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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.
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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 εἰς τὸν ικανὸν [ικανῶν 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 (αἱ ἐπίθεμοι τῶν Ῥωμαίων). 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
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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 (ἐνερεθεῖς, φοβοδύνουν 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.


(a) Chap. i. 5 f. Paul writes: “We received grace and Apostleship, with a view to obedience of faith ἐν πᾶσιν τοῖς ἐθνεσιν ... ἐν οἷς ἐστε καὶ ὁμοίως.” 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 ἐθνη 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 πᾶσιν τοῖς ἐθνεσιν means “among all the nations,” it becomes perfectly meaningless.

(b) Chap. i. 13. “I purposed often to come to you, ... ἵνα πιάς καρπὸν σχῶ καὶ ἐν ύμιν καθὼς καὶ ἐν τοῖς λοιποῖς ἐθνεσιν.” This case is quite unambiguous. The Roman Christians are put on a level with the rest of the ἐθνη, 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 ἐθνεσιν. 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
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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 ἑδυνη 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. (ἕτε δοῦλοι τῆς ἁμαρτίας), though they have undoubtedly something which recalls the ἐξ ἑδυν ἁμαρτωλοί 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 : Ἀβραὰμ τῶν
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 γνωσκομεν νομον, 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
inmeasurable 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 _prima 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 _τύχες_ 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
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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* (ἐθετό 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 xxii. 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_. Melanchthon calls it _doctrina 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. Melanchthon 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". Pfeiderer, 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 Pfeiderer (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
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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 \( \text{\textit{G}} \), 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): \textit{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 quae non sunt a Marcione temerata, hoc ipsum caput diverse posuitur; innonnullis eternim codicibus post eum locum quem supra diximus hoc est: omne autem quod non est ex fide peccatum est: statim cohaerens habetur: ei autem qui potens est vos confirmare. Alii vero codices in fine id, ut nunc est posuitur, 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 fratre suo, 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 habitu, 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
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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 all. Amen." 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,
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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—διτε με άπο λευναλημ και κύκλο μέχρι τοῦ ελουρικοῦ πεπληρωκέναι το εναγέλιον το 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 οποι άνομάθη χριστός, ηνα μη άπο ἀλλότριον θεμέλιον οἰκοδομῶ, αλλὰ. 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 purports 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 Cenchreae, would naturally have Ephesus rather than Rome as her goal. But there is no reason to believe that she was sailing from Cenchreae, 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 Patrobius), Philologus, Julia, Nereus are found in the sepulchral inscriptions on the Appian Way as the names of persons connected with ‘Caesar’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' ὑμῖν ὄνν 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, Pfleiderer, 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. lxxxiii.-lxxxiv.), 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.*, B, ABC. B and D 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". B 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 νο[μῷ]. G is the Codex Boernerianus, now in Dresden, and is a little later than F. It wants Romans i. 1 ἀφωμισμένος . . . i. 5 πίστεως, and ii. 16 τὰ κρυπτά . . . ii. 25 νομοῦ Ἰτ. 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 cursive"; 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 ΝΒ form one; DEFG a second; and ΝΑCLP a third. ΝΒ form what Westcott and Hort describe as “neutral” authorities; DEFG are “Western”; ΝΑCLP 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 ΝΑC; (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.
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. ἀφορισμένος εἰς εὐαγγέλιον θεοῦ: for καλέν and ἀφορίζειν similarly 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. ἐπομήνηγείλατο. 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 ἄγιασ (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 ἄγιον which belongs to God, or is connected with Him: ἄγιοι 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 γάρ υἱὸς Χ. Ἰ. ὁ ἐν υἱῷ δὴ ἡμῶν κηρυχθείς. Taken
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 γεννημένου, 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 ὄρθισθέντος is ambiguous; in Acts x. 34, 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 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 ὄρθισθέντος (cf. 2 Cor. xiii. 4: ήτα ἐν δυνάμεις θεοῦ): declared to be Son of God "by a miracle," a mighty work wrought by God; and also with νικῶν 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 πνεύμα ἀγιωσύνης, 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
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; and implies competence as well as voca-
tion. 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
υποκοπὴν 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
ἐθνεῖς (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. ύπέρ τοῦ ὑνίματος 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 κλητοί 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 ἄγιοι,
saints, in virtue of His calling. See on
κλητὸς ἀπόστολος above. The word
ἄγιος did not originally describe char-
acter, but only a certain relation to God;
the ἄγιος 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
ἄγιος. Phil. iv. 21 (ἀπαύγασθε σάντα,
ἄγιον ἐν Χ. Ἰ.) is not an exception. The
ideal of God’s people cannot be ade-
quately 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 greet-
ing is followed by a thanksgiving, which
passes over insensibly into an intro-
duction of a more personal character, in
which Paul explains his desire to visit
the Romans and to work among them
(ver. 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 uncon-
sciously 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 re-
ferred to in ver. 10. (Weiss.) διὰ τὴν 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 bless-
ings 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
something to be thankful for. ἐν δὲ τῷ κόσμῳ is, of course, hyperbole, but a Church in Rome was like a city set on a hill.

Ver. 9 f. μαρτυρος γάρ μου ἦστιν 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 σπευρόμενῳ μοι: Paul’s ministry is spiritual and rendered with his spirit—not like that of the ministers in the ἄγιον κασμικόν at Jerusalem. ἐν τῷ εὐαγγελίῳ: in preaching the glad tidings of His Son. ὡς ἀδιάλειπτος: the ὡς may either be “how” or “that”: looking to 1 Thess. ii. 10, “how” seems more probable. μενένιον ὑμῶν ποιεῖται: I remember you. Cf. Job xiv. 13 (O that Thou wouldst appoint me χρόνον ἐν ὧς μενεῖν μοι ποιήσῃ). ἐπὶ τῶν προσευχῶν μοι: at my prayers. (Winer, p. 470.) For εἰ πως, see Acts xxvii. 12 and Burton, Moods and Tenses, § 276. ζῇν 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. εὐδοκήσασα: 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 ὀδὸς, which was no doubt present to consciousness when the word εὐδοκήσασα 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 βεβηληματί 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 μεταδῷ χάρισμα πνευματικόν. The χάρισμα in this case 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. τούτῳ δὲ ἦστιν: 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 συμπαρακληθῆται must be ὑμῖν in the first instance, though widening, as the sentence goes on, ἐν ὑμῖν) 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. οὐθεὶν δὲ ὑμᾶς ἄγνοεῖν: a phrase of constant recurrence in Paul, and always with ἄδελφοι (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. ἐκκλησίαν ἄχρι τοῦ δεύτερου: 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 τινὰ καρπὸν σχῶ: that I may obtain some fruit among you also. καρπὸς 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 λαοῖς ἔνθησιν: nothing could indicate more clearly that the Church at Rome, as a whole, was Gentile.
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 πάπαραξ, 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 eaiser, 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 ἐστιν: 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 Ἰωάννης, Ἰησοῦς, 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 ἀπωλεία which awaits sinners at the last judgment. In παντὶ τῶν πιστεύσων Ἰουδαίων τὸ πρῶτον καὶ Ἐλλήνων 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
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, there can be no doubt that the fundamental religious problem for the Apostle—that which made a Gospel necessary, that 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 ἀποκάλυπτεται ἕκ πίστεως εἰς πίστιν, καθὼς γέγραπται, ἑν μὲν ἐν τῇ πίστει ἢ ἐν δόξῃ ἢ ἐν ἐλπίδι τί ἐστιν ὁ δικαιοσύνη; ἤν τί ἐστιν ὁ δικαιοσύνη γὰρ ἐν ἀνθρώπου ἢ ἐν θεῷ; ὁ δὲ δικαιοσύνη ἕκ πίστεως ζητεῖται."
rather than of religious import; this "richtfertigendes Walten Gottes" cannot but have as its consequence "the justification of man, a righteousness which proceeds from God and is valid before God" (Dik. Theou 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 die τὴν πάρεσιν τῶν προγενομένων ἀμαρτημάτων ἐν τῇ ἀναχήρασιν, 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 (δικαιοῦσαι) 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 invariable 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. ἀποκαλύπτει 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 ἀποκάλυπτει was a μυστήριον: cf. xvi. 25 f. εἰς πίστεως εἰς πιστιν. 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 εἰς πίστεως; and it leads to faith in the sense of saving reliance on Christ, i.e., it is εἰς πιστιν) 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. εἰς πίστεως in the quotation is probably to be construed with ἔπνευσαι. To take it with δικαιοσύνη (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 (18-22) 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. ὑπή in the N.T. "is usually
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 ἡμᾶς ἐκ τῆς ὁργῆς τῆς ἐρχόμενης. 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. ἀνοηθεία is "positive and active irreligion": see Trench, Syn., § lxvi. τῶν τῆς ἀληθείας 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. ἀληθεία 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 ἀληθείαν. Hence the latter sense is to be preferred (see Wendt, Lehre Jesu, II., S. 203 Anm.). διὸτι τὸ γνωστὸν τοῦ θεοῦ κ.τ.λ. There is no indisputable way of deciding whether γνωστὸν here means "known" (the usual N.T. sense) or "knowable" (the usual classic sense). Cremer (who compares Phil. iii. 8 τὸ ἑπεράχων τῆς γνώσεως, Heb. vi. 17 τὸ ἐμπεράχων τῆς βουλῆς, Rom. ii. 4 τὸ χρηστὸν 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 (ἄφρατα), but clear to intelligence (νοοῦμενα), ever since creation (ἀπὸ κτίσεως κόσμου: for ἀπὸ thus used, see Winer, 403), 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, 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 αὐτῶν ἀναπτυγματίζων 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 διὸτι 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 (diaλογισμοί, "perverse self-willed reasonings or speculations," S. and H.) were made vain (ἐματαιώθησαν); the result nullified 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...
of Him some image of a corruptible, even of a vile creature. The expression ἡλαθαί τὴν δόξαν κ.τ.λ. is borrowed in part from Ps. ev. 20 (LXX): ἡλάθαντο τὴν δόξαν αὐτῶν ἐν ὄρειοι μᾶκχου ἐσθοντος χόρτου. The reduplication of the same idea in ὅρων μᾶκχου εἰκόνος 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. Excepts 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 ἀτμίας; ver. 28, εἰς ἀδόκιμον γοῦν) 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 degrade it, was a Divine judgment, τὸ ἀτμιαζότατα τὰ σώματα αὐτῶν ἐν αὐτῶι, 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 ἀτμιαζότατα being made to depend immediately on ἀκαθαρσίαν).

Ver. 25. οὕτως μετέλαβαν 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 ψεύδος, abstract for concrete, is the idol or false God. The ἐν (cf. ver. 23) answers to Hebrew ἐν, παρὰ τὸν κτίσαντα: to the passing by, i.e., disregard or contempt of the Creator. For this use of παρὰ, see Winer, 503 f. οὗ ἐστὶν εὐλογητὸς: the doxology relieves the writer's feelings as he contemplates such horrors.

Ver. 26. 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.
On the one hand, they pronounced the true God unapproachable; on the other, they did not think fit, after trial made as to which is the right, to keep God in their knowledge. God gave them up to 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. This is the Stoic word which Cicero renders officia. The one thing answers to the other. Truth and justice, honor and good name, 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 Phenicia, 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, whether it is true or false, is not 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. 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? Religions 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 Phenicia, 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 de-
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 Gentile; 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. διδ.: 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 διδ.: therefore. ἐὰν ψ = in that in which, τὰ αὐτὰ πράσεις, 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 ἐλήθειαν is predicate: God's judgment squares with the facts—this is the whole rule of it. τοὺς ὀ ο ῶ ντα σ ῶ τα πράσε σ τα; those whose conduct is such as has been described. For the text, see critical note.

Ver. 3. σὲ 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 σὲ 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. η承接s the alternative. Either he thinks he will escape, or he despises, etc. χριστότητι 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. ἔτοιχος 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. θησαυρίσεις σεαυτῷ ὁργήν: contrast our Lord's many sayings about "treasure in heaven" (Mt. vi. 19 ff., xix. 21). ἐν ἡμέρᾳ ὁργῆς = 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

1 δὲ ABDGKL, γαρ ΝC 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".
day of judgment" (Mt. xi. 22), “the last day” (John vi. 39), “the day of God” (2 Pet. iii. 12), “that day” (2 Cor. iii. 15, 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 lx. 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 "categorical conceptions 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. ἀφαρσαίαν = "proves that the goal of effort is nothing earthly." (Lipsius). ἡ ἀλώνιος comprehends all these: as its counterpart, δάκταλος in ver. 31, involves the loss of all. ἡ λήθη is governed by ἀπειθοῦ. Ver. 8. τοῖς δὲ ἔριδείας: for the use of ἐκ, cf. iii. 26, τὸν ἐκ πίστεως ἱσχύου; Gal. iii. 7, ὅ ἐκ πίστεως; Ch. iv. 14, ὅ ἐκ νόμου. Lightfoot suggests that it is better to supply πράσασον, and to construe ἔριδείας with the participle, as in Phil. i. 17 it is construed with καταγγέλλοντι: 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 ἀληθεία, 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 accurs indignation and wrath, etc.

Ver. 9. ὁργὴ = wrath within; θυμὸς wrath as it overflows. ἡλίψις and στενοχωρία, according to Trench, Synonyms, § 53, 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 ἐσταται for the changed construction. καταγγείλοντο 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 =
judgment day, when sin is simply past. Weiss says it is used as though law is the only one that has to be dealt with. The use of the aorist i]p.a.pTov is whatever it might be; really, the Mosaic sin "in law" shall be judged "by law". In point of fact, no doubt, there was only one law given by God, 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 ἀπολούνται, κρίθονται, δικαιοθήσονται all refer to the day of final judgment.

Ver. 15. oίτινες ἐνδείκνυται: the relative is qualitative: "inasmuch as
twenty times in the Pauline epistles. It views the witness of conscience, reflect-
ing moral functions which imply the first instinctive consciousness of the
day; and (3) their thoughts. Their thoughts bear witness to the existence of
law in them, inasmuch as in their mutual intercourse (μεταξύ ἄλλων) these thoughts are busy bringing accusations, or in rarer cases (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 κατηγοροῦντων or ἀπολογούμενων: 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 σων 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, xxii. 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, έν συνείδησις 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 ἀπολογοῦμενων, 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, ἀπολογοῦνται, καθήμενοι, δικαιωθήσονται: the great principle of ver. 6—ἀποδίδεις ἑκάστῳ κατὰ τὰ ἐργα 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. "I've the name of 'Jew'." This double use of 'Jew' is the only one in N.T. In this sense, the verb only. The construction is not quite regular, but the meaning is clear. The natural order would be: 'If thou bearest the name of Jew, and restest upon the law, yet in thy conduct setttest 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 settseth the law at nought—is made a wrt 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. 'Ioudaios epomena: bearest the name of 'Jew'. The epistolography does not denote addition, but direction: 'Ioudaios 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 'Iosaphelieitai (ix. 4, 2 Cor. xi. 22). The terms must have had a tendency to coalesce in import, though 'Ioudaios is national, and 'Iosaphelieitai religious; for the religion was national. 'Epavrapazai tov vóum: grammatically vóum 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, epil tov Kýrion epavrapazaito. Kauýgaíais ev thew: boastest in God, as the covenant God of the Jews, who are His peculiar people. Kauýgaíais = kauyga: the longer form is the usual one in the kouy.

Ver. 18. 'To thelemia is God's will. Lipsius compares the absolute use of ódóu, thória and ónyma. 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 'dokimázeis ta diáferonta, katachóumenos ek tov vóum: 19. pétoiaías te seautoi in Phil. i. 10. 1 Cor. xiv. ódýgon einai tufólov, fôs tòv en skòste, 20. 'Paiidéuthein aphromos, 19. ó Heb. xii. 9. ðedáskalos hpetôn, ðoxanta tòv mórphouiv tòv gýmwskei kai tìs'

1 ei di ÷ABD; K; ei D L Syr. ei di has probably been changed into di (Alford) to avoid the anacoluthon.

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 restest upon the law, yet in thy conduct settseth 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 settseth the law at nought—is made a wrt 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. 'Ioudaios epomena: bearest the name of 'Jew'. The epistolography does not denote addition, but direction: 'Ioudaios 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 'Iosaphelieitai (ix. 4, 2 Cor. xi. 22). The terms must have had a tendency to coalesce in import, though 'Ioudaios is national, and 'Iosaphelieitai religious; for the religion was national. 'Epavrapazai tov vóum: grammatically vóum 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, epil tov Kýrion epavrapazaito. Kauýgaíais ev thew: boastest in God, as the covenant God of the Jews, who are His peculiar people. Kauýgaíais = kauyga: the longer form is the usual one in the kouy.

Ver. 18. 'To thelemia is God's will. Lipsius compares the absolute use of ódóu, thória and ónyma. 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 'dokimázeis ta diáferonta, katachóumenos ek tov vóum: 19. pétoiaías te seautoi in Phil. i. 10. 1 Cor. xiv. ódýgon einai tufólov, fôs tòv en skòste, 20. 'Paiidéuthein aphromos, 19. ó Heb. xii. 9. ðedáskalos hpetôn, ðoxanta tòv mórphouiv tòv gýmwskei kai tìs'
suggests the same disparaging note 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 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. βδελυγόμενος 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 ἱεροσύλλα is referred to in Acts xix. 37, and according to Josephus, Ant., iv., 8, 10, it was expressly forbidden to the Jews: μὴ συλάν ιερὰ ξενικά, μὴ ἄν ἐπυμομασ­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­&n...
be extended to everything of the same character as circumcision. ὄφελείν: 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, it is very probable more correct to refer it to what is the Mosaic one, but it is regarded simply in its character as circumcision. ἀιτία, as Burton does, as Vaughan says, it is almost like a compound word, "if thou be a law doer". Similarly παραβάτης νόμον 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. γέγονεν: by the very fact becomes and remains.

Ver. 29 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
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 φανερῶ) 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, Ἰουδαῖος; 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 σαρκὶ; 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. οὐ δὲ ἐπαινοῦσεν Κ.Τ.Λ. The οὐ is masculine, and refers to the ideal Jew. The name Ἰουδαῖος (from Ἰουδα = praise, Gen. xxix. 35) probably suggested this remark. οὐκ εἰς 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 περιστέριν τοῦ Ἰουδαίου is that which the Jew has “over and above” the Gentile. τίς ἢ ὄφελεσα θέτε
and this promise seemed threatened by the distribution of authorities here, see note on ἐπιστευθησαν τὰ ἀλόγα τοῦ Θεοῦ. 3. τί γὰρ, εἰ ἤπιστησαν τινες; a Acts vii. 48; Heb. v. 12; 1 Pet. iv. ii.

1 For καθὼς ΝΕ read καθαπερι, υπηρεσὶς BGKL, etc., υπηρεσία NADE. For the distribution of authorities here, see note on πρῶτον, page 589, note 2. 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 ΝΑ, 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 ει and η he regards as accidental; in KLP it occurs some sixty times.

