

COMMENTARY

ON

PAUL'S LETTER TO ROMANS:

WITH A REVISED GREEK TEXT,

COMPILED FROM THE BEST RECENT AUTHORS,

AND A

NEW TRANSLATION.

BY

MOSES E. LARD.

PREFACE.

In December, 1863, I announced my intention of writing, at some future day, Providence favoring, a commentary on Paul's Letter to the disciples in Rome. Since that announcement, many untoward events have conspired to defeat my purpose. Among the chief of these has been the want of adequate leisure. But, at last, I am thankful to say, I have been enabled to bring the work, such as it is, to a close. I here present it to the public, with a single regret, which is, that it is not more worthy of the great theme upon which it has been written.

In studying the Letter in question, I had been constantly impressed with the conviction that no commentary on it, with which I was acquainted, was sufficiently free from the influence of particular scholastic tenets to meet the wants of those who desire to know the simple truth, as it is in Christ, without having it formulated in the schools, or modified by special theories of religion. I greatly felt the need of a work, the sole aim of which should be, to determine precisely what Paul means, regardless of what that meaning favors or disfavors. Such a work I could not command. I soon discovered that those who have written on the Letter are, for the greater part, either intensely Calvinistic, on the one hand, or intensely anti-Calvinistic, on the other. Paul wrote to favor neither of these parties, hence, neither of these parties, as such, can interpret him.

Again. The extreme doctrine of justification by faith only, has so completely engrossed the mind of commentators, since the sixteenth century, that it seems never to have occurred to them, as even a possible fact, that Paul may not have been writing in their exclusive interest. They have regarded him as certainly of their order, and, as a consequence, have written him up into a partisan, only more partisan than themselves. The result has been that in many places their works are a complete perversion of the truth, and not an exhibition of it. From these writers I could derive no benefit, except where their cherished doctrine was out of sight.

The present work is an effort to supply, so far as the ability is possessed, the deficiency here complained of. I only wish I were able to feel that it is successful. I fear, however, the reader may find himself compelled to see in me the same fault which I have, with constant reluctance, seen in others. Still I am not without hope that this may not prove so.

The sole aim, then, of the present Commentary is to ascertain the exact sense of Paul, and to express it in terse, clear English. How far this has

been accomplished, I dare not venture to say. Of what I have aimed to do, I am a perfectly competent judge; of what I have actually done, I may be a very poor one.

My Commentary proper, then, consists, in brief, in an effort so to amplify the Apostle's meaning that the English reader can not fail to catch it. This meaning, besides, where it has been thought necessary, I have attempted to defend both by offering in its support such affirmative arguments as occurred to me, and by endeavoring to show the futility of such as have been used to subvert it. In the latter work, it is true, I have not attempted much.

One charge I have felt solicitous not to be exposed to; namely, the charge of passing shyly over the difficult passages, and of dwelling with plethoric fulness on the easy ones. The very opposite has been my aim. Accordingly, I have studied the former passages till I have not been able to realize additional light from farther study. I have then, but not sooner, set down my conclusions. Of their merits I do not speak. Of the latter passages I have said, I hope, enough, but I have certainly not intended to dwell on them at length.

The reader will notice that I have never seemed to think whether my expositions were favoring Calvinism, Arminianism, or any other ism. And this is strictly true. Indeed, I have been concerned solely with the sense of Paul, and with neither the sense nor non-sense of others.

I have felt most anxious, and, I trust, not unsuccessfully, to avoid the appearance of learned display, so common in works of this kind. My ambition has been, so far as practicable, to make a book for the common reader. I have, therefore, refrained from unintelligible allusions, the use of foreign words, and citations of unfamiliar authors; in fine, from everything which could wear the appearance of mere display, without being, at the same time, positively necessary. In this respect, I trust, I have not been studious in vain.

It remains to add only a few more items, before putting an end to this preface. And, first, in regard to Lexicons to the New Testament, I feel it a duty to say, that I have not always found them as trustworthy as I could have wished. They, like commentaries, are usually very perceptibly tinged with the peculiar sentiments of their authors. The same remark applies to grammars. Such works I have been compelled to use with caution.

In the next place, I have not been enabled, it may be hazardous to say, to derive from the so called *usus loquendi* of the New Testament, and the inductive method, the aid which others claim to have derived. Certainly I have constantly kept both in view; but I have usually found that each passage has a meaning so peculiarly its own as not always to be very obviously susceptible of elucidation by light derived from other passages. Consequently, I have endeavored to ascertain the sense of each separate passage, by whatever means seemed fullest of the promise of success, without slaving it specially to any one method. I could not feel safe in any other course.

Nor have I stopped to offer learned criticisms upon the Text, on all oc-

casions, whether they were demanded or not. I have felt content, in many places, to give the sense in a plain way and pass on.

Neither have I cumbered every clause and verse with references to numerous parallel passages. My reasons for this are two: 1. Strict parallelism in the New Testament, outside of the Four Gospels, is very rare. 2. Such references are never consulted. I have hence felt unwilling to be at pains to cite them.

In the matter of English moods and tenses, I have not endeavored to conform them to Greek models. Only when the mood or tense was the fact, or part of the fact, to be communicated, have I felt it necessary to be extremely careful. In all other instances I have used the liberty of writing English, not Greek.

MOSES E. LARD.

LEXINGTON, KY., FEBRUARY 2, 1875.

INTRODUCTION.

Of Paul's ancestors we know nothing, except that he was of the Tribe of Benjamin, the youngest son of Jacob. On the road between Bethel and Bethlehem, and not far from the latter place, that tribal ancestor was born. His mother, the beloved Rachel, died in giving him birth, but not till she had named him *Benoni*, son of my sorrow, which Jacob subsequently changed to Benjamin. The Tribe, though the least, save one, among those of Israel, was not without distinction. Saul, the first king of Israel, was a Benjamite as was also Mordecai, certainly one of the most honored and distinguished deliverers the nation ever had. As warriors, the Benjamites were renowned, being most unerring bowmen, who usually, it seems, drew the string with the left hand. And this fact may serve to account for their dexterity, for the acquired skill which comes from laborious training is always more accurate than that which is more natural, because less cultivated. But of all the sons of Benjamin, to Saul of Tarsus must be awarded the foremost place. If we except the royal heir of Judah, in the person of Jesus of Nazareth, it is not extravagant to say that the world is to day more indebted to him than to any other man that ever lived in it. To say that this is due to him as inspired, would be true, but it does not impair the truth of the remark.

HIS PARENTS.

Respecting Paul's parents we have not, in the New Testament, even one satisfactory remark. He alludes to his father once, and mention is made, Acts xxiii. 16, of his sister and her son, both of whom appear to have been living at the time in Jerusalem. How deeply we regret the want of even one full historic line touching his mother. That must have been a noble woman to whom God gave so noble a son. If all nations delight to call Mary "blessed," how also would thousands have deep pleasure in cherishing the name of the favored Hannah or Lois, that gave birth to one whose name is to stand inseparably linked, through all time, with that of the Savior of the world. Did she ever live to hear him preach "Christ and him crucified"? Or did he ever have the exquisite pleasure of "burying in baptism" the form that had hushed him with lullabies through many a long tardy night, at a time when the vast Gentile world, whom he was subsequently to wake to the sublime activities of ransomed life, were slumbering on through

their still darker night of idolatry? Did she live to see him stand in the forefront and hottest of the fight with "spiritual wickedness," when no one could vie with him in "labors? Was it ever her happiness to "let him down by the wall in a basket," and so foil the malice of demoniac foes? Did that maternal hand ever wash the blood from his heroic back, after he had received "forty stripes save one"? Did she ever inspire him with brave words, saying, "Count all things but loss, my son, for the excellency of the knowledge of Christ Jesus," while the "care of all the churches" was upon him? These are questions over which we have a melancholy pleasure in thinking, but which we have no means of answering.

PLACE OF HIS BIRTH

Fortunately for us, the Apostle himself gives us the place of his birth. It was Tarsus in Cilicia, "no mean city," a remark which history abundantly justifies. For Strabo tells us that in refinement and love of learning, it equalled or even surpassed Alexandria and Athens. Tarsus stood on the banks of the river Cydnus, in a broad and fertile plain, skirting the northeastern shore of the Mediterranean. It lay almost due north of Jerusalem, and just south of latitude 37. Its location was an admirable one, and we are consequently not surprised to learn that it was little less famous for its commerce than its letters. To the east of it, on the other side of the mount Amanus range, lay Mesopotamia, the early cradle of the human family, to the west of it, and east of the Ægean sea, lay that vast and densely populated inland country, which subsequently was the scene of so many of Paul's labors. The city had formerly been under the sway of the Greeks, and its population was still largely Greek, but at the time of Paul's birth it was a "free" Roman city, so made by Augustus Cæsar. Here, in "free" Tarsus, Paul was born, although it was not from the circumstance of the city's being free that he derived his "free birth."

DATE OF HIS BIRTH UNKNOWN

The year in which Paul was born has shared the fate of most of the dates of those early days, and been lost. There is a passage in a sermon ascribed, but with questionable authority, to Chrysostom, from which it has been inferred that he was born the second year of our era. A. D. 14 has also been named as the probable year of his birth. But these dates, though not wholly beyond the range of truth, are conjectural. Indeed, we possess no data from which the time of his birth can confidently be determined. He was a "young man" at the time of Stephen's death. This much is certain, and it fixes his birth with tolerable certainty towards the close of Herod's life, or in the early part of that of Archelaus. This was the period of Rome's greatest splendor. Augustus was at the height of his power, and the world was resting a little from the long martial struggles of the past. The provinces were enjoying uncommon advantages, and even the Jews were exempt, for the time, from imperial tyranny, and from

slaughter at the hands of idolaters Roman couriers shot rapidly along every highway, and Roman eagles were the emblems of power in almost every land John the baptist was still in the "hill country" of Judea, and the Savior at carpentry with Joseph in Nazareth About this time Paul must have made his first appearance as a little boy in the streets of Tarsus

NOT KNOWN HOW HE CAME TO BE FREE BORN

How Paul came to be free born is unknown His father may have purchased a Roman citizenship, which was not uncommon, or it may have been conferred on him, or on some of his ancestors, as a reward for distinguished services rendered in some of those wars in which Tarsus sided with Rome The latter is the more probable hypothesis For if Paul reflected, in any marked degree, the characteristics of his father, which is certainly not improbable, then that father was sure to attain distinction in whatever Cæsar's cause he might espouse He would be no man to play an obscure second part In the thickest of the fight his shield would always be borne, while no one would excel him in unfaltering devotion to his chief For this devotion he would be honored with the first distinction of a Roman More likely thus, I think, than otherwise, Paul became "free born"

HIS STAY IN TARSUS

How long Paul lived in Tarsus, or to what degree he had been educated before leaving for "the feet of Gamaliel," can only be conjectured It is not very probable that the parents of one who was always ready to boast of being a "Hebrew of the Hebrews," and of belonging to the "strictest sect" among the Jews, would value very highly a Gentile education The very reverse is the more likely And then the purpose of his parents to educate him in the metropolis of their own country, would render them the less concerned about his being educated in Tarsus Besides, the immature age at which Paul must have gone to Jerusalem, to justify his own remark that he was "brought up" there, is inconsistent with the supposition of a liberal education at home The probability is that about all that can be said of him in this particular is that he was respectably educated, for a youth, before he left for Jerusalem Furthermore, his use of the Greek language is that of a highly endowed man by nature, who had learned to speak it as a vernacular with great fluency and wonderful force, rather than that of one who had been long and nicely trained in the schools of the masters All these circumstances point to a no very elaborate Gentile education.

PECUNIARY CONDITION OF HIS PARENTS

The pecuniary condition of Paul's parents can hardly have been very low They had long lived in Tarsus, and latterly in most prosperous times Tarsus was a thrifty place, with a large eastern, western and maritime trade, and the Jews are proverbially a thrifty people Besides, the ambition to educate their son in the

best school in Jerusalem, points to a proud family, conscious of the means to accomplish their wish. The abject have no such aspirations as this family had.

THEIR SOCIAL POSITION.

Moreover, the social position of Paul's parents must have been high. The faultless honor, proud bearing, independence, delicacy, and gentle tact which always distinguished their son, are the sure indexes to a cultivated family of fine standing. Paul boasted of being a citizen of "no mean city," and no doubt could have added, with equal truth, and a member of no mean family.

IN THE SCHOOL OF GAMALIEL.

How long Paul remained in the school of Gamaliel, or how long he had been out of it, if out at all, when he is introduced to us, on the occasion of Stephen's death, as the "young man at whose feet the witnesses laid down their clothes," we are without the means of saying. He tells us that he was "taught according to the perfect manner of the law of the fathers", which could hardly have required less than from four to six years. But he may have lived in the city a much longer time than that. The expression, "a young man," applied to him at the stoning of Stephen, is most likely to be taken with some latitude. A mere stripling could hardly have gained the notoriety which he gained about that time; nor would one have been confided in by those in authority as we know he was. Neither is it likely that the Savior would call a mere youth to act the conspicuous and responsible part which Paul acted from the very day of his baptism on. I should think, then, that we may safely assume Paul to have been little less, if any, than thirty years old at the time of his call. Certainly his call at an earlier date is not probable. But be these conjectures as they may, from his call on, we know much of his history; whereas, from that event back, we know very little.

HIS PERSONAL APPEARANCE.

Even tradition, no matter how unsatisfactory, is not devoid of interest for us, when it relates to one concerning whom we are so eager to catch every hint that can lead us to a still better acquaintance with him. We are, therefore, ready to hear, though the legend be a wholly untrustworthy one, how, according to ancient rumor, Paul personally looked. One thing is certain, he must have looked some way, and as probably this as any other, and as probably a hundred others as this. Tradition, then, believed it would seem in the ages immediately succeeding him, pictures Paul for us as slender in body and low (it is worthy of note, that we never think of him as a man of powerful build); and it farther draws him as so distorted or lame as at times to provoke the sneer of his enemies. His head, though bald, is represented as a noble one; his features were bold and strikingly Jewish; his complexion was so fair as quickly to reveal every change in his highly sensitive feelings; his eyes were bright and gray: his eyebrows heavy;

his countenance was indicative of high intelligence and deep thought, his expression was hopeful, pure and sweet, while his amiable face charmed every body and repulsed none. Such is the beautiful picture which fond tradition has handed down to us of this great man. It is pleasant to linger on its features and indulge the hope that they are not wholly ideal.

HIS POWERS OF ENDURANCE.

Although Paul was most probably a man of slender bodily mold, still he must have been wonderfully endowed with powers of endurance. He had one of those tough, delicate organisms which appear always failing, and yet never fail. With a body of anything else than steel, he could never have endured the hardships which we know he endured, and we know not a tithe of those through which he must have passed. True, much of this is attributable, no doubt, to the succoring hand of his Master, who was his never failing help in need, but it is not sufficient to account for every thing. Paul, as Paul simply, and not as supernaturally sustained, is the only solution of much of the problem of his life. No one, I venture, ever rose higher above that low type of men called "sensual," than he. On the one hand, he was the very embodiment of thought and sensibility, and on the other, the very negation of the Epicurean. In a word, he seems to have been a sinewy woman in form, but a Roman of the Romans in intellect, continuity of purpose, will power, and never flagging energy.

HIS NATURAL AUTHORITY.

Paul was the Napoleon of the apostles in authority. Not that as an apostle he was more highly endowed than they, for he was not, but in this particular nature had been lavish with him. He was a "born king" among men, whether "making tents," or proclaiming the "unsearchable riches of Christ." Nor is the trait one which the biographer can venture to overlook. Some men were never made to command any thing, not even a cart. The women henpeck them, and even their own children never obey them. Nature has never commissioned eye or mouth or any thing else in their case. But not so Paul. His very look was a mandate which only needed articulation to be complied with. But, although thus endowed, he was usually, among his brethren, "gentle as a nurse cherishing her children." Only when occasion called for it was he "such, when present, as he was by letter, when absent." No where was this characteristic of the Apostle ever more conspicuously displayed than in the presence of great crowds, composed largely of his enemies. Usually he at once awed them into silence, and seldom failed to leave them with a "division." In the church, Paul's enemies could not stand before him for a moment, nor as a rule could they do so out of it, except when maddened to frenzy. And when we reflect on the countless forms in which insubordination made its appearance among the early disciples, we can readily discover the wisdom of the Savior in selecting a man of

Paul's faculty to quell it. One unclothed with his natural authority could never have achieved what he did. Perfection in a public functionary requires that the authoritative word shall be seconded by the authoritative look.

HIS INTELLECT.

In intellect, I think it probable that Paul's admirers have usually overrated him. Great he certainly was, but that he was transcendently so, is not in evidence. He was a man of commanding intellect—no more. Nor was it necessary that he should be more. There were other traits of mind far more essential to his success than mere greatness. He needed a mind of faultless balance, a mind of perfect symmetry, one of consummate normal action and great exactitude, rather than otherwise. To such a mind divine truth reveals itself more naturally than to any other; and then such a mind can more readily comprehend divine truth, and be juster to it, than any other. Whatever of greatness such a mind would lack, would be more than compensated for in the fact of inspiration. Now, the whole known history and labors of Paul come in to confirm the justness of the estimate here placed upon him. He was always equal to the crisis, be that what it might—no mean proof of greatness. He always did just the thing he should have done, and said just the thing he should have said. This indicates eminent mental harmony, and exquisite mental action. We never feel, when studying Paul, that he should have done this or that, or should have acted thus or so. We never have an improvement to suggest, either upon matter or manner. This points to a mind of astonishing perfections; and such a mind was Paul's.

INSPIRATION.

As it is impossible to study Paul for a moment, or indeed any other apostle; or to attempt any proper estimate of him, either as speaker or writer, without the subject of inspiration constantly obtruding itself upon our notice, this seems a suitable place to pause a little on that curious topic. Besides, other reasons suggest to me the necessity for a slight notice of the subject in this connection. Of course it must be briefly treated here.

What, then, is inspiration? I answer, that in its fulness, it comprehends five things: 1. The personal presence in the inspired of the Holy Spirit; 2. The communication to his mind of ideas; 3. Selecting the words in which these ideas shall be spoken or written; 4. Endowing him with powers of speech; 5. Conferring upon him power to work miracles, in order to confirm whatever message he delivers. On each of these items I think it well to add a few reflections:

1. *The personal presence in the inspired of the Holy Spirit.* If I am asked how the Holy Spirit can personally dwell in a human being, I reply, I do not know. Neither do I know or understand how the human spirit can dwell in a human body, but I profoundly believe the fact. And so in regard to the personal

indwelling of the Holy Spirit. I believe the fact, though I am without an explanation of the mode of it. If the Holy Spirit be a person, and infinite in power, which I believe is generally conceded, then to affirm that it can dwell in a human being, is certainly not an assertion necessarily *felo-de-se*. It is the affirmation of a simple matter of fact, for the confirmation of which a single passage of holy writ is sufficient; and that we have such passage, no one acquainted with the Bible will deny. The Savior, in speaking to the apostles of the Spirit, said: "He dwells with you, and *is in you*." John xiv: 17, *revised Greek text*. This settles the question of the Spirit's indwelling.

But the mere indwelling of the Holy Spirit is not inspiration, although it is the antecedent to it, and necessary condition of it. For, conceivably the Spirit might dwell in a person, and yet communicate to him no ideas, in which event we should not hold him to be inspired. Something more, then, than mere indwelling is essential to inspiration.

2. *The communication to his mind of ideas.* No matter whether these ideas be original or revived, whether they be ideas of things in heaven or things in earth, the communication of them to the mind is essential to inspiration, and without them there is no inspiration. But the mere communication of ideas is not enough; for were the process of revelation to stop here, it would evidently stop at an incomplete stage. Another step, therefore, is necessary.

3. *Selecting the words in which the ideas communicated shall be spoken or written.* Were the ideas simply communicated, and the endowed then left to select the words in which to impart them, we can readily see how great blunders might be committed, and disastrous results follow. The Holy Spirit alone that communicates the ideas, is fully capable of selecting the words which will precisely convey them; and this it does. See 1 Cor. ii: 13.

4. *Endowing with the power of speech.* The language which would have to be used in conveying the ideas might be unknown to the endowed. In that case it would certainly be necessary to invest him with the power to use it. Whether this would be requisite, where the language to be used was known, can not confidently be said, though I should think not. Apparently were a known word, containing a given idea, to be suggested to the mind, no necessity can be discovered for supernatural aid to utter it; and where such aid is not required, it is not given.

5. *Conferring power to work miracles in order to confirm whatever message is delivered.* The Holy Spirit may dwell in a man; may communicate to his mind ideas; may select the words in which to convey them; may endow with utterance; and still, unless it confer the power to confirm, all is manifestly lost: for belief, without proof, is impossible.

Now, these are the elements that enter into the conception of inspiration; and how completely they secure the human family against error in the matter of revelation, can readily be seen.

When now I speak of Paul as inspired, no one can misunderstand me; nor, which is far more important, provided what has just been said be correct, can any one misunderstand what inspiration itself is.

It is proper to add, that only when acting as an apostle, or when preaching the gospel, or writing for Christ, can Paul or any one else properly be said to be under the influence of inspiration. When not acting as an apostle, or acting merely for himself, there is no evidence that Paul was any more effectually protected against error, or blunders, or sin, than any other discreet and prudent christian. He may have been, to be sure; but if so, the fact is not known. But whenever his acts concerned Christ, or involved the welfare of human beings; whenever, in other words, he acted officially, then even a fault was not allowable. Confessedly, this places the matter of revelation on high ground, but not on ground too high to be perfectly safe.

TO WHOM DID PAUL WRITE?

We are at last enabled to abandon the region of tradition and conjecture, and to enter that of certainty, or at least probability. The Letter in hand was written to "all who are in Rome, beloved of God, called holy"; in other words, and briefly, it was written to all christians living in Rome at the time. But it was written to them as individuals, and not as a body or church. This is a remarkable difference between the present Letter and some others written by Paul. Those are addressed to churches as such; this is addressed to individuals as such. Indeed, church unity or organization is not even once alluded to or recognized in the Letter, unless it be implied in ch. xvi: 17. How now shall we account for the circumstance? The Apostle writes a letter to the metropolis of the world, which, as a point of divergence for christian light and influence, was certainly without a superior, if it had any equal. Here large numbers of disciples had either congregated from other countries, or been converted on the spot—disciples who had never enjoyed a visit from any apostle; and yet Paul says nothing to them upon the subject of church order or government, upon the duties of overseers and deacons. Why the omission? Simply, I conclude, because nothing of the sort was necessary; for had it been so, it is inconceivable that the Apostle would have failed to mention it. This, as an indefinite general reply, must, I presume, be accepted as correct. But why was the instruction in question not necessary? That the disciples in Rome had among them men endowed with gifts of the Spirit is certain. Among these gifts the Apostle himself mentions *prophecy, teaching, exhortation, and ruling*. Now, I conclude that these spiritual men had so admirably ordered and regulated the church or churches, if there were several, as to render any thing from Paul on church organization and government unnecessary. This I deem a fair answer to the question, as well as a fair solution of the difficulty.

As to the supposition of some, that, at the time when Paul wrote, there was no church in Rome, in the strictly local sense of the term, and that this is the reason why none is taken notice of, I think it so improbable as to need no lengthy reply. It is certainly vicious logic to infer from the silence of the Apostle the non existence of a church. That there was no one single church, or consolidated body, I think most likely. The better supposition is, that there were several churches. We have one mentioned, and it is hardly possible that this was all. The order of the day was, especially when regulated by inspired teachers, to form the disciples, in a given locality, into a church, and appoint over them the prescribed officers. The proper inference is, that Rome was no exception to this rule.

COMPOSITION OF THE CHURCH.

What was the composition of the church or churches in Rome? I put the question alternatively, because, as just said, I think it probable, so numerous were the disciples, that there were several churches. But one thing is certain, on the hypothesis of several churches, that no two of them were ever ruled or presided over by the same set of officers. Each church in that day, according to the New Testament, had to have its own overseers and deacons, who ruled at home only, and had no authority or control elsewhere, and what the custom of that day was, is the law to this. Popery had its rise in the claim of the same overseer to rule two or more churches at the same time, and it may have it again. But to the question.

The church in Rome (I speak of it as a unit, merely for the sake of brevity) was composed of two classes of christians, Jewish and Gentile, in what relative proportions we have no means of knowing. Of these, the Jews, in many individual instances, would still evince strong leanings towards Moses and the ancient worship; while the Gentiles would evince similar, but feebler leanings towards their former customs. On both sides these leanings would be sincere. Consequently, collisions and alienations, growing out of them, would be frequent and sometimes bitter. Debates, owing to the partially clouded minds of each of the parties, would be unpeacefully common. These would be sure not to engender the most amiable feelings. The consequence would be a steady tendency to division between the parties, and disintegration of churches. Such was certainly the composition, and such the probable condition of the church in Rome.

SOCIAL POSITION.

Of the social position of the disciples in Rome little is known, and yet it can no doubt be approximated somewhat closely by aid of a few well known facts. It may then be assumed with much confidence, that the church was not composed of the aristocratic, or noble-born, and the very rich. This remark would be true as a general rule, though an occasional exception to it might occur. The classes here named are never the first to embrace the gospel.

Even when they do embrace it at all, they do so only after awhile, when to be a christian becomes the vogue. It was long before this was the case in Rome; though, at length, about the time, or a little before, the "man of sin" made his appearance, it became the case. Then, even royal blood was often not ashamed of Christ and his church—a disastrous day that for the purity of christianity. When pomp, and power, and ignorance enthrone themselves in the kingdom of God, humility and piety are at an end; and the kingdom rapidly degenerates. Such was the case then; and such will always be the case.

Neither, from the very nature of christianity, could the church in Rome have been composed of that rout or canaille, so many of whom are usually found grouped together in large cities. The very purity of the gospel would, after awhile, slough them off. At first they would be sure to enter the church in large numbers, being attracted to it by its benevolent spirit, as a means of support. But a little sharp discipline would soon eliminate them. The vicious and low never stick long by any thing where their evil habits are rigorously held in check.

The church in Rome, then, at the time of Paul's writing, must have been composed of that powerful and virtuous middle class, who are always the first to embrace the gospel; and who, after all, constitute the true element of strength in the kingdom of Christ. So long as a church is composed of this class, it is above contempt, on the one hand, and insured against corruption, on the other. But, alas for it, when it becomes filled with a so-called superior element.

BY WHOM WAS THE CHURCH PLANTED?

The question, By whom was the church in Rome founded? has been elaborately and sharply discussed; and still it remains unsettled. Into the merits of the discussion I can not attempt to enter. Such an undertaking would be fruitless of final results, and, therefore, measurably unprofitable. The question can be settled within certain safe, though not very definite limits. More than this is not attainable.

It may, then, be accepted as indisputable that the church in Rome was not founded by an apostle. There is not one vestige of disinterested and trustworthy evidence that, up to the time of Paul's second imprisonment, if there was a second, any other apostle, besides himself, had ever been in Rome. The Romish hierarchy, it is true, confidently assert the contrary; but then the Romish hierarchy have a deep interest in sustaining their legends about the apostle Peter. But even granting what is possible, nay, probable, that Peter may have visited the imperial city towards the close of his life, and the very concession negatives the idea that he had any hand in founding the church there. The claim, therefore, of an apostolic origin for the church in Rome must be abandoned as utterly groundless.

By whom, then, was it founded? still recurs unanswered. The

most reliable theory of its origin is, that it was planted by some of those "strangers of Rome," who, doubtless, became christians at the first Pentecost after the ascension. By earlier converts, it could not have been established; by these it may have been; and what in this instance may have been, is most probably what was. These "strangers" witnessed the splendid miracles of that Pentecost, and, most likely, many others of those which so rapidly followed. With these miracles they would be profoundly impressed, and of them long retain the most vivid recollections. Being thus thoroughly christianized and full of zeal; enjoying, besides, for a season, daily instruction from the apostles; their hearts aglow with love for all mankind, and consequently anxious that others should share in their new joy—what more natural than that, on returning home, they should fill thousands of ears with the marvelous things they had seen and heard in Jerusalem? At once they would begin to make converts and immerse them. Thus, more naturally, it seems to me, than in any other way, would the nucleus of the church be formed.

Besides, we can in no other way so satisfactorily account for the possession of those gifts of the Spirit, which we know many of the Roman christians had, as by assuming that they received them at the Pentecost just named. Would not the apostles be most anxious to qualify these "strangers" to preach the gospel, at least to Jews, in so great a city as Rome; and would they not be sure to do it? They would, I should think, confer upon them the very "best gifts," and so send them home thoroughly fitted for the work of proclaiming Christ.

Moreover, the church in Rome must have enjoyed some extraordinary advantages to attain the distinction it so soon attained. For, when Paul wrote, we learn that even then its "belief was spoken of in the whole world." Its numbers, besides, at that early day, were very great. All this would be sufficiently accounted for by the special qualifications which the "strangers" carried back with them, but in no other way.

Furthermore, unless we assume a very early establishment of the church in Rome, it is impossible to account satisfactorily for the magnitude of its power and influence at that time. Perhaps no church of the age surpassed it in the elements of a brilliant name and of a far-reaching influence. It is questionable whether even the church of Jerusalem stood ahead of it in these respects, however it may have stood in others.

Now, all these facts seem to me to harmonize with no theory of the church's origin so well as with the one here maintained. Indeed I believe it to be the only theory which meets all the requirements of the case, and against which no really valid objections can be urged.

WHERE WAS THE LETTER WRITTEN FROM?

According to those who have given the subject the most minute attention, the Letter was written from Greece during Paul's third

general missionary tour. After his two-years stay, or more, in Ephesus, he went into Macedonia. Here, and in the surrounding country, he spent some time in giving the disciples "much exhortation." After this "he came into Greece, and there abode three months." This was his second visit into Greece; and while there, it is believed, he wrote the Letter.

But from what point in Greece did he write? The most reliable answer is, Corinth. Indeed, that Corinth was the place of writing, is rendered almost certain by the following considerations: 1. Paul commends to the disciples in Rome, Phebe, who must herself either have borne the Letter, or have gone with those that did; for Paul expected her to arrive in Rome with the Letter, and receive the benefit of its commendation. Phebe was a deaconess of the church in Cenchrea; and Cenchrea was the sea-port of Corinth, lying only a short distance from it, to the south-east. This fact would place Paul either in Cenchrea or close to it. 2. Erastus, the treasurer of "*the city*," sent his greeting in the letter to the brethren in Rome. Now, "*the city*" here meant, τῆς πόλεως, can hardly have been any other than Corinth. In the whole circumjacent country, the phrase "*the city*" would denote Corinth, and it only. And if so, then Corinth is determined to be the place of writing. Were I, in writing to a friend at a distance, to say, the treasurer of the city sends you his greeting, that friend would instantly understand "*the city*" to be the one from which I wrote. And so in the case in hand. "*The city*" means the city from which Paul wrote. 3. "Gaius, my host, greets you." At the time of writing, then, Paul was staying with some one named Gaius. Was not this the very Gaius whom Paul, himself, had formerly baptized? With no one else would he be so likely to be staying. If so, it settles the question in hand; for this Gaius lived in Corinth. I conclude, then, with the general voice of the learned, that the Letter was written from Corinth.

WHEN WRITTEN?

To discuss this question fully would require more space than can here be devoted to it. I must, therefore, content myself with a brief summary of the evidence in the case. According to our best chronology, Paul left Ephesus not long after Pentecost, in the year, A. D., 57. This would correspond with the year of Rome, 110, and be the 3d of Nero. Three months of that year Paul spent in Greece, most likely in Corinth. Here he wrote the Letter, and left in time to be in Jerusalem at the Pentecost of 58. He must, then, have written it either in the latter part of 57, or the early part of 58, most probably the latter. This was the 4th of Nero, the year in which our best chronologies place the writing. For the present, then, 58 must stand as the most reliable date.

But I must here caution the common reader (the learned do not need it) against reposing too much confidence in these ancient dates. Certainly, they may be true; but then just as certainly many of them may not be. The very most that can be claimed

for themselves, that in most instances they are an approximation to the truth. But even this gives them so high a value that we can not dispense with them.

FOR WHAT PURPOSE?

This question is best answered by the contents of the Letter. Whatever effect these contents were designed to produce, is the purpose for which the Letter was written. What is that effect? It is concisely as follows. 1. To show to both Jews and Gentiles that, being guilty of the same sins, they are all alike involved in the same condemnation, 2. That for these sins they are without excuse, since both have had light, and therefore know better, 3. That from their sins they can never be justified by law, and that, consequently, without Christ, they are hopelessly lost, 4. To point out how Jews under the law, and how Gentiles without it, are justified in Christ, 5. To show, generally, what effect Adam's sin has had on the whole human race, and what counter-effect Christ's death has had, 6. To vindicate God's conduct in at first adopting the Jews as his peculiar people, and in now rejecting them, and receiving the Gentiles, 7. To show why he rejects the one and accepts the other, 8. To foretell the future of both peoples. In short, the purpose is to show that no one can be saved by law, whether written or unwritten, and that, consequently, all must be saved by the gospel, and by it alone, if saved at all. 9. And finally, to indicate how both, as saved, are to conduct themselves so as to attain to eternal life. This is certainly a meager outline of the effect the Letter was intended to produce, but a fuller one is not deemed necessary.

The Apostle had long and ardently desired to see Rome, but had hitherto been hindered. That he intended his Letter to supply, in some measure, the place of a personal visit, I think not unlikely. Had he been in Rome at the time, the topics of the Letter are the topics upon which he would have dwelt. He would have sought alike the complete emancipation of the Jews from the law, and of the Gentiles from their errors, and the thorough enlightenment of both in the gospel, as the divinely-appointed and all-sufficient plan and means of salvation. The end would have been the harmony of both in the love and peace and fellowship of Christ. To this end the Letter constantly looks. Hence the warning in the latter part of it against division.

Again, the Apostle, no doubt, expected his Letter to be widely read, and to be handed down to coming ages. Naturally, then, he would wish to make it a great doctrinal chart for the future, and so it is. It is the whole gospel compressed into the short space of a single letter—a generalization of christianity up to the height of the marvelous, and a detail down to exhaustion. All this the Apostle was unquestionably looking to, and the wide-spread influence of his Letter to-day, together with its conceded high importance, only attests how far-seeing he was.

LANGUAGE AND STYLE.

Paul's language is bold, vigorous, and fresh. A feeble or plodding intellect could never have used such language as he uses. Indeed, unflagging power seems to be one of the most striking characteristics of his mind; and this characteristic everywhere crops out in his language. His words march along like giants, and never glide in tranquil currents. His thoughts rush on as if wild; and his words rush on like his thoughts. The conception of euphony seems never to have been before his mind when selecting his words. On the contrary, power and vitality seem always to have determined his choice. His words are like boulders between the mountain-top from which they have been disengaged, and the sea towards which they have bounded. Their source you can never mistake, nor their tendency fail to trace. No one can doubt that a powerful brain poured forth this verbal torrent, nor that its aim is to make the mind teem with light. It is replete with the force and buoyancy of the new divine life.

In style, Paul is characteristic and peculiar. Usually, he is luminously clear; always strong and dignified; in the main consecutive; abounding in sudden transitions; very compact; and occasionally elliptical even to obscurity. One of the most remarkable and difficult features of his style is its long and intricate digressions. This circumstance, at times, renders the interpretation of him uncertain. His style, though it can not be pronounced a faultless one, when compared with the great masters, is, nevertheless, a noble one. It indicates a mind of rare versatility and wealthy in speech. It may be wanting in the polish of Thucydides, but it carries a volume of thought no where else surpassed. Paul's style is flowing, never betraying the slightest hesitancy. Smoother, at times, it might advantageously be; but even in its ruggedness we come at last to delight. We would, hence, never transpose those angular clauses, nor *dele* those edged words. In them we feel that we possess a chain which, like the submarine wire, ties our minds across the past to that of the great servant of Christ, who is author to them; and we refuse to lay hands on its sacred links. We are content with our treasure as it is.

COMMENTARY.

CHAPTER I. SECTION I.

Παῦλος δούλος Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, κλη-
τός ἀποστολος, ἀφωρισμένος εἰς εὐαγ-
γελιον Θεοῦ, ² ὃ προεπηγγέλματο διὰ τῶν
προφητῶν αὐτοῦ ἐν γραφαῖς ἁγίαις, ³ περὶ
τοῦ υἱοῦ αὐτοῦ, τοῦ γενομένου ἐκ σπέρ-
ματος Δαυὶδ κατὰ σάρκα, ⁴ τοῦ ὀρισθέν-
τος υἱοῦ Θεοῦ ἐν δυνάμει κατὰ πνεῦμα ἁγι-
ωσύνης, ἐξ ἀναστάσεως νεκρῶν—Ἰησοῦ
Χριστοῦ τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν, ⁵ διὸ οὐ ἐλάβο-
μεν χάριν καὶ ἀποστολὴν εἰς ὑπακοὴν πίσ-
τεως ἐν πᾶσι τοῖς ἔθνεσιν ὑπὲρ τοῦ ὀνόμα-
τος αὐτοῦ, ⁶ ἐν οἷς ἐστέ καὶ ὑμεῖς κλητοὶ
Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, ⁷ πᾶσι τοῖς οὖσιν ἐν
Ῥώμῃ ἀγαπητοῖς Θεοῦ, κλητοῖς ἁγίοις.
χάρις ὑμῖν καὶ εἰρήνη ἀπὸ Θεοῦ πα-
τρὸς ἡμῶν καὶ κυρίου Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ.

Paul, a servant of Jesus Christ, a
called apostle, set apart to the gospel
of God, ² which he formerly prom-
ised through his prophets, in the holy
Scriptures, ³ concerning his Son,
who, as to his flesh, was born of the
seed of David, ⁴ but, as to his pure
spirit, was determined, by power, to
be the Son of God, by the resurrec-
tion of the dead—Jesus Christ our
Lord, ⁵ through whom we have re-
ceived favor and apostleship, in order
to the obedience of belief, in all na-
tions, for his name's sake, ⁶ among
whom you also are called of Jesus
Christ, ⁷ to all the beloved of God,
who are in Rome, called holy, favor
to you and peace from God our Fa-
ther, and the Lord Jesus Christ.

SUMMARY.

Paul, a called apostle, is set apart to preach God's gospel, which he had be-
fore promised, through the prophets, in the holy Scriptures. The gospel
respects his Son, who was born of the seed of David, as to his flesh, but
determined, by power, to be God's Son, as to his spirit, by the resurrection
of the dead. This Son is Jesus Christ our Lord. From him Paul received
favor in becoming a Christian, and the office of an apostle, both these
being received to induce men in all nations to believe and obey Christ. He
writes this Letter to all the holy who are in Rome.

The Apostle commences his Letter with a few brief remarks
relative to himself. From these, however, he quickly passes to the
gospel. He tells us whose this is, and whom it respects. Hav-
ing thus introduced Christ, he states his origin as to the outer
man, and how he became determined for us to be the Son of God
as to the inner man. His remarks here are of the deepest signifi-
cance. He next tells us to whom he writes; expresses his thank-
fulness that the belief of the disciples in Rome was so widely
known; states how he prays for them; how he longs to see them,
and why. His expressions here are full of genuine solicitude and
good feeling.

After this he comes to the great theme of the Letter. *The gospel is God's power for salvation to all that believe.* For this bold announcement a single reason is assigned, which, at the same time, is also an explanation. *In the gospel is revealed God's justification by belief.* To amplify, explain, defend, and apply this comprehensive statement is the all-engrossing aim of the present Letter. The remaining contents of the chapter can be best noticed as we advance. It is now in place to proceed to details.

Paul, This is the name by which the Apostle was known throughout by far the most active and eventful part of his life. It was his proper name as an Apostle. His former name, the one his parents gave him, was Saul, a strictly Hebrew name. Why he exchanged the one name for the other, we have no satisfactory means of knowing. We have the fact, and all beyond the fact is conjecture. Perhaps were it even not conjecture, it would be of little value to us.

a servant of Jesus Christ, The word *doulos* is most probably from *deo*, (*δέω*), *to bind*. It is a general term applicable to every thing bound, tied, or fettered. Anciently it was applied to persons to denote that they were slaves, that is, were not free, or had not the control of their own acts, but were bound by or subject to the will of others. Paul was a *doulos*, not of men; but of Jesus Christ. He was a *bond-man*, and hence not free; he owned not himself, nor controlled his own acts. He was bound by the will of another. But this bondage did not degrade; it ennobled. It fettered, it is true, to the will of Christ; but this is the best form of freedom, freedom to do right, freedom from sin, and freedom from the fear of death. Such bondage is not vassalage, but the very perfection of freedom.

But there is possibly another fact implied in the word *doulos*. All christians have been redeemed by the blood of Christ. It is the price paid for them. They are consequently his, or belong to him, and therefore are bound by his will. His will is the measure of their liberty, and the rule of their acts. But in this sense every christian is a *doulos* as truly as was Paul. Hence the term denotes no circumstance in the Apostle which it denotes not in other christians. As *douloi*, *servants*, they are all equal. The term, therefore, in the present case, is neither a title of office, nor a mark of special distinction. It denotes a simple fact common to all christians.

a called apostle, Paul was not merely called *to be* an apostle,

as our common version has it; he was actually one. He might have been called *to be* one; and yet not have become one for a long time afterwards. This is not the meaning of *kletos*. Paul was an apostle. This was the fact. But he was more; he was a called or chosen apostle. The word apostle tells what he was; the word called, how he became so. The word called, moreover, must be limited to Christ. Paul was not called by men, as was Matthias. He was called immediately by Christ. The call came from Christ directly to him, and not through another.

apostle, The word apostle, from *apostello*, literally means one sent from, sent out, sent away. This is its general meaning. In the present case, however, it signifies specifically one sent out from Christ and by him. But while this is the meaning of the word, it performs here still another function. It is a high official title. Indeed, it is the title of the highest order of men in the kingdom of Christ. Any one sent out for any purpose, good or bad, is an apostle in the common sense of the term. But none could be apostles in its high scriptural sense except those whom Christ in person called and sent out. These were apostles in an extraordinary sense. They were apostles in a sense which left them without predecessors, without equals, and without successors.

set apart The word *aphorizo*, primarily means to separate one thing from another by drawing a boundary-line between them. Separation by means of dividing lines is its radical import. In the present case it describes, in itself, a single circumstance in Paul's call to the apostleship. He was called. This was the first fact. This call he obeyed, and in the act *separated* himself from the world and its pursuits. This separation is the real thought couched in the word. How, then, it will be asked, does it come to mean set apart *to the gospel*? I answer, by itself it does not mean it. Set apart to a thing is not inherent in the word. All it means is simply separated. It is the words, therefore, which follow it that tell to what.

to the gospel of God, Paul was called by Christ, and by him set apart or devoted to the gospel. Not simply to preach it though this chiefly, but to do every thing else essential to its complete establishment. The gospel, it will be noticed, is here called the gospel of God. It is so called, doubtless, because God is Father to and sends Him who is its more immediate author. But in a sublime sense the two are one. Hence what is the one's is the other's. The gospel, be it added, is not called the gospel of

God because it respects him or has him for its object; but because he is its origin or author. The Genitive *Theou* here denotes source.

Many efforts have been made to supplant the word gospel by the use of other terms and phrases, such as good news, glad tidings, etc. Up to this time these efforts have not been successful; nor is their success to be desired. The word *euaggelion* literally means a good message, good report or good news. But this is the precise meaning of our current term gospel, which is probably from the Saxon *gode* or *god*, and *spell*, the two together meaning good news. The word gospel, therefore, is the exact equivalent of the Greek word, and since it is both very current and perfectly understood, it should be retained.

2. which he formerly promised through his prophets, in the holy Scriptures, The gospel to which Paul was set apart is characterized by four facts which deserve special mention. It is God's gospel; he formerly promised it; promised it through his prophets; promised it in the holy Scriptures. For Jews these facts contain a fine argument. They had the prophecies which they acknowledged to be the product of inspired men. They were then compelled, first, either to repudiate these prophecies, or deny that they promised a gospel; or, second, to deny that the gospel which Paul preached was the gospel they promised, or to accept his gospel. The first and second they could not do. They, therefore, decided to deny that the prophecies promised the gospel which Paul preached, and consequently to reject it; and this they did, notwithstanding the fact that his gospel was confirmed by miracles performed before their eyes. Their denial consequently was not only willful, but without the semblance of just excuse.

3. concerning his Son, These words should be immediately joined with the expression "the gospel," and not, as some insist, with the word "promised." It was not the promise that concerned God's Son, but the gospel. The promise immediately concerned the gospel, the gospel immediately the Son.

who, as to his flesh, was born of the seed of David, Or, to render with very severe closeness, *Who came into being, as to his flesh, out of David's seed.* The verb *ginomai* denotes, not un-originated being, as does *eimi*, but originated being. It denotes the act of becoming, or coming into existence. *Ginomai* is the word here used. Hence the being or existence which it denotes is originated being. But this being is predicated of Christ's

flesh only. It is not affirmed of him in his totality, or as to both his natures. As to his flesh only had he an origin. Moreover, this flesh, or rather Christ himself, in so far as he was flesh, came into being out of one of David's descendants. He was of the family of David in a direct line, as God had promised he should be.

4. but, as to his pure spirit, was determined by power to be the Son of God, Or, to render *ad verbum*, but as to spirit of holiness. That *kata pneuma* is here the intentional antithesis of *kata sarka*, is so clear to my mind, and is so generally accepted by the best commentators, that I shall not attempt its defence. *Sarx* denotes all that was human in Christ; *pneuma* all that is divine. Hence the two terms completely comprehend him in his wholeness, and as to natures exhaust him. *Sarx* denotes the outer man; *pneuma* denotes the inner, and although a different designation, it is the exact equivalent of the ὁ Λόγος of John, rendered *the Word*.

But on what ground, it may be asked, do I render *pneuma hagiosunes*, *pure spirit*? I answer, on the ground of necessity. That the Genitive of *hagiosune* is the Genitive of quality, hardly admits of a doubt. The quality or attribute which it denotes is that of inherent, underived, and inseparable holiness. The term is then equivalent to an adjective. Now perspicuity requires that this adjective shall be the one which is truest to the sense and freest from uncertainty. I grant that *pure* is not truer to the sense of the original than *holy*, and certainly it is far from being so general a rendering; but then it is less likely to mislead. The phrase holy spirit, as all know, is appropriated, having, both in holy writ and in common speech, a uniform, single meaning. It signifies the Holy Spirit. Hence to render the preceding words *holy spirit* is almost sure to suggest the wrong idea. It suggests the Holy Spirit, and not *the spirit*, or inner, divine man of Christ, which, I maintain, it denotes. I may add that both the view and the rendering here presented are no novelties among learned writers on the Letter. The view has the sanction strictly, and the rendering, substantially, of such names as Stuart, Alford, Bloomfield, etc.

Not a few have sought to relieve the phrase of its difficulty by rendering it *holy spiritual nature*. But this, although true in fact, is not tenable as a translation. It is simply a commentary or paraphrase. Nature is not in the original, and therefore is not educi-

ble from it. Neither is spiritual. The original has *spirit* strictly; and by no law of exegesis known to me can it be transmuted into spiritual. Of the phrase *pneuma hagiosunes* there are but four admissible renderings, namely: *spirit of holiness, spirit of purity, holy spirit, and pure spirit*. Of these I prefer the last, because, while it is clear and true, it can not mislead. It is unfamiliar, I grant, but use will remedy this.

But as to his pure spirit Christ was *horisthentos whiou Theou en dunamai*. What is the meaning of this language? Certainly, according to commentators, it is not free from difficulty. Indeed, according to some it would seem to be hopelessly perplexed. Whether in this these authors are wholly right or wholly wrong, or only partly the one and partly the other, I shall not here stop to inquire. I shall present what I conceive to be the truth in the case, and leave the reader to seek for difficulties.

The word *horizo* primarily means to draw a *horos* or line, and thus to fix a limit, mark out, or determine. It also means to appoint or constitute, which is a more remote or much freer sense than the former. Now which of these senses is the true one in the present instance? Between them our choice lies. Here let us note that Christ was *horisthentos* as to his *pure spirit*; and further, he was *horisthentos* the *Son of God*. With these two facts before us, let us try the two senses of the word.

First. I shall assume, as already said, that the expression pure spirit denotes the inner, uncreated man of Christ; in other words, that it denotes the *Logos* who became flesh and dwelt among us. Now construing *horisthentos* in the second sense just named, and can it possibly be affirmed of Christ that, as to his inner man, he was ever, in any way or by any means, constituted or appointed the Son of God? I think not. He was not the Son of God by constitution or appointment. He was the Son of God in and of himself, by reason of his nature and relations to the Father, independently of and antecedently to all constituting and appointing acts. I hence conclude that the second sense of the word is inadmissible.

Second. Let us now try the first sense. According to this, *horisthentos* does not express the act of constituting or appointing Christ to be, as to his *pneuma* or spirit, the Son of God, but the act of determining or marking him out *to us* as, in respect to his spirit, the Son of God. The word denotes not how he became the Son of God; but that he was shown to us as such. And this is

precisely the fact in the case. As to his inner man, Christ was never constituted or appointed the Son of God. At least we have no evidence to this effect. But as to his inner man he was marked out or demonstrated *to us* to be the Son of God; for otherwise we could never have known the fact. I hence conclude that to mark out or determine is the true sense of the word; and of these I prefer determine.

With the majority of both ancient and modern commentators I construe *en dunamai* with *horisthentos*. This construction seems to possess the double advantage of being both more simple and more natural than any yet proposed; and besides, it leaves us to give to *en dunamai* its apparently most obvious meaning here. The phrase I would render *determined by power*. That is, we could not know by intuition, nor perhaps in any other way, save the one employed, that Christ is, as to his spirit, the Son of God. This had to be determined for us; and it was determined by power. In what specific way it was determined will appear under the next clause.

by the resurrection of the dead—Jesus Christ our Lord, ἐξ ἀναστάσεως νεκρῶν. Here again we have a much disputed clause, which has been very variously rendered. Some construe *ex* to mean *after*, and accordingly render the clause *after the resurrection*. But this is evidently forced. It appears to come out reluctantly from beneath the critic's hammer, rather than present itself freely and at once. I believe the weight of authority to be against it, and hence reject it.

Again: the expression *anastaseos nekron* is by many translated the resurrection *from* the dead, making it denote specifically Christ's own resurrection. But this does great violence to the language. Resurrection *of* the dead, not *from* the dead, is the simple, obvious, and natural rendering of the expression; and since nothing is known to require a different rendering, I regard it as dangerous to resort to any other. The expression refers to Christ's raising others from the dead, not to his own resurrection.

But how, it may be asked, does raising the dead determine Christ to be, as to his spirit or inner man, the Son of God? I answer, Christ raised the dead only *as* the Son of God, or in that character. He never raised the dead merely as a man. He claimed to raise them only as the Christ; and the act of raising established the claim. Peter also raised the dead; but he raised them as an apostle only, and not as the Son or God; and the act

of raising proved the reality of the character in which he acted. Moreover, when we reflect on all the facts in the life of Christ, not one strikes the mind as so overwhelming a proof of the presence in him of divine power, underived or undelegated, as his raising the dead. In soul we feel it to be the most stupendous fact of the Bible; and as a proof of the claims of him who performed it, even when those claims are to the avowed effect of his being the Son of God, it is plenary and final. True this feeling may arise, in part, from the deep interest we have in the resurrection of the dead; but, if so, it only shows the wisdom of him who selects it as a proof. Its force is enhanced, not weakened, by the circumstance.

Here it may be well to sum up the facts asserted or implied in so much of the present wonderfully comprehensive and condensed paragraph as we have now gone over. Paul was an apostle; a called apostle; devoted to the gospel. This much relates to Paul himself. This gospel was God's gospel; he had formerly promised it; promised it through his prophets; promised it in the holy Scriptures. This gospel respected his Son; this Son, as to his flesh, was born of one of David's descendants; but as to his inner man, was determined to be the Son of God; determined by power, the power being exerted in raising the dead; and this Son is Jesus Christ our Lord. After this the Apostle briefly returns to himself again.

5. through whom we have received favor and apostleship, The word favor denotes all that Paul had received in becoming a christian. But it denotes nothing more, and hence nothing peculiar to him, since all christians receive the same. It is the term apostle which denotes wherein he was distinguished. The one term simply ranks him among christians, giving him no superiority over them; the other ranks him among apostles, and makes him their equal.

in order to the obedience of belief in all nations, The particle *eis* is often used, as here, to express the end or object of an act or acts. Accordingly the clause states the end for which Paul had received favor and the apostleship. But both when he became a christian and when he was made an apostle this end was looked to. He was not made a christian for himself alone, and only an apostle for the benefit of others. He was made both for the sake of others. Could each disciple, in the present day, realize that he, too, is made a christian for the obedience of belief, it

might greatly add to the activity of many; and that both the many and the world would be gainers by the addition is simply certain.

The end for which Paul received favor and apostleship was the *obedience of belief*. This expression is susceptible of two different meanings. First: The words *obedience of belief* may be taken together as expressing a single thing—belief as an act of obedience. In this view the phrase would resemble the expression, gift of a pen, meaning a pen as a gift. Accordingly the end of Paul's call would be simply to induce the act of believing. This view is clearly incorrect, and is therefore rejected. Second: The words may be separated and made to stand for two entirely different things: 1. obedience, or conformity to the divine will; 2. belief, or the mental conviction from which the obedience springs. According to this view, Paul received favor and apostleship in order to induce men to obey Christ, but to obey him from belief as the principle leading to it. This is the view here held as the true one. The Genitive *pisteos* is Genitive of source or cause. The obedience springs out of the belief as its source or moving cause. Of course the apostle's call was not to induce the obedience without the belief, nor the belief without the obedience. It was to induce both, but the one as arising out of the other. Belief first, then obedience as growing out of it—this was then, as it still is, the divine, immutable order. No act of obedience is acceptable to God which is not prompted by belief in him who performs it. For this reason, among others, infant baptism is to be rejected. It is not the obedience of belief, and thus wanting the very essence of acceptableness, it is no obedience at all.

It will be noticed that I here use the word belief instead of the word faith; and as this usage will continue throughout the present work, it is proper to assign a reason for it.

We have in the original two words, *πίστις* and *πιστεύω*, both having the same root and same meaning, with the single distinction, that the one is a verb, the other a noun. The verb strictly means to believe, and is uniformly so translated in the Scriptures. Indeed we have no other word but believe by which to render it. This word not only translates it, but exhausts it. Now the noun has exactly the same meaning as the verb. Consequently since we must translate the verb *believe*, we surely ought to translate the noun *belief*. Again, the original noun and verb are cognate. This cognation is wholly left out of view when the verb is rendered believe, and the noun faith, but completely preserved when

the one is rendered believe, and the other belief. That is, believe is seen to be related to belief just as *pisteuo* is to *pistis*.

But if it be alleged that the words belief and faith differ in sense; and that the latter only, and not the former, correctly translates the original, I deny the allegation. It has no foundation in fact. The one word has not a shade of meaning which the other has not. Faith in Christ and belief in Christ are not different expressions for different things, but different expressions for the same thing. No distinction whatever exists between them. To say, as is sometimes done, that faith embraces the affections of the heart, while belief does not, is to draw on metaphysics for our tenets, and not on the New Testament.

Besides, a world of error and superstition has collected about the word faith, which does not attach to the word belief. With the disuse of the word faith will go in part, at least, this error and superstition. It is therefore best to give up the word. In belief we have all that is in faith; hence in parting from faith we lose 1.0 truth. Nor is what is here said true merely of a single book in the New Testament. The word faith should wholly disappear from its pages. This is not, I grant, likely to happen soon; but it is not therefore the less necessary. It is a weakness of our nature that our attachment to what we happen to be familiar with often leads us to prefer the objectionable to the faultless. This weakness will show itself in the present case.

for his name's sake, The word "name" here stands for Christ himself. The meaning then is for Christ's sake. The object of Paul's mission was the obedience of belief among all nations for the sake of Christ, which means in his interest or for his honor. In construction the clause should be joined with the expression "obedience of belief."

6. among whom you also are called of Jesus Christ, All are called of Christ who hear the gospel, but they alone are chosen who obey it. Those here spoken of are said to have been called of Christ, because the call proceeded from him as its source. Such is the force of the Genitive. But "called" does not denote persons merely called, or who when called refused to accept. It denotes such as being called had obeyed; it denotes the saved.

7. to all the beloved of God who are in Rome, This shows to whom the present Letter was written. It was to those only in Rome who were beloved of God. Hence to entitle the Letter, as in our common version, the Letter to the Romans is

erroneous. The Letter was not written to Romans as such, in any sense, but to those only in Rome who were christians, whether Romans, Jews, or Greeks.

called holy, Common version, called "to be saints." But this is incorrect. They were not called *to be* holy, though this they were certainly to be; they were styled or named holy. They were holy, and therefore so called. The word "saint" should be wholly dropped from the sacred page. It is too vague, and has been too much abused to be tolerated longer.

CHAPTER I. SECTION 2.

⁸ Πρῶτον μὲν εὐχαριστῶ τῷ Θεῷ μου, διὰ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, περὶ πάντων ὑμῶν, ὅτι ἡ πίστις ὑμῶν καταγγέλλεται ἐν ὅλῳ τῷ κόσμῳ. ⁹ Μάρτυς γάρ μου ἐστὶν ὁ Θεός, ᾧ λατρεύω ἐν τῷ πνεύματί μου, ἐν τῷ εὐαγγελίῳ τοῦ υἱοῦ αὐτοῦ, ὡς ἀδιαιρέτως μνησθῆναι ὑμῶν ποιούμεναι, ¹⁰ πάντοτε ἐπὶ τῶν προσευχῶν μου δεόμενος εἴ πως, ἤδη ποτὲ, εὐδοθήσομαι ἐν τῷ θεληματι τοῦ Θεοῦ ελθεῖν πρὸς ὑμᾶς. ¹¹ ἐπιποθῶ γὰρ ἰδεῖν ὑμᾶς, ἵνα τι μεταδώ χρίσμα ὑμῖν πνευματικὸν εἰς τὸ στηριχθῆναι ὑμᾶς, ¹² τοῦτο δὲ ἐστὶ, συμπαρακληθῆναι ἐν ὑμῖν, διὰ τῆς ἐν ἀλλήλοις πίστεως, ὑμῶν τε καὶ ἐμοῦ

⁸ First, I thank my God through Jesus Christ respecting you all, that your belief is spoken of in the whole world. ⁹ For God is my witness whom I serve in my spirit, in the gospel of his Son, that I constantly make mention of you, ¹⁰ always entreating in my prayers that, some how, I may, at last, be favored by the will of God to come to you. ¹¹ For I long to see you that I may impart to you some spiritual gift that you may become steadfast; ¹² and this is, that I may be comforted in you through the belief which is in us both, in you and in me.

SUMMARY.

Paul is thankful that the belief of the disciples in Rome is spoken of everywhere. He always mentions them in his prayers, and desires at some time a prosperous journey to them. He longs to see them, and to impart to them some spiritual gift to strengthen them. From their mutual belief he hopes to derive much comfort.

8. First, I thank my God through Jesus Christ respecting you all, that your belief is spoken of in the whole world. The meaning is not that Paul thanked God in their behalf, as helping them. His thankfulness respected them, as they were the occasion of it. Their belief was spoken of in the whole world. It was this fact especially that caused him to be thankful. With the mention of their belief would circulate the name of Christ in whom they believed. This always gave the Apostle joy. The phrase "the world" means the world as known to the people of that day, and not the whole globe.

9. For God is my witness, whom I serve in my spirit, in the gospel of his Son, To serve God in spirit is a fine phrase with a deep meaning. It does not signify, as some suppose, mere sincerity in worship. It signifies that the true service of God has its seat in the spirit and springs out of it. This service consists in the belief, love, and other acts of homage, which go up to God out of the soul. These spiritual states and emotions find vent through the gospel. They originate in the spirit, but find expression through the appointments of the gospel, which thus become a sort of dialect through which the spirit proclaims its fealty to God. Only when men serve God thus can their service be true. All other service has its breaks and interruptions, this alone must have none. The christian's conduct may become loose; still so long as, in spirit, he remains true, there is hope. But whenever he fails here, all is lost. A man's soul never wholly drops God till his belief is extinct; but the moment this dies within him, he is a withered branch ready for the burning. His apostasy is then complete, never to be remedied.

Of the true worshipers the Savior says, "they shall worship the Father in spirit and in truth." We exactly complement this when we serve God "in spirit, in the gospel," *in spirit* meaning in the inner man or with it, *in the gospel* meaning according to it as a rule or law. Thus Paul served God, thus must we.

that I constantly make mention of you, It was the custom of the primitive christians, when praying, to mention by name those brethren and churches in whom they felt a deep special interest. It is matter of regret that so affectionate a custom should ever have been allowed to fall into disuse. It is surely the duty of christians to revive it. It would have the effect to kindle fraternal affection in other breasts and to foster it in our own, and no want of any age exceeds the want of such affection among the children of God.

10. always entreating in my prayers that, some how, I may, at last, be favored by the will of God, to come to you. But in coming, Paul desired his journey to be a prosperous one. Hardships already suffered in his Master's cause made him now shrink from a recurrence of them. He hence prayed that his journey might be a happy, or good one, for such is the idea involved in *euodo*. He no more than other men courted those great trials which at times visit the children of God. Their effect, beyond a certain point, is to break the spirit not to

strengthen it. It is hence dangerous to venture too far. We should meet them bravely when they happen, but we should never seek them, nor attempt to provoke them.

