

THE
EPISTLE OF PAUL, THE APOSTLE
TO THE
ROMANS,
IN THE AUTHORIZED VERSION;
WITH A NEW TRANSLATION
AND
COMMENTARY

BY T. O. SUMMERS, D.D., LL.D.

Nashville, Tenn.:
SOUTHERN METHODIST PUBLISHING HOUSE.
1881.

Entered, according to Act of Congress, in the year 1881,
BY THE AUTHOR
in the Office of the Librarian of Congress, at Washington.

TO
JOHN BERRY McFERRIN, D.D.

MY DEAR SIR:—As Editor, Missionary Secretary, and Book Agent, you have been at the head-quarters of Southern Methodism for more than a quarter of a century, and during that time we have labored together as true yoke-fellows: as a slight testimonial of my friendship, permit me to inscribe your name on this Dedication-page.

If done at all, it must be done speedily, as you and I must shortly put off these tabernacles. But we hope to renew our friendship in that "better country," where we have many dear friends waiting to welcome our arrival. Among the foremost of those whom we have not seen in the flesh will be "our beloved brother Paul," who will kindly tell us how near we came to the true interpretation of his wonderful Epistle to the Romans. But such meditations belong not to this place.

The permission to put your name on this page will give the volume favor among the thousands of our Israel.

Your brother in Christ,

THE AUTHOR.

Publishing House of the M. E. Church, South,
Nashville, Tenn., Jan. 24, 1881.

PREFACE.

IN undertaking the task of writing a Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans—to which we had been so long urged—we proposed to follow the general plan adopted in the Commentaries on the Gospels and on The Acts—adapting it as a popular work to all classes of students. We have done so. But the peculiarity of matter and style in this Epistle demanded some variation. We found it necessary, *e.g.*, to make an entirely new translation, embodying some of the various readings which have come to light in modern times—the reason for which, where expedient, has been given in the notes. The idiom of the original has been reproduced, as far as possible—though in some cases at the expense of smoothness in the version. Critical students, moreover, wish to see the original terms when the sense cannot well be given without citing them. The common reader will condone this, as he can pass over critical notes of this sort, and get the result without regarding the process by which it is reached—though he might be all the better satisfied with it, as he sees it is not reached without due care and research. In such a writing as this Epistle, no other course will answer.

The names of authors cited are sometimes abbreviated—*e.g.*, "W. and W." for Webster and Wilkinson. As a grammatico-critical Commentary, theirs is unsurpassed. William Webster was an accomplished scholar—Fellow of Queen's College, Cambridge—Assistant Master in King's College School. His death some years since was much lamented. William Francis Wilkinson was at one time Theological Tutor of Cheltenham College, and more recently Rector of Lutterworth, the parish of John Wycliffe. In the year 1880 occurred the Semi-millennial Celebration of the great Reformer's Translation of the Scriptures—of which we have made much use in the present work. We sent to his successor, by a friend, our grateful acknowledgment of the help derived from the work of which he was the joint author. But on visiting Lutterworth, our friend—who, by the way, first called our attention to that Commentary—found that he too had passed away—sad to state, he had died by his own hand, in a fit of cerebral derangement!

We sent our acknowledgments, with our Commentary on John, to Professor Tholuck, who kindly received them before he passed away. For the help derived from him in preparing this work, as well as the former, we would fain make a fresh acknowledgment.

But when we meet in paradise, this pleasant duty can be better performed in their case; and in that of John Chrysostom, James Arminius, John Goodwin, James Macknight (who first, through Adam Clarke, gave us the key to portions of this Epistle, which Augustin and his followers so sadly misconstrued), and many others, whose works have been so freely consulted, and who have been duly credited in the notes.

As noted in previous volumes, we have followed the usual abbreviations—A, B, C, D, Sin., etc., for the Alexandrian, Vatican, Paris, Cambridge, Sinaitic, MSS., and others; Heb., LXX., Vulg., Syr., etc., for the Hebrew Bible, Septuagint, or Greek version, Vulgate, or Latin, and Syriac version, etc.

Other contractions and technical terms may be found explained in dictionaries and other manuals. Every name of person, or place, or thing, requiring explanation in the notes, has received it. The map prefixed will afford no little assistance to the student.

For the beauty and accuracy of the typographical execution, we are greatly indebted to Messrs. Spillers, Cuthbert, and Kelsea, who took special pains in the premises—while the author, by careful readings and revisions, has shown all diligence and care to keep the work as free from error as possible.

INTRODUCTION.

I.—ORIGIN OF THE EPISTLE TO THE ROMANS.

THAT this Epistle was written to the Church at Rome, by the Apostle Paul, and was recognized at the time and ever after as a part of the inspired canon, was never questioned except by certain fanatical heretics—Ebionites, Encratites, and Cerinthians—who rejected it because it opposed their errors.

The internal evidence of its genuineness is conclusive. It bears the inscription of "Paul a servant of Jesus Christ, a called apostle": it is written in his style—its personal allusions, familiar observations, Scripture quotations, peculiar mode of discussing controverted subjects, exhortations, counsels, etc., point to no other writer—while its agreement with the state of things at that time in Rome, as recorded in contemporary writings, especially the Acts of the Apostles, leaves no room to doubt of its Pauline origin.

The external evidence is quite as satisfactory. It is repeatedly quoted by the Apostolical Fathers—Barnabas, Clemens Romanus, Ignatius, and Polycarp—and by their successors, Irenaeus, Theophilus of Antioch, Clemens Alexandrinus, Origen, Tertullian: it is recognized in the Muratorian Fragment (*cir.* 150 to 200 A.D.), and all other Catalogues of the Holy Scriptures, and it was placed in the old Syriac and Latin translations of the New Testament. By none of these authorities was its Pauline origin questioned. Modern skeptics are forced to recognize this venerable document as an Epistle of the Apostle of the Gentiles—though they inconsistently reject the gospel to the truth and divinity of which it bears so irrefragable testimony.

The historical and critical proofs of this, as presented with so much opulence of learning by Lardner in his "Credibility," and so much acuteness of argument by Paley in his "Horae Paulinae," and the accumulated evidence furnished by more recent writers, have scarcely ever been assailed—indeed, it would be insane to attempt to set aside testimony so full, so clear, so overwhelming.

It may be affirmed, therefore, without fear of any contradiction worthy of notice, that this Epistle was written from Corinth by Paul, *cir.* A.D. 58, just before he went to Jerusalem with the contributions to the poor saints in Judea. Acts xix.; xx.; Rom. xv. 25, 26. He employed Tertius as an amanuensis, though he verified the manuscript by an autograph indorsement. It was forwarded by Phebe, a

deaconess of the Church at Cencrea, who visited the imperial metropolis on some business, the character of which is not stated.

II.—DESIGN OF THE EPISTLE TO THE ROMANS.

The apostle had a fivefold purpose in writing the Epistle to the Romans.

First. He wrote to establish the equal claims of Jews and Gentiles to evangelical privileges—all alike being sinners, all alike may be saved through the redemption that is in Christ Jesus.

Second. To settle the great evangelical principle that "We are accounted righteous before God only for the merit of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ by faith, and not for our own works or deservings"—legal obedience of any sort—showing that this doctrine of gratuitous pardon—"that we are justified by faith only—is a most wholesome doctrine, and very full of comfort."

Third. The apostle sets forth the practicableness and necessity of holiness under the Evangelical dispensation.

Fourth. He wished to compose the differences arising in the Church, in regard to certain cases of conscience which required apostolical direction.

Fifth. He wanted, moreover, to testify his love to the brethren at Rome, and to inform them of his purpose to visit them as soon as possible, to enjoy their society, and to confirm them in the faith.

These five points are not handled according to our modern rules of dialectics, or rhetorical arrangement, or in the articulate manner of a Catechism or Confession of Faith. Matters which belong to one section of the Epistle receive attention in another. Thus, personal concerns, which for the most part are relegated to the close of the Epistle, are anticipated in the introduction, and also in an affecting manner in the beginning of his diatribe against Jewish exclusiveness (ch. ix.), to show that instead of being prompted by prejudice, as the Apostle of the Gentiles, he wrote under the influence of the most intense love to his brethren according to the flesh. So his doctrine of sin is properly reproduced in his essays on justification and sanctification, as these points are anticipated in the opening of the Epistle. But is not this method in accordance with the analogy of nature, and well adapted to the design of the writer? It is possible that the effect which it produces on the attentive reader might not be heightened by a recension of the Epistle according to modern rules of composition. After a careful study of this masterly document, the design of the writer is so apparent, and the result is so satisfactory, that one is left to marvel at the controversies which it has occasioned.

III.—PREREQUISITES TO THE STUDY OF THE EPISTLE TO THE ROMANS.

First. It is not necessary that the student should be intimately versed in Roman history, or that the commentator should devote much space to this matter; yet some knowledge of the subject seems necessary to a proper comprehension of this Epistle. Accordingly every point of the kind—such as allusions to persons, places, and events—occurring in the Epistle, has received due attention in the notes, which, it is hoped, will prove serviceable and satisfactory. It may not, perhaps, be out of place to add a paragraph concerning the Eternal City.

Rome was founded by Romulus, *cir.* 753 B.C. It first occupied only the Palatine Hill, but subsequently embraced six other hills. At one time its walls were twenty miles in circuit. It had thirty-seven gates, and thirty-one roads radiated from it to all parts of the Empire. It is situated in latitude 41° 54' north, and longitude 12° 27' east—on both sides of the Tiber, fifteen miles from its mouth in the Mediterranean. There were formerly eight principal bridges over the river, relics of three of which still remain. The city was adorned with magnificent buildings, among which was the Capitol, on the Capitoline Hill, which inclosed the temples of Jupiter, Minerva, and Juno. On the Vatican Hill was the temple consecrated to Apollo and Mars, on the site of which a church dedicated to St. Peter was built A.D. 324. This was substituted by the present edifice, which was begun in 1506, and dedicated in 1626. It cost forty-eight million of dollars—a large amount of which was raised by the sale of Indulgences. The Vatican adjoining it is a palace containing four thousand four hundred and twenty-two halls, chapels, etc. It has a library of one hundred thousand printed books, and twenty-five thousand MSS. There are more than sixty private palaces and three hundred and sixty-four churches in the city—these, with the splendid remains of antiquity, are in juxtaposition with the most wretched hovels, the bulk of the population being in a deplorable state of poverty, ignorance, and vice. The Ghetto, or quarter assigned to the Jews, has always been a scandal to humanity. In ancient times the Jews had a part of the city assigned them; but in the reigns of Tiberius and Claudius, they were banished from Rome. (Acts xviii. 2.) As soon as possible, however, they returned; and many Jews have continued to reside in Rome, though under great disabilities and oppressions—from which they are happily relieved under the present anti-papal *regime*.

It is probable that Christianity was introduced into the Imperial City by the "strangers of Rome," who returned from Jerusalem after the great Pentecost, A.D. 33. Paul visited it *cir.* 62, and suffered martyrdom there under Nero, *cir.* 66. Tradition says Peter was crucified there at the same time, which may have been the case; but it is not certain that Peter ever visited Rome. The early Christians there were fearfully persecuted by some of the emperors; the catacombs near the

city and under it are impressive mementoes of their sufferings. These persecutions, of course, ceased when Constantine came to the throne.

In 410 the city was taken by Alaric, and in 455 by Genseric: it fell under the power of the Ostrogoths and the emperors of the East, and in the eighth century passed into the hands of the popes, and became the capital of the States of the Church. From 1809 to 1814 it was the capital of the Department of Rome in the French Empire. In 1848 the pope was expelled, and in 1849 a republican form of government was inaugurated; but the papal authority was re-instated by the French, and the pope returned to the Vatican in 1850. But in 1870 he was deposed by Victor Emmanuel; and whether or not his temporal power will ever be restored, it might be over-bold in any one to say. Several Protestant churches have been since erected in Rome.

A plan of Rome, giving a comparative view of the ancient and modern cities, with a graphic description of the city as it appeared in the times of the apostles, may be found in the "Life and Epistles of St. Paul," by Conybeare and Howson. A full description of Rome, ancient and modern, with elegant pictorial illustrations, may be found in Potter's Bible Encyclopaedia.

Second. It is of great importance that the student, as well as the commentator, should come to the study of this Epistle with freedom from all undue theological bias. This should be specially noted in regard to the Fall (ch. v.), and to election and reprobation (ch. viii.; ix.). It is worse than folly to attempt to find Augustinianism, on the one hand, or Pelagianism, on the other, where there is neither. The germs of these and other erroneous systems are found, indeed, in this Epistle; but they are there only to be condemned; and the marvel is, that after what the inspired apostle has written in this Epistle, they should ever have been developed.

Third. Attention should be paid to the character and circumstances of the writer and those to whom he wrote. This has been generally overlooked in theological discussions on certain portions of the Epistle. It was not conceived in the Council of Trent, nor in the Synod of Dort—in the Lambeth Palace, nor the Westminster Assembly of Divines! The quinquarticular controversy had not then arisen; though one may descry the germ of it in the exclusiveness which some arrogantly assumed, and which the apostle so earnestly opposed.

Fourth. Due regard should be had to the dialect used by the writer. It is a vigorous Hellenistic Greek. It abounds with Hebrew idioms, admirably adapted to the subject and design of the Epistle, and the character and condition of those to whom it was addressed. It is also well adapted to us on whom the ends of the world have come—as it is embodied in a collection of other writings of a similar character, the study of which, in connection with this Epistle, will leave the

student in doubt as to the meaning of but few expressions employed by the writer. This point seems to have been too generally overlooked by the translators of our Authorized Version; hence we have given an original translation, in the execution of which this matter has been duly regarded. It is indeed one of great importance. Under the bias of false philological principles, interpreters of this Epistle have been led astray almost as much as others who have essayed to interpret it under the bias of certain dogmatic proclivities. It will be seen by the notes that we have paid due attention to the various readings of MSS. and versions, and the interpretations of commentators of every school, ancient and modern.

But it is unnecessary to enlarge on questions of this sort, which, it is hoped, have received sufficient attention and elucidation in the Exposition.

Written with much labor and prayer, this Commentary is sent forth with a devout hope that, by God's blessing, it may afford some aid to the seeker of truth in the study of this *magnum opus* of the great Apostle of the Gentiles.

NEW TRANSLATION
OF
The Epistle of Paul, the Apostle, to the Romans.

CHAPTER I.

- 1 PAUL, a servant of Jesus Christ, a called apostle,
2 separated unto God's gospel, which he promised of
3 old, through his prophets, in Holy Scriptures; concerning his Son—who was
born of David's seed, according
4 to flesh, who was declared God's Son in power, according to a Spirit of
holiness, by a resurrection of the dead
5 —Jesus Christ our Lord; through whom we receive grace and apostleship for
obedience of faith among all
6 the Gentiles, for his name; among whom are ye also
7 called ones of Jesus Christ: To all who are in Rome, beloved of God, called
saints—grace to you, and peace, from God our Father, and the Lord Jesus
Christ.
8 First, indeed, I thank my God, through Jesus Christ, for all of you, because
your faith is being celebrated in
9 all the world. For God is my witness, whom I serve with my spirit in the
gospel of his Son, how incessantly
10 I make mention of you always in my prayers, asking if by any means, now
at length I shall be permitted by
11 the will of God to come to you. For I long to see you, that I may impart to
you some spiritual gift, in order
12 that ye may be established; and this is, to be encouraged among you by the
mutual faith of you and me.
13 Now I would not have you ignorant, brethren, that many times I purposed
to come to you (and yet was hindered—till the present), that some fruit I
might have

14 among you also, even as among the other Gentiles. To both Greeks and Barbarians, to both wise and unwise, I
15 am a debtor. Thus, as far as in me lies, I am ready to preach the gospel even to you who are in Rome.
16 For I am not ashamed of the gospel, because it is God's power for salvation to every one who believes, both
17 to Jew, first, and to Greek. For God's righteousness in it is being revealed, by faith for faith, as it is written, But the righteous by faith shall live.
18 For God's wrath is being revealed from heaven against all ungodliness and unrighteousness of men, who
19 hold the truth in unrighteousness; because the knowledge of God is manifested among them, for God mani-
20 fested it to them. For his unseen things since the creation of the world are perceived, being understood by the things made—both his eternal power and divinity—so
21 that they are inexcusable; because when they knew God, they glorified him not as God, or gave him thanks, but became vain in their reasonings, and their foolish
22 heart was darkened; professing to be wise men, they be-
23 came foolish; and exchanged the glory of the incorruptible God for a likeness of an image of corruptible man,
24 and birds, and quadrupeds, and reptiles. Wherefore God also delivered them over, in the lusts of their hearts, unto impurity, so that their bodies were dishon-
25 ored among them; who exchanged the truth of God for a lie, and worshiped and served the creature instead of
26 the Creator, who is blessed forever. Amen. On this account God gave them up unto infamous passions; for even their females exchanged the natural use for that
27 which is against nature; and likewise also the males, leaving the natural use of the female, were inflamed in their lust one toward another—males and females committing indecency, and receiving in themselves the recompense of their error, which was meet.
28 And as they did not choose to retain the knowledge of God, God gave them over unto a reprobate mind to

29 do things unbecoming; having become filled with all unrighteousness, fornication, depravity, covetousness, malice; full of envy, murder, contention, deceit, malignity; whisperers, backbiters; God-hated, contumacious, arrogant, braggarts, inventors of evil things, disobedient to parents; without understanding, covenant-breakers, without natural affection, implacable, unmerciful; who knowing the ordinance of God, that those who practice these things are worthy of death, not only do them, but are even well pleased with those who practice them.

CHAPTER II.

1 THEREFORE thou art inexcusable, O man, whosoever thou art who judgest; for wherein thou judgest another, thou condemnest thyself; for thou who judgest art practicing the same things. But we know that the sentence of God is according to truth upon those who practice such things. And thinkest thou this, O man, who judgest those practicing such things as these, and art doing them, that thou shalt escape the sentence of God? Or the riches of his goodness, and forbearance, and long-suffering, dost thou despise, not knowing that the goodness of God leadeth thee to repentance? But according to thy hardness and impenitent heart, thou treasurest up to thyself wrath in a day of wrath and revelation of God's righteous judgment—who will render to every one according to his works—to those on the one hand, who, by perseverance in well-doing, seek for glory, honor, and immortality, eternal life; to those on the other hand, who are contentious, and do not obey the truth, but obey unrighteousness, shall be indignation and wrath, tribulation and anguish, upon every soul of man who doeth evil, both of Jew first, and of Greek; but glory, honor, and peace, to every one who works that which is good, both to Jew, first, and to Greek; for there is no respect of persons with God.

12 For as many as without law sinned, without law also shall perish; and as many as in law sinned, through law

13 shall be judged. For not the hearers of the law are righteous with God, but the doers of the law shall be

14 declared righteous. For when Gentiles—those who have no law—by nature do the things of the law—

15 these, having no law, to themselves are law; who exhibit the work of the law written in their hearts, their conscience bearing joint-testimony, and their reasonings

16 among one another, accusing, or even defending, in a day when God will judge the secrets of men, according to my gospel, through Jesus Christ.

17 But if thou art named a Jew, and retest thyself in

18 law, and boastest in God, and knowest his will, and distinguishest the things which differ, being instructed out

19 of the law; art persuaded, moreover, that thou thyself

20 art a guide of the blind, a light of those in darkness; an instructor of the foolish, a teacher of babes; having the

21 form of knowledge and of truth in the law: the one therefore who is teaching another—thou dost not teach thyself; the one who is preaching not to steal—thou

22 dost steal; the one who is charging not to commit adultery—thou dost commit adultery; the one who is abhor-

23 ring idols—thou dost rob temples; who in law boastest, by the transgression of the law, thou dishonorest God;

24 for the name of God on account of you is blasphemed among the Gentiles, as it is written.

25 For circumcision, indeed, profits, in case that thou practicest law; but in case thou art a transgressor of

26 law, thy circumcision is become uncircumcision. In case, therefore, the uncircumcision keep the requirements of the law, will not his uncircumcision be ac-

27 counted for circumcision? And the uncircumcision by nature fulfilling the law, shall judge thee, who, with

28 letter and circumcision, art a transgressor of law. For not he who is a Jew outwardly is one, nor is that circumcision which is outward in the flesh, circumcision;

29 but he is a Jew who is one inwardly, and circumcision is of heart, in spirit, not in letter, whose praise is not of men, but of God.

CHAPTER III.

1 WHAT then is the pre-eminence of the Jew? or what

2 is the profit of circumcision? Much in every way: for first, indeed, because they were intrusted with the ora-

3 cles of God. For what if some distrusted? Shall their

4 distrust make the trust of God void? Far be it! But let God be true, though every man be a liar, as it is written, That thou mayest be justified in thy words, and mayest overcome in thy judgment.

5 But if our unrighteousness evinces God's righteousness, what shall we say? Is God unrighteous who in-

6 flicts wrath? (I speak as a man.) Far be it! For

7 then, how will God judge the world? For if the truth of God by my lie abounded unto his glory, why yet am

8 I also judged as a sinner? And why may we not (as we are slandered, and as some affirm that we say) do evil that good may come?—whose condemnation is just.

9 What then? do we surpass them? Not in the least; for we before proved that both Jews and Greeks are all

10 under sin, as it is written, There is none righteous, no,

11 not one. There is none who understands, there is none

12 who seeks after God: all turned aside, together they became unprofitable; there is none who doeth goodness

13 —there is not even one. A sepulcher opened is their throat; with their tongues they were using deceit; ven-

14 oms of asps is under their lips; their mouth of cursing

15 and bitterness is full; swift are their feet to shed blood;

16 destruction and misery are in their ways; and a way of
17 peace they did not get to know; there is no fear of God
18 before their eyes.

19 Now we know that whatever things the law says, it speaks to those who are
in the law, in order that every mouth may be stopped, and all the world may
be under

20 penal sentence to God; because by works of law no flesh shall be declared
righteous in his presence, for through law is knowledge of sin.

21 But now apart from law, a righteousness of God has been manifested, being
attested by the law and the

22 prophets; namely, a righteousness of God through faith of Jesus Christ, unto
all, and upon all, who believe;

23 for there is no difference; for all sinned, and are com-

24 ing short of the glory of God, being declared righteous freely, by his grace,
through the redemption which is

25 in Christ Jesus: whom God set forth a propitiatory offering, through faith in
his blood, for a declaration of his justice, because of the pretermission of
former sins,

26 through the forbearance of God; with a view to the declaration of his justice
in the present time, that he might be just while justifying him who is of faith
in Jesus.

27 Where then is the boasting? It is excluded. By what law? Of works? Nay,
but by a law of faith.

28 Therefore we reckon that a man is justified by faith,

29 without works of law. Or is he the God of Jews alone?

30 and not also of Gentiles? Yes, of Gentiles also; seeing one is the God who
will justify circumcision by faith,

31 and uncircumcision through the faith. Law, then, do we make void through
the faith? Far be it! On the contrary, we establish law.

CHAPTER IV.

1 WHAT then shall we affirm Abraham our father to

2 have found, as to flesh? For if Abraham by works was justified, he has
ground of boasting; but not with God;

3 for what says the Scripture? And Abraham believed

4 God, and it was reckoned to him for righteousness. But to him who works,
the reward is not reckoned as of

5 grace, but as of debt; whereas to him who works not, but believes on him
who justifies the ungodly—his faith is reckoned for righteousness.

6 Even as David also affirms the blessedness of the man to whom God reckons
righteousness without works:

7 Blessed are they whose iniquities are forgiven, and

8 whose sins are covered. Blessed is a man to whom the Lord may in no wise
reckon sin.

9 This blessedness, then, is it affirmed of the circumcision, or also of the
uncircumcision? for we say that

10 the faith was reckoned to him for righteousness. How then was it reckoned?
when he was in circumcision, or in uncircumcision? Not in circumcision, but
in uncir-

11 cumcision. And a sign he received—of circumcision—a seal of the
righteousness of the faith which he had in the uncircumcision, in order that
he might be a father of all who believe while in uncircumcision, that the

12 righteousness might be reckoned also to them; and a father of circumcision
to those who are not only of circumcision, but who also walk in the steps of
the faith of our father Abraham, in uncircumcision.

13 For not through law was the promise to Abraham and his seed that he
should be the inheritor of a world,

14 but through righteousness of faith. For if they who are of law are inheritors,
the faith becomes useless, and the

15 promise is made void; for law causes wrath: but where

16 there is no law neither is there transgression: on account of this it is of faith,
in order that it may be according to grace, to the end the promise may be
sure to all the seed—not to that of the law only, but to that also of the

17 faith of Abraham, who is a father of us all (as it is written, For I have
appointed thee a father of many nations), before God whom he

believed—him who makes alive the dead, and calls the things which are not as

18 things which are: who against hope, believed in hope, that he might become a father of many nations, according to that which had been said, Thus shall be thy seed.

19 And not becoming weak in the faith, he considered not his own body already dead, being about a hundred years

20 old, and the deadness of Sarah's womb. But with regard to the promise of God, he wavered not through unbelief, but was strengthened in the faith, giving glory

21 to God; and, fully assured that what he has promised

22 he is able also to perform, therefore also it was reckoned

23 to him for righteousness. Now it was not written on

24 his account alone, that it was reckoned to him, but on our account also, to whom it is to be reckoned—to those who believe on him who raised Jesus our Lord from the

25 dead; who was delivered up on account of our offenses, and was raised on account of our justification.

CHAPTER V.

1 THEREFORE being justified by faith, we may have

2 peace with God, through our Lord Jesus Christ; through whom also we have had the access, by the faith, into this grace in which we stand, and we may exult in hope of the glory of God.

3 And not only so, but we may exult also in the tribulations, knowing that the tribulation produces patience;

4 and the patience, experience; and the experience, hope;

5 and the hope makes not ashamed, because God's love has been poured out on our hearts, by means of the

6 Holy Spirit who was given to us. For we being yet without strength, Christ yet at the proper time, died for

7 the ungodly. For scarcely for a righteous man will any one die—for, perhaps, for the good man some one

8 might even dare to die—but God evinces his own love toward us, in that we
being yet sinners, Christ died for

9 us. Much more, then, being justified by his blood, we

10 shall be saved, through him, from the wrath. For if, being enemies, we were
reconciled to God through the death of his Son, much more, having been
reconciled,

11 we shall be saved by his life. And not only so, but also exulting in God,
through our Lord Jesus Christ, through whom we have now received the
reconciliation.

12 Wherefore, as through one man, sin entered into the world, and death
through sin, and so death passed

13 upon all men, in that all sinned—for until law sin was in the world, but sin
is not taken into account where

14 there is no law; yet death reigned from Adam to Moses, even over those not
having sinned upon the likeness of the offense of Adam, who is a type of the
coming one;

15 but not as the offense so also is the free gift; for if by the offense of the one
the many died, much more the grace of God, and the gift by grace, that of the
one man

16 Jesus Christ, superabounded to the many; and not as through one having
sinned is the gift; for the judicial sentence, indeed, was from one offense to
condemnation, but the free gift is from many offenses to justification;

17 for if by the offense of the one, death reigned through the one, much more
they who receive the superabundance of the grace, and of the gift of
righteousness, in

18 life shall reign through the one, Jesus Christ—hence, then, as through one
offense, the result was to all men to condemnation, even so through one
righteous act it was

19 unto all men unto justification of life. For as through the disobedience of the
one man, the many were constituted sinners, so through the obedience of the
one, the

20 many will be constituted righteous. Moreover, law entered besides, that the
offense might multiply, but where

21 sin multiplied grace exceedingly abounded; that as sin reigned in death, so also might grace reign, through righteousness, to life everlasting, through Jesus Christ our Lord.

CHAPTER VI.

1 WHAT then shall we say? We may continue in sin
2 that grace may increase? Far be it! We who died to
3 sin, how shall we still live therein? Or are ye ignorant that all we who were
baptized unto Christ Jesus, unto
4 his death were baptized? Therefore we were buried with him through the
baptism unto his death, in order that as Christ was raised from the dead
through the glory of the Father, thus also we should walk in new-
5 ness of life. For if we have become united in the likeness of his death,
certainly we shall be also in that of his 6 resurrection; knowing this, that our
old man was crucified with him, in order that the body of sin might be
7 destroyed, that we should no longer serve sin. For he
8 who died has been released from sin. And if we died with Christ, we believe
that we shall also live with him;
9 knowing that Christ having been raised from the dead, dieth no more, death
no more has dominion over him.
10 For the death which he died, he died to sin, once for all;
11 but the life which he lives, he lives to God. Thus also reckon ye yourselves
dead indeed to sin, but alive to God in Christ Jesus.
12 Let not sin therefore reign in your mortal body,
13 unto the obeying of its desires; nor present your members as instruments of
unrighteousness to sin; but present yourselves to God, as alive from the
dead, and your
14 members as instruments of righteousness to God. For sin shall not have
dominion over you; for ye are not under law, but under grace.
15 What then? May we sin because we are not under
16 law, but under grace? Far be it! Do ye not know that to whom ye present
yourselves servants for obedience, his servants ye are to whom ye render
obedience, whether of sin unto death, or of obedience unto righteousness?

17 But thanks to God, that though ye were servants of sin, yet ye obeyed from the heart that form of instruction
18 unto which ye were delivered; and being freed from
19 sin, ye became servants to righteousness. I speak in the manner of men, because of the weakness of your flesh; for as ye presented your members servants to impurity and to lawlessness for lawlessness, so now present your members servants to righteousness for sanctifica-
20 tion. For when ye were servants of sin, ye were free as
21 to righteousness. What fruit therefore had ye then in those things whereof ye are now ashamed? for the end
22 of those things is death. But now having been set free from sin, and having been made servants to God, ye have your fruit unto sanctification, and the end life
23 everlasting. For the wages of sin is death; but the gift of God is life everlasting in Christ Jesus our Lord.

CHAPTER VII.

1 OR are ye ignorant, brethren—for I am speaking to those who know law—that the law has dominion over a
2 man as long time as he lives? For the married woman is bound by law to the living husband; but if the husband die, she is set free from the law of her husband.
3 Hence, then, the husband being alive, she shall be called an adulteress, if she become another man's; but if the husband die, she is free from the law, so that she is not
4 an adulteress, though she become another man's. So, then, my brethren, ye also were made dead to the law, through the body of Christ, that ye may belong to another—to him who was raised from the dead, that we
5 should bring forth fruit to God. For when we were in the flesh the passions of sins, which were through the law, worked in our members, for the bringing forth of
6 fruit to death. But just now we were freed from the law, dying to that wherein we were held, so that we serve in newness of spirit, and not in oldness of letter.

7 What then shall we say? That the law is sin? Far be it! On the contrary, I did not recognize sin, except through law; for even concupiscence I had not known,

8 if the law had not said, Thou shalt not covet. But sin, having taken occasion, through the commandment, produced in me all concupiscence; for without law sin is

9 dead. I, however, was alive without law, at one time; but the commandment having come, sin sprang up to

10 life, and I died; and the commandment which was for

11 life, itself was found to be unto me for death. For sin having taken occasion, through the commandment, com-

12 pletely deceived me, and through it killed me. So that the law indeed is holy, and the commandment holy, and

13 just, and good. Has then the good become death to me? Far be it! But it was sin—that it might appear sin—through that which was good, to me producing death, that sin might become exceeding sinful, through the commandment.

14 For we know that the law is spiritual; but I am

15 carnal, sold under sin. For that which I produce, I do not approve; for not what I wish, that I practice; but

16 what I hate, that I do. But if what I wish not that I

17 do, I consent to the law that it is good. Now, then, it is no longer I that produce it, but sin dwelling in me.

18 For I know that there does not dwell in me—that is, in my flesh—a good thing; for to wish is present with me,

19 but to produce what is good I find not. For the good which I wish, I do not; but the evil which I wish not,

20 that I practice. But if I do that which I wish not, it is no longer I that produce it, but the sin dwelling in me.

21 I find therefore the law that when I am wishing to do

22 the good, the evil is present with me. For I delight in

23 the law of God, as to the inward man; but I behold a different law in my members, warring against the law of my mind, and making me a captive to the law of sin

24 which is in my members. O wretched man that I am!

25 Who will deliver me from the body of this death? I thank God, through Jesus Christ our Lord. So then I myself, indeed, with the mind serve God's law, but with the flesh a law of sin.

CHAPTER VIII.

1 THERE is, then, now no condemnation to those who are in Christ Jesus, who walk not according to flesh, but

2 according to spirit. For the law of the spirit of the life in Christ Jesus freed me from the law of sin and death.

3 For—that which was impossible by the law, because it was weak through the flesh—God, sending his own Son in likeness of sinful flesh, and on account of sin, con-

4 demned the sin in the flesh; that the righteous requirement of the law might be fulfilled in us, who walk not

5 according to flesh, but according to spirit. For they who are according to flesh, mind the things of the flesh; but those according to spirit, the things of the spirit.

6 For the minding of the flesh is death; but the minding

7 of the spirit is life and peace. Because the minding of the flesh is enmity toward God; for to the law of God it

8 does not submit itself—indeed, it cannot. And they

9 who are in flesh cannot please God. But ye are not in flesh, but in spirit, if so be that God's Spirit dwells in you; if, however, any one has not Christ's spirit, he is

10 none of his. But if Christ is in you, the body, indeed, is dead, because of sin, but the spirit is life because of

11 righteousness. If, moreover, the Spirit of him who raised up Jesus from the dead is dwelling in you, he who raised up Christ from the dead will also make alive your mortal bodies, because of his indwelling Spirit within you.

12 So, then, brethren, we are debtors, not to the flesh,

13 according to flesh to live; for if according to flesh ye live, ye must die; but if in spirit ye put to death the

14 deeds of the body, ye shall live. For as many as are
15 led by God's Spirit are God's sons. For ye received not a spirit of bondage
again unto fear; but ye received a
16 spirit of sonship, wherein we cry Abba, Father. The Spirit himself testifies
with our spirit that we are chil-
17 dren of God. But if children, also heirs—God's heirs, indeed, but Christ's
joint-heirs—if so be we are jointly suffering, that we may be also jointly
glorified.

18 For I reckon that the sufferings of the present period are not worthy to be
compared with the future glory
19 to be revealed unto us. For the eager expectation of the
20 creation awaiteth the revelation of the sons of God. For the creation was
made subject to vanity, not by choice,
21 but through him who subjected it in hope; because even the creation itself
shall be freed from the bondage of corruption, into the freedom of the glory
of the children
22 of God. For we know that all the creation is jointly groaning and jointly
travailing till the present time;
23 and not only so, but even ourselves possessing the first-fruits of the Spirit,
even we ourselves, groan within ourselves, awaiting adoption—the
redemption of our body.

24 For in the hope were we saved. But hope beheld is not hope; for what one
beholds, why does he still hope
25 for? But if what we do not behold, we hope for, with
26 patience we wait for it. And likewise also the Spirit assists in our
infirmities; for what we should pray for as we ought, we know not; but the
Spirit himself mak-
27 eth intercession for us with groanings unspeakable. But he who searches the
hearts, knows what is the mind of the Spirit, because according to God he
intercedes for saints.

28 But we know that all things work together for good to those who love God,
to those who according to pur-
29 pose are called ones. Because whom he foreknew, he predefined as
conformable with the likeness of his Son,

30 that he might be First-born among many brethren; and whom he predefined, the same he also called; and whom he called, the same he also justified; and whom he justified, the same he also glorified.

31 What then shall we say to these things? If God

32 is for us, who is against us? He who, indeed, spared not his own Son, but delivered him up for us all, how shall he not also with him freely give us all things?

33 Who will bring an accusation against God's chosen

34 ones? It is God who justifies. Who is he that condemns? It is Christ who died; yea, rather, who was raised again; who also is at God's right-hand; who also

35 intercedes for us. Who will separate us from the love of Christ? Tribulation, or distress, or persecution, or

36 famine, or nakedness, or peril, or sword? (According as it is written, For on thy account we are put to death the whole day: we are reckoned as sheep for slaughter.)

37 Nay, in all these things we are more than conquerors

38 through him who loved us. For I am persuaded that neither death, nor life, nor angels, nor principalities,

39 nor powers, nor present things, nor future things, nor height, nor depth, nor any other creature, shall be able to separate us from the love of God, which is in Christ Jesus our Lord.

CHAPTER IX.

1 I SPEAK the truth in Christ, I lie not, my conscience

2 jointly witnessing with me in the Holy Spirit, that I have great grief and unceasing anguish in my heart.

3 For I could wish that I myself were anathema from Christ, for my brethren, my kinsmen, according to

4 flesh; who are Israelites, whose are the adoption, and the glory, and the covenants, and the legislation, and

5 the service of God, and the promises; whose are the fathers, and of whom is Christ—that is, according to flesh—he who is God over all, blessed forever. Amen.

6 But the case is not so as that the word of God has failed. For not all who are
of Israel, these are Israel;

7 nor because they are a seed of Abraham are they all children; but in Isaac
shall be called a seed to thee:

8 that is, not the children of the flesh, they are children of God, but the children
of the promise are reckoned for a

9 seed. For this word is one of promise, According to this

10 season, I will come, and Sarah shall have a son. And not only so, but also
Rebecca, having conceived by one

11 man, our father Isaac—for they not having been born, nor having done any
thing good or bad, that the purpose of God according to election, may
remain, not of works,

12 but of him who calls—it was said to her, The elder shall

13 serve the younger; according as it is written, Jacob I loved, but Esau I hated.

14 What then shall we say? Is there unrighteousness

15 with God? Far be it! For to Moses he says, I will have mercy on
whomsoever I may have mercy, and I will have compassion on whomsoever
I may have com-

16 passion. So then it is not of the willer, nor of the run-

17 ner, but of God who has mercy. For the Scripture says to Pharaoh, For this
very thing did I raise thee up, that I might show forth in thee my power, and
that my name

18 might be declared in all the earth. So then on whom he pleases he has
mercy, but whom he pleases he hardens.

19 Thou wilt say then to me, Why does he yet com-

20 plain? For who withstands his will? Yea, rather, O man, who art thou that
repliest against God? Shall the thing formed say to him who formed it, Why
didst thou

21 make me thus? Or has not the potter a right over the clay, out of the same
lump, to make, indeed, one vessel

22 for honor, but another for dishonor? But if God, wishing to show forth his
wrath, and to make known his power, bore with much long-suffering, vessels
of wrath,

23 fitted for destruction; and that he might make known the riches of his glory
on vessels of mercy, which he

24 previously prepared for glory—whom he also called, us,

25 not only of Jews, but also of Gentiles. As he says also in Hosea, I will call
him not my people, my people, and

26 her not beloved, beloved; and it shall be in the place where it was said, Ye
are not my people, there they shall

27 be called sons of the living God. But Isaiah exclaims concerning Israel,
Even though the number of the sons of Israel may be as the sand of the sea,
the remnant shall

28 be saved. For he is finishing, and cutting short the word, in righteousness;
for a shortened word the Lord

29 will make on the earth. Even according as Isaiah has said before, If the Lord
of Sabaoth had not left us a seed, as Sodom we should have become, and as
Gomorrah we should have been made like.

30 What then shall we say, That Gentiles—those not following
righteousness—laid hold on righteousness—

31 righteousness, however, which is by faith. But Israel pursuing a law of
righteousness, did not attain a law of

32 righteousness. Why so? Because they pursued it not by faith, but as by
works of law; for they stumbled

33 against the stone of stumbling; as it is written, Behold, I lay in Zion a stone
of stumbling and rock of offense, and yet no one believing on him shall be
ashamed.

CHAPTER X.

1 BRETHREN, indeed, my heart's desire, and petition

2 to God for them, are for salvation. For I bear them witness that they have zeal
for God, but not according

3 to knowledge. For not recognizing the righteousness of God, and their own
seeking to establish, to the righteousness of God they were not subjected.

4 For Christ is an end of law for righteousness to every

5 one who believes. For Moses writes concerning the righteousness which is
by law: The man doing these
6 things shall live by them. But the righteousness by faith thus speaks, Say not
in thy heart, Who shall ascend into the heaven? that is, to bring down Christ;
7 or, Who shall descend into the abyss? that is, to bring
8 up Christ from the dead. But what does it say? The word is nigh thee, in thy
mouth, and in thy heart—that
9 is, the word of faith which we preach. For if thou shalt confess by thy mouth,
that Jesus is Lord, and shalt believe in thy heart that God raised him from the
dead,
10 thou shalt be saved. For in heart it is believed unto righteousness, and by
mouth it is confessed unto salva-
11 tion. For the Scripture says, No one believing on him
12 shall be ashamed. For there is no distinction between Jew and Greek, for he
is the same Lord of all, rich unto
13 all those invoking him. For every one, whosoever may invoke the Lord's
name shall be saved.
14 How then could they invoke him on whom they believed not? And how
could they believe in one of whom they heard not? And how could they hear with-
15 out a preacher? And how could they preach unless they were sent? As it is
written, How beautiful are the feet of those who publish glad tidings of
peace, who pub-
16 lish glad tidings of good things! But all did not submissively hear the glad
tidings; for Isaiah says, Lord,
17 who believed what we heard? So then the faith is from what is heard, and
that which is heard is through God's
18 word. But I say, Did they not hear? Yes, indeed! Unto all the earth went
forth their sound, and unto the
19 ends of the inhabited world their words. But I say, Did not Israel know?
First, Moses says, I will provoke you to jealousy by that which is no nation,
and by a
20 foolish nation I will provoke you to anger. But Isaiah is very bold, and says,
I was found by those not seek-

21 ing me, I became manifest to those not inquiring after me; but with regard to Israel he says, All the day I stretched forth my hands to a disobedient and contradicting people.

CHAPTER XI.

1 I SAY then, Did God cast off his people? Far be it! For even I am an Israelite, of the seed of Abraham, of

2 the tribe of Benjamin. God did not cast off his people whom he foreknew. Or do ye not know—in the account of Elijah—what the Scripture says, how he complains

3 to God against Israel, Lord, thy prophets they killed; thy altars they dug down; and I was left alone; and

4 they seek my life. But what says to him the response? I reserved to myself seven thousand men who bent not

5 knee to Baal. Thus then, even at the present time, there

6 is a remnant according to an election of grace. But if by grace, it is no longer from works; otherwise the grace is no longer grace. But if of works, it is no longer grace, otherwise work is no longer work.

7 What then? What Israel seeks after, that it found not: but the election found it, but the rest were hard-

8 ened. As it is written, God gave them the spirit of stupor; eyes not to see, and ears not to hear, unto this

9 very day. And David says, Let their table be made into a snare, and into a net, and into a stumbling-block,

10 and into a recompense to them: darkened be their eyes, not to see, and their back always bow thou down.

11 I say then, Did they stumble so that they should fall? Far be it! On the contrary, by their offense salvation came to the Gentiles to provoke them to jealousy.

12 But if their offense was a world's riches, and their diminishing Gentiles' riches, how much more their fullness?

13 For I speak to you the Gentiles—inasmuch, indeed, as

14 I am an Apostle of Gentiles—I glorify my ministry—if by any means I may provoke to jealousy the flesh of

15 mine, and may save some from among them. For if the casting away of them was a world's reconciliation, what shall the recovering of them be but life from the dead?

16 If, moreover, the first portion was holy, the lump will be also; and if the root was holy, the branches will

17 be also. But if some of the branches were broken off, and thou, being a wild olive, wast grafted in among them, and didst become a joint-partaker of the root and the fatness of the olive, exult not over the branches;

18 but if thou dost exult, thou bearest not the root, but the

19 root thee. Thou wilt say, then, Branches were broken

20 off in order that I might be engrafted. Well, by their want of faith they were broken off; and thou by thy faith hast been standing: be not high-minded, but fear;

21 for if God did not spare the natural branches, lest he shall also not spare thee.

22 See, then, God's kindness and severity: upon those, indeed, who fell, severity, but upon thee God's kindness, if thou abide in the kindness, otherwise even thou shalt

23 be cut off. But even they, if they abide not in their want of faith, shall be grafted in, for God is able to graft

24 them in again. For if thou wast cut out from the natural wild olive, and contrary to nature wast grafted into a good olive, how much more shall these, the natural branches, be grafted in their own olive?

25 For I would not have you ignorant, brethren, as to this mystery, that ye be not wise in your own conceits, that a hardening in part has happened to Israel,

26 until the fullness of the Gentiles come in. And so all Israel will be saved, as it is written, The Deliverer shall come out of Zion, and shall turn away ungodliness from

27 Jacob. And this with them is the covenant from me,

28 when I shall take away their sins. With regard to the gospel, indeed, they are hated, on your account; but with regard to the election, they are beloved on account

29 of the fathers; for irrevocable are the gifts and the call-
30 ing of God. For as you once disobeyed God, but now
31 obtained mercy by their disobedience, so also now these disobeyed, so that
through the mercy showed to you,
32 they also may obtain mercy. For God shut up all under disobedience, that he
may have mercy on all.
33 O depth of God's riches, and wisdom, and knowledge! How unsearchable
his judgments, and untrace-
34 able his ways! For who knew the Lord's mind? or
35 who was his counselor? Or who first gave to him, and
36 it shall be repaid him? Because of him, and through him, and for him, are
all things. To him be the glory forever. Amen.

CHAPTER XII.

1 I EXHORT you, therefore, brethren, by the mercies of God, to present your
bodies, a living sacrifice, holy,
2 well-pleasing to God, your rational service, and not to be conformed to this
world, but to be transformed in the renovation of your mind, that ye may
prove what is the will of God, the good, and well-pleasing, and perfect.
3 For I say, through the grace which was given to me, to every one among you,
not to think of himself more highly than he ought to think, but to think
soberly, as
4 God to each one divided a measure of faith. For just as in one body we have
many members, but all the mem-
5 bers have not the same office, so we, the many, are one body in Christ, and,
severally, members one of another.
6 But having gifts different, according to the grace given to us, whether
prophecy, let us prophesy according to
7 the analogy of the faith; or deaconship, let us attend to
8 the deaconship; or he who teaches, to the teaching; or he who exhorts, to the
exhortation; let the almoner act with simplicity; the ruler, with diligence; the
consoler, with cheerfulness.
9 Let love be unfeigned—hating the evil, cleaving to

10 the good. In brotherly love, be tenderly affectioned toward each other; in honor going before one another.

11 In diligence be not backward—in the spirit being fer-

12 vent, to the Lord doing service. In hope, rejoicing; in

13 tribulation, enduring; in prayer, persevering; in the necessities of the saints, sharing; hospitality, pursuing.

14 Bless those who persecute you; bless, and curse not.

15 Rejoice with those who rejoice, and weep with those who

16 weep. The same thing toward one another minding—not the high things minding—but with the humble con-

17 sorting. Be not wise in your own conceits. To no one rendering evil for evil; providing honorable things be-

18 fore all men. If possible—as far as depends on you—

19 with all men being at peace; not avenging yourselves, beloved, but give place to anger; for it is written, To

20 me is vengeance, I will recompense, says the Lord. If therefore thy enemy hunger, feed him; if he thirst, give him drink; for this doing, thou wilt heap coals of fire on

21 his head. Be not overcome by evil, but overcome evil by good.

CHAPTER XIII.

1 LET every soul subject himself to superior authorities; for there is no authority except from God: but

2 those that are have been appointed by God; so that he who sets himself against the authority, to the appointment of God opposes himself; and those who oppose

3 shall receive for themselves judgment. For they who rule are not a terror to the good work, but to the evil. But wouldst thou not be in fear of the authority? Do that which is good, and thou shalt have praise from it.

4 For God's servant he is to thee for good. But if thou do evil, be afraid; for not in vain the sword he wears. For he is God's servant, an avenger for wrath to him

- 5 who doeth evil. Wherefore there is a necessity to submit yourselves, not only on account of the anger, but
- 6 also on account of the conscience. For on this account, ye pay tribute also, for they are God's public ministers
- 7 constantly attending to this very thing. Render to all their dues: tribute to whom tribute is due; toll to whom toll; reverence to whom reverence; honor, to whom honor.
- 8 Owe nothing to any one, except to love one another;
- 9 for he who loves the other has fulfilled law. For this, Thou shalt not commit adultery, Thou shalt not commit murder, Thou shalt not steal, Thou shalt not bear false witness, Thou shalt not covet; and if there is any other commandment, in this word it is summed up, Thou shalt
- 10 love thy neighbor as thyself' Love to one's neighbor works not evil; love, therefore, is a fulfillment of law.
- 11 And this, knowing the time, that it is an hour already for us to be roused out of sleep; for now is our
- 12 salvation nearer than when we believed. The night advanced, the day has drawn near; let us therefore put off the works of darkness, and let us put on the weapons of
- 13 light. As in day-time, let us walk becomingly; not in revels and carousals; not in whoredoms and debauch-
- 14 eries; not in strife and envy; but put ye on the Lord Jesus Christ, and make not provision for the flesh for lusts.

CHAPTER XIV.

- 1 BUT the weak in the faith, receive ye, not for judg-
- 2 ments of opinions. One, indeed, has faith to eat all
- 3 things; but he who is weak eats herbs. Let not him who eats despise him who eats not; and let not him who eats not, judge him who eats; for God received him.
- 4 Who art thou that judgest the servant of another? To his own master he stands or falls; but he shall be made to stand; for God can make him stand.
- 5 One, indeed, judges one day to be above another; but another judges every day to be alike. Let each be

6 fully persuaded in his own mind. He who regards the day, regards it to the Lord, and he who regards not the day, regards it not to the Lord; and he who eats, eats to the Lord, for he gives thanks to God; and he who eats

7 not, eats not to the Lord, and gives God thanks. For no one of us lives to himself, and no one dies to himself;

8 for whether we live, we live to the Lord, or whether we die, we die to the Lord; whether, therefore, we live or

9 die, we are the Lord's. For to this end Christ died and lived, that both of dead and living he might have lordship.

10 But thou, why dost thou judge thy brother? or also thou, why dost thou despise thy brother? for we shall all

11 stand before the judgment-seat of Christ. For it is written, As I live, says the Lord, To me shall bend every knee,

12 and every tongue shall confess to God. So then every one of us concerning himself shall give account to God.

13 No longer, then, let us judge one another, but rather judge this, not to put a stumbling-block before

14 your brother, or a snare. I know, and am assured, through the Lord Jesus, that nothing is unclean by itself; yet to him who counts any thing to be unclean, to

15 him it is unclean. For if because of food thy brother is grieved, thou walkest no longer according to love: do

16 not with thy food destroy him for whom Christ died. Let

17 not your good thing, then, be evil spoken of. For the kingdom of God is not eating and drinking, but right-

18 eousness, peace, and joy in the Holy Spirit. For he who herein serveth Christ, is well-pleasing to God and approved to men.

19 Let us, therefore, follow after the things of peace,

20 and the things of mutual edification. Do not for the sake of food demolish the work of God. All things, indeed, are pure; but it is evil for the man who eats so as

21 to cause stumbling. It is noble, not to eat flesh, nor to drink wine, nor to do any thing, whereby thy brother

22 stumbles, or is ensnared, or is weak. Hast thou faith? Have it to thyself before God. Blessed is he who does

23 not judge himself in what he allows. But he who doubts, if he eats, stands condemned, because he eats not of faith; and whatsoever is not of faith is sin.

CHAPTER XV.

1 NOW we who are strong ought to bear the infirmities

2 of the weak, and not to please ourselves. Let every one of us please his neighbor unto that which is good, with a

3 view to edification. For even Christ pleased not himself, but, as it is written, The reproaches of those who re-

4 proached thee fell on me. For whatsoever things before written, were written for our instruction, that through the patience and through the comfort of the Scriptures

5 we might have the hope. And may the God of the patience and of the comfort give you to be of the same mind one toward another, according to Christ Jesus;

6 that with one accord, ye may with one mouth, glorify

7 the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ. Wherefore receive one another, as also Christ received you, to God's glory.

8 Now I say, Jesus Christ became a minister of circumcision in behalf of God's truth, in order to confirm

9 the promises of the fathers; and that the Gentiles, in behalf of mercy might glorify God, as it is written, For this cause, I will confess to thee among the Gentiles, and

10 sing to thy name. And again he says, Rejoice, ye Gen-

11 tiles, with his people. And again, Praise the Lord, all

12 ye Gentiles, and applaud him, all ye peoples. And again, Isaiah says, There shall be the root of Jesse: and he who rises to reign over Gentiles, in him shall Gen-

13 tiles trust. Now the God of the hope fill you with all joy and peace in believing, that ye may be superabounding in the hope, in power of the Holy Spirit.

14 But I am persuaded, my brethren, even I myself, concerning you, that ye also yourselves are full of goodness, replenished with all knowledge, being able also

15 to admonish one another. But I have written to you, brethren, more boldly, in some respect, as reminding

16 you, through the grace given to me by God, that I should be a minister of Jesus Christ for the Gentiles, ministering the gospel of God, that the offering of the Gentiles might

17 be acceptable, being by the Holy Spirit. I have therefore ground for exultation in Christ Jesus, as to matters

18 relating to God. For I will not dare to speak any thing of those things which Christ did not work through me,

19 unto obedience of Gentiles, by word and work, in power of signs and wonders—in the Spirit's power—so that from Jerusalem, and round about as far as Illyricum, I

20 have fulfilled the gospel of Christ. Yet on this wise being honorably desirous to preach the gospel not where Christ was named, lest I should build on another's foun-

21 dation; but, as it is written, They to whom nothing was told, concerning him, shall see, and they who have not heard shall understand.

22 Wherefore also I was frequently hindered from

23 coming to you. But now, no longer having place in these regions, and having for many years a strong de-

24 sire to come to you, whenever I may go into Spain, I will come to you, for I hope going through to see you, and by you to be sent forward thither, if first, in some respect, I should be filled with you.

25 But now I am going to Jerusalem, ministering to

26 the saints. For Macedonia and Achaia were pleased to make some contribution for the poor of the saints who

27 are in Jerusalem—for they were pleased, and their debtors they are; for if in their spiritual things the Gentiles shared, they ought also in their carnal things

28 to serve them. This then completed, and sealing to them this fruit, I will come through your city, to Spain;

29 and I know that coming to you, I shall come in fullness of blessing of the gospel of Christ.

30 But I entreat you, brethren, by our Lord Jesus Christ, and by the love of the Spirit, to strive together

31 with me in your prayers to God in my behalf, that I may be delivered from the contumacious in Judea, and that my ministration, which is for Jerusalem, may be

32 acceptable to the saints, so that in joy I may come to you by God's will, and be refreshed together with you.

33 Now the God of peace be with you all. Amen.

CHAPTER XVI.

1 MOREOVER, I commend to you Phoebe, our sister,

2 being a deaconess of the Church in Cenchrea, that ye may receive her in the Lord, in a manner worthy of the saints, and assist her in whatsoever business she may have need of you; for she also was an assistant of many and of me myself.

3 Salute Prisca and Aquila, my fellow-workers in

4 Christ Jesus, who for my life laid down their neck, to whom not I alone give thanks, but also all the Churches

5 of the Gentiles, and the Church at their house. Salute Epenetus, my beloved, who is a first-fruit of Asia unto

6 Christ. Salute Mary, who toiled much for us. Salute

7 Andronicus and Junia, my relatives and my fellow-prisoners, who are distinguished among the apostles, and

8 who have been in Christ before me. Salute Amplias,

9 my beloved in the Lord. Salute Urbanus, our fellow-

10 worker in Christ, and Stachys my beloved. Salute Apelles, the approved in Christ. Salute those of the

11 household of Aristobulus. Salute Herodion my kinsman. Salute those who are of the household of Nar-

12 cissus, who are in the Lord. Salute Tryphaena and Tryphosa, who labor in the Lord. Salute Persis the be-

13 loved, who labored much in the Lord. Salute Rufus, the chosen in the Lord,
and the mother of him and of

14 me. Salute Asyncritus, Phlegon, Hermas, Patrobus,

15 Hermes, and the brethren with them. Salute Philologus, and Julia, Nereus
and his sister, and Olympas, and

16 all the saints with them. Salute one another with a holy kiss. All the
Churches of Christ salute you.

17 Now I exhort you, brethren, to mark those who cause the divisions and the
offenses, contrary to the teaching which ye learned, and turn away from
them.

18 For such as these serve not our Lord Jesus Christ, but their own belly, and
by their good words and fair

19 speeches, deceive the hearts of the unsuspecting. For your obedience is
reported to all: over you therefore I rejoice; and I wish you to be wise indeed
respecting that which is good, but harmless respecting that which

20 is evil. And the God of peace will bruise Satan under your feet shortly. The
grace of our Lord Jesus Christ be with you.

21 Timothy my work-fellow, and Lucius, and Jason, and Sosipater, my
relatives, salute you.

22 I Tertius, who wrote the Epistle, salute you in the Lord.

23 Gaius, the host of myself and of the whole Church, salutes you. Erastus, the
treasurer of the city, salutes you, and Quartus the brother.

24 The grace of our Lord Jesus Christ be with you. Amen.

25 Now to him who is able to establish you, according to my gospel, even the
preaching of Jesus Christ, according to the revelation of a mystery, in ancient
times

26 undivulged, but now manifested, and through prophetic Scriptures,
according to an appointment of the everlasting God, for obedience of faith,
unto all the Gentiles

27 made known—to an only wise God, through Jesus Christ—to him be the
glory forever. Amen.

THE EPISTLE OF PAUL, THE APOSTLE, TO THE

ROMANS.

CHAPTER I.

1 *Paul commendeth his calling to the Romans, 9 and his desire to come to them.*
16 *What his gospel is, and the righteousness which it sheweth.* 18 *God is angry with all manner of sin.* 21 *What were the sins of the Gentiles.*

I.—1. *Paul*,—Paul substitutes the Hebrew Saul. (See on Acts xiii. 8.) A *servant*—The literal meaning of *doulos*, a bondman, a slave, is nearly or quite lost sight of, as in Rev. xxii. 3, 6. Moses is called *Ebed Jehovah*, "the servant of the Lord"—*doulos* in LXX. James calls himself "a servant of God and of the Lord Jesus Christ" (Jas. i. 1); Peter, "a servant and an apostle of Jesus Christ" (2 Pet. i. 1); Jude, "a servant of Jesus Christ" (Jude 1); John, "his servant John" (Rev. i. 1). Cf. 1 Cor. vii. 22; Gal. i. 10; Eph. vi. 6; Phil. i. 1; Col. iv. 12. Paul considered himself as much under the authority of Jesus Christ as Moses was under the authority of Jehovah. *Called to be an apostle*,—a called apostle. He was not self-constituted, as his enemies insinuated, but called by Christ himself, though not in the same way, or at the same time, as the original twelve; nor merely an apostle in the general sense of missionary, or messenger, as Barnabas, Epaphroditus, and others, but invested with all the prerogatives of other members of the sacred college (Acts ix. 15-29; 1 Cor. ix. 1, 2; Gal. i.). Like all the other apostles, Paul had immediate vocation from Christ, when he was seen in his glorified state—plenary inspiration, miraculous endowments, and the prerogative of communicating them to others, and universal jurisdiction. *Separated*—It is not likely that Paul alludes to his former profession as a Pharisee (a Separatist), or to appointment to a specific work (Acts xiii. 2), but to the designation in the divine purpose from his birth—his concurrence being foreseen—which took effect at his conversion (Acts xxvi. 16-20; Gal. i. 15-17; cf. Jer. i. 5). *Unto the gospel of God*,—Unto God's gospel. Geneva: "Put apart to preach the gospel of God"—to proclaim the good news of salvation; sent by God to the world by Christ. (See on Mark i. 14, 15; xvi. 15; Luke ii. 10; iv. 18; 1 Cor. xv. 1; Gal. i. 6-16; Eph. iii. 1-8.)

2. *Which he had promised afore*—Which he promised of old through his prophets. The word suggests the *protevangeliium* of Gen. iii. 15. Paul here, as was his custom, states that he was only proclaiming the good news concerning Christ

which the prophets had pre-announced in the Scriptures. It was important to state this at the outset, to preclude an objection which the Jews might urge against his doctrine, as the apostle of the Gentiles. (See on Acts xiii. 14-52; xvii. 2, 3; xxvi. 6, 7, 22, 23.) He closes the Epistle in the same strain (Rom. xvi. 25-27). *In the Holy Scriptures*,—In Holy Scriptures: we speak of Holy Scripture in the same way, without the article—the Old Testament. The prophecies are not confined to the sixteen books of the Prophets. Augustin: "The N.T. is concealed in the O.T.; the O.T. is revealed in the N.T."

3. *Concerning his Son*—The order of the original connects this with verse 1—God's gospel about his Son—and throws the emphasis on *Jesus Christ our Lord*,—the great subject-matter of the gospel; the words between are a kind of parenthesis. Christ is called God's Son, because of the eternal generation of his Divinity (John i. 14, 18); the miraculous generation of his humanity (Luke i. 35); because of his Messianic commission (John x. 34-36); his resurrection, as begotten from the dead (Acts xiii. 33; Col. i. 18); and as he is heir of all things (Heb. i. 3-5). *Which was made*—Who was born of David's seed—as the Messiah was to be of the house and lineage of David. (See on Matt. i. 1-16; Luke i. 27-32; iii.; Acts ii. 29, 30; xiii. 22, 23; Rom. xv. 12; 2 Tim. ii. 8; Rev. v. 5; xxii. 16.) *According to the flesh*;—Anarthrous: according to flesh—not meaning his human nature, but "as to outward kindred, by natural descent (Acts ii. 30; Rom. ix. 3; Gal. iv. 23, 29; 1 Cor. x. 18)." See Robinson's Lexicon, under [σαρκ](#). So Parkhurst: "It signifies consanguinity, natural relation, or descent (Rom. i. 3; ix. 3, 5, 8). So St. Paul, as being an Israelite, of the seed of Abraham, calls the Jews *his flesh* (Rom. xi. 4; comp. ver. 1). In this sense also it is applied in the LXX. for Heb. *basar* (Gen. xxix. 14; xxxvii. 27; Judg. ix. 2)." Of the twenty-four times in which [kata-sarka](#) occurs in N.T., it is used twenty-two times by Paul. The sense is varied according to the connection; but here the connection shows that natural descent is meant—not as Schaff and others, "the entire human constitution, body, soul, and spirit."

4. *And declared to be the Son of God with power*,—Who was declared God's Son in power—[ουτοςγενετο](#), from [ουριζω](#)—whence our word "horizon," the boundary-line between earth and sky—defined, marked out, demonstrated, "determined" in the margin. Lange: "Established as Son of God in power:" he has a nebulous note, in which he fails to prove that it means "exalted to heavenly majesty." Macknight: "Locke understands this of the miraculous power, described Eph. i. 19, 20, whereby Jesus was raised from the dead. I rather think *power* denotes the strength of the evidence by which he was demonstrated to be the Son of God." Certainly; but this involves the other. He was declared in power—as exerted in the resurrection—to be God's Son. The prodigies which attended his crucifixion, and which foretokened his resurrection, forced the centurion and others to say, "Truly, this was the Son of God." Admit his resurrection, and you

cannot doubt his divine Sonship. Chrysostom: "What, then, is the being declared? Being shown, manifested, judged, confessed, by the feeling and suffrage of all—prophets, birth, miracles, the Spirit, the resurrection." *According to the Spirit of holiness*,—If *kata-sarka* meant the human nature of Christ, then *kata pneuma agiwsuŕhv* might mean, as the antithesis, the divine nature; but the former refers to his genealogy, showing that he was a descendant of David, and the latter refers to his resurrection, effected by the Holy Spirit, as declaring him to be God's Son. It is harsh to call the divine nature of Christ "the Spirit of holiness," which seems, says Parkhurst, "an Hebraical expression for the Holy Spirit." Pearson (On the Creed, Art. IV.) seems to refer it to the divinity of Christ, alluding to 1 Pet. iii. 18 (quickened by the Spirit)—*ignotum per ignotius*—but in Art. VIII. he distinctly explains it of the Holy Spirit, the Third Person of the Trinity. So Whitby, who refers to Matt. iii. 16, 17; xii. 28; Acts x. 38, and adds, "What our great Prophet Jesus was, as in a more sublime, so in this sense, *the Son of God*, endowed with power of working miracles by the Holy Ghost, for confirmation of his doctrine, God hath demonstrated, saith the apostle here, by *raising him from the dead*." So Burkitt. *By the resurrection from the dead*:—Literally, "by resurrection of dead;" *dead* is in the plural; and so some refer it to the raising of Lazarus and others by Christ, and the resurrection of certain saints when he rose. Others refer it to the general resurrection, which is no demonstration till it takes place. Conybeare and Howson: "Resurrection of the dead' had already become a technical expression, used as we use 'Resurrection.'" That Paul refers to Christ's resurrection, as a proof of his divine Sonship, is clear from the scope of the passage, compared with Rom. iv. 25; vi. 4, 9; viii. 11, 34; x. 9; Eph. i. 19, 20. Paul (in the Greek) follows this digressive passage with an emphatic enunciation of the Saviour's title, *Jesus*, meaning a Saviour, his personal name; *Christ*, the Anointed One, the Messiah; *our Lord*—"Head over all things to the Church." Eph. i. 22; Acts x. 36; Rom. x. 12.

5. *By whom we have received grace and apostleship*,—Through whom we received. Paul here, as elsewhere, uses the plural when referring to himself alone. The aorist refers to the particular time when he received from Christ *grace*—that is, a supernatural endowment for the *apostleship*—the peculiar office of an apostle. Alford: "Keep the grace and apostleship separate and strictly consecutive, avoiding all nonsensical figures of hendiadys, hypallage, and the like." 1 Cor. xv. 9, 10; Eph. iii. 7, 8. Chrysostom ("we received it of grace"), Beza, Philippi, and others, make it an hendiadys, "grace of apostleship." *For obedience to the faith*—For obedience of faith—obedience which has faith for its spring. John vi. 29; Gal. v. 6; 1 Thess. i. 3. There is an ethical element in faith (Mark xvi. 16). Some make faith here objective. So Lange, referring to Acts vi. 7; but there it is in the dative, with the article; he makes it the same as obedience to Christ. *Among all nations*,—Among all the Gentiles. He speaks as the apostle of the Gentiles—as

the word is rendered Rom. xi. 13, and commonly in Paul's Epistles. Chrysostom includes the twelve apostles and others, because Paul could not preach literally to all the Gentiles! Lange renders "all the nations," including the Jews; but the article refers it to the Gentiles: cf. ver 13. *For his name*:—All this was for the honor of Christ—for the manifestation of his character and claims. Acts ix. 15, 16; xv. 26; xxi. 13. Lange puts this in apposition with "obedience of faith;" but Meyer, Alford, Hodge, and others, understand it, "for the glory of Christ."

6. *Among*—Among whom are ye also called ones of Jesus Christ. This does not seem to be "flat," as Alford says. *Kl htoi*—always without the article—in Paul's writings seems to be used technically. Rom. i. 7; viii. 28; 1 Cor. i. 2, 24. Though there were Jews in the Church at Rome, yet it was considered a Gentile Church. Tyndale gives the sense: "Of the which heathen are ye a part also, which are Jesus Christ's by vocation." Macknight: "The called disciples of Jesus Christ." It seems to be a genitive of possession, though Alford, Bloomfield, Conybeare and Howson, and others, render, "called by Jesus Christ."

7. *To all*—To all who are in Rome, beloved of God, called saints. The titles which were given to God's ancient people are now given to Christians. Deut. x. 15; xiv. 2; Ex. xix. 5, 6; 1 Pet. ii. 9, 10. They are the special objects of God's love, and are holy persons by profession, and should be in character and practice—"the holy catholic Church, the Communion of saints." *Grace to you*,—The common epistolary salutation, taking the place of the Heb. "Peace be with you!" and the heathen "Health to you!" May the divine favor rest upon you, securing to you *peace*—that is, in Heb. style, all needful blessings, temporal and spiritual! The Father is the original Source of grace and peace; Christ is the meritorious cause of our realizing these blessings. Cf. Num. vi. 25, 26. This verse connects with ver. 1, and closes the salutation, which Schaff says begins with the second sentence, "Grace," etc., "which," he says, "should form a verse by itself." The introduction properly begins with ver. 8—as Chrysostom says, "An exordium worthy of this blessed spirit"—and ends with ver. 17. Chrysostom: "See how continually he puts the word *called*, saying, called to be an apostle; among whom ye also are called; to all that be in Rome, called."

8. *First*,—First, indeed. There seems to be no apodosis for *prwton men*: the *de* in ver. 13, referred to by Alford, seems too far removed, and may refer to ver. 10. Winer says it "is unquestionably an anacoluthon; the apostle had in view a 'second,' or a 'then,' which, however, was lost sight of, in consequence of the altered structure." Before I enter on the main subject, I express my thanks to God for you. *I thank my God*—A Pauline expression. 1 Cor. i. 4; xiv. 18; Phil. i. 3; Philemon 4. Olshausen says: "Paul opens most of his Epistles with giving thanks to God for the faith of his readers: it is only in 2 Cor. and Gal., where he was obliged to find decided fault, that this thanksgiving is wanting." But cf. Titus,

Heb., where it is wanting; it is virtually in 2 Cor. i.; 1 Tim. may seem to be an exception; but cf. i. 12-17. *Through Jesus Christ*—Paul offers all his offerings "through the ever-blessed Name." Thanksgiving, as well as prayer, must be presented through the mediation of Christ. *For you all*,—*Peri* > has better authority—including the great uncials, A, B, C, D, K, Sin.—than *υπερ*, but the meaning is the same—concerning all of you: not in their place, or for their benefit, though in a sense it was so. *That your faith*—Because the renunciation of idolatry and the espousal of Christianity by citizens of Rome, the metropolis of the world, would naturally be reported in all parts of the empire—*orbis terrarum*.

9. *For God is my witness*,—A Pauline expression. 2 Cor. i. 23; 1 Thess. ii. 5, 10; Phil. i. 8. As he says, he prayed incessantly—that is, in his constant private devotions—for a people whom he had never seen; he appeals to the Searcher of hearts, who alone could testify to the case—thus showing his sincerity and earnestness. Paul assured other Churches that he prayed for them. Eph. iii. 14-19; Col. i. 9; 1 Thess. i. 2. *Whom I serve*—Not *doul euw*, corresponding to *doul-ov*, ver. 1, but *latreuw*, as in Rev. xxii. 3. Though of Levitical origin, referring to divine worship (Heb. viii. 5, *et al.*), yet here it has a wider scope. Phil. iii. 3; 2 Tim. i. 3; Heb. xii. 28. *With my spirit*—With sincerity and earnestness. John iv. 23, 24. *In the gospel*—In preaching the gospel. *Of his Son*,—Genitive of the object, Christ being the burden of the gospel. Mark i. 1. Chrysostom makes it genitive of possession, referring to John xvii. 10. *That*—Here the *wj* (not for *of*) seems to have the force of *how*, referring to "incessantly:" God knows how incessantly (constantly) I make mention of you always. This construction seems warranted by Paul's manner. Eph. i. 16; Phil. i. 3, 4; 1 Thess. i. 2, 3; iii. 6; 2 Tim. i. 3, 4; Philemon 4. *In my prayers*.—'*Epi* > on occasion of my prayers—when I perform my stated devotions. Chrysostom notes this as an emphatic proof of love, and says: "Will, then, any of us be able to boast that he remembers, upon praying at his house, the entire body of the Church? I think not. But Paul drew near to God in behalf of the whole world, continually."

10. *Making request*—Asking, if by any means, now at length—after many disappointments; ver. 13; 1 Thess. ii. 17, 18. *I might have a prosperous journey*—I shall be permitted—be so prospered as to be able to visit you. So the word is used 1 Cor. xvi. 2; 3 John 2. He was not then on his journey to Rome. Rom. xv. 22, 23.

11. *Some spiritual gift*,—Many think the spiritual gift cannot be a miraculous charism, as Paul would not consider that so important, and he himself would not derive the benefit from it of which he speaks (ver. 12), and therefore he must mean *paraklesis*—such aid and comfort as results from the exercise of ministerial functions. But might not both be included? The miraculous *charismata* were of immense importance in establishing the faith of the infant Church, and especially

would a gift of this sort by the hands of the apostle of the Gentiles be considered invaluable by these Roman neophytes; and it could be imparted only by an apostle when present. Acts viii.; xix.; Mark xvi. 20; 1 Cor. i. 4-8; 1 Thess. iii. 10; 1 Cor. xii. Their confirmation in the faith would, of course, react favorably on the apostle. Rom. xv. 29.

12. *That is*,—And this is to be encouraged among you. The very sight of these Roman believers, when they met Paul at Appii Forum and The Three Taverns, caused him to "thank God, and take courage" (Acts xxviii. 15). How greatly would he be encouraged when he imparted to them some spiritual gift, by which their faith would be strengthened like his own! It is difficult to render **sumparaki hqhrai**: the title of the Holy Spirit—"Paraclete"—(John xiv.; xv.; xvi.) comes from the same root. (See on John xiv. 16.)

13. *Now I would not have you ignorant*,—A Pauline formula. Rom. xi. 25; 1 Cor. x. 1; xii. 1; 2 Cor. i. 8; 1 Thess. iv. 13. *That often-times*—That many times I purposed to come to you, and yet was hindered, till the present. Paul was so long kept from Rome because it was his pre-eminent business to preach the gospel where Christ had not been named. Rom. xv. 15-24. He had to organize and regulate Churches in many places, visit Jerusalem, etc. The apostles themselves sometimes *proposed* one thing, while the Spirit *disposed* them to another. Acts xvi. 6-10. *Fruit*—The produce of their renewed nature. John iv. 36; Rom. vi. 21, 22; Phil. i. 22; iv. 17; James iii. 18. (See on Rom. xv. 16.)

14. *I am debtor*—To both Greeks and Barbarians, to both wise and unwise, I am a debtor—that is, to Gentiles of every nation and class, as he was emphatically the Apostle of the Gentiles. Rom. xv. 15, 16; Gal. ii. 7. He does not here specify the Jews, though he labored also for their conversion. Rom. ix.; x. By Greeks are probably meant all who spoke the Greek language, including the Romans who wrote and spoke Greek, as well as Latin; by Barbarians, all who spoke other tongues. (See on Acts xxviii. 2, 4; 1 Cor. xiv. 11; Col. iii. 11.) Paul intended no nice distinction; he used a common formula. So Ovid. Cicero: *Non solum Graecia et Italia; sed etiam omnia Barbaria*. (*De Fin.* ii. 15.) Tyndale and Geneva: "To the Greeks, and to them which are no Greeks." Cranmer: "Ungrekes." By wise and unwise are meant enlightened and ignorant people—"sage and savage." Matt. xi. 25; 1 Cor. i. 25; Luke xxiv. 25. As the obligation was laid on Paul to preach to the Gentiles, he owed them this service, and he wished to pay it. 1 Cor. ix. 16, 17.

15. *So*,—Thus being a debtor to all, so far as it is within my power, subject to the divine will. Paul was eager to preach in the imperial metropolis. *To you that are at Rome also*.—Even to you who are in Rome—comprehending all the dwellers in Rome.

16. *Ashamed*—Shame is the feeling which arises when reputation is in peril. As the theme of the gospel is most humiliating, "Christ crucified," it might be thought he would be ashamed to proclaim it in the center of power, and glory, and riches, and profligacy, and superstition—hence the disclaimer. So Chrysostom. Instead of being ashamed of the gospel because of the cross which it proclaims, Paul gloried in it on that account. 1 Cor. i. 17-31; Gal. vi. 14. *Of Christ*:—Wanting in the best MSS. and versions. *The power of God*—The instrument by which God exerts his power in saving men from sin and its consequences—to every one that believeth;—There is no other limitation; faith is indispensable. The gospel can save none who reject it. "Every one" opposes Jewish exclusiveness; "who believes" opposes Jewish legalism. *To the Jew first*,—Both to Jew first, and to Greek. The Jews divided the world into Jews and Gentiles, as the Greeks divided it into Greeks and Barbarians. The Jew is first, because he *inherits* the gospel from his forefathers. John i. 11; iv. 22; Rom. iii. 1, 2; ix.-xi. The gospel was first preached to the Jews. Luke xxiv. 47; Acts i. 8; xiii. 46. Some MSS. omit "first." Chrysostom says it denotes an honor in order of time only. *The Greek*.—%E| | hn is used for the singular of eἰς ἕνα, Gentiles; eἰς ἕνα, individual Gentiles; εἰς ἕνα, Gentiles collectively. This verse is the key-note of the Epistle, which treats not merely of justification, but of salvation, by faith—including justification, the *relative* work (iii.-v.), and sanctification, the *real* work (vi.-viii.), resulting in eternal salvation of body and soul in heaven.

