲ ἡμέρα ἤγγικεν· ἀποθώμεθα οὖν τὰ ἔργα τοῦ σκοτούς, καὶ ἐνδυσώμεθα<sup>2</sup> τὰ ὄπλα τοῦ φωτός. 13. ὡς ἐν ἡμέρα, εὐσχημόνως περιπατήσωμεν, μὴ κώμοις καὶ μέθαις, μὴ κοίταις καὶ ἀσελγείαις, μὴ ἔριδι καὶ ζήλῳ· 14. ἀλλ' ἐνδύσασθε τὸν Κύριον Ἰησοῦν Χριστὸν,<sup>3</sup> καὶ τῆς σαρκὸς ἠ πρόνοιαν μὴ ποιεῖσθε εἰς ἐπιθυμίας.

f<sup>1</sup> Cor iv. 5; Eph. v. 8, 11; vi. 12; 1 Thess. v. 4 f. g<sup>1</sup> Eph. v. 8 f.; 13. h Acts xxiv. 2.

<sup>1</sup> ἡμας DEFGL; but Ξ<sup>1</sup> ABCP give υμας. υμας is put in text by Weiss, W. and H., and Tischd<sup>f</sup>.; and by W. and H. and Treg. in margin. All put ἡδη with Ξ ABC before the pronoun.

<sup>2</sup> For καὶ ἐνδυσώμεθα read ἐνδυσώμεθα δε with ABC<sup>1</sup>D<sup>1</sup>P. W. and H. bracket δε; Ξ<sup>1</sup> and a MS. of Sah. have neither καὶ nor δε. For ὄπλα AD read ἔργα. μὴ ἐριδι καὶ ζήλῳ; B reads the plural ἐρισι κ. ζήλοισ, which W. and H. put in margin, but it is probably a case of conforming instinctively to the other clauses; cf. the converse change of plural (αὶ διαθηκαὶ) into singular in note <sup>2</sup>, page 657 (also in B).

<sup>3</sup> For κυριον I. X. B and Clem. give Χριστον Ἰησουν without κυριον, which W. and H. print in margin, keeping κ. I. X. in text.

sums up all that precedes, but especially vers. 8-10. εἰδότες τὸν καιρὸν: ὁ καιρὸς is not "the time" abstractly, but the time they lived in with its moral import, its critical place in the working out of God's designs. It is their time regarded as having a character of its own, full of significance for them. This is unfolded in ὅτι ὥρα ἦδη κ.τ.λ. ἦδη (without waiting longer) is to be construed with ἐγερθῆναι: "it is time for you at once to awake" (Gifford). No Christian should be asleep, yet the ordinary life of all is but drowsy compared with what it should be, and with what it would be, if the Christian hope were perpetually present to us. νῦν γὰρ ἐγγύτερον ἡμῶν ἢ σωτηρία: for now is salvation nearer us than when we believed. ἢ σωτηρία has here the transcendent eschatological sense: it is the final and complete deliverance from sin and death, and the reception into the heavenly kingdom of our Lord Jesus Christ. This salvation was always near, to the faith of the Apostles; and with the lapse of time it became, of course, nearer. Yet it has often been remarked that in his later epistles Paul seems to contemplate not merely the possibility, but the probability, that he himself would not live to see it. See 2 Cor. v. 1-10, Phil. i. 23. ὅτε ἐπιστεύσαμεν: when we became Christians, 1 Cor. iii. 5, xv. 2, Gal. ii. 16.

Ver. 12. ἢ νῦν προέκοιψεν: the true day dawns only when Christ appears; at present it is night, though a night that has run much of its course. ἀποθώμεθα

οὖν τὰ ἔργα τοῦ σκοτούς. Things that can only be done in the dark—that cannot bear the light of day—are therefore to be put away by the Christian. For ἀποθώμεθα (properly of dress) cf. Jas. i. 21, 1. Pet. ii. 1, Heb. xii. 1. τὰ ὄπλα τοῦ φωτός: for τὰ ὄπλα see on chap. vi. 13, Eph. vi. 11, 1 Thess. v. 8. The idea is that the Christian's life is not a sleep, but a battle. τὰ ὄπλα τοῦ φωτός does not mean "shining armour"; but (on the analogy of τὰ ἔργα τοῦ σκοτούς) such armour as one can wear when the great day dawns, and we would appear on the Lord's side in the fight. An allusion to the last great battle against the armies of anti-Christ is too remote, and at variance with Paul's use of the figure elsewhere.

Ver. 13. ὡς ἐν ἡμέρα: as one walks in the day, so let us walk εὐσχημόνως. The same adverb is found with the same verb in 1 Thess. iv. 2: A.V. in both places "honestly". The meaning is rather "in seemly fashion," "becomingly"; in 1 Cor. xiv. 40 it is rendered "decently," where also regard for decorum (the æsthetic side of morality) is in view. κῶμοι and μέθαι are again found conjoined in Gal. v. 21; ἔρις and ζήλος in Gal. v. 20 and 1 Cor. iii. 3. W. and H. following B. put ἐρισι καὶ ζήλοισ in margin; the plurals in this case as in the others would indicate the various acts or manifestations of excess, whether in self-indulgence or self-will.

Ver. 14. ἀλλὰ ἐνδύσασθε τὸν Κ. Ἰ. Χριστὸν. ἀλλὰ emphasises the contrast between the true Christian life and that

<sup>a</sup> Acts xviii. 26; Ch. xv. 7; Philemon v. 12, 17. **XIV. 1. ΤΟΝ δὲ ἀσθενούντα τῇ πίστει <sup>a</sup> προσλαμβάνεσθε, μὴ εἰς διακρίσεις <sup>b</sup> διαλογισμῶν. 2. Ὅς μὲν πιστεύει φαγεῖν πάντα, ὁ δὲ**

which has just been described. The Christian puts on the Lord Jesus Christ, according to Paul's teaching, in baptism (*cf.* Gal. iii. 27), as the solemn deliberate act in which he identifies himself, by faith, with Christ in His death and resurrection (chap. vi. 3). But the Christian life is not exhausted in this act, which is rather the starting-point for a putting on of Christ in the ethical sense, a "clothing of the soul in the moral disposition and habits of Christ" (Gifford); or as the Apostle himself puts it in vi. 11, a *reckoning* of ourselves to be dead to sin but alive to God in Christ Jesus. Every time we perform an ethical act of this kind we put on the Lord Jesus Christ more fully. But the principle of all such acts is the Spirit of Christ dwelling in us (chaps. vi.-viii.), and it is the essential antagonism of the spirit to the flesh which determines the form of the last words: καὶ τῆς σαρκὸς πρόνοιαν μὴ ποιήσθε εἰς ἐπιθυμίας. It is to inquire too curiously if we inquire whether σὰρξ here is used in the physiological sense = the body, or in the moral sense = *libidinosa caro* (as Fritzsche argues): the significance of the word in Paul depends on the fact that in experience these two meanings are indubitably if not inseparably related. Taking the flesh as it is, forethought or provision for it—an interest in it which consults for it, and makes it an object—can only have one end, *viz.*, its ἐπιθυμίας. All such interest therefore is forbidden as inconsistent with putting on the Lord Jesus Christ in the power of the Holy Spirit.

CHAPTER XIV. 1-XV. 13. One subject is before the Apostle's mind throughout the whole of this section—the relations of "the strong" and "the weak" in the Church at Rome. It is connected in a variety of ways, which are felt rather than expressed, with what precedes. Thus it is pervaded by the same sense of the supreme importance of mutual love among Christians which characterises chaps. xii. and xiii. It makes use, in much the same way as chap. xiii. 11-14, of the impending judgment (xiv. 10), to quicken the sense of individual and personal responsibility. Possibly, too, there is a more formal connection with chap. xiii. Paul has been warning against the indulgence of the flesh (xiii. 14), and this prompts him, by contrast,

to speak of those who by an inadequate appreciation of Christian liberty were practising an "over-scrupulous asceticism". There has been much discussion as to who "the weak" and "the strong" respectively were. The weakness is weakness in respect of faith; the weak man is one who does not fully appreciate what his Christianity means; in particular, he does not see that the soul which has committed itself to Christ for salvation is emancipated from all law but that which is involved in its responsibility to Him. Hence his conscience is fettered by scruples in regard to customs dating from pre-Christian days. The scruples in question here were connected with the use of flesh and wine, and with the religious observance of certain days (whether as fasts or feasts is open to question). Possibly the persons indulging such scruples were Jewish Christians, but they need not have been. They were certainly not legalists in principle, making the observance of the Jewish law or any part of it an essential condition of the Christian salvation; otherwise Paul, as the Epistle to the Galatians shows, would have addressed them in a different tone. Further, the Jewish law does not prescribe abstinence from wine or from animal food; and there is no suggestion here, as in 1 Cor. 8, that the difficulty was about food that had been offered in sacrifice to false gods. Hence the influence at work in the Roman Church in producing this scrupulosity of conscience was probably of Essene origin, and akin to that which Paul subsequently treats with greater severity at Colossae (Col. ii. 16). At Rome the scruples were only scruples, and though there was danger in them because they rested on a defective apprehension of Christianity, they could be tenderly dealt with; at Colossae they had grown into or adapted themselves to a philosophy of religion which was fatal to Christianity; hence the change of tone. But though "the weak" need not have been Jews, the scruples in which their weakness was expressed, had so far Jewish connections and Jewish affinities; and it is probable, from the way in which (chap. xv. 7-13) the discussion of the relations of the weak and the strong passes over into an exhortation to unity between Jew and Gentile in the Church, that the two classifications had a

ἀσθενῶν λάχανα ἐσθίει. 3. ὁ ἐσθίων τὸν μὴ ἐσθίοντα μὴ ὁ ἐξουθενείτω, c<sup>1</sup> Cor. i. 28; vi. 4; xvi. 11.  
καὶ ὁ μὴ<sup>1</sup> ἐσθίων τὸν ἐσθίοντα μὴ κρινέτω· ὁ Θεὸς γὰρ αὐτὸν προσελάβετο. 4. σὺ τίς εἶ ὁ κρίνων ἀλλότριον οἰκέτην; τῷ ἰδίῳ κυρίῳ στήκει ἢ πίπτει· σταθήσεται δέ· δυνατὸς γὰρ ἐστίν·<sup>2</sup> ὁ Θεὸς στήσαι αὐτόν. 5. Ὅς μὲν κρίνει<sup>3</sup> ἡμέραν παρ' ἡμέραν, ὃς δὲ κρίνει πᾶσαν

<sup>1</sup> For καὶ ὁ μὴ  $\aleph^2 D^3 LP$ , read with  $\aleph^1 ABCD^1$  ὁ δὲ μὴ.

<sup>2</sup> For δυνατὸς γὰρ ἐστίν  $\aleph ABCD^1 F$  and all edd. read δυνατεὶ γαρ. ὁ θεὸς DFL; but  $\aleph ABCP$  (and all edd.) ὁ κυριος.

<sup>3</sup> ὁς μὲν κρίνει  $\aleph^2 BDFL$ ; ὁς μὲν γαρ κρίνει  $\aleph^1 ACP$  latt. Weiss regards the γαρ as a mere interpolation (cf. the case in note <sup>1</sup>, page 602); Tischdfl. inserts; W. and H. bracket.

general correspondence; the weak would be Jews or persons under Jewish influence; the strong would be Gentiles, or persons at least who understood the Gospel as it was preached to the Gentiles by Paul.

Ver. 1. τὸν δὲ ἀσθενούντα: as Godet points out, the part. as opposed to ἀσθενῆ, denotes one who is for the time feeble, but who may become strong. τῇ πίστει: in respect of faith, i.e.—in Paul's sense of the word—in respect of his saving reliance on Christ and all that it involves: see above. One is weak in respect of faith who does not understand that salvation is of faith from first to last, and that faith is secured by its own entireness and intensity, not by a timorous scrupulosity of conscience. προσλαμβάνεσθαι is often used of God's gracious acceptance of men, but also of men welcoming other men to their society and friendship, 2 Macc. viii. 1, x. 15. μὴ εἰς διακρίσεις διαλογισμῶν: not with a view to deciding (or passing sentence on) his doubts. The διαλογισμοί are the movements of thought in the weak man, whose anxious mind will not be at peace; no censure of any kind is implied by the word. The strong, who welcome him to the fellowship of the Church, are to do so unreservedly, not with the purpose of judging and ruling his mind by their own. For διακρίσεις see 1 Cor. xii. 10, Heb. v. 14.

Ver. 2. ὃς μὲν: cf. ver. 5, ix. 21. πιστεύει φαγεῖν πάντα: has confidence to eat all things. See Winer, p. 405. Gifford quotes Demosthenes, p. 88: προέσθαι δὲ τὴν προικ' οὐκ ἐπίστευσεν: "he had not confidence, i.e., was too cautious, to give up the dowry". This use of πιστεύειν shows that πίστις to Paul was essentially an ethical principle; the man who was strong in it had moral independence, courage, and originality.

ὁ δὲ ἀσθενῶν λάχανα ἐσθίει: it is impossible to suppose that Paul here is "writing quite generally"; he must have had a motive for saying what he does, and it can only be found in the fact that he knew there were Christians in Rome who abstained from the use of flesh.

Ver. 3. ὁ ἐσθίων . . . μὴ ἐξουθενείτω κ.τ.λ. Paul passes no sentence on either party, but warns both of the temptations to which they are exposed. He who eats will be inclined to contempt—to sneer at the scruples of the weak as mere prejudice or obscurantism; he who does not eat will be inclined to censoriousness—to pronounce the strong, who uses his liberty, no better than he should be. This censoriousness is forbidden, because God (ὁ θεὸς is emphatic by position) has received the strong into the Church, and therefore his place in it is not to be questioned.

Ver. 4. σὺ τίς εἶ ὁ κρίνων ἀλλότριον οἰκέτην; the sharpness of this rebuke (cf. ix. 20) shows that Paul, with all his love and consideration for the weak, was alive to the possibility of a tyranny of the weak, and repressed it in its beginnings. It is easy to lapse from scrupulosity about one's own conduct into Pharisaism about that of others. οἰκέτης is rare in the N.T. Paul has no other example, and may have used it here for the suggestion (which δοῦλος has not) that the person referred to belonged to the house. τῷ ἰδίῳ κυρίῳ στήκει ἢ πίπτει: for the verbs in the moral sense see 1 Cor. x. 12. The dative is dat. comm. It is his own Lord who is concerned—it is His interest which is involved and to Him (not to you) he must answer—as he stands or falls. σταθήσεται δέ: but he shall be made to stand, i.e., shall be preserved in the integrity of his Christian character. δυνατεὶ γὰρ ὁ Κύριος στήσαι αὐτόν: for the Lord has power to keep

d Ch. viii. ἡμέραν. ἕκαστος ἐν τῷ ἰδίῳ νοῦ πληροφορεῖσθω. 6. ὁ ἄ φρονῶν τὴν  
 5 ἡμέραν Κυρίῳ φρονεῖ, καὶ ὁ μὴ φρονῶν τὴν ἡμέραν Κυρίῳ οὐ φρονεῖ.<sup>1</sup>  
 ὁ ἐσθίων Κυρίῳ ἐσθίει, εὐχαριστεῖ γὰρ τῷ Θεῷ· καὶ ὁ μὴ ἐσθίων  
 Κυρίῳ οὐκ ἐσθίει, καὶ εὐχαριστεῖ τῷ Θεῷ. 7. οὐδεὶς γὰρ ἡμῶν

<sup>1</sup> καὶ ὁ μὴ φρονῶν τὴν ἡμέραν Κυρίῳ οὐ φρονεῖ om.  $\aleph$ ABCDF, vulg., Copt., etc. Almost all crit. edd. follow these authorities and omit; but Alf. only brackets the words, holding that the omission may be due to homæoteleuton. The clause is found in C<sup>3</sup>LP, Syr., Chrys., Thdr̄t. There are other instances of homæoteleuton in the attestation of this passage, as Alf. points out. Thus 66<sup>1</sup> omits from ἡμεραν to ἡμεραν, 71 from ἐσθίει to ἐσθίει, and L from τῷ θεῷ to τῷ θεῷ. Insert καὶ before ὁ ἐσθίων with  $\aleph$ ABCDFL.

him upright. Paul does not contemplate the strong man falling and being set up again by Christ; but in spite of the perils which liberty brings in its train—and the Apostle is as conscious of them as the most timid and scrupulous Christian could be—he is confident that *Christian* liberty, through the grace and power of Christ, will prove a triumphant moral success.