11. For I long to see you that I may impart to you some spiritual gift—*charisma pneumatikon*. What this spiritual gift, or *charisma pneumatikon* was, it is not easy to say. Commentators are not agreed in regard to it. Indeed it is a point which we have no decisive means of settling. Certainly it was either a miraculous gift, or some spiritual favor falling below it, as instruction or the like. Our choice lies between these; and the most that can be done is to show which side is the more probable. The word *charisma* ordinarily means any favor bestowed. But in the New Testament it also means a miraculous gift. Paul himself certainly employs it in this sense, 1 Cor. xii: 9; but this we learn from the other words used with it. The notion of the miraculous is not inherent in the word itself. Still in the case in hand I decidedly incline to the side of a miraculous gift. Nothing would so confirm the disciples in Rome as bestowing on them such a gift; and since confirmation was the end for which the Apostle wished to bestow it, the greater probability seems to be that the gift was a miraculous one. Had the Apostle wished to see the disciples merely to instruct them in the ordinary way, or to comfort them by exhortation, and so confirm them, he would most likely have used the customary form of speech to convey that idea, and not the form here found. *Pneumatikon*, I take it, does not signify pertaining to the human spirit, but proceeding from the Holy Spirit. Hence, in the phrase "spiritual gift," the word "spiritual" denotes not nature but source, not to what relating, but in what or whom originating.

that you may become steadfast, The object of imparting the spiritual gift to the disciples was to strengthen and establish them. It was to render them immovable. Not that they were dangerously weak, but the gift would render them savingly firm.

12. And this is, that I may be comforted in you through the belief which is in us both, in you and in me. Paul desired this steadfastness that, as a consequence, he might derive comfort from them—comfort from their settled belief. This much is clear. But it is not so clear how he expected to derive comfort from his own belief. Yet such was the case. I explain thus: When the holy in Rome should see his belief, the ground of it, and how unwavering it was, they would themselves become

greatly encouraged This would give him pleasure. Thus his own belief, by its effect on them, would react on himself, and so comfort him.

CHAPTER I. SECTION 3.

¹³ Now I wish you not to be ignorant, brethren, that I often proposed to come to you, (and that I have been hindered to the present,) that I might have some fruit among you also, even as among the other nations ¹⁴ Both to Greeks and barbarians, both to wise and foolish, am I debtor ¹⁵ So, as to myself, I am ready to preach the gospel even to you who are in Rome ¹⁶ For I am not ashamed of the gospel; for it is God's power for salvation to every one who believes, to Jew first, and to Greek ¹⁷ For in it is revealed God's justification by belief in order to belief, as it is written, he who is just by belief shall live.

¹³ Οὐ θέλω δὲ ὑμᾶς ἀγνοεῖν, ἀδελφοί, ὅτι πολλὰκις προεθεμην ελθεῖν πρὸς ὑμᾶς, καὶ ἐκωλύθη ἄχρι τοῦ δεῦρο, ἵνα τινὰ καρπὸν σχῶ καὶ ἐν ὑμῖν καθὼς καὶ ἐν τοῖς λοιποῖς ἔθνεσιν. ¹⁴ Ἑλλησὶ τε καὶ βαρβάροις, σοφοῖς τε καὶ ἀνοήτοις ὀφειλέτης εἰμὶ. ¹⁵ Οὕτω τὸ κατ' ἐμὲ προθυμὸν καὶ ὑμῖν τοῖς ἐν Ῥώμῃ εὐαγγελισασθαι. ¹⁶ Οὐ γὰρ ἐπαισχύνομαι τὸ εὐαγγέλιον, δύναμις γὰρ Θεοῦ ἐστὶν εἰς σωτηρίαν παντὶ τῷ πιστεύοντι, Ἰουδαίῳ τε πρῶτον καὶ Ἑλληνι. ¹⁷ Δικαιοσύνη γὰρ Θεοῦ ἐν αὐτῷ ἀποκαλύπτεται ἐκ πίστεως εἰς πίστιν, καθὼς γεγραπται· ὁ δὲ δίκαιος ἐκ πίστεως ζήσεται.

SUMMARY

Paul had often purposed to come to them, and had been hindered. He desired some fruit among them, such as he had in the other nations. He is debtor to preach the gospel to all men, and therefore to those at Rome. He is not ashamed of the gospel, for it is God's power for salvation to all who believe. In it is revealed God's justification by belief in order to induce belief.

The present section will be found one of the most important into which this great Letter is to be divided. Its importance appears from two considerations: 1. It comprehensively enounces the themes on which the apostle chiefly dwells. 2. Without a correct understanding of its leading terms the Letter itself can never be understood. On it, then, we cannot bestow too much thought.

13. Now I wish you not to be ignorant, brethren, that I often proposed to come to you, (and that I have been hindered to the present,) It appears that previous to writing the Letter, Paul had often purposed visiting the disciples in Rome, but in every instance had been hindered. His purposes, therefore, must have been of his own forming. The Spirit had not caused them, for if so, they would not have been defeated. To them Paul was sole author. He had formed them simply as a good man, and not under guidance of the Spirit. As a man he

often desired to do things which the Spirit would not permit. The purposes here alluded to are instances in point. Moreover, whenever he was hindered, as in the present case, it was the Spirit, most probably, that did it, to whose will he was subject. To the will of Christ he was bound as a servant; to the will of the Spirit as an apostle. For him the Spirit determined two things: Where he should go; what he should say; to which is to be added, that it always empowered him to prove his mission divine. At all other times, it left him to himself, to act his part as he wished. It was at such times that he formed these purposes. As they were his own, unprompted by the Spirit, and all things considered, not the best, the Spirit would not allow him to execute them. Besides, to the unwillingness of the Spirit is to be added still another check on the Apostle. Satan, too, sometimes hindered him. Not where the Spirit had purposed, but when Paul himself had, as in the case in hand. When the Spirit purposed, nothing could successfully interpose; but when it was the Apostle alone, the Spirit might not permit, and Satan might hinder. In both these ways, as a mere man, he was liable to be interfered with.

that I might have some fruit among you also, even as among the other nations. The fruit which Paul had among the other nations consisted in the children of God whom he had begotten by the gospel. Christians were the fruit of his labor. The phrase *en humin* here, I take it, is not to be construed strictly, as referring exclusively to the disciples, but freely, as to the Romans as a nation. The meaning is, I desire to have some fruit among you Romans as a nation, as I have among the other nations.

14. Both to Greeks and barbarians, both to wise and foolish am I debtor. Paul means that he was under obligation to preach the gospel to all men in all nations. Accordingly, as he had preached it in other nations, and obtained fruit, so he was now ready to preach it among the Romans where he desired fruit. To the church he wished to impart a spiritual gift to confirm them; to the Romans he desired to preach the gospel to convert them. That would give him comfort; this would be his fruit.

15. So, as to myself, I am ready to preach the gospel even to you who are in Rome. This translation, though a little free, will, I trust, be found close and true to the sense. *So, as to myself*. The meaning is, so or accordingly, as to myself, or

so far as I am concerned, I am ready. I may never be permitted to preach to you in Rome; for I may still be hindered, as I have heretofore been; but so far as respects myself, I am ready, whenever the Spirit may so please.

Instead of "So, as to myself," the clause is sometimes rendered *So, according to my ability*. But this is surely incorrect. It is trite to make the Apostle say he was ready to preach the gospel according to his ability. Evidently he was in no danger of attempting to preach it below his ability or not according to it.

16. For I am not ashamed of the gospel; Therefore I am ready to preach it even in Rome. I am ashamed of it nowhere, before no people. Still, as in Corinth, so in Rome, Paul would have preached it in "weakness and in fear and in much trembling." As to the gospel he was without shame; but as to himself, full of distrust and trembling. Thus should it be with every preacher. As to himself he should be diffident and concealed, but as to his theme, bold, manly, and demonstrative.

for it is God's power for salvation The gospel is called God's power for salvation, because it contains the provisions which he has ordained for this end; and which, if accepted by us, will certainly effect it. Salvation is viewed by the Apostle as an end and difficult; so much so as to require God's power to accomplish it. The gospel is that power. Not only so; it is God's only power for salvation. Therefore, he who is not saved by the gospel will never be saved at all. For him who rejects the gospel there is no hope. He is lost.

Three great powers antagonize salvation—the world, the flesh, and Satan. These powers must be overcome. Nothing short of God's power can do this. The gospel does it; hence the propriety of calling it God's power for salvation. It is his power, because it proceeds from him: it is for salvation, because it is ordained to effect it.

to every one who believes, The great fundamental truth of the gospel is that Jesus Christ is the Son of God. This is the thing to be believed, in order to salvation. It is the matter, the whole matter, of our belief. The facts which underlie it as proof, and on which it rests, are the death, burial, and resurrection of Christ. Couched in these few items is the saving creed of the world. No man can reject it and be saved.

But the gospel is not unconditionally the power of God for salvation. It saves him only who believes it. To all others it is

condemnation, not salvation. "He that believes not shall be damned." But he who would be saved by the gospel must not stop short at belief. To believe he must add obedience. The "obedience of belief" is the divine order. That is, belief first, and obedience next as something prompted by it and springing out of it—this is Heaven's own arrangement, with which there must be no interference, and from which there must be no departure. Paul received favor and apostleship not for belief alone, but for the *obedience* of belief. This is final as to the order of these items and their value. One of the great errors into which so many professors have fallen consists in sundering the expression obedience of belief, and in making so much to depend on the belief solely, and so little on the obedience. But as the two are bound up indissolubly together in the divine verbiage, so they forever stand the inseparable conditions of salvation. To maintain their unity is to stand for the truth, to dissolve them is to annul it.

17. For in it is revealed God's justification by belief. As to the exact meaning of *dikaiosune*, commentators are not agreed. Not that they differ so widely in regard to it, as on some other points. But certainly their agreement is not uniform and close. Into their conflicting views, where they conflict at all, I believe it would not be profitable to enter. These the reader can consult for himself, and on their merits pass his opinion. My object is to endeavor to determine the precise sense in which Paul uses the word in the clause in hand. This will require patience and skill. But a few preliminaries demand attention first.

1. The justification, assuming this for the present to be the correct rendering of the word, is called God's justification. But whether we render by justification or righteousness, and we have certainly to render by one or the other, one thing is to be distinctly noted, the word does not express an attribute of God. It denotes a justification of which he is author; and it is called his to contradicting it from the justification of the law. The latter is described by Moses thus: "He who has done these things shall live by them." That is, he who has obeyed every requirement of the law, without one omission, shall live by his deeds. Of course such a life would be an absolutely sinless one, and acquittal from every charge would be a right which could not be withheld. Such an acquittal would be a *dikaiosune ex ergon nomou*—a *justification by works of law*. But in this sense no human being

can be justified. Gal. ii: 16. Now, there stands over against this, and differing from it, another justification which is *ek pisteos*, by belief. This is God's justification; that is the law's. The one is conceivable, but impossible; the other alone is practicable. The law's would be the justification of a person wholly sinless; God's is the justification of the sinner. In the case of the law, justification would be a debt due from God to the accused. In the case of belief the justification is a matter of favor and not of debt. In other words, to the man who should "do these things," God would owe justification; but to him who believes simply, he does not owe it. True, he bestows it, but as a favor and not as something owed.

2. Paul introduces *dikaïosune* into the clause in hand without qualification. It was a term current in his day with a well defined signification. Neither the subject-matter about which he uses it, nor the context serves to modify it. He must then have introduced it in its current and well known meaning. Consequently an unusual or far-fetched import is not to be admitted.

3. The gospel is God's power for salvation. As a power it is a cause; and viewing it as a cause, salvation is its effect. Now between the gospel as a cause and salvation as an effect, stands *dikaïosune*. Put the gospel in motion, and *dikaïosune* falls in with it, and as a factor acting with it, in the direction of its end, helps it to reach it. Consequently, in determining the signification of the word, we must seek a meaning which both tends to salvation and is a part of it, as well in its incipiency as in its ultimatum.

4. *Dikaïosune* is something done of God or of Christ; and it is done for the sinner, and not for the sinless. Moreover, it is something done for the believer, and not for the unbeliever. It is conditioned on belief, and is not done without it. Further, it looks to salvation, and is essential to it. Previous to it none will claim that salvation has occurred; subsequent to it none will deny that it has. Hence in discovering the meaning of the word we must find a sense which denotes something done for the believing sinner, prior to which he is not saved, subsequent to which he is.

With these preliminaries I proceed to an effort to determine the meaning of the word. This I shall commence by examining its most important cognate.

Dikaïo, (*δικαίω*). When God is the author of the act or state,

and man the subject, this word and *dikaio* must be regarded as having almost identical meanings. Indeed the only distinction between them is that the one denotes in action what the other expresses as state. True, they sometimes differ, but this is owing to a difference in the sources of the act or state, or in the subjects to which they are applied. At root and in essence they have the same meaning.

Generally *dikaio* means to hold as right or just, to do right, to do justice to, to treat as just or declare innocent, *to acquit or remit: guilt, and then to hold and treat as just*. Now of the meanings here enumerated, I shall maintain that the last, or the one in italics, is the one in which Paul uses the word in the clause in hand. But first I propose to show that this is certainly a meaning of the word in other books of the Bible as well as in the Letter under consideration. This I shall do by a few citations:

1. "Keep thee far from a false matter; and the innocent and righteous slay thou not: for I will not justify the wicked." Or according to the Septuagint: *Stand you aloof from every unjust charge: the innocent and just slay not; and you shall not justify the wicked for the sake of gifts*. Exod. xxiii: 7.

This verse is held to have been addressed to those in authority as judges. It admonished them to beware of untrue counts, especially not to slay the innocent on false testimony. A doubtful case was to be referred to God himself, for the reason that he "will not justify the wicked." Earthly judges they might escape; him they could not. The word *acquit* is here the exact rendering of the Septuagint *dikaio*. Moreover, it is the very word which both the subject and connection require, and is the only word that expresses the sense truly and clearly.

2. "If there be a controversy between men, and they come unto judgment that the judges may judge them, then they shall justify the righteous and condemn the wicked." Deut. xxv: 1.

Here, as in the preceding instance, the proceedings are judicial. In the case of the wicked, the order is to condemn; in the case of the just, to acquit. The word used by the Seventy is *dikaio*; and no term so closely renders it as *acquit*. The subject and the occasion determine both sense and translation.

3. "And by him all that believe are justified from all things, from which you could not be justified by the law of Moses." Acts xiii: 39.

That the things from which the people could not be justified

by the law were their sins will not be questioned. Or, still more correctly, the reference is both to sin and its penalty. From these justification by the law was impossible. From both Christ justifies the believer. The phrase justified *from* (ἀπό) has the force of released from or acquitted. Released from is the exact sense. This may be held as indisputable. But this when applied to sin is the precise meaning of the phrase remission of sin. Here now in a passage in the New Testament, a passage from Paul's own lips, *dikaio* clearly means to be released from sin, to be acquitted, or pardoned. The passage is perhaps final as to the meaning of the word. The scene is judicial, the party arraigned is the believer, the charge is of his sins, and the result is release from them. This release is expressed by *dikaio*. In all similar cases, then, release from sin or acquittal must be held to be its true meaning.

Now that belief in the passage from Acts, and the belief in the clause in hand from Romans, are identical, I presume no one will deny. Equally certain is it that the justification in each is the same. The only difference is that in Romans the justification is conceived of as just revealed in the gospel, whereas in Acts it is viewed as realized. But the justification in Acts is release from sin. Therefore the justification in Romans is release from sin. I do not see how the meaning of a word can be more conclusively determined than this determines the meaning of *dikaio*.

4. "So even David speaks of the blessedness of the man to whom God counts justification without works: Blest are they whose iniquities are forgiven, and whose sins are covered, blest is the man to whom the Lord will not count sin." Rom. iv: 6, 7.

If we still lack any conditions to enable us to determine the meaning of *dikaiosune*, the present passage supplies them. God is before us as judge, and man as the accused. In the transaction God counts to him justification without works. It is then of belief. Hence the man is a believer. To him God counts *dikaiosune*. To what is this the exact equivalent? The answer is, to having his iniquities forgiven, his sins covered, or not counted to him. It is the exact equivalent of release from sin and its penalty, the equivalent of pardon. Therefore to count *dikaiosune* to a believer is the same as to release him from sin or to forgive him.

Now in the clause under consideration the *dikaiosune* is God's, and is of belief. That is, to speak concretely, it is the *dikaiosune*

of a believer. Moreover, as in the case spoken of by David, the *dikaiosune* is courted to the believer, so is it, we conclude, in the clause in hand. Farther, since in the two cases the parties are the same, and the transactions the same, the cases themselves must be the same. Consequently *dikaiosune* in the clause in hand must mean to be released from sin or to be forgiven. It is then to be translated by justification, and not by righteousness; and by justification in the sense of acquittal from guilt, or remission of sins.

Now to show that the view here maintained is neither novel nor deficient in authority, I cite the following passages from eminent writers on the Letter. In each passage its author is commenting on the clause in question:

"But the word *dikaiosune* is the *usual* one employed by Paul to designate gospel-justification, i. e., the pardoning of sin, and accepting and treating as righteous. With these facts before us, we now return to our text. *Dikaiosune Theou* seems very plainly to have the same meaning here that it has in Rom. iii: 21, and in the other passages just referred to in this epistle, viz: the *justification* or *pardoning mercy* bestowed on sinners who are under the curse of the divine law; or the state or condition of being pardoned, i. e., justified or treated as just."—STUART.

"One thing is certain, that *dikaiosune Theou* must here mean (as in the rest of the Epistle, and others of St. Paul) Gospel justification, or the mode of obtaining pardon bestowed by God on man."—BLOOMFIELD.

"Now if man is to become righteous from being unrighteous—this can only happen by God's grace—because God *declares him righteous*, assumes him to be righteous: *Dikaioun* is not only negative to *quit* but also positive to *declare righteous*, but never to *make* righteous by transformation, or imparting of moral strength by which moral perfection may be attained."—ALFORD.

"*Dikaio, dikaiosune.* Many cognate significations have been assigned to the verb *dikaio*, but in the New Testament it invariably denotes *to acquit*, i. e., *to justify, to account just*. Hence the derivative noun *dikaiosune* signifies *acquittal*. The words indeed are strictly forensic; and, as employed in the Epistles, imply a *judicial* sentence of the Almighty upon all mankind, as obnoxious to divine punishment."—TROLLOPE.

Now I would by no means be understood as denying that *dikaosune* often means righteousness, as well as justification. It

means both, and the one as certainly as the other. But it means neither exclusively. Hence to render it uniformly by the same word is a grave error. It should in some instances be rendered justification, in others righteousness; and it is the business of the commentator to distinguish the passages in which it has these different meanings from one another.

As an instance, among many, of the use of the word in the sense of righteousness, take the following: "For I tell you that unless your righteousness excel the righteousness of the Scribes and Pharisees, you shall never enter into the kingdom of heaven." Matt. v: 20. It would be absurd to represent the justification of one man, using the word in the sense of acquittal, as excelling that of another. Clearly the word here means righteousness.

Take also the following from the Letter under consideration: "Neither present your members as instruments of unrighteousness, to sin; but present yourselves to God, as alive from the dead, and your members as instruments of righteousness, to God." Rom. vi: 13. Unquestionably the word here means righteousness, that is, a course of life in conformity with the requirements of right or of christian morality.

Finally then, whenever, in the course of these comments, I meet with *dikaïosune* in the sense of righteousness I shall so render it; in all other instances I shall render it justification.

in order to belief—*eis pistin*. Here again we encounter a much litigated phrase. Indeed, according to some commentators it seems to mean almost anything or nothing; while according to others, it means one thing about as well as another. One thinks that *ek pisteos* signifies belief in the Old Testament, while *eis pistin* means belief in the New. Another thinks the two expressions are to be taken together as a climax, their meaning being, from belief to belief, i. e., from a lower to a higher degree of belief. Some again would read the verse thus: For in the gospel, God's righteousness is revealed from belief to belief, closely connecting the two expressions with the verb revealed. Others still thus: For in the gospel God's righteousness by belief is revealed to belief. All these views I regard as radically erroneous, some of them as fanciful, and therefore reject them. Of the authors I am consulting, Macknight, Stuart, and Bloomfield alone seem to have the true conception of the clause. Accordingly they render it almost precisely as I have done. Substan-

tially they render thus: In the gospel is revealed God's justification by belief for belief, i. e., to induce belief. Or still more fully: In the gospel is revealed the fact that God will justify the believer, and this is done in order to induce men to believe. This last I hold to give the truth in the case.

Nothing is more common in the New Testament than the use of *eis* to denote the end or object for which anything is done. Take an example from the verse immediately before the one containing the clause in hand. The gospel is God's power, *eis sotcrian, for salvation*; or as a power it is for an end—salvation. So the clause before us. In the gospel is revealed God's justification by belief, *eis pistin, for belief*, it is revealed for, or to induce a certain end, to induce belief. Surely there is nothing difficult here. As a motive to induce men to believe, God reveals to them that if they will believe he will justify them. This is simple and clear. I can not see why the clause has been thought so perplexed.

As farther evidence of what is here said, I cite the following from Galatians, which contains, differently expressed, the same idea. "Knowing that a man is not justified by works of law, but through faith in Jesus Christ, we also believed on Christ Jesus, that we might be justified by faith in Christ, and not by works of law." Gal ii: 16.

Knowing that a man is justified by belief in Christ, even we have believed in him. We have believed in him—why? Because we know that he who believes will be justified. This we know, because it has been revealed to us, and our knowledge so obtained becomes the motive to believe. Thus this verse seems to settle the import of the clause in question.

as it is written, he who is just by belief shall live. The common version has, "the just shall live by faith." This is certainly intelligible, but if correct, it is difficult to see why the Apostle cites it. The question before him is not by what means do the just live, but how is the believer justified? To the former question, the citation, as found in our version, would be relevant, to the latter it is not. The Apostle had just asserted that in the gospel God's justification *by belief* is revealed. To those who insisted on justification by the law only, this would be novel and false. To prevent such a judgment against him, and at the same time to secure a verdict in his favor, he cites from Habakkuk. As much as to say: God's justification is by belief, and not by

law Be not startled at this. The prophet himself asserts as much. He says, the just *by belief* shall live. I assert only the same.

It is very true that the just lives by his belief, and it is equally true that he becomes just by it. It is this point and not that, which the Apostle has in mind, and which he is laboring to establish. Hence the necessity of rendering the citation as I have rendered it.

CHAPTER I. SECTION 4.

¹⁸ Ἀποκαλύπτεται γὰρ ὀργὴ Θεοῦ ἀπὸ οὐρανοῦ ἐπὶ πᾶσαν ἀσεβειαν καὶ ἀδικίαν ἀνερχομένων τῶν τῆν ἀληθειαν ἐν ἀδικία κειμένων· ¹⁹ διότι τὸ γνωστόν τοῦ Θεοῦ φανερόν ἐστιν ἐν αὐτοῖς· ὁ Θεὸς γὰρ αὐτοῖς ἐφανερώσε· ²⁰ τὰ γὰρ ἀόρατα αὐτοῦ ἀποκτείνουσι τὸν κόσμον τοῖς ποιήμασι νοούμενα καθορᾶται, ἧ τε αἰδίου αὐτοῦ δύναμις καὶ θειοῦς, εἰς τὸ εἶναι αὐτοῦ ἀναπολόγητους· ²¹ διότι γινώσκοντες τὸν Θεὸν οὐχ ὡς Θεὸν ἔδοξασαν ἢ ἠγαθήσαν, ἀλλ' ἐματαιώθησαν ἐν τοῖς διαλογισμοῖς αὐτῶν καὶ ἐσκοτίσθη ἡ ἀσυνετος αὐτῶν καρδία· ²² φησκόντες εἶναι σοφοὶ ἐμωρανθησαν, ²³ καὶ ἠλλαξαν τὴν δοξαν τοῦ ἀφθάρτου Θεοῦ ἐν ὁμοιωματι εἰκόνας φθάρτου ἀνθρώπου καὶ πετεινῶν καὶ τετραποδῶν καὶ ἐρπετῶν· ²⁴ διὸ παρέδωκεν αὐτοῖς ὁ Θεὸς ἐν ταῖς ἐπιθυμίαις τῶν καρδιῶν αὐτῶν εἰς ἀκαθαρσίαν τοῦ ἀτιμαζεσθαι τὰ σῶματα αὐτῶν ἐν αὐτοῖς, ²⁵ οἵτινες μετήλλαξαν τὴν ἀλήθειαν τοῦ Θεοῦ ἐν τῷ ψεύδει, καὶ ἐσεβασθησαν καὶ ἐλατρευσαν τῇ κτίσει παρά τὸν κτίσαντα, ὅς ἐστιν εὐλογητὸς εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας—ἀμήν.

¹⁸ Now God's wrath is revealed from heaven against all impiety and injustice of men, who keep down the truth by injustice ¹⁹ Because that which is known of God is manifest among them, for God has made it clear to them ²⁰ For his unseen traits are perceived since the creation of the world, being known by the things that are made—both his everlasting power and divinity, so that they are without excuse ²¹ Because they, knowing God, did not glorify him as God, nor did they thank him, but became foolish in their reasonings, and their stupid heart was darkened. ²² Professing to be wise, they acted as fools, ²³ and exchanged the glory of the incorruptible God for an image like corruptible man, and fowls, and fourfooted beasts, and creeping things. ²⁴ Therefore God gave them up, in the lusts of their hearts, to uncleanness, to dishonor their bodies among themselves, ²⁵ who exchanged the truth of God for a lie, and worshiped and served the creature instead of him that made it, who is blessed forever—amen.

SUMMARY.

The wrath of God is revealed from heaven against the impiety and injustice of all men who keep down the truth. The Gentiles had the truth, for God had made it known to them. But when they knew God they did not glorify him as God. By their reasonings they became foolish, and dull in heart, and exchanged the honor due to God for the worship of idols. For this God gave them up to base passions, and as the result they dishonored their bodies among themselves.

18. Now God's wrath is revealed from heaven. The connection of thought here is not obvious. The Apostle introduces the paragraph with *gar, for, but why?* Usually *gar* introduces a reason for, an illustration or confirmation of something preceded

ing. But if such be the case here it is not perceivable. Indeed the paragraph which follows *gar* seems quite independent of what precedes it. There is no apparent connection between them. This, with the presence of a particle ordinarily implying dependence, is what creates the difficulty. Stuart thinks *gar* refers to an implied thought in Paul's mind. His language is: "As to the *gar* with which this verse is introduced, I am now persuaded that it refers to an *implied* thought in the mind of the writer, which intervened between vs. 17 and 18, viz: This *dikaio-sune Theou* is now the only *dikaio-sune* possible for men. That this is so, the sequel shows; which is designed to prove that all men are in a state of sin and condemnation, and can be saved only by *gratuitous* pardon."

Bloomfield, on the other hand, while doubting a connection, still admits a probable one. He says: "It is, however, by no means clear to me that any connection was *intended*; for the *gar* may here have, as often, the *inchoative* sense: and it is admitted by almost all commentators that this verse commences what Schoettgen calls the *tractatio cum Gentilibus*. Yet it is probable that it was meant to serve as a *connecting link* between the *general position*, on the efficacy and universality of the gospel, and the *proof at large*, of the necessity of this justification by faith only—from the inefficiency of the law, whether of Moses or of Nature to save men.'

Upon the whole I can discover, at least, no verbal or logical connection in the use of *gar*. Still I am persuaded that the matter of the one paragraph must stand related to the matter of the other. It can not be that in Paul's mind the two were wholly disjoined. He had just asserted that the gospel is God's power for salvation. By implication, then, there is no other power or means of salvation. This would destroy all hope of salvation in the Gentile on his ground. But in assigning a reason for this assertion the Apostle adds: "For in it is revealed God's justification by belief." There is, then, no other justification. This would extinguish all hope of justification in the Jew, as based on the law. Now, in proof of all this, he proceeds to show that the condition of both Jew and Gentile was such as to warrant both his assertions and their implication. This showing he introduces by *gar*. Assuming this to be correct, then *gar* is used much in the sense of *de*, and should be rendered *now*. All things considered, I am disposed to accept this view as correct, or as more nearly correct

than any yet proposed. On the nearly equivalent significations of *gar* and *de* in certain cases, see Winer.

Moreover, the learned are not altogether agreed as to the order in which the Apostle intended his thoughts to succeed one another, and consequently as to the translation of the clause. Some would render it thus: For the wrath of God from heaven is revealed. Others thus: For the wrath of God is revealed from heaven. This latter I hold to be correct. The collocation is not God from heaven, but wrath is revealed from heaven.

against all impiety and injustice Impiety, *asebeian*, means a failure in our duties to God, injustice, *adikian*, a failure in our duties to men. Both terms are general, and denote as well a total failure, as every lower degree of it. The two terms together express the whole volume of human sins. In the clause before us, if they do not indicate total failures, they certainly indicate degrees fearfully near total. But the Apostle is not speaking of the impiety and injustice of men generally, but of a particular class of men, whom he mentions in the next clause.

of men, who keep down the truth by injustice. The first inquiry here respects the word *truth*, *altheian*. What truth is referred to? Certainly not the truth contained in the gospel. This much all concede. The reference is to an age anterior to the gospel, and therefore to a people who had never heard it. We subtract then the truth in the gospel from the truth mentioned in the clause. This done, I take the word truth as standing for all other truth relating to, and designed to regulate piety, or duty to God, and justice, or duty to men. The impiety and injustice named were the impiety and injustice certainly of men who had *ten altheian*, the truth, and not of men who had it not. This truth related, first, to their duty to God, and, second, to their duty to men; and the impiety and injustice consisted in a failure to keep it in both these respects.

But whence had this truth been derived? Originally from God himself. From him it had come either immediately, as in the case of Adam, or mediately through angels, or inspired men, as in subsequent ages. Some, therefore, had it in the form of an original revelation; others in the form of tradition. But whether in that form or this, it was the truth, and the only truth the world had prior to the gospel. On it, and on traditions from it, and corruptions of it, the world's conscience was formed. But it was not derived from conscience. Conscience originates no truth

It merely approves conformity to truth, or to what is held as truth, and condemns violations of it. This much it does, no more. The truth in question had a divine, not a human origin; and it existed, in most cases, no doubt in a greatly perverted form. The more remote the tradition from its original source, the dimmer it becomes, till finally every vestige of truth evanishes from it, and it becomes a lie. Such is the history of truth after it passes into the form of tradition.

To keep down the truth is a strong phrase. Of course it expresses the act of those who had the truth. By their injustice they overpowered it, kept it down, and thus hindered its circulation. They restrained it as by fetters. In all ages iniquity in those who have the truth has had this effect. Those who have not the truth will not receive it from the corrupt. He who has truth and would propagate it, must himself remain pure. His life must be consistent with the truth he has; otherwise he becomes an impediment to it. In the hands of the unjust, truth is powerless for good. Thus to keep it down is a great sin. When God gives us truth it is that it may control us, and through us others. If we cause it to fail he will not acquit.

of men, The word "men" would here include all men in all ages, who, prior to that time, had, by their injustice, kept down the truth; but it seems from what follows in the chapter that the Apostle designed it to embrace the Gentiles only. The Jews are taken up and separately considered farther on. The context and mode of treatment thus serve to limit the word.

19. Because that which is known of God That is, among the Gentiles. Not that which *may be* known. It would have been going too far to say that all that *may be* known of God actually was manifest among the Gentiles alluded to. For this reason I reject the common rendering. So also Alford. But it would be quite proper, as such was the fact, to say that what *is known* of God was manifest among them. This knowledge would constitute the ground of their responsibility and render them inexcusable. So at least Paul thought.

The connection of thought between this verse and the one preceding it, may be thus indicated: "The wrath of God is revealed from heaven against all impiety and injustice of men who keep down the truth by injustice." The Gentiles to whom I am now alluding have the truth. The proof of this I here subjoin: "Because that which is known of God is manifest among them:

for God has made it clear to them. In other words: God has made clear a certain thing to the Gentiles. It was thus that it became manifest among them. The thing thus manifest is *to gnoston*—what is known of God, and the thing so known is *the truth*.”

Some of the learned thus connect the two verses: “The wrath of God is revealed from heaven against all impiety and injustice of men who keep down the truth by injustice.” This wrath the Gentiles have suffered. Because that which may be known of God in regard to impiety and injustice is manifest among them in the form of wrath; for God has made it clear to them—has clearly manifested his wrath.

This I admit to be true; but it is not *the truth* here. The thing which is known of God, which was manifest among the Gentiles, manifest because God had made it clear to them, was *the truth*, and not his wrath.

Verses 18 and 19 assert or imply three facts which it was necessary to prove: 1. That the Gentiles had the truth; 2. That they kept it down by their injustice; 3. That the wrath of God is revealed against their impiety and injustice. How the first fact is proved has just been shown. The second is proved by pointing out how they abused the truth; and the third by enumerating the consequences of their sins which God visited on them. The proof and amplification of these facts occupy the remainder of the chapter.

20. For his unseen traits are perceived since the creation of the world, The word “perceived” means *discovered by the senses or by the mind*. It is hence the very word required here. *Since* the creation—*apo*. I render *apo since*, with Tholuck and others. The meaning is not perceived *by* the creation of the world; for this would be virtual tautology, since it is the exact import of the expression, *known by the things that are made*.

This verse is designed to confirm what is said in the preceding one; and the two verses together form an argument from the greater to the less. In verse 19 the Apostle says that what is known of God in regard to piety and justice, the truth from him respecting them, is manifest among the Gentiles, because He has made it known to them. To justify and confirm this statement the Apostle now declares that even God’s unseen traits, the higher and more difficult things to know, have been taken notice of ever since the creation of the world, being cognizable by the

things that are made. And if these have always been known, how much more the truth relating to practical matters of so much importance as piety and justice. If the greater is known, the less must be. The unseen traits mentioned by the Apostle are immediately explained to be God's everlasting power and divinity.

It does not strike me that the Apostle intended to enounce the facts contained in verse 20, as something new which he desired his readers to know. He rather assumed them to be known and admitted, and simply used them to prove what he had said in verse 19.

Ever since the creation of the world and men have existed, they have been enabled, by means of the works of creation, to arrive at the apprehension of certain traits of the Almighty, otherwise undiscoverable by them. These traits are called unseen, because it is impossible for the outward eye to take notice of them. They are apprehensible or knowable by the mind only—not immediately; for the act of cognition is by means of the things that are made. From the works of creation the mind, by a process, passes to the perception of the traits. This process I take to be one of reasoning. Given the conception of God, and from the works of creation the mind infers, as matter of knowledge, certain of his traits, as power, and so on. Only thus can it discover these traits by means of created things

And here we must be cautious. The Apostle does not affirm that by means of created things we come to know God. With Paul the conception of God is assumed. It is only certain traits of God that we thus discover. God is not knowable by means of creation. From creation we infer traits, not God. God himself, not nature, communicated to man, as an original datum, whatever conception man at the first had of him. Creation can not give the conception of God. This embraces, not to mention more, the notion of spirit and of infinite power; and the notion of these is not in a physical and finite creation, and, therefore, can not be inferred from it. If nature alone furnished these notions it would furnish them continually; that is, it would furnish them and preserve them. All nations would then have them. But we know that this, as a historical fact, is not so. But the conception of God once given by himself, and much that is difficult is gone. In countless ways the works of nature may then suggest his traits.

Moreover, assuming this to be the origin of the conception,

and we can readily account for its prevalence in the world. It, and much that is bound up with it, would be propagated in two ways: orally at first in the form of tradition, and next in written records. In that way it spread among the Gentiles, and became the *to gnoston*, the thing known among them, in this way it was preserved among the Jews.

both his everlasting power and divinity, It is easy to understand how the notion of God's power is obtained from the works of creation. These works are an effect, and as such they must have had an adequate cause. As an effect they are immeasurably vast, and therefore must have resulted from a cause immeasurably powerful. But God is their cause, and hence the notion of his power. This much is clear.

But how do we obtain from the works of creation the notion that God's power is *everlasting*? The answer is not very apparent. The notion of everlasting duration is not inherent in that of power. Hence, from the one alone we can not infer the other. But two solutions, as it seems to me, lie open to us. 1 From creation as an effect we infer the power of God who produced it. But we infer power only, and not the notion of everlasting. In itself and as a fact, however, the power is everlasting, and this being known to Paul, he so named it. In other words, from creation we infer the power only, while Paul characterizes it according to its nature. 2 God is the author of creation, and from creation as an effect we infer his power. But this power does not pertain to him as an accident. It inheres in him as an inseparable attribute, and since he is everlasting, so is his power. It is thus, I conclude, that we get the notion of everlasting in God's power, and not from the works of creation.

and divinity, The word *Theiotes* I here translate divinity, because I have not a better term, but whether correctly or not, I can not venture with confidence to say. I take the word as denoting, like power, a single characteristic of God. Consequently I can not agree with those who make it designate the "sum of divine qualities." Surely this is incorrect, for that "sum" must include power, and yet from *Theiotes*, as here used, power is excluded, being expressed by *dunamis*. Moreover, the word must denote some trait which stands in close relation to the works of creation, since it is perceived by them. But to say precisely which trait it expresses is the difficulty. So incomprehensible is God, and so multiform his characteristics, that we become bewil-

dered in their presence. From the divine complexity which shines out in the works of creation, how hard is it to select a single trait, and say of it with confidence, this is the *theiotes*. Yet this trait was known among the Gentiles of whom Paul is speaking. Much more than must we know it. But this is not the difficulty. The difficulty is in saying which trait, out of many, it is. Were I called upon to name it, I should coin a word for the purpose, and call it the *deityship* of God. By this I would express specifically his divine lordship and preservation. God's power creates—this all nature proclaims, and he upholds what he has made. No two facts in the manifestations of nature are more apparent than these. In upholding and preserving nature God displays his *deityship*. This then I take to be the trait which *theiotes* expresses.

It is proper to add that the *usus loquendi*, usually held to be the great arbiter in questions of criticism, can lend us no aid here. The word in hand is *hapax legomenon*, that is, it occurs but once in the New Testament. This greatly increases the difficulty in understanding it. It may, I think, be safely assumed, as already said, that it denotes a single divine trait, a trait closely related to creation, and perceivable by it. Thus far we are safe. But when we come to designate specifically the trait, we seem to me to be guided by conjecture alone.

so that they are without excuse. In v. 19 the Apostle declares that what is known of God, his truth, respecting piety and justice, was manifest among the Gentiles, God having shown it to them. This he confirms in v. 20. He curtly adds: "So that they are without excuse," i. e., for their sins. Paul here assumes the great and constantly recurring fact in the divine government, that knowledge of duty is the measure of responsibility. Had the Gentiles not known, they would have been free, but having light, they were without excuse.

With v. 20 Paul ends his proof of the fact that the Gentiles had the truth. This done, and his conclusion drawn, he commences, in v. 21, the proof of his second fact, namely, that they had kept down the truth by iniquity. He shows that they had abused it, perverted and abandoned it, and thus had kept it down and rendered it inoperative.

21. Because they, knowing God, did not glorify him as God, This verse assigns a reason for the conclusion of v. 20. That conclusion is, that the Gentiles were without excuse. In

proof of this the Apostle now shows how, and under what circumstances, they had acted.

To glorify God is to adore and honor him because of his divine nature and excellencies. It is of the very essence of piety. In the fact stated by the Apostle we have additional evidence that the Gentiles had the truth. They knew enough to enable them to glorify God as God. Yet they failed. In what the failure consisted we are not told. Paul merely says, they did not glorify God as such. They either ceased to use the truth as a guide, or perverted it. It thus failed of its object in them; and in this way it was either hindered or wholly suppressed.

nor did they thank him; We thank God for benefits received, and the feeling which prompts the act is gratitude. As the debt we owe to him, on this score, is great, the feeling should be active and profound. A failure here is indicative of the deepest debasement. The people in whom this feeling has become extinct have reached the lowest degree of spiritual degeneracy. No sin is more inexcusable. Such was the depth to which the Gentiles had gone down.

but became foolish in their reasonings, The word *emat-aiothesan* primarily signifies to become vain or foolish, and I see no reason for seeking a more remote meaning here. I hence can not think with some, that the word means to become "devoted to vanities," meaning by the expression, devoted to idolatry. There is the less reason for this, since, in v. 23, both the fact of idolatry and the mode in which it arose are distinctly stated.

The Gentiles were at fault in their reasonings either because they set out from wrong premises, or because they conducted the process amiss, and reached unwarrantable conclusions, or they may have been at fault in both these respects and most likely were. Correct reasoning can injure no people. It was by means of their reasonings that the Gentiles became foolish. This could not have happened had their reasonings been sound. Foolish reasoning alone makes those foolish who do it.

What subjects the Gentiles reasoned on we are not told. Doubtless they were the *theiotes* and *dunamis* of God, together with the truth they had. Reasoning amiss on these made them fools in regard to God and their duty to him. Rationalism is a dangerous thing whenever it undertakes to solve the mysteries of God, or to lay down any other basis of human duty than the divine will. Better accept some things on the authority of God,

which we can not solve, than to act the fool by rejecting every thing.

and their stupid heart was darkened. The word heart here stands for the power within us which takes cognizance of divine truth. So, Tholuck in substance. *Asunetos* signifies wanting in discernment or perception. Stupid, in the sense of bluntness of spiritual perception, is the aptest word known to me by which to render it. As the foolish reasonings of the Gentiles gradually usurped possession of their minds, the truth faded from them. At last the light which was in them went out. Thus their heart became darkened.

22. Professing to be wise they acted as fools, When men are reasoning God and truth out of their souls, they usually make large pretensions to wisdom. It was so with the Gentiles in olden time; it is so with rationalism still. But the pretense is a poor compensation for the loss. He acts the fool, not the wise man, who thus reasons. Better is the "foolishness" which stands with God, than the reasoning which rejects him.

23. and exchanged the glory of the incorruptible God for an image Common version: "Changed the glory of the uncorruptible God into an image." But this can not be correct. How can the glory of God be changed *into* an image? The one can not be transmuted into the other. But it is easy to understand how, in the case in hand, the one could be exchanged for the other. The Gentiles, when they knew God, glorified him not as God, but became foolish in their reasonings; their stupid heart became darkened; and though they professed to be wise, they acted as fools. The result was that they lost the true conception of God, and for him, as the object of their worship, substituted idols. Thus the exchange was made.

It is better, perhaps, with some of the learned, to regard the phrase, "glory of the incorruptible God," as a designation of God, equivalent to *glorious incorruptible God*. The meaning will then be, in short: they exchanged God for idols. Or we may take "glory" as standing for the whole of the worship then due to God. The meaning will then be: they exchanged the worship of God for the worship of idols. That is, they abandoned the one, and betook themselves to the other.

like corruptible man, and fowls, and four-footed beasts, and creeping things. Idolatry at the first had a deep criminal significance. Originally God did not intend man to worship

a being whom he could not see. In the act, it can not be denied, there is something difficult and unnatural. When God made Adam he visited him and talked to him familiarly as a gracious father with his child. Man looked upon his great Creator face to face. The homage he then paid him was the glad, spontaneous outburst of his heart. It was not an effort, but a deep exquisite pleasure. But man sinned: and that glorious Presence forever withdrew. Still the soul, though wrecked, longed to look again upon the object of its adoration. In the course of time Satan, who, at the first, had suggested sin, now suggested that God could be worshiped just as well under some visible form. The suggestion seemed to meet the profound, instinctive longings of the spirit, and idolatry arose. The idol was, at this time, no doubt, a mere aid to devotion. It helped the mind to mount from the mere material form before it up to the invisible One whom it represented. But men, with whom playing the fool had become habitual, and whose heart had become darkened, would not long remember these refined distinctions. Consequently, from viewing the idol as a mere aid, they soon came to view it as God. "These be thy gods, O Israel." Exod. xxxii: 4. Such probably was the origin of idolatry. On man's part the intention was to aid devotion; on Satan's, to eject God from the soul. Satan succeeded, not man.

God appoints the worship of himself, and prescribes its mode and laws. Whenever man undertakes to invent aids, the result is that the divine appointment is supplanted, and the human invention takes its place.

like corruptible man. *Ad verbum—likeness of an image of corruptible man.* The idea is exactly expressed to our minds and in our language by *an image like corruptible man.* In their traditions men would still retain the fact, obscured and distorted, that they had been created in the image of God. In making an idol to represent God, their first thought would be to make one as nearly like him as possible. They would, therefore, make it like man, feeling that thereby they were making it like God. But as they sunk in grossness, they would make their idols to resemble those beasts and fowls from which they derived most benefit, or those animals and creeping things they most feared. Those they would worship; these seek to propitiate. Such would be the origin of the images representing the lower order of creatures, and of the homage paid them.

24. Therefore God gave them up, in the lusts of their hearts, to uncleanness, God gives people up when he ceases to restrain them from evil or protect them against it. When, in other words, he lets them alone to do as they please without hindrance from him in the matter of sin. This clearly implies that till God gives a people up, they are always under his protecting care. Language could not more clearly imply the constant oversight of God in the affairs of men. How, with such an implication before him, any man can deny an immediate divine providence in human affairs, I can not see. Indeed the blindness which can do it would itself seem to be an instance of the "giving up" spoken of.

in the lusts of their hearts, With Lange and others I think the *en* of this clause should not be rendered *by* or *through* God did not give them up to uncleanness by or through their lusts. Their lusts were not a means by which he effected this end. The *en* denotes their state or condition when God gave them up. He gave them up because they had abandoned him and resorted to the worship of idols; but at the time when he did this they were living in lust. This was their condition.

to uncleanness, That is, to practice it. But God did not design or appoint the uncleanness, and then abandon the people to it. The uncleanness was the result of their lusts. God abandoned them; and immediately their lusts hurried them into the uncleanness.

to dishonor their bodies among themselves. Critics are not agreed as to whether *atimazesthai* is middle or passive. It may be either, and either gives a good sense. I prefer to think it middle, and accordingly so render it. But the point is of little importance, and is therefore dismissed.

But how shall we render the clause? Certainly in one or the other of the following ways: God gave them up *so that* they dishonored their bodies; or he gave them up *to dishonor* them. The latter, as is obvious, makes God *intend* the dishonor; the former says nothing of intention, but merely states the result of the giving up. The weight of modern authority is in favor of the former rendering. But why? Certainly not on philological grounds; for on these, the latter rendering has the advantage. The former rendering, then, as it seems to me, rests on no ground except that commentators do not like to make God intend the dishonor. But this is insufficient. It is distinctly stated that God

gave them up. Now for what did he do this? Not merely that they might dishonor their bodies—this and no more. But he gave them up to let them learn what their lusts would plunge them into, and this end he intended, not for its own sake, but as a punishment for abandoning him, for idolatry and for their lusts. This I believe to be the true intent of the clause. I therefore prefer the latter rendering.

Precisely how the Gentiles dishonored their bodies appears in vs. 26, 27. These verses also exemplify the import of the clause *among themselves*.

25. who exchanged the truth of God for a lie, This clause closely resembles the one in v. 23, already noticed, namely: "Who exchanged the glory of the incorruptible God for an image," &c.; and the two clauses should be rendered alike. In the one case the glory of God is exchanged for an image; in the other, the truth of God is exchanged for a lie. Or more closely still, the truth of God is exchanged for *the false*—that which is false in itself, false in the sense of being a lie, and false in the sense of being a sham. The reference is to idols and idol worship.

I see no reason for seeking, as some do, an unusual meaning for the expression *the truth of God*. Both its import and construction seem very simple. The Genitive of God is genitive of source, the meaning being the truth which is from God. The truth is evidently the same as that of v. 18, which was kept down by unrighteousness. This truth primarily respected the worship due to God; and it is as primary that it is here before the Apostle's mind. The truth which respected God and his worship the Gentiles exchanged for the lie which prescribed idol worship. Or the sense may be the fuller one, that both the one true God and his worship were exchanged for *the false* in the shape of idols and the worship paid them.

The clause seems designed to explain more clearly whom God delivered up to uncleanness to dishonor their bodies. If, instead of the simple *who*, we render *whitines whoever*, we shall come still nearer the sense. The meaning of the two verses may be accurately and fully expressed thus: Therefore God gave them up in the lusts of their hearts to uncleanness to dishonor their bodies among themselves—gave up whoever exchanged the truth of God for a lie.

and worshiped and served the creature instead of him

that made it. The word here rendered worshiped is generally assumed to denote so much of our duty to God as is internal, while the one rendered served denotes the outward part. The distinction may possibly have been intended here, but I can not see it. The two words together simply denote the whole of the worship due to God. This was all transferred to the creature. The term creature is general, and includes every created thing that was worshiped. The expression *ton ktisanta* is almost uniformly rendered the Creator. But for this there is no necessity. It is the participle, not a noun, and with the article means *him that made*. This phrase closely and neatly renders it, and any thing different is gratuitous. Trueness is better than brevity.

CHAPTER I. SECTION 5.

²⁶ Διὰ τοῦτο παρέδωκεν αὐτοὺς ὁ Θεὸς εἰς πάθη ἀτιμίας· αἱ τε γὰρ θήλειαι αὐτῶν μετέλλαξαν τὴν φυσικὴν χρῆσιν εἰς τὴν παρὰ φύσιν. ²⁷ Ὁμοίως τε καὶ οἱ ἄρσενες ἀφέντες τὴν φυσικὴν χρῆσιν τῆς θηλείας ἐξεκαίθησαν ἐν τῇ ὀρέξει αὐτῶν εἰς ἀλλήλους, ἄρσενες ἐν ἄρσεσι τὴν ἀσχημοσύνην κατεργαζόμενοι, καὶ τὴν ἀντιμισθίαν ἣν ἔδει, τῆς πλάνης αὐτῶν ἐν ἑαυτοῖς ἀπολαμβάνοντες. ²⁸ Καὶ καθὼς οὐκ ἔδοκίμασαν τὸν Θεὸν ἔχειν ἐν ἐπιγνώσει, παρέδωκεν αὐτοὺς ὁ Θεὸς εἰς ἀδόκιμον νοῦν, ποιεῖν τὰ μὴ καθήκοντα, ²⁹ πεπληρωμένους πάσῃ ἀδικίᾳ, πονηρίᾳ, πλεονεξίᾳ, κακίᾳ, μεστοῦς φθόνου, φόβου, ἔριδος, δόλου, κακοηθείας· ψιθυριστὰς, ³⁰ καταλάλους, θεοστυγεῖς, ὕβριστὰς, ὑπερηφάνους, ἀλαζόνες, ἐφευρετὰς κακῶν, γονεῦσιν ἀπειθεῖς, ³¹ ἀσυνέτους, ἀσυνθέτους, ἀστόργους, ἀνελεήμονες, ³² οἵτινες τὸ δίκαιωμα τοῦ Θεοῦ ἐπιγνώτες, ὅτι οἱ τὰ τοιαῦτα πράσσοντες ἄξιοι θανάτου εἰσίν, οὐ μόνον αὐτὰ ποιοῦσιν, ἀλλὰ καὶ συνευδοκοῦσι τοῖς πράσσουσι.

²⁶ For this reason God gave them up to vile passions. For even their females changed the natural use into one contrary to nature. ²⁷ Likewise also the males, quitting the natural use of the female, burnt in their lust for one another, males practicing with males indecency, and receiving in themselves the reward of their error, which was fit. ²⁸ And inasmuch as they did not judge fit to keep God in their knowledge, God gave them up to a rejected mind to do unbecoming things: ²⁹ being filled with all injustice, malice, greediness, evil; full of envy, murder, strife, deceit, malignity; whisperers, ³⁰ slanderers, Godhaters; insolent, proud, boastful, inventors of evil, disobedient to parents, ³¹ stupid, faithless, without natural affection, pitiless—³² who knowing the decree of God, that they who practice such things are worthy of death, not only do them, but are even well pleased with those that practice them.

SUMMARY.

Being abandoned of God, both their men and women degraded themselves by their vile practices. They received in their own bodies the due reward of their error. They rejected God from their knowledge, and he rejected them. After this they became filled with every vice and crime. These they not only practiced themselves, but even had delight in others for practicing them. All this they did, knowing the decree of God, both against their sins and against themselves. They therefore sinned wilfully and recklessly.

26. For this reason God gave them up to vile passions. This verse is a repetition, in part, of v. 24. But it is more. It states the particular uncleanness to which God abandoned the Gentiles, and details how they dishonored their bodies among themselves. The reason for the abandonment is the same in both verses. It was idolatry.

The graded descent of the Gentiles is here worthy of note. They knew God—this is the plane from which they took their downward course. But they did not honor him as God; became foolish in their reasonings; their heart, failing in the perception of spiritual things, became darkened; they played the fool; lost the true notion of God; ended in worshiping and serving the creature. At this point God abandoned them; and again they began to descend—this time into moral and physical corruption. Down they went, and still down, till they touched the bottom of human degradation. How sublime the height from which they fell; how low the depth they reached!

to vile passions. The passions to which God abandoned the Gentiles were those mentioned in this and the next verse. They were the unnatural lusts which females cherished for females, and males cherished for males. It is impossible to conceive of anything in the form of vice more disgusting than the practices to which they led. As the simple translation of the two verses presents their contents in a light sufficiently strong, I shall not comment on them in detail.

That the vices here specified by Paul were actually practiced among the Gentiles admits of no doubt. The testimony to the fact, independent of the Apostle's, is conclusive. Seneca, Martial, and Petronius, the last contemporary with Paul, all confirm the Apostle's statement. The *Tribades*, a notorious class of women, addicted to one of the vices, practiced their crime under the name of sapphic love; and every one at all read in history, has heard of the Lesbian vice. The same vice is said to be indulged in in Paris, France, in the present day; and there is little doubt of its existence in other modern cities. The vice called *pederasty* is known to have been disgracefully common in Greece and Rome about the time Paul wrote. Xenophon mentions the fact of its being forbidden by Lycurgus. Nor were these vices confined to the low, unthinking herd. Some of the most distinguished are accused of them. By Plutarch, for example, we are told that even Solon, the great Athenian law-

giver, was implicated in them; and Stuart says that Zeno, the founder of the Stoics, was accused of the same. To the preceding may be added the fact, mentioned by Bloomfield, and confirmed by others, that discoveries made in Herculaneum and Pompeii confirm all that Paul has said. Nor were these vices rare, and viewed as we view them. Indeed one of the writers just named, as quoted by Hodge, goes so far as to say that they were so common, and the countenance given to them so great, that no one feared being detected in the act of committing them. Moreover, they are known to prevail in more countries than one even in our own day.

and receiving in themselves the reward of their error, which was fit. The error here, I must think, is the error into which their males and females fell in the vices just named. The word *plane* means wandering, going astray, deception; and in the vices named the Gentiles confessedly went astray. Besides, the reward which they received was one due their error; and that it was also the one deserved by their vices can hardly be questioned. It was a reward received in their persons—most likely a penalty in the form of disease which they suffered. I hence deem that *plane* refers strictly to erring in the matter of their vices.

Some commentators refer *plane* to their going astray from God to idolatry; but the reference seems far too remote. Certainly that was a *plane*, and their vices were a distant consequence of it; but then there are too many intermediate errors to permit us to refer *plane* over them all to the first. It would be safer to make it include all these errors than to refer it exclusively to the first. If any one will attentively read the passage in the original, I think it will never occur to him that *plane* can have any other reference than to the vices.

What the reward of their error was, which they received in themselves, we are not told. But from the nature of the crimes committed, we can hardly fail to conjecture it. The vices consisted in the grossest bodily abuse long continued. The result would be the worst form of those diseases which are known to follow such abuse. It would be, besides great pain, premature decay of the body, which again would lead to decay of the mind. A life, therefore, imbittered by disease and pain, with enfeebled powers of intellect, and early death would be the reward of their error.

28. And inasmuch as they did not judge fit to keep God in their knowledge, The sense is clear, but it is difficult, owing to the want of closely corresponding words, to make the translation entirely satisfactory. *Dokimazo* primarily means to prove a thing by trial, to put it to the test. "I have bought five yoke of oxen, and I go to prove them." But this sense is clearly inadmissible here. The word also means to approve or think fit. It occurs in this sense, 1 Cor. xvi: 3: "And when I reach you, I will send, with letters, him whom you may *approve*, to carry your gift to Jerusalem." Also, 1 Thess. ii: 4: "But as we *have been thought worthy* by God to be entrusted with the gospel, so we speak, not as pleasing men." It is certainly in this sense that the word occurs in the clause in hand. The Gentiles, after long trial especially after their perception of spiritual things had grown blunt, after their heart had become *asunetos*, and they had fallen into idolatry and its attendant vices, did not approve or judge fit to retain God in their knowledge. They preferred rather to let the knowledge they had of him perish from their minds, which was the same as not choosing to keep him in their knowledge. They wished no farther acquaintance with him.

to keep God in knowledge, The phrase "to keep God in knowledge" is thought by some to be a stronger expression than *to know God*. But the fact is not apparent. Its exact equivalent is to know God—to have him in mind as an object of constant and distinct thought. The two phrases differ in form, not in sense.

God gave them up to a rejected mind As the Gentiles, on their part, did not think proper to do one thing; so God, on his, did not think proper to do another. They did not choose to keep him in their knowledge; and so he did not choose to keep them in his care. He had now fully tested their minds, tested whether they would keep him in thought. He had had them on trial, as the assayer his metal in the crucible. Their minds failed, and he rejected them. The word "*rejected*," in this sense, though not exactly to my taste, is the truest word to the Apostle's sense I can find. God repudiated the Gentile mind, or *threw it away*. It would not retain him, and he refused to have it.

to do unbecoming things; Unbecoming things are all things inconsistent with our duty to ourselves and to others. The phrase is comprehensive, and, unqualified, would include every species and form of vice and wickedness. I apprehend, how

ever, that it is designed to refer more particularly to the vices just named by the Apostle, and to those immediately to be enumerated. Less than these it hardly includes; more it scarcely can.

29. **being filled with all injustice, malice, greediness, evil;** *Pepleromenous* belongs to the *they* which is the subject understood of *poicin*. The persons who were filled with all injustice, etc., were those who did not choose to keep God in their knowledge, and whom he abandoned to do unbecoming things. Being once forsaken by him, because they had forsaken him, they went from bad to worse, and from worse to worst, till they complemented the following fearful list of crimes.

Efforts have been made, particularly by German commentators, to show that the Apostle enumerates these crimes in order, or at least sets them down in kindred groups. But these efforts are founded rather in the fancies of their authors than in the work of Paul. He is innocent of the order and grouping ascribed to him. He was intent on describing the true condition of the Gentile world, but with no wish to display his skill in the art of rhetoric. His object was to tell the whole truth, but as to the order in which his items should succeed one another, he has evinced no discoverable concern.

being filled with It need not be supposed that each individual Gentile embodied in himself the whole of these crimes. The list is affirmed of a community as such, and not of its several members. What was true of the whole was true, no doubt, in large measure, of its individual parts. Still a general corruption of individuals is all that need be assumed. For example, one man may have been filled with greediness, but not have been boastful; another may have been boastful, but not filled with greediness; and so on to the end.

all injustice, This expression is generic, and comprehends the whole volume of human crimes. The specifications herein following are its included particulars. The men in whom the "all injustice" had its seat were the men who kept down the truth—and no wonder. No heart can be at the same time the abode of these crimes and of the truth. The sense of truth is extinct in the heart in which they dwell. *Malice:* Deep-seated hatred accompanied by the wish and will to do others personal injury. When intensified it is apt to seek the opportunity to vent itself in bloodshed. *Greediness:* The inordinate love of money. It is dangerous because almost sure to lead to the use

of unjust means to accomplish its ends. Covetousness and avarice are both good meanings of the word. *Evil, kakia*: Moral baseness—the depraved disposition which is ready for every type of crime. *Villanous disposition* is very close to the sense.

full of envy, murder, strife, deceit, malignity. *Envy*: The disposition which grudges another his excellence or place. It leads its possessor to underrate its object, and thereby to be unjust to him. When it speaks, it is usually in the form of pity for the slandered. The truly noble are ever free from it. *Murder*: The wilful and malicious taking of human life. This crime, according to the Bible, should always be punished with death. But in our day, especially in our country, it generally brings with it only a good deal of notoriety, and not death. But we may rest assured of this, that God will one day visit on the people of this country a fearful retribution for the indulgence which they show to the crime. Take the life of him who wilfully and with malice takes the life of his fellow man—do this surely, do it in all cases, and murder will cease. Fail to do this, and you breed mobs; for the world is apt to feel that a murderer hung by a mob is a less evil than a murderer turned loose by a corrupt court of law, to murder again at will. That is a morbid and most pernicious sentiment which forgets what is due to God, to society, and to the murdered, through sickly sympathy for the murderer. It is devoid of justice; nor is it any proper expression of mercy. *Strife*: The disposition to be contentious and quarrelsome. It is the standing violation of the law of peace. It is not strife for the sake of truth and right. Such strife is lawful. But it is strife simply for its own sake—a morbid feeling, which seeks to irritate every body and thereby disquiet them. *Deceit*: The Greek word *dolos* primarily signifies a bait, i. e., for a fish. From this it readily comes to mean an artful trick, stratagem, device. As a disposition of mind it is the inclination and will to practice every species of fraud to effect an end. Where it prevails justice in dealing is unknown. It is the very opposite of an honest purpose. *Malignity*: Extreme evilness of nature. As a disposition it has its seat low in the depraved heart, is treacherous, and crops out in bad habits and customs. It is of the essence of activity in the corrupt soul.

whisperers, 30. slanderers, Godhaters, *Whisperers*: Secret slanderers, persons who slip slyly about and blacken names and characters by whispering their vile tale in willing ears.