17. *For therein*—For God's righteousness in it is being revealed, by faith for faith. This expands the thought of ver. 16. *Dikaiosunē*, in this Epistle, does not mean God's attribute of righteousness, but righteousness which he accounts to the believer—that is, justification. Olshausen says: "From the connection with verse 16, which exalts the gospel as the *power* of God, it is plain that it cannot signify the mere declaring a person righteous, but the real making of him righteous." That is, indeed, involved in "salvation" (see on ver. 16), but *dika*, here means that alone. (See on Rom. iii. 21, 22, 25, 26; iv. 3, 5, 6, 9, 11, 13, 22; x. 3, 6, 10.) This method of justification *is revealed*, fully disclosed, in the gospel. As *ek pisteōs* is rendered "by faith" in the quotation which illustrates this clause, it seems forced to give it any other meaning here; besides, it is agreeable to the *usus loquendi*. Cf. Rom. iii. 30; iv. 16; v. 1; ix. 30, 32; x. 6; Gal. ii. 16; iii. 11, 24. The righteousness which is acquired by faith is also for faith. Faith does not cease its office in the moment of justification; justification is retained by its constant exercise; for we live by faith, and this faith produces a real righteousness (sanctification), which always follows a relative righteousness (justification); for the faith which justifies also sanctifies. The quotation from Hab. ii. 4 answers the apostle's purpose, whether or not the prophet meant to say that the righteous man of whom he speaks was made righteous by faith. By his confidence in God he preserved his life when unbelievers perished—he lived by his faith. So the believer in Christ, who is

justified by faith, lives by his faith. This is a great truth—one which enters largely into the discussion of this Epistle—and therefore it is thus distinctly stated. Bengel comes near the truth when he says the righteousness of God is revealed, as derived from faith, and as being offered to faith—"by faith from bow to stern." Say for faith, in order to the life of faith—not merely "to faith." The life of faith on earth leads inevitably to eternal life in heaven, if there be a continuance in it. This passage, therefore, well harmonizes with Heb. x. 38, 39. Chrysostom says, "He, then, who has become righteous shall live, not for the present life only, but for that which is to come." The two prepositions, [ek](#), "by," and [eij](#), "for"—as used by Paul—furnish the clew which guides us out of the labyrinth in which so many have been lost. Without any sharply-defined division, the apostle, having finished his salutation, introduction, and statement of his theme, proceeds to its discussion. He first shows that the heathen and the Jews—and both alike—are "under sin," and need redemption. To this he devotes the remainder of this chapter and chap. ii.

18. *For*—Another [gar](#), connecting the discussion with the proposition, ver. 16, 17: there is need of the gospel *because* all men are sinners, and God is angry with sinners. *The wrath of God*—God's "utter abhorrence of sin, and aversion to those who live in it;" it is a necessary result of his perfect rectitude. It must not be construed merely of punishment, present or future—as by Chrysostom. *Is revealed*—An apocalypse of his anger, as in ver. 17 there is an apocalypse of his righteousness—the same word is used. The present participle—is being revealed—indicates that the revelation is now going on. *From heaven*—The seat of law and government. In the providential government of the world the great Rector of the universe has not left himself without witness; he has in many ways testified his abhorrence of sin. Ver. 24; ii. 2; Ps. lviii. 9-11. *Ungodliness*,—'[Asebeia](#), lack of reverence, impiety, atheism, polytheism, idolatry—sins directly against God. *Unrighteousness*—'[Adikia](#), lack of justice—referring more particularly to sins directly against man; but they overlap each other; hence, in the last clause, *unrighteousness* covers the whole. *Who hold the truth*—As [katecontwn](#) is a compound word, meaning sometimes to hold fast, to hold down, to hinder, repress, suppress, and the like, the old versions render "withhold;" Rheims, "detain;" Vulg., *detinent*; Alford, "held back the truth in iniquity;" Olshausen, "to keep under, to restrain the activity of, as in 2 Thess. ii. 6; Acts xxvii. 40." Lange renders "hold back," and says: "An odd explanation is this: 'Who possess the truth with unrighteousness—that is, sin against better knowledge' (Michaelis, Koppe, Baur)." Not so *odd*; the next words show it means that they possessed the truth, yet lived contrary to it; so Chrysostom. Thus Robinson: "Having a knowledge of the truth, but living in idolatry and unrighteousness, as is explained in the next verses." '[Al hqei an](#) is "religious and moral truth, the truth of God." [Katew](#) means possess in 1 Cor. vii. 30; 2 Cor. vi.

10; Dan. vii. 18, 22, LXX.—where it renders the Chaldee *chasan*, to possess, "to have and to hold." Webster and Wilkinson: "Who grasp the truth, retain possession of its germ and substance—used in a literal sense, Matt. xxi. 38; ethical, Luke viii. 15; 1 Cor. xi. 2; xv. 2; 1 Thess. v. 21; Heb. iii. 6, 14. That possession is meant is clear from 19, 20, 21, 25, 28. But possession of the truth in such circumstances is reconcilable with a virtual and practical abandonment of it. They know what is right, and do what is wrong. 'Truth not so much disbelieved as hated' (Howe)—[ejh ajikial](#) marks the sphere, or element, in which they moved. Neglect of social duties was the groundwork of their perverted moral and intellectual condition. Some trace in the word the idea of detaining, or restraining, as when we 'hold fast' a prisoner, and combine the ideas thus, 'who, possessing enough of the germs of religious and moral verity to preserve them from abandonment, have checked the development of truth in their lives by the love and practice of sin.' But the apostle is speaking of the light of truth which reached them from the works of creation: this light they could not restrain or imprison."

I know the right, and I approve it too—
Condemn the wrong, and yet the wrong pursue.

19. *Because*—Because the knowledge of God is manifested among them. This sustains the assertion of ver. 18, that they possessed the truth; they had the knowledge of God. W. and W. say, "The objective knowledge of God from his works becomes subjective—apparent in the working of their minds, ii. 15." But the next clause shows that he alludes to that which is known of God, as he subjectively manifested himself to them, as he proceeds to set forth in ver. 20—not (as Schaff) "the inborn consciousness, inseparable from our reason—the germ of the ontological argument of Anselm." Of course, the knowledge is subjective in every one who regards the manifestation. Schaff objects to Lange's rendering, "the knowledge," preferring "what is known;" but Lange says, "what is known concretely as knowledge." This is the Hellenistic use of *gnostos*=the classic *gnotos*. *Hath shewed*—The aorist should be rendered manifested—viz., at and by the creation, as next verse.

20. *For the invisible things of him*—For his unseen things. This develops the thought of ver. 19. God's perfections, his eternal power and divinity, inhere in a personal Being, who is himself "invisible," but "dimly seen in these his lower works." *From*—Since. Not by the works of creation, but from the time of the creation, when the manifestation was made by God—ver. 19. *Are clearly seen*,—Rheims and others, "are seen." Alford is correct: "Are perceived—not 'are plainly seen'—this is not the sense of [kata](#) in [kaqoraw](#), but rather that of looking down on, taking a survey of, and so apprehending or perceiving." *Being understood*—Apprehended by the mind. "The revelation without us gives scope and play to the revelation within us." "Faith's interior eye" is opened, and the

oxymoron is realized: "Th' Invisible appears in sight." We have no innate knowledge of God, nor can we acquire it by intuition, apart from divine communication. We are "creatures capable of God"—possessing certain primordial elements—so that the teachings of nature and of the Holy Spirit (as well as of the Bible) can lead us to some knowledge of God. This is what is called Natural Theology. Paul may have had his eye on Ps. xix. and Wisdom xiii., which passages should be closely studied in connection with this verse; cf. Acts xiv. 15-17; xvii. 24-29. *By the things that are made*,—Dative of instrument. Lange: "By means of his works." *His eternal power and Godhead*;—Rather divinity—the totality of divine perfections: these are the unseen things of God. Power is specified because so apparent in the creation of the world. The marks of design in creation, perceived by the contemplative mind, force us to recognize a designing power—one who was before all things, and by whom all things consist. Col. i. Hence the common compellation, "Almighty and everlasting God." *So that*—Correct—*ei j* here denotes result, not purpose. Chrysostom: "Not to bereave them of all excuse, but that they may come to know him." Lange may well protest so earnestly against Meyer's teleological construction, "in order that they may be without excuse." "This rendering leads to a monstrous view of the purpose of the creation of the world: it is too fatalistic even for the conception of predestination, which it was once designed to support." He indorses the view of De Wette and Tholuck, against Meyer, that *ei j*, with *to* and the infinitive in Romans, is not always teleological. Meyer says the result must also be determined beforehand; which, says Lange, "is a kind of predestination, which is self-contradictory—predestinated to have no excuse—that is, predestinated for guilt!" Hodge and other predestinarians, however inconsistently, reject this as absurd and impious. It does not follow from this that what is called natural religion can save men. The atonement extends to all, and the Spirit operates on all—so that, without a written revelation, heathens, using the light they have, may be saved: it is horrible to deny this.

21. *Because*—This connects with ver. 18. They possessed the truth, but practiced unrighteousness. *When they knew God*,—Ver. 19—they did not celebrate his perfections (what he is in himself), nor thank him for his mercies (what he is to his creatures). *Became vain in their imaginations*,—They absurdly and perversely reasoned themselves into idolatry (ver. 23), which the Hebrews stigmatized as vanity. 1 Kings xvi. 13; 2 Kings xvii. 15; Jer. ii. 5; viii. 19. (See on Acts xiv. 15.) *Foolish heart*—Undiscerning, not retaining God in its knowledge. The heart in Scripture is the seat of intellect, sensibility, and will. *Was darkened*.—Not a prolepsis, but a climax. By their folly they lost what light they had. The intellect being darkened, of course the sensibility was obtunded, and the will perverted. They became stupid, like the gods they made and worshiped. Ps. cxv. 8.

22. *Professing*—Professing to be wise men, they became foolish. Both mythologists and philosophers boasted of superior wisdom; but they acted like fools—the former in setting forth their polytheistic, and the latter their pantheistic, absurdities. Jer. x. 1-16; 1 Cor. i. 20. The philosophers among the Greeks and Romans were proverbially boastful of their wisdom. But all civilized heathen nations looked down upon the rest of mankind as barbarians. They were puffed up by their knowledge, while they devised, or accepted and practiced, or at least sanctioned, the basest superstitions.

23. *And changed*—This is an instance of their folly; hence Macknight renders, "For they changed." 'Al l assw here means to exchange one thing for another, and in the LXX. represents the Heb. *hemir*, "to change for something else, to exchange—with *beth* (LXX. *ej*) of the thing for which exchange is made. Ps. cvi. 20; Jer. ii. 11; Lev. xxvii. 10." So Gesenius, Robinson, Tholuck. In Ps. cvi. 20, it is "changed their glory for the image of an ox." By "their glory" is meant Jehovah, the God of Israel, whose perfections, displayed in the works of creation, are transcendently glorious. Ps. xix. 1. As usual, the abstract is put for the concrete. *Uncorruptible*—Rendered "immortal," 1 Tim. i. 17—that which cannot decay; opposed to *corruptible*—mortal, that which does decay. 1 Cor. xv. 52; Wis. xii. 1. There is no reference to moral corruption. *Into an image made like*—A Hebraism, meaning, for an image like. The words refer to man, birds, quadrupeds, and reptiles. The Romans imported the statues of deities in human form, which the Greeks so much affected, and also the lower forms of other idolaters—especially the reptile-worship of the Egyptians, who also worshiped images of birds and beasts, particularly the ibis and the bull-god Apis, to which there is reference in the passage here cited—Ps. cvi. 20. The repetition of *and* emphasizes the descending climax.

24. *Wherefore*—For this cause—as they dishonored God, he left them to debase themselves; and what a depth of debasement! Ver. 26-28; Ps. lxxxii. 12. *Also*—Many good MSS. (A, B, C, Sin., Vulg.) omit this; but others have it. So Chrysostom, who says: "God let them alone, because he could not make them virtuous by compulsion; he let them see, by actual trial, what would be the result of their dereliction. As they left God, God *also* left them. In natural lewdness, not only does one dishonor the other, but each dishonors himself."

25. *Who*—This connects this verse, as an illustrative parenthesis, with the foregoing—*q.d.*—seeing that they exchanged the true idea of God for a lie. The LXX. uses *yeudov* for the Heb. *sheker*, a false god. Jer. xiii. 25; Isa. xliv. 20. *Worshipped*—Reverenced, referring to the sentiment. *Served*—With rites and ceremonies. *More than*—*Para*>beyond, to the exclusion of the Creator. Philo may well say that Moses was amazed when the Israelites substituted the golden calf for Jehovah: "What a lie they substituted for so great a reality!" *Who is*

blessed for ever. Amen.—This is Pauline. Rom. ix. 5; 2 Cor. xi. 31. The Jews and other Orientals use doxologies of this sort when any thing has been said derogatory of God, showing that they, as it were, resent the insult to the Divine Majesty. How much soever they may derogate from the divine honor, God will eternally receive the glory due unto his name.

26, 27. *For this cause*—Bengel says: "In stigmatizing sins, we must often call a spade a spade. The dignity and earnestness of the judicial style does not offend modesty by the use of appropriate language." Yet Paul found it necessary to use elliptical and euphemistic language in describing the gross sensualities of the heathen world. Paul did not always call a spade a spade. Chrysostom admires his judgment—"both speaking chastily, and yet stinging the hearer." Classical writers abound with revolting illustrations of these awful charges brought by the apostle against the heathen world; and these are corroborated by the discoveries in Pompeii and Herculaneum, together with the pictures and statues in Hindoo temples. The vilest abominations were connected with their idolatrous worship, their deities being the examples and patrons of these detestable lusts. See Lev. xviii. Chrysostom draws an appalling picture of those abominable "Lesbians" and Sodomites, whose "punishment was in the pleasure itself;" all the more horrible because, like the insane, they chose to wallow in this filth, degrading themselves below the level of brutes—men ceasing to be men, without becoming women, and women ceasing to be women, without becoming men! "How many hells shall be enough for such?" Paul would not call them *men* and *women*, but "males" and "females," in contempt.

28. *And even*—And as they did not choose. Conybeare and Howson attempt to reproduce the *paronomasia*: "And as they thought fit to cast out the acknowledgment of God, God gave them over to an outcast mind, to do the things that are unseemly." Tholuck prefers the English version. Cf. 2 Cor. xiii. 6, 7, 8. They reprobated God, and were reprobated by him. Job xxii. 14. *A reprobate mind*,—Chrysostom: "It was not the flesh (as some heretics say), but the mind, to which the sins of wicked lusts belonged, and it was thence the fount of these evils flowed. For since the mind is become un-distinguishing, all else is then dragged out of course and overturned, when he is confounded who held the reins." The twenty-three terms in the following catalogue do not express so many evils sharply defined, or logically arranged. The accumulation was designed to show the intensely evil condition of the heathen world, as there is not a vice which can be named which may not be charged upon it. Classical writers fully corroborate the charge. *Not convenient*:—A *meiosis* for abominable.

29. *Being filled*—Having become filled. *Fornication*,—If *porneia* be genuine, it stands for every kind of uncleanness. It is wanting in some good MSS. and versions, and is canceled by many critics, as having arisen out of *ponhria*

(*wickedness*), which is omitted in some MSS., and transposed in others. The resemblance of the words may have occasioned the omission of one or the other by transcribers. If Paul did not use it, it was because he had just dealt largely in sins of this sort, which bring all others in their train. *Wickedness*,—Depravity. *Maliciousness*;—Malice. *Debate*,—Contention. *Whisperers*,—Secret slanderers.

30. *Backbiters*,—Open detractors. *Haters of God*,—*Qeostugeiv* is passive. The Vulgate has *Deo odibiles*; Wycliffe, "hateful to God;" Rheims, "odible to God." See Fragments of Neophron's Medea, Frag. 2: "Restrain your daring and god-hated (*Qeostugev*) obstinacy." Theodoret, Grotius, Lange, commentators generally, construe it as active, all admitting that it is never elsewhere so used. In defense of the active, Schaff says, "God hates the sin, but loves the sinner." This is an excellent *gnome*, but does not apply in this case. God does hate the sinner, *quoad* his sins. "The wicked and him that loveth violence his soul hateth" (Ps. xi. 5). To be God-hated is the most damning characteristic: we say of a detestable wretch that he is "God-forsaken"—*q.d.*, outrageously bad. *Despiteful, proud, boasters*,—Contumacious, arrogant, braggarts. *Inventors of evil things*,—Bengel: "New pleasures, new gains, of new arts for injuring others, as in war, 2 Macc. vii. 31—Antiochus is said to have been an inventor of all evil against the Hebrews."

31. *Without understanding*,—Void of true wisdom. (See on ver. 21.) *Covenant-breakers*,—'*Asunqetouv* seems to have been placed after *ajuneouv*, because it is like it in form; this is in Paul's manner. The LXX. uses it for the Heb. *bogedah* (Jer. iii. 8), "her treacherous sister Judah." *Without natural affection*,—'*Astogouv*, void of that affection which parents ought to have for children, and children for parents and other relatives. Exposing infants obtained among the Greeks and Romans. Aged and helpless parents are left to perish among some heathens. "Emperors murdered their parents, and violated their sisters." Chrysostom says, "Every beast loves his like, and every man his neighbor, but these became more ferocious than beasts." *Implacable*,—Omitted in A, B, and some other MSS. Alford thinks it was a gloss on *ajunqetouv*. But it is in many good MSS. It may have been omitted because *ajspordouv* has the same ending with the preceding three words. It joins well to *unmerciful*—cruel. The Romans were horribly cruel. Witness the gladiators, "butchered to make a Roman holiday." With this horrible catalogue compare 2 Tim. iii. 2-4; Wis. xiv. 22-31; Thucyd. iii. 82-84. Philo the Jew brings a similar charge against both Jews and Gentiles of his age.

32. *Who, knowing the judgment of God*,—The ordinance of God. The writings of the philosophers show that they considered these crimes as condemned by God, and deserving retribution. The remains of primitive revelations, the phenomena of nature, the dispensations of providence, the light of conscience under the influence of the Holy Spirit (Rom. ii. 14, 15), told them that these things were

wrong. In what sense they considered them *worthy of death* is not so clear. They had no adequate conception of eternal death as the retribution for sin, yet they had some notion of it. Some of the crimes entail temporal death; some were visited with capital punishments. But it is likely the apostle uses the word *death* in a general sense, as comprehending all the evil which results from sin, just as life comprehends all the good which results from virtue. *But have pleasure*—But are even well pleased with those who practice them. It is the *ne plus ultra* of wickedness to take pleasure in the sins of others. The reference is not to the apologies of philosophers for vice—as the Epicureans and Stoics, for licentiousness, even incest and sodomy, Aristotle for revenge, etc.—but to the sentiments of the heathen as such, sunk so low in profligacy and crime.

CHAPTER II.

1 *They that sin, though they condemn it in others, cannot excuse themselves, 6 and much less escape the judgment of God, 9 whether they be Jews or Gentiles. 14 The Gentiles cannot escape, 17 nor yet the Jews, 25 whom their circumcision shall not profit, if they keep not the law.*

II.—1. *Therefore*—Wherefore refers to i. 32: as thou knowest the law of God, thou art inexcusable in breaking it. *O man*,—Many refer this to the Jew; but he is not mentioned till ver. 9, and not directly addressed till ver. 17. The apostle is alluding to those Gentiles (his language, indeed, applies to Jews as well) who censured the vices in question, and condemned those who practiced them—not like those in i. 32, who took pleasure in them, but practiced the same themselves. They were not exonerated from blame by condemning vice while they were guilty of it. *Another*,—Lit., the other: thy neighbor; but here it means any one deserving censure.

2. *But we are sure*—But we know that the sentence of God is according to truth upon those who practice such things. The sentence corresponds to the crime; it is agreeable to inexorable justice.

3. *And thinkest thou this*,—He presses the point; there is not only self-condemnation, as in ver. 1, but the condemnation of God.

4. *Or*—This introduces another thought: as God spares thy life, notwithstanding thy sins, thou construest his patience as impunity, being willfully ignorant that it is designed not to encourage sin, but to lead to repentance. Eccl. viii. 11. *Despisest*—Treatest with neglect—pervertest its design. *Riches*—A favorite word with Paul, denoting fullness, abundance. Rom. ix. 23; xi. 23, *et al.* *Goodness, and forbearance, and long-suffering*;—A climax; goodness, kindness in general; forbearance, postponing punishment; long-suffering, continuing to do so under

constant provocations. Lange makes goodness generic, the other two specific: this seems favored by the repetition of goodness, and not of the other two. *Not knowing*—Culpably ignoring. *Leadeth*—In the present tense it denotes the design, though it may be frustrated. Leading implies voluntary following; but Hedge says, God makes willing! Were these wretches made willing? Why will men allow themselves to be so biased by peculiar dogmas? *Repentance?*—Change of mind from the evil to the good. (See on Matt. iii. 2.) Alford does not put a mark of interrogation at the end of this verse, or of the next, though he thinks the question is continued through both verses, "but loses itself in the digressive clauses following, and nowhere comes pointedly to an end." The whole passage may be read indicatively, not interrogatively.

5. *But after*—But according to thy hardness—Cranmer and Geneva, "Stubbornness." *Impenitent*—'Ametanohton (which occurs here only in N.T.) is opposed to *metanoian*, ver. 4. *Treasurest*—The Hebrews use this word for the accumulation of evil things, as well as of good. Amos iii. 10; James v. 3. It is contrasted with the riches of God's goodness. *Unto thyself*—Chrysostom: "Not God for thee." *Wrath*—Put for punishment—its effect. *Against the day*—In a day of wrath—a time, not here specified, when the wrath of God, spoken of in i. 18, shall be poured out. Cf. Ezek. xxii. 24; Zeph. ii. 2, 3; Rev. vi. 17. Winer: "Expressed by abbreviation: thou art treasuring up to thyself wrath (which will be poured forth) in the day of wrath." *Revelation*—Manifestation of God's righteous judgment. The reading "recompense" is peculiar to the Vatican. The insertion of *kai>*"and righteous judgment," has considerable support; but it is probably an interpolation, the transcriber supposing the three genitives are put in contrast with the three in ver. 4. But cf. i. 17, 18. *Dikaiokrisia* occurs nowhere else—*dikaiokri, "the Lord the righteous Judge." 2 Macc. xii. 41.*

6. *Who will render*—This is one of the commonplaces of Scripture. Ps. lxii. 12; Prov. xxiv. 12; Jer. xvii. 10; xxxii. 19; Matt. xvi. 27; 1 Cor. iii. 8; 2 Cor. v. 10; Rev. ii. 23; xx. 12; xxii. 12. It was well to repeat it in this place, so that no one may suppose that justification by faith impinges upon this eternal principle of equity. The law of retribution cannot be set aside by any economy of salvation. God rewards the faith by which we accept pardon, though it has no *merit*, as he punishes the unbelief which rejects it. There is an ethical element in both the one and the other, as well as the works proceeding respectively from each.

7. *To them*—To those, on the one hand, who by perseverance in well-doing—so Winer. Meyer, gen. obj. Lange, gen. sub., "the endurance which is peculiar to the truly good work." Cf. Rom. xiii. 3. *Seek for glory*,—Not "the good fame which commonly attends virtuous actions"—men are not encouraged to seek for that—but meetness for the inheritance of the saints in light—the bliss of heaven. Rom. viii. 18; 2 Cor. iv. 17; 1 Thess. ii. 12; 2 Tim. ii. 10; Heb. ii. 10; 1 Pet. v. 10.

Honour.—The personal dignity which will accrue to those who overcome, and shall be seated with Christ in his throne. Rev. iii. 21; 2 Tim. ii. 12; cf. 1 Pet. i. 7. *Immortality*.—This caps the climax. "Perpetuity of bliss is bliss." 1 Cor. ix. 25; xv. 42, 50, 52, 53, 54; 2 Tim. i. 10; 1 Pet. i. 4; Wis. ii. 23. *Eternal life*.—Connected with ver. 6: "Who will render to every man, etc.—to the good, eternal life."

8. *But unto them*.—To those, on the other hand, who are contentious—Vulg., *ex contentione*; Wycliffe, "of strife;" Rheims, "of contention;" Tyndale, "rebellious;" Cranmer, "that are rebels;" Geneva, Tomson's Beza, Wesley, and others, as A.V. The word is rendered "strife" in 2 Cor. xii. 20; Gal. v. 20; Phil. ii. 3; James iii. 14, 16; "contention," Phil. i. 16; Ruckert, Meyer, Alford, and others, render "self-seeking;" Lange, "self-seeking partisans"—deriving *ε̅ρι̅σει̅α* from *ε̅ρι̅σι̅ς*, a hired workman, and not from *ε̅ρι̅σι̅ς*, strife, from which it is distinguished in 2 Cor. xii. 20; Gal. v. 20. Robinson: "Party-strife, faction, contention." But it may mean "contention," in the sense of contumacy—"not that of open violence, but of mental resistance and unbelief" (Trollope). This sense suits what follows. *And do not obey the truth*.—*Ἀπει̅σῶ̅μαι* means to be un-persuadable, unbelieving, disobedient. It occurs sixteen times in N.T. It is rendered "believe not" eight times; "unbelieving," Acts xiv. 2; "to be disobedient," four; "obey not," three times. The noun *ἄπει̅σει̅α* is rendered four times "unbelief," three times "disobedient;" the adjective *ἄπει̅σι̅ς* is always (six times) rendered "disobedient." The refusal to believe the truth, when duly presented, is not mere *ἄπισ̅τι̅α*, unbelief—it is disbelief, disobedience, springing from rebellion, contumacy. The truth here is the same as in Rom. i. 18, 25, whatever God has revealed by any method for the obedience of faith. *But obey unrighteousness*.—Sinful inclinations, which withstand the moral consciousness; cf. i. 18 (Tholuck). Bengel well says: "Truth and unrighteousness are often contrasted: 1 Cor. xiii. 6; 2 Thess. ii. 10, 12. Truth includes righteousness, and unrighteousness implies falsehood." *Indignation and wrath*.—Many of the best MSS. have "wrath and indignation;" but the common reading seems correct, as *ῥῶ̅μος*, says Robinson, "denotes *the mind* roused to anger, while *ὀ̅ργῆ̅ς* is anger itself, the emotion, including the desire of revenge:" *ὀ̅ργῆ̅ς* is thus stronger than *ῥῶ̅μος*. *Ῥῶ̅μος* occurs eighteen times in N.T., and is always rendered "wrath" except here, and in Rev. xvi. 19; xix. 15, where it is rendered "fierceness," and used with *ὀ̅ργῆ̅ς* "fierceness of his wrath." *Ὀ̅ργῆ̅ς* occurs thirty-six times in N.T., and is rendered "wrath" thirty-one times; "anger," three times; "vengeance," Rom. iii. 5; "indignation," Rev. xiv. 10. Some put *ὀ̅ργῆ̅ς* first, as the heat of the fire, then *ῥῶ̅μος*, as the bursting forth of the flame. Schaff says: "The change in the construction, from the acc., ver. 7, to the nom., ver. 8, is no doubt intentional: God gives eternal life, and wills all men to be saved; but condemnation is man's own guilt, and comes, so to speak, *Deo*

nolente"—noteworthy from a Calvinist. Bengel, on Matt. vii. 24: "God refers things relating to salvation to himself; evil things he severs from himself."

9. *Tribulation*—*Qliiyiv* occurs forty-five times in N.T., and is rendered "tribulation" twenty-one times; "affliction" eighteen; "anguish," John xvi. 21; "burdened," 2 Cor. viii. 13; "persecution," Acts xi. 19; "trouble," three times. It means pressure, compression. The Vulg. has *tribulatio*, which comes from *tribulum*, a thrashing-sledge. *Anguish*,—*Stenocwria* is rendered in the Vulg. *angustia*—hence our "anguish." It means "straitness," and is rendered "distress," Rom. viii. 35; 2 Cor. vi. 4; xii. 10; cf. Isa. viii. 22, LXX., where we render "anguish." This word is stronger than *qliiyiv*—as if one were subjected to flogging, pressed into a close place, from which he vainly attempts to escape. Thus Paul says: "We are troubled (*qliibomēnoi*) on every side, yet not distressed (*stenocwromēnoi*)," 2 Cor. iv. 8. Tribulation and anguish are experienced, by the sinner, as the infliction of the indignation and wrath of the Divine Majesty. Paul may have had his eye on Ps. lxxvii. (lxxviii.) 49, 50, LXX.: "He sent out against them the fury of his anger, wrath, and indignation, and affliction, a message by evil angels. He made a way for his wrath: he spared not their souls from death." *Upon every soul of man*—An emphatic periphrasis for every man. Cf. Ezek. xxvii. 13; Rev. xviii. 13; Lev. v. 1, 2. The LXX. renders Num. xix. 11, "He who touches the dead body of any soul of man." *That doeth evil*;—The compound verb is used here, as in i. 27, perhaps in the sense of "commit," "consummate," referring to evil: in ver. 10 the simple verb is used, "worketh good." But the compound is used of both good and evil, Rom. vii. 13, 15, 17, 18. *Of the Jew*—Of Jew first, and of Greek. (See on i. 16.)

10. *But glory, honour, and peace*,—Repetition from ver. 7, in the Heb. style, though "peace" (Heb. *shalom*) takes the place of "immortality"—denoting, say W. and W., "the highest blessedness of the incorruptible state—that in which there is no change nor decay." It contrasts with "tribulation and anguish." *To the Jew first*,—Both to Jew, first, and to Greek.

11. *For*—Explicative: the principle is this. *There is no respect of persons with God*.—This is another *gnome*, or adage, of frequent occurrence in the Bible. Deut. x. 17; 2 Chron. xix. 7; Job xxxiv. 19; Acts x. 34; Gal. ii. 6; Eph. vi. 9; Col. iii. 25; 1 Pet. i. 17. *Proswpol hyia* occurs only here and in Eph. vi. 9; Col. iii. 25; James ii. 1, and the cognates in Acts x. 34; James ii. 9. God makes no arbitrary or groundless distinctions; men of all nations will be judged according to their character.

12. *For*—This brings forward the reason of the assertion in ver. 9, 10, showing the equity of the divine procedure. *Without law*:—Anarthrous—without a written revelation of the will of God, like that which Jews and Christians possess. Cf. ver. 14, 15. *Shall perish*—Shall be punished without reference to the law which they

never possessed. 'Apoβl umi means to die the second death in John iii. 15, 16; x. 28; 1Cor. i. 18; viii. 11; 2 Cor. ii. 15; iv. 3; 2 Thess. ii. 10; 2 Pet. iii. 9. It does not mean, as Dodwell and some others suppose, extinction of being, but of well-being. Cf. Matt. xxv. 46. *In the law*,—Also anarthrous. As many as in law sinned, through law shall be judged—those in possession of a written law, or positive revelation of the will of God. Some take kriβw here for katakriβw, "condemn," as in ver. 1, or "punish;" but it refers to the application of law to the case of the culprit, determining the extent of his guilt—the punishment, of course, to follow—hence the variation in the terms. *By the law*,—Through the operation of law—according to its provisions. John xii. 48.

13. *For not the hearers of the law*—Alluding to the Jews, who heard the law read in their synagogues, and imagined that this would secure their salvation. Many of their rabbins speak as though no descendant of Abraham, being circumcised, and hearing the law, could be lost. The sentiment of Paul is like that of James, "Be ye doers of the word, and not hearers only, deceiving your own selves" (James i. 22-25), and of John, "He that doeth righteousness is righteous" (1 John iii. 7); cf. Matt. vii. 21; 1 John ii. 29. *Shall be justified*.—Declared righteous. This does not conflict with justification by faith, as faith in Christ is imputed for righteousness (Rom. iv. 5), and the works resulting from it will be rewarded as righteous acts in the day of judgment. Matt. xxv.; James ii. The article before νομου (the law), in both cases, is probably genuine, though wanting in some MSS., and canceled by Alford and some others.

14. *For when*—For when Gentiles—those who have no law—who have no written law, or positive revelation of the divine will. *Do by nature*—Robinson: "in a moral sense, the native mode of thinking, feeling, acting, as unenlightened by the influence of divine truth. Eph. ii. 3." *The things contained*—The things of the law. The article here refers to law in the former clause—Mosaic, or any other written law. The dictates of their own moral sense supply the place of law. They felt bound to obey

What conscience dictates to be done,
Or warns me not to do.

The language implies that some Gentiles did obey the law of conscience—sinning and repenting, as is the case with many who have the written law. Their imperfect obedience, as it was produced by the Spirit of Christ, so it was accepted through the merits of Christ.

15. *Which shew*—"Inasmuch as they evince the effect of the [revealed] law—what it would have produced, what is tantamount to it." *Written in their hearts*,—Alluding to the writing of the decalogue on the two tables of stone. 2 Cor. iii. 3. If, for instance, under the promptings of this law of conscience, they

honored their parents, they evinced the effect designed to be produced by the fifth commandment. Sophocles speaks of "the unwritten and indelible laws of the gods." Plutarch speaks of "a law which is not outwardly written in books, but implanted in the heart of man." *Their conscience also bearing witness*,—Their conscience bearing joint-testimony. Parkhurst, on [suneidhsiv](#), says: "I. The conscience, or mind itself, considered as privy to, or conscious of, the actions or thoughts of the man. John viii. 9; Rom. ii. 15; ix. 1; 2 Cor. iv. 2; v. 11. II. The conscience, or mind, considered as passing a judgment on a man's own thoughts, words, or actions, according to some rule. Rom. xiii. 5; 2 Cor. i. 12; 1 Pet. ii. 19." But surely conscience here embraces both. It is, as Robinson says, "that moral faculty which distinguishes between right and wrong, and prompts to choose the former, and avoid the latter." But it does more than that; it testifies to guilt or innocence, and so produces remorse or satisfaction. It thus exercises the functions of lawgiver and judge, witness and attorney. This is the God-appointed province of conscience, though it is frequently perverted and blinded. *And their thoughts the mean while*—And their reasonings among one another, accusing, or even defending. Their reasonings, reflections, "self-judging voices of the conscience"—sentence against sentence, in the inner strife—accusing of wrong, and producing remorse; apologizing or defending against the charge, so as to produce peace within.

16. *In the day*—In a day when God will judge the secrets of men, according to my gospel, by Jesus Christ. Some construe this with ver. 12, or with ver. 13—Alford, with ver. 10. Bengel connects directly with ver. 15, making no parenthesis: "Construed with *show*; the present tense is no objection, ver. 5; and Paul often says, 'in the day of the Lord,' which means more than against the day. 1 Cor. v. 5. Compare 1 Tim. v. 21. Such as each thing was, such shall it then be seen, be determined, and abide." All the secret workings of the soul will be brought to view in that day, when God will discriminate the thoughts and motives from which actions proceed. Conybeare and Howson supply "as will be seen in that day." Tholuck, "and this especially in that day." Lange fails in his effort to refer this to the crises which occur in this life: "On the day of the promulgation of the gospel, the better Gentiles manifested their ordination to salvation, just as the majority of the Jews made manifest their hardness of heart." He alludes to Acts xiii., where "ordained" means *disposed*—of course, by the use of preventing grace—but that is foreign from this case. *By Jesus Christ*,—This is put last in the original, giving emphasis to the fact more emphatically to be stated, Rom. xiv. Cf. John v. 22; Acts xvii. 31. *According to my gospel*.—Agreeably to the terms of the gospel which I preach. Rom. xvi. 25; 1 Cor. xv. 1; 2 Tim. ii. 8.

17. *Behold*,—The reading of many MSS., Syr., Vulg., is preferred, "But if." Then the protasis extends to the end of ver. 20, and the apodosis begins ver. 21. *Thou art called a Jew*,—Not *cognominaris*, "surnamed" (Vulg., Rheims), but

"named," as the word is used, Gen. iv. 17, 25, LXX. Schleusner says that, like *kal eōmai*, it is *to be*. But if thou art a Jew—the apostle now leaving the Gentiles, and directly addressing the Jews. He is going to show that they too are in a state of guilt and condemnation, needing redemption, as well as the Gentiles. But he first sets forth their superior advantages. "Jew" designates the Israelite according to his religion—as the etymology indicates—one praised—the theocratic name of honor. *And restest in the law*,—And restest thyself in law. They felt secure, as they had God's revealed will. Though the tables of the law written by God were no longer in the ark, yet they had copies in every synagogue, and in many private houses, kept with punctilious care. Cf. Micah iii. 11, LXX. *And makest thy boast of God*,—And boastest in God, claiming him as the God of Israel—their peculiar covenant God. Deut. xxxiii. 26-29; Ps. cxliv. 15; cxlvi. 5; Rom. ix. 4, 5.

18. *And knowest his will*,—Lit., the will, *sc.*, of God, in whom they boasted. They not only had his law, but they professed to know what it requires. *And approvest the things that are more excellent*,—Rather, distinguishest the things which differ. They boasted of their knowledge of casuistry. *Being instructed out of the law*,—In those matters they had the law for their catechist: *kathcew* (hence our "catechise") literally means to instruct orally.

19. *And art confident*—Art persuaded, moreover, that thou thyself art a guide of the blind. Cf. Matt. xv. 14. *A light of them which are in darkness*,—The Jews thought it their mission to enlighten the benighted Gentiles. Ps. lxxvii.; Isa. lxvi. 19. Hence their zeal in proselyting. Matt. xxiii. 15.

20. *An instructor of the foolish*,—Those ignorant of divine things. *A teacher of babes*,—Those uninstructed, uninformed, like children. (See on Matt. xi. 25; xxi. 16; 1 Cor. iii. 1; Heb. v. 13.) *Which hast the form of knowledge*,—Bengel: "*Μορφωσιν* is taken here in a good sense in reference to the boasting Jew: the form, plan, or outline—of knowledge and of the truth—an *hendiadys*—the truth expresses accuracy in established doctrine, now called orthodoxy." But there does not appear to be an *hendiadys*. The law furnished the Jew a correct scheme, or outline, of knowledge and truth. Conybeare and Howson: "Possessing in the law the perfect matter of knowledge and of truth." Theophylact: "Thou hast the form—not in actions and good works, but in the law in which thou trustest for the formation of virtue." Cf. Rom. vi. 17: "form of doctrine," type, mold.

21. *Thou therefore*—The apodosis, corresponding to the protasis, ver. 17-20, is indicated by the *οὐα*, therefore. The literal rendering brings out the force of the passage, which is pointed, elliptical, abrupt. It seems better, with the Vulgate, Bengel, Wesley, Olshausen, to point it indicatively, not interrogatively—though Chrysostom says, "he carries on his discourse by way of question, turning them on themselves." The rhetorical effect is greater with the literal rendering: The one therefore who teaches another—thou dost not teach thyself. Bengel: "He who does

not practice, does not teach himself." Matt. xxiii. 3, 4. The apostle seems to have his eye on Ps. l. 16-18. According to Josephus, the lower ranks among the Jews were much given to theft and rapine, and the priests and rulers to rapacity.

22. *Adultery*,—A besetting sin of the Jews in every age. They are charged with it by the prophets, Jer. v. 7, 8; xiii. 27; Ezek. xxii. 11; and by our Lord, Matt. xix. 3-11; John viii. 3-11; and by Josephus, the Talmud, and other authorities—even their rabbins were notorious for the commission of this sin. *Thou that abhorrest idols*,—From *bdel ussomai* comes *bdeugma*, an abomination, by which the Jews designated an idol. (See on Matt. xxiv. 15.) After the captivity, the Jews detested idolatry; hence the play on the word. *Dost thou commit sacrilege?*—Lit., "rob temples." The avaricious Jews, who detested idols, would take from their temples, or receive from others who stole them, the gold and silver images, votive offerings, and other valuable things, in direct violation of the law of God. Deut. vii. 25, 26. So Chrysostom; Josephus, Ant. iv. 8. 10. Robbers of temples are spoken of in Acts xix. 37; 2 Macc. iv. 19, 20, 32, 42, where *iērosulov*, temple-robber, is used.

23, 24. *Thou that makest thy boast of the law*,—Who in law boastest—the form of address is changed. The Jews boasted that they had a written law, while the Gentiles had none. In Baruch iv. 3, the law is called the "honor"—glory—of Israel. As the Israelites were God's witnesses, designed to set forth his character and claims to the world, by their crimes they caricatured the law, and so dishonored the Lawgiver. The heathen would naturally say, If that is the best Jehovah can do for his chosen race, we may as well hold on to our own religion. The apostle quotes indirectly from Isa. lii. 5; Ezek. xxxvi. 20-23; cf. 2 Sam. xii. 14. The inconsistent lives of professing Christians produce the same effect in our day.

Long we have our burden borne,
Our own unfaithfulness—
Object of the heathen's scorn,
Who mocked our scanty grace.

Lange says: "Meyer has good reason for reading ver. 23 not as a question, but as a categorical impeachment: this is supported by the *gaβ* in ver. 24."

25. *For circumcision*—For circumcision, indeed, profits, in case that thou practicest law. This meets an objection of the Jew: Is Judaism, then, of no advantage? He replies to this more fully in ch. iii.; here he answers by concession—*q.d.*, Yes, indeed; circumcision—which is the exponent of Judaism (Gal. v. 3)—is profitable, but only if he who is circumcised practice law. Law, without the article, is put in contrast with the rite. Bishop Middleton says: "Without the article we are to understand not the law itself (nor indeed would

'practice the law' be very intelligible), but moral obedience, or virtue, such as it was the object of the law to inculcate, and of which circumcision was the outward and visible sign. Thus in the next verse, instead of νόμος (law) we have in the same sense ταδικαίωμα του νόμου (the requirements of the law). We have also, 1 Macc. ii. 21, νόμος και δικάίωμα (law and requirements), where νόμος is used, as it is here by St. Paul. So also Sirac. xxxiii. 2, 3; xxxv. 1. The same explanation will serve for νόμος (of law) below, ver. 27." Circumcision is available to a law-keeper, but not to a lawbreaker: the latter, though a Jew, is no better than a Gentile, who is a law-breaker.

26. *Therefore, if*—In case, therefore, the uncircumcision keep the requirements of the law. The Gentiles who perform the virtuous actions required by the law of God, though they have it not in a written code like the Jews, will fare as well, here and hereafter, as the latter. *Uncircumcision* and *circumcision* are abstracts for concretes—as in ver. 27.

27. *And shall not*—And the uncircumcision by nature fulfilling the law, will judge thee who, with letter and circumcision, art a transgressor of law. *By nature*,—This belongs to *the uncircumcision*. (See on xi. 21, 24.)

Gentiles by nature, we belong
To the wild olive wood.

So "Jews by nature." Gal. ii. 15. *If it fulfil the law*,—Keeping the requirements of the law, ver. 26. *By the letter*—*Di* means "with." Alford: "In a state of external conformity with the written law and circumcision." Rather, in possession of a code of laws and the seal of the covenant. The virtuous Gentile judged, or condemned, the wicked Jew. Matt. xii. 41, 42; Heb. xi. 7. The condemnation is both here and in the day of judgment.

28, 29. *For he is not a Jew*,—For not he who is a Jew outwardly is one. He is "an Israelite indeed, in whom there is no guile," whose inward sentiment corresponds to his outward profession; and the circumcision which avails to salvation is not merely the outward rite, but that which it symbolizes, the purification of the heart—spiritual, not carnal—which meets not merely the approval of men who judge according to the outward appearance, but of God, who looks at the heart. 1 Sam. xvi. 7; Matt. vi. 1-6; 1 Cor. iv. 5. Paul, of course, had his eye on such passages as Deut. x. 16; xxx. 6; Jer. iv. 4; ix. 26; cf. Phil. ii. 2, 3; Col. ii. 11. The Jews must have been familiar with such passages, and it seems strange that they should overlook them in so exaggerating the importance and virtue of the outward rite. They went so far as to say that no circumcised person could be damned—that an apostate Jew would by a miracle be restored to uncircumcision in order that he might be sent to hell! But how many are there who profess and call themselves Christians that make a similar preposterous mistake

in regard to baptism, notwithstanding there are such plain passages as John iii. 3-6 and 1 Pet. iii. 21! The more spiritual Jews understood the subject nearly like the apostle. Thus, this passage occurs in the Talmud: "The Jew sits in the interior of the heart." Rab. Lipman says, "Faith depends not on circumcision, but rather on the heart—circumcision will not make an unbeliever a Jew." *Whose praise*—Bengel says this alludes to the name Jew—"they shall praise thee," Gen. xlix. 8. "He therefore adds, *whose*, not *of which* (circumcision)." But there may have been no reference to the meaning of the name, which is so common; and, as Tholuck says, *ou=whose*, refers both to the Jew inwardly, and to the circumcision of the heart, as antecedents, and hence is to be regarded as neuter, after the Hebrew style. This receives praise not only from man, but also from God.

CHAPTER III.

1 *The Jews' prerogative: 3 which they have not lost: 9 howbeit the law convinceth them also of sin. 20 Therefore no flesh is justified by the law, 28 but all, without difference, by faith only: 31 and yet the law is not abolished.*

III.—1. *What advantage*—What, then, is the pre-eminence of the Jew? *Then*—This refers to the preceding, thus: If the true Jew is one who is spiritually pure, which a Gentile may be, and if the true circumcision is of the heart, which a Gentile may experience, what advantage is there in being of the Jewish nation, and receiving ceremonial circumcision? This objection, or inquiry, the apostle anticipates, as natural to arise in the mind of the reader. It is followed by three others, which are duly answered—furnishing proof that the apostle's doctrine does not impinge upon the dignity and importance of the old economy. Then, ver. 9-20, he shows that all, Jews and Gentiles, are guilty and helpless, needing redemption, which is set forth in the remainder of the chapter. But he first answers the anticipated objection, as stated in ver. 1.

2. *Much*—Much in every way: for, first, indeed, they were intrusted with the oracles of God. *Chiefly*,—*Prwton mer gas*—rendered "First of all," 1 Cor. xi. 18—means first, as if there were to follow other instances. (See on i. 8.) *The oracles of God*.—Divine communications. (See on Acts vii. 38; Rom. ix. 4, 5; cf. Ps. cxlvii. 19, 20.) Chrysostom: "They had the law put into their hands, because he held them worthy so far as to intrust to them the oracles, which came down from above." God, so to speak, had confidence in the Jew, so as to make him the trustee of divine revelation.

3. *For what*—For what if some distrusted? Paul makes this remark to show that the Jews had great advantage in possessing the oracles of God, though some of them (he uses a soft expression) *did not believe*—that is, were unfaithful to their trust. The words rendered "committed," "believe," "unbelief," "faith," all come

from *peiaw*, to persuade, and in the passive, to be persuaded, and so to trust, to believe, to obey; but trust and its derivatives convey the idea, implying faithfulness. *Shall their unbelief*—Shall their distrust make the trust of God void? The form of the question requires a negative answer. *The faith of God*—The trust God committed to them. *Without effect?*—To make void, as ver. 31; Eph. ii. 15. God keeps faith with men, though men break faith with God. The sun shines always the same, invariable in its splendor, whatever may preclude our seeing it. Men may shut their eyes to the light of truth, but it shines ever the same. The apostle is shocked at the contrary conception. "If we are faithless, he remains faithful—he cannot deny himself." 2 Tim. ii. 13.

4. *God forbid*;—*Mh-geroi to*: Far be it! Let it not be! This formula is found frequently in Rom. and Gal.; once in Luke (xx. 16), once in 1 Cor. (vi. 15), and nowhere else in N.T. It occurs in a few places in LXX. and the later Greek writers. It expresses strong aversion and horror. *Yea, let God be true*,—But let it be acknowledged that God is true—he is faithful to his word—all his "oracles" will prove true. *But every man a liar*;—The *de* rendered "but," has the force of "though," as in 2 Cor. xiii. 7. The apostle seems to have his eye on Ps. cxvi. 11—though every man appear to be a liar. *Fiat justitia, pereat mundus. As it is written*,—The quotation is precisely from Ps. li. 4, LXX., and may be rendered, "That thou mayst be justified in thy words, and mayst overcome in thy judgment." The Heb. is literally, "That thou shalt be justified in thy speaking, thou shalt be clear in thy judging." God, by the prophet, brought accusation against David, and set forth his guilt: instead of defending himself, David confessed his sin, and acknowledged his guilt, and thus justified God's accusation, and "owned him conqueror." The scene is not a trial in court—God being Judge, and passing sentence—but a controversy, like that in Micah vi. The parallels require this interpretation: thou shalt be justified=thou shalt be clear; in thy speaking=in thy judging. As if God had said, David, thou art guilty of great crimes, and deservest to be punished; and David confesses that the charge is just, and the punishment is deserved. The LXX. and Paul are seen to agree with the Heb., without any torturing of the one or of the other. It is obvious that the LXX. endeavored to transfer the Heb. idiom into Greek; hence the peculiar forms, "in thy words, in thy judging," the latter being in the infinitive mood, either passive or middle. Tholuck says: "Though the Heb. is required to be understood actively, the LXX. might nevertheless have adopted the middle for its analogy to the active." Bengel: "God at once both judges and is judged—that is, pleads in judgment; for here it has the meaning of the middle voice, such as verbs of contending often have." The use made of the quotation is simply to illustrate the position that even the sin and condemnation of men set forth the righteousness and truth of God—the latter being heightened by the contrast. Lange says: "Whenever the covenant between God and man is shaken or broken, absolute faithfulness is always found on God's

side: he is a rock—Deut. xxxii. 31, etc.—while all the vibrations, as well as all the breaches, of faithfulness, are on the side of men."

5, 6. *But*—But if our unrighteousness evinces God's righteousness, what shall we say? Is God unrighteous who inflicts wrath? This is not a formal objection of a Jew, or the question would be so put (ouj instead of mh) as to require an affirmative answer, as Wesley, indeed, renders, "Is not God unjust who taketh vengeance?" But the apostle is proceeding to remove an anticipated difficulty. Our unrighteousness may evince God's righteousness, and yet God be righteous in punishing us for our sins. *I speak as a man*,—I speak as men usually speak. So Rom. vi. 19; Gal. iii. 15; and the Talmud. Paul says this as a kind of apology for even hypothetically predicating unrighteousness of God: hence the exclamation, *God forbid*:—Far be it from us to entertain a thought so horrible and profane! The wickedness of the whole world, by contrast, evinces the righteousness of God; and so, on the principle in question, God cannot judge the world! He proceeds to illustrate this position.

7. *For if*—For if the truth of God by my lie abounded unto his glory. "The truth of God" corresponds to "the righteousness of God," ver. 5. "My lie" corresponds to "our unrighteousness," ver. 5: it is not idolatry, as i. 25. Paul uses the first person singular, not in the name of an objector, but in the vivacious style, according to his manner. Rom. vii. 7-25; Gal. ii. 18-21. *Why yet am I also judged as a sinner?*—If my conduct conduce to God's glory, in that case why does he punish me as he punishes others? The present tense expresses the rule of God's proceeding.

8. *And not*—This elliptical passage presents grammatical difficulties, which divide the critics: the simplest, and perhaps best, solution is that adopted by Chrysostom, Theophylact, OEcumenius, Luther, Bengel, Wesley, Tholuck, Olshausen, and others: "And why should we not—as some traducing us say we recommend—do evil that good may come?" Winer says "the apostle had intended to make poiein kaka> etc., dependent on kai <mh> but on account of the parenthesis appended it to legein in oratio recta." The apostle gives the *reductio ad absurdum*—an argument which yields a conclusion so horrible and revolting, shows its fallacy. It needs no other reply than the exclamation, *Whose damnation is just*—that is, those who hold such a diabolical sentiment deserve the punishment they will get. Paul is the more pungent, perhaps, because the slander originated in an antinomian perversion of the doctrine of justification by faith, charged upon him and his fellow-ministers, which he earnestly deprecates and denounces in ver. 31; Rom. vi.

9. *What then?*—What is the inference? Because we Jews have greater privileges than the Gentiles, does this argue that we surpass them in piety? Not at all. In the first and second chapters Paul made good the charge of sin against

Gentiles and Jews alike—the latter being as delinquent in regard to the written law as the former in regard to the unwritten. Winer: "Have we any advantage?" Alford: "Have we (Jews) the (any) preference?" Lange: "Are we ahead, or better?" Like many of the Greek Fathers, they construe *prooemeqa* as a middle. *Under sin*;—As a tyrant. Rom. vi. 12-23. All men are on the same level, as it respects justification before God.

10. *As it is written*,—This formula occurs nineteen times in Romans. The quotation is from Ps. xiv. 1-3; but it does not agree literally with either the Heb. or LXX., though it agrees in sense with both. The universal terms, so emphatically employed, present a difficulty. There never was a time when there was no righteous man upon the earth. David, in this very Psalm, speaks of the righteous in contrast with the wicked here described. Burkitt explains it thus: "There is none originally, efficiently, or independently, completely, perfectly, righteous." Bengel: "Paul quotes with propriety David and Isaiah, though their complaints apply to their own times, and even that with the exception of the godly, Ps. xiv. 4, etc. For that complaint describes men as God looking down from heaven finds them, not as his grace makes them." Neither David nor Paul meant to affirm that all here said was predicable of every man—even of every unregenerate man. There are similar descriptions in Gen. vi., of the world before the Flood—in Isaiah, Jeremiah, and the other prophets—including the Elohist recension (Ps. liii.) of this Jehovistic Psalm. Yet they speak of the godly in their times. What Paul meant is simply to apply the delineation of David as to the corruption of his age to the general depravity of the race. Those who reject the remedy show what they would be who avail themselves of it, had they also rejected it. By yielding to the depravity of their fallen nature, and rejecting the proffers of grace, men will inevitably go into sin—some of one kind, some of another, according to their peculiar bent, temperament, and circumstances:

Each wandering in a different way,
But all the downward road.

This passage is frequently cited in proof of inherited, inherent, universal, and total, depravity—for which Paul seems to quote it. It may not prove it directly, but in connection with other proofs it shows that in every age society, from the least to the greatest, has been thoroughly imbued with sin, thus showing that men belong to a fallen, degenerate race.

Such deeds of sin, that bitter root,
In every heart are found;
Nor can they bear diviner fruit
Till grace refine the ground.

11. *There is none that understandeth*,—God and goodness. 1 Cor. ii. 14; cf. Ps. ii. 10. *That seeketh after God*.—God is hidden to us in our fallen state, and so has to be sought by prayer and the study of his works and word. Acts xvii. 27; Ps. cv. 3; Isa. lv. 6.

12. *They are all gone out of the way*,—Lit., all turned aside. In the Heb. it is simply, "Every one has departed." We are left to supply the ellipsis, from God—as Deut. xi. 16; Jer. v. 23; Dan. ix. 11. All men are apostates, till restored to the good and the right way. *They are together*—Together they became unprofitable: a *meiosis* for wicked. Matt. xxv. 30. It is the rendering of the Heb. *alach*, to be corrupt. *There is none*—There is none who doeth goodness—the opposite of unprofitable, from *crestov*, profitable; so goodness. *No, not one*.—There is not even one.

13. *Their throat*—A sepulcher opened is their throat. A revolting metaphor: a tomb just opened sends forth an intolerable stench; so pestilential words come from the mouth of the wicked. These verses (13-18) are cited *verbatim* from the LXX. of Ps. xiv. (not in the parallel, Ps. liii.); in the Vulg. (not in Jerome); and in the Liturgical version (not in A.V.). They are not in the Heb. of Ps. xiv., but are introduced from some passages in other Psalms and Isaiah. This clause and the next are *verbatim* from Ps. v. 9, LXX. *With their tongues they have used deceit*;—They were using deceit: *ejdol iousan* is the Alexandrian form of the imperfect *ejdol ioun*. They were using deceit when God looked down on them; and he can witness it any time. *The poison*—Venom of asps is under their lips. *Verbatim* from Ps. cxli. 3, LXX. The asp secretes "under his lips" a deadly venom, which well represents slander, whose tongue, says Shakespeare, "outvenoms all the worms of Nile."

14. *Whose mouth*—Their mouth of cursing and bitterness is full. Nearly from Ps. x. 7, LXX. The third word, "fraud," is not quoted. They are always ready to pour out maledictions and bitter denunciations. But instead of "bitterness," the Heb. has "deceits"—*mirmoth*—which differs from *meroroth*, "bitterness," only in a single consonant—*r* for *m*. The latter word is used for poison and bile, or gall—"the poison of asps," Job xiv. 25; cf. Deut. xxxii. 32, 33, where "clusters of bitteresses"—*meroroth*—are joined with "the cruel venom of asps."

15. *Their feet*—Swift are their feet to shed blood. Altered from Isa. lix. 7, where the LXX. has *tacinoi*, instead of *ojeiv*, which means sharp, acid, but it is used for "swift" in Amos ii. 15, LXX.—"swift of foot." They were eager for murder. The metaphor is carried out in the next verse.

16. *Destruction and misery are in their ways*:—*Verbatim* from Isa. lix. 7. As they swiftly pursue their murderous course, they scatter ruin and anguish wherever

they go. Of course, they destroy and distress themselves, but the connection shows that others are the victims of their cruelty. So the next verse.

17. *And the way*—And a way of peace they did not get to know. In Isa. lix. 8, the Vatican has *ouk oiđasi*, they know not; but the Alexandrian, like Paul, has *eđnwsan*, they knew not—or, they did not get to know—the force of the 2 aorist. No matter who wanted peace, their voice was still for war. Cf. Ps. cxx. 6, 7. Of course, they have no peace of mind—though this may not be meant. Prov. iv. 17; Isa. lvii. 19-21; James iii. 14-18.

18. *There is no fear of God before their eyes.*—*Verbatim* (except "their" for "his") from Ps. xxxvi. 1, LXX. Bengel: "The seat of reverence is in the eyes." Tholuck: "Arising from a sense of his holiness." A reverential regard for God as our Sovereign and Father is at the root of all religion; so the converse. Mal. i. 6; Job xxviii. 28; Ps. cxi. 10; Prov. i. 7; ix. 10.

19. *Now we know*—Now we know that whatever things the law says it speaks to those who are in the law. This refers to the passages cited from the Psalms and Isaiah, for all the O.T. is sometimes called "the law." John x. 34; xii. 34; xv. 25; 1 Cor. xiv. 21. *It saith*—It speaks (*l al ei*, not *l egei*, as in the former clause): it declares to those who are in the circle of the law—as "in the doctrine of Christ," 2 John 9. The O.T. Scriptures were addressed to all who lived in that dispensation. *That every mouth may be stopped*,—Lit., hedged in, shut up, silenced. *And all the world may become guilty before God.*—May be under penal sentence to God. If the law—God's written revelation to the Jews—shows that they are guilty, *a fortiori*, the Gentiles must be guilty—so that the whole world becomes "liable to the divine justice."

20. *Therefore*—Because by works of law—*dioti* means "because." Both nouns are anarthrous. The world is in a state of guilt, as proved—liable to punishment—because by works of law none can be declared righteous before God; for by law—by its application to the character and conduct of men—sin is discerned.

Let Jews and Gentiles stop their mouths,
Without a murmuring word,
And the whole race of Adam stand
Guilty before the Lord.
In vain we ask God's righteous law
To justify us now,
Since to convince and to condemn
Is all the law can do.

The law has what is called a *usus politicus*—it is thus a restraint in its operations on society; a *usus elenchticus*—convincing of sin; a *usus didacticus*—being a rule

of life; and in all these respects it is a rule of judgment, retribution corresponding to both precept and penalty. Besides acting as a rule of life, it marks our transgressions, and defines the penalty. This is done by "law," whether that of the Jew, in O.T., or that of the Gentile, in the heart. Rom. ii. 14, 15. Deeds required by law, and those produced by law, are the same in this case. *There shall no flesh*—No flesh shall be declared righteous in his presence. *Sarx* (flesh) may possibly glance at man's weakness and corruption. Bengel: "All flesh is the same as the world, ver. 19, but besides implies the reason—the world and its righteousness are flesh: therefore it is not of itself justified." Tholuck: "The apostle designates man by *sarx*, which has the concomitant idea of weakness, as it were, 'poor feeble man cannot justify himself before the eye of God.'" But here and in the parallel, Gal. ii. 16, it seems to mean mankind, as in Matt. xxiv. 22, *et al.* The apostle cites, with slight verbal variation, Ps. cxliii. 2, LXX., "For in thy sight shall no one living be justified." *For by the law*—For through law is knowledge of sin—anarthrous, as the nouns in the first clause.

21. *But now*—But now, apart from law, a righteousness of God has been manifested. As the case stands—referring to what was said about law, ver. 20, and confirming the view there given. *The righteousness of God*—The absence of the article must not be overlooked, nor must it be rendered "God's righteousness." It is a righteousness which God has manifested, and still manifests, to believers—hence the perfect tense. See on i. 17, where a righteousness of God by faith is spoken of as revealed to faith. *Without the law*—Apart from law—independently of it, though not antagonistic to it. *Being witnessed*—Being attested by the law and the prophets. This mode of justification is attested by the O.T. Scriptures, which are meant by "the law and the prophets." Matt. v. 17; Luke xvi. 16; John i. 45; Acts xiii. 15; xxviii. 23. Here the law means the Pentateuch—the prophets, the remainder of the O.T. Sometimes "the law" covers the whole. (See on ver. 19.) Sometimes "the Psalms" are distinguished from "the law and the prophets." (See on Luke xxiv. 44.) The ceremonies of the Levitical institute attest the doctrine here set forth; but Paul may have had his eye on the passages which he adduces in chaps. i. and iv.—Gen. xv. 6; Ps. xxxii. 1, 2; Hab. ii. 4. (See on Luke xxiv. 44-47; Acts x. 43.)

22. *Even*—Namely, a righteousness—a mode of justification which God has provided—not through works of law, but through faith of Jesus Christ—that method which Christ enjoins—a righteousness which comes unto all and upon all who believe, without any distinction of Jew or Gentile—all alike needing it, and all alike entitled to it. If Paul intends any thing more than a strong emphasis by the use of the two prepositions—*eij*, "unto," and *eji* > "upon"—and the repetition of *pan*tav, "all" ("and upon all" being omitted in A, B, C, Sin., and some versions and Fathers), it may mean, as W. and W. say, "Extends to all in the divine purpose, and is effectual upon all who believe—a flood which penetrates to all,

and even streams over all' (Olshausen)." The repetition of "all" and the change of prepositions are designed to impress on the reader the universality of the grace of the gospel.

Its streams the whole creation reach,
So plenteous is the store:
Enough for all, enough for each,
Enough forevermore.

23. *For*—For all sinned—In the original revolt, and by actual transgression. The aorist expresses the fact that they are all sinners, as Lange says, "They sinned in the sense that they have become sinners." *And come*—And are coming short of the glory of God. It is the present participle. This is the result of sin, as man's chief end is to glorify God and to enjoy him forever; and this he fails to do as a sinner. Those interpretations must be rejected: "To receive praise from God." This may be the Johannine force of the formula; cf. John xii. 43; John v. 41, 44. This does not appear to be a Pauline sense; nor does "praise in God's sight;" nor "the image of God," or holiness which we have lost through sin: this is against usage and the connection of the phrase. "Glory with God," as in Rom. v. 2, would make a good sense, if the tense would allow it; but Paul is speaking of "the existing condition of men." Chrysostom misses it: "Bereft of the glory, he who has offended belongs not to such as are glorified, but to such as are put to shame." It is a wonder that the learned men who favor these various views did not think of one more simple and agreeable to the scope of the passage: All men sinned—the aorist states the fact—all are coming short in regard to the glory of God; they fail to answer the end of their creation, which is to glorify God by a life of piety. Isa. xliii. 21; Matt. v. 16; 1 Cor. x. 31. W. and W. adopt substantially this view, which agrees with the next clause.

24. *Being justified*—Being declared righteous, freely by his grace. Winer: "The apostle conceived the connection thus, 'and come short of the glory of God, since all are justified by grace (free gift)—the last proves the first.'" And the first proves the necessity of the last. Paul does not mean that all are actually justified, but all, if justified, must be justified by this method. *Freely*—As a gift, from *dwrea*>a gift. *By his grace*,—By his favor, as the originating cause. The twofold expression gives great emphasis—surely pardon is gratuitous! Rom. xi. 6. *Through*—Expressing the means. *The redemption*—'*Apōl ut̄w̄siv* is derived from *l ut̄ron*, "loosing-money," a ransom, the price paid for the release of a captive (see on Matt. xx. 28), and *apō*>from, and means redemption—e.g., from the guilt and consequences of sin by Christ, who gave his life as the *lutron*, or ransom. Eph. i. 7; Col. i. 14; Heb. ix. 15. *That is in Christ Jesus*:—Dative of instrument: by him as the Redeemer.

25. *Whom God*—Whom God set forth a propitiatory offering. It is in the aorist. It does not mean "pre-ordained," as in the margin and Chrysostom; nor "proposed," as Rheims; but exhibited, showed to the world. **ἰλᾱσθῆιον** means propitiatory. It is used in the LXX. for the golden cover of the ark, called "the mercy-seat," Heb. ix. 5; "throne of grace," Heb. iv. 16, because it was sprinkled once a year with the blood of an expiatory victim. Lev. xvi. 13-16. Over it was the *Shekinah*, or "glory of the Lord," and from it came gracious responses to the people. The phrase **ἰλᾱσθῆιον ἐπιπέμα**, or propitiatory covering, occurs Ex. xxv. 17. Many render it here "a mercy-seat;" but that sounds harsh, referring to Christ. It is best to supply **κύμα**, "offering" Christ is called **ἰλᾱσμός**, "Propitiation"—abstract for concrete, "Propitiator"—1 John ii. 2; iv. 10. Cf. Luke xviii. 13; Heb. ii. 17; viii. 12. *Through faith in his blood*,—Alford says: "Such an expression as this is unexampled, and the clause 'in his blood' requires a primary, not a subordinate, place in the sentence, because the next clause directly refers to it. As 'by faith' is the subjective means of appropriation, so 'in his blood' is the objective means of manifestation of Christ as a propitiatory sacrifice; 'blood' does not mean 'death,' but refers to propitiation *by blood*—the well-known typical use of it in sacrifice." If **αὐτοῦ**, "his," were rendered as a neuter "its," it would mean the blood of the propitiatory sacrifice. However, "faith in his blood" may mean the same as faith in his *death*—as blood is "the visible symbol of death"—and both expressions denote his propitiation for sin, which is the object of faith. Hence we are said to be "justified by his blood," Rom. v. 9, and to "have redemption through his blood, the forgiveness of sins." Eph. i. 7; Col. i. 14, 20; Heb. *passim*; Luke xxii. 20; 1 Pet. i. 2, 19; 1 John i. 7; Rev. i. 5; v. 9. Olshausen: "We are not to consider **ἰλᾱσθῆιον** as dependent upon **πίστιν**, but must supply as follows, 'which must be received through faith in his blood.'" *To declare*—For a declaration of his justice, because of the pretermission of former sins. The propitiatory sacrifice of Christ, apprehended by faith, demonstrates the rectoral justice of God, which might otherwise be impeached, as he had borne with sinners from Adam, the first transgressor and progenitor of the sinning race, through all succeeding ages. The reason of the divine forbearance is seen in the propitiation of Christ, whose virtue has a reflex bearing on all time past since sin entered into the world. The patience extended to sinners, and the pardon of penitents, before the death of Christ, are both attributed to that as the great meritorious cause. *Remission*—**ἀφεσις** means remission, the sending away of sins, forgiveness, pardon. Matt. xxvi. 28; Acts ii. 38; v. 31; x. 43; xiii. 38; xxvi. 18; Eph. i. 7, *et al.* But the word here is **παρᾱσις**, which means pretermission, passing by, overlooking, not punishing. The word occurs nowhere else in the N.T. or LXX., but the verb is used in Ecclus. xxiii. 2—"pass not by my sins." Cf. Acts xvii. 30: "The times of this ignorance God winked at"—overlooked. This does not imply that incorrigible sinners, whether Jews or Gentiles, were not punished before the

coming of Christ—the apostle has just stated that they were—but it was with great forbearance, and Christ's propitiation accounts for it.

26. *To declare*,—With a view to a declaration of his justice in the present time, contrasted with the former times, just mentioned. God set forth the propitiatory sacrifice of Christ for this as well as for the other purpose. Through this expedient God declares his rectoral justice, while he declares just him who believes in Jesus—who has faith in his stoning blood. The words *dikaïosunh*, *dikaïon*, and *dikaïwma*, come from *dikaïov*, right, just; and are properly rendered justice, just, and justifying; we have no participle corresponding with righteousness, as justifying corresponds with justice. The mercy extended to penitent sinners, who believe in Christ, does not impinge upon the justice which demands satisfaction, as that satisfaction is found in his propitiatory sacrifice appropriated by faith.

27. *Where*—Where, then, is the boasting?—viz., of the Jew, ver. 1, 9; iv. 1, 2. Chrysostom thinks it effrontery for a criminal, who is unable to defend himself in court, and who has been forgiven by royal favor, to boast! A law of works, if duly kept, might allow of boasting; but a law of faith excludes boasting, as it recognizes the merit of Christ as the sole ground of justification. How can a bankrupt, taking the benefit of the act for insolvent debtors, boast of his riches? Still, it is "a law of faith," and without conforming to it there is no justification, though there is obviously no merit in so doing. Meyer: "Because the gospel prescribes faith as the condition of salvation." Chrysostom: "He calls the faith also a law, delighting to keep to the names, and so allay the seeming novelty. But what is the law of faith? It is being saved by grace." This seems to be what Tholuck, Alford, and others, mean by *norma*, or a rule of faith. "He that believeth, shall be saved; but he that believeth not, shall be damned."

28. *Therefore*—Therefore we reckon that a man is justified by faith without works of law. Now, says Calvin, he sums up the main proposition as indubitable, adducing it for farther explication. The common reading, *oun* (therefore), not *gas* (for), is probably correct. So Syriac, Chrysostom, and most MSS.

29. *Is he*—The particle *h* should not be omitted; it has the force of "or," "else," as in Matt. vii. 9. Or is he the God of Jews alone? and not also of Gentiles? Yes, of Gentiles also. W. and W.: "In the two inquiries the first is a question of appeal, *an?* the second articulates an affirmative answer, *nonne?* One is the God." This is implied in Jewish monotheism, and the O.T. constantly affirms that the God of the Jews is the one only God—the God of all the earth.

30. *Seeing it is*—Seeing one is the God who will justify circumcision by faith, and uncircumcision through the faith. "Who will justify" has perhaps the force of the present, "who justifies." Winer: "The future, in expressing great truths, sometimes very nearly assumes the import of the present, as Gal. ii. 16; Rom. iii.

20. This, however, is a rule which, since the introduction of Christianity, continues to be a force in the world. The same construction, substantially, occurs also in Rom. iii. 30, where *dikaioun* is an act of God constantly thus realized." The article is not in the Greek before "circumcision" and "uncircumcision," nor in Wycliffe, Rheims, Tyndale, Geneva—as the abstract terms stand for "Jews" and "Gentiles" respectively. *By faith*,—The customary formula—*ek pistewv*: this is said of the Jews; they always have priority. *Through faith*.—The article is in the Greek, so that *dia—of which so much has been said to so little purpose, to note the different import from *ek pistewv*—means simply "through the same faith"—the article referring to the faith just mentioned—*q.d.*, by means of the same faith—Alford's objection to the contrary notwithstanding. The argument shows that there is no difference in the force of the prepositions. Winer: "Paul had assuredly no intention of making any distinction between the respective significations of *ek pistewv* and *dia, as, in a doctrinal point of view, *pistis* may with equal propriety be considered either the *source* or the *means* of blessedness (Gal. iii. 8; Eph. ii. 8)." Paul probably varied the expression, as he intended to repeat the latter in the next verse, as more suitable to his question.**

31. *Do we then*—Law, then, do we make void through the faith? Far be it! On the contrary, we establish law. The objection might be made by any one. Jew or Gentile, as indeed it has been made, and still is made, by both. In fact, the Antinomian perversion of "the faith," as the means of justification—construing it to imply the imputation of Christ's righteousness—does indeed make void all legislative enactments. Alford says "law" means "the law," but adds, "the law of God given by Moses, when speaking of the Jews, as here: the law of God, in as far as written in their consciences, when speaking of the Gentiles; and when including both, the law of God generally, his written, as well as his unwritten, will." Very good; and for this reason the article is omitted, as both Jews and Gentiles are here included. Law is not made void by the faith which justifies the sinner. On the contrary, it is established, or confirmed. Chrysostom, who refers law to the Mosaic law, says of faith: "The intention of the law it did establish, and what all its enactments aim after, this has it brought to a consummation. Consequently, it has not disannulled, but perfected it." The faith which justifies recognizes the binding force of law—relies upon the propitiation of Christ (ver. 24, 25, 26), which satisfies its demands, for remission of its penalty, and always works by love, and purifies the heart—so that obedience to law characterizes every true believer. Cf. Rom. vi.; viii. 1-4; Eph. ii. 8, 9, 10; James ii. 14-26. Thus, instead of there being any contrariety between "law"—any divine requirement—and "the faith"—reliance on Christ for salvation—there is a perfect harmony, and one is of no account without the other.

CHAPTER IV.

1 *Abraham's faith was imputed to him for righteousness, 10 before he was circumcised. 13 By faith only he and his seed received the promise. 16 Abraham is the father of all that believe. 24 Our faith also shall be imputed to us for righteousness.*

IV.—1. *What shall we then say*—What, then, shall we affirm Abraham, our father, to have found, as to flesh? "Then" refers to the preceding argument and conclusion—*q.d.*, "Such being the case—Jew and Gentile, circumcision and uncircumcision, being on the same level—what advantage accrued to Abraham by observing legal ordinances? None, as to justification." His circumcision was nothing in this respect. This was an occasion of boasting with the Jews; but it was not so considered by God, who justified Abraham in view of his faith, before he was circumcised (ver. 11). His faith—not works, such as circumcision and the observances of the law, to which the circumcised were bound (Gal. v. 3)—was reckoned for righteousness. *Abraham, our father*—He is frequently so styled in N.T.—Matt. iii. 9; Luke xvi. 24, 27, 30; John viii. 33, 56. Some MSS. have *propatora*, forefather, *patriarcham* (Syr.); but "father" is the usual title, and it is likely Paul so wrote. Chrysostom has both. *As pertaining to the flesh*,—Many join this to "our father;" but it was needless to say that of Abraham, and it involves "a harsh hyper-baton," as Tholuck says—to avoid which some copyists place "hath found" before "Abraham our father." But the received text is probably genuine. Chrysostom says, "He calls him father as pertaining to the flesh to throw them out of the genuine relationship to him, and to pave the way of the Gentiles to kinsmanship with him." But the scope requires the words "as to flesh" to be construed with "hath found," or acquired. What did Abraham gain by his circumcision? This is an echo of the question, iii. 1. "Flesh" is a technical expression, frequently used by Paul, especially when treating on this subject. W. and W.: "*Sarx* (flesh) doubtless refers to circumcision (Gal. vi. 12; Phil. iii. 3), and embraces the whole system which the Judaizers opposed to the truth of the gospel, vii. 4; 'the law of a carnal commandment,' Heb. vii. 16; ix. 10; Gal. iii. 3." Alford says it cannot refer to circumcision, because "of works" (ver. 2), which is parallel, is plural, and circumcision is not a work; but he adds, "Doubtless in so far as circumcision was a mere work of obedience, it might be in a loose way considered as falling under that category; but it came after justification, and so is chronologically here excluded." That is the point which Paul makes. The Jews considered circumcision the greatest of all works. We must place ourselves in the position of the apostle to understand his language. Whitby explains the words "as to flesh" "by virtue of his obedience to God's command in circumcising the flesh of his foreskin. So Israel according to the flesh (1 Cor. x. 18) is Israel according to the circumcision of the flesh; to know Christ according to the flesh (2 Cor. v. 16) is to know him according to his circumcision, as being of the stock of

Abraham; to glory according to the flesh (2 Cor. xi. 18) is to glory in being circumcised. In this the Jews had the greatest confidence of being acceptable to God, and therefore are represented by St. Paul as having confidence in the flesh, Phil. iii. 3, 4, declaring that no circumcised Jews go to hell, God having promised to deliver them for the merit of circumcision. Moreover, that vain opinion had obtained among the Jews, that Abraham was not pure, or accepted with God, till after his circumcision. This opinion the apostle here confutes, and then (ver. 11) shows what his circumcision signified." That the Jews considered circumcision a meritorious work appears from the texts cited (though several cited by Whitby may have a different meaning) and John vii. 22, 23; Gal. v. 6, 11; vi. 15; Eph. ii. 11—"the circumcision in the flesh"—Phil. iii. 3, 5. Paul uses *peritomh* "circumcision," thirty-one times in his Epistles, and often as a technicality, like "flesh." He uses *akrobustia*, "uncircumcision," nineteen times, as the converse. *Hath found?*—To have found. The omission of this word in the Vatican was a mere slip. It means to have acquired, as we gain any thing by working for it.

2. *For*—Assigning the reason for introducing the case of Abraham: For if Abraham by works was justified, he has ground of boasting—which Paul says is excluded, iii. 27. Works here are circumcision and other legal observances, which were developed into the Levitical economy. This explains the phrase "as to flesh," ver. 1. *He hath*—He has ground of boasting, but not with God—not so as to meet with God's approbation; for God testifies that he was justified by faith; and that excludes boasting—iii. 27.