περιτομῆς; = "What good does his circumcision do him?" Πολ δις goes with τὸ περιστὸν. κατὰ πάντα πρῶτον: however you choose to view the position, πρῶτον μὴν 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 πρὸς, 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. τι γὰρ; For how? i.e., Well then, how stands the case? Cf. Phil. i. 18. εἰ ἤπιστησαν τινες = if some did disbelieve. It is not necessary to render this, with reference to ἐπιστευθησαν 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. (l.) 6, which Paul quotes exactly after the LXX: the Hebrew is distinctly different, but neither it nor the original context are regarded. εν τοὺς λόγιας 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. νίκησες: win thy case (see note on text). Burton, Moods and Tenses, §§ 198, 199. εν τῷ κρίνοντα σοι: Probably the infinitive is passive: "when thou art judged"; not middle, "when thou submittest thy case to the
The quotation from Ps. cxvi. 2 f. 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 ἁπτοσία, 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. ὃ ἐπιφέρων τὴν ὀργήν: 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, 164, who renders here: is God unrighteous, who (because He) visiteth with wrath?). κατὰ ἀνθρωπον Μέγα: cf. Gal. iii. 15, Rom. vi. 16, i Cor. ix. 8. There is always something apologistic 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 τι ἐτι καγὼ 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 καγὼ 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,
is not that all that is required? Why am I, too, like the rest of the world, is not that all that is required? Why were not for what follows. But the slander of ver. 8, which forms part of the same question as τί ἐστὶ κάγω κ.τ.λ. and to which reference is made again in chap. vi. 15, had not the Jews, but the Apostle in his Christian character, for its object; hence it seems preferable to take the κάγω 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, how, then, are we to understand the situation? It is necessary to take these words by themselves, and make προεξόμεθα a separate question: the answer to τί could not be οὐ, but must be οὐδὲν. The meaning of προεξόμεθα has been much discussed. The active προεξέχω means to excel or surpass. Many have taken προεξόμεθα as middle in the same sense: So the Vulg. procellimus 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 προεξόμεθα could be taken together, it might certainly be rendered, What then is our plea? but it is impossible to take προεξόμεθα in this sense without an object, and impossible, as already explained, to make this combination. The only alternative is to regard προεξόμεθα 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 πάσι προσήκει,
"Oti óuk ēstai diákaioi oudé eis. II. óuk ēstiv ó συνιῶν, óuk ēstiv ó ἐκκλητῶν τῶν Θεόν. 12. πάντες ἐξέκλιναν, ἀμα ἡχρεώθησαν. ouk

1 o συνιῶν; om. o ABG vulg.; ins. NDKL. The o before ἐκκλητῶν is also omitted BG, and in both places, in text though not in marg., by W. and H. (marg., o ἐκκλητῶν). This ἐκκλητῶν is the reading in B.

2 ἡχρεώθησαν ἁBνδΓ. ouk ēstiv ποιων, so ABG; but N D have o ποιων. W. and H. put the former in text, the latter in marg. The second ouk ēstiv is om. in B 672 and in the marg. of W. and H.

κατ’ οὐδὲν προερχόμενος ὑπὸ τοῦ Δίος: "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 negativized 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 ἀμαρτίαν, 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. lxix. 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. Ouk ēstiv diákaioi oudé eis. 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.
Ver. 11. οὐκ ἔστιν σωτίων. For the form (σωτίων or σωτίων), see Winer, p. 97. If we read ὅ σωτιῶν 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. ἡχρησθήσαν is the LXX rendering of ἡχρηστότης, which means "to become sour," "to turn" (of milk): one and all they have become good for nothing. Χρηστότης 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 בִּדְבַּר, and means "good". οὐκ ἔστιν ἐως ἔνος, 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 Bocotic and another Chalcidic; it was apparently widely diffused. The last clause, ὅσοι ἀπέδικαν 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: οὗ τὸ στόμα αὐτοῦ.

Vers. 15-17. These verses are rather a free extract from, than a quotation of, Is. lxix. 7, 8. They describe the moral corruption of Israel in the age of the prophet. According to Lipsius, σύντριμμα καὶ ταλαιπωρία 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."
justification out of the question; to in "flesh," but in "law." "By the law justify. is the very thing which the law cannot do, and it cannot do it because it is weak owing to the flesh. But in this case, but its strength, which puts strength to accomplish. But the explanation of the axiom lies not only in "flesh," but in "law." " By the law
21. Now δὲ χαρίς νόμου δικαιοσύνη Θεοῦ πεφανέρωται, μαρτυρου-
μένη ὑπὸ τοῦ νόμου καὶ τῶν ἰδιώτων· 22. δικαιοσύνη δὲ Θεοῦ διὰ
πίστεως Ἰσχυροῦ Χριστοῦ, εἰς πάντας καὶ ἐπὶ πάντας τοὺς πιστεύοντας· ὁ γὰρ ἀρματον, καὶ διαστολήν.

οὐ γάρ ἐστι καὶ διαστολή. 23. πάντες γὰρ ἠμαρτον, καὶ διαστολὴν τινα

1 καὶ εἰπὶ πάντας; so ΝΣΔΡΓΚΛ, but om. ΝABC. The words are omitted by
Lachm., Tischdf., Tregelles, W. and H., but retained by Weiss, who explains the
omission by homoeoteleuton. As εἰπὶ 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 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 καὶ σκότῳ τοῦ νῦν: the reception of the Gospel
means the coming of a new world. χαρίς νόμου: legal obedience contributes no-
thing to evangelical 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, ἐπὶ 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 ζέδω 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 δέ 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: ἀφορόντες εἰς τὸν τῆς πίστεως ἄρχηγον καὶ τελευτήν Ἰσχυροῦ, 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 ΝABC 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. ἠμαρτον must be rendered in
English "have sinned"; see Burton,
Moods and Tenses, § 54. διαστολὴν 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.
xiv. 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

VOL. II.
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 "his doxa tou theou." 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 doxa 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. δικαιομένου: 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 του θεου) favours this connection, but it is forced and fanciful. In sense δικαιομένον refers to πάντας τούς 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. δωρεάν 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 something." Christ is all in it (1 Cor. i. 30); hence its absolute freeness. της αυτου χαριτη repeats the same thing: as δωρεάν signifies that we contribute nothing, της αυτου χαριτη signifies that the whole charge is freely supplied by God. αυτου in this position has a certain emphasis. δια της ἀπολυτρώσεως της εν Χ.λ. 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 ἀπολυτρώσεις. In Eph. i. 7, Col. i. 14, Heb. ix. 15, it is equal to forgiveness. Ἀπολυτρώσεις 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 ἀπολυτρώσεις, 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 ις., Ant., xii. ii. 3: πλεένων δε ἡ πτερακοσίων ταλάντων τα τῆς ἀπολυτρώσεως γενησεθαι φαμέων κ.τ.λ.; and Philo, Quod omnis probus liber, § 17 (of a Spartan boy taken prisoner in war) ἀπογονοῦ ἀπολυτρῶν ἀξιόμενος εἰκώτων διεχριστάτω, 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 λυτρον and ἀντιλυτρον 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, ἀπολυτρώσεις 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 ἀπολυτρώσεις 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 ἀπολυτρώσεις is in Christ Jesus, and it is in Him as One whom God set forth in propitiatory power, through faith (or, reading δια της πίστεως, through the faith referred to), in His blood. προθέτει in Eph. i. 9 (cf. Rom. i. 13) is "purposed"; but here the other meaning, "set forth" (Vulg. propositum) suits the context much
better. Ἰλαστήριον has been taken in various ways. (1) In the LXX it is the rendering of ἱλαρετήμα, (A.V.) "mercy-seat". In one passage at least, Ex. xxv. 16, ἱλαρετήμα is rendered Ἰλαστή-

ριον ἔτθεμα, 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 ἡ μ. ὁ ν., or some equivalent phrase. Cf. 1 Cor. v. 8 (Christ our passover). A "mercy-seat" is not such a self-evident, self-interpret-
ing 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 ἱερεῖον, 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 Ἰοσ., Ἀντ., xvi. 7, i: περιέφοβος ὁ αὐτὸς ἤξει καὶ τοῦ δέους Ἰλαστήριον μνήμα . . . κατασκευάστο. The passage in 4 Macc. xxv. 22 (καὶ διὰ τοῦ αἵματος τῶν εὐθείων ἱερείων καὶ τοῦ Ἰλαστήριον [τοῦ] βαθάτου αὐτῶν ἡ θεία πρόνοια τὸν Ἰσραήλ προκακώθητα διάσωσεν) is inde-

cisive, owing to the doubtful reading.* Perhaps the grammatical question is insoluble; but there is no question that Christ is conceived as ended with propitiatory power, in virtue of His death. He is set forth as Ἰλαστήριος(ν) ἐν τῷ αἵματος 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 ended 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 pur-

pose of διὰ τῆς πίστεως is not at once clear. Grammatically, it might be con-

strued with Ἐφ. 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 βαθάτου, to support the view that in Ἰλαστήριον (as a substantive) Paul is thinking not of the concrete ἱερεῖον, 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 βαθάτου), without special allusion to the ἱλαρετήμα. But see Deissmann, Bibelstudien, S. xxi ff.
taken. Faith must have its place, therefore, in the profoundest statement of the Gospel, as the correlative of grace. Thus διὰ (τῆς) πίστεως, though parenthetic, 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 "winked at" (Acts xvii. 30) the transgressions of men perpetrated before Christ came (πρὸ-γεγονότων), ἐν τῇ ἁνοχῇ 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. 1. 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 ἅμεσα, the revocation, of punishment, is borne out, according to Lightfoot, Notes on Ἐπ. 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 character 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. πῶς, 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. Τῇ ἔνδειξιν: the article means "the ἔνδειξις already mentioned in ver. 25". But the last clause, εἰς τὸ εἶναι αὐτοῦ 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. (Hàring 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 τῷ πάρεσιν τῶν προγεγονότων ἁμαρτι-μάτων.) 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
God's character and makes it possible for Him to justify those who believe. The passage itself contains nothing explicit—except in the words εν τω αυτω αιματι. 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 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 εις το ειναι αυτων δικαιον κ. δικαιοντα, "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. 

Ver. 27. του ουν; where, since this is the case, is boasting? εξεκλεδθη: for the use of the tense, cf. εβληθη and εξηρασθη in John xv. 6; it is equivalent to, "is peremptorily, or once for all, shut out." δια ποιου νομου; 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-
form? No: its character is given when we call it a constitution or law of "faith." Nòmos 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 nòmos—divine institutes.

Ver. 28. λογισμένα γάρ: see critical note. In λογισμένα there is no idea of an uncertain conclusion; it rather suggests the confident self-consciousness of the reasoner. ἄνθρωπος is not "any human being," as if beings of another sort could be justified otherwise; it is like the German "man" or "one". Cf. I Cor. iv. i, vii. i, 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. ἡ ἰουδαϊκά 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. εἶπερ is the best attested reading, but the argument seems to require that it should "approximate to the sense of εἶπερ" (Simcox, *Language of the N.T.*, p. 177), 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. δικαιώσεi 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, εὐ δικαιώσει περιτομὴν ἐκ νόμου, οὔδε ἀκροβυστίαν διὰ τοῦ νόμου: when, in the case of the Jews, the fahity 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. i, 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 οὗν καταργοῦμεν 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 εἶπερ = if God is indeed one (which no Jew, the supposed interlocutor, would deny).
IV. 1. Tit oûn éproumèn Ἀβραάμ τὸν πατέρα ἡμῶν εὐρηκέναι κατὰ σάρκα; 2. εἰ γὰρ Ἀβραάμ ἐξ ἐργῶν ἐθικαίωθη, ἦχει καύχημα, ἀλλ’ οὐ πρὸς τὸν Θεόν. 3. τί γὰρ ἡ γραφὴ λέγει; "Ἐπίστευσε δὲ Ἀβραάμ τῷ Θεῷ, καὶ ἔλογισθε αὐτῷ εἰς δικαιοσύνην. 4. τῷ δὲ ἐργαζόμενῳ ὁ μισθὸς οὐ λογίζεται κατὰ σάρκιν, ἀλλὰ κατὰ τὸ δείκτην."

1 The T.R. Ἀβραάμ τὸν πατέρα ἡμῶν εὐρηκέναι is found in KLP, Theodoret and later fathers. For πατέρα, προσπάτωρ is read in ΝABC etc. ἐπάνω in ΝACDFG lat. and Egypt. versions, etc. In B 471 εὐρηκέναι 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 margin after ἐρουμεν. The R.V. omits it in margin, inserting it in text. Weiss retains it.

2 πρὸς τὸν Θεόν; om. τὸν ΝABCDF.

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 more secure than ever under the Gospel. Another kind of proof is given in chapters 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 oûn 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 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 προσπάτωρ ήμῶν, 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 εαὐτὸ 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’ oû 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 ἐπίστευσε 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 l., 605 (Mangey), as well as Clem. Rom., l., 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
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 ἀσεβὴς (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 by works. Cf. Philo, i., 486 (quoted in Mayor on Jas. i. 21): δίκαιον γὰρ οὗτος οὐδὲν ὡς ἀκάττω καὶ ἀμιγεῖ τῷ πρὸς θεὸν μόνον πίστει κεχρησθαί... τὸ ἐπὶ μόνο τῷ ἄντι βεβαιῶς καὶ ἀκινῶς ὄρμεν... 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 δίκαιον τὸν ἀσεβῆ.

Ver. 6 ff. καθάπερ καὶ Δαβίδ: 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 τὸν ἀνθρώπον: "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
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 οὗν οὕτως: 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 γάρ κ.τ.λ.: for our proposition is, that his faith was reckoned, etc.

Ver. 10. πῶς οὖν ἔλογισθή: 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. xxvii., 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 and seal 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 ἡ ἡλικία ἅρματος, propter signum foederis ejus." But usually of Jews: "Jonah shewed Leviathan sigillum (Ἀβραὰμ πατris nostri)." See Schoettgen, Wetstein, or Delitzsch, ad loc. περιτομὴς (for which W. and H. have in margin περιτομὴ) must be a genitive of apposition. With εἰς τὸ εἶναί 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 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 σταυροῖσει 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
A condition which would limit the speculative line. Instead of arguing all believers: for it is not through law fulfilled to all independently of law, he law was heard of, and therefore must be reiterated and confirmed here in who are of law, which extends it to all who believe. We righteousness of faith—a condition heritance to the Jews, but through the proof of this proposition, similar to the sense of I Cor. vi. 14, that the promise was 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 ἐπαγγελία 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 Abrahomo legitimus: quod mundum hunc et mundum futurum non nisi ea de causa consecutus sit, quia in Deum credit, q.d., Gen. xvi. 6. And Wetstein, Tanhuma, 165, 1: Abrahamo patri meo Deus possidendum dedit caelum 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. τὸ 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. κατηγρηται: a
favourite word of Paul, who uses it twenty-five times.

Ver. 15. ὁ γὰρ: 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. οὗ δὲ: δὲ is the true reading (see critical note), not γὰρ: but where law is not, neither is there παράβασις. It would not have been true to say οὐδὲ ἀμαρτία, for Paul in chap. ii. recognises the existence and guilt of sin even where men live ἀνόμως; 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, this 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. οὐ γὰρ: because of the nature of law, and its inability to work anything but wrath. εἰκ πίστεως: the subject is the promise, considered in reference to the mode of its fulfilment. οὗ κατὰ χάριν: χάρις is God's part is the correlative of πίστεως in man's. εἰς τὸ εἶναι βεβαιαν 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. οὗ τὸ ἐκ τοῦ νόμου μόνον ἀλλὰ καὶ τὸ 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 Gentiles 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.

ὅτι ἐστὶν 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. Opponentibus hae verba Judaeis, qui Abrahamum non nominant nisi cum adjecito ΛΑΘΗΝ fater 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.
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 κατενάντι ὁ ἐπίστευσεν θεοῦ is most simply resolved into κ. θεοῦ ὃς ἐπίστευσεν: 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 έκ νεκρῶν ἐγείρειν δυνατὸς ὁ θεός) is not suggested here (yet see ver. 24), and hence it is better to take ἐμπροσθος τούς 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 ἄντα, 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 ἐπρημένον, Οὐχὶς κ.τ.λ., Gen. xv. 5: the passage is familiar, and the οὐχὶς is supposed to suggest its own interpretation—the stars of the heaven.

μὴ ἀσθενήσας . . . κατενάντης, 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 κατενάντης," Burton, Moods and Tenses, §145. This remark holds good only with the reading κατενάντης: if we read οὗ κατ. the meaning is, He considered not his body quiisper qui non esset imbecillis (Winer, p. 610). ἐκατοντακτὴς ποῦ (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 ὤν. In ver. 20 (εἰς δὲ τὴν ἐπαγγέλαιαι) 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. xxii. 21, Jas. i. 6, Rom. xiv. 23. τῇ ἀπεισίᾳ: 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. οὗς δέξαν τῷ θεῷ: for this Hebraism see Josh. vii. 19, Jer. xiii. 16, John ix. 24, Acts xii. 23. For πληροφορήθησις xiv. 5, Col. iv. 12.

Ver. 22. διό: 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
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 attitude toward God is the same as Abraham's, God that quickeneth the dead. In Paul, on the other hand, where Christians are described as those who through Christ believe in God who raised Jesus our Lord, He whose attitude toward God is the same as Abraham's, God that quickeneth the dead, 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 raised because we were justified 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, δικαιωθησθεν τιν εν τω άματι αυτω, 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
the time determined by Providence, they receive the Gospel. Hence διὰ τὴν δικαιοσύνην 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 of 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 Byleschlag does (Neuest. 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. i.-ii. 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: Μην ἐγείρει τὸν μακαρίσαμεν τοῦ ἄνθρωπον οἵ δὲ θεοὶ λογίζεται δικαιοσύνην χορὶς ἐργῶν. Vers. 1. δικαιοσύνης takes up emphatically the δικαιοσύνην 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.
Having, therefore, been justified (the Apostle says), εἰρήνην ἐξομεν πρὸς τὸν θεόν. The MSS. evidence is overwhelmingly in favour of ἐξομεν, so much so that W. and H. notice no other reading, and Tischdf. says ἐξομεν 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 doxastic expositions, and is proceeding to exhortation. To read ἔξωμεν, and then to take καλούμεθα as subjunctive both in ver. 2 and ver. 3 (as the R.V.), is not only awkward, but inconsistent with οὗ μόνον δεί, ver. 3. If the hortative purpose dominated the passage throughout, the Apostle must have written μὴ: see Gifford, p. 122. It is better (reading ἐξομεν) to take καλούμεθα in ver. 2 with δεί οὗ, and co-ordinate it with τὴν προσαγωγὴν: “through whom we have had our access, and rejoice, etc”. Then the οὗ μόνον is in place. But the uninterrupted series of indicatives afterwards, the inappropriateness of the verb εξελεῖν 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 ἐξομεν, 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. δέ οὗ καλ: 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. προσαγωγή 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. καλούμεθα, which always implies the expression of feeling, is to be co-ordinated with ἐξομεν. ἐπὶ ἐλπίδι 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 ἐπὶ ἐλπίδι, cf. iv. 18: the construction is not elsewhere found with καλούμεθα.