Ver. 5. The Apostle passes from the question of food to one of essentially the same kind—the religious observance of days. This is generally regarded as quite independent of the other; but Weiss argues from ver. 6, where the text which he adopts in common with most editors seems to contrast “him who *observes the day*” with “him who *eats*,” that what we have here is really a subdivision of the same general subject. In other words, among those who abstained from flesh and wine, some did so always, others only on certain days. “To observe the day” might in itself mean to observe it by fasting—this would be the case if one’s ordinary custom were to use flesh and wine; or it might mean to observe it by feasting—this would be the case if one ordinarily abstained. Practically, it makes no difference whether this reading of the passage is correct or not: Paul argues the question of the distinction of days as if it were an independent question, much as he does in Col. ii. It is not probable that there is any reference either to the Jewish Sabbath or to the Lord’s Day, though the principle on which the Apostle argues defines the Christian attitude to both. Nothing whatever in the Christian religion is legal or statutory, not even the religious observance of the first day of the week; that observance originated in faith, and is not what it should be except as it is freely maintained by faith. For *ὅς μὲν* see ver. 2. *κρίνει ἡμ. παρ’ ἡμέραν* means

judges one day “in comparison with,” or “to the passing by of” another: *cf.* i. 25, Winer, 503 f. Side by side with this, *κρίνει πᾶσαν ἡμέραν* can only mean, makes no distinction between days, counts all alike. In such questions the important thing is not that the decision should be this or that, but that each man should have an intelligent assurance as to his own conduct: it is, indeed, by having to take the responsibility of deciding for oneself, without the constraint of law, that an intelligent Christian conscience is developed. For *πληροφορεῖσθω* *cf.* iv. 21, and Lightfoot’s note on Col. iv. 12. *νοῦς* (vii. 23) is the moral intelligence, or practical reason; by means of this, enlightened by the Spirit, the Christian becomes a law to himself.

Ver. 6. The indifference of the questions at issue, from the religious point of view, is shown by the fact that *both* parties, by the line of action they choose, have the same end in view—*viz.*, the interest of the Lord. *ὁ φρονῶν τὴν ἡμέραν* *cf.* Col. iii. 2. The setting of the mind upon the day implies of course some distinction between it and others. The clause *καὶ ὁ μὴ φρονῶν . . . οὐ φρονεῖ* is omitted by most editors, but its absence from most MSS. might still be due to *homæoteleuton*. *εὐχαριστεῖ*: thanksgiving to God consecrates *every* meal, whether it be the ascetic one of him who abstains from wine and flesh (*ὁ μὴ ἐσθίων*), or the more generous one of him who uses both (*ὁ ἐσθίων*): *cf.* Acts xxvii. 35, 1 Cor. x. 30, 1 Tim. iv. 3-5. The thanksgiving shows that in either case the Christian is acting *εἰς δόξαν θεοῦ* (1 Cor. x. 31), and therefore that the Lord’s interest is safe.

Ver. 7 f. *οὐδεὶς γὰρ ἡμῶν ἑαυτῷ ἕη κ.τ.λ.* The truth which has been affirmed in regard to the Christian’s use of food, and observance or non-observance of days, is here based on a larger

ἐαυτῷ ζῆ, καὶ οὐδεὶς ἐαυτῷ ἀποθνήσκει. 8. ἐάν τε γὰρ ζῶμεν,  
 τῷ Κυρίῳ ζῶμεν· ἐάν τε ἀποθνήσκωμεν, τῷ Κυρίῳ ἀποθνήσκωμεν.  
 ἐάν τε οὖν ζῶμεν, ἐάν τε ἀποθνήσκωμεν, τοῦ Κυρίου ὁ ἐσμέν. 9. εἰς ὁ Ch. viii.  
 τοῦτο γὰρ Χριστὸς καὶ<sup>1</sup> ἀπέθανε καὶ ἀνέστη καὶ ἀνέζησεν, ἵνα καὶ ὁ; I Cor.  
 νεκρῶν καὶ ζώντων κυριεύσῃ. 10. Σὺ δὲ τί κρίνεις τὸν ἀδελφόν σου;  
 ἢ καὶ σὺ τί ἐξουθενεῖς τὸν ἀδελφόν σου; πάντες γὰρ<sup>f</sup> παραστησόμεθα<sup>f</sup> Acts  
 τῷ βήματι τοῦ Χριστοῦ.<sup>2</sup> 11. γέγραπται γὰρ, “Ζῶ ἐγὼ, λέγει Κύριος, xxvii. 24.  
 ὅτι ἐμοὶ κάμψει πᾶν γόνυ, καὶ πᾶσα γλῶσσα ἐξομολογήσεται<sup>3</sup> τῷ

<sup>1</sup> Om. και before ἀπέθανε with  $\aleph^1$ ABC<sup>1</sup>D<sup>1</sup>FP. For ἀνέστη και ἀνέζησεν read only ἐζησεν with  $\aleph$ ABCDLP and all edd.

<sup>2</sup> του Χριστου  $\aleph^3$ C<sup>2</sup>LP: του θεου  $\aleph^1$ ABC<sup>1</sup>DF and all edd.

<sup>3</sup> ἐξομολογήσεται πᾶσα γλῶσσα BD<sup>1-3</sup>F (and A of LXX); but πᾶσα γλῶσσα ἐξομολογήσεται  $\aleph$ ACD<sup>2</sup>LP. The latter order is followed by Weiss, W. and H., and Tischdf. Probably the verb was put first in BF, etc., to conform to the parallel clause.

truth of which it is a part. His whole life belongs not to himself, but to his Lord. “No one of us liveth to himself,” does not mean, “every man’s conduct affects others for better or worse, whether he will or not”; it means, “no Christian is his own end in life; what is always present to his mind, as the rule of his conduct, is the will and the interest of his Lord”. The same holds of his dying. He does not choose either the time or the mode of it, like a Roman Stoic, to please himself. He dies when the Lord will, as the Lord will, and even by his death glorifies God. In ver. 14 ff. Paul comes to speak of the influence of conduct upon others; but here there is no such thing in view; the prominence given to τῷ κυρίῳ (τοῦ κυρίου) three times in ver. 8 shows that the one truth present to his mind is the all-determining significance, for Christian conduct, of the relation to Christ. This (ideally) determines everything, alike in life and death; and all that is determined by it is right.

Ver. 9. εἰς τοῦτο γὰρ . . . ἵνα: cf. 2 Cor. ii. 9. ἐζησεν refers to the resurrection, as is shown by the order of the words, the connection elsewhere in Paul of Lordship with the resurrection (cf. Phil. ii. 9 ff.), and the aorist tense which describes an act, and not the continued existence of Christ on earth (Sanday and Headlam): cf. Rev. ii. 8 (ὅς ἐγένετο νεκρὸς κ. ἐζησεν), xx. 4 f. ἵνα denotes God’s purpose in subjecting His Son to this experience. We must not suppose that ἀπέθανε is specially connected with νεκρῶν and ἐζησεν with ζώντων; there is the same mannerism as in iv. 25. Rather is it through Christ’s resurrection

that His lordship over the realm of death is established, so that not even in that dark world do those who are His cease to stand in their old relation to Him. τοῦ κυρίου ἐσμέν holds alike in the seen and the unseen.

Ver. 10. Σὺ δὲ: thou, in contrast with the one Lord and Judge of all. In face of our common responsibility to Him, how dare we judge each other? τὸν ἀδελφόν σου: another reason for not judging: it is inconsistent with a recognition of the brotherhood of believers. ἢ καὶ σὺ τί ἐξουθενεῖς κ.τ.λ. Or thou, again, why despisest thou? etc. This is addressed to the strong and free thinking, as the first question is to the weak and scrupulous Christian. Censoriousness and contempt are never anything but sins, not to be practised but shunned, and that all the more when we remember that we shall all stand at one bar. παραστησόμεθα τῷ βήματι τοῦ θεοῦ: God is the universal Judge. In 2 Cor. v. 10 we have τῷ βήματι τοῦ Χριστοῦ, but here τοῦ θεοῦ is the correct reading. We cannot suppose that by τοῦ θεοῦ here Paul means Christ in His Divine nature; the true way to mediate between the two expressions is seen in chap. ii. 16, Acts xvii. 31. When we all stand at that bar—and it should be part of our spiritual environment always—no one will look at his brother with either censoriousness or contempt.

Ver. 11. γέγραπται γάρ: the universal judgment proved from Scripture, Is. lv. 23. Paul follows the LXX, but very freely. For ζῶ ἐγὼ λέγει κύριος the LXX has κατ’ ἐμαυτοῦ ὀμνῶ. The same passage is quoted more freely still

Θεῷ". 12. ἄρα οὖν<sup>1</sup> ἕκαστος ἡμῶν περὶ ἑαυτοῦ λόγον δώσει τῷ Θεῷ. 13. Μηκέτι οὖν ἀλλήλους κρίνωμεν· ἀλλὰ τοῦτο κρίνατε  
 g Matt. xvi. μᾶλλον, τὸ μὴ τιθέναι πρόσκομμα τῷ ἀδελφῷ ἢ "σκάνδαλον."<sup>2</sup> 14.  
 23; xviii. οἶδα καὶ πέπεισμαι ἐν Κυρίῳ Ἰησοῦ, ὅτι οὐδὲν κοινὸν δι' ἑαυτοῦ.<sup>3</sup> εἰ  
 7; Ch. xvi. 17; Rev. ii. 14. μὴ τῷ λογιζομένῳ τι κοινὸν εἶναι, ἐκείνῳ κοινόν· 15. εἰ δὲ<sup>4</sup> διὰ βρῶμα  
 ὁ ἀδελφός σου λυπεῖται, οὐκ ἔτι κατὰ ἀγάπην περιπατεῖς. μὴ τῷ

<sup>1</sup> οὖν  $\Sigma$ ACEL, all cursives, is put in text by Tdf. and bracketed by Alf. and W. and H. It is omitted in BD<sup>1</sup>FP<sup>1</sup>, Syr. and by Weiss, who thinks it much more natural that the common Pauline formula **αρα ουν** should have been completed than mutilated. The authorities are divided in the same way between **δωσει** and **αποδωσει**: BDF supporting the latter, which is adopted by Weiss, and  $\Sigma$ AC the former, which is adopted by W. and H. So also Weiss omits **τω θεω** with BF; but W. and H. bracket it, as it is found in  $\Sigma$ ACDLP.

<sup>2</sup> **το μη τιθεναι προσκομμα τω αδελφω η σκανδαλον.** **προσκομμα** and **η** are both om. by B, Syr., Arm. Weiss thinks this gives the true reading, **το μη τιθεναι τω αδελφω σκανδαλον**, and W. and H. put it in margin.

<sup>3</sup> **δι εαυτου**  $\Sigma$ BC, followed by W. and H., Weiss, Alf.; **δι αυτου** ADEFGL, and of edd. Lachm. and Treg.

<sup>4</sup> For **ει δε** read **ει γαρ** with  $\Sigma$ ABCDFP and all edd.

in Phil. ii. 10 f. to describe the exaltation of Christ. In Isaiah it refers to the coming of God's kingdom, when all nations shall worship Him. **ἐξομολογήσεται τῷ θεῷ** = shall give thanks or praise to God: xv. 9, Mt. xi. 25, and often in LXX =  $\text{ἰ}\text{ῆ}\text{ῆ}\text{ῆ}$ . In the sense of "confess" it takes the accusative.

Ver. 12. **ἄρα (οὖν)**: So then—conclusion of *this* aspect of the subject: cf. v. 18, vii. 25. Every word in this sentence is emphatic: **ἕκαστος, περὶ ἑαυτοῦ, λόγον δώσει, τῷ θεῷ**. For **λόγον** in this sense see 1 Pet. iv. 5, Heb. xiii. 17, Matt. xii. 36, Acts xix. 40.

Vv. 13-23. The Apostle now proceeds to argue the question of Christian conduct in things indifferent from another point of view—that of the influence which our conduct may have on others, and of the consideration which is due to them. **μηκέτι οὖν ἀλλήλους κρίνωμεν**: thus much follows from what has been said already, and **κρίνωμεν** therefore forbids both the censorious and the contemptuous estimate of others. **ἀλλὰ τοῦτο κρίνατε μᾶλλον**: be this your judgment rather. Cf. 1 Cor. ii. 2, vii. 37. **τὸ μὴ τιθέναι πρόσκομμα τῷ ἀδελφῷ**: this is of course addressed to the liberal party. For **πρόσκομμα** see 1 Cor. viii. 9. The word does not occur in the Gospels, but it is a remarkable fact that in most of our Lord's express teaching about sin, it is sin in the character of **σκάνδαλον**, a snare or stumbling-block to others, with

which He deals. Paul develops his ideas quite freely from his conception of faith, but in all probability he was familiar with what Jesus taught (Matt. xviii.).

Ver. 14. In principle, the Apostle sides with the strong. He has no scruples about meats or drinks or days. **ἐν Κυρίῳ Ἰησοῦ**: it is as a Christian, not as a libertine, that Paul has this conviction; in Christ Jesus he is sure that there is nothing in the world essentially unclean; all things can be consecrated and Christianised by Christian use. **κοινόν**: cf. Acts x. 14, 28, Rev. xxi. 27. It is the opposite of **ἅγιον**, and signifies that which is not and cannot be brought into relation to God. **εἰ μὴ τῷ λογιζομένῳ κ.τ.λ.** Though there is nothing which in itself has this character, some things may have it subjectively, *i.e.*, in the judgment of a particular person who cannot help (from some imperfection of conscience) regarding them so; to *him* (**ἐκείνῳ** emphatic) they are what his conscience makes them; and his conscience (unenlightened as it is) is entitled to respect. For **εἰ μὴ** cf. Matt. xii. 14, Gal. ii. 16.

Ver. 15. Many expositors here supply something; *e.g.*, "You must have respect therefore for his scruples, although you may not share them, for if," etc. (Sanday and Headlam); but it seems simpler to connect the **γάρ** with the leading idea in the writer's mind, Put no stumbling-block before a brother, for, etc. **διὰ βρῶμα** is contemptuous: "for the sake of food"



βρώματί σου ἐκείνον ἀπόλλυε, ὑπὲρ οὗ Χριστὸς ἀπέθανε. 16. Μὴ <sup>h</sup> βλασφημείσθω οὖν ὑμῶν τὸ ἀγαθόν. 17. οὐ γάρ ἐστιν ἡ βασιλεία <sup>i</sup> τοῦ <sup>1</sup> Θεοῦ βρώσις καὶ πόσις, ἀλλὰ δικαιοσύνη καὶ εἰρήνη καὶ χαρὰ <sup>k</sup> ἐν Πνεύματι Ἁγίῳ. 18. ὁ γὰρ ἐν τούτοις <sup>1</sup> \* δουλεύων τῷ Χριστῷ

<sup>h</sup> Ch. iii. 8.  
<sup>i</sup> 1 Cor. iv.  
20.  
<sup>k</sup> Matt. vi.  
24; Ch.  
xvi. 18;  
Eph. vi.  
7; Col. iii.  
24.

<sup>1</sup> For *εν τούτοις*  $\aleph^3 D^3 L$  read *εν τούτω* with  $\aleph^1 ABCD^1 F$  and all edd.

thy brother is grieved. *βρώμα* is the food which the strong eats in spite of his brother's scruples. *λυπεῖται* need not imply that the weak is induced, against his conscience, to eat also (though that is contemplated as following); it may quite well express the uneasiness and distress with which the weak sees the strong pursue a line of conduct which his conscience cannot approve. Even to cause such pain as this is a violation of the law of Christ. He who does it has ceased to walk *κατὰ ἀγάπην*, according to love, which is the supreme Christian rule. In the sense of this, and at the same time aware that the weak in these circumstances may easily be cajoled or overborne into doing what his conscience disapproves, the Apostle exclaims abruptly, *μη τῷ βρώματί σου ἐκείνον ἀπόλλυε ὑπὲρ οὗ Χριστὸς ἀπέθανεν*. To tamper with conscience, it is here implied, is *ruin*; and the selfish man who so uses his Christian liberty as to lead a weak brother to tamper with his conscience is art and part in that ruin. The wanton contempt such liberty shows for the spirit and example of Christ is emphasised both here and in 1 Cor. viii. 11 f. *Ne pluris feceris tuum cibum quam Christus vitam suam*.

Ver. 16. *μη βλασφημείσθω οὖν ὑμῶν τὸ ἀγαθόν. τὸ ἀγαθόν* is somewhat indefinite. It has been taken (1) as the good common to all Christians—the Messianic salvation—which will be blasphemed by the non-Christian, when they see the wantonness with which Christians rob each other of it by such conduct as Paul reprobates in ver. 15; and (2) as Christian liberty, the freedom of conscience which has been won by Christ, but which will inevitably get a bad name if it is exercised in an inconsiderate loveless fashion. The latter meaning alone seems relevant. For *βλασφ.* see 1 Cor. x. 30.