3. *For what saith the scripture?*—The passage alluded to: the question is *verbatim* from Gen. xv. 6, LXX., except that the LXX. has *kai* and the apostle *de* which, following *episteuse* (believed), gives it more prominence. W. and W.: "There are five usages of the object of belief—1, the simple dative, expressing merely the object; 2, with *ej*, which implies union with; 3, with *eij*, denoting the bent and purpose of the mind; 4, *epi* with dative, repose, reliance on; 5, *epi* with accusative, mental direction." The first is the present case. Abraham believed "the word of the Lord," in regard to his seed. In the Hebrew it is, "And he believed in Jehovah, and he reckoned it to him for righteousness." It does not, of course, mean that Abraham exercised explicit faith in Christ, in order to justification. Alford says: "The whole question so much mooted between Protestants, on the one hand, and Romanists, Arminians, and Socinians, on the other, as to whether this righteousness was reckoned (1) *per fidem*, being God's righteousness imputed to the sinner; or (2) *propter fidem*, so that God made Abraham righteous on account of the merit of his faith, lies in fact in a small compass, if what has gone before be properly taken into account. The apostle has proved Jews and Gentiles to be all under sin—utterly unable by works of their own to attain to righteousness. Now, faith, in the second sense mentioned above, is strictly and entirely a work, and as such would be the efficient cause of man's

justification—which, by what has preceded, it cannot be. It will therefore follow that it was not the act of believing which was reckoned to him as a righteous act, or on account of which perfect righteousness was laid to his charge, but that the fact of his trusting God to perform his promise introduced him into the blessing promised." It was very unfortunate, and indeed reprehensible, in Alford, to call the semi-Pelagians of the English Church Arminians, as Arminius, John Goodwin, Wesley, and all true Arminians, are as much opposed to Romanists and Socinians, on this question, as the Calvinists themselves, while they reject the figment of the imputation of Christ's righteousness for justification, as that leads to Antinomianism. It is absurd to talk about Christ's righteousness being imputed to Abraham—or, for that matter, to any one else. There is no merit in faith, though there is great demerit in unbelief. If Abraham had discredited the word of Jehovah, he would not have been justified; but he believed the promise of God, which comprehended salvation by Christ, though he had no explicit revelation concerning it; and this, as W. and W. say, "was put to his account, was considered as admitting him to the state and privileges of *δικαιον*"—the righteous. This is fully expanded in this chapter—at the close of which our explicit faith in Christ is said to have the same effect as Abraham's implicit faith. It is not said that faith is reckoned for righteousness as a substitute for it—the word is *ειj*, not *α̅ντι* >for which it is not used—though faith is accepted for justification instead of works, as it has reference to the propitiatory sacrifice of Christ, which is the sole ground of pardon and acceptance with God. Rom. iii. 24-26. Paul proceeds to illustrate this position, showing that the righteousness for which faith is reckoned—in other words, that which faith appropriates—is the non-imputation of sin, justification, pardon—not sanctification, which is not treated of till chap. vi. Faith worketh by love, and purifieth the heart; but that comes after justification—it is a work done in us by the Holy Spirit, whereas justification is a work done for us on the sole ground of the merits of Christ appropriated by faith. *Counted*—*λογιζομαι* is an arithmetical term, though variously used; it occurs forty-one times in N.T., being used thirty-five times by Paul. Our translators have unfortunately used eleven different words to render it—as many as three in this chapter, where it has but one and the same meaning—"count," "reckon," "impute."

4. *Now*—But to him who works—the laborer who works for hire. The participle is used because of the negative in the next verse. *Is the reward not reckoned*—Tholuck puts a stop here, as he thinks "reckoned" cannot apply to the payment of a debt. He says "it is expressed with great precision by Michaelis: 'To him who does works the reward is not said to be *reckoned*, an expression which makes it appear as if it were given from grace, but he obtains it because it is his due.'" This savors of hypercriticism; and the language will hardly bear this construction. Alford is correct: "The stress is on *κατα-χαριν* (of grace), not on *λογιζεται* (reckoned), which, in this first member of the sentence, is used hardly

in the strict sense of imputing, or reckoning, but of allotting, or apportioning—its use being occasioned by the stricter *logizetai* below."

5. *But to him*—Whereas to him who works not—as a hireling for wages. *But believeth on him*—'Eti > upon, with the accusative, denotes the direction toward which the mind is turned, and so, say W. and W., is suitable to a young convert. *That justifieth*—While justifying, as in iii. 26. *The ungodly*,—The word is singular; but there seems to be no reference to Abraham, as the idolater, Josh. xxiv. 2. It means the impious one—one who is wicked—as i. 18.

6. *Describeth*—Affirms. *Imputeth*—Reckons. That this is no imputation of Christ's righteousness is clear from what follows, which explains it as the pardon of sin: the non-reckoning of sin is the same as the reckoning of righteousness. So Calvin himself, and the old Protestant doctors. How strange that Schaff should fail to see this! The quotation is *verbatim* from Ps. xxxii. 1, 2, LXX. The Hebrew has the plural in both verses: O the blessings of him whose transgression is forgiven, whose sin is covered! O the blessings of a man to whom Jehovah will not reckon iniquity! It is thought David wrote this Psalm after he had repented of his sin in the case of Uriah and Bathsheba; so that he describes his own experience. He penitently sought pardon, and obtained it, trusting alone in the mercy of God, never dreaming of his own works as the ground of pardon.

7. *Iniquities*—Acts of lawlessness. 1 John iii. 4. *Are forgiven*,—Lit., "were remitted:" they were sent away when the act of justification was passed, as the scape-goat bearing the sins of the people was sent away. *Sins*—Departures from duty: the same word is used in the next verse in the singular, as referring to the singular subject. *Are covered*.—Lit., "were covered"—by the act of justification. The Heb. *kasah*, to cover, applied to sin, means to conceal, put it out of sight, pardon—not exactly "atoned for" (Lange).

8. *Will not impute*—May in no case reckon—a strong expression: the two negatives (*oujmh*)>with the subjunctive aorist—not referring to future pardon, as in the day of judgment. The penitent is sure of pardon whenever he believes; the failure is what in no wise may take place.

9. *Cometh*—Tyndale, Cranmer, Geneva, Tomson, have "came." Theophylact suggests to supply the ellipsis by a similar word, *piptei*—Does it fall on? The Vulgate has *manet*; Rheims, "abide in;" Wycliffe, "dwelleth." But it is best to supply "affirmed," as ver. 6: This blessedness, then, is it affirmed of the circumcision, or also of the uncircumcision? *Upon*—'Epi here means "of," or "in respect to," as in Mark ix. 12, 13. *Only*,—Winer says this is not required. But Tholuck says it is required by the *kai*>also, that follows. It is not supplied in the Vulgate, or in Tyndale, Cranmer, or Rheims; but it is in Wycliffe, Tomson, and Geneva, Bengel, Wesley, Macknight, and others. It seems needed, and is added

in some MSS. *Circumcision—uncircumcision*—Abstract for concrete, as in iii. 30. *For we say*—That is, this question is answered by what we have said of Abraham (ver. 3), who was justified by faith, as well as David, who was circumcised. *Faith*—The faith—namely, "the faith of him"—ver. 5.

10. *How*—Under what circumstances, then, was it reckoned? *Not in circumcision*,—For Abraham was justified by faith several years before he was circumcised. Cf. Gen. xv. 6; xvii. 23-27.

11. *And he received*—And a sign he received—of circumcision. The genitive of apposition, as in Matt. xxiv. 30, where the "sign" is "the Son of man" himself; so Eph. iv. 9, where "the lower parts of the earth" mean this lower world. *Shmeion* here means a symbol, a visible token of the covenant into which God entered with Abraham and his seed—in Heb. *oth*, Gen. xvii. 11; cf. Gen. ix. 12, 13, where the rainbow is the sign of the covenant with Noah. Though Abraham was not circumcised immediately after the act of faith mentioned Gen. xv., yet that act was specially recognized in the covenant of which circumcision was the sign. *A seal*—The impression of a seal—a sign of confirmation. 1 Cor. ix. 2; 2 Tim. ii. 19. The Jews call circumcision "the sign of the covenant," "the holy sign," "the seal of Abraham:" in the Targum, on Canticles, they speak of "the seal of circumcision." So the Fathers speak of baptism. *Father*—Author, source, beginner—as the Heb. *ab*. Gen. iv. 20, 21; 1 Macc. ii. 54. The rabbins say, "Abraham is the father of all those who follow his faith." In the next verse Paul speaks as a Jew, "our father Abraham." Cf. John viii. 37, 39. (See on ver. 1.) *That righteousness*—That the righteousness might be reckoned also to them. He was justified by faith before he was circumcised, to show that believing Gentiles, who are thus his seed, may be justified in like manner—"which it could not be," says Whitby, "were circumcision the condition of justification."

12. *And the father*—And that he might be a father of circumcision. The reception of the Gentiles into the family of Abraham does not involve the rejection of his natural descendants, if they imitate his faith. *To them*—To those who are not only of circumcision, but who also walk in the steps of the faith of our father Abraham, in uncircumcision. The word "walk" expresses an orderly movement, like one who closely marks the footsteps of another to tread in them. W. and W. say, "The article [before *stoucousi*, "walk"] gives greater effect to their position and designation as actors." Abraham's faith is represented as foot-prints; and indeed he walked by faith from the time when he left Haran till he offered Isaac—nay, till his death. Hence he is appropriately called the father of believers, both Jews and Gentiles. Cf. Gal. iii., where the reference to baptism in connection with this subject is suggestive. Terrott: "By asserting that circumcision was a seal of spiritual blessings, the apostle invalidates the principal arguments which have been brought against infant baptism." Baptism, like circumcision, is

a sign and seal of the covenant; but it no more justifies than did circumcision; like that, too, it symbolizes spiritual regeneration, but does not constitute it, or effect it, though, like it, it is a means of grace. (See on ii. 28, 29.)

13. *For*—In corroboration of the foregoing statement, that believing Gentiles, as well as Jews, are counted as Abraham's seed. The order of the Greek should be preserved: For not through law was the promise to Abraham and his seed, that he should be the inheritor of a world, but through righteousness of faith. There is no promise, in so many words, that Abraham "should be the heir of the world;" nor does there seem to be any reference to the promise of the land of Canaan to Abraham and his seed. Gen. xiii. 14-17; xv. 18-21. *Kosmos* is not the same as Heb. *erets*, rendered *gh* in the LXX. of Genesis—*i.e.*, the land of Canaan. Nor does it mean the spiritual or heavenly Canaan. But the promise is that the spiritual seed of Abraham shall inherit all nations—not merely those of Canaan—not that "country" (*patria*, Heb. xi. 14, 15), but *a world*; hence it is anarthrous. Cf. Gen. xxii. 18; Matt. viii. 11; Gal. iii. 6-9. *Ki hronomov* means inheritor, or possessor; so the Heb. *yarash*, to possess, Gen. xv. 7. The rabbins say, "The proselyte presents his firstlings, and confesses his faith in one God, as it stands written of Abraham, 'I have made thee a father of many nations: lo, he is the father of all the earth.'" "Our father Abraham possesses the world which now is, and that which is to come, by faith alone." Not through law—obedience to legal enactments (so not through circumcision)—but through righteousness of faith—"the promiser," say W. and W., "treating and rewarding as righteous him who believes the promise."

14, 15. *For if they which are of the law*—They who are of law are those who depend on legal works for justification. This is a *reductio ad absurdum*. The meaning is: If the inheritance accrues by a legal title, then the faith of which he has spoken is useless, and the promise is nullified; because, as has been already proved, the condition has not been fulfilled: law has been broken, and the reward forfeited. For law causes—is the occasion, of wrath—there must be an expression of divine justice when law is violated; if the precept is broken, the penalty must be enforced, and that entails forfeiture of the promise. Lange inserts the article before "law," but says it does not refer exclusively to the Mosaic law, but with the idea of the legal stand-point—"the natural moral law too worketh wrath." *For where no law is*,—Some of the best MSS., followed by Alford and others, have *de* "but," instead of *gas*, "for." The sense then may be: But where there is no law, on the observance of which the promise depends, there is of course no transgression working the forfeiture of the promise. This keeps us out of the labyrinth in which many Fathers, schoolmen, and commentators, have been lost.

16. *Therefore it is of faith*,—It depends on faith, not on works of law, in order that, being of grace, it may be sure to all the believing posterity of Abraham. *Not*

to that only which is of the law,—The article is used before "law," not perhaps to designate the law of Moses, but in reference to law as spoken of in the preceding verses: there is no article before "faith" in the next clause, as it is defined by "Abraham." "The contrast," as Olshausen says, "is not, therefore, between Jews and Gentiles, but only between men seeking to establish a righteousness by the law"—by legal obedience of any kind—"and believers, whether among Jews or Gentiles." No one would be sure of the promise if it depended on his own works; every believer is sure of it through grace.

17. *As it is written*,—The quotation is *verbatim* from Gen. xvii. 5. *I have made*—**Tiqhmi**, to set, like Heb. *nathan*, to give, means here, to constitute. *Before him*—This is joined to ver. 16; what comes between is parenthetical. In the sight of God—in his judgment. Tholuck: "With respect to the construction, it will be found necessary to suppose an attraction and rhetorical transposition, which must be resolved into 'before God in whom he believed.'" He refers to Winer, who admits the construction, but says the passage may be explained more simply, as also Alford—repeating **katenanti**—"before God in whose sight he believed." Tholuck: "It is at once most agreeable to the language and meaning to take *katenanti* here in the sense, 'according to the judgment or design of God,' as in the Heb., 'in my eyes.' So Origen, Cocceius, Bausobre, De Wette. The purpose of appending the clause, unquestionably, was to intimate that God already foresaw the many that were one day to follow Abraham upon the path of believing submission, and thereby be numbered among his people." *Who quickeneth the dead*,—A phrase descriptive of God's omnipotence, as 1 Tim. vi. 13, applied to the case in hand—the deadness of Abraham and Sarah, as to procreation—ver. 19. *And calleth those things*—God speaks of things not existing as though they were, as they exist in his prescience—another general predicate of God, applied to the case in hand—the numerous seed of Abraham spoken of as existing, when Isaac, through whom they were to come, was not born, nor likely to be. Acts vii. 5; Rom. ix. 7.

18. *Who against hope*—Bengel: "He believed in the hope of the promise against the hope of reason: **para** >against, and **epi** >in, the contrasted particles, produce a striking *oxymoron*." Chrysostom: "It was against man's hope, in hope which is of God." *That he might become*—In order to his becoming: his faith had respect to his spiritual progeny. The quotation is literally from Gen. xv. 5, LXX., where the reference is to the stars, which were shining when Abram received the promise. Cf. Ps. cxlvii. 4.

19-22. *And being not weak in faith*,—And not becoming weak in the faith which he had reposed in God's promise, though many years had elapsed since it was given, and he and his wife were long past the period of procreation: but, on the contrary, his faith ignored all natural impossibilities, and fastened upon the

promise of God. Sarah laughed with incredulity (Gen. xviii. 9-15); Abraham laughed with wonder and joy, as the expression of his faith; therefore also, for this reason, as well as for the promptness of his faith, as first exercised (Gen. xii.; xv.), it was reckoned to him for righteousness (Gen. xvii.); and it was then that he received the sign of circumcision, "a seal of the righteousness of the faith which he had being yet uncircumcised." God was glorified by Abraham's faith, as it illustrated his power and faithfulness.

Faith, mighty faith, the promise sees,
And looks to that alone;
Laughs at impossibilities,
And cries, It shall be done!

Abraham's faith seems to have been constantly increasing from the time when it induced him to leave Haran to the time when it culminated in the offering of Isaac, and it is eulogized accordingly in Heb. xi. 8-19—where there is an echo of the passage before us. There is a similar reference to the advanced age of Abraham and Sarah, as being past the period of procreation—the same word, "dead," being used not elsewhere in that form. As Sarah's faith is there mentioned, it is likely she overcame her incredulity by noting Abraham's faith. The peculiar manner in which this remarkable phenomenon is stated might lead to the inference that the virility miraculously restored to Abraham remained, so that he became the father of other children after Sarah's death. The case was the more striking in that Sarah never produced but the one child—Isaac alone being the child of promise. Hence the difference between the treatment of Isaac and Abraham's other children. Gen. xxi. 10; xxv. 5, 6; cf. Gal. iv. 30. The received text, "considered not," means he paid no attention to these natural obstacles. But some good MSS. and versions omit **ouj** ("not"), yielding this sense: Though he attentively considered these obstacles, yet his faith rose above them. But there is no **mev** ("though") after "considered," to correspond with **de** "but," ver. 20), which means, "neither was he doubtful," etc.

23. *Now it was not written*—The aorist, as in Rom. xv. 4; 1 Cor. x. 11—not the perfect, as common—as it refers more particularly to the design of the Holy Spirit when the language was penned. *For his sake alone*,—On his account—for his personal honor.

24. *But for us also*,—The same preposition (**dia**)—on our account, for our advantage—that we may imitate his faith, and share his blessing. *If we believe*—Tyndale, Cranmer, Geneva, "so we believe;" Rheims, "believing;" Tomson, "which believe." It is literally, "to those believing:" it defines "us also" in the preceding clause. *On him that raised*—This periphrasis is pertinent and expressive. The resurrection of Christ is set forth as a prodigy of divine power (Eph. i. 19, 20). Alford: "The central fact in our redemption, as the procreation of the seed of promise, was in the performance of the promise to Abraham (see ch.

i. 4; 1 Cor. xv. 14, ff.), and resembling it, in the making alive the dead—ver. 17." *From the dead*,—The original is anarthrous, as usual, either because of the preposition (εκ—Middleton on Greek Article, vi. 1), or because of usage, in the case of particular substantives—this being one specified by Winer. Rotherham: "From among [the] dead." (See on Rom i. 4.)

25. *Who was delivered*—*Paradidomi* is frequently rendered "betray," as Matt. x. 4; xvii. 22; xxvi. 21, where the betrayal of Jesus by Judas is predicted. Here it refers to God's giving over his Son "to death"—as it is expressed in Geneva and Tomson. Cf. Rom. viii. 32; and Gal. ii. 20; v. 5, 25, where the same word is used of Christ's giving himself for us. *For*—*Dia*, on account of. *Our offences*,—So *paraptwma* is rendered in six other places in Romans. In Matt. vi. 14, 15; xviii. 35; 2 Cor. v. 19; Eph. ii. 1; Col. ii. 13, it is "trespass." In Rom. xi. 11, 12, "fall;" Gal. vi. 1; James v. 16, "fault;" Eph. i. 7; ii. 5; Col. ii. 13, "sin." It literally means a falling aside;" "trespass" nearly expresses the idea, as that is *transpass*—a passing beyond the line of duty. *Raised*—As in ver. 24. *For*—On account of—*dia*, as in the former clause. Paul is fond of such repetitions, as in ver. 23, 24. Christ was delivered on account of our offenses—that is, to die as a peculiar sacrifice for them; and he was raised from the dead on account of our justification—that is, that we might obtain justification—the pardon purchased by his death. This distinction is not to be pressed, as sometimes we are said to be justified by the death, or blood, or sacrifice, of Christ. Rom. iii. 24, 25, 26; v. 9, 10, 19; while our deliverance from sin is attributed to his resurrection, 1 Cor. xv. 17. The death of Christ, for our redemption, postulates his resurrection; and his resurrection implies his sacrificial death—neither would be available without the other. *Justification*.—Not *dikaiosunē*, previously used, but *dikaiwsiv*, which occurs once more in N.T. (Rom. v. 18). Robinson: "The act of declaring righteous." Bengel: "A verbal noun differing from *dikaiosunē*, righteousness."

CHAPTER V.

1 *Being justified by faith, we have peace with God, 2 and joy in our hope, 8 that since we were reconciled by his blood, when we were enemies, 10 we shall much more be saved being reconciled. 12 As sin and death came by Adam, 17 so much more righteousness and life by Jesus Christ. 20 Where sin abounded, grace did superabound.*

V.—1. *Therefore*—This connects with the foregoing, from which it ought not to have been divided. As we are justified by faith, not by law, we may have peace with God; and as through Christ we have access into this grace, we may exult in hope of the glory of God. This construction assumes the genuineness of the various reading εἰς ἡμᾶς for εἰς ἡμᾶς—the subjunctive instead of the indicative.

Tholuck says, "The external evidences for both readings are nearly equiponderant; the internal speak decidedly for the indicative." Dr. Hodge echoes the statement about their being "nearly equally divided," without perhaps paying attention to the facts. That is more summary than satisfactory. Alford, who had examined the subject more thoroughly, says, "It is impossible to resist the strong MS. authority" for the subjunctive. All the ancient uncial MSS. (except one or two), many of the cursives, the principal Greek and Latin Fathers, the Peshito, Coptic, and Latin, and other ancient versions, have the subjunctive. The first appearance of the indicative is in a correction in the Codex Sin., which cannot be traced higher than the sixth century—unless a similar correction in the Vatican may have been made before that, and have been copied into it, as the Codex Sin. largely follows the Vatican. The indicative is found in F, and in most of the cursives of a later date. The London (Wesleyan) *Review* for April, 1878; adopts the subjunctive, and contends that the passage means, "Let us, then, justified by faith, have peace with God;" or, "Let us, then, be justified by faith, and thus have peace with God." Alford says, "The diplomatic authority compels us to adopt a reading against which our subjective feelings rebel." His note is unsatisfactory, self-contradictory. In his sixth edition he allows that it may be nothing but an *itacism*, as many of the old MSS. confound long and short *o*. Bloomfield is satisfied with this, but others are not. The solution of Tregelles and others, that it means "we ought to have"—which they call the deliberative sense—is objected to by Alford, who says it is hortatory: "Let us have peace." As the language is rhetorical, it may be construed as a kind of Epicism, or in the concessive sense—*q.d.*: Seeing that we are justified by faith, we may have peace with God—which we could not have if justification were by works, as in these we have all failed, and are all under condemnation. The word rendered "rejoice," in both cases, is *καυχωμεθα*, which is both indicative and subjunctive, and so may be rendered like the other, we may rejoice, or exult, in hope of the glory of God, as we are introduced through Christ, by faith, into the divine favor. That is rendered possible now, which otherwise would be impossible. Thus, without indorsing Alford's ambiguous note, his conclusion may be received: "The whole passage is declaratory of the consequences flowing from justification by faith, and does not exhort, but assert." That what is asserted as possible is recognized as actual in the case of the apostle and other believers, is true; but that does not weaken, but rather strengthen, this interpretation. It is certainly attainable by this process, if some have thus attained it. Dr. Schaff says: "The concessive sense—*we may have, it is our privilege to have*—would give excellent sense. But such a use of the Greek subjunctive, approaching the meaning of the future, though easily derived from the general principle that the subjunctive mood signifies what is *objectively possible*, as the indicative what is *actual*, and the optative what is *desirable, or subjectively possible*, is somewhat doubtful, and not mentioned by Winer (p. 268, 7th ed.), who, in independent sentences, admits only the *conjunctivus adhortativus*, and the

conjunctivus deliberativus; comp. Kuhner and Jelf." But Jelf says: "The conjunctive expressing something future, the realization of which is expected from the present position of circumstances, differs from the future only in that the latter does not express the future action as merely something which we have reason to expect, but as (by anticipation) something certain. The affinity between these two expressions is clear—the future, in reality, depends on a supposition as well as the conjunctive. This use of the conjunctive in positive sentences occurs only in Epic writers, but in negative sentences it is found, though but rarely, in Attic Greek." Kuhner is to the same effect. The hortatory sense seems inadmissible; but Alford's objection, borrowed from Olshausen, has no weight: "How can a man be exhorted to *have* peace with God?" Very well: it implies the performance of the conditions on which it is bestowed, to which any one may be exhorted. A man may be exhorted to get a throne in heaven, though it depends on the grace of God. The truth is, the concessive sense, in this case, hardly differs from the deliberative: If we are justified by faith, then we may have peace with God. Chrysostom: "Let us have peace—that is, let us sin no more, nor go back to our former state; for this is making war with God." *Peace with God*,—Not "toward God," but "in regard of God." It is the opposite of enmity, and consists in the removal of God's wrath—he is reconciled to us, and we are reconciled to him, as a result of justification by faith.

2. *By whom also we have access*—Through whom also we have had the access—we have been introduced into the state of acceptance with God, or divine favor; we can have audience with the King on his throne. Heb. iv. 16; x. 11, 19, 20, 21, 22; cf. Rom. iv. 25: we have "peace" by his death; "access," by his life of mediation in heaven. Lange says: "The usage, at bottom, is plainly not that of a worldly audience with an Eastern king, but the type of the entrance of the high-priest into the holy of holies. See 1 Pet. iii. 18; Heb. x. 19. The glory of God has reference to the Shekinah." But both meanings coalesce. The holy of holies was the special residence of the Great King, seated on his throne of grace. Through Christ we are introduced, and have constant (not merely annual) access to his gracious presence. *By faith*—By the faith—the same as in justification, as the one follows the other. It expresses the instrumentality. It is omitted in B, D, F, but found in all the rest, Syr., Vulg., and many Fathers. *Into this grace*—This state of favor—of acceptance with God. *Wherein we stand*,—In which we abide. 1 Cor. xv. 1; 2 Cor. i. 24. *Rejoice*—Exult—better than rejoice, glory, boast, or triumph, as variously rendered. Thus C. Wesley:

Exults for joy our rising soul,
Disburdened of her load,
And swells unutterably full
Of glory and of God.

In hope—Lit., "on hope." The exultation is grounded on the hope of that dignity and bliss which God will bestow on us in heaven. 1 Pet. v. 10; cf. John xvii. 24. The Vulg., "glory of the children of God," is considered by Meyer a "good periphrase." Admitting that it is "a genitive of possession," we exult in hope of it, as we are to share it. John xvii. 1, 4, 5, 22, 24; Rom. viii. 17; Jude 24, 25. To behold his glory is to share it—as Moses did. Ex. xxxiv. 30; cf. 1 John iii. 2; Matt. v. 8.

3. *And not only so*,—A Pauline expression—ver. 11, *et al.* *But we glory in tribulations also*;—We may exult also in the trials of life. Their enemies, who subjected them to many of those afflictions, reproached them with them: Of what avail is your religion, if it involves you in so many afflictions? The answer is, We exult in them, as well as in the prospect of our reward. The article implies that the tribulations were well known and present to the mind. They were a special stumbling-block to the Jews, who thought that all God's people would enjoy prosperity under the reign of the Messiah. The believers exulted in their tribulations—not, of course, in themselves considered, but on the account of the effects they produced—these constitute the ground of exultation—not "amidst," as some construe—as follows. *Knowing*—Because we know that the tribulation—put in the singular, perhaps, because all the items in this noble climax are in the singular. *Worketh*—Works out—produces. *Patience*;—As all the items specified are subjective and internal, it is not necessary to substitute "constancy," "endurance;" the idea of perseverance is comprehended in patience, which embraces "suffering ill and doing well;" but here the former is specially meant. Bengel: "In believers; for in unbelievers the result is rather impatience and apostasy. Patience is not learned without adversity: it characterizes a mind not only prompt, but also strong to endure."

4. *And patience*,—And the patience. *Experience*;—This seems as good a rendering as any; all the old translations have it, except Wycliffe ("proving") and Rheims, "probation" (from Vulg. *probationem*), which perhaps means experience. Luther, Melancthon, Beza, Grotius, and others, so render. Some have "approval," "confirmedness," "genuineness," etc. It is objected to "experience" that "it implies simply that just estimate of our real state which the self-examination induced by affliction enables us to form; that it has nothing to do with the doctrine of *inward experience*, is manifest from the fact that, so far from authorizing an arrogant confidence, it only *worketh hope*; and that this hope will not be disappointed, depends upon the proper use of those *means of grace* which the love of God has given us." Such reasoning tends to establish the rendering of A.V. Who ever dreamed of such an Antinomian figment, misnamed *experience*? Experience, as used by Paul, is very nearly like that defined by Webster: "Practical acquaintance with any matter by personal observation, or trial of it, or by feeling its effects, by living through it, or the like." Wherein does that differ from "that just estimate of

our real state, which the self-examination induced by affliction enables us to form?" Bengel: "It will be difficult to find any one using *dokimh*>before Paul—*dokimh*>is the quality of that man who is *dokimov*"—"who has been proved by various casualties and perils." Is there no confidence but "an arrogant confidence?" Is there any religion without experience and confidence? The patient endurance of affliction does indeed give "proof" to others that we are followers of Christ, and so secures the "approval" of God—as Macknight: "Proof of God's assistance, and of our own steadfastness, or approbation bestowed by God," as he renders it; but Paul seems to use the word in a subjective sense, expressing the result of the tribulation on those who patiently endure it. *And experience*,—And the experience—viz., that thus gained—of the power of grace to support us in our trials. This is indeed a ground of exultation, as it cannot fail to produce a hope of the reward in heaven promised to all who thus "endure afflictions." Matt. v. 10-12; Acts v. 41; xiv. 21; xx. 23, 24; Heb. vi. 10, 11, 12; xii. 1, 2, 3; 1 Pet. i. 6-9; iv. 12-19; Rev. ii. 10; vii. 13-17.

5. *And hope*—And the hope—that thus produced. *Maketh not ashamed*:—Robinson: "From the Heb. by metonymy of cause for effect, to bring to naught one's hope, to disappoint." Rom. ix. 33; x. 11; 1 Pet. ii. 6; cf. Isa. xxviii. 16, LXX.; Eccclus. ii. 10. Hope is the expectation of future good, and as good is desirable, it embodies desire. One may well be ashamed of expecting that for which we have no good ground of expectation, or to desire that which is not desirable. But the hope of the believer is based on the perfections, promises, and performances, of God, of which he has experience.

His love in time past forbids me to think,
He'll leave me at last in trouble to sink:
Each sweet Ebenezer I have in review
Confirms his good pleasure to help me quite through.

Then its object elicits and justifies the most intense desire, as it comprehends "the resurrection of the dead, and the life of the world to come." It is thus a "good hope, through grace," "given us" by God through Christ. 2 Thess. ii. 16, 17. Paul may have had his eye on Ps. cxix. 116, LXX., "Uphold me, according to thy word, and quicken me; and let me not be ashamed from my expectation." The Heb. *sabar* means to wait for, to expect, to hope, as in Ps. cxix. 166; and so our translators here render the noun; cf. Ps. cxlvi. 5, 6, where the same word is used. *Because the love of God*—God's love to us. There is a good note in Tomson's Beza: "Wherewith he loveth us:" "The ground of hope is an assumed testimony of the conscience by the gift of the Holy Ghost, that we are beloved of God, and this is nothing else but that which we call faith, whereof it followeth that through faith our consciences are quieted." Theodoret, Augustin, Pelagius, Anselm, Bernard, and Romish and Rationalist divines generally, make it our love to God.

But Origen, Chrysostom, Luther, Calvin, Bengel, Tholuck, Meyer, Lange, and other Germans, Alford, Stuart, and English and American critics generally, consider it God's love to us, as that is a surer basis for our hope than our love to him. However, it is not simply "God's love," but it is God's love as experienced by us, which invariably calls forth a responsive affection: "We love him because he first loved us" (1 John iv. 19). Olshausen expounds it in nearly the same way. Thus the witness of the Holy Spirit, and the witness of our own spirit, blend into each other, and are inseparable. Rom. viii. 16. *Is shed abroad*—Has been poured out. The word is the same as that used to describe the pentecostal effusion (Acts ii. 17, 18, 33); so Tit. iii. 6: "Shed on us abundantly"—poured out on us copiously—as a stream which descends and overflows, and spreads out in all directions. *In our hearts*—This is the locality where the effusion takes place. But "heart" here is not to be restricted to the seat of the affections; it rather, as is usual in Scripture, takes in the whole inward man—intellect and will, as well as sensibility. The intellect cognizes the love of God, the affections are excited by it, and the will joyfully accepts it, and reciprocal affection immediately takes place. *By the Holy Ghost*—By means of the Holy Spirit, who was given to us. All that is done in us in the work of salvation is by the agency of the Holy Spirit. The aorist seems to refer to some past impartation. Olshausen, Alford, and others, refer it to the pentecostal effusion of the Spirit. Schaff says: "This could not apply to Paul, who was called afterward; hence it must be referred to the time of regeneration, when the pentecostal fact is repeated in the individual." But the Holy Spirit was given to the Church as a corporate body, for all time, at the pentecostal inauguration. There was, indeed, a repetition of the baptism of the Spirit when subsequently he was poured out on new believers, whether Jews, Samaritans, or Gentiles. Acts viii.; x.; xix. But the Holy Spirit was given (aorist) as to individuals when they first believed (Eph. i. 13, 14), and the love of God has been and is shed abroad (perfect) in their hearts. The gift was at a certain time; the effusion is continuous—not miraculous gifts, as at pentecost, but God's love. Wesley: "The divine conviction of God's love to us, and that love to God which is both the earnest and beginning of heaven." Conybeare and Howson think those are mistaken "who will never allow St. Paul to use the aorist in a perfect sense." They render, "who has been given unto us"—thus confounding the nice distinction of the apostle.

6. *For*—The MSS. and versions greatly vary. The received text with A, C, D, K, Sin., and the principal cursives, Syr., and principal Fathers, have **eji** ("yet") at the beginning of the verse; and some, as A, B, C, D, F, G, Sin., Latin versions, have **eji** after **ajsqenwn** ("without strength"). Olshausen says: "Griesbach has even admitted this reading into the text; but it was soon rejected by Knapp, and, in fact, it appears only to have been adopted from those MSS. which had erased it at the beginning of the verse, and were determined by the parallel passage in

ver. 8. If we retain the double *eji*, we must explain the repetition by the strong feeling under which St. Paul wrote, just as in vii. 21." Retain it, then—especially as it is a mistake that the second was in those MSS. alone which had erased the first. The Vatican alone has *ei]ge*, which Alford adopts and renders, "If, that is." The Vulg., followed, of course, by Wycliffe and Rheims, has *Ut quid enim*, "For why did." Winer accounts for the location of the first *eti*, because the writer expected the intelligent reader to put it where the sense requires. Lange says the twofold *eti* has a good meaning as emphasis; and in regard to the first, Olshausen says, "On account of the emphasis which this particle gives, the ardent soul of the apostle could not pronounce it too soon." Paul certainly wanted to emphasize the love of God in Christ, in that while we were yet without spiritual strength—"no health (saving power) in us"—utterly debilitated by sin—no method of human origination, how long soever tried, having helped us in the least—yet at the proper time—the time designated in the divine counsels, and predicted by the inspired prophets—the proper time, therefore, in the history of the world, Christ died for the ungodly—the same who were without strength—whose debility was occasioned by their impiety, "while we were yet sinners" (ver. 8), "when we were enemies" (ver. 10). Mark i. 15; Rom. xvi. 25; Gal. iv. 4; Eph. i. 10; 1 Tim. ii. 6; Tit. i. 3. Human reason cannot point out a more appropriate time (or place) for the sacrifice of Christ than that in which it occurred. *For the ungodly*.—The love of Christ is thus more fully expressed than if Paul had said simply "for us." The word *υπερ* means for the good of, in behalf of; but then it was in behalf of sinners, because it was in their stead, as appears from ver. 7, 8; cf. John xiii. 37, 38; xviii. 14; Rom. xvi. 4; 2 Cor. v. 20, 21; Philemon 13, where *υπερ*=*ajti* in place of. W. and W. beautifully illustrate the reasoning: "In behalf of, in favor of. The original meaning is *over*, or *above*—Lat., *super*. As if a bird hovering over her young warded off a blow from them, and bare it herself; if by this act she rescued them from destruction at the sacrifice of her own life, we see how the thought of dying *over* them is merged in the greater of dying instead of them. Thus a shield suggests the thought of being over that which it protects, and of receiving the blow *instead* of that which it defends." The substitutional sense of *υπερ* occurs frequently in the classics.

7. *For scarcely*—Indeed, instead of dying for the ungodly, no one will hardly die for a righteous man; for the good man possibly some one might dare to die. This is not so much an exception as an extension of the thought. It cannot be expected that any one would offer to die in the place of one who is merely just, to whom no one is under obligation; indeed, for the good man—one who is recognized as a benefactor (hence the article)—it is only a bare possibility that any one might venture to die. Wesley: "Perhaps—one—would—even—dare to die. Every word increases the strangeness of the thing, and declares even this to be something great and unusual."

8. *But God*—Alford ought not to have omitted *Qeov* on the authority of the Vatican. Some may have thought "Christ" should be here, not "God;" but cf. John iii. 16; 1 John iv. 9, 10. It must be borne in mind that the love of Christ is comprehended in the love of God. 1 John iii. 16. *Commendeth*—Evinces, demonstrates. *His love*—His own love: the pronoun is emphatic, and sets forth God's love in contrast with man's love. *While we were yet sinners*,—Wesley: "So far from being *good*, that we were not even *just*." As sinners, "enemies" (ver. 10).

9. *Much more then*,—It is an argument *a fortiori*. If he died for us when we were enemies, surely he will secure us from the wrath threatened against sinners (i. 18; ii. 9), now we have become friends. Our justification is here attributed to his blood, as in iv. 25 to his resurrection; the one involves the other. *Blood*,—This stands for death, as it also stands for life. The shedding of blood is the sacrifice of life. It is used because of the sacrificial idea. Matt. xxvi. 28; Eph. i. 7; ii. 13; Col. i. 20; 1 John i. 7; 1 Pet. i. 18, 19; Rev. i. 5. No importance is to be attached to blood, as a physical substance; it is the exponent of a sacrificial death. The halter, or the hemlock, or any other mode of death, would have answered as well as the cross—without any shedding of blood. *Wrath*—The wrath of God threatened against sinners. There is wrath, as well as love, in God: the former is the holy repugnance of the divine character to sin, as the latter is pure affection toward the good, or pity for the bad. To be saved from the wrath of God is to be delivered from the effects of it. 1 Thess. i. 10.

10. *For*—This denotes an expansion of the previous thought. *If when we were enemies*,—The strongest term that could be used. Hated by God, because hateful to him, as Rom. xi. 28, where the word is the antithesis of "beloved." (See on i. 30.) Alford says, "Those unborn at the death of Christ could not have been *εχθροι* > in the active sense." But every child of man has in him the seeds of enmity to God, which never fail to germinate when there is occasion, except as antagonized by the grace of Christ. The enmity is mutual, as is the reconciliation. But first God is reconciled to us by the death of his Son; then we are reconciled to God by accepting the conditions of peace which he proposes. Then, *a fortiori*, being at peace with God through our Lord Jesus Christ, surely we shall be saved by his life of intercession for us in heaven. John xiv. 19; Rom. viii. 34. Not that he can do more for us simply by his exaltation—though, in a sense, that is true (John vii. 39; Matt. xxviii. 19)—but we are subjectively in a more hopeful condition, better disposed to receive his aid, and better prepared to profit by it. *By his life*.—Schaff: "In—in vital union with his life—in antithesis to *διὰ* > through, by means of his death." But *εἰ* (no matter what is said to the contrary), here and elsewhere (*e.g.*, Acts xi. 14), has an instrumental force. So Alford: "We shall be saved by means of his life"—though he errs in referring it to "the fact of his life" on earth.

11. *And not only so*,—An echo of ver. 3; there we exult in tribulations, as well as in hope of the glory of God; here we are exulting in God—not only at peace with him, not only shall be saved by him from future wrath, but we are exulting in him from whom all these blessings flow. *We have now received the atonement*.—Accepted the terms of reconciliation, and are thus reconciled. Etymologically, the word atonement expresses the sense of *katal l agh* but it has obtained a technical meaning in theology—viz., the satisfaction made to the divine perfections by the mediation of Christ, from which results the reconciliation of God to man, and of man to God. *Katal l agh* occurs four times in N.T., and is always rendered "reconciliation," or "reconciling," except here, and it should be here also. Rom. xi. 15; 2 Cor. v. 18, 19. The cognate verb is so rendered twice in ver. 10; so in 1 Cor. vii. 11; 2 Cor. v. 18, 19, 20. In every instance, except one or two, it refers to making peace with God through Christ.

12. *Wherefore*—This does not appear to be illative, but it notes a farther development of the argument—showing that Christianity was not to be restricted to Jews, but to extend to all men, as all men are involved in the original prevarication. The construction of this section has greatly perplexed the critics. It is asked, Where is the *apodosis*, or other member of the comparison? Erasmus and Beza make the *apodosis* begin with *kai <di a>* "and death through sin." Clericus, Wolf, Wesley, and others, begin at *kai <ou fww>*, "and so," which they render "even so," which the words will not bear. Both those methods lose sight of the comparison between Adam and Christ. Calvin, Meyer, and others, suggest an *epanorthosis*—the apostle being carried away by the thought in ver. 13, 14, and so put for the *apodosis*, "who is a type of the future Adam." Origen, Tholuck, and others, suppose an *anantapodoton*, or intentional *anacoluthon* (Schaff)—a *protasis* without an *apodosis*. But even Schaff says the apostle "brings out the double parallel of similarity and dissimilarity in full, as a conclusion, ver. 18, 19, 21." Macknight, Cocceius, Elsner, Alford, Conybeare and Howson, derive the other member of the comparison from ver. 11. Macknight says: "I think this verse should not be separated from the 11th by a full point, but by a comma, so as to be read in this manner: 'Our Lord Jesus Christ; by whom we have received the reconciliation, for this reason, as though by one man sin entered,'" etc. Alford refers to Matt. xxv. 14 for this use of *w s per* "as." All these and some other methods seem forced. Luther, Melancthon, Bengel, Stuart, Hodge, Whedon, and the generality of critics, indorse the method of A.V., putting ver. 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, in a parenthesis, and finding the conclusion, or *apodosis*, in ver. 18. Meyer objects the length and importance of the parenthesis; but that is eminently Pauline. He says, too, ver. 18 is not so much a re-assumption as a recapitulation. It may be admitted that the *apodosis* might have been differently worded if there had been no intervening parenthesis or digression, which it keeps in view; but it is a re-assumption, as well as a recapitulation: the *protasis* is repeated because of the

interruption. "Accordingly, then, as by one act of transgression," etc. W. and W.: "The apostle completes the comparison commenced at ver. 12, and sums up the argument." *As by one man*—The sin of Eve is not taken into account in this connection, as in 2 Cor. xi. 3; 1 Tim. ii. 14, because the command was given to Adam, who was the head of Eve and of all his posterity: if he had not yielded to her solicitations, she would have been disposed of, and another wife provided for Adam. Satan is not mentioned, as he could not have brought sin into the world of mankind, if man had not yielded to his temptation. Tholuck cites many passages from the rabbins affirming the teaching of this passage; but they borrowed it, probably, from the N.T.—other rabbins advance opposite views—there being orthodox and heterodox parties among Jews as well as among Christians. The Pauline view was derived directly from Gen. iii.; cf. Eccl. vii. 29; Wis. ii. 24. The entire species descends from Adam, and he transmits his nature to all his posterity. Ben Sirach says, "Of the woman came the beginning of sin, and through her we all die." Ecclus. xxv. 24. But she was the *occasion*, the man was the *cause*, of the evil which has come upon the species of which he was the head. It is vain to speculate as to what would have been the fate of Eve if Adam had not yielded to her solicitation, or what would have been her fate if Adam had fallen and she remained upright. Paul considers Adam the head of the species, viewed as a solidarity, though without impinging on personal individual freedom and responsibility. *Sin entered into the world*,—Not *the* sin, though it has the article; nor *a* sin, as if it referred to "the offense"—that was the way in which sin entered—by the "fall" of Adam; hence the distinction between "offense" and "sin." It is rightly rendered "sin"—referring to the principle of moral evil. It is personified, as in James i. 15: "When lust hath conceived, it bringeth forth sin; and sin, when it is finished, bringeth forth death." Sin came to our earth when Satan came hither to tempt the woman: it entered into it (ei jht-qe) when Eve yielded to the tempter; but it entered into the world, viewed as a human solidarity, when Adam fell. Hence follow original sin, or natural depravity ("birth-sin"); sinfulness—the sin that dwelleth in us; actual sin—that which is wrought by us in the development of the superinduced principle of evil. *And so death passed upon all men*,—Death is here personified: like a conqueror, he marches through the generations of men, constituting the world into which sin entered to prepare his way. Ver. 14 shows that physical death is meant; cf. 1 Cor. xv. 21, 22; Gen. ii.; iii.; Wis. ii. 23, 24. Some argue that it cannot be temporal death, because man did not thus die in the day that he sinned; but he became mortal—*moribund*—which meets the case. It is hardly exegetical to say that "it embraces all physical and moral evil, as the penal consequences of sin" (Schaff). Sin itself is spiritual death; the "fall" caused a separation of the soul from God—that is spiritual death—the perpetuation of which is eternal death—the antithesis of eternal life, ver. 21. We may popularly speak of death, spiritual, temporal, and eternal, as the penalty of the law given to Adam; but mortality is

what the apostle here means. If Adam had not sinned, he would have had constant access to the tree of life, and immortality would have been secured to him and his innocent posterity in this or another state. *For that all have sinned*:—In that all sinned. The margin "in whom," follows the Vulg., *in quo*, adopted by Augustin and many Romanists, Lutherans, and Calvinists: it is incorrect. 'Ef jw has the sense of a conjunction. Winer: "*Wherefore, on which account*, Diod. S., 19, 98; and *because*, 2 Cor. v. 4; Rom. v. 12." Schaff: "*So far as, inasmuch as*—it is not so much a causal as a qualifying and conditioning conjunction, which shows more clearly the connection of death with sin. It implies that a moral participation of all men in the sin of Adam is the medium or cause of their death; just as faith on our part is the moral condition of our participation in Christ's life. It is unfavorable to the doctrine of a gratuitous imputation. The legal act of imputation is not arbitrary and unconditional, but rests on a moral ground and an objective reality." That sounds strange from a Calvinist! What is there in infants corresponding to faith, as "the moral condition of our participation in Christ's life"? Infants participate in Christ's life, without faith, or any moral quality or act of their own; so do they in the death superinduced by Adam's sin, though they are incapable of actual sin. Chrysostom: "But what means *for that all have sinned*? This: he having once fallen, even they who had not eaten of the tree did from him, all of them, become mortal." Lange: "In view of the death of innocent children, we may assume different degrees of guilt and death 'in proportion as,' or 'in that measure they all sinned.'" But he has already rendered it properly "on the ground that," "inasmuch as." Surely Paul did not mean to say infants die in a small degree—in proportion to their *guilt*! Augustin sends some infants to a mitigated hell; but when they die, their death is as complete as the death of adults. Robinson hesitates between "for that," "because," and "in that," "on condition that:" according to the latter, he says, "Paul here affirms the universal co-existence of sin and death, without making the sin of each individual to be the cause of his own death." But whether it is "for that," or "in that," it implies that none but sinners die; or, at least, that all who die are sinners. Infants die; they never personally sinned—where is the explanation? The passage is aoristic—not "all *have* sinned," but "all sinned," as in iii. 23. Macknight says, "Infants sinned in Adam, as their federal head, that is, are involved in the consequences of his sin." They certainly did not do any thing "in Adam" for which they are responsible, as they could not act when they did not exist; and "the consequences of sin" are not sin, but death—as here viewed. He would hardly say, They die because they die! Other Calvinists, and some so-called Arminians, embrace his opinion. Paul does not seem to have had in view any of the fine theological distinctions which have been multiplied by the critics. He says simply, "all die because all sinned"—taking the species as a whole, a solidarity—not a loose heap, like a sand-bank, but an organic whole: they are all sinners. That some die before they commit actual sin does not affect the proposition—all have a sinful nature, as all come from a sinful stock. In 2 Cor. v.

14, Paul says, "If one died for all, then all died"—that is, "all are dead"—which is the force of the aorist: so in this case, "all sinned"—that is, all are sinners—so all are mortal. Bloomfield says: "They are treated as sinners, are considered guilty in the sight of God—namely, on account of Adam's fall: thus the expression will be equivalent to 'constituted sinners,' ver. 19; and *εἰ/ ὡ* may be rendered "because." It is nowhere said that infants "are considered guilty in the sight of God"—they belong to a guilty race; but they are not punished for Adam's sin. In view of their organic connection with Adam, they are liable to die; but if they die before the commission of actual sin, they are more than indemnified by Christ.

The Second Adam shall restore
The ruins of the first.

If they live, they will develop the principle of sin, which is in their nature, though antagonized by the Spirit of life in Christ Jesus.

13, 14. *For*—Referring to ver. 12: "all died because all sinned." *Until the law*,—The Greek is anarthrous—until law, any law—in opposition to "no law," ver. 13. (See on ver. 20.) *Sin was in the world*:—Men were sinners before a law was promulgated, enforced by the penalty of death. But during that period there was no positive law, like that given to Adam. *Do this, or die*, and a similar legislation by Moses; yet all men died; but where there is no law there is no penalty: therefore this penalty of death must be that of the law which Adam broke; and as all his descendants share in the offense, so they do in the penalty—that is, as all are sinners, all are mortal; though during the period specified they violated no law which had the penalty of death. There is no particular reference to infants and idiots (Macknight and others), though they are comprehended. All died during the patriarchal age, though they did not transgress a positive law having the penalty of death. They were sinners; hence they were mortal, according to the law given to their primordial head. *Death reigned*—Personified as a king whose realm is universal—the only one known on earth. *After the similitude*—In a way similar to that of Adam—the violation of a positive precept, enforced by the death-penalty. *Who is the figure*—*Τύπον* (type) here means a representation—viz., as Adam was the source of sin and death to all men, so Christ is the source of righteousness and life. The resemblance is of a general character, the opposition being as striking as the agreement—which the apostle proceeds to show. This occasions the extension of the parenthesis. Cf. 1 Cor. xv. 21, 22, 45-49. *Him that was to come*.—The coming One, as he was looked for till his advent.

15. *For if through*—For if by the offense of the one, the many died. *Much more*—Quantitative, not logical—*q.d.*: Far more good comes to the world through Christ than evil through Adam, *The grace of God*,—The divine favor manifested to men in the redemption by Christ, who is the meritorious medium of its communication. He is styled *the one man*, as the antithesis of Adam, and as the

representative of our species in his human nature—"the Son of man." *Hath abounded unto many*.—Superabounded to the many—*oi + pol | oi pantev*, all mankind—used to mark more prominently the antithesis—"the many," opposed to "the one." It is not the perfect, but the aorist, superabounded. Christ not only redeemed all that fell through Adam's fall, but procured for them far greater blessings than they lost in Adam.

In him the tribes of Adam boast
More blessings than their father lost.

16. *And not*—This is called the second distinction—in kind—modal, as the former is quantitative. *As it was by*—And not as through one having sinned. Lange adopts the reading, "one transgression," which is favored by the absence of the article before *edov* ("one"), as Paul uses the article when *edov* refers to a person. But the received text has the better authority. The meaning is, that the sentence on Adam's sin differed from the gift by Christ: the former was occasioned by one offense, for which he was condemned—the latter inures to the acquittal of many offenses—not only the "offense" of Adam, but all the offenses of his posterity. *Justification*.—*Dikaiwma*, as opposed to *katakrima*, condemnation, means acquittal—justification. (See on ver. 18.)

17. *For*—For if by the offense of the one, death reigned through the one. This farther develops and concludes the parenthesis. The distinction here respects the evil produced by the one sinner, Adam, and the good produced by the One of whom he was the type, *Jesus Christ*—whose name is placed at the end of the sentence for the greater effect—"defining," says Meyer, "the unnamed but well-known One, as it were in triumph." *Much more*—Much more they who receive the superabundance of the grace, and of the gift of the righteousness, in life shall reign through the one, Jesus Christ. Lange and Alford say this is a logical conclusion—*a fortiori*; but they make it *quantitative* in ver. 15, as it is there a question of abounding, a matter of degree—in ver. 17 a matter of fact—*reigning*. "But the logical *plus* involves also a real *plus*," and *vice versa*. Thus the justified will reign in life more than the partakers of Adam's offense were reigned over by death. Thus "much more" has the same force here as in ver. 9, 10, 15. *Receive*—Not the aorist, as in ver. 11, but the present tense, expressing not one act only, but a continued process by which the superabundance is imparted. So Alford and others. As it is received by faith, there is a personal appropriation of the imparted blessings. Lange says: "Tholuck questions the right to make prominent, according to Thomas Aquinas, Grotius, Stier, and others, the element of subjective spontaneousness, here, where the 'whole weight falls on the divine work of grace.' But the apostle speaks of the self-active appropriation of the work of grace in the life of believers." How can "the reconciliation" be "received" but by faith? and is not the believer active in the exercise of faith, though it is "the

divine work of grace"? The superabundance of the grace is not, as Alford says, "the grace implanted and working in man," but the favor of God manifested through Christ, as in ver. 15. *The gift of righteousness* is that of which Paul is treating—justification by faith. It is not inherent righteousness—sanctification—of which he is not yet treating (see on chap. vi.), but it answers to the *dikaiwma* of ver. 16, which Meyer, Alford, and others, render "an absolatory sentence"—the effect of which is justification. *Shall reign in life*—Macknight well says: "They who receive the overflowing of grace shall have infinitely greater happiness in their new life than they had miseries and sorrows in the state into which they were brought through Adam's disobedience, expressed by 'the reigning of death,' in this verse and in ver. 14." The phrase expresses the highest state of happiness and honor. Rom. viii. 17; 2 Tim. ii. 12; Rev. ii. 10; iii. 21. Dr. Taylor says that if eternal punishment had been brought on all mankind by Adam's sin, the offense, with its consequences, would have been of the same extent with the gift of righteousness, and so the apostle could not have spoken of any surplusage of grace, and of the gift of righteousness, beyond the offense—whereas there is a great surplusage if the death threatened was merely temporal, as he holds. But it may have been eternal death to the original pair, and non-existence to their posterity, but for the redemption by Christ. Surely eternal life is a great surplusage over non-existence, as well as over the reign of death which obtains notwithstanding the redemption. The name of Jesus Christ closes the parenthesis, or episode, and brings the apostle back to his argument in ver. 12.

18. *Therefore*,—Hence, then. Meyer says, " *Ἄρα οὖν* is conclusive, 'accordingly, then;' it is of frequent use in Paul, and contrary to classical usage, at the beginning of the sentence." It is resumptive from ver. 12. The apostle briefly restates the *protasis*, because of the digression, ver. 13-17, and then states the *apodosis*. *As by the offence of one*—Theodoret, Theophylact, Bengel, Lange, and others, thus render *ἑνὸς*, as a masculine, as in ver. 15, 17, 19; but there it has the article—here it has not, as it has not in ver. 16, where it is obviously neuter—one offense being contrasted with many offenses: here it is contrasted with one *dikaiwma*, or righteous act. *Judgment*—Tholuck also supplies "judgment," and "the free gift" (in the next clause), which gives the sense. But many critics adopt Winer's simpler way: "We must supply *ἄπερ* impersonal; *res cessit*." W. and W.: "As by one act of transgression the result was to all men to condemnation, so by one righteous act, etc.—*i.e.*, all men were reached for condemnation, all men were reached for justification. *Dikaiwma* is here opposed to *paraptwma* (offense), as in ver. 16 to *katakrima* (condemnation). This *dikaiwma* is the decreed sacrifice, the accepted atonement, the act of God in Christ for man's deliverance and acquittal, that act which pronounced man justified, acquitted." Lange says: "Here, as in ver. 16, Meyer makes the *dikaiwma* to mean judgment of justification. It is simply the same everywhere. If it be said that Christ is our

righteousness, it is the same as saying that Christ is the personal medium of our justification." He renders *rechtfertigungsgut* (the good of justification), and says it is the medium of justification—*rechtfertigungsmittel*—which is in harmony with the form of the word. Were *dikaiwma* the real justification of mankind, *katakrima* would be its real condemnation, and that would be a contradiction. The *dikaiwma* is the presupposition of the *dikaiwsiv*. *Dikaiwma* occurs ten times in N.T.—rendered "ordinance," Luke i. 6; ix. 1, 10, plural; "judgment," Rom. i. 32; xv. 4; "righteousness," Rom. ii. 26; v. 18; viii. 4; Rev. xix. 8; "justification," Rom. v. 16. A careful examination of these passages will show the difficulty of finding one word by which to render it in every case: certainly, "the good of justification" will not do in several of these passages. Bengel says, "It may be called *justificamentum*, the ground and material of justification." *The free gift came upon all men*—It was to all men. Lange says, "The future *apobhsetai* supplied by Winer and Philippi in the *apodosis*, is sufficiently implied in *eij dikaiwsin zwhv*." Winer and Meyer prefer *apebh*, as in the former clause. *Unto justification of life*.—Lange refers this to the general judgment. Romanists interpret it of progressive justification—which is sanctification. Bengel: "That divine declaration by which the sinner, subject to death, has life awarded him, and that justly." Watson: "That act of God by which a sinner, under sentence of death, is adjudged to life." "As to infants, they are not, indeed, born justified and regenerate; but they are all born under the free gift, the effects of the righteousness of one, which extended to all men; and this free gift is bestowed on them *in order to* justification of life—the adjudging of the condemned to live." Augustin, Calvin, Tholuck, and others, agree substantially in this, the justification, whose result is life. In the case of those who die in infancy, the free gift results in eternal life, without the intermediate justification by faith.

19. *For*—Explanatory of ver. 18, drawing the argument to a close. *As by one man's disobedience*—As through the disobedience of the one man. As *parakoh* means to hear amiss, and so to neglect to hear, Bengel suggests that Adam was seduced through carelessness; as Chrysostom says, "Whence did man wish to disobey God? from heedlessness." *Many*—The many—all men: so expressed, perhaps, to give the idea of a multitude, a mass, as opposed to *the one*. (See on ver. 15.) *Were made sinners*,—Were constituted sinners. As all were in the loins of Adam when he sinned, and all are propagated from him, all partake of his fallen nature. Hence in every age and clime men have been sinners; there is no exception. "That which is born of the flesh is flesh" (John iii. 6). This is a restatement of ver. 12, in which the discussion began. Chrysostom and others say "sinners" here means "liable to punishment and condemned to death." But as this is without their personal fault, they are, or may be, indemnified in the future life. This is true, as far as it goes; but Paul goes deeper than that. *So by the obedience of one*—Of the one: *upakoh* the opposite of *parakoh* means to hear, to listen

with attention, and so to obey. Thus was it with Christ. Cf. Ps. xl. 6-8; Heb. x. 5-9. The context shows that it was his "obedience unto death" which is meant—called by divines his passive obedience. But his active obedience was necessary to precede his passive, and qualify him for it.

For he who can for sin atone
Must have no failings of his own.

The fiction of the imputation of Christ's active obedience to us for justification, once popular among a certain class of theologians, finds little support in these days. It is the tap-root of Antinomianism. Nothing is imputed to us which is not our own. The passive obedience of Christ inures to us, as it is the meritorious cause of our righteousness—we are justified by his blood, ver. 9. *Shall many*—Will the many. It is expressed in the future, as it looks forward to the last generation of men. *The many*, here, is as extensive as in the former clause—that is, *all*—so far as the design of God is concerned. The atonement was made for all—"every man"—"the world"—all who are sinners, and need it—that is, all the descendants of Adam. If any fail of the result, it is through their own fault. All who will be saved, will be saved through the atonement of Christ, including infants and others who never heard of him, provided they put no bar in the way of their salvation, corresponding to the unbelief for which those who were made acquainted with "the great salvation," and rejected it, "shall be damned." *Be made righteous*.—Constituted, as in the former clause. *Kaquisthmi* means to set down, to place. By Adam's disobedience all men were set down, placed in the condition of sinners; by Christ's obedience all men are placed in the condition of the righteous, subject to the requirement of faith, as previously set forth by the apostle. As *dikaiov* and its cognates refer to justification, or the pardon of sin, being reckoned as righteous on condition of faith in Christ, the apostle most probably means that in this place. However, as Paul had no distinctions of the kind in view, he might comprehend real as well as relative righteousness—as all who believe are made righteous by regeneration (as is shown in the next chapter) as well as reckoned righteous by justification. Universalism has no place here, because unbelievers exclude themselves from the benefits of "the obedience" of Christ. W. and W. express the sense briefly and tersely: "For as by the disobedience of the one man the many, mankind in general, were placed in the condition of sinners, thus by the obedience of the one shall mankind be put in the condition of righteous—*parakohv*, the disobedience shown in the 'offense;' *upakohv*, the submission shown in the *dikaiwma*, not the observance of the law by Christ—his 'active obedience,' as it is called, though that was necessary that he might be 'the just' (Acts iii. 14; xxii. 14; 1 Pet. iii. 18)—but his 'obedience unto death' (Phil. ii. 8), his submission to the penalty."

20. *Moreover*—To continue the antithesis. *The law entered*,—Law came in besides. The law of Moses is meant, though the article is not prefixed—not because there can be no mistake occasioned by its omission; mistakes have been made in consequence—but to set forth the legal character of the Mosaic economy: it was by eminence *law*—just as we speak of "law and gospel," without the article. *Pareish-t-qen* does not mean "crept in," as in Gal. ii. 4, the only other place where the word is used in N.T., but, "came in besides" what is stated in ver. 19. It was medial between Adam and Christ. The Jew would recognize the force of this, having been under the law. Chrysostom: "Entered by the way—meaning that its need was temporary, not absolute or imperative." *That the offence might abound*.—Multiply. As it cannot be said that the legislator enacted laws that they may be broken, *iħa* is construed by many as ecbatic, and not telic. Alford and others say it is never so used. It is telic in form, and ecbatic in force. The event was foreseen. God knew that the law of commandments contained in ordinances, together with the moral code, would be violated, and so the offense would be multiplied. For ulterior reasons he enacted the law that sin might thus develop itself as *offense—fall—transgression*—like Adam's—of a positive injunction, in order that the depravity and impotency of our fallen race might be more fully seen, and the need of redemption be more fully demonstrated; "for by the law is the knowledge of sin" (Rom. iii. 20). This is illustrated in Rom. vii. Olshausen makes an acute remark: "Paul regards the law as a salutary medicine, which forces the disease that rages in the inward, nobler parts, to the surface." Cf. Gal. iii. 19, 24, 25. Chrysostom: "The particle (*iħa*) does not assign the cause, but the result; for it was not given in order that it might abound, for it was given to diminish and destroy the offense. But it resulted the opposite way, not owing to the nature of the law, but to the listlessness of those who received it." *But where sin abounded*,—Multiplied—by the offenses against explicit law sanctioned by penalty. This showed the need of the gospel, as the ceremonial economy pointed to it. *Grace did much more abound*:—Exceedingly abounded.

It rises high, and drowns the hills,
Has neither shore nor bound,

21. *That as sin hath*—That as sin reigned in death, so also might grace reign. Here comes the ultimate *iħa*, without which the medial *iħa* of ver. 20 would not have been. Cf. ver. 13, 14, 17. The sovereignty of sin was shown in the work of death: so the sovereignty of grace appears through righteousness—by our being accounted righteous, through faith—resulting in everlasting life, through Jesus Christ our Lord. This grand idea, with the ever-blessed Name, closes this wonderful discussion.

CHAPTER VI.

1 *We may not live in sin, 2 for we are dead unto it, 3 as appeareth by our baptism.*
12 *Let not sin reign any more, 18 because we have yielded ourselves to the service of righteousness, 23 and for that death is the wages of sin.*

VI.—1. *What shall we say then?*—An objection may be raised, or an inference drawn, from the preceding argument, that we may do evil—persist in sin—that good may come, that grace may increase. (See on iii. 5; v. 20.) Paul proceeds to repel such an inference. *Shall we*—We may continue still in sin that grace may increase? Winer: "In Rom. vi. 1, 15, the conjunctive is the preferable reading, as in Luke iii. 10; John vi. 5; but in Rom. vi. 2 the authority for *zhōmen* (indic.) predominates, and the future here forms a distinct contrast to the aorist *apeqanōmen*." Alford: "The deliberative subjunctive." (See on v. 1.)

2. *God forbid:*—An expression of horror and aversion at the thought, as impious and absurd. *How shall we,*—We who died in respect to sin (aorist) in our conversion—how shall *we*—emphatic—still live *in* it? By our mystical death we became separate from sin, as a corpse is from life: it can perform none of the functions of life. Gal. ii. 19; Col. ii. 20. This is like 1 John iii. 9: "Whosoever is born of God doth not commit sin; for his seed remaineth in him, and he cannot sin, because he is born of God." It is impossible while the seed remaineth; he may forfeit it, as Adam did, and then there is not only a possibility of sinning, but a certainty. But what an incongruity in such apostasy! Grotius: *Hic non impossibilitatem, sed rei indignitatem ostendit. Indignum est si loti in lutum revolvimur.* Gal. iv. 9; 2 Pet. ii. 22. Death separates its subject from all the living. Plantus: *Nilil mecum tibi; mortuus tibi sum.*

3. *Know ye not*—The conjunction should not be omitted: Or are ye ignorant? (See on Matt. vii. 9; Rom. iii. 29.) The formula is Pauline. Rom. vii. 1. If the general maxim, ver. 2, should not strike them, the particular illustration now to be advanced surely would. *That so many of us*—That all we who were baptized unto Christ Jesus, unto his death were baptized? *Eij* may be better rendered "unto," as it is in a similar passage, 1 Cor. x. 2. As those who were "baptized unto Moses" were brought under the obligation of his religion, so those who are baptized unto Christ are brought under the obligations of his religion. (See on Matt. xxviii. 19; Acts xix. 5; Gal. iii. 27.) *Were baptized into his death?*—Unto his death were baptized. Not here a profession of faith in his death, but mystical conformity to it, as expressed in the next verse.

4. *Therefore we are*—Therefore we were buried with him through the baptism unto the death. Lunge says, "Buried in death—an *oxymoron*, according to which burial precedes, and death follows, as is illustrated in the immersion into the bath of baptism." This is a *hysteron proteron*, which makes Paul speak as a fool! Bury

a man before he is dead! Bury a man that he may die! It is hard to see how any one could give an interpretation so absurd. Lange must have been betrayed into it by adopting the popular notion that Paul alludes to baptism by immersion. But it does not appear that that mode of baptism was introduced at so early a period: all the baptisms in N.T. seem to have been performed by affusion. There was nothing in the burial of Christ which could suggest dipping; and dipping could not suggest the burial. Paul does not say that we were "buried into death." The words, "the baptism unto the death"—referring to the clause, "were baptized unto his death"—must be taken together, as conveying one idea. The burial follows the death, and as the mystical death is effected through baptism, so is the burial—which is here particularly noted, as it more vividly sets forth the idea of separation—viz., from sin—on which the apostle is treating. "Liquid graves" were foreign from his thoughts! A man may seem to be dead, may be reported dead, believed to be dead; but it may be only suspended animation—wait awhile, he may revive; but no one doubts his death when he is buried. Hence that clause in the Creed, "and buried" (1 Cor. xv. 4)—the proof of his death—his entire separation from the living. This is a striking symbol of our separation from sin, by our baptism as a sign, and pledge, and a means of its accomplishment, in the case of the first Christians, their baptism was co-etaneous with their conversion, and so was identified with it. As a means of grace, it assisted in the exercise of repentance and faith, to which, together with future obedience, it solemnly pledges the subject. It symbolizes "the renewing of the Holy Ghost," by which alone the great spiritual change is effected. Hence repentance, faith, prayer, and divine influence, are usually associated with the rite, so that none might mistake the "outward sign" for the "thing signified," the inward and spiritual grace. Mark xvi. 16; John iii. 5; Acts ii. 38; viii. 36-38; xxii. 16; Tit. iii. 5; 1 Pet. iii. 21. Baptism, in the sense explained, not only effects our mystical death and burial, but also our mystical resurrection—as the resurrection of Christ followed his death and burial. *That like as Christ*—In order that—this was the design as well as the result. We die to sin in order that we may live unto God. This is set forth by the symbol here chosen: Christ died and was buried, that he might be raised from the dead. *By the glory of the Father*,—Through, by means of—the glory—that is, the power—of the Father. The divine excellence is displayed in the exertion of omnipotence in the raising of Christ from the dead. Eph. i. 19, 20; 1 Pet. i. 21. Ps. lxxviii. 34, "Ascribe ye strength (*oz*) unto God; his excellency is over Israel, and his strength (*oz*) is in the clouds," reads in the LXX., "Give ye glory to God: his excellency is over Israel, and his power is in the clouds." Cf. Col. i. 11. *Even so*—Thus also we should walk in newness of life. A common Hebraism, meaning the pursuit of a prescribed course of action—here peculiarly expressive, as *walking* is as demonstrative a proof of life as *burial* is of death—as in the case of Lazarus. John xi. *In newness of life*.—Not merely a new life—that, of course—but *newness of*

life, as this more emphatically sets forth the resurrection state—the condition of those who are raised from the death of sin to the life of righteousness.

5. *For*—Confirmatory and illustrative of the preceding. *If we have been planted together*—Since we have—an assumed fact. *Sumfutov* is not from *futeuw*, to plant, but from *fuw*, to grow, and means, literally, grown together, and so, closely united. The kind of union is specified, first, in the likeness of Christ's death, and, secondly, in the likeness of his resurrection. This spoils some fine analogies, but it cannot be helped—*e.g.*, Chrysostom: "By the word *planting* he alludes to the fruit we reap from his death; for as his body, when buried in the earth, produced the salvation of the whole world, so ours also, when buried in baptism, has borne the fruits of righteousness, sanctification, adoption, and a thousand blessings." The scope of the passage requires us to consider our assimilation to his resurrection, as spiritual—from the death of sin to the life of righteousness. W. and W. say: "There is reference to a double resurrection—one to newness of life, the other (8) to eternal life; the future *esomeqa* expressing the certainty of the one and the futurity of the other." That is said with epigrammatic point and force. But with the *aj la-kai* certainly also, it rather expresses certainty, without any distinction, as if our spiritual resurrection were of the present, and our bodily resurrection of the future. There may be a glance at the resurrection in the last day, as that is complementary to our spiritual resurrection. Cf. John v. 24-29; vi. 40; Rom. viii. 10, 11. The future tense simply expresses the logical connection between death and resurrection: we first die to sin, and then we are raised to newness of life.

6. *Knowing this*,—Since we know this—the participle assigns a reason. *That our old man*—After all the *profound* interpretations of this passage—many of them very bewildering—Wesley's simple exposition seems to be correct, and harmonizes well with other passages: "Coeval with our being, and as old as the fall, our evil nature; a strong and beautiful expression for that entire depravity and corruption which by nature spreads itself over the whole man, leaving no part uninfected. This in a believer is crucified with Christ, mortified, gradually killed, by virtue of our union with him, that the body of sin—all evil tempers, words, and actions, which are the *members of the old man* (Col. iii. 5)—might be destroyed." Cf. 2 Cor. v. 17; Eph. iv. 22-24; Col. iii. 5-10. Our corporeal nature is not the seat of sin; it is the shrine in which the soul, which is the seat of sin, has its abode, and through which it operates, using its organs in the commission of sin; hence we speak of "our sinful souls and bodies;" and we are exhorted "to cleanse ourselves from all filthiness of the flesh and spirit," and we are to be sanctified in spirit, soul, and body. But the metaphor in this passage does not refer to our physical nature, as "the seat of sin"—which it is not. Cf. Gal. ii. 20. *Is crucified with him*,—Aorist: was crucified with him—was jointly crucified. *Might be destroyed*,—Some say, "might be rendered powerless." *Katargew* is a favorite

word with Paul, who uses it twenty-six times, while it occurs but once elsewhere (Luke xiii. 7), where it is rendered "cumbered." It is translated "make void," Rom. iii. 31; "abolish," Eph. ii. 15, *et al.*; "destroy," here and 1 Cor. vi. 13; xv. 26; 2 Thess. ii. 8; Heb. ii. 14, where it refers, as here, to a person—literal or metaphorical.

7. *For he that is dead*—For he who died has been released from sin. At first view this metaphor seems inappropriate, as it is designed to sustain the statement in the preceding verse, which represents "the old man" as dead, and we released from his service. But the apostle speaks of it as "*our* old man," and his meaning is, that in regard to sin we are dead, and so we are released from the service of sin. Paul uses the word *dedikaiwtai* ("justified" in the margin), perhaps, because he had made so much use of it in the preceding discussion, giving it here the cognate sense of "acquitted," or released. Sin, our old master; can exact no service from us now we "are dead to sin," ver 2. Some render literally, "For he who died (aorist) has been justified (perfect) from sin." Riddle renders the aorist "has died," because it precedes the perfect, which expresses a present state, "is acquitted." But all our old translators render both in the present, as they express the state of death and acquittal which still remains. Cf. 2 Cor. v. 14.

8. *Now if we be dead with Christ*,—And if we died with Christ. The aorist still refers to the time of conversion, as in ver. 1-7—this being a continuation of the argument. Still the A.V., as in all the old translations, conveys the sense. *We believe*—Not used dogmatically, nor to express trust, yet "with the idea of hope and certain expectation," as in Acts xv. 11. So Robinson. *That we shall also live with him*:—The future is to be understood, as in ver. 5.

9. *Knowing*—Knowing that Christ, having been raised—from the dead, dieth no more; death no more has dominion over him—no longer *lords* it over him—as a *kurios*, lord, or master, lords it over the servant. Peter says it was not possible that Christ should be held under death, which he came to abolish; but he voluntarily placed himself under the power of death for a short period. John ii. 19-22; x. 17, 18; Acts ii. 24.

10. *For in that he died*,—For the death which he died, he died to sin once for all. Heb. vii. 27; x. 10. By his death on the cross he terminated all the connection which he had with sin, passing into a world where there is no sin to require atonement, or to occasion annoyance. He became eternally separated from it. *But in that he liveth*,—But the life which he lives, he lives to God, in and for the Father's glory, separated from all vicarious connection with sin, and united with the Father in the glory which he had with him before the world was. Olshausen objects to this interpretation, as Christ thus lived for God on earth, and he lives for man in heaven. He interprets thus: "Christ died once for sin—that is, to extirpate it—and lives eternally for God—that is, to further righteousness. Death is then,

as at v. 10, 11, understood as a dying off from sin, and a living for God." But this differs little, if any, from the foregoing interpretation. The Greek interpreters (followed by Tholuck) punctuate thus: "For in that he died to sin, he died once only." Ecumenius: "Thus he will never die any more, because in the death he once endured he did not die like other men, as being subject to death, but in consequence of the sin of the world, that he might take away and destroy it." Chrysostom: "You must not conclude from the circumstance of his having once died, that he is mortal—that is the very reason that he is henceforth immortal. His death was the death of death. Because he has died, he now dies no more, for that death he died to sin." Whitby: "For in that he died to the putting away of sin (Heb. ix. 26, 28), he died thus once for all; but the life he liveth is an eternal life, wholly dedicated to the glory of God. Phil. ii. 9, 10, 11."

11. *Likewise*—After the model of Christ, as before. *Reckon*—Regard it as a settled matter that you must do so, and be sure that you are doing it. *Dead*—A strong expression: "corpses in regard to sin." *Through Jesus Christ*—'En denotes the union believers have with Christ in his death and in his life, both symbolically and really.

12. *Let not sin therefore reign*—In view of your new relation, ver. 11. Sin is a usurper, a tyrant, not a lawful sovereign. Having been deposed, let him not again usurp the throne. *In your mortal body*,—Your body became mortal by sin: now you are redeemed from its power, as your body is destined to a glorious immortality, let it not be enslaved to the tyrant that made it mortal. There may be, as some of the Greek Fathers and others suggest, a glance at the shortness of the conflict in contending against sin, and of the pleasures which it promises; they are but "for a season;" the body is dying—will soon be dead—and, if faithful, you will be forever delivered from sin. *That ye should*—The best reading, perhaps, is, "Unto the obeying of its desires"—as in A, B, C, Sin., Syr., Vulg., and many Fathers and editors. Lange well says: "Even if the body were holy, its impulses would have to be subject to the dominion of the spirit; much more must they be subject to the spirit, since they are diseased, irritable, excitable, and inclined to self-assertion and demoniacal self-distraction."

13: *Neither*—Nor present your members as instruments of unrighteousness to sin. Lange says: "Without doubt *parastaxein* has reference to enlistment or delivery to military service. The apostle is writing to Rome, the metropolis of military affairs, and therefore derives his figure from Roman customs (comp. chap. xiii. 12)." This specious view has been indorsed by others. But it is not "without doubt." Bloomfield well says: "We have here a continuation of the foregoing imagery—in which sin is considered as a slave-master—as introductory of a kindred admonition. For here I cannot, with Calvin, Beza, and others, recognize a military allusion, however frequent such may be in Paul's writings;

for, as I find De Wette has said, the comparison here is to servitude, rather than soldiery; nor need we call in the military allusion, since the *οϕλ α* may be taken (as indeed is its primary sense) to denote instruments, lit., 'tools.'" The verb occurs forty-one times in N.T., and never elsewhere has the military idea, unless Acts iv. 26, "the kings of the earth *stood up*," etc., be an exception. Homer speaks of all the tools (*οϕλ α*) with which Vulcan worked (Il., xviii. 409-413), and he so calls the tackling of a vessel (Odys. xxi. 390; ii. 398). But sin employs its servants in work of the most slavish character, and makes them furnish their own tools; as in warfare of the most diabolical character, and makes them furnish their own weapons—the members of their body, by which the carnal mind operates. *But yield*—But present yourselves to God. If the aorist here differs in meaning from the present in the first clause, the difference cannot well be expressed in English. W. and W.: "The aorist denoting the action as performed once for all—the present denoting continuance, habit." Schmidt: "The imper. present commands to occupy one's self with something; the imper. aorist, to accomplish something." To which Lange adds, "That something already under consideration, or already undertaken, must be carried through." Riddle notes the greater definiteness of the aorist. In Rom. xii. 1—"present your bodies a living sacrifice to God"—the verb is in the aorist, yet the exhortation is given to "brethren," who are supposed to have done this at their conversion. Bengel says the aorist here is "more forcible" than the present; for that reason, perhaps, it is used in Rom. xii. 1—not merely "be presenting"—Rotherham's rendering of the present—but "present"—let the presenting be accomplished. *Yourselves*—Not merely "your members," but your entire selves. *As those*—As alive from the dead. Regard yourselves as having been dead in sin (as in Eph. ii. 1-5—no reference to ver. 2, "dead to sin"), but now alive—viz., to God. Carrying out the figure, if the body is alive to God, all its members will be employed as instruments to promote his glory. 1 Cor. x. 30. *And your members*—Supply *parasthsate*, as in the preceding clause—and present your members. Chrysostom: "Hence the body is not evil, since it may be made an arm of righteousness—there is a hard warfare at hand for us."