Ver. 3. οὗ μόνον δεί ἀλλὰ καλ καλούμεθα: and not only (do we glory on that footing), but we also glory in tribulations. Cf. Jas. i. 2 ff. ἐν ταῖς θλίψεωι 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.
Ver. 4. ὑπομόνην κατηργάζεται: has as its fruit, or effect, endurance. ὑπομόνη has more of the sense of bravery and effort than the English “patience”: it is not so passive. ἡ δὲ ὑπομόνη δοκιμήν: endurance produces approvedness—its result is a spiritual state which has shown itself proof under trial. Cf. Jas. i. 12 (δοκιμαζοντες γενόμενον = when he has shown himself proof). Perhaps the best English equivalent of δοκιμή 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 καταστύχει: and hope, i.e., the hope which has not been extinguished, but confirmed under trial, does not put to shame. Ps. xxii. 6. Spes exit 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. ἄπαντα τοῦ θεοῦ. 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. ἐκκένωσαν 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 ἀγίου τοῦ δομένου ἡμῖν: the aorist τοῦ δομένου 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 εἰ 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 εἰπέρ (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 εἰ 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 εἰ 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 εἰ 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. έτει 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 η ᾗ. έτει: “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-
ology 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 ἁγαθοῦ neuter: some who take δικαίου as masculine take τοῦ ἁγαθοῦ 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 ἁγαθοῦ because the exceptional case is definitely conceived as happening. ἁπαθανεῖται, gnomic; see Burton, § 6g. Unless ἁγαθοῦ is meant to suggest a certain advance upon ἄμαρτοι because the exceptionality of the case 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. xxii. 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. ἁγαθοῖς καὶ τολμῆσιν 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. ἂντων is an emphatic 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. ἄμαρτοι: they are no longer such, but justified, and it is on this the next step in the argument depends.

Ver. 9. πολλῷ ὀνών 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 Him. ἀπὸ τῆς δικαιοσύνης ἦμων: they are no longer such, but justified, and it is on this the next step in the argument depends. Verse 10 rather repeats, than grounds anew, the argument of ver. 9. εἰ γὰρ ἔχθροι ἄντες: this is practically equivalent to ἄμαρτοι ἄντες ἡμῶν. The state of sin was that in which we were ἔχθροι, and the whole connection of ideas in the passage requires us to give ἔχθροι the passive meaning which it undoubtedly has in xi. 28, where it is opposed to ἀγαπητοῖς. 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
there love in God equal to it? Yes, when we were enemies we were reconciled to God by the death of His Son. 

1 Corinthians v. 11. In the Cross, and argues from that to the perfection of that religion. For an examination of the Pauline idea of reconciliation, see especially Schmiedel on 2 Corinthians v. 21, Excursus. 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 καταλλαγὴ 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 καταλείπθης ἐν τῇ τοῦ παντοκράτορος ὅρην πάλιν ἐν τῇ τοῦ μεγάλου δεσπότου καταλαλαγή μετὰ πάθης διότι ἐπαναθάνῃ. For an examination of the Pauline idea of reconciliation, see especially Schmiedel on 2 Corinthians 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
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 ἡμαρτον in ver. 12, and the connection between Christ and the new humanity by αἱ τὰς περιστεραὰ τῆς χάριτος λαμβάνοτες in ver. 17.

Ver. 12. ἄντωτο 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. ἀντωτος: the sentence beginning thus is not finished; cf. Mt. xxv. 14. There is a virtual apodosis in the last clause of ver. 14: δὲ ἐκτὸς τύπου τοῦ μελλόντος; 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 διάλθεν, cf. Ps. lxxvii. 17, Ez. v. 17) ἐφ’ ψ πάντες ἡμαρτον. 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. ὡς ἐκτεινοῦν τὸν ἀνθρωπόν ἐπ’ ἀφθαρσίαν . . φθόνῳ δὲ διαβαδλοῦ θάνατος εἰσέλθεν 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. viii. 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’ ψ πάντες ἡμαρτον, 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’ ψ means προτέρες 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 ἡμαρτον? Many interpreters take the aorist rigorously, and render: because all sinned, i.e., in the sin of Adam. Omnès peccarunt, Adamo peccante (Bengel). This is supported by an appeal to 2 Cor. v. 14, εἰς ἕτερ πάντων ἀπέθανον: αὖ ὁ πάντως 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’ ψ πάντες ἡμαρτον 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 ἡμαρτον 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
Appendix. However the omission may have originated, fl-1 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. ἀχρὶ γὰρ νόμου = ἀπὸ 'Αδὰμ μέχρι Μωϋσεως, 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 ἐβασιλεύσεων) over persons whose sins cannot be imputed to them, seems at variance with the explanation just adopted of πάντες ἡμαρτον. 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 ἤ αἱ πάντες ἡμαρτον according to which all men sinned in Adam's sin, and so (and only so) became subject to death. But the empirical meaning of ἡμαρτον 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 ὁμοίωματι κ.τ.λ.—even over those who did not sin after the likeness of Adam's transgression. For ινα, 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 indis-solubly united. And this Adam is τύτως τοῦ μὲλλόντος sc. 'Αδὰμ. 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. "Quernammodum homo primus fuit unus in peccato, sic Messias erit postremus, ad auferendum peccatum penitus;" 16 and 9.9 has "Aadamus postremus est Messias". Cf. Delitzsch: Brief an die Römer, p. 82 f. The extent to which the thought 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 mora fuisse". 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 ἡμαρτον),

1 τους μη ἁμαρτήσαντας, so ΝΑBCD"GΚΛΠΩ; the μη 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, μη is undoubtedly the true text.
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. πολλῷ 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. ή δυρεὰ ἐν χάριτι is to be construed together: to repeat the article before ἐν χάριτι is not essential, and ή δυρεὰ 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. ἐπερισσεύειν: 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 διάφορα, 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 εἷς 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. εἷς ἐνός: ἐνός is masculine, resuming the ἐνὸς ἀμάρτησαν of the previous clause; not neuter, with παραπτωμάτων 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 περισσεύσαν τῆς χάριτος καὶ τῆς δυρεᾶς τῆς δικαιοσύνης λαμβάνοντες we again touch experience, and an empirical condition is attached
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 \( \text{ἐκ τῆς παρακοής τοῦ ἔνδος ἀνθρώπου ἀμαρτάνων} \) is uncertain. The language of the N.T., cf. Jas. iv. 4, 2 Tim. ii. 12. 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. \( \text{δικαίωσις κατεστάθησαν} \) It is because Paul conceives of this justification as conditioned in the case of each of the \( \text{πολλοὶ} \) 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
not then, but when they believe in Christ, that men are constituted dikaios.

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. pareisologen: 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 pareisagw, 2 Pet. ii. 1; pareisodw, Jude 4; pareisefw, 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". Iwa pleanv to parapmwa: the purpose expressed by Iwa 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. Oi de eplesoasen h amartia: amartia seems used here, not parapmwa, 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". oi 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. Uperpetiropsoesen: "the eplesoasen had to be surpassed." (Meyer). Cf. 2 Cor. vii. 4. Paul is excessively fond of compounds with uperp. 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". En to baswtov: it is more natural to oppose this to zwh aiwos, 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 dia dikaioswns, 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 (dia dikaioswns); its goal, its limit which is yet no limit, is eternal life. Some, however, construe elis zwh aiwos with dia dikaioswns: through a righteousness which ends in eternal life: cf. elis dikaioswn zwhs, ver. 18. Dia 1. X. tou kurioi hwm: this full rhetorical close has almost the value of a doxology.

Chapter VI.—Vers. 1-4. 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 the moral 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
VI. I. Τι δόν ἐρωτεύμεν; ἡ ἐπιμενοῦμεν τῇ ἁμαρτίᾳ, ἢ ἡ χάρις πλεονάσῃ; 2. μὴ γένοιτο. οἴτινεσ ἀπεδάνομεν τῇ ἁμαρτίᾳ, πῶς ἐτίξισμον ἐν αὐτῷ; 3. ἢ ἀγνοεῖτε ὅτι δοσιν ἐβαπτίσθημεν εἰς Χριστὸν ἤσοιον, εἰς τὸν θάνατον αὐτοῦ ἐβαπτίσθημεν; 4. ἀνετάκτηθημεν ὅν, αὐτῷ διὰ τοῦ βαπτίσματος εἰς τὸν θάνατον. ἢν, ὧσπερ ἥγερθη Χριστὸς ἐκ νεκρῶν διὰ τῆς δοξῆς τοῦ πατρὸς, ὃτῳ καὶ ὡμεῖς εἰν

1 For επιμενοῦμεν read επιμενοῦμεν with ABCDF.
2 ἤσοιον 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. Τι δόν ἐρωτεύμεν; 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? Lightfoot 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. οἴτινες ἀπεδάνομεν 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 for ever out of any relation to it. πῶς ἐτίξισμον; 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. ἢ 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. δοσιν βαπτίσθημεν: we all, who were baptised into Christ Jesus, were baptised into His death. The δοσι is not partitive but distributive: there is no argument in the passage at all, unless all Christians were baptised. The expression βαπτίσθημα 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. i Cor. x. 2, and the expression βαπτίσθημα εἰς τὸ νόμο τοῦ Κυρίου Χριστοῦ. In the same way βαπτίσθημα 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 regenerate, 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. συνετάκτηθημεν ὅν 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. i Cor. xv. 3 f. It introduces a false abstraction to say.
5. He says "unto death," not "unto His death": death in the whole context is perfectly definite. The verb ὁλοκαυτήσας of His death is union with Him altogether (and therefore in His resurrection). Eἰ γὰρ, σύμφωνον γεγόναμεν τῷ ὑμοίωματι τοῦ θανάτου αὐτοῦ: it is simple to take συμφ. and τῷ ὑμοίωματι 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. 

6. The object of this crucifixion of the old man was "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.

7. I.e. ἐπετάθημεν αὐτῷ 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 general idea, see Burton, § 397.

8. ἐν Χριστῷ: see Burton, § 397. The Apostle 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.

9. ἐκδότες...: see note on ἀνάστασις ver. 5: there is no conscious separation of ethical and transcendent life with Christ—so Paul it is one life.

10. ἐν Χριστῷ: see Burton, § 397. 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
towards Him, because He made Himself sin. "His death on the Cross was the final triumph of His holiness over all 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. διὰ θανάτου κηρυκτής. The life that He lives He lives to God.

Ver. 10. This is expanded in ver. 10. διὰ ἐναρθρίαν, τῇ ἀμαρτίᾳ ἐναρθρίαν ἐφάπαξ; the διὰ is 'cognate' accus. Winer, p. 209. "The death that He died, He died to sin once for all." The dative τῇ ἀμαρτίᾳ 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 [itakes 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

1 νεκρός μεν εἶναι ἅθαρτος; εἶναι νεκροὺς μεν ἁθάρτους νεκροὺς μὲν εἶναι τῇ ἀμαρτίᾳ ἐναρθρίαν τῷ Κυρίῳ ἡμῶν. εἰς τῷ θνητῷ

2 τῷ κυρίῳ ἡμῶν; om. ABDF, and edd.; ins. Νίκλ. KLP.
10—17.
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όμων * σώματι, εἰς τὸ ὑπάκουειν αὐτῇ ἐν¹ ταῖς ἐπιθυμίαις αὐτοῦ. 13. ἐν Χ. viii. 11. μηδὲ παραστάσετε τὰ μέλη ὦμῶν ὑπὲρ αἰκίας τὴν ἀμαρτίαν. ἀλλὰ παραστήσατε ἐναυτὸς τῷ Θεῷ ὡς ἕν νεκρῶν ζωντας, καὶ τὰ μέλη ὦμῶν ὑπὲρ δικαιοσύνης τοῦ Θεοῦ. 14. ἀμαρτία γὰρ ὦμῶν οὐ κυριεύειν ὑμῖν ἐν Χ. xiii. 12. οὐ γὰρ ἐστε ὑπὸ νόμου, ἀλλὰ ὑπὸ χάριν.

15. Τι ous; ἀμαρτήσομεν, εἰ δὲ ὦκεν ὑμῶν ἀλλὰ ὑπὸ ous; ὑμῶν ὑπὸ τὸν χάριν; μὴ γένοιτο. 16. οὐκ οἴδατε ὅτι ὁ παριστάτησθαι εὐαγγελίαν θεοῦ εἰς ὑπάκουην, δοῦλοί ἐστε ὑπάκουετε, ἤτοι ἀμαρτίας εἰς θάνατον, ἡ ὑπάκουη εἰς δικαιοσύνην; 17. χάρις δὲ τῷ Θεῷ, ὅτι ἤτε

1 αὐτὴ εἰς C3KLP; om. ἝΑΒC 47, vulg.; αὐτὴ only, DF, Orig.-inter. The received reading is apparently an attempt to combine the other two.

2 ὦς DFKLP 17; but ὀς ἝΑΒC 47.

For ἀμαρτήσωμεν ἝΑΒC DKLP read ἀμαρτήσωμεν.

2 Cor. x. 4, 6, 7, and cf. ὀψάνια, ver. 23. ὢν πρὸς νεκρῶν ζωντας: they were really such; the ὀψαλ 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. ἀμαρτήσομεν; deliberative: are we to sin because our life is not ruled by statutes, but inspired by the sense of the character which God approves? 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 δοῦλος is the exclusive property of one, and he belongs to that one εἰς ὑπάκουη, with obedience in view; nothing else than obedience to his master alone is contemplated. The masters here are ἀμαρτία whose service ends in death, and ὑπάκουη (cf. v. 19) whose service ends in righteousness. Δικαιοσύνη here cannot be "justification," but righteousness in the sense of the character which God approves. ἤτοι 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 ἤτε . . . ὑπηκούσατε δὲ: the co-ordination seems to imply that Paul is grateful (1) that their servitude to sin is past—ἡτε 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 τὸ παρεδόθη τῷ τυποῦ διδαχῆς must be resolved into τὸ τύπῳ τῆς διδαχῆς εἰς τὸ παρεδόθη. The alternative is εἰς τὸν τυπὸν τῆς διδαχῆς ἐς παρεδόθη ὦμῶν (Kypke). But ὑπηκούσατε 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 Jerusalem. Catechet. lect. iv., § iii.: πρὸ δι τῆς εἰς τὴν πίστιν παραδόσεως; the catechumens were handed over to the faith. But what is the τύπος διδαχῆς 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, "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 διδαχῆς in a more general sense;
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 ὕμων. 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 descend 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.

δοῦλοι τῇ ἁμαρτίᾳ, ὑπηκούσατε δὲ ἐκ καρδίας εἰς διὰ παρεδόθητε τύπον διδαχῆς. 18. ἐλευθεροθέτετε δὲ ἀπὸ τῆς ἁμαρτίας, ἐδούλωθετε τῇ δικαιοσύνῃ. 19. ἀνθρώπινον λέγω διὰ τὴν ἀσθένειαν τῆς σαρκὸς ὕμων. ἂστερ γὰρ παρεστήσατε τὰ μέλη ὑμῶν δοῦλα τῇ ἁκάθαρσι καὶ τῇ ἁνομίᾳ εἰς τὴν ἁνομίαν, οὕτω νῦν παραστήσατε τὰ μέλη ὑμῶν δοῦλα τῇ δικαιοσύνῃ εἰς ἁγιασμὸν. 20. ὅτε γὰρ δοῦλοι ἦτε τῆς ἁμαρτίας, ἐλευθεροθετήτε ἐπὶ τῇ δικαιοσύνῃ. 21. τίνα ὦν καρπὸν εἴχετε τότε, ἐφ’ οίς νῦν ἐπαισχύνεσθε; τὸ γὰρ τέλος ἕκεινον βάνατος. 22. νῦν δὲ εἰλευθερωθέντες ἀπὸ τῆς ἁμαρτίας, δοῦλωθετέ σε ὑπὸ τὸ Θεός, ἐξεῖτε τὸν καρπὸν ὑμῶν εἰς ἁγιασμὸν, τὸ δὲ τέλος ἐξ ἔσχος αἰώνιον. 23. τὰ γὰρ ὑπόστεν τῆς ἁμαρτίας βάνατος· τὸ δὲ χάρισμα του
The 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. δόξων 1 Macc. iii. 28, xiv. 32. The idea of a warfare (see ἐπίλα, ver. 13) is continued. The soldier's pay who enlists in the service of sin is death. To illustrate. "All this is normal and natural, for the wages of sin is death," 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. 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) 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 υμᾶς 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.

VI. i—4. ΠΡΟΣ ΡΟΜΑΙΟΥΣ

VII. 1—4. Οὐδὲ αἰῶνας ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ τῷ Κυρίῳ ἡμῶν. VII. 1. Ἡ ἀγνοεῖτε, ἀδελφοί (γυνῶσκουσι γὰρ νόμον λαλῶ;) ὅτι ὁ νόμος κυριεύει τοῦ ἀνδρότου ἐφ᾽ ὧν φέρεται ἡμῖν: τοῦ ἀνδρότου ἐφ᾽ ὧν φέρεται ἡμῖν: ἐὰν δὲ ἀποθῆκη ὁ ἄνηρ, κατηργηθῇ ἀπὸ τοῦ ἀνδρός. 2. ἐὰν γὰρ ὁ ἄνηρ ὕπανδρος γυνὴ τῷ ἀνδρὶ ἀνεῖσθαι νόμῳ: ἐὰν δὲ ἀποθῆκη ὁ ἄνηρ, κατηργηθῇ ἀπὸ τοῦ ἀνδρός. 3. ἢ ἡ γυνὴ τῶν ἀνδρῶν μοιχαλίς χρηματίσει, ἡμῖν γένηται ἀνδρὶ ἐτέρῳ: ἐὰν δὲ ἀποθῆκη ὁ ἄνηρ, ἐλευθέρω ἀτῶν ἀπὸ τοῦ νόμου, τοῦ μὴ εἶναι αὐτὴν μοιχαλίδα, γενομένην ἀνδρὶ ἐτέρῳ. 4. ὅτε, ἀδελφοί μου, καὶ ὑμεῖς ἐθανατώθητε τῷ νόμῳ διὰ τοῦ σώματος τοῦ Χριστοῦ, εἰς τὸ γενέσθαι υμᾶς ἐτέρῳ, τῷ ἐκ νεκρῶν
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 δώμωμα 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 ἐπερχόμενον: 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 καρποφορήσαμεν; 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 (θανάτου) to the first (καρποφορήσαμεν) 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 τῷ σαρκὶ is materially the same as ἐν τοῖς νόμοις: the same state of the soul is described more from within and more from without. The opposite would be ἐν τῷ πνεύματι, oe ἐν χάριν. 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 καρποφόρησαι 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. κατηγορήθημεν: 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 ψυχῇ, 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 τοῦτο with ἀποθανόντες, something vaguer than the law, though involving and involved by it (the old life in the flesh, for instance) must be meant. ὡστε δουλεύειν κ.τ.λ.: "enabling us to serve" (S. and H.): for ὡστε with inf. in N.T., see Blass, Gramm. des N.T. Griech., § 218. ἐν καινοτοῖς πνεύματοι 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 πνεύμα and γράμμα, see 2 Cor. iii.; for ψυχή in this expression, see Burton, § 481.
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 ἁμαρτιῶν 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 from the relations of sin and law what inference then shall we draw? as from the revelations of sin and law just suggested. Is the law sin? Paul repels the thought with horror. Is the law just suggested. Is the law sin? Paul repels the thought with horror. 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 ἠδειν. ἐὰν 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 the 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 tenth commandment. Its generality made it the most appropriate to quote. Its generality made it the most appropriate to quote. It seems impossible to deny the reference to the tenth commandment (Exod. xx. 17) when the words οὐκ ἐπιθυμήσατε 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 ἁμαρτία 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
Ver. 9. *ἐγὼ δὲ ἐξων 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.