Ver. 17. Insistence and strife on such matters are inconsistent with Christianity: *οὐ γάρ ἐστιν κ.τ.λ.* Usually in Paul ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ is transcendent; the kingdom is that which comes with the second advent, and is the inheritance of believers; it is essentially (as it is called

in 2 Tim. iv. 18) *α βασι. ἐπουράνιον*. See 1 Thess. ii. 12, 2 Thess. i. 5, 1 Cor. vi. 9 f., xv. 50, Gal. v. 21. This use of the expression, however, does not exclude another, which is more akin to what we find in the Gospels, and regards the Kingdom of God as in some sense also present: we have examples of this here, and in 1 Cor. iv. 20: perhaps also in Acts xx. 25. No doubt for Paul the transcendent associations would always cling to the name, so that we should lose a great deal of what it meant for him if we translated it by "the Christian religion" or any such form of words. It always included the reference to the glory to be revealed. *βρώσις κ. πόσις*: eating and drinking—the acts, as opposed to *βρώμα*, ver. 15, the thing eaten. *ἀλλὰ δικαιοσύνη κ. εἰρήνη κ. χαρὰ ἐν πνεύματι ἁγίῳ*: are these words ethical or religious? Does *δικ.* denote "justification," the right relation of man to God? or "righteousness," in the sense of just dealing? Is *εἰρήνη* peace with God, the result of justification (as in v. 1), or peace among the members of the Church, the result of consideration for each other? The true answer must be that Paul did not thus distinguish ethical and religious: the words are religious primarily, but the ethical meaning is so far from being excluded by the religious that it is secured by it, and by it alone. That the religious import ought to be put in the forefront is shown by *χαρὰ ἐν πν. ἁγ.* which is a grace, not a virtue. In comparison with these great spiritual blessings, what Christian could trouble the Church about eating or drinking? For their sake, no self-denial is too great.

Ver. 18. *ἐν τούτῳ*: "on the principle implied by these virtues" (Sanday and Headlam). One may serve Christ either eating or abstaining, but no one can serve Him whose conduct exhibits indifference to righteousness, peace and joy in the Holy Spirit. *δόκιμος τοῖς ἀνθρώποις*: so that there can be no occasion given to any one to blaspheme. Cf. xvi. 10, 2 Tim. ii. 15, Jas. i. 12. A sound Christian character wins even the world's approval.

εὐάρεστος τῷ Θεῷ, καὶ δόκιμος τοῖς ἀνθρώποις. 19. ἄρα οὖν τὰ  
 1 Ch. xii. εὐάρεστος τῷ Θεῷ, καὶ δόκιμος τοῖς ἀνθρώποις. 19. ἄρα οὖν τὰ  
 13; 1 Cor. τῆς εἰρήνης <sup>1</sup>διώκωμεν,<sup>1</sup> καὶ τὰ τῆς οἰκοδομῆς τῆς εἰς ἀλλήλους.  
 xiv. 1; 1  
 Thess. v. 20. Μὴ ἔνεκεν βρώματος κατάλυε τὸ ἔργον τοῦ Θεοῦ. πάντα μὲν  
 15  
 m Tit. i. 15. <sup>m</sup>καθαρά, ἀλλὰ κακὸν τῷ ἀνθρώπῳ τῷ διὰ προσκόμματος ἐσθίουσι.  
 n 1 Cor.  
 viii. 13. 21. καλὸν τὸ μὴ φαγεῖν <sup>n</sup>κρέα, μηδὲ πιεῖν οἶνον, μηδὲ ἐν ᾧ ὁ ἀδελφός

<sup>1</sup>διώκωμεν CDE, latt.; διώκομεν  $\aleph$ ABFLP. According to S. and H. διώκωμεν is a "somewhat obvious correction," and less expressive than διώκομεν. This is also the view of Weiss and Tischdf. But W. and H. put διώκωμεν in text and διώκομεν in marg.

Ver. 19. ἄρα οὖν: see ver. 12. τὰ τῆς εἰρήνης is not materially different from τὴν εἰρήνην: all that belongs to, makes for, peace; we cannot argue from its use here that the word must have exactly the same shade of meaning in ver. 17. διώκωμεν: the indicative διώκομεν is very strongly supported, and would indicate the actual pursuit of all true Christians: "Our aim is peace," and τὰ τῆς οἰκοδομῆς τῆς εἰς ἀλλήλους = mutual up-building. Cf. 1 Thess. v. 11, 1 Cor. xiv. 26. The practical rule implied here is that, when anything is morally indifferent to me, before I act on that conviction, I must ask how such action will affect the peace of the Church, and the Christian growth of others.

Ver. 20. Paul repeats the rule of ver. 15. μὴ κατάλυε: the opposite of οἰκοδομεῖν. See Matt. xxvi. 61, Gal. ii. 18. τὸ ἔργον τοῦ Θεοῦ (1 Cor. iii. 9) what God has wrought, i.e., the Christian Church (which is destroyed by such wanton conduct) or the Christian character and standing of an individual (which may be ruined in the same way). πάντα μὲν καθαρὰ: this is the principle of the strong, which Paul concedes (μὲν); the difficulty is to get the enlightened to understand that an abstract principle can never be the rule of Christian conduct. The Christian, of course, admits the principle, but he must act from love. To know that all things are clean does not (as is often assumed) settle what the Christian has to do in any given case. It does not define his duty, but only makes clear his responsibility. Acknowledging that principle, and looking with love at other Christians, and the effect of any given line of conduct on them, he has to define his duty for himself. All meat is clean, but not all eating. On the contrary (ἀλλὰ), κακὸν τῷ ἀνθρώπῳ τῷ διὰ προσκόμματος ἐσθίουσι; sin is involved in the case of the man who eats with offence. Some take this as a warning to the weak; but the whole

tone of the passage, which is rather a warning to the strong, and the verse immediately following, which surely continues the meaning and is also addressed to the strong, decide against this. The man who eats with offence is therefore the man by whose eating another is made to stumble. For διὰ προσκόμματος see ii. 27, Winer, p. 475.

Ver. 21. A maxim for the strong. For καλὸν cf. Mark xiv. 6. Abstinence in order that others may not be made to stumble is morally noble. ἐν ᾧ: usually προσκόπτειν takes the Dat., ix. 32, 1 Pet. ii. 8. That there were those in the Church at Rome who had scruples as to the use of flesh and wine, see on ver. 2. Paul would not have written the chapter at all unless there had been scruples of some kind; and he would not have taken these examples if the scruples had concerned something quite different.

Ver. 22. The true text is σὺ πίστιν ἣν ἔχεις: "the faith that thou hast, have thou to thyself in the sight of God". The verse is still addressed to the strong. The faith he has is the enlightened faith which enables him to see that all things are clean; such faith does not lose its value though it is not flaunted in reckless action. Ὁν κατὰ σεαυτὸν Wetstein quotes Heliod. vii. 16: κατὰ σεαυτὸν ἔχε καὶ μηδενὶ φράζε. Cf. 1 Cor. xiv. 28 (ἑαυτῷ δὲ λαλείτω καὶ τῷ θεῷ). ἐνώπιον τοῦ Θεοῦ reminds the strong once more (ver. 10) that the fullest freedom must be balanced by the fullest sense of responsibility to God. In another sense than that of 1 Cor. ix. 21 the Christian made free by faith must feel himself μὴ ἄνομος Θεοῦ ἀλλ' ἐννομος Χριστοῦ. μακάριος ὁ μὴ κρίνων ἑαυτὸν ἐν ᾧ δοκιμάζει: "a motive to charitable self-restraint addressed to the strong in faith" (Gifford). It is a rare felicity (this is always what μακάριος denotes) to have a conscience untroubled by scruples—in Paul's words, not to judge oneself in the matter which one approves (sc., by his own practice);

σου προσκόπτει ἢ σκανδαλίζεται ἢ ἀσθενεῖ.<sup>1</sup> 22. σὺ πίστιν<sup>2</sup> ἔχεις ; κατὰ σεαυτὸν ἔχε ἐνώπιον τοῦ Θεοῦ· μακάριος ὁ μὴ κρίνων ἑαυτὸν ἐν ᾧ<sup>3</sup> δοκιμάζει. 23. ὁ δὲ διακρινόμενος, ἐὰν φάγη, κατακέκριται, οἷ τ. Cor. ὅτι οὐκ ἐκ πίστεως· πᾶν δὲ ὁ οὐκ ἐκ πίστεως, ἁμαρτία ἐστίν.<sup>3</sup> <sup>xvi. 3.</sup>

<sup>1</sup> ἡ σκανδαλίζεται ἡ ἀσθενεῖ om.  $\aleph^1$ AC, Syr., Copt., Aeth.; ins.  $\aleph^3$ BDFLP, vulg., Sah. S. and H. call this a very clear instance of a Western reading in B, and therefore justify the omission with W. and H. and Tischdf.; but Weiss, who thinks ἡ ἀσθενεῖ is too difficult to be explained as a gloss, retains the words.

<sup>2</sup> After πίστιν ins. ἡν  $\aleph$ ABC; so most edd., omitting the mark of interrogation after εχεις. For σαυτον read σεαυτον with  $\aleph$ ABCDKLP, etc.

<sup>3</sup> After ἁμαρτία ἐστίν the great doxology of chap. xvi. 25-27 is inserted by ALP and most other MSS., though some, including AP, have it in both places; om. here  $\aleph$ BCD<sup>1</sup>, vulg., Syr.

and he who has this felicity should ask no more. In particular, he should not run the risk of injuring a brother's conscience, merely for the sake of exercising in a special way the spiritual freedom which he has the happiness to possess—whether he exercises it in that way or not.

Ver. 23. ὁ δὲ διακρινόμενος ἐὰν φάγη κατακέκριται: such, on the other hand, is the unhappy situation of the weak—a new motive for charity. For διακριν. cf. iv. 20, Jas. i. 6, Mark xi. 23. The weak Christian cannot be clear in his own mind that it is permissible to do as the strong does; it may be, he thinks one moment, and the next, it may not be; and if he follows the strong and eats in this state of mind, κατακέκριται he is condemned. The condemnation is absolute: it is not only that his own conscience pronounces clearly against him after the act, but that such action incurs the condemnation of God. It is inconsistent with that conscientiousness through which alone man can be trained in goodness; the moral life would become chaotic and irredeemable if conscience were always to be treated so. ὅτι οὐκ ἐκ πίστεως, sc., ἔφαγεν. The man is condemned because he did not eat ἐκ πίστεως: and this is generalised in the last clause πᾶν δὲ ὁ οὐκ ἐκ πίστεως ἁμαρτία ἐστίν. All that is not of faith is sin; and therefore this eating, as not of faith, is sin. It is impossible to give πίστις here a narrower sense than Christianity: see ver. 1. Everything a Christian man does that cannot justify itself to him on the ground of his relation to Christ is sin. It is too indefinite to render *omne quod non est ex fide* as Thomas Aquinas does by *omne quod est contra conscientiam*: it would need to be *contra*

*Christianam conscientiam*. All a man cannot do remembering that he is Christ's—all he cannot do with the judgment-seat (ver. 10) and the Cross (ver. 15) and all their restraints and inspirations present to his mind—is sin. Of course this is addressed to Christians, and there is no rule in it for judging the character or conduct of those who do not know Christ. To argue from it that works done before justification are sin, or that the virtues of the heathen are glittering vices, is to misapply it altogether.

CHAPTER XV.—Vv. 1-13. The fourteenth chapter has a certain completeness in itself, and we can understand that if the Epistle to the Romans was sent as a circular letter to different churches, some copies of it might have ended with xiv. 23: to which the doxology, xvi. 25-27, might be loosely appended, as it is in A. L. and many other MSS. But it is manifestly the same subject which is continued in xv. 1-13. The Apostle still treats of the relations of the weak and the strong, though with a less precise reference to the problems of the Roman Church at the time than in chap. xiv. His argument widens into a plea for patience and forbearance (enforced by the example of Christ) and for the union of all Christians, Jew and Gentile, in common praise. It seems natural to infer from this that the distinction between weak and strong had some relation to that between Jew and Gentile; the prejudices and scruples of the weak were probably of Jewish origin.

Ver. 1. ὀφείλομεν δὲ: what constitutes the obligation is seen in chap. xiv. It arises out of our relation to others in Christ. Looking at them in the light of what He has done for them as well as for us, and in the light of our responsibility

a Acts xiv. 8. XV. 1. Ὁφείλομεν δὲ ἡμεῖς οἱ δυνατοὶ τὰ ἀσθενήματα τῶν ἄδυνάτων βαστάζειν, καὶ μὴ ἑαυτοῖς ἀρέσκειν · 2. ἕκαστος γὰρ ἡμῶν τῷ πλησίον ἀρεσκέτω εἰς τὸ ἀγαθὸν πρὸς οἰκοδομήν. 3. καὶ γὰρ ὁ Χριστὸς οὐχ ἑαυτῷ ἤρρεσεν, ἀλλὰ, καθὼς γέγραπται, “Οἱ ὀνειδισμοὶ τῶν ὀνειδιζόντων σε ἐπέπεσον ἐπ’ ἐμέ”. 4. ὅσα γὰρ προεγράφη,<sup>2</sup> εἰς τὴν ἡμετέραν διδασκαλίαν προεγράφη · ἵνα διὰ τῆς ὑπομονῆς καὶ

<sup>1</sup> Om. γαρ with  $\Sigma$  ABCDFLP.

<sup>2</sup> ὅσα γὰρ προεγραφή  $\Sigma$  AC<sup>δ</sup> LP; so most edd. B, latt., Aeth. give εγραφή. D<sup>1</sup> and F have προσεγραφή, which confirms the reading of  $\Sigma$  AC. προεγραφή ια  $\Sigma$  ALP; but εγραφή  $\Sigma$  B C D F, vulg. and all edd. After καὶ ins. δια  $\Sigma$  ABCL. After εχωμεν B adds της παρακλησεως, which W. and H. put in marg.; but the addition is as inept as that of λογων in the same MS. at ver. 18, and to be explained in the same way (an anticipation of a later word).

to the Judge of all, we cannot question that this is our duty. ἡμεῖς οἱ δυνατοί: Paul classes himself with the strong, and makes the obligation his own. δυνατοί is of course used as in chap. xiv.: not as in 1 Cor. i. 26. τὰ ἀσθενήματα τῶν ἀδυνάτων: the things in which their infirmity comes out, its manifestations: here only in N.T. Paul says “bear” their infirmities: because the restrictions and limitations laid by this charity on the liberty of the strong are a burden to them. For the word βαστάζειν and the idea see Matt. viii. 17, Gal. vi. 2, 5, 17. μὴ ἑαυτοῖς ἀρέσκειν: it is very easy for self-pleasing and mere wilfulness to shelter themselves under the disguise of Christian principle. But there is only one Christian principle which has no qualification—love.

Ver. 2. τῷ πλησίον ἀρεσκέτω: this rule is qualified by εἰς τὸ ἀγαθὸν πρὸς οἰκοδομήν. Without such qualification it is “men-pleasing” (Gal. i. 10) and inconsistent with fidelity to Christ. Cf. 1 Cor. x. 33, where Paul presents himself as an example of the conduct he here commends. For εἰς and πρὸς in this verse cf. chap. iii. 25 f. According to Gifford εἰς marks the “aim”—the advantage or benefit of our neighbour—and πρὸς the standard of reference; the only “good” for a Christian is to be “built up” in his Christian character.

Ver. 3. καὶ γὰρ ὁ Χριστὸς κ.τ.λ. The duty of not pleasing ourselves is enforced by the example of Christ: He did not please Himself either. If this required proof, we might have expected Paul to prove it by adducing some incident in Christ’s life; but this is not what he does. He appeals to a psalm, which is in many places in the N.T. treated as having some reference to Christ (e.g.,

John ii. 17 = Ps. lxix. 9, John xv. 25 = Ps. lxix. 4, Matt. xxvii. 27-30 = Ps. lxix. 12, Matt. xxvii. 34 = Ps. lxix. 21, Rom. xi. 9 = Ps. lxix. 22, Acts i. 20 = Ps. lxix. 25; see Perowne, *The Psalms*, i., p. 561 f.); and the words he quotes from it—words spoken as it were by Christ Himself—describe our Lord’s experiences in a way which shows that He was no self-pleaser. If He had been, He would never have given Himself up willingly, as He did, to such a fate. It is hardly conceivable that σε in Paul’s quotation indicates the man whom Christ is supposed to address: it can quite well be God, as in the psalm. Some have argued from this indirect proof of Christ’s character that Paul had no acquaintance with the facts of His life; but the inference is unsound. It would condemn all the N.T. writers of the same ignorance, for they never appeal to incidents in Christ’s life; and this summary of the whole character of Christ, possessing as it did for Paul and his readers the authority of inspiration, was more impressive than any isolated example of non-self-pleasing could have been.