They always affect great innocence themselves, and tell their hurtful story regretfully. When done, they are sure to enjoin on you not to mention the matter to others lest it might do harm. The world contains few things more despicable. *Slanderers:* These are the public blabs of communities, the open tattlers who know every thing they should not know, and tell every thing they should not tell, the newsmongers of inns and low places. They have one peculiarity—they never tell secrets, but such things only as are notoriously true! They hence always appeal to some one in the crowd to verify their lie. *Godhaters:* These are the impious wretches who, having cast God out of their souls, have sunk down into the very night of sin. Nature has become so prostituted in them, and their hearts so saturated with evil that for even their daily bread they requite God only with hate. Of the turpitude of such an insult it is impossible for the pure mind to form a true conception. To hate God is the most abhorrent thought to the soul that language can express. In enormity it is without a parallel.

insolent, proud, boastful, inventors of evils, disobedient to parents, *Insolent:* Persons are insolent when in their haughtiness they look down upon others with contempt, and so treat them and speak to them as to mortify them and wound their feelings. It is an ignoble trait, found only in base minds. *Proud:* To be proud is to place too high an estimate upon ourselves. It leads us to be vain, and to look upon others as inferiors. The truly noble are never proud. *Boastful:* The boastful are such as speak of themselves, their acts and property in an ostentatious and over-colored style. The vice is closely akin to lying, and is the very opposite of modesty. *Inventors of evils:* These were persons who invented base methods to accumulate property, to gratify ambition, and to satisfy lust. The word evils must be taken in a wide sense, as including every species of villany which can injure either ourselves or others. *Disobedient to parents:* Perhaps no sin mentioned by the Apostle so clearly indicates, as does this, how completely humanity was wrecked in the Gentiles. To be disobedient to parents in the sense of being cruel to them, or indifferent to their wants, is the lowest degree of human debasement. It often occurred among the ancients.

31. stupid, faithless, without natural affection, pitiless—
Stupid: On this word I have already had occasion to comment

It here means dullness in the perception of spiritual things. But how, the reader will ask, can its import be set down as a sin, and a person be held responsible for it? Were it natural, it could not be. But it is induced by unwillingness to retain in mind those divine truths which keep it bright and sharp. God's truth is the soul's food, which renders it active and keen in its perceptions. Without this food it becomes gross and dull, and at last loses its perspicacity. The import, therefore, is criminal, because the consequence of a criminal rejection of the truth. *Faithless*: The word faithless here does not refer to a general, but specific faithlessness. It denotes want of faith in keeping covenants and contracts. It includes alike the acts of nations and of individuals. Where it prevails all confidence in human pledges is at an end. *Without natural affection*. The word signifies more particularly a want of affection for kin, especially, it may be, for children. It is thought by some to refer to the unfeeling custom among Gentile parents of exposing their infants to die, when, from any cause, they were disinclined to raise them. The word possibly has this reference, but it is not certain. It means to be heartless towards those who should be dear to us from the ties of blood. *Pitiless*: The word signifies to be merciless or unforgiving to those who err. The pitiless man shows no leniency to those who are out of the way, but cruelly exacts the last farthing. When we remember how prone all are to do wrong, we must regard the trait as a most diabolical one. Nothing can be more opposite to God than it is, or be looked upon by him with deeper displeasure.

Here ends the hideous list of crimes and vices and sinful mental states enumerated by the Apostle. To define each word exactly, as it stood defined to his mind, is more than any one can now claim the ability to do. A safe approximation to his meaning is all that, in some instances, can be expected. Different words so often seem to blend their import, and to lap the one over the other, that to keep their several significations distinct, and make them stand apart each on its own plat, is by no means easy. I shall feel glad if, in the end, it turns out that my efforts in this direction are in respectable part successful.

32. who, knowing the decree of God, To whom does the word *who* here refer? Clearly to those who did not choose to keep God in their knowledge, whom, therefore, he abandoned to a rejected mind to do unbecoming things, and who as a conse-

quence practiced the crimes and vices just specified. It does not then add a new class of characters to the preceding list. It merely adds a fuller description of those there named. The persons there named committed the crimes mentioned, knowing the decree of God as to the penalty they deserved. And more, they even countenanced and indorsed others in doing them. Such I take to be the reference of *who*, and the connection of thought.

knowing the decree of God, The Gentiles, then, in perpetrating their enormities were not acting in ignorance. They knew the decree of God respecting the very vices they were practicing. But they did not regard it. They had light, but despised it. It was this that made their guilt so deep. They knew the decree. That was all. Not that they recognized it as just. The probability is they regarded it as the very reverse. Their heart had become *asunetos*; dull of perception; and the justness of the decree against their sins would be among the first things to which they would grow blind. They sinned, then, not in ignorance, but more probably in unbelief.

But whence did they derive the knowledge of God's decree? The question is not settled by the Scriptures. We are consequently left to conjecture. I cite an author or two in reply. Alford: "*To dikaioma*—the sentence of God, unmistakably pronounced in the conscience" Stuart thinks they derived it "from the disclosures made respecting God in the works of nature," and from "their own conscience and moral sense." And so others

But with these authors I can not agree. I see not how either the works of nature or the human conscience could ever disclose the decree in question. "The things of God no one knows, but the Spirit of God" God himself, I take it, revealed his decree respecting the penalty of sin, revealed it by his Spirit to the men with whom originally he communicated on such matters, as Noah. Thus only, I deem, could this decree ever become known. But being once known, we can easily account for its prevalence. It would spread in the form of a tradition. All would thus come to know it, and would have their consciences molded in accordance with it. Thus it would not be a deliverance of conscience, but become a criterion of its formation.

that they who practice such things are worthy of death, The word death here seems to have perplexed commentators very much. Bloomfield thinks it means "the severest punish-

ment both in this world and in the next." Hodge. "Death here means the penalty of the law, all those evils by which sin is punished." Stuart thinks the word is used "*figuratively*," and that it means "*punishment, misery, suffering*." Alford: "Probably a general term for the fatal consequences of sin; that such courses lead to death." Tholuck says the word "may be taken in a more extensive sense for *misery, punishment*, or in a more confined, for *death*, the greatest of all bodily punishments." Lange: "The general idea of death in the Gentile consciousness of guilt, as the punishment of the most varied forms of sin."

These citations present some diversity of opinion; and besides they would seem to imply that the interpretation of the word is not easy. But I can not feel the difficulty of these writers. There is no apparent necessity for understanding the word death in any unusual sense. I therefore take it in its ordinary meaning, as denoting simply natural death.

We must remember that the decree in question was not the decree of men; nor that the Gentiles were worthy of death according to a human decision. It was God, not men, who decreed them to be worthy of death. And where is the difficulty here? If God could decree Adam worthy of death, as we know he did, for a single sin, should we think it strange that he would decree the Gentiles worthy of death for their countless sins? It was not only right that Adam himself should die for his sin; but it is also right that all his posterity should die for it. God adjudged the whole human family worthy of death for this one sin. How much more then could he adjudge the Gentiles worthy of death for their sins? True, though Adam was adjudged worthy of death, he did not die for some time after he sinned; and so with the Gentiles. Though they were worthy of death, the penalty was not at once inflicted. The fact, however, that they did not die at once did not prove them not worthy. It proved a respite, nothing more.

not only do them, but are well pleased with those that practice them. They not only practice such vices and crimes as the Apostle has just named; but they do this knowing that God has decreed them worthy of death for practicing them. They thus contemn his decree and defy him. Nay more, they delight to know that others do the same things. They are not content to sin themselves; they go farther, and show their pleasure in others that sin, and thus try to render it universal,

Nothing so encourages men to sin as to show them that we think all the better of them for it. Especially is this true of infidelity. The countenance which grown men, who are infidels, give to young men, does more to foster infidelity in the latter than all the arguments infidels ever constructed. We must not only not sin ourselves, but we must frown on it in others.

The Apostle having now shown the moral condition of the Gentiles, and the utter hopelessness of their case, proceeds to consider the state of the Jews. In doing this, he will demonstrate that both are equally guilty, and equally without the hope of even a possible justification. This done, and the conclusion is obvious. Both are alike in absolute need of "God's justification." This is the conclusion which the Apostle desires to fix at last deeply and distinctly in the minds of both.

CHAPTER II.

SECTION I.

Therefore you are without excuse, O, man, whoever you are that judge; for in that in which you judge another, you condemn yourself; for you that judge practice the same things. ² But we know that God's judgment is according to truth against those that practice such things. Do you then count on this, O, man, who judge those that practice such things, and do them yourself, that you will escape the judgment of God? ⁴ Or do you despise the abundance of his goodness and forbearance and patience, not knowing that God's goodness leads you into repentance? ⁵ And according to your impenitent heart and hardness do you heap up for yourself wrath in a day of wrath and of disclosure of the just judgment of God? ⁶ who will render to each according to his deeds—everlasting life to those who, by continuance in good works, seek for glory and honor and incorruption—⁷ anger and wrath to those who are contentious, and obey not the truth, but obey injustice. ⁸ Affliction and distress will come upon every soul of man who works evil, of Jew first, and of Greek. ⁹ But glory and honor and peace will be given to every one who works good, to Jew first and to Greek. ¹¹ For there is no respecting the person with God.

Διὸ ἀναπολόγητος εἶ, ὦ ἄνθρωπε, πᾶς ὁ κρίνων· ἐν ᾧ γὰρ κρίνεις τὸν ἕτερον, σεαυτὸν κατακρίνεις· τὰ γὰρ οὐτὰ πρᾶσσεις ὁ κρίνων. ² Οἶδαμεν δὲ ὅτι τὸ κρίμα τοῦ Θεοῦ ἐστὶ κατὰ ἀλήθειαν ἐπὶ τοὺς τὰ τοιαῦτα πρᾶσσοντας. ³ Λογίζῃ δὲ τοῦτο, ὦ ἄνθρωπε, ὁ κρίνων τοὺς τὰ τοιαῦτα πρᾶσσοντας καὶ ποιῶν αὐτά, ὅτι σὺ ἐκφεύξῃ τὸ κρίμα τοῦ Θεοῦ, ⁴ ἢ τοῦ πλοῦτου τῆς χρηστότητος αὐτοῦ καὶ τῆς ἀνοχῆς καὶ τῆς μακροθυμίας καταφρονεῖς, ἀγνοῶν ὅτι τὸ χρηστὸν τοῦ Θεοῦ εἰς μετάνοιάν σε ἄγει, ⁵ Κατὰ δὲ τὴν σκληροτητά σου καὶ ἀμετανοητὸν καρδίαν θησαυρίζεις σεαυτῷ ὀργὴν ἐν ἡμέρᾳ ὀργῆς καὶ ἀποκαλύψεως δικαιοκρισίας τοῦ Θεοῦ; ⁶ ὅς ἀποδοσει ἐκίστω κατὰ τὰ ἔργα αὐτοῦ—⁷ τοῖς μὲν καθ' ὑπομονὴν ἔργου ἀγαθοῦ δοξάν καὶ τιμὴν καὶ ἀφθαρσίαν ζητοῦσι, ζωὴν αἰώνιον—⁸ τοῖς δὲ ἐξ ἐριθείας καὶ ἀπειθοῦσι τῇ ἀληθείᾳ, πειθομένοις δὲ τῇ ἀδικίᾳ, ὀργὴ καὶ θυμὸς ⁹ Θλίψις καὶ στενοχωρία ἐπὶ πᾶσαν ψυχὴν ἀνθρώπου τοῦ κατεργαζομένου τὸ κακόν, Ἰουδαίου τε πρώτου καὶ Ἑλλήνου· ¹⁰ δοξα δὲ καὶ τιμὴ καὶ εἰρήνη παντὶ τῷ ἐργαζομένῳ τὸ ἀγαθόν, Ἰουδαίῳ τε πρώτῳ καὶ Ἑλληνι· ¹¹ οὐ γὰρ ἐστὶ προσωποληψία παρὰ τῷ Θεῷ.

SUMMARY

The Jew constantly condemned the Gentile for doing certain things; but in doing so he condemned himself, for he did the same things. God's just judgment is against all who do such things as the Jew did. Therefore he can not escape condemnation. The goodness and patience of God are designed to lead men to repentance; but the Jew misconstrues these and does not repent. By this course he heaps up for himself wrath in the last day, when God will render to every one according to his deeds. To the good he will give eternal life; on the disobedient he will inflict wrath. There is no partiality with God.

The connection between this chapter and the first is not obvious; and it has cost critics no little trouble. *Διὸ*, with which the chapter begins, is certainly illative. This is conceded with

hardly an exception. But the fact in the preceding chapter from which the inference is drawn, which *dio* introduces, seems not easily discovered. I prefer to think the inference drawn from no single fact, but from the whole current of the Apostle's teaching respecting the Gentiles. The connection I take to be this: The Gentiles had the truth from God respecting their duties both to him and to one another. Notwithstanding this, they forsook God and resorted to the worship of idols. They did more. They sunk down into the grossest sins and vices, knowing at the same time the decree of God against both. Now, whoever thus acts is without excuse. You Jews yourselves so decide. Therefore you are without excuse, inasmuch as you do the same things under the same circumstances. This seems to present the precise turn of thought with which the second chapter opens. It clearly sets out with an address to the Jews who judged, judged the Gentiles; and its design is to show that they, equally with the Gentiles, are without excuse, because of their practising the same things. From this the inference would be easy. If they were guilty of the same crimes with the Gentiles, they were under the same condemnation, and therefore equally with them stood in need of "God's justification." The object of the Apostle is now to convince them of this fact.

Therefore you are without excuse—*anapologetos*. The Jews, for it is they who are addressed, were not only without justification, but without even an apology. They had nothing to plead in their defence. They were without excuse, because, like the Gentiles, they had the truth and violated it. The argument assumes the common principle of justice that those who know their duty and wilfully neglect it, are inexcusable. This is not only the decision of God, but the common sentiment of mankind.

O, man, whoever you are that judge; The phrase, "O, man, whoever you are," if unqualified, would include every individual of the human race. But the Apostle narrows it by the epithet *that judge*. It includes then only those that judge, but it includes all these. It is hence so formed as to include Gentiles as well as Jews; but it is designed to refer particularly to the latter. There were enlightened Gentiles, as Cornelius, who would be quite as ready as Jews to condemn the Gentile vices named by Paul. The phrase therefore is made to include them also. The word judge here means more than the bare act of

judging. It means to pass sentence on, or condemn—a decision, a felt decision, that certain persons and acts were wrong, deeply and fatally wrong.

for in that in which you judge another, you condemn yourself; The Jews condemned the Gentiles for doing the things named by Paul. This they knew within themselves to be the fact. This fact the Apostle assumes. But the Jews, in condemning the Gentiles, condemned themselves also; not expressly, for this they were shy of doing. They condemned themselves by implication only, and this an implication which they did not discover till it was pointed out to them. The Jew condemned the Gentile. This is all. But this done, and the Apostle tells him that in the act he has, on the principle of common justice, condemned himself. The confirmation of this follows in the next clause.

for you that judge practise the same things. That is, you practise the same thing which the Gentiles practise. This also the Jew knew within himself to be true; and this also the Apostle assumes. The argument then stands thus: You Jew condemn the Gentile for doing certain things. But you do the same things yourself. If now your judgment is good against the Gentile, it is also good against yourself. It is thus that you condemn yourself.

Of course the principle which underlies the Apostle's argument, and which he assumes, is that like sins deserve like condemnation. To this may also be added the other principle assumed by him, namely, that in judging, the person is not to be respected. To this the Jew would be likely to demur; for he seems to have thought that the mere circumstance of being a Jew protected him against condemnation. But the Apostle's argument, as we shall presently see, is proceeding on a very different principle.

2. But we know that God's judgment The *de* of this clause is difficult. As to how it should be translated, the learned are not agreed. Stuart renders it *for*; Macknight, *besides*; and Alford, *now*. The majority, however, render it *but*. With these I agree, though *but* does not make the connection clear. The drift of thought appears to be as follows:

In condemning the Gentile, the Jew certainly condemned himself. This he could not deny. Still he could reply that his judgment, at best, might be wrong; that he could not know all

the facts in the case; and that, therefore, though he did virtually condemn himself, it amounted to but little. The force of this, the Apostle would feel bound to admit, and to it would reply: Be it so. *Your* judgment is not infallible. *But* we know that the judgment of God is according to truth against those that practise such things. You practise them; and he condemns you. You are then justly condemned.

is according to truth against those that practise such things. God's judgment is his high judicial decision in the case. This judgment is *kata aletheian, according to truth*; that is, it is according to the real merits of the case. It is not according to appearances, but to reality. It goes to the very bottom, and takes in all the facts, the opportunities, the motives, the law—in a word, every thing essential to an absolutely perfect judgment. Such a judgment is *according to truth*; it is true to every fact and circumstance in the case, and is therefore of the very essence of justice. This judgment God has pronounced upon all those who practise such things as have now been named. You Jews practise them. Your case, then, is hopeless; you are certainly condemned.

The Apostle adroitly couches his argument in general terms so as surely to embrace the Jew without as yet naming him. He is thus craftily preparing his mind for the tremendous conclusion in which it is his purpose, at last, to involve him, a conclusion which will cut him loose from Abraham, from circumcision, from the law, and send him in despair to Christ. He is guilty of every sin the Gentile is guilty of. He condemns himself. God condemns him. What then remains for him? Nothing could be more skilful than the mode of the Apostle's advance on the Jew.

practise such things. Our word practise has in it more of the idea of habit than the word do. The latter may denote habitual doing, but it also applies to single acts. Practise, on the contrary, is never applied to a single act, but to such only as we repeat many times. It hence more accurately renders *prassontas* here than do; for the evil deeds of which the Apostle speaks were constantly recurring deeds.

such things. Not exactly the same, but like them. They may have been even worse, and probably were; since they were the deeds of Jews. For the more intelligent a people are, the more refined and debasing are their sins, when once they sink

down low into vice. Hence, although their sins were not identical with those of the Gentiles, still they were so nearly so, as to fall under the same condemnation.

3. Do you then count on this, O, man, who judge those that practise such things, and do them yourself, that you will escape the judgment of God? This verse contains a deep hint at a new and dangerous error of the Jew, which it was highly important to correct, but not proper as yet to name. That he trusted to his relation to Abraham, to his circumcision, and to the fact of having the law, for salvation is indisputable. On these grounds he clearly counted on God's partiality. Consequently, although he knew himself to be guilty of the same sins which he condemned in the Gentile, and although he expected God to condemn these sins in the Gentile, he yet evidently did not expect God to condemn him. He expected God to overlook in him, because a Jew, what he knew he would not overlook in the Gentile, and what even he himself did not overlook. This, in him, was an inveterate error. The way to cure it was not to attack it openly, but under cover of general terms, to get his assent to some obvious principle of justice which would work it out of him. This was the only way to oust it.

Paul had just comprehensively said: "We know that God's judgment is according to truth against those who practise such things." You Jews practise them. That judgment, then, is against you. Do you then count on escaping it? How can you so count, when it is according to truth, according to the realities of the case, and in no sense based on mere personal considerations? God's judgment is *according to truth*. It therefore knows nothing of your relation to Abraham, or your circumcision.

4. Or do you despise. The *or* here introduces an alternative, and the train of thought may be thus indicated. Do you then count on this, that though equally guilty with the Gentiles, you will escape the judgment of God because you are a Jew? Is this your conclusion? Or do you despise the abundance of God's goodness, and forbearance, and patience? You are surely doing one or the other. Were you not expecting to escape, you would repent of your sins; for God is bearing with you for this purpose; and the design of his goodness is to lead you into it. But you are not repenting. You are, then, despising his goodness, and forbearance, and patience. One or the other of these alter-

natives the Jew was bound to accept; and either exhibited him in a dangerous position.

Despise—*Kataphroneis*: This word means to look mentally down upon; that is, to look upon with a feeling of contempt. Despise, etymologically taken, is its exact synonyme.

the abundance of his goodness, and forbearance, and patience, The word *ploutos* means wealth, riches; and from this it readily comes to signify abundance. *Goodness*: This word denotes God's kindness as shown in his dealings with men. *Anoches* means holding up or holding back. It is closely rendered by our word forbearance. *Makrothumias* refers to God's disposition, and signifies that it is long suffering. The difference between this and the preceding word is, that the one denotes the disposition to bear long, while the other expresses the outward manifestation of the disposition in patience. Both words refer back to the judgment of God as mentioned in v. 2. That judgment is against all who sin as do the Gentiles. But God is not now executing it. He is disposed to hold back, and is actually doing so. This he does to afford men opportunity to repent, and so prepare to see him in peace.

not knowing that God's goodness leads you into repentance? *Agnoon*: This word means simply *not knowing, being ignorant*; and I see no reason for supposing that it is here used in a different sense. True, many learned men understand it to signify *not considering, not acknowledging*. But the necessity for this is not apparent. I here take the word, as said, to mean *not knowing, being ignorant*. It denotes, however, not an unavoidable ignorance, since the ignorance was that of the Jew. On the contrary, it denotes an ignorance resulting either from wilful disinclination to know, or wilful neglect of the means of knowing. In either case the ignorance was culpable. The force of the word will be brought out more clearly by reading the verse thus: Or do you, Jew, now ignorant of the fact that God's goodness is designed to lead you into repentance—do you despise his goodness, and forbearance, and patience? To despise these is bad enough, but to despise them in culpable ignorance is still worse.

I do not understand the Apostle to mean that the Jew despised the goodness of God *because* he was ignorant. The ignorance was not cause to the despising. The ignorance was a fact; the despising was a fact; and the two facts merely co-existed: not were antecedent and result.

that God's goodness leads you into repentance? Not that it absolutely and in fact so leads you; for it does not. But it constantly acts on you for this purpose. The design of God's goodness is to lead you into repentance. Accordingly it is always acting on you in this direction. But you are ignorant of this design, and are therefore uninfluenced by it. God's intention is defeated in you through your degeneracy.

From the Greek *ago*, through the Latin, comes *act*; and using *act*, instead of *lead*, gives us, though in a form strange to us, the exact sense. Not knowing that the goodness of God *acts* you into repentance; that is, acts on you to lead you into it. The word expresses a fact, and implies its intention.

into repentance—*eis*. I prefer here the usual meaning of this particle after verbs of action or motion. Repentance denotes our mental determination to forsake sin, resulting in the actual abandonment of it. The purpose of God's goodness is to lead us through this mental change into this abandonment. The conception of the Apostle is clear and fine, and should be strictly preserved.

5. And according to your impenitent heart and hardness Lachman, Alford, and T. S. Green all regard this verse as a continuation of the question started in the preceding verse. They would end the question with v. 5. The view is correct, although it is opposed by some. Indeed, I see not how any one can attentively read the two verses together and come to a different conclusion.

Still there is another view of considerable weight, which is to end the question with v. 4, and assume a suppressed sentence. The view may be thus indicated: Or do you despise the abundance of his goodness, and forbearance, and patience, not knowing that God's goodness leads you into repentance? *You despise the abundance of his goodness, &c. This is what you do.* And according to your impenitent heart, &c. According to this view, v. 5 is not a part of the question, but the simple statement of matters of fact. Between the two views, so nearly equal in merit, it is hardly important to make a choice. Still I prefer the former, as appearing the more obvious and natural. But whichever view is adopted, the sense remains the same. Indeed, they do not differ as to the sense, but merely as to how it is to be expressed.

The reader will notice that instead of *hardness and impenitent*

heart, I transpose and read, *impenitent heart and hardness*. The object is to avoid uncertainty. The common reader is apt to think that *hardness* must in some way qualify heart, and that therefore it should be *hard*. Such, however, is not the case; and accordingly I so arrange as to prevent the mistake. Hardness is a noun standing for its own peculiar fact, and in no respect a qualificative of heart.

according to This phrase means in conformity with, not in proportion to. As is your moral state, so will be the award. You are hard and your heart is impenitent. Conformably with this you will be punished.

impenitent heart The impenitent heart of Paul is not a heart simply impenitent as a fact; but a heart either so dark and corrupt that it could not repent, or so perverse that it would not. It is not a heart not penitent by nature, but a heart actively impenitent from depravity and vice.

hardness This word denotes the moral or spiritual insensibility of the Jew. Through a life of deep degradation his whole inner man had become petrified. God's goodness, and forbearance, and patience spent their force on him with no more effect than on the pebbles in his way. He lived wholly untouched by the divine beneficence, and consequently never returned one responsive emotion to his Maker and Benefactor. When such hardness can be predicated of a man, humanity is about extinct in him. If he has not placed himself beyond the possibility of redemption, it is difficult to state in what his failure consists.

you heap up for yourself wrath in a day of wrath This language is metaphorical, being borrowed from the well known custom of collecting wealth or goods, and of laying them up for future use in some particular place provided for the purpose. The Apostle conceives of the day of judgment as a storehouse in which the heaping up takes place. Wrath is the thing so heaped up. This is effected by means of sin. Plainly, by persisting in their wickedness, the Jews were augmenting the punishment to be inflicted on them in the last day. The word "wrath" signifies the deep displeasure which God will finally evince in punishing sin.

and of disclosure of the just judgment of God? The day which is to display God's wrath is also to disclose his just judgment. It will be the day in which he will judge the whole human family. Some he will acquit and crown with immor-

talty, others he will condemn and punish. But the punishment of these will be shown to be as just as the acquittal of those, and both will be shown to be absolutely just

6. **who will render to each** To each simply as a man, and wholly without regard to the accident of being Jew or Gentile. This sweeps from the Jew all hope of partiality. In the great day of retribution, God will not know him as a Jew. His descent from Abraham will be nothing, his circumcision will be nothing. He will be recognized as a human being only. In this character alone will he stand before God. This laid the ax at the very root of his hope. It cut the Jew down to the common level of other men. True, the Apostle does not as yet name him. But his sagacity could not fail to see that the word *each* included him as surely as it did the Gentile. He was left without escape.

according to his deeds— To render to a man according to his deeds is to render to him according to his life as good or bad. The language does not imply that God keeps an account current with a man, charging him with all his bad deeds, and crediting him with all his good ones, and that at the end of life, he will strike a balance, and punish or reward him merely for the difference. The word *deeds* covers the life as upright or the reverse, and the meaning is, that accordingly as it is this or that, will be the requital.

The Apostle had just mentioned a day which is to disclose God's just judgment—δικαιοκρισία. If just, then must it be according to our deeds. In his soul the Jew could not but feel this to be right. It was not the Gentile's condemnation that he was a Gentile, nor the Jew's justification that he was a Jew. The life as good or as bad must strike all minds as the only ground of a *just judgment*. It was this conception of a just judgment that suggested to the Apostle's mind the supplement *according to his deeds*. Into that conception the thought contained in these words would enter as an essential, integral part. The two would stand inseparably united in his mind. The aim of the Apostle is to extirpate from the mind of the Jew all thought of security based on the naked ground of being a Jew. This he does by placing him on general grounds of common justice. To enable him to recognize these grounds clearly was to cure his narrow Jewish conceits. These cured, and he was ready for the gospel.

7. everlasting life to those who, by continuance in good works, seek for glory and honor and incorruption— The Apostle here states more particularly what he means by rendering to each according to his deeds. He first distributes the human family into two classes. To the first class, God will render everlasting life. To the second, anger and wrath, or the effects of his displeasure with sin. The first class habitually practise good works. This is the tenor of their lives. In doing this they are intentionally seeking for glory, and honor, and incorruption. These constitute the motives which actuate them. The second class are contentious. This is their first characteristic. Next, they obey not the truth. This describes them negatively. They wilfully refuse to do every thing God requires of them. Finally, they obey injustice. They do every thing God forbids them to do. The description is exhaustive.

8. anger and wrath to those who are contentious, and obey not the truth, but obey injustice—literally, those who are *ex eritheias*. The word *eritheia* is involved in some uncertainty. In the first place, its derivation seems to be not clearly settled. This leaves its sense in doubt. In the second, its use in the New Testament affords us almost no aid in determining its meaning. These facts render its translation difficult.

The ancient expositors, without exception, as far as known to me, derived the word from *ἐρεθίζω*, which would give it the signification of stirring up excitement or strife. This is also the derivation of some of the more recent critics, as Stuart and Bloomfield. The weight of modern authority, however, is now decidedly against this view. The best late critics derive the word from *ἐπιθεῖω*. This gives it the meaning of canvassing (i. e., for votes), intriguing party spirit, faction, contention. Robinson and Alford thus derive it, the former giving it the sense of faction, contention, and the latter rendering it "*self-seeking*." The Septuagint uses it in the sense of rebellious and disobedient, which I take to be very close to its import in the clause in hand. Of the two or three words, then, by one of which I believe we must render it, I prefer *contentious*. According to this, the clause before us literally means, *to those who are of contention*, or as the sense of a well known usage, *to those who are contentious*. Contentious refers to the disposition, as well as to the practice growing out of it. It means contentious against the truth, on the one hand, and contentious for injustice, on the other. The result of

this would be disobedience to the former, and obedience to the latter. This corresponds closely with the words which follow contention. To those who are contentious *and obey not the truth, but obey injustice*. Such I believe to be the meaning of the clause.

glory and honor and incorruption— These are the accompaniments of everlasting life. Glory denotes the distinction which the blessed will attain, honor, the esteem in which they will be held, and incorruption their absolute exemption from sin and impurity.

For the transpositions which appear in verses 7, 8, no apology need be offered. The sense is not thereby in the slightest altered, while the gain is great in the way of clearness. A glance at the verses will evince this.

9. Affliction and distress will come upon every soul of man who works evil, Here we have an ellipsis of the verb, which I supply by *will come*. The verse, so far, is a mere reiteration of the contents of v 8. The two verses differ in language only, not in matter. In this, as in that, the broad principle is assumed that every man, no matter who he may be, who is guilty of wrong-doing, will be punished. Of course it is taken for granted that the wrong-doing continues through life, or is never repented of and forgiven. The Apostle having now fully stated, amplified, and reiterated his broad principle, makes a direct personal application of it to the Jew. This he could now do without justly giving offence, or seeming to be indelicate. What his comprehensive generalities certainly included, could, without impropriety, be specifically named. Henceforward the volume of argument is with the Jew. He is boldly met and grappled with without stint.

of Jew first, and of Greek. The word "first" does not denote order, but *distinction*. The meaning is, the Jew especially, or above all others, because favored above all others. The word Greek, though usually denoting the Greeks strictly, has here a wider signification. It includes the Gentiles also. The two words, Jew and Greek, embrace the whole of mankind.

will come. The time when the affliction and distress will come is the last day, or day of wrath. The affliction and distress of this verse are the outward expression of the anger and wrath of the preceding one.

upon every soul of man. Does the Apostle mean by this

language that it is the soul particularly, or by itself, that will be the subject of future punishment? Some commentators have been of this opinion: but in it I can not concur. The phrase, "every soul of man," is a popular expression for every man. It is the whole man, and not exclusively his soul, that will be punished.

10. But glory, honor, and peace will be given to every one who works good, to Jew first, and to Greek. The glory, honor, and peace are the rewards to be conferred in the last day. In small measure, and as a foretaste, they are realized in this life; but they will not be realized in their fulness till in the next. As in the matter of punishment, the Jew outranks the Greek, because of the abuse of better opportunities, so in the matter of blessing, the same even justice gives him the pre-eminence, because of the better life. How profoundly must he have felt the fairness of the Apostle's teaching. Well was it calculated to prepare him for the following generalization which underlies that teaching as a principle, and vindicates it as a reason.

11. **For there is no respecting the person with God.** This is the confirmation and proof of all the Apostle has said about punishing men according to their deeds. To respect the person is to be partial. It is to be controlled by person, not deeds, in rendering a decision; to make judgment a sham by making it the embodiment of mere personal preferences, instead of, as it always should be, the expression of rigorous impartiality and perfect justice.

There is no respecting the person with God. If not, then the Jew stands before him on the same level with the Greek. His being a Jew is nothing; his circumcision is nothing. The line and the plummet are laid to him; so that without some new remedy, heretofore not thought of by him, he is lost. Thus the Apostle cuts him up from his last ground of hope as a Jew. When this is effectually done, and his soul is penetrated with the fact, he will be prepared for God's "justification by belief." To this extremity the Apostle is steadily pushing him.

In order to the salvation of the Jew, two things were absolutely essential, namely: 1st. To convince him profoundly that the grounds on which he hoped for salvation could never secure it. These grounds were four: 1. descent from Abraham; 2. circumcision; 3. his legal religion; 4. the partiality of God. His

expectation of this last rested mainly on the other three. *Sap* those, and this went; *sap* this, and his hope went; this, v. 11 *saps* Here the Jew stood then, and here he stands now. 2d. To bring him to believe with his whole heart that Jesus is the Christ. But in order to this, all his grounds of hope must be destroyed. To effect this, therefore, is now the Apostle's aim.

CHAPTER II. SECTION 2.

¹² For as many as have sinned without law shall also be lost without law; and as many as have sinned under law shall be condemned by law, ¹⁶ in the day when God shall judge the secrets of men, by Jesus Christ, according to my gospel. ¹⁴ For not the hearers of law are just with God; but the doers of law shall be justified. ¹⁴ For when nations who have not law do by nature the deeds of the law, these not having law are law to themselves; ¹⁵ who show the law's work written in their hearts when their conscience testifies in agreement, and their reasonings among one another accuse or even defend.

¹² Ὅσοι γὰρ ἀνόμως ἤμαρτον, νόμως καὶ ἀπολοῦνται· καὶ ὅσοι ἐν νόμῳ ἤμαρτον, διὰ νόμου κριθήσονται. ¹³ Οἱ γὰρ οἱ ἀκροαταὶ νόμου δίκαιοι παρὰ Θεοῦ, ἀλλ' οἱ ποιηταὶ νόμου δικαιοθήσονται. ¹⁴ Ὅταν γὰρ ἔβη τὰ μὴ νόμον ἔχοντα φέσει τὰ τοῦ νόμου ποιῶσιν, οὗτοι νόμον μὴ ἔχοντες ἑαυτοῖς εἰσὶ νόμος, ¹⁵ οἷτινες ἐνδείκνυται τὸ ἔργον τοῦ νόμου γραπτὸν ἐν ταῖς καρδίαις αὐτῶν, συμμαρτυρούσης αὐτῶν τῆς συνειδήσεως καὶ μεταξύ ἀλλήλων τῶν λογισμῶν κατηγορούντων ἢ καὶ ἀπολογουμένων, ¹⁶ ἐν ἡμέρᾳ ὅτε κρινεῖ ὁ Θεὸς τὰ κρυπτὰ τῶν ἀνθρώπων κατὰ τὸ εὐαγγέλιόν μου διὰ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ.

SUMMARY.

The Gentiles who have sinned without a written law will be judged without one; while the Jews will be judged by the law under which they live. Nations who have no written law are law to themselves in so far as they know right from wrong. What they know in this respect is attested by their conscience, and shown by their mutual accusations and acquittals.

12. For as many as have sinned without law Law is will, whether it respects accountable beings or mere inanimate things. But in the case of the former, to be binding, it must be made known to them in some intelligible form; in the case of the latter, it is impressed on them. Accordingly, God's law respecting man is his will revealed to him. In this sense the word law is used in the passage before us. It means any direct revelation of God's will, and not exclusively the law of Moses. Hence to sin without law is to sin without an immediate revelation. It is not to sin without the law of Moses merely, but to sin without any direct expression of the divine will.

"For as many as have sinned." To whom does the language refer, and how many does it include? It refers to and includes

all upon whom the law of Moses was not binding. In comprehension it is coextensive with the word Gentile, and in sense is identical with it.

But how could the Gentiles sin without law? Without law in some form they could not. But the Gentiles had the truth, at least a measure of it. This Paul has already told us; and in the truth they had law. It was in disobeying this truth that they sinned. They had no direct revelation from God, as had the Jews. It was not, therefore, by violating such revelation that they sinned. The law they had was in the form of tradition. But in breaking it, they as effectually sinned as if it had been an immediate revelation. It was not the less binding because of its form. They had only the less of it, and were the more liable to forget it.

shall also be lost without law; They shall be lost without being condemned by the terms of a direct revelation, such as the Jews had. The measure of light they have, be it much or little, is their rule of life. By this they will stand or fall.

But here we need to guard a point or two. In every condition of life in which men are lost, they can also be saved. Indeed, the primary provision is always for salvation, the alternative being to be lost. What the special conditions of salvation are in a given case, as in that of the Gentiles, it may be impossible to say. Still they are certainly to be assumed. Perfect conformity to the rule of life would indisputably secure salvation. But if perfect conformity be practically impossible, and salvation is still attained, then must it be by the intervention of mercy on some condition, as repentance. Moreover, the reason or ground of this intervention would, in all cases, be the same, to-wit: the redemption which is in Christ.

“For as many as have sinned without law shall also be lost without law.” This would seem to teach that all, without exception, who have so sinned, will be lost. But such is not the case. The meaning is, that all who have so sinned, *and are lost*, will be lost without law. To be lost is a thought which has two sides to it. It implies, on the one hand, to be lost to eternal life; and on the other, to be positively condemned and punished. The profound folly of annihilation was never in Paul’s mind.

and as many as have sinned under law This language does not imply that there are any under law who have not sinned. It simply denotes so many of the human family as have a law

directly revealed from God. All such sin without exception. As the preceding expression certainly refers to and includes Gentiles only, so this certainly refers to and includes Jews only. But it includes all Jews, and all whom it includes have sinned.

shall be condemned by law, God will condemn them; but the rule according to which he will try them is the law under which they live. In the present clause *krithesontai* should be rendered condemned, not judged. To judge simply does not necessarily imply condemnation. It may imply acquittal. But of those who live under law not one can be acquitted. They have all, *without exception, sinned, and must all, without exception, be condemned.* By the law, God can acquit no one who has broken it. He must condemn him. Hence condemned is better than judged.

If those who live under the law are saved, it is not because they are acquitted by the law. It is because favor intervenes in virtue of the blood of Christ, and they are gratuitously released from the condemnation of the law. Salvation is a gift, not the payment of a debt—not an unconditional, but a conditional gift. Because of the atonement made by Christ, God can in justice prescribe these conditions, though he may not be bound to do so. He prescribes them from favor, and in mercy to the guilty. When they are complied with, he forgives, not because forgiveness is merited, on the one hand, or owed, on the other. He forgives gratuitously. Forgiveness then is a gift; and so are its results.

Here, in my judgment, at the end of v. 12, is the place for v. 16. It should be immediately joined, as in the translation, to *krithesontai*. This, as Bloomfield remarks, is the "opinion of most eminent expositors from Grotius downward." Stuart and Alford, however, would make vs. 11-15 parenthetical, and so unite v. 16 to 10. If the view here held, with Bloomfield and other "eminent expositors," be not correct, then that of Stuart and Alford is. Still I think these two writers wrong, and the other view the true one. My reasons for connecting vs. 16 and 12 are compactly these: The language, *For as many as have sinned without law*, includes the whole Gentile world down to the time of Christ; while the expression, *shall also be lost without law*, refers to the fate which awaits the wicked among them at the last day. They shall be lost, and not saved. This is their final doom. In like manner, the clause, *as many as have sinned under law*, certainly includes all Jews prior to the gospel; while

the phrase, *shall be condemned by law*, refers to the condemnation of the last day. Thus the words Gentile and Jew include the whole human family previous to the gospel; and *lost and condemned* denote the final disposition of the wicked among them. But the day of condemnation for the wicked is the day of acquittal for the just. In other words, it is the last great day, the very day of v. 16. The *krithesontai* of v. 12 is merely the condemnatory side of the *krinci* of v. 16. Both words refer to the same event. For these reasons I think it best to insert v. 16, and comments here. The numbering looks awkward, but the advantage arising from a properly connected sense more than counterbalances this. The Greek I make no attempt to rearrange, but leave it as in the text.

16. in the day when God shall judge the secrets of men, That is, the secrets of all men. This is clearly the day of final judgment. In that day God will judge every man on the basis of his whole life. Every unknown act and hidden thought will be taken into the account. And as sure as that judgment is to occur on this ground, so sure is it that every responsible human being will be condemned. It will be first a judgment according to the law of life of each individual. But by this law no man can be justified. This must be fully shown. Then, for the first time, will be disclosed to all the absolute and universal necessity for justification by belief. When this is seen, both saved and lost will begin to understand and realize the work of Christ.

by Jesus Christ, according to my gospel. God will judge the world by Christ because Christ himself will be the judge. This is on the principle that what God does by another he does himself. *According to my gospel*, not as the rule according to which the judging will take place. For those who lived and died under the law of Moses will be judged by it; the Gentiles, according to the law written in their hearts; and those who live under the gospel, by it. The meaning is, that inasmuch as the fact of a general judgment is taught in my gospel, so one will take place.

13. For not the hearers of law are just with God; That is, not those who merely hear it, but do not keep it. Equally, then, at least, they who simply have it. Here the Jew is distinctly given to understand that the mere circumstance of having the law amounts to nothing. Therefore, on this ground he can have no hope. He must seek his safety in something else.

but the doers of law shall be justified. The word law here signifies any expression of God's will. It comprehends all divine law, as well law in the form in which the Jew had it, as law in the form in which the Gentile had it. For it is as true of the Gentile as of the Jew, that not he who merely hears law, but *ne only who does it will be justified*. By doers of law we must not understand persons who keep its requirements in part, and in part fail. We must understand perfect obedience, or obedience to every precept without even one failure. But since there is no such obedience, there is of course no justification based on it. The justification of the clause, therefore, is merely potential, not actual. If God delivers a law it is that it may be obeyed. This would strike the mind even of a Jew as certain. But since no Jew, not even the best, could claim that he perfectly kept the law, it would follow in his own mind that there was no justification by law for him. This was precisely the conclusion which the Apostle desired to fix deep in his mind. For this done, and the road into his heart lay open to the gospel.

But it is important to notice the sense in which the word justified is here used. The persons justified are those who have perfectly kept the law. They are then not sinners, nor have they ever been. Hence they are not justified in the sense of being released from sin or pardoned. They are justified in the sense of being acquitted when accused, on the score of absolute innocence. They are simply declared to be just or sinless. Justification in such a case would be merited and could not be withheld. But in this sense no soul of man can be justified. Such justification is impossible; and such only is the justification of law. The position of the Apostle, though applicable alike to Gentile and Jew, is designed especially for the Jew.

14. For when nations who have not law Not nations who have not *the* law of Moses, but who have no *written* law from God of any kind. "*Not law*" does not mean absolutely no law, as the immediate sequel shows, but no written law. The reference here is to v. 12. There the Apostle says, For as many as have sinned without law, &c. On this the question would arise, How can nations sin without law? The question is here answered.

do by nature "By nature" means nature without a written law, and not necessarily nature wholly unenlightened by divine truth. It means Gentile nature, such as it was at the time which

the Apostle had in his mind, and in the circumstances by which it was then surrounded. This nature may have been highly cultivated in some instances, as we know it was in many of the ancient nations. Still they were without a written code from God; and even the knowledge they had from him in the form of tradition had become so blended in their minds with other knowledge that it could no longer be distinguished as divine. With them all the light they had was virtually natural. In all their acts they were controlled simply by their own convictions and feelings, and to no extent by recognized divine authority. Nature was their guide, not revelation.

the deeds of the law—*ta tou nomou*. The word *poiein* means strictly *to do*. When it is said of a man *poiei* he *does* (i. e., anything), the result is a deed. Now, since the *ta tou nomou* here are things actually done, and not merely to be done, it is best to render by the familiar word “deeds.” True, the deeds done were such as the law of Moses did require, provided the reference be to it; or such as the unrevealed law would have required, provided the reference be to it. The reference, however, in *tou nomou* is to the law of Moses, while the *ta* refers to the moral duties which it enjoined. With these duties, many of the Gentiles were well acquainted, and practised them to a commendable degree. For example, they loved truth and spoke it; they hated theft, adultery, and the like, and avoided them. The reference in *ta* is to such things as these.

these not having law are law to themselves; They are law to themselves in so far only as they have a correct knowledge of duty. When, in other words, their knowledge of duty corresponds with the requirements of the law, they are then, and to that extent, a law to themselves. In this case, when they do what they know to be right, they are guiltless; when they do otherwise, they are held as sinners. But they cease to be a law to themselves the moment their knowledge becomes vicious and leads them to do wrong. In this case they would rather be held as doubly guilty, guilty for their vicious knowledge, and guilty for the acts to which it led. Knowledge which leads men to do wrong is no law in the estimation of God. Law with him is a rule of right, not of wrong.

15. who show the law's work written in their hearts This clause is explanatory of the preceding one. It states who **are law to themselves**, namely, not every nation, but **those only**

who show the law's work written in their hearts. They alone are law to themselves who know what is right. The expression *law's work, or work of the law*, is general, and means such duties as the law required. *Written in their hearts* is metaphorical, and signifies not only that they knew certain things to be right, but felt impelled by conscience to do them.

when their conscience testifies in agreement, It was thus that they showed the law's work written in their hearts. The showing was effected by means of conscience thus testifying, or when it did it. *Summartureo* signifies to testify with another, or in agreement with another. Accordingly, the clause means that their conscience testified in regard to certain things being duties, in agreement with the law. It is the participle of the verb that is here used; and it is clearly to be resolved by a particle of time, as in the translation. On this usage see Winer, p. 344, and Stuart, Grk. Gram., p. 264.

and their reasonings among one another accuse or even defend. Here again we have the same usage as in the preceding clause, and requiring the same mode of treatment: that is, the participles contain the notion of time which is to be indicated if necessary. In the present clause it is not necessary, because expressed in the preceding one. The Gentiles reasoned among themselves on questions of right and wrong, as well as on acts as right or wrong. In these reasonings they criminated or defended one another according to the facts in the case. They thus showed their knowledge of duty, or of the things which the law required. In other words, they showed the work of the law written in their hearts. The expression *or even defend* would seem to imply that the accusing was the rule and the defending the exception. As if the idea was, For the most part they accuse, but sometimes *even* defend.

The two preceding clauses are not to be regarded in the light of separate proofs. On the contrary, they are to be taken together as a single proof, settling a single fact, namely, that the Gentiles had the work of the law written in their hearts.

How came the "law's work" to be written in the Gentile heart? The answer is conjectural. Some have supposed the reference to be to a natural sense of right inherent in all men, a sense either innate in the soul or springing up spontaneously in it as the inner life unfolds. The reference certainly is to a sense or knowledge of right relative to certain duties. But how came the Gentile by

that sense? I should rather think it formed on unperished traditions of the divine will, communicated to the early fathers of mankind. That the sense might be thus formed can hardly be denied; and what might thus have been, it is perhaps safest to assume as having actually been. A natural or inborn sense of right equivalent to the "law's work," or what it requires, I deem a very hazardous assumption.

CHAPTER II. SECTION 3.

¹⁷ Εἰ δὲ σὺ Ἰουδαῖος ἐπονομάζη, καὶ ἐπαναπαύῃ νόμῳ, καὶ καυχᾶσαι ἐν Θεῷ, ¹⁸καὶ γινώσκεις τὸ θέλημα, καὶ δοκιμάζεις τὰ διαφέροντα κατηχούμενος ἐκ τοῦ νόμου, ¹⁹πέποιθᾶς τε σεαυτὸν ὁδηγὸν εἶναι τυφλῶν, φῶς τῶν ἐν σκότει, ²⁰παιδευτὴν ἀφρόνων, διδάσκαλον νηπίων, ἔχοντα τὴν μόρφωσιν τῆς γνώσεως καὶ τῆς ἀληθείας ἐν τῷ νόμῳ—²¹ὁ οὖν διδάσκων ἑτερον σεαυτὸν οὐ διδάσκει; Ὁ κηρύσσων μὴ κλέπτειν κλέπτει; Ὁ λέγων μὴ μοιχεύειν μοιχεύει; Ὁ βδελυσσόμενος τὰ εἰδωλα ἱεροσυλεῖ; ²²Ὁς ἐν νόμῳ καυχᾶσαι, διὰ τῆς παραβάσεως τοῦ νόμου τὸν Θεὸν ἀτιμάζεις. ²⁴Τὸ γὰρ ὄνομα τοῦ Θεοῦ δι' ὑμᾶς βλασφημεῖται ἐν τοῖς ἔθνεσι, καθὼς γέγραπται.

¹⁷ But since you call yourself Jew, and rely on the law, and boast in God, ¹⁸and know his will, and approve the better things, being instructed by the law, ¹⁹and are confident that yourself are a leader of the blind, a light of those in darkness. ²⁰an instructor of the ignorant, a teacher of babes, having in the law the form of knowledge and of the truth—²¹you then who teach another do you not teach yourself? You who preach, steal not, do you steal? ²²You who say, commit not adultery, do you commit adultery? You who abhor idols, do you rob temples [*of them?*] ²³You who boast in the law, dishonor God by breaking the law. ²⁴For as it is written, God's name is, because of you, spoken evil of among the nations.

SUMMARY.

The Jew made great pretensions to superior knowledge; yet he acted as though he himself needed to be taught. He was inconsistent in his conduct. He preached not to do this and did it. He taught not to do that, and did it. He boasted in the law, yet broke it. He abhorred idols; yet robbed temples of them to serve them. He affected great reverence for God; yet dishonored him by breaking his law. Nay, he even brought his name into disrepute among surrounding nations.

Paul has now shown the Jew, in the preceding part of the chapter, that in condemning the Gentile, which he constantly did, he condemned himself. This he shows on the principle that what he condemned in others he himself was guilty of. He has told him, moreover, that God's just judgment is against all such vices as he practises, and has warned him not to expect to escape that judgment so long as he continues to do evil. He has also

told him that God will reward every man according to his deeds; that he will crown the pure, who seek it, with eternal life, and visit the wicked and impenitent with anger and wrath. He has informed him that, notwithstanding his vain conceit to the contrary, there is no respecting the person with God; that the Gentiles will be tried by the law written in their hearts, and not by the law of Moses; and that he, on the contrary, though living under that law, will be condemned by it. He has reminded him that not the hearers of the law are just with God, which is about all he is; but that the doers of the law alone will be justified, which he is not. Thus the Jew is shown how he stands and where, first, on the principles of common justice, and, second, according to his own life, and the spirit of his law. This being done, the Apostle now proceeds to arraign him specifically on his own assumptions, and on facts in his life which he could not deny—to show him, in a word, how he stands on special counts.

17. **But since you call yourself Jew,** With Bengel I take *eponomaze* to be middle and not passive. The meaning is not, since you are called, but since you call yourself, give yourself this name. The word Jew must here be taken, according to Jewish estimation, as a mark of high and peculiar distinction. Paul being himself a Jew, knew well the sense in which the Jew used it, and could therefore speak advisedly. It was the national name in which the greatest pride was felt, the verbal badge which marked them as better than others. A Jew as a Jew looked on a Gentile as a dog; yet the latter might be a good Samaritan and the former a heartless Levite. A mere name, not significant of superior excellence of life, is a poor thing to be proud of; and this is the very point made in the clause.

and rely on the law, The word law here indisputably refers to the law of Moses, yet it is used without the article. Numerous efforts have been made to account for the fact, not one of which is satisfactory. As nothing depends on settling the point, I shall not trouble the reader with discussions of it. The fact at which the Apostle aims can not be mistaken. The Jew *relied upon* (exact force of *epanapauo*) the mere fact of having the law, as a ground of safety. In his estimation its bare bestowment on him proved him to be favored of God above all others. Confident of this favor, he had no fear. But the law was not a thing to be simply had; it was a thing to be obeyed. In this lay the safety, not in that; yet the Jew concluded the reverse. You,

Jew, rest upon the law, but how do you use it? The sequel will show.

and boast in God, To boast in God is not necessarily wrong. It may be right, and is, where it springs from a feeling of real reverence, and is accompanied by a scrupulous effort to please him. But where the boast is only a boast, where it is that and no more, it is a sham. Such was the boasting of the Jew alluded to. On all such hollowness God frowns, not smiles.

18. and know his will, It is not only right, in fact, to know God's will, but highly commendable. Nay, it is culpable not to know it where we have opportunity. The wrong then lies not in knowing God's will, but in regarding this knowledge, by itself, as a mark of superiority, and ground of acceptance with God. It is not knowing that makes us better than others, but doing. The point made against the Jew is that, although he knew God's will, he obeyed it not. He did worse; he sunk to the level of the Gentile in positive vice.

and approve the better things, being instructed by the law—*dokimazeis ta diapheronta*. Commentators waver here between two significations, and with reason. *Dokimazo* is clear, but not easy to render. It means to try, put to the test, and as a result of the trial, to approve, accept. The word has both meanings; and the difficulty is in saying which is the true one here. Upon the whole I prefer *approve*. This meaning seems the more natural, and the better to fit the connection. Again, *ta diapheronta* has two distinct meanings. Its first, in classic Greek, is *points of difference* or simply *differences*. Its second is difference in the sense of one thing being better than another. I take the phrase in the latter sense. The Jews were instructed by the law. Their sense of right, therefore, was nicer or more delicate than that of people without their advantages; and their powers of discrimination sharper. Their education, in a word, the more highly qualified them to distinguish between the worse and the better, and to approve correctly. This I take to be the fact expressed in the clause.

The other rendering of the clause, and the more popular one just now, is—*distinguish things that differ*. The original has both senses, and the one not less certainly than the other. Nor do I see any way of showing conclusively which is the one intended. A single fact, more than any thing else, decides my preference. The same clause occurs in Philip. i: 10., where it

obviously means to *approve the better things*; and confessedly whatever it means in one passage it means in the other. I hence prefer, as now said—*approve the better things*. This the Jew did by the aid of better light. But he practised the worse. This he did from a perverted nature and a corrupt heart. This is the case charged against him.

19. and are confident that yourself are a leader of the blind, The language is metaphorical, and signifies, not the literally blind, but the spiritually blind. It signifies the ignorant—the ignorant, most likely, of all nations. To these the Jew claimed pre-eminent fitness to be leader. He was to them, in his own esteem, instead of God, to lead them out of darkness into light, and from vice into virtue. We should expect him, then, to be at least what he proposed to make others. But he was not. This is the thrust. He affected to take splinters out of others' eyes, while his own were full of beams.

a light of those in darkness, The expression is beautiful, the only regret being that it should signify a pretense, and not a reality. Christ is the *to phos* (τὸ φῶς) of every man. This high distinction the Jew, in his self-assumed superiority, arrogated to himself. But the light which he claimed to be to others was darkness in himself. He was himself the heathen whom, in his vanity, he was affecting to illumine in the person of another.

20. an instructor of the ignorant, a teacher of babes, The Jew looked on all men as ignorant but himself. He accordingly assumed to be capable of instructing all. This, from his circumstances, he should have been; but this he was not. It was because he said, "I know," and knew not; because he should have done, and did not, that his sins clung to him. His whole life was a hypocrisy.

having in the law the form of knowledge and of the truth. Not the knowledge itself then, nor the truth itself, but the mere form or outline of them. The word *morphosis* signifies form, or more strictly perhaps, forming, shaping out, outlining. The meaning is, that the law merely outlined the truth to those who had it. It was a schoolmaster to train for Christ; and in this capacity it shadowed forth in forms only, the reality. It was to the truth and knowledge, which are in Christ, as the artificial globe is to the world. The one is the resemblance of the other, or its likeness in mere form. But with only this form of knowledge and of truth the Jew should have been, both in intelligence

and practice, what we know he was not. It was precisely this that rendered his condemnation so sure.

21. You then who teach another, do you not teach yourself? The question is a sarcastic reproach. You, Jew, who affect so much superiority, and claim to be the light and teacher of the world, teach first yourself. You, more than any, need the very lesson which you seek to give to others. Be pedagogue to self first, if you would be consistent. Especially before you go out to enlighten others, try the experiment at home in the following particulars :

You who preach, steal not, do you steal? The reader who is acquainted with the original will notice that I render these infinitives as imperatives. On the infinitive in this sense see Trol. N. T. Gram. p. 156; and Win. p. 322. The whole force of the passage lies in this, that the very Jews who proclaimed, steal not, were themselves thieves. They were gross hypocrites. While preaching against a sin they were themselves, at the very time, committing it. We must not, however, suppose that every Jew was a thief. It is only necessary to assume that the sin was very general. A Judas in every twelve is quite enough.

22. You who say, commit not adultery, do you commit adultery? Here recurs the same species of hypocrisy. Men practise the very sin against which they inveigh. The Jew condescends to the rest of the world merely to reform them, yet he is guilty of the very vice he proposes to correct. Adultery is said to have been exceedingly common among the Jews. This we can readily believe. They were a rich people, deeply sunk in both physical and spiritual degradation. In such case the vice always abounds. Ignorance, idleness, and luxury are three steps that land low in the pit of corruption.

You who abhor idols, do you rob temples [of them?] This passage has cost critics no little trouble. It is usually rendered thus: You who abhor idols, do you rob temples? No one can here mistake the sense. But what connection is there between abhorring idols and robbing temples? The obvious answer is none. Most commentators, sensible of this, have abandoned the literal import and resorted to a figurative one, which I can but regard as strained and unnatural. I shall not trouble the reader with it, nor attempt to refute it.

The analogy of thought in the cluster of passages, of which this is one, seems to me to point out the true solution. You who

preach, steal not, do you steal? You do. That is, you do just the thing you teach others not to do. You who say, commit not adultery, do you commit adultery? You do. The very deed you forbid in others you do yourself. You who abhor idols—now what, by analogy, is the proper answer? Clearly this: You who abhor idols, do you serve them? This, I suspect, falls near the truth. But *hierosuleo* does not mean to serve idols; it means to despoil temples. Whence then the notion of serve? Not from the word itself, but from the inconsistent life of the Jew, and the implications in the case. Do they yield it? You who abhor idols, do you despoil their temples? You do. But to despoil a temple means to carry off at least some of its contents. In the case before us, however, the thing carried off is not expressed. It is to be conjectured. Still something is actually carried away; and in supplying it we must supply something between which and abhorring idols there is the same inconsistency as between a Jew's preaching to others not to steal, and himself stealing. This thing is certainly an idol. You who abhor idols, do you carry them off from their temples? You do; *and that to serve them*. This seems almost conclusive.

Let us next try the philology of the case. The verb *hierosuleo* is from *hieros* and *sulao*. From *hieros* comes *hieron* a temple. *Sulao* signifies to strip off, carry off, take away. Putting the two words together, and they mean, in common usage, to carry off or take away the contents of a temple. So far all is clear. Now to determine what the Jew carried off, we must suppose something which will both render him grossly inconsistent, and make him a violator of the law. Let this be an idol, and the work is done. You, Jew, affect to abhor idols; and yet you take them from temples and serve them.

Perhaps the best way to translate *hierosuleis* is to render it very literally: *do you rob temples?* To this add in brackets the words of *them*, to indicate what is taken, and leave the purpose for which, to be understood. Every difficulty seems now removed; and the passage is shown to be both significant and pertinent.

When to this we add the notorious idolatry of the Jews, and the fact that they imported their idols or the patterns of them from foreign temples and nations, and we have, in my opinion, the explanation of a passage which has heretofore been thought to be hopelessly obscure.

23. **You who boast in the law, dishonor God by breaking the law.** I see no necessity for giving to this passage the interrogative form, and therefore render it as a simple categorical sentence. The Jew boasted much in the law, boasted of its being from God, of its being a mark of his peculiar favor, of its being given through angels, of its being from Moses, of its perfection—in all this he boasted. Yet he broke this law, constantly broke it, broke it in stealing, broke it in committing adultery, broke it in serving idols. With all these violations the Apostle impeaches him. He does more. He tells him that in breaking the law he dishonored God. The Jew affected great jealousy for the honor of God, and appeared profoundly shocked when he saw others dishonor him. Yet he himself could break his law even by worshipping an idol, and thus do him the greatest of all dishonor. The Jew was not only most inconsistent, but covered with sin.

24. **For as it is written, God's name is, because of you, spoken evil of among the nations.** The Jew not only himself personally dishonored God by breaking the law; but he caused surrounding nations to dishonor him. He claimed God exclusively as his God; and the heathen reasoned: like people, like god. Consequently, since the Jew was dissolute and corrupt in his life, they thought meanly of his God and held him in contempt. We of to-day judge a man's religion by his life; and the heathen, who had the conception of many gods, judged a man's god by his conduct. Good man, good god; bad man, bad god, was their theory.

And much as the name of God suffered in that day, does christianity suffer in this. It is judged, harshly judged, by the conduct of its professed friends. Hostile sects abound, each claiming for itself that it is right, and denying right to others. Alienation, want of fraternity, and bitterness exist. Often strife flames high and even persecution rages. The world looks on and says: "This religion is not divine; for if it were, it would unitize its votaries, make them more rational, and fill their hearts with love." Christianity is human, is the consequent, and not wholly unnatural conclusion of the world. But of course the reasoning of the world is unsound. Christianity must be judged on its merits, and not by the abuses which it suffers at the hands of those who have embraced it. Sects and parties are not divine, but it does not therefore follow that what they abuse is not.

CHAPTER II. SECTION 4.

²⁵ For circumcision is of service, provided you practise the law; but if you are a breaker of the law, your circumcision becomes uncircumcision. ²⁶ If then the uncircumcised keep the precepts of the law shall not his uncircumcision be counted for circumcision? ²⁷ And the uncircumcision, which is natural, will, by fulfilling the law, condemn you who, with the letter and circumcision, are a breaker of the law. ²⁸ For he is not the Jew who is one simply without; nor is that circumcision which is merely without in the flesh. ²⁹ But he is the Jew who is one within, whose praise is not of men, but of God; and circumcision is of the heart, in spirit, and not in letter.