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 ἀμαρτία;) and the commandment, which is the law in operation, holy and just and good. ἀγαθή means that it belongs to God and has a character corresponding; δικαια that its requirements are those which answer to the relations in which man stands to God and his fellow-creatures; ἁγια 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
is, or excite a stronger desire for deliverance from it. The second clause with ἐνα (ἦν γένηται καθ’ ὑπερβολὴν ἀμαρτολός ἡ ἀμαρτία) 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. ἐγώ δὲ σάρκινος εἰμι, πεπαριμένος ὑπὸ τὴν ἁμαρτίαν: I, as opposed to the law, am a creature of flesh, sold under sin. σαρκίνος 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 πεπαριμένος 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 εἰμί is determined simply by the ἐστίν 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 of νινθακόω, 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 γάρ ὁ θέλω k.t.l. There is “an incomprehensible contradiction in his action”. κατεργάζεσθαι 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. οὐθεὶς τεταρτήθη ἐν οἷς πράσσειν: 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 ἁγαθή (ver. 12) its beneficial purpose.

Ver. 17. Νυνὶ δὲ οὐκέτα ἐγὼ κατεργάζομαι ἀτόμῳ. ἐγώ 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. τοῦ ἐνοικοῦν ἀτόμου πνεύμα 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 anti-nomian, or manichean, as well as evan-
Only here and vers. 19. 20. 21. 22. 23. sum. OTL: most. Eπισκῆσα άρα τόν νόμον τῷ θελοντὶ \(\text{ἐμοὶ \, κ.τ.λ.}\). is equivalent to Επισκῆσα άρα \(\text{δὲ \, νόμος \, τῷ \, θελοντὶ \, ἐμοὶ \, κ.τ.λ.}\). 1 This is what I find the law---the Mosaic law. The construction is not intolerable, if we observe that Επισκῆσα άρα τόν νόμον τῷ θελοντὶ \(\text{ἐμοὶ \, κ.τ.λ.}\). is equivalent to Επισκῆσα άρα \(\text{δὲ \, νόμος \, τῷ \, θελοντὶ \, ἐμοὶ \, κ.τ.λ.}\). 2 "This is what I find the law---or like 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 \(\text{ἐμοὶ}\) has something tragic in it: \(\text{με},\) who am so anxious to do otherwise. Ver. 22 f. Further explanation: the
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realises that he is himself in the state
regenerating spirit. It is called inward

chief organ. Paul does not see in his

other words to itself: "of whom a man

certain forces operate; he sees two

aspects, if not
descrred in ver. 23. Here also νόμος is
not used in the modern physical sense,
but imaginatively: "I see that a power

is involved in its doom. Salvation must in-

volved in its doom. Salvation must in-

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

for which thanks are given.

The body of this death" is there-
fore 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 in-
clude deliverance from the body so far
as the body has this character and
destiny.

Ver. 25. The exclamation of thank-
giving shows that the longed-for deliver-
ance 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 eman-
cipation as a Christian. διὰ Ἡ. τοῦ

Kυρίου 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 ἀρα οὐν 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
character of law.  

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.


Ver. 1. οὖθεν ἄρα τοίς ἔν Χ. Ἰ. The οὖθεν is emphatic: condemnation is in every sense cut off by the question. τοίς ἔν 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 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 δι’ οὐκομενος ᾑωτοποιηματιν” 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. In ἐν 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 of “in that,” or “because”. For the meaning cf. vii. 18. What the law could not do, God did by sending τὸν ἀντίτον υἱὸν His own Son. With the coming of so great a Person,
Ev entered the world. God sent His Son

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 in connection with sin. The connection implies that sending Him was in some way related to the end to be secured. But what do the words mean? ὁμοιόματι occurs in Rom. i. 23, v. 14, vi. 5, and also in Phil. ii. 7. This last passage, in which Christ is described as ὁμοιόματι ἀνθρώπων γενόμενος, is the one which is most akin to Rom. vii. 3, and most easily illustrates it. There must have been a reason why Paul wrote in Philippians in ὁμοιόματι ἀνθρώπων γενόμενος instead of ἀνθρώπων γενόμενος, and it may well have been the same reason which made him write here ὁμοιόματι σαρκὸς 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 σαρκaphragmatos, 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 ὁμοιόματι 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 ὁμοιόματι 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 ὁμοιόματι σαρκὶ ἁμαρτίας, 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. δῶρον, but in Isa. lii. 10 and 8). 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 f.), 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 inexusable 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
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 in a life of sin which might be fulfilled in us. See note on iii. 31. Tois μη κατα 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. κατα σάρκα: the flesh meant is our corrupt human nature. κατα πνεύμα: 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 γάρ by which it is hooked together” (Jowett). οἱ κατὰ σάρκα δύντε 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 πνεύμα are those whose nature is determined by the spirit: for τὰ τοῦ πνεύματος see Gal. v. 22.

Ver. 6. τὸ γάρ 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. μεθ’ εἰς is emphatic. You can please God, for you are not in the flesh, etc. εἰς τὰς ἐξουσίας 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 τὰς πνεύματα Ἡρωδίου οὐκ ἔχει, οὗτος οὐκ ἔστιν αὐτῷ. 10. εἰ δὲ Ἰησοῦς οὐκ ἔμεθα, τὸ μὲν σῶμα νεκρόν δὲ
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 such as 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 χριστοῦ 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. οὓς suggests the rank and privileges of the persons in question; τέκνοι (in ver. 16 f.) their kinship in nature to God. Yet
cannot everywhere be urged in the N.T.

Ver. 15. Sons, or γάρ ἐλάβετε πνεύμα σουλήσας. 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 τέκνα, a spirit proper to those who were being translated from the servile to the filial relation to God. τοῦ ἐαυτοῦ ἑαυτοῦ, 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: τοῦ ἑαυτοῦ ἑαυτοῦ ver. 3, τοῦ ἑαυτοῦ ἑαυτοῦ 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 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 'Αββά ὁ πάτηρ. 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 which with it speaks is, as we know, prompted and inspired by the Divine Spirit itself. For similar distinctions Gifford compares ii. 15 and ix. 1. 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 κληρονόμοι is relative to υἱοί; 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 εἰς περιστάσασθαι ἡμᾶς καὶ προσφέρεσθαι. The word περιστάσασθαι 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; and 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. λογιζόμεθα γάρ κ.τ.λ. λογιζόμεθα 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 μέλησαν δοξαν ἀποκαλυφθήναι cf. in Gal. iii. 23.
ally for SJ.  It is in this way that the idea is that of looking for what one does not find—hence of futility, frustration, disappointment.  But this, if creation be considered not as a system in which nothing continues from man to man, as it will be when the sons of God are revealed, it will pass from creation as well as man.  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.  And the hope is that 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. lxv. 17, 2 Pet. iii. 13, Rev. xxii. 1): this is
Paul's faith, and the sighing of creation attests it.

Ver. 22. ὡταμένοι γὰρ κ.π.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 συστενάξει καὶ συνωθίνει 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 Messianae; but in συνωθίνει there is the suggestion of the travail out of which the new world is to be born. ἀχρι τοῦ νῦν means up till now, without stopping, ever since the moment of ὑπεστήγη.

Ver. 23. Second testimony to the glorious future. οὐ μόνον δὲ ἡ κ.π.λ. —not only all creation, but we Christians: we ourselves, τὴν ἀπαρχὴν τοῦ πνεύματος ἔχουσα, 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 ιεροθεῖαν ἀπεκδεχόμενοι, τὴν ἀπολύτρωσιν τοῦ σῶματος 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 ἐν 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 the resulting construction be. Weiss argues that the sense of ἐλπὶς 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 ἐλπὶς in the second clause (τὸς σπερατὰ) 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 ἐλπὶς 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
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 if, in II. Thess. i. 3 we have ις υπομονή τῆς ἐλπίδος ὑμῶν used of a suffering but steadfast Church: υπομονή is the constancy which belongs to and characterises hope in dark days. In the pastoral epistles (I Tim. vi. 10; Tit. ii. 2) instead of the πίστις, ἀγάπη, ἐλπίς, of earlier letters, Paul writes πίστις, ἀγάπη, υπομονή, as if he had discovered by experience that in this life "hope" is the constancy which belongs to and characterises hope in dark days.

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 τὶ προσευχόμεθα καθὼς δει οὐκ οἴδαμεν. The article makes the whole clause object of οἴδαμεν: Winer, p. 644. Broadly speaking, we do not know what we are to pray for—the perfecting of salvation; but we do not know what we are to pray for καθὼς δει—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 στεναγμοὶ ἀναλήπτους. ὑπερεντυγχάνει is found here only in N.T., but ἔντυγχανεν in this sense in vers. 27, 34, Heb. vii. 25. In Rom. xi. 2 with κατὰ = to make intercession against. ἀναλήπτους does not mean "unspoken" but "unutterable". The στεναγμοὶ 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 ἀλαλήπτους—groanings (or sighs) that banale 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. τὴν τὸ φρόν. τοῦ πνεύματος: what the Spirit is set upon, the whole object of its thought and endeavour. ὑπὲρ ἀγίων in agreement with God's will, see 2 Cor. vii. 9-11.

Ver. 28. Conclusion of the argument: the Apostle glories in the assurance of God's eternal and unchangeable love in Jesus Christ. οἴδαμεν δὲ further, we know; in a sense this is one ground more for be-
lying 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 ἕδυξασ)." etc. τοῖς ἀγαπ.

τῶν θεῶν describes the persons in question from the human side: τοῖς κατὰ πρόθεσιν κλητοῖς ὤννιν 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 ἕδυξασ. Eph. i. 11, 11, 11, 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 γεννάσκω (γεννάσκω) 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 προάρισεν 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 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. 10-12. The Apostle now resumes the series of the Divine acts in our salvation. οὖς δὲ προώμεν, 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. τι οὖν ἐρωμέν 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 ὑπέρ 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.
1 Christos alone BDEK, most cursive, and Treg. Christos Ἰησοῦς ἩACFL 17, vulg., etc. Weiss puts X. 1 in text, thinking the omission in B, etc., accidental; W. and H., and Lachm. bracket Ἰησοῦς. The καὶ before εγερθεῖς is wanting in ἩABC. The καὶ before εστιν is wanting in ἩAC but is found in ἩBDFKL. It is omitted by W. and H. and Tischd., bracketed by Lachm., but retained by Weiss. After εγερθεῖς ἩAC insert εκ νεκρῶν; W. and H. bracket this, but all other crit. edd. omit, with ἩBDFKL, etc.

οὐκ ἐφείσατο, cf. Gen. xxii. 12, οὐκ ἐφείσω τοῦ υἱοῦ σου τοῦ ἄναπτύτου 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 οὐχι 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. I 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. 1. 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 ἐγκαλεῖται κατὰ ἐκλεκτῶν θεοῦ; who shall bring a charge against persons who are God's chosen? The absence of the article (cf. ὑπὲρ ἄγιον, 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 foreknowledge 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 ἐγκαλεῖται 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 κατακριμων a new question, and find the answer in verse 34: Christos Ἰησοῦς ὁ ἀποστανῶν = the only person who can condemn is the Judge, viz., 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 κατάκριμα with his eye on Christ, who died for our sins? μᾶλλον δὲ εἰρηθεὶς [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.
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. ex. 1, and is often used in the N.T. than any other words of the Old), who also makes intercession on our behalf. δὲ καὶ ἐντυγχάνει: a solemn climax is marked by the repetition of δὲ, and by this 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, i 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. xliv. 23 is peculiar. It exactly reproduces the LXX, even the δὲ being simply transferred. The καὶδὲ 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 βασανόμεθα of the psalm, and suggested the quotation. The point of it, both in the psalm and in the epistle, lies in ἐνεκέν 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. vi. 2, 3 Cor. i. 5, Col. 1. 24. Instead of despairing, he glories in tribulations.

Ver. 37. ὑπερικόμεν: 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 μικᾶν and ὑπερικάν (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 ἐνεκέν 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. τέλεσιμαι cf. 2 Tim. i. 12. ὁ ἡμῶν ὡς ὁ θάνατος oúte λωτῇ: 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
very point, cf. John viii. 51, xi. 28, xii. 25 f., I Thess. iv. 13-18, I 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 light of the Apostle's thoughts just when they would soar above all limitation' (Gifford). oüte ἀγγέλωι oüte 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 ἀγγέλωι good and ἀρχαί evil powers, though both spiritual; or ἀγγέλωι 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 I Cor. xvi. 24, Eph. i. 21 favours a suggestion in S. and H. that possibly in a very early copy oüte δυνάμεις had been accidentally omitted after oüte 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. oüte ἐνεστώτα oüte μέλλοντα: cf. I Cor. iii. 22. oüte ψωμα oüte βάρος: 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. oüte ἄξων: 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 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
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. 30-30x. 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 willfully 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 invokes 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, ὡμέν δὲ λέγον τοῖς ἑθένσι), 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 importunate 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 μαῖς is governed by σον: conscience attests what he says, and that ἐν πνεύματι ἀγίῳ—the spirit of
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: τὴν being intensified in ὄντως, οὐδὲν in ἀδιάλειπτος, and μοι in τῇ καρδίᾳ μου. Paul cannot find words strong enough to convey his feeling.

Ver. 3. ἡ ἐνδομή γὰρ ἀνάθεμα εἶναι κ.τ.λ. For I could wish that I myself were anathema, etc. For the omission of δὲ 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 (κατεργάσθη ἀπὸ Χριστοῦ). ἀνάθεμα Gal. i. 8 f., 1 Cor. xii. 3, xvi. 22 is the equivalent of the Hebrew רָעָבָה, 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. xxxiii. 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. οὕτως εἶναι Ἰσραήλιται: 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. ὁ ἱερός τοῦ ναοῦ: this is not the Christian church: the glory must refer to something definite, like the pillar of cloud and fire, the ἱερόν τῆς του σπάεται 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 ἦ 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. xiv. 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 Israelitic religion "the best was yet to be," as all the highest minds knew. Ver. 5. ὁ υἱὸς τῆς αἰκατερίας: 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?
But the supreme distinction of Israel has yet to be mentioned. 

21. e. v. Christ's greatness by calling Him God who is over all, God blessed for ever, it seems to me almost arbitrary, but merely sum up the whole impression made on the mind by the study of Paul's writings, an impression 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 Apostles' writings; and though there is some irregularity in the grammar, and perhaps some
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 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 procedure of God. The use of ὧν, which is in itself unnecessary, emphasises ἐν 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. 6-23) 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 ὁλον δὲ δι’ ἐκπεπτωκέναι ὁ λόγος τοῦ Θεοῦ. οὐ γὰρ πάντες ἀδελφοί ἔχουσι τοῦ Ἰσαακκαὶ ἐπεξερεύνων τοῦ Θεοῦ. οὐ δὲ διὰ τὸ πάντως τέκνα, ἀλλὰ "ἐν Ἰσαακ κληθῆσαί τοις σπέρμα". 8. τούτ’ ἔστιν, οὐ τά τέκνα τῆς σαρκός, ταύτα τέκνα τοῦ Θεοῦ. ἀλλὰ τά τέκνα τῆς ἐπαγγελλίας λογίζεται εἰς σπέρμα. 9. ἐπαγγελλίας γὰρ Ἰσαακ, ἐπιστρέφει τοιοῦτον ἔλεος, καὶ ἐσται τῇ Ἰσαακ, ὁ λόγος οὗτος, "Κατὰ τόν καιρόν τούτον ἔλεος οὖσαι, καὶ ἐσται τῇ Ἰσαακ," (Jas. xi. 10).
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' ἐκλογήν, 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 ex lex; He is a law to Himself—a law all love and holiness and truth—in all His purposes towards men. So Calvin: "ubi mentionem glorire 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.
continued in ver. 12. "Israel of whom
μων ἃν: Paul speaks here out of his own
consciousness as a Jew, addressing him
self to a problem which greatly exercised
other Jews; and calls Isaac "father" as
the person from whom the inheritance
was to come. Ver. 11. μὴ γὰρ γεννη-
θέντων μὴθε πραξάντων: "the conditional
negatives (μὴ γάρ, μὴθε) represent the cir-
cumstances not as mere facts of history,
but as conditions entering into God's
counsel and plan. The time of the predic-
tion 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 theo-
logical 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 αἰῶνων, Eph. iii.
11; it is God's ἡδα 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' ἐκλογήν,
legate, 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 per-
fectly intelligible purpose, for it is de-
scribed as πρόθεσις ἢν ἐποίησεν ἐν
Χριστῷ Ἰσχου, and what God means by
Christ Jesus no one can doubt. God's
eternal purpose, the purpose carried out
κατ' ἐκλογήν, yet embracing the universe,
is clearly revealed in His Son. The per-
manent 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. xxx. 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 provid-
ence; He is obviously thinking of Jacob
and Esau as individuals, whose own re-
lation to God's promise and inheritance
(involving no doubt that of their pos-
ternity) 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 indi-
viduals to an absolute decree of God
which has no relation to what they are
or do, but rests simply on His inscrut-
able 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 chil-
dren of Abraham; and this He can do
quite effectually, on the lines indicated,
without consciously facing this tremen-
dous hypothesis.

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

Ver. 14. Τὶ οὖν ἐροῦμεν; cf. vi. i,
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. ὁ ἑῳ ἔνωσεν γὰρ λέγει. ὁ ἑῳ
Μωυσεῖ is emphatic by position: the
person to whom this declaration was
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 δν δρ, and the point is that in showing mercy God is determined by nothing outside of His mercy itself. οἰκτείρειν is stronger than ἔλεείν; 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 γάρ 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 Φαραώ: 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 ἔγινε ἡ σε. The LXX in Exod. ix. 16 read: καὶ ἐνεκέννη τοῦτον διεστηριδήθη, the last word, answering to the Hebrew νώτερα, 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 μαρ. 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.
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, it is he who shaped me; 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 to a sort of political interpretation of the O.T. words he uses; and this summary fashion to repress. A man might say, but irrelevant. For 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. It 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.

1 ω ἀνθρωπος stands before μενοῦντε in ΝAB (B omits ye), and so in all crit. edd.
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 pre·

sumptuousness 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. el δέ: the δέ 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 σκεύη όργῆς κατ. είς 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 δέ: it is an aggravation of the very difficulty from which the Apostle is making his escape; (b) it is inconsistent with the words εν 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 η όργη, the wrath of God, is relative to sin, and to nothing else: except against sin, there is no such thing as wrath in God. In σκεύη όργῆς the word σκεύη 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 pre­

cluded by η όργη, the wrath of God. In the σκεύη όργῆς 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 σκεύη όργῆς as a quotation from Jer. i. (LXX xxvii.) 25; for there the words mean "the instru­ments by which God executes His wrath," les armes de sa colère (Reuss).

κατηρισμένα 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 κατηρισμένος = 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 el δέ 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 σκεύη όργῆς, the latter on those who are σκεύη ἐλέους; but, in carrying out both parts
22—27.

PROΣ ΡΩΜΑΙΟΥΣ


1 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 σκεύη ὄργης there is much long-suffering, for the σκεύη ἔλεους a preparation and a calling in which God's free unmerited mercy is conspicuous. καὶ ἐν γνώμῃ: This is mentioned as a principal purpose of God. ἐπὶ σκεύη ἔλεους: the glory is conceived as something shed upon the persons concerned; they are irradiated with the Divine brightness. Cfr. 2 Thess. i. 10. δόξα: in such connections has usually a supersensible 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. ἐκ προστοίμασεν ἐλοί 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: οὖς καὶ ἐκάλεσεν ἡ μ. ἂς = whom he also called us. The σκεύη ἔλεους, 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 προστοίμασεν and in ἐκάλεσιν. How much is covered by προστοίμασεν 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-ammı) and Not beloved (= Lo-ruhmah) 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.
k Here only (and so also of ὑπόλειμμα.)