Ver. 4. Here Paul justifies his use of the O.T. ὅσα γὰρ προεγράφη = the whole O.T. εἰς τὴν ἡμετέραν διδασκαλίαν ἐγράφη: was written to teach us, and therefore has abiding value. 2 Tim. iii. 16. ἵνα introduces God’s purpose, which is wider than the immediate purpose of the Apostle. Paul meant to speak only of bearing the infirmities of the weak, but with the quotation of Ps. lxix. 9 there came in the idea of the Christian’s sufferings generally, and it is amid them that God’s purpose is to be fulfilled. διὰ τῆς ὑπομ. κ. τῆς παρακλ. τῶν γραφῶν κ.τ.λ.: “that through the patience and the comfort wrought by the

τῆς παρακλήσεως τῶν γραφῶν τὴν ἐλπίδα ἔχωμεν. 5. ὁ δὲ Θεὸς τῆς ὑπομονῆς καὶ τῆς <sup>b</sup> παρακλήσεως δόξῃ ὑμῖν τὸ αὐτὸ φρονεῖν ἐν <sup>b</sup> 2 Cor. i. 3-7; Heb. vi. 18; xii. 5. ἀλλήλοις κατὰ Χριστὸν Ἰησοῦν· 6. ἵνα ὁμοθυμαδὸν ἐν ἐνὶ στόματι δοξάζητε τὸν Θεὸν καὶ πατέρα τοῦ Κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ. <sup>c</sup> Ch. xiv. 1. <sup>d</sup> Gal. ii. 17. 7. Διὸ <sup>e</sup> προσλαμβάνεσθε ἀλλήλους, καθὼς καὶ ὁ Χριστὸς προσελάβετο ἡμᾶς <sup>1</sup> εἰς δόξαν Θεοῦ. 8. λέγω δὲ, Ἰησοῦν Χριστὸν <sup>2</sup> <sup>d</sup> διάκονον <sup>e</sup> Ch. i. 5; Phil. ii. 13. γεγενῆσθαι περιτομῆς <sup>e</sup> ὑπὲρ ἀληθείας Θεοῦ, εἰς τὸ βεβαιῶσαι τὰς

<sup>1</sup> ημας, so BDP cursives; adopted by Weiss, W. and H. text. But ημας is put in marg. by W. and H., and by many edd. in text. It really seems to have arisen from ημας being changed to agree with the preceding context in which the readers are directly addressed. Yet it is strongly supported by  $\aleph$ ACD<sup>2</sup>3<sup>4</sup>FL. Ins. του before θεου  $\aleph$ ABCD<sup>2</sup>FP.

<sup>2</sup> For δε Ἰησοῦν Χριστὸν read γαρ Χριστὸν with  $\aleph$ ABC and all edd. γεγενῆσθαι  $\aleph$ AELP; γενεσθαι BCDF. The edd. are divided. Tischdf., W. and H., and Treg. marg. read γεγενῆσθαι; but W. and H. put γενεσθαι in marg., while Lachm. and Treg. have it in text. Weiss thinks the case can only be settled by analogy; and as  $\aleph$ , which is the strongest support of γεγενῆσθαι, quite arbitrarily changes γενεσθαι in Phil. i. 13 into γεγονεσθαι, he allows that to discredit it here, and reads γενεσθαι.

Scriptures we may have our hope". τὴν ἐλπίδα is the Christian hope, the hope of the glory of God; and the Christian has it as he is able, through the help of God's Word in the Scriptures, to maintain a brave and cheerful spirit amid all the sufferings and reproaches of life. Cf. v. 2-5. This is, if not a digression, at least an expansion of his original idea, and at

Ver. 5 Paul returns to his point in a prayer: the God of the patience and comfort just spoken of grant unto you, etc. τὸ αὐτὸ φρονεῖν ἐν ἀλλήλοις κατὰ Χριστὸν Ἰησοῦν: cf. xii. 16, where, however, τὸ αὐτὸ φρονεῖν with εἰς ἀλλήλους is not quite the same. Paul wishes here that the minds of his readers—their moral judgment and temper—may all be determined by Jesus Christ (for κατὰ, expressing the rule according to which, see chap. viii. 27): in this case there will be the harmony which the disputes of chap. xiv. disturbed.

Ver. 6. ἵνα introduces the ultimate aim of this unanimity. ὁμοθυμαδὸν here only in Paul, but eleven times in Acts. ἐν ἐνὶ στόματι: in Greek writers usually ἐξ ἑνὸς στόματος. τὸν θεὸν καὶ πατέρα τοῦ Κ. ἡμῶν Ἰ. Χ. The A.V. renders, "God, even the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ," making τοῦ Κυρίου depend on πατέρα only. This rendering does not make God the God of Christ, but defines the only true God as the Father of Christ. It is defended by Weiss, who appeals to the passages in which "God and Father" is found with

no genitive: 1 Cor. xv. 24, Eph. v. 20, Col. iii. 17, Jas. i. 27, iii. 9. The argument is not convincing, especially in view of Eph. i. 17 (ὁ θεὸς τοῦ Κ. ἡμῶν Ἰ. Χ., ὁ πατὴρ τῆς δόξης) and John xx. 17: hence the R.V. is probably right ("the God and Father of our Lord"). When the Church glorifies such a God with one heart and one mouth it will have transcended all the troubles of chap. xiv. It is this accordant praise of all Christians which is the ruling idea in vers. 7-13.

Ver. 7. διὸ προσλαμβάνεσθε ἀλλήλους: διὸ = that such praise may be possible. For προσλαμβ. see xiv. 1-3. καθὼς καὶ ὁ Χριστὸς προσελάβετο ὑμᾶς. ὑμᾶς covers both parties in the Church, however they are to be distinguished; if Christ received both, they are bound to receive each other. The last words, εἰς δόξαν τοῦ θεοῦ, are probably to be construed with προσλαμβάνεσθε ἀλλήλους; they resume the idea of ver. 6 (ἵνα . . . δοξάζητε); the διὸ with which ver. 7 begins starts from that idea of glorifying God, and looks on to it as the end to be attained when all Christians in love receive each other. But the clause has of course a meaning even if attached to what immediately precedes: ὁ Χριστὸς προσελ. ὑμᾶς. Cf. Phil. ii. 11, Eph. i. 12-14. Christ's reception of the Jews led to God's being glorified for His faithfulness; His reception of the Gentiles to God's being glorified for His mercy. So Weiss, who argues that in what follows we have the expansion and proof of the

ἐπαγγελίας τῶν πατέρων · 9. τὰ δὲ ἔθνη ὑπὲρ ἐλέους δοξάσαι τὸν Θεὸν, καθὼς γέγραπται, “ Διὰ τοῦτο ἔξομολογήσομαι σοι ἐν ἔθνεσι, καὶ τῷ ὀνόματί σου ψαλῶ ”. 10. καὶ πάλιν λέγει, “ Εὐφράνθητε, ἔθνη, μετὰ τοῦ λαοῦ αὐτοῦ ”. 11. καὶ πάλιν, “ Αἰνεῖτε τὸν Κύριον, πάντα τὰ ἔθνη,<sup>1</sup> καὶ ἐπαινέσατε αὐτὸν, πάντες οἱ λαοί ”. 12. καὶ πάλιν Ἡσαΐας λέγει, “ Ἔσται ἡ ρίζα τοῦ Ἰεσσαὶ, καὶ ὁ ἀνιστάμενος ἄρχων ἐθνῶν, ἐπ’ αὐτῷ ἔθνη ἐλπιούσιν ”. 13. ὁ δὲ Θεὸς τῆς ἐλπίδος πληρῶσαι ὑμᾶς πάσης χαρᾶς καὶ εἰρήνης<sup>2</sup> ἐν τῷ πιστεῦναι, εἰς τὸ περισσεῦναι ὑμᾶς ἐν τῇ ἐλπίδι, ἐν δυνάμει Πνεύματος Ἁγίου.

<sup>1</sup> For τὸν κυριον παντα τα εθνη (so LXX), read παντα τα εθνη τον Κυριον  $\aleph$ ABDP and all edd. For ἐπαινέσατε (so LXX, B) FLP read ἐπαινέσατωσαν (LXX, A)  $\aleph$ ABCD.

<sup>2</sup> Against all edd., who keep the received text, Weiss finds himself compelled, instead of πληρῶσαι ὑμᾶς πάσης χαρᾶς καὶ εἰρήνης, to read πληροφορησάι ὑμᾶς ἐν πάσῃ χαρᾷ κ. εἰρήνῃ. This is the reading of B, and is found with only the omission of ἐν in F G; Weiss thinks it quite inexplicable except as the original; πληροφορ. has a point of attachment in xiv. 5, and the double ἐν (ἐν πάσῃ χαρᾷ . . . ἐν τῷ πιστεῦναι) in this clause answers exactly to that in the next (ἐν τῇ ἐλπίδι, ἐν δυνάμει πν. ἁγίου). The other reading is supported by  $\aleph$ ACDLP.

idea that God's glory (the glory of His faithfulness and of His mercy) is the end contemplated by Christ's reception alike of Jew and Gentile.

Ver. 8. λέγω γὰρ Χριστὸν διάκονον γεγενῆσθαι περιτομῆς = what I mean is this—Christ has been made, etc. διάκονον περιτομῆς is usually understood as “a minister to the Jews, to circumcised people” (cf. iii. 30, iv. 9), and this seems to me the only intelligible explanation. In exercising this ministry (and He exercised directly no other: Matt. xv. 24) Christ was of course circumcised Himself and set from His birth (Gal. iv. 4 f.) in the same relation to the law as all who belonged to the old covenant; but though this is involved in the fact that Christ was sent to the Jews, it is not what is meant by calling Him διάκονον περιτομῆς. ὑπὲρ ἀληθείας θεοῦ: in the interest of God's truth (cf. i. 5: ὑπὲρ τοῦ ὀνόματος αὐτοῦ). The truth of God, as the giver of the promises to the fathers, was vindicated by Christ's ministry; for in Him they were all fulfilled, 2 Cor. i. 20. τὰς ἐπαγγ. τῶν πατέρων: the promises belonged to the fathers, because they were originally made to them.

Ver. 9. τὰ δὲ ἔθνη ὑπὲρ ἐλέους δοξάσαι τὸν θεόν: Some expositors make this depend directly on λέγω, as if Paul had meant: “I say Christ has become a minister of circumcision, in the interest of the truth of God . . . and that the Gentiles have glorified God for His

mercy,” the only contrast being that between God's *faithfulness*, as shown to the descendants of Abraham, and His *mercy* as shown to those without the old covenant. But if τὰ δὲ ἔθνη κ.τ.λ. is made to depend on εἰς τὸ, as in the A.V., there is a double contrast brought out: that of *faithfulness* and *mercy* being no more emphatic than that of the *fathers* and the *Gentiles*. Indeed, from the passages quoted, it is clear that Paul is preoccupied rather with the latter of these two contrasts than with the former; for all the passages concern the place of the Gentiles in the Church. At the same time it is made clear—even to the Gentiles—that the salvation which they enjoy is “of the Jews”. Hence the Gentiles must not be contemptuous of scruples or infirmities, especially such as rise out of any associations with the old covenant; nor should the Jews be censorious of a Gentile liberty which has its vindication in the free grace of God. καθὼς γέγραπται: the contemplated glorification of God answers to what we find in Ps. xviii. 50, LXX. Christ is assumed to be the speaker, and we may say that He gives thanks to God among the Gentiles when the Gentiles give thanks to God through Him (Heb. ii. 12).

Ver. 10. καὶ πάλιν λέγει: Deut. xxxii. 43, LXX. The Hebrew is different.

Ver. 11. καὶ πάλιν, αἰνεῖτε: Ps. cxvii. 1, LXX—only the order of the words varying.

Ver. 12. καὶ πάλιν Ἡσαΐας λέγει: Isa.

14. Πέπεισμαι δέ, ἀδελφοί μου, καὶ αὐτὸς ἐγὼ περὶ ὑμῶν, ὅτι <sup>Ch. i. 29;</sup> καὶ αὐτοὶ <sup>Mat.</sup> μεστοὶ ἐστε ἀγαθωσύνης, πεπληρωμένοι πάσης <sup>xxiii. 28.</sup> <sup>1</sup> γνῶσεως, <sup>h</sup> <sup>Ver. 24;</sup> <sup>Ch. xi.</sup> <sup>25;</sup> <sup>2 Cor.</sup> <sup>i. 14;</sup> <sup>ii. 5.</sup> <sup>2</sup> δυνάμενοι καὶ ἀλλήλους ρουθετεῖν. 15. <sup>2</sup> τολμηρότερον <sup>2</sup> δὲ ἔγραψα ὑμῖν, ἀδελφοί, ἀπὸ <sup>h</sup> <sup>2</sup> μέρους, ὡς ἐπαναμνήσκων ὑμᾶς, διὰ τὴν χάριν

<sup>1</sup> After **πάσης** ins. **της** **NSBP**, Clem.; om. **ACDFL**.

<sup>2</sup> **τολμηρότερον** **NSCDFLP**; **τολμηρότερος** **AB**. The latter is read by Weiss, W. and H., and Treg. A similar change (from **σπουδαιότερος** into **σπουδαιότερον**) is made by DFG in Phil. ii. 28. **ἀδελφοί** om. **NSABC**. **υπο του θεου** **ACDLP**; **απο του θεου** **NSBF** and most edd.

xi. 10. Paul again follows the LXX, only omitting ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ ἐκείνῃ after ἔσται. The words are meant to describe the Messianic kingdom and its Davidic head. It is a universal kingdom, and the nations set their hope in its King, and therefore in the God of salvation whose representative He is. Such a hope in God, the Apostle's argument implies, will result in the praise which glorifies Him for His mercy (ver. 9).

Ver. 13. Prompted by ἐλπιούσιν, the Apostle closes this section, and the body of the epistle, by calling on "the God of hope" to bless those to whom it is addressed. For the expression ὁ θεὸς τῆς ἐλπίδος cf. ver. 5: it means the God Who gives us the hope which we have in Christ. The joy and peace which He imparts rest on faith (ἐν τῷ πιστεύειν). Hence they are the joy and peace specially flowing from justification and acceptance with God, and the more we have of these, the more we abound in the Christian hope itself. Such an abounding in hope, in the power of the Holy Ghost (Acts i. 8, Luke iv. 14), is the end contemplated in Paul's prayer that the God of hope would fill the Romans with all joy and peace in believing. For the kind of supremacy thus given to hope compare the connection of ver. 5 with ver. 2 in chap. v.

The rest of this chapter is of the nature of an epilogue. It falls into two parts: (1) vers. 14-21, in which Paul, while apologising for the tone which he has occasionally employed, justifies himself for writing to the Romans by appealing to his vocation as an Apostle; and (2) vers. 22, 33, in which he explains to them the programme of his future work, including his long-deferred visit to them, and begs their prayers for a successful issue to his visit to Jerusalem.

Ver. 14. **πέπεισμαι δέ**: the tone in which he has written, especially in chap. xiv., might suggest that he thought them very defective either in intelligence,

or love, or both; but he disclaims any such inference from his words. **ἀδελφοί μου** has a friendly emphasis: cf. vii. 4. **καὶ αὐτὸς ἐγὼ** cf. vii. 25: it means "even I myself, who have taken it upon me to address you so plainly". **ὅτι καὶ αὐτοὶ μεστοὶ ἐστε ἀγαθωσύνης**: that even of yourselves ye are full of goodness, i.e., without any help from me. **ἀγαθωσύνη** in all N.T. passages (Gal. v. 22, Eph. v. 9, 2 Thess. i. 11) seems to have an association with **ἀγαθός** in the sense of "kind": the goodness of which Paul speaks here is probably therefore not virtue in general, but the charity on which such stress is laid in chap. xiv. as the only rule of Christian conduct. **πεπληρωμένοι πάσης γνῶσεως**: filled full of all knowledge—"our Christian knowledge in its entirety" (Sanday and Headlam). This, again, may refer to the comprehension of Christianity shown by the strong of chap. xiv.: or it may be intended to apologise for the unusually doctrinal character of the epistle. Both **μεστοὶ** and **πεπληρωμένοι** occur also in i. 29. **δυνάμενοι κ. ἀλλήλους ρουθετεῖν**: in a sense therefore self-sufficient.

Ver. 15 f. **τολμηρότερος . . . ἀπὸ μέρους**: the description does not apply to the letter as a whole, but only to parts of it: Gifford refers to vi. 12-21, xi. 17 ff., xii. 3, and especially chap. xiv. throughout. **ὡς ἐπαναμνήσκων ὑμᾶς**: here only in N.T. There is the same courteous tone as in i. 11 f. He does not presume to teach them what they do not know, but only to suggest to their memory what they must know already but may be overlooking. **διὰ τὴν χάριν τὴν δοθεῖσάν μοι**: this is the real justification of his writing. As in i. 5, xii. 3, the **χάριν** is that of Apostleship. It is not wantonly, but in the exercise of a Divine vocation, and a divinely-bestowed competence for it, that he writes. **εἰς τὸ εἶναι με λειτουργὸν Χριστοῦ Ἰησοῦ εἰς τὰ ἔθνη**: there is a certain emphasis on

τὴν δοθεῖσάν μοι ὑπὸ τοῦ Θεοῦ, 16. εἰς τὸ εἶναι με λειτουργὸν Ἰησοῦ  
 i Here only. Ἰησοῦ εἰς τὰ ἔθνη, ἱερουργούντα τὸ εὐαγγέλιον τοῦ Θεοῦ, ἵνα γένηται.<sup>1</sup>  
 On the  
 verse cf.  
 Phil. ii.  
 ἡ προσφορά τῶν ἔθνῶν εὐπρόσδεκτος, ἡγιασμένη ἐν Πνεύματι Ἁγίῳ.  
 17.  
 k Ch. v. 7; 17. ἔχω οὖν<sup>2</sup> καύχησιν ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ τὰ πρὸς Θεόν· 18. οὐ γὰρ  
 2 Cor. x.  
 12; xi. 21. k τολμήσω<sup>3</sup> λαλεῖν τι ὧν οὐ κατειργάσατο Χριστὸς δι' ἐμοῦ, εἰς ὑπακοήν

<sup>1</sup> For γένηται Weiss, against all edd., reads γενηθη with B. The change of this into the commoner form γένηται is an emendation current in all the groups into which the MSS. can be classified.