14. *For sin shall not*—This is an encouraging assurance—much needed, considering the strength of sin, personified as a tyrant: he shall not be allowed to domineer over you. *For ye are not under the law*,—Not under law—the reference is not merely to the law of Moses, but to a legal economy of any sort. Law affords no assistance in opposing sin, or in pardoning it, as the apostle has shown. (See on ver. 20; iii. 20; cf. 1 Cor. xv. 56.) We should be discouraged from making any effort to live to God, if, in view of our weakness and the temptations which surround us, there were not a power vouchsafed to us which no law furnishes, and if provision were not made for the pardon of our failures. *But under grace*.—The gospel: a system of favor, not of "wrath," which "the law worketh" (iv. 15).

15. *What then?*—In view of the fact that we are not under law, but under grace. *Shall we sin,*—May we sin? The best MSS. have the deliberative conjunctive. (See on ver. 1.) Paul anticipates an objection, as in ver. 1, to amplify the argument, and to show that it does not tend to Antinomian licentiousness, which has been charged upon it in every age, and to which, indeed, it has been perverted. *God forbid.*—Abhorred be the thought! (See on Rom. iii. 4, 6, 31; vi. 2.)

16. *Know ye not,*—You certainly see this dilemma: No man can serve two masters, whose commands are as opposite as those of God and of sin. (See on Matt. vi. 24.) The language is not tautological: If you present yourselves as servants to sin (personified), then you are the servants of sin, and can have no other master; so, *vice versa*, if you present yourselves to God, as his servants—the words "of God" are, of course, understood after *obedience*. It would seem that the antithesis of *death* should be *life*; but righteousness is the sphere in which life exists—all outside is death. If understood as spiritual death, that is the immediate result of sin, and if not arrested will be followed by eternal death; and "the body is dead because of sin"—the remedy for that, in the case of believers, is the resurrection. Rom. viii. 10, 11.

17. *But God be thanked,*—A Pauline expression. *That ye were*—The stress is laid on "were;" hence, in the original, the particle (*μεν*) "though," corresponding to (*δε*) "yet," is omitted. Paul did not, of course, thank God that they had ever been sinners, but that, having been such, they were such no more. *But ye have*—Yet ye obeyed from the heart. The service was not merely formal and external, but spiritual and internal—sincere and earnest. Chrysostom: "Ye were neither forced nor pressed, but ye came over of your own accord, with willing mind." *That form of doctrine*—That type of teaching—the gospel. They were delivered over to this at their conversion. This is what they were to obey, as containing the orders of their new Master. As type may mean mold, some think Paul used it as a metaphor: the Romans, like melted metal, were cast into the mold of the gospel, and, being plastic, received its impression. W. and W.: "They were put under a die, or mold, from which they were to receive a new impression." Chrysostom: "The obedience from the heart shows the free will; but its being delivered, hints the assistance from God. But what is the form of doctrine? It is living aright, and in conformity with the best conversation."

18. *Being then*—And being freed from sin, ye became servants to righteousness. Some render *εἰδουλὸν* *wachte* enslaved, and suppose in the next verse Paul apologizes for using so harsh a word. If he had used it in that sense, it would seem to need an apology. But *doul-ov* in this chapter does not necessarily mean slave. The freeing here spoken of is not manumission, but release from the obligation of servitude voluntarily assumed or allowed. The service of sin is

indeed the most debasing slavery—all the more so because it is voluntary: the service of God is perfect freedom.

19. *I speak after the manner of men*,—I repeat these familiar illustrations, as men do when they adapt their discourses to the ineptitude of their hearers; because you are unable to comprehend spiritual subjects without such explanations. The flesh denotes weakness, as opposed to the spirit: they were in that sense carnal, and not spiritual, like the Corinthians, to whom Paul wrote in a similar way. 1 Cor. iii. 1-3. It does not seem to mean, as Theodoret: "I adapt my admonition to your nature, knowing the passions which work in your mortal body." It must be borne in mind that the Christians to whom the apostle wrote were generally neophytes, newly converted from heathenism or Judaism, and were very weak and immature in their knowledge of divine things—hence the illustrations and repetitions to meet their limited capacity. Cf. Gal. iii. 1, 15; Heb. v. 11-14; Isa. xxviii. 10; Luke xxiv. 25. *For as ye have yielded*—For as ye presented. The aorist refers to the time, ideally considered, when they bound themselves to the service of sin—chose sin as their master. *Uncleanness*—Impurity was a form of sin to which the Gentiles were greatly addicted—a gross sin against a man's self, and others who are accomplices in its commission. *Iniquity*,—Lawlessness—another form of sin, more directly against God—rebellion against his authority. It is a principle rather than an act. Its development results in its greater intenseness—hence the expression, "for lawlessness"—no other word was needed, whereas in the next clause the terms are varied. Bengel: "The servants of righteousness progress; workers of iniquity are workers of iniquity, nothing more." Cf. 1 John iii. 4: "Whosoever committeth sin transgresseth also the law; for sin is the transgression of the law"—*ajomia*, lawlessness, as here—where it is both genus and species. *Holiness*.—'Agi *asmov* occurs ten times in N.T.—rendered five times "holiness," and five times "sanctification." It might, perhaps, have been well if it had been uniformly rendered "sanctification"—"which," says Lange, "does not perfectly coincide with the idea of completed holiness, and in which there is at once expressed the constant ethical movement, rather than a substantial and quiescent condition." There are four other words rendered holiness: *agiothv*, Heb. xii. 10; *agiwsumh*, Rom. i. 4; 2 Cor. vii. 1; 1 Thess. iii. 13; *eujsebeia*, Acts iii. 12 (elsewhere, fourteen times, "godliness"); *osiothv*, Luke i. 75; Eph. iv. 24. "Holiness" occurs nowhere else in A.V. It might be well to restrict it to *osiothv*. 'Agi *asmov*, says Riddle, comes into view here rather as a progressive state than as an ultimate one; hence, against Meyer—who says it always means holiness, never sanctification—he agrees with Lange.

20. *For when ye were*—A restatement of the view given of their former condition—servants of sin—to prepare for the final statement of their present condition—making the contrast the more emphatic. *Ye were free from*

righteousness.—As to righteousness, which had them not as servants—their service being pre-engaged to another master.

21. *What fruit*—What fruit, therefore, had ye then in those things? Many point thus: "What fruit had ye then at that time? Things of which ye are now ashamed." It is said that *καρποϋ* means the deeds, or productions, of men, viewed as trees, never the reward of them. But this is not sustained by proof. Fruit means effect, result, Rom. xv. 28; Gal. v. 22, where it is contrasted with "works," ver. 19—Eph. v. 9; Heb. xii. 11; James iii. 17. Cf. Heb. *peri*, Jer. xvii. 10, and LXX. Also profit, good result, John iv. 36; Rom. i. 13; Phil. i. 22; James iii. 18. Here Robinson, Parkhurst, and others, put this place. A.V. agrees with Chrysostom, Grotius, Bengel, Meyer, Stuart, Hodge, Wesley, and all the old English versions. The negative answer is, of course, implied—all works, slavish works, and no fruit, no profit. *For the end*—instead of profit—the end, the result, is death—as in ver. 23.

22. *But now*—But now, having been set free from sin, and having been made servants to God, ye have your fruit—not works, but the effect of them—the service of God tending to sanctification—always increasing in proportion to our zeal in God's service. *The end*—The final result. The contrast between eternal life, as a divine gratuity—not merited by us—and *death*, eternal death, as the antithesis of eternal life—earned by sin, not inflicted by arbitrary decree—is very striking. It makes a fitting close to this important section—which must not, however, be violently discerpted from what follows.

23. *For the wages*—*Ὀυσῶνία* is the word used for the pay of a soldier, rations, etc. Luke iii. 14. But here it means recompense, retribution; cf. 2 Cor. xi. 8, where it denotes recompense made to ministers for their service. (See on ver. 22.) *Through*—In Christ Jesus our Lord: by virtue of our union with him, as in ver. 11. Eternal life, begun here in spiritual life, flows into us by the union which we have with Christ—he the Head, we the members.

CHAPTER VII.

1 *No law hath power over a man longer than he liveth.* 4 *But we are dead to the law.* 7 *Yet is not the law sin,* 12 *but holy, just, good,* 16 *as I acknowledge, who am grieved because I cannot keep it.*

VII.—1. *Know ye not,*—Or, are ye ignorant, brethren? The conjunction (*h*) should not be omitted. (See on vi. 3.) This does not connect with vi. 14, to the exclusion of the remainder of the chapter. Paul's meaning seems to be that as believers are no longer servants of sin, so they are no longer under law, in the sense here recognized,

but under grace—the illustration in the former case being taken from the relation of master and servant, and now in the latter case from the relation between husband and wife. The question anticipates a negative answer: they were not ignorant of the conjugal law in question. *For I speak*—For I am speaking to those who know law. *That the law*—Any law—not merely the Mosaic. It is a general statement which none would dispute. *As long as he liveth?*—All that time, and no longer: that is the force of the language.

2. *For*—An illustration and proof of the principle assumed. *The woman*—The married woman is bound by law to the living husband. *Loosed*—Lit., "annulled from." *The law of her husband*.—The law respecting him—that which bound her to him.

3. *Shall be called*—[Crhmatizw](#) is used in this sense in N.T., here only and in Acts xi. 26.

4. *Wherefore*,—So then, my brethren, ye were made dead to the law. Now comes the application; but in the example, the liberated person is the survivor; in the application, the liberated person is the dead person. But this was no slip. Paul knew what he was writing. He did not change the terms for euphemism, in condescension to the Jews, who might not like to be told that the law was dead! Paul tells them that plainly enough, and informs them why, and in what sense. The law was dead to them, so that they were at liberty to be married to another, even Christ. But then they were dead to the law, through the body of Christ—that is, his sacrificial death for our sins—they died with Christ—[ejanatwqhte](#), were slain, "made dead," "crucified" (Gal. ii. 19, 20); and as he was raised from the dead literally, so were they mystically, as Paul fully sets forth in the preceding context, of which he never loses sight. Thus, though the law claims dominion, it is not entitled to it: death has dissolved the obligation. The beauty, propriety, and force of the metaphor, pushed almost to allegory, appear the more fully, as the analysis is more closely made. The marriage contract runs, "till death do you part:" it contemplates no return to life of the deceased party. So there the allegory stops, and it is unexegetical to press it any farther. *That ye should be married*—That ye may belong to another—a Heb. matrimonial formula—*hayah*—Lev. xxii. 12; cf. LXX. *That we should bring forth fruit*—The design, and not merely the result, of entering into this new relation, to which *fruit* refers; but the figure is not to be pressed. *Unto God*.—To God—The simple *dative commodi*—to the glory of God. This illustration would be readily comprehended by Jews, and would greatly assist them in comprehending the transfer from the legal to the evangelical dispensation.

5. *For*—Explanatory. *When we were in the flesh*,—Under the law, when we were sensual—"not having the Spirit." Chrysostom: "In evil deeds—in a carnal life." *The motions of sins*,—Not sinful emotions, but the passions unsanctified which led to sins (genitive of object). *Which were by the law*,—Occasioned by it.

The law irritated a nature which was hostile to it, and which rebelled against its authority. (See on ver. 8-11.) *Did work*—Energized so as to produce results (middle, not passive). The passions energized in the members of the body, employing them in the production of fruit which ends in death. This is a glance back at vi. 21. Some interpret the metaphor of progeny, in view of the matrimonial allusion; but it is the antithesis of bringing forth fruit to God, ver. 4.

6. *But now*—But just now we were freed. The aorist alludes to their recent conversion. *That being dead*—There is but little authority for this erroneous reading. Nearly all MSS. and versions have "dying," or "having died"—an aorist agreeing with the preceding, and stating the ground of release. (See on ver. 4.) *Wherein we were held;*—The obligation of the law, as the means of justification. *That we should serve*—So that we serve: no slavery is here suggested by the word *doulouein*. *In newness of spirit*,—All the terms are anarthrous: in newness of spirit, and not in oldness of letter. "Spirit" is opposed to "letter." (See on Rom. ii. 29; 2 Cor. iii. 6.) The service is in the sphere of the spirit, acted upon by the great dynamical Agent, the Holy Spirit, who operates to produce the result.

7. *What shall*—What, then, shall we say? That the law is sin? Far from it! Paul thus anticipates an objection suggested by ver. 5. Chrysostom: "As if the objection came forward, not of himself, but in the course of discussion." (See on vi. 1.) This begins a parenthesis, or episode, which ends with ver. 25. It has occasioned much unnecessary controversy. Whom does the apostle mean by the *ejw*—the "I?" Is he detailing his own experience? or the experience of a Jew? or of the Jews at large, before, under, and after law? If his own experience, is it his experience as a Christian, freed from sin and from the law? To ask this last question is to answer it; and this ought to settle the controversy. Surely Paul never meant to say,

To good and evil equal bent—
I'm both a devil and a saint!

Erskine's Sonnets were not then written, and his dualistic theology was never imagined. Indeed, this passage received no such interpretation till the days of Augustin; and he himself propounded the opposite, and held to it till he was driven from it in the Pelagian controversy, which occasioned his false views of predestination and cognate points. The schoolmen, who leaned to Augustinianism, naturally enough indorsed his erroneous interpretation of this passage—as did Luther, Calvin, and many of their followers. It seems passing strange that they should do so; but the force of dogmatic bias is very great. They had no clear views of preventing grace, which operates upon man before regeneration, and hence they stumbled at the declarations in ver. 22, 25. It is said there can be no *tertium quid* party. The *Ego* must be one and the same person, either regenerate or unregenerate, as there can be none between. But why not? The experience of thousands proves that there can be a state between, or that the unregenerate may

be divided into two classes—the unawakened, unconcerned sinner (ver. 9), and the awakened, anxious sinner (ver. 24). Passing through the first stage (carnal security) into the second (struggling for pardon), he passes into the third—so gloriously described in chap. viii., which, omitting this parenthesis, follows naturally ver. 6. There is too much individuality—too much personal experience—to allow of the interpretation which makes this passage refer merely to Jews, or the world at large, who were without a positive law from Adam to Moses, in the sense of chap. v. 13, 14—then under that law till Christ—when they were delivered from it by "the law of faith," or the gospel. This, indeed, as Whitby shows, suits the general scope of the apostle's argument in this Epistle, and the case of the apostle serves to illustrate this general position. The *Ego*, therefore, is not to be confined to the apostle—as in the Confessions of Augustin; but, as in Rom. iii. 7; 1 Cor. iv. 6; x. 30, *et al.*, he speaks by *koinonia*, or *metaschematismos*. Those critics who refer this passage to the apostle in his regenerate state are driven to such exegetical subterfuges as one should think would convince them of the untenableness of their position, as is fully shown by Arminius in his masterly Dissertation on Rom. vii. Surely they never read that logical, massive, unanswerable monograph. In it he clearly and conclusively shows that the apostle does not speak about himself, nor about a living man under grace, but that he has transferred to himself the person of a man placed under the law; that this opinion has always had defenders in the Church; that, instead of favoring Pelagianism, in a most distinguished manner and designedly it refutes it; that the novel view which refers it to the regenerate was not approved by any of the ancient Fathers of the Church, not even by Augustin himself, but was refuted by him and others, though Augustin modified his original view, which was correct, by admitting that it may refer to the regenerate, so far as concupiscence goes, but no farther, and making distinctions which are arbitrary, puerile, and unexegetical, so that what is commonly called the Calvinistic view of this passage is not Augustin's; and, finally, Arminius demonstrates that the novel opinion which he opposes is injurious to grace, and adverse to good morals. His exegetical analysis of every verse anticipates the modern commentator, and leaves him little to do, except to reproduce his lucid and satisfactory exposition. Bengel is right, says Lewis, "in referring chap. vii. to the legalist, earnest indeed, but who does not find his sanctification in grace; and chap. viii. to the man justified by grace." "This is now the common interpretation." *Is the law sin?*—As if he had said, remarks Arminius, "Can it therefore be attributed to the law that it is itself, or the cause of evil desires in us, because ver. 5 speaks of 'the motions of sins which were by the law'? The apostle replies that it is very wrong to entertain even the bare thought of such a thing concerning the law. He subjoins a proof of the removal of the great effect from the contrary effect which the law has; for the law is the index of sin, or that which points it out; therefore it is neither sin nor the cause of sin. He then illustrates this proof by a special example: 'For I should not have known

concupiscence unless the law had said, Thou shalt not desire, or covet." *God forbid*.—Far be it! He is horrified at the thought. *Nay*,—This does not refer to "God forbid," but to the idea suggested before; and it means, On the contrary; the law is not sin; it is the index of sin—that which points it out. (See on iii. 20.) *I had not known sin*,—2 Aor. of *ginwskw*—I did not recognize. *The law*:—It is anarthrous, and refers to law as such: in the next clause the article refers it to the Mosaic law. *For I had not known lust*,—For even concupiscence I had not known (pluperfect of *oi@a*). As the word rendered lust (*epiqumi a*) is the cognate noun of the verb rendered "covet," it is perhaps best to render it "concupiscence"—"irregular and inordinate desire." The reference to the tenth commandment shows what is meant. Wesley: "Evil desire: I had not known it to be a sin; nay, perhaps I should not have known that any such desire was in me. It did not appear till it was stirred up by the prohibition."

8. *But*—Continuative. *Sin*,—The principle of depravity. *Taking occasion*—Presented by the external world, and seized upon by sin. *By the commandment*,—"Thou shalt not covet." This, in its spirit, extends to every thing prohibited—interdicting concupiscence of every kind. *Wrought in me*—Produced, or originated and developed, in me. This is to be joined to "sin"—which rebels against the commandment, as a hostile power to which it will not submit, and the law itself cannot force submission. *For without the law*—This is an aphorism, adduced in support of the preceding statement: for without law sin is dead. (See on iv. 14; 1 Cor. xv. 56.)

9. *For*—However, I was alive without law, at one time. I considered myself alive to God. If any period of Paul's life is specially meant, it was not that of childish innocence, but that described in Phil. iii. 4-11. "I lived in all good conscience," because of my external conformity to the law; but when the commandment forbidding concupiscence, as sin, came home to me in all its spirituality and power, by the sin-convincing Spirit, sin sprang up to life, showing that it was in me, though I knew it not. It broke forth in me, because of the irritation of the prohibition, and I was its hapless and helpless victim. Wesley: "My inbred sin took fire, and all my virtue and strength died away; and I then saw myself to be dead in sin, and liable to death eternal."

10. *And the commandment which was ordained to life*,—Which was for life. This prohibition of concupiscence, as well as every other precept of the law, was originally designed to be a means of preserving and increasing spiritual life. "This do, and thou shalt live." Cf. Lev. xviii. 5. *I found to be unto death*.—As it was sure to be violated, and its penalty incurred: so strong is the power of inbred sin.

11. *For sin, taking occasion*—(See on ver. 8.) *Deceived me*,—The word is intensive—completely deceived me. The reference seems to be to the seduction of Eve, Gen. iii. 1-13; 2 Cor. xi. 3; 1 Tim. ii. 14. What is there said of Satan is

attributed to sin, which, as Lange says, "first made the commandment a *provocation*, and then a means of *condemnation*." The deception consisted in this, that the danger involved in committing the sinful act was overbalanced by the pleasure which it would give. Inbred sin, in the case assumed, does what Satan did in the case of our first parents.

12. *Wherefore*—So that it appears from the foregoing that the law indeed is holy. The particle (*meñ*) requires *de* in the *apodosis*, but ver. 13 implies it. *Holy*,—Intrinsically pure, like God who enacted it—requiring holiness by every precept and prohibition; and so, in particular, by *the commandment* in question, "Thou shalt not covet"—which is also *just*—requiring nothing which is not perfectly equitable, and demanding that which is so; *and good*—being highly conservative and beneficent in its tendency.

13. *Was then*—Has, then, the good become death to me? The law—an echo of the last word in ver. 12—opposed here to death, the great evil. Paul anticipates and answers an objection, as before. As though he had said, remarks Arminius, "Sin, by this abuse of the law to seduce and kill us, has produced the effect, that in return its own depravity and perverseness be made manifest by the law. This perverse depravity consists in sin working death by the law which is good, and in being made exceedingly sinful by the commandment, which is just and holy, and that it might not only become a sinner above measure by its own wickedness, but also might be declared to be such by the instigation of the law, which it has so shamefully abused to produce these effects." *Exceeding sinful*.—The sinful principle thus develops all its capacity for sinfulness. There is nothing by which it can be compared but itself.

14. *For we know*—Paul frequently uses the plural in stating a recognized fact: cf. Rom. ii. 2; viii. 22, 28, *et al.* *That the law is spiritual*:—Enacted by God, who is a Spirit, expressing his character, and requiring a spiritual conformity thereto. *But I am carnal*,—The authorities are about equally divided between *sarkikov* (text rec.) and *sarkinov*—the former is *carnalis*, the latter *carnens*, a stronger term; but they are used interchangeably. It might have been better to render "fleshly," as *sarx*, which so often occurs in N.T., is always (except in three cases) rendered "flesh," and *sarkinos* is rendered "fleshly" in 2 Cor. iii. 3; so is *sarkikos* in 2 Cor. i. 12; 1 Pet. ii. 11—elsewhere "carnal." The contrast here shows what is meant by fleshly—not corporeal, but morally weak and depraved—opposed to the spirituality of the law, and unable to comply with its requisitions, though approving them. Tholuck: "Human nature, as weak and impotent for good." Theodoret: "He calls him fleshly (*sarkikon*) who has not yet obtained spiritual rest." Chrysostom: "Man, as comporting himself in the law, and before the law." *Sold under sin*.—As a vanquished enemy was sold into slavery: the man described by the *Ego* being conquered by his passions is brought into slavery to sin. Alford

well says, "This is the strongest assertion of man's subjection to the slavery of sin in his carnal nature." And yet, forsooth, this must be predicated of the regenerate, who are declared to be no more the servants of sin (John viii. 36; Rom. vi. 17; viii.), even Paul himself, who says it was not so: "The law of the Spirit of life in Christ Jesus, hath made me free from the law of sin and death" (viii. 2; 1 Cor. ix. 27). Tholuck: "The expression was already common in Hebrew, and was applied to those who, as it were, stood under the disposition of the wicked one. 1 Kings xx. 25; 2 Kings xvii. 17; 1 Macc. i. 15. So the rabbins." Meyer: "This unqualified assertion, 'carnal, sold under sin,' and that in contrast to 'spiritual,' ought to have prevented the misconception of Augustin, etc., in supposing this passage to refer to one already born again." Bengel shows that the change of the tense here is only in the apostle's manner, for the sake of more lively expression, as in viii. 2, 4, 9, where he changes also from the first to the second person. Arminius: "The utmost care is evinced not to impose any ignominy on the law, or to ascribe any blame to it, and the entire mischief is attributed to the power of sin, and to the weakness of that man who is under the law." "As if the apostle had said that the law is incapable of hindering the strength and operation of sin in men who are under the law, arises from this, that men under the law are carnal; in whom therefore the law, though it is spiritual, does not possess so much power as to enable it to restrain the strong inclination of the flesh to things which are evil and contrary to the law. And since sin, by a certain right of its own, exercises dominion over those men who are under the law, therefore it comes to pass that they have been made bond-slaves to sin, and are bound and fettered like a purchased menial." Lange says: "Meyer incorrectly distinguishes the past tenses of ver. 7-13, and the present tenses of ver. 14, ff., by saying that in the former case Paul has described his psychological history before and under the law, and in the latter that he portrays his natural standing, in opposition to the spiritual character of the law. But down to ver. 13 he has rather portrayed the genesis of the really internal and legal stand-point. But after ver. 14 he describes the whole development of this standpoint—that is, the inward conflict of the sinner who has perceived the inward character of the law." Winer: "Sold under sin—into the power of sin."

15. *For*—Bengel: "For tends to strengthen 'sold.' The slave serves an unworthy master, first joyfully, then with grief; lastly, he shakes off the yoke." *That which I do*,—Work out, produce, perform—[katergazomai](#), as in ver. 8, 13. *I allow not*:—Augustin, Beza, Grotius, Arminius, and others, understand [ginwskw](#) here to mean, to allow, or approve. Lange, Alford, and others, interpret, to know. Tholuck says, if the Hebraistic sense, to approve (as Hos. viii. 4), be adopted, it would not differ from what follows. He says, "More correctly do Chrysostom, Theodoret, Pelagius, and others, understand it of an obscuration of the knowing faculty." Whitby anticipates the objection: "This interpretation ('I allow not'), saith Mr. L., makes the following words a tautology; whereas I judge it very reasonable

to say, I allow not, because I would not; yea, I hate to do what I do." Arminius: "For a servant does not do that which seems good to himself, but that which his master is pleased to prescribe to him; because thus is the word *ginwskw* used in this passage for 'I approve.' But if any one thinks that it is here used in its proper signification, the argument will be the same, and equal its validity; 'for,' as Christ has told us, 'the servant knoweth not what his lord doeth;' neither is his lord bound, nor is he accustomed, to make known to his servant all his will, except so far as it seems proper to himself to employ the services of his menial through the knowledge of that will. But the first signification of the word is better accommodated to this passage, and seems to be required by those things which follow; for a more ample explanation of this argument is produced in the following words: 'For what I would, that do I not; but what I hate, that do I;' which is an evident token of a will which is subjugated, and subject to the will of another—that is, to the will of sin. Therefore he is the servant and the slave of sin." Cf. Matt. vii. 23; John x. 14; 1 Cor. viii. 3; 2 Tim. ii. 19, *et al.*, for this use of the word. The two meanings blend in one. W. and W.: "I do not approve—do not recognize as my own." So apparently Chrysostom: "It means, I am involved in darkness, I am hurried away; I sustain a wrong." So Theodoret: "For he who is overcome by pleasure, or again, the man intoxicated with anger, has not a clear perception of the sin; but after the passion has ceased, he acquires a sense of its evil." *For what I would*,—For not what I wish, that I practice. As no one performs a moral action without volition, Paul must use the word *qelw*, in this passage, in the sense of *velleity*, and not of *volition*, as the schoolmen express it. But the word *volition* may be retained, as it is used in two senses (as also is *nolition*)—either as it follows the judgment of general estimation, when it chooses that which the law prescribes, or as it follows the judgment of particular approbation, when it chooses that which appears desirable, though forbidden. Arminius sustains this view by references to Augustin, Aquinas, Zanchius, and Bucer, who says there is in man a twofold will—"one, that by which he consents to the law; another, that by which he does what he detests: the one follows the knowledge of the law by which it is known to be good; the other follows the knowledge which is derived from the senses, and which is concerning things present." "The volition and nolition which follow not the last judgment, cannot so well be simply and absolutely called volition and nolition, as *velleity* and *nolleity*. Those, however, which follow the last judgment cannot so well be simply and absolutely called efficacious volition and nolition, to which the effect succeeds." The unawakened sinner has one judgment and one volition: he chooses nothing but sin; the awakened sinner, yet unregenerate, and "under the law," chooses holiness with *velleity*, but not with efficacious volition; the regenerate man does both—his volition follows "particular approbation," as well as "general estimation." It matters little, therefore, whether *thelo* be rendered will, would, wish, or desire, provided it is not understood in the sense of that determination of the executive

power of the soul which immediately precedes action; for in that sense no man can will to do that which he knows is impossible. Hence God works in us both to will and to do of his good pleasure. As it is *will*, it cannot be forced; hence there must be concurrence with divine influence; but as it is in bondage, that influence is indispensable. This is the true evangelical synergism, which the apostle sets forth in this chapter, and those chapters which precede and follow. *That do I not*;—*Prassw*, practice—to do any thing habitually. In ver. 19 it refers to evil, of which it is oftenest used, and is frequently rendered "commit." Acts xxv. 11, 25; Rom. i. 32; ii. 2. *But what I hate*,—The same as "allow not," or approve not, and "would not," in the preceding and succeeding clauses. W. and W. say, gratuitously: "A strong expression indicating an effort due to nothing short of regeneration. Ps. xcvi. 10; Prov. viii. 13; Heb. i. 9. For the identity of this experience with that of the regenerate, cf. Gal. v. 17." Surely those authors never read Arminius on Gal. v. 17, or they would have seen no such identity is there found, nor do the texts cited prove the position assumed. Of course, Christ and all good men hate evil; but then they hate it, and do not commit it, whereas the awakened, unregenerate sinner hates it, and yet commits it. The struggle in Gal. v. 17 is very different from that in Rom. vii. *That do I*.—*Poiw*—the usual word for "do": so ver. 16. Whitby: "'Being allured with pleasure, we,' say Theodoret and OEcumenius, 'oft do those things which are abominable, as being opposite to the law;' for whilst the law represents sin as pernicious and destructive both to soul and body, it is as natural for all men to hate it as to love themselves; but then, as Photius saith, when the sweetness, or pleasure, of the action is proposed to the mind, the hatred goes off, and the soul is wrought up to an affection to it; and thus it is with every enlightened man that sins against his conscience, and doth the evil which he would not do. 'These words,' saith Origen, 'show that the carnal man, of whom he speaks, endeavors a little to resist his vices by the instinct of the law of nature, but that at last he is overcome by them, and oppressed with them.'" Riddle well remarks, "It is a gratuitous inference that a reference of this verse to the unregenerate implies a contradiction of the depravity of the human will." Heathen writers abound in references to this contrariety in man—the war between conscience and passion. See Thucyd. Histor., lib. iii., c. 45; Diod. Sic. Biblioth., lib. i., c. 71; Xenophon Cyrop., lib. vi., c. i., sec. 21; Eurip. Medea, v. 1077; Epictetus Enchirid., lib. ii., c. 26; Seneca, Epist. iii.; Ovid, Met., vii. 19.

I know the right, and I approve it too—

Condemn the wrong, and yet the wrong pursue.

Tholuck quotes from Rab. Aleksaudrie: "Lord of the worlds, known and open it is to thee, that our will is to execute thine; and who prevents it? The leaven that is in the lump." "Grotius justly observes, however, that it must be a sad thing indeed if the Christian, as such, could apply these sayings to himself."

16. *If then*—Now seeing that I wish not to do what the law forbids, and yet do it, I add my voice to that of the law, that it is good—beautiful, excellent, noble—the word is *kalon*—comprehending all the traits specified in ver. 12. Bengel: "The assent of a man to the law against himself is a remarkable trait of religion—a great testimony for God." This trait of religion is produced by preventing as well as by regenerating grace—indeed, the former must precede the latter. Thus the Penitential Psalm:

And if my soul were sent to hell,
Thy righteous law approves it well.

17. *Now*—Tholuck, Alford, and others, say that *nuni* is merely logical, not temporal. "But," as Lange says, "it denotes not merely a continued movement in the treatment, but also in the subject discussed. The understanding has first entered upon the side of the law; now this is done also by the real will of the *Ego*." Augustin, Grotius, Arminius, Cocceius, Koppe, and others, make *nuni* temporal; but they differ as to the specified time. Calvinists refer it to the state of regeneration—Arminians, to the time which precedes regeneration, after awakening, before which the *Ego* was the willing slave of sin. The *Ego* is now ideally distinguished from sin, and the flesh, through which sin operates. Arminius is, as usual, judicious: "As if he had said, 'Formerly, when I was without the law, I committed sin; but now, when I am under the law, I no longer commit, but sin that dwelleth in me.' This is in unison with what is said in ver. 9, 'For I was alive without the law once,' or formerly; 'but when the commandment came, sin revived, and I died.' For while he 'was alive without the law,' he committed evil without any reluctance of mind or of will. Therefore, at that time, he did evil; but now, being placed under the law, he undoubtedly commits sin, but he does it against his conscience, and not without resistance on the part of his will. Wherefore, the cause and culpability of sin must be ascribed, not so much to the man himself as to the violent impulse of sin." *But sin that dwelleth in me*.—Arminius shows that *existing* and *dwelling* are very different—the latter denoting not only occupancy, but also domination. Sin may exist in the regenerate, but it does not reign in them; it does reign in the unregenerate, even in the awakened. As the demoniac is controlled by the demon that possesses him, so the awakened sinner is controlled by sin, which has taken possession of him. Sin is the principal; the *Ego* is the miserable partner in this diabolical business.

18. *For I know*—By experience, as here detailed. *That in me*—The same *Ego*, but qualified. *That is, in my flesh*,—The corrupt nature, as distinguished, not from the Holy Spirit, but from "the mind," ver. 25. Arminius: "Though the word *flesh*, in the abstract, be urged, yet *the whole man* may be called *flesh*, but not *the whole of man*; for the mind which condemns sin, and justifies the law, is not *flesh*. But this very same mind may in some degree be called *carnal*, because it is in a man

who is carnal, and because the flesh, which fights against the mind, brings the whole man into captivity to the law of sin, and by this means has the predominance in that man." No good reigns in the unregenerate though awakened sinner, while no sin reigns in the regenerate: if good ceases to reign in them, they cease to be regenerate. Chrysostom beclouds the subject by making the flesh mean the body, which he labors to show is not itself evil. *For to will is present with me*;—To wish, or the wishing, lies near me; but to work out, to produce, that which is good—to ~~kal on~~—the desirable, the right. *I find not*.—The omission of *euji skw* in A, B, C, Sin., and some cursives, and Fathers, and versions, was probably occasioned by a failure to understand it. It is in other MSS. and versions—Vulg., *non invenio*. Bengel: "My mind, though seeking, does not really find it." And yet he is regenerate! The verse ends very abruptly without this word, which is probably genuine.

19. *For*—Confirmatory. This, says Lange, "points to a fountain of wicked actions, which proceeds immediately from the unconscious life in opposition, and this is the darkness of the sensuous life."

20. *Now*—But if I do that which I wish not, it is no longer I that produce it, but the sin dwelling in me. The *Ego* is the man himself, who disowns his own sinful acts. They are his, for he performs them: he will not claim them, because indwelling sin, which has the mastery, forced him to the performance.

I hate my sins, no longer mine,
For I renounce them too.

21. *I find then*—I find therefore the law, that when I am wishing to do the good, the evil is present with me. Chrysostom, who seems to restrict "the evil" to "the evil moral choice" and "sinful actions," considers this an obscure passage. The construction seems involved. Meyer considers the law referred to, the law of Moses! It rather means, as Parkhurst says, here and in ver. 23, 25; viii. 2, "a force, or principle of action, equivalent to a law." The article has the force of a pronoun, *this law*. Wesley renders "a law," but he well defines it, "An inward constraining power, flowing from the dictate of corrupt nature." The *oñi*, "that," is put before the last clause, perhaps to give it prominence; but our idiom seems to require its transposition, as in A.V.

22. *For*—This is a farther development of the thought. *I delight*—Lit., I am pleased with—stronger than "consent to," ver. 16. The more the sinner learns of the law of God, the more beauty will he see in it, that he should desire conformity to its requirements. No argument is required to prove that an awakened sinner, not yet regenerate, can be pleased with the law of God, though it condemns him: indeed, it is difficult to see how he could repent of his violations of the law, and desire to be able to keep its precepts, if he were not thus affected by its great

excellence. Experience settles that question. Chrysostom says, "He means, For I knew even before this what was good, but when I find it set down in writing, I praise it." *After the inward man*:—It is strange that any should consider this the new man—the regenerate nature! The phrase occurs in Eph. iii. 16, and a similar one in 2 Cor. iv. 16, where it is contrasted not with the carnal mind, but with the body, as the outward man. So "the hidden man of the heart," 1 Pet. iii. 4. It means the soul, whose intellect sees the beauty of the law, whose affections are stirred by the sight, and whose will decides for it, though powerless to execute its behests, for the reason assigned. Arminius cites numerous testimonies of the Fathers and modern divines for this interpretation.

23. *But I see*—But I behold a different law in my members. Bengel: "From the higher region of the soul, as from a watch-tower, which is called *nous*, the mind, and is the repository of conscience." It is common for a man to speak of himself, and of his soul or body, as if they were distinct from his personality. *Another law*—A different law—force, or principle of action, as in ver. 21. *In my members*—The organs of the body, as energized by the "passions of sins." (See on ver. 5.) *Warring against*—Cf. James iv. 1; 1 Pet. ii. 11. *The law of my mind*,—Which is the law of God subjectively considered—as the mind, or inward man, approves of the law of God, and adopts it as the rule of life, or principle of action. *And bringing me into captivity*—Conquering and capturing and making me over to the law of sin—that evil force which exists in the organs of my lower nature. (See on ver. 14, 21.)

24. *O wretched man that I am!*—Me miserable! He has reached the profoundest depths of self-despair. His own reason, the law, every thing—powerless. "There is no health in us"—no means of salvation. *Who shall*—Who will deliver me? This is the turning-point. He has some idea of the means of deliverance. The tear of repentance begins to drop from the eye of faith. *From the body of this death?*—Not this dead body—no reference to the chaining of a living man to a corpse—no reference to the physical organization, as such (Chrysostom, "the mortal body"), as if he were praying for removal from the world. But body here means "the old man"—"sin that dwelleth in me," and which bringeth forth death—which symbolizes all the misery and ruin superinduced by sin. Arminius well defends this view, and refers to Rom. vi. 6, and Col. ii. 11, and to Augustin and Epiphanius, in its support. Tholuck says, "The body of this misery"—though he erroneously explains, "the body in which I undergo this misery"—the legalist, in despair, wishes for a violent death to end the strife! The gloss in the Spanish version of Amat has *concupiscentia mortifera*. Seiler: "Who will deliver from the power of inordinate sensuality, which entails upon me punishment and death?" De Wette: "From the body of such ruin?"

25. *I thank God*.—The received reading and rendering is probably correct. No one has better expounded it than Arminius: "This clause contains a thanksgiving, in which St. Paul returns thanks to God, that he, in his own person, has been delivered from this body of sin, about which he had been treating, and to which that man was liable whose character he was then personating. In this thanksgiving is contained, by implication, an answer to the preceding interrogatory exclamation—that is, 'The grace of God will deliver this man from the body of this death, from which he could not be delivered by the law.' This is directly and openly explained by some copies of the Greek original, in which this verse is thus read: 'The grace of God, through our Lord Jesus Christ'—that is, 'this grace will deliver me, or the man whose character I have been personating, from the body of this death'—a thing which it was the chief purpose of the apostle to prove in this investigation." Macknight supplies the ellipsis from ver. 24, thus: "I thank God, who delivers me through Jesus Christ our Lord." *Dia* > "through," does not here mean, "I render thanks through the mediation of Christ," or, "in his name;" but, I render thanks that through Jesus Christ I get deliverance. Paul could hardly help referring to his own case, which elicited this outburst; but then he refers to it as appropriating the case he was personating. Such ejaculations are in Paul's manner. *So then*.—This inference is merely the conclusion of the digression concerning the man under law struggling for deliverance—ver. 7-25. The general conclusion as to equal privileges of Jew and Gentile—the great question under consideration—is presented in the following chapters. Chrysostom: "He recalled to mind our former condition again in these words." *With the mind*—Those who interpret this passage according to the later and erroneous view of Augustin consider "the mind" the regenerate part of the apostle, and "the flesh" the unregenerate: so that, possessing two natures at the same time, he could serve two masters, God and sin! This is Manicheism with a witness! The mind here means "the inward man," ver. 22, as it does in ver. 23, as "the flesh" means the same as in ver. 18. *I myself*—The same *Ego* of whom he has been discoursing: this seems to be the force of the *autos* prefixed to the *Ego*. *The law of God*;—God's law—a law of God, anarthrous—as in the following case, "a law of sin"—perhaps to bring out more emphatically the contrast between the two masters, God and sin. In his unawakened state he served only one master, sin; when awakened he served both God and sin; but as that cannot be done effectually, sin gained the mastery, and God was really not served at all; but in the regenerate state, as described in the next chapter, he does not serve sin at all, but only God (viii. 2)—where there is the first mention of "the law of the Spirit of life in Christ Jesus"—a very different thing from the law of God, or the law of the mind, which approves of it, but has no power to obey it, and cannot have till it is imparted by the regenerating Spirit.

CHAPTER VIII.

1 *They that are in Christ, and live according to the Spirit, are free from condemnation.* 5, 13 *What harm cometh of the flesh,* 6, 14 *and what good of the Spirit:* 17 *and what of being God's child,* 19 *whose glorious deliverance all things long for,* 29 *was beforehand decreed from God.* 38 *What can sever us from his love?*

VIII.—1. *There is therefore now*—Bloomfield and others say, "An inference from vii. 25." Wesley and others, "The apostle here resumes the thread of his discourse, which was interrupted vii. 7." Tholuck: "These words cannot be looked upon as a conclusion derived from what immediately precedes, but are rather an inference from chap. iii. to the subject of which the apostle again returned in the second half of chap. v." He properly, however, suggests that it refers to "the main point of the Epistle, the free justification of Christians; accordingly this *ᾱρα* ('therefore'), as conclusive in reference to the man converted, forms a sharp contrast with the *ᾱρα* of vii. 25, as conclusive in reference to the man in a legal state." Papists and Augustinians, therefore, find here no support to their notion that the war between flesh and mind continues, but the believer is not condemned for the sins which through the flesh he commits! *No condemnation*—*Katakrima*, as in v. 18. They no longer violate the precept, and so are not included in the penalty, and past offenses are pardoned through faith—as v. 1. *In Christ Jesus*,—Not merely in his mystical body, the Church, but in union with him by faith, as the branches are in the vine. John xv. *Who walk not after the flesh, but after the Spirit.*—This clause is omitted in many good MSS., versions, and Fathers, and the words "but after the Spirit" in many more, and many critics consider it an interpolation from ver. 4: it is thought, too, that the parallelism is injured by its insertion, which does not appear to be the case. It is easier to account for its omission in some MSS., etc., than its insertion in others. The verse in the received text fits in very well after vii. 6—that is, before the digression, vii. 7-25. To walk according to flesh is to be governed by our sinful, unregenerate nature. To walk according to spirit is to be governed by our spiritual nature—to move in the spiritual sphere, where the Holy Spirit influences the spirit of him who is in Christ Jesus, producing a disposition like his—the mind which was in Christ Jesus. Phil. ii. 5. (See on vi. 4.) Macknight: "According to the inclinations of their spirit, enlightened and strengthened by the Spirit of God." This development of the regenerate nature follows the removal of condemnation—that is, the experience of justification, the continuance of which is conditioned on this course of holy living.

2. *For the law*—The energy, or principle of action, as in vii. 21, 23, 25—not simply the gospel. *Of the Spirit of life in Christ Jesus*,—The comma is not to be placed after life, as if "in Christ Jesus" meant through Christ Jesus. The law of the

spirit of the life in Christ Jesus, as Heumann and Tholuck express it, is "the impulse of that new and godly life-principle which spiritual fellowship with Christ imparts." This life-principle is produced by the Holy Spirit, the Lord and the Life-giver—who will come more prominently into notice in ver. 9, 11, 14, 16. *Hath made me free*—Freed me: the aorist refers to the time of conversion, when the deliverance came. *From the law of sin and death*.—The controlling power of sin and of death, as in vii. 24, 25. Strange that any one should suppose this refers to the moral or the Mosaic law! The believer, indeed, is freed from "the law of commandments contained in ordinances," and from every law (except "the law of faith"), as the ground of justification, but not as a rule of life and final judgment. Cf. ver. 4 and ii. 12, 13. This is a fine example of the expulsive power of a contrary and superior affection. The love of God excludes all baser loves.

3. *For*—Explanatory of ver. 2. The construction of this clause, as a *nominativus pendens* (as in Heb. viii. 1), is the simplest suggested, and requires no supplied words, but only proper punctuation, to bring out the sense of the verse: For that which was impossible by the law, because it was weak through the flesh—God, sending his own Son in likeness of sinful flesh, and on account of sin, condemned sin in the flesh. *The law*—Whether of Moses or of nature, could not effect our justification and sanctification—not because it is imperfect in itself, for it is "holy" (vii. 12), but because it has to operate through our fallen nature—it was relatively *weak*—it could neither pardon sin nor prevent it, and produce holiness. Chrysostom makes *flesh* here mean, "not the essence and subsistency, but the more carnal sort of mind;" so in ver. 8, 9. Strange that he should construe it anywhere, in this discussion, of the bodily organization! *God sending*—This comprehends all that Christ was sent to accomplish. *His own Son*—This implies the eternal filiation of the Second Person in the Godhead; he was a Son—God's Son, in a peculiar, pregnant sense, before he was sent—hence the greatness of the love which sent him. John iii. 16. *In the likeness of sinful flesh*,—Lit., "in likeness of flesh of sin." In John i. 14 it is said, "The Word was made flesh"—cf. Heb. ii. 14—but the distinction here is to be carefully noted, as it was by the orthodox Fathers. Philippi well says Christ did not appear in the flesh of sin, which was the Ebionite view, nor in the likeness of flesh, which was the Docetic notion, but in the likeness of the flesh of sin, which is the Biblico-Pauline view. Irvingites and other fanatics get no support here for their heresy that Christ's assumed human nature was identical with ours, in sin as well as in infirmity—contrary to Heb. iv. 15 and 2 Cor. v. 21. *And for sin*,—Connected with the preceding. Christ appeared like a sinner, on account of sin—of course, to separate sin from sinners. "He was manifested to take away our sins, and in him is no sin" (1 John iii. 5). In this connection the phrase cannot be restricted to the meaning, "by a sacrifice for sin." *Condemned sin*—Condemned the sin—that which he came to destroy. There is an echo of the *katakrima* in ver. 1. Stuart finds a paronomasia: "There is now no

katakrima for Christians; but there is a *katakrima* for their carnal appetites and desires." Sin is condemned when its guilt being pardoned in justification, its inbeing is adjudged to destruction by sanctification. *In the flesh*:—To be joined with condemned. It is not *his* flesh, nor *our* flesh, but *the* flesh—that which he assumed in common with us—in our nature, sinless in him, sinful in us, he accomplished every thing necessary for our complete deliverance from sin—a salvation which is to be realized by us in a life of faith and obedience, as in ver. 4.

4. *That the righteousness of the law*—*Dikaiwma* here cannot mean justification, but the righteous requirements of the law, as set forth in ch. vi. Chrysostom: "The end, the scope, the well-doing. For what was its design? and what did it enjoin? To be without sin. This, then, is made good to us now through Christ." *Might be fulfilled in us*,—The passive form imports that God worketh in us to will and to do of his good pleasure; but he cannot work in us without our concurrence—he works, and we work with him. Some stumble at the word "fulfilled," objecting that perfection in obedience is not to be expected in this life. But why not? It is commanded, and provision is made for its attainment. All that the law requires is to love God with all our powers, and to love our neighbor as ourselves; and it is scarcely reverent to say that God requires of us impossibilities. Riddle says: "The fulfillment does not take place at once, nor in this life, perhaps; but surely must be the end (comp. Eph. ii. 10; Col. i. 22), and that it is in the apostle's mind here is evident from the latter part of the chapter." *Who walk not*—(See on ver. 2.) Riddle demurs at Lange's statement that this "is not only the characteristic but also the necessary condition of believers;" but he admits "that this is a condition of the final fulfillment—a condition which implies the Divine Spiritual power as its cause." Of course; but this dynamic influence cannot operate on natures which are not plastic to it, and concurrent with it: this synergism is all but self-evident. How can a poor, weak creature like fallen man make the slightest movement toward obedience without the Divine Spirit? and how can the Spirit operate upon a free agent without his concurrence? not only for "the final fulfillment" of the works of the law, but for the performance of any moral action?

5. *For they that*—For they who are according to flesh mind the things of the flesh, but those according to spirit, the things of the spirit. This is a development of ver. 4. The sentiment is nearly the same, as Matt. vii. 18. *Fronousin* comes from *frhō*, the mind, or soul, and means to set the mind, comprehending thought, affections, and will, upon any object, as in Matt. xvi. 23; Phil. iii. 19; Col. iii. 2: so the noun in ver. 6, 7. *The things of the flesh*:—All that belong to our fallen nature—all that are opposed to the spirit. 1 John ii. 16. The flesh prompts to sin; the spirit, to holiness: the bent of the regenerate and of the unregenerate is in opposite directions.

6. *For to be carnally minded is death;*—A good reason why the spiritual man will not mind the flesh. This is the opposite of life and peace, as in ver. 2; vi. 23. This translation gives the sense, though one more literal would be preferred; it is hard to find an adequate rendering. In the Ninth Anglican Article, "Of Original or Birth Sin," it is said, "This infection of nature doth remain in them that are regenerated, whereby the lust of the flesh, called in Greek *φρονημα σαρκος*, which some do expound the wisdom, some sensuality, some the affection, some the desire of the flesh, is not subject to the law of God." Wycliffe has "prudence;" Rheims and Geneva, "wisdom;" Rotherham, "preference;" Alford and others, "mind of the flesh;" but Alford explains, "thoughts, cares, and aims;" Grotius and Castalio, *studium*, which cannot perhaps be better represented in English than by "the minding of the flesh," as in our margin, Parkhurst, and Macknight. Chrysostom says, "Carnal-mindedness is the reasoning which is earthly, gross, and eager-hearted after the things of this life and its wicked doings." *But to be spiritually minded is life and peace:*—But the minding of the spirit—obeying "the impulse of that new and godly life-principle," noted in ver. 2—is life—blessedness, in vital union with God through faith (John xvii. 2), as the opposite (death) is the sum of all misery, as it is separation from God, the source of all bliss. Peace is added, because of the contrast of "enmity" in the next verse. As the soul is in harmony with itself, and with the law, and government, and loyal subjects of God, there must be "the peace of God, which passeth all understanding." Phil. iv. 7; James iii. 17, 18; see on Rom. v. 1. Peace thus results from sanctification, as well as from justification.

7. *Because the carnal mind*—Because the minding of the flesh is enmity toward God. The word is not too strong; for he who is devoted to sin hates God who forbids and punishes it. *For it is not subject to the law of God,*—For it does not submit itself—it is in the middle voice. Sin is lawlessness (1 John iii. 4), in its very nature hostile to the law and the Lawgiver. This antagonism of our fleshly disposition, our unregenerate nature, to the law of God, is the burden of ch. vii.

8. *So then*—*De* does not seem to be adversative (as Alford), but *metabatic*: And they who are in the flesh—in an unregenerate state—*cannot please God.*—It implies that they may attempt to do so, but will fail, as is shown in ch. vii.

9. *But ye are not in the flesh,*—Ye, however, are not in flesh, but in spirit, if so be that God's Spirit dwells in you. Here the Holy Spirit, as the Lord and Life-giver, the efficient Agent in our regeneration, is brought distinctly to notice. He enables our spirit to dominate the flesh. (See on ver. 1, 2.) He dwells in us, so as to regulate all our thoughts, feelings, and purposes—as if the apostle had said, Ye are not in an unregenerate, but in a regenerate state—not hating God, but pleasing him, as ye are influenced by his Spirit. *Now, if any man*—If, however, any man has not Christ's spirit, he is none of his. Riddle says: "This is a *dictum*

probans for the Western doctrine of the procession of the Holy Ghost from the Father and the Son (*Filioque*, Synod of Toledo, A.D. 589). This was the final contribution to the doctrinal statement of the Trinity." If the reference is to the Third *Person* of the Godhead, it favors the economical rather than the ontological procession from the Son as well as from the Father: both constitute "the Western doctrine" of the *Filioque*. John xvi. 7, 14, 15. Tholuck: "We have here a warning that faith, which is only seated in the understanding, is not accounted Christianity. There is in the true Christian the *life* of Christ. The *pneuma Cristou* is made the same with the *pneuma Qeou* in the preceding context, and the same with the *Cristov* in the one following, inasmuch as the spirit of the Redeemer is but a peculiar manifestation of the spirit [Spirit] of God. John xvii. 10." This is somewhat confused: what he means, perhaps, is that the Holy Spirit so operates in the believer as to produce in him "the mind of Christ." This is a *caveat* against Antinomian abuse of the doctrine of faith.

When from the curse he sets us free,
 He makes our nature clean;
 Nor would he send his Son to be
 The minister of sin.

10. *And if Christ be in you*,—The *de* contrasts with the preceding: the substantive verb *is*, supplied, assumes the fact: but if Christ is in you, as you profess. Christ is in believers personally, by his own divinity; he is in them representatively, by the Holy Spirit; and morally, by their possessing his spirit, or mind—which seems, from the preceding context, to be what is here meant; but this always implies the other two. Cf. John xiv. 23; vi. 54; xv. 4; Gal. ii. 20; Eph. iii. 17; Col. i. 27. *The body is dead*—The *mea*, omitted by our translators, ought to be rendered "indeed:" the meaning is, "though the body is dead"—not "the body of sin," but our corporeal frame, rendered mortal by the sin of Adam—an echo of ch. v. 12. It is dead in law, adjudged to death—"mortal," as in the next verse. *The Spirit*—Not the Holy Spirit, but the believer's soul—his spirit, as distinguished from his body, and as the subject of the Holy Spirit's influences. *Is life*—Being permeated by the spirit of life in Christ Jesus. The abstract is put for the concrete, for emphasis. Chrysostom observes, "He says not the *living* Spirit, but *life*, to show that it could impart it to others also." But Tholuck well says, "It is not the Divine Spirit, but the spirit of man, as is clear from the contrast with *soma*" (body). *Because of righteousness*.—Macknight: "Vigorous with respect to righteousness." It is rather, on account of righteousness, both justifying in the removal of guilt, and sanctifying in the removal of the inbeing of sin: the result is, the life of God in the soul. Riddle paraphrases well: "But if Christ be in you, though your body indeed is dead, having in it the seeds of death, and about to die on account of sin, whose effects are not yet totally removed, but your spirit, permeated by the Holy Spirit, is life already, and to be yet more truly so, on

account of righteousness, implanted in you by the Holy Spirit, in virtue of your union to Christ."

11. *But if*—If, moreover, the Spirit of him who raised up Jesus from the dead is dwelling in you. The circumlocution (repeated) contains an argument. What God did for Jesus we may fairly expect him to do for all who have his Spirit abiding in them. He will not leave the work incomplete. The moral resurrection (of the soul) shall in due time be followed by the physical resurrection—the body also shall be raised. Cf. John v. 24-29; 1 Cor. xv. 20-23; Eph. i. 19-22. *He that raised up Christ*—His official name, as the action passes over to us: the name Jesus in the former clause refers to his person, and recalls the historic fact of his resurrection. *Shall also quicken*—Rotherham: "Will make alive even your death-doomed bodies." The word *zwopoihsei*, "will make alive," was probably used rather than "raise," because of the *zwh*>"life," in ver. 10. A living body will be prepared for a living spirit. Cf. Gen. ii. 7; iii. 20. *By his Spirit*—Instead of the genitive, about an equal number of authorities have the accusative, rendered in the margin, "because of his Spirit." The Macedonians adopted this reading to evade the argument of the orthodox for the divine personality of the Holy Spirit founded on the genitive—which asserts that he is the Agent in the quickening. Alford thinks that the accusative may bear that sense—perhaps it is better to say it is not incompatible with it. The resurrection of Christ is attributed to each Person in the Trinity (see on Rom. i. 4); so the resurrection of believers. The term *mortal bodies* (see on vi. 12) fixes the sense—physical, not ethical. Doubtless there is a certain quickening of the body of the regenerate before death, as it is no longer the instrument of sin; but it is "our vile body" till it is raised from the grave, of which an earnest is given by the indwelling Spirit, who, of course, will be an Agent in the resurrection at the last day. 2 Cor. v. 5.

The Spirit raised my Saviour up,
When he had bled for me;
And, spite of death and hell, shall raise
Thy pious friends and thee.

Chrysostom makes a distinction where there seems to be no difference: "All shall rise, yet not all to life, but some to punishment, and some to life. This is why he did not say 'shall raise up,' but 'shall quicken.' And this is a greater thing than resurrection, and is given to the just only; and the cause of this honor he adds in the words, By his Spirit that dwelleth in you."

12. *Therefore*,—Illative from ver. 11. *Brethren*,—He uses this endearing appellation in various parts of this Epistle, to gain a favorable hearing to his exhortations, reproofs, etc. *We are debtors*—We owe fealty to God, who has done and promised to do so much for us. *Not to the flesh*,—Our corrupt nature has no

just claim on us. *To live after the flesh.*—We are under no obligation to live according to its behests.

13. *For if ye live after the flesh, ye shall die.*—Ye must die—death in every sense is the unavoidable result—though Satan said, "Ye shall not surely die." (See on ver. 6.) *But if ye through the Spirit*—But if in the spirit ye put to death the deeds of the body, ye shall live. Turner: "**Pneumati** may be translated 'in the spirit,' and explained of the Christian's spiritual state in opposition to a former carnal one; or, 'by the spirit,' meaning by the influence of the spiritual character implanted in him; but it is better to retain the usual exposition, the Holy Spirit, as he is the Agent by whom alone we are enabled to live conformably to our obligations, and as in the next verse he is spoken of as the leader of God's children." It may be construed, 1, "in the Holy Spirit"—in communion with him; or, 2, "through the Holy Spirit"—the instrumental dative—which produces this result; or, 3, "through the believer's spirit"—the instrumental dative; or, 4, "in spirit." As the noun has not the article, nor **dia** ("through"), nor any other preposition, and as flesh and spirit are thus contrasted through this section, and the *usus loquendi* favors it (cf. 1 Cor. vii. 34; xiv. 2; 2 Cor. ii. 13; Rev. iv. 2; xvii. 3; xxi. 10), it is best to render "in spirit"—the higher nature dominating the lower nature. But as this takes place under the conduct and by the influence of the Holy Spirit, as noted in the next verse, the difference of construction is of no practical moment. We cannot put to death the deeds of the body—no matter by what penances—without the Holy Spirit; and he, of course, cannot do it in us without our concurrence. 1 Cor. ix. 27. *The deeds of the body.*—**Praxeiv** is sometimes used in a good sense, as "The Acts of the Apostles;" or in an indifferent sense, as Matt. xvi. 27; Rom. xii. 4; but elsewhere in a bad sense, as Luke xxiii. 51; Acts xix. 18; Col. iii. 9—which last place, "ye have put off the old man with his deeds," is near akin to this place—as "the old man" means "the flesh" or corrupt nature, and *the body* is here used in nearly the same sense; for it is not simply the physical organization which is meant, but the body as it is actuated by sin in the members. (See on vi. 12.) By misunderstanding this, some early copyists substituted "flesh" for "body." *Ye shall live.*—It is not necessary, with Alford and others, to exclude the *natural* result of this discipline, though, of course, the divine benefaction is to be kept prominent—the life extending to eternity. Rom. vi. 23. Chrysostom, who understands by body, as well as by flesh, the physical organization, gives an arbitrary solution: "It is not the essence of the body whereof he is discoursing, but the deeds of the flesh—and not all deeds, but such as are evil—not seeing, hearing," etc. (that is, we must not commit suicide!)—we must "mortify those which tend toward wickedness," etc. Middleton says: "**Pneumati** is here evidently used in the adverbial sense to mean spiritually, for it is opposed to **kata-sarka**, carnally, in the preceding clause: **pneumati** **Qeou**—also in the next verse seems to mean little more. Macknight, however, understands both these of the Holy Spirit,

as if we had read υπο , or $\text{διὰ τοῦ Ἁγίου Πνεύματος}$; for some preposition is, I think, always used when an act is said to have been accomplished through the agency of the Holy Spirit."

14. *For*—This states the basis of the assurance in ver. 13. *As many*—And no more. *As are led*—If they are under the guidance of God's Spirit, they will lead holy lives. *They are*—These are God's sons—Being like God, partakers of a divine nature, they show their paternity. 1 Pet. i. 23; 2 Pet. i. 4; 1 John iii. 9. Alford and others note that they are called "sons," not "children"—being a higher and more mature relation—Gal. iv. 6. Christ is never called "the child of God," but "the Son of God." But tekna , "children," is used of believers, ver. 16, 17, 21; cf. John i. 12—where it is tekna , though rendered "sons."

15. *For*—Confirmatory of the preceding. *Ye have not received*—The aorist, ye received not, refers to the time of their regeneration. *The spirit*—A spirit of bondage again unto fear—such a servile spirit as that which they had before their conversion, described in ch. vii.—hence the word παλιν , "back," or "again." *But ye have received*—But ye received a spirit of sonship, wherein we cry, Abba, Father. This filial disposition was infused in justification (which is always accompanied with adoption) and regeneration, by the Holy Spirit, who is specified in the next verse. There is danger of pedantry in the use made of this metaphorical language: whether the word *adoption* should be used, or "sonship;" whether the reference is to the Roman law, which made all children, including the adoptive, equal in regard to privileges, or the Jewish law, which allowed the first-born a double inheritance—these and other nice points were not probably had in view by the apostle. As children are like their parents—as they have many tokens of their filiation, and as many privileges as well as obligations belong to the filial relation—so it is with believers in Christ. He is their Elder Brother, and through him they acquire the adoption of sons—he being the Firstborn among many brethren. As justification stands related to sanctification, so adoption stands related to regeneration—the *relative* work in each case corresponding to the *real* work—our character is made to agree with our relation. None can have the adoption of sons without possessing a filial nature. "Ye must be born again." *Whereby*—Wherein we cry—possessing the filial relation and disposition, we use the filial style. Crying is the expression of earnest prayer, as in the Psalms (lxxvii. 1; cvii. 6, *et al.*); Gal. iv. 6. *Abba, Father*.—So Mark xiv. 36 and Gal. iv. 6—nowhere else. *Abba* is Chaldaic for father— אבא is vocative, according to Hebrew usage. Our Lord used *Abba* in his agony—he had been accustomed to it, doubtless, from his infancy; it sounds more tender and endearing—more childlike; *ab* and *am*, Heb. for father and mother, are the simplest labial sounds, easy of utterance to an infant—so *papa* and *mamma*. Selden's allusion to the Talmud, which says servants were not allowed to call the master *abba*, but only *ab*, seems far-fetched. The double name may have reference to childlike

repetition; but then it would seem that *Abba* should be repeated. Some think the Greek word is used to explain the Chaldaic; but it is represented as a part of the exclamation. Augustin, Calvin, and others, suggest that the bilingual form shows that both Jews and Gentiles enjoy the common privilege; but Christ used the bilingual form in the garden—surely not for explanation, or for the other reason. Euchologies are not to be governed by ordinary rules—they are the language of feeling. The English liturgy abounds in bilingual forms and passionate expressions. Luther renders, "Dear Father;" cf. Heb., *Abi*, "My Father," 2 Kings ii. 12; Jer. iii. 4. The Syriac renders, "My Father." Middleton says: "The article has here the force of a possessive pronoun; the addition is expressive of the most impassioned feeling. *Abba* was the Oriental term by which children *familiarly* addressed their parents; the addition of 'my Father' was required to give it solemnity and force." But surely *Abba* was a solemn as well as a familiar address. Those who construe *pneuma* in this verse of the Holy Spirit reach the same conclusion—thus Olshausen: "We have received the one true Spirit: this Spirit leaves us not in a state of bondage, nor calls forth such a state again; but he begets a filial consciousness. For the state of fear and bondage is not that of castaways, but subordinate only to that of children: the utterly dead man alone is without fear and without the feeling of bondage (vii. 9); with the awakening (vii. 10-24) fear begins; with the regeneration (vii. 25, etc.), love."

16. *The Spirit itself*—The Spirit himself testifies with our spirit, that we are children of God. Wycliffe: "And the like Spirit yieldeth a witnessing to our spirit." Tyndale and Cranmer: "The same Spirit certifieth our spirit." Geneva: "The which self-same Spirit beareth witness together with our spirit." Tomson's Beza: "The same Spirit beareth witness with our spirit." But if *pneuma* in ver. 15 meant the Holy Spirit, still this rendering is not allowed by the order of the words. Winer says: "*To-αὐτο-πνεῦμα* means *the same Spirit*; but *αὐτο-το-πνεῦμα*, *the Spirit himself*. Kru. 107. Comp. for the former Rom. ix. 21; Phil. i. 30; Luke vi. 38; xxiii. 40; 2 Cor. iv. 13; for the latter, Rom. viii. 26; 1 Cor. xv. 28; 2 Cor. xi. 14; John xvi. 27." Rheims has it right, literally from the Vulgate, "For the Spirit himself (*ipse*) giveth testimony to our spirit." For grammatical concord the neuter *αὐτο* is used, agreeing with *pneuma*, which is neuter; but as it designates a person, it should be rendered in the masculine—"himself"—as our translators have done in John xiv. 17, *et al.* There are two parties here—the Holy Spirit and our spirit; but it is a joint attestation—not as if the Holy Spirit deposed to the fact, and our spirit independently corroborated it; or *vice versa*, as Tholuck: "Our spirit *concludes* that we are the children of God: his Spirit impresses the seal upon that conclusion." The Holy Spirit operates upon our spirit, so as to induce concurrent action, as in all the synergism of the spiritual life. He finds a suitable subject—the spirit of a penitent believer—one who by his grace has been brought to penitence and faith; and he produces in the consciousness of the believer a persuasion of his

sonship, inspiring filial sentiments, especially childlike confidence in God, which, as it is wrought by the Holy Spirit, is realized in the consciousness of the believer, so that it is a conjoint testimony. The Holy Spirit puts the words "Abba, Father" into our mouth, and so we cry, "Abba, Father." Thus "he that believeth on the Son of God hath the witness in himself" (1 John v. 10). *Summarturew* is used in Rom. ii. 15 and ix. 1—not elsewhere—*marturew* being the reading preferred in Rev. xxii. 18—in the sense of confirming by the testimony of conscience. Here the Holy Spirit is the deponent, and he confirms the fact—*sub* being like *con* in *confirmari, contestari*. It is therefore impertinent to ask, "To whom does the Holy Spirit or our spirit bear witness?" To whom does our conscience bear testimony, as in 2 Cor. i. 12, "Our rejoicing is this, the testimony of our conscience," etc.? By an act of introspection a man searches his own heart: "For what man knoweth the things of a man, save the spirit of a man which is in him" (1 Cor. ii. 11)? In the present case the fact can only be ascertained by the Holy Spirit, through whose influence it takes place, and by whose agency it is substantiated in our consciousness: in this sense it is a joint testimony. Olshausen says well: "In this state of being children, then, the witness of our own spirit with [and] that of the Divine Spirit permeate each other in a peculiar manner. The one that properly gives witness in this *testimonium Spiritus* is the Divine Spirit; the human spirit is more the receiver of the witness from him, as it is said, Spirit witnesseth that Spirit is truth (1 John v. 6)—that is, the Spirit needs no witness but himself for his truth—as the light is not and cannot be testified by aught but by itself. But as the physical light needs an eye, a faculty of receptivity, in order to be perceived, and as this is itself light, so is the spiritual light, the *nouv* (the human *pneuma*) the eye for the Divine Spirit. This witness of the Spirit is not to be placed merely in the feeling (1 John iii. 19), but his whole inward and outward efficacy must be taken together; for instance, his comfort, his incitement to prayer, his censure of sin, his impulse to works of love, to witness before the world, and such like more. Upon the foundation of this immediate testimony of the Holy Spirit, *all the regenerate man's conviction of Christ and his work* finally rests. For the faith in the Scripture itself has its basis upon this experience of the divinity of the principle which it promises, and which flows into the believer while he is occupied with it. This passage is, besides, important as one of the most striking in which the *human spirit* is represented *as not in and by itself identical* with the Divine. The human spirit may be defiled by sin (2 Cor. vii. 1), the Divine not—he may be grieved only (Eph. iv. 30), or driven away; but as the absolute principle of holiness, he is himself incapable of spot. By communication of this highest principle of all life, man therefore first becomes one spirit with the Lord himself, as it is said 1 Cor. vi. 17. *Summarturein* here, as at ii. 15, is not of the same import with the simple verb—a twofold witness rather is here spoken of, that actually indeed blends again to *one*, wherein, however, a positive and a negative side may be distinguished."

17. *And if children*,—But if children, also heirs. This states the consequence—among all people, children inherit their father's property. *Heirs of God*,—God's heirs, indeed, but Christ's joint-heirs. The *μεν* ("indeed")—omitted by our translators—corresponding to the *δε* ("but") in the next clause, must not be overlooked. We are constituted heirs by the Father, though we are joint-heirs with his First-born—ver. 29, 30; Heb. i. 2; 1 Cor. iii. 21, 22, 23; John xvii. 22. The metaphor is not to be pressed. The meaning is, as Christ, the Father's well-beloved Son, shares in his paternal love, and is rewarded for all his mediatorial services and sufferings, so we, his brethren—adopted children of the same Father—will share with him in his reward; if we bear our cross, as he bore his, we shall wear our crown, as he wears his. *If so be*—If so be we are jointly-suffering, that we may be also jointly-glorified. This was specially appropriate in the case of the first believers, who were called to suffer persecution for the sake of Christ—so that they were indeed his fellow-sufferers, and hence were cheered with the assurance that they should share in his glory. Matt. v. 10, 11, 12; Acts xiv. 22; 2 Tim. ii. 11; 1 Pet. iv. 12-v. 1; Heb. xii. 2; Rev. ii. 10; iii. 21; vii. 13-17.

18. *For*—Developing the thought of ver. 17. *I reckon*,—*Logizomai* occurs forty-one times in N.T., and A.V. renders it by eleven different words. Here Wycliffe has "deem;" Tyndale and Cranmer, "suppose;" Geneva, "confirm;" Rheims, "think;" Tomson, "count." W. and W.: "It is an arithmetical word—count up, calculate, form a conclusion after balancing the account, iii. 28; vi. 11." Here it is the action of the mind, or judgment, as the result of reasoning and experience—no guess-work. *The sufferings*—Especially persecutions: ver. 17, 35, 36; 2 Cor. i. 5; iv. 17. *Of this present time*—Of the present period. *The glory*—The future glory to be revealed unto us. *Shall be*—As in ver. 13. W. and W.: "As that which is destined—denoting what must happen—the glory which is certain to be made manifest with respect to us." *Eij* does not mean *in*: it may be taken in a pregnant sense, "in and to;" but "unto," or "with regard to," gives the sense.

19. *For*—An illustration of the greatness of this glory. *The earnest expectation*—'*Apokaradokia*, from *apo*, "from;" *kara*, the head; and *dokeu* to watch—as the head is thrust forward when we are looking eagerly for some object—eager expectation. *Of the creature*—*Ktisiv*, creation—not inanimate or irrational creatures; not Jews or Gentiles, as such, converted or unconverted; but mankind—the world. Green: "the human race." *Ktisiv* occurs nineteen times in N.T. In Mark x. 6; xiii. 19; Rom. i. 20, 2 Pet. iii. 4; Rev. iii. 14, it is rendered "creation"—referring to the production of the world by the power of God; it is rendered "creature" in Rom. i. 25; viii. 39—in both which places it might be rendered "creation," as what is created. In Heb. ix. 11 it is rendered "building," where it might also be rendered "creation"—that which is made; in 1 Pet. ii. 13,

"every ordinance of man" means "every human creation." In the other ten places—to wit, Mark xvi. 15; 2 Cor. v. 17; Gal. vi. 15; Col. i. 15, 23; Heb. iv. 13; and the four places in this paragraph—it may, not to say *must*, refer to human beings—individuals or the mass, according to the context. The gospel is to be preached "to every creature"—surely not to irrational or inanimate, but to human creatures. Paul says it was preached to every creature under heaven—to all creation—but no one doubts his meaning. Christ is the first-born of every creature—that is, he stands at the head of redeemed creation. In Gal. vi. 15; 2 Cor. v. 17, a new creature is a regenerated person. In Heb. iv. 13 it *may* embrace others; but it means principally, if not exclusively, human beings. So in this paragraph, in every instance, it means "the creation"—that which is affirmed of it, defining its meaning and restricting it to the world of mankind. W. and W.: "It can hardly be doubted that the same meaning must be affixed to *ktisiv*, wherever it occurs in 19-22. Now in 22, *pasa hktisiv* clearly refers to the human race, for it is opposed to 'ourselves who have the first-fruits of the Spirit.' In Mark xvi. 15; Col. i. 23, it means all mankind. It is used in the same way as *kosmov*, when denoting 'the people' of the world. We may consider, then, that the apostle speaks of the vague expectation of 'a good time coming,' which then extensively prevailed, but which, as founded on a human instinct, due to God's intention with regard to our race intimated in the earliest prophecies, may be predicated universally of mankind." Whitby's defense of this interpretation has been assailed, but never refuted. The objection that mankind at large have no conception of the heavenly state, and so no expectation of it, is thus answered by Whitby: "In the sacred dialect, desire and expectation is ascribed to creatures in reference to things they want, and which tend to their advantage, though they explicitly know nothing of them. Thus the Messiah is called 'the expectation of the Gentiles,' Gen. xlix. 10; 'the desire of all nations,' Hag. ii. 14." *Waiteth for*—'*Apekdecomai* occurs also in ver. 23, 25; 1 Cor. i. 7; Gal. v. 5; Phil. iii. 20; Heb. ix. 28: in the last two places it is rendered "look for"—it means to await with expectation. Thus the eager expectation of creation awaits the revelation of the sons of God—as Tholuck says, the strengthening of the attributive notion into a substantive makes a double prosopopoeia—not only the creation, but the expectation of the creation, awaits. *The manifestation*—It seems a pity that the fine word apocalypse, from the original, was not always used to represent the latter. It occurs eighteen times as a noun, and is rendered fourteen times by "revelation" (or its cognate, twice), and the verb, which occurs twenty-six times, is always rendered "reveal." "Revelation" (as in Rev. i. 1) is the best representative of apocalypse. It is an uncovering, or disclosure, of what before existed, but was concealed—the dignity of believers, as the sons of God—heirs apparent to a crown of glory—obscure, despised in this world, revealed in their true character at the revelation of Jesus Christ. 1 Pet. i. 7, 13; iv. 13.

Nor doth it yet appear
How great we shall be made;
But when we see our Saviour here,
We shall be like our Head.

Of the sons of God.—No distinction of emphasis was perhaps intended by "sons"—not "children."

20. *For*—Some begin a parenthesis here, ending it with "subjected the same," so as to join "in hope" with "manifestation of the sons of God;" others begin the parenthesis at "not willingly," and end it with "subjected the same," so as to connect "in hope" with "made subject to vanity." Others allow of no parenthesis, connecting "in hope" with "him who hath subjected the same"—as in A.V.—rendering the following *of* not "that," but "because." Tholuck says: "The *of* may stand either *ai ti ol ogi kwv*, as is held by most, and among these by Luther, or '*objective*,' as it is taken by Baumgarten, Koppe, De Wette, and others. The latter is the preferable way—'in hope that.'" The present tendency seems in that direction; but Alford renders "because," and Conybeare and Howson say: "We agree with Dean Alford that it is better here not to render, as some do, 'in hope that;' for, were this correct, the words 'the creation itself' would not be so emphatically repeated." This seems judicious. They put only a semicolon after "hope," and render *of* "for," which appears to give the sense. *The creature*—The creation—the world of mankind—the fallen race of Adam. *Was made subject to vanity*,—Not idolatry, as some of the Fathers explain it; for the heathen went into idolatry "willingly," as Paul says, Rom. i. 20-23; but frailty, including all the miseries resulting from the fall, especially the weakness, pain, and death of the body—*fqora*>corruption, ver. 21. So Chrysostom, OEcumenius, Theophylact, and others. Theodoret says he calls that vanity to which all things in the world are subject, "corruption." This seems, says Origen, to be spoken of the body, for that only is subject to corruption. Whitby says this "is apparent also from the things they groan for—viz., the redemption of the body from corruption, that this mortal might put on immortality, or be clothed with its house from heaven, that mortality might be swallowed up of life. 2 Cor. v. 1-5." He refers to Ecclesiastes and Ps. xxxix. 5, 11; cxliv. 4, for this use of the word vanity, and says, "When Adam became mortal he called his son Abel, *Vanity*. Gen. iv. 2." *Not willingly*,—The race of man did not themselves choose this state of frailty; it was superinduced in consequence of the fall of their primogenitors. *But by reason*—But through him who subjected it in hope. Not "the devil," as Locke and some others thought!—not Adam, who was indeed the *occasion*—but God himself. Bengel: "Adam rendered it liable to vanity, but he did not subject it." It agrees with Alford's hybrid theology to say, "If the occasion pointed at by *subjected* be required, I should hardly fix it at the fall of man, but at his creation, in the eternal counsels, when he was made capable of falling, liable to change"! God himself tells us when he subjected man

to this vanity—Gen. iii. 17, 18, 19—when he cursed the ground for man's sake, and said, "Dust thou art, and unto dust shalt thou return." All the evils of this mortal life may be comprehended in the curse: "The trail of the serpent is over them all." W. and W.: "The expression is evidently in opposition to 'not willingly,' 'by reason of him who subjected it'—*i.e.*, by his constraining will—his decree of toil, suffering, and death, consequent on the fall. Gen. iii. 16." There is no necessity of rendering *upetagh*, "was made subject," in the middle voice, as Bengel: "Passive with a middle meaning, though it partially personifies." Mankind were passive in this subjection—God subjected them. *In hope*;—Bengel: "Construe with *was made subject*, so *in hope* is put absolutely, Acts ii. 26, and confer *by hope*, ver. 24." But it amounts to the same thing to connect "in hope" with what immediately precedes—"subjected the same." It is literally "upon hope"—"resting upon, maintaining the hope." It is not necessary to predicate the hope of him who subjected; it was rather given along with the malediction to mankind, who are subjected to it—as hope was found at the bottom of Pandora's box. But for this hope of redemption Adam would not have been permitted to propagate his race in a state of sin and corruption.