1 For κατάλειμμα (which is the reading of the LXX) DFKLP, read with Ν'AB υπόλειμμα.

2 Εἰ δικαιοσύνη ὑπὸ λόγων συντετμημένων ou, Ν'AB 47. “Western and Syrian” authorities have the words, in agreement with the LXX. But the γὰρ after the first λόγος 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 πέρι; 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 ἔδωκεν δὲ λαῷ Ἰσραήλ ὡς ἡ ἄμμος τῆς βαλαντίνης, τὸ κατάλειμμα αὐτῶν σωθήσεται. λόγον συντετμημένον καὶ συντετμημένον [ἐν δικαιοσύνῃ, ὅτι λόγον συντετμημένον] κύριος ποιήσει ἐν τῇ ὁμοίωσιν δῆλη. The words bracketed are omitted by most editors, but the sense is not affected. τὸ υπόλειμμα has the emphasis: only the remnant shall be saved. This doctrine Paul apparently finds confirmed by the words λόγον γὰρ συντετμημένον καὶ συντετμημένον 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 (συντετμημένον), but He at the same time limits or contracts it (συντετμημένον), 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 στέρμα or seed which God leaves is the same as the υπόλειμμα. 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 σκεπὴ ὄργης καταργημένα εἰς ἀπόλειαν would not be σκεπὴ ὄργῆς 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-
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, insomuch as God had made His way of salvation plain and accessible to all.

Ver. 30 f. ἦν δὲν ἐποίησαν; 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 (ἐθνῶν, not ἔθνη) that did not follow after righteousness attained righteousness, the righteousness which followed in 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 δικαιοσύνη 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. 

The conclusion of the foregoing discussion is—God's answer to the question raised.
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 \textit{\textit{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 \textit{δικαιοσύνη θεοῦ}, God's own gift and work in you; or you may start \textit{\textit{ἐξ ἐργῶν}}, 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 \textit{ἐλεγχον}, but only \textit{οὐ ἐξ ἐργῶν}; 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 \textit{προσέκοψαν ἃρ ἀπὸ τοῦ προσκόμματος}, The stone on which they stumbled was Christ, and especially His Cross. The \textit{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 \textit{ἐπὶ αὐτῷ} after \textit{διπτεῦσιν} (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 (\textit{οἱ Ἰudentοι}) it is clear that the persons addressed are a Gentile Church. \textit{Πρὸς εὐαγγέλιον} 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. \textit{εὐδοκία} is a word of power; it is a feeling of inner satisfaction, an "Etymologicum ineditum" quoted in Schleusner explains it by \textit{ἐξουσία}, His inmost desire and his supplication to God are in their interest, with a view to their salvation. The \textit{πᾶς} has no corresponding δὲ; the sad reality which answers to it does not need again to be expressed.

Ver. 2. Their good qualities compel his affection. \textit{ἐνθυμοῦντες} 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—4.

ΠΡΟΣ ΡΩΜΑΙΟΥΣ

X. 1. ἈΔΕΛΦΟΙ, ἡ μὲν εὐθυκία τῆς ἐμῆς καρδίας, καὶ ἡ δέησις ἡ 1· 2 a 2 Cor. xi. 2. πρὸς τὸν Θεόν ὑπὲρ τοῦ Ἰσραήλ ἐστιν εἰς σωτηρίαν. 2. μαρτυρεῖ b Acts xvii. 23; 1 Tim. i. 13. γὰρ αὕτως ὡς ἔξαλλον Θεοῦ ἔχουσιν, ἀλλ' ὡς κατ' ἐπίγνωσιν. 3· c Gal. vi. 5. ἁγνοοῦντες" γὰρ τὴν τοῦ Θεοῦ δικαιοσύνην, καὶ τὴν ἰδίαν "δικαιοσύνην 2· d Phil. iii. 9. ξητοῦντες στήμα, τῇ δικαιοσύνῃ τοῦ Θεοῦ ὡς ὑπετάγχαν. 4. τέλος 3· e Mark iii. 26; Heb. vii. 5.

1 η before πρὸς τὸν Θεὸν om. ΝΑΒΔΦ. For τοῦ Ἰσραήλ ἐστιν read αὐτῶν with ΝΑΒΔΦ 47, etc.

2 τὴν ἰδιαν δικαιοσύνην ΝΦΓΚΛ and most cursives, is adopted by Tischdf., but most edd. with ΑΒΔΠ 47, vulg. omit δικαιοσύνην.

pel. ἀλλ' οὖ 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, i Tim. ii. 4, 2 Tim. ii. 25; it is especially used of religious knowledge, and suggests attainment in it (ἀρτὶ γινώσκω ἐκ μέρους, τότε δὲ ἐπιγνώσαμαι, 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 ὑπετάγχαν 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 χριστὸς 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. Μνησθῆς γὰρ γράφει: Moses' authority is unimpeachable on this point. The righteousness that comes from law
must be an achievement: the man who has done it shall live in it, Lev. xviii. 5. Paul writes ευ αυτῇ with reference to δικαιοσύνη: the ευ αυτois of the LXX refers to πάντα τά 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 be saved 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.

 δικαιοσύνη (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 τό πέραν τῆς βαλάνσιας. These two indefinite proverbal expressions for the impossible are interpreted by Paul. With τοῦτο ἐστιν (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 God’s gift to faith.

Ver. 8. ἡ γὰρ ἐν εὐθυτοὶς δικαιοσύνη, etc. 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 ἐντολή αὐτῇ ἦν ἐγὼ ἐντολαίῳ σοι σήμερον) is not oppressive nor impracticable (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 εἰπής ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ σου: = do not think, especially thought you would be ashamed to utter. τὸς ἀναβησθήσεται εἰς τὸν οὐρανὸν . . . ἡ τίς καταβησθήσεται εἰς τὴν ἀβυσσόν; 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.
the righteousness of God depends. \textit{tīs 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". \textit{ὅτι} = \textit{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 χερσί σου ποιεῖς αὐτό) he disregards. ἐὰν ὀμολογήσῃς τὸ ἰδίᾳ \ldots \ 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 στόματι σου precedes ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ σου. \textit{τὸ ἰδίᾳ} is virtually \textit{the Gospel}, as God's word concerning His Son and faith in Him. We confess it when we say, Jesus is Lord. 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-atoning 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. \textit{καρδίᾳ γὰρ πιστεύεται εἰς δικαιοσύνην, στόματι δὲ ὀμολογεῖται 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 \textit{δικαιοσύνην}, 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, \textit{unerhörter Dogmatismus}.

Ver. 11. This verse proves from Scripture the main idea in the preceding, \textit{viz.}, that faith saves. It is a quotation from Is. xxviii. 16 (see ix. 33) with the addition of \textit{πᾶς}, to which nothing corre-
1. the Law teaches us how to do right, but it does not give us the power to do it. The Law is a means of making us aware of our need of a Savior; it is now asserted in another sense that the same Lord is waiting to save all who come to Him in faith. 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. 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 πάς 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 ῥῆμα 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

spends 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 Ἰουδαϊκως τε καὶ Ἑλληνος : 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. πλούτων 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 ἀνεξηγείως πλοῦτος τοῦ Χριστοῦ, τὸς ἐπικαλουμένους αὐτῶν: cf. 1 Cor. i. 2 where Christians are described as οἱ ἐπικαλουμένοι τὸ δύσμοι τ. Κ. μὲν ι. 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.
12–17.
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χωρίς κηρύσσοντος; 15. τῶς δὲ κηρύσσοντι, ἐὰν μὴ ἀποσταλάσω; καθὼς γέγραται, "Ὡς ὥραιοι οἱ ποδεῖς τῶν εὐαγγελιζομένων εἰρήνην," τῶν εὐαγγελιζομένων τῷ ἀγαθῷ" 16. Ἄλλῳ οὖ κάντες "ὄψεσθαι τοὺς ἐν ἀκοὴν ἑαυτῷ. Ἡ θυσία γὰρ λέγει, "Κύριε, τίς ἐπίστευσε τῇ ἀκοῇ στ Θεσσ. ιι. ἡμῶν;" 17. ἢ ἡ πίστις ἐξ ἀκοῆς, ἢ δὲ ἀκοὴ διὰ ρήματος θεοῦ. 2

1 For κηρύσσοντι read κηρύσσων with ΝΑΒDKLP. For καθὼς read καθαπερ with B. See note 1, page 598.

2 εὐαγγελιζομένων εἰρήνην τῶν om. Ν1ABC 47; ins. Ν2DFKLP. The omission may be due to homoeoteleuton. 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.

3 τοῖς εὐαγγελιζομένων ἄγαθον. Weiss says with good reason: "It may be due to the homoeoteleuton. 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."

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. τῶς οὖν ἐπικαλεσμένους: sq. τούτων. τῶς δὲ πιστεύσωσιν οὐκ ἠκούσαν; 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. τῶς δὲ ἀκούσωσιν: this deliberative form is in all probability right: see critical note and Blass, Gramm. des Neut. Griech., 205. ἐὰν μὴ ἀποσταλάσω: viz., by the Lord Whom they preach, and Who is heard speaking when they speak. Cf. i Cor. i. 17, ἀποστειλέν μὲ Χριστὸς... εὐαγγελίζωσα. 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. ii. 7" (Gifford). ὡς ὥραιοι: 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. οὗ 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 ηῇστισεν τινες. Yet this quantum of unbelief does not disconnect the Apostle; for it also, as well as the proclamation of the Gospel, is included in the prophecy. τίς εἰπε· τῇ ἀκοῇ ἡμῶν is a lament over practically universal unbelief. ἡ ἀκοὴ ἡμῶν in Isaiah means "that which we heard," but who the "we" are is not clear. If a representative prophet speaks, ἀκοὴ will mean that which he and other prophets heard from God: "Who hath believed the revelation made to us?" Cf. Isa. xxvii. 9, 19. If a representative of repenting Israel speaks, ἀκοὴ 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 parenthesis: Paul's logical mind cannot let slip the chance of showing how this quotation confirms the connection of ideas in ver. 14. ἢ ἢρα suits a rapid passing inference better than the more deliberate ἢ ἢρα οὖν which is much more frequent in Romans. Cf. i 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 ρήματος Χριστοῦ through the Word concerning Christ.
That which when heard is κοινός is when spoken δόμα, and it is the condition of faith. The construction in δόμα Χριστοῦ is the same as in τὸ δόμα 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 ἄλλα λέγω introduces a plea on their behalf. It is Paul who speaks; hence the form of the question μή ὅδικουσαν 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. μενούγησε is immo nero. 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. ἄλλα 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 inability to understand God's Word, ought to be incompatible ideas. Τῇ πώτῳ Μωυσῆς λέγει, Deut. xxxii. 21. πώτῳ 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. Ησαΐας δὲ ἅπατολμᾶ: "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 ἐξε καὶ μὴ ἐπερωτώτες means those who put no question to me, se., about the way of salvation. In Isa. lxv. i 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

---

1 Is. before ouk egw 4ABCD3F.

* The part of Isa. lxv. i 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.
have been a message to the Jews, which they could not misunderstand; it should have been a message to the righteousness of faith. The arms outstretched coming under any obligation to God for as for Israel, he says, etc., Is. lxv. 2. For the ignorance there spoken of is one against self-exaltation; and (3) vers. 25-36, 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 ἀπώσατο δὲ θεός τῶν λαῶν αὐτοῦ; For the words, cf. Ps. xciv. 14 (xciii. LXX), § Sam. xii. 22. In both places the promise is given ὃς ἂν αὐτοῦ ἐλθῇ ἐν αὐτῷ, 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 Ἰσραήλ ἣν ἐγὼ ἐλήμ: 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, am 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 σπέρματος Ἀβραὰμ:
XI. 1. LEWQ oiv, M7 apowusto o THEOS ton lauv autou; 
M7 genoiot λαυν ἀπώσατο ὁ Θεὸς τῶν λαῶν αὐτοῦ; μὴ γένοιο τοῦ Θεοῦ τῶν λαῶν αὐτοῦ, ὃ ἐκπροέρχεται ἐκ τῆς Ἰσραήλ ἐκ τῆς Ἰσραήλ ἐκ τῆς Ἰσραήλ.

2. ouk apowasto o THEOS ton lauv autou, ὁ προεγω. Ἡ οὐκ οἴδατε ἐν Ἡλία ἴ αγγελα προφητα ἐγείρθη ἐν τῇ Ἰσραήλ ἐκ τῆς Ἰσραήλ ἐκ τῆς Ἰσραήλ. Ch. ix. II. 5, OUTW<; b Ch. s Ch. ix. II. 5, OUTW<; b Ch. s

Presented the post-exilic theocratic people. tribe which with Judah mainly represented what the heart has indignantly protested against in ver. 1. ἐν ἦραφὴ ἔστιν ἢ ἡ γραφή; ἡ ἐκπροέρχεται ἐν τῇ Ἰσραήλ ἐκ τῆς Ἰσραήλ ἐκ τῆς Ἰσραήλ. Ch. ix. II. 5, OUTW<; b Ch. s Ch. ix. II. 5, OUTW<; b Ch. s

"Κ一处," τοὺς προφήτας αὐτοῦ ἀπέκτειναν, καὶ τὰ τυσιαστικὰ ἐν τοῖς κατάκεκαπαν κἀκεῖ ὑπελεύθη μόνος, καὶ ξυτοῦσι τὴν ψυχὴν μου." 4. ἀλλὰ τὰ λέγει αὐτῷ ὁ χρηματισμός; "Κατέλυτον ἐμαυτῷ ἐπτακισιλῶς ἅνδρας, οὕτως οὐκ ἐκκαμφάν γόνον τῇ Βααλ." b Ch. iii. 26. c Ch. ix. 11. 5. οὕτως οὖν καὶ ἐν τῷ νόου 
καιρῷ λείμμα κατελυμένον χάριτος

Το θερμικήν ἑργάζεται ἐν τῷ κατακόμβῳ τῆς Ἰσραήλ ἐκ τῆς Ἰσραήλ ἐκ τῆς Ἰσραήλ. Ch. ix. 11. 5, OUTW<; b Ch. s Ch. ix. 11. 5, OUTW<; b Ch. s

λέγων ἦν; ὁμ. ἵνα ABCDF.

Τὸ θερμικήν ἑργάζεται ἐν τῷ κατακόμβῳ τῆς Ἰσραήλ ἐκ τῆς Ἰσραήλ ἐκ τῆς Ἰσραήλ. Ch. ix. 11. 5, OUTW<; b Ch. s Ch. ix. 11. 5, OUTW<; b Ch. s

χρηματισμός: the word is related to χρηματισμός (Mt. ii. 12, 22, Acts x. 22, Heb. viii. 5) as χρηματισμός to χράω: it means the oracle, or answer of God, in the sense of a mere unconditional decree, having no relation to anything but His own will, for 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: οὕτως οὐκ ἐκκαμφάν γόνον τῇ Βααλ. οὕτως is qualitative: such were those whom God reserved for Himself, men who never bowed knee to Baal. Βααλ takes the fem. art. because it was often replaced in reading by ἦν (LXX αὐθαυνή) διαβολή.

Ver. 5. Application of the principle of ver. 4 to the present. οὐκ εἰσῆλθεν ο(IDC) in the present regarded not merely as a date, but as in some sense a crisis. Ήγένον: a remnant has come to be—he is that which has emerged from the general unbelief of Israel. κατελυμένον 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
love alone. The idea is the same as in chap. ix. 6-13: but cf. note on ver. 4.

Ver. 6. Expansion of χάριτι 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. ἐνεργέω: 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: ἐπείξασθε Ἰσραήλ κ.τ.λ. What Israel is in quest of is πνεῦμα κατανύξεως; 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 ἐκλεκτοὶ = τὸ λείμα. ἐπαράδειγμα: 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 κατηγοροῦμαι εἰς ἀπάλειαν 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. ἀστύνημα τοῦ νόηματος, 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. κατάνυξις only occurs in LXX, Is. xxix. 10, Ps. lxx. 4 (οἴνον κατανύξεως); but the verb κατανύσσεσαι is used by Theod. in Dan. x. 15 to translate שׁוּפָּה (cognate to שׁוּפָּה), and in other places of any overpowering emotion: see Fritzsche ad loc. Winer, p. 177. It is God Who sends this spirit of stupor, but He does not send it arbitrarily nor at random: it is always a judgment. ἐώς τής στήμερος ἡμέρας: in Deut. xxix. 4 ἐώς τής ἡμέρας. The change emphasises the fact that what Israel had been from the beginning it was when Paul wrote,
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. and Dąvels λέγει: another proof of ἐπορθοθησαν, 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. γενέθητω ἡ τράπεζα αὐτῶν κ.τ.λ. Their table in the psalm is in that which they delight, and it is this which is to prove their ruin. παγίς, θήρα, and σκάθαλων 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 God’s purpose includes and uses their ruin. —ἀν τε ἡ παραπτώματα αὐτῶν πλοῦτος κόσμου, και τοῦ ηττμα αὐτῶν πλοῦτος ἐθνῶν, πόσω μᾶλλον τὸ πλή-

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

Ver. ii. λέγω οὖν: I say then, taking up the problem again. μὴ ἐπτασιαν 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. i Thess. v. 4, i Cor. vii. 29, Gal. v. 17. ἄλλα: 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. ii. Both ηττμα and πληρώμα are difficult words, but it is not necessary to suppose that they answer mathematically to one another, though Wetstein explains them by — and +. ἡττμα may mean (as in Is. xxxi. 8) defeat, or (as in 1 Cor. vi. 7) loss; it can hardly mean diminutio eorum, or paucitas fidei eorum credentium; τὸ πληρώμα αὐτῶν must mean the making up of them to their full numbers. There is an exhaustive study of the word πληρώμα 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.
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. η προσλήψις: the assumption of the Jews into God's favour. ξωὴ εἰκ 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. ξωὴ εἰκ 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. ἀπερχόμενος ἀγαθά 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 η ἀπαρχὴ ἡγία, καὶ τὸ φῶρα: This explains Paul's assurance that Israel has a future. For ἀπε. 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 branches, signify the same thing. As the application in ver. 28 proves, what is presented in both is the relation of the

Ver. 13 f. ὃμιν δὲ λέγω τοῖς θεωσιν. 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 ffl); 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 πλῆρωμα of ver. 12, and so to bring on a time of unimaginable blessing for the Gentile world. ἐφ' οὖν Mt. xxv. 40. μὲν οὖν is printed in all the critical editions, but Sanday and Headlam would read μενοῦν 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. ἐγώ: 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)," For the interpretation of δοξάζω see 2 Thess. iii. 1, John xvii. 4. For εἰ ποιεσίς see Buttmann, p. 255 f. τινὰς εἰς αὐτῶν: disenchancing 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 γάρ η ἀποβολὴ αὐτῶν κ.τ.λ. Their ἀποβολὴ is their rejection by God on the ground of unbelief. καταλαγὴ κόσμου: a world's reconciliation. In 2
patriarchs to the people as a whole. As chosen by God, the fathers were διόνομα, 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 ἀπαντήσατε. But, 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. 