<sup>2</sup> After οὖν ins. τὴν BCDF; om. ΞALP; W. and H. bracket. For πρὸς θεόν read πρὸς τον θεον with ΞABCDFL and all edd.

<sup>3</sup> For τολμήσω B has τολμω, which W. and H. put in margin. The fut. is retained by most edd. with ΞACDFGLP. For λαλεῖν τι read τι λαλεῖν with ΞABCDF.

εἰς τὰ ἔθνη, and the whole sentence would be inept, as a justification of Paul for writing to Rome, unless the Roman Church had been essentially Gentile. For λειτουργὸν see note on xiii. 6. The word here derives from the context the priestly associations which often attach to it in the LXX. But obviously it has no bearing on the question as to the "sacerdotal" character of the Christian ministry. The offering which Paul conceives himself as presenting to God is the Gentile Church, and the priestly function in the exercise of which this offering is made is the preaching of the Gospel. Paul describes himself as ἱερουργούντα τὸ εὐαγγέλιον τοῦ Θεοῦ *sacerdotis modo evangelium administrantem*. Fritzsche (on whose note all later expositors depend) explains the *sacerdotis modo* by *accurate et religiose*; just as a Levitical offering was not acceptable to God unless the prescribed ceremonial was precisely observed, so the offering of the Gentiles at God's altar would be unacceptable unless Paul showed a priestlike fidelity in his ministry of the Gospel. But this is to wring from a word what an intelligent appreciation of the sentence as a whole, and especially of its pictorial character, refuses to yield: the clause ἵνα γένηται . . . εὐπρόσδεκτος depends not on ἱερουργούντα, but on the whole conception of Paul's ministry, *i.e.*, on εἰς τὸ εἶναι με λειτουργὸν κ.τ.λ. For ἡ προσφορά τῶν ἔθνῶν, genitive of object, *cf.* Heb. x. 10. This great offering is acceptable to God (1 Pet. ii. 5) because it is ἡγιασμένη consecrated to Him ἐν πνεύματι ἁγίῳ. Those who believed in the Lord Jesus Christ, as the result of Paul's sacred ministry of the Gospel, received the Holy Spirit: this (as distinct from the ceremonial "without spot or blemish")

was the ground of their acceptance (*cf.* xii. 1 f.).

Ver. 17. ἔχω οὖν καύχησιν: I have therefore ground of boasting. In spite of the apologetic tone of ver. 14 f. Paul is not without confidence in writing to the Romans. But there is no personal assumption in this; for he has it only in Christ Jesus, and only τὰ πρὸς τὸν θεόν in his relations to God. *Cf.* Heb. ii. 17, v. 1.

Ver. 18 f. All other boasting he declines. οὐ γὰρ τολμήσω τι λαλεῖν ὧν οὐ κατειργάσατο δι' ἐμοῦ ὁ Χ.: in effect this means, I will not presume to speak of anything except what Christ wrought through me. This is the explanation of ἔχω οὖν καύχησιν ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ. The things which Christ did work through Paul He wrought εἰς ὑπακοήν ἔθνῶν with a view to obedience on the part of the Gentiles: *cf.* i. 5. This combination—Christ working in Paul, to make the Gentiles obedient to the Gospel—is the vindication of Paul's action in writing to Rome. It is not on his own impulse, but in Christ that he does it; and the Romans as Gentiles lie within the sphere in which Christ works through him. λόγῳ καὶ ἔργῳ: λόγος refers to the preaching, ἔργον to all he had been enabled to do or suffer in his calling. 2 Cor. x. 11, Acts vii. 22, Lc. xxiv. 19. ἐν δυνάμει σημείων καὶ τεράτων. σημεῖον and τέρας are the words generally employed in the N.T. to designate what we call miracle: often, too, δύναμεις is used as synonymous (Mark vi. 2). All three are again applied to Paul's miracles in 2 Cor. xii. 12, and to similar works in the Apostolic age of the Church in Heb. ii. 4: all three are also found in 2 Thess. ii. 9, where they are ascribed to the Man of Sin, whose Parousia in this as in other respects is



ἐθῶν, λόγῳ καὶ ἔργῳ, 19. ἐν δυνάμει σημείων καὶ τεράτων, ἐν δυνάμει Πνεύματος Θεοῦ.<sup>1</sup> ὥστε με ἀπὸ Ἱερουσαλήμ καὶ κύκλῳ μέχρι τοῦ Ἰλλυρικοῦ πεπληρωκέναι τὸ εὐαγγέλιον τοῦ Χριστοῦ. 20. οὕτω δὲ φιλοτιμούμενον<sup>2</sup> εὐαγγελίζεσθαι, οὐχ ὅπου ὠνομάσθη Χριστὸς, ἵνα μὴ ἐπ' ἄλλότριον θεμέλιον οἰκοδομῶ. 21. ἀλλὰ, καθὼς γέγραπται, "Οἷς οὐκ ἀνηγγέλη περὶ αὐτοῦ, ὄφονται.<sup>3</sup> καὶ οἱ οὐκ ἀκηκόασι, συνήσουσι".

<sup>1</sup> Θεου ΞD<sup>2</sup>LP; αἰου ACD<sup>1-3</sup>; om. B. B certainly seems right here, though W. and H. put [αἰου] in text. Both θεου and αἰου seem interpolations to complete the expression.

<sup>2</sup> φιλοτιμούμενον ΞACD<sup>2-3</sup>L, Orig.; φιλοτινομαι BD<sup>1</sup> (gr.) FP. Edd. seem to regard the latter as a change made to simplify the construction, and the case is one of those in which the value of B may be lessened by Western influence; hence they prefer, as a rule, the former reading. But Weiss reads φιλοτινομαι because it is exegetically necessary, and says he is not aware of any such arbitrary change of a participle into a finite verb.

<sup>3</sup> ὄφονται before οἷς B; and so W. and H. and Weiss. The order in received text conforms to the LXX and the next clause.

regarded as counterfeiting that of Christ. *τέρας* is always rendered "wonder" in the A.V., and, as though the word were unequal to the phenomenon, it is never used alone: in all the places in which it occurs *σημεῖον* is also found. The latter emphasises the significance of the miracle; it is not merely a sight to stare at, but is suggestive of an actor and a purpose. In this passage, "the power" of signs and wonders seems to mean the power with which they impressed the beholders: more or less it is an interpretation of *ἔργῳ*. So "the power" of the Holy Ghost means the influence with which the Holy Spirit accompanied the preaching of the Gospel: more or less it answers to *λόγῳ*: see 1 Thess. i. 5 and cf. the ἀπόδειξις πνεύματος κ. δυνάμεως, 1 Cor. ii. 4. ὥστε με κ.τ.λ. "The result of Christ's working through His Apostle is here stated as if the preceding sentence had been affirmative in form as well as sense" (Gifford). ἀπὸ Ἱερουσαλήμ: this agrees with Acts ix. 26-29, but this, of course, does not prove that it was borrowed from that passage. Even if Paul began his ministry at Damascus, he might quite well speak as he does here, for it is not its chronology, but its range, he is describing; and to his mind Jerusalem (to which, if let alone, he would have devoted himself, see Acts xxii. 18-22) was its point of departure. καὶ κύκλῳ: most modern commentators have rendered this as if it were τοῦ κύκλῳ—from Jerusalem and its vicinity, by which they mean Syria (though some would include Arabia, Gal. i. 17): for this use of κύκλῳ see Gen. xxxv. 5, Judith i. 2.

But most Greek commentators render as in the A.V.—"and round about unto Illyricum". This is the interpretation taken by Hofmann and by S. and H., and is illustrated by Xen., *Anab.*, vii., i., 14 (quoted by the latter): *πότερα διὰ τοῦ ἱεροῦ ὄρους δέοι πορεύεσθαι, ἢ κύκλῳ διὰ μέσης τῆς Θράκης. μέχρι τοῦ Ἰλλυρικοῦ* can (so far as *μέχρι* is concerned) either exclude or include Illyricum. Part of the country so called may have been traversed by Paul in the journey alluded to in Acts xx. 1 f. (*διελθὼν δὲ τὰ μέρη ἐκεῖνα*), but the language would be satisfied if he had come in sight of Illyricum as he would do in his westward journey through Macedonia. *πεπληρωκέναι τὸ εὐαγγ. τοῦ Χριστοῦ*: have fulfilled (fully preached) the Gospel of Christ. Cf. Col. i. 25. Paul had done this in the sense in which it was required of an Apostle, whose vocation (to judge from Paul's practice) was to lay the foundation of a church in the chief centres of population, and as soon as the new community was capable of self-propagation, to move on.

Ver. 20. οὕτω δὲ φιλοτιμούμενον (1 Thess. iv. 11, 2 Cor. v. 9): making it my ambition, however, thus to preach the Gospel, etc. This limits *πεπληρωκέναι*: he had never sought to preach where Christianity was already established. A point of honour, but not rivalry, is involved in *φιλοτιμούμενον*. *ὠνομάσθη*: cf. 2 Tim. ii. 19 and Isa. xxvi. 13, Amos vi. 10. To name the name of the Lord is to confess Him to be what He is to the faith of His people. ἵνα μὴ ἐπ' ἄλλότριον θεμέλιον κ.τ.λ. The duty of an

22. Διὸ καὶ ἐνεκοπτόμην τὰ πολλὰ <sup>1</sup> τοῦ ἔλθειν πρὸς ὑμᾶς, 23. νυνὶ δὲ μηκέτι τόποι ἔχων ἐν τοῖς κλίμασι τούτοις, ἐπιποθίαν δὲ ἔχων τοῦ <sup>m</sup> Luke viii. ἐλθεῖν πρὸς ὑμᾶς <sup>m</sup> ἀπὸ πολλῶν <sup>2</sup> ἐτῶν, 24. ὡς εἶν <sup>8</sup> πορεύομαι εἰς τὴν <sup>43</sup> Σπανίαν, ἐλεύσομαι πρὸς ὑμᾶς· ἐλπίζω γὰρ διαπορευόμενος θεάσασθαι ὑμᾶς, καὶ ὑφ' ὑμῶν προπεμφθῆναι ἐκεῖ, εἰς ὑμῶν πρῶτον ἀπὸ <sup>n</sup> Ver. 15. <sup>o</sup> Luke i. 53; <sup>n</sup> vi. 25. μέρους <sup>o</sup> ἐμπλησθῶ. 25. Νυνὶ δὲ πορεύομαι εἰς Ἱερουσαλήμ, διακονῶν

<sup>1</sup> τα πολλὰ **NA**CLP; πολλakis BDF.

<sup>2</sup> For πολλων **NA**DFL read ικανων with ECP, Weiss, W. and H., Alford.

<sup>3</sup> For ως εαν read ως αν with **NA**BC. Om. ελευσομαι προς υμας **NA**BCDF and all edd.

Apostle was with the foundation, not the superstructure. 1 Cor. iii. 10. The same confidence in his vocation, and the same pride in limiting that confidence, and not boasting of what Christ had done through others, or intruding his operations into their sphere, pervades the tenth chapter of 2 Cor.

Ver. 21. ἀλλὰ καθὼς γέγραπται: Paul's actual procedure corresponded with, and indeed led to the fulfilment of, a famous O.T. prophecy. Isa. lii. 11 exactly as in LXX. It is absurd to argue with Fritzsche that Paul found a prediction of his own personal ministry (and of the principles on which he discharged it), in Isaiah, and equally beside the mark to argue that his use of the passage is "quite in accordance with the spirit of the original". The LXX is quite different from the Hebrew, and Paul quotes it because he liked to be able to express his own opinion or practice in Scripture language. It seemed to him to get a Divine confirmation in this way; but an examination of various passages shows that he cared very little for the original meaning or application.

Vv. 22-33. The Apostle's programme. He is at present on his way to Jerusalem with the gifts which his Gentile churches have made for the relief of the poor Christians there. The issue of this visit is dubious, and he begs their prayers for its success. After it is over, he means to proceed to Spain, and on the way he hopes to pay his long deferred visit to Rome.

Ver. 22. διὸ καὶ ἐνεκοπτόμην: the work which detained the Apostle in the East also hindered him from visiting Rome. For another ἐγκόπτειν see 1 Thess. ii. 18. τὰ πολλὰ is more than πολλάκις in i. 13: it is distinguished in Greek writers both from ἐπίστε (sometimes) and ἀεί (always) and is rightly rendered in Vulg. *plerumque*. As a rule,

it was his work which kept Paul from visiting Rome, but he may have had the desire to do so (*e.g.*, when he was in Corinth) and have been prevented by some other cause. The rendering of R.V. "these many times" (apparently, all the definite times included in πολλάκις i. 13) is unsupported by examples.

Ver. 23. νυνὶ δὲ: but now — the sentence thus begun is interrupted by ἐλπίζω γὰρ and never finished, for the words ἐλεύσομαι πρὸς ὑμᾶς in T.R. are an interpolation. μηκέτι τόποι ἔχων: not that every soul was converted, but that the Apostolic function of laying foundations had been sufficiently discharged over the area in question. κλίμα is only found in the plural in N.T. 2 Cor. xi. 10, Gal. i. 21. ἐπιποθίαν: here only in N.T. ἀπὸ ικανῶν ἐτῶν: the desire dated "from a good many years back". Cf. ἀπὸ κτίσεως κόσμου, i. 20, Acts xv. 7.

Ver. 24. ὡς εἶν πορεύομαι εἰς τὴν Σπανίαν: it is here the apodosis begins, which being broken in on by ἐλπίζω is never formally resumed, though the sense is taken up again in ver. 28 f. ὡς εἶν is temporal = *simulacque*: cf. 1 Cor. xi. 34, Phil. ii. 23; Buttmann, p. 232. The principle which Paul has just laid down as regulating his Apostolic work (ver. 20) forbids him to think of Rome as a proper sphere for it; great as is his interest in the capital of the world, he can only pay it a passing visit on the way to another field. ὑφ' ὑμῶν προπεμφθῆναι ἐκεῖ: it has been said that Paul expected or claimed "*quasi pro jure suo*" to be escorted all the way to Spain (by sea) by members of the Roman Church; but this is not included in προπεμφθῆναι. Practical illustrations are seen in Acts xx. 35, xxi. 5: similar anticipations in 1 Cor. xvi. 6, 11. For πρῶτον see Mt. vii. 5, viii. 21. ἀπὸ μέρους indicates that no such stay would be equal to the Apostle's longing

τοῖς ἁγίοις. 26. εὐδόκησαν γὰρ Μακεδονία καὶ Ἀχαΐα ἢ κοινωνίαν ῥ Heb. xiii. τινὰ ποιήσασθαι εἰς τοὺς πτωχοὺς τῶν ἁγίων τῶν ἐν Ἱερουσαλήμ. <sup>16</sup>  
 27. εὐδόκησαν γὰρ, καὶ ὀφείλεται αὐτῶν εἶσιν. εἰ γὰρ τοῖς πνευματικοῖς αὐτῶν ἐκοινωνήσαν τὰ ἔθνη, ὀφείλουσι καὶ ἐν τοῖς σαρκικοῖς  
 "λειτουργῆσαι αὐτοῖς. 28. τοῦτο οὖν ἐπιτελέσας, καὶ σφραγισάμενος ῥ 2 Cor. ix. αὐτοῖς τὸν καρπὸν τοῦτον, ἀπελεύσομαι δι' ὑμῶν εἰς τὴν Σπανίαν. <sup>12</sup>

for fellowship with the Romans, but it would be at least a partial satisfaction of it.

Ver. 25. *ἠὲν δὲ* is not a resumption of *ἠὲν δὲ* in ver. 23: there is an entire break in the construction, and Paul begins again, returning from the Spanish journey, which lies in a remote and uncertain future, to the present moment. "But at this moment I am on the way to Jerusalem, ministering to the saints." *διακονῶν* does not represent this journey as part of his *apostolic ministry*, which might legitimately defer his visit once more (Weiss); it refers to the service rendered to the poor by the money he brought (see 2 Cor. viii. 4). For whatever reason, Paul seems to have used "the saints" (a name applicable to all Christians) with a certain predilection to describe the Jerusalem Church. Cf. ver. 31, 1 Cor. xvi. 1, 2 Cor. viii. 4, ix. 1, ix. 12: all in this connection.

Ver. 26. *εὐδόκησαν γὰρ Μακεδονία καὶ Ἀχαΐα*: Macedonia and Achaia would include all the Pauline Churches in Europe, and we know from 1 Cor. xvi. 1 that a similar contribution was being made in Galatia. *εὐδόκησαν* expresses the formal *resolution* of the churches in question, but here as in many places with the idea that it was a spontaneous and cordial resolution (though it had been suggested by Paul): see chap. x. 1 (Fritzsche's note there), Luke xii. 32, Gal. i. 15, 1 Cor. i. 21, 1 Thess. ii. 8, iii. 1. *κοινωνίαν τινὰ*: *τινὰ* marks the indefiniteness of the collection. It was no assessment to raise a prescribed amount, but "some contribution," more or less according to will and circumstances. For *κοινωνίαν* in this sense see 2 Cor. viii. 4, ix. 13: where the whole subject is discussed. *εἰς τοὺς πτωχοὺς τῶν ἁγίων*: from the partitive genitive it is clear that not all the saints in Jerusalem were poor. But Gal. ii. 10, Acts vi. show that the community at least included many poor, towards whom it assumed a responsibility so burdensome that it was unable to discharge it unaided.