²⁵ Περιτομή μὲν γὰρ ὠφελεῖ ἐὰν νόμον πράσσης· ἐὰν δὲ παραβῆτης νόμου ἦς, ἡ περιτομή σου ἀκροβυστία γέγονεν. ²⁶ Ἐὰν οὖν ἡ ἀκροβυστία τὰ δικαιώματα τοῦ νόμου φυλάσσης, οὐχ ἡ ἀκροβυστία αὐτοῦ εἰς περιτομὴν λογισθήσεται; ²⁷ Καὶ κρινεῖ ἡ ἐκ φύσεως ἀκροβυστία τὸν νόμον τελοῦσα σὲ τὸν διὰ γράμματος καὶ περιτομῆς παραβῆτην νόμου. ²⁸ Οὐ γὰρ ὁ ἐν τῷ φανερῷ Ἰουδαῖός ἐστιν, οὔτε ἡ ἐν τῷ φανερῷ ἐν σαρκὶ περιτομή. ²⁹ Ἀλλὰ ὁ ἐν τῷ κρυπτῷ Ἰουδαῖος, καὶ περιτομὴ καρδίας ἐν πνεύματι, οὐ γράμματι, οὐ ὁ ἔπαινος οὐκ ἐξ ἀνθρώπων ἀλλ' ἐκ τοῦ Θεοῦ.

SUMMARY.

Circumcision is of no value unless the law is kept. The Gentile who keeps the law, though not circumcised, will be accepted. The Jew who breaks the law, though circumcised, will be condemned. The Judaism and circumcision which save men are in the heart and spirit, and not outward in literal fleshly marks.

25. For circumcision is of service, provided you practise the law; The general sentiment of the preceding part of the chapter is that, in the case of the Jew, nothing will avail with God but keeping the law. The Apostle now proceeds to confirm this sentiment. *Gar* introduces the confirmation. In order to do this, he ingeniously selects circumcision. On this the Jew staked probably more than on any other fact in his history. The selection is happy and pertinent.

The value of circumcision is contingent. To the Jew this was certainly something new. Circumcision is of service, *provided* you practise the law. Clearly this is previous teaching reiterated in a slightly varied form—the doers of the law alone shall be justified. But the implication is the disastrous feature to the Jew. If the law is not kept, circumcision is worthless. Not descent from Abranam, nor having the law, nor circumcision avails any thing. Every thing depends on keeping the law.

The same general principle holds good under the gospel. One thing is void without another. Belief is of no validity without repentance; baptism is of no account without belief; being in the church is useless without a holy life, and so on.

but if you are a breaker of the law, your circumcision becomes uncircumcision. The language, *breaker of the law*, must not be taken as signifying a single transgression only; for a single transgression, unless it were expressly so provided, could not have the effect here stated. It must be taken as denoting habitual transgression, a life of sin. The *parabates nomou* was a wicked man, one abandoned to sin. The circumcision of such a man became void. He was to God no more than a heathen. His life abrogated his circumcision.

26. If then the uncircumcised keep the precepts of the law, shall not his uncircumcision be counted for circumcision? The *ean oun* here signifies *in that case or in that view*. That is, if, when a Jew breaks the law, his circumcision becomes uncircumcision, then when the Gentile keeps the law, in that case, his uncircumcision ought to become circumcision. The rule which requires the Jew to keep the law in order to make good his circumcision, should certainly make the uncircumcision of the Gentile, who keeps the law, good to him for circumcision. And this is just what it does. The whole of which amounts to this: That circumcision is of no value to him who breaks the law; and not being circumcised is no disadvantage to him who keeps it.

But we must not here overlook a difference. For a Jew not to be circumcised was not the same as for a Gentile not to be circumcised. In that case, the Jew broke God's covenant, but not so the Gentile. But after the Jew became circumcised, then unless he kept the law, his circumcision amounted to nothing.

27. and the uncircumcision, which is natural, will, by fulfilling the law, The uncircumcision, which is natural, is simply no circumcision at all; it is not being circumcised. The meaning is, The Gentile who is not circumcised will, by fulfilling the law, &c. But we must not suppose that the Gentile, any more than the Jew, ever actually fulfilled the law. This no one did. The case is a hypothetical one; and the participle *telousa* might legitimately be so rendered as to indicate the fact. It might be rendered thus: And the uncircumcised Gentile will, *if* he fulfil the law. See Stuart N. T. Gram. p. 164. The Apostle conceives of it as possible that the Gentile might fulfil the law; and from this conceived case, draws his conclusion.

But I think it probable that Paul had in mind not only a possible but an actual case. He intended that in so far as the Gen-

tile did fulfil the law, though the fulfilment was not complete, and the Jew failed, even to that extent the Gentile had the preference. In other words, a good man among Gentiles, though not a perfect one, was better than a bad man among Jews.

condemn you who with the letter and circumcision are a breaker of the law. When the Gentiles did what the Jew should have done, but did not, he showed the duty to be practicable. He thus rendered it clear that the failure of the Jew was wilful, and wilful disobedience is always held to be a just ground of condemnation. The Gentile condemned the Jew by showing that his disobedience was inexcusable.

The expression, *dia grammatos kai peritomes*, here rendered *with the letter and circumcision*, means having the law and being circumcised. That is, the Gentile who fulfils the law will condemn you who, though you have the law and are circumcised, yet break the law. You break it, notwithstanding your advantages. *Dia*, with the genitive, sometimes occurs in this sense, though not often. It denotes the circumstances under which a thing is done.

28. For he is not the Jew who is one simply without; nor is that circumcision which is merely without in the flesh. Rendered *ad sensum*. This is an inference from the preceding premises; and it both confirms what has just been said, and carries it out to its ultimate end. When the Apostle says, he is not the Jew who is one simply without, he does not mean that he is a Jew in no sense. He means that he is not the sort of Jew who will stand in the last day with God. He is a Jew, to be sure, but not such a one as will be saved. To be a Jew simply without, is to be a Jew only by having the law and being circumcised; it is to be a Jew in name only, or without keeping the law. It is best, therefore, to render, he is not *the* Jew, not he is not *a* Jew. *A* Jew he still was, but not *the* Jew who should be saved.

In like manner we must hold in regard to the clause, "nor is that circumcision which is merely without in the flesh." Circumcision it certainly was, but not the circumcision which aids in saving. Circumcision is of service only when the law is kept; but since the law is never kept, circumcision is of no value. It avails nothing with God in saving.

29. But he is the Jew who is one within, That is, he who is the Jew within is the Jew who will be saved. In him only God delights. But what is *the within* referred to? I

answer, it is the spirit and the heart. To be the Jew in these is to be *poor* in the former and *pure* in the latter—it is to be *poor in spirit* and *pure in heart*. They alone who are such will see God; and they will see him, whether they formerly lived under the law, or now live under the gospel. The hidden man of the heart, and not the outward Jew, with his fleshly circumcision and mere letter, will abide with God.

But farther: In the word "*within*," the Apostle lays his first corner stone of the christian edifice. He here breaks ground for the gospel. In this soil it is to take root and grow. Belief is *within*—"with the heart man believes"; and justification is *by belief*. We here have the first note of preparation for the redemption which is in Christ. Turn men's thoughts from the without to the within—usually a difficult task, and the great primary work of salvation is fully set in.

whose praise is not of men, but of God: This clause is placed here merely to have it in juxtaposition with the part of the sentence to which it belongs. The Jew who is to be saved is pure within. This within is hid from men. From them, therefore, it can have no praise. Men praise the without; they praise circumcision and the like. But God looks into the within; and where it is holy, he delights in it, and praises it.

and circumcision is of the heart, in spirit, and not in letter. The circumcision which saves, respects the heart or inner man; and it consists in the excision of whatever is impure or unholy. It has its seat in the spirit, and consists, first, in purifying it, Col. ii: 11; and, secondly, in keeping it pure. The true worshipers are those that worship in spirit and in truth. Circumcision "in letter" can be nothing but the ordinary circumcision of the Jew—the outward mark in the flesh. Letter is the outward or visible part of the law, as opposed to its sense. Accordingly, circumcision in letter would be outward and visible, like the letter of the law.

CHAPTER III.

SECTION I.

What then is the advantage of the Jew? or what the profit of circumcision? ² Much in many a way. For, first, they were entrusted with the revelations of God. ³ What then?—inasmuch as some were not faithful. Will their unfaithfulness render God's fidelity of no effect? ⁴ Not at all. On the contrary, let God be true, but every man false; that, as it is written, you may be justified in your words and overcome when judged. ⁵ But if our injustice display the justice of God, what shall we say? Is not God unjust who inflicts wrath? I speak as a man. Not at all. ⁶ For how then shall God judge the world? For if God's truthfulness abounds the more to his honor by my being false, why am also I still condemned as a sinner? ⁸ And should we not do evil that good may come? as we are falsely said [to do], and as some declare we say, whose condemnation is just.

Τι οὖν τὸ περισσὸν τοῦ Ἰουδαίου; ἢ τίς ἡ ὠφέλεια τῆς περιτομῆς; ² πολλὰ κατὰ πάντα τρόπον. Πρῶτον μὲν γὰρ ὅτι ἐπιστεύθησαν τὰ λόγια τοῦ Θεοῦ. ³ Τί γάρ; εἰ ἠπίστησάν τινες. Μὴ ἡ ἀπιστία αὐτῶν τὴν πίστιν τοῦ Θεοῦ καταργήσει; ⁴ μὴ γένοιτο. Γινέσθω δὲ ὁ Θεὸς ἀληθής, πᾶς δὲ ἄνθρωπος ψεύστης, καθὼς γέγραπται, Ὅπως ἂν δικαιοῦθῃς ἐν τοῖς λόγοις σου καὶ νικήσῃς ἐν τῷ κρίνεσθαι σε. ⁵ Εἰ δὲ ἡ ἀδικία ἡμῶν Θεοῦ δικαιοσύνην συνίστησι, τί ἐροῦμεν; Μὴ ἄδικος ὁ Θεὸς ὁ ἐπιφέρων τὴν ὀργήν;—κατὰ ἄνθρωπον λέγω. ⁶ μὴ γένοιτο. ἐπεὶ πῶς κρίνει ὁ Θεὸς τὸν κόσμον; ⁷ Εἰ γὰρ ἡ ἀλήθεια τοῦ Θεοῦ ἐν τῷ ἐμῷ ψεύσματι ἐπερίσσευσεν εἰς τὴν δόξαν αὐτοῦ, τί ἐτι καγὼ ὡς ἁμαρτωλὸς κρίνομαι; ⁸ Καὶ μὴ, καθὼς βλασφημούμεθα καὶ καθὼς φασί τινες ἡμᾶς λέγειν, ὅτι ποιήσωμεν τὰ κακὰ ἵνα ἔλθῃ τὰ ἀγαθὰ; Ὡν τὸ κρίμα ἔνδικόν ἐστι.

SUMMARY.

The Jews, in being such, possessed many peculiar advantages, among the most important of which was being entrusted with the revelations of God. Still, though thus highly favored, many of them were very unfaithful. But this will have no effect upon God's faithfulness. He will remain true, though all men should prove false. Moreover, even when the Jew's injustice had the effect to display the justice of God, still God must punish the injustice; and he does right in doing so. We must not do evil that good may come, and we will certainly be punished if we do.

The Jew has now been shown that, in point of guilt, he stands on a level with the Gentile; and that God will judge both with impartiality. He has been farther shown that having the law, or merely hearing it, amounts to nothing; and that he alone who keeps the law will be saved. He has been still farther shown that if the Gentile keep the law he will be accepted, though not circumcised; while he himself, who breaks the law, will be condemned, notwithstanding his circumcision. He has been finally shown that the Judaism and circumcision, which avail with God, are in the heart and spirit, and not external. After this, nothing could be more natural than the question with which the present

chapter opens. The Apostle propounds it for the Jew, in order to get the chance himself to answer it. He thus anticipates objections to what he has now said, and proceeds to meet them. Some of these objections contain real difficulties, which the Apostle deemed it necessary to dispose of here.

What then is the advantage of the Jew? or what the profit of circumcision? The question is a conditional inference. Since being a Jew, without, is of no avail; and since circumcision is useless, unless the law be kept, *then, ὅν, what is the advantage of being a Jew? or what the profit of circumcision?* The reply anticipated by the Jew is *none*. But since this would not be true, it is not given. There may be no advantage in being a Jew merely without, and yet great advantage in having his opportunities; no profit in the mere outward mark of circumcision, and still much profit in the covenant to which it relates. The question therefore is defeated. Though designed to elicit the reply, *no advantage, no profit*, it does not do it. Consequently, the reply is not such as the Jew expected.

2. *Much in many a way.* The reply is *πολυ*, i. e., *πολυπερισσον*—much advantage. That *panta tropon* can not be rendered *every way*, as it usually is, I think evident. In the first place, *panta*, in many places, as every scholar knows, does not signify all, but *very many*, or *a large number*. In the second, the Apostle himself has just excluded two important ways. He has said, in effect, that there is no advantage in being a Jew merely without. This is *one way*. Also, that circumcision is of no service, unless the law be kept. This is a second. Now to render *much every way*, including all ways, when here are the very two things excluded, on which the Jew chiefly relied, is clearly inadmissible. We are therefore tied down to the rendering, *much in many a way*. Thus also Stuart.

The Jew, in being a Jew, possessed many advantages. But whether each advantage should prove a blessing or the reverse, was contingent. If he used his advantages properly, they were blessings; if not, they proved curses. But the Apostle, after replying *much in many a way*, proceeds to specify.

For, first, they were entrusted with the revelations of God. The word *revelations* includes every form of divine communication which God had caused to be committed to writing. All these were confided to the keeping of the Jews; and next to Christ himself and the gospel, I must regard these revelations as

the greatest boon ever bestowed on any portion of the human family. The respects in which they have blessed the world are countless. They are to-day our only authentic record of the origin and early history of man; and besides, they have in large measure taught the world its equity, determined its legislation, and molded its humanity. But of course I can not attempt an enumeration.

3. **What then?**—inasmuch as some were not faithful. The *gar* here concedes the preceding statement, while *ti* suggests a difficulty implied in it. The thought may be thus expanded: True, God confided his revelations to the Jews. But they were not faithful to the trust. They did not obey those revelations as they should. Here then emerges a difficulty. How about God's promises to Israel? Will he still prove true to them? Hence the following question:

Will their unfaithfulness render God's fidelity of no effect? God's fidelity, *pistin*, is his never-failing faithfulness in keeping his word. He confided to Israel his oracles. He did more. He promised to bless them above all other people. But Israel were false to the trust committed to them. What effect, now, will this have on God? Will he not feel himself absolved from all obligation to keep faith with Israel? *Katargeo* means *to leave idle or unemployed*; and the idea is, Will not the unfaithfulness of the Jews cause God to ignore his promises, or to leave them idle or unredeemed?

4. **Not at all.** A simple unconditional denial. In no case will God's fidelity fail. Men may prove false, but he never. True, a threat or promise is sometimes not kept; but in all such cases it is conditional, whether the condition be expressed or not. Men fail to perform conditions, and God is released; but his fidelity is not hereby in the least affected.

On the contrary, let God be true, but every man false; *De* is here strongly adversative; and the fact should be made to stand boldly out, as in the expression, *on the contrary*. The verb used in the clause, "let God be true," is *ginestho*, which primarily means *to become*. The sense is, Let it, at all times and under all circumstances, *become* evident that God is true, and every man false. Not, let him *be* true, whether he is so or not; but let it *become* obvious that he is true, because he *is* so. Likewise, not, let every man *be* false, whether he is so or not; but let it *become* apparent that he is false, since he *is* so. Let all men be proved

false to trusts; God never can be. He must stand absolutely and forever true. Consequently, although all Jews were unfaithful, this can have no effect on God's fidelity. All his covenants and promises will be kept inviolate.

That, as it is written, you may be justified in your words It must remain forever evident that God is true; that when he is arraigned on his words he may be justified; that is, may be shown to have strictly kept them. To justify God is to show that he *is* just—that he is true to all he has said, and therefore guiltless.

and overcome when judged. The conception and language are forensic. God is judged when he is arraigned in human thought, on his dealings with men. When thus arraigned, he must always come off victor. It is not enough that he simply gain his cause; he must gain it triumphantly. This is the force of *nikeses*. He must be shown to be absolutely innocent of every charge. Nor let it be imagined that God is seldom arraigned. He is arraigned in the very charge just considered; and in countless ways we, as it were, arraign him every day. We arraign him for creating us capable of sin; for exposing us to temptation; for subjecting us to death for another's sin; for appointing us to a life of hardship; for requiring us to be holy in the midst of great trials; for not revealing to us more of the future—on all these counts, and many more, we arraign him. Not that we formally arraign him, and accuse him of wrong. But we arraign him in our perplexities, in our discontents—in a word, in the very modes in which we think of him. Not to be wholly reconciled to God is to arraign him. Now how profound is the necessity that he shall be shown to be, in all the items named, as well as in all others in which he is in any way questioned, not only just, perfectly so, but even perfectly good.

5. But if our injustice display the justice of God, what shall we say? "Our injustice" is the exclusive injustice of the Jews; and it consisted in their unfaithfulness to the revelations of God. The Jews did not obey these revelations, and herein were unjust. But, strictly speaking, their injustice did not display God's justice. It was rather the occasion of God himself displaying it. But had such been the case, still the Jew could not have claimed even extenuation of guilt, much less exemption from punishment. His sin would have remained none the less a sin for displaying the justice of God. Sin is sin, no matter what it displays; and it must be dealt with as such. **God's justice is**

his just dealing with the Jews according to his word. Consequently to make *dikaiosunen* here mean "his plan of justification" by belief betrays an extraordinary misapprehension of the word.

Is not God unjust who inflicts wrath?—I speak as a man. Not at all. If our disobedience—the disobedience of the Jews—to God's will, displays his fidelity to his word, is he not unjust in punishing us? He is, is the answer expected. On this the argument would be, But God will never show himself unjust. Therefore he will not punish us for our unfaithfulness. Such is the exact position of the Jew. But it is a delusion. God will punish sin no matter what it displays. This is Paul's position. Sin may be so overruled that good emerges out of it; but this is not because of any good in the nature of sin. The good emerges in virtue of the divine overruling, and in spite of sin. By the overruling sin is defeated, but not canceled. Hence its punishment is not averted.

The Jew should have remembered that God is author to two classes of promises. In the one he proposes to bless Israel, provided they keep his statutes. In the other, he threatens to punish, if they do not. Now fidelity to his word required that he should remember the threats no less than the promises. Indeed, it required that he should remember the threats the more; since the rule was that the statutes were broken, and not kept. But of all this the Jew lost sight.

I speak as a man. That is, in what I now say, I am using the language of others, not my own. I am talking as an objector. *Not at all:* An emphatic negative to the preceding question.

6. For how then shall God judge the world? This contains the reason for the preceding negative answer; and it, at the same time, reduces the position of the Jew to an absurdity. God can not justly punish the Jew; because, as they say, their unfaithfulness displays his fidelity. Then, for the same reason, he can not judge, and justly punish the world. The sins of the world as much display his fidelity as do the sins of the Jews. Therefore he can not justly punish the world. But this proves too much even for the Jew, and is consequently false.

7. For if God's truthfulness abounds the more to his honor by my being false, In some respects this verse and the 8th are difficult. The sense is determinable; but the construction of the 8th is anomalous. Both the 6th and 7th verses are intended to refute the position of v. 5. How the 6th refutes it has now

been shown. The 7th refutes it much in the same way, but by a special, personal argument, drawn, in my judgment, from Paul's own case. The two expressions, "*my being false*" and "*also I,*" I regard as decisive of this. On no other hypothesis, apparent to me, can these two expressions be satisfactorily explained. Tholuck and Bloomfield appear to be of the same opinion, but Stuart dissents. The position of v. 5, and the special argument of v. 7, may be thus expanded:

When you Jews attempt to show that you should not be punished, your mode of reasoning is vicious. You can not deny that you have been unjust. But this injustice, you say, has displayed the justice of God. You therefore can not see how he can be just, and punish you. Now I will prove that your reasoning is false. In order to do this, I take my own case, and show how you view me. I am held by you to be false ($\epsilon\mu\omega\ \Psi\epsilon\upsilon\sigma\mu\alpha\tau\iota$) to the religion of my fathers. I am ($\kappa\acute{\alpha}\gamma\omega$) consequently condemned by you as a sinner. But in all this I am wronged, according to your own reasoning. For if the truthfulness of God has abounded the more to his honor by my being false, why do you still condemn me as a sinner? If, according to your reasoning, you should not be punished, neither should I.

God's truthfulness consists in his being true to his word, true to all the demands of justice, true to all the facts in each case in which he judges.

why am also I still condemned as a sinner? If you Jews should not be condemned because your sins display the truthfulness of God, for the same reason, neither should I be. Impunity for you, on a given ground, should surely be impunity for me, on the same.

But the special argument of v. 7 contains, in my opinion, a probable peculiarity worthy of notice. That argument is true, taking *aletheia* not only in the Jewish sense; but it is true, taking it in the christian sense. Thus: If the truthfulness of God (Jewish sense) has abounded the more to his honor by my being false (your view) to your religion, as you say is the case, then, according to your reasoning in your own behalf, I should not be deemed a sinner by you, and be treated as I am. *Argumentum ad hominem*. But, *argumentum ad rem*, if the truth respecting Christ, the gospel, has abounded the more to the honor of God by my being false to your religion (your view), then I am in fact no sinner, which is just the truth, and should not be adjudged

one. I suspect that the Apostle intended to construct an argument which is true, taking *aletheia* in either or both of these acceptations. One thing is certain, he has done it.

8. And should we not do evil that good may come? A discussion of the verbal peculiarities of this verse could hardly interest the reader; and I am sure it could not profit him. It is therefore pretermitted. The sense, as I understand it, I have expressed exactly in the translation. In this understanding both Stuart and Bloomfield concur substantially, differing only immaterially as to the mode of expressing it. With both sense and mode of expressing it, Tholuck closely agrees. From this the reader will see that my understanding of the passage is not peculiar. The clauses I arrange unusually. But by this the sense (the chief thing) is not affected in the slightest; and much is obviously gained in the way of perspicuity. Rendered as literally as I can render it, the verse reads thus: *And should we not, as we are hurtfully reported, and as some allege we say, do evil that good may come, whose condemnation is just?* From this the reader will discover that the only peculiarity of the rendering which I adopt, consists in a particular arrangement of the clauses. This is resorted to solely for the sake of clearness.

The verse is a still farther refutation of the position of v. 5. By it, that position is reduced to a palpable absurdity. Thus: Your mode of reasoning (the mode of the Jews) justifies another false conclusion. You say that your injustice displays the justice of God. Then the greater your injustice, the greater the display. Be it so. To display God's justice is a good thing. Your injustice is indisputably evil. Shall we, then, do evil that good may come? The reduction is complete.

as we are falsely said [to do,] and as some declare we say, whose condemnation is just. The only freedom I here use consists in bracketing *to do*. We are compelled to supply something, and the circumstances of the case seem to point to this. Certain parties alleged that Paul said, we should do evil that good may come. Now, those who would represent him as so saying, would have no scruple in representing him as so acting. *To do*, then, seems to be more naturally required than any thing else. But those who so represented the Apostle slandered him and injured him. He lets them know that for this deed they are condemned, and that the sentence is just.

CHAPTER III. SECTION 2.

⁹Τί οὖν; προεχόμεθα; οὐ πάντως. Προησιασάμεθα γὰρ Ἰουδαίους τε καὶ Ἕλληνας πάντας ὑφ' ἁμαρτιαν εἶναι, ¹⁰ καθὼς γέγραπται, ὅτι οὐκ ἔστι δίκαιος οὐδὲ εἷς, ¹¹ οὐκ ἔστιν ὁ συνιών, οὐκ ἔστιν ὁ ἐκζητῶν τὸν Θεόν. ¹² πάντες ἐξέκλιναν, ἅμα ἠχρειώθησαν· οὐκ ἔστι ποιῶν χρηστότητα, οὐκ ἔστιν ἕως ἑνός. ¹³ Τάφος ἀνεωγμένος ὁ λάρυγξ αὐτῶν, ταῖς γλώσσαις αὐτῶν ἐδολιούσαν, ἰὸς ἀσπίδων ὑπὸ τὰ χεῖλη αὐτῶν. ¹⁴ ὡν τὸ στόμα ἀρᾶς καὶ πικρίας γέμει. ¹⁵ ὅξεις οἱ πόδες αὐτῶν ἐκχέαι αἷμα, ¹⁶ σύντριμμα καὶ ταλαιπωρία ἐν ταῖς ὁδοῖς αὐτῶν, ¹⁷ καὶ ὁδὸν εἰρήνης οὐκ ἔγνωσαν. ¹⁸ οὐκ ἔστι φόβος Θεοῦ ἀπέναντι τῶν ὀφθαλμῶν αὐτῶν. ¹⁹ Οἶδαμεν δὲ ὅτι ὅσα ὁ νόμος λέγει, τοῖς ἐν τῷ νόμῳ λαλεῖ, ἵνα πᾶν στόμα φραγῆ καὶ ὑπόδικος γένηται πᾶς ὁ κόσμος τῷ Θεῷ. ²⁰ Διότι ἐξ ἔργων νόμου οὐ δικαιωθήσεται πᾶσα σὰρξ ἐνώπιον αὐτοῦ· διὰ γὰρ νόμου ἐπίγνωσις ἁμαρτίας.

⁹What then? Do we excel? By no means. For we have already charged that both Jews and Greeks are all under sin, ¹⁰as it is written: there are none just, not one; ¹¹there are none who understand; there are none who seek God; ¹²all have turned aside; together they have become useless; there are none who do good; there is not even one. ¹³Their throat is an open grave; with their tongues they deceive; the poison of asps is under their lips; ¹⁴their mouth is full of cursing and bitterness; ¹⁵their feet are swift to shed blood; ¹⁶ruin and misery are in their paths; ¹⁷and the way of peace they have not known; ¹⁸there is no fear of God before their eyes. ¹⁹Now we know that whatever the law says, it says to those under the law, that every mouth may be shut, and the whole world become guilty before God. ²⁰For by works of law no flesh shall be justified in his sight; for by law is the knowledge of sin.

SUMMARY.

In point of guilt, then, are the Jews any better than the Gentiles? None at all. All are alike under the dominion of sin, and therefore are alike guilty. This is proved by the very scriptures which the Jews have. The law condemns all, and justifies none. Therefore, by law, no one may expect to be acquitted in the presence of God. Instead of being justified by law men only learn from it that they are sinners.

9. What then? Do we excel? By no means. The words *ti oun* should be taken by themselves, as in the translation. They imply a thoughtful question on what has gone before. *Proechometha* is Middle, and here means *to excel, be superior, be better*. Of these I prefer *excel*, as being simple and close to the sense. The passage is an inference from previous teaching, put in the form of a question, and having strict reference to the moral condition of the Jews, or their condition under sin. Do we excel? that is, do we excel the Gentiles? Certainly the Jews greatly excelled the Gentiles in many respects. But these were the respects in which God had peculiarly favored them. Their opportunities for spiritual and moral culture were unparalleled. They had an infallible guide in regard to their duties both to God and to one another. In these respects they stood high above the

Gentiles. But in two most material respects they did not excel; and the reference is to these: 1. in guilt they stood on a level with the Gentiles; 2. as to justification or acquittal from sin, they had no advantage. On these two points, Jew and Gentile were equal before God. It is with strict reference to these points that the question is asked. This is evident from what follows.

For we have already charged that both Jews and Greeks are all under sin; I have no Lexicon that gives *prove, show, or convict*, as a meaning of *aitiaomai*. True, Bengel renders *proetiasametha*, "we have proved before," which, though authorized, seems unusual. The verb is deponent Middle, and signifies *to accuse, charge, blame*. I render *proetiasametha* by our familiar phrase *we have already charged*. This is clear and true. "Under sin" means to be subject to it, be a slave to it. It also means to be under the condemnation of it. The latter is particularly referred to. The word *Greeks* means the same as Gentiles, Jews and Greeks comprehending the whole human family.

10. as it is written: there are none just, not one; The sense of Ps. xiv, 3. The object of these citations is to prove the undoubted guilt of the Jews. That of the Gentiles was conceded. It would then follow that, in regard to sin, the Jews were no better than the Gentiles, or did not excel them. This is the point to be settled. The word "just" here means to be wholly free from sin—free from it in the sense of never having committed it. In this acceptation, the *ad sensum* citation is strictly true. There are none absolutely just. Therefore all are under sin. This is what the Apostle had charged, and what is now, by the passage, shown to be true. Paul's declarations the Jews might deny, but not their own scriptures. They were, then, compelled to acknowledge themselves under sin. No more could be said of the Gentiles. Consequently, as to sin, Jews and Gentiles were equal. The Jews, then, did not excel the Gentiles; and this is the proposition to be established.

But the word "just" has, besides, a popular, current sense in which we must be careful not to understand it here. Joseph, the husband of Mary, was a "just" man, current sense, but not wholly so; he was not sinless. Simeon was "just," but not perfectly free from sin; and so of others. Paul does not here use the word just in this sense, but in the one stated in the preceding paragraph.

11. there are none who understand; None who under-

stand perfectly, or have a strictly true knowledge of God's law and a just appreciation of his goodness. The Jews greatly abused themselves, and as a result, their understanding of divine things grew blunt. They abused the revelations of God, and consequently the light of truth went out in them. The sun of their inner man became eclipsed.

there are none who seek God; None who seek him perfectly, or without a failure—a partial result of the fact just stated. So soon as the soul becomes dark, it ceases to long for God. Whenever his glorious image vanishes from the mirror within, the original is no longer desired. In its blindness, the spirit sinks down into the inaction of the night of death.

12. all have turned aside; together they have become useless; Their understandings have become dark, and consequently they have turned aside from the way that leads to God. The result of their ignorance and error is that they have become useless. God can no longer turn them to any good account. It only remains to spew them out of his mouth.

there are none who do good; there is not even one. And if there be not even one who does good, then there is not even one who is just. Consequently all are guilty before God. Are the Jews, then, better than the Gentiles? Do they excel them? Not at all. When the Apostle says, "there are none who do good," we must understand him in like manner as when he says, "there are none just." There are none who do good wholly, or without exception, none who never sin.

13. Their throat is an open grave; An open grave is an unnatural sight. It is expected to be closed. So of the throats alluded to. By long abuse they had become unnatural. They should have been shut on their corrupt contents, but were not. They stood open; and every thing that issued from them, in the form of speech, was offensive. It was like the odor which exhales from an open grave with its body rotting in it.

with their tongues they deceive; Back of a deceptive tongue lies a deceptive heart; and this is to that as cause to effect. There is the studied purpose to deceive, and the word suited to it. Such tongues, like parasites, live only on the wreck of good faith.

the poison of asps is under their lips; What such lips say is to reputations as the poison of the asp in the blood. It is death. To the honorable and sensitive mind earth has no keener

anguish than a stain on the name. Slander usually, like a burn, leaves a life-long scar behind. Death would often give less pain.

14. their mouth is full of cursing and bitterness; They are full of blasphemy and oaths. These are aimed against God. Thus the mouth which he created to bless him is used to grieve him. By bitterness is meant those wounding, stinging words which the wicked utter. None suffer from them as do the innocent.

15. their feet are swift to shed blood; They are eager to commit murder, and rush fiercely on their victim. They lie in wait for him; and when they see him they grow impatient. They start up quickly, and slay him greedily.

16. ruin and misery are in their paths; Wherever they go they destroy reputation, or life, or something else held dear, and thus sow misery in their way. But worst of all, they ruin souls, and so plant in them endless misery.

17. and the way of peace they have not known; Because they have not wanted to know it. Discord and strife are the unnatural elements in which they delight. Restless souls themselves because of guilt, they seek to destroy the peace of every one else. What they will not have, they resolve others shall not.

18. there is no fear of God before their eyes. No wonder then that we have the preceding catalogue. Where God is not feared, nothing else is; and when this last barrier to vice is broken down, sin comes in like a flood.

On these specifications the following items may be noted: 1. The things here enumerated are charged against the Jews. Their own scriptures allege them; and, therefore, by them the charges are not deniable. 2. They are not to be assumed as true of every individual Jew. It is enough that they are true of a great many. 3. They fully justify the Apostle's charge that both Jews and Greeks are equally under sin; and that the former in no sense excel the latter. Indeed the catalogue here drawn of the Jew falls scarcely below that drawn of the Gentile in ch. 1. 4. The citations, though mostly from the Psalms, are not exclusively so. Nor are they in every instance verbally close either to the Hebrew or the Septuagint. They are true to the sense; no more.

19. Now we know that whatever the law says, it says to those under the law. We know, you Jews know, I know, we all know, and therefore can not deny, that whatever the law

says, it says to those under it. The law here is the law of Moses, and those under it are the Jews. The word *whatever* includes every thing which, when done, is a sin. Now the law declares the spiritual states and deeds just enumerated to be sins. It declares this to the Jews as being under it and bound by it. Their own scriptures, therefore, as now quoted, show them to be covered with sins. This they can not deny. They are then condemned, every one of them, by the very law under which they live. There is not even one exception.

that every mouth may be shut, That before the just sentence of the law, every Jew may be silenced, not having even one plea to urge in his defence. Stuart thinks the *hina* here not *telic*. Nothing strikes me as more certain than that it is. The very design of the scriptures, in pronouncing certain things to be sins, and in declaring the Jews to be guilty thereof, is to silence them on the question of justification by law, to destroy every vestige of hope therein, and thus to shut them up to the justification which is in Christ. "Every mouth" is limited by the context to every mouth under the law. It is equivalent to every Jew.

and the whole world become guilty before God. Not strictly that, in the way named, the world *becomes* guilty from being previously *not guilty*; but it thus becomes *manifest* that it is guilty. The world becomes guilty by its own actual transgressions; but when the scriptures establish these transgressions against it, and the law pronounces sentence, its guilt then becomes manifest. The phrase *become guilty* hardly gives the full sense of the original. The meaning is to become *hupodikos*, that is, *one under sentence* of condemnation.

But how is it that the whole world, including both Jews and Gentiles (for this is the comprehension of world), becomes guilty by proofs and acts which convict the Jews only? In but one way that I can see. Jews and Gentiles were guilty of the same deeds. These deeds were in themselves sins; and, in the case of the Jews, were so declared. But the law in declaring them to be sins in the Jews, virtually declared them to be sins in the Gentiles; and so in condemning the Jews, in effect condemned the Gentiles. The law of Moses was not obligatory upon the Gentiles. In no other way, then, as it seems to me, except in the way named, could it condemn those not bound by it.

20. For by works of law *Dioti* should not here be re-

dered *therefore*, as many render it. It does not deduce a conclusion from preceding premises, but assigns a reason for what has just been said. What the law says, it says to those who are under it, and have broken it, in order to its becoming evident that the whole world is guilty before God. This lesson, it is profoundly necessary the world should learn. The reason is, that by works of law no flesh shall be justified. When once the world has fully learned this lesson, it will be ready to abandon law as a means of justification, and resort to Christ.

The phrase, "works of law," has given rise to almost endless controversy, and that without much reason. The word law is anarthrous, and therefore must be taken, not specifically, as denoting the law of Moses only, but generically, as including every form of law which men have from God as a rule of conduct. Accordingly, while it includes the law of Moses, it does more. It also includes the law of the Gentiles, be that law what it may, provided God requires them to keep it. God's law, as made known to men, assumes two forms: it commands what is right and prohibits what is wrong. That, we must do; this, not do. Now the word law, as here used, comprehends both these forms. It includes every thing which, when done, whether by Jew or Gentile, or both, is a sin; and every thing which, when not done, by either or neither, is a sin. The word *works*, on the other hand, comprehends every act which law, in this sense, commands or forbids. It includes both things done, and things not done which should have been. Now, taking both law and works, as here defined, what Paul means is, that by works of law no human being can be justified in the sight of God. From the 18th verse of the first chapter, down to the present, this is the grand conclusion for which the Apostle has been preparing the mind of his readers. He first prepares the Gentile for it, and then the Jew. Many a turn in his current of thought has implied it; but not until he had shut every Jewish mouth by taking away its last defence; not until he had placed the whole world before God as guilty and condemned, did he see fit to enounce it. How it is that by works of law no flesh can be justified, will appear under the next clause.

for by law is the knowledge of sin. Had God never given a law touching sin, or revealed to us what it is, the conception of sin had never been in our minds. Our very primary knowledge of sin is from law. From law then we learn, theoretically,

what sin is, or what acts are sins. By actual personal experience we all know that we have committed these acts, and, therefore, that we are sinners. Again, we have law defining sin. With this law we compare the acts of others, and so learn that they are sinners. Thus, from law we learn what sin is; and by comparison, that both we and all others are sinners. Now law can justify him only who perfectly keeps it, and never breaks it. If law be broken it must condemn. But we have all broken it, broken it without exception, certainly broken it. Truly, therefore, by works of law no one can be justified.

CHAPTER III. SECTION 3.

²¹ *Νυνὶ δὲ χωρὶς νόμου δικαιοσύνη Θεοῦ* *πεφανερώται, μαρτυρουμένη ὑπὸ τοῦ νόμου καὶ τῶν προφητῶν,* ²² *δικαιοσύνη δὲ Θεοῦ διὰ πίστεως Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, εἰς πάντας τοὺς πιστεύοντας· οὐ γὰρ ἐστὶ διαστολή·* ²³ *πάντες γὰρ ἡμαρτον καὶ ὑστεροῦνται τῆς δόξης τοῦ Θεοῦ,* ²⁴ *δικαιούμενοι δωρεὰν τῇ αὐτοῦ χάριτι διὰ τῆς ἀπολυτρώσεως τῆς ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ,* ²⁵ *ὃν προέθετο ὁ Θεὸς ἰλαστήριον διὰ πίστεως ἐν τῷ αὐτοῦ αἵματι, εἰς ἐνδειξιν τῆς δικαιοσύνης αὐτοῦ, διὰ τὴν παράσιν τῶν προγεγονότων ἁμαρτημάτων* ²⁶ *ἐν τῇ ἀνοχῇ τοῦ Θεοῦ, πρὸς τὴν ἐνδειξιν τῆς δικαιοσύνης αὐτοῦ ἐν τῷ νῦν καιρῷ, εἰς τὸ εἶναι αὐτὸν δίκαιον καὶ δικαιούντα τὸν ἐκ πίστεως Ἰησοῦ.*

²¹ But now God's justification without law is revealed, being attested by the law and the prophets, ²² even God's justification by belief in Jesus Christ, for all who believe—(For there is no difference; ²³ for all have sinned and come short of the glory of God)—²⁴ they being justified freely by his favor, through the ransom which is in Christ Jesus, ²⁵ whom God has set forth as an atoning sacrifice through belief in his blood, for a proof of God's justice, on account of remitting the sins formerly committed ²⁶ during his forbearance, also for a proof of his justice at this time, that he may be just while justifying him that believes in Jesus.

SUMMARY.

But although justification by law is impossible; still God has revealed another way of justifying men, a way, too, that is attested both by the law and the prophets. He has revealed a plan of justifying people by means of their belief in Jesus Christ, revealed it to all, both Jews and Gentiles. This justification takes its rise in God's favor; it is procured by a ransom which has been accomplished by Christ; Christ effected this ransom by his blood; and we attain the benefit of it by believing in him and obeying him. This ransom enables God to be just while forgiving the sinner, provided he is a believer in his Son.

21. But now God's justification without law is revealed, The Apostle had just said that, by works of law, no one can be justified. It remained, then, for God to propound another plan. Justification by law is practically impossible. Intuitively, then,

if it be attained, it must be without law. The following verses propose the plan and, in part, unfold it.

Now, nuni, under Christ, or as things at present stand. *God's justification*. Justification, as was shown in chap. 1, means, first, to be released from sin, to be forgiven; and, secondly, to be held and treated as just. *Justification without law*; that is, justification which is realized apart from law, or independent of it. Indeed, if there be any actual justification, it must be without law, since justification by law is purely ideal or theoretic, no instance of it ever having occurred. *Is revealed*—is now, for the first time, revealed or clearly made known, not as something possible, but as something which all can actually realize, if they will. All the Apostle here states is, the naked fact that God's justification is revealed. This once distinctly enounced and he can proceed to details.

being attested by the law and the prophets, The expression "law and prophets" is here equivalent to the writings of the Old Testament. These writings attest a justification without law. They both teach the doctrine and exemplify it—this being the way in which they attest it. Abraham, for example, is a case in point, whose belief was counted to him for justification; that is, he was justified without law. Much that the prophets say is also to the same effect. Indeed, one of them asserts the doctrine in so many words, namely, "the just by belief shall live." The law, too, pointed to Christ as the true Lamb of God who takes away the sin of the world; and remitting sin is the radical fact in justification. In a word, both the law and the prophets bare testimony to Christ, and to the salvation which is in him. This salvation, which, at bottom, is justification, is without law. Thus, the law and the prophets attest justification without law, by attesting the salvation of Christ, which is without it.

22. *even God's justification by belief in Jesus Christ*, The *de* of this verse has cost critics much trouble. With hardly an exception, they assume it to be adversative; and then find their difficulty in translating it. But is it adversative? The statement to which, indisputably, it looks back is, "but now God's justification without law is revealed." Now, between this statement and the one introduced by *de*, there is not even the semblance of adverseness. On the contrary, the one introduced by *de* is the mere explanation of the other. *De* then is not adversative. It simply adds an explanation. I render it by *even as*

denoting that the clause explained and the one explaining are the same in sense, the only difference being that the one is general and the other special. On the use of *de* in this sense see both Robinson and Winer.

God's justification It is called God's because he is author to it, performs the act, or does the justifying. *By belief in Jesus Christ:* Our belief in Christ is the condition, not the sole one except as implying others, nor a condition of merit, but of mercy; that is, a condition on the actual presence of which in us, God will, of pure mercy, extend to us justification. But, of belief, and its value in redemption, more fully, as I proceed.

Instead of belief *in* Jesus Christ, we might render belief *of* Jesus Christ, which would mean *belief respecting him*, Jesus Christ evidently being genitive of object. But this rendering, though more literal than the other, is not so clear. It is better, therefore, to say belief *in*.

for all who believe— *eis pantas pisteuontas.* These words are closely connected in sense with *pephanerotai, is revealed.* The meaning is, But now God's justification without law is revealed *for all who believe*, that is, for their benefit. His justification without law is also revealed *to all*; but it will not profit all, because all will not accept it. It will profit those only who believe. It is hence revealed *eis* for them, for their benefit.

Nor should the word "all" be taken as distributing the human family into individuals. It denotes them nationally, rather than individually. Justification without works is revealed to Jews and Gentiles. These are the *all*.

(**For there is no difference; 23. for all have sinned and come short of the glory of God.**) This sentence is clearly parenthetical, and should be so marked, as here. The meaning is, there is no difference, on the score of guilt, between Jews and Gentiles; for all alike have sinned and come short of the glory of God. The word "glory" here means honor, the honor *due to* God. The genitive is genitive of object. All have sinned, and thereby failed to honor God as they should. They owed it to him to honor him by keeping his law perfectly, but they have not done so.

24. they being justified freely by his favor, The connection may be thus shown: God's justification is revealed for all who believe, they being justified freely by his favor. That is, those who believe are they who are freely justified. *They*, the

subject of "being justified" is supplied from the clause "all that believe." Being justified *freely, dorean*. Our justification is bestowed on us as a gift; it is not earned by us, or we make no requital for it.

by his favor—by God's favor. Justification is gratuitous on the part of God. He does not owe it to us, nor can we claim it as a right. We accept it as a sheer gratuity. Were it by law, or perfect obedience, the very reverse would be the case.

through the ransom which is in Christ Jesus, In this compressed and comprehensive sentence we have the ground of the whole remedial system. On this ground depends every thing. To expand it, in all its amplitude, would be to write the history of human redemption, from its conception in the mind of God up to its consummation in the glorification of the saved. We must, however, pause on it a few moments.

What is implied or assumed in the sentence? 1. That the whole human family had sinned. This is the bottom implication, the one which underlies all others. 2. That all were condemned for sin, and in bondage to it. 3. That, as the penalty of sin, all were doomed to death and future punishment. These are the facts implied or assumed in the ransom of Christ.

through the ransom *διὰ τῆς ἀπολυτρώσεως*. *Apolutrosis* is from *apolutro*. *Apolutro* means to release on the payment of a ransom. The ransom (*lutron*), money or any thing else, being paid, *apolutro*, I release the person or thing held. The only distinction between *lutro* and *apolutro* is in *apo*, which either simply intensifies the force, or, it may be, still retains its signification of *from*, denoting separation. According to this, the one means I release, i. e., for a ransom; the other, I release *from*. *Apolutrosis*, then, signifies releasing for a ransom, or a releasing ransom; that is, a ransom which has the efficacy or effect to release. This last is nearest the sense.

With these facts and definitions before us, we are prepared to look more closely into the ransom, releasing ransom, which is in Christ. The thing which man forfeited by sinning is life—"in the day thou eatest thereof, thou shalt surely die"; and the penalty which he incurred is future punishment. Now Christ takes his own life, as it were, and with it, as a ransom, buys us off from sin and its penalty. In other words, he pays his life for us, and so releases us from sin and its consequences. "You have been bought with a price." 1 Cor. vi: 20. The ransom from

death, however, i. e., natural death, operates only as a respite, of which more in the proper place. But, at the first, this ransom is merely potential, or exists simply as a provision of the divine favor. Not only so, but we are bought off by it conditionally. We believe in Christ and obey him—*obedience of belief*. Thereupon the ransom takes effect; and we are not only released from sin, but the sin is forgiven. Being thus freed from sin, we are, from this on, viewed and treated as just. This is justification through the ransom which is in Christ, justification in virtue of its efficacy. The ransom is the meritorious means of the justification, or the valuable consideration which procures it. The expression, ransom which is in Christ, means the ransom which he has effected, and which still has its efficacy in him. But the subject—and no more important one will soon present itself to the reader's thought, is still farther developed under the next clause.

25. whom God has set forth as an atoning sacrifice through belief in his blood, *Set forth*—placed out before the world as an object to be looked on or taken notice of. *As an atoning sacrifice*—*hilasterion*. This word is used by the Septuagint to denote the mercy-seat, which was the lid that covered the ark. It was of pure gold; and out of it the cherubim were made, that stood on its ends. On this mercy-seat the high-priest sprinkled, once every year, the blood of the sin-offering, and so made an atonement for the sins of the people. Is *hilasterion* to be applied to Christ in the sense of mercy-seat? I think not; though I see no violent reason against it. I simply prefer a different sense, as both more congruous and more accurate, and therefore reject this.

Hilasterion is the neuter of *hilasterios*, used as a noun: and, as such, it has the signification of both an adjective and a noun. It is equivalent to *hilasterion thuma*. *Hilasterion*, when applied to a heathen sacrifice or offering, meant expiatory, i. e., designed to expiate, conciliate, or incline to benignity. When applied to Christ, it means atoning; that is, having this efficacy or effect. *Hilasterion*, then, is an *atoning sacrifice*. Now God has set forth Christ as the *hilasterion* of the world. Viewed first as a person, he is the victim to be offered. "He offered himself without spot to God." Heb. ix: 14. When slain, he is the sacrifice—the *thuma*. In being slain, he sheds his blood; and this blood contains his life. "The life of the flesh is in the blood." Lev. xvii: 11. This blood, with his life in it, is the atoning mat-

ter which is to be given as a ransom for the sinner. "It is the blood that maketh an atonement for the soul." See Lev. as above.

And just here seems to emerge the true idea of the atonement, *katallage*, which has cost the world so much thought. I concisely state my conception of it. *Katallage* is from *katallasso*, which primarily means *to change* or *exchange*, that is, one thing for another. The radical fact, then, in the atonement is exchange—*exchange of life for life*. Christ exchanges or gives his life as a ransom for the sinner's life; he buys the sinner off from sin and procures the remission of it. "In whom, [Christ], we have redemption through his blood, even the remission of sins." Eph. i: 7. As a ransom, the blood of Christ must be distinguished by two characteristics: It must possess great value and great honor—great value, because the whole human family are to be redeemed by it; and great honor, because, by sin, both God and his law have been dishonored, and this must be repaired. Accordingly, Peter says: "Knowing that you were ransomed, not with perishable things as silver and gold, from your foolish mode of life, handed down from your fathers, but with the precious blood of Christ, as of a lamb without blemish and pure." 1 Pet. i: 18, 19. The original of *precious blood* is *timio haimati*. Now, *timio*, from *timios*, here means having both great value and great honor. Of the absolute value and honor of the blood of Christ, we can have no adequate idea. They may be infinite, for aught we know, but must, at least, be equal to the end to be accomplished by them. That end is nothing less than the contingent redemption of the whole human race. Not that all will be redeemed, but all might be. The blood has efficacy to redeem all. Now when this blood is offered and accepted, when it takes effect as a ransom, which it does when we believe in, and obey Christ, then we are released from sin; and the sin is forgiven. This exchange of Christ's blood for the sinner is the *katallage*—the atonement.

through belief in his blood, Some of the best commentators connect the phrase *in his blood* immediately with *hilasterion*, thus: whom God has set forth as an atoning sacrifice in his blood. This is unquestionably true; but whether it be the collocation intended by the Apostle may well be doubted. Christ is an atoning sacrifice in his blood, or by means of it; but he is so contingently. He is so on the condition of belief. Now the

conditional efficacy of his blood seems to me to be the very point the Apostle is guarding, by placing *through belief* where it stands. Christ is an atoning sacrifice *through belief*. Without belief he is not one, at least not an available one. We must believe in his blood in order to be ransomed by it. This is the fact which the Apostle is seeking to protect.

for a proof of God's justice, *Endeixis* signifies *pointing out, exhibition, proof*. It must here be taken in the sense of full exhibition or proof. Christ, as an atoning sacrifice, demonstrates God's justice in remitting sin. His justice therefore is not merely pointed out, but a full proof of it is given. The fact of remission proves his favor and mercy, but not his justice. This is proved by Christ as a *hilasterion*.

Instead of saying, for a proof of *his* justice, and during *God's* forbearance, I transpose *God* and *his*, and read as in the translation. By this, the sense remains the same; and an ambiguity is removed from *his* which might be taken as referring to Christ.

God's *justice* not *justification*. I find myself wholly unable to translate *dikaiousunes* here justification. The sense of the passage clearly requires a different word. Indeed, if we translate it justification, then *dia ten paresin* can not, without great violence, be so rendered as to suit it, or make a consistent sense. Stuart tries hard to do this, and yet, to my mind, completely fails. God does not set forth Christ as an atoning sacrifice for a proof or an exhibition of his justification. But, inasmuch as he remitted sins before Christ died, he sets forth Christ as an atoning sacrifice, to prove that in doing so he was just. Had he remitted them without such a sacrifice, the fact might have argued him unjust. The point is, not to show what God did, but that he was just in doing what he did.

Again: whatever *dikaiousune* means in v. 26, it means in v. 25. Verse 26 reads thus: for a proof of his *dikaiousune* at this time, that he *may be just*, while justifying him that believes in Jesus. A proof of God's justification is a proof of nothing beyond the fact. It has no power to show him as just while justifying the believer in Jesus. But a proof that he is just, is conclusive that he will continue to be so. God's justice in forgiving sin is the thing to be proved. To establish this is the Apostle's object. *Justice*, then, and *not* justification, is the meaning of the word.

on account of remitting the sins formerly committed
The sins here referred to were sins committed prior to the time

of Christ. But in what acceptation shall we take *parcsin*? Some think, in the sense of *passing by*. Those who thus think, insist that no sins committed prior to Christ were really remitted till his death. They contend that the sins of that period, even in the case of the saved, were merely passed by or overlooked, as it were, till Christ died; and that then, but not before, they were actually forgiven. They rest their theory on the meaning of *parcsin*, and on the assumed fact, that sins could not be really forgiven till Christ had shed his blood.

But as to *parcsis* the theory fails. True, *parcsis* means passing by, or letting pass. But nothing decisive can be inferred from this. *Aphesis*, in like manner, means sending away, sending from; yet it is the usual word for remission. Both words are derived from *hiemi*, the one by prefixing *para*, the other, *apo*. Now, as *aphesis* means sending away, or sending from, in the sense of remitting or forgiving; so *parcsis* means passing by, or letting pass, in the same sense. When used of sin, as here, it means remitting it. When God passes by sin, or lets it pass, he is done with it; just as when he sends sin away, he is done with it.

Nor is the theory tenable on the basis of the assumed fact. Certainly men were saved before the death of Christ, as Enoch, and others. But to say that these men were saved without their sins being really remitted, is too absurd to be entertained. God never ignored a man's sin, for the time being, and saved him, leaving the fact of actual remission to take place at some future period. He may, during our lifetime, pass by our sins and not punish them, as we know he does; but when, after death, he saves us, no sins remain to be forgiven. Nor is it necessary to assume that Christ's blood had no efficacy till after it was shed. All men lived prior to his death in virtue of the ransom which is in him. Just as conceivably could sins be remitted through his blood before it was shed. If his blood acts through all time since it was shed, as it does; so may it have acted through all time before it was shed. The ransom of Christ touches all human life, as well as all human sin, and that without regard to time. It was redemption to all who were saved before he died; it is redemption to all who shall be saved subsequently.

In the case of all the saved prior to Christ's death, God remitted their sins through, or by reason of, the retrospective efficacy of

his blood. They believed God and obeyed him, and by obedience perfected their belief. This done, the ransom of Christ took effect in their behalf, just as in our case. Their belief was counted to them for justification; and they were saved. Now, as proof that in all this, God was strictly just, he has set forth Christ as an atoning sacrifice. On account of what he did, or as a reason for it, this proof became necessary. So great is the value, and so great the honor, inherent in the ransom of Christ, that God can do all he does in the way of saving sinners, and still remain perfectly just. Neither his honor nor his justice is thereby tarnished or compromised.

26. during his forbearance, Even before Christ's death, God was bearing with the human family for his sake. By his ransom they had been bought off from immediate death, though for no definite period. That period God lengthened out, notwithstanding they were constantly sinning, to give all an opportunity to be saved. He bore then, as he bears now, that none might be lost except those who wilfully refused to be saved.

also for a proof of his justice at this time, I supply the word *also* merely because it makes a fuller and better sentence. It is not necessary, but still is of service. The *pros ten endeixin* of this verse is identical in sense with the *eis endeixin* of the preceding one. No successful effort has been made to show a distinction between them. I can see none, and hence do not affect to draw any. The phrase *at this time* signifies the time since Christ. God has set forth Christ as an atoning sacrifice, for a proof to all men now that, in remitting sin, he is just, and neither arbitrary nor unjust.

that he may be just while justifying him that believes in Jesus. Not merely that God may be *shown* to be just, though this is necessary, but that he *may be* absolutely just in forgiving the believer. He sets forth Christ as a sacrifice to prove that he *is* just, and that he will continue to be so. Only on the condition of such an offering could he be just while justifying the unjust. The reader will notice that I render *kai while*. On its use in the place of a particle of time, see MCK. Prelim. Ess. 210, or any good grammar.

Ton ek pisteos literally means *him who is of belief*. But this, though perfectly clear, is awkward to English ears. It is best, therefore, to use some more familiar form of speech, as in the translation. Between the two expressions, *him who is of belief*

and him that *believes*, no difference in sense exists. They are merely different modes in different languages of saying the same thing.

CHAPTER III. SECTION 4.

²⁷ Where then is boasting? It is shut out. By what law—of works? No indeed; but by the law of belief. ²⁸ For we conclude that man is justified by belief, without deeds of law. ²⁹ Is he the God of Jews only, and not of Gentiles? Yes, of Gentiles also; ³⁰ since there is one God who will justify the circumcision by belief, and the uncircumcision by belief. ³¹ Do we then render law of no effect by belief? Not at all; but we establish law.

²⁷ Ποῦ οὖν ἡ καύχησις; ἐξεκλείσθη. Διὰ ποίου νόμου; τῶν ἔργων; οὐχί, ἀλλὰ διὰ νόμου πίστεως. ²⁸ Λογιζόμεθα γὰρ δικαιουῖσθαι πίστει ἄνθρωπον χωρὶς ἔργων νόμου. ²⁹ Ἡ Ἰουδαίων ὁ Θεὸς μόνου; οὐχὶ καὶ ἐθνῶν; ναὶ καὶ ἐθνῶν. ³⁰ εἴπερ εἷς ὁ Θεός, ὃς δικαιώσει περιτομὴν ἐκ πίστεως καὶ ἀκροβυστιαν διὰ τῆς πίστεως. ³¹ Νόμον οὖν καταργοῦμεν διὰ τῆς πίστεως; Μὴ γένοιτο, ἀλλὰ νόμον ἱστανόμεν.

SUMMARY.

The justification of God is by belief, and not by deeds of law. It is a matter of favor, then, and not of merit. Consequently, no man can boast that he has deserved it or merited it. This justification is for Gentiles as well as for Jews. God is the God of both, and is ready to bless both, to bless them in the same way, and on the same conditions.

27. Where then is boasting? It is shut out. This question is in fact a conclusion from preceding premises, expressed interrogatively. This is clear from *oun*. The meaning is: Therefore, none can boast; neither the Jew can boast, nor the Gentile can boast; because there is no ground for it. On the contrary, all have sinned, and all are condemned. No man merits justification; the Jew does not merit it by his law, nor the Gentile, by his. Consequently there is no place for boasting. It is utterly excluded.

By what law—of works? No indeed; but by the law of belief. Boasting is shut out by force of law; but by what law? Is it by the law of the Jew, which justifies only on condition of perfect obedience? Certainly not. Nor is boasting excluded by the law of the Gentile, for the same reason. By what law, then, is boasting shut out? By the law of belief; that is, by the gospel. God's justification, which is the only practicable justification, is revealed in the gospel. The fact of it, the ground of it, and the mode of it, are therein revealed. This justification is by belief in Christ, perfected by obedience to him; it is by *the obedience of belief*. The ground of it in God is favor and

mercy; the reason for it, the ransom of Christ. It is bestowed on us as a gratuity, and accepted by us without requital. Boasting then that we merit justification is wholly excluded by operation of the law of belief—the gospel.

by the law of belief. That this expression is but a compendious designation for the gospel, I think too evident to need defending. Boasting is shut out by that only, through which justification is received as a matter of favor. This is indisputable; and that justification is thus received only through the gospel is equally certain. The expression “by the law of belief,” then, and the gospel, are but two different names for the same thing.

In the scheme of human redemption, favor, God's favor, stands out and apart by itself, stands alone in its absoluteness, as the principle in the Father's bosom in which salvation had its inception; Christ stands over against law; and belief, over against deeds. Therefore, in discussing justification belief becomes, of necessity, the constant antithesis of deeds. Hence its prominence, and the frequency of its recurrence. Not that we are justified by belief alone, that is, by belief apart from the acts of obedience which it implies; but our justification is ascribed to belief, because it stands out more conspicuously than any thing else, as being the condition of gratuitous justification, in opposition to deeds of law, as the ground of merited justification.

In the expression “law of belief,” the word law, taken technically, can mean only the law according to which belief is produced, or the law according to which it acts after being produced, or belief itself viewed as a law, or all these together. But such meanings are out of the question in the present case. Law of belief is a representative expression, denoting the gospel as a scheme of gratuitous justification, in which belief is the primary and most prominent condition.

28. For we conclude that man is justified by belief, without deeds of law. This passage is not an inference from what precedes. It is confirmative of the position that boasting is shut out by the law of belief. The *gar* here is affirmative in office.

It was over this passage that Luther made his famous translation, “we are justified by faith *only*,” which daring act gave rise to that doctrine. But Luther's act was prompted solely by his aversion to the Papal tenet of justification by works. It is without defence

either from scripture or philology. I much admire Luther's bold opposition to the error of Rome, but deeply regret the extreme to which it led him. Not that the doctrine of justification by faith only is as dangerous as the Romish position to which it stood opposed. This I do not hold. On belief in Christ, absolutely taken, it would be difficult, in my judgment, to lay too great stress. To its importance and necessity as a condition of justification, I give my cordial assent. Nor even against its value as a means have I any thing to say. In all these I believe, and for them contend. It is only when belief is affirmed to be the sole condition of justification that I put in my demurrer. To illustrate what I mean, I shall assume what I believe will not be denied; namely, that the doctrine of justification and the doctrine of remission of sins are identical doctrines. A man can not be justified, and his sins remain unforgiven; nor be forgiven, and remain unjustified. Now it is held by all who have a proper regard for the Bible, that no one can be forgiven without repentance. Farther: it is conceded by all, that repentance is one act of obedience to Christ's authority, and belief a different act. These two acts can never be confounded; nor has the one any power either to usurp the place of the other, or supplant it. Each performs a special function which the other can not perform; nor can either become a substitute for the other. How now, in the light of this, can belief be the sole condition of justification? The truth is, it is impossible. And with this, I am done, for the present, with Luther's error.