Ver. 18. μὴ κατακαυχῶ τῶν κλάδων: for the genitive see Buttman, 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. ἐπείς 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. καλὸς: “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.
ψηλοφρόνει, ἀλλὰ φοβοῦ· 21. εἰ γὰρ ὁ θεὸς τῶν κατὰ φύσιν κλάδων ὦκ ἐφείσατο· μὴ πώς 1 οὐδὲ σοῦ ἐφείση. 22. ἵδε οὖν χρηστότητα καὶ ἀποτομάν Theos· ἐπὶ μὲν τοὺς πεσόντας ἀποτομαίνει· ἐπὶ δὲ σὲ ἡ Here only χρηστότητα, 2 εἶναι ἐπιμείνειν τῇ χρηστότητῃ· ἐπεὶ καὶ ύν ἐκκοπή· 23. καὶ ἐκεῖνοι δὲ, ἐὰν μὴ ἐπιμείναιν 2 τῇ ἀποτία, ἐγκεντυθότων τί δυνάτος γὰρ ἐστιν ὁ θεὸς πάλιν ἐγκεντῦται αὐτοῖς. 24. εἰ γὰρ σὺ ἐκ τῆς κατὰ φύσιν ἐξεκόπησις ἀγριελαίου, καὶ παρὰ ὁ φύσιν ἐνεκεν· ο Ch. i. 26. τρίσθης εἰς καλλιεργείαν, πῦρς μᾶλλον οὗτοι οἱ κατὰ φύσιν ἐγκεν· p Here only.

1 Om. μητως ΝΑBCP 47. For feiostaι: ΝΒCDFL read eiostaι. All crit. edd. read feiostaι, but while most edd. omit μητως it is retained by Weiss (with DEFLG, 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 oversight of the transcriber's.

2 χρηστότητα the second time D2FL; but χρηστότης θεος ABCD1, and so all edd. For επιμείνειν ΝΒΔ1 read επιμείνεις, and so most edd. but not Alf.

3 For επιμείνων ΝΒΔ1 read επιμείνων; see also last verse.

εὐστήκας: 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 ψηλαφρόνειν: cf. xii. 16. i Tim. vi. 17 has μὴ ψηλαφρόνειν. Neither is classical. φοβοῦ: consistent with πίστις. Timor opponitur non fiduciae sed supercilii 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 feiostaι (not feiostaι), but Weiss would retain μητως (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 μητως (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. ἀποτομαία: here only in N.T. The moral idea is that of peremptoriness, inexorableness; in Greek writers it is contrasted with ἡμερότης, ἀπεικόνισις, πράσινος.

Cf. 2 Cor. xiii. 10. ἐὰν ἐπιμείνης τῇ χρηστότητῃ: if you remain 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. κακεῖνοι δὲ: and they too, they on the other hand, viz., the unbelieving Jews, ἐὰν μὴ κτλ., 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 irreparable, 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 ἐγκεντυθόσιν αὐτοῖς they will be incorporated again in the true people of God.
25. Oū γὰρ θέλω ὡμᾶς ἀγνοεῖν, οὐχ ἡμῖν ἢ ἐμοῖς, ἀλλ' ἐν τῷ μυστηρίῳ τούτῳ ὑπάρχει (οὐ μὴ ἦτο παρ' ἐμοῖς ἡ φρονὶς), ὅτι

Τρισθήσονται τῇ ἱδίᾳ ἑλαίᾳ;  
γι' ἀλληλον, ἀδελφοί, τὸ μυστηρίον τούτο (οὐ μὴ ἦτο παρ' ἐμοῖς ἡ φρονὶς), ὅτι

τὰ πάρεται ἀπὸ τοῦ Ἰσραήλ γέγονεν, ἀρχις οὐ τὸ πλήρωμα τῶν

1 παρ' ἐμοῖς ἐνοῦς Κατ., εὐαγγελιστ. 

Ver. 24. God's power to engraft the Gentile Christians (1) was cut off; it was not possible, but not with God. Nothing less than the thought of God could keep Paul from despairing of the future of Israel.

Ver. 25. Paul gives an argument proving that God's power has been conformed to the Gentile Christians. He compares the Gentile Christians to the olives, which are uncultivated and have no suitableness for the uses which the olive is intended to subserve. The Gentile Christians are less with nature than the Jews. The Gentile Christians (2) have been cut off from their own nature, and are in violation of nature, and have been engrafted into a good olive. In comparison with this, one may even say easy, to call those who are not His own. The Gentile Christians (1) were cut off from their own nature, and have been 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 have been cut off from their own nature, have their connection with it re-established? Weiss takes ἕναντια ἐν καταφυσίᾳ 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 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 shall be saved. He expressly puts this truth forward as a revelation (τοῦ βασιλέως, 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
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 θέλει ὑμᾶς ἄγνωστοι: cf. i. 13, 1 Cor. x. 1, xii. 1, 2 Cor. i. 8, but especially i 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 τούτο: 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 ἀποκάλυψει 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 (ἐκ μικροῦ). Τὸ μὴ ἦτε ἐν ἀναπτύσσοντι: 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 ἀναπτύσσοντι (AB) πάρε ἐναπτύσσοντι is found in BCDL, etc. Both occur in LXX but the former is much more likely to have been changed. τὸ πλήρωμα τῶν ἑθῶν = 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. καί ὁ λόγος = 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 Jew so universal that the separation into an elect remnant and the rest who were hardened shall disappear" (Gifford). καθὼς γέγραπται Ἰσα. lxx. 20 f., but the last words οὐαὶ ἄφελωμα κ.τ.λ. from Ἰσα. xxvii. 9. The prophet says ἐνεκεν
For νυν, which is found in ACDEFGL, text, νυν in marg. Weiss puts νυν in text, thinking that the double νυν in ver. 31 may have induced the dropping of the η.

For other cases, see Textkritik, S. 62.
out by the Apostle in verse 32: God shut them all up into disobedience that He might have mercy upon them all. Ver. 30. ποτε: once, in the past, chap. i. 18-32. τῇ τοῦτων ἀπεθάνατε = owing to their disobedience. Cf. vers. 11, 15. Ver. 31. τῷ ὑμετέρῳ ἐλέει is to be construed with οἷς καὶ αὐτοὶ γὰρ ἐλεηθῶσιν. For the order cf. Gal. ii. 10, 2 Cor. xii. 7. It seems pedantic to make the construction strictly parallel to τῷ τοῦτων ἀπεθάνα, 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 (BD), but cannot be forced to mean more than "now in their turn".

The imminence of the result is not in view. Ver. 32. συνέκλεισε γὰρ ὁ θεὸς τοὺς πάντας εἰς ἀπεθάναν: 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 τούς 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 ἀπολλάσσειν 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 ὁ λόγος is frequent in LXX: the σῦν 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-eludo and examples in Gal. iii. 22, Ps. xxx. 9 I.XX. ἐλεησον:
“to have mercy upon” means “to make partakers of that ‘common salvation’ (Jude 3) which is emphatically a dispensation of mercy” (Gifford).

Ver. 33. ἐν βάθος πλαύτου 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 πλαύτου, σοφίας and γνώσεως are most simply construed as co-ordinate. For πλαύτος 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 inexpressible, 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 γνώσεις 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. Synonyms, § lxxv. τὰ κρίματα αὐτοῦ: except 1 Cor. vi. 7 which is different, this is the only example of κρίμαta (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 יבשוע, to which it often answers in the LXX. In Ps. xxxvi. 6 we have τὰ κρίματα σου ἄδοικος 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 ἄδοι αὐτοῦ are prac­tically 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 τὸ προεδρουκένα αὐτῷ, καὶ ἀνταποδοθήσεται αὐτῷ; see Job xlii. 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 require 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 αὐτοῦ: 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. 16, 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
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 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. παρακάλω 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 ὑκτημάτων: for the substantive see 2 Cor. i. 3 (= ὅρισμα, 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. παραστήσαται 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 σῶματα 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. θυσιάν ξύσαν: "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 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. ἀγίαν: contrast i. 24. εὐδαιμονίαν according to all analogy (see concordance) should go with τῷ θεῷ, and this is secured by the order of the words in Ἀρ. vulg. τὴν λογικὴν λατρείαν ὑμῶν: in apposition not to τὰ σῶματα 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 ἀθυσία; it is λατρεία which is not λογική, not appropriate to a being whose essence is λόγος, i.e., reason or spirit.
Ver. 2. καὶ μὴ συνεχιστήσεσθε: 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 συνεχιστήσεσθε and μεταμορφώσθε—on the ground of other distinctions assumed between σκέψη 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: το μεταμορφώμενον καὶ συνεχιστήσασθαι καὶ μεταμορφωθῆσθαι in ABV31 (gr.) F. The infinit. 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). οὐκ ἀπ' ἀρχῆς is om. by ABV31 (gr.) F 47 and all edd.

Ver. 3. 1 το θέαμα before εὐαρέστησον θλιπ., vulg. So W. and H. text, but marg. as rec. Weiss. on the ground that το θέαμα is to be construed with παρακαλῶ, keeps these words to the end.

2 συνεχιστήσεθε... μεταμορφώσθε; so BLP, W. and H. text; but συνεχιστήσεθε and μεταμορφωθῆσθαι in ABV31 (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). οὐκ ἀπ' ἀρχῆς is om. by ABV31 (gr.) F 47 and all edd.

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. τὸ γὰρ: the γὰρ indicates that "humility is the immediate effect of self-surrender to God" (Gifford). ἐν τῷ καθευδοτικῷ. Paul illustrates in his own person, in giving this advice, the

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 unregenerated man cannot do this; it is destitute of moral discernment—has no proper moral faculty, τὸ ἀγαθὸν καὶ εὐαρέστητον καὶ τέλειον: these words may either qualify τὸ δείκνυμα 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 ἀγαθὸν, good in the moral sense; εὐαρέστητον well pleasing, &c., to God (so in all the nine cases of the adjective and three of the verb εὐαρέστησις 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. 

1 Pet. ii. 9. τῷ Ὑπερτεροφείτω, ὡστε ἀνεπάρκειαν ὑμῶν. 2. καὶ μὴ συνεχιστήσεσθε τῷ στέλλοντι, ἀλλὰ μεταμορφώσθε τῇ ἀνακαλύψει τοῦ νοῦς, εἰς τὸ δοκιμάζειν τὸ δείκνυμα τοῦ Θεοῦ καὶ εὐαρέστητον καὶ τέλειον. 3. Κύριε γὰρ, διὰ τῆς χάριτος τῆς δοθείσης μοι, πάντι τῷ ὑπερτεροφείτῳ, ἀλλὰ φρονεῖν εἰς τὸ θέαμα πρὸς τὸ δοκιμάζειν τῷ καθευδοτικῷ καὶ τῷ ὑπερτεροφείτω. 4. Λόγω γὰρ, διὰ τῆς χάριτος τῆς δοθείσης μοι, πάντι τῷ ὑπερτεροφείτῳ, ἀλλὰ φρονεῖν εἰς τὸ θέαμα πρὸς τὸ δοκιμάζειν τῷ καθευδοτικῷ καὶ τῷ ὑπερτεροφείτω.
2-6. IIP02: PQMAIOY2: 

For p.eA1J '71"OAAa. ALP read 'll'oAAa. p.eA1J with ~BDF latt. and most edd; but W. and H. give p.eA1J 'll"OAAa. a place in marg.

2 Foro Se (altered to agree with e•s ?) read TO Se ~ABD1 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. 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. 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 υπερφονειν: υπερφονειν here only in N.T., but a common word. παρ' δε δει φονειν: beyond the mind or habit of thought one ought to have. For this use of παρα see xiv. 5, Lc. xiii. 2, Heb. i. 9. φονειν εις το σωφρονειν: to cherish a habit of thought tending to sobriety of mind. σωφροσύνη is described by Jos., Macc. 2 1., as giving man dominion not only over bodily ἑπίθυμιαι but also over those of the soul, such as φιλαρχία, κενοδοξία, ἀλλαξονία, μεγαλονεία, βασικαινία. These are precisely the qualities to which Paul opposes it here. φονειν 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. i 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. i Cor. iv. 7.

Ver. 4 f. καθαπερ γάρ: For language and figure cf. i Cor. xii. 12. Also Eph. iv. 15 f., Col. i. 18. The comparison of the organism—social organism—is very common in classical writers: see Wetstein and Jowett here.

Ver. 5 f. ἐκάστῳ ὡς ὁ θεὸς ἐμέρισεν μέτρον πίστεως. ἐκάστῳ is governed by ἐμέρισεν: its place makes it emphatic. Cf. i Cor. iv. 7. Ver. 4 f. καθαπερ γάρ: For language and figure cf. i 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.

The comparison of the community to a body—the social organism—is very common in classical writers: see Wetstein and Jowett here. The comparison of the community to a body—the social organism—is very common in classical writers: see Wetstein and Jowett here.
Here only, "ἀναλογίαν τῆς πίστεως ἑτε διακονίαν, ἐν τῇ διακονίᾳ. ἑτε ὁ διδάσκων, ἐν τῇ διδασκαλίᾳ. 8. ἐτε ὁ παρακάλων, ἐν τῇ παρακλήσει. ὁ μεταδίδων, ἐν ἀπλότητι. ὁ προέτραμεν, ἐν σπουδῇ. ὁ ἑλέων, ἐν ἠλεοτητί.

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 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—if we may see by glancing at the phenomena of church life—that we 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 v, x, xii. 4, 9, 31, t P. iv. 10. With the exception of t P. iv. to (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 δοθείσαν, ἐκ, when we believed. προφητεύων κατὰ τὴν ἀναλογίαν τῆς πίστεως. προφητεία is the highest of χαρίσματα, I Cor. xiv. I 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—ὑπερφορονεῖν—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 προφητεύειν 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 word again, was supposed to be represented in the creed or rule of faith; and to interpret κατὰ τ. ἰ. 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
gift has it 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. διδάσκων ἐν τῇ διδασκαλίᾳ: it is in his teaching that the διδασκαλός possesses the gift peculiar to him: cf. Cor. xiv. 26. ὁ παρακαλόν ἐν τῇ παρακλήσει: so again with the exhortor, the man who speaks words of encouragement: cf. xv. 4, 5; Acts iv. 36, ix. 31, xiii. 15. It is in his παρακλήσις, and not in something else, that his χαρίσμα lies. Thus far Paul has not defined the quality of the χαρίσματα, 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 δ ἐκκλησίας (cf. Eph. iv. 28, Luc. iii. 11), the man who imparts of his means to those who need; he has his χαρίσμα in ἀπλότητι. 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 μεταδίδοναι when He bestows this mind on him by His Spirit. ὁ προστάσιμον 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 πρόστασις xvi. 2, and Hort, The Christian Ecclesia, p. 126 f.) but in any case he had the χαρίσμα which fitted him for his special function in σταυρότητι, moral earnestness or vigour. A serious masculine type of character is the pre-supposition for this gift. Finally ὁ ἔλεων, he who does deeds of kindness, has his χαρίσμα in ιλαρότητι. 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. (xxix.) 11: ἐν πάσῃ δοσει ιλάρωσον τὸ πρόσωπόν σου, καὶ εὐφρονίαν ἄγιασον 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 ἐστε) with the numerous participles.

Ver. 9. ἡ ἀγάπη ἀνυπόκριτος: see 2 Cor. vi. 6, 1 Pet. i. 22. Probably the following clauses ἀπουσταγώντες . . . κολλώμενοι κ.τ.λ. are meant to explain this. Love is undisssembled, 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. ὑστερεῖν according to Eustath. in II. a. p. 58 (quoted by Wetstein) adds the idea of πρισμάτων to that of μισεῖν: the ἐπιεικές intensifies the idea of aversion or repulsion. Love is not a principle of mutual induction; 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 condemned evil. τῷ ἀγάπῃ is neuter, like τῷ πονηρῷ, 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. ἀδελφός 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. τῇ σπουδῇ μὴ ἄκνηροι, τῷ πνεύματι 
ξένοντες, τῷ Κυρίῳ διδασκάλου τῆς σαφείς ὑπομένοντες, τῇ προσευχῇ προσκαρτεροῦντες · 13. ταῖς χρείαις τῶν εἰς ἀφοθομένον ἀφοθομένα καὶ χαιρεταὶ.

1 For κυρίῳ ᾽ΑBDG 1LP, etc., some Western authorities (D1F gr. G lat.) read καρπόν, 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 διδασκάλου in the midst of a series of clauses of limited sense" (W. and H., Appendix, p. 110).

2 ταῖς χρείαις ᾽ΑBD1LP 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 (= χρείαις) 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 ἄλληλοις προσηγούμενοι: "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 προσηγούμενοι 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, προσηγούμενοι 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 ἄκνηροι: σπουδὴ 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 ξένοντες: 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 διδασκάλου: 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 exhausted—the service of Christ—and in that we must be constantly engaged.

Ver. 12. τῇ ἐλπίδι διδασκάλου: 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 not = ἐπὶ ἐλπίδι there, but in a line with the other datives here: in point of hope, rejoicing. τῇ θλίψει υπομένοντες: υπομ. 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, I 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 χρείαις τῶν ἄγιων κοινωνοῦντες: "the saints" as in viii. 27, i 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 ἀπόλλυται τῆς κοινωνίας εἰς αὐτούς means the liberality of your contribution to them), and Heb. xiii. 16, where κοινωνία is a synonym of εὐποιεῖ.

Ver. 13. ταῖς χρείαις τῶν ἄγιων κοινωνοῦντες: "the saints" as in viii. 27, i 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 ἀπόλλυται τῆς κοινωνίας εἰς αὐτούς means the liberality of your contribution to them), and Heb. xiii. 16, where κοινωνία is a synonym of εὐποιεῖ.
and certainly active. *τήν 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 πίστεων καὶ φιλοξενίαν ἐδόθη αὐτῷ—i.e., Abraham—νίκος ἐν γῆς; or, διὰ φιλοξενίαν καὶ εὐσεβείαν ἀπὸ ἑαυτῆς) 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. μή καταράσθη : 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. καὶ before κλαίειν om. Β Dodd; ins. AD²LP 47. W. and H. put in marg. ; Weiss in text, regarding its omission as merely accidental.

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 (μή δότε) with which he concludes (ver. 21 μή νικά, 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 ψυχὴλα 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 συναπαγόμενοι in both these places is due not to itself, but to the context. The contrast with τὰ ψυχὴλα 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 of Wordsworth's sonnet addressed to Milton . . . "and yet thy heart the lowest 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.
Ver. 17. From this point the subject treated is chiefly the Christian's attitude to enemies. μη δενι κακόν ἀντὶ κακοῦ ἀποδ. μηδενι 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 καλά 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 καλά. πάντων has the same kind of emphasis as μηδενι: Require evil to no one; let your conduct be such as all must approve.