Ver. 27. *εὐδόκησαν γὰρ*: they have resolved, I say. Paul felt bound to let

this resolution affect his own conduct, even to the extent of delaying his journey westward. Indeed he explains in 2 Cor., chaps. viii. and ix., that he expected great spiritual results, in the way of a better understanding between Jewish and Gentile Christianity, from this notable act of Gentile charity; hence his desire to see it accomplished, and the necessity laid on him to go once more to Jerusalem. *ὀφείλεται*: cf. i. 14, viii. 12. The resolve of the Gentile Churches to help the poor Jewish Christians, though generous, was not unmotivated; in a sense it was the payment of a debt. *τοῖς πνευματικοῖς αὐτῶν*: the spiritual things belonging to the Jews in which the Gentiles shared are the Gospel and all its blessings—"salvation is of the Jews". All the gifts of Christianity are gifts of the Holy Spirit. *ἐν τοῖς σαρκικοῖς*: the carnal things of the Gentiles, in which they minister to the Jews, are those which belong to the natural life of man, as a creature of flesh—the universal symbol of these is money. There is the same idea in a similar connection (the support of the Gospel ministry) in 1 Cor. ix. 11. In neither place has *σαρκικά* any ethical connotation. *λειτουργῆσαι* is simply "to minister to": no official, much less sacerdotal association. Cf. Phil. ii. 30.

Ver. 28. *τοῦτο οὖν ἐπιτελέσας*: having brought this business to a close. It is a mistake to find in Paul's use of *ἐπιτελεῖν* any reference to the performance of a religious rite: see 2 Cor. viii. 6, 11, Gal. iii. 3, Phil. i. 6. *σφραγισάμενος αὐτοῖς τὸν καρπὸν τοῦτον*. "This fruit" is, of course, the collection; it is one of the gracious results of the reception of the Gospel by the Gentiles, and Paul loves to conceive and to speak of it spiritually rather than materially. Thus in 2 Cor. viii. and ix. he calls it a *χάρις*, a *διακονία*, a *κοινωνία*, a *ἀδρότης*, a *εὐλογία*: never money. The point of the figure in *σφραγισάμενος* cannot be said to be clear. It may possibly suggest that Paul, in handing over the money to the saints, *authenticates* it to them as the fruit of their *πνευματικά*, which have been sown among the Gentiles (so S.

- r Gal. iii. 29. οἶδα δὲ ὅτι, ἐρχόμενος πρὸς ὑμᾶς, ἐν πληρώματι <sup>r</sup> εὐλογίας τοῦ  
 14; Eph. εὐαγγελίου τοῦ <sup>1</sup> Χριστοῦ ἐλεύσομαι. 30. Παρακαλῶ δὲ ὑμᾶς, ἀδελ-  
 1.3; Heb. φοί, διὰ τοῦ Κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, καὶ διὰ τῆς ἀγάπης τοῦ  
 vi. 7; <sup>1</sup> Πνεύματος, συναγωνίσασθαι μοι ἐν ταῖς προσευχαῖς ὑπὲρ ἐμοῦ πρὸς  
 Pet. iii. 9. τὸν Θεόν. 31. ἵνα ῥυσθῶ ἀπὸ τῶν <sup>a</sup> ἀπειθούντων ἐν τῇ Ἰουδαίᾳ, καὶ  
 s John iii. 30; Acts ἵνα <sup>2</sup> ἡ διακονία μου ἢ εἰς Ἱερουσαλὴμ εὐπρόσδεκτος γένηται τοῖς  
 xiv. 2; ἀγίοις. 32. ἵνα ἐν χαρᾷ ἔλθω <sup>3</sup> πρὸς ὑμᾶς διὰ θελήματος Θεοῦ, καὶ  
 xvii. 5. συναναπαύσωμαι ὑμῖν. 33. ὁ δὲ Θεὸς τῆς εἰρήνης μετὰ πάντων  
 ὑμῶν. ἀμήν.<sup>4</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Om. του ευαγγελιου του ἸΑΒCDEF and all edd.

<sup>2</sup> After και om. ινα with ἸΑΒCDE<sup>1</sup>. διακονια ἸΑCDE<sup>3</sup>L; δωροφορια BDF. W. and H. regard δωροφορια as a Western reading which belongs to the inferior element in B, and therefore adopt διακονια; so Tischdf. But Weiss thinks διακονια obviously suggested here by its use in 2 Cor. viii. 4, ix. 1, 12 f., and puts δωροφορια, which occurs nowhere else in the N.T., in his text. The change of it to διακονια induced, he believes, the further change of ἐν before Ἱερουσαλὴμ (which is also the reading of BDF) into εἰς (which is found like διακονια in ἸΑCDE<sup>3</sup>L). This argument seems to have real weight, even though BDF is not always a strong combination of authorities.

<sup>3</sup> ἐν χαρᾷ ἐλθω. This is the reading of BDEFGLP, and is retained by Weiss. It has the critical advantage of making it possible to understand how B could have come to omit the clause και συναναπαύσωμαι ὑμῖν, and the exegetical advantage of properly defining the end aimed at in the prayer, which was that Paul might come with joy to Rome, not that he might refresh himself after that. W. and H. put the received text in margin, but read in text ινα . . . ἐλθων . . . θεου συναναπαύσωμαι ὑμῖν. ἐλθων is the reading of ἸΑC, and these MSS. also omit και. For θεου B has κυριου Ἰησοῦ; D<sup>1</sup>F Χριστου Ἰησοῦ; *alii aliter*. Possibly the original reading was θελήματος alone (*cf.* 1 Cor. xvi. 12), which has been variously supplemented.

<sup>4</sup> ἀμήν om. AF; ins. ἸBCDLP and all edd.

and H.); or it may only mean "when I have secured this fruit to them as their property" (so Meyer). The ideas of "property," "security," "formality," "solemnity," "finality," are all associated with σφραγίς and σφραγίζω in different passages of the N.T., and it is impossible to say which preponderated in Paul's mind as he wrote these words. *Cf.* John iii. 33, vi. 27. ἀπελεύσομαι is simply *abibo*: the idea of departing from Jerusalem is included in it, which is not brought out in the R.V., "I will go on". δι' ὑμῶν: *cf.* 2 Cor. i. 16. εἰς Σπανίαν: there is no evidence that this intention was ever carried out except the well-known passage in Clem. Rom. I. 5 which speaks of Paul as having come ἐπὶ τὸ τέρμα τῆς δόσεως: an expression which, especially if the writer was a Jew, may as well mean Rome as Spain. But all the more if it was not carried out is this passage in Romans assuredly genuine; a second-century writer would not gratuitously ascribe to an apostle

intentions which he must have known were never accomplished.

Ver. 29. For ἐρχόμενος . . . ἐλεύσομαι *cf.* 1 Cor. ii. 1. ἐν πληρώματι εὐλογίας Χριστοῦ. Paul's desire was to impart to the Romans χάρισμά τι πνευματικόν (i. 11), and he is sure it will be satisfied to the full. When he comes he will bring blessing from Christ to which nothing will be lacking. On πλήρωμα see xi. 12.

Ver. 30. παρακαλῶ δὲ ὑμᾶς. In spite of the confident tone of ver. 29, Paul is very conscious of the uncertainties and perils which lie ahead of him, and with the δὲ he turns to this aspect of his situation. ἀδελφοί (which W. H. bracket) is an appeal to their Christian sympathy. διὰ τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰ. Χ. For διὰ in this sense see xii. 1. The Romans and Paul were alike servants of this Lord, and His name was a motive to the Romans to sympathise with Paul in all that he had to encounter in Christ's service. διὰ τῆς ἀγάπης τοῦ πνεύματος:

XVI. 1. ΣΥΝΙΣΤΗΜΙ δὲ ὑμῖν φοίβην τὴν ἀδελφὴν ἡμῶν, οὖσαν<sup>1</sup> a 1 Tim. iii. 8, 12. <sup>a</sup>διάκονον τῆς ἐκκλησίας τῆς ἐν Κεγχραεῖς· 2. ἵνα αὐτὴν<sup>b</sup> προσδέξησθε<sup>2</sup> b Phil. ii. 29. ἐν Κυρίῳ ἀξίως τῶν ἁγίων, καὶ παραστήτε αὐτῇ ἐν ᾧ ἂν ὑμῶν χρῆξῃ πρᾶγματι· καὶ γὰρ αὐτὴ<sup>c</sup> προστάτις πολλῶν ἐγενήθη, καὶ αὐτοῦ<sup>c</sup> Here only in N.T.

<sup>1</sup> After οὖσαν ins. καὶ ἤ<sup>BC1</sup>; so Weiss. W. and H. bracket.

<sup>2</sup> αὐτην προσδέξησθε ἤALP; αὐτην after προσδ. BCDF. For αὐτου εμου read εμου αὐτου with ABCL.

the love wrought in Christian hearts by the Spirit of God (Gal. v. 22) is another motive of the same kind. συναγωνίσασθαι μοι, ἐν ταῖς προσευχαῖς. συναγωνίζομαι is found here only in the N.T., but ἄγων and ἀγωνίζομαι in a spiritual sense are found in each of the groups into which the Pauline epistles are usually divided. What Paul asks is that they should join him in striving with all their might—in wrestling as it were—against the hostile forces which would frustrate his apostolic work. Cf. Just. Mart., *Apol.*, ii., 13: καὶ εὐχόμενος καὶ παμμάχως ἀγωνιζόμενος. ἀγωνία in Lc. xxii. 44 seems to denote awful fear rather than intense striving. πρὸς τὸν θεόν is not otiose: Paul felt how much it was worth to have God appealed to on his behalf.

Ver. 31 f. ἵνα βυσθῶ ἀπὸ τῶν ἀπειθούτων: from the disobedient, i.e., from the Jews who had not received the Gospel, 2 Thess. i. 8, chap. xi. 30. καὶ ἡ διακονία μου κ.τ.λ. It was not the unbelieving Jews only who hated Paul. To them he was an apostate, who had disappointed all their hopes; but even Christian Jews in many cases regarded him as false to the nation's prerogative, and especially to the law. There was a real danger that the contribution he brought from the Gentile Churches might not be graciously accepted, even accepted at all; it might be regarded as a bribe, in return for which Paul's opposition to the law was to be condoned, and the equal standing of his upstart churches in the Kingdom of God acknowledged. It was by no means certain that it would be taken as what it was—a pledge of brotherly love; and God alone could dispose "the saints" to take it as simply as it was offered. Paul's state of mind as seen here is exactly that which is revealed in Acts xx. 17-38, xxi. 13, etc. ἵνα ἐν χαρᾷ ἔλθῶν . . . συναπαύσωμαι ὑμῖν. συναναπ. here only in N.T. but cf. συναπακληθῆναι, i. 12, and συναγωνίσασθαι ver. 30. "Rest after the personal danger and after the ecclesiastical crisis of which the personal danger formed

a part" (Hort). The ἵνα here seems to be subordinate to, not co-ordinate with, the preceding one. Paul looks forward to a time of joy and rest beyond these anxieties and dangers, as the ultimate end to be secured by their prayers. διὰ θελήματος θεοῦ: it depends on whether Paul is to return or how. He did reach Rome, by the will of God (i. 10), but hardly in the conditions anticipated here.

Ver. 33. ὁ δὲ θεὸς τῆς εἰρήνης: there is an appropriateness in this designation after ver. 31, but "peace" is one of the ruling ideas in Paul's mind always, and needs no special explanation in a benediction: 2 Cor. xiii. 11, Phil. iv. 9, 1 Thess. v. 23.

CHAPTER XVI. On this chapter see introduction. It consists of five distinct parts: (1) The recommendation of Phœbe to the Church, vers. 1 and 2; (2) a series of greetings from Paul himself, vers. 3-16; (3) a warning against false teachers, vers. 17-20; (4) a series of greetings from companions of Paul, vers. 21-23; (5) a doxology.

Ver. 1 f. Συνίστημι δὲ ὑμῖν φοίβην. συνίστημι is the technical word for this kind of recommendation, which was equivalent to a certificate of church membership. Paul uses it with especial frequency in 2 Cor., both in this technical sense (iii. 1, v. 12), and in a kindred but wider one (iv. 2, vi. 4, vii. 11, x. 12, 18). τὴν ἀδελφὴν ἡμῶν: our (Christian) sister, 1 Cor. vii. 15, ix. 5. The spiritual kinship thus asserted was a recommendation of itself, but in Phœbe's case Paul can add another. οὖσαν καὶ διάκονον τῆς ἐκκλησίας τῆς ἐν Κεγχραεῖς: who is also a servant of the Church in Cenchrææ. It is not easy to translate διάκονος, for "servant" is too vague, and "deaconess" is more technical than the original. Διακονία was really a function of membership in the Church, and Phœbe might naturally be described as she is here if like the house of Stephanas at Corinth (1 Cor. xvi. 15) she had given herself εἰς διακονίαν τοῖς ἁγίοις. That

ἐμοῦ. 3. Ἀσπάσασθε Πρίσκιλλαν<sup>1</sup> καὶ Ἀκύλαν τοὺς συνεργούς μου ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ, 4. (οἷτινες ὑπὲρ τῆς ψυχῆς μου τὸν ἑαυτῶν τράχηλον ὑπέθηκαν· οἷς οὐκ ἐγὼ μόνος εὐχαριστῶ, ἀλλὰ καὶ πᾶσαι αἱ ἐκκλησῖαι τῶν ἐθνῶν·) καὶ τὴν κατ' οἶκον αὐτῶν ἐκκλησίαν. 5. ἀσπάσασθε Ἐπαίνετον τὸν ἀγαπητὸν μου, ὅς ἐστιν ἀπαρχὴ τῆς Ἀχαΐας<sup>2</sup> εἰς Χρι-

<sup>1</sup> For Πρίσκιλλαν (corrected by Acts xviii. 2) read Πρίσκιαν ἸABCDFL.

<sup>2</sup> For τῆς Αχαΐας LP, read τῆς Ἀσίας with ἸABCDF. The wrong reading is due to 1 Cor. xvi. 15.

is, a life of habitual charity and hospitality, quite apart from any official position, would justify the name **διάκονος**. On the other hand it must be remembered that the growth of the Church, under the conditions of ancient society, soon produced "deaconesses" in the official sense, and Phœbe may have had some recognised function of **διακονία** assigned to her. Cenchrææ was on the Saronic gulf, nine miles E. of Corinth: as the port for Asia and the East, many Christians would pass through it, and a Christian woman who gave herself to hospitality (xii. 13) might have her hands full. ἐν Κυρίῳ: no mere reception of Phœbe into their houses satisfies this—their Christian life was to be open for her to share in it; she was no alien to be debarred from spiritual intimacy. ἀξίως τῶν ἁγίων: with such kindness as it becomes Christians to show. καὶ παραστήτε αὐτῇ (Jer. xv. 11): after the Christian welcome is assured, Paul bespeaks their help for Phœbe in whatever affair she may require it. He speaks indefinitely, but his language suggests that she was going to Rome on business in which they could assist her. καὶ γὰρ αὐτῇ: in complying with this request they will only be doing for Phœbe what she has done for others, and especially for Paul himself. προστάτις (feminine of προστάτης) is suggested by παραστήτε. Paul might have said παραστάτις, but uses the more honourable word. προστάτης (*patronus*) was the title of a citizen in Athens who took charge of the interests of μέτοικοι and persons without civic rights; the corresponding feminine here may suggest that Phœbe was a woman of good position who could render valuable services to such a community as a primitive Christian Church usually was. When she helped Paul we cannot tell. Dr. Gifford suggests the occasion of Acts xviii. 18. Paul's vow "seems to point to a deliverance from danger or sickness," in which she may have minis-

tered to him. It is generally assumed that Phœbe was the bearer of this epistle, and many even of those who regard vers. 3-16 as addressed to Ephesus still hold that vers. 1 and 2 were meant for Rome.