21. *Because the creature itself*—Because even the creation itself shall be freed. This states the reason of the whole procedure; and hence the repetition of "the creation"—though thus doomed to vanity, it shall be freed from it: provision is made for its deliverance. The language expresses the solidarity of the species—the provision made for one is made for all: if any fail to realize it, it is not on account of any limitation on the part of God—none are excluded, but those who exclude themselves. None should stumble at the universal terms employed by the apostle, knowing his manner—as in Rom. v. 15-21; xi. 26-32; 1 Cor. xv. 22; 1 Tim. ii. 3-6, *et al.* When occasion serves, the limitations and conditions are sufficiently explicit—as in ver. 5-13; cf. Rom. ii.; Eph. v. 5, 6; 2 Thess. i., *et al.* Restorationists, therefore, cannot derive from this passage much aid for their *apokatastasis*. The reason of the emphatic designation, "even the creation itself," is given in ver. 22, 23. *Shall be delivered*—As this verb is cognate with the noun which follows, it should be rendered alike—"shall be freed into the freedom of the glory." *From the bondage of corruption*,—It is well called slavery; for men are subjected to corruption involuntarily, and are kept in slavery to it: there is no manumission till the resurrection. The corruption is the "vanity" of ver. 20. *Into*—The *ei j* here is pregnant—freed from the one, and admitted into the other. Winer notes this case of brachyology. *The glorious liberty*—This hendiadys hardly gives the sense: it is the freedom of the glory—the freedom belonging to the glory spoken of ver. 18—opposed to the bondage of corruption. The prominent idea must not be made an attributive. "Glory" is a better word than incorruption (though this is the opposite of corruption), because it has in it the idea of weight—durability, as opposed to "vanity," ver. 20. Cf. Heb. *chabod*, and 2 Cor.

iv. 17, 18. *Of the children of God.*—The same as "the sons of God," ver. 19: no distinction, like that which Alford suggests.

22. *For we know*—A Pauline expression—stating a patent fact—ii. 2; iii. 19; vii. 14. Tholuck says: "Summary of what has been said. The assurance expressed by *οἱ ἄδελφοί*, shows, as Bucer justly remarks, that the Jewish Christians, as having once been Jews, and the heathen Christians whom they instructed, were firmly persuaded of such a close connection of the inanimate creation with man." But Paul does not appear to have the inanimate creation in view. None, Jews or Gentiles, needed to be told, what they all knew by painful experience, that all the creation—the whole world of mankind—was jointly groaning and jointly travailing, sighing under the burdens of life, and longing for deliverance. Whitby: "All the world under that sense of mortality, which still subjects them to bondage; for, as Cicero confesses, 'death must be terrible to those who with their life lose the enjoyment of all good things; and if it be an evil, must be an eternal evil, because it doth forever deprive them of all good'—'that the fear of it disturbs all the tranquillity of life—and that this renders our whole life miserable; for what pleasure can there be in that life which is perpetually perplexed with the thoughts of death?'" Hear the echo in Heb. ii. 15: "And deliver them, who, through fear of death, were all their life-time subject to bondage." This is not like Goethe's poetic "sensation, as if nature, in wailing sadness, entreated something of me, so that, not to understand what she longed for, cut through my very heart." His own dying cry for "more light" may have been more in accordance with the travail in question! *Groaneth*,—Literally, jointly groaneth and jointly travaileth. The metaphor of birth-throes is very expressive, but must not be pressed: the world does not bring forth the new creation.

23. *And not only they*,—Instead of ungrammatically supplying "they," render, "And not only so"—not only is the creation at large, but even ourselves, possessing the first-fruits of the Spirit, even we ourselves. The repetition is for emphasis, and perhaps to show that the apostle includes himself with other believers. The gifts of the Spirit imparted to the first believers were an *arrhabon*, or earnest, of their future inheritance, just as the first-fruits offered in the tabernacle were an earnest of the forthcoming harvest. Num. xviii. 12; Lev. xxiii. 9-14; Ex. xxiii. 19; 2 Cor. i. 22; Eph. i. 14; 1 Pet. iv. 14. Winer ably defends the use of the genitive of apposition here (as in Rom. iv. 11, "the sign of circumcision"); the Spirit is the first-fruits—"the Spirit of adoption"—an earnest of another *adoption, to wit, the redemption of our body*—when the glorification shall be complete. No wonder that the world at large groans under the burdens of life and the bondage to death, having but a vague expectation of deliverance, when we who have the earnest of it, even we ourselves, groan within ourselves, awaiting our perfect and eternal deliverance. '*Ἀπολύσει*' here drops the idea of ransom, and means deliverance from the bondage in which the body is held in this life, and

in the grave. Then, in the highest sense, we shall become the "children of God, being the children of the resurrection" (Luke xx. 36). The omission of the article before *uiōqesiān* does not imply that it is "the realization of sonship," as if sonship was not imparted when the "spirit of sonship" was given, ver. 15. They were then constituted sons of God, but it requires another act of adoption to make the work complete; that takes place in the redemption, or resurrection, of the body. Chrysostom says: "The redemption of our body is the perfect glory. Our lot, indeed, is at present uncertainty to our last breath, since many who were sons have become dogs and prisoners. But if we decease with a good hope, then is the gift unmovable, and clearer, and greater, having no longer any change to fear from death and sin. For this is full redemption, not a redemption only, but such that we shall never again return to our former captivity"—*apolutrosis*, not *lutrosis*.

24. *For*—Confirmatory of the preceding. *We are saved by hope*.—Aorist: "In the hope were we saved." When we received the spirit of sonship, it was as an earnest of our future and eternal salvation, the hope of which was thus implanted in the soul. Winer: "The dative is here a real ablative of the mode and manner." Alford, "form, or condition." Bengel seems correct: "The dative, not of the means, but of the manner—we are so saved, that something may even yet remain for which we may hope—both salvation and glory." Conybeare and Howson are hardly correct: "The salvation whereto we were called lies in hope." Luther is better: "We are indeed saved, yet in hope." Lange: "They have the inward adoption in the witness of the Spirit; but the adoption of glory in the pledge of the Spirit"—rather *earnest*, being a part of the inheritance. Present salvation is a foretaste of future salvation, which is the object of hope. Chrysostom says: "This is about what he means: We are not to seek our all in this life, but to have hope also." *But hope that is seen*,—Here hope, as often, means the object of hope. Cf. Col. i. 5; 2 Thess. ii. 16; 1 Tim. i. 1; Heb. vi. 18. Hence the apostle adds *is not hope*—though by a metaphor it is so called. *For what*—For what one beholds, why does he still hope for? Fruition supersedes hope. So the ancient heretics, who said the resurrection was past already, no longer had it as an object of hope—as it will not be to us when we shall have experienced it: theirs was a delusion—ours will be a reality.

25. *But if*—But if what we do not behold, we hope for, with patience we wait for it. Patience here is the same as in ver. 3. "Patient in suffering ill, and doing well;" but endurance under trials is the prominent idea, and hope is indispensable to that, and admirably subserves it. Hence the apostle speaks of the "patience of hope." 1 Thess. i. 3; Heb. x. 36; James i. 3, 4, *et al.* Chrysostom: "The name of patience belongs to hard work and much endurance; yet even this he has granted to the man who hopes, that he might solace the wearied soul."

26. *Likewise*—And even so also the Spirit gives us aid in our infirmities. Some connect with ver. 16. The Spirit not only witnesses our adoption, but aids our devotions; others connect with the groanings of the creation—it not only groans, but the Spirit also: it is best to connect with ver. 23-25: Not only do we groan and long for redemption, but the Holy Spirit becomes a party in the business, and renders us aid in our infirmities, as we are not able to pray aright without his aid. So in the Post-Communion Collect: "Have compassion on our infirmities, and those things which for our unworthiness we dare not, and for our blindness we cannot, ask, vouchsafe to give." Some important MSS. and versions have "weakness"—in the singular. The poet has it—perhaps for the rhyme—finely giving the sense:

To help our soul's infirmity,
 To heal thy sin-sick people's care,
 To urge our God-commanding plea,
 And make our hearts a house of prayer,
 The promised Intercessor give,
 And let us now thyself receive.

Come in thy pleading Spirit down, etc.

That the Spirit is not here subjective is clear; and by none has this been better set forth than by Whitby: "The Spirit here cannot signify the spirit of a man, for that cannot be said to help with us, being a constituent part of us, or to intercede for us, when we know not ourselves what to pray for as we ought; for, saith Theophylact, Moses thus prayed to see the land of Canaan, and Jeremy for the Jews, and St. Paul to be delivered from the thorn in the flesh; but the Spirit of God, who is said to intercede for us, not as an advocate, or mediator, betwixt God and us—that being the office of our great High-priest—but as an exciter or director of us in our addresses to God, to render them for matter according to the will of God, and for manner fervent and effectual—*proseuchē* *ejergoumenē*—inwrought prayer, and to make our very sighs and groanings prevalent; for he is here said only to intercede for us with sighs and groanings, excited by him, after that redemption to which he sealeth us, and of which, he being the earnest and pledge, we are hence moved with greater faith and fervency to long for the enjoyment of it. And this is the reason why I think not fit to interpret this passage with some of the Fathers, of a public *charisma*, or gift of prayer, since that must spend itself in words for the edification of the Church, and not in silent groanings. See Ex. ii. 24; vi. 5; Judg. ii. 18; Ps. xxxviii. 9; cii. 20; Acts vii. 34. Thus when our Lord had twice groaned in the Spirit (John xi. 33, 38), he saith, I thank thee, O Father, that thou hast heard me (ver. 41)." *Helpeth*—*Sunanti l ambarōmai* means to take hold in turn with any one—to lay hold along with; but this must not be pressed, as if there were a burden which is

borne by the two parties uniting their force. The synergism of the N.T. is very different from that. We cannot operate at all till the Holy Spirit operates on us, and co-operates with us; but then this dynamism implies that there is a free moral agent who responds to the divine influence, and concurs with it. We cannot pray, repent, believe, obey, without the Spirit; but it is absurd to say that the Holy Spirit does all this for us, or that it can be done without our concurrence and co-operation. This is implied in the very idea of *help*. Tholuck says, "The *sub* merely strengthens the idea of helping." It does more—it expresses the synergistic idea of helping: "he helps us to help ourselves"—bringing into exercise all our powers. The *sub*, therefore, is like that in *summarturei*, ver. 16. Chrysostom says, "The Spirit works with thee, and on all occasions bears his part in the alliance." Tholuck: "The plural, 'infirmities,' enforces the idea of the singular, and must not, as is done by Chrysostom, Grotius, and others, be expanded to mean outward sufferings. Just as little will it bear to be applied, after Origen, Cocceius, and others, to our ignorance of what to pray for. It refers to the timidity of our soul." Bengel puts the abstract for the concrete—our prayers, which are in themselves infirm. But the Spirit helps us in our infirmities (or weakness), to enable us to bear the trials of life (ver. 23), and in particular to pray for all needed grace, according to what follows. *For we know not*—*to* (omitted in translation) belongs to the whole clause—the case in point. We are ignorant of both the form and the matter of prayer. *The Spirit itself*—Himself, as in English Spirit is masculine; cf. ver. 16. This emphasizes the dignity of our Intercessor. *Maketh intercession*—The compound word is here used—the *uþer* having reference to the parties for whom the intercession is made; hence it is thought that the words *for us*, wanting in many MSS., are an interpolation. *With groanings which cannot be uttered*.—Unspeakable. As it is the influence of the Spirit, no human language can express it; and as our emotions are so intense, and our capacities are so limited, we cannot find suitable words for utterance. The synergism must be kept in view. Lange gratuitously wonders at Meyer's suggestion of an analogy in the case of demoniacal possession. But there is an analogy: as the evil spirit entered into, influenced, and used the organs of, the demoniac, so the Holy Spirit enters into the believer, influences him, and uses his organs—only in this case the latter is always the willing co-operant with the former—the two become one *quoad* the matter in hand. "He that is joined to the Lord is one Spirit." The Holy Spirit is an Intercessor, as he is that other Paraclete promised by Christ, John xiv. Christ is our Paraclete with the Father in heaven; the Spirit is our Paraclete on earth: Christ intercedes for us by pleading his own merits; the Spirit intercedes in us, by suggestion, excitation, and support.

27. *And*—But—though not spoken. God understands it, because *he searcheth the hearts*—that is his exclusive prerogative. 1 Chron. xxviii. 19; Jer. xvii. 10. Rev. ii. 23. *Knoweth what is the mind of the Spirit*,—Though there is a personal

distinction between the Persons of the Trinity, yet as the Father knows the Son, and the Son the Father (Matt. xi. 27), so the Spirit, "who proceedeth from the Father and the Son," knows the mind of both (1 Cor. ii. 10, 11), and is known by both. *Because*—Not "that:" it shows that God knows what the Spirit intends, as his intercession for saints is according to God, that is, in correspondence with his will. All acceptable prayer is according to the will of God—the Holy Spirit knows what that is.

28. *And*—*De*>perhaps glances at the afflictions of ver. 18 ff., and may be rendered, "But." *We know*—The result of faith in God's perfections, promises, and performances. *All things*—This, of course, includes events. Alford justly enough censures Augustin for including our sins; but in his subsequent notes he runs into fatalism, which virtually makes God the author of sin! The next clause shows that sinners have no part nor lot in the matter: in so far as any one sins he throws himself out from under the divine protection, and exposes himself to *evil*, and has no promise of *good*. Isa. iii. 10, 11; Mal. iii. 17. *Work together*—They co-operate under the controlling providence of God, all of whose perfections stand engaged to make the good man blessed. It is in the present tense.

T' accomplish his design,
The creatures all agree,
And all the attributes divine
Are now at work for me.

To them that love God,—That settles the question—love is the very opposite of sin: it is the essence of obedience. *To them who are the called*—Lit., to those who according to purpose are called ones. (See on i. 6.) It is unexegetical, and betrays the sinister influence of a dogmatic spirit, to speak here of "effectual calling." Every invitation of the gospel is *effectual*, when it is accepted. No one is forced to accept it—if there were any who have no gracious ability to accept it, they could not be censured for declining it; and if any were "sweetly forced" to accept it, they are no more to be commended than those who were reprobated are to be censured. These are well-nigh self-evident propositions, and argument would be wasted on them. The divinely-appointed synergism runs through the whole process of salvation. No one can enter on the divine life unless first empowered and excited to do so by the Holy Spirit, and the Holy Spirit never forced any one to concur and co-operate with his grace, and never continued to operate without his concurrence and co-operation. This is the constant teaching of the Scriptures, and is attested by experience—indeed, the common sense of mankind indorses it as proper and right. No interpretation of particular texts which varies from this can be correct. Better acknowledge that we do not know the meaning of a passage than give it an interpretation which contradicts these acknowledged principles, and makes God capricious, cruel, and the author of all the sin and misery in the

universe. Chrysostom, Theodoret, and Epiphanius, refer the purpose to man—"his" (God's) in our version not being in the Greek. Chrysostom: "Hence he says that it is not the calling alone, but the purpose of those called also, which works the salvation. For the calling was not forced on them, nor was it compulsory. All of them were called, but all did not obey the call." This is sound doctrine, whatever may be thought of the exegesis. God's purpose is to save all who believe in Jesus, and to condemn all "who won't believe."

29. *For*—Explanatory. *Whom he did foreknow*,—As God foreknew all men and things, this precognition must refer to the persons here had in view—namely, all, Gentiles as well as Jews—for this is the great design of the Epistle to show that God purposed from the beginning to call Gentiles to the enjoyment of equal privileges with Jews, in the fellowship of his Son: "God hath not cast away his people whom he foreknew" (xi. 2); "even us whom he hath called, not of the Jews only, but also of the Gentiles" (ix. 24); "for God hath concluded them all in unbelief, that he might have mercy upon all" (xi. 32). It is a pity that men will not let the apostle explain himself. *He also did predestinate*—*Proorizw* occurs six times in N.T.—the cognate noun ("predestination") does not occur at all. Calvin's predestination, or foreordination, precedes foreknowledge—God, he says, foreknows all things because he predestinated or fore-ordained all things. The foreknowledge here specified by Paul precedes the predefining. Of course, this is in the order of thought—the knowledge and the defining being at one and the same time in the divine mind. The word is used in the same sense as here in Eph. i. 5, 11, and nowhere else. There the apostle states that according to the divine purpose Jewish believers were predefining—marked out beforehand—to the enjoyment of the adoption of sons and other privileges to which, he says, Gentile believers were also called—"that the Gentiles should be joint-heirs, and a joint-body, and joint-partners, in the promise in Christ Jesus, through the gospel." Cf. Eph. i. 13, 14; iii. 1-13. The prerogative specified in this predefining is conformity to Christ—*summoσfouv*, with a genitive, may be rendered as a substantive, "copies of the likeness of his Son." *Eij wσ* means an image, or copy—something which resembles another. Copies of the likeness may seem to be pleonastic; but it may imply the peculiar appearance of the Son of God, as the brightness of the Father's glory, and the express image of his person, in his glorified humanity—the Son of man—the prototype of mankind—the model by which we are to be molded. This assimilation, indeed, supposes conformity to his sufferings and death (Phil. iii. 10), but the ultimate reference is to his state in glory. 1 Cor. xv. 49; Phil. iii. 21; 1 John iii. 2, 3. Tholuck: "All that Paul means to specify is the glorious scope toward which, as he afterward says, the calling, justification, and the exaltation to glory, conduct." *That he might be the first-born*—That he might have many brothers, he being the elder brother—the first-born of the family. God's purpose includes all believers in this honor; but

then Christ took the nature of our common humanity—not of one more than another—so that all who have borne the image of the earthly Adam shall also bear the image of the heavenly, except such as despise their birthright, and refuse to be made "partakers of the divine nature." "Beloved, now are we the sons of God, and it doth not yet appear what we shall be: but we know that, when he shall appear, we shall be like him; for we shall see him as he is" (1 John iii. 2). The [prwtotokov](#) (Heb., *bekor*) received a double portion of the inheritance, besides other prerogatives. Deut. xxi. 17; Ps. lxxxix. 27. As the firstborn was pre-eminent among his brothers, so Christ is the Head of redeemed and glorified humanity. Col. i. 15-18; Heb. i. 5, 6; ii. 14; Rev. i. 5.

30. *Moreover*,—But—this introduces the method by which this is accomplished—the stand-point of the writer being the state of glory to which believers are raised; hence the verbs are all aorists—not, as some say, "in the sense of systematic operation." Winer: "The aorist is used, because he who in behalf of whom God has completed the justification has also obtained from him the glorification—though he will only enter subsequently on the actual possession of the glory. In no part of the N.T. does the aorist express what is wont to be done." *Whom he did predestinate*,—Whom he previously defined, or marked out, for so distinguished privileges. *Them he also called*:—The Jews before had been called to be, in a theocratic sense, the children of God; but it was in the divine purpose to call the Gentiles. As this was the most wonderful event which had ever taken place in their history—one which powerfully shocked the prejudices of the Jews—the apostle never tires of the subject. Gal. and Eph. *passim*; 2 Tim. i. 9-11; and especially Rom. ix.; x.; xi.; xv.; cf. Acts x.; xi.; xiii.; xv. Tholuck: "There can be no doubt that by the calling we have primarily to understand the mere invitation to the kingdom of God in all the passages where it appears—1 Cor. i. 9; vii. 15, 17, 18, 20, 21, 24; Gal. i. 6; v. 8, 13; Eph. iv. 1, 4, etc. It may well, however, be supposed that the apostle uses the verb as well as the participle [kl htoi](#) >only of that vocation which is complied with, and by which the divine purpose is actually accomplished." Of course—he has here nothing to do with those who reject the call, as many do: if all were to accept it (as all might), then all would be embraced, as all who obey, that is, all who believe in Christ, are *justified*, and so correspond to the description in ver. 28. *Them he also justified*:—It was needless to say, they being obedient to the heavenly call, because the apostle has thoroughly discussed the conditions of justification—no unbelievers—those who reject the call—are justified. The calling forces no one to obey it—none are *made* willing to accept the invitation, though all are enabled both to will and to do of God's good pleasure. Here is the evangelical synergism. It is not necessary to deviate from the meaning assigned to "justified" in the former part of the Epistle—acquitted, pardoned, dealt with as if righteous. (See on iii.-v.) *And whom he justified, them he also glorified*.—Many understand this

of elevation to spiritual dignity in this world—the consummation being in the future state—either construing the aorist as what is customary, or as a future—against which there may be grammatical objections. Supposing that the apostle has his stand-point at the grand consummation of the whole redeeming process, the aorist is in place. As the justification depended on obedience to the calling, so the glorification depended upon the retention of the justification; for God says, "The just shall live by faith; but if he draw back, my soul shall have no pleasure in him" (Heb. x. 30). Instead of glorification, the greatest shame and contempt awaits the apostate. 2 Pet. i. 5-11; ii.; cf. Ezek. xxxiii. 12, 13; Matt. v. 13. xviii. 23-35. Those who endure to the end shall be saved. By whatever methods God may save others—uncalled heathen, infants, etc. (see on ch. ii.)—the apostle lays it down here as certain that all who are called to believe in Christ, and who do believe in him, and are justified, and as a result "love God," and do not make shipwreck of their faith, shall be made like Christ.

Soul and body
Shall his glorious image bear.

31. *What shall we then say*—What then shall we conclude from the foregoing? (See on iii. 9.) *If God be for us*,—It is best to supply the indicative substantive verb, in the present, *q.d.*, Since God is on our side, who is against us to do us any harm? Tholuck: "The apostle runs into an almost poetical enthusiasm, of which Erasmus, with all reason, says, *Quid unquam Cicero dixit grandiloquentius*. From the explanation he here makes of his former theme, we moreover clearly see that the sole purpose of the apostle was to show that nothing can harm the Christian, if the Christian does not harm himself. To speak of a *decretum absolutum*, in virtue of which God chooses to confer faith, and with faith, salvation, only on certain individuals, would have been entirely out of the train of ideas which has hitherto been pursued. The apostle shows that suffering cannot frustrate the divine call. To make this section furnish a proof of the Calvinistic view, it must have said that even by revolt and sin the *klesis* could under no circumstances be endangered. That the *klesis* of believers may, however, be shaken by culpable unfaithfulness on their own part, appears at least to be implied in 2 Pet. i. 10." *Who can be*—Who is against us? The interrogatory is almost a challenge: it is very spirited.

32. *He that*—He who indeed—the enclitic (*ge*) should not be omitted: Surely he also. *Spared not*—Paul evidently had his eye on Gen. xxii. 12, 16, where this same word (*feidomai*) is used in the LXX., in the address of God to Abraham: "Thou hast not spared thy beloved son." It thus stands for the Heb. *chasak*, to restrain, withhold, spare; cf. 2 Kings v. 20; Isa. xiv. 6, Heb. Bengel: "God, as it were, did violence to his paternal love." *His own Son*,—There may be an antithetic glance at his adopted sons, ver. 15, 16, but the emphasis is laid on the *ἰδιον* (own), as Christ is *Monogenh̄s*, the only-begotten Son of the Father. John i. 14,

18; iii. 16, 18; 1 John iv. 9. The eternal filiation of his divinity, and the miraculous generation of his humanity, constitute him, in a proper, peculiar sense, the Son of God, as in a similar correlative sense God is his Father. John v. 18. This infinitely intensifies the grace manifested in the gift of Christ. *But delivered him up*—To death, and, of course, to all the humiliation and suffering which was consummated in death. Isa. liii. 6; Matt. xvii. 22, 23; x. 21. (See on Acts ii. 23.) *For us all*,—In our stead, as well as for our benefit. (See on Rom. v. 8; John iii. 16; Luke xxii. 19; Gal. i. 4; 1 John ii. 1, 2.) He died for all men; but Paul is here speaking of believers—those who avail themselves of the benefits of his death. *How shall he not*—How can it be that he will not? The question is addressed to our reason—arguing from the greater to the less. *With him also*—In consequence of this his greatest gift. The *kai* ("also"), says Bengel, is an *epitasis*—an emphatic addition. *Freely give us all things?*—All things that we need—all that will subserve our interests, including sanctified afflictions. Ps. lxxxiv. 11; 1 Cor. iii. 21, 22. Bengel: "In contrast with 'he did not spare'—the consequences of redemption are also of grace." Chrysostom: "He who gave the greatest thing to his enemies, how shall he do else than give the lesser things to his friends?"

33. *Who shall lay*—Many follow Augustin in pointing all the clauses in ver. 33, 34, 35, 36, as interrogatories. But it seems too great a rhetorical stretch of questions before there is an answer; and then the answer in ver. 37 does not suit the questions of ver. 33, 34, but those in ver. 35. But, as has been well said, it is not the object of the apostle to remove fears respecting the mercy of God, but to weigh the love of God, and the benefits purchased by Christ, against the persecutions to which Christians were exposed both by Jews and heathens; and hence he infers (ver. 38, 39) that no adverse circumstances, no hostile power, could really injure them for whom God's love would direct all things to their final good. The punctuation of Origen and others, indorsed by Meyer, seems forced: "Who shall lay any thing to the charge of God's elect? It is God that justifieth; who therefore is he that condemneth? It is Christ who died, etc.; who therefore shall separate us, etc.?" All the old versions except Rheims (which follows the Vulgate) are like A.V. Who will bring an accusation against God's chosen ones? Wycliffe: "Who shall accuse against the chosen men of God?" Tyndale, Cranmer, Geneva, Tomson: "God's chosen." Rheims has "the elect of God." The word occurs twenty-three times in N.T., and is rendered sixteen times "elect," and seven times "chosen." It sometimes denotes what is *choice*, excellent, beloved, as Luke xxiii. 35; 1 Pet. ii. 4, 6, 9; sometimes it denotes Christians, as chosen out of the world in consequence of their faith in Christ, *i. q.*, believers—Matt. xxiv. 22, 24, 31; Rom. xvi. 13; 2 Tim. ii. 10; Tit. i. 1; 2 John 1, 13. The cognate word *ej ogh* ("election") occurs seven times—in the objective sense, as Rom. ix. 11—when it becomes subjective by the concurrence of those who are chosen, then they are the elect of God—as in this place—Christians, believers, saints—the terms are

interchangeable. Any one can see that there is here no absolute, unconditional act of election by which "the elect" are chosen to eternal salvation—indeed, Peter exhorts the elect to give diligence to make their calling and election sure. 2 Pet. i. 10; cf. Rev. xvii. 14. Despite their election, in the objective sense, the great body of the Jews became *reprobate* in consequence of unbelief and disobedience. Rom. xi.; Heb. iii. and *passim*. W. and W. give an ambiguous paraphrase of this clause: "Who shall arraign? Who shall call to account the elect of God, those whom God receives into the arms of his mercy, for their sins of willfulness, negligence, or ignorance?" Astounding! By God's act of justification all sins of every class are forgiven to penitent believers, who thus become "God's elect." But if "God's elect" are guilty of those sins, one need not go far to find an accuser, and it will not be merely the devil, "the accuser of our brethren"—God, who once justified them, will now condemn them, and the condemnation will be eternal unless they repent. The opposite view is that detestable Antinomianism against which the apostle so earnestly declaims in ch. vi., and in the former part of this chapter. God recognizes as his elect only those who answer Peter's description: "Elect according to the foreknowledge of God the Father, through sanctification of the Spirit, unto obedience and sprinkling of the blood of Jesus Christ" (1 Pet. i. 2). "But ye are a chosen [elect] generation, a royal priesthood, an holy nation, a peculiar people; that ye should show forth the praises of him who hath called you out of darkness into his marvelous light" (1 Pet. ii. 9), etc.; cf. 2 Pet. i., where the elect are exhorted to lead a holy life, and by diligence to make their calling and election sure, not like some who declined from the faith, "and forgot that they were purged from their old sins"—whose latter end, as he says in the next chapter, was worse than the beginning. It is deeply to be deplored that men will allow their pet dogmas to sway their judgments in questions so important, and so thoroughly settled by the sacred writers themselves. *It is God that justifieth*:—So the apostle has shown in the preceding part of the Epistle. He seems to have his eye on Isa. l. 8, 9, which reads in the LXX.: "For he who justified me draws near: who is he that judges me? Let him stand up against me at once. Yea, who is he that judges me? Let him draw nigh to me. Behold the Lord, the Lord will help me: who will hurt me?" This favors the punctuation in A.V. of ver. 33, 34. Chrysostom is quaint: "If when a horse-breaker has selected colts fit for the race, no one can find fault with them without being laughed at, much more when God selects souls are they who lay any charge against them deserving of laughter. It is God that justifieth."

34. *Who is he that condemneth?*—The apostle may have had in view "the accuser of our brethren," the great adversary of God and man, who impeached the integrity of Job—but the challenge is general. "Who shall the Lord's elect condemn?" Like Peter's challenge: "And who is he that will harm you, if ye be followers of that which is good?" (1 Pet. iii. 13). *It is Christ that died*,—Paul gives

a rapid summary of what Christ has done, and is doing, for the salvation of "the elect." He died for them—thus atoning for their sins—yea, more, he is also risen from the dead, to make his death available to believers (see on iv. 25; v. 9, 10; xiv. 9), and he is at the right-hand of God—exalted to the highest dignity and power—the mediatorial throne—so often alluded to in descriptions of Christ's majesty and authority. See on Matt. xxii. 44; Mark xvi. 19; Luke xxii. 69; Acts ii. 33, 34; v. 31; vii. 55, 56; Eph. i. 30; Col. iii. 1; Heb. i. 3, 13; viii. 1; x. 12; xii. 2; 1 Pet. iii. 22. To seat a prince on the right-hand of the sovereign denotes that he participates in the government of the realm: he thus possesses prerogative and power to punish enemies and protect friends. No metaphor can be more expressive. What force that gives to the idea of his intercession, next mentioned!

He ever lives above,
For me to intercede,
His all-redeeming love,
His precious blood to plead:
His blood atoned for all our race,
And sprinkles now the throne of grace.

The Father hears him pray,
His dear anointed One;
He cannot turn away
The presence of his Son!

Christ pleads for us as our Mediator, 1 Tim. ii. 5; Heb. viii. 6; cf. Job xxxiii. 23, 24—as our High-priest, Heb. iv. 14; v. 10; vi. 20; vii. 24, 25, and *passim*—as our Advocate (*Paraclete*), 1 John ii. 1. His intercession is, as it were, a prolongation of his High-priestly prayer, John xvii. In his intercession, as Lange says, "there is comprised his protection against the unauthorized accusers from without, and the condemnatory results of the injury of the new life from within"—always assuming that our prayers are blended with his—hence the need of that "other *Paraclete*," who helps our infirmities by his internal intercessions. (See on ver. 26, 27.) It is useless to ask how Christ intercedes, whether by voice, or gesture, or the exhibition of "the dear tokens of his passion"—the Father knows the mind of the Son, as he knows the mind of the Spirit. Metaphors of this sort must not be pressed. We have a powerful Friend at court, on whom we can rely—we are safe while under his protection.

35. *Who*—*Ti* (what) may have been expected; but it is *Ti* ("who")—as in the other cases; and the seven evils adduced are personified—enemies opposing us—"as so many gladiators," says Calvin, "taking arms against the Christians." *Shall*—Will separate us from the love of Christ? The love which Christ has to us—genitive of the subject. His love toward us will not cease because we suffer

the reverses specified; nor shall they cause us to forfeit his love: if we are separated from his love, it will be our fault, not his—ver. 37. *Shall tribulation*,—These seven evils are detailed in order—first *tribulation* and *distress*. See on Rom. ii. 9, where the latter is rendered "anguish"—the "straitness" to which the primitive believers were frequently reduced. *Persecution*,—*Di wgmov*, from *di wkw*, to pursue—the word speaks for itself: see on Matt. xiii. 21; Acts viii. 1; xiii. 30; 2 Cor. xii. 10; 2 Thess. i. 4; 2 Tim. iii. 11. *Famine*,—Ordinary dearth is not meant, but scarcity of food, when driven before persecution. *Nakedness*—Resulting from a similar cause. *Peril*,—Danger of life—Paul uses it eight times, referring to different sources of danger, in 2 Cor. xi. 26. *Sword?*—Death by violence—martyrdom—which Paul and most of the apostles experienced.

36. *As it is written*,—Paul cites a pertinent passage *verbatim* from the LXX. of Ps. xliv. 22. This Psalm was probably written during the captivity in Babylon, when the Jews were fearfully persecuted by their foes. *For thy sake*—For on thy account. The Jews were punished by God for their sins, but their enemies persecuted them because of their religion. Note their persecutions under Nebuchadnezzar, Darius, Antiochus Epiphanes. *We are killed all the day long*;—There is hardly a reference to the slaughtering of sheep all day long in the outer court of the temple. Sheep destined for slaughter are meant—as in ver. 11. "Thou madest us as sheep for meat." Cf. 1 Cor. iv. 9; xv. 31, 32. Bengel: "The first class of the blessed is most filled up with those who met a violent death. Matt. xxiii. 34, 35; Heb. xi. 37; Rev. vi. 11; xx. 4."

37. *Nay*,—This is a more forcible rendering of *aj la* than "nevertheless" (Tyndale, Cranmer, Geneva, Tomson), or "but" (Wycliffe, Rheims). It is a bold negative answer to the challenge of ver. 35. *In all these things*—Not merely in regard to them, nor merely over them, but *in* them. We are more than conquerors in patiently and joyfully enduring these afflictions, as we gain the conquest over ourselves as well as over our spiritual foes. Prov. xvi. 32. So Chrysostom: "For the wonderful thing is not merely that we gain the victory, but that we conquer by means of things that were meant to ensnare us, and do not merely conquer, but more than conquer—*i.e.*, with the utmost ease, and without sweat and toil. For not merely when actually suffering, but even when we prepare our mind, do we erect trophies against the enemy; and rightfully too, for God is our fellow-soldier. Do not therefore disbelieve if, when scourged, we overcome the scourgers; if, when put to flight, we vanquish our pursuers; if, when dying, we rout the living. For when you have supposed both the power and the love of God, there is nothing to hinder these strange and incredible things from taking place, and the victory to be above measure splendid." How the apostles and martyrs more than conquered may be seen in Acts iv.; v.; vii.; xvi.; Rev. *passim*. As to Paul's own personal experience of the afflictions in question, read 1 Cor. iv. 9-13; 2 Cor. xi. 21-33.

More than conquerors,—'Up̄erni kw̄m̄en means, literally, to more than conquer, as the Geneva renders. Wycliffe, Cranmer, Rheims, have simply "overcome;" Vulgate, *superamus*; Tyndale, "strongly overcome;" Luther, "conquer far;" Alford: "We are far the conquerors—the up̄ēs intensifies the degree of the conquest, but does not express a superiority over it." W. and W.: "We are triumphant conquerors—up̄ēs increases the force of the original verb." *Through him that loved us*.—A proper rendering of the aorist. The reference appears to be to Christ—cf. Rev. i. 5, 6. It refers to his constituting himself the "Lover of souls" (Wis. xi. 26) when he undertook their redemption—that relation eternally subsisting. His love moves him to grant us all the aid we need in making our calling and election sure.

38. *For*—Developing the point in question, *I am persuaded*,—I am confident, as the word is rendered, Rom. ii. 19; Phil. i. 6, *et al.* As Paul does not say that he is persuaded he never will fall into sin, and so forfeit his interest in the love of God, but that the objects specified shall not be able to separate us from it, the word may have the same meaning as in xiv. 14, where it expresses certainty: "I know and am persuaded in the Lord Jesus"—so that the distinction of W. and W. is not needed: "In ver. 28 we have oīd̄amen, as a matter of historical record—pepēismai means satisfactory assurance for the future, though there is not positive knowledge." It frequently has this meaning, as in Rom. xv. 14; Phil. i. 6; 2 Tim. i. 5; cf. 2 Tim. i. 12. *Death*,—Put first, as the most formidable. That will only bring us into closer union with Christ. Phil. i. 23. *Life*,—Its prolongation amid afflictions. *Nor angels, nor principalities, nor powers*,—Terms borrowed from the Jewish angelology. Eph. i. 21; vi. 12; Col. i. 16; 1 Pet. iii. 22. Abstract terms, as frequently, are put for concrete. Principalities and powers denote the higher ranks in the heavenly hierarchy. Minute distinctions are here out of place. In some MSS. and versions the word "powers" is transposed, and put after "things to come." It seems most natural where it is in the received text. Some suppose good angels are meant—the objection that *they* would not attempt to sever Christians from Christ, is met by the reply that the apostle does not say that they would, but only speaks hypothetically, as in Gal. i. 8 he says, if an angel from heaven were to preach any other gospel, let him be accursed. Others think evil angels are meant, as they are continually attempting this nefarious work. Clemens Alex., Grotius, *et al.*, so understand it. Bucer, Bengel, and others, comprise both—all intelligences in the universe besides men, and as more powerful than men. The Scriptures intimate that there are distinctions among the fallen angels, as well as among the good. Matt. xxv. 41; Eph. vi. 10-12. *Things present*,—"The present distress," 1 Cor. vii. Persecuted as they were, they longed for deliverance, but they knew that God could give them all the grace they needed to endure their trials. *Things to come*,—Gloomy as was the outlook. The reference does not seem to be to the *post-mortem* state of existence.

39. *Nor height, nor depth*,—Comprehending all space. Cf. Isa. vii. 11. The scope of the passage, and its highly rhetorical character, hardly warrant any limitation, as to heaven and earth, or heaven and hell. *Nor any other creature*,—Bengel: "Whatever exists outside of God, and of whatever kind. He does not even condescend to mention visible enemies." Cf. 1 Cor. iii. 21, 22. *Shall be able to separate us*—"Our leave unasked." Bengel: "Neither by violence, ver. 35, nor by law, ver. 33, 34." Cf. 1 Cor. x. 13. *From the love of God*—God's love to us, as manifested in Christ Jesus our Lord. This shows our interest in him, and what we may expect from him. It is absurd to infer from the foregoing that we cannot by unfaithfulness forfeit our interest in his love and protection. "If we forsake him, he will cast us off forever." Paul knew this—hence 1 Cor. ix. 27, and the warnings which follow in ch. xi. Cf. Hebrews, *passim*.

CHAPTER IX.

1 *Paul is sorry for the Jews.* 7 *All the seed of Abraham were not the children of the promise.* 18 *God hath mercy upon whom he will.* 21 *The potter may do with his clay what he list.* 25 *The calling of the Gentiles and rejecting of the Jews were foretold.* 32 *The cause why so few Jews embraced the righteousness of faith.*

IX.—1. *I say the truth in Christ*,—Many think that this is swearing by Christ and the Holy Spirit, but there is no clear case of this in Paul's writings; though he frequently calls God to witness his sincerity. The formula occurs 1 Tim. ii. 7 (though some MSS. omit "in Christ" in that place). W. and W.: "As one united to Christ, the element and substratum of my spiritual life. John xv. 4; xvii. 23; 2 Cor. v. 17; xii. 19. Thus it corresponds with the concurrent attestation of his conscience, and the overruling Spirit." Cf. 2 Cor. xi. 10: "As the truth of Christ is in me." *I lie not*,—The negative added to the affirmative for emphasis. (See on John i. 20.) *My conscience also bearing me witness in the Holy Ghost*,—See on Rom. ii. 15; viii. 16, where similar terms are used. W. and W.: "Parallel to 'in Christ'—as one feeling and speaking under the influence of the Holy Ghost. An action, or passion, or sentiment, said to be in the Holy Spirit, is thereby represented as merged, involved, in the Spirit's internal agency and operation. Rom. xiv. 17; Col. i. 8; 1 Thess. i. 5, 6; Jude 20." Paul makes this solemn asseveration concerning his sorrow—the occasion of which he afterward sets forth—perhaps to prepare his Jewish readers for some statements he is about to make, which they might consider unpalatable. A Jew himself (none the less for being a Christian), he felt a most tender concern for the Jews, and, of course, sets down naught against them in malice, but all in love.

2. *That I have great heaviness*—That I have great grief, and unceasing anguish in my heart.

3. *For I could wish*—The imperfect *hujomen* has the force of the optative: I could wish, were it possible or right to do so. See Winer, Gr. N.T., sec. 41. *That myself*—That I myself—emphatic. *Were accursed*—The word *ajaqema* occurs six times in N.T.—e.g., Acts xxiii. 14: "We have anathematized ourselves with an *anathema*;" cf. ver. 12, 21. 1 Cor. xii. 3: "No man speaking by the Spirit of God, calleth Jesus *anathema*." 1 Cor. xvi. 22: "Let him be *anathema*, *maran atha*." Gal. i. 8, 9: "Though we, or an angel from heaven, preach any other gospel—let him be *anathema*." It is a later form for the Attic *ajaqhma*—a votive offering. It is used in the LXX. for the Heb. *cherem*=any thing devoted to destruction. Lev. xxvii. 29; Josh. vi. 17, 18; vii. 1; cf. Deut. vii. 26, where an abominable thing (*bdelugma*) is called *anathema*. To be an *anathema* from Christ is to be separated from him, and devoted to destruction. As it cannot be supposed that Paul would be willing to be eternally damned on any account, some refer the *anathema* to such a curse as was about to be inflicted upon the Jewish nation—temporal destruction, as in the wish of Moses, Ex. xxxii. 32. Photius intimates that Paul could wish if it were possible to be separated from Christ, if that would bring his brethren into union with him, as then he would be brought in with them—"like some colt separated a little from its mother!" Many critics, however, understand it as in Tomson's Beza: "The apostle loved his brethren so entirely, that if it had been possible he would have been ready to have redeemed the casting away of the Israelites with the loss of his own soul forever; for this word separate betokeneth as much in this place"—*anathema* being rendered "separate" in Tomson and Geneva—Wycliffe: "Departed from Christ." Those who take this view generally say the apostle knew it was not possible or proper that such should be the case—hence he did not really wish it. Many other solutions have been proposed, but it is useless to notice them all. Calvin (Ins., iii. 20-35) says: "Moses and Paul felt a pleasure in averting their minds and eyes from themselves, and in praying with vehement and ardent zeal for their own destruction, that they might promote the kingdom and glory of God, even at the expense of their own happiness." Wesley: "As if he had said, I could wish to suffer in their stead; yea, to be anathema from Christ in their place. In how high a sense he wished this who can tell, unless himself had been asked, and had resolved the question? Certainly, he did not then consider himself at all, but only others, and the glory of God. The thing could not be; yet the wish was pious and solid, though with a tacit condition if it were right and possible." John Goodwin argues cogently for the opinion that it does not refer to eternal destruction, but to the infamy and death to which sacrilegious persons and the like were devoted—"a present visible destruction." He thinks the word separated, or accursed, from Christ may import this, as Paul was Christ's bosom friend, and "his brethren"

knew that he placed his greatest felicity in his relation to him—"in this respect wishing to be separated from Christ for their good, he expressed the greatest affection toward them that could be." This is not unreasonable—especially if we add, with Trollope, "In whatever sense the words are taken, they are plainly hyperbolic, and uttered in the warmth of the speaker's heart, without any exact calculation of their import." *For my brethren*,—A common Hebraism for *my kinsmen*. Wycliffe: "For my britheren, that ben my cosyns after the fleisch"—kindred by natural descent—according to flesh. (See on i. 3.)

4. *Who are Israelites*;—An honorable designation. John i. 47; 2 Cor. xi. 22; Phil. iii. 5. *To whom pertaineth the adoption*,—Wycliffe, Rheims: "Whose is the adoption of sons"—though Wycliffe omits the article in every clause, translating from the Vulgate. See Ex. iv. 22; Deut. xiv. 1; xxxii. 6; Isa. i. 2; Jer. iii. 19; Hos. xi. 1. See on Rom. viii. 15, 23; Gal. iv. 5; Eph. i. 5—where the word is used in an evangelical sense—here it is used in a national, theocratical sense. *The glory*,—The Shekinah, which abode over the ark in the tabernacle and first temple. Ex. xl. 34; 1 Kings viii. 11; Ps. lxxx. 1; Heb. ix. 3-5. *The covenants*,—Made with Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, and with the whole nation at Sinai, and on other occasions. Gen. xv.; xvii.; xxvi. 24; xxviii. 13-16; Ex. xxiv. 7, 8. *Di aqhkh* means a dispensation, or economy, the conditions being prescribed by God, man having no right to dictate or to decline, but only to stipulate obedience, and to prove faithful to the engagement, as it is his interest as well as his duty so to do. *The giving of the law*,—The legislation implying the giving of the code by God. What an honor was this for the theocratic people! *The service of God*,—All the old English versions, except Wycliffe and Rheims, add "of God"—indeed, it is implied in the word—*latreia* means divine service, as in Heb. ix. 1, 6: so the verb. (See on Acts vii. 7; xxvi. 7, *et al.*) *The promises*;—Those made to the patriarchs concerning the Messiah, including, of course, those which had reference to "the land of promise." (See on iv. 13, 14, 16, 20; ix. 8, 9; xv. 8. So Gal. and Heb. *passim*.)

5. *Whose are the fathers*,—Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, are chiefly meant—not because "our" is omitted, which is used in Acts vii. 11, 12, 39, 44; xiii. 17—as Paul would hardly say "whose are *our* fathers"! He is speaking of their greatest honors and privileges, *And of whom*,—And of whom is Christ—that is, according to flesh—so far as his human descent is concerned—implying that he had another origin. (See on i. 3, 4.) The Messiah was to be an Israelite—Jesus was one. Matt. i.; Luke iii.; John iv. 9, 22; Rom. xv. 7. *Who is*—He who is God over all, blessed for ever. Amen. *Paṣtwn* ("all") may be either masculine or neuter—it is probably neuter, as in xi. 36—meaning the universe—not merely all the persons spoken of before. As this passage affords so strong proof of the essential Deity of Christ, the heterodox have endeavored to evade its force, and some of the orthodox have unfortunately given them aid and comfort in this. Some would omit "God;" but

it is in all the MSS., ancient versions, and Fathers—only a few of the Fathers chance to omit it. Some would give the sense of "Lord" to "God;" but if he is *Lord* over all, he must be *God*, as he is here called—obviously in no subordinate sense. Some tinker the text by changing *oJwħ* into *wħ oJ*"to whom belongs also the ever-blessed God"—outraging common sense. Erasmus put a colon or period after *sarka* ("flesh")—reading the doxology, "God over all be blessed for ever!" But a doxology would be here out of place. The *wħ* ("who") would be superfluous, and *euj oghtov* ("blessed") should precede the name of God. Thus Whitby: "This exposition is so harsh, and without any like example in the whole N.T., that as none of the orthodox ever thought upon it, so I find that it not ever came into the head of any Arian: Socinus himself rejects it for this very good reason that *God be blessed* is an unusual and unnatural construction; for wherever else these words signify *blessed be God*, blessed is put before God, as Luke i. 68; 2 Cor. i. 3; Eph. i. 3; 1 Pet. i. 3, and *Qeov* hath an article prefixed to it; nor are they ever immediately joined together otherwise. The phrase occurs twenty times in the O.T., but in every place *blessed* goes before, and the article is annexed to the word *God*, which is a demonstration that this is a perversion of the apostle's words." Tholuck says: "There is something strange in the undefined nature of the expression, 'who is above all,' which cannot be excused by John iii. 31, and in the position of the predicate 'blessed' after the subject—in fine also *Qeov* as that subject, would have required the article." Such pitiful evasions are utterly unexegetical, and betray the hopelessness of the cause they are intended to support. The plain meaning of the passage is as understood by Fathers, School-men, Reformers, translators, of every class—except a few antitrinitarians. Thus the Vulgate: *Qui est super omnia Deus benedictus in secula, Amen*—rendered quaintly, but correctly, by Wycliffe, "That is God above all things, blessed in to worlds." Tyndale: "Which is God over all things blessed for ever." Cranmer: "Which is God in all things to be praised for ever." Geneva: "Which is God over all blessed for ever." Rheims: "Who is above all things God blessed for ever." Cf. Rom. i. 25; 2 Cor. xi. 31. *Amen*.—As Alford says, this "implies no optative ascription of praise, but is the accustomed ending of such solemn declarations of the divine Majesty; compare i. 25."

6. *Not as though*—As if he had said, I do not mean by what I have intimated concerning the state of the Jews—so many of whom reject Jesus as the Messiah—that the promise made to the fathers respecting Israel has failed. God never said that all who are born Jews, and none else, should be saved—as the Jews boasted. Paul refutes the former proposition in this place—the latter in ver. 24 ff. *For they are not all Israel*,—For not all who are lineally descended from Israel—the posterity of Jacob, the people called Israel—are "Israelites indeed," as there are those who say they are Jews—God's own people—and yet are not, but a synagogue of Satan. John i. 47; Rev. ii. 9. (See on ii. 28, 29.) The construction

of Macknight does not agree with the scope of the passage: "they do not constitute the whole of the people"—rather, many of them are not the people of God.

7. *Neither*,—Nor because they are a seed of Abraham are they all children. The Jews boasted that they had Abraham to their father; but so had the Ishmaelites; yet the promise referring to the Messiah was not made to the descendants of Abraham through Ishmael, but through Isaac. *In Isaac shall thy seed be called*.—A literal quotation from the LXX. of Gen. xxi. 12. The promised seed shall be in the line of Isaac—not of Ishmael.

8. *That is*,—The apostle explains: Not those who are lineally descended from the patriarchs, as such, are children of God, but those only who are the children of the promise, are reckoned for a seed. The word "seed" is here used because of the quotation. Here it means the covenant people, culminating in the Messiah. Gal. iii.; iv. Bengel: "The Jews were Exclusives, Particularists—*i.e.*, those who believe God's grace limited to a portion of mankind—therefore Paul directly refutes them. The sum of this discussion, according to those who deny universal grace, is this: God gives *faith* to whom he will—he does not give it to whom he will not. According to Paul, it is this: God gives *righteousness* to those who believe—he does not give it to those who work; and that is by no means contrary to his word. Nay, he himself has declared, by types and testimonies, that the former, the sons of the promise, are received; that the latter, the children of the flesh, are rejected. This decree of God is certain, indisputable, just: as any man—or people—listens to or resists it, he is either accepted in mercy, or rejected in wrath."

9. *For*—This refers to the promise in ver. 8; hence *promise* is the emphatic word: For this word is one of promise, According to this season I will come. This is a free quotation from the LXX. of Gen. xviii. 10; cf. ver. 14, which reads, "I will return and come to thee according to this season punctually, and Sarah thy wife shall have a son." A.V.: "I will certainly return unto thee according to the time of life, and lo, Sarah thy wife shall have a son"—lit., "when the time lives again:" cf. Gen. xvii. 21; xxi. 2; 2 Kings iv. 16, 17. This may refer to the same day next year, or to the expiration of the period from conception to birth. [Eijwfav](#)—*ad horas, h. e. proecise*, as Schleusner.

10. *And not only this*;—Not only have we the choice of the son by one mother, and the rejection of another by a different mother, with one and the same father, but there is a case of the choice of one son and the rejection of another by the same mother, as well as father. *Our father Isaac*,—Our common progenitor: so Abraham and Jacob are styled. John viii. 39; iv. 12.

11. *For*—This verse is parenthetical, developing the point in ver. 10. For they—meaning the twins—the case being well known—not having done good or

bad: instead of *kakos*, the Alex., Vat., Sin., have *fau-on*, foul, worthless, bad—that the elective purpose of God may remain—not fail (cf. ver. 6)—being not dependent on man's works, but God's determination.

12. *It was said unto her*,—This being the case, God said to Rebecca, *The elder*—the greater in age, *major natu*—*shall serve the younger*—the less in age, the *minor*. This reversed the law of primogeniture. There was nothing in Jacob—of course, not then, as he was not born—nor in his character as developed in future life, which moved God to choose him rather than Esau to be the progenitor of the promised seed; but one had to be chosen, and God saw fit to choose the younger, as he did in the case of Isaac and David. It does not appear that Esau ever personally served Jacob, but the contrary. It was Jacob who feared Esau—not Esau who feared Jacob—saying, "Let me find grace in the sight of my lord." (Gen. xxxiii.) But the descendants of Esau were brought under tribute to the descendants of Jacob—2 Sam. viii. 14; 2 Kings xiv. 7, 22; Josephus Ant., xiii. 9, 1. John Hyrcanus brought them into complete and perfect subjugation. This quotation is literal from the LXX., and agrees with the Heb.

13. *As it is written*,—The quotation is literal from Mal. i. 2, 3, LXX. The whole passage in the LXX. reads thus: "I have loved you, saith the Lord. And ye said, Wherein hast thou loved us? Was not Esau Jacob's brother? says the Lord; and yet I loved Jacob, and hated Esau, and laid waste his borders, and made his heritage as dwellings of the wilderness. Because one will say, Idumea has been overthrown, but let us return and rebuild the desolate places, thus saith the Lord Almighty, They shall build, but I will throw down, and they shall be called, The borders of wickedness, and, The people against whom the Lord has set himself for ever." There may be no necessity of softening the word "hated"—understanding it, as in Gen. xxix. 31; Luke xiv. 26, *et al.*, "loved less"—as it does not refer so much to Esau as to his descendants, who, as a nation, brought down upon themselves the divine displeasure on account of their sins; but did not the Jews do so too? The *hatred* must be understood in contrast with the *love*: this referred to the choice of Jacob and his posterity to the federal privileges already noted, and to the possession of the promised land, "flowing with milk and honey, the glory of all lands," while Esau and his descendants were excluded from those privileges, and assigned to an inferior inheritance—according to the blessing of Isaac, as he said to Esau in regard to Jacob: "Behold, I have made him thy lord, and all his brethren have I given to him for servants; and with corn and wine have I sustained him; and what shall I do unto thee, my son? And Esau said unto his father, Hast thou but one blessing, my father? bless me, even me also, O my father. And Esau lifted up his voice, and wept. And Isaac his father answered and said unto him, Behold, thy dwelling shall be the fatness of the earth, and of the dew of heaven from above; and by thy sword shalt thou live, and shalt serve thy brother: and it shall come to pass when thou shalt have the dominion, that thou shalt break his

yoke from off thy neck" (Gen. xxvii). In this transaction Esau does not appear to disadvantage in regard to character, as compared with Jacob. He was not excluded from the divine favor because he was excluded from the primogeniture, nor was Idumea, on the whole, a bad inheritance. Malachi does not say that it was, but rather implies the contrary—so Obadiah—but Esau's heritage was "laid waste" because of the wickedness of his descendants; and a like fate came upon the land of Israel—though with reserves for theocratic and Messianic reasons. To say that this election and reprobation were personal, unconditional, absolute, and eternal, is to contradict the record; for the Lord said unto Rebecca, "Two nations are in thy womb, and two manner of people shall be separated from thy bowels; and the one people shall be stronger than the other people; and the elder shall serve the younger." It is well to remember that "God is his own interpreter." There is no reference to the eternal states of Esau and Jacob, or of their descendants. The election and reprobation were indeed unconditional and absolute—not dependent upon character and works, good or bad, but simply on the divine purpose; and by that very token common sense ought to teach us that it did not refer to personal salvation, as that is conditioned on faith and obedience, as damnation turns on unbelief and disobedience—of which doctrine the Bible is full. There is no proof that either Ishmael or Esau was a hopeless reprobate in a personal, moral sense. They were circumcised, and so had sealed to them the *spiritual* blessings of the covenant (though without its peculiar prerogatives)—they were prayed for and blessed by their parents, and God heard the prayers, and blessed them—they appear to advantage in some parts of their history—they displayed filial piety in uniting with their brothers in the interment of their respective fathers, and many of their descendants were noted for piety—Job and his friends being of the posterity of Esau, and they will compare favorably with the best of Jacob's descendants, God being the judge. Job i.; xlii.; and *passim*; Ezek. xiv. 14, 20; James v. 11. On the other hand, while Isaac is not much censured, he is not much commended; and Jacob seems to have needed repeated conversions, though he finally developed a fair character—several of his sons, and conspicuous among them Judah, the covenant heir, were reprobates of no common dye, though they may have repented. Their descendants, as a people, were as notorious for their wickedness as for their privileges. Millions of them perished in their repeated rebellions and apostasies; and finally, because of unbelief, as a body, they were rejected of God, as the apostle proceeds to show in the following context, ending with ch. xi. It is astounding that men will set aside divine testimony, the facts of history, the moral sense and the common sense of mankind, by affirming that the election and reprobation in question respected the eternal fate of Jacob and Esau, and their posterity! It so happens that the question which has been so misunderstood by many is of easy solution; but if it were not, no one would be justified in putting such a construction on it as makes God the author of sin—a capricious tyrant, subverting all moral principles, and contradicting all experience.

That God is loving to every man may be inferred from his nature and perfections: this agrees with a thousand plain declarations of Scripture; therefore, if any passages seem to teach otherwise, we may be sure that we misinterpret them: we may not know what they teach, but we know that they do not contradict the perfections of God and the thousand plain passages which set forth his universal grace. It is preposterous to say that the sovereignty of God—by which is absurdly meant his arbitrary election of some to salvation, without any foresight of faith and obedience, and the reprobation of others to damnation, before they have done any evil—is true, and so also is the free agency of man—though the two cannot be reconciled. There is not a sane man that ever advanced any thing so preposterous on other subjects; and it is quite pitiful to see men take leave of their common sense when they venture on religious topics. But the truth is, whatever men, under the influence of iron-bound systems, may imagine, they do not believe in this "horrible decree." Divine sovereignty and human agency require no reconciliation, as they were never at variance—the one establishes the other. God of his own good pleasure decrees the terms on which Jews and Gentiles—all men—may be saved—enables all to comply with those terms, as he has mercy on all—but *he forces none*.

14. *What shall we say then?*—A Pauline formula, anticipating an objection, and exciting attention. Cf. ver. 30; iv. 1; vi. 1; vii. 7; viii. 31. *Is there unrighteousness with God?*—John Goodwin: "Do you think that any such thing followeth from what has been said concerning the purpose of God to justify and adopt those who shall believe, and not those who depend upon works for their justification, as that he should be unrighteous or unjust? Nay, 'God forbid'—Let it not be! or, Far be it from me! and from every man, to affirm or teach any thing that should imply any unrighteousness or injustice in God in the least."

15. *For he saith to Moses,*—The quotation is from Ex. xxxiii. 19, literally as in the LXX. The variation from the Heb. does not affect the sense. In the Heb. all the verbs are in the future; in the LXX., the second in each clause is in the subjunctive present, which gives the sense. The Heb. has "I will be gracious"—which may apply to the good and happy, as well as to the bad and miserable, who are the objects of mercy. John Goodwin says: "Arias Montanus out of the Hebrew renders it thus, 'I will add grace to whom I will add grace;' Junius thus, 'But I will be gracious to whom I shall be gracious.' . . . It was more properly matter of grace in God unto Moses than of mercy to make such a signal discovery unto him of his glory as here he promiseth to do; unless we shall say that Moses was somewhat miserable before this manifestation was made unto him, and relieved by it; both which haply, in a sense, and this tolerable enough, may be admitted. The same act of God toward men may be, and more generally is, both an act of grace and mercy, though in different considerations. However, God, in the words before us unto Moses, with a high hand of authority, asserted

his absolute liberty to confer both the one and the other on whom himself only pleaseth, saying not only, 'I WILL be gracious,' or will add grace 'to whom I will be gracious,' but also, 'And I will have compassion on whom I will have compassion.' It was no part of the apostle's intent, by owning the Septuagint, in their exchanging tenses with Moses, to strengthen Calvin's apprehension, occasioned, as it seems, thereby; his conceit being that the words sound to this effect: 'On whom I have once decreed to show mercy, I will never take away my mercy from him, and will follow him with perpetual kindness, to whom I once decreed to be kind.' Such positions as these are no consecutories to the apostle's doctrine, the intent whereof is only to assert a liberty in God to show mercy, to confer justification, adoption, salvation, etc., upon whom or what manner of persons himself pleaseth: not a liberty, much less a purpose, to continue those or any like mercies unto such persons as men shall obtrude upon him, and particularly not unto such unto whom he hath most severely threatened and declared that they shall not be continued. Now, many of those whom God decreed, upon their believing, from eternity, to justify and adopt, apostatize from, and make shipwreck of, their faith, as the Scripture in many places testifieth—from whom he hath peremptorily threatened to take away the grace of justification which before he had conferred upon them; therefore the emphatical import of the apostle's expression, *I will have mercy, on whom I have*, now or at present, *mercy*, respects the same species, not the same persons of men; being as if he had said, 'To that sort or kind of men to whom now, or at this day, I show mercy, namely, in pardoning their sin and justifying their persons, meaning believers, I will show the like mercy at all times hereafter to the world's end.' Or rather thus, 'I will have mercy on whom I have mercy'—that is, 'I will not, or there is no reason that I should, be taken off or put by men or by angels, from showing the grace or mercy of justification and adoption unto those—that is, that kind of men to whom I at this day show this grace or mercy, and these are such who believe; on these I am ultimately and unremovably resolved to show mercy.' According to as well the one exposition as the other, God asserteth his liberty against all opposers and contenders with him, to dispense his high favors where and on whom himself pleaseth." It is not necessary to restrict the grace and mercy here spoken of to Moses, though he was in a distinguished sense the object of divine regard, but it extended to the people for whom he intercedes. The Israelites had sinned in the matter of the golden calf; God punished them for their sin, and threatened their extermination as a people, but relented at the intercession of Moses and the repentance of the people. As a guarantee of the divine favor, Moses prayed the Lord to show him his glory; whereupon the Lord said, "I will make all my goodness pass before thee, and I will proclaim the name of the Lord before thee; and will be gracious to whom I will be gracious, and will show mercy on whom I will show mercy. And the Lord descended in the cloud, and stood with him there, and proclaimed the name of the Lord. And the Lord passed by before him,

and proclaimed, The Lord, the Lord God, merciful and gracious, long-suffering, and abundant in goodness and truth, keeping mercy for thousands, forgiving iniquity, and transgression, and sin, and that will by no means spare the guilty; visiting the iniquity of the fathers upon the children, and upon the children's children, unto the third and to the fourth generation." Ex. xxxii.-xxxiv. Who the thousands are to whom God is gracious and merciful, we know by the second commandment and the current teaching of Scripture—the penitent and obedient—"them that love me, and keep my commandments;" and who those are whom he will punish—the impenitent and disobedient. How strange that these principles of the divine government should be overlooked in view of Num. xiv., where the Lord reiterates his promises and threatenings, and shows on whom and for what they were to be respectively administered. Nothing could cause him to deviate from his purpose. Hence the carcasses of the rebellious fell in the wilderness, though they were all of the chosen seed! Caleb and Joshua alone, because they had another spirit, and followed the Lord fully, were allowed to enter the promised land. (See Ps. xcv.; Heb. iii.; iv.) So rigid and inexorable are God's purposes, that though Moses and Aaron were "saints," and were admitted at death into the heavenly Canaan, yet they were excluded from the earthly Canaan, because of a marked case of defection at the Waters of Strife. God's sovereignty and man's subjection must be impressed upon us by whatever lessons or examples of mercy or of wrath. Some render, "whom I should pity"—"whom I should compassionate"—implying that the dispensations in question are not arbitrary, but grounded on satisfactory reasons—which is, of course, the case. But the announcement seems to be intended to express the one idea of the divine sovereignty—*q. d.*, I will do whatsoever I may think right—I shall not consult ignorant, sinful mortals, my subjects, as to the principles by which I should govern them, nor give account of any of my matters. Not, indeed, that a thing becomes right because God does it; but God does it because it is right; and "Shall not the Judge of all the earth do right?" Thus the very form of the question furnishes the answer, "Is there unrighteousness with God?" "He is the Rock; his work is perfect; for all his ways are judgment; a God of truth, and without iniquity, just and right is he." Deut. xxxii. 4.

16. *So then*,—An inference from the foregoing. *It is*—Supplied by the translators. It is not within the province and prerogative of man, but of God: a similar ellipsis occurs in ver. 32. The Sovereign alone lays down the terms on which his rebel subjects can obtain pardon. *Not of him that willeth, nor of him that runneth*,—Goodwin says this refers to "the whole species or kind of such persons who are most zealously intent and bent in their spirits upon the keeping of the law, in order to, or upon the hope of, their justification thereby." He says this is the interpretation of most expositors, and refers to what is said of the Jews in this regard—ver. 31, 32; x. 2, 3; Acts xv. 1; xxi. 20, and elsewhere. "Earnestness and

fervor of engagement, in one kind or other, is elsewhere expressed by the metaphor of running. 1 Cor. ix. 24, 26; Gal. v. 7; Ps. cxix. 32, to omit many other places." So Tholuck—but there is scarcely an allusion to the Grecian races. No one can be saved without willing and running; but the divine mercy precedes our willing and doing, and makes us capable of both. Phil. ii. 12, 13. See Calvin's Inst., Book ii. 5, 17. Whedon suggests that there is an allusion to the earnest desire and effort of Moses to save the Israelites—as in the history adduced. Others suggest Abraham's wish for Ishmael. Others refer it to the *desire* of Isaac to bless Esau, and Esau's running to get the venison. Riddle might have spared the following fling: "This is the interpretation of Watson and many Arminian commentators; but it is not necessary to oppose a view so far-fetched, and favoring such an anti-climax." Was Macknight an Arminian? Yet he set forth this anti-climax long before Watson. Was Stuart an Arminian? He did the same. John Goodwin, the great Puritan Arminian, John Wesley, Whedon, and other Arminians, do not indorse it; nor do Bengel, Tholuck, and other German commentators, who are sound Arminians on the subject of election.

17. *For the scripture saith*—This is not so much a personification of Scripture, as its identification with its Divine Author—*q.d.*, God says in the Scripture—Ex. ix. 16. *Unto Pharaoh*,—The Egyptians called their kings anciently by this title, which means "king," or "sun," the hieroglyphic for "king." The Hebrews seem to have identified it with *Phera*, a leader, or prince. Judg. v. 2. Nothing is known of this Pharaoh save that "he knew not Joseph"—whence it is inferred that he was of a different dynasty from his predecessors in the throne of Egypt. *Even for this same purpose*—For this very thing—about to be specified. *Have I raised thee up*,—The Heb. *amad* means to stand, and in Hiphil, as here, to cause to stand, which the LXX. renders by "thou wast preserved"—viz., kept alive during the six plagues already inflicted. So Schleusner: *Superesse facio*. John Goodwin says: "The Chaldee paraphrase explains it thus, 'For this cause have I endured thee,' or patiently borne with thee. This notion of the words well agrees with that phrase of the apostle, 'endured with much long-suffering the vessels of wrath fitted to destruction,' ver 22. The Sept. translates it, 'And for this cause hast thou been kept, or preserved, until now.' 'And for this very thing hast thou been preserved.' Ambrose: 'He speaketh thus because Pharaoh being guilty of so many and great evils that he ought not to live, and a person that would never prove good, lest he should either think that he lived upon the account of his own goodness, or that God whom he often had thought might be deceived, was unable to avenge himself on him, hath this message sent unto him by God, For this cause have I saved thee alive.' Junius: 'Therefore have I caused that thou shouldst remain alive.' Peter Martyr: 'The Hebrew verb signifieth to stand, but in Hiphil to make to stand, or to lift up and establish, although many interpret it to preserve, or save alive, as if Pharaoh, while others fell by death, was preserved alive and remained.' He cites

Calvin at large on Ex. ix. 16, who says that this sense may be embraced: 'For therefore God spared Pharaoh that he should stand,' or continue, 'for a time.'" Goodwin thinks that the sending of this message to Pharaoh after the sixth plague, and not at the beginning, favors this interpretation. He thinks the apostle's language, "raised thee up," agrees with this—as his preservation through the plagues was, as it were, "a raising him up from the dead." Whitby: "Heb., I have made thee to stand, or I have preserved thee—'for this cause hast thou been kept,' so the Seventy—*i.e.*, from falling by the plague of boils—so Jerome and Tremellius. 'I have kept thee alive,' saith the Targum of Ben Uzziel. See the Chaldee, the Syriac, and the Arabic versions, to the same sense. And the connection of this with the former verse rightly rendered makes this sense necessary; for the 15th verse cannot be rendered in the future sense, as our translation doth—for Pharaoh and his people did not die by the pestilence. It is therefore to be rendered as the Jews, Fagius, Amamus, Cartwright, and Ainsworth, translated: 'For now I had sent out my hand, and I had smitten thee and thy people with the pestilence, and thou hadst been cut off from the earth; but in very deed for this cause I have made thee stand up.' So the Targum of Ben Uzziel. Whence we may learn how alien from the truth and from the import of the words is that exposition which saith, 'For this cause have I created thee, or raised thee to be the king of Egypt.'" Parkhurst: "I have raised thee up—*i.e.*, not originally, or from thy birth, but, I have caused thee to stand or subsist, as it is in the Hebrew—I have preserved thee from perishing by the preceding plagues. To this sense the LXX. Comp. Macknight." Rose cites Schleusner, and says, "The great body of divines agree in this interpretation." Bretschneider, Fritsche, Alford, say it means, "I have excited thee, stirred thee up to rebel." This, as W. and W. say, "cannot possibly be the meaning of the Hebrew"—no, nor of the LXX., nor of Paul. Some refer it to eternal predestination: God decreed that Pharaoh should be born, have his heart hardened to rebel, and be drowned and damned. Olshausen well says: "It is quite horrible when Gomarus and the other Supralapsarians say that when God will condemn a man he first creates sin in him, in order that after he has been plunged into sin, he may be justly damned." Some refer it to God's raising up Pharaoh to occupy the throne—he being a hardened rebel, was left in his hardness and impenitent heart (Rom. ii. 5), to be made an example of God's wrath against willful and incorrigible sinners. There are no dogmatic reasons against that interpretation, and there are some exegetical reasons in its favor. Josephus (Ant. viii. 2. 1) is cited for it: "A certain king is rising up (*εξεγειρεται*) by appointment over all this people." The words, both in this place and in the LXX., are in the aorist: "I preserved thee"—"I raised thee up"—which seems to favor this view, though it does not forbid the common interpretation. It is thought, too, that Paul varied from the LXX. in order to express this view. Olshausen: "St. Paul has intentionally sharpened the language of the LXX. . . . But Paul's translation entirely corresponds with the original text. The interpretation, 'permit to stand,'

'permit to continue,' for which Tholuck decides, is no doubt admissible in itself; but in the first place, it is not the nearest to the Hiphil of *amad*, and next it is contrary to the sense and intention of the writer, as the following verses clearly show. %Opwv must be taken strictly tel ikwv, in order that Pharaoh might become a monument of the penal justice of God. God provided that the evil actually existing in him should be manifested in this definite form. The last words of the quotation, which in no way affect the main idea, agree with the LXX., only they have ijscua instead of duamin. St. Paul, therefore, substituted ejhgeira with express design, as his argument required a circumstance which puts all mitigations of the thought out of the question." The last interpretation may be correct, but it is not easy to see the force of the reasoning in its favor. The telic sense of opwv agrees as well with the one as with the other: God may have sustained the life of Pharaoh in order to show forth in him his power in punishing incorrigible offenders, as well as raising him to the throne for that purpose. What mitigation of the thought is there in this? None, unless the thought were that of the horrible decree, which Olshausen himself repudiates in this place. In the Alexandrian recension of the LXX. the word is duamin, as in Romans—the meaning is the same; and Paul hardly intended to differ from the LXX. in substituting ejhgeira for diethrhqv—the substitution was made, probably, because the former word was more familiar; he uses it in 1 Cor. vi. 14, in a cognate sense: "God hath both raised up the Lord, and will also raise up us by his own power"—raising up from affliction is near akin to raising up from the grave. Luke also in N.T. uses diathrew—only twice (Luke ii. 51; Acts xv. 29), and in a sense remote from that in question. *That I might shew my power*—Whatever might be meant by God's raising up Pharaoh—whether to the throne or from the plagues with which he had been punished, the end which God had in view was realized. He did show his power in a most remarkable manner—over the mighty kingdom of Egypt, with its self-willed and obstinate king, and "against all the gods of Egypt did he execute judgment," when he sent his plagues upon them—as the Egyptians worshiped the subjects of the plagues. Hence the Song of Moses (Ex. xv.) says: "Who is like unto thee, O Lord, among the gods? who is like thee, glorious in holiness, fearful in praises, doing wonders? The people shall hear, and be afraid; sorrow shall take hold on the inhabitants of Palestine. Then the dukes of Edom shall be amazed; the mighty men of Moab, trembling shall take hold upon them; all the inhabitants of Canaan shall melt away." How literally this was fulfilled may be seen in the language of Rahab: "I know that the Lord hath given you the land, and that your terror is fallen upon us, and that all the inhabitants of the land faint because of you. For we have heard how the Lord dried up the water of the Red Sea for you, when ye came out of Egypt" (Josh. ii. 9, 10). How often is this alluded to in the Scriptures and in other writings! The end had in view by God is singularly illustrated in the use made of this example by the apostle.

18. *Therefore hath he mercy*—He will be merciful to those who he sees are proper subjects of his mercy, and he will punish those who he sees are proper subjects of his wrath. This he applies to the Jews, who should experience mercy, if they accept of Jesus as their Saviour, or wrath, if they obstinately reject him. That is the whole of it, as is set forth more at large in ch. xi. Though there was no merit in their accepting Jesus as their Saviour—the very terms exclude the vain notion of merit, as it is all of grace—yet their unbelief implies rebellion against the Divine Sovereign who has the prerogative of dictating by what method, and on what terms, men shall be saved. It is interesting to see how anxious most Calvinists are to assert that God did not harden Pharaoh's heart—that he does not harden the heart of any one—by any positive action upon the heart. He leaves them, they say, in their natural depravity, and they will be sure to harden their own hearts, as Pharaoh hardened his, and as the Jews of the apostles' day hardened theirs. That is correct, if this be added, that God never withdrew his grace from any one till he gave evidence that he "received the grace of God in vain." The talent was given to the unprofitable servant, and was taken away for non-improvement, and he was punished in addition; which shows that he could and should have improved it. It does not appear but that Pharaoh might have repented, and found pardon, at any stage of the proceedings; and, as Goodwin says, though it is not likely, it is not impossible that he did so *in extremis*—but too late to save himself and army from destruction in the Red Sea. The Bible repeatedly and emphatically states that man is responsible for his obstinacy—and that settles the question. Even the Synod of Dort says: "The talent of grace which was once granted by God is taken away from no man, unless through his own default he hath first buried it (Matt. xxv. 28). Hence it is that in the Scriptures we are from place to place admonished that we resist not the Spirit, that we quench not the Spirit, that we receive not the grace of God in vain, that we fall not away from God (Heb. iii. 7). This reason is most clearly given why the creature is at any time forsaken by God, namely, because he is first forsaken by it. Prov. i. 24, 26; 2 Chron. xxiv. 20. But it is nowhere in the Scripture so much as insinuated in the least that God is either wont or *willing* to take away from any man the aid of exciting grace, or any other help which he hath once given in order to his conversion, unless the man himself hath first made way for it by his sin. This was the doctrine of the orthodox Fathers, who had to do with the Pelagians. Whether Austin, or Prosper, the one of them saith, 'It is the will of God that a man should continue in a good frame of will, who also forsakes no man until himself he first forsakes.'" Goodwin, who has a masterly and exhaustive dissertation on this subject in his Exposition of Rom. ix., alluding to this deliverance of the Synod of Dort, says: "is it not the first-born of things that are strange, that so many learned and grave men should speak and write such things as these, and yet deny that God vouchsafeth unto every man a sufficiency of means for salvation? or that God beareth in his breast the most doleful and irreconcilable war of a fatal reprobation

from eternity against far the greatest part of men, from their first conception in the womb? 'Doth a fountain,' saith the Apostle James, 'send forth at the same place sweet water and bitter?' Calvin also hath many passages in his writings very express for the assertion of the same truth—I mean, that God never withdraws that preventing or exciting grace, which is given unto every man, from any man until the man himself by voluntariness of sinning provoketh him to it; and consequently, that he willeth not to harden any man or men, but such only who are like unto Pharaoh." Goodwin shows how closely Paul keeps to the point he had in view: "God is at liberty—hath a justness of power—to reject, reprobate, and destroy whom he will. Those whom he willeth thus to reject, reprobate, and destroy, he hath in the example of Pharaoh, and by his proceedings with him from first to last, declared to be obstinate and impenitent unbelievers. Therefore the doctrine of justification in the sight of God by faith reflecteth not the least shadow of unrighteousness upon him." Goodwin notes that, "As for Ex. vii. 13, where our last translation, without any ground either from the context or otherwise, readeth, 'And he hardened Pharaoh's heart,' the former translation read it, according to the original, 'So Pharaoh's heart was hardened.' Mr. Ainsworth translates, 'waxed strong;' and some observe that God is not said to have hardened Pharaoh's heart under any of the five first plagues, nor until the sixth and afterward." The LXX. and Vulgate read like the Geneva—so Murphy: "And Pharaoh's heart was hardened, as the Lord had spoken. It is the prerogative of the Omniscient to predict the conduct of men. Though we cannot explain this mystery, yet from the known character of a man, we can sometimes make a shrewd guess at the way in which he will act in given circumstances." But why call in the shrewd guesses of ignorant man, as if they were analogous to the perfect knowledge of Omniscience? W. and W.: "The sacred writers frequently use active verbs when they ascribe to the persons of whom they speak, not a direct and positive agency, but a permission to others to perform the actions. God did not interfere to prevent Pharaoh from following the bent of his own mind. In the language of the Helvetic Confession, 'There is enough of vice and corruption to preclude all necessity for God's infusing a new and increased depravity. Therefore, when it is said that God hardens, blinds, gives up to a reprobate mind, it is to be understood that God does it by just judgment, as a judge and avenger.'" It should be added that God cannot force any man's heart to be either hard or soft. He affords such gracious influences to every man as are adapted to soften his heart and save him; and has solemnly decreed to have mercy on those who improve by them, and to abandon the incorrigibly obstinate, after much long-suffering, to their hardness and consequent perdition. That is all there is of it.