Under the gospel we have one, and only one, great and all-meritorious ground of justification. *That ground is the atoning blood of Christ.* Once for all, let this be fully conceded, with no reserved understanding that it shall hereafter be receded from. Now, obviously, before this ground, and by force of it, all acts of obedience stand alike devoid of merit to procure justification. No matter how great their value in other respects, they have none in this. Belief then has no merit to procure justification, nor has repentance, nor any other act. Wherein then lies the value of these acts? In this, that Christ has appointed them as the specific conditions, on compliance with which, he invests us with the benefit of his blood. His blood is for redemption; these acts are for his blood. What these specific acts are, and how many, I pause not here to inquire. I merely reiterate that belief is not the only one.

without deeds of law. This important expression needs some slight elucidation. Because we are justified without deeds of law, many seem to conclude that therefore law is nothing, and deeds of law nothing. But this is quite a mistake. Paul says, in the very Letter in hand: *The law is holy, and the commandment holy, and just and good.* Our not being justified by law does not result from the worthlessness of deeds of law. It results from our not doing these deeds. If we did them, we would be justified by them; but we do them not, and therefore are not justified. We must not, then, conclude that there is nothing in acts of obedience to law. There is nothing in them when not done, but life in them when done. But the value of one deed of law is conditioned on the whole. Unless we do all, we realize nothing. A less number does not entitle to justification. This is true of law strictly, but is not true of the gospel.

29. **Is he the God of Jews only, and not of Gentiles?** The connection may be thus indicated: "We count that man is justified by belief, without deeds of law." If so, then surely there is a chance for the Gentiles. Or is he the God of Jews only, and not of Gentiles?

Yes, of Gentiles also; That is, he is the God of the Gentiles as truly as of the Jews. All are alike his offspring, and stand before him with equal chances for the future. However their lots may differ in this life, in the light of the judgment they are equal. We have here a fine argument in behalf of the Gentile, drawn, not from his relation to law, but from his relation to God as his Maker. God is alike Father to all; all have alike sinned against him, and he will justify all in the same way.

30. **since there is one God who will justify the circumcision by belief, and the uncircumcision by belief.** God is the God of the Gentiles as well as of the Jews; since there is but one Maker of all; and he will justify both alike—Jews by belief, Gentiles by belief. The Future here is used to express a general truth, or constantly recurring fact, and therefore has nearly the same import as the present. See Winer, p. 280.

The reader will notice that I render *ek pisteos* and *dia tes pisteos* exactly alike, namely, *by belief*. Between the two expressions I can discover no difference. If there be any, it amounts to about this, that in *ek pisteos* the justification is conceived as arising *out of* the belief as source; whereas, in *dia tes pisteos* it is conceived as realized *through* the belief as means. But even

this difference is ideal rather than actual. The article before the latter *pisteos* merely identifies it with the former. The two expressions, therefore, should be translated in the same words. In speaking of them Winer says: "Paul certainly does not have in view a difference of meaning between them." When we translate, God will justify the Jews *by* belief and the Gentiles *through* belief, we bewilder, not enlighten.

31. Do we then render law of no effect by belief? Not at all: If justification by law be impossible; and if it is attainable only through belief, then by operation of belief is not law rendered useless? The Apostle conceived that the question might occur to some, and he therefore raises it himself, for the purpose of answering it. But the question is really a nonsequitur. Law may be wholly useless for one purpose, and yet indispensable for others. This is the error in the question. Law is of no service as a means of justification; yet it answers countless other important ends. Hence the proper answer is the strong negative we have.

but we establish law. Not, we establish law *by belief*; for this is not the meaning. We do not render law useless by belief—this is all. We establish law—Who? I Paul. How? By my teaching and practice. I teach all men to do what is right and not to do what is wrong. This is the purpose of law. I thus act myself. I therefore indorse and confirm law; I show it to be both necessary and right. Only in the matter of justification do I teach that law avails nothing, not because of any defect in law, but simply because it is never kept.

CHAPTER IV.

SECTION I.

What now shall we say that Abraham our father obtained according to the flesh? ² For had Abraham been justified by deeds, he has ground for boasting. ¹ But he has none before God. For what says the scripture? Abraham believed God, and it was counted to him for justification. ⁴ Now to him who works, the wages is not counted as a favor, but as a debt. ⁶ But to him who works not, but believes on him who justifies the wicked—his belief is counted for justification. ⁶ Even as David also speaks of the man's blessedness to whom God counts justification without deeds: ⁷ Blest are they whose iniquities are forgiven, and whose sins are covered; ⁸ blest is the man to whom the Lord will not count sin.

Τί οὖν ἐροῦμεν εὐρηκέναι Ἀβραάμ τὸν πατέρα ἡμῶν κατὰ σάρκα; ² Εἰ γὰρ Ἀβραάμ ἐξ ἔργων ἐδικαιώθη, ἔχει καύχημα. Ἀλλ' οὐ πρὸς Θεόν. ³ Τί γὰρ ἡ γραφή λέγει; Ἐπίστευσε δὲ Ἀβραάμ τῷ Θεῷ, καὶ ἐλογίσθη αὐτῷ εἰς δικαιοσύνην. ⁴ Τῷ δὲ ἐργαζομένῳ ὁ μισθὸς οὐ λογίζεται κατὰ χάριν ἀλλὰ κατὰ ὀφείλημα. ⁶ Τῷ δὲ μὴ ἐργαζομένῳ, πιστεύοντι δὲ ἐπὶ τὸν δικαιούντα τὸν ἀσεβῆ, λογίζεται ἡ πίστις αὐτοῦ εἰς δικαιοσύνην. ⁶ Καθάπερ καὶ Δαυὶδ λέγει τὸν μακαρισμὸν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ᾧ ὁ Θεὸς λογίζεται δικαιοσύνην χωρὶς ἔργων. ⁷ Μακάριοι ὧν ἀφέθησαν αἱ ἀνομίαι καὶ ὧν ἐπεκαλύφθησαν αἱ ἁμαρτίαι. ⁸ μακάριος ἀνὴρ ᾧ οὐ μὴ λογίσσῃται Κύριος ἁμαρτίαν.

SUMMARY.

Abraham was not justified by deeds. If so, he had ground to boast that he merited justification. On the contrary, his belief was counted to him for justification. Justification by deeds is like a debt; but justification by belief is matter of favor. David describes justification to be the same as forgiving sins.

The Apostle had just said, "We conclude that man is justified by belief, without deeds of law"; and by this he means, We hold it to be true in all ages, both before the law and since; we hold it to be true in all cases, in that of the Jew, and that of the Gentile; in a word, we hold it to be universally true. Are we right in this? Let us proceed to put the question to the test. In order to do this, we will take the case of Abraham. How was he justified? If by works, then you Jews are right, and I am wrong; but if by belief, then I am right and you are wrong. Thus the issue is formed.

What now shall we say that Abraham our father obtained? It is better to render *heurekenai*, *obtained* than *found*. True, the latter is more literal, but the former gives the better sense. Abraham was justified. This is conceded. How did he obtain it?—by works, or by belief? Not, how did he find it?

However, either sense is correct, only I think that given by *obtained*, preferable. Justification is something sought and obtained, rather than something sought and found. Again: it is sufficient to render the Perfect as a simple Aorist. Nothing is gained by saying *has* obtained.

according to the flesh? The phrase *kata sarka* places Abraham before us simply as a man; and it is almost synonymous with deeds, in the sense of perfect obedience. What shall we say that Abraham obtained *kata sarka*? Did he obtain justification in that way? If so, then he obtained it by deeds; but if by belief, then it was not *kata sarka*. This is farther evinced by the implied answer, thus: Question—What shall we say that Abraham obtained *kata sarka*? Answer—He did not obtain justification. The reason is now assigned.

2. For had Abraham been justified by deeds, he has ground for boasting. Had Abraham's obedience to God been perfect, he would have been justified by it. In that event, he could have boasted that justification, in his case, was no matter of favor; that it was due to him as a debt, and therefore his right. This the Apostle concedes. But no Jew even claimed for Abraham perfect obedience; hence he could not claim for him justification by deeds.

Edikaiothe is Indic. Aorist, introduced by the conditional *ei*. But as the condition is known to be contrary to the fact, the verb should be rendered as above.

3. But he has none before God. The usual rendering and pointing of this clause, in connection with the preceding one, are utterly faulty. They are with slight variations, as follows: For had Abraham been justified by deeds he has ground for boasting, but not before God. This is the very opposite of what the Apostle meant to say. His meaning is, Had Abraham been justified by deeds he has ground of boasting *before God*; but, as the case is, he has none. But by the common rendering he is made to say: Had Abraham been justified by deeds, he has ground of boasting, but *no ground* before God, which is suicidal. But supply *he has* from the preceding clause, this being clearly required by *alla* which so often implies something suppressed, and the sense becomes clear and fine, as is seen in the translation. Indeed, we then have a conditional syllogism, with conclusion suppressed; in which, from the denial of the consequent, the denial of the antecedent follows, thus: If Abraham

had been justified by deeds, he has ground for boasting: But he has no ground before God; therefore he was not justified by deeds.

For what says the scripture? The question has immediate reference to the preceding clause, and is adduced to confirm it. Abraham has no ground for boasting. As proof, what says the scripture?

Abraham believed God, and it was counted to him for justification. The reference is to Gen. xv: 6. Abraham believed God, believed not only in him, but all he said; believed in him in the ordinary, but full import of the word; believed all the difficult things he spoke. It is not necessary to assume that Abraham's belief extended to the details of what God said, and comprehended them all. There was nothing miraculous in his belief. It was belief in the sense in which we believe, the only difference being in the things believed.

But what, precisely, was the thing counted to Abraham? It was not the righteousness of God, nor the righteousness of Christ. This much is certain. Indeed, the position that Christ's righteousness, whether the attribute or the righteousness of perfect obedience, is ever imputed to human beings, is without even the semblance of countenance from the Bible. It is matter of astonishment that it should ever have been held; and matter of still greater astonishment that any one should now hold it. Nor was it the naked act of believing that was counted to Abraham. To suppose this is altogether too contracted. It was the substantive thing belief that was counted, but this in so far only, as it contained the whole future obedience of the man. As a mere abstract or psychological state, Abraham's belief was useless and not counted. The seed we are about to plant is valuable, so far only as it contains in itself the germ of a future crop. So with Abraham's belief. It contained in it, in germinal form, the future life of the man. As thus containing, it was counted to him, not otherwise.

To count a thing to a person is to set it down to his advantage; to so value and use it, in reckoning, as to cause it to inure to his future benefit.

Abraham's belief was counted to him *eis dikaiosunen*. What does this mean? First: It does not mean to count *dikaiosunen* instead of something else. The expression will not admit of this interpretation. Second: Nor does it signify to count *dikaiosun-*

nen as equivalent to, or as having equal value with, something else. But it means to count *dikaiosunen* as *one thing*—the consideration of value or equivalence being excluded—in order to obtain another. This is its meaning. The use of *eis*, in this sense, or as performing this function, is so well known, and so common in the New Testament, that I shall not stop to adduce examples of it. Moreover, be it noticed, that the thing counted to Abraham was *his own*, not another's. *Dikaiosune* means acquittal from sin, with subsequent recognition and treatment as just. Now Abraham's belief was counted to him *eis*—in order to, *dikaiosunen*—in order to his acquittal from sin, or that, by means of his belief, he might obtain justification. It was, in a word, the condition of his release or pardon, just as it is the condition of ours. Such is the meaning of the expression.

But farther: As the ground, on which alone our belief can become a condition of pardon, is the now actually atoning sacrifice of Christ; as, in other words, this is the ground which enables God to recognize our belief as a condition, and to be just while forgiving us; so also was it in the case of Abraham. That sacrifice, long before ordained of God, and then, though not offered, considered by him as offered, was the ground on which Abraham's belief became erected into a condition of remission. By its operation alone then, as now, was God enabled to be just while acquitting Abraham. Should any urge this distinction: That we believe in Christ, while Abraham believed in God only, I ask, Where was the Logos then? John says: "In the beginning was the Logos, and the Logos was with God, and the Logos was God." Was the belief of Abraham, then, in the one, in fact, and by necessary implication, belief also in the other? It is exciting to think so.

But here it is proper to notice, briefly, the apparent discrepancy between Paul and James on justification; and I use the word apparent, significantly. Do the apostles contradict each other? Emphatically not. How then can they be shown to teach the same thing? I examine first the fuller statement of James, which, closely rendered, is as follows:

"But are you willing to know, O vain man, that belief without deeds is useless? Was not Abraham our father justified by deeds when he offered Isaac his son upon the altar? You see that belief worked with his deeds, and by deeds his belief was perfected; and the scripture was fulfilled which says: But Abraham

believed God and it was counted to him for justification ; and he was called the friend of God. You see that by deeds man is justified, and not by belief only." Jas. ii: 20-24.

A few things may here be taken for granted, while a few distinctions should be kept in view: 1. The deeds of James are deeds of a believer, and are acts of obedience to the divine will. 2. They do not amount to perfect obedience or embrace the whole of human duty, but only a part of it. 3. James concedes that man is justified by belief, and denies merely that he is justified by belief only; that is, by belief to the exclusion of the acts of obedience included in it, as joint conditions with it, of justification. 4. James, no more than Paul, teaches that man is justified by deeds in the sense of perfect obedience. 5. The deeds of James are not acts of merit, but simply conditions of justification. All these points may be safely conceded, indeed I believe they must be.

Now from the statement of James, in connection with the preceding, the following corollaries result: 1. That justification by belief only, as excluding other joint conditions with it of justification, contradicts the word of God. 2. That James, by inspiration, has bound up together belief and certain acts not separately named by him, as joint conditions of justification. These acts, therefore, can never be sundered from belief, nor be denied to be conditions of justification.

From all of which it follows, that when Paul says, we are justified by belief, inasmuch as he does not say by belief only, thereby excluding other conditions, he must be construed as meaning, we are justified by belief as including these conditions. Thus there is not even the remotest contrariety between the two apostles. The one expressly binds together belief and certain unnamed acts as conditions with it, of justification; and as the other does not, in any way, exclude these acts, he must be understood as implying them.

Should it be alleged that James speaks of the justification of a person already accepted of God, as is a christian, while Paul speaks of that primary justification which occurs at the instant when we become christians, I reply, that the allegation is gratuitous and unwarranted by the scripture. I reply farther, that the principle of justification is the same, whether the justification be that of the saint or the sinner. In both cases, it is by belief with other acts; and in neither case by belief without those acts.

4. Now to him who works, the wages is not counted as a favor, but as a debt. An illustration taken from common life, and couching in few words the whole theory of justification by works. When a man hires out to labor, and has done his work, his wages is not looked at in the light of a favor, and handed to him as such; but in the light of a debt owed him, and to be paid him as his due. *To ergazomeno—to him who works; i. e., who performs erga nomou, every duty required by the law. Ergazomeno is of the same import as ho poion ta erga, he who does all the deeds the law commands.* But what is the application of the illustration? It is both special and general. First, it is special to Abraham. Abraham's justification was not counted to him as a debt; for his obedience was not perfect. On the contrary, it was counted to him as a favor, which is decisive against its being of works. Second, the application is general. Whoever keeps the whole law deserves or merits his justification, just as the laborer merits his wages, when he has ended his work. But since there is no one who keeps the whole law, there is, therefore, no such justification. Justification is in all instances matter of favor, which is proof that it is never of works.

5. But to him who works not, Or to him who keeps not the whole law, or does not his whole duty. And since this is true of all, the inference presently to be drawn is applicable to all, applicable to Abraham, applicable to us.

but believes on him who justifies the wicked— The wicked here is a believer; for God never justifies the unbeliever. Moreover, although a believer, he is still unjustified; for if justified, he could not be called wicked. Now these facts almost, perhaps quite, imply a definition of justification. The man is a believer, but still wicked or unforgiven; and God proceeds to justify him. What does he do? Clearly he forgives the man, and thereafter holds him and treats him as just. This precisely is justification. In its inception it is remission; subsequently it is recognition and treatment as just.

But farther: It will be conceded that the wicked is not justified in his impenitence; nay, it will be denied that he can be justified in it. "Except ye repent, ye shall all likewise perish." "God commandeth all men every where to repent." In disobedience to these scriptures, justification is impossible. Now since belief is one thing, and repentance a different thing, each expressed in its own word, and both commanded separately as distinct, but

closely related acts, it follows that in repentance we have another condition of justification besides belief. We have one of those conditions which, under Christ, accompany belief, which work together with it, and so enable it to reach its end—the salvation of the soul. On this, the question would very naturally arise, are even belief and repentance all the conditions of justification? They may be, they may not be. The question can be answered only by determining the whole number of distinct acts which Christ has ordained as conditions precedent to salvation, in the sense of remission or justification. But for this determination we are not yet ready.

his belief is counted for justification. His belief is counted *in order to* his justification or that he may be justified. Stuart thinks that *dikaïosune* is not to be understood here in the sense of justification. Amongst other remarks, he has this. "To say that *faith was counted for justification*, would make a tolerable sense; but to say, *it was counted as complete obedience* would be saying just what the Apostle means to say, viz.: that the believer is gratuitously justified." Still Stuart admits that justification "is the more common meaning of the word in this epistle."

First. I submit that to say, *belief is counted for justification*, is quite as tolerable as to say, "*faith was counted as complete obedience*", and far more so. Indeed, to say that "faith was counted as complete obedience", is to say what simply never transpired, and what never will. It is to say what is wholly groundless, and therefore what is not tolerable in any sense.

Second. What is the subject which the Apostle has in hand? Indisputably, it is justification. Accordingly, in v. 2, we have, "had Abraham been justified by works"; and in v. 5, "who justifies the wicked." Now I hold that in accordance with the subject in hand, and these renderings, v. 3 should read, *it was counted to him for justification*, and v. 6, *his belief is counted for justification*. The translation of the verb determines what the translation of its cognate noun should be. We translate the verb *justifies*. Indisputably then we should translate the noun *justification*. How belief is counted, as well as on what condition, and for what purpose, has already been explained, and consequently need not be farther dwelt on here.

6. Even as David also speaks of the man's blessedness to whom God counts justification without deeds: David, too, is quoted to prove the proposition in hand, to-wit

that the sinner is justified by belief without deeds. The word "deeds" here includes the sum of human duty; hence, "without deeds" means without doing our whole duty. To count justification without deeds to any one, is simply to justify him without perfect obedience. As the person justified is confessedly a believer, there is, no doubt, in the phrase "count justification," an ellipsis of the word belief, the full form being, to count belief for justification. This is the usual and normal form. Belief is the thing counted, justification is the end for which.

7. Blest are they whose iniquities are forgiven, This passage is especially valuable as throwing additional light on the import of justification. The person to whom God counts justification without deeds is the person whose iniquities he forgives. Of this a doubt can hardly exist. Hence to count justification without deeds is to forgive without perfect obedience. It is, in other words, to release from sin on condition of belief, and then to treat as just.

and whose sins are covered; The fact of the preceding statement expressed in slightly different language. To "cover sin" is the same as to "forgive iniquity."

8. blest is the man to whom the Lord will not count sin. To count justification to one is the same as not to count sin to him; and not to count sin is to release from it, or forgive it. Here again the import of justification comes out. It is equivalent to not counting sin, or remitting it, with the implied consequence of esteeming and treating as just. A formal definition of justification could hardly be more satisfactory.

"We conclude that man is justified by belief without deeds of law." This is the proposition. In proof, Abraham is first brought forward who lived before the law. Was he justified by deeds? He was not. On the contrary, his belief was counted to him for justification. Justification to him, therefore, was matter of favor and not of debt; it was a gratuity, and not the payment of a due. David's testimony is next adduced, who lived under the law, and spoke while it was still in force. How does he depose? Blessed is the man to whom God counts justification without deeds. But who is this man? The man whose iniquities are forgiven; he to whom the Lord does not count sin—he is the man to whom justification is counted. Therefore, both from the case of Abraham and from the testimony of David, justification is shown to be by belief, as the condition of it, and not by a perfect life before the law, nor by perfect obedience under it.

CHAPTER IV. SECTION 2.

Ἔτι ὁ μακαρισμὸς οὖν οὗτος ἐπὶ πῆν περιτομῆν, ἢ καὶ ἐπὶ τὴν ἀκροβυστίαν; λέγομεν γὰρ ὅτι ἐλογίσθη τῷ Ἀβραάμ ἡ πίστις εἰς δικαιοσύνην. ¹⁰ Πῶς οὖν ἐλογίσθη; ἐν περιτομῇ ὅτι, ἢ ἐν ἀκροβυστίᾳ; οὐκ ἐν περιτομῇ, ἀλλ' ἐν ἀκροβυστίᾳ. ¹¹ Καὶ σημεῖον ἔλαβε περιτομῆς, σφραγίδα τῆς δικαιοσύνης τῆς πίστεως τῆς ἐν τῇ ἀκροβυστίᾳ, εἰς τὸ εἶναι αὐτὸν πατέρα πάντων τῶν πιστευόντων δι' ἀκροβυστίας, εἰς τὸ λογισθῆναι καὶ αὐτοῖς τὴν δικαιοσύνην, ¹² καὶ πατέρα περιτομῆς, τοῖς οὐκ ἐκ περιτομῆς μόνον, ἀλλὰ καὶ τοῖς στοιχοῦσι τοῖς ἴχνεσι τῆς ἐν ἀκροβυστίᾳ πίστεως τοῦ πατρὸς ἡμῶν Ἀβραάμ.

Now is this blessedness for the circumcision [only]? or for the uncircumcision also? For we say that to Abraham belief was counted for justification. ¹⁰ How then was it counted to him?—while he was in circumcision, or in uncircumcision?—not in circumcision, but in uncircumcision. ¹¹ And he received the mark of circumcision, as a seal of the justification of the belief which [he had], in uncircumcision, that he might be the father of all who believe, in uncircumcision, that to them also justification may be counted; ¹² and the father of circumcision, not to those who are merely circumcised, but to those who also walk in the steps of the belief which our father Abraham had, in uncircumcision.

SUMMARY.

The blessedness of justification by belief, alike for Jews and Gentiles, Abraham was justified before he was circumcised. His circumcision a seal of that fact. Hence justification does not depend on circumcision. Abraham is father to all who believe in an uncircumcised state; also to all the circumcised who walk in his steps.

9. Now is this blessedness for the circumcision [only]? or for the uncircumcision also? Here the Apostle gives another turn to his argument, and brings the Gentile fully into view. He has been reasoning from the case of Abraham, the father of the Jews, and from the testimony of David, one of them. The conclusion is that belief without complete obedience is counted to a man for justification; that to be justified is not to have sin counted to us, which is the same as being released from it; and that his state, who is thus favored, is a peculiarly blessed one. But will not this blessedness be limited to the descendants of Abraham and kin of David? It will not. This negative is the proposition now to be made good.

The verb of the preceding clause has to be supplied, as none is expressed. Several are allowable, as *legetai*, *piptai* and so on; but I do not see that any one of them is necessary. I think it quite sufficient to supply the simple *esti*. This gives a consistent and perfect sense. I also deem it better to render *epi for* in the

sense of *for the sake of*, a meaning which it has before the accusative.

For we say that to Abraham belief was counted for justification. The latter of the two preceding questions anticipates, and takes for granted an affirmative reply. The present clause is the confirmation of that reply. The whole may be thus presented: Now is this blessedness for the circumcision only? or for the uncircumcision also? For the uncircumcision also. For we say that to Abraham, belief was counted for justification.

10. How then was it counted to him?—while he was in circumcision, or in uncircumcision?— That is, at what period in his life was it counted to him, or what was then his state? Was it after his circumcision, or before it?

not in circumcision, but in uncircumcision. His belief was counted to him for justification before he was circumcised. Consequently, the blessedness of justification is not limited to circumcision, but it extends to, and includes, the uncircumcision also. It is for Gentiles no less than for Jews. Thus the reply is established.

11. And he received the mark of circumcision, The genitive of *peritome* is merely definitive of *semeion*—he received circumcision as a mark, or he received a mark which consisted in his circumcision.

as a seal of the justification of the belief which [he had], in uncircumcision, The preceding clause states a simple matter of fact, to-wit, that Abraham received the mark of circumcision. The present clause states one of the purposes which that mark answered. It sealed Abraham's justification. God placed circumcision, as it were, upon his justification, as an authoritative seal, thereby endorsing it to all future ages as his mode of salvation. But I said *one* of the purposes which the mark answered. The other purpose was, as a ratifying token of the covenant which God made with Abraham at the time when he appointed circumcision. "*the justification of the belief*" The genitive *pisteos* is genitive of source, the meaning being, the justification which is of belief or by it. Belief was counted to Abraham *for*, or *in order to*, justification; or justification was the end looked to in the counting. The justification resulted from the belief when counted, or came of it. It was hence the justification of belief. "*Which he had*"—*which* refers to the belief that Abraham had before his circumcision, and not to his justification.

The clause [he had,] which I supply, is necessary to complete the sense, as the reader can see at a glance.

How long Abraham had been justified, when he received the mark of circumcision, can not confidently be said. It was certainly more than thirteen years. He was circumcised in his ninety-ninth year, at which time Ishmael was thirteen years old; and he was justified before Ishmael's birth. This is quite sufficient for Paul's purpose. His object is to show that Abraham was certainly justified before he was circumcised; and this, in order to settle that the blessedness of justification is not confined to circumcision.

The critical reader will notice that I here, as previously, use the word justification, and not righteousness. On this he may dissent, and possibly deem me arbitrary. The former I should regret, the latter I disavow. My strong conviction is, that I am right; and this is my defence. But I can not here re-open again, at length, the investigation of the word. I must refer the reader to what is said on it in the comments on the first chapter, and content myself with a few supplementary remarks.

Dikaiosune indisputably means either justification or righteousness. This is conceded. Which meaning has it here? To test, I again cite as follows: Abraham believed God and it was counted to him *eis dikaiosunen*. Shall we translate by *justification* or by *righteousness*? If by righteousness, what is the meaning? This: Belief was counted *eis, instead of, or as the equivalent of, righteousness*, that is, instead of perfect obedience. This meaning of *eis* is very rare; though it occurs in ch. ii, 26. But farther: Belief is, on all hands, conceded to be a condition of justification. Whether it be the only condition, or merely one with others, is not here in question. It is, at least, a condition. Justification is *dia pisteos*—this is decisive as to belief being a condition. Now let us repeat: Belief, as a condition, was counted *eis*, instead of, or as equivalent to, a life of perfect obedience. This is wholly inadmissible. For, if true, then belief ceases to be a condition of justification. Indeed, in that case, belief ceases to be a condition of any thing. It has lost its character as a condition. When one thing takes the place of another, as its equivalent, the former is not a condition of the latter. It is a *substitute*, not a condition. This is decisive against rendering *dikaiosunen* righteousness, unless we are ready to abandon the conditional character of belief.

sees were offended, after they heard this saying? ¹³ But he answered and said, Every plant, which my heavenly Father hath not planted, shall be rooted up. ¹⁴ Let them alone: they be blind leaders of the blind. And if the blind lead the blind, both shall fall into the ditch. ¹⁵ Then answered Pe'ter and said unto

had proved that by their tradition they were nullifying the word of God; he had charged them with hypocrisy; he had declared that all of their worship based on the authority of tradition was vain worship; and he had swept away the entire fabric of their traditional law of uncleanness, by declaring that a man is not defiled by that which goes into his mouth. He had not only defended himself, but he had turned their own weapons with irresistible effect against them, and it is not surprising that they were offended.

13. Every plant.—In reply to the modest complaint of the disciples. Jesus compares the Pharisees to plants in a garden that were not planted by the owner of it, and declares that they shall be rooted up. They were teaching without divine authority or approbation; and what he had said was intended not to please them, but to root them up.

14. Let them alone.—Let them alone, not in the way of ceasing to expose their errors, but in the sense of making no effort to appease them. The disciples were to be regardless of them as Jesus was, making no change in either the matter or manner of discourse for their sake. Sometimes the best way to move men is to be totally indifferent to them; and when men stand opposed to the truth from corrupt motives, the only possible chance to do them

him, Declare unto us |this: *the*| parable. ¹⁶ And [Jesus] said, Are ye also yet without understanding? ¹⁷ Do not ye [yet] understand, that whatsoever entereth in at the mouth goeth

¹⁵ ταύτην Rec. Omitted by Lach., T. S. Green, Alford, Tregelles.

¹⁶ Ἰησοῦς Rec. Omitted by Lach., Tisch., T. S. Green, Alford, Tregelles.

¹⁷ οὐνο Rec. οὐ Lach., Tisch., T. S. Green, Tregelles.

good is to offend them, for when you please them you only confirm them in their wicked ways.

both fall.—It is sometimes thought, that if a man is misled by his teacher, he will be excused for going astray; but Jesus here teaches that the blind man who is led will fall into the ditch with his blind leader. This is clear enough in reference to the literally blind, and Jesus asserts it in reference to the spiritually blind. If a man, knowing himself to be blind, allows another blind man to lead him, he deserves to fall into the ditch. He should choose a leader who can see, and as there is no leader who can see all the way that we have to travel except Jesus, let us take his word as our only guide, going only as it leads us. The word of God must be our pillar of cloud by day, and of fire by night; we move when it moves, and stop where it stops.

15, 16. the parable.—The disciples were themselves so much under the influence of tradition, that they supposed the remark about that which defiles to be a *parable*. They had been blindly led by the blind guides.

17-19. they defile the man.—Here the Christian idea of uncleanness is fully stated, and the disciples were the better prepared for it by the gradual manner in which it was approached. In this entire paragraph Jesus treats of that

But suppose we translate by *justification*. How stands the matter then—better or worse? The reader can easily decide. Belief is, by consent of all, a condition of justification. As such, it may, within itself, have great value, or it may have none. The question is not before us. As to equivalence, *nihil*. Belief may be equal, with God, to a whole life of perfect obedience, or it may fall immeasurably short of it. It may have no value, save as a naked continuous act or mental state. On this, we know nothing, nor can we know any thing. But belief is a condition precedent to justification, and necessary to it. With this condition Abraham complied, that is, he *believed*; and God, on the basis of the ransom which is in Christ, counted his belief to him, not instead of, nor as equivalent to, a life of perfect obedience; but that, by means of it, as a condition, he might attain to justification, or release from sin. In other words, he counted his belief to him; and thereon, of his mercy, justified him. This view alone strikes me as the true one. It is more simple than any other known to me, is closer to the meaning of *eis*, and is in stricter accordance with the true theory of conditions. As appointments, conditions are not usually instead of, or equivalent to, something else, but simply *for*, or *in order to* some end. I hence still adhere to *justification*.

that he might be the father of all who believe, in uncircumcision, That is, the father of all believing Gentiles. *Dia* here is *dia conditionis*; that is, it denotes the state in which a person is when he acts, the state being viewed, at the same time, as that through or by means of which the act takes place. Abraham believed and was justified previously to his circumcision. The Gentiles also believed while in uncircumcision. Now Abraham received circumcision, first, as a seal of that justification; and, secondly, that he might become the father of all believing Gentiles. As much as to say, God proposed to Abraham, as a special honor, to constitute him the head of all the saved by Christ, on condition of his being circumcised; and he, in order to attain that honor, consented, and received circumcision. By his circumcision he became promoted to this special distinction, but in virtue of his previous belief and justification.

that to them also justification may be counted; The meaning is, That all who believe while in uncircumcision, do so, in order that to them also justification may be counted; or still more simply, they believe, in order that they may be justified.

The object or end for which they believe is justification—the actual realization of it.

12. and the father of circumcision, not to those who are merely circumcised, Here the reference is to the Jews; and the meaning is: Abraham received the mark of circumcision, that he might be the father of circumcision, “not to those who are *merely* circumcised,” that is, circumcised and no more; or who have nothing else to recommend them but their naked circumcision. Abraham did not receive circumcision in order to become the father of circumcision to such. To these he is father *kata sarka*, according to the flesh, and not as a special honor. To such he is no father in the sense in which he is father to believers.

but to those who also walk in the steps of the belief which our father Abraham had, in uncircumcision. The sense of this much disputed verse I take to be concisely this: “And the father of circumcision”, not to those of the Jews who are merely circumcised, and no more; but to those of them who, besides being circumcised, also walk in the steps of the belief which Abraham had, in uncircumcision. This I strongly incline to think the meaning.

But, according to another view, the following is the import: “And the father of circumcision”, not to those only who are circumcised, but to those also who walk in the steps, &c. Here the reference is both to *Jews and Gentiles*. But to this exegesis there are two objections: 1. It places *only* where it clearly should not stand. 2. The Gentiles have just been mentioned; and the very thing said of them which is here said. Such a repetition can not be admitted. These objections, therefore, strike me as decisive against the present view.

On the other hand, it is objected to the rendering which I adopt, that it converts *tois* in the phrase, *alla kai tois*, into a *solecism*. But this I deny. On the contrary, I hold *tois* to be normal and necessary. The first part of the verse is literally as follows: *and the father of circumcision to those not of circumcision only*, or not of it merely. The meaning here can not be mistaken. Now recast, varying only very slightly, thus: and the father of circumcision not to those merely circumcised. So far, well.

But now comes the adversative clause, commencing with *alla kai tois*. *Alla* here, as often, implies a suppressed clause, and

this is the very circumstance which requires *tois*. All of which may be exhibited thus: But to those, *tois*, who, *besides being circumcised* (suppressed clause), also walk in the steps of Abraham's belief. Now when the whole is drawn out, including this clause, we have: "and the father of circumcision", not to those who are merely circumcised, but to those, *tois*, who, *besides being circumcised*, also walk in the steps of Abraham's belief. Not only does this give a perfect sense, but *tois* is shown to be no solecism. Besides we have no repetition of any part of the sentiment contained in the preceding verse.

Finally, the reader will notice that in translating the foregoing clause I am a little freer than usual. The sense, however, I have aimed to follow closely.

walk in the steps of the belief This language is metaphorical, and, if my conception of its import be correct, beautiful. First. It may signify to believe simply, as Abraham believed; that is, to take him as an example, in the matter of belief, in all particulars which enter into and constitute both the fact of belief and its circumstances. This we should certainly do, whether it be the import of the language or not; and I deem it not its import. Or, secondly, the Apostle may have conceived of belief as personified, and as pursuing with never erring foot the leadings of the divine will, whether that will pertain to the complex, and, at times, almost crushing duties of this life, or to the sublime and difficult visions of the future, which occasionally burst upon us through the medium of revelation, as when Abraham "saw Christ's day and rejoiced." This, I take it, suggests the meaning of the language. Thus viewed, belief appears as a person marching grandly on, surely to an imperishable crown, because in steady obedience to the voice of God, and we are "walking in its steps." Many have, in time gone, thus "walked"; and it is gratifying to know that many are thus "walking" now. To all such Abraham is "father." And who so worthy of this distinction as that great man who never "staggered" at the promise of God, but always "gave him glory," even when, at his command, the blade of a fatal knife gleamed in an uplifted hand over the form of his typical boy? Surely the age has never been when the necessity rose higher than at this time, for children of God who have the nerve to "walk in the steps of Abraham's belief"—a time which, unless I misread its ominous signs, is destined to witness the wrecking of the belief of many who for a time "ran well."

CHAPTER IV. SECTION 3.

"Now the promise, that he should be the heir of the world, was not made to Abraham, nor his offspring, through law, but through justification by belief. ¹⁴ For if they of law be heirs, belief is rendered of no effect; and the promise is a failure. ¹⁵ For the law works wrath; but where no law is there is no transgression. ¹⁶ Therefore, it is by belief, that it may be by favor, that the promise may be sure for all the offspring,—not to him only, who is of the law, but to him also who is of Abraham's belief, who is the father of us all; ¹⁷ (as it is written: I have made you a father of many nations), before God in whom he believed, (who makes alive the dead, and calls things not existing as existing), ¹⁸ who, against hope, believed in hope; so that he became the father of many nations; according to the saying: So shall your offspring be. ¹⁹ And being not weak in belief, he did not mind his own body, now dead, being nearly a hundred years old, and the deadness of Sarah's womb; ²⁰ and he did not decide against God's promise through unbelief. But he grew strong by belief, (giving glory to God), ²¹ being also fully convinced that what he had promised, he is able also to do. ²² Therefore it was counted to him for justification.

"Οὐ γὰρ διὰ νόμου ἡ ἐπαγγελία τῷ Ἀβραάμ ἢ τῷ σπερματι αὐτοῦ, τὸ κληρονόμον αὐτὸν εἶναι κόσμου, ἀλλὰ διὰ δικαιοσύνης πίστεως. ¹⁴ Εἰ γὰρ οἱ ἐκ νόμου κληρονόμοι, κεκένωται ἡ πίστις, καὶ καθήρηται ἡ ἐπαγγελία. ¹⁵ Ὁ γὰρ νόμος ὀργὴν κατεργάζεται· οὐ δὲ οὐκ ἔστι νόμος, οὐδὲ παράβασις. ¹⁶ Διὰ τοῦτο ἐκ πίστεως, ἵνα κατὰ χάριν, εἰς τὸ εἶναι βεβαίαν τὴν ἐπαγγελίαν παντὶ τῷ σπερματι, οὐ τῷ ἐκ τοῦ νόμου μόνον, ἀλλὰ καὶ τῷ ἐκ πίστεως Ἀβραάμ, ὃς ἔστι πατὴρ πάντων ἡμῶν. ¹⁷ καθὼς γέγραπται, ὅτι πατέρα πολλῶν ἐθνῶν τέθεικά σε, κατέναντι οὐ ἐπίστευσε Θεοῦ, τοῦ ζωοποιούντος τοὺς νεκροὺς καὶ καλοῦντος τὰ μὴ ὄντα ὡς ὄντα. ¹⁸ ὃς παρ' ἐλπίδα ἐπ' ἐλπίδι ἐπίστευσεν εἰς τὸ γενέσθαι αὐτὸν πατέρα πολλῶν ἐθνῶν, κατὰ τὸ εἰρημένον, Οὕτως ἔσται τὸ σπέρμα σου. ¹⁹ Καὶ μὴ ἀσθενήσας τῇ πίστει, οὐ κατενόησε τὸ αὐτοῦ σῶμα ἤδη νεκρωμένον, ἑκατονταετῆς που ὑπάρχων, καὶ τὴν νεκρωσιν τῆς μήτρας Σάρρας. ²⁰ εἰς δὲ τὴν ἐπαγγελίαν τοῦ Θεοῦ οὐ διεκρίθη τῇ ἀπιστίᾳ. Ἀλλ' ἐνεδυναμώθη τῇ πίστει, δὸς δόξαν τῷ Θεῷ, ²¹ καὶ πληροφορηθεὶς ὅτι ὁ ἐπηγγέλται, δυνατὸς ἔστι καὶ ποιῆσαι. ²² Διὸ ἐλογίσθη αὐτῷ εἰς δικαιοσύνην.

SUMMARY.

God promised to Abraham and his offspring that they should inherit the world. But the promise was in virtue of justification by belief, and not in virtue of law. If the inheritance depended on law, none could attain it. Therefore it is by belief that all may attain it. The power and influence of Abraham's belief shown.

Mentioning Abraham's circumcision, together with the object for which he received it, namely, that he might be the father of all believers, in all time, would very naturally suggest the curious promise made to the patriarch on that occasion. Accordingly, the Apostle proceeds to speak both of the promise and of that in virtue of which it was made. In the preceding section it was shown, in the case of Abraham too, that justification is inde-

pendent of circumcision. In the present section, it will be farther shown that the promise involving his highest distinction was independent of law. Thus it will be shown to the Jew that, even in Abraham's case, who was his model and his boast, neither circumcision nor law availed any thing. The inference is easy—neither can avail any thing now. To bring a Jew to this conclusion was the only effectual way to prepare him for Christ.

13. Now the promise that he should be the heir of the world, "The promise" here alluded to is, no doubt, the one recorded in Gen. xvii: 5; namely, "A father of many nations have I made you." This becomes evident, provided the word "nations" be taken, as it certainly must be, to signify the whole number of Abraham's children *by belief*, his spiritual children, who shall, at last, be gathered together out of the various nations of the earth. The promise having reference to these nations is the one which constituted him "heir of the world,"—how, we shall presently see.

The world, The word "world", *kosmos*, I construe as denoting simply the material earth, or globe; nor do I see how it can be made to bear any other meaning. But the word can not here signify the world in its present form; for Abraham and his spiritual seed have never inherited it in this form, neither will they. It must, then, refer to the world in its future, renovated or glorified form—in its final form, when it becomes a "new earth". In that form, indisputably, Abraham and his spiritual seed will inherit the world, but never in any other. The reference, therefore, I conclude, is to the future earth. But on this, more presently.

was not made to Abraham, nor his offspring, The word "offspring" need not, as some commentators think, be limited to Christ. It certainly includes him, but it just as certainly does not exclude others. It here clearly denotes the whole of Abraham's children by belief. This is made evident by v. 16.

through law, but through justification by belief. The promise was not made through law; that is, it was not made because of, or in consideration of law, but in consideration of justification by belief. Or, the promise was made through justification by belief as the means of procuring it, and not through law as that means.

14. For if they of law be heirs, belief is rendered of no effect; and the promise is a failure. They of law are those

who have law, and upon whom it is obligatory. If these only be heirs of the world, and that, too, by operation of law, belief has turned out a fruitless thing. It has resulted in nothing, though the ground on which the fulfilment of the promise was to be realized. Besides, the promise itself is a failure, a failure because belief has failed, in consideration of which it was made. If those of law only, be heirs, of course it is law that invests with heirship, and not belief. But this was not the case with Abraham, and therefore is not now the case.

15. For the law works wrath; Or it inflicts punishment. "The law" means any law, or all law. Law does not invest those who are of it with the heirship of the world. This it would do if it were perfectly kept, but this is never done. On the contrary, it inflicts punishment on all, because all have broken it, and when once it is broken, none can inherit by it.

for where no law is there is no transgression. I understand the Apostle thus: But should any one insist that the law does not punish him, because he has not broken it; and that therefore he is entitled to inherit by it, I reply, that he is mistaken. For only where there is no law, is there no transgression. But with those of law this, of course, can not be the case. They not only have law, but have broken it, and therefore can not be justified by it; and since they can not be justified by it, they can not inherit by it.

16. Therefore, it is by belief, that it may be by favor, That is, the inheritance of the world is by belief. The promise, in the first instance, was made through justification by belief; and now, in the second, the inheritance is to be realized by belief. Neither is through law. For if the inheritance depended on law, obviously no one could ever attain it, since all fail in obedience. To depend on law is the same as depending on perfect obedience. To be attainable, then, the inheritance must be a matter of favor. In other words, it must be bestowed, like pardon, as a gratuity, and not as a debt. Accordingly, it is made dependent on belief, as the condition of it. Through law, it would be matter of right, not of favor; through belief, it is matter of favor, not of right.

that the promise may be sure for all the offspring,— May be sure to be fulfilled for the benefit of all, or be sure to be kept for all. If the inheritance depended on law, it would be sure to fail all; but as it is matter of favor, and dependent on

the condition of belief, all may attain it who will. It is sure for all who desire it. In the expression, *it is by belief*, we must not take belief by itself. The meaning is, it is by justification by belief.

not to him only, who is of the law, By this, clearly, the Jew is meant; but whether he exclusively is referred to in the preceding clauses, where *nomos* is without the article, may be doubted. The inheritance is for the Jew, for him as a favor, and by belief; but it is not for him only. It is for others as well.

but to him also who is of Abraham's belief, This means the Gentile. To be of Abraham's belief is to have the belief which he had, and like him to be justified by it.

God promised to Abraham and his spiritual children that they should one day inherit the world. The condition, upon which the inheritance is to vest, is justification by belief. Whatever is thus inherited is matter of favor, not of debt. But by law the inheritance is impossible. Herein, therefore, is shown the advantage of belief over law, which seems to be a special design of the present section. Justification is by belief, not by law; the inheritance of the justified is by belief, not by law. Surely, then, in view of all this, the excellence of belief must be conceded.

But up to the present, as previously said, the justified have not inherited the world. Nothing is more certain than this. Nor is there the slightest probability that, so long as they are in the flesh, they ever will inherit it. At least, if any such probability exist, it is not, at present, apparent. I must therefore conclude, as already intimated, that the inheritance will consist of the glorious future earth, the "new earth," which the saints are to inherit in their spiritual bodies. I can feel satisfied with no other view of the subject. True, Stuart thinks that such a view "implies a method of interpreting the *Messianic* prophecies that can not be defended on the ground of rational exegesis." But then those who have read Stuart touching the future home of man, and the future condition of the earth, can well afford to distrust the accuracy of any thing he says on the subject. His views appear strangely unscriptural to me.

who is the father of us all; The father of all believers. To all such he is father by special appointment; and they are children to him by belief. Or he is *pisteuatic* father to them, and they are *pisteuatic* children to him. Were this word tolerable, it would convey the thought precisely. It is from *pisteuo*, I

believe, and would be an acquisition. It is here used, however, not for the purpose of suggesting its adoption, but simply to convey the sense.

17. (as it is written: **I have made you a father of many nations**), Or, I have constituted you, *tetheika*, a father of a multitude of nations. Ab-ram, the patriarch's original name, signifies great or exalted father; Ab-raham, his new name, father of multitudes, *ab* meaning father, and *raham*, in Arabic, a vast number or great multitude.

Abraham was father to two sets of children: to the Jews he was father according to the flesh, and to them was given the literal or earthly Canaan; to believers he is father by appointment, and to them is to be given the world to come, or heavenly Canaan. Paul is here referring particularly to believers.

before God, in whom he believed, By common consent, a complicated and difficult passage. One cause of trouble is, that while *episteuse* requires the dative; it here has the genitive. But the circumstance is thus explained: *Katenanti* governs the genitive, and is here followed by it. *Theos* is then put in the genitive by *attraction* to correspond with it. True, the attraction of the noun instead of the pronoun is rare, but even in the N. T. we have several instances of it. Again: the arrangement of the words is peculiar, the noun and pronoun appearing to exchange places. But this was most likely intentional, in order to connect *Theos* the more closely with the following clauses. The difficulty, however, is easily remedied, as is seen in the translation.

Both in arranging and rendering the words of the passage, I follow, as I deem, the safest expositors. The sense, as here given, is clear, and probably true. I construe the passage as expressive of a high honor, thus: Abraham is the father of us all, is so before even God. He has this distinction by divine favor and in divine estimation.

Winer proposes to explain the passage thus: *katenanti Theou, katenanti hou episteuse*—father of us all *before God, before whom he believed*. The sense is good, but there is no necessity for the repetition of *katenanti*. I prefer the arrangement of Bengel and others, which I follow.

(who makes alive the dead, This and the following clause are clearly of the nature of a digression from the main course of thought. The present clause asserts a simple matter of fact, in

language to be taken literally. It had, as I conjecture, this origin: At the moment, Paul had in mind the decayed condition of Abraham's body shortly before Isaac's birth, and remembered how God had restored it to former vigor. It was virtually a case of making the dead alive. From the body of Abraham the Apostle at once passed to all the dead, as indicated in the clause. The passage is hence, as I deem, to be construed as asserting one fact while referring to another, or as asserting the resurrection of the dead in the light of revitalizing the body of Abraham.

and calls things not existing as existing,) It is matter of regret that it is not allowable to express, in a translation, the abstract form of this pithy remark. It would be faultless to say: *calls the non-existing as existing.* *Ta me onta* denotes *realities*, but realities not yet in existence, not yet called out into being by the creating, or reproducing power of God. Where such things, whether races of men, or mere things, are to be brought into being at some future time, God, in referring to them, speaks of them *hos onta*, as though now actually existing. The reference here, as in the former case, I imagine to be two fold: The dead *to us* are *me onta*, not existing, not standing out, not visible. But when God speaks of them, it is *hos onta*, as in being, because, to him, not only are all actually in being, but he intends to restore them to life. In like manner, when God said to Abraham, I have made you a father of many nations, the nations were *me onta*, not in being. But God spoke of them *hos onta*, as in being, because he intended to bring them into being.

18. **who, against hope, believed in hope;** "Against hope" might be thought to mean *against*, or in opposition to *all reasonable ground of hope*. But this is not the sense. In Abraham's case, at the time there was absolutely no natural ground of hope, every vestige of such ground being absent. Instead, therefore, of believing against, or contrary to all ground of hope, the very thing he believed against was the utter want of it. There was no ground of hope. This was the fact. Against this fact, or in spite of it, Abraham believed. *Believed in hope.* To believe in hope is to believe in connection with it, or to have hope to accompany the belief. Abraham believed all God said, and hoped for all he promised. Belief is the basis of hope; hence where there is no belief, there is no hope.

so that he became the father of many nations; *Eis to genesthai* I take to be *ecbatic*, not *telic*. Abraham did not be-

lieve *with a view to*, or *for the purpose of*, becoming the father of many nations. At least, I think this improbable. On the contrary, he believed simply; but he did it so grandly that, in consideration of it, he was appointed to become the father of many nations. Of course, when he was told that he should thus become a great father, he believed it; but this was not the motive for the belief, or the intention he had in the act. He believed, because it was due to God, and because he had the heart, and with no eye to results. Not that there would have been any thing wrong in Abraham's believing in order to such an end; but I do not think this the meaning of the language. Suppose no such end had been proposed, would Abraham not still have believed? Or was it merely the promised result that induced him to believe? I can not think so, and hence deem the *ecbatic* sense the better.

according to the saying: So shall your offspring be. He became the father of many nations agreeably to, or in conformity with, the promise: So shall your descendants be. "So"; that is, as the stars are for number, so shall your posterity be for multitude.

19. And being not weak in belief, he did not mind his own body now dead, being nearly a hundred years old. He was not weak in the item of belief. *Pistei* is the dative of sphere. His belief being strong, kept him strong; hence, without it, he might have been weak. *He did not mind* his own body now dead; or he did not regard it, or suffer it to influence him. *Dead*, as applied to a living body, is a strong term; but it precisely expresses the fact in the case. As to the power of reproduction, and the word is used strictly of this, Abraham's body was literally dead. This power was wholly extinct in it. Whatever his body was in other respects, in this, it was *nenekromenon*—Perfect participle, and meaning, it had before died, and still remained dead.

{ In the expression, "did *not* mind", the weight of authority seems to be against *ou*. Green omits it, and Alford brackets it; although he thinks it essential to the sense. If the original of the Letter in hand contained it, I can imagine no motive for omitting it; but I can see one for interpolating it—the sense is not good without it. If omitted at all, it must have been by accident. As its claim to genuineness is still in question, I shall retain it for the sake of the better sense. This may turn out one of those

cases in which inferior authority, with a good sense, should prevail over superior authority, with a bad or defective sense.

and the deadness of Sarah's womb; The case of Sarah was that of a simple *nekrosis*; that of Abraham was one of *nenekromenon*. He had had the power of reproduction, and lost it; she had never had it. These were the adverse facts which, through the power of belief, he refused to mind or be affected by. God had said to him: So shall your posterity be; and before this declaration, with Abraham, all obstacles of nature gave way. Would it were so still.

20. and he did not decide against God's promise through unbelief. Literally, *he was not deciding* against. I feel satisfied that the usual renderings of this passage are incorrect. The difficulty is with *diekrithe* which commentators render quite differently. With *ou* Stuart, taking it in a Middle sense, translates it *did not doubt*. But "did not doubt through unbelief," is virtual tautology. It is nearly the same as, did not doubt through doubting. Doubt and unbelief differ in degree, not in kind. Green renders it "*wavered not*"; Lange, Tholuck, Alford and Hodge, "*staggered not*"; McKnight, "*did not dispute*"; Bengel, "*did not [stagger or] doubt*"; Bloomfield, "*did not hesitate or doubt*"; and so on.

Diakrino signifies to separate, discern, distinguish, decide, criticise, judge, estimate—the *dia* serving merely to strengthen the compound. It also means to contend, waver, stagger, doubt, these latter being regarded as tropical rather than literal. Now I see no reason for not taking the word in a primitive sense as *decide*. *Eis* is then to be rendered *against* as indicating the adverse direction of the mental act. When to this we add the known circumstances of the case, *decide* seems to become a necessity. God promised to Abraham a countless posterity. But at the time, both his own body and that of Sarah were dead for purposes of procreation. In the midst of these violently conflicting facts, he had to make up his mind. He had to decide whether to believe God against nature, or believe nature against God. A decision was the very act called for. Again, whatever act *diekrithe* denotes was the act which Abraham did not perform *through unbelief*. To determine this, let us suppose him under the influence of unbelief. What act would his unbelief certainly have induced? Clearly it would have induced him to decide against God's promise, and to reject it. But he was ac-

tuated by belief, and not by unbelief. What was the effect? He *decided* for the promise. For these reasons I render *diekrithe*, as in the translation.

But he grew strong by belief, (giving glory to God), 21. being also fully convinced that what he had promised, he is able also to do. *Alla* is a bold adversative, almost always signifying emphatically *but*. As, however, it is the neuter plural of *allos*, it also sometimes means *otherwise, other way, on the contrary*. In this sense it might be very appropriately taken here. Still, as I see nothing to be gained by this, I shall retain its usual rendering. *Being fully convinced* is the explanation of *grew strong by belief*. If *epeggeltai* be construed as Middle, the reading is smoother, and the sense the same.

There was no unbelief in Abraham; and consequently no decision against the promise of God. On the contrary, he grew strong through the power of his belief. At so great a height did it sustain him, that he honored God in all he did, especially in being fully convinced that all he had promised, however improbable, he would certainly do. To give glory to God is to ascribe to him just what is due him, and to obey him in all he says.

22. Therefore it was counted to him for justification. A conclusion deduced no less from the character of Abraham's belief, than from the belief itself. So great was the power of his belief over his mind, in shaping his conduct, that it was counted. Had it been a naked act or mere mental state, unaccompanied by any results glorifying God, it would not have been counted. In that event, it would have been ignored. Belief, to be counted, must, as in the case of Abraham, be peculiarly attended—it must have proper internal effects, and lead to proper outward results. In itself, it must amount to a full conviction that all God says is true, and that all he promises will be done. It must then, first, strengthen the inner man of him who has it, and lead him to disregard obstacles; and, secondly, it must induce him to do whatever God commands. Belief is perfected by its accompaniments; and when this is done, it is counted, not before.

CHAPTER IV. SECTION 4.

²³ Now it was not written, that it was counted to him, for his sake alone, ²¹ but for our sake also, to whom it is to be counted—to us who believe on him who raised Jesus our Lord from the dead, ²³ who was given up because of our sins, and was raised for our justification.

²³ Οὐκ ἐγράφη δὲ δι' αὐτὸν μόνον ὅτι ἐλογίσθη αὐτῷ, ²⁴ ἀλλὰ καὶ δι' ἡμᾶς, οἷς μελλεῖ λογιζεσθαι—τοῖς πιστευούσιν ἐπὶ τὸν ἐγείραντα Ἰησοῦν τὸν κύριον ἡμῶν ἐκ νεκρῶν, ²⁵ ὅς παρεδόθη διὰ τὰ παραπτώματα ἡμῶν, καὶ ἤγερθη διὰ τὴν δικαιοσύνην ἡμῶν.

SUMMARY.

The fact that Abraham's belief was counted to him for justification, written for our sake as well as his. Whom we must believe on, and what in. Why Christ was given up to death, and the object for which he rose.

23. Now it was not written, that it was counted to him, for his sake alone, On this concise statement commentators are accustomed to bestow hardly a thought. Possibly it is worthy of something more. It carries us back to the time when it was indited, and to the vision and purpose of its author. It was written for Abraham's sake, it is true, but not for his alone. It was written for our benefit also. We who are of Abraham's belief were before its author's mind at the instant when he penned it. He looked through the centuries to come, and the vision of the redeemed rose before him. Of purpose he wrote for their sake. He had them in thought as his hand moved over the parchment; and as he told how belief was counted to Abraham, he saw how, in like manner, it would be counted even to us. Truly is justification by belief attested by the prophets.

24. but for our sake also, to whom it is to be counted—The Present tense is here used to express a general and constantly recurring fact. But while a Present in form, it has in fact the force of the Future; or rather the force of a Present continued into the future. Our belief is not to be counted to us at some period now distant, thereby implying that it is not at present counted. It is both now counted and will continue to be so.

to us who believe on him who raised Jesus our Lord from the dead, "Us who believe" are not us Jews as such, nor yet us Gentiles as such, but every individual of the whole human race in so far as they believe. It excludes not one who is a believer, nor includes one who is not. "Who believe on him"—But it is not enough to believe on God simply. We must believe on him *as the Raiser of Jesus from the dead.* If not,

our belief is void; it will not be counted. For this reason the belief of the deist is a nullity. Of course to believe on God as raising Christ from the dead is to believe on Christ as raised from the dead. No belief will ever be counted which does not embrace this fact. The reason for this is obvious. To reject Christ's resurrection is to reject him; and to reject him is to reject the sole basis of redemption. God could not be just in justifying him who rejects Christ; for this would be the same as justifying without Christ, which, in justice, can not be done.

25. who was given up because of our sins, Was given up to be put to death. But who gave up Christ? Surely the Father, with his consent. True, men were the voluntary agents; but far back of the sinful betrayal and crucifixion was the original will of God moving to and permitting all. God sent his Son into the world to die for it; and the Son came into the world to die for it. After this, men did the rest.

There are two acceptations in which Christ was given up *because of our sins*. 1. Had our sins not existed he would not have been given up. In this view, they caused him to be given up or led to it. 2. Our sins could not be remitted without the ransom of his blood. Consequently remission of sins was the motive which induced the giving up. It was the end effected by it, and therefore the reason for it.

and was raised for our justification. No doubt many reasons existed for Christ's resurrection, and many objects were accomplished by it; but Paul is here viewing it with exclusive reference to its great object. Christ was raised for our justification; that is, in order to complete provision for it, and effect it. His blood had been shed. But that blood as yet remained unoffered. Christ rose from the dead to consummate this offering. While on earth he was not a priest; indeed he could not be. Therefore he left the earth, and went up on high. When he appeared in heaven, the true holy place, it was as Highpriest for the household of belief. What he had to offer was his own ineffable life or precious blood. This offering he presented, and it was accepted. The ransom for man was now paid; and the atonement completed. It only remained for men to believe, and have their belief counted to them. This done, and they were ready to be invested with all the benefits of that ransom—**remission of sins**, together with its attendant blessings.

CHAPTER V.

SECTION I.

Therefore being justified by belief, we have peace with God through our Lord Jesus Christ; ²through whom also we have access into this favor in which we stand; and [through whom] we rejoice in hope of the glory of God. ³Not only so, but we even glory in afflictions; knowing that affliction produces patience; ⁴and patience, approval; and approval, hope. ⁵And this hope makes not ashamed; because God's love is poured out in our hearts by the Holy Spirit that is given to us. ⁶For while we were still without strength, Christ died, at the set time, for the wicked. ⁷(Now hardly for the just will any one die; yet for the good, may be, some one might venture even to die. ⁸But God shows *his* love for us in this, that while we were still sinners, Christ died for us.) ⁹Much more then, being now justified by his blood, we shall be saved from wrath through him. ¹⁰For if, while we were enemies, we were reconciled to God by the death of his Son; much more, being reconciled, we shall be saved by his life. ¹¹And not only so, but we also rejoice in God, through our Lord Jesus Christ, through whom we have now received the reconciliation.

Δικαιωθέντες οὖν ἐκ πίστεως εἰρήνην ἔχομεν πρὸς τὸν Θεὸν διὰ τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ. ²δι' οὗ καὶ τὴν προσαγωγὴν ἐσχήκαμεν εἰς τὴν χάριν ταύτην ἐν ἣ ἑστήκαμεν καὶ καυχώμεθα ἐπ' ἐλπίδι τῆς δοξῆς τοῦ Θεοῦ. ³Οὐ μόνον δε, ἀλλὰ καὶ καυχώμεθα ἐν ταῖς θλίψεσιν, εἰδότες ὅτι ἡ θλίψις ὑπομονὴν κατεργάζεται, ἣ δὲ ὑπομονὴ δοκιμὴν, ἣ δὲ δοκιμὴ ἐλπίδα. ⁴Ἡ δὲ ἐλπίς οὐ καταισχύνει, ὅτι ἡ ἀγάπη τοῦ Θεοῦ ἐκκεχυται ἐν ταῖς καρδίαις ἡμῶν διὰ πνεύματος ἁγίου τοῦ δοθέντος ἡμῖν. ⁵Ἐτι γὰρ Χριστὸς ὄντων ἡμῶν ἀσθενῶν κατὰ καιρὸν ὑπὲρ ἀσεβῶν ἀπέθανε. ⁶(Μόλις γὰρ ὑπὲρ δικαίου τις ἀποθανεῖται ὑπὲρ γὰρ τοῦ αγαθοῦ τάχα τις καὶ τολμᾷ ἀποθανεῖν. ⁷Συνίστησι δὲ τὴν ἑαυτοῦ ἀγάπην ὁ Θεὸς εἰς ἡμᾶς, ὅτι ἔτι ἁμαρτωλῶν ὄντων ἡμῶν, Χριστὸς ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν ἀπέθανε.) ⁸Πολλῶ οὖν μᾶλλον δικαιοθεντες νῦν ἐν τῷ αἵματι αὐτοῦ σωθησόμεθα δι' αὐτοῦ ἀπὸ τῆς ὀργῆς. ⁹Εἰ γὰρ ἔχθροὶ ὄντες κατηλλάγημεν τῷ Θεῷ διὰ τοῦ θανάτου τοῦ υἱοῦ αὐτοῦ, πολλῶ μᾶλλον καταλλαγέμεθα σωθησόμεθα ἐν τῇ ζωῇ αὐτοῦ. ¹⁰Οὐ μόνον δέ, ἀλλὰ καὶ καυχώμενοι ἐν τῷ Θεῷ διὰ τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, δι' οὗ νῦν τὴν καταλλαγὴν ἐλαβομεν.