Ver. 3 f. Greeting to Prisca and Aquila. ἀσπάσασθε: only here does Paul commission the whole Church to greet individual members of it (Weiss). For the persons here named see Acts xviii. 2. Paul met them first in Corinth, and according to Meyer converted them there. Here as in Acts xviii. 18, 26 and 1 Tim. iv. 19 the wife is put first, probably as the more distinguished in Christian character and service; in 1 Cor. xvi. 19, where they send greetings, the husband naturally gets his precedence. τοὺς συνεργούς μου ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ: on first acquaintance they had been fellow-workers, not in Christ Jesus, but in tent-making: they were ὁμότεχνοι, Acts xviii. 3. οἷτινες: *quippe qui*. τὸν ἑαυτῶν τράχηλον: the singular (as Gifford points out) shows that the expression is figurative. To save Paul's life Prisca and Aquila incurred some great danger themselves; what, we cannot tell. They were in his company both in Corinth and Ephesus, at times when he was in extreme peril (Acts xviii. 12, xix. 30 f.), and the recipients of the letter would understand the allusion. The technical sense of ὑποθεῖναι, to give as a pledge, cannot be pressed here, as though Prisca and Aquila had given their personal security (though it involved the hazard of their lives) for Paul's good behaviour. οἷς οὐκ ἐγὼ μόνος εὐχαριστῶ κ.τ.λ. The language implies that the incident referred to had occurred long enough ago for all the Gentile Churches to be aware of it, but yet so recently that both they and the Apostle himself retained a lively feeling of gratitude to his brave friends. καὶ τὴν κατ' οἶκον αὐτῶν ἐκκλησίαν: these words do not mean "their Christian household," nor do they imply that the

στόν. 6. ἀσπάσασθε Μαριάμ,<sup>1</sup> ἥτις πολλὰ <sup>d</sup> ἐκοπίασεν εἰς ἡμᾶς. <sup>d</sup> Ver. 12.  
 7. ἀσπάσασθε Ἀνδρόνικον καὶ Ἰουνίαν τοὺς συγγενεῖς μου καὶ  
 ἑσθναίχμαλώτους μου, οἵτινες εἰσιν <sup>e</sup> ἐπίσημοι ἐν τοῖς ἀποστόλοις, <sup>e</sup> Col. iv. 10.  
 οἱ καὶ πρὸ ἐμοῦ γέγονασιν <sup>f</sup> ἐν Χριστῷ. 8. ἀσπάσασθε Ἀμπλιαν<sup>3</sup> <sup>f</sup>  
 τὸν ἀγαπητὸν μου ἐν Κυρίῳ. 9. ἀσπάσασθε Οὐρβανὸν τὸν συνεργόν <sup>f</sup>  
<sup>Philemon</sup>  
<sup>23.</sup>  
<sup>f</sup> Matt.  
<sup>xvii. 16.</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Μαριάμ  $\aleph$ DFL; Μαριαν ABCP, and so most edd. For ἡμας read υμας  $\aleph$ ABC<sup>1</sup>P.

<sup>2</sup> For γεγonaσιν read γεγοναν with  $\aleph$ AB.

<sup>3</sup> For Ἀμπλιαν read Ἀμπλιατον with  $\aleph$ AB<sup>1</sup>F.

whole Christian community (in Rome or in Ephesus) met in the house of Prisca and Aquila. They signify the body of believers meeting for worship there, a body which would only be part of the local Christian community. Cf. 1 Cor. xvi. 19, Col. iv. 15, Philemon 2, Acts xii. 12. "There is no clear example of a separate building set apart for Christian worship within the limits of the Roman Empire before the third century, though apartments in private houses might be specially devoted to this purpose" (Lightfoot on Col. iv. 15). ἀσπάσασθε Ἐπαί-  
 νετον τὸν ἀγαπητὸν μου: after Priscilla and Aquila, not a single person is known of all those to whom Paul sends greetings in vv. 3-16. ἀπαρχὴ τῆς Ἀσίας: Epænetus was the first convert in Asia (the Roman province of that name). Cf. 1 Cor. xvi. 15. There is no difficulty in supposing that the first Christian of Asia was at this time—temporarily or permanently—in Rome: but the discovery of an Ephesian Epænetus on a Roman inscription (quoted by Sanday and Headlam) is very interesting.

Ver. 6. It is not certain whether Μαριάμ (which is Jewish) or Μαριάν (Roman) is the true reading. ἥτις πολλὰ ἐκοπίασεν: the much labour she had bestowed is made the ground (ἥτις) of a special greeting. εἰς ἡμᾶς is much better supported than εἰς ἡμᾶς: there is something finer in Paul's appreciation of services rendered to others than if they had been rendered to himself. Cf. Gal. iv. 11.

Ver. 7. Andronicus is a Greek name, which, like most names in this chapter, can be illustrated from inscriptions. Ἰουνίαν may be masculine (from Ἰουνίας, or Ἰουνιάς contraction of Junianus), or feminine (from Ἰουνία): probably the former. τοὺς συγγενεῖς μου: i.e., Jews. Cf. ix. 3. It is hardly possible that so many people in the Church addressed (see vv. 11, 21) should be more closely connected with Paul than by the bond of

nationality. But it was natural for him, in writing to a mainly Gentile Church, to distinguish those with whom he had this point of contact. Cf. Col. iv. 11. συναιχμαλώτους μου: this naturally means that on some occasion they had shared Paul's imprisonment: it is doubtful whether it would be satisfied by the idea that they, like him, had also been imprisoned for Christ's sake. The αἰχμάλωτος is a prisoner of war: Paul and his friends were all Salvation Army men. The phrase ἐπίσημοι ἐν τοῖς ἀποστόλοις, men of mark among the Apostles, has the same ambiguity in Greek as in English. It might mean, well-known to the apostolic circle, or distinguished as Apostles. The latter sense is that in which it is taken by "all patristic commentators" (Sanday and Headlam), whose instinct for what words meant in a case of this kind must have been surer than that of a modern reader. It implies, of course, a wide sense of the word Apostle: for justification of which reference may be made to Lightfoot's essay on the name and office of an Apostle (*Galatians*, 92 ff.) and Harnack, *Lehre der zwölf Apostel*, S. 111-118. On the other hand, Paul's use of the word Apostle is not such as to make it easy to believe that he thought of a large class of persons who might be so designated, a class so large that two otherwise unknown persons like Andronicus and Junias might be conspicuous in it. Hence scholars like Weiss and Gifford hold that what is meant here is that Andronicus and Junias were honourably known to the Twelve. οἱ καὶ πρὸ ἐμοῦ γέγοναν ἐν Χριστῷ: they had evidently been converted very early, and, like Mnason the Cypriot, were ἀρχαῖοι μαθηταί, Acts xxi. 16. On γέγοναν see Burton, *Moods and Tenses*, § 82. The English idiom does not allow of a perfect translation, but "were" is more idiomatic than "have been".

Ver. 8. Ἀμπλιᾶτον: "a common Roman slave name". Sanday and Head-

ἡμῶν ἐν Χριστῷ, καὶ Στάχυν τὸν ἀγαπητόν μου. 10. ἀπάσασθε Ἄπελλῆν τὸν δόκιμον ἐν Χριστῷ. ἀπάσασθε τοὺς ἐκ τῶν Ἀριστοβούλου. 11. ἀπάσασθε Ἡρωδίωνα τὸν συγγενῆ μου. ἀπάσασθε τοὺς ἐκ τῶν Ναρκίσσου, τοὺς ὄντας ἐν Κυρίῳ. 12. ἀπάσασθε Τρύφαιναν καὶ Τρυφῶσαν τὰς κοπιώσας ἐν Κυρίῳ. ἀπάσασθε Περσίδα τὴν ἀγαπητὴν, ἣτις πολλὰ ἐκοπίασεν ἐν Κυρίῳ. 13. ἀπάσασθε Ῥοῦφον τὸν ἐκλεκτὸν ἐν Κυρίῳ, καὶ τὴν μητέρα αὐτοῦ καὶ ἔμοῦ.

I am give inscriptions from the cemetery of Domitilla, which make it probable that a person of this name was conspicuous in the earliest Roman Church, and may have been the means of introducing Christianity to a great Roman house. τὸν ἀγαπητόν μου ἐν Κυρίῳ: Paul has none but *Christian* relations to this man.

Ver. 9. Οὐρβανὸν: also a common slave name, "found, as here, in juxtaposition with Ampliatius, in a list of imperial freedmen, on an inscription A.D. 115" (Gifford). τὸν συνεργὸν ἡμῶν: the ἡμῶν (as opposed to μου, ver. 3) seems to suggest that all Christian workers had a common helper in Urbanus. Of Stachys nothing is known but that he was dear to Paul. The name is Greek; but, like the others, has been found in inscriptions connected with the Imperial household.

Ver. 10. Ἄπελλῆν τὸν δόκιμον ἐν Χριστῷ: Apelles, that approved Christian. In some conspicuous way the Christian character of Apelles had been tried and found proof: see Jas. i. 12, 2 Tim. ii. 15. The name is a familiar one, and sometimes Jewish: *Credat Judæus Apella*, Hor., *Sat.*, I, v., 100. By τοὺς ἐκ τῶν Ἀριστοβούλου are meant Christians belonging to the household of Aristobulus. Lightfoot, in his essay on Cæsar's Household (*Philippians*, 171 ff.), makes Aristobulus the grandson of Herod the Great. He was educated in Rome, and probably died there. "Now it seems not improbable, considering the intimate relations between Claudius and Aristobulus, that at the death of the latter his servants, wholly or in part, should be transferred to the palace. In this case they would be designated *Aristobuliani*, for which I suppose St. Paul's οἱ ἐκ τῶν Ἀριστοβούλου to be an equivalent. It is at least not an obvious phrase, and demands explanation" (*Philippians*, 175).

Ver. 11. Ἡρωδίωνα τὸν συγγενῆ μου. This agrees very well with the interpretation just given to τοὺς ἐκ τῶν Ἀριστοβούλου. In the household of Herod's

grandson there might naturally be a Jew with a name of this type, whom Paul, for some cause or other, could single out for a special greeting. τοὺς ἐκ τῶν Ναρκίσσου τοὺς ὄντας ἐν Κυρίῳ: the last words may suggest that, though only the Christians in this household have a greeting sent to them, there were other members of it with whom the Church had relations. The Narcissus meant is probably the notorious freedman of Claudius, who was put to death shortly after the accession of Nero (*Tac.*, *Ann.*, xiii., 1), and therefore two or three years before this epistle was written. His slaves would probably pass into the emperor's hands, and increase "Cæsar's household" as Narcissiani (Lightfoot, *loc. cit.*).

Ver. 12. Τρύφαιναν καὶ Τρυφῶσαν: "It was usual to designate members of the same family by derivatives of the same root" (Lightfoot): hence these two women were probably sisters. The names, which might be rendered "Dainty" and "Disdain" (see Jas. v. 5, Is. lxvi. 11) are characteristically pagan, and unlike the designation τὰς κοπιώσας, "who toil in the Lord". They are still at work, but the "much toil" of Persis, the beloved, belongs to some occasion in the past. τὴν ἀγαπητὴν: Paul does not here add μου as with the men's names in vv. 8 and 9. Persis was dear to the whole Church.

Ver. 13. Ῥοῦφον τὸν ἐκλεκτὸν ἐν Κυρίῳ: for the name see Mark xv. 21. If Mark wrote his gospel at Rome, as there is ground to believe, this may be the person to whom he refers. In the gospel he is assumed to be well known, and here he is described as "that choice Christian". ἐκλεκτὸν cannot refer simply to the fact of his election to be a Christian, since in whatever sense this is true, it is true of all Christians alike; whereas here it evidently expresses some distinction of Rufus. He was a noble specimen of a Christian. καὶ τὴν μητέρα αὐτοῦ κ. ἔμοῦ: where she had "mothered" Paul we do not know. For the idea *cf.* Mark x. 30.



14. ἀσπάσασθε Ἀσύγκριτον, Φλέγοντα, Ἑρμᾶν, Πατρόβαν, Ἑρμῆν,<sup>1</sup> καὶ τοὺς σὺν αὐτοῖς ἀδελφούς. 15. ἀσπάσασθε Φιλόλογον καὶ Ἰουλίαν, Νηρέα καὶ τὴν ἀδελφὴν αὐτοῦ, καὶ Ὀλυμπᾶν, καὶ τοὺς σὺν αὐτοῖς πάντας ἁγίους. 16. ἀσπάσασθε ἀλλήλους ἐν φιλήματι ἁγίῳ. ἀσπάζονται ὑμᾶς αἱ ἐκκλησίαι<sup>2</sup> τοῦ Χριστοῦ. 17. Παρακαλῶ δὲ ὑμᾶς, ἀδελφοί, σκοπεῖν τοὺς τὰς<sup>3</sup> διχοστασίας καὶ τὰ σκάνδαλα, παρὰ τὴν g 1 Cor. iii. 3; Gal. v 20. διδαχὴν ἣν ὑμεῖς ἐμάθετε, ποιούντας· καὶ ἐκκλίνατε<sup>3</sup> ἀπ' αὐτῶν.

<sup>1</sup> Here  $\aleph$ ABCD<sup>1</sup>FP and all edd. transpose Ἑρμᾶν and Ἑρμῆν.

<sup>2</sup> After ἐκκλησίαι ins. πασαι  $\aleph$ ABCLP and all edd.

<sup>3</sup> For ἐκκλίνατε read ἐκκλινετε with  $\aleph$ <sup>1</sup>BC, Weiss, W. and H., Tischdf.

Ver. 14. Of Asyncritus, Phlegon and Hermes nothing is known. Patrobas (or Patrobius) may have been a dependant of a famous freedman of the same name in Nero's time, who was put to death by Galba (Tac., *Hist.*, i., 49, ii., 95). Hermas has often been identified with the author of *The Shepherd*, but though the identification goes back to Origen, it is a mistake. "Pastorem vero *nuperrime temporibus nostris* in urbe Roma Herma conscripsit *sedente cathedra urbis Romae ecclesia Pio eps. fratre ejus*": these words of the Canon of Muratori forbid the identification. τοὺς σὺν αὐτοῖς ἀδελφούς indicates that the persons named, and some others designated in this phrase, formed a little community by themselves—perhaps an ἐκκλησία κατ' οἶκόν τινος.

Ver. 15. Philologus and Julia, as connected here, were probably husband and wife; or, as in the next pair, brother and sister. Both, especially the latter, are among the commonest slave names. There are Acts of Nereus and Achilleus in the *Acta Sanctorum* connected with the early Roman Church. "The sister's name is not given, but one Nereus was a member of the [imperial] household about this time, as appears from an inscription already quoted" (Lightfoot, *loc. cit.*, p. 177). Olympas is a contraction of Olympiodorus. τοὺς σὺν αὐτοῖς πάντας ἁγίους: see on last verse. The πάντας may suggest that a larger number of persons is to be included here.

Ver. 16. ἀλλήλους. When the epistle is read in the Church the Christians are to greet each other, and seal their mutual salutations ἐν φιλήματι ἁγίῳ. In 1 Thess. v. 26 the προϊστάμενοι apparently are to salute the members of the Church so. In 1 Cor. xvi. 20, 2 Cor. xiii. 12, exactly the same form is used as here. The custom of combining greeting and kiss

was oriental, and especially Jewish, and in this way became Christian. In 1 Pet. v. 14 the kiss is called φίλημα ἀγάπης; in Apost. Const., ii., 57, 12, τὸ ἐν Κυρίῳ φίλημα; in Tert. de Orat., xiv., *osculum pacis*. By ἁγίον the kiss is distinguished from an ordinary greeting of natural affection or friendship; it belongs to God and the new society of His children; it is specifically *Christian*. αἱ ἐκκλησίαι πασαι τοῦ Χριστοῦ: "this phrase is unique in the N.T." (Sanday and Headlam). The ordinary form is "the Church" or "the Churches of God": but in Matt. xvi. 18 Christ says "my Church": cf. also Acts xx. 28, where τὴν ἐκκλησίαν τοῦ Κυρίου is found in many good authorities. For "all the Churches" cf. ver. 4, 1 Cor. vii. 17, xiv. 33, 2 Cor. viii. 18, xi. 28. Probably Paul was commissioned by some, and he took it on him to speak for the rest. If the faith of the Romans were published in all the world (chap. i. 8), the Churches everywhere would have sufficient interest in them to ratify this courtesy. "Quoniam cognovit omnium erga Romanos studium, omnium nomine salutatur."

Vv. 17-20. Warning against false teachers. This comes in very abruptly in the middle of the greetings, and as it stands has the character of an afterthought. The false teachers referred to are quite definitely described, but it is clear that they had not yet appeared in Rome, nor begun to work there. Paul is only warning the Roman Church against a danger which he has seen in other places. There is a very similar passage in Phil. iii. 18 f., which Lightfoot connects with this, arguing that the persons denounced are not Judaizing teachers, but antinomian reactionists. It is easier to see grounds for this opinion in Philipians than here: but chap. vi. 1-23 may be quoted in support of it.

h Ch. xiv. 18. οἱ γὰρ τοιοῦτοι τῷ Κυρίῳ ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ<sup>1</sup> Χριστῷ οὐ<sup>h</sup> δουλεύουσιν, 18. ἀλλὰ τῇ ἑαυτῶν κοιλίᾳ· καὶ διὰ τῆς ἰχρηστολογίας καὶ εὐλογίας ἐξαπατῶσι τὰς καρδίας τῶν ἀκάκων. 19. ἡ γὰρ ὑμῶν ὑπακοὴ εἰς πάντας ἀφίκετο· χαίρω οὖν τὸ ἐφ' ὑμῶν·<sup>2</sup> θέλω δὲ ὑμᾶς σφοδρῶς μὲν εἶναι εἰς τὸ ἀγαθόν, ἀκεραίους δὲ εἰς τὸ κακόν. 20. ὁ δὲ Θεὸς τῆς k Rev. ii. 27. εἰρήνης<sup>k</sup> συντρίψει τὸν Σατανᾶν ὑπὸ τοὺς πόδας ὑμῶν ἐν τάχει. ἡ

<sup>1</sup> Ἰησοῦ om. Ξ<sup>1</sup>ABCDFP and all edd.