19. *Thou*—Alford questions the reference of this by Grotius, Tholuck, Lange, and others, to the Jewish objector, as it may arise in the mind of any reader. But Paul must have referred especially to the Jews, as it was against their

exclusiveness that he was arguing. So an Arminian would object to Calvinists, who maintain a similar exclusiveness. The apostle anticipates the objection in order to answer it, and to show that there is nothing arbitrary or capricious in the divine election and reprobation. There is a moroseness in the form of the objection—the name of God is not mentioned; and there is an insinuation that he is a chronic complainer, and that without cause. Why does *he yet* complain? Lange well remarks, "Chap. iii. 5 ff. proves that Paul can also reply to a similar charge by an answer which brings out the ethical relations in harmony with the connection. But the first task presented to him here is to go back with the quarrelsome Jew resting upon the righteousness of his works, to the absolute dependence of man on God." Goodwin says **OUA**, rendered "then," means "therefore," and so refers to the last clause of ver. 18, "whom he will he hardeneth"—*q.d.*, why does he yet complain of men's continuing in sin, if he hardens them? *For who hath resisted his will?*—That is, who can resist his will? (Cf. Isa. xliii. 13, and many other places, for the idiom.) As Goodwin says, it refers to his decretory, and not his preceptive, will—as all sinners resist the latter. God could not complain of any for resisting his decretory will, as that is what none can do. If he has absolutely and unconditionally decreed to elect a certain number, and to reprobate a certain number—to soften the hearts of the former, and to harden the hearts of the latter, that they may be proper subjects for salvation or damnation, as the case may be, no one in his senses could suppose God would find fault with the reprobates. They could not do otherwise than they did—they would have sinned if they had resisted his will. The impious and blasphemous assertion of Gomarus, that God made them sin in order to make them fit for damnation, is perfectly correct on this hypothesis. But, as Goodwin says, "Though the decreeing will of God be, in the sense declared, irresistible, yet if this will be, 1. To harden none but those who voluntarily first harden themselves, and so might have prevented their hardening; and, 2. To leave those whom he doth at any time harden in a capacity of relenting and returning to their former or a greater tenderness, so that if they do it not, it becomes a high aggravation of their former sin, certainly he hath reason in abundance to reprove and complain of those who are at any time hardened by him, and so continue." That this is Paul's meaning, he himself proceeds to show. How horrible is the perversion of it by Estius, that "the first rise of any man's hardening, which is God's dereliction of him, has no other cause than the will of God!" Even Augustin says—though it contradicts his theory of predestination—that "God deserts no man that does not first desert him." If God's dereliction be the cause of men's hardening, and the hardening be the cause of their sin and damnation—according to the axiom, *Causa causae est causa causati*—then God is represented in the Bible as using all possible means to keep men from doing and suffering what, according to this dogma, he absolutely decrees and causes them to do and suffer! The mind can conceive of nothing more impious.

20. *Nay but*,—*Menouage* is rendered "Yea, rather," Luke xi. 28, and "Yea, doubtless," Phil. iii. 8, and "Yea, verily," Rom. x. 18. Parkhurst: "Thou presumest to arraign the conduct of God, *therefore, truly*, let me ask thee, who art thou, O man." *O man*,—Expressive of contempt. Rom. ii. 1. Chrysostom: "Art thou a partner in his government? But dost thou sit a judge with God? For in comparison with him thou art not even any thing. Not this or that, but nothing at all. For to say, Who art thou? is much more expressive of contempt than to say, Thou art nothing." *Shall the thing formed say*—A strong way of saying it is very improper to say this. Wesley: "Little, impotent, ignorant man, that accusest God of injustice, for himself fixing the terms on which he will show mercy—why hast thou made me capable of honor and immortality only on believing?" Goodwin notes the absurdity of the querulous complaint, as God could not make any one to be any thing but what he is. If he makes an angel, an angel he is—not a man: if he makes a man, a man he is—not a beast: if he makes a beast, a beast he is—not a stone. It is as weak as it is wicked to challenge the right of God to make various orders of creatures, and to govern them according to their nature; but it is far more so to say that he created any creature to make him eternally miserable.

21. *Hath not the potter power over the clay*,—It has been said that Calvinists suppose Paul alludes to Isa. xxix. 16; xlv. 9, and Arminians to Jer. xviii. 1-10; but though there may be a good reason why Calvinists should not refer to Jer. xviii., as it subverts their theory, there is no reason why Arminians should ignore the passages in Isaiah—and, in fact, they do not ignore them, but they refer to them in explaining the apostle's language, which refers to all these passages, if not to some in the Apocrypha. In Isa. xxix. the prophet is reproving the Jews for their perverseness, hypocrisy, and obstinate opposition to God's plans, and he exclaims with astonishment and horror, "O your perverseness! If the potter should be reputed only as the clay! For so the thing formed would say to its former, He never made me; and the thing produced would say to its producer, He knows nothing." So Cowles gives the sense of the passage. In Isa. xlv., God sets forth his monarchy over the universe—sharing the government with no dualistic power, according to the Persian doctrine—Cyrus, to whom the language relates, being a Persian king. He is instructed that Jehovah, the God of the Jews, is the great and only Potentate, and that he commissioned Cyrus to deliver the Jews from captivity. He then shows how vain and wicked it would be for poor, weak mortals to oppose themselves to his decree: "Woe to him that striveth with his Maker, as the potsherd with the potsherds made up of earth." The brittle nature of potsherds suggests the fate of weak mortals who oppose God's government: "Thou shalt dash them in pieces like a potter's vessel" (Ps. ii. 9). "Shall the clay say to him who fashions it, What makest thou?" This exposes the absurdity of all such opposition to the Creator and Disposer of all things. He made moral agents—this implies their possibility of sinning, and so of suffering; but as Cowles pertinently says, "The question, Where

lies the guilt of this sinning? is met by the woe which God denounces upon the sinner, and by the verdict of universal conscience and reason, that the denounced woe is just and right." The passage in Jer. xviii. is to the same effect. Jeremiah is remonstrating with the Jews for their wickedness and obstinate rebellion against God, who threatened them with punishment for their sins. To set before them, not the caprice, captiousness, and arbitrariness of God's government, but its perfect equity, he said to the prophet: "Arise and go down to the potter's house, and there I will cause thee to hear my words. Then I went down to the potter's house, and, behold, he wrought a work on the wheels. And the vessel that he made of clay was marred in the hand of the potter: so he made it again another vessel, as seemed good to the potter to make it." There, says the absolutist, does not that prove absolute predestination? Jeremiah did not so understand it—he proceeds: "Then the word of the Lord came to me, saying, O house of Israel, cannot I do with you as this potter? saith the Lord. Behold, as the clay is in the potter's hand, so are ye in mine hand, O house of Israel. At what instant I shall speak concerning a nation, and concerning a kingdom, to pluck up, and to pull down, and to destroy it; if that nation against whom I have pronounced, turn from their evil, I will repent of the evil that I thought to do unto them. And at what instant I shall speak concerning a nation, and concerning a kingdom, to build and to plant it; if it do evil in my sight, that it obey not my voice, then I will repent of the good wherewith I said I would benefit them." No wonder Necessitarians are shy of this passage! What is here affirmed actually took place—not only in the case of Pharaoh, but of the Jews themselves—hence the allusion of the apostle. The case of the Ninevites illustrates the bright side of the picture. Jonah iii. 10. The language is so explicit that it needs no comment. The prophet knew better how to handle metaphors and allegories than to make them "run on all-fours," as do some who make moral agents, responsible beings, entirely passive, like clay in the hands of the potter. The only point for which he uses the metaphor is to set forth the doctrine that as the potter does what he pleases with the clay, according to its nature, so God does what he pleases with men, according to their nature, as the apostle proceeds to explain it, in the remainder of the chapter, and in chapters x. and xi. Olshausen remarks: "On the image of the potter comp. Job x. 8; Isa. xlv. 9; Eccus. xxxiii. 13; Wis. xv. 7; but the passage which appears more particularly to have been in the apostle's mind in this comparison is Jer. xviii." The ancients made great use of pottery; hence the frequent reference to fictile vessels. The passage in Wisdom is remarkable: "For the potter tempering soft earth, fashioneth every vessel with much labor for our service; yea, of the same clay he maketh both the vessels that serve for clean uses, and likewise also all such as seem to the contrary; but what is the use of either sort the potter himself is the judge. And employing his labor lewdly, he maketh a vain god of the same clay, even he which a little before was made of earth himself, and within a little while after returneth to the same." Eccus. xxxiii. 13 reads, "As the clay is in the potter's hand to fashion it at his

pleasure: so is man in the hand of him who made him, to render them as liketh him best." But Ben Sirach did not suppose that the Almighty Potter could do with it as wickedly as the *lewd potter* in Wisdom, who made out of it an idol to worship! Chrysostom knew well enough what Paul meant, and it is marvelous that any one should have overlooked it, as none would or could, were they not blinded by preconceived dogmatic prejudices: "Here he does not say this, as if he would deprive us of free-will, but to show us how far we are bound to obey God. The only end for which he selected this example, was not to lay down a rule of action, but to inculcate submission and silence. And this is a rule which ought always to be observed, that we must not take all the parts of a simile, without exception, but, selecting what is subservient to the purpose for which it is employed, omit every thing else." How could any man of common sense overlook this? Yet Thomas Aquinas says that there is no reason why we are placed as stones in the building, in the top or bottom, but because the architect wills it! Well does Tholuck exclaim, "Were the immortal souls of men really *stones*, there might be some truth in what this Aristotelian fatalist says!" Wesley understood the matter—he knew what use to make of the metaphor. The plasticity of the subject is as perfect as that of unresisting clay; but as the subject is not mere clay, but a free, moral, responsible agent, he prays:

Lo, in thy hand I lie,
And wait thy will to prove,
My Potter, stamp on me, thy clay,
Thy only stamp of love.

That makes the difference between Moses and Pharaoh, and the election of believing Gentiles, and the reprobation of unbelieving Jews—the case in question—and so, by parity, of all others. Supralapsarians set the Divine Potter to work from all eternity electing and reprobating angels and men for no reason but his own absolute will. Out of what lump did he make these vessels for honor and for dishonor? Sublapsarians think they mitigate this horrible decree by referring it to the condemned mass, the lump of mankind fallen in Adam—a part of this lump being fashioned as vessels of honor, and the rest as vessels of dishonor—and that for no reason but God's own absolute will!—and all this with the apostle's explanation and application of the metaphor before their eyes—which the common sense of a child can comprehend, and which the moral sense of every man living indorses. Goodwin has a powerful dissertation to this effect, which cannot well be abridged. Wesley well notes that, as Creator, Proprietor, and Lord of all, God has the right to make what creatures he pleases, without assigning a reason (though doubtless he has a good and a wise reason) for what he does. "But as the Moral Governor of the universe, he shows the reason why some are saved and others lost. Therefore, though he hath mercy on whom he willeth, and whom he willeth he hardeneth (that is, suffers to be hardened in consequence of their

obstinate wickedness), yet his is not the will of an arbitrary, capricious, or tyrannical being. He wills nothing but what is infinitely wise and good; and therefore his will is a most proper rule of judgment. He will show mercy, as he hath assured us, to none but true believers, nor hardens any but such as obstinately refuse his mercy." *Clay*,—*Phi ov* here means potter's clay in the raw state. *Lump*—*Fusama* means the mass kneaded and prepared for molding. Cf. 1 Cor. v. 6, 7; Rom. xi. 16. *Honour*—*dishonour*—Honorable or base uses. Wis. xv. 7 explains this: so 2 Tim. ii. 20, 21: "In a great house there are not only vessels of gold and of silver, but also of wood and of earth: and some to honor, and some to dishonor. If a man therefore purge himself from these [keep aloof from sinners and their sins], he shall be a vessel unto honor, sanctified, and meet for the master's use, and prepared unto every good work." So it seems the place assigned to any one in God's great house, the Church, does depend on the course he voluntarily follows, and the character which he thus acquires. By what aid he acquires it the apostle is not slow to inform us. This principle is of universal application.

22. *What*—This is supplied in A.V.—which omits the *de*x("but"), of which Goodwin loudly complains, as if the translators, with a Calvinistic bias, wished to ignore the connection. There seems to be an *anacoluthon*, or rather *aposiopesis*. W. and W. supply the *apodosis* thus: "saved us by calling and justifying." Some supply from ver. 20, "Who art thou, O man, that canst answer God?" But both methods seem forced. Goodwin supplies, "Hath he not power?" making the *protasis* of ver. 21 the *apodosis* of ver. 22, 23: "If God, willing to do thus and thus, hath he not power to do either or both?" "This completes the sentence, and makes the sense savory and congruous." Goodwin suggests that the apostle leaves these words to be supplied, to show the dependence of these verses on the preceding. Then he was carried away, as it were, with his theme, hasting to make the application of his argument. *Willing to shew his wrath*,—No one has any reason to complain if God bears patiently with sinners to bring them to repentance, and so show them mercy; or if they harden themselves, and continue impenitent, God displays his wrath, and exhibits his power. Matt. xi. 22-24; Rom. ii. 4, 5. *Vessels of wrath*—Alluding to the vessels of dishonor ver. 21—sinners who have made themselves capable of receiving the wrath of God, as a vessel is capable of receiving what may be put in it, or of being dashed to pieces as useless. *Fitted to destruction*:—Tholuck considers the participle as put Hebraistically for the "adjective verb"—*ready, suited*—that is, fit for destruction. But the correspondent word, "prepared," in ver. 23, suggests the process by which they were made fit for destruction—their own obstinacy, and the divine forbearance thus abused. It is impious to say—and the apostle would shudder at the horrible thought—that God, by his decree and the execution of it, fitted them for destruction—God the author of sin! Fletcher says, "Our salvation is of God—and

so ver. 23—our damnation of ourselves." 2 Thess. i. 8, 9; Rom. i. 32; ii. 4-8. Chrysostom: "He calls Pharaoh not only a vessel of wrath, but also one fitted for destruction—that is, fully fitted, indeed, but by his own proper self. For neither had God left out aught of the things likely to recover him, nor did he leave out aught of those which would ruin him, and put him beyond any forgiveness."

23. *And that he might make known*—As in the examples adduced. *The riches of his glory*—A Pauline expression. (See on ii. 4.) *On the vessels of mercy*,—"Filled up and laden with the very affluence of glory," says Whedon; but does *επι* ("on") suggest that figure? The moral perfections of God are eminently displayed in his having mercy on penitent sinners—they become indeed vessels for honor. *Which he had afore prepared unto glory*,—Those he previously prepared for heaven. The work is attributed to God, though the Scriptures abundantly testify that it is synergistic—omnipotent grace cannot prepare men for heaven without their concurrence. Eph. ii. 8, 9, 10; Phil. ii. 12, 13. Chrysostom: "Whence, then, are some vessels of wrath, and some of mercy? Of their own free choice. God, however, being very good, shows the same kindness to both. For it was not those in a state of salvation only to whom he showed mercy, but also Pharaoh, as far as his part went. For of the same long-suffering both they and he had the advantage. And if he was not saved, it was quite owing to his own will; since, as for what concerneth God, he had as much done for him, as they who were saved."

24. *Even us*,—Lit., Whom he also called, us. It is the aorist tense, and alludes to the calling of the Gentiles together with the Jews—their believing acceptance of the call being implied, as in Rom. viii. 30, and other places in Paul's Epistles. Elsewhere, the word simply means "invited," whether the invitation is accepted or rejected, as in Matt. xx. 16, "Many are called, but few chosen." Cf. Matt. xxii. 8, 14. God predestinates to a conformity to the image of his Son, and consequent glorification, none but those who are called in the sense here intended—that is, who accept the call. Goodwin makes a sensible observation on this place: "The obedience of faith in believers is both here and frequently elsewhere rather ascribed unto the calling of God than to their compliance with the call, though this be as requisite to the production of such an effect as the other, because it is the principal and primary cause, and most worthy consideration." The word "even"—*και*—also—is emphatic, expressive of wonder at the grace thus displayed. *ου̅ς* ("us") is masculine; but *σκευ̅ς* ("vessels") is neuter—such grammatical licenses, however, are common in Scripture and other writings. (See Winer, sec. 21.) *Not of the Jews only*,—This is added because the Jews thought that vessels of honor could be formed alone out of the Jewish lump. But the whole scope of the Epistle is to show that Gentiles are called as well as Jews, and both are alike accepted on condition of faith, or both alike rejected if they will not believe and obey the gospel.

25. *As he saith also in Osee*,—Alford suggests that he says "also" to intimate "that the matter in hand was not directly prophesied in the citation, but one analogous to it." But it may mean, As it was even predicted in Hosea. The quotation is from Hosea ii. 23, where the Hebrew reads, "I will have mercy upon her, who had not obtained mercy; and I will say to her who was not my people, My people art thou." The LXX. reads, "And I will love her who was not beloved, and I will say [to him or it] that was not my people, Thou art my people." The Alexandrian copy reads the first clause, "I will have mercy on her who had not obtained mercy," or, as it may be rendered, "pity the unpitied one." 1 Pet. ii. 10 agrees with the Vatican reading and Romans. The Heb. might be rendered either by the word "love" or "mercy"—the latter, however, here denotes that pity or tenderness of regard which springs from love. The feminine gender was occasioned by the name of the prophet's daughter, *Lo-ruhamah*, "Not having obtained mercy." Hos. i. 6; cf. ver. 9; ii. 1. *I will call*—Constitute.

26. *And it shall come to pass*,—This quotation is from Hos. i. 10, slightly differing from the Heb. and LXX. Both quotations refer, in Hosea, to the Israelites of the ten tribes, who were rejected by God because of their idolatry—as Calvin and others interpret; but Pareus and others interpret it of the Gentiles. Goodwin and others think the "oracles" in Hosea were so indited as to apply primarily to the Jews, or Israelites, and by accommodation to the Gentiles. The Israelites in their captivity were mixed with Gentiles, so that what is said of one might be said of the other—hence Peter refers the language to the Gentiles—Paul seems to embrace both. Goodwin thinks that the apostle's design in citing these passages was to show that it is no new thing that persons once rejected, or alienated from God, should be restored to his favor, so that the Jews had no reason to complain that Gentiles as well as Jews were made vessels of mercy prepared for glory, on condition of their faith in Christ, however great may have been their previous alienation from him. The sense may be thus given: And it shall be in the place—any-where in their dispersion, where the inhabitants twitted them with their rejection as God's people, they should, on their acceptance of Jesus as the Messiah, be recognized as his people, as well as the believing Gentiles. *There*—Not in the Heb. or LXX. *Shall they be called*,—So LXX., which has "even they," making it emphatic. *The children*—The Heb., LXX., and Paul, have "sons"—but, as Goodwin says, in a case like this it comprehends daughters. *The living God*.—So called in opposition to dead idols, and because he exists through all generations and to all eternity to fulfill all his counsels—Goodwin says "because his glory is waxing in the minds of men and angels." (See on Matt. xvi. 16; xxvi. 63; Job vi. 57, 69; 1 Thess. i. 9; 1 Tim. iii. 15.)

27. *Esaias also crieth*—Goodwin says this indicates either great sorrow or an ardent desire that all men, especially the Jews, should lay it to heart—probably the latter. The quotation is from Isa. x. 22, 23, where the prophet states that though

the great body would be taken, principally of the ten tribes, but including many of the kingdom of Judah—according to the boast of Sennacherib in the Assyrian Annals 200,150 people—of course, a gross exaggeration—yet the remnant spoken of ver. 20, 21, should return. In the other quotation from Isa. i. 9, it is said that it should be a very small remnant, yet enough to preclude the fate of Sodom and Gomorrah, which were utterly destroyed. This the apostle applies to the case of the Jews under the gospel: though the great body of them should be rejected because of their unbelief, yet there should be a remnant of believers, who would prove as a seed, producing ultimately a glorious harvest. The quotation from Isa. x. 22, 23, agrees nearly with the LXX., which has, "And even though the people of Israel be as the sand of the sea, the remnant of them shall be saved. He is finishing and cutting short the word in righteousness, for a shortened word the Lord will make in the whole land." This differs in language, but agrees substantially with the Hebrew—which Tholuck renders: "The extermination is determined, it accordingly streams forth, bringing righteousness; for the Lord God of hosts executeth the appointed destruction in all the land." Zunz is terse and to the point: "The ruin is decreed—righteousness overflows, for the Lord the God of hosts executes a firmly determined desolation in the middle of all the land." *As the sand of the sea*,—A common comparison for a great number—Gen. xxii. 17; xxxii. 12—hence referred to the great body of the Israelites, who were carried into captivity. *A remnant*—"Yet the remnant" is the sense. *Shall be saved*:—Isaiah refers to their return from captivity, and to their allegiance to Jehovah. Paul refers it to their salvation through faith in Jesus as the Messiah, who was rejected by the great body of the Jews.

28. *For he will finish*—For he is finishing and cutting short the word—**l**ogon. He will speedily accomplish his decree, which was to punish the Israelites for their sin, and that by the instrumentality of the Assyrian, but to accomplish this by a just proportion, not allowing of an utter extermination. So in the destruction of Jerusalem and the Jewish State by the Romans, the days were shortened for the sake of the elect. Ver. 28 was added as a part of the quotation, without any special application to gospel times. *The Lord*—In Isaiah it is "the Lord Jehovah of Sabaoth." It is not likely that Paul omitted "Jehovah of Sabaoth" for the reason assigned by Goodwin, that he wished merely to express his right of dominion, which is done in the word *Adoni*, and not his executive power: he wished to express both, and **Κυριον** ("Lord") does it. He retains the other in the next quotation—the reason, perhaps, that he omitted it in this. *The earth*.—Heb, *erets*, LXX. **οικουμενη**, and **gh**—here, all mean the land of Israel. Chrysostom makes the "short word" faith (Rom. x. 9), and says: "This short word carries with it not salvation only—but also righteousness."

29. *And as Esaias said before*,—Vulg., *praedixet*; Rheims, "foretold"—so Rose, Robinson, De Wette, Tholuck, and others; but all the old versions (except

Rheims), Beza, Calvin, Grotius, Goodwin, W. and W., and others, agree with A.V., and Alford says, "Surely there is no necessity for affixing an unusual sense to the word where the ordinary one suits much better." Isa. i. 9 is not properly a prophecy. Wesley: "Had said before concerning those who were besieged in Jerusalem by Rezin and Pekah." Goodwin has "had said," and remarks, "The preter-perfect tense for the preter-pluperfect is Hebrew-wise." But the perfect may be retained, "has said." *The Lord of Sabaoth*—Bengel: "In 1 Sam. and Isa. *Sabaoth* is put [in the LXX.] for the Heb. *tzebaoth*—in all other books it is translated *Pantokratw̄r*, 'Ruler over all': whence there is strong ground for conjecture that one, or perhaps several persons, translated those two books, and different persons the rest. And in the same 1 Sam. Scripture begins to give this title to God, although others had been formerly used, as it were, in its place. Ex. xxxiv. 23." Alford says: "This is not strictly the case—*dunamewn* is found in several places, and *sabawq* occurs in Zech. xiii. 2, B a. " *Sabaoth* means "hosts," and sometimes denotes the heavenly bodies (Isa. xxxiv. 4), and sometimes the angels (1 Kings xxii. 19; cf. Luke ii. 13); sometimes both are spoken of together (Ps. cxlviii. 2, 3; cf. Job xxxviii. 7). "Jehovah (God) of hosts" is frequently found in Psalms, Isa., Jer., Zech., and Mal. The rabbins say, when God judges his creatures, he is called *Elohim*—when he shows mercy, *Jehovah*—when he fights against sinners, he is called *Sabaoth*—but it is "Jehovah God of hosts." James (v. 4) writes, "the Lord of Sabaoth"—Macknight suggests, as more agreeable to the Jews. The reference to Sodom and Gomorrah is frequent in the Bible—thus Jude: "Even as Sodom and Gomorrah, and the cities about them, . . . are set forth for an example" of utter destruction. Cf. Matt. xi. 23, 24. *And been made like unto*—Goodwin: "We should have been in all ages mentioned upon all occasions for a people exemplarily destroyed, rush and branch, by God, as Gomorrah now is. The Greek translators use the like expressions elsewhere. Hos. iv. 6; Ezek. xxxii. 2." They follow the Heb. idiom.

30. *What shall we say then?*—(See on ver. 14.) What shall we infer from the foregoing discussion? Not merely from the passages cited from the prophets—they are incidental and illustrative—but what is the conclusion of the argument? Tholuck: "Melanchthon justly says, This expressly shows the cause of reprobation, namely, because they would not believe the gospel—therefore the similitude of the clay is not to be understood as if the will of man was not the cause of reprobation." *That the Gentiles which followed not after righteousness*,—There is no necessity of limiting the metaphor to a race, like Lange and others, or to a hunt, like Whedon. Agonistic allusions are scarce in Romans—Hebraistic metaphors abound. *Diwkw̄* seems to denote the same as the Heb. *radaph*, which means to pursue for any purpose—to seek after any thing—it is so used in the classics—so the rabbins. The heathen, as a mass, knew but little, and cared but little, for righteousness, till they were enlightened by the gospel,

then they did—that is, those who were constituted the vessels of mercy, and the Israel of God, sought it by faith, and obtained it. *Even the righteousness*—A righteousness, however (*de*); which is by faith. (See on i. 17.)

31. *But Israel*,—The great body of the Jews—"the remnant" excepted. *Which followed after the law of righteousness*,—Not *per hypallagen*, for the righteousness of the law. The article is not used—it means a rule, or method, of justification. The Jews sought it by works, by merit of their own, and, of course, failed. This is more fully developed in ch. x. *Hath not attained*—Did not attain. The Gentiles laid hold on it—the Jews did not even come up to it—they fell short in the pursuit. This is strikingly illustrated in Acts xiii. 38-52. (See notes.) Their pursuing (willing and running) resulted in failure. *To the law of righteousness*.—W, and W.: "To a system, or dispensation, of righteousness—*i.e.*, the gospel covenant of grace and justification—*norma juxta quam Deus justificat*." The omission of "righteousness" after the second "law," in some MSS., is not to be indorsed. Bloomfield ably defends the received text. Tischendorf has restored it, after canceling it. It is no tautology—it gives clearness and emphasis to the passage.

32. *Wherefore?*—Why did the Jews fail to attain righteousness? *Because they sought it not by faith*,—Chrysostom says, "This is the clearest solution of the whole passage." It specially explains ver. 16. *But as it were*—Tholuck says: "The *ωϋ* ('as') answers to the Heb. *caph veritatis*—*i.e.*, it involves a comparison with all objects of the same species. The use of it is particularly manifest at John i. 14, where Chrysostom remarks it, likewise at John vii. 10; Phil. ii. 12; Philemon 14." Winer (sec. 65): "*Ek pistew* ('by faith') denotes the objective standard—*ωϋ εξ ε̅ργον* ('as by works') the purely ideal." Alford: "Subjectively—as if about to obtain their object by." *By the works of the law*.—By works of law—both nouns are anarthrous—any works opposed to faith will fail to justify. The received text appears to be genuine—though some good MSS. and versions omit *νομου* ("of law"). *For they stumbled*—Some MSS., versions, and critics, omit "for." *Proskoptw* means to strike against any thing, and especially a *proskomma*—or stumbling-stone. Alford thinks "the similitude of a race is still kept up"; but the figure of stumbling is used in a very general sense in the Scriptures. (See on Matt. xi. 6; xvi. 23.)

33. *As it is written*,—Paul does not quote literally from either the Heb. or LXX. of Isa. xxviii. 16 and viii. 14, but, after the Jewish manner, he takes such clauses as he wants from both places, and blends them together. Isa. xxviii. 16 reads in the Heb.: "Behold I have laid in Zion a foundation-stone, a tried stone, a corner-stone, precious, and surely founded: he who trusts it need not fly"—as Tholuck renders. The LXX. has, "Behold, I lay for the foundations of Sion a costly stone—a choice corner-stone, invaluable for its foundations; and he who believes shall by no

means be ashamed." Isa. viii. 14 reads in the Heb.: "He will be for a sanctuary, but for a stone of stumbling, and for a rock of offense to both the houses of Israel; for a gin and for a snare to the inhabitants of Jerusalem." The LXX. is free enough: "And if thou shalt trust in him, he shall be to thee for a sanctuary; and ye shall not come against him as against a stumbling-stone, neither as the falling of a rock; but the houses of Jacob are in a snare, and the dwellers in Jerusalem in a pit." The apostle, having no use for the predicates of the foundation-stone in Isa. xxviii., introduces those of the stumbling-stone in Isa. viii. Some of the Jews, in Hezekiah's time, wanted to form a league with Egypt against Assyria—against this the Lord warns them, giving them the assurance that if they did they should certainly come to grief, as one falls who runs against a stumbling-block; but that all true theocrats, who trusted in Jehovah, would realize his sure protection, and not be confounded before their enemies. The ancient Jews referred both passages to the Messiah—they primarily referred to events then imminent; but these were typical of a higher fulfillment, as Christ and the apostles affirm. Matt. xxi. 42-44; Acts iv. 11; 1 Pet. ii. 6, 7, 8. Simeon so applies Isa. viii. (See on Luke ii. 34.) Augustin says: "Christ in the state of humiliation is the little stone at the feet, on which the daring runner stumbles: Christ in the state of exaltation is the mighty rock, which, falling from on high, dashes the rebellious to pieces." This refers to the two words, *liqov*, a stone, and *petra*, a rock—but the distinction is not obvious. Tholuck: "The words are delivered in the name of Jehovah to such of the theocrats in Judah as stood in danger of being seduced into distrust of the divine aid against their enemies, Israel and Syria. In opposition to such fears God here offers himself to all who yield him the honor, for a secure sanctuary; but on the other hand, to such as assume a position of hostility against him, for a stone of offense and fall." "As Christ is the rock, through which alone the man who is alive to his need of salvation can obtain firm footing, so is he likewise, however, the rocky point upon which the proud and self-righteous dash themselves, and break their hard heads." It expresses failure in aim, and consequent misfortune and grief. So the Jews, as Chrysostom says: "Stumbling comes from not attending, and from panting after other things, because they gave their minds to the law, they struck against the stone." *Whosoever*—*Pav* is omitted in the LXX., and in many MSS. in this place; but it is found in every MS. of Rom. x. 11. *Believeth on him*—Some render "on it"—the stone; but Goodwin says, "*aujtw* cannot relate unto *liqov*, because of *petra*, being the feminine gender, coming between; therefore must needs relate unto the person signified by that *liqov*, or stone." He does not think that the formula, "As it is written," binds us to the conclusion that the words were primarily designed to refer to Christ; but that there is an affinity between what is there recorded and what took place in regard to the question in hand. As the Jews stumbled and fell by rejecting the provisions made for their welfare in the days of Isaiah, so says Paul, they again stumble and fall by their unbelief and rejection of Jesus, as the promised Messiah, and the only means of obtaining the righteousness

they sought—while the Gentiles, by believing on him, realized it, though they had not previously sought after it. *Shall not be ashamed.*—The Heb. is, "shall not make haste"—flee away, as routed in battle, and so confounded, or ashamed—so the LXX., only that has the subjunctive. It is inexpressibly painful and pitiful to see great and good men so warped by dogmatic prejudice as to reject the lucid interpretation which the inspired apostle gives of "the mystery" of the rejection of the Jews for their unbelief, and the election of the Gentiles because of their faith—not because the former were unconditionally and absolutely reprobated, and the other elected, from all eternity—than which nothing can be more horrible and foreign from the divine nature and economy, as here set forth, and more fully developed in the next two chapters. (See John Goodwin's Dissertation on Romans ix.)

CHAPTER X.

5 *The scripture sheweth the difference betwixt the righteousness of the law, and this of faith, 11 and that all, both Jew and Gentile, that believe, shall not be confounded, 18 and that the Gentiles shall receive the word and believe. 19 Israel was not ignorant of these things.*

X.—1. *Brethren,*—He thus kindly prefaces the rebuke which is to follow. Cf. vii. 1; ix. 1, 2, 3. A.V. overlooks the *men* ("indeed"), which calls for a corresponding *de* ("but")—that is not expressed, but implied in ver. 2, 3—*q.d.*, I indeed desire their salvation, but they oppose it. *My heart's desire*—*Eudokia*, like the Heb. *ratzon*, is sometimes used for will, or desire, or purpose, the intent being benevolent, as here. Chrysostom: "For it is not likely that the same person should desire their salvation, and not desire it only, but even pray for it, and yet should also hate them, and feel aversion to them; for by his heart's desire here he means exceeding good desire." *For Israel*—The best authorities have "for them"—thus connecting this chapter more immediately with the preceding, as seems proper. *That they might be saved.*—This is a correct paraphrase—lit., "for salvation"—not "for destruction." He hoped for their salvation, and prayed and labored for it. Bengel says, "Paul would not have prayed for them, had they been utterly reprobate."

2. *For I bear them record*—For I testify in regard to them. *A zeal of God,*—Not "great zeal," "godly zeal," but "zeal for God." Cf. John ii. 17; Acts xxi. 20; xxii. 31; Gal. i. 14. *But not according to knowledge.*—Their zeal was not directed by correct views of the plan of salvation. Still, their earnestness afforded ground to hope favorably in their case—stolid indifference generates despair.

3. *For they, being ignorant*—Lit., ignoring—not recognizing the spiritual and evangelical import of their own Scriptures. *Of God's righteousness,*—The

justification which God reckons to the believer in Christ. (See on i. 17.) *And going about to establish their own righteousness*,—The best authorities omit "righteousness" in this clause: Their own seeking to establish—that is, to set it up as the basis of acceptance with God. *Have not submitted themselves*—It is not material whether it be rendered as a middle or as a passive—the latter comprehends the former, and comprises, besides, all other agencies employed in bringing the soul into captivity to the obedience of Christ. It is the 2 aorist, and so seems to refer to the time when the proposition of salvation through Jesus Christ was made to them, and was rejected by them. *Unto the righteousness of God*.—Chrysostom: "This he calls God's righteousness, that from faith, because it comes entirely from the grace from above, and because men are justified in this case, not by labors, but by the gift of God. But they who evermore resisted the Holy Spirit, vexatiously trying to be justified by the law, came not over to the faith."

4. *For Christ is the end of the law*—Middleton does not show any good reason for this rendering. Both words—**τελον** ("end") and **νομου** ("of law")—are anarthrous, and the article should not be prefixed to either. Paul may have special reference to the Mosaic law; but he here speaks of law in general, as in iii. 20, 21, 28, 31, *et al.* To every one, Jew or Gentile, who has sought in vain to be justified by legal works, Christ is an end of law. Having found Christ, and justification through him, he no more seeks to be justified by law—there is an end to that. Phil. iii. 7, 8, 9, furnishes a luminous commentary on this passage: "What things were gain to me, those I counted loss for Christ. Yea, doubtless, and I count all things but loss for the excellency of the knowledge of Christ Jesus my Lord; for whom I have suffered the loss of all things, and do count them but dung that I may win Christ, and be found in him, not having mine own righteousness, which is of the law"—or, rather, that from law (anarthrous, as here)—"but that which is through the faith of Christ, the righteousness which is of God by faith." By losing sight of this simple and satisfactory solution, many critics have involved themselves in inextricable difficulties—making Christ the scope of the Mosaic law in several senses—or chronologically taking place of the law, the Christian succeeding the Jewish dispensation; or fulfilling the law, the ceremonial by his death—the moral by his life; or, as Chrysostom interprets, the end, or intention, of the law was to make men righteous, but, failing in this, "Christ gave a fuller accomplishment of this end through faith"—nebulous, as all his copious comment on this passage. *To every one that believeth*.—The believer in Christ is justified—obtains pardon, which he could not obtain by legal works of any sort. "But to him that worketh not, but believeth on him that justifieth the ungodly; his faith is counted for righteousness" (Rom. iv. 5). Hence righteousness in this place does not mean sanctification, but justification—relative, not real, righteousness—according to its current meaning in this Epistle. (See on i. 17.) Real, or implanted,

righteousness, of course, comes through Christ; but here it means justification by faith. "Christ is made of God unto us wisdom, and righteousness, and sanctification, and redemption" (1 Cor. i. 30)—where the one is distinguished from the other, though Christ is the Source of both. Legal obedience is set aside, as the condition of justification—faith, in its very nature, rejects every thing as the ground of pardon, except the merits of Christ, who is our exclusive and all-sufficient Saviour.

The best obedience of my hands
Dares not appear before thy throne;
But faith can answer thy demands
By pleading what my Lord has done.

Tyndale, Cranmer, and Geneva, understand it of justification; they render, "to justify all that believe." Meyer comes near the point: "Christ ends the law by introducing the economy in which no longer the law, but faith, is the ground of salvation."

5. *For Moses describeth*—Rather, writes concerning—as it is not a description. *Of the law*,—By law—the best authorities omit the article. *That the man—%Oti* ("that") *recitantis*, should be omitted in translation: The man doing these things shall live by them—not "by it," *aujth*, but "by them," *aujtoiv*—the received text being the best supported. The quotation is literally from the LXX. of Lev. xviii. 5: so the Heb. 'En, like *beth*, means through, or by means of—obedience being the condition of life. Origen and others restrict "life" to residence in Canaan, which, indeed, was a legal sanction; but this does not exclude a higher sense—viz., happiness in the next world, as well as in this. So far as *law* was concerned, the sanction was life as the reward of obedience, and death as the penalty of disobedience—the counterpart being, "The soul that sinneth, it shall die." Whatever provision may have been made for repentance and pardon was outside of law—the apostle has nothing to say about that. The later Jews extend the idea of life to the future state; thus Onkelos and Jonathan: "Whosoever keeps those commandments shall thereby live in the life eternal." Eben Ezra says, Moses promises eternal life to those who know the secret of the law—to others, temporal things. Christ understood it of "eternal life." Luke x. 25, 26. The moral law is necessarily a rule of life and future judgment. That this is compatible with its rejection as the condition of justification, or the pardon of sin, has been already noted. Chrysostom: "There is no other way of becoming righteous in the law save by fulfilling the whole of it; but this has not been possible for any one, and therefore this righteousness has failed them. But tell us, Paul, of the other righteousness also, that which is of grace. What is that then? and of what does it consist in? Hear the words in which he gives a clear sketch of it. For after he had refuted the others, he goes on to this."

6. *But the righteousness which is of faith*—Rather, "by faith." (See on i. 17.) *Speaketh on this wise*,—Thus speaks—a personification. *Say not in thine heart*,—Think not—a Heb. idiom, as we think in language. *Who shall ascend into heaven?*—Paul here applies to the case in hand Deut. xxx. 11-14, which reads thus in the LXX., varying very little from the Heb.: "For this commandment which I give thee this day is not grievous, neither is it far from thee. It is not in heaven above, saying, Who shall go up for us into heaven, and shall take it for us, and we will hear, and do it? Neither is it beyond the sea, saying, Who will go over for us to the other side of the sea, and take it for us, and make it audible to us, and we will do it? The word is very nigh thee, in thy mouth, and in thy heart, and in thy hands, to do it." It cannot be supposed that in Deuteronomy Moses contradicts what he has said in Leviticus. The passage in Deuteronomy merely says that the Israelites had a knowledge of God's will brought to them, so that they had not to go to heaven or over the sea—proverbial expressions for accomplishing great undertakings—in order to ascertain what God required of them. Cf. Micah vi. 8; Job xi. 9; Ps. cxxxix. 8, 9; Amos ix. 2. Thus Baruch iii. 16: "Who hath gone up into heaven, and taken wisdom, and brought her down from the clouds? who hath gone over the sea, and found her?" So Philo: "What need is there, either to take long journeys, or go to sea, in search of virtue, we having the root of it within us?" The Jerusalem Targum renders the words of Moses: "O that there were one like Jonah the prophet, who would descend into the depth of the great sea!" Paul uses the word "abyss" in the same sense, and the rather, as it furnishes a striking antithesis to "heaven." It is absurd to construe this of "the Isles of the Blessed," on the one hand, and "Tartarus," on the other. All that Moses said was that they had not to perform any difficult service in order to ascertain the will of God. Paul simply applies this to the case in hand. Those to whom he wrote might readily ascertain what God required of them in order to their justification—extending the idea to the performance, as well as the knowledge, of the requirements. *That is, to bring Christ down from above*:—The Jews, with their carnal notions, could not think of a Messiah who was not visibly and corporeally present with them; but Paul shows that that would not help the matter of their salvation. It is "expedient" that Christ should remain in heaven, as the object of faith, not sight. John xvi. 7; xx. 29; 1 Pet. i. 8.

7. *Or, Who shall descend into the deep?*—A poetical and rhetorical expression for the grave—not the world of spirits. As Christ was not visibly present, they were disposed to discredit his resurrection, and demanded his re-appearance on the earth. But the testimony of those who had seen him after his resurrection, confirmed by miracles, could not be disbelieved by the sincere and earnest seekers after truth. The application of the language of Moses to Christ is in Paul's manner. It is not necessary to suppose, with Rabbi Bechai, that Moses intended that it should refer to the Messiah, and be fulfilled in him. Tholuck: "The apostle's object

is to show how easy is righteousness by faith. Accordingly, the infinitives after *tout' eḡti* ('that is') are to be regarded as statement of the purpose of that proceeding which forms the subject of the question. The member of the Old Testament theocracy needed no more to ask, Who shall ascend into heaven to make known unto me God's will? The subject of the N.T. needs just as little to put this question—nay, not even, Who shall ascend into heaven to bring Christ down?" This short and easy method of expounding the passage avoids the fruitless logomachies in Schaff's Lange, Alford, and others. Surely it is bold to say with Theodoret, indorsed by Meyer and others, "Paul teaches again the difference between the law and grace, and introduces Moses the lawgiver as teacher of both." It takes hard squeezing to force the latter out of Deut. xxx., which treats only of the law. Luther comes near the mark: "Paul frames against the self-righteous, as it were, a new and right text, but of the words of Moses." So Bengel: "The parody, if I may so call it, most sweetly alludes to the passage, without expressly quoting it." Wesley: "To accommodate to our present subject the words which Moses spoke touching the plainness of the law." Chrysostom: "He uses the words found in the O.T., being always at pains to keep quite clear of the charges of the love of novelties, and opposition to it. For this which he here says of faith, Moses says of the commandment itself, so showing that they had enjoyed at God's hand a great benefit. For there is no need to say, he means, that one must go up to heaven, or cross a great sea, and then receive the commandment, but things so great and grand hath God made of easy access to us." So Grotius, Beza, De Wette, Stuart, Hodge, and others.

8. *But what saith it?*—The Cambridge MS., the Vulg., Origen and several other Fathers, Wycliffe, Tyndale, and Rheims, have, "What saith the Scripture?" But it is the personification of righteousness by faith, as ver. 6. *The word is nigh thee*,—The revealed will of God concerning the condition of salvation is made known to thee—that is, to all to whom the apostles preached. *In thy mouth*,—By which it is professed. *And in thy heart*:—By which it is believed. So far the Heb.—the LXX. adds, "in thy hand;" but this addition is not needed, nor did it suit the apostle's scope to say, as in the Heb., "that thou mayst do it"—as he is treating of faith—not of works of law. *The word of faith*,—The subject-matter of belief—the proposition of salvation. Gal. iii. 2; 1 Tim. iv. 6. *Which we preach*:—Paul and his co-laborers. Chrysostom: "The word is nigh thee—that is, it is easy. For in thy mind, and in thy tongue, is thy salvation. There is no long journey to go, no seas to sail over, no mountains to pass, to get saved. But if you be not minded to cross so much as the threshold, you may even while you sit at home be saved. For in thy mouth and in thy heart is the source of salvation." (See on ver. 14.) C. Wesley makes a good use of this passage in rejecting the Mystic schemes of justification, which, however worded, are but thinly-veiled methods of justification by legal works:

Oft I in my heart have said,
"Who shall ascend on high,
Mount to Christ, my glorious Head,
And bring him from the sky?
Borne on contemplation's wing,
Surely I shall find him there,
Where the angels praise their King,
And gain the Morning Star."

Oft I in my heart have said,
"Who to the deep shall stoop,
Sink with Christ among the dead,
From thence to bring him up?
Could I but my heart prepare
By unfeigned humility,
Christ would quickly enter there,
And ever dwell in me."

But the righteousness of faith
Hath taught me better things:
"Inward turn thine eyes," it saith,
While Christ to me it brings,
"Christ is ready to impart
Life to all for life who sigh:
In thy mouth, and in thy heart,
The word is ever nigh."

9. *That*—%Oti here is not *recitantis*, as in A.V.; but it assigns a reason for the foregoing—hence confession is put before belief, conforming to the order of the words in the quotation—whereas Paul himself gives them in the order in which they would be naturally presented in preaching—see ver. 10. All the old English versions, except Wycliffe, have "For." *With thy mouth*—By thy mouth, as we say, "by word of mouth." *The Lord Jesus*,—As it is anarthrous, most commentators construe *Kυριου* ("Lord") as a predicate, placed first for emphasis. So Stuart, Tholuck, Meyer, W. and W., Lange. B and some Fathers have *οτι Κυριου 'Ihsou*—others add *eστιν*—that Jesus is Lord. Alford demurs, because Paul often uses *Kυριου 'Ihsou* for "the Lord Jesus"—though he admits that in 2 Cor. iv. 5 he does not, but renders "Christ Jesus as Lord." To acknowledge him as "Lord" is to recognize his Mediatorial royalty, as in Phil. ii. 11: "And that every tongue should confess that Jesus Christ is Lord"—*οτι Κυριου 'Ihsou Cristou*—where Jesus Christ is used as a proper name, the subject of the predicate *Kυριου* (Lord), as here. Chrysostom says, "That he is Lord, then, is plain from the resurrection." *That God hath raised*—That God raised him from the

dead—not as an isolated historical event, but as the central fact of our redemption, ratifying his atoning sacrifice. (See on iv. 25.) *Thou shalt be saved.*—From sin and its consequences.

10. *For with the heart,*—As the words are anarthrous, it is better to render, For in heart it is believed unto righteousness, and by mouth it is confessed unto salvation. The passive verbs refer to the proposition specified—"the word of faith," as preached by the apostles. Faith is an exercise of the mind—spiritual, internal, known only to God and the believer. Confession is a vocal expression of it. Thus the distinction is not between "the heart and the head," as some say, but between the heart and the mouth—the internal and the external. Heart, in Scripture, means mind, spirit, soul—"the inward man"—"the hidden man of the heart"—the spiritual, as distinguished from the corporeal. It thus comprehends intellect, sensibility, and will—all the functions of our spiritual nature. The intellect receives and comprehends the proposition to be believed; the sensibility is excited by a sense of sin, and the need of a Saviour; and the will, as the executive power of the soul, closes in with the overture, and completes the act of faith.

Lord give me faith. He hears: what grace is this?
Dry up thy tears, my soul, and cease to grieve:
He shows me what he did, and who he is—
I must, I can, I will, I do, believe!

It is absurd to talk about the faith of the *heart* (meaning the affections), as contrasted with the faith of the *head*; and it is equally so to talk about a mere "historical faith," as being sufficient for salvation. The devils believe thus, and make confession too; but are they saved by their faith and confession? Luke iv. 33, 34; James ii. 19, 20. Olshausen says, "A dumb faith is no faith." "I believe, therefore I spoke; we also believe, and therefore speak." 2 Cor. iv. 12. The confession is not to be restricted to mere vocal utterance, as at baptism—yet this may be primarily intended; and thus we have the germ of the Creeds and Confessions of the catholic Church. So in the case of the eunuch, who wanted to be baptized. "Philip said, If thou believest with all thine heart, thou mayest; and he answered, and said, I believe that Jesus Christ is the Son of God." The context shows that he did believe with all his heart—that is, his soul, including intellect, affections, and will. *Unto righteousness*;—In order to justification. Tyndale, Cranmer, Geneva: "For the belief of the heart justifieth." Tomson's Beza has this note: "Faith is said to justify, and furthermore seeing the confession of the mouth is an effect of faith, and confession is the way to come to salvation, it followeth that faith is also said to save." Alford well says: "Clearly the words righteousness and salvation are not used here, as De Wette and others, merely as different terms of the same thing, for the sake of the parallelism; but, as Tholuck quotes from

Crellius, salvation is the *terminus ultimus et apex justificationis*, consequent not merely on the act of justifying faith as the other, but on a good confession before the world, maintained unto the end." *Eij* ("Unto") denotes the end, or purpose.

11. *For the scripture saith*,—Isa. xxviii. 16. (See on ix. 33.) *Whosoever*—An echo of ver. 4. It is not in the Heb. or LXX., but it is implied.

12. *For there is no difference*—There is no distinction between Jew and Greek in regard to the freeness of the gospel and the conditions of salvation; for he is Lord of all—Gentiles as well as Jews. (See on iii. 29.) Lange: "We must suppose a breviloquence here: One and the same Lord is Lord over all. The one Lord is Christ, according to Origen, Chrysostom, Bengel, Tholuck, and most other expositors—see ver. 9; Acts x. 36; Phil. ii. 11." Olshausen: "Ὁ αὐτὸν is the subject, and ΚΥΡΙΟΝ the predicate. According to the context, God is primarily meant, as the quotation indicates, but according to St. Paul's way of thinking, it is, of course, God *in Christ*. Πλουτεῖα relates to the riches of grace and mercy, from which no one is excluded. By *eij* is signified the direction in which the stream of grace pours itself forth." Rather, Paul naturally applies to Christ the name and attributes of the Jehovah of the O.T. *Rich*—A Pauline expression. (See on ii. 4; ix. 33; xi. 12, 33.) Lange well says: "This is both the enlargement and restriction of Christ's rich proofs of salvation—only those who call upon him, but also all who call upon him, share in his salvation. The calling upon him is the specific proof of faith, by which they accept him as their Lord and Saviour."

13. *For whosoever*—The Greek is stronger, For every one, whosoever may invoke the Lord's name shall be saved. The *γὰρ* ("for") introduces the quotation, which is literal from Joel iii. 5, Heb.; ii. 32, LXX., Eng. This occurs at the close of a magnificent Messianic prophecy. (See on Acts ii. 16-21.)

14. *How then shall they call on him*—Instead of the future indicative, the majority of the principal MSS. have the aorist subjunctive, in every case in this *sortes*—which is best rendered, "How then could they." Here is a descending climax. The questions imply a negative. They could not invoke one in whom they had no faith; they could not believe in one of whom they heard not; they could not hear without a preacher; men could not preach unless they were sent. Paul puts the case thus in order to bring into prominence the mission of the apostles, and thus show the turpitude of unbelief. The context shows that the reference is principally to the unbelieving Jews, though, of course, it comprehends also the unbelieving Gentiles. *In whom they have not believed?*—There must be initial faith in Christ to induce any one to call upon him for salvation. This invocation is, indeed, the way in which faith is exercised, and by which justification and all other fruits of faith are realized. *Of whom they have not heard?*—Of whom they heard not. The verbs are all aorists. Some render *οὐ* ("of whom") as an adverb of place—"where they did not hear." Vulg. and Rheims: "Or how shall they believe him whom they

have not heard?" *And how shall they hear without a preacher?*—They could not hear the gospel unless some one proclaimed it to them. [Khrussontov](#) means one announcing as a herald—as in ver. 8—"the word of faith which we preach"—[khrussomen](#). This fixes the meaning of the word.

15. *And how shall they preach, except they be sent?*—It is not necessary here, with Olshausen, to show that apostles and other ministers have an outward, ecclesiastical vocation, as well as an inward and divine. The apostles, in the first instance, had only the latter—there being no Church to indorse their divine commission. Luke ix.; xxiv. 44-49; Matt. xxviii. 19, 20; Mark xvi. 15-20; Acts ix.; Gal. i.; ii. The sending forth of Paul and Barnabas on their missionary tour, by the Church at Antioch, at the instance of the Holy Spirit, does not affect this principle. Acts xiii. They had been preaching to Jews and Gentiles before this. That ordinary preachers should have a vocation from the Church, as well as from the Holy Spirit, is true, but not pertinent to this case. *As it is written*,—The quotation is from Isa. lii. 7—an abridgment and slight change of the Hebrew text—the LXX. is different. Some MSS., versions, and Fathers, omit the clause, "that preach the gospel (or glad tidings) of peace." The scribes, perhaps, left it out because of similar endings—a frequent cause of omission. Paul omitted "upon the mountains," as not necessary, and changed the singular to the plural, as better suiting the scope of his discourse. Many deny the reference in Isaiah to messengers hastening over the mountains to Jerusalem to announce the return of the captives from Babylon, as in Isa. xl.; others see nothing else in the passage. Most commentators see a reference to that, and that as prophetically typical of the preaching of the gospel. This explains and justifies the elevated language employed by the prophet, which would have been hardly proper if it had no Messianic reference. Cf. Isa. xl.; xlii.; liii.; lxi.; Luke iii. 4, 5; iv. 17-21; John xii. 37-41; Acts xiii. 26-35. *How beautiful are the feet*—Some say, even their feet, though dusty with travel—as Chrysostom, "whose feet even they praised because of the matter of their preaching." Bengel: "Their feet at a distance—how much more their lips close by!" Lange refers the beauty to the running as symbolical of the desired winged movement and appearance of the gospel itself—which is rather vague. But the feet are alluded to as the organs of progression. It must have been to the watchmen on the walls of Jerusalem "a thing of beauty and a joy" to see the messengers bounding over the mountains, eager to deliver their welcome message. Nahum i. 15. Tholuck: "The feet are described as the members which act in the messenger. There appears a kindred metonymy in Sophocles, *Electra*, v. 1357; cf. Acts v. 9." Some of the rabbins construe this of the times of the Messiah. *Peace and good things*—mean the same as "salvation" in the Heb. text. Cf. Luke ii. 13, 14.

16. *But they have not all*—If it was designed for all, why are not all saved by it? The sense is, Why are so few saved by it? The answer is here given. When they

heard it, only a few yielded to its demands. Cf. John xii. 37-41. *Obeded*—'Upakouw—related to *ajoh*—means to hear with submissiveness—to hearken, to believe, to obey. *The gospel*.—The glad tidings—ver. 15. *For Esaias saith*,—The quotation is from Isa. liii. 1, LXX. The Heb. has not "Lord." *Who hath believed*—Who believed what we heard? Cowles says, "The speakers are the gospel heralds of chap. lii. 7, giving the result of their first labors in preaching the gospel." Perhaps so. But all through this chapter—to ver. 11, 12—the Jews are the speakers—the prophet being their mouth-piece. *Our report?*—Lit., "the hearing of us." Conybeare and Howson render *ajoh* in both verses "our teaching," and say, "There is no English word which precisely represents *ajoh* in its subjective, as well as objective, meaning." But hearing suits both verses—as the word in both cases is subjective. It is the message viewed from the stand-point of the hearers, not of the speaker—*q.d.*, Who among us believed what we heard? This meaning suits the Heb. as well as the Greek, as it is not in Hiphil, as the common interpretation makes it. If the speaker be the prophet himself, it may mean, Who believed what he heard from us? The scholiast on Euripides, *Phoenissae*, line 826, explains *ajoh* by *to-ajoumenon*, "which is heard."

17. *So then*,—So then the faith is from what is heard. It does not come from the mere act of hearing. The good seed must be sown, and be received into good ground, in order to produce fruit. Lange says, "As this preaching does not meet with universal faith, only the announcement itself can be meant." Does not this confound the *ajoh* with the *rbma*? That which is heard is through God's word. It comes to men by means of divine revelation. On God's part the gospel is revealed; ministers are sent forth to proclaim it; men hear it—if what is heard, is received with docility, sincerity, and earnestness, faith in it will always follow. But there can be no faith without due attention to what is heard—nothing to hear unless it is revealed by God, and made known by duly accredited agents. None are held responsible for not believing the gospel, if they have no means of becoming acquainted with it. Such are not ranked with unbelievers. Mark xvi. 15, 16; John iii. 19; ix. 39, 40, 41; Acts viii. 35-39; xiii. 44-52. Cf. ver. 20, 21. Chrysostom: "He says, I was not speaking of mere hearing—*ajoh*—nor of the need of hearing men's words and believing them, but I mean a great sort of hearing; for the hearing is by the word of God. They were not speaking their own, but they were telling what they learnt from God. And this is a higher thing than miracles." The reading "Christ" for "God" in many good MSS., versions, and Fathers, may have arisen from a gloss taken into the text. Bede has *Dei Christi*. Alford suggests that the received text was "a rationalizing correction to suit better the sense of the prophecy." That is very improbable. The Codd. Bezae and Sin. have several corrections—so that they are on both sides. B, C, and Vulg., have "Christ." A, K, L, Syr., and cursives, have "God."

18. *But I say*,—This is not the language of a Jewish opponent, as Beza thinks, here and in ver. 19 (where Macknight so refers it); it is a Jewish way of introducing a question—*q.d.*, But let me ask, if the Jews did not hear the gospel—was it not preached to them? If they did not hear it, it was their own fault, for it was everywhere preached. *Yes verily*,—So *menouage* must here be rendered; cf. ix. 20. *Their sound*—This is from Ps. xix. 4 (Heb. 5). It is an exact quotation from the LXX., and agrees with the Heb. A.V. renders *kao*, "line" (in the margin, "rule, or direction"). Thus Aquila renders it *kanwa*, rule; and Bengel refers to 2 Cor. x. 13, which is not pertinent. It means a cord, and so a measuring line, and the string of a harp—hence, a sound—*Fqoggov*, the sound of a musical instrument (1 Cor. xiv. 7), or of the voice. Symmachus has *heov*. Paul elegantly cites this poetical description of the universal revelation of God in nature, as descriptive of the spread of the gospel. The apostle's hyperbole must not be pressed. The language, as Lange says, must be understood *qualitatively*, not *quantitatively*. The gospel was preached in all the great cities of the known world in the apostles' days. Col. i. 6, 23. So Justin Martyr and Tertullian. Philo uses similar language of the laws of Moses: "The fame of the laws which he left behind spread through the whole habitable world—*oikoumenhv*—has reached even to the extremities of the earth." Calvin says the psalmist means, "God has manifested himself to the Gentiles from the beginning, if not by the preaching of men, yet by the witness of his creatures." But that is not pertinent, because the "creatures" made no revelation of any thing pertaining to the redemption of man. It is surprising that Alford should say that he has nowhere found any notice "that Ps. xix. is a comparison of the sun and the glory of the heavens with the word of God"—except a faint hint in Bengel! Dr. Watts entitles his paraphrase of Ps. xix., "The books of nature and of Scripture compared; or the glory and success of the gospel." Note the third stanza:

Sun, moon, and stars, convey thy praise
 Round the whole earth, and never stand;
 So when thy truth began its race,
 It touched and glanced on every land.

Beautiful comparison! Judicious comment! But Watts is careful to note the contrast between "nature" and "the gospel." David appears to have had no allusion to the latter—Paul does not intimate that he had. Nor does Chrysostom, who says: "What do you say, They have not heard? Why, the whole world, and the ends of the earth, have heard. And have you, amongst whom the heralds abode so long time, and of whose land they were, not heard?" This refers it properly to the Jews. An ancient Latin hymn sees in the sun "the Bridegroom—Giant—God and man in one"!

19. *But I say*,—(See on ver. 18.) *Did not Israel know?*—W, and W. think this is in contrast with ver. 18, which "relates principally to the Gentiles." But Chrysostom appears to be right in referring both to Israel, thus: "For what if they heard, but did not know what was said, nor understand that these were the persons sent. Are they not to be forgiven for this ignorance? By no means." It is rather free to render the active *עָנָו*, with Tholuck and W. and W.: "Was not Israel instructed?" But the meaning is the same. They knew in the sense of having the means of knowledge—their ignorance (ver. 2, 3) was not invincible, and therefore it was inexcusable. Bengel: "The meaning is, that Israel could and should have known God's righteousness, but did not wish to know it, ver. 3, and that is now shown from Moses and Isaiah." Meyer objects to this view—held by Chrysostom, Calvin, Beza, Philippi, Olshausen, Forbes, and others, that an affirmative answer is expected, when, Riddle says, Paul knew sadly that the reverse was the fact. But surely the Jews received sufficient proof of the truth of the gospel to make them responsible for its acceptance, and to hold them inexcusable for its rejection; and that is all the apostle's argument requires. Hence it is not necessary to say, with Aquinas and others, that it refers to the transfer of the gospel from the Jews to the Gentiles; or, with Fritzsche, Lange, and others, that the gospel should become universal; or to look for other solutions, Bretschneider very arbitrarily renders, "Did not God know Israel?" The approved reading, "Did Israel not know?" adds no emphasis to Israel, which is by some to be meant in ver. 16. *First, Moses saith*,—Chrysostom: "Paul said, 'First, Moses,' to show that a second will come who says the same things in a clearer and plainer way." The quotation is from Deut. xxxii. 21. Paul follows the LXX., except that he substitutes "you" for "them;" and both render the two Hebrew words by one, "nation." The A.V., both here and in Deut., follows the Heb., *people—nation. I will provoke you to jealousy*—Of course, this is the language of Jehovah reported by Moses. It is an echo of the former clause of the verse in Deut.: "They have moved me to jealousy with that which is not God; they have provoked me to anger with their vanities, and I will move them to jealousy with those who are not a people: I will provoke them to anger with a foolish nation." This is a severe rebuke of the Israelites, who are threatened by Jehovah with abandonment to their enemies—the idolatrous nations who so frequently subdued them when "they did evil in the sight of the Lord, and served Baalim"—when "they forsook the Lord God, and followed other gods of the people that were round about them, and provoked the Lord to anger." Judg. ii. 11-15, and *passim*. It is not necessary to suppose that in this passage Moses specifically predicted that the Jews would reject the gospel, and that the Gentiles would embrace it, and thus the former would be provoked to jealousy and anger by the latter; though such was the case—xi. 11-14. *Parazhl ow* well represents the Heb. *kana*, which in Hiphil means to excite any one's jealousy—as a husband by the aberrations of his wife—the conjugal union representing the relation of God to his covenant people. So God provoked the Jews to jealousy by

taking the Gentiles into covenant with himself, when they had violated it. *By them that are no people*,—Lit., "upon a no-nation"—Heb., "no people." The Jews considered all other nations as *nobodies*—they alone were *the people*. Deut. xxxii. 6-9 ff; xxxiii. 3; Luke ii. 32, *et al.* 'Epi>by—on account of. W. and W.: "The ground on which the action rests as its support." *By a foolish nation*—Lit., "upon a nation without understanding." Heb., *nabal*—which has in this place a moral meaning. (See on i. 21, 31; cf. Ps. xiv. 1; Job ii. 10.) *I will anger you*.—I will provoke you to anger. The Jews were always highly incensed when any Gentile nation was preferred before them, as they considered themselves God's peculiar treasure, above all people—"a kingdom of priests, a holy nation"—Ex. xix. 5, 6—which they were, as long as they were true to the theocracy. But, when they went into idolatry, and especially when they rejected the gospel, God rejected them, and put the believing Gentiles in their place. Matt. viii. 11, 12; Rom. xi. Tholuck: "The meaning of the passage in Moses is, If you serve other gods, which are not gods, I will move you to jealousy by favoring the nation of the Canaanites, which is as good as no nation at all. That the passage contains a prediction, properly so called, can, therefore, not be affirmed. 'Epi>as in various modes of construction, *e.g.*, *veroa laetandi, dolendi*, denotes the occasion."

20. *But*—Macknight renders "besides," and Olshausen says, "*De* is not to be taken as marking opposition, but continuation." Tholuck: "The *de* stands opposed to a *mea*, which must be mentally supplied after *Prwtov* ('first') in ver. 19." Bengel: "What Moses had intimated, Isaiah boldly and openly proclaims." *Is very bold, and saith*,—This means Isaiah expresses himself with great boldness. He speaks plainly. The Hebrews use this construction instead of the infinitive. But it is a common usage. Winer: "He is bold, and says—he expresses himself with great boldness." The quotations are from Isa. lxx. 1, 2. They do not agree verbally either with the Heb. or the LXX. The Heb. reads thus: "I am sought of them that asked not for me; I am found of them that sought me not. I said, Behold me, behold me, unto a nation that was not called by my name. I have spread out my hands all the day unto a rebellious people, which walketh in a way that was not good after their own thoughts." The LXX. reads: "I became manifest to them that asked not for me; I was found of them that sought me not. I said, Behold, I am, to a nation that called not on my name. I have stretched forth my hands all the day to a people disobedient and contradicting, to those who walked in a way that is not good, but after their sins," Paul transposes and abridges to suit his subject, but gives the sense of both the Heb. and LXX. *I was found of them that sought me not*;—This is descriptive of the Gentiles, who had lost concern for the true God, having abandoned themselves to idolatry. They were not called by the name of Jehovah, as were the Jews. According to Aben Ezra, Rabbi Moses Hacoben said, "The first verse is to be understood of the nations of the world, as if it had been said, I am found of the nations which are not called by my name; but to my people

I have stretched out my hand," etc. *I was made manifest unto them*—The Heb. has, "I was sought, or inquired after, by those who asked not for me"—that is, those who had not previously prayed to the true God. *Darash* means to inquire, seek, consult—and *the finding* is implied. Cf. Ezek. xiv. 3; xx. 3; xxxvi. 37, where the same word is used. In the next clause, "them that sought me not," the word is *bakash*, to seek—with a more general signification. Olshausen: "The idea is parallel to that in ix. 30, 31, and the contrast which is there expressed is to be supplied in this place also, *And* those who (in appearance) sought me, have not found me." Tholuck: "To seek and to inquire after God, according to the Hebrew, is significant of adoration. Here is a picture of the character of Gentilism, as at ix. 30."

21. *But to Israel*—But in regard to Israel. So he frequently styles the Jews in these chapters. *All day long*—All the day. Through all their history. *I have stretched forth my hands*—Fritzsche: "As one inviting to his embrace." Conybeare and Howson: "As a mother opening her arms to call back her child to her embrace." Tholuck: "Equivalent to calling. Prov. i. 24." Alford: "The attitude of gracious invitation." Macknight: "An allusion to the action of an orator, who, speaking to the multitude, stretches out his arms, to express his earnestness and affection." It may embrace all these meanings—as Lange says, "The principal idea is the *gestus* of gracious, importunate, and expressed admonition, of entreaty, compassionate sympathy, and continuous appeal." Matt. xxiii. 37.

Now, even now, your Saviour stands,
All day long he spreads his hands,
Cries, Ye will not happy be—
No, ye will not come to me.

Tholuck well says: "If from this passage we once more look back upon the tenth and ninth chapters, it is manifest how little Paul ever designed to revert to a *decretum absolutum*, but meant to cast all blame upon *the want of will* in man, resisting the gracious will of God." *Disobedient*—'*Apei qew* is rendered "believe not" in xi. 30, 31; xv. 31, and in six other places in our version of N.T.; and "disobey," or "obey not," in five other places—the adjective is always rendered "disobedient"—the noun thrice "disobedience;" four times "unbelief." There is an ethical element in unbelief, so that it implies disobedience. (See on ii. 8.) *Gainsaying*—To speak against, to contradict. Luke ii. 34; Acts xiii. 45. It means rebellious, contumacious. Philippi thinks that this, which is not in the Heb. or LXX., expresses the positive side of disobedience, as the other does the negative: thus the full meaning of the Hebrew is expressed. Chrysostom is excellent here: "He means by the day the whole period of the former dispensation. But the stretching out of the hands means calling and drawing them to him, and inviting them. Then to show that the fault was all their own, he says, 'to a disobedient and

gainsaying people.' You see what a great charge this is against them. For they did not obey him even when he invited them; but they gainsaid him, and that when they saw him doing so, not once, or twice, or thrice, but the whole period. But others who had never known him, had the power to draw him to them. Not that, he says, they had the power to do it, but to take away lofty imaginings even from those of the Gentiles, and to show that it was his grace that wrought the whole, he says, 'I was made manifest,' and 'I was found.' It may be said, Were they then void of every thing? By no means, for the taking of the things found, and the getting a knowledge of what was manifested to them, was what they contributed themselves. Then to prevent these saying, But why was he not made manifest to us also? he sets down what is more than this, that I not only was made manifest, but I even continued with my hands stretched out, inviting them, and displaying all the concern of an affectionate father, and a mother that is set on her child. See how he has brought us a most lucid answer to all the difficulties before raised by showing that it was from their own temper that ruin had befallen them, and that they are wholly undeserving of pardon. For though they had both heard and understood what was said, still, not even then were they minded to come to him." He still farther develops his synergistic views of this passage—especially dwelling upon God's provoking the Jews to jealousy, by admitting the docile Gentiles to higher privileges than those which the Jews had enjoyed, and which all of them might have realized but for their obstinate rejection of them.

CHAPTER XI.

1 *God hath not cast off all Israel.* 7 *Some were elected, though the rest were hardened.* 16 *There is hope of their conversion.* 18 *The Gentiles may not insult upon them:* 26 *for there is a promise of their salvation.* 33 *God's judgments are unsearchable.*

XI.—1. *I say then,*—Forestalling an erroneous inference from the preceding verses, x. 19, 20, 21. *Hath God cast away*—Did God cast off? The aorist refers to the admission of the Gentiles and the rejection of the Jews, as a body, for their unbelief. The form of the question presupposes a negative answer—which is given with his usual emphatic utterance, implying an abhorrence of the very thought. *His people?*—The Israelites as a nation. (See on ix. 25, 26.) *For I also*—If God had utterly rejected the Israelites, then Paul himself would have been rejected, for he was an Israelite. *Of the seed of Abraham,*—He says this to recall the promise made to that patriarch; cf. iv.; ix. *Of the tribe of Benjamin.*—Not mentioned because Benjamin was a son of Jacob by his beloved Rachel; nor because that tribe was blended with the tribe of Judah—the regal tribe; but simply to identify himself clearly and fully with the peculiar people—as in Phil. iii. 5.

2. *God hath not*—God did not cast off his people—ver. 1. *Which he foreknew*.—When he chose the descendants of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, as his peculiar people, he knew what would be their fortunes—how they would sin—how they would suffer—to what straits they would be brought—how few of them, at times, would prove true to their calling as representatives of the theocracy—but he chose them notwithstanding—knowing that there would be always a faithful seed among them, and that in the latter days they would, as a body, be received with the fullness of the Gentiles into the kingdom of the Messiah. All this is discussed in the latter part of the chapter—which does not intimate a "national restoration of the Jews to pre-eminence," as Alford expresses it. *Wot ye not*—It is strange that the A.V. should follow Cranmer rather than Rheims, "Or know you not." The *h* ("or") introduces a new point—an illustrative example—as in Matt. vii. 9; Rom. ix. 21. *Of Elias?*—In the account of Elijah. (See on Luke xx. 37.) *How he maketh intercession to God against Israel*,—When *ejntugcaaw* is followed by *upes*, it means to intercede for—when by *kata*, as here, it means to intercede against, or to complain against, any one. *Saying*,—This is wanting in many of the best uncial MSS., versions, and Fathers.

3. *Lord*,—This is a slightly altered and abridged quotation from the LXX. of 1 Kings xix. 10: "And Eliu said, I have been very jealous for the Lord Almighty, because the children of Israel forsook thee: thy altars they digged down; and thy prophets they killed by sword; and I only am left alone, and they seek my life to destroy it." In ver. 14 the LXX. comes nearer the Heb., which repeats ver. 10 exactly. The variations are of no consequence. The prophets of Jehovah were killed by command of Jezebel. 1 Kings xviii. 4. The altars which were demolished were those erected to Jehovah by the remnant of his true worshipers, when they were precluded from attendance at the temple worship, where alone altars were to be erected, while the kingdom of Israel was a unit. *And I am left alone*,—In 1 Kings xviii. 22, Elijah says, "I, I only, remain a prophet of the Lord." Here it seems to refer to the true worshipers of God. Elijah, as Lange says, was not in the mood to acknowledge absconders as true worshipers. *And they seek my life*.—Cf. Matt. ii. 20.

4. *The answer of God*—*Crhmatismo* is used specifically for a divine oracle. (See on Matt. ii. 12, 22; Heb. xii. 25.) It is called "a voice," 1 Kings xix. 13. Hence, perhaps, the *Bath Kol* of the later Jews. *I have reserved*—This corrects the false rendering of the LXX., 1 Kings xix. 18: "And thou shalt leave." The Complutensian, however, has, as in the Heb., "I will leave," or reserve. *To myself*—Not in Heb. or LXX., but added to bring out the sense—for my service. *Seven thousand men*,—A definite for an indefinite number. *Who have not bowed the knee to the image of Baal*.—Lit., "who bowed not knee to the Baal." The LXX. is awkward: "All knees which bowed not knee to the Baal, and every mouth which did not worship him." This, as well as the Heb., implies that it was a number of

limitation—there were none besides these. *The image*—Our translators supplied this as the rendering of *eijkwa*, or *sthbh*, an image, as Baal here has the feminine article. De Wette says this is arbitrary, though it is sanctioned by Erasmus, Grotius, and others. Tobit (i. 5) says, "My father Naphthali sacrificed unto the heifer Baal," where the feminine article is used before Baal, as before heifer. But Tobit may have given the name Baal to one of Jeroboam's calves. Selden and others say Baal was an androgynous deity—hence in the LXX. the feminine article is sometimes used—*e.g.*, Jer. ii. 8; Zeph. i. 4; Hos. ii. 8; but in the place here cited, and in other places, the LXX. has the masculine. But is there any proof that Baal was androgynous? The name means "lord"—sometimes "husband"—and he is associated with Ashtaroth, a feminine deity—the former denoting the sun, and the latter the moon—though some contend that Baal was Jupiter. Tholuck and others think the feminine is used by way of contempt, as Jerome says on Hos. x. 5. So the rabbins. Some suggest a slip of memory on the part of the apostle! But what about Jeremiah, Hosea, and Zephaniah? Winer, who suggests that Paul quotes from memory, says, "It was matter of indifference whether Baal was regarded as a male or a female false deity." This is more summary than satisfactory; but the question is more puzzling than important.

5. *Even so then at this present time also*—Notwithstanding the general defection and rejection of the Jews, there is a remnant of the faithful—ix. 29. *According to the election of grace.*—A Hebraism for "a gracious election."

6. *And if by grace,*—But if by grace, then it cannot be by works—meritorious legal performances. Tholuck: "Grace and desert by work stand in absolute antithesis, and mutually exclude one another." (See on iv. 4, 5.) Alford makes an unexegetical, and gratuitous remark—"not for their desert, nor their foreseen congruity, but of God's free unmerited favor." If he means by that ambiguous expression that God's gracious election had no respect to the faith of those chosen, he simply contradicts the teaching of the entire Epistle, and especially of the latter part of this chapter, which plainly asserts that the great mass of the Jews were rejected because of their unbelief, while the Gentiles, who were grafted in their place, were chosen because of their faith. *But if it be of works,*—This sentence is wanting in some MSS., Fathers, and versions. It is probably genuine, and was added as the inversion of the foregoing, for the sake of precision and emphasis. If I merit compensation by working for it, it is absurd to call that favor, just as it is absurd to speak of merit when justification by faith, and not by works, shows that it is a free gift—a sheer matter of divine favor. Chrysostom: "Each word maintains its own rank, showing at once God's grace, and the obedient temper of those who receive salvation; for by saying *election*, he showed the approval of them; but by saying *grace*, he showed the gift of God."