SUMMARY.

Being justified by belief, we have peace with God. Through Christ we have access into our present state of favor, and through him, are filled with hope. God's love poured out in our hearts by the Holy Spirit given to us. While we were helpless and wicked, Christ died for us. Be a man ever so good no one will die for him, yet Christ died for us when we were sinners. Hereby God showed his love for us. Since Christ died for us when sinners, we may feel sure of being saved now that we are justified by his blood. Reconciled to God by the death of Christ, by whom we are to be saved.

Justification by belief has now been not only established, but illustrated and amplified at length. This fact, the commencement of the present chapter takes for granted. It is now, therefore, in order to speak of some of the fruits of justification in the chris-

tian life. But these fruits the Apostle desires to exhibit in immediate connection with the great fact from which they result. Accordingly, he here reiterates that fact in the form of the following conclusion:

Therefore being justified by belief, The sense is the bolder if *oun* is here allowed its proper illative force. True, the conclusion it introduces is a repetition, but this does not affect the sense of the participle.

we have peace with God through our Lord Jesus Christ; On this clause arises a rather difficult question of textual criticism. Shall we read $\epsilon\chi\omicron\mu\epsilon\nu$ in the Indicative, or $\epsilon\chi\omega\mu\epsilon\nu$ in the Subjunctive? If the latter, the sense is hortatory, thus: Therefore being justified by belief, *let us have peace with God.* This reading has two points in its favor: 1. The preponderance of Manuscript authority; 2. It is the more difficult reading, in which case the rule applies: *Lectio difficilior principatum tenet—the more difficult reading has the preference.* Accordingly a majority of the more recent critics adopt $\epsilon\chi\omega\mu\epsilon\nu$. Alford adopts it in his text and translates accordingly, but defends the Indicative sense in his note. Green also adopts it, although in commenting on it, in his *Developed Criticism*, he speaks with reserve. Indeed he admits it to be a case in which “the testimony of Manuscripts must be received with caution, if not with abatement.” Riddle, in Lange, in a critical note on the text, rejects it, though recognizing the force of the authority in its favor. Upon the whole, although I acknowledge the claims, upon purely textual grounds, of the Subjunctive reading, I still can not accept it. My reasons for this decision are two: 1. the Subjunctive reading may have resulted from transcription, as some of the best critics contend; 2. the Subjunctive sense appears to be incapable of defence. This I conceive to be almost decisive. While in all cases due regard must be had for high textual authority, still, that authority is not competent to make an apostle speak either no sense, or a bad sense. To say, “Therefore being justified by belief, let us have peace with God”, is without consistent or natural significance. Peace is a fact which results from justification, not something which the justified are merely exhorted to have, but may not have. Again, had the reading been: “Therefore being justified by belief, *let us have peace with God,* the sense would have been tolerable at least, on the ground *that let us have peace meant let us be at peace with God; that is, let us commit sin*

no more, and thereby be at peace with him. But the reading is, let us have peace *through our Lord Jesus Christ*. What can this mean? To exhort the sinner to seek peace through Christ is intelligible and altogether proper; but to exhort the justified, who already have peace, to have it through Christ, is not admissible. The justified have peace, as a fact, through Christ, not are simply exhorted to have it.

As to the *dcliberative* sense, "*shall we have peace*", and the *concessive*, "*may we have peace*", propounded by some, I do not think it necessary to do more than barely state them. Both may be, with safety, set aside as untenable.

Finally, I feel compelled, for the present, and till we get something more decisive than we have now, to abide by the Indicative reading. This is inferior to the Subjunctive on textual grounds only, but immeasurably superior to it in sense. Perhaps I should rather say, I prefer the text which yields a good and suitable sense, to one which yields no sense, or a bad one.

we have peace with God through our Lord Jesus Christ; A state of sin is, on our part, a state of enmity towards God; the enmity existing in us, not in him. Consequently its direction is from us towards him, not from him towards us. But sin being cancelled, the enmity ceases, and peace ensues. The peace, like the enmity, is *pros ton Theon*, towards God; it is peace on our part with him. This peace we have or enjoy through Christ; because through him we obtain justification which induces it. But it is not peace in the sense of exemption from troubles of the world. It is peace of conscience, peace of soul.

2. through whom also we have access into this favor in which we stand; *Charin* here denotes a state, a state of favor, the state of being justified, and accepted of God. Through Christ we have justification, through him peace, and through him access into a state of favor—what is it we have not through him? *Prosugoge*, when used of persons, signifies approach to their presence; when used of a state, as here, introduction into it.

That this state of favor is identical with the church or kingdom of God, hardly admits of doubt. Assuming this, and the important inquiry arises, by what means have we access into this state? Certainly it is *through Christ*, through whom primarily, as an atoning sacrifice, the way of access has become possible, and by whose appointment it is rendered practicable. But it is through

him in another sense. He is the *prosagogeus* who conducts the introduction, or by whose authority and direction it takes place. Still the inquiry recurs, since the introduction is not unconditional, by what specific means or steps is it effected? This state of favor and the state of justification are the same. Consequently the conditions of the one are the conditions of the other. But we are justified by belief. After what has now been said, this needs no proof. Belief then is at least one of the conditions of the access. In agreement with this, we are said to believe *eis into* Christ; and to be in Christ is to be in this state of favor, or in the kingdom. But we are also baptized *eis Christon, into Christ*. Here then is another means by which we gain access into "this favor." Hence, probably, the remark of Alford: "This access would normally take place in baptism." This remark he doubtless made in view of the following: "Except a man be born of water and of the Spirit, he can not enter into the kingdom of God." To be in the kingdom is certainly to be in "this favor." Hence the means of access into that, is the means of access into this. In view of these facts, Alford's remark would seem to fall little, if any, short of the truth.

and [through whom] we rejoice in the hope of the glory of God. The sense here can be fully expressed only by repeating *through whom* from the foregoing clause. It is clearly understood; but it improves the perspicuity if expressed. *Kauchometha* is precisely rendered by *rejoice*. This is chaste, and seems to me better suited to the emotions of the Christian in prospect of the future, than *exult* or *glory*. But in the following clause, I feel sure the word should be differently rendered. "The glory of God" signifies the honor and felicity of the future state, the distinction and happiness with which he will invest the redeemed when they stand in his presence.

3. Not only so, but we even glory in afflictions; Here *Kauchometha* is better rendered *glory* than rejoice. The feeling to be expressed is one of exultation or triumph. The christian rejoices in hope of future good; but he exults over present afflictions. *Thlipsesin* has the article, and denotes *the* afflictions of life, all the afflictions that befall us. Under these the christian must not sink, nor by them be broken; but over them all he must triumph as victor—all however through Christ.

knowing that affliction produces patience; Patience is that iron trait of character which enables us to bear with calm

constancy all the ills of life. Afflictions, if wisely used, and this is here assumed, have the effect to form this trait. They fortify the temper and will against a day of need, and so secure us against a diminution of peace and joy. When we remember how constantly these afflictions recur, the necessity for patience becomes apparent. They are the crucible of fortitude; this, the pledge of victory.

4. and patience, approval; Approval from God, and from ourselves. *Dokime*, as applied to the christian life, denotes that it has been put to the test by affliction, has successfully endured the ordeal, and now stands purified and approved.

and approval, hope. When we have patiently and triumphantly endured affliction, have emerged from the trial approved, well may we indulge the hope of final acceptance. Our achievements now virtually guarantee the end.

5. And this hope makes not ashamed; *This* serves here the same purpose that the article does in the Greek; and it is used, not as a translation, but because it gives a better sentence. In *Kataischunei* we have clearly a Present used for a Future, or rather the future spoken of in a Present. The meaning is, that this hope will not, in the end, cause us shame by disappointing us. We will surely realize what we hope for, and therefore will never have reason to feel ashamed that we hoped. *Makes not ashamed.* Makes whom not ashamed? Clearly us who have it. But to say that this hope makes not ashamed is the same as to say we are not ashamed of it. We are not now ashamed of our hope, nor shall we ever be.

because God's love is poured out in our hearts by the Holy Spirit God's love is not particularly the love we have for him, nor particularly the love he has for us. *Agape* denotes simply *love*. But the special measure of it here spoken of is from him as source, and is therefore called his. This love is not diffused through our hearts, as some have held, but is poured out in them—not *into* them, but *in* them. It is from God as fountain, and is poured out in us by the Holy Spirit as agent.

that is given to us. To us Jews, to us Gentiles, to all who are justified. The Holy Spirit is given to us by being sent into our hearts to dwell there. This is the fact asserted by the Apostle; and no false exegesis must be allowed to negative it. Inexplicable it is, I grant; but it must not therefore be rejected. The argument on hope, then, stands thus: The Holy Spirit is given

to us as an earnest of our future inheritance. Eph. i: 14, 15. By this Spirit our hearts are filled with love. In these facts we have both proof and pledge that God will invest us with what we hope for. This hope then will not disappoint us. Therefore it neither now makes us ashamed, nor will it hereafter.

6. For while we were still without strength, Christ died, at the set time, for the wicked. "*Without strength*"—*asthenon*, helpless and powerless to save ourselves. "*At the set time*"—*kata kairon*, at the exact time fixed by the Father, and therefore precisely when it would do the world the largest measure of good. Whatever happens to an age by appointment of God, is best not only for it, but also for all other ages. It was best for us, of to-day, that Christ should have died when he did. "*Died for the wicked*"—*hupcr*, died for their benefit, not in their stead. The latter idea, it is true, is involved in the conception of the atonement; but it is not expressed here. In the phrase, for while *we* were still without strength, *we* comprehends the whole human race as unjustified. Likewise, in the expression, *died for the wicked*, *the wicked* comprehends the whole race as sinners. Hence the *we* and *the wicked* are identical. The meaning therefore is: For while we were without strength, Christ died, at the set time, for *us, the wicked*. We, the destitute of strength, were the wicked for whom he died.

But what is the force of *gar*? It is confirmative; the clause it introduces being designed to confirm the remark, "this hope makes not ashamed." The following is the connection: If while we were still sinners Christ died for us, died to procure for us, among other things, a glorious future inheritance, how much more will he, now that we are redeemed by his blood, and justified by belief in him, invest us with that inheritance? Though, for the present, it is but an object of hope, we shall certainly realize it at last. He who has done for us the great thing, will surely do for us the less. Therefore our hope will never put us to shame.

7. (Now hardly for the just will any one die; yet for the good, may be, some one might venture even to die. An illustration drawn from the known conduct of men, and intended to set forth, in a bold light, God's love for the world, in contrast with our love for one another. Among the whole human race not one man can be found who is ready to die for the wicked; hardly one is ready to die for the just. Yet Christ

died for the unjust. Not only so. It is barely possible to find a man who is bold enough to die for the good. But Christ died for the bad. For this very purpose God sent him into the world. Truly then does his death prove the Father's love.

It is here assumed that some one might be found to die for the good when he would not for the just. The good, in other words, is held to have the stronger claim on human gratitude. From this it has been inferred that the good man, besides being just, is also beneficent; and that it is this fact which gives him the stronger claim. Possibly the view is correct.

On the passage Green has the following admirable note, which I transcribe:

The several steps of the advancing argument, when restored to their formal order, would stand as follows:—In behalf of the good man, at his highest standard, may be (τάχα), one will be found that has the heart to die; hardly then in behalf of a barely upright man will one die; hard therefore must be the sacrifice in dying for those that had not reached even the lower of the before mentioned conditions, but were still sinners.

The critical reader will notice that we have here three *gars* close together. Most likely they all have the same meaning; but to represent them all by the same word in English is not allowable, thus: For while we were still without strength Christ died, at the set time, for the wicked. For hardly for the just will any one die; for for the good, may be, some one might venture even to die. This clearly is inadmissible. Or should we attempt a remedy by varying the rendering of *hyper*, since it, too, occurs three times, we encounter the same difficulty. As to the sense of the passage there is no trouble. That is clear. Accordingly I deem it best to express this simply, in close English, without attempting to render *ad verbum* as to *gar*. A different course seems impracticable.

8. But God shows his love for us in this, that while we were still sinners Christ died for us.) The emphasis is here on *his*. If the *hoti* in this verse be construed as causal, as it usually is, the reasoning becomes inconsequential, thus: But God shows his love for us, *because* while we were still sinners Christ died for us. *Because* is here devoid of meaning, and the two clauses between which it stands are without connection or dependence. Christ's dying for us is neither cause nor reason why God shows his love. On the contrary, it is the fact by which he shows it. Hence the *hoti*, with the following words, is the "sign", as Trollope calls it, and "not the cause" of God's showing

his love. It subjoins *the how*, or fact in which, and must be rendered accordingly.

9. Much more then, being now justified by his blood, we shall be saved from wrath through him. An argument from the fact of Christ's death to the certainty of its results. If he died to redeem us while we were still sinners, much more will he save us from punishment for sin, now that we have been forgiven. "Justified by his blood"—by it both as cause and means. The blood of Christ is the great antecedent reason which enables God to be just while justifying the unjust. In other words, it procures justification. Belief is a mere condition, not a cause or reason. But "justified by his blood" subserves here another valuable end. It determines the import of the word justified; for being justified by his blood is the same as being forgiven by it. Moreover, the import of the verb settles the meaning of the noun. For if being justified by his blood means being forgiven, then clearly justification means forgiveness. Remission is the radical fact in justification, the consequent to it being recognition and treatment as just.

10. For if while we were enemies, we were reconciled to God by the death of his Son; *Enemies*, that is, to God, the fact being evinced, negatively, by our disinclination to do his will, and, positively, by our evil inclinations and sins. "We were reconciled to God": The whole doctrine of reconciliation, as in operation, is here stated in one brief sentence. We are reconciled to God, *not God to us*. Reconciliation implies a change, a change from enmity to love, and from disobedience to obedience. But this change takes place wholly in us, and in no part in God. God is unchangeable; with him there is not even the semblance of turning. Even his wrath is not a fitful emotion, often subsiding, as with us; but a profound, steady sense of right, which has no alternative but to punish sin. On the contrary, though God was bound not to acquit the guilty; he, at the same time, so loved the world as to give his Son to die for it. In that death, we have the most astounding proof of God's love for us. On our part, we accept this proof as satisfactory, and in return love God. "We love him because he first loved us".

Every effort to make it appear that in reconciliation there is a mutual change, a change in God from enmity to love, as well as in us, but dishonors him, as it seems to me, and perverts his truth. The view is not required either by the character of God

or any known fact in the life or death of Christ. It is gratuitous, and injurious, and therefore should be abandoned.

much more, being reconciled, we shall be saved by his life. Or we shall be saved by him alive. In his life-state, or living state, subsequently to his death, Christ consummates all the provisions of salvation, and in person superintends the work. In this way he brings it to a successful end, and so saves us by his life, or by being alive. There is no other way apparent in which Christ's life can have the effect to save us.

11. And not only so, but we also rejoice in God, through our Lord Jesus Christ, We not only glory in afflictions, v. 3; but we also rejoice in God. Such I take to be the reference and connection. Some construe thus: Not only are we reconciled to God, but we also rejoice in him. The sense is good; but it fails to indicate the connection. The preceding is the more natural. To rejoice in God is to rejoice in him as our Father, as having forgiven our sins, and filled us with hope of eternal life. It is to rejoice in the sublimest of beings, for the sublimest of reasons, and in view of the sublimest of ends.

through whom we have now received the reconciliation. Here, for the first time, in the New Testament, we have the word *Katallage*, translated in our common version *atonement*. The verb occurs in the preceding verse, but not the noun till now. As I have already expressed my views on the import of the word, as well as on the value and significance of the great fact for which it stands, I shall not reiterate. Still, a few additional remarks may not be out of place.

To receive the reconciliation is to receive that which effects it. We are reconciled to God by the death of his Son. Hence to receive the reconciliation is to receive Christ's death; and to receive his death is to believe in it and accept it as an atoning sacrifice for our sins. It is not enough to believe that Christ died; we must believe that he died as a sin-offering for us, as the Lamb of God that takes away our sin. To accept in soul this great fact is to receive the reconciliation; the practical effect of which is to become reconciled. So soon as we accept the fact in the cordial belief of it, and obey Christ, our sins are remitted—remitted by God, of favor, through Christ's blood as the meritorious reason, and on condition of belief and obedience. The Holy Spirit is then given to us, or takes up his abode in us, as the earnest of our future inheritance. Nothing now remains but to

perfect holiness in the fear of the Lord, or to work out our salvation with fear and trembling.

On some accounts, it is to be regretted that the word *atonement* ever found a place in our common version. With its cognates it is thus defined by Richardson: "To be, or cause to be, *at one*. To be in unity or concord, in friendship or amity: to return or restore to favor; to reconcile, to satisfy, to propitiate". As a definition, this is exhaustive. But religious speculators were not long in losing sight of the true meaning of the word, which was good and pertinent; and so, in the course of time, it became the mere canonized designation of a certain theory of the value and effects of Christ's death. It is now known almost exclusively in this sense, and not in its original and proper meaning. At first it meant, if not precisely what reconciliation means, only a little more, namely, return to amity or good feeling. But on hearing it pronounced in this day we never receive such an idea from it. The word has, I believe, one advantage over reconciliation. It involves the notion of repairing the injury done to God by sin, not wholly, it may be, but still of repairing it. This notion reconciliation may, at bottom, imply, but it does not express it. It is matter of regret that atonement can not be restored to its strictly original meaning; but till this is done, which is not probable, it should be displaced by reconciliation.

And here I wish to remark, in a general way, on the subject of the atonement or reconciliation, that efforts, no matter from whom coming or how well meant, to lower the value of Christ's blood or depreciate its efficacy in redemption, are most injurious in their effects on the popular faith, and are, therefore, to be deeply deprecated. It is impossible, in my opinion, to exalt Christ too highly, so long as we do not place him above the Father, or to set too high an estimate on the excellence of that glorious life which was appointed to be the ransom of the human family, and which was actually paid for this end. That we may err while speculating on a subject confessedly so difficult is readily granted; but if we must err at all, for the sake of the Master, I plead that it be done in efforts to place him high in the world's esteem, and to do justice to that "precious blood" by which we have been redeemed. Let the scale over which Christ passes into our affections be an ascending, not a descending one. There is no danger that we shall ever do him or his achievements justice "over much."

CHAPTER V. SECTION 2.

¹² Therefore, as by one man sin entered into the world, and death by sin, and thus it spread to all men, because all sinned. ¹³ For until the law sin was in the world, but sin is not counted when there is no law. ¹⁴ Yet death reigned from Adam to Moses, even over those that had not sinned in the likeness of Adam's transgression, who is the type of him that was to come. ¹⁵ But not as was the sin, so also is the gift. For if by the sin of the one, the many died, much more have the favor of God and the gift by favor of the one man, Jesus Christ, abounded to the many. ¹⁶ And not as was the sentence which was by the one that sinned, so is the gift. For the sentence was because of one sin to condemnation, but the gift is to justification from many sins. ¹⁷ For if by one sin death has reigned through the one man, much more are they, who receive the abundant favor, and the gift of justification, to reign in life through the one, Jesus Christ. ¹⁸ Therefore, then, as by one sin sentence came upon all men to condemnation, so also by one righteous act the gift came upon all men to justification of life. ¹⁹ For as by the disobedience of the one man, the many were constituted sinners; so also by the obedience of the one, the many are to be constituted just.

¹² Διὰ τοῦτο ὡς περ δι' ἑνὸς ἀνθρώπου ἡ ἁμαρτία εἰς τὸν κόσμον εἰσῆλθε, καὶ διὰ τῆς ἁμαρτίας ὁ θάνατος, καὶ οὕτως εἰς πάντας ἀνθρώπους διήλθεν, ἐφ' ᾧ πάντες ἥμαρτον. ¹³ Ἄχρι γὰρ νόμου ἁμαρτία ἦν ἐν κόσμῳ, ἁμαρτία δὲ οὐκ ἐλλογείται μὴ οὗτος νόμος. ¹⁴ ἀλλὰ ἐβασίλευσεν ὁ θάνατος ἀπὸ Ἀδὰμ μεχρι Μωσέως καὶ ἐπὶ τοὺς μὴ ἁμαρτήσαντας ἐπὶ τῷ ὁμοιώματι τῆς παραβάσεως Ἀδάμ, ὃς ἐστὶ τύπος τοῦ μέλλοντος. ¹⁵ Ἄλλ' οὐχ ὡς τὸ παραπτώμα, οὕτω καὶ τὸ χάρισμα εἰ γὰρ τῷ τοῦ ἑνὸς παραπτώματι οἱ πολλοὶ ἀπέθανον, πολλῶ μᾶλλον ἢ χάριτος τοῦ Θεοῦ καὶ ἡ δωρεὰ ἐν χαριτί τῇ τοῦ ἑνὸς ἀνθρώπου Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ εἰς τοὺς πολλοὺς ἐπερίσσευσε. ¹⁶ Καὶ οὐχ ὡς δι' ἑνὸς ἁμαρτήσαντος τὸ ὄφλημα, το μὲν γὰρ κριμα ἐξ ἑνὸς εἰς κατακριμα, τὸ δε χάρισμα ἐκ πολλῶν παραπτωμάτων εἰς δικαιομα. ¹⁷ Εἰ γὰρ ἐν ἐνὶ παραπτώματι ὁ θάνατος ἐβασίλευσε διὰ τοῦ ἐνός, πολλῶ μᾶλλον οἱ τὴν περισσείαν τῆς χαρίτος καὶ τῆς δωρεᾶς τῆς δικαιοσύνης λαμβανοντες ἐν ζωῇ βασιλευσουσι διὰ τοῦ ἑνὸς Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ. ¹⁸ Ἄρα οὖν ὡς δι' ἑνὸς παραπτώματος εἰς πάντας ἀνθρώπους εἰς κατακριμα, οὕτω καὶ δι' ἑνὸς δικαιομάματος εἰς πάντας ἀνθρώπους εἰς δικαίωσιν ζωῆς. ¹⁹ Ὡς περ γὰρ διὰ τῆς παρακοῆς τοῦ ἑνὸς ἀνθρώπου, ἁμαρτωλοὶ κατεστάθησαν οἱ πολλοί, οὕτω καὶ διὰ τῆς ὑπακοῆς τοῦ ἑνὸς δικαιοὶ κατασταθήσονται οἱ πολλοί.

SUMMARY

By one man sin entered into the world, and death by that sin. Sin in the world before the law, but not counted. From Adam to Moses men died, though guilty of no sin like Adam's. Adam a type of Christ, but not in all respects. The sin not like the gift. By the sin of one all died, the favor of God and gift of Christ abound to all. Nor was the sentence like the gift. The sentence because of one sin, the gift consists in being justified from many sins. Through one sin death reigns over all, yet all who are justified will reign in life through Christ. As by one sin all have been condemned, so by Christ's death all are to be so far justified as to live. By the sin of Adam all constituted sinners, by the death of Christ all constituted just.

12. This verse is generally thought, and not without reason, to introduce one of the most difficult passages of the Letter. Its difficulties must certainly be acknowledged, still I can not but

feel that they have been exaggerated. The passage is profound and comprehensive. Herein perhaps lie its difficulties. Its main object, as is usually conceded, is obvious. It is to contrast the effects of Christ's death with the effects of Adam's sin; and to show how the death is even more than a remedy for the sin. This much lies on the very surface of the passage. But although this is granted, its connection is justly held to be obscure, and its details intricate and hard to trace. From v. 12 to the end of the chapter is one mass of thought closely tied together, yet strikingly rugged in its digressions and transitions. One thought suggests another, and this a third, and so on to the end. All these are dependent one on another, or stand in contrast one over against another. Such are some of the peculiarities of the passage. But it has others. Its first words are clearly illative; yet the conclusion which they introduce is not met with till we reach v. 18. Thus closely dependent parts are found standing widely apart. This embarrasses interpretation. Again, between the illative words and their conclusion is found a series of deep doctrinal comparisons and contrasts. To adjust these properly and bring their meaning fully and clearly out is confessedly not easy. From these hints the reader can readily infer the necessity for patience and care in an effort to explain the passage.

12. Therefore, *dia touto*. These words I feel compelled, after careful thought, to take, as already intimated, in their simple illative import. No other sense seems to me admissible or tenable. Accordingly, I reject the transitional meaning, insisted on by some, together with all others. True, by this course the connection is not made quite clear, nor the passage freed from difficulties; but then the words are retained in their usual force, and difficulties are at least not increased. This is a gain. It is always safe, in the absence of opposing evidence to assume that words are used in their common acceptance.

But assuming the words to be illative, and two questions present themselves: 1. Where is the conclusion they introduce? 2. From what premise does it result? Both questions are important, and neither is thought easily answered.

To the first question I reply, that the conclusion is brought out in v. 18. Nor can this be regarded as unlikely or strange when the character of the paragraph is considered. Verse 12 begins thus: "*Therefore as by one man sin entered into the world*". This clearly required the Apostle to state the case of the "one

man" first, before drawing his conclusion. But in doing this, he was led into a field of truth so new and so important as to demand a pause and some enlargement. This consumed his space between vs. 12 and 18, and so kept his conclusion in abeyance. But ending his task here, he at once proceeded to draw his conclusion. This he did, not by reiterating *dia touto*, but by the use of *ara oun*, because his conclusion has now become, as it were, a sort of double conclusion, a conclusion both from his main premise and from matter intervening between vs. 12 and 18. Or rather, the conclusion seems to be a conclusion from the main premise, and a summing up of the intervening matter.

The connection and relation of parts may be exhibited thus: *Therefore as by one man sin entered into the world* [here the case of the one man stated] *therefore then* [thread of thought resumed and conclusion drawn] *as by one sin sentence came upon all men to condemnation.* Of all the solutions which have been suggested, this (which is that of Bloomfield and Stuart) seems to me to be least open to objection, to be the most natural, and best to stand the test of criticism. I therefore accept it.

To the second question I reply, that the main premise is found in v. 10, and is the death of Christ. No other premise warrants the conclusion, or meets the necessities of the case. By that death we have been redeemed, have been reconciled, have been justified; in a word, by it every thing has been done for us essential to a complete rescue from the effects both of Adam's sin and of our own. *Therefore as by one man sin entered into the world, and death by sin; so by one righteous act of Christ, which is his death, acquittal from the sentence of death* (which is but an included part of what his death has achieved) *has been procured for all, so far as to allow us to live the life we are now living.* Such I believe to be the course of thought and of argument. Nor do I see how its correctness can be questioned; provided it be conceded, as I believe it must be, that v. 18 resumes the connection of thought, which was broken at v. 12, after *dia touto*, and draws the conclusion. That the *one righteous act* of v. 18 is the same as the *obedience of the one* of v. 19 is conceded by all. And that *the obedience of the one* is the righteous act of Christ in submitting to death, is equally certain. But from *the one righteous act* of v. 18, which is Christ's death, the conclusion is drawn. Therefore it was from this death, as mentioned in v. 10, that the Apostle was about to draw his conclusion

when he used *dia touto* in v. 12. If asked why refer particularly to the death of Christ as mentioned in v. 10, rather than as named in some other verse, I reply, that the conclusion would more naturally be drawn from the last mention of his death preceding *dia touto* than from any more remote mention.

Having now settled, as far as seems practicable, the difficulty respecting the connection of thought; or rather, having pointed out both the conclusion to which *dia touto* relates, and the premise from which it results, we are ready for the comparison begun in v. 12, together with its details.

as by one man sin entered into the world, This one man was Adam. He was the first to violate God's law; and this violation was the first sin. The first sin then was an act. It was not a nature, nor a principle, nor a weakness, but an act, the act simply of doing what God told Adam not to do. God said to him, "Thou shalt not eat of the fruit." This was God's will or law in the case. But Adam ate; and in the act transgressed this law. The transgression was the act in which sin had its origin in the world. Whatever may have been the origin of evil, or however sin may have prevailed elsewhere in the universe, this was its origin in our world. To it three parties stood, each peculiarly related. God was author of the law; Adam broke it; Satan tempted to the act; and in the act sin began. Here in a few short sentences we have the story of the origin of sin. Would that its subsequent history could be as briefly told.

It is proper to add, that although the first sin was an act, the word sin does not always denote an act in scripture. It often denotes sin as a substantive or noun. As a substantive, sin is frequently spoken of as a principle, some times, as a power, and again, as simple evil. But of these and other meanings and shades of meaning, I need not here speak.

and death by sin; That is, death entered into the world by sin. Not only so, it entered into the world by *one sin*. It was not from sin as an aggregation or widely prevalent power that death resulted. It resulted from sin as a unit, a single thing, one act. For if, after his first sin, Adam had never committed another, still the death of the whole human race would have followed. It followed not from his second sin, nor third, nor from all. It followed from his first only.

Nor must the word *death* be here taken in any unusual sense. By it simple ordinary death is meant, no more. To say that it

signifies mortality, or spiritual death, is to speak without warrant. It implies mortality, and no doubt much besides; but here it expresses only death. When it is said of Adam, Gen. v: 5, "and he died", we have the exact meaning of the word death in the preceding clause.

But death did not result from sin in the sense in which an effect results from its cause. At least this is not known. God appointed that if Adam sinned he should, as the penalty of his act, die; and death resulted from this appointment. The relation therefore between the two, was that of crime and penalty. It was judicial, and had its foundation in the nature of absolute right. Sin must have a penalty. This is the most inexorable of necessities, the sternest of God's laws.

If we are asked why death, rather than something else, was affixed as the penalty of the first sin, no answer can be given. We know the penalty, but the reason for it remains in the counsels of God. It is gratifying to hope that the far hence may enlighten us on the question.

But it would be inadmissible to assume that death, common death, was the whole penalty of Adam's first sin. He suffered, besides, expulsion from the presence of God, and from the garden, and became an outcast on the earth, now cursed on his account. But it is not to these things that I refer. As to the present life, death was certainly the great penalty of Adam's sin; still it was not the whole. His death did not cancel his sin. On the contrary, his sin survived its temporal penalty; and he lived after his death. For that subsequent state, too, his sin had its penalty. Now it is just here that the redemption effected by Christ emerges into view. By that redemption Adam's sin, while he yet lived, was cancelled (a fact assumed), and with the sin its future penalty. This now restored him to the favor of God, and gave him title to all other blessings secured for him in Christ. Thus we must look even beyond death for the whole penalty of sin.

and thus it spread to all men, The word *it* here has death, not sin, for its antecedent. The meaning is, thus death spread to all. But how, or in what way, did death spread to all? The answer is easy. God decreed beforehand that if Adam sinned, both he and all his posterity should die. All were thus bound up alike in the same decree to the same doom. Accordingly, when Adam sinned, the decree took effect, and all died. Such is the brief

reply. Now assuming death to be, as to our present state, no more than an adequate penalty of a *single sin*, and this we are compelled to do; and the nature of sin becomes as incomprehensible as the infinite. No human being can conceive of its enormity. What would be, at this rate, an adequate penalty for the sins of a single life lasting through a period of fifty years? The question is perfectly bewildering.

because all sinned. With Winer and others, I render ἐφ' ᾧ *because*, as being both true to the sense and very perspicuous. A few critics have construed ἡ as masculine, and made it refer to *anthropou* (man) as its antecedent. According to them the meaning is, *in whom*, that is, *in Adam* all sinned. But against this construction there are two strong objections. 1. *Anthropou* is too far back to be the antecedent. 2. Were this the meaning, ἐν ᾧ would have been used, not ἐφ' ᾧ. I therefore reject the construction.

All sinned. Not all have sinned, nor all sin. *Hamarton* is the aorist or simple historical tense, expressing sudden, non-recurring action in past time; and I regard the Apostle as here speaking strictly. The verb should therefore be rendered *sinned*. But sinned in what sense? Did all sin personally and actually? Certainly not. For we know that many die, as infants, who have never thus sinned. Besides, assuming what I believe to be strictly true, that the sin which all committed was the sin which induced the death of all, and we are restricted to a single answer. The sin which induced the death of all was indisputably Adam's sin. This then must have been the sin that all committed. But there is only one admissible sense in which all could have committed that sin, to-wit, *representatively*. Therefore, when it is said that "all sinned", I take the meaning to be, that all sinned in Adam as being in him. By divine appointment, Adam, in committing his first sin, and as to its penalty, death, stood for and represented the whole of his posterity. If this be not the sense in which all sinned, then that sense, it seems to me, is not discoverable. Nor should this solution be objected to on the ground of being strange, since we accept other things equally as strange. We all admit that death is the result of one sin of Adam. Now I have no more difficulty in understanding how we could all commit that sin, than in seeing how we can all be justly required to die for it. Indeed, it is much easier to understand how, by representation, we all could and did commit it, than to see how,

without representation or participation in some sense, we all can be justly subject to death for it

Farther, when it is said, 1 Cor xv 22, "in Adam all die," the language admits of but one interpretation, namely, all die in consequence of the sin which he committed, or all die by him, that is, by his act. Now if death resulted from sin on the sole ground of implication in it, then implication by representation must be admitted. We are certainly not implicated on the ground of actual personal sin. Representation then is the only alternative.

But in Heb vii 9, 10 we have a parallel case to the preceding, which may serve to shed some light upon it. It is there said of Levi that, before he was born and while he was still "in the loins" of his ancestor Abraham, he "paid tithes" to Melchisedec. Now if Levi, while still in the loins of Abraham, could and did pay tithes, with equal certainty could the whole posterity of Adam, while still in him, sin. And what they could thus do, they did, and from the deed came death.

Again in v 14 following, the Apostle speaks of "death reigning from Adam to Moses, even over those that had not sinned in the likeness of Adam's transgression." Here now were persons who had sinned, yet not as Adam sinned. Not that their sin differed from his, but the mode of committing it differed. In both cases I take the sin itself to have been the same, since it was that in virtue of which death reigned. The difference lay in the manner. Adam sinned actually and in his own person, these sinned, not actually and in person, but in Adam as being in him and represented by him. Such I take to be the import of the passage, and if correct, it settles the meaning of the clause in hand.

In further confirmation of what is here insisted on, I call attention to the verb *dielthen*. It is aorist, and as such, signifies momentary action in the past. The *dia* denotes the thoroughness of the action. "*Death spread*"—the whole thing was done in the past. Moreover, it was done *at once* "To all"—the spreading was thorough, not one escaped. But how could all this occur, unless, as already said, in and by Adam? When he sinned all sinned in him. With that sin death entered, entered at once and for all time, and entered for the whole human race. All this seems to be couched in the verb.

But here it is proper to take a distinction. Sin by representation does not imply guilt, as actual personal sin does. It may

both justify and demand the appointment of a penalty, as in the case in hand, but no more. Hence no one of his posterity will ever, after death, be held responsible for Adam's sin. As to them, his sin will never, after death, be brought into account. No notice will be taken of it. In their case, therefore, death is not the consequence of personal guilt, but of connection with a guilty parent. Accordingly, though we all die for Adam's sin, no one of us will ever be judged for it. For our own sins only, will we be judged. These alone involve the notion of personal responsibility, and hence imply guilt. For them alone, therefore, we shall have to account.

In regard to the sin of Adam, which induced death, a false mode of reasoning is sometimes employed. It is argued that suffering implies guilt; and that since we all suffer even death for Adam's sin, therefore we must be guiltily connected with it. But this is not correct. Suffering may always imply the guilt of some one; but it does not necessarily imply the guilt of *the sufferer*. If a ship founder, through the criminal intent of the pilot to wreck her; and all the passengers perish, their suffering certainly does not imply guilt on their part. And so in countless other cases. Death implies connection with a guilty ancestor, but not the guilt of his dying offspring.

True, it is a great hardship to have to suffer death for the sin of another. It would seem hard enough to have to die for our own sin; but to die for the sin of another seems peculiarly hard. This is the universal sentiment of mankind. Still so to suffer is right, however difficult it may be for us to see it. God can rightfully appoint for his children what is hard; he can not appoint what is wrong. Hard it certainly is to die for Adam's sin; wrong it certainly can not be. It was hard for Christ to die for the sins of the world, yet it was right.

Of the various theories which have been based on the clause in hand; or more strictly, perhaps, of the various methods which have been adopted to explain it, I mention only the following: 1. That in the phrase "all sinned" the reference is to actual personal sin. This is the view of Stuart, which he labors hard to defend, but clearly without success. 2. That "sinned" does not signify actually and personally sinned, but merely treated or viewed as sinners. Such seems to be the view of Bloomfield, which he briefly states, but does not argue. 3. That the expression "all sinned" means all actually sinned in Adam; and that

the sin was as really the sin of each of his posterity as of Adam himself. This is the theory of Augustine, Robert Haldane and other Calvinists. 4. That the meaning is, all sinned in Adam, as being in him, so far as to be justly subjected to death, but not so far as to incur guilt. The first part of this view is held by MacKnight and Hodge; and the whole is maintained in the present work.

With the mere statement of these theories I dismiss them, as I do not see that an extended discussion of them could be made to result in good. Should the reader, however, feel curious to see them examined even to weariness, he can easily be gratified by reference to any one of several popular critics, as Hodge, Stuart, &c.

13. For until the law sin was in the world; To me this verse is difficult. Its general object is, as I feel sure, to confirm the contents of v. 12; hence the *gar* at its commencement. But it is not in the general object that I encounter my difficulties. I find them in the details. In v. 12 it is said death spread to all, because all sinned. This is the specific fact to be now illustrated and confirmed.

"*Until the law.*" The word *law* here denotes the law of Moses; and the word *until* covers the whole period between Adam and Moses. This is evident from the following verse.

"*Sin was in the world.*" Sin was in the world both potentially and actually. It was in humanity as a power, and in the daily conduct of men as a fact. But it was not from sin in this form that death resulted. Death, as the pre-determined doom of all, on the condition of sin, was provisionally in the world the instant in which Adam committed the first sin, and so before the second sin was committed. To the sin mentioned in the clause, no penalty of death was attached. Therefore, from it the death of no one resulted. The death of all had already been effected in the first sin of Adam. To this sin only that penalty had been affixed, hence from it alone death came.

but sin is not counted when there is no law. To count sin (*ellogeitai*) is to set it down against a person, and hold him responsible for it. It is here, in the present clause, that I encounter my chief difficulty. From Adam to Moses there was no law. This is the implication. But surely it is not to be taken strictly. For had there been absolutely no law, there could have been no sin. Yet we are told that sin was in the world. I then conclude the meaning to be, either that there was no revealed

law in the sense of the law of Moses, or no law the violation of which was to induce death. Both alternatives are true; but had there been a revealed law, sin would certainly have been counted. This alternative then may be dismissed at once. Accordingly, I conclude that the word law is here used to denote law, *the breaking of which was to entail death*. This view, moreover, is required by the current of the Apostle's argument. Taking now the word law in this sense, and the first part of the clause in hand becomes explicable. The meaning then is: But sin is not counted *for death*, when there is no law making death the penalty for breaking it. In this view of the case, the Apostle's argument becomes overwhelming. It stands concisely thus: From Adam to Moses there was no law, the penalty of breaking which was death. Then of course during that period there was no sin committed which could entail death. Yet, during all this time, the human family were dying. They must then have died for Adam's sin alone.

To this solution there are two objections: 1. That it requires the term law to be taken in a peculiar sense. I grant it, but see no escape. It will not do to say that from Adam to Moses there was no law in any sense. The people certainly had the law of sacrifice, together with the general laws of right and wrong. These laws they violated, and in the act committed sin; and these sins were counted against them as in the case of Cain, and of those destroyed in the flood. The conclusion then seems unavoidable, that though the people had law in some sense, they had no law of death. 2. That after the word counted, we have to supply *for death*; and after the word law, the phrase, making death the penalty of breaking it. This again I grant, but plead necessity for it as in the former case. We know that sin was in the world from Adam to Moses; for so the Apostle declares. And to say that sin was in the world, but was not counted, is to say that though men committed sin, God took no notice of it. This is not allowable. Consequently, the only remaining alternative is, to conclude that though sin was in the world it was not counted for death, as in the case of Adam; and that therefore the death of all resulted from Adam's sin.

To my own mind the preceding solution is not entirely satisfactory. But as I have none better of my own, and can find none better elsewhere, I submit it on its merits. On a thorough examination, I believe the reader will find it cumbered with fewer difficulties than any other.

If asked, why select the period from Adam to Moses to prove that death resulted from Adam's sin alone? I answer, because it was the period which would most clearly establish the fact.

14. **Yet death reigned from Adam to Moses,** Death is here drawn as a tyrant dominating over all, even to the extent of death. The conception is highly wrought, the fact being, when unrhethorically expressed, that all died, not one escaping. The clause is a bold contrast to the preceding verse, and goes to confirm the view just taken of it. It implies that a condition of things has there been stated from which death could not be expected. That condition has already been noticed, being as follows: There was no law from Adam to Moses, the breaking of which, induced death; hence, during that time there was no sin committed which could entail death. In such a condition of things death was not to be expected. Yet death reigned. The conclusion then is, that it must have reigned in consequence of Adam's sin, and not in consequence of sins subsequently committed.

even over those who had not sinned I understand the clause, "those who had not sinned," as including the whole human family from Adam to Moses. Accordingly, I reject the notion, as untenable, that it includes only infants and other irresponsible persons. These it certainly includes, but that it excludes all others is without support. The clause is thought not to refer to adults, or the responsible; because it is assumed that the expression "*had not sinned*," denotes those only who had not sinned personally. But this is incorrect, as we shall presently see.

in the likeness of Adam's transgression, To sin in the likeness of Adam's transgression means to sin as he sinned when he transgressed. Or still more explicitly, it means to break a law like the law he broke, to break it in the manner in which he broke it, and with like results. The word likeness means likeness in all particulars essential to Adam's sin. It must be noticed that the preceding expression, *had not sinned*, does not even imply, much less say, that those to whom it refers had not sinned at all. Indeed the implication is that they had sinned; and if so, they had sinned, no doubt, in every way in which men could and did sin in that day. Only in one way they had not sinned; they had not sinned in the likeness of Adam's transgression. By this epithet the phrase *had not sinned* is limited, but by no other. Therefore the phrase may be taken as including all the sins of the time, save the one excluded by the epithet.

How then did those persons, over whom death reigned, sin, who had not sinned in the likeness of Adam's transgression? Certainly they had committed no personal sin, the penalty of which was death; because there was no law extant which they could break to this effect. But this merely tells how they did not sin, not how they did. The answer then is, *they sinned in Adam*; and the specific unlikeness between his sin and theirs, was the unlikeness between sinning in person, and sinning in and by a representative. Adam did not sin in and by another; his posterity did. This makes the difference.

Whether we are to regard death as the immediate result of Adam's sin, or the corruption and enfeeblement of his body as the immediate result, and death as the result of these, are questions which have received some attention. It is not here proposed to dwell on them at length. Still a few thoughts may not be out of place. The better view seems to be, to regard the corruption and degeneration of the body as the more immediate effect of Adam's sin, and death as resulting from these. But certainly death was the great ultimate and all-comprehending penalty of his sin; and whether it resulted immediately from the sin, or mediately through a corrupted body, is not material. In considering the matter, however, an item must be taken into account, which possibly may be essential to a correct conclusion. We must remember that, besides being condemned to die, Adam was driven out of the garden, and so cut off from the tree of life. This no doubt operated very injuriously upon his body. Much of its future condition may be attributable to the fact. Still, though other causes may have had their effect, and no doubt did, to his sin his death was due. But for that sin he had never died.

Moreover, whatever effect Adam's sin had on his body, in the way of corruption and otherwise, it has also had on ours. We inherit our bodies from him, and inherit them since his fall; hence what his body was, ours are. No doubt the change which sin effected was great. Our own frail bodies afford ample and painful proof of this. They are not what Adam's was before he fell.

But how has the sin of Adam affected our spirits? The view of many is, that it has corrupted each of his descendants, both *in body and in spirit*. But of the truth of this, there is no evidence. That Adam's sin has corrupted our bodies is granted; but it has never touched our spirits. It takes our own personal sins to corrupt these. Another's sin can not do it. The sin which

we wilfully commit is the only sin to which guilt attaches; and the sin to which guilt attaches is the only sin that can corrupt the spirit. I hence conclude that Adam's sin has no effect upon his posterity after death. It spends its force wholly in this life; in the next it has none.

who is a type of him that was to come. Type is from the Greek *tupos*, and this from *tupto*, to strike; and it means an impression or print made on something by a blow designed to produce it. It has also several other kindred significations, and denotes besides, as with printers, the metallic form that produces the impression. Religiously, type applies to any thing that, by previous design, resembles another, and so shadows it forth; and the type may be a person, a thing, or an event. The thing resembling is the type, the thing resembled the antitype. The pascal lamb, for example, was a type; Christ is the antitype; Moses delivering the Israelites from Egypt was a type of Christ delivering people from sin; the uplifted brazen serpent, with its efficacy, was a type of the crucifixion of Christ and its efficacy; and so on. A type may answer to its antitype in various and numerous ways, as by resemblance or contrast, and in single points or many. In the case in hand, Adam may be conceived as resembling Christ in many particulars. The former, for instance, is the natural head of the human family; the latter is the spiritual head of the redeemed; and so in other respects. But the specific resemblance before Paul's mind, between Adam and Christ, was not so strictly a resemblance between them personally viewed, as between their acts and the consequences of their acts. Adam performed a single act—a sin; Christ performed a single act—obedience to death. That peculiarly affected the whole human race, this did likewise; that in one way, this in a different way. That brought death on all; this procured a respite in virtue of which all live the life we now live. That took all into the grave; this brings all out alive. In a word, whatever evils Adam's sin brought upon the world, without our agency, are all countervailed and remedied by the single act of Christ without our agency. Thus Adam is a type of Christ.

of him that was to come—Τοῦ μέλλοντος, literally *the coming one*. Upon which Alford remarks: "Not '*qui futurus erat*', as Beza, Reiche; but spoken from the Apostle's *present* standing, *who is to come*." But here I think Beza right, and Alford wrong. Paul was not looking at Christ as still to come, but at Christ as

already come. Previous to his advent into the world to die for it, he was *the coming one*. This is the "coming" to which Paul alludes, the coming which preceded, and was in order to, the *one act of obedience*, which is contrasted with the *one sin of Adam*. It is therefore strictly correct to say *qui futurus erat—who was to be or come*.

15. But not as was the sin, In order to complete the sense, the English requires that both in this and in the next clause the verbs shall be expressed; accordingly I insert them. Indeed, it is one of the marked peculiarities of the Section in hand, that from verses 15 to 19, inclusive, it is exceedingly elliptical. Its difficulties are due, in no small degree, to this circumstance. Important nouns, and equally important verbs, are omitted. This certainly insures brevity; and just as certainly it promotes obscurity. Our only remedy is, where the sense is obvious, to express it in close transparent English, no matter how many words this may take. A word-for-word translation of the verses alluded to would not be intelligible to an ordinary reader, if indeed to any. I shall therefore supply, without hesitation, all ellipses which the nature of our language requires to be filled. Nor do I deem it necessary, as some have done, to place the supplied words in brackets. The sense demands them, and justifies them. This is enough.

The reader will notice that I here render *paratoma sin*. Etymologically the word means *falling beside, falling away, fall, error, sin*. That it here denotes the first sin of Adam, the sin that brought in death, is admitted by all. It is best therefore to render it simply *sin*. This is the fact it stands for; and so to render it as to make it constantly indicate this fact preserves uniformity, and keeps up a close reference to the first mention of the sin in v. 12. MacKnight renders the word "fall"; Alford, "act of transgression"; but these renderings, though correct, have no advantage over *sin*.

The Apostle had just said that Adam is a type of Christ. But the resemblance does not hold in all respects. They differ both in their acts and in the effects of their acts. We have here the first difference stated. *Not as was the sin, so also is the gift*. The things first contrasted, then, are the sin and the gift. The sin was, in its effects, the diametrical opposite of the gift; while the effects of the latter reach far beyond those of the former. The difference is both in kind and quantity. The difference in

kind is appreciable; that in quantity is indeterminate. The Apostle merely says of it *pollo mallon—much more*; but how much more he has not intimated.

so also is the gift. *Charisma* is a hard word to translate, hard because of the difficulty of determining the idea, the whole idea or fact expressed by it. Accordingly, it has been variously rendered, as “gift of grace,” “gracious gift,” “free gift,” “the boon,” “favor bestowed,” &c. The word, I take it, embraces two ideas—favor as a source, and gift as the thing proceeding from it. In this view I feel confirmed by the fact that in the latter part of the verse, where the word occurs, *charis* and *dorean* stand as its equivalent. If this be true, as I am persuaded it is, the word means more than either gift or favor, taking these even in a wide sense. It means a voluminous gift, a gift proceeding from the joint favor of God and of Christ. Indeed the word comprehends the whole of what has accrued to the human family from the death of Christ, or it covers all the ground included in the *much more* of the Apostle. Hence the difficulty of finding any one or two words that will adequately render it. Upon the whole, I think it best to translate it simply by *gift*, using this term in a very comprehensive sense, and as expressing a product of favor. This, though not all I could wish, seems the best the case admits of.

For if by the sin of the one, This clause is designed to confirm the preceding clause, and, at the same time, to point out, in part, how the “sin” differs from the “gift.” “The one” stands for *the one man*, who was Adam; and the “sin” was his first sin. “The many” is idiomatic for *all* (so decides Bloomfield), and gives place to it in v. 18.

“*By the sin*”: This sin was the reason, with God, for inflicting death; and within itself it was the instrument which effected it. By it all die; but for it, none had. And here we must distinguish. Men did not merely become mortal by this sin, and afterwards die for their own sins. By it they both became mortal and died. To this sin alone universal death is due. And this seems to involve us in a difficulty. Men are constantly spoken of in the Bible as having died for their own sins, as Achan, the prophet of Judea, the Amalekites, and many others. But suppose they had never sinned at all. What then? They would still as surely have died as they did. In that event, they might have lived much longer than they did, and no doubt would;

still in the end they would all certainly have died. What relation then did their own sin sustain to their death? It was merely the occasion of executing, for purposes of punishment, the sentence pronounced on all, on account of Adam's sin, sooner than it would otherwise have taken effect. Adam's sin rendered them liable to death at any moment; and their own sin simply hurried on the end, an end, however, which awaited them sooner or later, whether they themselves sinned or not.

"Of the one": This expression forever settles the question, For whose sin do we die? It is for the sin of *"the one"*, not for the sin of any one else, not even for our own sin. Language could not more definitely determine the answer to a question than does this. How, in the light of the expression, any one could ever conclude that we die for our own personal sins, is something I can not understand. A finality must be assumed for some questions in the Bible; otherwise I am unable either to determine its value or perceive the use it was intended to be put to.

the many died; In what sense? According to some, spiritually at the instant, physically in the end. Does the word "died" justify the conclusion? I think not. That all died physically when Adam sinned is conceded, not died actually and physically at the moment, for then would the race have been extinct; but sentence was then pronounced, provision was then completed, and only a brief respite stayed the end. So sure were all to die, that the event is spoken of as if it had already taken place.

But did they not also die spiritually? That Adam, both in body and spirit, was, so soon as he sinned, cut off from vital union with God, seems certain, and that, but for the redemption which is in Christ, he would then have died and been forever lost, is equally true. But what of his posterity? For it is admitted that in his first sin he was standing for them. His posterity died in the current and ordinary sense of the word, died physically, or what we call a natural death. This much must be conceded, more than this cannot be. I hence deny that Adam's sin ever touched or in any way affected the spirit of one of his posterity. Of course, I am not here denying absolutely but technically; I am denying for want of proof. The sin of Adam cleaves to his posterity up to the point where body and spirit separate; beyond this point, in my opinion, the spirit is as free from its influence as though the sin had never been commit-

ted. Therefore, in their case, and as to Adam's sin strictly, not their own, all that appears necessary is, that the redemption of Christ should bring them out of the grave and restore them to life again. This, accordingly, it does, and in the case of the saved, far more. It brings the saved out of the grave to a *spiritual* body, and restores them to a far better life than even Adam's ever was, and under immeasurably better circumstances. The redemption of Christ "*more*" than countervails the sin of Adam.

But the instant one of Adam's posterity commits a personal sin, his spirit becomes involved; and he now stands where Adam stood when he first sinned. This sin, and this only, corrupts his soul; and for it he will certainly be lost unless, in this life, it be forgiven. Adam's sin has corrupted our bodies; our own sin corrupts our spirits: for that, we die; for this alone, we can be lost. And here comes into view the broad provision for personal sin, which has been made in the death of Christ. By that death, God can be just while forgiving the sinner. We believe in Christ and obey him. Thereupon all our sins are cancelled, and we await in hope the proud day of the resurrection. But even here we must not forget the "*much more*" of the Apostle. Whether the sin be the single sin of Adam, or the countless sins which we ourselves have committed, the death of Christ is provision for them all, and "*much more.*" This "*much more*" includes a better body than Adam ever had, a better life than he ever lived, a better world than he ever lived in, a world where Satan, and sin, and death can never come.

In a general way, I wish to remark here, in passing, that we have been so long in bondage to the conceptions and language of scholastic teaching, that we seem afraid to take the semblance of liberty even with our own thoughts. We must accept the doctrine of original spiritual death and total depravity as a consequence of Adam's sin, just as though they were intuitions, or were taught on every page of the Bible. For one, however, I demur, and insist that we shall reverently accept all that the Bible actually asserts, or necessarily implies; and that we may safely deny all else. This limitation has my creed, no other. I do not believe in the spiritual death and total depravity of Adam's posterity as the effect of his sin. Physically they all die for his sin, and physically they have all been corrupted by it. Spiritually they die for their own sins, and by these only are they spiritually depraved. This much is certain, more is conjectural.

much more have the favor of God, and the gift by favor of the one man, Jesus Christ, abounded to the many. "The many" to whom the favor and gift have abounded are exactly co-extensive with "the many" who died; and as the many who died include the whole race, so to the whole race the favor and gift have abounded. But in what special respects have the favor and gift abounded? The question is answered by determining in what respects Adam's sin has affected all. By that sin all die and go into the grave—this much certainly. To this extent then, at least, must the favor and gift abound. They must bring all out of the grave and restore them to life, so that all that was lost in Adam may be regained in Christ; but this, not as matter of debt, but as matter of favor. God and Christ were not bound, *that we know of*, to restore the human family. They restore them of favor. But having once determined to restore them, they will do so completely, and "more."

But here an important question arises. The favor and gift abound "much more" than the effects of the sin. In what sense? Do they actually invest all with any thing more than restoration to life? I presume not. All that they do beyond this consists in provisions made, not in actual benefits bestowed. They provide for the salvation of the whole human race from personal sin, but they invest none with this salvation except those that obey Christ. As to the wicked, it is not known that a single benefit will be conferred beyond simply restoring them to life; and that too, it may be, in the very bodies, unchanged for the better, in which they died. Thus far only, then, in their case, do the favor and gift abound. But with the saved it is widely different. With them the favor and gift abound even up to immortality and eternal life. Hence it is to the saved exclusively, that the "much more" of the Apostle has reference.

And here, perhaps, it is proper to add a word respecting infants. They too die in Adam, and so in Christ will be made alive. All they lost in the former, they will regain in the latter. Thus far then all—the saved, the wicked, infants, occupy the same ground and will be treated alike. But far "more" than this, I judge, will be done for infants. As they have no personal sins to answer for, I see no reason why they should not be placed on an equality with those whose personal sins are forgiven. At any rate, I shall assume that this will be done. They will then be brought out of the grave to a spiritual body, and, besides, to all

the other honors of the saved. Thus far the favor and gift abound in their case.

The word "favor" occurs here in its ordinary acceptation; but the word "gift" seems to be used in a special sense, as we shall see when we reach v. 17. Its being qualified by justification is unusual, and gives to it a peculiar turn.

16. **And not as was the sentence, which was by the one that sinned, so is the gift.** I know not a critic or translator who does not admit this clause to be very elliptical. As all concur in this admission, I shall accept it as true. Indeed, its justness can be made apparent even to the unlearned reader by a word-for-word rendering, thus: *And not as by one that sinned, the gift.* It can not be said that this conveys to the mind no sense; the sense is merely very incomplete. But what words shall we supply? Clearly such as the clause itself and the context demand; and such as, when supplied, give us a full pertinent sense. Hodge renders the clause thus: *And not as it was by one that sinned, so is the gift.*" As a general, indefinite rendering, this is excellent; and it covers, I doubt not, the ground before the Apostle's mind. But it merely comprehends or implies his meaning, not expresses it. "*And not as it was*". What does *it* refer to? Let this be determined and expressed, and not merely referred to. I supply *krima* from the next clause, which is sanctioned by Stuart, Hodge, Tholuck, and others. The next clause gives, as Alford remarks, "the reason for" the present clause, a fact indicated by *gar*. The present clause, then, must imply, as he continues, all that the "next expands"; and since the next expands *krima, sentence*, I therefore decide to supply *sentence*. That this gives the exact meaning of the Apostle, I have not a doubt. The two things then to be here contrasted are the sentence and the gift. How they are contrasted appears in the next clause.

For the sentence was because of one sin to condemnation; A sentence to condemnation is a sentence in which some person or thing is condemned, a *condemning sentence*. In this instance, the person condemned was Adam; the reason for it, his one sin; the end to which, death—his own and that of his posterity.

but the gift is to justification from many sins. A "gift to justification" is justification bestowed as a gift; it is justification, not as a debt due to those that receive it, nor as something merited, but as a pure gratuity.

But the gift differs from the sentence. The sentence was because of *one sin*, and ended in death. The gift respects *many sins*. *pollon paraptomaton*, all that will ever be forgiven, and consists in a plenary justification from them all. Such are the respects in which the gift and sentence differ.

The reader will notice that I do not render the *ex* before *henos* and the *ek* before *pollon paraptomaton* alike. This he may hastily decide to be wrong. But all attempts to render them alike not only fail to give the sense, but give a false sense. That the Apostle conceived of the sentence and the gift as emerging respectively *out of* the "one sin" and *out of* the "many sins", seems almost certain. Hence his use of *ek*. But the one sin was *the reason* for the sentence. The *ek* before it therefore is correctly rendered *because*. The "many sins", however, are not the reason for the gift, in any view or sense. Consequently the *ek* before "many sins" *can not be rendered because*, nor by any equivalent expression. In the clause, we have three closely related terms—gift, justification, many sins. The gift respects immediately the justification, the justification immediately the sins. Now justification can stand related to sins in but one way, namely, as a release *from* them. *From*, then, I consider the proper rendering of *ek* before "many sins". This leads, I grant, to some immaterial transposing; but I see no way to avoid it, and bring out the sense. Stuart also adopts it in his translation.

17. For if by one sin death has reigned through the one man; The Aorist here seems to require an English Perfect. The Apostle had in view the whole period over which death had reigned from its commencement to the moment of writing. Hence, though the time of the verb is past, it is properly a Perfect past, since it is always touching the present. It is therefore truer to the sense to say *has reigned* than simply *reigned*.

Death reigned through the one man then, and it reigns through him now; because he committed the sin which induced it. Death reigns through none of Adam's posterity; it reigns over them, but through him. Moreover, it reigns by one sin, not two nor many. One man, one sin, death—and the tragic tale is told.

The Greek Text here is involved in some doubt. Upon the whole I decide, with Tischendorf and Green, to adopt the reading of A. F. and G. On grounds of reason, this reading has the advantage; on purely manuscript grounds, the weight of authority is against it. I may add, that the sense remains the **same** whichever of the two best sustained readings we accept.

much more This phrase seems here to denote, not so much quantity or excess, as degree in certainty. If by one sin death has reigned through the one man; *much more certain is it* that "they who receive", &c. But how can one thing that is to be in the future, be more certain than one which has been in the past? Strictly, of course, this is impossible. The language is rhetorical, and must be construed as expressing only the highest degree of certainty

are they, who receive the abundant favor, Literally, *the abundance of the favor* which is very accurately condensed into the preceding. The Future here I render as a sort of Present-future. To receive the abundant favor, is to receive the favor in its all-abundant provisions. But the reception is voluntary and active, not passive. It is the act of him who believes in Christ and obeys him, and of no other.

and the gift of justification, This clause determines, as previously intimated, the import of the word gift; but as the word has already been noticed, little more need be added. The primary idea in justification is remission of sins. Now when we receive remission of sins, not as a due, which is impossible, but as a gift, we receive the gift of justification. Looked at from God, justification is an act, a gratuitous act; looked at from us, it is a thing we receive, for which we make no return—a gift. Such is the meaning of the phrase "gift of justification".

to reign in life Those who are thus to reign are they who receive the abundant favor and the gift of justification. They are the saved. Accordingly, I conclude that "the life" is not the present poor life with its accompaniments of hardship, and sorrow, and pain, but the ineffable future life. Much more shall the redeemed reign there, than has death reigned here. It is a fine antithesis to place the reign of life over against, and high above, the reign of death.

through the one, Jesus Christ. Christ, with his own blood, has purchased for us the life in which we are to reign; and he, in person, will invest us with it. Through him it has been provided, through him we hope for it; and through him we are to realize it.

18. Therefore, then, as by one sin sentence came upon all men to condemnation; The *ara* here is strictly illative, the *oun* concessive; and the two are correctly represented, the former by *therefore*, the latter by *then*. *Henos paraptomas*

should be rendered *one sin*, not *sin of one*, meaning sin of Adam. Had the Apostle designed to say *sin of one*, he would have reiterated the form of v. 15, *to tou henos paraptomati*, that is, *sin* would have been in the Dative, and *one* in the Genitive. As however he failed to do this, I conclude he did not mean to say *sin of one*.