Ver. 18. εἰ δυνατὸν: cf. Matt. xxiv. 24. το εξ ὑμῶν: for what depends on you. Cf. 1. 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 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 ἐκδίκησις 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, Str. xiii. 22, xix. 17, xxxviii. 12, Eph. iv. 27. For ἀγαπητοι 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 γὰρ: Deut. xxiii. 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 ἐκδίκησιν ἀνταποδοσίως). 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. εἰν πεινὰ 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 comburet 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
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 through the good we do to our adversary, turning him so from an enemy into a friend. *Vincit malos,* says Seneca, *pertinax bonitas:* Wetst. accumulates similar examples from classical writers. The *ἐν* in *ἐν τῷ ἀγαθῷ* is probably = Ἰ: 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 Pharisées to ask, Is it lawful to give tribute to Caesar 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 xxvii. 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 subject 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 Caesar the things that are Caesar'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. πάντα ψυχή is a Hebraism:
Acts vii. 2. δοκεῖ ὅτι ἀντιτασσόμενος ἵνα ἐξουσία, τῇ τοῦ θεοῦ διαταγῇ ἀνθρώπινη; οἱ δὲ ἀνθρώπινοι, ἑαυτοῖς κρίμα λήψονται. 3. οἱ γὰρ ἄρχοντες οὐκ εἰσὶν φῶς τῶν αἰωνῶν ἐργῶν, ἀλλὰ τῶν κακῶν. Θελεῖς δὲ μὴ φοβεῖσαι τὴν ἐξουσίαν; τὸ αἰωνιὸν ποιεῖ, καὶ εἰς ἐξαιρετικοὶ πάντες εἰς αὐτὴς. 4. οἱ γὰρ διάκονοι ἐστιν σοὶ εἰς τὸ ἄγαθον. εἰ δὲ τὸ κακὸν ποιεῖς, φοβοῦ. οὐ γὰρ ἐκή τὴν μάχαιραν φορεῖ. Θεοῦ γὰρ διάκονος ἐστιν, ἔκδοκος εἰς ὄργην τῷ 1.

1 τῶν ἀγαθῶν ἐργῶν ἀλλὰ τῶν κακῶν D3 gr. L, etc.; τὸ ἀγαθὸν ἐργὸν a. τὰ κακὰ ἰναβὸν epywv a.Α.Α.ο. The vulg. and lat. fathers have non sunt timori boni operis, from which W. and H. deduce another reading τοῦ αἰωνοῦ εργον. They suspect a primitive error, and Hort favours the correction τῷ αἰωνιῷ εργῳ, comparing 1 Tim. vi. 18.

cf. Acts ii. 43, iii. 23, and chap. ii. 9. For ἐξουσίας cf. Luke xii. 11: it is exactly like “authorities” in English—abstract for concrete. ὑπερεχούσαι describes the authorities as being actually in a position of superiority. Cf. 1 P. ii. 13, and 2 Macc. iii. 11 (ἀνδρὸς ἐν ὑπερχῇ κειμένῳ). οὐ γὰρ ἔστιν ἐξουσία εἰ μὴ ὑπὸ θεοῦ: ὅπως is the correct reading (ΝΑΒ), not ἀπό. Weiss compares Bar. iv. 27. έσται γὰρ ἄνων ὑπὸ τοῦ ἐπάγοντος μνεία. 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 σώσαι 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. δοκεῖ 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 τεταγμέναι, 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. θελεῖς δὲ μὴ φοβεῖσαι 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 ἄγαθον ποιεῖ: do what is (legally and morally) good.

Ver. 4. θεοῦ γὰρ διάκονος ἐστιν σοι εἰς τὸ ἄγαθον. διάκονος is feminine agreeing with ἐξουσία, which is “almost personified” (Sanday and Headlam). The σοι is not immediately dependent on διάκονος, 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. εἰ δὲ τὰ κακὰ ποιεῖς, φοβοῦ: only when the individual does that which
is contrary to the end set before the State by God—commits to κακῶν, which frustrates τὸ ἄγαθον—need he fear: but then he must fear. ὅ γὰρ εἰκή: for not for nothing, but for serious use, does the ruler wear the sword. For εἰκή 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 Griffith, “expressly vindicates the divine 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 θεου γὰρ διακονοῦσι εἰσιν are repeated, it is the punitive ministry of the magistrate which is alone in view. ἐκδίκασι εἰς ἄργην: an avenger for wrath. ὡς ἄργη 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. 22. τὸ τῷ κακῶν πράσσοντι = to him who works at evil. The process is presented in πράσσειν rather than the result. Cf. i. 32.

Ver. 5. διὸ ἀνάγκη ὑποτάσσεσθαι: there is a twofold necessity for submission—an external one, in the wrath of God which comes on resistance; an internal one, in conscience. Even apart from the consequences of disobedience conscience recognises the Divine right and function of the ἔσχαται and freely submits to it. διὰ τούτο γὰρ καὶ φόρους τελείτε. διὰ τούτο 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, 1 Cor. xvi. 22; but here is probably used indefinitely of any imposts made for the support of the Government. λειτουργοὶ γὰρ θεοῦ εἰσίν: 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 λειτουργεῖν, 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 τούτῳ 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 τῷ αὐτῷ 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. ὁφέλειάς, ὁφέλε- λετε) it is better not to make too decided a break at either place. All the words in ver. 7, φόρος, τέλος, φόβος, τιμή 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 μηδὲν μηδὲν ὁφέλετε seems expressly written as the negative counterpart to ἀπόδοτε πάσιν τὰς ὁφέλιάς in ver. 7, introduces at the same time a wider subject—that of the duties of all
individuals toward each other. 
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I. Καὶ τοῦτο, εἰδότες τὸν καιρὸν, ὅτι ὡρα ἡμᾶς ἡ ἡμέρα ἐξ ὑποῦ ἔγερθηναι, νῦν γὰρ ἐγγύτερον ἡμᾶς ἡ σωτηρία, ἢ ἡτέ ἐπιστεύσαμεν.


1 ἡμᾶς DEFGL; but ΝΑΒΚ give ὑμᾶς. ὑμᾶς is put in text by Weiss, W. and H., and Tischdf.; and by W. and H. and Treg. in margin. All put ἡμᾶς with ΝΑΒΚ before the pronoun.

2 οὔτως καὶ εὐσχημονωθήτω τοις εὐσχημονοις δείκτης with ABCDP. W. and H. bracket δε; ΝΑ and a MS. of Sah. have neither καὶ nor δε. For ὑπὸ AD read ἑργα. μὴ ερίδι καὶ ἐζησ. B reads the plural ἐρίδι καὶ ἐζησ. 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 (ἀν διαθήκας) into singular in note 2, page 657 (also in B).

3 For κύριον I. X. B and Clem. give Χριστὸν Ἰησοῦν without κύριον, 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 ὡρα ἡμᾶς κ.τ.λ. ἡμέρα (without waiting longer) is to be construed with ἔγερθηναι: “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 ἡμᾶς ἡ σωτηρία: for now is salvation nearer us than when we believed. ἡ 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, ἡτέ ἐπιστεύσαμεν: when we became Christians, I Cor. iii. 5, xv. 2, Gal. ii. 16.

Ver. 12. ἢ νῦν προέκοψας: the true day dawns only when Christ appears; at present it is night, though a night that has run much of its course. ἀποθάλαμεν ova τά ἐργα τῶν σκότων. Things that can only be done in the dark—that cannot be done by light of day—are therefore to be put away by the Christian. For ἀποθάλαμεν (properly of dress) cf. Jas. i. 21, i. Pet. ii. 1, Heb. xii. 2. τὰ ἐπίλα τοῦ φωτός: for τὰ ἐπίλα see on chap. vi. 13, Eph. vi. 11, i Thess. v. 8. The idea is that the Christian’s life is not a sleep, but a battle. τὰ ἐπίλα τοῦ φωτός does not mean “shining armour”; but (on the analogy of τὰ ἐργα τῶν σκότων) such armour as one can wear when the great day dawns, and we would appear on the Lord’s side in the sight. 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. ὅς ἐν ἡμέρᾳ: 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 seeming fashion,” “becomingly”; in 1 Cor. xiv. 40 it is rendered “decently,” where also regard for decorum (the aesthetic side of morality) is in view.

κόμοι and κέδαι are again found conjoined in Gal. v. 21; ἔρις and ἐζησ. in Gal. v. 20 and 1 Cor. iii. 3. W. and H. following E. put ἔρις καὶ ἐζησ. 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 ἐνυδάσασθε τὸν Κ. Ἰ. Χριστὸν. ἀλλὰ emphases the contrast between the true Christian life and that
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 end, 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 τῇ σαρκί ἐπονομάζεται ὁ ἄνθρωπος μὴ ποιεῖσθαι εἰς ἐπιθυμίας. It is to inquire too curiously if we inquire whether σάρξ here is used in the physiological sense = the body, or in the moral sense = libidinosae 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
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 ἀσθενοῦντα: as Godet points out, the part. as opposed to ἀσθενή, 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 entirety and intensity, not by a timorous scrupulosity of conscience. προσλαμβανόμενος is often used of God’s gracious acceptance of men, but also of men welcoming other men to their society and friendship, 2 Mac. vii. 1, x. 15. μὴ εἰς διακρίσεως διαλογισμῶν: not with a view to deciding (or passing sentence on) his doubts. The διαλογισμοῖς 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. δὲ μὲν: cf. ver. 5, ix. 21. πιστεύει φαγεῖν πάντα: has confidence to eat all things. See Winer, p. 405. Gifford quotes Demosthenes, p. 88: προσέβαι τῇ τὴν προΐκ' οὐκ ἔπιστευεν: “he had not confidence, i.e., was too cautious, to give up the downy”. This use of πιστευέων shows that πίστις to Paul was essentially an ethical principle; the man who was strong in it had moral independence, courage, and originality. 

1 For καὶ οὐ μη Ν3DM LP, read with Ν1ABCD 1 o de μη.
2 For δυνατός γαρ εστιν Ν1ABCD F and all edd. read δυνατεῖ γαρ. ο θεὸς DFL; but Ν1ABCF (and all edd.) ο κυρίος.
3 ος μὲν κρίνει Ν3BDFL; ος μὲν γαρ κρίνει Ν1ACP latt. Weiss regards the γαρ as a mere interpolation (cf. the case in note 1, page 602); Tischdf. inserts ο. and H. bracket.
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 δυς μέν see ver. 2. κρίνει ήμι. παρ’ ήμέραν 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 πάσαν ήμέραν 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 πληροφορείσθω 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. δρονέων την ήμέραν cf. Col. iii. 2. The setting of the mind upon the day implies of course some distinction between it and others. The clause καὶ μὴ δρονέων … οὐ δρονέω is omitted by most editors, but its absence from most MSS. might still be due to homeoteleuton. εὐχαριστεί: thanksgiving to God consecrates every meal, whether it be the ascetic one of him who abstains from wine and flesh (δ μὴ εσθίων), or the more generous one of him who uses both (δ εσθίων): 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. οὐδείς γὰρ ήμῶν ισαύτος δι’ Κ. Π. 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
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 judge: it is inconsistent with a recognition of the brotherhood of believers. 

Ver. 9. *εἰς τοῦτο γὰρ... ἵνα: cf. 2 Cor. ii. 9. *ἐξεστίν refers to the resurrection, as is shown by the order of the words, the connection elsewhere in Paul of Lordship with the resurrection (cf. Phill. ii. 9 f.), and the aorist tense which describes an act, and not the continued existence of Christ on earth (Sanday and Headlam): cf. Rev. ii. 8 (δο *ἐγένετο νεκρός κ. *ἐξεστίν), xx. 4 f. *ἵνα denotes God's purpose in subjecting His Son to this experience. We must not suppose that *ἀπέθανεν is specially connected with *νεκρός and *ἐξεστίν with *ζωντών; 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. 

Ver. 10. *σὺ δὲ τί κρίνεις τὸν ἀνδρόν σου; ἢ καὶ σὺ τί ἐξουθενεῖς τὸν ἀνδρόν σου; πάντες γὰρ ἐκ παραστησόμεθα Acts xxvii. 23. τῷ βήματι τοῦ Χριστοῦ. 2. *ἐγράφαται γὰρ, "Ζω ἐγὼ, λέγει Κύριος, ὅτι ἐμοὶ κάψυε πᾶν γόνον, καὶ πᾶσα γλώσσα ἐξωμολογηθηται τῷ τοῦ κυρίου τοῦ δικαίου". This (ideally) determines everything, alike in life and death; and even by his death glorifies God. In ver. 14 if. 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. 11. *ἐγράφαται γάρ: the universal judgment proved from Scripture, Is. lv. 23. Paul follows the LXX, but very freely. For ἐγώ ἐγὼ λέγει κύριος the LXX has κάτι ἐμαυτοῦ ὄνομα. The same passage is quoted more freely still.
12. ἀρα οὖν ἐκατοσ τ ἡμῶν περὶ ἑαυτοῦ λόγον δώσει τῷ θεῷ. 13. Μηκέτι οὖν ἄλληλος κρίνωμεν· ἄλλα τούτο κρίνατε μᾶλλον, τὸ μὴ τιθέναι πρόσκομμα τῷ ἄδελφῳ ἐκ σκάνδαλου. 14. οἴδα καὶ πέπεισμα ἐν Κύριῳ Ἰησοῦ, ὅτι οὐδὲν κοινὸν δι' ἑαυτοῦ. 15. ἐν τῷ λογιζόμενῷ πι κοινῶν εἶναι, ἐκείνῳ κοινῶν. 16. ἐν τῷ λογιζόμενῳ πι κοινῶν εἶναι, ἐκείνῳ κοινῶν. 17. ἐὰν δὲ διὰ βρώμα τοῦ ἄδελφος σου λυπεῖται, οὐκ ἐκ τἀκτα ἀγάπην περιπατεῖς. μὴ τῷ

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. ἐξουσιωθησαί τῷ θεῷ shall give thanks or praise to God: xv. 9, Mt. xi. 25, and often in LXX = ἀνατίθημι. In the sense of “confess” it takes the accusative.

Ver. 12. ἀρα (οὖν): So then—conclusion of this aspect of the subject: cf. v. 18, vii. 25. Every word in this sentence is emphatic: ἐκατοσ τε περὶ ἑαυτοῦ, λόγον δώσει, τῷ θεῷ. For λόγον in this sense see 1 Pet. iv. 5, Heb. xiii. 17, Matt. xxi. 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 ἄλληλος κρίνωμεν: thus much follows from what has been said already, and κρίνωμεν therefore forbids both the censorious and the contemptuous estimate of others. ἄλλα τούτο κρίνατε μᾶλλον: be this your judgment rather. Cfr. 1 Cor. ii. 2, vii. 37. τὸ μὴ τιθέναι πρόσκομμα τῷ ἄδελφῳ: 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 Κύριῳ 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. κοινῶν: cf. Acts x. 14, 28, Rev. xxi. 27. It is the opposite of ἄγιον, and signifies that which is not and cannot be brought into relation to God. εἰ μὴ τῷ λογιζόμενῳ 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 (ἐκεῖνῳ 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 it,” 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 βρώμα is contemptuous: “for the sake of food”
thy brother is grieved. 

brima is the food which the strong eats in spite of his brother's scruples. 

A 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 xnp/.. Usually in Paul so that there can be no occasion given to any one to blaspheme.

Ver. 16. μὴ βλασφημείσθω σου ὑμῶν τὸ ἀγαθὸν. τὸ ἀγαθὸν 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 reprobrates 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 i Cor. x. 30.

Ver. 17. Insistence and strife on such matters are inconsistent with Christianity: τὸ γὰρ 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) a βασιλεία ἐπουράνιον. See 1 Thess. ii. 12, 2 Thess. i. 5, i Cor. vi. 9 f., xv. 50, Gal. v. 27. 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 i 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. 
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Ver. 17. Insistence and strife on such matters are inconsistent with Christianity: τὸ γὰρ 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) a βασιλεία ἐπουράνιον. See 1 Thess. ii. 12, 2 Thess. i. 5, i Cor. vi. 9 f., xv. 50, Gal. v. 27. 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 i 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. 
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Ver. 19. ἅρα 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. διώκομεν: 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 ἄλληλον = mutual upbuilding. 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 καταλέει: the opposite of οἰκοδομεῖν. See Matt. xxvi. 61, Gal. ii. 18. τὸ ἐργὸν 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 (μὴν); 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 (ἄλλα), κακὸν τῷ ἀνθρώπῳ τῷ διὰ προσκόμματος ἐσθιόντι; 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 ὕπω: usually προσκόπτειν takes the Dat., 1 X. 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 ἐς ἔχει: “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. ὁ κατὰ σεαυτὸν Ὀπλεστήρος quotes Heliod. vii. 16. συνέχει to 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 ἀνομίας θεοῦ ἄλλον ἐνομοσχέσω παρὰ ὑπὸ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ. μακάριος ὁ μὴ κρίνων ἐαυτὸν ἐν ὕπω 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 (σ., by his own practice);
and he who has this felicity should ask not 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 φάγῃ κατακέκριται: such, on the other hand, is the unhappy situation of the weak—a new motive for charity. For διακρινόμενος, 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, κ.κ., ἐφαγεν. The man is condemned because he did not eat ἐκ πίστεως: and this is generalised in the last clause πάν ὁ δὲ οὐκ ἐκ πίστεως ἀμαρτία 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. δέθελαμεν 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...
Acts xiv. 6. Οφείλομεν δὲ ἡμεῖς οἱ δυνατοὶ τὰ ἀσθενήματα τῶν ἀδύνατων βαστάζειν, καὶ μὴ ἑαυτοίς ἀρέσκειν. 2. Ἐκατόστοι γὰρ ἡμῶν τὸ πλη- σίον ἀρεσκέτω εἰς τὸ ἄγαθον πρὸς οἰκοδομήν. 3. καὶ γὰρ ὁ Χριστὸς οὐκ ἑαυτῷ ἠρεσεν, ἀλλὰ, καθὼς γέγραπται, "Οἱ ἑαυτισμοὶ τῶν ἑαυτισμῶν σε ἐπέπεσον ἐπὶ ἑμὲν". 4. δὲ γὰρ προεγράφη, εἰς τὴν ἡμετέραν διδασκαλίαν προεγράφη, ἵνα διὰ τῆς ὑπομονῆς καὶ

1 Om. γαρ with ΝΑΒΔFLP.

2 ὅσα γὰρ προεγράφη ΝΑCDFLP; so most edd. B, latt., Ath. give εγγράφη. D1 and F have προεγράφη, which confirms the reading of ΝΑ. προεγράφη ina Ν3ALP; but εγγράφη Ν1BCDF, vulg. and all edd. After καὶ ins. διὰ ΝΑΒCL. After εἰσομέν B adds τῆς παρακλήσεως, which W. and H. put in marg.; but the addition is as inept as that of οὐσία 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 δυνατοὶ: Paul classes himself with the strong, and makes the obligation his own. δυνατοὶ is of course used as in chap. xiv.: not as in 1 Cor. i. 26. τὰ ἀσθενήματα τῶν ἀδύνατων: 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. vii. 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 ἄγαθον πρὸς οἰκοδομήν. Without such qualification it is "men-pleasing" (Gal. i. 10) and inconsistent with fidelity to Christ. Cf. 1 Cor. x. 22, where Paul presents himself as an example of the conduct he here commends. For εἰς and πρὸς in this verse cf. chap. iii. 25 ff. 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 adding 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 i. 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 διδασ­ καλίαν εγγράφη: was written to teach us, and therefore has abiding value. 2 Tim. iii. 16. ἤνα 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 ὑπομον. κ. τῆς παρακλ. τῶν γραφῶν κ.τ.λ.: "that through the patience and the comfort wrought by the
Scriptures we may have our hope". τὴν ἑλπίδα 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 approaches 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 ἵστοιν: cf. xii. 16, where, however, τὸ αὐτὸ φρονεῖν with εἰς ἀλλήλοις 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. ίνα introduces the ultimate aim of this unanimity. ὀμοθυμάδων here only in Paul, but eleven times in Acts. ἐν ἑνί στόματι: in Greek writers usually εἰς 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 dependent 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 πατήρ 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 ἀλλήλοις: διὸ = that such praise may be possible. For προσλαμβ. see xiv. 1-3. καθὼς καὶ ὁ Χριστός προσέλαβε τὰ ἱμάτια: ἱμάτια 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 ἀλλήλοις; they resume the idea of ver. 6 (καὶ ... δοξάζετε); 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 Χριστός προσελ. ἱμάτια. 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
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 γεγεννηθηναι 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. xvi. 24) Christ was of course circumcised Himself and set from His birth (Gal. iv. 4 l) 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 ὁνόματος 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 ἐθνὶ ὑπὲρ ἐλεοῦς 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 ἐθνὶ 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 γέγραψα· the contemplated glorification of God answers to what we find in Ps. xlviii., 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 Ἡσαίας λέγει: Isa. 716
14. Πέπεισμαι δὲ, άδελφοί μου, καὶ αὐτὸς ἐγώ περὶ ὀμῶν, δι’ εἰς Χθ. i. 29; Matt. xxvii. 38.
καὶ αὐτοὶ μεστοὶ ἐστε ἀγαθωσύνης, πεπληρωμένοι πάθες γνώσεως, δυνάμενοι καὶ ἄλληλοις νοεθετεῖν. 15. τολμηρότερον δὲ ἔγραψεν ὑμῖν, άδελφοί, ἀπὸ μέρους, ὡς ἐπαναμμηνέσκων ὃμας, διὰ τὴν χεριν

1 After παθής ins. τῆς ΝΒΠ, Clem.; om. ACDFL.
2 τολμηρότερον ΝCDFLP; τολμηρότερος AB. The latter is read by Weiss, W., and H., and Treg. A similar change (from σπουδαίοτερος into σπουδαίοτερον) is made by DPG in Phil. ii. 28. άδελφοι om. ΝABC; από τοῦ θεου ΑCDLP; από τοῦ θεου ΝΒΠ and most edd.
For γενναίος Weiss, against all edd., reads γεννηθεί with B. The change of this into the commoner form γενναίος is an emendation current in all the groups into which the MSS. can be classified.