7. *What then?*—What is the conclusion from the foregoing? What is the fact in the case? *Israel*—Meaning the Israelites in a body, as always in N.T. *Hath not obtained*—That it found not, but the election found it. The abstract put for the concrete—that part of the nation which was chosen, on the ground of faith—the rest being hardened by unbelief, and so rejected, as the apostle explains, ver. 19-25.

8. *According as it is written*,—Paul refers to Deut. xxix. 4; Isa. vi. 9, 10; xxix. 9, 10—not intending a literal quotation. Cf. 2 Cor. iii. 14, 15. He blends the passages to suit his theme. He cites them to show that Israel had been hardened before by unbelief. Cf. Heb. iii.; iv. *God hath given*—Aorist, gave. The LXX. has, "The Lord has caused you to drink a spirit of stupor"—Heb. *tardaimah*, a deep sleep. *Eyes that they should not see*,—Hebraistic idioms, by which God is represented as doing what he only predicts, or permits. (See on Matt. xiii. 13, 14, 15; John xii. 39, 40.) Chrysostom: "Do not imagine that 'he gave' means an agency, but a permission only."

9. *And David saith*,—This is nearly literal from the LXX. of Ps. lxix. 22, 23—it differs more from the Heb.—though all are alike in substance. *Let their table be made a snare*,—Tomson's Beza: "As unhappy birds are enticed to death by that which is their sustenance, so did that only thing turn to the Jews' destruction, out of which they sought life—to wit, the law of God, for the preposterous zeal whereof they refused the gospel." Tholuck: "Dangers should overwhelm them where they least expect it." Both views are comprised in the figure. *Pagiv*—Heb. *pach*—is always rendered "snare" in N.T. *Trap*,—*Qhpa* occurs nowhere else in N.T. It has no word corresponding to it in the Heb. text quoted; but it is in the LXX., which renders *resheth* by it in Ps. xxxv. 8, and elsewhere—where we render "net"—Wycliffe, "cacchyngē." *Stumbling-block*,—*Skandalon*—Wycliffe, "sclaundre;" Rheims, "scandal;" Tyndale, Cranmer, Geneva, "an occasion to fall," which gives the sense—rendered "offense," Rom. ix. 33, and elsewhere. Heb. *mokaish*, rendered *skandalon* in LXX., Josh. xxiii. 13; 1 Sam. xviii. 21, where A.V. has "snare." *And a recompense*—A requital of evil. But the Heb. has "and things for peace be for a snare." Their very rest shall be a stumbling-block to them. The Heb., differently pointed, means "for retribution," as in the LXX.

10. *Let their eyes be darkened*,—Not by old age, as Tholuck once thought. Olshausen says, "It cannot well be understood of old age and its troubles, because *diapantox*, equivalent to Heb. *tamid* (always), is joined with them: we shall do better to understand subjection, perhaps, with blinding the eyes." Deut. xxviii. 65, 66, 67. Instead of bending the back, the Heb. has "make their loins continually to shake"—which amounts to the same. This indicates terror and alarm. Dan. v. 6; Nah. ii. 10. There is no necessity of changing these imperatives to predictions, as the language of David is theocratic, as in Ps. cxxxix. 21. David was not noted for

private revenge. 1 Sam. xxiv. Chrysostom expounds it of "the bringing down of the Jews who believed not to the lowest state of desolation—evils not to be ended."

11. *I say then*,—(See on ver. 1.) *Have they stumbled*—Aorist—Did they stumble—Israel, the Jews as a body, are meant. Cf. ix. 33. *That they should fall?*—W. and W.: "To the end that they should be cut off from their relation to God." If *ῑηα* be telic, referring to intention, it can only mean that God did not intend that their stumbling should result in their ultimate ruin. They add, Let the thought be never entertained; on the other hand, by their stumbling—*παρὰπτῶματι*—at that stumbling-stone, a crucified Messiah, ix. 32, and so rejecting the gospel invitation, salvation is come, etc. Matt. xxi. 42, 43; xxii. 8, 9; Luke xiv. 24." They say that to fall "must be understood in a graver or lighter sense, according to the context. This very class is spoken of in ver. 22, as 'them which fall.'" But Alford seems nearer the truth: "The subject is the Jews as a people, not the unbelieving individuals of ver. 22." Cf. ver. 7. *God forbid*:—Far be it! The thought is not to be entertained for a moment. (See on ver. 1.) *But rather through their fall*—On the contrary, by their offense—*Παράπτωμα* is always rendered "offense" in this Epistle, except in these two verses. It is frequently rendered "trespass." (See on Matt. vi. 14, 15; Rom. iv. 25; v. 15, 16, 17, 18, 20.) It should not be rendered "fall," as it may be confounded with *πίπτω*, here rendered "fall." *Salvation is come unto the Gentiles*,—Olshausen well observes, Salvation, doubtless, would have come to the Gentiles, even in the case of Israel's having believed; but it would not have been until later; and, moreover, if Israel had remained true to its calling, the Gentile would not have become the transmitter of the ordinances of salvation. So Chrysostom. Cf. Acts xiii. *To provoke them to jealousy*.—The Jews. (See on x. 19.)

12. *Now if*—But if their offense, as in ver. 11. *Be the riches of the world*,—Was a world's riches, as in ver. 11. *And the diminishing of them*—The result of their offense—their loss. The word occurs elsewhere only in Isa. xxxi. 8, LXX., and 1 Cor. vi. 7. *The riches of the Gentiles*;—Explanatory of the preceding clause—Gentiles being all nations, except the Jews, with whom they are here put in contrast. *How much more their fullness?*—As *πλεῖστωμα*, like *πλοῦτος* (riches), is placed in contrast with both *παράπτωμα* (fall, offense) and *ἡττήμα* (diminishing, loss), it seems to denote their fullness, their replenishing, their restoration (in the subjective sense) to their former prosperous state, as the people of God, by their participation of the unsearchable riches of Christ. These words, *πλεῖστωμα* and *πλοῦτος*, are great favorites with Paul, who uses them with a wide latitude of meaning—both being antithetical to scantness and poverty. Critics have been greatly exercised over this verse, but the foregoing seems to be the true interpretation. Alford gives the same sense in substance: "If their impoverishment be the wealth of the Gentiles, how much more shall their enrichment be?"

Bloomfield: "We have here an *argumentum a minori ad majus, et per contrarium—q.d.*, 'If from the *lapse* of the Jews so great a benefit followed to the whole world, undoubtedly a far greater would follow from their restoration.'" This thought is expanded in what follows.

13. *For*—This seems to be the true reading, not "but," as in some MSS. and versions. *I speak to you Gentiles,—Q.d.*, I am writing to you, the Gentiles in question—the bulk of the Roman Church being Gentiles. *Inasmuch*—Not *quamdiu* (Vulg.); Rheims, "as long verily as." The A.V. omits the ~~μερ ου~~—the received Greek text omits the ~~ου~~: render "inasmuch, indeed." *As I am*—Note the emphatic ~~εγω~~>*The apostle of the Gentiles*,—Both words are anarthrous—an apostle of Gentiles. *I magnify mine office*:—Lit., "My ministry I glorify." He does not mean that he eulogized his office, but that he glorified it by his labors for the conversion of Gentiles. He labored incessantly and successfully to accomplish his commission. Acts xxvi. 16-18; Rom. xv. 15-21.

14. *If by any means I may provoke to emulation*—The same word rendered "jealousy" in ver. 11. Of course, his primary object was the salvation of the Gentiles, hoping that thus he might excite the Jews to emulate them in embracing the gospel. Koppe says, "This neither savors of despair on the one hand, nor great confidence on the other." Cf. Acts xxvii. 12; Rom. i. 10; Phil. iii. 11. Some render, "If possibly." *Them which are my flesh*,—My kindred—the Jews: see on ix. 1-5. *And might save*—And may save—put in the way of salvation—some from among them.

15. *For*—Illustrative. *If the casting away of them*—The same as their diminishing, ver. 12. *Be the reconciling of the world*,—The occasion of the reconciliation of the Gentiles to God. Bloomfield says, "by bringing about the death of Christ"; but it rather refers to the removal of the enmity of the Gentiles to God by their acceptance of the gospel. Eph. ii. This ~~καταλ λ~~ ~~αγα~~>reconciliation, as Olshausen says, explains the more general expression, "riches," in ver. 12. The Jews and Gentiles are here contrasted as collective bodies—the Gentiles now being the great bulk of the kingdom of God, or Church, as the Jews were formerly, and so the principal transmitter of the gospel. All the apostles, indeed, were Jews, and so were some of the evangelists and other ministers in the apostolic Church; but the great bulk of the Jewish people rejected Jesus as the Messiah, and were in consequence rejected by him, and Gentile believers were adopted in their stead. From the days of the apostles to the present, the Church has been constituted principally of Gentile believers. *What shall the receiving of them be*,—The conversion of the Jews, as a body, ver. 25. This explains "their fulness" in ver. 12. The question implies that the influence will be very great. *But life from the dead?*—The resurrection of the world, in a spiritual sense; cf. Ezek. xxxvii.; Rev. xx. 4-6. It imports, as Bloomfield suggests, by a strong and lively figure, the

greatest rejoicing, such as receiving a dead friend raised to life—a spiritual resurrection of a world dead in trespasses and sins. There seems to be no reference, as many of the Fathers thought, and some moderns, to a bodily resurrection, shortly following the conversion of the Jews.

Come, then, thou great Deliverer, come,
The veil from Jacob's heart remove:
Receive thy ancient people home,
That, quickened by thy dying love,
The world may their reception find
Life from the dead for all mankind.

16. *For*—The approved reading is *de*—If, moreover, the first portion was holy. Wycliffe is curious: "For if a litil part of that that is taastid be holi, the hool gobet is holi." Tyndale, Cranmer, "the whole heepe"; Rheims, "the masse also." *Furama* is rendered "lump" wherever it occurs in A.V. Rom. ix. 21; 1 Cor. v. 6, 7; Gal. v. 9. The reference is to Num. xv. 20, 21—where the LXX. has, "Ye shall offer your bread a heave-offering; as a heave-offering from the threshing-floor, so shall ye offer it, even the first portion—*aparche*—of your dough—*furamatov*." Robinson: "The first-fruits of the mass, or lump, trop. for the patriarchs of the Jewish people, parall. *hrijza*." The *phurama*—first portion—precedes the mass, and gives character to it, just as the root the branches. They are holy in the sense of consecrated to God—"a holy nation." Ex. xix. 6. Alford: "Physically evolved from a holy root."

17. *And if some*—But if, notwithstanding their high prerogatives, some of the branches were broken off—depreciating the number, as Tholuck acutely suggests—to preclude the boasting of the Gentiles. *A wild olive-tree*,—The tree is put for a branch of the tree. The *zayith* (Heb.)—*'El aia*—is a tree frequently mentioned in the Bible. In its wild state it is a low, thorny shrub, but when cultivated, it has no spines, and reaches the height of twenty or thirty feet. Its leaves are like those of the willow—in pairs, lanceolate, of a dull green color on the upper, and hoary on the under surface—and they are not deciduous. The flowers are little white tufts between the leaves. The fruit is an elliptical drupe—first green, then purple and black. Its seed is a hard stone. The fleshy part yields abundance of oil. It abounds in Palestine and other warm countries. It blossoms in June, and its fruit ripens in August and September. This is, of course, the *kallielaios*, "the good olive-tree," ver. 24—that cultivated in orchards and gardens. The *agrielaios* (Lat. *oleaster*), the wild olive-tree—that which grows wild in the field, as its name imports—is but little value, bearing small fruit, or none at all. Some say that the branches of the wild olive-tree were sometimes grafted into the good olive, to increase its vigor and growth. But Paul says the engrafting of the wilding *is contrary to nature*—the natural course being, as in the

case of the orange, to engraft the branches of the good into the stock of the wilding. The spiritual arboriculture is thus the reverse of the natural. *Among them*,—Those Jewish branches that were not unfruitful. *Of the root and fatness*—Some MSS. read "of the root of the fatness"; but the received text is probably genuine. Lange properly rejects the notion of an hendiadys, and says, "The communication with the root secures participation in the good sap."

Gentiles by nature, we belong
To the wild olive wood:
Grace takes us from the barren tree,
And grafts us in the good.

With the same blessings grace endows
The Gentile and the Jew:
If pure and holy be the root,
Such are the branches too.

Chrysostom: "Put into the same noble rank—the same nature."

18. *Boast not*—Exult not over the branches. The Gentiles must not be supercilious toward the Jews, because so many of the latter were rejected for their unbelief. *But if thou boast, thou bearest not*—Winer: "A *protasis* is joined to an *apodosis* without directly intervening terms: but if thou exult, know, or reflect, that not thou, etc." Cf. 1 Cor. xi. 16. The Gentiles shared in the blessings of the Abrahamic covenant, though they were not the natural descendants of Abraham—therefore they should be modest, and not supercilious toward those who were—ver. 20. Tholuck: "Such a presumption toward the branches could not be without presumption toward the root."

19. *Thou wilt say then*,—In case the elected Gentiles should exult over the rejected Jews, they would be likely to defend their so doing by referring to the fact that the rejection of the latter was purposed by God, in order to the election of the former. *The branches*—MS. authority is largely against the article—its omission agrees with ver. 17: "Some of the branches." *That I*—In order that I—[ejw](#)> emphatic.

20. *Well*;—Granted—be it so—God did intend the election of Gentiles in place of rejected Jews; but why were they rejected? *Because of unbelief they were broken off*,—The literal here is mingled with the figurative. The article expresses the possessive—their unbelief. Tholuck says the datives have the sense of ablatives. Alford renders, "through their unbelief—by their faith"—but rather "through" or "by" expresses "the occasion, or cause—on account of" (Winer). Tholuck says: "The apostle requires true self-knowledge: this will beget an apprehension of the possibility of falling by unbelief, and from thence will flow compassion for the Jews, who fell from that cause." *Be not high-minded*,—Think

not too highly of thyself. Rom. xii. 16; 1 Tim. vi. 17. *But fear*:—The elected Gentiles are as liable to fall as were the elected Jews, and, if they do, will certainly be punished as much as the covenant people of God. Heb. iii.; iv.

21. *Take heed*—There is no necessity of supplying these words. The sense is, Fear lest, as God did not spare the natural branches, he will also not spare thee. Winer: "If God spared not (matter of fact—he had in reality not spared them), so (it is to be feared) lest he also spare not thee. Here the apostle might have uttered the sentence categorically, 'so will he not spare thee;' but he preferred to give it a milder turn by using *mhpwv*: that perhaps the *oujde-sou-feisetai* might not be realized." "*Feisetai* (indic.) is far better supported than *feishtai* (subj.)—if God has not spared (I infer and fear), that he will not spare thee."

22. *Behold therefore*—See, then, in view of the foregoing. *The goodness and severity of God*:—God's kindness (as in Rom. ii. 4) and severity—*apotomia* means a cutting off—hence severity, the opposite of kindness. Olshausen says "it is equivalent to *ojgh* (wrath), but is preferred on account of the figure of the cut-off branches"—though Alford strangely denies the allusion. Paul frequently mingles literal and figurative terms. *On them which fell*,—The particle *mev* should not be overlooked—it gives emphasis to the contrast—upon those indeed who fell, severity, but upon thee God's kindness. The authority for inserting *Qeou*—"God's") is good—so for the nominatives—as Riddle says, "The nominatives give an elliptical construction: there is severity, there is the goodness of God." Ruckert suggests that *Qeou* may have been a gloss to guard against the mistake of Clement Alex., who refers the kindness to men—but this is not likely. *If thou continue in his goodness*:—The kindness of God was the same, whatever the event; but this is added to warn the Gentiles of their liability to fall and to forfeit that kindness, as the Jews had done. The apostle wishes to check presumption, and to impress them with the necessity of watchfulness and the constant exercise of faith. *Otherwise thou also*—Even thou, safe as appears thy state. *Shalt be cut off*.—Bengel: "By the sword; not merely shalt be broken off, as they were by the hand." But Robinson considers it parallel with "break off," ver. 17, 19, 20. The metaphor suggests a pruning-knife, or an ax—the idea is severance of the branch from the tree, as in John xv.—"for," says Chrysostom, "the Jew was cut off."

23. *And they also*,—But even they, if they abide not in their want of faith, shall be grafted in. Chrysostom: "For the blessings do not abide by thee unmovable, if thou be negligent, as neither do the evils to them, if they alter. You see what a great thing a man's free choice is, how great is the authority of the mind. For none of these things is immutable—neither thy good nor his evil." *For God is able to graft them in again*.—Alford excepts to the view of Grotius and others, "that God's power to graft them in has always been the same, but has waited for their change of mind to act." But that is just what God continually says—"I would, but

ye would not." It is aside of the question to say God has the power to remove their unbelief and awaken faith, and that this is included in the engrafting. If it be meant that God can do this for them *nolens volens*, or can force their wills, it is contrary to Scripture, philosophy, and experience—if it be meant that he can furnish all requisite aids to faith, and, on their concurrence with his grace, can restore them to his favor and their covenant relation to him, the language is pertinent, and is an intimation that, as a body, the Jews will be thus restored—"since he doeth things beyond expectation," as Chrysostom says. Cf. Matt. iii. 9.

24. *For if thou wert cut out*—This is an argument from congruity: if wild olive branches, contrary to nature, are grafted into the good olive-tree, it ought not to be considered impossible or improbable that branches of the good olive-tree may be so engrafted. Chrysostom: "If their faith was able to do what was contrary to nature, much more will it that which is according to nature. When you hear that he keeps speaking of contrary to nature, and according to nature, do not suppose that he calls this nature unalterable; but he tells us in these words of what is probable and likely to happen, and what is improbable; for moral good is not of nature, but of choice alone." Hodge infers from this that the future restoration of the Jews is more probable than was the introduction of the Gentiles into the Church.

25. *For I would not*,—Paul's usual formula in introducing weighty sentences. Rom. i. 13; 1 Cor. xii. 1; 2 Cor. i. 8; 1 Thess. iv. 13. *Brethren*,—Tholuck thinks the Gentile believers are here meant—they were probably uppermost in the apostle's mind, though he may not have intended any distinction. *Of this mystery*,—Chrysostom: "Meaning by mystery here what was unknown and undivulged, containing much which was strange and unexpected." Bengel says, "The call of the Gentiles had been a mystery (ch. xvi. 25); but now the conversion of Israel is likewise a mystery." *Lest ye should be wise in your own conceits*—Cf. Prov. iii. 7. The Gentile believers would be inclined to dogmatize concerning the Jews—that they had utterly forfeited their prerogatives as the covenant people, and were totally excluded from the Church. This *caveat* was designed to check such uncharitableness, which was not unlike the arrogance which he had censured in the Jews. Bengel: "The very term *mystery* checks the reader's pride. Hence the admonition is repeated, xii. 16; ver. 20." *Blindness*—A hardening (see on ver. 7). *In part*—A mild expression, like "some" in ver. 17, though in fact it was the great body of the Jewish nation. It was not, however, a universal hardening: there was a believing remnant. Calvin construes it *quodam-modo*, as a qualitative, and not total, hardening; but the sense appears to be extensive, not intensive. *Until*—Noting a *terminus ad quem*. *The fulness of the Gentiles*—The totality of the heathen world, including all nations, not all individuals. A nation may be converted, or brought into external communion with the Christian Church, while individuals belonging to it may remain in unbelief and sin. But when the gospel

shall have pervaded all nations, and "the knowledge of the Lord shall cover the earth, as the waters cover the sea," the Jews, as a body, will acknowledge Jesus as the Messiah. *Be come in.*—May have entered the kingdom of God, the Church. John x. 9, 16. Bengel: "No nation shall remain to which the gospel shall not have been preached in the whole world; although much of mankind will continue to be wicked."

26. *And so*—Tholuck says it means "and then." Bengel better: "He does not say, 'and then,' but more forcibly, 'and so,' in which the *then* is included—namely, Israel's blindness will be cured by the very coming in of the Gentiles." *All Israel*—Opposed to the "part," ver. 25: it denotes totality, like the "fulness" of the Gentiles. *As it is written*,—This is a free citation of Isa. lix. 20, 21, which in the Heb. reads, "And the Redeemer (*Goel*) shall come to Zion, and unto them that turn from transgression in Jacob, saith the Lord. As for me, this is my covenant with them, saith the Lord, My Spirit," etc. The LXX. renders, "And the deliverer shall come for Sion's sake, and shall turn away ungodliness from Jacob. And this shall be my covenant with them, said the Lord." The clause, "when I shall take away their sin," seems to be taken from Isa. xxvii. 9. *Out of Sion*—Heb., "to Zion"—the LXX., "for the sake of Sion"—all harmonize in this, that Zion was the center of the theocracy, and so Jehovah comes out of Zion to, or for good to, Zion. Cf. Ps. xiv. 7; 1. 2. The Heb. seems to denote that the Redeemer will come to those who are converted, while the LXX. and Paul seem to say that he will come to convert them. Both agree. Christ converts them by the gospel, they being obedient to it, and then he incorporates them into his Church, as his covenant people. *The Deliverer*,—The Heb. *Goel* (Redeemer) fixes the mind on Christ. *Jacob*:—The nation of Israel.

27. *For*—And this with them is the covenant from me, when I shall take away their sins. Chrysostom: "Not when they are circumcised; not when they sacrifice; not when they do the other deeds of the law; but when they attain to the forgiveness of sins." This reflects back on the discussion concerning justification by faith. Cf. Jer. xxxiii. 33, 34; Heb. viii. 6-13; x. 15-17.

28. *As concerning*—With regard to the gospel, indeed—in view of their rejection of it—they are hated—rejected by God—while you embrace it, and are accepted; but in view of the choice made of the fathers, they are beloved of God, so that as a people they are not absolutely rejected from the covenant; for God never intended to revoke his promises to Israel, when he entered into the covenant with Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob. Notwithstanding the great defalcation of Israel, the covenant remains in full force, and Israel at any time may avail themselves of its provisions. *Enemies*—As opposed to *beloved*, this means "hated"—recognized as adversaries, not entitled to divine favor.

29. *For the gifts and calling*—Tholuck construes this as an hendiadys—the calling being the gift; but Alford says better, "The gifts—generally—and calling—as the most excellent of these gifts." *Without repentance*.—God does not revoke his covenant-gifts, though men may forfeit them by their sins. Num. xxiii. 19. Tholuck: "The calling, as formerly the election, must not be understood of the inward vocation to Christ's kingdom by the *gratia irresistibilis*, but of their appointment as outward covenant people, which properly involved likewise an outward call to the gospel; and accordingly that was preached in the first instance to them." Paul knew nothing of "irresistible grace."

30. *For as ye*—For as you once disobeyed God. This conclusion is Pauline. The meaning is, that as the Gentiles who were disobedient to God before they received the gospel have obtained mercy by the reception of the gospel, which the Jews as a body rejected, so the evangelization of the Gentiles will inure to the salvation of the Jews. There is no partiality or exclusiveness with God, who shut up all Jews and Gentiles alike in their disobedience, not to execute wrath on them, but to show them all mercy. He thus reverts to the argument of chaps, i.-iii. Chrysostom: "Ye were disobedient, and they were saved. Again, they have been disobedient, and ye have been saved. Yet ye have not been so saved as to be put away again, as the Jews were, but so as to draw them over through jealousy while ye abide." Paul's reasoning must not be pressed beyond. He does not mean that all the Gentiles were lost before they received the gospel; nor that all the Jews were in the divine favor while the Gentiles were wandering in ignorance and idolatry—much less that the disobedience of the one was really the cause of the salvation of the other. He is speaking of Jews and Gentiles as organic bodies—the latter being called to the privileges of the gospel, and incorporated into the Church on occasion of the disobedience of the former. (See on ver. 11, 12; Acts xiii. 46.)

31. *Even so*—So also now these disobeyed. 'Apei η ew means to be unpersuadable—to refuse to believe on competent evidence—to disobey, in consequence of unbelief. Hence it is rendered "believe not," or "disobey," as the inward sentiment or outward development may be the more prominent—so the noun. (See on. ii. 8; x. 21.) 'Apei η thv is always (six times) rendered "disobedient." Tholuck says, "The dative (through our mercy) does not here express the cause, but the mode, of the divine mercy toward Israel."

32. *For God hath concluded them all in unbelief*,—The versions are curious: Vulg., *Conclusit enim Deus omnia in incredulitate*—thus rendered by Rheims, "For God hath concluded all into incredulity;" Wycliffe, "For God closid to gidre alle things in unbileve;" Tyndale, "God hath wrapped all nations in unbelief;" Cranmer, "For God had wrapped all nations in unbelief;" Geneva, "For God hath wrapped all nations in disobedience;" Tomson, "For God hath shut up all in

unbelief." [Sugkl eiw](#)=*conclusio*=a shutting up. Paul uses the aorist: "For God shut up all under disobedience, that he might have mercy on all." (See on ver. 30, 31.)

33. *O the depth*—All these nouns are anarthrous, as it is an exclamation: O depth of God's riches, and wisdom, and knowledge—three co-ordinate genitives: they are not to be minutely analyzed. [Pl outov](#) ("riches"), with its cognates, is one of Paul's favorite terms. In Rom. ii. 4 he speaks of "the riches of God's kindness, and forbearance, and long-suffering;" ix. 33, "the riches of his glory;" Eph. i. 7, "the riches of his grace;" cf. Eph. i. 18; ii. 4. 7; iii. 16; Col. i. 27. In Eph. iii. 8 he speaks of "the unsearchable riches of Christ," without specifying what the riches are: so in Phil. iv. 19 he speaks of "God's riches in glory in Christ Jesus." In Rom. x. 12 he is said to be "rich unto all who call upon him." The context seems to require that the riches here should refer to the divine resources of grace, which are so great as to be adequate to the demands of all.

Its streams the whole creation reach,
So plenteous is the store;
Enough for all, enough for each,
Enough forevermore.

Or it is an ocean, without a bottom or a shore. Tholuck: "We would not then need to refer [pl outov](#), so explicitly as it is done by Grotius, to the *love* of God, but to the fullness of the divine life in general, as the riches of Christ, Eph. iii. 8." But this fullness is considered as it refers to the provision made for the salvation of all, Jews and Gentiles—a whole world of sinners lost. Tholuck: "It is clear from the connection that these words are merely the expression of adoring wonder at the magnitude of *the divine compassion*, and, accordingly, that they cannot be applied, as is done by Augustin and predestinarians in general, to put to silence the man who denies *an unconditional withholding of the grace of God*. These words are rather a testimony against a *decretum absolutum* on the part of God." Chrysostom: "Here, after going back to former times, and looking back to God's original dispensation of things, whereby the world has existed till now, and having considered what special provision he had made for all occurrences, he is stricken with awe, and cries aloud—awe-struck at his having had the will and the power to do all this, and by opposites effecting opposites." *Both of the wisdom*—Lit., "and of wisdom and of knowledge." Perhaps no such distinction is meant here as in some places where *sophia* means the practical application of knowledge, and *gnosis* acquaintance with the truth. Tholuck considers the words here equivalent, as in Col. ii. 3. Wisdom may refer to the divine conduct in the intricate affairs of the divine government, in managing the concerns of nations, as here of Jews and Gentiles; and knowledge may refer to the divine omniscience, which from the beginning knew all things which come to pass. *How unsearchable are his judgments*,—His dispensations—"acts of his providence" (Robinson)—are

inscrutable. So Heb. *mishpatim*—Ps. xix. 10; xxxvi. 6; cxix. 75. It is parallel with *ways*—methods of the divine government—counsels. Acts xiii. 10; Rev. xv. 3. *Past finding out!*—The word means untraceable—from *iptnov*, a track. "He plants his footsteps in the sea"—so that we cannot discover his footprints.

34. *For who hath known*—The aorists might better be rendered "knew" and "was." Who was in the divine council when God marked out his plans? Paul alludes to Isa. xl. 13, LXX.: "Who knew the Lord's mind? and who was his counselor, to instruct him?" Paul quotes it again, in part, 1 Cor. ii. 16. He hardly intended to refer "knew" to the knowledge—"counselor" to wisdom, ver. 33. Cf. Wis. ix. 17; Eccles. xviii. 1-7; Horne's Introduction, Part I., ch. 10.

35. *Or who hath*—Or, who first gave to him, and it shall be repaid him? This seems to be taken from Job xli. 11 (Heb. 3—LXX. 2, but not to the point)—where the Heb. and Vulg. read, "Who has previously given to me, that I may restore to him?" The language expresses most emphatically that all the good we possess is from God's infinite and unmerited grace.

36. *For of him,*—As the Source—*and through him,*—As the Dispenser—*and to him,*—As the End. *Are all things:*—In the universe, and especially in the Church. Eph. i. 19-23; iii. 20, 21; Col. i. 16-27. *To whom be glory for ever.*—Unto the ages. Bengel: "The glory of the riches, wisdom, knowledge." It is, perhaps, too subtle to say that "of him" refers to "riches"—"through him" to "wisdom"—"to him" to "knowledge;" or to refer the three predicates respectively to the Three Persons of the Trinity, though the thought may have been present to the apostle's mind. Cf. 1 Cor. viii. 6; Eph. iv. 6. Tholuck: "God is the basis of all that exists, for from him all truth took its rise. God is the means of all that exists, for he directs all that exists to its destination. God is the end of all that exists, for in him alone all the creatures rest. It was from God that man derived his being—to God he must return if he would truly be. Through God must he be led to God. And thus God's mercy is the beginning, the middle, and the end." Marcus Antoninus seems to have had his eye on this passage when he apostrophizes Nature: "Of thee all; in thee all; unto thee all." So Dr. Johnson:

O Thou, whose power o'er moving worlds presides!
Whose voice created, and whose wisdom guides!
From thee, great God, we spring—to thee we tend:
Path, motive, guide, original, and end!

So Milton (Par. Lost, v. 165):

Him first, him last, him middle, and without end.

Amen.—Paul usually closes his doxologies with "Amen." So be it! So shall it be! This closes the doctrinal part of the Epistle, to which it gives the joyous key-note—

Thine all the glory, man's the boundless bliss.

CHAPTER XII.

1 *God's mercies must move us to please God.* 3 *No man must think too well of himself,* 6 *but attend every one on that calling wherein he is placed.* 9 *Love, and many other duties, are required of us.* 19 *Revenge is specially forbidden.*

XII.—1. *I beseech you*—Rather, exhort. The apostle has closed the doctrinal, and is advancing to the practical, part of the Epistle. *Therefore,*—In view of xi. 32-36, which indeed comprises the doctrinal part of the Epistle. *By the mercies of God,*—As developed in the foregoing. The plural (οἰκτιρῶν) corresponds to the Heb. *rachamim*, 2 Sam. xxiv. 14: "His mercies are great"—rendered "tender mercies," Ps. cxlv. 9. The consideration of the gracious provision God made for them should induce the return of gratitude and obedience, here enjoined. *That ye present*—To present—as the victim was placed before the altar. Luke ii. 22; Rom. vi. 13. *Your bodies*—As the exponent of every thing at your disposal—even your bodily members, which have been employed in the service of sin. Rom. vi. 12, 13. Sin must no longer reign in them—they are to be the temple of the Holy Ghost—their members are to be "instruments of righteousness unto God." *A living sacrifice,*—Referring to the burnt-offering, or holocaust, which was entirely consumed. No dead animal was to be brought to the altar; but the victim was slain before it was burnt. Ours is "a living sacrifice"—the consecration of our lives. *Holy,*—No unclean or imperfect animal was allowed to be offered under the law: no moral impurity is tolerated under the gospel. *Acceptable*—Well-pleasing to God—that is the regimen—not "present to God," as Bengel construes. *Your reasonable service.*—In apposition with "present," etc.—*λογικῆς*, rational, as opposed to "carnal"—sacrifices of animals which have no reason—mere symbolical service. This is real, spiritual, as it seems to mean in 1 Pet. ii. 2; cf. John iv. 23, 24. Chrysostom says, "spiritual ministry," and puts it in contrast with the carnal service of the Jews. *Latreia* here means divine service. The sacrificial idea obtains. Cf. 1 Pet. ii. 5: "a holy priesthood, to offer up spiritual sacrifices, acceptable to God by Jesus Christ."

2. *And be not conformed*—This and the next verse are infinitives in the best MSS., in regimen with "exhort": I exhort you to present your bodies, etc., and not to be conformed, etc. The word means to give or receive the same, from (σχημα), with any thing—rendered "fashioning according to," 1 Pet. i. 14; cf. 1 Cor. vii. 31. Meyer: "The present infinitives denote a continued action, while *παράσθαι* (1

aorist) represents the presenting of the offering, as a completed act." *To this world*:—*Aion*, or age. The present scene and order of things—with the idea of evil, both moral and physical—Luke xvi. 8; xx. 34; 2 Cor. iv. 4; Gal. i. 4—contrasted with the heavenly world. Phil. iii. 19, 20. Chrysostom: "He calls it this *age* to indicate its liableness to misfortune, and by the word *fashion*, its unsubstantialness." *But be ye transformed*—But to be transfigured, as the word is rendered, Matt. xvii. 2; Mark ix. 2: "are changed," 2 Cor. iii. 18. Our word metamorphose comes from the Greek term. Bengel: "*Morphe*, form, denotes something more inward and complete than *schema*, fashion. Conf. Phil. ii. 6, 8; iii. 21. The outward appearance of the saints should agree with the inward form." Chrysostom: "He says not change the fashion, but be transformed, to show that the world's ways are a *fashion*, but virtue is not a fashion, but a kind of real form, with a natural beauty of its own." *By the renewing*—In the renovation of your mind. The dative does not express the instrumental but the formal cause. **Ἀνακαινώσις** occurs only here and in Titus iii. 5, where the efficient Agent of the renovation is specified—"the renewing of the Holy Ghost." The cognate verbs are used, 2 Cor. iv. 16; Col. iii. 10; Heb. vi. 6. The **νοῦς**, mind, here denotes the heart, soul, or spirit, "the inward man," comprehending intellect, sensibility, and will, all of which are changed as to their object and operation in the work of sanctification. Cf. Col. ii. 11. The words rendered "conformed" and "transformed," as Lange says, are passive, with a reflexive meaning. We are not to allow ourselves to be conformed to this world, but to be transfigured in our minds by the renewing of the Holy Ghost. *That ye may prove*—Realize or experience in the process and by the result. Eph. v. 10; Phil. i. 10. Not merely "acquire the faculty of proving." *What is that good*,—The order of the words is this: that ye may prove what is the will of God, the good, and well-pleasing, and perfect. As there is no repetition of the article, the adjectives all apply to the same thing—they are not epithets referring to the will of God, but rather abstract neuters, in apposition with it: what is the will of God—that which is good (Rom. vii. 12), and acceptable (that is, well-pleasing to God), and perfect (nothing else being required, nothing better being conceivable, James i. 25). What is good must please God, and as it accords with his will, must be perfect. Chrysostom: "How is the body to become a sacrifice? Let the eye look upon no evil thing, and it has become a sacrifice; let thy tongue speak nothing filthy, and it has become an offering; let thy hand do no lawless deed, and it has become a whole burnt-offering. But this is not enough—we must have good works also: let the hand do alms, the mouth bless them that cross one, and the hearing find constant leisure for divine lessons." So in James iv. 4 and 1 John ii. 15-18, where **κόσμος=αἰῶν**.

3. *For*—To come to particulars. *I say*,—A mild expression for enjoin. *Through the grace*—By the knowledge and authority with which he was endowed in the apostolic commission—not his personal counsel. Rom. i. 5; xv. 15; 1 Cor. iii. 10;

Eph. iii. 7, 8. Chrysostom: "He does not say by the wisdom, or by the law given of God, but by the grace, reminding them of benefits, so as to make them submissive"—which seems strained. *To every man*—An emphatic individual application. Chrysostom: "Not to this and to that, merely, but to governor and governed, and slave and free, and illiterate and wise, and woman and man, and young and old. For the law is common to all, as being the Lord's. By this he makes his language inoffensive." *Not to think*—This free rendering gives the sense. Some reproduce the play upon *uperfroneia*, *froneia*, and *sofroneia*, in this awkward manner: "Not to be high-minded above that which he ought to be minded, but to be so minded as to be sober-minded." Cf. Rom. xi. 20. Olshausen says: "It is indicated that there is also a false humility, which will not own to itself what God has done. True humility is the right and healthy view of ourselves and our position." *Soberly*,—Bengel: "Unto moderation—an excellent virtue among those who are spiritual." Tholuck: "To have such sentiments as beget modesty." 1 Tim. ii. 9; Tit. ii. 6; 1 Pet. iv. 7. One who has a sound mind thinks justly of himself, in comparison with others. *According*—As to each man God divided a measure of faith. To every believer, on his entrance into the Church, God imparts a subjective capacity for the reception of the gifts and graces which he will be called upon to exercise for the good of the Church. Tholuck and others understand by faith here those gifts and graces themselves—the cause for the effect. Beza, Robinson: "Christian knowledge." Chrysostom: "The gift by faith." The measure of faith is rather the faculty with which every believer is endowed, as the apostle proceeds to particularize. *Metron* means "a portion as measured off, or allotted"—referring to kind, as well as degree. Eph. iv. 7, 13, 16; 2 Cor. x. 13. Chrysostom: "By using the word *dealt* he solaces him who had the less, and humbles him who had the greater, share. For if God dealt it, and it is no achievement of thine, why think highly of thyself? But if any one says that faith here does not mean the gift, this would only the more show that he was humbling the vain boasters. For if that faith which is the cause of the gift, by which faith miracles are wrought, be itself from God, on what ground dost thou think highly of thyself?"

4. *For*—Illustrative. Paul elsewhere refers thus to the body and its members—especially in a similar passage, 1 Cor. xii. The ancients were fond of this metaphor. *Office*:—Function—rendered "matters," Ecclus. xi. 10. Ambrose, *officia*.

5. *Being many*,—The many—all the members of the Church. *In Christ*,—The Head, or organic vital center. Eph. i. 22, 23; iv. 15, 16. *And every one*—The received text has *οἱ*—some of the best MSS. *to*>Lange: "*To<de<kaq' ei* is a solecism of the later Greek, instead of *to<de<kaq' epha*." Render, "and severally members one of another."

6. *Having then*—This may be immediately joined with the foregoing, "and having different gifts"—it seems best, however, to make a new paragraph: But having gifts different—so that what follows is hortatory, and not descriptive, as in the Vulgate and some other versions. *According to the grace that is given to us*,—The *charismata* (gifts) correspond to the *charis* (grace), and seem to denote official functions, as the grace of ver. 3 denotes the apostleship. The different offices here noted are more fully detailed in 1 Cor. xii., especially ver. 28-30: "God hath set some in the Church, first apostles, secondarily prophets, thirdly teachers," etc. There were no apostles in the Church at Rome, but Paul assumes apostolical authority over it. It seems that there were *prophets* there. The *nabi* of the O.T. uttered the mind of God, under a divine afflatus, in rebukes, promises, predictions, etc., as circumstances required. So in N.T. Church. Acts xi. 27; xiii. 1; xv. 32; xxi. 10; 1 Cor. xii. 28, 29; xiv. 29, 32, 37, and *passim*; Eph. ii. 20; iv. 11. *Let us prophesy*—It seems necessary to supply these words, or others of like hortatory import. *According to the proportion of faith*;—Lit., "the analogy of the faith." Aquinas and others understood it objectively, of the system of revealed truth, as in 1 Pet. iv. 11 (a passage near akin to this): "If any man speak (let him speak) as the oracles of God." Hence the theological formula, "the analogy of faith," which may be used profitably, but which has been abused notoriously—as every man makes the analogy of faith correspond to his own system. But here faith is to be understood subjectively. The proportion of the faith is "the measure of faith" of ver. 3. No functionary should exercise himself in another's province. The grace imparted to him proportions his faith to the work required of him, and he must not be curious or ambitious to transcend "the measure" indicated. Tholuck: "*Pistis* (faith) denotes the believing faculty of man, over which the inspired discourse ought not in enthusiastic intoxication to soar. Compare the serious admonition, Jer. xxiii. 28."

7. *Or ministry*,—The service rendered by Christ, the apostles, and other ministers of religion, is called generally a *diakonia*; but this word has also a restricted meaning, called technically "serving tables," distributing the charity of the Church to the needy. Acts vi. The officer who did this is called *diakonos*, whence our word "deacon." Rom. xvi. 1 (rendered "servant"); Phil. i. 1. Tholuck: "In the early Church the *diakonov* was the person to whom the charge of externals was committed, such as cleaning the place of worship, the care of the indigent and the sick. Acts vi. 1. In the synagogue this office-bearer was called *chazan*. Such a person stood exposed to the dangers of striving after the teacher's office. We must here supply *menešw*, or *eštw*. Cf. 1 Tim. iv. 15." In after times the diaconate was divided, and sextons and other officers were employed in these lower functions—the deacons being needed as assistants of the elders in higher capacities. *Or he that teacheth*,—Here the concrete form is used. Winer: "The construction (the acc. governed by *ečontev*) is kept up only as far as *eñ th-diak.*,

then commences a new construction with concretes, for which Paul might have written *eīje didaskal iav*, etc." The *didaskalos* sometimes corresponds to the Jewish rabbi. John i. 39. John the Baptist, Christ, and the apostles, are so designated. But *didaskalos* specially designates an officer of the Church, whose duty it was to teach the principles of Christianity. Acts xiii. 1; 1 Cor. xii. 28, 29; Eph. iv. 11. This seems to be the meaning here. Neither the time and manner of teaching, nor the persons taught, are specified in N.T. Homiletical and catechetical instruction, adapted to both old and young, are probably included.

8. *Or he that exhorteth*,—Paraclete comes from this word *parakal ew*: it comprehends hortatory discourses of every kind, admonitory, consolatory, etc. All ministers, of course, gave exhortations; but there appears to have been a class of functionaries specially adapted to this work. On this injunction is based the rule in the Methodist Discipline: "Let every exhorter diligently exercise the functions of his office, without assuming those of a preacher." *He that giveth*,—Better in the margin, "imparteth"—not referring to private charity, but to the distribution of the alms of the Church: Let the almoner act with simplicity. *Apl othv* means singleness of heart. Eph. vi. 5; Col. iii. 22; Wis. i. 1. This is an important injunction in regard to the discharge of the peculiar functions of the deacon (for no distinct office seems here intended), as there is a strong temptation to promote one's own personal interest in distributing public funds. The almoner should be perfectly disinterested—neither imparting nor withholding from any sinister or selfish considerations. *He that ruleth*,—*Proisthmi* means to preside, rule, lead. 2 Thess. v. 12; 1 Tim. v. 17; cf. 1 Tim. iii. 4, 5, 12, where it refers to family government. Here it refers to the elders of the Church, who were all rulers, though one of them was called the presiding elder—that is, the moderator—in an after age, the bishop. It cannot be gathered from this, or any other place in N.T., that there was a class of lay elders, called ruling elders, distinct from preaching elders. *He that sheweth mercy*,—Wycliffe: "He that hath mercy, in gladness." Tyndale, Cranmer: "If any man show mercy, let him do it with cheerfulness." Geneva: "He that showeth mercy, let him do it with cheerfulness." Rheims: "He that showeth mercy, in cheerfulness." Alford says ours "is the very best rendering, and I cannot conceive that any *officer of the Church* is intended, but every private Christian who exercises compassion." This is not satisfactory. Unfortunately, our language has no verb cognate with "mercy." The Vulgate is good: *Qui miseretur in hilaritate*. In the distribution of diaconal work some of the deacons distributed alms; others visited the sick, those imprisoned, etc., that they might be relieved. This was necessary in times of persecution, and when there were no hospitals for the care of sick strangers, and the like. Some men and women are specially fitted to this work—one prime qualification for it being a cheerful spirit. The frequent sight of suffering, loathsome scenes, fretfulness, ingratitude, exposure, etc., have a tendency to dull the sensibilities, to engender impatience, and provoke

disgust—hence the admonition to cheerfulness—*hilarotes*. "A merry heart doeth good like a medicine" (Prov. xvii. 22). A cheerful nurse ("Doctor Merry") sometimes does better than the physician. Never wear a cloudy face in a sick-room. Robinson: "Spoken of those who had charge of the poor, or perhaps of private benevolence." Cf. Prov. xiv. 21; xxviii. 8, Heb. and LXX. Van Oosterzee, in his "Practical Theology" (lxiv. Poimenics), says: "To Dutch institutions for higher instruction, there was formerly attached a 'Professor Theologiae Praesertem Paracleticae;' and it is still desirable that every minister of the gospel show himself, by word and deed, such a Professor within his own circle." Perhaps the best rendering is "Consoler"—some have "sympathizer." The *paracletis* here alluded to comprises kind words and deeds, administered in the name of the Church.

9. *Let love be*—Some render, "Love is"—but the series is imperative. *Without dissimulation*.—Lit., "unhypocritical"—unfeigned. *Abhor*—The participial form notes the relation to the former clause. We should not profess esteem for those whose character is bad, nor fail to do so toward those whose character is good—without regard to social position, and the like. Ps. xv. 4; 1 Thess. v. 21, 22.

10. *Be kindly affectioned*—*Fil ostorgov* denotes love to near relations. *With brotherly love*;—*Fil adel fia* means love of brothers, corresponding with the former. Christians constitute a spiritual kindred, and they should love one another accordingly, 1 Thess. iv. 9; Heb. xiii. 1; 1 Pet. i. 22; 2 Pet. i. 7; cf. 1 Pet. iii. 8. *In honour*—In the manifestation of esteem or respect. *Preferring one another*;—Going before. Vulg., *invicem praevenientes*. Go before others in showing respect. Chrysostom: "There is nothing which makes friends so much as the earnest endeavor to overcome one's neighbor in honoring him."

11. *Not slothful*—Backward, remiss. *In business*;—*Spoudh* seems to have the same meaning here as in ver. 8—diligence, or zeal. Chrysostom: "For this also gendereth love when with honor we also show a readiness to protect—as there is nothing that makes men beloved so much as honor and forethought." Alford refers to what follows: "There is no necessity of distinguishing: we must not be backward in the diligent performance of any of the duties here prescribed." Tholuck: "It will not do, however, to connect this admonition with the former: *spoudh* means the disposition of zeal for the kingdom of God, in which the Christian ought to be indefatigable." *Fervent in spirit*;—In the spirit being fervent. Chrysostom refers this to the Holy Spirit: "All things will be easy from the Spirit and the love, while thou art made to glow from both sides. Dost thou not see the bulls that carry a flame upon their back, how nobody is able to withstand them? So thou also wilt be more than the devil can sustain, if thou takest both these flames." But the reference seems to be to a zealous disposition, explanatory of the

preceding. Thus Apollon was "fervent in the spirit." Acts xviii. 25. Of course, "the Holy Spirit lights this fire within."

So shall the fervor of my zeal
Be the pure flame of love.

Serving the Lord;—To the Lord doing service. Some MSS. have *kairw*—"time," instead of *Kuriw*—"Lord"; but external and internal authority favor the received text. Many of the duties prescribed refer directly *to* our neighbor; but we serve the Lord when, by his will, through his grace, and to his glory, we serve our neighbor. Cf. Col. iii. 22-24.

12. *Rejoicing in hope;*—An expectation of future good is the ground of great enjoyment. "Hope, of all passions, most befriends us here." *Patient in tribulation;*—Enduring trials, especially persecution, without repining. In this and following verses we have an echo of the Sermon on the Mount. Especially note the joyful endurance of tribulation, which is impossible without the hope of the gospel—hence "the patience of hope." 2 Thess. i. 3. *Continuing instant in prayer;*—In prayer persevering. So Acts i. 14; Col. iv. 2, *et al.* The cognate noun is rendered "perseverance," Eph. vi. 18. Constant intercourse with God is indispensable to the ends in question.

13. *Distributing*—This participle has an intransitive meaning, as sharing, or participating, with Christians, in their necessities. This, of course, implies sharing our means with them. Cf. Gal. vi. 6. This is the spirit of the Golden Rule. Chrysostom: "He does not say, Bestow upon, but share with the necessities of the saints, to show that they receive more than they give, that it is a matter of merchandise, because it is a community. Do you bring in money? They bring you in boldness toward God." *Saints;*—The saints—members of the Church. (See on Rom. i. 7.) *Given to hospitality.*—Hospitality pursuing. Chrysostom: "He does not say doing, but pursuing—so as to instruct us not to wait for those that shall ask it, and see when they will come to us, but to run to them, and to run them down. Thus did Lot, thus Abraham." Hospitality was specially enjoined on ministers. 1 Tim. iii. 2; v. 10; Tit. i. 8. Tholuck: "By this fine virtue of the early Christians, their fellowship as brethren was promoted in a very high degree."

14. *Bless them*—(See on Matt. v. 44; Luke vi. 27-36.) *Persecute*—*Diwkontav*—an echo of *diwkontev* ("pursuing") in ver. 13. Our enemies *pursue* us with acts of cruelty, while we *pursue* others with acts of kindness. *Bless, and curse not.*—Added for emphasis in the Heb. style.

15. *Rejoice*—The verbs here are infinitives—with the force of imperatives. Supply, It is your duty to rejoice, etc. Bengel: "The infinitive for the imperative, a thing common among the Greeks, and here a courteous mode of expression. 'I exhort' is understood from ver. 1. Laughter is properly opposed to weeping; but

here, as 1 Cor. vii. 30, joy is used, not laughter, which is less suitable to Christians in the world." "True joy is not only an emotion and a privilege, but also a Christian duty. It is the highest kindness in God. He wishes us to rejoice, and to spend our spiritual life joyously." Chrysostom: "It requires more of a Christian temper to rejoice with those who rejoice, than to weep with those who weep. For this nature itself fulfills perfectly, and there is none so hard-hearted as not to weep over him who is in distress; but the other requires a very noble soul, so as not only to keep from envying, but to even feel pleasure with the person who is in esteem. And this is why he placed it first." Rochefoucauld cynically says, "In the misfortunes of our best friends there is something not altogether displeasing to us." If that is a touch of nature which makes the whole world kin, it ought to be extirpated by regeneration.

16. *Be of the same mind*—Paul returns to the participial form—counseling harmony of feeling and action, which he often inculcates. Rom. xv. 5; 2 Cor. xiii. 11; Phil. ii. 2. Hence he adds, "not the high things minding"—as ambition is incompatible with that harmony. *But condescend to men of low estate*.—This is a good, though free, rendering. Many favor the neuter of the margin, "be contented with mean things"—which seems a better antithesis. But no minute verbal antithesis was intended. "To be led away," in Gal. ii. 13; 2 Pet. iii. 17, means to be seduced to evil. Here the word means to associate with others—viz., humble persons. Tholuck: "Those to whom no peculiar spiritual gifts were vouchsafed: the more gifted Christians might be blinded with the conceit of having no fellowship with such weaker brethren." Chrysostom: "Bring thyself down to their humble condition, ride or walk with them, do not be humbled in mind only, but help them also, and reach forth thy hand to them, not by means of others, but in thy own person, as a father taking care of a child, as the head taking care of the body. As he says in another place, 'being bound with those who are in bonds.' But here he means by those of low estate not merely the holy-minded, but those of a low rank, and those one is apt to scorn." Olshausen: "The word here answers to the Heb. *ane*, or *anav*." He cites Luther, who extends it to any wretched persons, good or bad, as Christ consorted with publicans and sinners to do them good. *Be not wise in your own conceits*.—Olshausen says, "This is parallel with minding not the high things—it is the worst form of high-mindedness—*i.e.*, of lovelessness—to think highly of self; by this a man's view is limited to himself, and the loving care for others is checked." The caution has another application in Rom. xi. 25.

17. *Recompense to no man*—To no one rendering evil for evil. No one, contrasted with "all men," in next clause. *Provide things honest*—*Kal a*>good, honorable, comely, noble. Tholuck: "*Pronoēomai*, in the active as well as the middle, signifies, like *prospicio*, to care for any thing. '*Enwpion*, after the Heb. *liphnai*, means 'according to the judgment.' The Christian ought, *as far as conscience permits*, so to walk that even the world will take no offense. 1 Cor. x.

32. What Tertullian makes the heathen say of such Christians is borrowed from the life: *Bonus vir Caius Seius tantum quod Christianus*. Tertullian, Apol., c. 3." Paul changed and abridged the passage from Prov. iii. 4, in LXX., not Heb., "Provide thou honorable things in the sight of the Lord and of men." Hence some MSS. and versions, including the Vulgate, have, "not only before God, but also before men."

18. *If it be possible*,—Objective—if others will allow you to be at peace with them. *As much as lieth in you*,—Subjective—as far as depends on you. Give no cause of quarrel. See South's sermon on this text.

19. *Dearly beloved*,—Paul's tenderness of style balances his rigor of injunction—not avenging yourselves, beloved, but give place to anger. Some say, "Go away from your adversary—retreat from his anger;" others, "Defer your own wrath"—according to the Latin adage, *Spatium durae irae*. (Cf. Lactantius, De Ira., c. 8.) But there appears to be no such Greek idiom. Eph. iv. 27 does not favor these views. The common construction is, Allow the anger of God to take place—which agrees with what follows. It is not necessary to supply "of God." Anger or punishment will always recompense the wrong-doer: let those who suffer wrong bide their time—Providence will see that they are avenged in due season. *For it is written*,—In the Heb. of Deut. xxxii. 35: "To me belongeth vengeance and recompense." The LXX.: "In the day of vengeance I will recompense." The citation in Heb. x. 30 is as here.

20. *Therefore*,—All after this in this verse is quoted *verbatim* from Prov. xxv. 21, 22, omitting the last clause. *If thine enemy hunger*,—Not merely do him no harm, but do him all the good you can. The language, of course, is figurative. Neither Solomon nor Paul counsels a general to provision an enemy's army, till it lays down its arms—though much may be done during the war to mitigate its horrors, without impinging on "the laws of war." Paul does not, however, here deal so much with warfare as with the animosities and antagonisms of general society. Cultivate a placable, forgiving spirit. *Thou shalt heap coals of fire on his head*.—Not to soften, like metals or meat—not to inflame with love—not to give the red blush of shame, though that may be the result—but to relegate the infliction to God, the great Avenger. The heaping of burning coals on any one is a common figure among the Hebrews for inflicting severe punishment—the opposite of feeding and giving drink. Ps. xi. 6; xviii. 8. One might almost think Paul had in view 2 Esdras xvi. 55: "God shall burn coals of fire upon his head." Tholuck: "The coals of fire may be an image for that tormenting sense of shame which, in the end, forces the adversary to supplicate forgiveness, inasmuch as no heart, however hard, can permanently resist a love so uniform, patient, and everywhere forgetting and subordinating self. This is just what is afterward said, without a figure, in ver. 21. So Augustin, Jerome, Pelagius, Ambrose, Erasmus,

Clarius, and others." Very good; but are all enemies thus infallibly overcome by kindness? What will be the fate of the incorrigible?

21. *Be not overcome of evil*,—An interpretative close. Do not be betrayed into revenge—that would be your defeat—you would be brought thereby into bondage; but rise superior to your enemy by showing him kindness, which will subdue his enmity—by God's grace—if any thing can. Seneca: *Vincit malos pertinax bonitas*.

CHAPTER XIII.

1 *Subjection, and many other duties, we owe to the magistrates.* 8 *Love is the fulfilling of the law.* 11 *Gluttony and drunkenness, and the works of darkness, are out of season in the time of the gospel.*

XIII.—1. *Let every soul*—Every person. (See on ii. 9; Acts ii. 41, 43.) This takes in Jews, as well as all other nations: they were disposed to rebel against the Roman government—hence the emphatic injunction. *Be subject*—Subject himself—the subjection should be voluntary. *Unto the higher powers*.—To superior authorities. If there had been a pope at Rome when Paul wrote, he must have submitted to Caesar. Chrysostom: "If thou be an apostle even, or an evangelist, or a prophet, or any thing whatsoever—inasmuch as this subjection is not subversive of religion. And he does not say merely 'obey,' but 'be subject.'" Tit. iii. 1; 1 Pet. ii. 13; Wis. vi. 1-5. *For there is no power*—For there is no authority except from God. Magistracy, whatever its form, is of divine institution. Chrysostom: "What say you? it may be said, is every ruler then elected by God? This I do not say, he answers. Nor am I now speaking about individual rulers, but about the thing in itself. For that there should be rulers, and some rule, and others be ruled, and that all things should not be just carried on in one confusion, the people swaying like waves in this direction and that—this, I say, is the work of God's wisdom. Hence he does not say, *for there is no ruler but of God*; but it is the thing he speaks of, and says *there is no power but of God*; and the powers that be are ordained of God. For since equality of honor does many times lead to fightings, he has made many governments and forms of subjection; as that, for instance, of man and wife, that of son and father, that of old men and young, that of bond and free, that of ruler and ruled, that of master and disciple." Most editors prefer the reading ἀπο> "from," to ὑπο> "of," or "by God." *The powers that be*,—But those that are have been appointed by God. The word "powers" may have been interpolated, as a gloss. God instituted civil government.

Order is Heaven's first law—and this confest,
Some are, and must be, greater than the rest.

But God has not ordered any particular form of government—so that a republican form, as well as a regal, exists by divine right. By his providential appointment or permission, particular men are raised to posts of authority; and it is our duty to submit to the *de facto* government, whatever it may be. We must yield active obedience in things which our conscience will allow, and passive obedience in things which our conscience will not approve. Acts iv.; v.; Dan. iii.; vi. Individual citizens or subjects must not oppose the civil government, though they must not comply with any wicked requisition. This has nothing to do with the right of revolution. Any people who consider themselves oppressed by their rulers, and who reasonably judge themselves strong enough to throw off the yoke, may do so. But every pacific effort should be tried before the sword is drawn.

2. *Whosoever therefore resisteth the power,*—Another combination of *tassw*—sets himself against God's appointment. Any opposition is meant. Chrysostom says Paul adds this lest any should think he was making them despicable, putting them thus under heathen rulers—the authority is divine, no matter who wields it. He says, In this way, too, he was more likely to draw the governors, who were unbelievers, to religion, and the believers to obedience; for there was quite a common report in those days, which maligned the apostles as being guilty of a seditious and revolutionary scheme. *And they that resist*—And those who oppose shall receive for themselves judgment. They shall be punished; but the punishment is a *krima*, the result of a judicial sentence. Tholuck says, "It intimates, as a consequence of the very order of things, that every insurrection brings along with it its due punishment." Lange says, "Revolution very often devours its own children." But the context implies that the punishment here meant is that which is inflicted, as Alford says, "from God, through his minister, the civil power." Revolution is an obvious duty and right, or an obvious sin.

3. *For*—We should obey magistrates because they are so beneficial—they are formidable only to the bad. The best authorities favor the singular, "good work" and "evil." Some think Paul would not have written thus after the Neronian persecution; but such an abuse of government lay not within his scope. Persecution by rulers was no new thing: that does not belong legitimately to magistracy. *Wilt thou then*—But wouldst thou not be in fear of the authority? This is an hypothetic premise, rather than a question. None need fear any infliction of punishment from the government, if they will obey its laws. Instead of censure there shall be commendation. Origen, indeed, says it was not the custom of rulers to praise the innocent; but Pelagius says, "The condemnation of the bad is the praise of the good." As in the case of the parental, conjugal, and other relations, submission is required to lawful authority, without saying any thing of what must be done in case of an abuse of authority. It is here assumed that magistrates act within their proper sphere. In case of persecution, Christians must bear it for the

sake of Christ, though they may demand the protection of law when they conduct themselves as peaceable citizens or subjects.

4. *For he is the minister of God*—Chrysostom: "For he maketh virtue easier for thee in other ways also, by chastising the wicked, by benefiting and honoring the good, and by working together by the will of God—whence too he has even given him the name of *diakonos*." In the Coronation Service the king is invested with the dalmatic, formerly the peculiar vesture of the deacon—as if he were endowed with an ecclesiastical office; but Paul meant nothing of this. He used the word as meaning servant. Bengel notes the use of the same word for magistrate and minister of the gospel. *But if thou do that which is evil, be afraid*;—Chrysostom: "It is not then the ruler who makes the fear, but our own wickedness." *For he beareth not the sword in vain*:—*Forei*, a frequentative form of *fepei*, may be rendered "weareth," as a badge of office. The *machaira* was a large slaughter-knife, or sword. (See on Matt. xxvi. 47, 51, 52, 55.) It was the symbol of retributive justice and war. Worn by the magistrate, it showed that he had the power of life and death. The dagger was thus worn by the Caesars. Alford: "In ancient and modern times the sword has been carried before sovereigns. It betokens the power of capital punishment; and the reference to it here is among the many testimonies borne by Scripture against the attempt to abolish the infliction of the penalty of death for crime in Christian States." Certainly, for the crime of murder. Gen. ix. 6. If the State has not the right and the power of enforcing obedience to law by the *ultima ratio regem*—the infliction of death on such as defy its authority—government is at an end. The sword is not a bauble or a toy—it means something of grave importance. *For he is the minister of God*,—Repeated. W. and W.: "For God's minister he is (in this case also), in the character of avenger." *A revenger to execute wrath*—An avenger for wrath to him who doeth evil. This explains the lax notion that punishment is only reformatory in its design. Even a penitent murderer should expiate his crime on the gallows. Lange notes that "there is something higher than mere human justice—viz., the divine retribution of wrath upon offenders." Chrysostom: "It is God's law he is carrying out; for what if he does not know it himself? Yet it is God who has so shaped things."

5. *Wherefore*—Because of this divine economy. *Ye must needs*—There is a moral necessity that ye should obey the magistrate. *For wrath*,—The anger spoken of in ver. 4. Ye should be obedient, not merely to escape punishment, but to uphold good order, and to have the approval of your conscience. "Submit yourselves to every ordinance of man for the Lord's sake" (1 Pet. ii. 13)—out of regard to the Lord—recognizing the religious element. Col. iii. 23. If the magistrate require any thing involving the breach of a higher law, the conscience will disallow this, as it will enforce and approve the other. Acts iv. 19, 20; v. 29.

Bengel: "For conscience' sake—which expects the praise of a good action from God's minister, ver. 3."

6. *For, for this cause*—For on this account—like the wherefore of ver. 5—another inference from ver. 1-4. *Pay ye*—Ye pay—not imperative, as *apodote*, ver. 7. By paying taxes they support the government, which is thus in their service. Lit., "Ye pay in full"—discharge all dues. *Tribute*—*Foßou*—tributes of various kinds. Robinson: "Properly, what is borne or brought in; hence a tax, tribute, laid upon persons and their property annually, in distinction from *teßov*, toll, which was more usually levied on merchandise and travelers. Luke xx. 22; xxiii. 2." *Also*:—Meyer: "Besides other obedient conduct." *God's ministers*,—*Lei tourgoi*—public ministers, who attended to governmental affairs—not here tax-gatherers. They are the same as the *diakanoi*, ver. 4. Ministers and magistrates have the same titles. Isa. xlv. 28; Jer. xxv. 9. *Attending continually*—Constantly attending to this very thing. Chrysostom: "For this is their life, this their business, that thou mayst enjoy peace. Wherefore, in another Epistle, he bids them not only be subject, but also pray in their behalf—that we may lead a quiet and peaceable life. For do not tell me of some one who makes an ill use of the thing, but look to the good order that is in the institution itself, and thou wilt see the great wisdom of Him who enacted this law from the first." The primitive Christians were so conscientious in paying tribute that Tertullian said, what the Romans lost by Christians in the way of temple-dues, was counterbalanced by their conscientious payment of taxes.

7. *Render*—Chrysostom: "Not give, but render, give back." *To all*—All men. *Their dues*:—What they have a right to claim. Chrysostom: "Not a favor." *Tribute*—Custom. (See on ver. 6.) *Honour*—Respect to persons of distinction. W. and W. refer *fobon*, *fear*, to the reverence paid to superiors (1 Pet. ii. 18; iii. 2)—*timha*, *honor*, to the courtesy due to equals. Rom. xii. 10.

8. *Owe no man any thing*,—Discharge every obligation. *But to love*—Chrysostom: "This is a debt also, not however such as the tribute or the custom, but a continuous one; for he does not wish it ever to be paid off, or rather he would have it always rendered, yet never fully so, but to be always owing; for this is the character of the debt, that one keeps giving and owing always." *For he that loveth another hath fulfilled the law*.—Perfect tense—in the act of loving, he accomplishes all that law demands. Alford says, "Not the Christian law, but the Mosaic law of the Decalogue." But *nomon*, law, is here anarthrous, as so often in this Epistle. Every legal obligation is discharged by love—ver. 9, 10. There may be, as Alford suggests, "an apologetic reference to the upholders of the law." Paul

has shown that gratuitous justification does not make law void—it secures love, which fulfills law. Gal. v. 23. Milton makes Satan say that he wanted to

in a moment quit
The debt immense of endless gratitude,
So burdensome, still paying, still to owe,
Forgetful what from him I still received,
By owing, owes not, but still pays, at once
Indebted and discharged—what burden then?

9. *For this*,—Paul cites several commandments of the second table of the Decalogue. *Thou shalt not bear false witness*,—This is omitted in many MSS., in the Syriac and Sahidic, and some Fathers and editors. It is in the Sinaitic and others, the Vulgate, Coptic, Chrysostom and other Fathers. It may have been readily omitted by a transcriber, and others followed his copy. So Chrysostom omits, *Thou shalt not covet*. It is likely Paul cited all the negative commandments of the second table. Like Christ, he disregards the order. Matt. xix. 18, 19; cf. Ex. xx.; Deut. v. In the Alex. copy of the LXX. the order is, "Thou shalt not commit adultery, Thou shalt not steal, Thou shalt not commit murder." So in Mark x. 19; Luke xviii. 20; James ii. 11. So Philo, who says it is because adultery is the most heinous sin. Is it worse than murder? And is stealing worse than murder? *And if there be*—And if there is any other commandment respecting our duty to our neighbor, implying that there is—and there are many others. *Briefly comprehended*—Lit., recapitulated—summed up—brought under one head. The word is also used in Eph. i. 10. *In this saying*,—This word—the precept contained in Lev. xix. 18. Rab. Akhibba calls it "the great summary." *Thy neighbour*—**Plhsion** means "one near"—hence the Jews restricted it in this precept to one of their own nation, or a friend. (See on Matt. v. 43.) Christ explains it to mean a fellow-man—any one whom we can serve. This is illustrated in the parable of the Good Samaritan. (See on Luke x. 25-37.) *As thyself*.—With the same kind of regard, though not equal. You must love yourself first, to know how to love your neighbor. As you would not injure yourself, you must not injure him. Hence the Golden Rule, Matt. vii. 12. The *positive* feeling of love will secure a perfect observance of the *negative* precepts here specified, and will, in addition, induce the performance of good actions, according to our ability. As this commandment is like unto that which requires us to love God with all our powers, the love of our neighbor springs from love to God, and leads to it. Chrysostom: "Let us then love one another, as in this way we shall also love God, who loveth us."

10. *Love worketh no ill to his neighbour*:—This may be the abstract for the concrete: he who loves. But it may be construed, Love to one's neighbor works not evil. So Wycliffe and Rheims nearly. The evil is that prohibited by the precepts

which love enforces. *Therefore love*—Love, therefore, is a fulfillment of law. **PI h̄swma**, fullness—here, fullness of performance: the word was probably suggested by **pepl h̄swke** ("hath fulfilled"), ver. 8. Love is the antithesis of selfishness, which is the essence of all sin. Matt. xxii. 39, 40; 1 Cor. xiii.; Gal. v. 14; 1 Tim. i. 5; James ii. 8.

11. *And that*,—And we should do this the rather. Cf. Heb. x. 25. So substantially Theodoret, Tholuck, Olshausen, Alford, and others. Winer: "Connected with ver. 8." *Knowing the time*,—Inasmuch as you know the time: ver. 12. *That now it is high time*—That it is an hour already for us to be roused out of sleep—the waking-hour. Sleep is used metaphorically in a good sense (Acts vii. 60; xiii. 36; 1 Thess. iv. 14; v. 10), but also in a bad sense (Eph. v. 14; 1 Thess. v. 1-8), as here. *For now is our salvation nearer than when we believed*.—The aorist refers it to the time of their conversion—as Eph. i. 13. Their salvation was their deliverance from the ills of life. Chrysostom: "Near is the resurrection, near is the judgment. He puts the resurrection now close by them. For as the time advances, he means the season of our present life is wasting away, and that of the life to come waxes nearer. If thou then be prepared, and hast done all whatsoever he hath commanded, the day is one of salvation to thee. Since it was not unlikely that in the beginning of their early endeavors they would be most earnest, in that their desire was at its full vigor, but that as the time went on, the whole of their earnestness would wither down to nothing, he says they ought to be doing the reverse—not to get relaxed as time went on, but to be fuller of vigor. For the nearer the King may be at hand, the more ought they to get themselves in readiness—the nearer the prize is, the more wide awake ought they to be for the contest, since even the racers do this when they are upon the end of the course, and toward the receiving of the prize, then they rouse themselves up the more." Because the metaphor of watchfulness is used by Christ, in the warning of his coming to destroy Jerusalem, some refer this passage to that event—Alford and others to his premillennial advent, on which the Scripture is silent. Nothing is said here of the coming of Christ—who, indeed, virtually comes to all at their death. Paul denotes by salvation our final redemption—made sure at death, consummated at the resurrection. Cf. 1 Thess. v. 8, 9; Heb. v. 9; ix. 28; Rom. viii. 17-25. So Doddridge's hymn, "Awake, ye saints, and raise your eyes."

12. *The night is far spent*,—The aorist is vivacious: the night advanced. All the old versions have, "is passed," except Wycliffe, who hits the sense: "The night went before, but the day hath nighed." *The day is at hand*:—Our translators omit the **de**, which is continuative—and the day has drawn near. The perfect suits the preceding aorist—**h̄ggi ken**, has drawn near, corresponds to **ejgut̄eron**, nearer, ver. 11. *Let us therefore cast off the works of darkness*,—Lay aside our unsightly night-clothes, indicated ver. 13. The metaphor is slightly varied—according to Paul's manner. This is not to be pressed. *And let us put on the armour of*

light.—%Opl a means weapons, John xviii. 3; 2 Cor. vi. 7; x. 4 (see on Rom. vi. 13). A Roman would realize the force of this figure. The Christian is viewed as a soldier (Eph. vi. 11-17; 1 Thess. v. 5-8), who is not dressed in day-apparel without his arms—hence, "armor of light." Grotius: *arma splendentia*. "The children of light, and the children of the day," are suitably appareled. Fighting, however, is not here the prominent idea. See next verse.

13. *Let us walk*—Still carrying on the metaphor. When we arise from sleep we walk forth into the world. This is a common figure for living—following the course of duty prescribed. *Honestly*,—A.V. represents three Greek words by *honest* and its cognates, and all denote dignity, honor, gravity—that which is becoming. *Ευψχομοῶν*, in a well-fashioned manner—"decently," 1 Cor. xiv. 40—becomingly, as it means in 1 Thess. iv. 12, a passage like this. The noun is rendered "comeliness," 1 Cor. xii. 23; the adjective, "honorable," Mark xv. 43; Acts xiii. 50; xvii. 12; "comely," 1 Cor. vii. 35; xii. 24. Christians should be admired for their virtuous lives. *Not in rioting and drunkenness*,—Here are three pairs of evils. The first pair have reference to revels and carousals, which orgies usually took place at night. "They that be drunken are drunken in the night" (1 Thess. v. 7). Both words are in the plural, as in the second pair. *Κωμοῦ*—Lat., *comissatio*. A set of drunkards sallied out after supper, making night hideous with their revels. *Μεθ* (comp. German *meth*, mead) means a drunken frolic, a carousal. Luke xxi. 34; Gal. v. 21. Chrysostom, who is unusually pertinent and forcible on these verses, says: "Not that he would forbid drinking, but the doing of it immoderately—not the enjoying of wine, but doing it to excess. As also the next thing he states likewise with the same measure—*not in chambering and wantonness*—for here also he does not prohibit the intercourse of the sexes, but committing fornication. *Not in strife and envying*.—It is the deadly kind of passions, then, that he is for extinguishing—lust, namely, and anger. Wherefore it is not themselves only, but even the sources of them, that he removes. For there is nothing that so kindles lust, and inflames wrath, as drunkenness, and sitting long at the wine. Wherefore, after first saying, *not in rioting and drunkenness*, then he proceeds with *Not in chambering and wantonness, not in strife and envying*." W. and W. refer the third pair to "the strife and emulation from party spirit, which too often prevailed in the Churches." Gal. v. 20. This, of course, is prohibited, but Chrysostom's view suits the scope.

14. *But put ye on*—As in ver. 12—though here the idea rises. *The Lord Jesus Christ*,—Invest yourselves with the virtues which he possessed, so that all who see you will virtually see your great Exemplar. There is no reference here, or anywhere else in Scripture, to the robe of Christ's personal holiness, made ours by imputation. We are to "walk as Jesus walked below." Gal. iii. 27; Eph. iv. 24; Col. iii. 10. Chrysostom: "He who is clothed with him has absolutely all virtue. For what is there that he is not minded to be to us, when he makes us cleave and fit on

to him in every way? And this is a sign of one loving exceedingly." W. and W.: "Armor was worn by way of defense, and as garb indicating profession. In both senses they had put on Christ formally, and were called upon to exhibit him practically." *And make not provision for the flesh*,—Provide not for your carnal nature, so as to gratify its illicit desires. This recognizes an ethical character in flesh, as in chaps. vii. and viii. So W. and W.: "Corrupt nature generally, whether it showed itself in sins of the flesh or spirit. Consult not for your corrupt nature, with a view to gratify its desires." So Robinson: see under *Sarx*. But many follow Chrysostom, who makes *sarx=soma*, the body: "For as he does not forbid drinking, but drinking to excess, not marrying, but doing wantonness, so too he does not forbid making provision for the flesh either, but doing so with a view to fulfill the lusts thereof, as, for instance, going beyond necessities. For that he does make provision for it, hear what he says to Timothy: 'Use a little wine for thy stomach's sake, and thine often infirmities.'" Bengel follows with hesitation: "The care of the flesh is neither forbidden here as bad, nor praised as good, but it is regulated and guarded against dangers as something of a middle character, and yet in a measure suspicious." That is vague. Bloomfield opposes the single construction of Macknight, "Make no provision for gratifying the lusts of the flesh," on Chrysostom's principle, but inconsistently recognizes an ethical element in flesh. Tholuck: "*Sarx* is here like *soma*." So Olshausen. Wycliffe, after the Vulgate: "And do ye not the business of the flesh in desires." Winer says it does not mean "Make provision for the flesh, not for lusts"—as if the negative (*mh*) immediately preceded "for lusts"—which it does not. Cf. Rom. xiv. 1.

CHAPTER XIV.