In both the first and second members of the verse, we have a noun and a verb to supply. The nouns we take from v. 16, to which, both in language and sentiment, v. 18 bears a very close resemblance. In v. 16 we have *eis katakrima*, the corresponding word to which is *krima*, the two meaning *sentence to death*. In v. 18 also we have *eis katakrima*, but no corresponding noun expressed. Now since the two expressions obviously have the same meaning, and the one has *krima*; it follows that *krima* is understood in the other also. I therefore supply it. Again, in v. 16 we have *charisma eis dikaioma*, *gift to justification*. In v. 18 we have *eis dikaiosin* with no corresponding noun before it. Now clearly what is expressed in the one verse is understood in the other. I hence supply *charisma*.

In both members I supply the verb *came*, which is simple and sufficiently clear. Perhaps it would be more in accordance with usage to say, in the first member, *sentence was passed* upon all men; and in the second, the *gift was bestowed* upon all. But as this requires more words, and is only a slight gain, I decline it. I may add that in supplying these ellipses, both nouns and verbs, I am sustained by the best critics.

With the *hospes* of v. 12, the Apostle introduces the *protasis* of a sentence, to which we have no corresponding *apodosis* till we reach the present verse. All efforts to support a different theory, I regard as failures. But here, in v. 18, in my judgment, we have that *apodosis*. After saying, in v. 12, "Therefore as by one man sin entered into the world", &c., the Apostle proceeds to state the case of the one man at some length; also that of his sin; and how this induced universal death. The subject is profound; and, besides, it involves principles of justice and right to which it is hard to reconcile the human mind. This the Apostle both saw and appreciated. Accordingly, he felt called upon to introduce, at once, the counterpart to the difficult views he had just been presenting; the counterpart to Adam; to his sin; and to death; in a word, to introduce the remedy, the ample remedy, which God has provided in Christ, not only for all the evils that

have befallen the human family in Adam, but also for our own personal sins. These topics fill the space between vs. 12 and 18, not in the form of a parenthesis or digression, but in that of a closely connected chain of thought, every link of which is important, and stands precisely in its proper place. These matters crowded the Apostle's *apodosis* back in his mind till they were disposed of. Then, however, reiterating in the first part of v. 18 what he had said in different language in v. 12, he introduces his long suspended *houlo*, and states his *apodosis*. This view of the paragraph before us, and of its dependent parts may not be satisfactory to other minds; to mine it is, if not perfectly so in every feature, so at least in the main.

sentence came upon all men That this is the sentence which was pronounced upon Adam for his first sin can not be questioned. It is the sentence that was provoked by "one sin"; and that the "one sin" which induced death. But this was the first sin. Hence the sentence is that which was then pronounced. Now in the same words in which God pronounced this sentence upon Adam, and for the same sin, he also pronounced sentence upon his posterity. In other words, there were but one sin and one sentence; and from these came the death of all. Here again it is determined for whose sin we die. After this, surely nothing more need be said on that point.

But Adam's posterity do not die because his sin was *imputed* to them; but because, being in him, in so far as they are human, they were acted for in his act. And this remark requires expansion. The doctrine of imputed sin, like the doctrine of imputed righteousness, has no sanction either in reason or in revelation. I can not have imputed to me another's sin, and be dealt with for it as though it were mine; not, at least, by any law of justice, of which the human mind is cognizant. Such is the verdict of mankind. But it is according to the constitution of nature, and a thing which occurs a thousand times every day, that we may be, and actually are, represented in, and by others both for good and for evil. Why not in Adam as well? And over against this there stands a widely different view, though a somewhat similar one; a view which, I grant, has struck me with some force, and which I here suggest. From Adam we are all descended in the way of common generation. On this line, *he* stands to us as head. From Christ we are all descended in the way of creation; for "by him all things came into being, and without him not even

one thing came into being that is in being." Jno. 1. On this line, *Christ* stands to us as head. To the one, we trace our origin through creation; to the other, our pedigree through generation. Now may it not be possible, no more is claimed, that since, in virtue of the one relation, we all die in Adam; so, in virtue of the other, we all live in Christ? In other words, that our dying in Adam is attributable to his sin, not because actually committed by us, or imputed to us; but because he acted for us in committing it. And so in regard to Christ. We did not actually obey in his act of dying, nor is the act imputed to us; but he acted for us in the deed, and in virtue thereof we live. If from the sin of the one we draw death, because of our relation to him; why not from the righteous act of the other draw life, because of our relation to him? I seem to understand one side of this parallel about as well as I do the other; and I think I perceive evidence of the same principle of government underlying both. I add only, that I am here merely propounding a problem, not expressing a belief.

to condemnation; Condemnation to what? Simply to death. For one sin God, in condemning Adam, condemned in him the whole of his posterity to death. The sentence, as to them, had this extent, no more. It had no reference whatever to eternal death, nor to any other effect beyond the grave.

so also by one righteous act According to Robinson the primary meaning of *dikaïomatos* is "*a right or just act, righteous deed*". With this agree the Lexicons generally. I translate it *righteous act*; and by this understand the act of Christ in dying as a ransom for the world. The act referred to is certainly that which antagonizes and countervails the sin of Adam, which is Christ's death. This, then, I doubt not, is the specific act denoted by the word. Again, that *dikaïomatos* in the present verse, and *hupakoes* in the next, signify one and the same thing, hardly admits of question; and as the latter refers to the obedience of Christ in dying, so also must the former. I hence conclude that the word is strictly rendered, when rendered *righteous act*, understanding this as just explained.

the gift came upon all men to justification of life. The word "gift" in connection with justification has already been explained, and need not be dwelt on here. But in what acceptation are we to take justification—in its ordinary and current sense? I feel sure, not. We are to take it as qualified by the context and

by the epithet life. The phrase *gift to justification* is the exact counterpart of the phrase *sentence to condemnation*; and the meaning of the latter determines the meaning of the former. The phrase, sentence to condemnation, means, as just shown, a sentence in which Adam and his posterity were, for his sin, condemned to simple temporal death. Now "*justification*" here means acquittal or release from *that sentence*, no more. It does not include the notion of the remission of personal sins, whether they be the sins of Adam's posterity, or his own. Remission of sins is not in the word; it signifies *release from a sentence*, no more. Nor is the release an unqualified release, but a special or peculiar one. It is first release from immediate death, and as such amounts to a respite. In virtue of it, Adam lived on after the sentence; and in virtue of it, we all live the life we are now living. But it signifies still more. It signifies the restoration to life, after death, of the whole human family, or the universal resurrection of the dead. The phrase is justification *to life*, justification so far as to be permitted to live, and so far as to be restored to life after death. The word *zoes* is in the Genitive, being the Genitive of object; life is the end or object of the justification.

Now release from the sentence of death in the sense just stated, is precisely what is necessary to an *apodosis* in the latter part of v. 12. "Therefore, as by one man sin entered into the world and death by sin, and thus it spread to all, because all sinned; so also by one righteous act of Christ the gift came upon all men to justification of life." Verse 12 is the appropriate place for the latter part of v. 18; and where, no doubt, it would have appeared but for reasons already assigned.

It is strange that two as fine critics as Stuart and Hodge, with several others that might be named, should have failed wholly to perceive the meaning of this important verse. Yet such is the fact. They all construe the word life to signify eternal life, and justification to have reference to personal sins. Such conceptions, however, are not in the verse. And very naturally their interpretation involves them in no small trouble. Especially, does Hodge seem to be perplexed. If, he reasons in effect, the phrase *all men*, in the latter part of the verse, denotes really the whole human race, then since justification signifies release from personal sins, and life means eternal life; how can we escape the conclusion of universal salvation? Indeed, according to his interpretation

there is no escape from it. But his remedy lay in correcting his premises, not in seeking to escape from a correct conclusion from false premises. The phrase *all men* certainly denotes the whole human race; but beyond this, the writers named appear to be right in nothing. Hodge seeks escape by limiting the phrase "all men" to a part only, but fails.

Of the authors before me, MacKnight alone appears to have had the correct view of the verse; and on it he is refreshingly clear and fine.

19. For as by the disobedience of the one man, Of course, "the one man" was Adam, and "the disobedience," his first sin. God said to him, "you shall not eat of it"; but he ate, and in the act disobeyed. This is the disobedience referred to.

The present verse I regard as furnishing a reason for what is said in v. 18. It is there merely asserted that by one sin, on the one hand, sentence came upon all men to condemnation; and that by one righteous act, on the other, the gift came upon all men to justification of life, but no reason is assigned for these assertions. The present verse gives the reason.

the many were constituted sinners; The verb *katestathesan* is here a very significant word; indeed, it is the key that unlocks the meaning of the verse. It signifies *to set down, place, make, appoint, ordain, constitute*. These are its most common meanings; and from them I select *constitute*, as exactly expressing the sense in which the word is here used.

The verb is passive, and means *were constituted*. Who now were constituted? The *hoi polloi*, the many. But the many did not constitute themselves, not by any thing they ever either thought or did. The act of constitution was another's, not theirs. They *were* constituted—by whom? The passage would seem to teach that it was by the disobedience of the one man. It reads, "For as by the disobedience of the one man the many were constituted." But this is incorrect. The disobedience of the one did not constitute the many, either as subject or agent. It was the means *through which or reason why* they were constituted by another. Did Adam constitute them? Certainly not; for whoever constituted them sinners is also to constitute them *just*. This excludes Adam. God then must have constituted the many, since there remains no one else.

What now did he constitute them? *Hamartoloi*, sinners. Now let the reader carefully note that the many were not sinners

within and of themselves, or by any acts of theirs; they *were constituted* sinners. We can not constitute him a sinner who is one by his own act. If he be a sinner by his own act, he is so independently of all acts of constitution. Nor did God constitute the many sinners through, or because of, any acts of their own. He constituted them sinners *through the disobedience of Adam*. Before that disobedience, they were not constituted; after it, they were. God must then have constituted them sinners through, or by means of Adam's sin, and because of it. This I believe to have been the fact; and, if so, it is the precise reason for saying they were constituted sinners. It is not said of Adam that he was constituted a sinner. Of course not. He was actually and in fact a sinner; and therefore could not be constituted one. But at the instant of constitution, his posterity were not sinners as he was. They had committed no sin, except as through him sinning for them. Therefore they were merely *constituted* sinners.

But God constituted them *sinner*s. Now in what sense must we take *hamartoloi*? As denoting actual sinners, say Stuart, Alford, and others. Were the word sinners wholly unqualified this would be correct; but as the case stands, it is not. The many *were constituted* sinners. The verb *katestathesan* itself qualifies the word. When I say the pen with which I write *was made*, has the phrase *was made* no qualifying effect? It not only implies that the pen did not make itself; but it also excludes the idea of its being unmade or eternal. So when Paul says, "the many were constituted sinners," his language implies that they did not become sinners by their own acts. In so becoming, they took no part. On the contrary, they were merely *constituted* sinners. The truth is, the very object of choosing the verb used was to negative the idea of their being actual sinners; and it effectually does it. The many were constituted sinners through Adam's sin, and because of it. But this was not done because of personal guilt, or with a view to it. The sole reason was Adam's sin; and the sole end, death.

That the view here taken of the sense, in which "the many were sinners," is correct will appear still farther when we come to notice the next clause.

so also by the obedience of the one, That "the one" referred to is Christ, is universally conceded. Indeed, there is no one else to be referred to. But in regard to the "obedience," the agreement is not so general. Some would make it refer to the

incarnation. But this, though a most important fact, is too remote to be meant here. Others would make the reference to be to the whole of Christ's life. This is too general; and, besides, it does not pointedly enough antagonize the single "disobedience" of Adam to which it is opposed. The true reference in the "obedience" is, I am confident, to the death of Christ in offering himself as a ransom for the world. "He humbled himself, becoming *obedient* to death, even the death of the cross." Phil. ii: 8. This is the obedience referred to.

the many That "the many" includes the whole human family, unless Adam be excluded, is admitted by all, except some advocates of peculiar features of Calvinism. As with these features I here have nothing to do, I pause not to notice them. But is Adam excluded? The doctrine of the first member of the verse, I think, evidently excludes him from "the many" in it; and if so, then he must be held as excluded from "the many" here. But although he may be thus excluded from this particular expression, the exclusion is not absolute, as he is certainly included elsewhere. When Paul says, "as in Adam all die; so, also, in Christ shall *all* be made alive," the latter "*all*" clearly includes Adam, though the former may not. The whole of mankind, including Adam, will be raised from the dead. This is all I am here seeking to save. "The many," then, I shall assume, includes the whole of mankind. Hence the whole of mankind are to be constituted *just*.

are to be constituted just. In regard to *kathistemi* I have but a word to add. It never signifies to make or cause a person to be what he is not. It means to set him down at precisely what he is, or precisely as he is.

What, next, is the import of the word "just"? Does it mean just in the sense of being sinless or pardoned? I think not. Like *hamartoloi* it is used in a peculiar sense. It means just for a certain purpose only, and not absolutely just. Indeed, the notion of being sinless is not in it. The word means to be just for the sole purpose of being raised from the dead.

Now in the light of these premises what is the import of the expression, *the many are to be constituted just*? The following, as I deem: Through the death of Christ as a means, and because of it as a reason, the whole human race are to be constituted just *to the extent, and for the sole purpose of being raised from the dead.* They are set down as just to this end. This I have hardly

a doubt is the import of the expression. By the disobedience of Adam, the many were *constituted* sinners so far as to be subjected to death. By the obedience of Christ, the many are to be *constituted* just so far as to be raised from the dead. The object of the Apostle seems to be, to show that just so far as the whole of mankind have been adjudged sinners for Adam's sin, so far are they all to be adjudged just for the death of Christ, and that since that induced death, so this is to induce the resurrection—and all this without the slightest reference to the personal merits or demerits of the parties affected.

If the preceding be the true exposition of the verse, as I believe it is, then, confessedly, most of the popular expositions of it are greatly at fault. Indeed, I know not one that is at all tenable. Even the best supported involves a false conclusion. For if we make "the many" to include all, and the word "just" to mean sinless or pardoned, I see no escape from the conclusion of universal salvation. Clearly this is unsound, and yet I know of nothing better among current solutions.

CHAPTER V. SECTION 3.

²⁰ Now the law entered in besides, that sin might increase. But where sin increased, favor abounded exceedingly more, ²¹ that as sin reigned in death, so also might favor reign through justification to everlasting life through Jesus Christ our Lord.

²⁰ Νόμος δὲ παρεισήλθεν ἵνα πλεονάσῃ τὸ παράπτωμα. Οὐ δὲ ἐπλεόνασεν ἡ ἁμαρτία, ὑπερπερίσσευσεν ἡ χάρις, ²¹ ἵνα ὡς περ ἐβασίλευσεν ἡ ἁμαρτία ἐν τῷ θανάτῳ, οὕτω καὶ ἡ χάρις βασιλεύσῃ διὰ δικαιοσύνης εἰς ζωὴν αἰωνίου διὰ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν.

SUMMARY.

The law entered that sin might increase. But the law did not increase sin by creating it. It increased it merely by discovering to men certain acts as sins, which before they had not known to be sins. But the more sin thus increased the more favor to those committing it abounded. Sin, like a monster reigned formerly and still reigns unnaturally in death. Favor, on the contrary, now reigns chiefly through or by means of justification. Hereafter it will reign in and through eternal life.

20. Now the law entered in besides, that sin might increase. The obvious meaning of the words, though at first sight hard to receive. The connection is not clear, nor is the reason for the remark very evident. In v. 12 the Apostle says, by one man sin entered into the world, and by that sin, death. The space between verses 12 and 20 he occupies in treating of this sin and its effects, and in pointing out the remedy in Christ

and his death. This done, he adds: "Now the law entered in besides"; that is, besides sin and death, the law also entered in. Three things entered into the world; sin entered in, death entered in, the law entered in. By law I understand, not law in general as a rule of conduct, nor the law of nature, but strictly the law of Moses. I see no relevancy in the word in any other sense.

The *de* is simply a continuative; and although slightly adverbative, it is correctly rendered by *now*. It is too closely followed by the next *de* to be rendered *but*. "*Entered in besides*"—*parciselthen*. *Eiserchomai* signifies simply *to come into, go into, or enter into*. *Pareiserchomai* means *to enter into besides, or in addition to*. It also sometimes signifies to enter into stealthily or secretly, a meaning wholly inadmissible here. In what sense the law entered in *besides* has just been stated.

that sin might increase. I see no necessity for rendering *paraptoma* by transgression or by any other more specific word than sin. *Hamartia* is clearly used as its synonym in the next clause. Since then it means simply sin, it is best so to render it.

But the law entered in besides *that sin might increase*. How are we to explain this? Possibly, at least, we are not bound to explain it at all. Is it a correct translation? This question settled, and, may be, our obligation is at an end. But let us note carefully what is affirmed, and what not. The law did not enter, *to bring in sin*; for sin was already in the world. Nor did it enter, that sin *might prevail*; since it already prevailed to some extent. But the law entered that sin might, some how, or in some way, increase as it had not increased previously; and the law had just this effect. Was this increase, then, attributable to any fault in the law? Not at all; for within itself the law was perfect. Or was the increase wrong? The very reverse; it was right. How then did the law increase sin? In *volume* I presume it did not increase it, *numerically* it did. Human nature was just as sinful before the law entered as after; and men committed fully as much wrong. But thousands of acts, which before the law, were simply unknown wrongs within themselves, were, by the law, determined to be sins. In this way more than in all others, did the law increase sin. This moreover was right. If a thing be wrong within itself, determine it to be so; prohibit it, and then punish it as sin when it is committed. The greater increase of sin, then, was due mainly to the altered circumstances induced by the law. Moreover, it was one purpose of the law to increase

sin, but in a lawful way, in order to show what human nature is capable of under a system of perfect law; and thus to lighten the necessity for the gospel. Consequently, the law increased sin not merely for the sake of the increase, but for the sake of ulterior ends

But where sin increased, favor abounded exceedingly more, However much the circle of sin widened, the circle of favor still stretched far beyond it, and however great the light that sin attained, favor still mounted above it. But favor abounded more particularly in the respite from immediate death, which all enjoyed, in the longsuffering shown to the human race, notwithstanding their countless personal sins, in the preparation for the gospel, through which it was conducting the world, in the types and shadows it was daily casting of the future church, and in the tongue of prophecy which was constantly pointing to, and exciting hopes, of the Messiah—in all these ways favor abounded.

21. that as sin reigned in death, *Ebasileusen* is the Indefinite past, which, probably, it is best to follow strictly here. Sin had reigned in death previously to the Apostle's time; it was reigning then, it is reigning now; and it will continue to reign till death is swallowed up in life. Of course, death is here conceived of as a ubiquitous and inexorable tyrant, whose sway embraces all, and reaches from the birth of sin to the sounding of the last trump. To reign in death is a bold metaphor which, being reduced, means simply that all at last die, not one escaping. The Apostle is clearly not here considering all the consequences of sin. He is looking at its workings in this life, and not at its effects, when un forgiven, beyond the present. It would be quite as correct, I presume, to speak of sin reigning in the punishment after death of the finally impenitent, as of its reigning in death now. Sin reigns in all the evil it has entailed upon man, whether time or eternity be in view

so also might favor reign through justification to everlasting life. On the contrary, favor is here personified as a benignant king, whose reign is only partial now, but whose victory is sure in the end. Sin reigns in death, favor reigns through justification. Release from sin is the means or sceptre through which favor is to achieve its final victory. This blessed reign is to go on, and prevail, and never cease, till its consummation in eternal life

through Jesus Christ our Lord. Favor reigns, primarily,

through justification as the means of everlasting life; and, secondarily, through Jesus Christ as the sublime personal source of the favor, who will fully carry out and execute all it has prompted and devised.

Thus ends, in the latter part of this chapter, one of the most profound and compactly-thought pieces of composition, it has ever been my fortune to meet with. If, when the reader has studied it as I have, he shall have the satisfaction of feeling that he is master of it, he will be the possessor of a sensation to which I am afraid to lay claim. I devoutly wish him the pleasure.

CHAPTER VI.

SECTION I.

What then shall we say? Must we continue in sin that favor may abound? ²Not at all. We who died to sin, how can we still live in it? ³Or do you not know that all we who were immersed into Christ Jesus were immersed into his death? ⁴We were then buried with him by the immersion into death, that as Christ was raised from the dead by the glory of the Father, thus we also should walk in newness of life. ⁵For if we have become united with him by the likeness of his death, surely we are also to be by that of his resurrection, ⁶knowing this, that our old man was crucified with him, that the sinful body might be rendered inactive, that we should no longer serve sin. ⁷For he that is dead is released from sin. Now if we died with Christ, we believe that we should also live like him; ⁸knowing that Christ, being raised from the dead, dies no more, death lords it over him no more. ¹⁰The death, then, which he died, he died to sin once; but the life which he lives, he lives to God. ¹Thus do you also account yourselves dead to sin, but alive to God in Christ Jesus.

Τί οὖν ἐροῦμεν; ἐπιμένωμεν τῇ ἁμαρτίᾳ, ἵνα ἡ χάρις πλεονάσῃ; ²μὴ γέροιστο. Οἵτινες ἀπέθανομεν τῇ ἁμαρτίᾳ, πῶς ἔτι ζήσομεν ἐν αὐτῇ; ³Ἡ ἀγνοεῖτε ὅτι ὅσοι ἐβαπτίσθημεν εἰς Χριστὸν Ἰησοῦν, εἰς τὸν θάνατον αὐτοῦ ἐβαπτίσθημεν; ⁴Συνετάφημεν οὖν αὐτῷ διὰ τοῦ βαπτίσματος εἰς τὸν θάνατον, ἵνα ὡσπερ ἠγέρθη Χριστὸς ἐκ νεκρῶν διὰ τῆς δόξης τοῦ πατρὸς, οὕτω καὶ ἡμεῖς ἐν καινότητι ζωῆς περιπατήσωμεν. ⁵Εἰ γὰρ σύμφυτοι γεγόναμεν τῷ ὁμοιώματι τοῦ θανάτου αὐτοῦ, ἀλλὰ καὶ τῆς ἀναστάσεως ἐσόμεθα ⁶τούτο γινώσκοντες ὅτι ὁ παλαιὸς ἡμῶν ἄνθρωπος συνεσταυρώθη, ἵνα καταργηθῇ τὸ σῶμα τῆς ἁμαρτίας, τοῦ μηκέτι δουλεῦν ἡμῶς τῇ ἁμαρτίᾳ. ⁷Ὁ γὰρ ἀποθάνων δεικνύεται ἀπὸ τῆς ἁμαρτίας. ⁸Εἰ δὲ ἀπέθανομεν σὺν Χριστῷ, πιστεύομεν ὅτι καὶ συζήσομεν αὐτῷ, ⁹εἰδότες ὅτι Χριστὸς ἐγερθεὶς ἐκ νεκρῶν οὐκέτι ἀποθνήσκει· θάνατος αὐτοῦ οὐκέτι κυριεύει. ¹⁰Ὁ γὰρ ἀπέθανε, τῇ ἁμαρτίᾳ ἀπέθανε ἐφάπαξ· ὁ δὲ ζῆ, ζῆ τῷ Θεῷ. ¹¹Οὕτω καὶ ὑμεῖς λογίζεσθε ἑαυτοὺς νεκροὺς μὲν τῇ ἁμαρτίᾳ, ζῶντας δὲ τῷ Θεῷ ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ.

SUMMARY.

We are not to continue in sin that favor may abound. On the contrary, as we died to sin before our immersion, it would be inconsistent to still live in it now. By being immersed into Christ we were immersed into his death, and so were buried with him; and as he rose to live a new life, so we also, being risen like him, are to live in newness of life. We became united with Christ by being buried with him; and we are to remain united with him by doing as he does, not living our former, but a new life. We were crucified with Christ in order to render inactive our sinful bodies, and this to the end that we might not serve sin. As we died with Christ and rose with him; so we must now live like him—we must live a new life free from sin. Christ being raised from the dead, is to die no more; and so with us. We have died to sin once, and this must be the end of our dying. In order to this we must sin no more. In dying, Christ died to sin once for all, but now ever lives to God; so our death to sin must be a finality; we must now constantly live to God, and consequently commit no more sin.

The present chapter stands in very close connection with the preceding one. Accordingly, it opens with the discussion of questions growing somewhat naturally, I do not say legitimately, out of what was there last said. These questions, some of which involve, not imaginary, but real difficulties, the Apostle now proceeds to dispose of in his usual thorough way. Indeed, as he proceeds, he seems to grow still more exhaustive. Difficulties he literally grinds to dust. Not a vestige of them is left.

1. **What then shall we say?** What inference is now deducible from the preceding remarks respecting sin and favor? Especially, what advantage can be taken of them by opponents? If perverted, what form will the perversion assume?

Must we continue in sin that favor may abound? The Future of the Subjunctive here implies duty or obligation; and it is correctly represented in the preceding. To continue in sin is to continue to commit it, as we committed it before our conversion.

If when sin abounds, God's favor abounds still more; and if by this abounding favor his love is displayed and he peculiarly honored, what then? Should we not all continue in sin, that favor may the more abound? Is this a legitimate conclusion from the foregoing premises? The Apostle foresaw that this use would be made of his doctrine, and that it would be injurious to it. He therefore anticipates the objection and refutes it.

2. **Not at all.** An emphatic negative, meaning that we are positively not to continue in sin. The reply is made necessary by the following fact, which is inconsistent with a different answer.

We who died to sin, Not we who *have* died to sin. The Aorist should be closely followed here. The meaning is, we who died to sin before our baptism. Of course it is taken for granted that, since we died then, we are still dead; but this is implied, not expressed.

To die to sin is to be wholly disinclined in mind to commit it, and consequently not to do so. The expression is a bold one, and not to be construed too strictly; for no one in the flesh can be said to be absolutely dead to sin, since no one lives and sins not. To be dead to sin is to be so as a rule, but not to be so without exception. The comprehensive, prevalent fact of the Christian's life is, that he is dead to sin; and so general must this fact be, that it shall remain barely not universal.

We die to sin when we believe in Christ and repent of our

sins. For the true conception of repentance is a determination to forsake sin, accompanied by the act. The best and only evidence we can give that we are truly dead to sin is our aversion to it, and cessation from it. None should be baptized till he has within himself a keen sense of this evidence. Baptism to one who is still alive to sin is as inconsistent as the literal burial of a man before he is dead. It is much to be feared that error is sometimes committed here.

how can we still live in it? The Future here denotes *possibility*, not simple futurity. See Winer, p. 279. The question asked involves an obvious absurdity. If we died to sin before our baptism, and continue dead to it, it is grossly inconsistent to think that we may still live in it. One chief object of our dying to sin was that we might remain dead to it. Shall we now defeat this object by continuing in sin? Consequently, we are not to continue in sin that favor may abound. On the contrary, if we commit sin with this object in view, instead of realizing God's favor, we shall experience only his wrath.

3. Or do you not know That is, should you not assent to what has just been said, you at least can not dissent from what follows. The interrogative η often introduces a question which has immediate reference to something just said. It performs this office here; and where such is the case, it should be translated. The connection of thought is then indicated, and the relation of parts shown.

that all we who were immersed into Christ Jesus That all whom the Apostle addressed had been immersed was a fact of which each was distinctly and perfectly conscious. A doubt respecting the fact was therefore impossible. They had been immersed—this they knew; they were immersed into Christ—this they had been taught. Of all this the question reminds them.

To be immersed into Christ—*what is it?* The radical conception in the form βαπτίζω εἰς τίνα or εἰς τι is that of *transition into* some one or *into* some thing. Deprived of this conception, the words are absolutely devoid of meaning. Nor does it matter whether the transition is into material things or moral relations, into physical or spiritual states. Motion *from*, by implication, and *into*, expressly, is in the words always and everywhere.

Accordingly, to be immersed into one body, 1 Cor. xii: 13, is to pass from without it (point of departure not here material) into

it; and becoming thereby inserted into it, to form a constituent member with its members. To be immersed into Moses, 1 Cor. x: 2, is to pass from without the circle of his authority into it, and so become bound to obey him. To be immersed into repentance, Matt. iii: 11, is to pass, by means of immersion, from the life of the impenitent into the state of him that has ceased from sin. In like manner, to be immersed into Christ is to pass from the world, where he is not believed in and obeyed, into a state of freedom from sin and of complete subjection to his will. It is equivalent to being born of water and of the Spirit, by means of which we cross over from the world into the present kingdom of God, or church. Farther, to be immersed into Christ and to be immersed into his name mean the same thing, since the name stands for the person.

But, it is proper here to add, that immersion into Christ is not the only means of transition into him. We *believe into* Christ, as well as are immersed into him, and the former just as certainly as the latter. "He that believes *εἰς τὸν υἱὸν into the Son*, has everlasting life." Jno. iii: 36. To be immersed *εἰς χριστὸν*, and to believe *εἰς υἱὸν* are similar verbal forms, with identical significations. Neither excludes the other, and both are alike essential to the end. We do not pass into Christ by immersion alone, nor by belief alone. We pass into him by the two jointly, and by neither separately. Should it be said in reply to this, that *baptizo* is a verb of motion and that *pisteuo* is not, I answer that the assertion is a mere arbitrary assumption. There is no foundation whatever for it. With reference to the state into which we pass, the one word can as readily be transitional as the other, and with *εἰς* both certainly are.

were immersed into his death? The course of argument is this: You know that you were immersed into Christ, and in the act you were immersed into his death. If now you were immersed into his death, you are dead, dead to the world, dead to sin. How then can you continue still to live in sin? With these premises before you, you can not do it. Of course the inability here implied is moral, not physical.

But what, more particularly, is it to be immersed into Christ's death? The Apostle conceives that by being immersed into Christ, we have become, as it were, one with him, so that whatever he did, we do. Consequently, when he died we died in him. We are then, as he is, dead to our former state. Accordingly, we

can not continue in sin. We are restrained from it by the circumstance of being dead to it in Christ.

4. **We were, then, buried with him by the immersion** The reader has noticed, no doubt, that where any tense of the verb βαπτίζω occurs in the present chapter, I have rendered it immerse. It is proper that I should here state my reasons for this rendering. In doing so, I shall be as brief as practicable.

The word baptize generically denotes action. This much, at least, will go unchallenged. When the Savior says: "Go, teach all nations, *baptizing* them," indisputably the word baptizing signifies action. Not only so, it signifies nothing but action. All that is in it, in the form of meaning, is action. This point then I shall hold as settled.

Now what specific action, if any, does the word baptize denote? That its primary and current meaning, in the Greek language, is *immerse*, no scholar can deny. Indeed, I venture that the whole history of philology does not furnish a less doubtful fact than this. In not one instance where the word occurs, in all Greek literature, does it necessarily mean to sprinkle or pour. At least, if such instance exist, the opponents of immersion have never adduced it. On the contrary, the word occurs in thousands of cases and combinations where it *must of necessity be translated* immerse, and can not be rendered otherwise. These are significant facts.

To cite Lexical authority, at length, in proof of what has just been said, would consume more space than can here be spared. Nor is this necessary; since every scholar knows that the testimony of one good authority is the testimony of all, up even to hundreds. However, I deem it prudent to cite at least a name or two, which I select from popular recent authors. Pickering defines the word to mean, ordinarily, "*to dip, immerse, submerge, plunge, sink, overwhelm*"—all clearly modifications of one radical meaning. Liddell and Scott give, as its primary meaning, *to dip repeatedly, dip under*. To these they add other remote meanings with which I have nothing to do. I am seeking the everyday meaning of the word. Prof. E. A. Sophocles, himself a Greek, to whom the language is vernacular, and recognized as one of the best Greek scholars of the day, gives, in his recent Lexicon, as the meaning of the word, "*to dip, to immerse, to sink.*" To this he adds the following special note: "There is no evidence that Luke and Paul and the other writers of the New Testament

put upon this verb meanings not recognized by the Greeks." But these citations must suffice.

To the preceding, I now add Paul's own testimony; and in doing so, I shall omit all adjuncts not material to the investigation, so that attention may be directed singly to the words expressing the act we are seeking to settle. He says: "We were buried by the *baptismatos*." Now this *baptisma* was a *fact* in the life of each disciple in Rome, which he is appealed to as personally knowing. It was not a trope, nor metaphor, but an actual material *fact*, about which a doubt could not exist. Paul who, at the time, had not seen these disciples, tells them that *through*, or *by means of*, this *baptisma* they *had been buried*. This settles the question. In the *baptisma* of Paul we are buried; and since that baptism always takes place in water; it therefore follows that in baptism we are buried in water.

Again, in *Colossians* he says; "Buried in the *baptismo*—*ἐν ᾧ*, in which, also you were raised." In the *baptismo*, then, two things occur: 1. We are buried; 2. We are raised. That is, we are buried in water and raised out of it. And this being raised out of the water is being born of it. But this is precisely what takes place in immersion. Therefore, immersion is the specific act denoted by baptism.

In response to the foregoing, the only thing that can be said is, that, in the passage noticed, the Apostle is speaking figuratively. In reply, I have only to say, that I here have no room to join issue with efforts, not at exegesis, but to pervert the word of God. The Apostle has defined himself too clearly to admit of excusable doubt. If the world is ready to assume the responsibility of rejecting him, while I regret the fact, I am without a remedy.

In conformity with the foregoing facts, John the baptist, and the disciples of Christ baptized *in* rivers, and *in* streams, and in places where there was much water. This is a conceded fact. How is it to be accounted for? On the hypothesis alone that they immersed. To visit a river or other body of water for the purpose of sprinkling is puerile and offensive to sober thought.

Again, John and the primitive disciples performed their baptisms *ἐν ὕδατι* in water, and *ἐν τῷ ποταμῷ* in the river. They did not baptize *with* the river, nor *with* the water, but *in* them. Nor did they baptize, being in the river, but they performed the act baptism in it. The explanation is simple. They baptized the people in the river, and in the act buried them. Buried, then, in water, or immersion, is the meaning of the word.

Finally, when the first Christians baptized, they went *into* the water; and, when done, they came *out of* the water. Hence an act of baptism requires both performer and subject to go into the water and come out of it. But for purposes of sprinkling and pouring this is not necessary; and the first Christians did no childish things. They went, then, into the water because they had to bury in it. Consequently, in the rite of baptism, the specific act performed is *burying in water and raising out of it*. For these reasons I render the word baptize, immerse, and in so doing have a deep sense of right.

I add that both Stuart and Hodge, confessedly eminent men, deny that we have here any allusion to immersion. Their efforts in defence of their views are singularly weak. But in this, they only illustrate the divine decree, that they who oppose the truth shall never appear strong when at their work.

To indicate that my own views, as just expressed, are not peculiar, I close with the testimony of a few distinguished expositors whom I cite for the benefit of those who may not happen to own their writings.

Chrysostom: "When we sink our heads in the water, as if in a tomb, the old man is buried, and, going down, is wholly hid once for all."

Tholuck: "In the early days of the church, persons, when baptized, were first plunged below, and then raised above the water."

MacKnight: "For are you ignorant, that so many of us as have, by baptism, become Christ's disciples, have been baptized into the likeness of his death, *have been buried under the water*, as persons who, like Christ, have been killed by sin."

Conybeare and Howson: "This passage can not be understood unless it be borne in mind that the primitive baptism was by immersion."

Barnes: "It is altogether probable that the Apostle has allusion to the custom of baptizing by immersion."

Bloomfield: "There is a plain allusion to the ancient mode of baptism by immersion."

into death, And if so, then we remain dead, dead to sin; and consequently can not continue in it. The Apostle is still refuting the position that we must continue in sin that favor may abound.

that as Christ was raised from the dead. There is here

an evident ellipsis of a clause. The full sentence is: That as Christ was raised from the dead by the glory of the Father, *to live a new life*. Without this clause the analogy intended by the Apostle is incomplete.

by the glory of the Father, By the *power* of the Father is what, at first sight, we would expect. How then shall we account for the use of *glory*? Certainly the glory of God was most conspicuously displayed in the resurrection of Christ; but then we are accustomed to regard Christ as being raised by power, and not by glory. The solution I deem to be, that the glory of God necessitated the resurrection, and so the use of the power that effected it. Power then was the immediate instrument, glory the circumstance that led to the use of it. Hence the resurrection was effected by both. We may then ascribe it to either, according to the object we have in view.

thus we also should walk in newness of life. Here, too, occurs an ellipsis which it is necessary to fill, in order to complete the sense. This done, and the clause reads: Thus we also, *being raised up as Christ was*, should walk in newness of life. From this, the inference to be drawn is, that since we are to walk in newness of life, we can not continue in sin.

“To walk” is a familiar metaphor, denoting *to live*. “Newness of life” does not mean so much a new life as a new manner of life. The life is supposed to remain, but the whole mode of it becomes changed. The gold in the coiner’s hand does not become new gold; but it assumes new and different shapes. So with the life: it does not itself become absolutely new, but all its manifestations become new and pure. The distinction is accurate and beautiful.

5. For if we have become united with him by the likeness of his death, This verse is usually passed over lightly by commentators, as if giving them no trouble; yet a more difficult one is rare. Indeed, but for the light thrown on it by the context, I see not how its meaning could be made out. Before examining it in detail, two short preliminaries need to be disposed of:

1. I feel satisfied that the common rendering, “If we have been *planted together*” is wrong. *Sumphutos* does not signify planted together. Were it from *sumphutcuo* it might; but it is from *sumphuo*, which means to grow together, or to be brought forth together, not to be planted together. Besides, planted together makes no consistent sense.

2. The Apostle has still in view the refutation of the position, that we must continue in sin that favor may abound. With this object the present verse must be made to harmonize, and in some way to contribute to it. This is not easy.

For if we have become So far all is clear. But what is it to become *sumphutoi*? *Sumphutos*, as just said, is from *sumphuo* which is composed of *sun* and *phuo*. *Phuo*, from which comes *phusis*, physics or nature, and the old Latin *fuo*, *fui*, *to be*, signifies to generate, produce, bring forth, that is, by force of nature. *Sumphuo*, then, must mean to generate, produce, bring forth together or *in connection with*. Accordingly, Robinson defines its N. T. meaning to be *grown together into one, connate, united, one with*.

Now in the light of these premises, what is it to become *sumphutoi*? It is to become kindred, united, or one with another in some respects. "For if we have become" *sumphutoi*—*kindred with Christ, united, or one with him*. This I believe gives the exact idea.

by the likeness of his death—*homoiomati*, the Dative of means or that by which. Not, "if we have become united" *with the likeness*, as Alford, but united *with him by the likeness*. *Homoioma* signifies that which is made like, one thing made like another, or resembling it; and hence, abstractly, likeness, resemblance. It here clearly refers to immersion. The *sunetaphemedia tou baptismatos* of the preceding verse is the *homoiomati* of this. Hence this verse is confirmatory of that, and therefore its *gar*. But the phrase "likeness of his death" is hardly clear. Its meaning is, *like Christ in death*. When dead, Christ was buried; hence likeness of his death is like him in that state. With these facts, the meaning of the clause begins to come out. "For if we have become united with Christ" by a rite like his burial, when dead—then, as in the next clause.

Surely we are also to be by that of his resurrection. That is, surely we are to be *sumphutoi*, united or one with Christ, by a *homoiomati* of his resurrection, by a *homoiomati* of him when raised from the dead. In other words, we are to be one with him by a life like his life after his resurrection. After he was raised, he no longer lived the life he lived before death. So with us. When raised in immersion, we are not to live the life we lived before. We are to live a new life; and hence we can not continue in sin.

To make the word resurrection here refer to the future resurrection of the just, as is usually done, is to misapprehend completely the Apostle's meaning. He has no such reference in mind. On the contrary, he refers exclusively to Christ's own resurrection, not to that of the future.

Alla kai, in the preceding, is a difficult combination to render into English. The former, after the hypothesis, seems designed to sharpen the inference; while the latter merely subjoins matter. The Future *esometha* implies obligation, as it often does, and not simple futurity.

6. Knowing this, that our old man was crucified with him, The old man is our former self, the self that sinned before we died to sin. It is neither the inner man alone, nor the outer man alone, but the two in one that formerly sinned. By being immersed into Christ we became, somehow, one with him; our life and his forming, as it were, one life, so that whatever befell him is held as befalling us. Accordingly, when he was crucified, we also were crucified with him.

that the sinful body might be rendered inactive, Literally, *the body of sin*; but as *hamartias* is Genitive of quality, it is best rendered by an adjective. The word *soma* I take here as denoting simply the human body with its passions, propensities, susceptibilities, and weaknesses. It may mean less than the "old man" of the preceding clause; but if so, it means that part of man which is especially concerned in sinning. The body stands next to the world; and being closely connected with it, it is immediately acted upon by all those influences which tempt to, and induce sin. Being easily excited, easily fired up, it is the chief instrument of sin. Hence the necessity of so enervating it as to render it inactive.

Katargeo, however, does not mean to extinguish wholly the power of sin in the body. The *vis peccati* still remains. But it means to weaken it to such a degree that sin virtually ceases. This weakening is due, first, to the renewed will keeping the body under, and stubbornly resisting temptation; secondly, to the Spirit within us helping our infirmities, and so contributing to the same end; and, thirdly, to God without, who is a present help in every time of need. In all these ways, the body is rendered inactive.

that we should no longer serve sin. The object of our being crucified with Christ is to render inactive the sinful body;

and the object of this inactivity is that we may no longer serve sin. Not to serve sin is not to commit it. From all of which the conclusion again results that we can not continue in sin.

7. For he that is dead is released from sin. The Apostle here states a well known fact which he uses to illustrate what he has just said. When a man is dead, literal death being meant, sin has lost its power over him. He now no longer commits it. Indeed he can not sin, because he has not the power. So with him (conclusion implied) who has been crucified with Christ. He is dead, dead to his former life, and therefore to sin. Consequently, sin has no power over him; and he no longer commits it, because being dead he can not.

But when it is said of him who is dead, that he is released from sin, the release is confined strictly to this life. It has no reference to the future, and, consequently, is not a release from future punishment for sin.

The verse is sometimes construed thus: For he that has died, that is, died to sin by being crucified with Christ, is freed from sin. He is no longer bound to it or by it, and therefore should not continue in it. The construction is good, and yields the same conclusion as the preceding; yet obviously it is but a reiteration of what is said in v. 6. It is therefore inadmissible. It is best to regard the verse as the expression of a general fact used to illustrate v. 6.

8. Now if we died with Christ, The hypothetical form of speech is very common with Paul. He uses it however merely to introduce a favorite form of argument, not to express doubt. We certainly died with Christ in being crucified with him. The fact is not doubtful. Not only so, we died by his crucifixion. Our death took place in his, and therefore, of course, in the same way and by the same means.

we believe that we should also live like him; *Pisteuomen* is plural, but that it is the conventional plural, used for the singular, hardly admits of a doubt. Paul gives expression to his own belief, not to that of others. The *we*, it is true, serves to conceal him, nevertheless he alone is in it.

The Future *suzesomen* is the Future of duty or obligation. It is used because the obligation, viewed in relation to the death in the crucifixion, where it took its rise, was strictly future. We may at pleasure render, *should live with*, or *should live like*. Either is true to the *sun*. I prefer the latter as better according

with the fact. So Robinson. If we should or ought to live like Christ, the question arises, How does Christ live. The reply is, he does not live the life he lived before his death; he lives a new life. So with us. We should no longer live the old life we lived before our death in Christ. We should live a new life, a life free from sin. Hence, again, the conclusion, we must not continue in sin that favor may abound.

I here take occasion to remark, that rendering the present Future, and that in v. 5, as common Futures, expressing simple futurity, has completely obscured the import of the two verses. As a consequence, neither yields the sense intended. Nor, excepting Stuart, is there a commentator before me that is free from the error. Indeed, the true exposition seems never to have occurred to them.

To this it may be replied, that by rendering and construing as I do, the Apostle is made to repeat himself more than once. But such is not the case. The Apostle does not repeat, but he wonderfully varies his thought and elaborates his refutation. He views the objection he is considering from different points, and pierces it on different sides. Reaching the same conclusion in different ways is not repetition.

9. knowing that Christ, being raised from the dead, dies no more, Knowing, *εἰδότες*, an expression used to introduce matters either actually known or concluded to be true. *Raised from the dead.* The word dead, *νεκρῶν*, is here plural, as also in v. 4, and denotes the whole of the human dead, and not simply the state of death. Hence, "raised from the dead," means brought out from among the dead, leaving them still in the grave. It does not mean simply restored to life from being dead. True, it means this, but then it means more, as just explained. *Dies no more.* Christ died once, never to die again. The results achieved by that event, and its value to mankind, can never be told. The infinite Mind alone takes it all in.

death lords it over him no more. Equivalent to "dies no more," except that the thought is here more fully and boldly expressed. The larger clause is the mere amplification of the less. But there is this fact to be taken notice of: Death lords it over Christ with his consent. Of his own accord he laid down his life, otherwise he had never died.

10. The death, then, which he died, he died to sin once; The *gar* is here epexegetical, that is, it introduces an

explanation of what immediately precedes. 1. Christ died to sin. What are we to understand by this? That when he died, he passed beyond the reach of sin. From this on, it could not tempt him, annoy him, nor cause his death. In a word, he was now wholly free from its influence which, previously to his death, he had never been. 2. In dying to sin he died, once for all, or once never to repeat it.

but the life which he lives, he lives to God. The δ in this and the preceding clause is accusative of object; and in both, there is an ellipsis of $\tau\omicron\upsilon\tau\omicron$, which presents Christ's death and life as strictly abstract conceptions. Literally rendered, the present clause reads: *that which he lives*, which is exactly equal to, *the life which he lives*; and as the latter is definite and clear, I decide to use it. Christ now lives; and the life he lives is supremely devoted to God. It is a life in absolute harmony with his will, and consequently sublime and pure.

11. Thus do you also account yourselves dead to sin, We here have the conclusion from vs. 9 and 10, in the form of a parallel to the death and life of Christ. Thus do you, disciples in Rome, also account yourselves dead to sin, as you do Christ; and consequently feel that you can no more continue in it than he can re-live his former life. Nay more, consider that as his dying to sin once was, with him, an end of dying; so your dying to sin is never to be repeated. You are not to return again to sin, and re-die to it often. You have died once; be that enough; and in order to this you must continually desist from it. Not a day nor an hour can you longer continue in it.

but alive to God in Christ Jesus. Instead of continuing in sin, consider that you are now to be wholly devoted to God His will is henceforward to be the rule of your conduct. Yourself, and life, and time, are all due to him. Nothing remains for sin. You must utterly abstain from it. *Alive in Christ.* By being immersed into Christ, we so became one with him, as to die in him when he died. In like manner, we also became alive in him when he became alive, and so arose with him, to live a new life. We died in Christ, i. e., to sin, were dead in him, and with him returned again to life. It deeply behoves us then to live like him as nearly as possible. We should consequently be, in conduct, holy, harmless, and pure.

CHAPTER VI. SECTION 2.

¹² Μὴ οὖν βασιλευτέω ἡ ἁμαρτία ἐν τῷ θνητῷ ὑμῶν σώματι εἰς τὸ ὑπακούειν ταῖς ἐπιθυμίαις αὐτοῦ, ¹³ Μηδὲ παριστάνετε τὰ μέλη ὑμῶν ὄπλα ἀδικίας τῇ ἁμαρτίᾳ, ἀλλὰ παραστήσατε ἑαυτοὺς τῷ Θεῷ ὡς ἐκ νεκρῶν ζῶντας καὶ τὰ μέλη ὑμῶν ὄπλα δικαιοσύνης τῷ Θεῷ. ¹⁴ Ἄμαρτία γὰρ ὑμῶν οὐ κυριεύσει, οὐ γὰρ ἐστε ὑπὸ νόμον ἀλλὰ ὑπὸ χάρι.

¹² Therefore let not sin reign in your mortal body, to obey its desires. ¹³ Nor present your members to sin, as instruments of wrong; but present yourselves to God, as alive from the dead, and your members to God, as instruments of righteousness. ¹⁴ For sin shall not lord it over you; for you are not under law, but under favor.

SUMMARY.

We are not to allow sin to reign in our bodies by obeying bodily desires. Nor must we use our members in the service of sin; but, as persons alive from the dead, we must be devoted to God, and use our members as instruments in exclusively working righteousness. Sin is not to lord it over us in the end, by having us condemned, for we are now under favor, and will be forgiven, and not under law which knows no forgiveness.

12. Therefore let not sin reign in your mortal body, to obey its desires. A summary conclusion from all that has been said in the foregoing part of the chapter. Sin is personified as a tyrant whose sphere of influence is the human body. This tyrant reigns in or rules over the body, but only as the desires of the body have control of it and lead it into sin. Objects of temptation act upon the desires and excite them; these now seek to be gratified; the will yields, and the result is sin. Such is the process. But we are not to allow these desires to become so excited as to impel us to obey them. It is thus only that the Apostle's injunction can be obeyed. In the expression "obey its desires, its refers to the body, not to sin.

13. Nor present your members to sin, as instruments of wrong; The word "members" includes every faculty and power of the human body with which we either commit sin or work righteousness. Indeed the body is the mere sum of these members, the only difference between it and them being the difference between a whole and its parts.

To present our members to sin is to tender them to sin to be used in its service. Viewing sin as a tyrant, the phrase is a military one, signifying to offer our services to our chief. In plain style, the phrase means to use our members in the service of sin. This we are not to do.

The word *adikias* is undoubtedly used here generically, to include every form of sin. It should therefore be translated as comprehensively as possible; and as I know of no word that so fully does this as *wrong*, I decide to use it. *As instruments of sin.* We are not to offer our members to sin, to be used by it, as tools or instruments in doing wrong. They are designed for a far nobler purpose, as we shall presently see.

but present yourselves to God, as alive from the dead, The antithesis of what has just been said. *Present yourselves*, inner man and outer, all the powers with which you have heretofore served sin, present them to God. Nothing is to be reserved for sin. *As alive from the dead.* The word *νεκρῶν* here, as in v. 9, is plural, and includes all the dead of the human family. The disciples in Rome had been among these dead, and had come out from them. How was this? They had been immersed into Christ, and in the act had been buried with him. This took them down among the dead. In being raised in immersion, they had been raised with Christ. This brought them out, &c, from the dead. Hence having come out from the dead, though still dead to sin, they were alive; and now, as being alive, they were to present themselves to God. According to this, we are not to present ourselves to God, till risen with Christ, till alive from the dead. At this point the service of God begins; here the life devoted to him sets in. It would be hard to reconcile this with much that is taught in the world in this day.

and your members to God, as instruments of righteousness. Present your members to God, with which, if you do not serve him, you will certainly serve sin. These members can never be idle. They are always active for evil, or active for good. Present them, then, to God; present them now; present them once, never to repeat it; and present them to be used, and to use them yourselves, as instruments in working righteousness. The word *righteousness* is here used very comprehensively; it is used to include every thing that is right, whether it be something due to God, due to men, or due to self. It comprises the whole volume of human duty.

The learned reader will notice that the original of *present*, in the former part of this verse, is Present tense; while the original of the same verb, in the latter part, is Aorist. The reason for the difference appears to be, that the Present inhibits a life, or a life-long course of conduct; while the Aorist commands a single act,

which is to be performed once, and never to be repeated. The difference, though insisted on chiefly by German commentators, does not seem to me to be important.

14. **For sin shall not lord it over you;** That is, sin shall not lord it over you, *in the end*, by procuring your final condemnation. This, I feel sure, is the meaning; and not, sin shall not lord it over you by inciting you to practise it. Assuming this, and *gar* becomes easy; it introduces a reason for what is said in the preceding verse.

for you are not under law, but under favor. You are under favor. Let this be conceded. How now does the fact keep sin from lording it over us? If the reference were to our daily conduct, it could not; but the reference is to our future condemnation. Favor keeps sin from lording it over us in that, by securing our pardon, and so preventing the condemnation.

But, on the other hand, suppose we were under law. How would that enable sin to lord it over us? Were we under law strictly, that is, law alone, or law unmixed with favor, we could never be forgiven. For our sins, in that case, we should surely be condemned. In this condemnation sin would lord it over us; at last it would be victor.

Perhaps the Apostle's meaning can be rendered the more apparent by repeating; and at the same time inserting, parenthetically, a few facts not here stated, but confessedly true. *Nor present your members to sin, as instruments of wrong;* though you will never become entirely sinless. Throughout life, with all your efforts to the contrary, you will still occasionally sin. *But present yourselves to God, as alive from the dead, and your members to God, as instruments of righteousness.* And although you do this, you will never become perfect in your conduct. So long as you are in the flesh, you will still sin more or less. However, let not this trouble you. *For sin shall not lord it over you in the end, by procuring your condemnation. For you are not under law.* If so, you could never be forgiven; and thus sin would, at last, lord it over you in your condemnation. *But under favor.* Your sins, therefore, if you are faithful to Christ, will be forgiven. Consequently, you can not be condemned for them; and so sin will be prevented from lording it over you.

CHAPTER VI. SECTION 3.

¹⁴What then? May we sin because we are not under law, but under favor? Not at all. ¹⁶Do you not know that to whatever you present yourselves as servants for obedience, its servants you are which you obey, whether of sin to death, or of obedience to justification? ¹⁷But thanks to God that though you were slaves of sin, you yet obeyed from the heart the model of teaching to which you were delivered; ¹⁸and having been freed from sin you became servants to righteousness—¹⁹I speak humanly on account of the weakness of your flesh. For as you presented your members as slaves to impurity and to lawlessness, in order to lawlessness; so now present your members as servants to righteousness, in order to holiness. ²⁰For when you were slaves of sin, you were free as to righteousness. ²¹Well, what benefit had you then from those things of which you are now ashamed? For the end of those things is death. ²²But now having been freed from sin, and become servants to God, you have your fruit in holiness, and the end, everlasting life. ²³For the wages of sin is death, but the gift of God is everlasting life in Christ Jesus our Lord.

¹⁴Τί οὖν; ἀμαρτήσωμεν ὅτι οὐκ ἐσμὲν ὑπὸ νόμον ἀλλὰ ὑπὸ χάριν; μὴ γένοιντο. ¹⁶Οὐκ οἶδατε ὅτι ὅ ἅ παριστάνετε ἑαυτοὺς δούλους εἰς ὑπακοήν, δούλοι ἐστε ὅ ἅ ὑπακούετε, ἥτοι ἀμαρτίας εἰς θάνατον, ἢ ὑπακοῆς εἰς δικαιοσύνην; ¹⁷Χάρις δὲ τῷ Θεῷ ὅτι ἦτε δούλοι τῆς ἀμαρτίας, ὑπηκούσατε δὲ ἐκ καρδίας εἰς ὃν παρεδόθητε τύπον διδαχῆς, ¹⁸ἐλευθερωθέντες δὲ ἀπὸ τῆς ἀμαρτίας ἐδουλώθητε τῇ δικαιοσύνῃ—¹⁹ἀνθρώπων λέγω διὰ τὴν ἀσθενεῖαν τῆς σαρκὸς ὑμῶν. Ὡσπερ γὰρ παρεστήσατε τὰ μέλη ὑμῶν δούλα τῇ ἀκαθαρσίᾳ καὶ τῇ ἀνομίᾳ εἰς τὴν ἀνομίαν, οὕτω νῦν παραστήσατε τὰ μέλη ὑμῶν δούλα τῇ δικαιοσύνῃ εἰς ἁγιασμόν. ²⁰Ὅτε γὰρ δούλοι ἦτε τῆς ἀμαρτίας, ἐλευθεροὶ ἦτε τῇ δικαιοσύνῃ. ²¹Τίνα οὖν καρπὸν εἴχετε τότε ἐφ' οἷς νῦν ἐπαισχύνεσθε; τὸ γὰρ τέλος ἐκείνων θάνατος. ²²Νυνὶ δὲ ἐλευθερωθέντες ἀπὸ τῆς ἀμαρτίας, δουλωθέντες δὲ τῷ Θεῷ, ἔχετε τὸν καρπὸν ὑμῶν εἰς ἁγιασμόν, τὸ δὲ τέλος ζωῆν αἰώνιον. ²³Τὰ γὰρ ὄψωνια τῆς ἀμαρτίας θάνατος· τὸ δὲ χάρισμα τοῦ Θεοῦ ζωὴ αἰώνιος ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ τῷ κυρίῳ ἡμῶν.

SUMMARY.

It is not true that we may sin because under favor, and not under law. We are to sin in no case and for no end. If we attempt to serve sin we become slaves to it, and in the end will be condemned to eternal death; but, on the other hand, if we are obedient to Christ, the effect will be release from all our sins. Though formerly sinners, we have now sincerely obeyed the gospel; and the consequence is freedom from all sins. Being thus freed, we are now living in holiness. When slaves to sin we were, in a sense, free from righteousness; and so now, being servants to righteousness, we are free from sin. We owe it nothing, and can not serve it. Indeed as we derived no benefit from our former sins, it would be manifest folly to return to them again. The end would be death, and by this we must be restrained. But we can no longer serve sin; for we are now servants of God, and are living holy lives. We can not serve both. The result of serving God will be everlasting life, which we can not afford to forfeit. The end of serving sin is eternal death which deters us from it.

15. **What then?** That is, what conclusion are we to draw from what has just been said? *May we sin because we are not under law, but under favor?* The Apostle foresaw that his teaching would be abused; and that the present inference would be drawn from it. He therefore anticipates the abuse, in order, beforehand, to have the chance of replying to it. But before passing on, the question itself needs some slight inspection.

The first reflection that suggests itself is, How can we sin if not under law? Sin is the transgression of law; and not to be under law would seem to be the same as to be without it. How, in that case, could we sin? From this it is evident that not to be under law does not mean to be wholly without it, and consequently at liberty to do as we please. Yet such seems to be the view of many. Because they are not under law, they take for granted that they are without restraint, and therefore law to themselves. Nothing could be more erroneous. For, although we may not be under law, we can sin nevertheless, which implies that we are still under law *in some sense*. The truth is, that we are under law while under favor; for to be under favor is simply to be under the gospel; and no one can say that to be under the gospel is to be without law. Hence to be under favor does not exclude law. It is to be without it in one sense, but to be under it in another. The full force of the question therefore is, *May we sin because we are not under law which condemns sin and makes no provision for pardoning it; but under favor which, though we sin, provides for remitting it?*

Not at all. We are not to sin because thus circumstanced. To do so is a wilful abuse of God's goodness, and a defeat of favor. He favors us only when making a determined effort not to sin. Consequently, if we sin wilfully, his favor is withheld.

16. **Do you not know that to whatever you present yourselves as servants for obedience, its servants you are which you obey,** The ϕ here may be construed either as masculine or neuter; but as there is no necessity for supposing it to be the former, I take it as neuter, and so render it. It would perhaps be closer to translate it *what* than *whatever*; but as the latter gives the bolder sense, I prefer it.

The verse assigns the reason for the strong negative *Not at all*. This it does by introducing a universally conceded fact. You know that you are bondmen to whatever you constantly serve. This is true in all the walks of common life; and it is equally true

of sin. If you habitually commit sin, you become slaves to it, the result of which is death, not mere temporal death, but eternal. You are then, though not living under law, restrained from sin by its fearful consequences. Within itself it is wrong to sin; but in the light of its results, it is appalling. You can not afford to serve it.

as servants for obedience, You are slaves to whatever you offer constant obedience. Or more fully, *eis hupakēn* denotes the end for which. When you present yourselves to sin, the end for which you do so, is obedience to it, or the constant practice of it.

its servants you are which you obey, whether of sin to death, or of obedience to justification? The usual rendering of the latter of these two clauses is *obedience to righteousness*. But, with Stuart and Bloomfield, I deem it wholly untenable. That *eis dikaiosunen* denotes the end attained, is indisputable. Now to say that righteousness is the end attained by obedience is palpably erroneous. Righteousness is obedience itself, not the end reached by it; it is a life, not an effect; a course of conduct, not what results from it. On the other hand, justification, being not unconditional, is strictly an end. It is attained by compliance with the conditions which are precedent to it, and on which it depends. Now, unquestionably, obedience is, in general terms, the condition on which justification depends. God justifies or acquits the obedient, not the disobedient. Hence to represent obedience as being for, or in order to, justification is strictly correct.

Again: in the expression, *servants of sin to death*, the death being, not natural death, but eternal, is the ultimate end of sin. It is sin in its final result. Of course this implies a sentence of judgment condemning to the result; but the result only, is here expressed, and not the sentence. This is understood. Likewise, and as standing over against this, in the expression *obedience to justification*, justification denotes the final sentence of acquittal which immediately precedes eternal life. In the one expression, the end of the obedience is expressed, the end of the justification being understood; in the other, the end of the sentence is expressed, the sentence being understood.

Under this clause, Riddle, in Lange, has this note: "Prof. Stuart here also confounds *dikaosune* with *dikaiosis*, and unfortunately paraphrases: '*obedience which is unto justification.*' This is open to lexical, as well as theological objections. *Dikai-*

osune is subjective—Hodge.” But it is a mistake to say that Stuart confounded the terms. On the contrary, he knew what every scholar knows, that in certain connections they have precisely the same meaning. It was this fact which led him to use the one term in the sense which the other sometimes has. As to the phrase “obedience which is unto justification” being open to both “lexical and theological objections,” I insist that it is open to neither; provided the lexicons be reliable, and the theology be true. The phrase is not very elegant, I grant; but beyond this, it is open to no objection. Had Mr. R. stated the objections to which he refers, and not left them to mere conjecture, his note would have been more satisfactory.