2 After ouw ins. την BCDGF; om. ΡΑΛΠ; W. and H. bracket. For πρὸς θεον read πρὸς τὸν θεον with ΡΑΒCDFL and all edd.

3 For τολμησας B has τολμᾶ, which W. and H. put in margin. The fut. is retained by most edd. with ΡΑCDFGLP. For λαλεῖν τι read τι λαλέειν with ΡΑBCDF.

eis τὰ ἐθν., 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 λειτουργὴν 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 λειτουργοῦντα τὸ εὐαγγέλιον τοῦ θεοῦ sacerdotes modo evangelium administrantium. Fritzsche (on whose note all later expositors depend) explains the sacerdotes 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 ἡ γέννησις . . . εὐπρόσδεκτος depends not on λειτουργοῦντα, but on the whole conception of Paul's ministry, i.e., on eis τὸ εἰναὶ με λειτουργὸν κ.τ.λ. For ἡ προσφορὰ τῶν ἑθνῶν, genitive of object, cf. Heb. x. 10. This great offering is acceptable to God (1 Pet. ii. 5) because it is ἑγερμένη consecrated to Him ἐν πνεύματι ἄγω. 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. ἐξω 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 τολμήσας τι λαλεῖν ὅν οὐ κατεργάσατο δι' ἑμοῦ 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 ἐξω οὖν καύχησιν ἐν Χριστῷ ἡ σοφ. The things which Christ did work through Paul He wrought eis ὑπακοὴν ἑθνῶν 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. λάγος καὶ ἑργα: λάγος refers to the preaching, ἑργα to all he had been enabled to do or suffer in his calling. 2 Cor. x. 11, Acts vii. 22, Lc. xxiv. 19. ἐν δύναμει σημείου καὶ παράτον. σημείον and παράτον 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 Μαῖς τῶν Ἁρματίων or to Parousia in this as in other respects is
regarded as counterfeiting that of Christ. 

téras 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 ἔργον. So "the power" of the Holy Ghost accompanied the preaching of the Gospel: more or less it answers to λόγον: see 1 Thess. i. 5 and cf. the ἀποδείξεις 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 κύκλω: most modern commentators have rendered this as if it were τοῦ κύκλω— from Jerusalem and its vicinity—by which they mean Syria (though some would include Arabia, Gal. i. 17): for this use of κύκλω 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. 1. 14 (quoted by the latter): πάτερα διὰ τοῦ Ἱεροῦ ἔδωκεν διὰ πορείαν, ἢ κύκλω διὰ μέσης τῆς θάλασσας. μέση τοῦ Ἰλλυρικοῦ can (so far as μέση 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 ff. (διελθὼν δὲ τὰ μέρη ἐκείνα), 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. ὥστε 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, ἀνομάσατο: cf. 2 Tim. ii. 10 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 ἐπὶ ἀλλήλων θεμέλιον κ.τ.λ. The duty of an
22. Διό καὶ ἐνεκοπτόμεν ἡ ἀρχή καὶ ἐνεκοπτόμεν ἡ ἀρχή τὰ πολλάν τοῦ ἔλεείν πρὸς ὑμᾶς, 23. νυνὶ δὲ μηκετί τότεν ἤχων ἐν τοῖς κλήματι τούτοις, ἐπιτυθάν τοῖς ἐρωμοῖς τοῦ ἔλεείν πρὸς ὑμᾶς "ἀπὸ πολλῶν ἐτῶν, 24. ὡς ἐὰν πορεύωμαι εἰς τὴν Ἀποστλὰν, ἐλεύσομαι πρὸς ὑμᾶς· ἐπτύξω γὰρ διαπεροῦμένους θεάσα­ντα ὑμᾶς, καὶ ὁ ὤμος προσενεφθήματι ἐκεῖ, εἰσὶ νῦν πρῶτον ἀπὸ μέρους ἐμπληθῶ. 25. Νυνὶ δὲ πορεύωμαι εἰς ἱεροσαλήμ, διεικόνιν τὸ πάλλα ΝΑΛΚΣ; πολλάκις ΒΔForge. 2 For πολλῶν ΝΑΔΠΛ read ἱκανῶν with BCP, Weiss, W. and H., Alford. 3 For ῥος εἰν read ῥος μια ΝΑΒΚΔ and all edd.

Apostle was with the foundation, not the superstructure. i 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. ἄλλα 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. διό καὶ ἐνεκοπτόμεν: the work which detained the Apostle in the East also hindered him from visiting Rome. For another ἐνεκοπτὲν see i Thess. ii. 18. τὰ πολλά is more than πολλάκις in i. 13; it is distinguished in Greek writers both from ἐνίοτε (sometimes) and ἐκεῖ (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 ἐπτύξω γάρ and never finished, for the words ἐλεύσομαι πρὸς ὑμᾶς in T.R. are an interpolation. μηκετί τότεν ἤχων: not that every soul was converted, but that the Apostolic function of laying foundations had been sufficiently discharged over the area in question. κλήμα is only found in the plural in N.T. 2 Cor. xi. 10, Gal. i. 21. ἐπτύξουν: here only in N.T. ἀπὸ ἱκανῶν ἐτῶν: the desire dated "from a good many years back". Cf. ἀπὸ κτίσεως κόσμου, i. 20, Acts xv. 7.

Ver. 24. ὡς ἐὰν πορεύωμαι εἰς τὴν Ἀποστλὰν: it is here the apodosis begins, which being broken in on by ἐπτύξω is never formally resumed, though the sense is taken up again in ver. 28 f. ὡς ἐὰν is temporal = simulatque: cf. i 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. ὡς ὦμος προσενεφθήματι 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 προσειμβήναι. Practical illustrations are seen in Acts xx. 35, xxi. 5: similar anticipations in i 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.
for fellowship with the Romans, but it would be at least a partial satisfaction of it.

Ver. 25. ὑπὲρ δὲ is not a resumption of ὑπὲρ 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 word "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. εἰσδόκησαν γὰρ Μακεδονία καὶ Ἄχαΐα: 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. εἰσδόκησαν 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. κοινωνιάν πινα : πινα 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 κοινωνιάν 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. εἰσδόκησαν 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. ὑπέθελται : 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. εἰς 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 σάρκικά any ethical connotation. λειτουργήσαν is simply "to minister to": no official, much less sacerdotal association. Cf. Phil. ii. 30.

Ver. 28. τούτῳ οὖν ἐπιτελεῖσας : having brought this business to a close. It is a mistake to find in Paul's use of ἐπιτελεῖσα any reference to the performance of a religious rite: see 2 Cor. viii. 6, 11, Gal. iii. 3, Phil. i. 5. σφραγισάμενος αὐτοῖς τὸν καρπὸν τούτον. "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 γάρμα, a διακονία, a κοινωνία, ἀδρότης, a εἰλογία: 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.
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. ἀπελεύθησαί 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' ύμων: 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 εἰς τὸ τέρμα τῆς δύσεως: 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 ἔρχομενος ... ἔλευσομαι cf. i Cor. ii. 1. ἐν πληρώματι εὐλογίας Χριστοῦ. Paul's desire was to impart to the Romans χάρισμα τι πνευματικόν (v. 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 πληρώμα see xi. 12.

Ver. 30. παρακαλῶ δὲ ύμᾶς. 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 ὕμων ἧς X. For διὰ in this sense see xi. 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 ἁγάπης τοῦ πνεύματος:
the love wrought in Christian hearts by
the Spirit of God (Gal. v. 22) is another
motive of the same kind.

forces which would frustrate his apostolic
end to be secured by their prayers. δια
̇θέληματος θεοῦ: it depends on this
whether Paul is to return or how. He
did reach Rome, by the will of God (i.
10), but hardly in the conditions antici-
pated 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 Phoebe
to the Church, vers. 1 and 2; (2) a
series of greetings from Paul himself,
vers. 3-15; (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. Συνιστήμι δὲ υἱῶν Φοίβην.
Συνιστήμι 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 kin-
ship thus asserted was a recommendation of
itself, but in Phoebe’s case Paul can add
another. οὕτων καὶ διάκονον τῆς
ἐκκλησίας τῆς ἐν Κεχρεαίᾳ: who is also
a servant of the Church in Cenchreae.
It is not easy to translate διάκονος, for
“servant” is too vague, and “deaconess”
is more technical than the original.
Diakônia was really a function of mem-
bership in the Church, and Phoebe
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 διάκονιαν τοῖς ἀγίοις. That
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 Phoebe may have had some recognised function of διάκονια assigned to her. Cenchreae 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 Phoebe 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 παραμετρέται (Jer. xv. 11): after the Christian welcome is assured, Paul bespeaks their help for Phoebe 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 αὕτη: in complying with this request they will only be doing for Phoebe what she has done for others, and especially for Paul himself. προστάτης (feminine of προστάτης) is suggested by παραμετρέται. Paul might have said παραμετρέται, but uses the more honourable word. προστάτης (paltrous) was the title of a citizen in Athens who took charge of the interests of μέτοχοι and persons without civic rights; the corresponding feminine here may suggest that Phoebe 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 ministered to him. It is generally assumed that Phoebe 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. άσπάσασθε: 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. τῶν συνεργῶν μου ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ: on first acquaintance they had been fellow-workers, not in Christ Jesus, but in tent-making: they were ἀμύστεχοι, Acts xviii. 3. οἰνίες: qui dixerit tōn έαυτών 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 ὑπόδειγμα, 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. ἄλιπεν ἄλιπον εὐχαριστῶ k.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

1 For Πρίσκυλλαν (corrected by Acts xviii. 2) read Πρίσκυλαν ΝΑΒCDFL.
2 For τῆς Ἀχαίας LP, read τῆς Ἀσίας with ΝΑΒCDFL. The wrong reading is due to 1 Cor. xvi. 15.
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). ἀνάσασθαι Επανεντον 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: Epenetus 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 Epenetus on a Roman Inscription (quoted by 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 f.) and Harnack, Lehre der zwolf Apostel, S. 117-118. 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 were 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".

1 Μαρίαμ ㅜDFL; Μαρίαν ABCP, and so most edd. For ἡμας read ἡμας ΝABC1P.
2 For γεγοναν read γεγοναν with ΝAB.
3 For Ἀμπλιαν read Ἀμπλιατων with ΝAB1F.
lam 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. The τὸν ἄγαπητὸν μου ἐν Κυρίῳ Paul has none but Christian relations to this man.

Ver. 9. Ὀφραῖν: also a common slave name, "found, as here, in juxtaposition with Amphius, 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. Ἀπελλῆς 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 Judaeus Apella, Hor., Sat., i., v., 100. By τοὺς ἐκ τῶν Ἀριστοβοῦλου are meant Christians belonging to the household of Aristobulus. Lightfoot, in his essay on Caesar's Household (Philippians, 117 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 Ἀριστοβοῦλου to be an equivalent. It is at least not an obvious phrase, and demands explanation" (Philippians, 175).

Ver. 11. Ἰωνίων τὸν συγγενή μου. This agrees very well with the interpretation just given to τοὺς ἐκ τῶν Ἀριστοβοῦλου. 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 ἄντας 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 "Cesar's household" as Narcissianni (Lightfoot, loc. cit.).

Ver. 12. Τρυφαίαν καὶ Τρυφώσαν: "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 description τὰς κοπιῶσας, "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 ἄγαπητήν: Paul does not here add μου as with the men's names in vv. 8 and 9. Persis was dear to the whole Church.
14. ἅσπασασθε Ἀσύγκριτον, Φλέγοντα, Ἐρμᾶν, Πατρόβαν, Ἐρμῆν, καὶ τοὺς σὺν αὐτῶι ἄδελφοις. 15. ἅσπασασθε Φιλόδογον καὶ Ἰουλίαν, Νερέα καὶ τὴν ἄδελφην αὐτοῦ, καὶ Ὀλυμπᾶν, καὶ τοὺς σὺν αὐτῶι πάντας ἄγιοι. 16. ἅσπασασθε ἄλληλους ἐν φιλήματι ἄγιῳ. ἅσπασται ὡμᾶς αἱ ἐκκλησίαι 2 τοῦ Χριστοῦ. 17. Παρακάλει δὲ ὡμᾶς, ἄδελφοι, σκοπεῖ τοὺς τὰς ἁγιοστασίας καὶ τὰ σκάνδαλα, παρὰ τὴν ἐφ. i Cor. iii. διαδίκην ἣν ὑμεῖς ἔμαθετε, ποιοῦτας καὶ ἐκκλίνατε 3 ἀπ’ αὐτῶν.

1 Here ΝΑΒCD1FP and all edd. transpose Ἐρμᾶν and Ἐρμῆν.
2 After ἐκκλησίαι ins. patai ΝΑΒCLP and all edd.
3 For ἐκκλίνατε read ἐκκλίνετε with ΝΘΒC, 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). Hermes has often been identified with the author of The Shepherd, but though the identification goes back to Origen, it is a mistake. "Pastorem vero superrime temporibus nostris in urbe Roma Herma conscripsit sedentia cathedra urbis Rome ecclesia Pio eps. fratre ejus"; these words of the Canon of Muratorius forbid the identification. τοὺς σὺν αὐτῶι ἄδελφοις indicates that the persons named, and some others designated in this phrase, formed a little community by themselves—perhaps an ἐκκλησία κατ’ οἰκόν 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 Nereis was a member of the [imperial] household about this time, as appears from an inscription already quoted" (Lightfoot, loc. cit., p. 177). Olympos is a contraction of Olympioporus, τοὺς σὺν αὐτῶι πάντας ἄγιοι: see on last verse. The πάντας may suggest that a larger number of persons is to be included here.

Ver. 16. ἄλληλοιοι. When the epistle is read in the Church the Christians are to greet each other, and seal their mutual salutations ἐν φιλήματι ἄγιῳ. In 1 Thess. v. 26 the προστάτμοι 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 φιλήμα ἄγατσι; in Apost. Const., ii., 57, 12, τὸ ἐν Κυρίῳ φιλήμα; in Tert. de Orat., xiv., osculum pacis. By ἄγιον 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 πάσαι 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. vii. 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 salutat."

Vv. 17-20. Warning against false teachers. This comes in very abruptly in the middle of the greeting and kiss, as it stands has the character of an after-thought. The false teachers referred to are quite definitely described, and 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 Philippians than here: but chap. vi. 1-23 may be quoted in support of it.
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 any 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 so prevent men from receiving” (Rom. xiv. 16). In this place “guileless” is rather the idea: suspecting no evil, and therefore liable to be deceived.

Ver. 19. η 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 χαίρειν ἐπί see 1 Cor. xiii. 6, xvi. 17. σοφοὶ μὲν εἶναι εἰς τὸ ἀγαθὸν, ἀκραίαν δὲ εἰς τὸ κακόν. For ἀκραίας see Matt. x. 16, Phil. ii. 15, and Trench, Syn., § lvi., where there is a full discussion and comparison with ἀκάκος. 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
doubtful whether Paul found anything there answering to συντρίβειν. The LXX has τηρήσει. ἐν τάξει: 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.π.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 γράφας 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. Γάιος ὁ ἐζένως μου κ. ἀληθείας 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 εἶναις μου is meant that Gaius was Paul's host in Corinth; ὁ εἶναις ἀληθινὸς 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, καὶ Κοῦρατος ὁ ἄδελφος.

1 Χριστοῦ om. N B, cdd.

2 For ἀσπάζομαι read ἀσπάζεται ΝABCD^F. Om. first μου B 67; W. and H. bracket.
This verse is wanting in ABC; ins. in DFL. See Introduction, p. 578.
πάντα τὰ ἔθνη γνωρισθέντος, 27. μόνω σοφῶ Θεῷ, διὰ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, ἡ ἴδε ν. 25. ὡς ἡ δόξα εἰς τοὺς αἰώνας. ἀμήν.

Πρὸς Ῥωμαίους ἐγράφῃ ἀπὸ Κορίνθου διὰ Φοίβης τῆς διακόνου τῆς ἐν Κεχρεαίς ἐκκλησίας. 2

1 ὡ is wanting in B, in F-lat., 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 αὐτῷ, which is found in P, be original; it is too natural a correction. Hence edd. are practically unanimous in keeping ὡ. After τοὺς αἰώνας ΝΑΔΠ add τῶν αἰώνων, but W. and H., with BCL and cursives, omit it. Weiss prints the addition in his text, yet argues for its omission (Textkritik, 89).

2 πρὸς Ῥωμαίους only, in ΝΑΒCD.

πᾶσι 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. μόνω σοφῶ 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 Ἱ Tim. i. 17 has no σοφῶ. The absence of the article here indicates that it is in virtue of having this character that God is able to stablish the Romans according to Paul’s Gospel. ὡς ἡ δόξα: it is impossible to be sure of the reading here. If ὡς 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 simplification’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 τῶν διὸν μιμήσεως and μόνω σοφῶ 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, ὡς ἡ δόξα κ.τ.λ. (Gal. i. 15, 2 Tim. iv. 18, Ἱeb. 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.