3 *Men may not contemn nor condemn one the other for things indifferent: 13 but take heed that they give no offence in them: 15 for that the apostle proveth unlawful by many reasons.*

XIV.—1. *Him that is weak in the faith*—Our translators omit the conjunction *de* which connects this verse with the foregoing, not immediately with the last verse—as Lange, agreeably to his interpretation of ver. 14—unless the sensualists there suggested by contrast the ascetics here—but rather with xiv. 8, 9, 10. While you are to love all men, you should show peculiar tenderness to Christians who are weak in the faith. The weakness is not in the faith, as Alford says, but in him who has the faith; and this, indeed, he admits when he says, "Weak in the faith=holding the faith imperfectly—*i.e.*, not being able to receive the faith in its strength, so as to be above such prejudices." W. and W.: "The whole of the Christian religion, in relation to the effects on the heart and understanding." Walford: "To be weak in faith is to have a narrow comprehension of the extent, harmony, and design of Christianity." Ver. 2, 22 favor the view of Bloomfield and

others, that "the faith"="his faith," or the principle of faith, as Olshausen says. He lacks a firm persuasion of the lawfulness of certain *adiaphora*—things indifferent. *Receive ye*,—**Prosl ambaww** is used in the intensive sense, as in ver. 3 and xv. 7, where we are exhorted to "receive one another as Christ also received us"—where it must mean to admit into fellowship. Cf. Acts xviii. 26; Philemon 12, 17. Wesley: "With all love and courtesy into Christian fellowship." This applies to the reception of any one into the Church by baptism, or into intimate fellowship after baptism. Alford: "Give him your hand"—as Syriac (Tholuck). Count him one of you—opposed to rejecting or discouraging him. *But not to doubtful disputations*.—Margin: "Not to judge his doubtful thoughts." Wycliffe renders the Vulgate: "But take ye a sick man in belief, not in demengis (judgings) of thoughts." Rheims: Not in disputations of cogitations." Tyndale, Cranmer: "Not in disputing and troubling his conscience." "Geneva: "But not to enter into doubtful disputations of controversies"—**mh-eij** means not for such a purpose. Admit him to your fellowship for mutual assistance and comfort, not for judgments of opinions—to settle the questions on which he has scruples. As those addressed are the stronger party, it is implied that the opinions in question are those of the weaker party. Chrysostom and others consider them the believing Jews, who thought that they were bound to abstain from things pronounced by the law unclean, and also to observe certain holy days, whereas the Gentile believers considered themselves free from all obligations of the sort. But the ceremonial law did not prohibit the use of all animal food and wine, whereas these weak brethren were vegetarians and aquarians. Others think they were converts from among the Essenes, who were ascetics of this sort; but they were rarely found in cities, and are never mentioned in N.T. Some think they were the Neopythagoreans, by whose opinions the Churches in Asia Minor were inoculated. But they were severely censured by the apostle—1 Tim. iv. 1-5—as well as those Judaizers who incorporated some of their notions with their own errors. Col. iii.; cf. Gal. iv. 9-11. Some consider this place parallel with 1 Cor. viii.; but there is no reference there to wine and holy days, or the ceremonial distinction of meats, but only of things offered to idols, which do not appear to be alluded to in Rom. xiv. The ascetics in this case would not raise any scruples in regard to what all parties disallowed. Whedon suggests that there may have been an infusion of Brahmanism in this asceticism. The possibility is that some of the Jews grafted certain ascetic principles of the Oriental philosophy on the ceremonialism of the law in regard to food and holy days, and that they retained such scruples after their conversion. Daniel and his friends would not defile themselves with the meat and wine furnished them in the court at Babylon, but subsisted on pulse. Dan. i. Tobit would not eat of the bread (**ajtoun**) of the Gentiles, though his fellow-captives at Nineveh did. Josephus says his master Banus was a vegetarian, and that certain priests, who were sent as prisoners to Rome, fed solely on figs and dates. (Life, c. ii.; iii.) There were precepts of this sort in the Mishna. Origen alludes to similar

Christian ascetics in his days. The Apostolical Canons distinguish between ministers, who on ascetic grounds abstained from flesh and wine, but condemned not those who did not, and others who considered the use of flesh and wine as sinful—condemning the latter. Hegesippus says: "James, brother of our Lord, drank neither wine nor fermented liquors, and abstained from animal food. A razor never came upon his head; he never anointed with oil, and never used a bath: he who alone was allowed to enter the sanctuary. He never wore woolen, but linen, garments. He was in the habit of entering the temple alone, and was often found upon his bended knees, and interceding for the forgiveness of the people; so that his knees became as hard as camels'." Of course, no credit is to be attached to such traditions—like popish fables of later times—yet they serve to show the high regard paid to asceticism in those times, especially by the Jews. It is hardly necessary to say that the aquarianism of modern reformers is not based on asceticism, though some betray a spirit not in keeping with the apostle's counsels, ver. 3.

2. *For one*—One, indeed—the *mea*, ("indeed") corresponds to the *de* ("but") in the next clause. The former is the strong, the latter the weak, of ver. 1. *Believeth that he may eat*—Has faith to eat—alluding to ver. 1. Winer: "The one has confidence to eat, and *may* is implied in *pisteuein*." The A. V. gives the sense. He believes that he has a chartered right to eat. Paul was thus strong in faith. 1 Tim. iv. 3, 4. *Another*,—But he who is weak. *Eateth herbs*.—Lives on an exclusively vegetable diet. Olshausen: "*Lachana* denotes all sorts of vegetables, as opposed to flesh." Lange and others construe this in a lax manner, as if it meant that these ascetics abstained from flesh only under certain circumstances, as at social feasts, so that they might not eat that which was unclean or offered to idols.

3. *Let not him that eateth*,—Any kind of food. *Despise—judge*—A fine distinction. One who has a healthy mind, strong in faith, is tempted to despise, look with contempt upon, one who is bound by sickly scruples, while the rigid ascetic is tempted to judge—that is, censure—one who uses the liberty which he believes is allowed by the gospel. *For God hath received him*.—The verb is in the aorist, referring to the time of his conversion. The verb is the same as that in ver. 1. Robert Hall—an Open-communication Baptist—says, "He who is good enough for Christ, is good enough for me." Cf. xv. 7. Some refer this to both parties; but the connection seems to restrict it to the eater, who was censured by the abstainer. God received the former as well as the latter, notwithstanding the harsh judgment of the abstainer.

4. *Who art thou*—A challenge, like ix. 20. What prerogative hast thou in the premises? It is not thy business. *That judgest*—Some refer this to the strong; but he is not the one who judges—it is the weak who censures the strong. Ascetics frequently condemn their more liberal brethren. *Another man's servant?*—The

servant of another—*aj lotrion* should not be restricted to "man's" (see on Luke xvi. 12)—yet the question refers to the impropriety of any one's meddling with the relation of a servant to his master. The *oikates* is a house-servant, as in Luke xvi. 13; Acts x. 7; 1 Pet. ii. 18. This gives greater point to the question, as it is not to be supposed that a master would keep a house-servant about him if he did not please him. *To his own master he standeth or falleth*:—This may be construed as a *dative commodi*: it is the master's affair: if he considers the servant proper for his service, he retains him; if not, he rejects him. *Yea*,—But (*de*) he shall be made to stand. Here the illustrative case passes into the case in hand: *q.d.*, But in this case the servant shall be allowed to retain his place. *For God*—There is strong MS. authority for "the Lord"; but *κυριον* may have been written by an early transcriber, from the preceding clause, "to his own master he stands or falls—for the master (*κυριον*) can make him stand." But Paul, according to his manner, abruptly applies the case, and uses the word God, as in ver. 3. *Is able*—*Dunato*, with an infinitive, means can do any thing—there is no natural or moral impossibility in the case. Without antagonizing any principle, God can—and will, for that is implied; cf. iv. 21; xi. 23—retain in his service the liberal believer, as well as the scrupulous, only let him not abuse his liberty, or despise his ascetic fellow-servant. To stand or fall does not seem to mean, to stand in or fall from grace—much less to be approved or condemned in the day of judgment; yet both are implied in retaining or forfeiting the relation of a servant of God, which seems to be the meaning.

5. *One man*—One, indeed, judges one day to be above another—Chrysostom refers this to days of fasting. Koppe and a few others indorse this. But it is generally referred to the observance of the Jewish Sabbath and other holy days, to which the Jews attached great sanctity—the Gentiles did not. The gospel neither prescribes nor proscribes them—unless their observance be enforced as a condition of salvation. Col. ii. 16; Gal. iv. 10. Alford has no right to infer from this that the apostles did not recognize the obligation to observe the Lord's-day. Jewish and Gentile believers alike observed that; though it is not called "the Sabbath" in N.T., or by the early Fathers. John xx. 19, 26; Acts xx. 7; 1 Cor. xvi. 1; Rev. i. 10. Justin Martyr and Tertullian speak of the observance of Sunday as the Lord's-day—giving it the prominence which was given to the patriarchal sabbath (Gen. ii. 3), and to the Jewish, saving certain ceremonial peculiarities grafted on the latter. But even in this case, we must leave conscientious Romanists, Greeks, Lutherans, Anglicans, Quakers, and others, who recognize no sabbatical sanctity in "the first day of the week," to their own Master.

6. *He that regardeth the day*,—He who minds, observes, a holy day, as a duty. *Regardeth it unto the Lord*:—To Christ. The datives here and in ver. 7, 8, are *commodi*—as Meyer says, in the *ethico-telic* sense—though connected with an objective dependence on Christ—which some consider the force of those datives

in ver. 7, 8: thus Macknight, who renders "by" in ver. 7, 8, but "to" in ver. 6. *And he that regardeth not the day, to the Lord he doth not regard it.*—He has regard to the will of Christ, who has abrogated the laws requiring its observance. It is not out of willfulness or wantonness, but out of regard to the will of the Master, that he declines the observance. This clause is wanting in the principal uncial MSS., the Vulg., Coptic, Ethiopic, some Fathers, and editors. It is found in other MSS., in the Syr., Basil, Chrysostom, Theodoret, and other Fathers. Some think it was inserted by copyists to balance the preceding clause. Whedon thinks Paul omitted it because of "the esteem of the special day alone that is so sanctioned—a strong proof-text of the validity of the Christian Sabbath"! Alford: "The words were probably omitted from the similar ending, *fronei*, of both clauses having misled some early copyists"—very likely—he adds, "but perhaps it may have been intentionally done after the observance of the Lord's-day came to be regarded as binding." Very unlikely. *He*—In most MSS., "and he." *That eateth*,—Indiscriminately—in like manner recognizes the will of Christ, who has canceled the ceremonial law concerning food. *For he giveth God thanks;*—Grace at meat shows the recognition. Observe the antiquity and scriptural indorsement of this practice. (See on Matt. xiv. 19; 1 Tim. iv. 3, 4.) *And he that eateth not*,—He who eats not thus indiscriminately, abstains in regard to the supposed will of Christ (though his scruple is baseless). *And giveth God thanks.*—Says grace over his "dinner of herbs."

7. *For none of us liveth to himself*,—As we are the Lord's servants—his purchased possession (1 Cor. vi. 19, 20; 1 Pet. ii. 9, 10; Ps. cxvi. 16)—our lives must be devoted to his service—indeed, we are to lay down our lives for him if he requires it—*a fortiori*, we are to defer to his will in regard to the *adiaphora* in question—not setting up ourselves as judges when Christ alone is the Lord of conscience.

8. *We live unto the Lord*;—Macknight does not construe the datives in this verse, and ver. 4 and 7, as *commodi*, but *instrumentalis*—"by the Lord"—yet he reaches the right conclusion: "Since none of us is his own master, neither hath any right to live as he lists, but all of us are the subjects of Christ, and are obliged to do as he hath commanded, it is a usurpation of Christ's prerogative to pretend to rule the opinions and actions of others in matters of religion; and no person should submit to such a usurpation." (See on Rom. vi. 10, 18, 19; Phil. i. 20, 21.)

9. *For to this end*—The death and resurrection of Christ acquired for him the right to govern all men in this world and in the next. Phil. ii. 8-11; Rev. i. 18.

He justly claims us for his own,
 Who bought us with a price:
 The Christian lives to Christ alone—
 To Christ alone he dies.

Christ both died, and rose, and revived,—The approved reading is, "Christ died and lived." Meyer well accounts for the various readings—they arose from attempts to explain the text. The aorist *eʒhsen* points to the resurrection: he lived after his death—lived again—his resurrection leading to his eternal life in heaven. Rom. vi. 9, 10. *Living*.—Alford: "In sense comprehending all created beings." But only those redeemed seem to be here intended.

10. *But why dost thou*—But thou, why dost thou? The emphatic pronouns show that the apostle first addresses the ascetic, remonstrating with him for censuring his liberal brother, and then the latter, for despising the former. *Thy brother?*—The repetition has great force. 1 Kings xx. 32, 33; Matt. vii. 1-5. *The judgment-seat of Christ*.—*Bhma* occurs twelve times in N.T., but only in one other place to designate the tribunal of Christ—2 Cor. v. 10. Some think from that place "Christ" was substituted for "God," which is the reading of many good MSS.; but the MSS. used by Origen, Chrysostom, other Fathers, Syriac, and Vulgate, have "Christ"—which suits the context here, as well as in 2 Cor. v. Cf. John v. 22-27; Acts xvii. 31; Matt. xxv.

11. *For it is written*,—In Isa. xlv. 23—where the Heb. is, "I have sworn by myself that unto me every knee shall bow, every tongue shall swear." The LXX.: "By myself I swear that to me every knee shall bend, and every tongue shall swear with respect to God." But the Alex. copy has "confess to God," as Paul: cf. Phil. ii. 10, 11. *As I live*,—Jehovah's formula of swearing by himself. *Shall confess to God*.—In Isaiah there is a prediction of Jehovah's universal sovereignty, indicated by the bending of every knee, with the oath of allegiance from every tongue. Paul refers this, in Phil. ii. 9-11, to the exaltation of Christ to the throne of the universe—here it refers to the consummation of his Mediatorial government in the general judgment. It seems that *ejxomol ogew* retains the idea of confession, as in the next verse. Reiche makes it the confession of sins, which Olshausen opposes, as not agreeing with the parallelism. Macknight says, "shall either voluntarily or by constraint acknowledge God's sovereign dominion, by giving an account to him at the judgment." This seems to be the sense. Meyer says it always means to praise when used as here with the dative. But see on Matt. xi. 25. The Vulgate has *confitebitur*, which Wycliffe renders "knowledge," meaning, as Tyndale and Cranmer, "shall give a knowledge;" Geneva and Rheims, "shall confess." In rendering our account to him, we acknowledge his exclusive sovereignty. Chrysostom: "For he does not barely say, every one shall worship, but shall confess—that is, shall give an account of what he has done."

12. *So then*—Agreeably to the foregoing. *Every one of us*—All alike. *Shall give account*—The Vulgate renders *l ogon* by *rationem*; Wycliffe, "reason." Cf. Acts xix. 40. *Of himself*—Concerning his own case—not concerning others. *To*

God.—Christ is God as well as man, and man as well as God—who so proper to be the Judge of all men?

13. *Let us not therefore*—No longer, then, let us judge one another—as Christ is Judge of all. This seems to take in the *despising* by the strong, as well as the *judging* by the weak—both imply censuring. *But judge this rather*,—Bengel: "A beautiful *mimesis*, in relation to what precedes. Instead of judging, in censuring one another's conduct, judge concerning what you ought not to do to one another—not to put a stumbling-block before your brother, or a snare." *Proskomma*, from *proskoptw*, to beat against, means a stumbling-block. *Skandalon* is, literally, the tricker of a trap, and so a snare, or a stumbling-block—hence the terms are interchangeable. (See on ver. 21; Matt. xvi. 23.) The Vatican MS. and the Syriac version omit *proskomma*, perhaps as a synonym. Stuart, Philippi, and many others, consider the latter as explanatory of the former. This is favored by the contradictory views of those who make a distinction—to wit, Macknight: "*Proskomma*, dashing the foot against a stone, but not falling—yielding a little to temptation, but recovering from it; *skandalon*, stumbling so as to fall—committing sin through temptation, contrary to knowledge." W. and W. reverse it: "*Proskomma*, a large obstacle against which one may strike the foot; *skandalon*, a smaller one likely to catch the foot: the former denotes a certain, the latter a probable, cause of falling." Bengel: "A *stumbling-block*—if a brother be compelled to do the same thing, ver. 20; *an offense*—if he abhors you for the deed." Alford: "*Proskomma*—see ver. 21: an occasion of stumbling in act; *skandalon* (*ib.*), an occasion of offense in thought." Lange vaguely refers the terms respectively to the two parties concerned, and says: "In ver. 21 the apostle seems to distinguish even three cases—to take offense forward, or backward, or to be strengthened in weakness"!

14. *I know*,—By the teaching of the O.T. Gen. i. 31; ix. 1-3; 1 Tim. iv. 3, 4. *And am persuaded*—Assured. My conviction drawn, by reason from the O.T., has been corroborated by the authoritative teaching of Christ. Construing *ej* as in, Alford says, "He is persuaded in his capacity as connected with Christ Jesus, as having the mind of Christ." W. and W.: "In the Lord Jesus. The elements of my knowledge and persuasion are in him—in my fellowship, union with him." So Tholuck: "He perceives truths in the consciousness of his fellowship with Christ." This is mystical and vague. Why not give *ej* the force of "through," as in the Geneva—"full certified through the Lord Jesus"? Robinson: "In or through the Lord." Wesley: "I am assured by the Lord Jesus—perhaps by a particular revelation." Lange says: "He has the fixed assurance of it in the fellowship of Christ, by virtue of justifying faith in his Spirit;" but he adds to this vague statement, "A consciousness of Christ's declaration in Matt. xv. 11 is here more probable than questionable; but then that declaration is not in a legal sense the basis of his freedom (comp. also 1 Cor. viii. 8; Col. ii. 14-16)." If any other

revelation were needed, he had it in Peter's vision, the symbol of which settled this question—which, indeed, was settled by the abrogation of the ceremonial law: cf. Acts xv. Bloomfield: "By the teaching of Jesus Christ himself, and not by human reasoning." *There is nothing unclean of itself*:—Lit., "common by itself"—in the sense of profane, ceremonially unclean. (See on Mark vii. 2; Acts x. 14.) No kind of food is in its own nature unclean, and so forbidden; but if any one accounts it so, to him it is so. Thus Grotius and others: "The persuasion of any food being forbidden is to a Christian Jew, as long as he is so persuaded, sufficient to make it unlawful for him to use the liberty from the yoke of Mosaic ordinances." *But to him*—Vulg., *nisi*—so Meyer and others: it expresses an exception; and "to him" is emphatic. The uncleanness is thus subjective.

15. *But*—There is no uncial authority for δε ("but")—the external authority for γαρ ("for") greatly preponderates. *But* seems to have been substituted to make an easier connection. However, the connection with "for" is not so obscure as some imagine. It assigns a reason for the admonition to the strong not to ensnare the weak. If he, by thy example, and to escape thy ridicule, eat against his conscience, and is aggrieved, or caused to fall, this is not according to the law of love, for love worketh no ill to a neighbor. Paul thus explains his meaning in a similar passage—1 Cor. viii. 7-13. W. and W. miss the scope when they say, "is distressed at witnessing thy (to him) bad example, and restating its influence." Macknight comes nearer the point: he renders λυπειται "hurt," and says: "Wherefore (reading δε) if thy brother, who thinketh certain meats unclean, is made to sin through thy eating such meat, whether it be by hating thee as a profane person, or by following thy example contrary to his conscience, or by apostatizing to Judaism." Wesley: "Wounded, led into sin." Robinson: "Aggrieved, offended." *Thy meat*,—βρωμα, food—for which "meat" stands in Old English. *Now walkest*—Thou walkest no longer. A common metaphor in the Bible for passing one's life, conducting one's self. *Charitably*.—Lit., "according to love," which requires us to do all the good we can, and no evil, to our neighbor. *Destroy not*—'Αποβι umi means to destroy utterly—to kill. Robinson refers it in this passage to "eternal destruction, the second death." There is no stronger word—the great destroyer gets his name "Apollyon" from it. Rev. ix. 11. Bloomfield says, "Not final perdition, but rather a present falling from a state of salvation by apostasy or otherwise." No one imagines that he is in final perdition while he is living! But if he dies in his apostasy, then what? W. and W.: "Imper. pres., as of an action continuing, and thus making rather a tendency than a complete effect." It is pitiful to see the attempts of some to evade the teaching of this passage as to "falling from grace." Macknight comes out boldly, despite his Church Confession: "Do not for the sake of pleasing thy palate destroy him for whose salvation Christ parted with his life. Here Christ is said to have died for a person who may be destroyed by sinning through our example." Bengel: "Do not

make more of thy food than Christ did of his life—*Destroy not*. 1 Cor. viii. 11. Even the true brother may perish, for whom Christ most lovingly died." Whedon: "The grieved brother might be induced through disgust to leave the Christian communion, and so be lost." But cf. 1 Cor. viii. 10, 11.

16. *Let not then your*—D, F, Syr., Vulg., and some other versions, have "our." *Good*—Chrysostom is in a fog: "Either their faith, or the hope of rewards hereafter, or the perfectness of their religious state." The good thing here is the freedom allowed to the strong, which they were expected to use with discretion and charity, so that it might not be evil spoken of. There is no antithesis in the Greek, as in our version. The Vulg., Wycliffe, and Rheims, transfer the word "blasphemed." It is rendered "evil spoken of" in 1 Cor. x. 30, which sheds light on this place. Cf. 1 Pet. iv. 4, 14; 2 Pet. ii. 2, 10, 12.

17. *For*—Do not act so, because it is inconsistent with the character of your religion. *The kingdom of God*—A theocratical expression, found nowhere else in Romans, but often in the Gospels, Acts, and Epistles. It means the government which God exercises by the mediation of Christ, and through the influence of the Holy Spirit, and the organism of the Church. In the Gospels and Acts it usually means the Christian Dispensation, or Church, or some distinguishing feature of it; and so occasionally in the Epistles; but there it generally denotes what is called the kingdom of glory, the other being styled the kingdom of grace—which is the inchoation, as the former is the consummation, of this government. (See on Matt. iii. 2.) Here it denotes the grand subjective elements of the kingdom of grace, or of those who are its subjects. There may be also an allusion to the Mosaic dispensation, which comprised so many "carnal ordinances." *Meat and drink*,—Eating and drinking. Drinking is added pleonastically—as often—people usually drink at their meals. It may also have a reference to wine, which some of the ascetics would not use—ver. 21—hardly to "the libations which formed part of the sacrifices" (W. and W.). The *adiaphora* are here contrasted with the essentials. *Righteousness, and peace, and joy in the Holy Ghost*.—Not to be taken ethically, as denoting a holy, pacific, and cheerful spirit—though that follows as an effect (cf. vi.; xii.-xvi.)—but doctrinally, in the sense in which those terms have been employed in this Epistle, especially in chaps, v.; viii. Justification by faith, securing peace with God, and holy joy, is not dependent on ceremonies of any sort, nor can the latter be put in its place. Cf. xv. 13. "In the Holy Ghost" is referred by Bloomfield and others to all three predicates, and Tholuck says it *may be* so referred; but it should be restricted to joy, because, as he says, "it serves specially to distinguish the mild, inward cheerfulness of the Christian from the impure jollity of the natural man." Alford says well: "In connection with, under the indwelling and influence of, as 'Rejoice in the Lord,' Phil. iv. 4," etc.

18. *For he that in these things*—There is good authority for the plural, though that for the singular predominates. But it should be hardly rendered "thus" (B. Crusius, Alford), rather "herein" (Lange), not restricting it, with Origen, to "the Holy Spirit," but embracing the whole sentence. *Serveth Christ*,—This is a check to Antinomianism. Freedom from Mosaic rites, and free justification by faith, do not lead to licentiousness (See on iii. 31; vi.) *Is acceptable*—Is well-pleasing to God, and approved by men. Lange thinks the best among those who dissent are chiefly meant; but it means men in general, who approve of the good actions of Christians, even if they do not imitate them. Matt. v. 16; Phil. ii. 15, 16; iv. 8; 1 Pet. ii. 11-20. So Tholuck. This is the opposite of the defamation, ver. 16. *Approved*—As coin which has been assayed and pronounced "current money with the merchant." Among the most depraved tribes may be found *a judicial mind*, which pronounces in favor of moral excellence.

19. *Let us therefore follow*—*Diwkw* is frequently used by Paul both in a good and in a bad sense. Rom. xii. 13, 14; Heb. xii. 14—to pursue earnestly. *The things which make for peace*,—Ascertain what course of conduct is likely to promote harmony, then pursue it. Bengel: "Peace and edification are very closely connected. Theology is in itself pacific, and is designed to edify. Controversy is not so directly useful for edification, though it should sometimes be added. Neh. iv. 17." So Wesley—who better expresses it. *One may edify another*.—Mutual edification. This fine word *oijkodomh* (building) is often used metaphorically for improvement or advancement in religion. Rom. xv. 2; Eph. iv. 12, 16, 29.

Build we each the other up;
Pray we for our faith's increase,
Solid comfort, settled hope,
Constant joy, and lasting peace.

20. *For meat destroy not*—Do not for the sake of meat demolish—the contrast to edify, ver. 19—"build up, not pull down." *The work of God*.—Bengel: "Which God accomplishes in the soul, by edification, and in the Church by harmony." Wesley improves on that: "Which he builds in the soul by faith, and in the Church by concord." 1 Cor. iii. 9. *All things indeed are pure*;—(See on ver. 14.) *But it is evil for that man*—It is bad, criminal, in him who eats so as to cause his brother to stumble. The next verse shows that the eater is the strong man, who by his eating causes the weak to stumble. (See on ver. 13.) But Chrysostom, Luther, Meyer, Lange, and others, refer the eating to the weak. Bloomfield says the words may be referred to the weak, but he refers them to the "advanced Christian"—he makes *di a>meta*=occasioning an offense to him.

21. *It is good*—Noble, worthy—*kal on*, opposed to *kakon*, bad, worthless, ver. 20. *Any thing*—This supply of the ellipsis seems to mean not to drink any thing; but it is best to supply "to do any thing." *Stumbleth*, or *is offended*, or *is*

made weak.—Bengel and Wesley place these three terms in contrast with "righteousness, peace, and joy in the Holy Ghost," which seems fanciful. Some consider the collocation a climax—others, an anticlimax. But the terms are nearly or quite synonymous, and are explanatory of each other. (See on ver. 13.) An early copyist, either considering them an interpolation, or merely explanatory, or from *homaeotel.*, omitted the second and third words, which are wanting in A, C, Sin. (first hand), Syr., Copt., AEth., and some Fathers.

22. *Hast thou faith?*—Fritzsche thinks this requires a negative answer (which is not the case), hence he adopts the concessive construction. Alford hesitatingly adopts the reading of four uncials, "the faith which thou hast." He says if the received text be taken, the interrogative rendering better suits the lively character of the address than the affirmative. Chrysostom hits the sense: "Here he seems to me to be giving a gentle warning to the vanity of the more advanced. And what he says is nearly this, Dost thou wish to show me that thou art perfect, and fully furnished? Do not show it to me, but let thy conscience suffice. And by faith he here means that which concerned not with doctrines, but with the subject in hand; for of the former it says, With the mouth confession is made unto salvation; and, Whosoever shall deny me before men, him will I also deny. For the former, by not being confessed, ruins us; and so does this by being confessed unseasonably." *Have it to thyself before God*.—He knows it—that is enough: he too is the object of all faith. Tholuck suggests it denotes "by thanksgiving." Cf. ver. 6. *Happy is he*—He is blessed whose conscience approves of all he does—provided he has used the means to get a rectified conscience. *Condemneth*—Judges. Meyer: "Who does not hold judgment over himself—who is so assured in his conviction that his decision to do this or that incurs no self-judgment." 2 Cor. i. 10. *Alloweth*.—The same word as in ver. 19 is rendered "approved;" but here it means *allows*, on competent proof. Olshausen here refers to an absurd interpolation in the Cambridge MS., and one or two others, of Luke vi. 4, which makes Jesus sanction Sabbath-breaking, if a man knows what he is doing!—"On the same day seeing one working on the Sabbath, he said unto him, Man, if indeed thou knowest what thou doest, blessed art thou; but if thou knowest not, thou art cursed, and art a transgressor of the law."

23. *And he that doubteth*—But he who doubts, if he eat, stands condemned—which is what our translators meant by *dammèd*—*katakekritai*—not *kriòwn*, rendered condemned in A.V., ver. 22. Every man is self-condemned who goes contrary to his conscience, whether it is right or wrong. Acts xxiv. 16; 1 John iii. 19-21.

I want the witness, Lord,
That all I do is right,
According to thy will and word,
Well pleasing in thy sight.

For—De and whatsoever—a general statement, or axiom, yet referring to the subject in hand. The Augustinian notion, that Paul here means to condemn all the actions of men who have not the Christian faith, is not to be received; nor is Heb. xi. 6 exactly parallel with this. Chrysostom: "When a person does not feel sure, nor believe that a thing is clean, how can he do else than sin? Now all these things have been spoken by Paul of the subject in hand, not of every thing." Wesley: "Whatever a man does without a full persuasion of its lawfulness, it is sin to him." The converse of this is not always correct, as a man's conscience may be ill-directed, and so his actions be wrong. He is not, of course, as guilty as one who sins against his conscience. Cf. Acts xxiii. 1; xxvi. 9; Phil. iii. 6; 1 Tim. i. 13-16; John xvi. 2. The "weak" sin, if they use the liberty of the "strong;" but the "strong" do not sin if, in condescension to the "weak," they restrain their liberty, as did Paul himself when, as he says, "To the Jews I became as a Jew, that I might gain the Jews; to them that are under the law, as under the law, that I might gain them that are under the law; to them that are without law, as without law, that I might gain them that are without law. To the weak became I as weak, that I might gain the weak: I am made all things to all men, that I might by all means save some" (1 Cor. ix. 20, 21, 22). See the instances in which he did this—Acts xvi. 3; xviii. 18; xxi. 26; 1 Cor. viii. 13. Observe, Paul shows clearly enough that he approved of the "strong," being one of them himself, and on proper occasions asserted his liberty, and even denounced the "weak" when by their asceticism and Judaizing course they were corrupting the simplicity of the gospel. How consistent was he in his casuistry!

CHAPTER XV.

1 *The strong must bear with the weak.* 2 *We may not please ourselves,* 3 *for Christ did not so,* 7 *but receive one the other, as Christ did us all,* 8 *both Jews* 9 *and Gentiles.* 15 *Paul excuseth his writing,* 28 *and promiseth to see them,* 30 *and requesteth their prayers.*

XV.—1. *We then*—This ought not to be divided from the preceding—*de* is continuative: Now we who are strong. Paul, as usual, places himself with the strong—not only because he was such, but to give greater effect to the counsel he gave them. *To bear*—Robinson: "To bear with, to endure"—but still the metaphor of carrying a burden is implied. Cf. Acts xv. 10; Gal. vi. 2, 5; Rev. ii. 2, 3. Lange: "Forbearance." *The infirmities of the weak*,—Those just specified, and all others

of a kindred character—not sins. Rev. ii. 2, 3. 'Asqenhmata is cognate with that rendered "weak" in xiv. 1—ajdunaṭwn ("weak") is the negative of that rendered "strong." *Not to please ourselves.*—As the ruling motive of action, irrespective of the welfare of others.

2. *His neighbour*—In xiv. 10, "brother." (See on xiii. 9, 10; xiv. 7.) *For his good*—Unto that which is good—not to sustain him in sin. *To edification.*—Not to pull down, but to build up, his religious character. (See on xiv. 19; 1 Cor. x. 33; Gal. i. 10.)

3. *For even Christ*—The Lord of all. He submitted to revolting conditions when on earth, for the benefit of others, according to the will of his Father. John v. 30; viii. 29; 2 Cor. viii. 9; Phil. ii. 8; Heb. v. 8; xii. 2, 3. *But, as it is written,*—The quotation is introduced without the *formula citandi*. Some think there is an ellipsis, which they variously supply—but that is not needed. Winer: "An *anacoluthon* peculiar to the N.T. sometimes occurs, according to which the writer proceeds in the words of an O.T. statement instead of his own—*e.g.*, Rom. xv. 3, instead of—but in order to please God he submitted to the cruelest reproaches—ver. 21," etc. The quotation is *verbatim* from the LXX., Ps. lxxviii. (lxxix.) 9, except that Paul has *epepeson, fell*, 1 aor., and the LXX. the 2 aor. It is noteworthy that John applies the former clause to Christ, "The zeal of thy house ate me up" (John ii. 17). David tells God that his zeal for his honor absorbed him, so that the reproaches cast on God he took on himself. Other portions of this Psalm are cited in N.T.—*e.g.*, John xv. 25; xix. 28; Acts i. 20. Chrysostom alludes to the reproaches on the cross, Matt. xxvii. 40, 41, 42, and says Paul "shows that it was not Christ alone who was reproached, but the Father also."

4. *For whatsoever things*—This remark justifies the citation, which primarily referred to David, and prepares for what follows. *Were written aforetime,*—Every thing in the O.T. *Learning,*—Instruction. *That we through patience*—The principal MSS. repeat *di a*>that through the patience and through the comfort of the Scriptures, we might have the hope—the patience and the comfort arising from the perusal of the Scriptures, excite desire and expectation of what God has promised to the faithful. Chrysostom: "That is, that we might not fall away (for there are sundry conflicts within and without), that being nerved and comforted by the Scriptures, we might exhibit patience, that by living in patience, we might abide in hope. For these things are productive of each other, patience of hope, and hope of patience, and both are produced by the Scriptures." (See on ver. 13; v. 2, 3, 4; Col. i. 5, 23, 27; 1 Thess. i. 3; 2 Thess. ii. 16; Heb. iii. 6; vi. 11, 18, *et al.*)

5. *Now the*—The *deis* continuative—the article should be retained: And may the God of the patience and of the comfort specified in ver. 4. God is so styled because he is the Author of both. *Like-minded*—To be of the same mind one toward another. The reference is not to dogmatic sameness, however desirable that

might be. The whole scope of the teaching in these two chapters is this, that we should have in essentials unity; in non-essentials, liberty; in all things, charity. *According to Christ Jesus*:—According to the spirit, and precepts, and example, of Christ. Phil. ii. 1-5.

6. *That ye may*—That with one accord ye may with one mouth—the same feeling impelling the same utterance—and that naturally a doxology. We formulate the points in which we agree, rather than those in which we differ, in our songs of praise. *God, even the Father*—The God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ. The Father is the God of Christ in his mediatorial character—though he does not join himself with us in saying, "Our God," any more than in saying, "Our Father." (See on John xx. 17; Eph. i. 17; Heb. i. 9.) W. and W.: "He who is both God and Father: God, defines his nature—Father, his person: *kai* (and') connects together God and Father so as to carry on the force of the article from one to the other." Sanderson, Bloomfield, and others, defend the explicative sense of *kai* as in A.V.

7. *Wherefore*—Bloomfield: "Wherefore, in order to the carrying out of the *comprecatio* of the last two verses—by neither party, Jew or Gentile, despising or censuring each other—receive one another, show consideration and kindness mutually, which will effectually promote the unity so indispensable to the well-being of the Church." (See on xiv. 1.) *As Christ also*—Christ received you of both parties; surely if good enough for him, you are good enough for each other. *Us*,—Authorities preponderate for "you," as in Syr. and Vulg. *To the glory of God*.—Some refer this to "Christ received you;" but it seems to refer to their receiving one another. God is glorified when his grace produces such an effect. John xiii. 35; xvii. 20-23; 1 John i. 3. Both constructions yield a good sense, and both are favored by Lange and W. and W. The context favors the latter; cf. ver. 6, 9. This is addressed to both parties, the strong and the weak, and generally Jews and Gentiles, of the union of whom in Christ he proceeds to speak.

8. *Now*—Authorities are nearly equal for *gar* ("for")—which Alford edits: he thinks it assigns a reason for the exhortation ver. 7. Bloomfield says *de* was read by the Syriac translator, and has the continuative force of *autem*—*but* or *now*. *I say*—This affirmation was designed to show that the Christian dispensation was designed alike for Jew and Gentile. *Jesus Christ*—Some MSS. transpose the names—others omit "Jesus." *Was*—Became a minister of circumcision. W. and W.: "In his ministry belonged to the Jewish race, was subject to their ordinances (Gal. iv. 4, 5), and exercised his ministry among them (Matt. xv. 24)." *For the truth of God*,—In behalf of God's truth—to prove his faithfulness. *To confirm*—To fulfill the promises made to the patriarchs, concerning the salvation of Israel through the Messiah, who was to spring from them. John iv. 22, 25; Acts ii. 40; iii. 13-26; xiii. 26-41; Rom. i. 16; iv., *et al.*

9. *And that the Gentiles*—And (I say) the Gentiles might glorify God in behalf of mercy. God's truth respected promises made to the Jews—his mercy is more ostensible in the case of the Gentiles, who were not within the covenant; yet this "mercy" was in the divine intention, as Paul has shown in this Epistle, and as he proceeds to show. *As it is written*,—The quotation is *verbatim* from the LXX. of Ps. xvii. (xviii.) 49, except that Paul omits "Lord." He applies to the Messiah, as did the old Jews, the language of David, who says he will celebrate his victories, to the praise of the Lord, among the heathen. (See on xiv. 11.)

10. *And again he saith*,—Some render, "it says," or, "it is written"—some supply "the Scripture"—Macknight, "Moses"—who says it in Deut. xxxii. 43—*verbatim* from the LXX., which differs from the Heb. But Lange says, "According to the theocratic idea, *rejoice to his people*, or rather, *make his people rejoice, ye Gentiles*, and *rejoice with his people*, amount to the same thing."

11. *And again*,—An exact quotation from the LXX. of Ps. cxvi. (cxvii.) 1. *Laud*—So all the old versions, except Wycliffe and Rheims, which have "magnify," after the Vulg. It is a stronger word than praise. Rotherham: "Repeat his praises"—applaud, extol. *All ye people*.—Heb. and Greek: "All the peoples"—Gentiles.

12. *And again Esaias saith*,—*Verbatim* from the LXX. of Isa. xi. 10. The Heb. differs considerably in form, though not in sense. *There shall be a root of Jesse*,—The root of Jesse, viz., his descendant through his son David—David's Son and Lord. Cf. Isa. xi. 1; liii. 2; Rev. v. 5; xxii. 16—where the root and offspring of David is the same—*ruza*, like the Heb. *shoresh*, meaning a sprout, or shoot, from the root. Cf. Eccus. xlvi. 22; 1 Macc. i. 10. Hence the shoot is the branch—the standard, ensign, around which men gather, and in which they confide, as the symbol of protection. Jesus was a lineal descendant of King David, Jesse's son—so the heir of his throne. This sets forth his Messianic royalty, as recognized by the Gentiles. *Trust*.—Lit., "hope"—confide in him for salvation.

13. *Now*—*De*>continuative, has this force. *The God of hope*—The hope in question. A beautiful title, like "the God of peace"—he who originates and sustains this hope. It is not likely that Paul alludes to the Roman goddess Hope, whose temple was twice consumed. *Fill you with all joy and peace in believing*,—Faith generates hope, and hope produces joy and peace. (See on xiv. 17.) *That ye may abound in hope*,—Superabound—be so filled with the hope of the gospel as to leave no room for any doubt, or fear, or misgiving. *Through the power*—Lit., in power of the Holy Spirit—the objective basis of this experience, as faith is its subjective basis—the constant synergism of Christianity. This, and not a barren formalism, or a mechanical "concord," or a tame submission to usurped authority over the conscience, is the ground of harmony and union, and the certain safeguard against bigotry and schism. 1 Cor. i. 10.

14. *And I myself*—Paul now makes a kind of apology to the Romans for addressing them so freely, without having a personal acquaintance with them: But, notwithstanding what I have written in the way of instruction and admonition—even I myself, who have no personal acquaintance with you, am persuaded, my brethren—the tender compellation gives effect to his address—concerning you—intimating that though he had never seen them, he knew of them—that ye yourselves also *are full of goodness*,—The Vulg., Wycliffe, Rheims, after F, have "love"—perhaps a gloss. 'Agaqwsuāh occurs in Gal. v. 22; Eph. v. 9; 2 Thess. i. 11, and seems to denote a kindly disposition, with which the apostle accredits them—though there may have been some among them who were not conspicuous for this virtue. Chrysostom includes all virtue. *Filled*—Better vary the rendering, as the word is different from the former. Rheims: "Replenished with all knowledge." *Able also*—Chrysostom: "Not to learn only, but also to teach." He intimates that if they were to use their capacities, they would not need his casuistry to guide them. 1 Thess. v. 1, 2, 11.

15. *Nevertheless*,—Though you are able to admonish one another (ver. 14). *Brethren*,—Some MSS. omit this, but it is probably genuine. *I have written*—Wycliffe alone of the old English translators renders as the historical aorist: "I wroto to you aparti." It is the epistolary aorist—as in Gal. vi. 11. *The more boldly*—Winer: "More strongly than from your Christian progress (ver. 14) might be necessary." *In some sort*,—Wesley: "In some respect." Robinson: "In part, partly, in some degree, 2 Cor. i. 14; ii. 5; Rom. xi. 25; xv. 15, 24; Diod. Sic. xiii. 108." He does not refer to parts of the Epistle (Alford and others), nor to the Jewish part of the Roman Church (Whitby), but to the subject-matter of the Epistle: *q.d.*, I have been somewhat free in my admonitions. *As putting you in mind*,—As farther reminding you. Chrysostom notes the gentleness and delicacy of this address: "He uses a word which means putting you in mind in a quiet way." *Because of the grace*—By the knowledge and authority with which he was divinely endowed in the apostolic commission—not his own personal authority. (See on xii. 3.)

16. *That I should be the minister*—A minister—*l ei tourgon*—a public servant, xiii. 6. Robinson: "A minister of Christ, of the gospel." *To the Gentiles*,—Alford: "In reference to the Gentiles": cf. xi. 13. *Ministering the gospel of God*,—Robinson: "Ministering as a priest in respect to the gospel"—which is what Alford means by "in the gospel"—the gospel, as he says, is not the sacrifice, but signifies that in behoof of which the ministering takes place. *That the offering up of the Gentiles*—*Prosfora* means an oblation, and seems to be here put in apposition with the Gentiles—they themselves are meant, not their offerings. Wesley: "As living sacrifices." (See on xii. 1.) Macknight: "By representing the converted Gentiles as a most acceptable offering to God, the apostle alluded to Isa. lxvi. 20, "They shall bring all your brethren for an offering to the Lord, out of all

nations.' But this offering was not a sin-offering, but a free-will offering; for the apostle nowhere speaks of his offering sin-offerings." So he never is called a priest. The figurative allusion to sacrificing here gives no countenance to sacerdotalism. *Might be acceptable, being sanctified by the Holy Ghost.*—In allusion, perhaps, to the washing and salting of clean victims for sacrifice. Here the offering was prepared for the altar by the Holy Spirit. Ps. cx. 3. Chrysostom: "Now no one will find fault with a priest for being anxious to offer the sacrifice without blemish. And he says this at once to elevate their thoughts, and show them that they are a sacrifice, and in apology for his own part in the matter, because he was appointed to this office. For my knife, he says, is the gospel, the word of the preaching—that the souls of those taught by me may be accepted. For it is not wood and fire, nor altar and knife, but the Spirit that is in all of us." W. and W., however, make it "the offering presented by the Gentiles." Yet they say: "As the sacrifices under the law were purified by water, so we are made fit for the service of God by devoting ourselves in the Holy Ghost as the element of our spiritual life. It is not the office of the Christian minister to offer a propitiatory sacrifice unto God, but by the influence of the Holy Ghost to bring men to offer themselves a living sacrifice. St. Paul no more calls himself a priest, in the strict sense of the term, than he calls the offering of the heathen an oblation in the sacrificial sense of [prosfora](#)>Phil. ii. 17." Alford: "The language is evidently figurative, and can by no possibility be taken as a sanction for any view of the Christian minister as *a sacrificing priest*, otherwise than *according to that figure*—viz., that he offers to God the acceptable sacrifice of those who by his means believe in Christ." Tomson's Beza (1599): "The Gentiles themselves, whom he offered to God as a sacrifice."

17. *I have therefore*—In view of my ministry, ver. 15, 16. *Whereof I may glory*—Ground for exultation. Some MSS. have the article, which Alford construes, "my boasting," which makes a good sense. [Kauchsiv](#) means exultation. (See on v. 2, 3.) *Through Jesus Christ*,—In his relation to Christ, and subserviency to him—no vain egotism. *In those things*—As to matters relating to God—things pertaining to his divinely-appointed ministry. Cf. Gal. vi. 14, where he uses the cognate verb, rendered "glory."

18. *For I will not dare*—In my exultation I will not be bold—[tol mhs w](#) is an echo of ver. 13. *To speak*—To speak any thing of what Christ did not work through me—dative of instrument. W. and W.: "He alone by me alone." *To make the Gentiles obedient*,—Unto obedience of Gentiles—anarthrous, as referring to Gentiles visited in this tour—not here to the Gentile world: cf. xvi. 26. *By word and deed*,—By preaching and miracles. Olshausen says "the ordinary operation of grace"—he distinguishes this from the extraordinary which follows.

19. *Through mighty signs*—In power of signs and wonders—that is, in the exercise of miracle-working power: *dunameiv*, in plural, is one of the three words for *miracles*—*shmeion*, a miraculous sign, and *teras*, a miraculous prodigy, are of frequent occurrence. (See on Acts ii. 22; Heb. ii. 4.) *By the power of the Spirit of God*;—In the Spirit's power—exegetical of signs and wonders—as they are wrought in the exercise of the miracle-working power of the Holy Spirit. W. and W., after Terrot, refer the signs and wonders to "deed," and the Spirit's power to "word," ver. 18—with no good reason. External authority is about equally divided between "Holy Spirit" and "Spirit of God"—while the Vatican has neither "holy" nor "of God"—both of which may be glosses received into the MSS. which have them. Paul often alludes to his miraculous endowments, but only with regard to their utility, as here: he was no vain thaumaturgist, like Simon Magus. Acts viii. *So that from Jerusalem*,—Then the eastern boundary of his journeying—the *terminus a quo*. *And round about*—Lit., "and in a circle," which may mean, "and in a circuit as far as Illyricum;" or, joined with Jerusalem, it may mean neighboring places. Tholuck specifies Arabia, Gal. i. 17. Alford says doubtfully, "perhaps Arabia." Others embrace Syria and Cilicia. A.V. follows Tomson's Beza, Tyndale, Cranmer, Geneva, "from Jerusalem and the coasts round about unto Illyricum;" Wycliffe, "fro Ierusalem bi cumpas to the illerik see." *Unto Illyricum*,—*Meeri* denotes the *terminus ad quem*—as far as to Illyricum. It does not imply that he preached in Illyricum, though he may have done so when he was laboring in Macedonia. Acts xx. 1-3. Illyricum was north-west of Macedonia, on the eastern shore of the Adriatic Gulf, north of Epirus—in it was Dalmatia (2 Tim. iv. 10), which name still distinguishes a portion of it. *I have fully preached*—Lit., "fulfilled"—as in Acts xii. 25; Col. i. 25—accomplished his mission. Chrysostom is very rhetorical, referring the "round about" to the route to Illyricum: "Count up the cities, and places, and nations, and peoples, not those under the Romans only, but those also under barbarians. For though you were to go the whole way through Phenicia and Syria, and the Cilicians, and Cappadocians, still reckon up also the parts behind, the country of the Saracens, and Persians, and Armenians, and that of the other savage nations. And this is why he said 'round about,' that you might not only go through the direct high-road, but that you should run over the whole, even the southern part of Asia in your mind. And as he ran over miracles thick as snow, in a single word, by saying, 'through mighty signs and wonders,' so he has comprehended again endless cities, and nations, and peoples, and places, in this one word 'round about.' For he was far removed from all boasting." The Golden-mouth boasted for him!

20. *Yea, so have I strived*—*Filotimeomai* means to love honor—hence some render, "But thus am I ambitious"—a word which hardly befits the mouth of Paul. The Vulgate, Rufinus, and Pelagius, omit the word, finding it difficult to translate it. Alford thinks the word, as used by Paul, seems to lose its primary meaning,

"making a point of honor." W. and W. render well: "Yet so aspiring, making it a point of honor." *Not where Christ was named*,—That is, where he had been previously preached—the connection seems to give it this sense—though others render "professed"—"named as Master and Lord, 2 Tim. ii. 19—where any bore the title of Christians." Robinson combines both: "To be mentioned, heard of, known—where Christ is already known and professed." *Lest I should build*—He pursued this course that he might not carry on the work which others had begun, while there were so many places where the gospel had never been preached. It was the special work of the apostles to lay the foundations of the Church in all parts of the world, leaving others to build on them. 2 Cor. x. 13-16. this did not, of course, preclude their laboring among the Churches anywhere when occasion served.

21. *But as it is written*,—In Isa. lii. 15—*verbatim* from the LXX.: "They to whom nothing was told concerning him shall see, and they who have not heard shall understand."

22. *For which cause*—On account of having to visit so many new places. *I have been much hindered*—The better rendering seems to be, these many times, or frequently—*τα πολὺ α*>So Chrysostom: "He makes the end of the like texture with the introduction. For while he was at the beginning of the Epistle (i. 13) he said, Oftentimes I purposed to come unto you, but was hindered hitherto. But here he gives the cause also by which he was hindered, and that not once, but twice, and even many times."

23. *But now having no more place in these parts*,—There was no more unoccupied ground in those regions, which he could reach, for the exercise of his peculiar apostolic ministry.

24. *Whensoever I take my journey into Spain*,—Whenever I might be journeying to Spain—a visit which he may or may not have made—history is silent. W. and W.: "Be well assured that if ever I travel." *I will come to you*:—Many MSS., versions, and Fathers, omit this clause—and some omit the following "for." Thus Chrysostom: "Whensoever I take my journey into Spain, I trust to see you in my journey." Some omit the clause, but retain the *γαρ* ("for"). Some suggest that when the interpolated clause was inserted, this was inserted to make sense; but when the clause was canceled, the *γαρ* was overlooked. De Wette and Tischendorf retain both it and the clause; so do Conybeare and Howson, though they think it an interpolation, but one which does not affect the sense. *For I trust*—For I hope going through to see you. He would naturally take Rome on his route. *And to be brought on my way thitherward by you*,—It was customary for the Churches to "welcome the coming and speed the parting guest"—especially an apostle. 1 Cor. xvi. 6. "By you," not "from you," as in some copies, is probably correct. *If first I be somewhat filled with your*

company.—Macknight hits the sense: "We have this expression, Susannah 53—'that they might be filled with her beauty'—to have great satisfaction in the enjoyment of it. By adding *in some measure*, the apostle insinuated that his desire of their company was so great that the few days he was to remain with them would satisfy it only in part." Chrysostom: "No length of time can fill me, or create in me a satiety of your love." Bengel: "He intimates that he will not be so long at Rome as he wishes"—but the next remark is here out of place: "or else that it is Christ, not believers, with whom believers may be perfectly filled."

25. *But now I go*—The present tense expresses that which is determined on and imminent. He could neither go on another tour in Greece, nor to Spain, at that time, as the wants of the destitute in Jerusalem were emergent. Cf. Acts xix. 21; xxiv. 17; 1 Cor. xvi. 1. The Christians at Jerusalem were reduced to great straits by persecutions and famines (Acts viii.; xi.; xii.), so that they greatly needed help. Paul availed himself of the occasion to promote good fellowship between Jewish and Gentile believers, which he could do with a good grace, being a Jew, and yet the apostle of the Gentiles.

26. *For it hath pleased them*—Lit., "For Macedonia and Achaia were pleased to make some contribution." So we say, America helped the Irish in their famine—meaning, of course, some of the people of America: so here many of the Christians of these provinces are meant. Macedonia was north of Greece proper—Philippi being the "chief city." (See on Acts xvi. 9-12.) The liberality of the Philippians in this contribution is eulogized in 2 Cor. viii.; ix. Achaia was south of Macedonia. Corinth was its capital. When Augustus divided the whole country into two proconsular provinces, he put Macedonia proper, with Illyricum, Thessaly, and Epirus, into Macedonia, and all south into Achaia—which is the country always meant by Achaia in N.T.—not the whole of Greece, as in the poets. (See on Acts xviii. 12, 27.) In 2 Cor. ix. 2, Paul says that Achaia took part in this contribution. *A certain contribution*—*Koinwnia*, communion, communication—some contribution. The language does not imply that it was small—it was probably considerable.

27. *It hath pleased them verily*;—For they were pleased. The *gar* ("for") introduces the emphatic repetition—they thought good to do so. *And their debtors they are*.—That is, they ought to aid them. *For if the Gentiles have been made partakers*—The verb is cognate with that rendered "contribution," ver. 26. This reciprocation is an expression of the communion of saints. Bengel well says, "An honorable term, and justly applied;" but it was needless for him to add, "Hence the community had already ended at Jerusalem." They never had it, except to some extent for the special pentecostal occasion. *Their spiritual things*,—The gospel conveyed to them by missionaries who were Jews—Jesus himself being a Jew. Cf. ver. 8, 9; John iv. 22. *To minister*—To render pecuniary assistance.

Lei tourghsai: so **lei tourgov** is used Phil. ii. 25, and **lei tourgi a** Phil. ii. 30; 2 Cor. ix. 12 (where it refers to this very case). Chrysostom, whose analysis of this passage is excellent, suggests that this was a delicate way of inciting the Romans to imitate the Greeks in this benevolence.

28. *Where therefore*—This, then, accomplished. *Sealed*—Making sure, delivering over, safely and faithfully. *This fruit*,—Outcome of Gentile benevolence. *I will come by you*—I will pass through Rome, on my way to Spain.

29. *And I am sure*—And I know. *That when I come*—Coming, I shall come—a Hebraism. *In the fulness of the blessing*—The nouns are anarthrous, the first, in Hebrew style, being used as an adjective—in full blessing of the gospel. Many MSS. and versions omit "of the gospel," but it is in the Syriac and Vulgate versions. Chrysostom says, "As he has here added *of the gospel*, on this ground we assert that he speaks not of money only, but of all other things"—yet he singularly adds, "As if he had said, I know that when I come I shall find you with the honor and freshness of all good deeds about you, and worthy of countless praises in the gospel—forestalling their attention by encomiums." But it means, says Alford, "that fullness of apostolic grace which he was persuaded he should impart to them." Macknight refers it to a miraculous *charism*; but see on Rom. i. 11.

30. *Now*—**De;**"but"—suggesting a necessity arising out of what follows: But I entreat you. *Brethren*,—Probably genuine, though wanting in the Vatican. *For the Lord Jesus Christ's sake*,—By our Lord Jesus Christ, and by the love of the Spirit—the love which the Holy Spirit inspires. This is an adjuration. 1 Cor. i. 10; Phil. ii. 1; Col. i. 8. *That ye strive together with me*—Lit., Agonize together, or in company—as in the gymnasium, or on the arena. Cf. Col. iv. 12. He wanted the aid of their prayers: so in every Epistle to the Churches, except the fallen Churches of Galatia. Doubtless the other apostles asked the brethren to pray for them, though this is not recorded.

31. *That I may be delivered from them that do not believe in Judea*;—From the contumacious in Judea. Some think he refers to "the Christian brethren of Jewish extraction;" but though some of them harbored prejudices against Paul, as the Apostle of the Gentiles, yet it is more likely that he here refers to the unconverted Jews. Their contumacy made them specially adverse to Paul. Acts xx. 22-24; xxi.; xxii. *And that my service*—And that my ministration for Jerusalem may be acceptable to the saints. The Christian Jews were afraid of those who rejected Jesus, because they persecuted them, and they were so far under this influence, and of their own lingering prejudice against Gentiles, that they might be disposed to reject their contribution, much as it was needed. What a touch of human nature is this!

32. *That I may*—So that in joy I may come to you by God's will. He could enjoy the society of the Roman brethren after his successful mission to Jerusalem; and they would be refreshed, or solaced, by his visit, as well as himself.

33. *Now the God of peace*—A frequent formula in benedictions. Rom. xvi. 20; Phil. iv. 9; 1 Thess. v. 23; 2 Thess. iii. 16; Heb. xiii. 20. It implies that God is "the author of peace"—in the wider Hebrew sense of all spiritual blessings; but here, and generally in N.T., it denotes that tranquillity which results from the reconciling influence of divine grace; hence it is called "the peace of God," and is found in the benediction with which Paul opens this Epistle, and indeed every Epistle, except that to the Hebrews. So Peter, 2 and 3 John, Jude, and Revelation. Cf. 1 Cor. xiv. 33; 2 Cor. xiii. 11.

CHAPTER XVI.

3 *Paul willeth the brethren to greet many, 17 and adviseth them to take heed of those which cause dissension and offences, 21 and, after sundry salutations, endeth with praise and thanks to God.*

XVI.—1. *I commend*—A.V. ignores the *de* "moreover," which marks a continuation of the discourse, changing the topic. Letters of introduction were common among the early Christians. Acts xviii. 27; 2 Cor. iii. 1. Phebe seems to have been the bearer of the Epistle. *Our sister*,—The common compellation of female members of the Church. *Which is a servant*—This is liable to be misconstrued as denoting a menial. Lit., "being a deacon." The peculiar domestic life of the Orientals makes deaconesses necessary to visit and relieve women. Chrysostom: "It is no slight thing to be called the sister of Paul; moreover, he has added her rank, by mentioning her being deaconess." *Cenchrea*:—The eastern port of Corinth, about eight or nine miles from the city. Acts xviii. 18.

2. *That ye receive her in the Lord*,—Entertain her for the Lord's sake—as a disciple. Matt. x. 41, 42; Rom. xiv. 3; Phil. ii. 29. *As becometh saints*,—In a manner worthy of the saints. The early Christians were proverbial for hospitality. *And that ye assist her in whatsoever business she hath need of you*:—It is hardly to be supposed that she had any legal business to transact, though *pragma* is sometimes used in a judicial sense. 1 Cor. vi. 1. W. and W.: "Private business, doubtless, of a domestic nature, or relating to property." Chrysostom: "Not in whatsoever businesses she she may be, but in such as she may ask of you; but she will ask in such things as lie in your power." *Succourer*—Assistant, as in the preceding clause—for also she herself—indicating service as of a superior to inferiors. Paul records his indebtedness to her hospitality and kindness, as in the case of Lydia. Acts xvi.

3. *Greet*—Salute—imperative, without any special direction to any to bear the salutation—*q.d.*, "Give my love"—"God bless"—it is more energetic than the indicative. *Priscilla*—The proper reading is Prisca, as in 2 Tim. iv. 19. The diminutive "Priscilla" is found in Acts xviii. 2, 18, 26; 1 Cor. xvi. 19, where there is an account of this woman and her husband. *My helpers in Christ Jesus*:—My fellow-workers in the cause of Christ. Prisca could labor in the same way in which Zenana women now labor in the East, visiting families which cannot be reached by men, reading the Bible, catechising, relieving the sick, etc. Phil. iv. 3.

4. *Who have for my life laid down their own necks*:—Lit., their own neck put under—sc., the ax, or sword. They hazarded their own lives to save the life of the apostle. This may have taken place at Corinth (Acts xviii.), or at Ephesus (Acts xix.). *Unto whom not only I give thanks, but also all the churches of the Gentiles*.—Some refer this gratitude to their saving of Paul's life; others, to their labors; Chrysostom, to "their hospitality and pecuniary assistance." Why not embrace all? Bengel makes a beautiful remark: "We still ought to thank Aquila and Priscilla, or shall do so hereafter"—for saving Paul's life. Paul puts Priscilla first in three places, and Aquila three. Conybeare and Howson refer to the courtesy of Paul to women evinced in this chapter, silencing a German infidel, who charged him with speaking and feeling coarsely in reference to women!

5. *Likewise greet*—This should be joined with ver. 3, 4: and the Church at their house. Chrysostom: "For they had been so estimable as even to make their house a church, both by making all in it believers, and because they opened it to all strangers." 1 Cor. xvi. 19; Philemon 1. *Epenetus*,—None of these names, to ver. 16, elsewhere occur, except perhaps Rufus. *The first-fruits*—A first-fruit of Asia: the first convert in Asia—that is, proconsular Asia. Some copies read *Achaia*; but the house of Stephanas was the first-fruit of Achaia. 1 Cor. xvi. 15. Here is an echo of Rom. xv. 16—as the first-fruit was offered to God.

6. *Greet Mary*,—Salute Mary, who toiled much for us—probably in attending to the wants of Paul and his friends. The various reading "you" for "us" has good support; but why should Paul tell them to salute her for serving them?

7. *Junia*,—Probably wife of Andronicus; but the nominative may be Junianus—masculine. It seems like "Julia," ver. 15. *My kinsmen*,—He does not seem to mean in the national sense (Rom. ix. 3), but personal—cf. ver. 11—his relatives, family connections. Wycliffe, Tyndale, Cranmer, Geneva, Rheims, "cousins." *Fellow-prisoners*,—Paul was often imprisoned, and his friends would naturally be sometimes imprisoned with him. The word means literally fellow-captives—captured in war. *Who are of note among the apostles*,—Some say Junias was a man, and he and Andronicus were apostles, and distinguished ones too—like Peter and Paul! Yet they are never heard of before or since! Others, that they were distinguished apostles in the sense of messengers, as John xiii. 16;

2 Cor. viii. 23; Phil. ii. 25. This seems to be Chrysostom's view; for he certainly would not put a woman, as he considered Junia, in the Apostolical College, with the Twelve! He says: "To be apostles at all, is a great thing; but to be even among those of note, just consider what a great encomium this is! But they were of note, owing to their works, to their achievements. O how great is the devotion of this woman, that she should be even counted worthy of the appellation of apostle!" Barnes: "This does not mean that they were apostles; for (1) there is no account of their having been appointed as such. (2) The expression is not one which would have been used if they had been: it would have been, 'who were distinguished apostles.' Comp. Rom. i. 1; 1 Cor. i. 1; 2 Cor. i. 1; Phil. i. 1. (3) It by no means implies that they were apostles. All that the expression fairly implies is, that they were known to the other apostles; that they were regarded by them as worthy of affection and confidence; that they had been known by them, as Paul immediately adds, before he was himself converted. They had been converted before he was; were distinguished in Jerusalem among the early Christians, and were honored with the friendship of the other apostles. (4) The design of the office of *apostles* was to bear *witness* to the life, death, resurrection, doctrines, and miracles of Christ. As there is no evidence that they had been witnesses of these things, it is improbable that they were set apart to the apostolic office. (5) The word *apostles* is used sometimes to designate *messengers* of Churches, or those who were sent from one Church to another on some important business; and if this expression meant that they *were* apostles, it would only be in some such sense as having obtained deserved credit and eminence in that business. See Phil. ii. 25; 2 Cor. viii. 23." Lange: "According to Acts xxiii. 16, the apostle had a nephew in Jerusalem, who took a deep interest in his cause, and as it is said of Andronicus and Junia, or Junias, that they were before him in Christ—that is, were believers—so it is natural to make a family from the names of Andronicus, Junias, or better, Junia, and Herodion, and to suppose that these, as the early converted kinsmen of Paul, had already made an impression in Jerusalem upon the unconverted Paul, and, after his conversion, had taken an interest in him in his captivity. Then these were specially adapted, like Aquila and Priscilla, to prepare the way for him in Rome. This would also give a simple explanation to *among the apostles*: they were highly respected as believers among the apostles in Jerusalem." Meyer: "Distinguished—that is, honorably known to the apostles." So Beza, Grotius, De Wette, Fritzsche, Philippi, and most critics—including the high Anglican Wordsworth. It is a rich thought of Alford, that they were noted apostles, when they needed "this certification from Paul"—as Riddle suggests. Alford thinks Paul had less intercourse with the other apostles than we suppose! The notion that they were apostles of the prelatical episcopal type—diocesan bishops—shows to what absurd lengths partisanship may go! *Were in Christ before me.*—Became Christians before Paul was converted.

8. *Amplias*—Short for *Ampliaton*. *In the Lord*.—Alford: "In the bonds of Christian fellowship."

9. *Urbane*,—The revisers of A.V. neglected the canceling of the final *e*, the old style of printing. Urbanus is the name—if abridged, it is simply Urban—two syllables. *Our helper in Christ*,—Our fellow-worker in the bonds of Christian fellowship, as ver. 8—of course, "in the work of Christ" (Alford), but the other seems to be the meaning.

10. *Apelles*—Not Apollos (Origen and others). *Approved in Christ*.—Chrysostom says this "includes the whole list of virtues." It implies that he had been tested, and found steadfast in his devotion to Christ. Alford: "By trial in the work of Christ." *Household*.—This word, supplying the ellipsis here and in ver. 11, may embrace wife, children, and servants: it does not necessarily embrace Aristobulus or Narcissus. In a similar passage (Phil. iv. 22) *oikia* is used: "They of Caesar's household"—meaning, probably, his servants. Cf. 1 Cor. xvi. 15. Of course, "in the Lord" is implied here, as in ver. 11. Aristobulus was probably a great-grandson of Herod the Great.

11. *Herodion*—A name derived from Herod—another of Paul's "cousins" as Wycliffe again renders the word. It is likely he was originally of Jerusalem—see on ver. 7. Hippolytus says he became Bishop of Tarsus—of course, Paul's birthplace—was this a case of apostolic nepotism? Others say he was Bishop of Patra! Worthless traditions. *Narcissus*,—Some identify him with the favorite of Claudius; but *he* was put to death by Nero, before this Epistle was written. Others make him Nero's favorite, who was put to death by Galba. Some of his slaves or freedmen were Christians.

12. *Tryphena and Tryphosa*,—Two zealous women. *Who labour*—Present tense. Perhaps Paul had just heard of their laboring. (See on ver. 6.) *The beloved Persis*,—Persis the beloved. Persis is the feminine of *Persikos* (Persian).

13. *Rufus*—Supposed to be the son of Simon, who bore the Saviour's cross. (See on Mark xv. 21.) *Chosen in the Lord*,—Whitby: "One of great excellency in Christianity, as we say, a choice man; so the word often signifies." Alford rejects this, and says, "one of the elect of the Lord"—which means the same, unless he wishes to insinuate "a sense unknown to our apostle." W. and W.: "That chosen one in Christ—in the sense of choice, picked—that approved one (10)." *And his mother and mine*.—His by nature, mine by motherly regards. Compare Terence, *Adelphi*, l. 2. 46: *Natura tu illi pater es consilius ego*. Cf. John xix. 27. It is a pleasing fancy that Paul was entertained at Jerusalem in the house of Simon, who bore the cross of Christ, as Paul did afterward in another sense.

14. *Hermas*,—Origen and others absurdly suppose that this was the author of "The Shepherd" which appears to have originated in the second century.

15. *Julia*.—Probably the wife of Philologus. *All the saints which are with them*.—Probably the Christians who associated with them in social worship: so ver. 14.

16. *An holy kiss*.—Paul recommends this in 1 Cor. xvi. 20; 2 Cor. xiii. 12; 1 Thess. v. 26. So Peter, 1 Pet. v. 14. Bengel thinks Paul meant that they should thus salute one another in his name—as we say, "Kiss for me." This is not likely, as the kiss was customary. He notes that in Paul's later Epistles it is not ordered, having perhaps been abused. But this is not likely. It is an Oriental custom, long retained—the *osculum pacis* of Tertullian, given after prayer, and especially at the Lord's Supper. It is still in vogue in the East. Cf. Luke vii. 45. It is likely that *all* the Churches which knew of Paul's intention to write this Epistle sent their love—as we say. Some MSS. omit "all"—as A.V. If Peter was at that time Pope of Rome, as papists say, it is strange that Paul did not finish these salutations by saying, "Above all, I and all the Churches salute His Holiness, Peter the Pope!" But neither in his Epistle to Rome, nor in his Epistles from Rome at a later date, does he mention Peter's name—and for a good reason—he was not there!

17. *Now I beseech you*.—A similar exhortation is found in 1 Cor. i. 10. *Mark them*—Keep your eyes on them, to avoid them. *Which cause divisions and offences*.—The divisions and the offenses, or stumbling-blocks—such as were then among them. (See on xiv. 13-23.) There seems to be no distinction intended between doctrinal and ethical matters. Divisions made parties—offenses caused apostasies. *Contrary to the doctrine*—Beside, inconsistent with, the teaching which you learned (aorist)—viz., when they were converted. Bengel: "To have learned once is binding. 1 Cor. xv. 1, etc." *And avoid them*.—Turn away from them. This does not refer to excommunication. 2 Thess. iii. 6.

18. *Jesus*.—Some MSS. omit Jesus—most of the uncials and Vulgate. Rheims: "Christ our Lord." *Their own belly*;—Expressive of selfishness and sensuality. Acts xx. 29; Phil. iii. 19; 1 Thess. ii. 5. Chrysostom refers this to the Jews, alluding to Titus i. 12. *Good words*—*Crhstol ogi av*—good-natured discourse. Like the Emperor Pertinax and Charles II., they talked well, but acted ill. *Fair speeches*—*Euj ogi av*—good speaking. These words are nearly synonymous. Some MSS. omit the latter. Bengel says of the former: "Promised, of themselves"—and of the latter, "praising and flattering you." *Deceive the hearts of the simple*.—*Exapatwsi*, "deceive out and out." They wholly beguiled the souls of the unsuspecting.

19. *For your obedience*.—The apostle is encouraged to exhort them thus, because their obedience, or tractableness, is everywhere reported. This is an echo of i. 8—which shows that "the obedience of faith" is meant. The next clause corroborates this view: he rejoiced because of their respect for apostolic authority. *But yet I would have you*.—The *de>*is continuative (though W. and W. say

"adversative"): and I wish you to be wise indeed, so as to discern what is good, that you may practice it, but harmless, as to evil—that is, with a pure (*akeraiouv*) mind, avoid it. This is an echo of Christ's charge to the apostles, "Be ye wise as serpents, and harmless (the same word) as doves." Cf. 1 Cor. xiv. 20; Phil. ii. 15. *Evil*.—*Kakon*—referring perhaps to *akakwn*, ver. 18. This exhortation is in Paul's method, mingling commendations with counsels—not, as Alford thinks, conveying some slight reproof—though it touches on evils which had crept into the Church at Rome.

20. *And the God of peace*—(See on xv. 33.) *Shall bruise Satan under your feet*—He means the devil, who fomented all the discords which disturb the Church. Here is an allusion to Gen. iii. 15, and shows who is meant by "the serpent." *Shortly*.—In a short time—a comfortable prediction and promise. *The grace of our Lord Jesus Christ be with you*.—Paul's usual benediction. By grace he means favor—the divine blessing. *Amen*.—There is no MS. authority for *Amen*.

21. *Timotheus*—(See on Acts xvi. 1, 2, 3.) *My work-fellow*,—*Sunergov* is rendered "helper," ver. 3, 9; 2 Cor. i. 24; "laborers together with," 1 Cor. iii. 9; "fellow-helper," 2 Cor. viii. 23; 3 John 8; "companion in labor," Phil. ii. 25; "fellow-laborers," Phil. iv. 3; 1 Thess. iii. 2; Philemon 1, 24—an unfortunate variety of renderings. *Lucius*,—A Cyrenian. (See on Acts xiii. 1.) *Jason*,—Probably the host of Paul and Silas at Thessalonica. (See on Acts xvii. 5-9.) *Sosipater*,—Probably the Sopater who left Corinth with Paul, soon after this Epistle was written. (See on Acts xx. 4.) These three were "cousins" of Paul (see on ver. 7). It was natural that Paul's converted relatives, especially if ministers, should sometimes accompany him.

22. *I Tertius*,—Probably an Italian. Some identify him with Silas, because the Hebrew word corresponding to Tertius sounds like Silas—but Silas is a contraction of Silvanus. It is a mark of genuineness, that in this inartificial way Paul's amanuensis should insert his salutation in the first person; this is so natural. Paul would be very likely to tell him, or he would ask permission, to send his regards to the brethren at Rome, with some of whom he was probably acquainted. *In the Lord*.—Not connected with "wrote this Epistle," but with "salute"—denoting a Christian salutation.

23. *Gaius*—Probably the Caius who was baptized by Paul. 1 Cor. i. 14. *Mine host*,—Paul was entertained by him at Corinth. *And of the whole church*,—Some think this means that the Christians held their meetings in his house; but it seems to denote that he was a man of unbounded Christian hospitality, like the Gaius of 3 John 5-8. *Erastus*—Some identify Erastus with the Erastus mentioned Acts xix. 22 (see note there), and with Erastus of 2 Tim. iv. 20. He was treasurer (*oikononov*) of the city of Corinth. *Quartus a brother*.—The brother. W. and W.: "Your brother—*i.e.*, one of your own Church—a native probably of Rome or

Italy." Alford: "The generic singular—one among the brethren. The rest have been specified by their services or offices." He means the rest of this group; cf. ver. 14, 15. Perhaps, in the epistolary style, it means simply "Brother Quartus," as we would say: he may have been a distinguished member.

24. *The grace*—Some MSS. and versions omit the benediction here, as it is in ver. 20; but probably Paul wrote it here with his own hand—that in ver. 20 being dictated—as he says, 2 Thess. iii. 17, 18, "The salutation of Paul, with mine own hand, which is the token in every epistle: so I write. The grace of our Lord Jesus Christ be with you all. Amen." Paul may have written ver. 23, 24, because Tertius had inserted his salutation, ver. 22. By this we know that only that salutation by Tertius was written without Paul's inspired dictation, and was inserted by his consent. *Amen*.—This seems to close the Epistle; but Paul frequently closes portions of his Epistles with doxologies, benedictions, and Amen. The doxology which follows is put in some MSS. after xiv. 23—in both places in some MSS., and entirely omitted in others; but the best authorities have it in this place.

25. *Now*—At the conclusion of this discussion, and in view of all the wonderful matters discussed—noted in the doxology itself—the apostle, as is his manner, makes this ascription of praise to Him who has the power to execute this scheme of universal salvation, as he alone had the wisdom to devise it. An echo of this doxology may be heard at the end of Jude's Epistle. *To him that is of power to stablish you*—An apposite periphrase. If they were at all weak and wavering in their attachment to Christianity, God was able to confirm them, and to keep them from falling. *According to my gospel, and the preaching of Jesus Christ*,—These clauses are in apposition: my gospel, even the preaching of Jesus Christ—the gospel which I received from him, and which I proclaim on his authority. Chrysostom improperly refers it to Christ's personal preaching. (See on ii. 16.) *According to the revelation of the mystery*,—Both nouns are anarthrous: a revelation of a mystery—what kind of revelation and mystery he proceeds to show. A mystery is a secret which cannot be found out till divulged by one who knows it. *Which was kept secret*—Undivulged. Lit., has been kept in silence. The perfect tense is used from Paul's stand-point—the silence having been unbroken till his time. *Since the world began*,—Lit., in times of ages. This may mean, as Hodge expresses it, "hidden from eternity in the divine mind"—*aiones* here denoting the eternity *a parte ante*, as the *aiones* in ver. 27 refer to the eternity *a parte post*. But the *χρονοiv* ("in times") seems to refer it to the past ages of the world. Paul, as the great divulger of this secret, frequently alludes to this—*e.g.*, 1 Cor. ii. 7-13; Eph. i. 9, 10; iii. 1-12; vi. 19; Col. i. 25, 26, 27; iv. 3, 4. (See on Rom. xi. 25.)

26. *But now is made manifest*,—Paul is fond of this word (*fanerow*), using it frequently in reference to the disclosure of the secret in question. Tit. i. 3. *And by*

the scriptures of the prophets,—Lit., and through prophetic scriptures—anarthrous—not meaning the books of the prophets, but passages referring to this subject contained in their writings. The apostles constantly made use of them in proclaiming the gospel mystery. Paul has done it largely in this Epistle. Indeed, those predictions concerning a free salvation for Jew and Gentile by Jesus, the promised Messiah, constituted the *organum* by which he wrought, in bringing the world to the obedience of faith. Christ himself pursued the same course. Thus, though the Gentile world knew nothing of what was provided for it, and the Jew had but a very imperfect knowledge of those things, yet when the predictions were placed alongside of their fulfillment in Jesus Christ, there was a revelation of the secret, which could not but result in obedience of faith in the case of every candid inquirer, whether Jew or Gentile. *According to the commandment of the everlasting God*,—An appointment—it was not by the apostle's own proper motion that he proclaimed this mystery, but God himself arranged, or appointed it. (See on i. 1-6.) The epithet is well chosen—it is the same word, or cognate, in all these verses—*aionian* times, ver. 25; the future *aiones*, endless ages, ver. 27; so here the *Aionian* God! He exists through all the ages, past, present, and future. *Made known*—For obedience of faith, unto all the Gentiles made known. (See on i. 5; xv. 18.)

27. *To God only wise*,—Unto an only wise God. Macknight renders, "To the wise God alone," and says: "If the translation were 'To the only wise God,' it would imply that there are some gods who are not wise—if we render, 'To God only wise,' the reader might be apt to think that God hath no perfection but wisdom." The reader who would so think would not be very wise! He construes it here and in 1 Tim. i. 17, and Jude 25, as meaning that "to the wise God alone," and to no other, praise should be ascribed. So W. and W. But this seems jejune, and is open to the same objection which he brings to the other renderings. "Only" qualifies "wise." It is anarthrous, as emphasis is laid on *only wise*—as the divine wisdom is so displayed in this economy. *Only* is used in the sense in which it is said God only has immortality—God only is good—that is, originally, independently, absolutely, infinitely, eternally. Chrysostom: "But when you hear him say, *to the only wise God*, think not that this is said in disparagement of the Son; for if all these things whereby his wisdom is made apparent were done by Christ, and without him no single one, it is quite plain that he is equal in wisdom also. What then is the reason of his saying *only*? To set him in contrast with every created being." *Be glory*—A.V. transposes this, omitting the relative "to whom." *Through Jesus Christ*. This is joined to "the only wise God." As he is revealed to us through Christ, so he is glorified through him.

We offer all our offerings through
The ever-blessed Name.

Olshausen and others construe this as an *aposiopesis*, and supply thus: "Unto him the only wise God, I commend you through Jesus Christ, to whom be glory for ever." So Conybeare and Howson. But Tholuck, W. and W., and others, recognize an *anacoluthon*—thus Winer: "Paul is led away from the intended construction by an extended statement regarding God in verses 25, 26, and instead of immediately annexing *be glory for ever*, forms a relative clause from the substance of the doxology, as if the dative *to God* concluded a sentence." W. and W. recognize the *anacoluthon*, yet they say: "But it is the apostle's object to ascribe glory to Jesus personally, as the revelation of God only wise." But, as Alford says, "It cannot without great harshness be referred to Christ, seeing that the words *to God only wise* resume the chief subject of the sentence, and to them the relative must apply." To an only wise God, through Jesus Christ—to him be the glory for ever. Amen. (See on xi. 36.)

END OF THE COMMENTARY ON ROMANS.