<sup>2</sup> χαίρω οὖν το ἐφ ὑμιν Ξ<sup>3</sup>DF; but Ξ<sup>1</sup>ABCLP and all edd. ἐφ' ὑμιν οὖν χαίρω. μὲν after σοφους Ξ<sup>2</sup>ACP; om. BDFL. Most edd. omit, but W. and H. bracket.

Ver. 17. σκοπεῖν: to keep your eye upon, either as an example to be followed (Phil. iii. 17), or (as in this case) as a peril to be avoided. τοὺς τὰς διχοστασίας καὶ τὰ σκάνδαλα ποιοῦντας: both the persons and their conduct are supposed to be known; "the divisions" and "the scandals," which had been occasioned in other Churches, are assumed to be familiar to the Romans. τὰ σκάνδαλα refers more naturally to conduct which would create a moral prejudice against the Gospel, and so prevent men from accepting it, than to an ordinary result of Jewish legal teaching. But if the latter caused dissension and generated bad tempers in the Church, it also might give outsiders cause to blaspheme, and to stumble at the Gospel (xiv. 13, 16). παρὰ τὴν διδαχὴν ἣν ὑμεῖς ἐμάθετε: ὑμεῖς is emphatic, and implies that *they* at least are as yet untouched by the false teaching. By "the teaching which you received" is meant not "Paulinism," but Christianity, though the words of course imply that the Roman Church was not anti-Pauline. ἐκκλίνετε with ἀπὸ in 1 Pet. iii. 11, Prov. iv. 15.

Ver. 18. οἱ γὰρ τοιοῦτοι κ.τ.λ. Christians must not associate with those who do not serve the one Lord. τῷ Κυρίῳ ἡμῶν Χριστῷ: this combination occurs here only in N.T. τῇ ἑαυτῶν κοιλίᾳ: cf. Phil. iii. 19, ὧν ὁ θεὸς ἡ κοιλία. The words need not mean that the teachers in question were mere sensualists, or that they taught Epicurean or antinomian doctrines: the sense must partly be defined by the contrast—it is not our Lord Christ whom they serve; on the contrary, it is base interests of their own. It is a bitter contemptuous way of describing a self-seeking spirit, rather than an allusion to any particular cast of doctrine. διὰ τῆς χρηστολογίας καὶ εὐλογίας: according to Grimm, χρηστολογία refers to the insinuating tone, εὐλογία to the fine style, of the false teachers. Ex-

amples from profane Greek bear out this distinction (εὐαρχός ἐστιν ὁ λόγος καὶ πολλὴν τὴν εὐλογίαν ἐπιδεικνύμενος καὶ εὐλεξίς), but as εὐλογία in Biblical Greek, and in Philo and Josephus invariably has a religious sense, Cremer prefers to take it so here also: "pious talk". ἐξαπατῶσι: vii. 11, 1 Cor. iii. 18, 2 Th. ii. 2. ἀκάκων: all the English versions, except Gen. and A.V., render "of the innocent" (Gifford). See Heb. vii. 26. In this place "guileless" is rather the idea: suspecting no evil, and therefore liable to be deceived.

Ver. 19. ἡ γὰρ ὑμῶν ὑπακοή: What is the connection? "I give this exhortation, separating you altogether from the false teachers, and from those who are liable to be misled by them; for *your* obedience (ὑμῶν emphasised by position) has come abroad to all men. (Cf. i. 8.) Over *you* therefore I rejoice, but," etc. He expresses his confidence in them, but at the same time conveys the feeling of his anxiety. For χαιρεῖν ἐπὶ see 1 Cor. xiii. 6, xvi. 17. σοφούς μὲν εἶναι εἰς τὸ ἀγαθόν, ἀκεραίους δὲ εἰς τὸ κακόν. For ἀκεραῖος see Matt. x. 16, Phil. ii. 15, and Trench, *Syn.*, § lvi., where there is a full discussion and comparison with ἄκακος. The fundamental idea of the word is that of freedom from alien or disturbing elements. What Paul here wishes for the Romans—moral intelligence, not impaired in the least by any dealings with evil—does suggest that antinomianism was the peril to be guarded against. Integrity of the moral nature is the best security: the seductive teaching is instinctively repelled.

Ver. 20. ὁ δὲ θεὸς τῆς εἰρήνης: used here with special reference to αἱ διχοστασίαι. Cf. 1 Cor. xiv. 33. συντρίψει τὸν Σατανᾶν: divisions in the Church are Satan's work, and the suppression of them by the God of peace is a victory over Satan. Cf. 2 Cor. xi. 14 f. There is an allusion to Gen. iii. 15, though it is

χάρις τοῦ Κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ<sup>1</sup> μεθ' ὑμῶν. ἀμήν. 21.  
 Ἀσπάζονται<sup>2</sup> ὑμᾶς Τιμόθεος ὁ συνεργός μου, καὶ Λούκιος καὶ Ἰάσων  
 καὶ Σωσίπατρος οἱ συγγενεῖς μου. 22. ἀσπάζομαι ὑμᾶς ἐγὼ  
 Τέρτιος ὁ γράψας τὴν ἐπιστολὴν ἐν Κυρίῳ. 23. ἀσπάζεταιται ὑμᾶς  
 Γάϊος ὁ ξένος μου καὶ τῆς ἐκκλησίας ὅλης. ἀσπάζεταιται ὑμᾶς Ἔραστο-  
 τος ὁ οἰκονόμος τῆς πόλεως, καὶ Κούαρτος ὁ ἀδελφός.

<sup>1</sup> Χριστου om.  $\aleph$ B, edd.

<sup>2</sup> For ἀσπάζονται read ἀσπάζεταιται  $\aleph$ ABCD<sup>1</sup>F. Om. first μου B 67; W. and H. bracket.

doubtful whether Paul found anything there answering to συντρίψει. The LXX has τηρήσει. ἐν τάχει: cf. Ez. xxix. 5; Deut. xxviii. 20. The false teachers may come and cause dissension, but it will not be long till peace is restored. ἡ χάρις κ.τ.λ. This benediction can hardly be supposed to belong only to vv. 17-20. It rather suggests that some copies of the epistle ended here; possibly that vv. 1-20 (for there is another benediction at xiv. 33) were originally an independent epistle.

Vv. 21-23. Greetings of Paul's companions.

Ver. 21. Τιμόθεος. In many of the epistles Timothy's name is associated with Paul's in the opening salutation (1 and 2 Thess., 2 Cor., Phil., Col., Philemon). Perhaps when Paul began this letter he was absent, but had come back in time to send his greeting at the close. He was with Paul (Acts xx. 4 f.) when he started on the journey to Jerusalem mentioned in xv. 25. Lucius, Jason and Sosipater are all Jews, but none of them can be identified. For the names (which may or may not be those of the same persons) see Acts xiii. 1, xvii. 5, xx. 4.

Ver. 22. ἐγὼ Τέρτιος ὁ γράψας τὴν ἐπιστολὴν: the use of the first person is a striking indication of Paul's courtesy. To have sent the greeting of his amanuensis in the third person would have been to treat him as a mere machine (Godet). ἐν Κυρίῳ goes with ἀσπάζομαι: it is as a Christian, not in virtue of any other relation he has to the Romans, that Tertius salutes them.

Ver. 23. Γάϊος ὁ ξένος μου κ. ὅλης τῆς ἐκκλησίας: As the Epistle to the Romans was written from Corinth this hospitable Christian is probably the same who is mentioned in 1 Cor. i. 14. Three other persons (apparently) of the same name are mentioned in Acts xix. 29, xx. 4, and 3 John. By ὁ ξένος μου

is meant that Gaius was Paul's host in Corinth; ὁ ξένος ὅλης τῆς ἐκκλησίας might either mean that the whole Christian community met in his house (cf. vv. 5, 14, 15), or that he made all Christians who came to Corinth welcome. Ἔραστος ὁ οἰκονόμος τῆς πόλεως. We cannot be sure that this is the Erastus of Acts xix. 22, 2 Tim. iv. 20; the latter seems to have been at Paul's disposal in connection with his work. But they may be the same, and Paul may here be designating Erastus by an office which he had once held, but held no longer. The city treasurer (*arcarius civitatis*) would be an important person in a poor community (1 Cor. i. 26 ff.), and he and Gaius (whose boundless hospitality implies means) are probably mentioned here as representing the Corinthian Church. Κούαρτος ὁ ἀδελφός: Quartus, known to Paul only as a Christian, had perhaps some connection with Rome which entitled him to have his salutation inserted.

Ver. 24. The attestation of this verse is quite insufficient, and it is omitted by all critical editors.

Vv. 25-27. The doxology. St. Paul's letters, as a rule, terminate with a benediction, and even apart from the questions of textual criticism, connected with it, this doxology has given rise to much discussion. The closest analogies to it are found in the doxology at the end of Ephes., chap. iii., and in Jude (vv. 24 and 25); there is something similar in the last chapter of Hebrews (xiii. 20 f.), though not quite at the end; Pauline doxologies as a rule are briefer (i. 25, ix. 5, xi. 36, Phil. iv. 20), and more closely related to what immediately precedes. This one, in which all the leading ideas of the Epistle to the Romans may be discovered, though in a style which reminds one uncomfortably of the Pastoral Epistles rather than of that to which it is appended, would seem more in place if it stood where AL and an immense num-

24. Ἡ χάρις τοῦ Κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ μετὰ πάντων ὑμῶν.  
 ἀμήν.<sup>1</sup> 25. Τῷ δὲ δυναμένῳ ὑμᾶς στηρίξαι κατὰ τὸ εὐαγγέλιόν μου  
 Gal. i. 12; καὶ τὸ κήρυγμα Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, κατὰ <sup>1</sup> ἀποκάλυψιν μυστηρίου χρόνοις  
 Eph. iii. αἰώνιους <sup>m</sup> σεσιγημένου, 26. φανερωθέντος δὲ νῦν, διὰ τε γραφῶν προ-  
 m Here φητικῶν, κατ' ἐπιταγὴν τοῦ αἰωνίου Θεοῦ, εἰς ὑπακοὴν πίστεως εἰς  
 only in N.T.

<sup>1</sup> This verse is wanting in  $\aleph$ ABC; ins. in DFL. See Introduction, p. 578.

ber of MSS. place it—after xiv. 23. It may represent the first emergence and conscious apprehension of thoughts which were afterwards to become familiar; but it cannot be denied that the many distinct points of contact with later writings give it, in spite of all it has of imposing, a somewhat artificial character, and it may not belong to the Epistle to the Romans any more than the doxology in Matt. vi. belongs to the Lord's Prayer.

Ver. 25 f. τῷ δὲ δυναμένῳ: cf. Eph. iii. 20, Jude v. 24. στηρίξαι: this word takes us back to the beginning of the epistle (i. 11.) Paul wished to impart to them some spiritual gift, to the end that they might be established; but only God is able (cf. xiv. 4) to effect this result. The establishing is to take place κατὰ τὸ εὐαγγέλιόν μου: in agreement with the gospel Paul preached. When it is achieved, the Romans will be settled and confirmed in Christianity as it was understood by the Apostle. For τὸ εὐαγγέλιόν μου cf. ii. 16, 2 Tim. ii. 8; also 1 Tim. i. 11, τὸ εὐαγγέλιον . . . ὃ ἐπιστεύθη ἐγώ. The expression implies not only that Paul's gospel was his own, in the sense that he was not taught it by any man (Gal. i. 11 f.), but also that it had something characteristic of himself about it. The characteristic feature, to judge by this epistle, was his sense of the absolute freeness of salvation (justification by faith, apart from works of law), and of its absolute universality (for every one that believeth, Jew first, then Greek). τὸ κήρυγμα Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ is practically the same as τὸ εὐαγγέλιόν μου. It was in a preaching (1 Cor. ii. 4, xv. 14, Tit. i. 3) of which Jesus Christ was the object that Paul declared the characteristic truths of his gospel: and this preaching, as well as the gospel, may be said to be the rule according to which the Romans are to be established as Christians. κατὰ ἀποκάλυψιν μυστηρίου . . . γνωρισθέντος. This passage "goes not with στηρίξαι, but with κήρυγμα" (Sanday and Headlam). This is the simplest construction: the gospel Paul preaches, the

gospel in accordance with which he would have them established, is itself in accordance with—we may even say identical with—the revelation of a mystery, etc. The μυστήριον here referred to is God's world-embracing purpose of redemption, as it has been set out conspicuously in this epistle. One aspect of this—one element of the mystery—is referred to where μυστήριον is used in xi. 25; but the conception of the Gospel as a μυστήριον revealed in the fullness of the time dominates later epistles, especially Ephesians (cf. Eph. i. 9, iii., 3, 4, 9, vi. 19). The Gospel as Paul understood it was a μυστήριον, because it could never have been known except through Divine revelation: μυστήριον and ἀποκάλυψις are correlative terms. χρόνοις αἰώνιους: the dative expresses duration. Winer, p. 273; cf. 2 Tim. i. 9, Tit. i. 2. For φανερωθέντος δὲ νῦν cf. iii. 21. The aorist refers to Christ's appearing, though the significance of this had to be made clear by revelation (Weiss). διὰ τε γραφῶν προφητικῶν . . . γνωρισθέντος: for τε cf. ii. 16. The connection is meant to be as close as possible: the γνωρίζειν follows the φανεροῦν as a matter of course. The γραφαὶ προφητικαὶ are the O.T. Scriptures of which Paul made constant use in preaching his gospel (cf. κατὰ τὰς γραφὰς in 1 Cor. xv. 3, 4). For him the O.T. was essentially a Christian book. His gospel was witnessed to by the law and the prophets (i. 2, iii. 21, iv., *passim*), and in that sense the mystery was made known through them. But their significance only came out for one who had the Christian key to them—the knowledge of Christ which revelation had given to Paul. κατ' ἐπιταγὴν τοῦ αἰωνίου Θεοῦ: cf. 1 Tim. i. 1, Tit. i. 3. The idea is that only an express command of the Eternal God could justify the promulgation of the secret He had kept so long. For the "Eternal God" cf. Gen. xxi. 33, 1 Tim. i. 17 (τῷ βασιλεῖ τῶν αἰώνων). εἰς ὑπακοὴν πίστεως: cf. i. 5. εἰς πάντα τὰ ἔθνη: in i. 5 it is ἐν

πάντα τὰ ἔθνη γνωρισθέντος, 27. μόνῳ σοφῷ<sup>1</sup> Θεῷ, διὰ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, n Jude v. 25.  $\omega^1$  ἢ δόξα εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας. ἀμήν.

Πρὸς Ῥωμαίους ἐγράφη ἀπὸ Κορίνθου διὰ Φοίβης τῆς διακόνου  
τῆς ἐν Κεγχρεαῖς ἐκκλησίας.<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup>  $\omega$  is wanting in B, in F-Iat., Orig.-interp., Syr., and is bracketed by W. and H. But whether this is to be explained as an intentional correction to simplify the construction, or a mere oversight (of which Weiss gives examples, *Textkritik*, S. 93), it can hardly be right. Neither can **αυτω**, which is found in P, be original; it is too natural a correction. Hence edd. are practically unanimous in keeping  $\omega$ . After **τοὺς αἰῶνας**  $\aleph$ ADP add **των αἰωνων**, but W. and H., with BCL and cursives, omit it. Weiss prints the addition in his text, yet argues for its omission (*Textkritik*, 89).

<sup>2</sup> **προς ρωμαιους** only, in  $\aleph$ ABCD.

**πάσι τοῖς ἔθνεσιν**: for **εἰς** in this sense see iii. 22. It is very difficult to believe that such mosaic work is the original composition of Paul.

Ver. 27. **μόνῳ σοφῷ θεῷ**: this description of God suits all that has just been said about His great purpose in human history, and the hiding and revealing of it in due time. The true text in 1 Tim. i. 17 has no **σοφῷ**. The absence of the article here indicates that it is in virtue of having this character that God is able to establish the Romans according to Paul's Gospel. **ῷ ἢ δόξα**: it is impossible to be sure of the reading here. If  $\omega$  be omitted, there is no grammatical difficulty whatever: glory is ascribed to God through Jesus Christ, through Whom the eternal purpose of the world's redemption has in God's wisdom been wrought out. But its omission is almost certainly a correction made for simplifi-

cation's sake. If it be retained, to whom does it refer? (1) Some say, to Jesus Christ; and this is grammatically the obvious way to take it. But it seems inconsistent with the fact that in **τῷ δὲ δυναμένῳ** and **μόνῳ σοφῷ θεῷ** Paul wishes unequivocally to ascribe the glory to God. And though it saves the grammar of the last clause, it sacrifices that of the whole sentence. Hence (2) it seems necessary to refer it to God, and we may suppose, with Sanday and Headlam, that the structure of the sentence being lost amid the heavily-loaded clauses of the doxology, the writer concludes with a well-known formula of praise, **ῷ ἢ δόξα κ.τ.λ.** (Gal. i. 15, 2 Tim. iv. 18, Heb. xiii. 21). This might be indicated by putting a dash after **Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ**. The thread is lost, and the writer appends his solemn conclusion as best he can.