17. **But thanks to God that though you were slaves of sin,** In this verse we are compelled either to assume an ellipsis of *καίτερ*, or make the Apostle say what is inconsistent with the whole spirit of christianity, with his own life, and with every feeling of the pious heart. I choose the former alternative. That Paul ever intended to say, Thanks to God that *you were slaves of sin*, is something I can not believe. At least I am unwilling to believe it, so long as I have the liberty of a much more agreeable choice. When to this we add, that there is not a section in the Letter, in which we do not have to supply one or more words, in order to complete the sense, the objection to supplying one here is without force. Besides, MacKnight lays it down as a principle that “*de*, in the latter clause of a sentence, sometimes implies that *ei kai* or *καίτερ* is omitted, and must be supplied.” In confirmation, he cites the verse in hand, and also 1 Pet. iv: 6. Bengel renders the passage as I do; but he neither discusses its structure, nor assigns a reason for his rendering. Bloomfield says: “It is better to suppose, with Grotius and Koppe, that as the participle is often put for the verb, so here by a Hebraism, or rather popular idiom, the verb is put for the participle, which would be equivalent to a verb with *καίτερ*, *although*.” He then translates as I do. On these authorities, I believe the reader may accept the preceding rendering as sufficiently close. The verse however presents an obstinate difficulty.

you yet obeyed from the heart You obeyed sincerely and earnestly, or your heart and will were in the act. All obedience to Christ should be thus characterized. The *de* of this clause I render *yet*, which is not, I grant, quite adversative enough; but I am without a stricter word. The structure of the foregoing par-

of the verse forbids *but*, and *on the contrary* is heavy. We hence seem tied down to *yet*.

the model of teaching The word *tupon* here signifies a model to which something is to be conformed. *Didaches* is Genitive of definition; and the two words together mean *doctrinal model*. This is but another name for the gospel. You were taught the gospel, and required to conform to it as to a model; in other words, to be obedient to it, obedient to its rites and precepts, to its spirit and practice. All this you did from the heart.

The expression *tupon didaches* is sometimes rendered *type of doctrine*, and held to denote baptism. But this is too special. The expression includes baptism, but does not stand for it exclusively. The Scriptures should never be forced to teach what is not clearly in them.

to which you were delivered; At first sight, this expression seems awkward and not well suited to the connection. But this arises from losing sight of the imagery which the Apostle is using. Sin is before his mind as a master to whom the disciples had been slaves; and he conceives of them as now delivered from this master to the model of teaching, to become henceforward obedient to it. The imagery is borrowed from the custom of delivering slaves from one master to another. In this view of the case, the expression is both intelligible and appropriate.

18. and having been freed from sin, Freed from sin as a slave is freed from his master by emancipation or by being transferred to another. Imagery aside, to be freed from sin is to be pardoned. In order to this, two things are necessary: 1. Obedience to the model of teaching; 2. That this obedience be from the heart. That tells what is to be done; this, the spiritual state in which it is to be done.

Here the disciples are said to have been *freed from sin* when they obeyed the model of teaching. In v. 16, they are said to have become servants to obedience *to*, or *in order to*, *justification*. These two expressions evidently mean the same thing. To be freed from sin is to be justified. That resulted from obedience to the model of teaching; this from obedience simply, but obedience to what? Clearly to the model of teaching; since there was nothing else to obey. This verse then confirms the interpretation already given of *obedience eis dikaiosunen*. It means, as said, obedience in order to *justification*.

You became servants to righteousness. You became voluntarily bound to do every thing that is right, and so to abstain from every thing that is wrong—bound to be pure in thought and holy in act.

19. **I speak humanly on account of the weakness of your flesh.** That is, in speaking of sin as a tyrant from whom you became freed, and of righteousness as a master to whom you became bound, I use language which men employ when delivering and receiving slaves—language with which you are familiar; and I do so because of your inability to understand a different style. You are uneducated in the matters of which I am speaking, and will therefore understand them the more readily if I convey them to you in figures and speech derived from your every-day life. "*Weakness of your flesh*" is weakness of nature, which had resulted from the darkness of heathenism, and the life of sin they had led.

for as you presented your members as slaves to impurity and to lawlessness, That is, as you *formerly* presented your members before being freed from sin. It is not easy to account for *gar* here, unless we assume a reference to a suppressed sentence, which has often to be done. In this view, the following would give the connection: When freed from sin you became servants to righteousness. In doing this, you did only what you were bound to do, and the more so, because of your former life. *For as you presented your members, &c.* As you did the one, so now do the other. *You presented your members as slaves.* Not only so, but the tender was accepted, and you did the service. You actually slaved it to sin. "*As slaves*" is not quite correct. *Doula* is neuter plural of the adjective *doulos*. Strictly rendered, the clause would read, presented your members as *servile instruments*; but as slaves is briefer, and safely close, it may be retained.

to impurity and lawlessness. These two words distribute the former life of the disciples. Impurity denotes personal sins, the sins we commit against ourselves, which consist in impure thoughts and unchaste conduct. The word embraces all that enters into an unholy personal life. Lawlessness, *anomian*, on the other hand, comprehends every form and species of sin which we commit against others, whether consisting in omissions of duty or positive transgression. Of course, the sins of both classes are, at the same time, sins against God.

in order to lawlessness; Lawlessness is general here, comprehending both the impurity and lawlessness of the preceding clause. The word states the object for which the disciples, in their former state, presented their members to evil. It was to commit sin, sin against themselves, and sin against others. Such was the use they made of powers designed to honor God and bless men.

so now present your members as servants to righteousness, in order to holiness. In plain, unfigurative style, as you formerly used all your powers of mind and body in committing sin; so now use them in doing right, that you may be holy—pure within and sinless without.

20. For when you were slaves of sin, you were free as to righteousness. Here again, *gar* seems to refer to a suppressed sentence. As if the Apostle had said: In requiring you to present your members as servants to righteousness, I am doing only what you yourselves recognize as right. When servants are released from one master, and become bound to another, you insist on their obligations to the latter. So in your case. When you were slaves of sin, on the principles of servitude, you were free as to righteousness. But now being bound as servants to righteousness, you confessedly owe it your service. To be free as to righteousness is to be free, not absolutely, but in the sense only in which a servant, while bound to one master, is free from another.

The expression *free as to* righteousness strikes the reader, no doubt, as needlessly unusual. He would prefer the common form *free from* righteousness. But this would require the Genitive with *apo*, whereas we here have the Dative. *Free as to*, or *in respect to*, is therefore the true rendering. The Dative is used for the sake of the more perfect contrast, and, at the same time, to limit the action expressed by the verb. When you were slaves of sin you were free, but this freedom was limited *to* righteousness. To be bound to the one was to be free as to the other.

The reader will notice that I translate *slave* of sin, but *servant* of righteousness; and since both words have the same original, he may ask why the difference. My reason is simply a regard for propriety. To say *slave* of righteousness would strike every one as incongruous and harsh; and *servant* of sin is too honorable. It is without the notion of degradation implied in slaving it to sin. *Slave* of sin is the only term which does justice to the idea.

21. Well, what profit had you then from those things of which you are now ashamed? The *oun* is here chiefly concessive; that is, it concedes the state mentioned in the preceding verse; and I know of no word that better translates it than *well*. Its force, as well as the scope of the passage, may be thus shown: When you were slaves of sin, you were free as to righteousness—granted: What benefit did you derive from the sins you then committed? The answer is *none*. It will be noticed that I adopt the pointing which ends the question with the word ashamed. To me, this alone gives a natural sense. *Εκείνων* is understood before *ἐφ' οἷς*—what profit had you from those sins of which you are now ashamed? Primarily, *karpon* signifies fruit, as fruit of trees; and so it easily comes to denote the fruit of a certain course of life, or the product of certain acts. It retains here the meaning of fruit, but fruit in the sense of benefit or profit: What profit had you from the sins of your former life? "*Of which you are now ashamed.*" The fact that when the disciples in Rome looked back over their past lives, they felt ashamed of the sins in which they had formerly delighted, shows the deep change that had taken place in their minds, and implies how sincere and thorough their repentance had been. Moreover if they had derived no benefit from their past sins, but, on the contrary, felt ashamed of them, they could certainly have no reason for returning to them; and this is what the Apostle is seeking to guard them against. The issue he is making with them is, that they are not to sin, because under favor.

For the end of those things is death. Not temporal death, but banishment from the presence of God forever. The clause is designed to confirm the previous remark. You derived no benefit from your former sins, nor will you ever do so; for the end of them is death. It is not their nature to yield you good; therefore you must not commit them.

22. But now having been freed from sin, Having been freed from sin as from a former master, the figurative style being still kept up. To be freed from sin is to be forgiven. There is no bondage like that to sin, nor any freedom like release from it. The end of that is eternal death; the end of this, eternal life.

and become servants to God, you have your fruit in holiness, and the end, everlasting life. Owing to a change of subject, the word *karpon* has not here exactly the same meaning as in the preceding verse. It means fruit yielded, rather than

benefit received. You have your fruit in holiness, or it consists in holy deeds; you are now servants of God, and the product is a holy life. Of course a holy life is a benefit; but this being assumed, it is not necessary to express it. *Eis karpon* does not mean *as to*, or *in respect to*, fruit. *Eis* is used in the sense of *en*. In having been freed from sin and in becoming servants to God, the disciples had passed *into* (previous transition) a state which required them to be holy. Here they had their fruit *cis in* holiness. In such cases, *eis* has the force of *en*. You have your fruit in the holy lives you live.

and the end, everlasting life. *To telos* is Accusative of object, and governed by *echete*. You have your fruit in holiness; and you have, as the end, everlasting life. In opposition to your former life, you are now living in holiness; and the end to which you look, and for which you hope, is everlasting life. You can not then, because you are under favor, afford to abandon this, and return again to the service of sin. The act would be without reason; it would wreck your hope, and, besides, entail on you eternal death.

23. For the wages of sin is death, Sin is still conceived of as a master whom the human family are serving; and it never receives service for nothing. It always pays. Whether the sinner stipulate for his wages or not, he is sure to receive it. What the wages of sin is, the Apostle here tells us: it is eternal death. How astounding the fact that so many should serve for such a reward! *Opsonia* originally signified rations issued to soldiers; but as these rations constituted part of their pay, the word came, in the course of time, to mean simply the wages for which one serves. Such is its meaning when used to denote the reward of sin.

but the gift of God is everlasting life in Christ Jesus our Lord. Everlasting life is a gift, and not wages paid for service, as is the death which is the reward of sin. This gift is bestowed on us *in* Christ; it is through him and by him. Through the efficacy of his blood, he has enabled the Father to bestow it; while he in person will finally invest us with it. In him provision was made for it; and in him we shall realize it.

CHAPTER VII.

SECTION I.

* Η ἀγνοεῖτε, ἀδελφοί, γινώσκουσι γὰρ νόμον λαλῶ, ὅτι ὁ νόμος κυριεύει τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ἐφ' ὅσον χρόνον ζῆ; ² Ἡ γὰρ ὑπανδρὸς γυνὴ τῷ ζῶντι ἀνδρὶ δέδεται νόμῳ· εἰάν δὲ ἀποθῆναι ὁ ἀνὴρ, κατήρηται ἀπὸ τοῦ νόμου τοῦ ἀνδρός. ³ Ἄρα οὖν ζῶντος τοῦ ἀνδρός μοιχαλὶς χρηματίσει, εἰάν γένηται ἀνδρὶ ἑτέρῳ· Ἐἰάν δὲ ἀποθῆναι ὁ ἀνὴρ, ἐλευθέρη ἐστίν ἀπὸ τοῦ νόμου, τοῦ μὴ εἶναι αὐτὴν μοιχαλίδα γενομένην ἀνδρὶ ἑτέρῳ. ⁴ Ὡστε, ἀδελφοί μου, καὶ ὑμεῖς ἐθανατώθητε τῷ νόμῳ διὰ τοῦ σώματος τοῦ Χριστοῦ, εἰς τὸ γενέσθαι ὑμᾶς ἑτέροις, τῷ ἐκ νεκρῶν ἐγεθῆντι, ἵνα καρποφορήσωμεν τῷ Θεῷ. ⁵ Ὅτε γὰρ ἦμεν ἐν τῇ σαρκί, τὰ παθήματα τῶν ἀμαρτιῶν τὰ διὰ τοῦ νόμου ἐνηργεῖτο ἐν τοῖς μέλεσιν ἡμῶν εἰς τὸ καρποφορήσαι τῷ θανάτῳ. ⁶ Νυνὶ δὲ κατηργήθημεν ἀπὸ τοῦ νόμου ἀποθανόντες ἐν ᾧ κατεχόμεθα, ὥστε δουλεύειν ἡμᾶς ἐν καινότητι πνεύματος καὶ οὐ παλαιότητι γράμματος.

Do you not know, brethren, for I speak to men knowing law, that the law rules over a man so long as he lives. ² For the married woman is bound by law to her living husband; but if her husband dies, she is released from the law of the husband. ³ Therefore, if while her husband lives, she becomes wife to another man, she will act the adulteress. But if her husband dies, she is free from the law; so that she is not an adulteress in becoming wife to another man. ⁴ And so, my brethren, you also died to the law by the body of Christ, that you might become bound to another, to him who was raised from the dead, that we might bear fruit to God. ⁵ For when we were in the flesh, the sinful desires which were by the law worked in our members, to produce fruit to death. ⁶ But now we are released from the law, having died to that in which we were held, so that we serve in newness of spirit, and not in oldness of letter.

SUMMARY.

The law rules over a man so long as he lives. As an example, take the married woman. She is bound by law to her husband while he lives. As proof that she is thus bound, if while her husband is alive, she marries another man she will act the adulteress. But when her husband dies she is released from the law which bound her to him. If she then marries she is no adulteress. And so you, my brethren, died to the law by the body of Christ when he died. You thus became released from the law, and consequently are at liberty to obey the risen Savior. When we were under the flesh, which we were before we obeyed the gospel, those sinful desires which are discovered to be such by the law, worked in us to produce fruit to death. But we are now released from the law, by dying to it, so that at present we serve God in a renewed spirit, through the gospel, and not in the old fashion prescribed in the law.

In v. 14 of the preceding chapter, the Apostle tells the disciples in Rome that they were not under law but under favor. Of this statement, so hard for Jews to receive, he there submits no explanation. He merely notices an unwarrantable conclusion,

which he foresaw would be drawn from it. But this done, he now returns to the statement and proceeds to show *how the disciples became released from the law*. This is the special object before him at present; and if the reader will only keep it distinctly in view, the opening of the present chapter will cost him but little trouble. How release from the law occurred, therefore, is now the point to be explained. Hence the peculiar form of the address: "brethren, I speak to men knowing law." A question of law, then, is to be settled, a question, however, falling within their knowledge; and one therefore which they could understand.

Do you not know, brethren, for I speak to men knowing law, In the expression, "I speak to men knowing law," I can not see an exclusive reference to the law of Moses. To restrict the expression thus, as some have done, is certainly arbitrary. The reference is to no particular law, but to law in general, Roman as well as Jewish. I speak to men knowing something of law generally. The point which the Apostle is about to make is true, to the extent intended, of all law, and of one as much as of another. It is therefore unnecessary to assume limitations.

that the law rules over a man so long as he lives. Something necessarily true of all human law. But if the man dies, the hold of the law ceases, and he is thenceforward released from it. Of course law, if it be divine, is here viewed in its relations to the present life only, and not in its relations to the future. But let the fact be distinctly noted, for it involves the special, objective point of the Apostle, that when the man dies he is released from the law. This being first boldly put, he next proceeds to confirm it.

2. For the married woman is bound by law to her living husband; This verse has cost commentators a vast amount of trouble; and all, as it seems to me, without much reason. Their whole difficulty has risen, first, from construing the verse as a sort of parable or allegory; and, secondly, from attempting to trace a minute correspondence between all its parts, and certain facts in the life of the christian. These efforts I must regard as mere fancy work. The Apostle states, in v. 1, the general proposition, that the law rules over a man so long as he lives. In v. 2, he confirms this by a special illustration taken from married life. If the husband dies, the wife is released; if the wife dies,

the husband is released. Not only does the death of either release the other; but it releases both. From this it follows, which is the point the Apostle is making, that since we are dead to the law, we are therefore released from it.

But how is this? The husband dies, and the wife is released, whereas *we* die, and *we* are released. Is not this incongruous, some will ask; and should we not rather have, the wife dies and the husband is released? But this would not improve the case; for we should still have, *we* die and *we* are released. The seeming incongruity arises from not remembering that by the death of either party, both are released, the husband from the wife, as fully as the wife from him. We die to the law—this is the fact; and this releases us from it, not the law dies to us. The law is never said to die; for the reason, I presume, that it can not die. Its principles of truth and right are alike immutable and immortal. As a ponderous ritual, prescribing a peculiar form of worship, Christ, by his death, took it out of the way; but in its fundamental features it never died. It is we who die, not the law; but hereby we are as effectually released from it, as if the law itself died.

but if her husband dies, she is released from the law of the husband. The law of the husband is the law which gives the husband control over his wife, and binds her to him. Now, as by his death, she is released from this law, so also is he; and if he still lived here after death, as does the christian who dies to the law, he would be as free to marry again, as is his wife. It is this fact that enables the christian, who is dead to the law, to become united to Christ. In the fact, moreover, we begin to discover the Apostle's design, which is, to establish first a release from the law by death, in order to justify a union with Christ. To this end his thoughts and arguments are tending.

3. **Therefore, if while her husband lives, she becomes wife to another man,** This verse is designed to confirm the preceding one. It is there said that the woman is bound to her living husband, bound so long as he lives. In proof of this she can not, during his life-time, consort with another man. To do so is a crime which, by the law of Moses, subjects her to death. Only when her husband dies, is she released.

she will act the adulteress. The Greek word *chrema* means any thing usable, as goods, property, resources, advantages. Accordingly, the verb *chrematizo* means *to handle usable things,*

or to *deal in them*. It means to transact business generally. Hence, before it can be correctly rendered in a given case, the special business about which it is employed must be known. If giving names be the business, it means to give a name or be named, accordingly as it is active or passive. If giving or receiving oracular responses be the business, it means to give or receive an oracular response. If warning or instructing by dreams be the business, it means to warn or be warned by a dream, and so on through an indefinite range of things. Here the business it is employed about is the unlawful intercourse of a wife, whose husband is still living, with another man. It therefore signifies acting the adulteress. This is its exact meaning. To render it, as in the E. V., "she shall be called an adulteress" is without warrant. The Apostle does not mean to tell what the woman shall be called, but what business she will be engaged in. She will act the adulteress.

But if her husband dies, she is free from the law; She may then marry at will. And so with us. Being released from the law (most probably the law of Moses here), we are at liberty to become bound to Christ. The only difference is this: the wife is released by the death of her husband, we by our own death to the law—an immaterial difference.

so that she is not an adulteress in becoming wife to another man. The Jews held the law to be of perpetual obligation. With them, consequently, no more aggravated sin could be committed than to abandon it. Indeed, so deeply rooted was this conviction in their minds that the early disciples from among them, including even the apostles, found it exceedingly difficult to give up the law. Hence the necessity of showing them that it could honorably be done. Once satisfy the Jew that in becoming a christian he dies to the law, and thereby becomes as effectually released from it, as is a wife from her husband by his death, and you remove his greatest obstacle in accepting the gospel. You do more. Pious Jewish christians, long after they became such, were troubled with scruples about forsaking the law. These you remove by establishing their release from it. This is the Apostle's work here. In order to effect it, two things are necessary: 1. To show that the law rules over a man so long only as he lives. This has now been done. 2. To convince the Jew that in obeying Christ he died to the law. This is now to be done. Hence the next verse.

4. And so, my brethren, you also died to the law by the body of Christ, In the preceding chapter, the Apostle has spoken of being dead to *sin*, and of not being *under* law. But *dead to the law* is a new expression, conveying a new and most important idea. For if the disciples had died to the law, intuitively they were released from it; and if released from it, then they had committed no sin in abandoning it for Christ. This is the conclusion to which the Apostle wishes to bring them.

But they died to the law *by the body of Christ*. How are we to understand this? That to die by the body of Christ is the same as to be crucified with him (ch. vi, v. 6) can hardly admit of a doubt; and if so, then the body of Christ is here used for Christ himself. In so far only, of course, as Christ died to the law, could the disciples die to it, since they died by him. But he died to it completely and finally. So then did they. But how could they die by Christ? In no way that we can conceive of, except representatively. In believing and being immersed, (*eis*) *into* Christ, the whole discipleship became, in life, somehow identified with his life. Hence whatever he died to, they died to. Thus both died to the law.

Or a still different interpretation has been suggested, which is here present. Christ was a descendant of David as to his flesh only (*kata sarka*); and so far only as he was a descendant of David, was he man and Jew. Thus far only, then, was he subject to the law. As the Logos, conceivably he was not subject to the law. All that was in him or pertained to him, over which the law had authority, was his body. Hence he could die to the law only in body. Accordingly, it was not by him in his wholeness, or as the entire Son of God, that the disciples died to the law, but by his body strictly. Such briefly is the interpretation. But it is objectionable on the ground that it requires us to conceive of Christ as separated in his death, as to the law, into his two respective natures, which is inadmissible. It is far better to regard him as dying, as the whole or undivided Christ, in every sense, to every thing, and for all purposes affected or effected by his death. A different view, I deem untenable. Christ was subject to the law as an individual, and not merely in this nature or that. As an individual, moreover, he died to it; and by him as such the disciples also died to it. In this view only, I see the truth.

that you might become bound to another, to him who

was raised from the dead, That is, to Christ. While this language is conformed to that used in the preceding verses relative to the marriage relation; it is not necessary to conclude that the Apostle intended to use that relation as a figure, and extend it. The case of the wife and the husband is adduced, not as a figure, but merely as an illustration. The translation therefore should express the fact simply, and not conform to a supposed figure. Accordingly, the common rendering, "that you might become *married* to another," is gratuitous and inept. Release from the law and obedience to Christ is the fact before the Apostle's mind, and not release from one husband and marriage to another. The disciples are not here viewed as a wife, and Christ as a husband. The effort so to view them has been a chief circumstance in rendering the interpretation of the passage difficult.

It was necessary, it seems, that the Jews should be first absolved from their obligation to the law, before becoming bound to Christ. Whether there was only one special mode in which this could be effected, we are not informed. It was accomplished as we have seen, by their death to the law in the manner just explained. To feel thus released was most important to them; since, without it, there was virtually no inducing them to accept the gospel.

that we might bear fruit to God. Not the fruit of marriage, as some, misconstruing the foregoing clause, have supposed, but fruit in the sense of acts of obedience to Christ. This is the fruit God requires of all. The acts are performed as in obedience to him; and consequently, when viewed as fruit, they are represented as being borne to him.

5. For when we were in the flesh, To be in the flesh is to be under the flesh; and to be under it is to be controlled by its propensities, evil inclinations, and desires. Hence the clause, "when we were in the flesh," means when we were governed by it; which was in our former unregenerate state, or before we became christians. The meaning is not, when we were under the law; but, strictly, before we obeyed the gospel. The clause has no reference to the law. It denotes the state of all men, whether Jews or Gentiles, before obeying Christ.

the sinful desires which were by the law Sinful desires, *pathemata ton hamartion*, are desires which, being indulged, lead to sin or cause it. They are called sinful because they tend to sin, and when gratified, end in it. "*Which were by the law.*"

How, or in what sense, by the law? Were the desires excited or set in motion by the law? Such is the usual reply; and the explanation given is, that the law, by inhibiting certain sins, excites or arouses the desires which lead to them. But this, to my mind, has always appeared exceedingly unsatisfactory. Indeed, I regard it as wholly false. Here are certain desires which can not be gratified without sin, and in countless instances are known to lead to it. Now can it be possible that the law of God, which is holy, excites these or stirs them up? If so, then complicity of the law, in the sins so caused, is inevitable. This conclusion I am compelled to reject; and rejecting it, I reject the explanation which leads to it. Satan may arouse desire; or it may be excited by its unlawful object, but never by the law.

What then is the meaning of the clause, "which were by the law"? I answer, desires which are *discovered by means of the law to be sinful*. In v. 7, seq., the Apostle says: "I had not known sin but by the law;" that is, I had never known or experienced what that thing is, which is called sin, had not the law pointed it out to me, and declared it to be sin. Now, if the Apostle had to learn, by the law, what sin itself is, much more surely had he to learn what desires are sinful. In farther proof of this, take the Apostle's own special confirmation of his remark. He says: "I had not known desire *to be sin* had not the law said, You shall not desire". Of course, the desire here was the desire of unlawful objects. Now, had this desire never been in motion previously to the law? Had it remained latent in all human breasts prior to that time? No one can so think. It existed before the law as certainly as after it; nor was it less active then than subsequently. The law then neither created it nor excited it. The law merely declared it to be sin, or made it known as such. This was the relation of the law to, and its effect upon desire.

worked in our members, to produce fruit to death. Our sinful desires worked in our members when we were in the flesh. Indeed, the proof of being under the flesh is the degree of activity of these desires. Many of them, it is true, are innocent, except when in excess; and all are harmless when kept dormant or under proper restraint. But whenever they are allowed to riot beyond bounds and over right, then they become deeply sinful and dangerous. Not only did these desires work in our members when we were under the flesh; but to a certain extent they work in them still; for, otherwise, we should be without sin. The

difference between our former state and present, is this: Then these desires ruled us; now we rule them. True, we are not now under the flesh, that is, we do not suffer it to control us; but still we are in it, and so long as this is the case, we shall be more or less influenced by it. Much as we may regret this, we are without a remedy for it. But the great, general fact of our christian life must be that, with masterly will, we control the flesh. The exceptions are to be accidental and unwilling. *Worked in our members.* Mostly in our fleshly members, as we were then in the flesh, but in all. Then it was that we made it our business to present, as the Apostle styles it, our members as slaves to sin, in order to work lawlessness. Nor did these desires work aimlessly; for they worked by direction of a master. Though blind themselves, they were not blindly led. Satan plied them and stimulated them; and they worked as slaves, to produce fruit to death. Their object was to induce sin, and this, in order to insure sentence of condemnation to eternal night. Of course it was being in the flesh, and under the law, that rendered the former unregenerate state of the disciples so fatal. Being in the flesh, they were sure to sin; and being under the law, they were sure to be condemned. Nor does law here signify the law of Moses only. The same was true of the disciples, no matter what law they lived under. If they sinned, which was certain, they were sure to be condemned. From that moment on, they were hopeless. How great, therefore, the necessity for releasing them from law and placing them under favor. How this was done has now been shown.

6. But now we are released from the law, having died to that in which we were held, We were held in the law, as in the power of a master; and we were so held till we died, which took place in Christ when he died. By that death, we were released from the law, and so passed under favor, where we now stand. Nor did we die to the law only; we died also to sin, so that sin no more dominates over us now than does the law; Nay, more, when Christ was crucified, our old man, our body or flesh, was also crucified with him. Accordingly, we are no longer under the dominion of the flesh. Dead to the law, dead to sin, and though in the flesh, not controlled by it—this is our present state.

so that we serve in newness of spirit, After "serve," supply God—so that we serve God. The word spirit here de-

notes, not the Holy Spirit, but the human, the spirit of the disciple. "Newness" expresses the quality or condition of that spirit as renewed by the gospel, and purified from sin in the blood of Christ. Such a spirit is not itself new, but in a renewed state.

and not in oldness of letter. "Letter" here means law, the law of Moses, I presume, while "oldness" signifies an attribute of it, as old or of long standing. To serve God in oldness of letter means, to serve him in the old mode prescribed in the law. But we no longer serve him thus. We are dead to the law, and consequently released from it, are dead to sin, are not under the flesh, are under favor, and renewed in spirit. How natural, then, that we should not serve in the old style of the law.

CHAPTER VII. SECTION 2.

⁷ Τι οὖν ἐροῦμεν; ὁ νόμος ἁμαρτία; μὴ γένοιτο. ⁸ Ἀλλὰ τὴν ἁμαρτίαν οὐκ ἔγνων, εἰ μὴ διὰ νόμου· τὴν τε γὰρ ἐπιθυμίαν οὐκ ᾔδειν, εἰ μὴ ὁ νόμος ἔλεγεν, Οὐκ ἐπιθυμήσεις. ⁹ Ἀφορμὴν δὲ λαβοῦσα ἡ ἁμαρτία διὰ τῆς ἐντολῆς κατειργάσατο ἐν ἐμοὶ πᾶσαν ἐπιθυμίαν· χωρὶς γὰρ νόμου ἁμαρτία νεκρά. ¹⁰ Ἐγὼ δὲ ἔζων χωρὶς νόμου ποτέ, ἐλθούσης δὲ τῆς ἐντολῆς, ἡ ἁμαρτία ἀνέζησεν, ¹¹ ἐγὼ δὲ ἀπέθανον· καὶ εὐρέθη μοι ἡ ἐντολή ἢ εἰς ζωὴν, αὕτη εἰς θάνατον. ¹² Ἡ γὰρ ἁμαρτία, ἀφορμὴν λαβοῦσα διὰ τῆς ἐντολῆς, ἐξηπάτησέ με, καὶ δι' αὐτῆς ἀπέκτεινεν. ¹³ Ὅστε ὁ μὲν νόμος ἅγιος, καὶ ἡ ἐντολὴ ἀγία καὶ δικαία καὶ ἀγαθὴ.

⁷ What then shall we say? Is the law sin? Not at all. On the contrary, I had not known sin but by the law. For I had not known desire to be sin, had not the law said, You shall not desire. ⁸ But sin, taking advantage through the precept, worked up in me every desire; for without law sin is dead. ⁹ And I was once alive without law, but when the precept came, sin revived, and I died; ¹⁰ and the precept which was given for life was found by me to end in death. ¹¹ For sin, taking advantage through the precept, deceived me, and by it killed me. ¹² So then the law is holy, and the precept holy, and just, and good.

SUMMARY.

The law is neither sinful nor the cause of sin. On the contrary, sin becomes known by the law. As proof, I had never known desire to be sin, but for the precept of the law forbidding it. But so soon as the precept was given, sin took advantage of the circumstance to work up desire in me, the very thing the law forbade; and thus I fell under the condemnation of the law. Without law sin is dead or powerless to kill. Accordingly, before the law I was alive or uncondemned, but when the precept came I broke it. Thus sin arose, and for it I was condemned to die. It was in this way that a precept which was designed for life turned out to end in death. The law then is not sin; but is holy in all its parts.

7. What then shall we say? What judgment shall we pronounce on what has just been said, what comment make, or objection urge? Is any thing open to criticism? If so, what?

Is the law sin?—The law of Moses. Is the law *sin*, not is it evil, or an evil thing? Or more precisely, is the law the cause of sin? This gives the exact sense. The reference is clearly to v. 5, where it is said: "When we were in the flesh, the sinful desires which were by the law worked in our members," &c. If these sinful desires were really by the law; that is, either generated or excited by it, then is not the law, indirectly at least, author to the sins thus caused? Such, it seems to me, must be the decision of mankind. But, "*Not at all*," is the bold denial of the Apostle. Then these sinful desires were not generated or excited by the law. No other conclusion meets the demands of the case. On the contrary, these sinful desires existed, not only anterior to *the* law, but anterior to all law. They have existed, not to say more, from the fall of man to the present; and they will continue to exist, so long as we are in the flesh. They exist alike in Jew and Gentile, alike where law is, and where it is not. They are universal. They are not then caused or excited by the law; *they are merely shown by the law to be sinful*. This defines the relation of the law to them. And for the precise reason that they are sinful *per se*, sinful within themselves, does the law declare them to be so, and interdict them.

Now of all the crudities that permeate the writings of commentators, surely one of the most glaring is, that the law, any law, excites or arouses these sinful desires by prohibiting them. The notion is not only untaught in the Bible, but is contradicted by the universal consciousness of mankind. That, when the Bible says, "You shall not steal," the precept arouses in human breasts the desire to steal, is what every man knows within himself to be false. The notion, which cumbers the pages of so many commentators, and of none more than those of Stuart and Hodge, should be universally repudiated. I venture the assertion that no man ever yet thoughtfully attempted its defense, who did not find himself in the following disagreeable dilemma: The Bible, I believe, asserts the notion, and therefore I must defend it; yet in my soul I feel it to be false. Of course, in all such cases, the verdict of the soul is held to be mendacious; while the imposed dogma of the Bible is held to be true. The notion, however, has not its origin in the Bible, but in certain false theories respecting the agency of the law in conversion. But into the merits of these theories, no investigation is here proposed.

On the contrary, I had not known sin but by the law.

Not, I had not experienced sin; for although this might have been true, it is not what the Apostle means to say. What he means to say is, I should never have known what sin is, or I should have had no knowledge respecting it, but for the law. And this is precisely the fact in the case. Had God kept silent in regard to sin, and never communicated with man upon it, in the form of law defining what things are sins, the conception of sin would never have been in the human mind. We should have lived and died, with no more knowledge of it, than though there was no such thing.

For I had not known desire to be sin, had not the law said, you shall not desire. A particular example designed to confirm and illustrate the preceding statement. So far is the law from being sin, that it both points out what is sin, and forbids it. It neither produces sin, nor abets it; on the contrary, it condemns it, and prescribes its punishment. This is the office of the law.

Epithumia is a difficult word to translate into English, not because of its uncertain import, but for want of an exactly corresponding word. *Covetousness* and *lust* are too narrow; and *desire* lacks the notion of evil, which the original implies. *Evil desire* would express the idea closely, and would serve well for the noun; but it is impracticable in rendering the verb. Upon the whole, I see no remedy but to translate simply by *desire*; and then to explain, that the desire is either sinful within itself, or respects sinful objects, or both. We can soon learn to associate with *desire* the full force of *epithumia*. We shall then be secure against error.

The exact word-for-word form of the original is, *For I had not known desire, had not the law said, you shall not desire*. But surely the Apostle did not mean to say that, but for this precept of the law, he would never have known what desire is. This would be to put in his mouth what was not true of himself or of any one else. His meaning then must be, I had not known desire *to be sin* had not the law said, &c. He not only knew of desire, but knew it, as well before the law as after; but he did not know it *to be sin*. This is what he learned by the law.

But when the Apostle says, "*I had not known desire*," &c., in whose behalf is he speaking? Is he speaking of and for himself, or is he representing others? I answer he is speaking of and for himself simply as a man; but he is saying what is true of

all men. The notion, still popular with some, that Paul, in certain parts of the present chapter, is personating a Jew under the law; and in other parts, a christian under the gospel, is purely fanciful. It is difficult to discover how it was ever invented; and equally difficult to understand how it ever found an advocate.

8. But sin, taking advantage through the precept, worked up in me every desire; The law, then, is not sin; nor does it cause those evil desires which induce it; but sin itself causes them. Such is the connection. Sin is here personified, and, as such, is represented as doing two things. 1. It takes advantage, i. e. of me, and so of all. This it is enabled to do by means of the precept of the law. In other words, the precept furnishes it the opportunity to take the advantage. 2. It "works up in me every desire," and so in all. The law says, "You shall not desire." Sin takes advantage of this, to work up in me the very thing which the law forbids. It is thus seen to be sin that causes these desires, and not the law.

But there is no real, personal entity, called sin, acting upon the human family, and causing violations of the law. Nor is there any abstract, evil thing so acting. Who then is it that performs the office here ascribed to sin? It is not our nature, however degenerate; for our nature is what is acted upon. Who then is it? *Satan*. In all cases of sin, and of the excitement of desire causing sin, he is a factor never to be lost sight of. It is he who leads us out into the wilderness, to tempt us to sin; he that takes advantage; he that works up evil desire. In computing the forces, then, that induce sin, he must always be taken largely into the account. Otherwise, we shall never conclude correctly.

for without law sin is dead. And, be it added, *Satan* powerless. Without law sin is not merely dead, it is non-existent. It not only does not exist, but can not. Law and sin are two terms of a correlation, the former of which not being, the latter is impossible. Not only so, it is inconceivable; for we can no more think of sin without law, than of body without space. Hence when it is said that without law sin is dead, we must remember that the conception is highly figurative. Without law, there is, in fact, nothing to be dead, nor any thing to be *as if* dead, save *Satan*; and possibly, at least, the allusion may be remotely to him.

9. And I was once alive without law, The Apostle is here obviously stating a universal fact, or fact true of all man-

kind; and the case he is putting is ideal; for there has never been a time, since Adam, when the human family were wholly without law. In other words, he is stating rather what would have been than what was. "I was alive once without law"—why? Because there being then no law, there was no sin; and there being no sin, there was nothing to be condemned for, and consequently nothing to die for—nothing to die for in any sense, literally or otherwise. I was therefore then alive, and alive of necessity, alive in the sense of being free from sin, and free from death. This is what all would have been without law, but what not one is under it:

but when the precept came, sin revived, and I died; The precept, "You shall not desire," is the one referred to; and although specific, it is used to set forth a universal truth; for the same result would have followed any precept. In other words, the Apostle is showing what followed the introduction of law, and not of a single precept. *When the precept came, sin revived.* But prior to the precept there was no sin, and consequently none to revive. The view then is of an ideal case. Plainly, when law came, sin also came; that is, came into being as a fact; in other words, so soon as I was placed under law I sinned. This is clearly the meaning. But having once sinned, I was condemned, and so died in the sense of being doomed to death for sin. This I take to be the death meant. It could not have been natural death, for this was not suffered; nor future death, for neither was this. It must then have been death in the sense just explained.

It is almost certain to my mind that, while the Apostle is stating, in this and the next verse, facts which, although said only of himself, are true of all men, he is at the same time closely paralleling the case of Adam. Indeed, that case and the one here presented resemble each other so strikingly that they might readily be taken as the same. Let the reader only inspect closely the verses named, with the case of Adam and his first sin before his mind, and he can not fail to be struck with the resemblance.

Nor must we here lose sight of Satan. The view would not be complete without him. "When the precept came, sin revived." This is very much like, when the precept came, Satan appeared; and the one is not more true than the other. When the precept came, Satan had his opportunity. He now stirred desire in the human breast, whether fallen or unfallen, and the result was sin. The sequel is known. Human nature is fearfully wrecked, I

grant; but in awarding to all their due, measure largely to this great foe.

10. and the precept which was given for life was found by me to end in death. The reader will notice that, unavoidably, I am a little free here; but I am unable to give the sense without it. Very literally rendered, the clause would read thus: *and the precept which was for life, this was found by me for death.* This clearly needs expansion.

The whole purpose of the law is here told in one brief clause. It was given for life, given to preserve it, and that in innocence. This was the design, both of the law given to Adam, and of that administered by Moses. Now if the law was given for life, it can not be sin; for sin destroys life. The charge, therefore, in v. 7, is false. "Was found by me to end in death"; not because it was intended for death, but because it was abused. It was given for life; but being transgressed, it condemned the transgressor, and so ended in death.

11. For sin, taking advantage through the precept, deceived me, The proof of what is said in the preceding verse. Hodge and some others would point thus: For sin taking advantage, by the precept deceived me; that is, deceived me by the precept. But this is erroneous. The precept was not the instrument of the deception, but the circumstance that furnished sin the advantage. The presence of the precept was a fact. Of this fact sin took advantage to deceive. This gives the idea. Now by dropping sin as personified, and substituting Satan for it; and by adverting again to the parallel of Adam, the meaning becomes clear. God said to Adam, "You shall not eat of it." Satan now had his advantage. Accordingly, he said to the woman, "you shall not die." This deceived her. It was the precept, then, that afforded the advantage; but the lie that did the deceiving. And so in the case in hand. It was through the presence of the precept that the advantage was taken, but by some other means that the deception was effected.

and by it killed me. The analogy to the case of Adam is still close; while the reference to it seems little less than certain. Sin is still personified; and, as such, is represented as killing. Satan, for whom sin most probably here stands, and whom the Savior calls "*a man-killer from the first,*" induced men to sin; and for this they die—naturally, if the sin be that of Adam—eternally, if it be that of his posterity, and unforgiven. The kill

ing here is of the latter kind. It is therefore not actual, but prospective; it is killing in the sense of being condemned to the second death. The killing is not what is often called spiritual death—a phrase unknown to the Bible, and expressing, almost certainly, a false idea.

12. So then the law is holy, and the precept holy, and just, and good. Verse 7 propounds the question, Is the law sin? To this the four next verses reply, not very fully, to be sure, but closely and conclusively. Indeed, the question needed no extended reply; for but few persons would be found to urge it. Verse 12 is the summary conclusion from the facts constituting the reply. The law referred to is the law of Moses; and the precept, the tenth of the decalogue—You shall not desire.

On the epithets holy, just, and good, it is not necessary to dwell. The reader will recognize them as substantially synonymous, though not strictly so. "Holy" means that the law is pure within itself, is without the taint of sin; "just," that it is right in its requirements of men, or free from wrong; "good," that it is positively beneficial, working the welfare of those to whom it relates.

CHAPTER VII. SECTION 3.

¹³ Did then that good thing become death to me? Not at all. But sin did, that sin might be seen working death to me by what is good, that sin might, by the precept, become excessively sinful. ¹⁴ For we know that the law is spiritual, but I am fleshly, sold under sin. ¹⁵ For what I do, I approve not; for I practise not what I wish, but what I hate, that I do. ¹⁶ If then I do what I do not wish, I agree with the law that it is right. ¹⁷ But now it is no longer I that do this, but the sin which dwells in me. ¹⁸ For I know that no good dwells in me, that is, in my flesh, for the wish is present with me, but doing right is not. ¹⁹ For I do not the good which I wish, but the evil which I do not wish, that I do. ²⁰ If then I do what I do not wish, it is no longer I that do it, but the sin which dwells in me. ²¹ I find it, then, the rule with me that, when wishing to do right, evil is present with me. ²² For I delight in the law of God in the inner man, ²³ but I see another law in my members, at war against the law of my mind, and making me captive to the sinful law which is in my members. ²⁴ Toil-worn man I! Who shall deliver me from this body of death? ²⁵ Thanks to God, he will, through Jesus Christ our Lord. So then with the mind I myself serve the law of God, but with the flesh the law of sin.

¹³ Τὸ οὖν ἀγαθὸν ἐμοὶ γέγονε θάνατος, μὴ γένοιτο. Ἄλλὰ ἡ ἁμαρτία, ἵνα φανῇ ἁμαρτία, διὰ τοῦ ἀγαθοῦ μοι κατεργαζομένη θάνατον, ἵνα γενῆται καθ' ὑπερβολὴν ἁμαρτωλὸς ἡ ἁμαρτία δια τῆς ἐντολῆς. ¹⁴ Οἶδαμεν γὰρ ὅτι ὁ νόμος πνευματικὸς ἐστίν· ἐγὼ δὲ σάρκινος εἰμι, πεπραμένος ὑπὸ τὴν ἁμαρτίαν. ¹⁵ Ὁ γὰρ κατεργαζομαι, οὐ γινώσκω· οὐ γὰρ ὁ θέλω, πρᾶσσω, ἀλλ' ὁ μισῶ, τοῦτο ποιῶ. ¹⁶ Εἰ δὲ ὁ οὐ θέλω τοῦτο ποιῶ, σύμφημι τῷ νόμῳ ὅτι καλός. ¹⁷ Νυνὶ δὲ οὐκέτι ἐγὼ κατεργαζομαι αὐτό· ἀλλὰ ἡ οἰκοῦσα ἐν ἐμοὶ ἁμαρτία. ¹⁸ Οἶδα γὰρ ὅτι οὐκ οἰκῆ ἐν ἐμοί, τούτ' ἔστιν ἐν τῇ σαρκί μου, ἀγαθὸν το γὰρ θέλειν παρακεῖται μοι, τὸ δὲ κατεργαζεσθαι τὸ καλὸν οὐ. ¹⁹ Οὐ γὰρ ὁ θέλω, ποιῶ ἀγαθόν, ἀλλ' ὁ οὐ θέλω κακόν, τοῦτο πρᾶσσω. ²⁰ Εἰ δὲ ὁ οὐ θέλω, τοῦτο ποιῶ, οὐκέτι ἐγὼ κατεργαζομαι αὐτό· ἀλλ' ἡ οἰκοῦσα ἐν ἐμοὶ ἁμαρτία. ²¹ Εὗρισκω ἄρα τὸν νομὸν τῷ θέλοντι ἐμοὶ ποιεῖν το καλόν, ὅτι ἐμοὶ τὸ κακὸν παρακεῖται. ²² Συνῆδομαι γὰρ τῷ νόμῳ τοῦ Θεοῦ κατὰ τὸν ἔσω ἄνθρωπον, ²³ βλέπω δὲ ἕτερον νομὸν ἐν τοῖς μέλεσι μου· ἀντιστρατεύομενον τῷ νόμῳ τοῦ νοῦς μου, καὶ αἰχμαλωτίζοντά με τῷ νόμῳ τῆς ἁμαρτίας τῷ ὄντι ἐν τοῖς μέλεσι μου. ²⁴ Ταλαίπωρος ἐγὼ ἄνθρωπος· τίς με ῥύσεται ἐκ τοῦ σώματος τοῦ θανάτου τούτου, ²⁵ Ἄρα τῷ Θεῷ διὰ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν. Ἄρα οὖν αὐτὸς ἐγὼ τῷ μεν νοῖ δουλεύω νόμῳ Θεοῦ, τῇ δὲ σαρκὶ νόμῳ ἁμαρτίας.

SUMMARY.

Did then a holy law become death to me? No. But sin did, in order that by effecting my death by a just law, its true nature might become known. The law is no source of death, because it is spiritual, but I am fleshly, and therefore at times under the dominion of sin. As evidence that I am fleshly, and consequently under evil influences, I often do what I do not approve, that is, I do wrong, and practise what I do not wish to practise. If now I do what I do not approve, I agree with the law that it is right, for the law requires just what I wish to do, and condemns only what I do not wish to do. Now when, under these circumstances, I sin, it is not I alone that of my own accord do it, but it is the sinful influences which I am under that impel

me to it. There is no good dwelling in my flesh; for while I can wish to do right, I am unable, because of the flesh, to do it. Indeed, I find it the rule with me, that whenever I wish to do right, evil is present, because the flesh is ever ready to prompt me to do wrong. In the inner man I delight in the law of God, but then there is another law in my members—this strong tendency to sin; and under its power I often sin. I am toil-worn in this strife between wishing to do right and not doing it, and hating to sin and yet sinning. Who shall deliver me from it? Thanks to God, he will. So then with the mind at least, I serve the law of God which is the great matter; but with the flesh I at times serve the law of sin.

13. Did then that good thing become death to me? **Not at all.** Literally, "*Did the good become death to me?*" But in English the abstract is wanting in fullness; and, besides, the reference is not sufficiently marked. It is therefore better to render more strikingly. By *that good thing* is meant the precept. In v. 10, the Apostle says, "The precept which was given for life was found by me to end in death"; and, in v. 11, "Sin taking advantage through the precept, deceived me, and by it killed me." The present question is evidently based on these two remarks; and although they very naturally suggest it, they do not warrant it. The precept was found to end in death, solely because men incurred its penalty by breaking it; and it was sin, not the law, that deceived and killed. The design of the law was to prevent sin. Accordingly, it not only did not incite to it, but warned against it. Consequently, it was in no sense responsible for it. The question therefore is correctly answered. The death I take to be the second death; and as this is still future, the meaning must be condemnation to it. The precept ended in death by condemning to it. Often, in the scripture, things which are future and certain are represented as already realized.

But sin did, That is, sin did become death to me. So the best critics now point and interpret. But sin became death by the precept—Why? That thereby its true nature might become known. Of course this assumes that men would recognize the penalty of sin as just, and from the penalty infer the character of sin.

that sin might be seen working death to me by what is good, Already the precept has been shown to be holy, and just, and good. In addition to this, let it now be shown that, notwithstanding this, sin works death by the precept; and the deep malignity of sin will be at once seen. Its working death by any means might exhibit it as very virulent; but its working death by what is essentially good, shows it to be enormously so.

that sin might, by the precept, become excessively sinful. Heinous as is sin within itself, it appears still more so from the means through which it operates. It appears to grow worse by the very mode in which it acts. In working evil by evil, it would remain simply itself; but in working evil by good, it surpasses itself. Its power for mischief increases as the means grow better through which it works. Difficult indeed is the problem of sin.

14. For we know that the law is spiritual, Here we have the formal reply to the question in v. 13, or rather, the reason for the negative answer. The following is the connection: Did then the precept (or the law, for the precept stands for the law) become death to me? Not at all. For we know that the law is spiritual.

What precisely does *spiritual* signify? Certainly it signifies some characteristic of the law, or some fact pertaining to it, but what? Is it used to denote that the law is from the Holy Spirit, that the Spirit communicated or indited it? I think not. For, although this is true, the fact is not here in view. Or does *spiritual* denote pure and holy? Hardly, since this has just been affirmed of the law. Spiritual, as applied to the law, means that the law is addressed to the spirit in man. In other words, the law is *pneumatikos* because it speaks to the *pneuma* in man, commanding what is right, and forbidding what is wrong—matters which the spirit alone can see and feel to be right. The law is adjusted to the *pneuma*, as light to the eye, and awakens therein the sense of its right and justice. Hence the remark, v. 22, infra, "I delight in the law of God in the inner man."

but I am fleshly, sold under sin. A most important statement, being indeed the clew to the interpretation of the remainder of the chapter. "But I am fleshly," I—who? I Paul, not I Paul the Apostle, but I Paul the christian, and therefore as furnishing in myself the experience of all other christians. I Paul am fleshly; though redeemed, and pardoned, and accepted, I am still fleshly; not wholly so, but fleshly, fleshly because still in a body of flesh, from the influence of which, so long as I am in it, I can never become entirely freed. Not only so; I am fleshly, and therefore *sold under sin*, not completely so, as before my conversion, but still under it, and under it to a certain extent as abjectly as is the slave under his master. For struggle against sin as I may, I still commit it. I seem powerless to abstain from

it entirely. Such I believe to be the meaning of a passage which has certainly been very differently construed, but, as I consider, without good reason. The Apostle is merely putting a fact boldly, which is true of every christian, the best as surely as the worst. Only let his language not be taken too strongly, and it presents no difficulty.

15. For what I do, I approve not; The proof that I am fleshly, and therefore sold under sin. As much as to say, I am a compound of contrarities and conflicts. I have a nature without and a nature within that antagonize each other. I sometimes obey this, and sometimes that, which renders my life abnormal and peculiar. Hence the chronicle of my life is an enigma to all except my fellows in Christ. They alone lead this life; and they alone that live it understand it. *What I do, I approve not.* The *I* of both these clauses denotes one and the same responsible self, and not the fancied outer man and inner man of some commentators. Neither here, nor elsewhere, in the chapter, is there the slightest foundation for the conception of a dual self-hood in the christian. The section in hand is not explained by such conceits. *What I do*, which is sometimes to obey the flesh and commit sin, *I do not approve.* But if you do not approve it, why do you do it? Simply because, being in the flesh, and therefore unavoidably under its influence, I am weakened by it, and so at times do wrong. This, however, I not only do not approve, but mourn.

A number of commentators render the passage thus: For what I do, I *know* not. So Alford, Lange, and others. That *ginosko* primarily and generally means to *know*, is certain; and equally certain is it that it sometimes also means to approve. The latter meaning, I grant, is rare; and in a given case, the presumption would be against it. Still, since *it is* a meaning, it must not be rejected, provided the sense demands it. Now I hold that to render the word *know*, in the present clause, is to make the Apostle, not only contradict himself, but speak like a simpleton. "For what I do, I know not." If a man know not what he is doing, he is demented. This will not do for Paul. Nor is the meaning, I am sold under sin, am a bondman, and therefore know not what I do. This is a nonsequitur. The bondman has no choice as to what he does, but he may know it, as well as his master. Again: "For what I do, I know not; *for I practise not what I wish, but what I hate, that I do.* Here we,

first make the Apostle say, "What I do, I know not;" and then in the very same verse, proceed to make him tell most discriminatingly what he does, thereby showing that he does know. Clearly this is inadmissible. I therefore reject *know*, and take *approve*.

For I practice, not what I wish, but what I hate, that I do. Confirmatory of the preceding statement. What I wish to practice is right, the very thing the law requires. But although I practice this in the main, I do not practice it uninterruptedly; for, being in the flesh, I am sometimes led by it to sin. Not that I am led absolutely against my will, but according to my inclinations, which are either of the flesh or determined by it. (Here let me remark, in parenthesis, that there is no such thing as sinning against a distinct and sustained act of the will. But we often will feebly, or half will, or will, as it were, with a sort of *undefined reservation*; in which case, the *quasi* will is easily overborne by the determined inclinations of the flesh. In such cases, we may seem to sin against will; but, the truth is, there is no will. There is merely a feeble, spiritual disinclination, overmatched by a powerful fleshly tendency.) I, in soul, always wish to do right, and if free from the flesh, would do it. But I am in the flesh, and can not annul its power. Therefore, being impelled by it, I at times do wrong. With the christian this is both the fact and the philosophy of sinning. *What I hate, that I do.* I, as a christian, literally hate sin, not merely dislike it, or disapprove it, but hate it; and still I sometimes commit it. Not that I commit all the sins I hate; but all I commit I hate, be they many or few. I therefore do not sin from love of sin. On the contrary, I hate sin; and yet so powerfully am I inclined to it by the flesh, that I commit it. Such is the effect on me of my two hostile natures, not originally hostile, but made so by the fall and by sin.

Of the truth of what the Apostle says, the christian needs no proof. He has the proof in his own daily experience. Paul's remarks are as closely true of all others as of himself. Indeed, the picture here drawn is the mere diary of every christian while in the flesh. The man who does not recognize it as his own has not yet learned himself. He has but a poor conception of his heart and of the struggle in which he is engaged. His consciousness lies a sealed book to him.

16. If then I do what I do not wish, I agree with the law that it is right. But every time I commit a sin, I do what,

as a christian, I do not wish to do. How now do I herein agree with the law? The law requires me not to do just what I do not wish to do. Thus we agree; and by my wish, I indorse the law as right.

17. But now it is no longer I that do this, but the sin which dwells in me. That is, it is no longer I alone, I the resolving self, uninfluenced by the flesh, that do what I do not wish. It is the sin which dwells in my flesh that does it; or rather, it is that sin which excites the flesh in order to cause me myself to do it; for if left to myself, unmoved by the flesh, I would do only what I wish to do, which is what the law requires, and therefore not sin. I commit sin, only as the flesh, on which sinful influences primarily act, causes me to commit it. Therefore, my sin is not to be ascribed to the responsible me alone, but to the flesh as a chief cause of it. Not that I am hereby rendered irresponsible, or left innocent when I sin; but hereby can be seen the part I act, and the part the flesh acts. Thus, to each, its due can be given.

18. For I know that no good dwells in me, that is, in my flesh. This shows that I have correctly interpreted the "me" of the preceding verse to mean the flesh. The clause is designed to confirm the statement, that it is the sin which dwells in me that causes me to do what I do not wish—a statement which seems to require a farther word of explanation. In it sin is obviously personified, and viewed as having its abode in the flesh, and as operating through it as an agent or instrument. This, more simply put, signifies that those influences, whether personal or otherwise, which induce sin, act, at first, and mainly, on the flesh, and through it cause the *me* that wills to sin. It is thus that sin dwells in the flesh and works evil.

When the Apostle says, "No good dwells in me," he means, that there is no power in the flesh working good or tending to it. Sin dominates over the flesh, when not otherwise ruled, only for evil. From it, consequently, we may look for no aid in doing what we wish. On the contrary, it antagonizes all our efforts at doing good. What remains, then, is, that by a powerful effort of will, we keep the flesh under, and compel it, as a reluctant instrument, to serve in the cause of right. More than this, we shall never achieve.

For the wish is present with me, but doing right is not. The proof of the foregoing remark. The meaning is, I have absolute power to wish to do right. Here my desire and

purpose are uninterfered with. So far, well *But doing right is not.* My difficulty lies, not in wishing, but in executing. Here alone I encounter inability, inability, moreover, clearly due to the flesh. For I who wish could do, if left to myself. Of this I am conscious. But I find myself unable to do, and the flesh only, remains to hinder. Therefore the flesh must be the let

19. For I do not the good which I wish, but the evil which I do not wish, that I do. The confirmation of the last preceding remark. "For I do not the good which I wish." Here I wish to do, but fail, the failure resulting from the interposition of the flesh. "But the evil which I do not wish, that I do." Here I wish not to do, but do, the doing being caused by the flesh. It is clear then, that the power to wish is with me, and that only the ability to do is not.

But farther: In the expression, "I do not the good which I wish," the word "good" comprehends all good, or at least all that is essential to a perfect human life; for, as a christian, I certainly want to do all this. But we cannot thus comprehensively take the expression, "the evil which I do not wish, that I do." For indisputably the evil which I do not wish to do is all evil; and it is not true that I do all evil. Even as a sinner, I did not do all evil; much less do I do all, as a christian. The meaning, then, must be: there are many sins which I do not wish to commit, and yet I commit them, being impelled to it by the flesh. In brief, known facts compel us to take the one expression universally and the other limitedly.

20. If then I do what I do not wish, it is no longer I that do it, but the sin which dwells in me. A substantial repetition, for the sake of fullness, of vs. 16, 17. If I do what I do not wish, it is clear that I act against my wish. But this I would not do, unless urged to it by some power overmastering me at the instant. That power is the sin which dwells in my flesh. Or plainly, the power of the flesh is so great, when its evil desires are excited, that it forces me to gratify them; and in the act I sin. It is sin, then, (personified) that usurping, for the moment, control of my flesh, causes me to do what I do not wish.

How accurately does the christian find his own daily experience delineated all along in these verses. It is difficult to say which is the more admirable, the truthfulness of the picture, or the skill with which it is executed. Both are matchless.

21. I find it, then, the rule with me that, when wishing to do right, evil is present with me. Or, very literally, *I find it, then, the rule to me wishing to do right, but evil is present with me.* The word *nomos*, from *nemo*—to allot, assign, apportion, signifies a custom, usage, law, ordinance. In the N. T. it almost uniformly signifies simply law; but in the present instance it seems best to take it in the sense of rule or custom. Indeed, the sense would be well given by custom, thus: I find it then the *custom* with me, &c. Most critics render the word law, but rule appears the more appropriate. We call that which regulates conduct a rule of life, rather than a law.

When I wish to do good, which, as a christian, I do always, I find it the rule with me that evil is present. Why? Because I am in the flesh, through which evil influences excite me to sin. The presence of the flesh is the presence of evil, and as I can not throw off that, even when wishing to do right, so I am never free from this.

Some commentators have troubled themselves no little over what they deem the difficulties of this verse. But from some cause, these difficulties are not apparent to me. I shall therefore not detain the reader on them.

22. For I delight in the law of God in the inner man, The reason for the second clause of the foregoing verse. I am, as a christian, constantly wishing to do right. The wish is the most absorbing of my nature; and it is prompted by my delight in the requirements of the law. These requirements strike me, in the inner man, as lovely and good. Hence my desire to do them. By the "inner man," is meant our spiritual nature, our pure intelligence, or the part in us that perceives and appreciates.

There is no christian, I presume, of any considerable experience, who has failed to notice how, in spirit, he delights in the word of God when reading it. Every requirement is most agreeable to him; so much so, indeed, that by its very agreeableness it commends itself to him as divine. Nor has he failed to notice how distinct and profound the wish is to keep these requirements; nor yet how keenly he feels the conscious inability to keep them. The philosophy of this peculiar condition is here explained.

23. but I see another law in my members, at war against the law of my mind, By "another law" is meant a different law from the law of God in which I delight; while "my

members" signifies my fleshly members, and my fleshly members, simply my flesh. As if the Apostle had said: I see another law in my flesh; only "my flesh" is distributed as a body into its members. The law which I see in "my members" is the *constant tendency* which I notice in them to sin, whenever excited by sinful objects. This tendency is called a law, and with as much propriety as the tendency of material bodies to a common centre is called the law of gravitation. Whether the tendency is owing to innate corruption of the flesh, or to powerful sinful influences acting upon it, or to the two combined, is hardly worth inquiring into. We are concerned about the fact of the tendency, rather than the causes of it.

So on the other hand, by the "law of my mind" is meant my *constant inclination* to do right. In all men, I presume, who are enlightened from on high, this inclination exists. Of its presence, each is distinctly conscious. But in the christian, more particularly, is it individualized and educated; and to such an extent may this be done as to render it the guarantee to him of his success. Now of course, the fleshly tendency to evil, and the mental inclination to right, are in constant collision. This constitutes the "war" of which the Apostle speaks.

and making me captive to the sinful law which is in my members. This sinful law, or more literally, *law of sin*, has already been explained. Not that the sinful law makes me captive, and keeps me so; for this would be to unchristianize me and carry me back into the world again. The import, therefore, is limited by the nature of the case. The sinful law makes me captive *sometimes*; plainly, I now and then sin. This is the fact. But now, on the contrary, and as standing over against this, the law of my mind prevails against the sinful law of my flesh, and holds it in check; so that the great, prevalent fact is, that I do right, the exception being, that I sin.

The sinful law is so called, not because it is prescribed by sin (personified) or emanates from it, but because, when obeyed, it leads to sin. Farther: the reader will notice that I translate *sinful law*, and not, *law of sin*. This I do to prevent a probable error. If we read, the law of sin, which is in my members, the common reader is almost sure to infer that it is sin which is in the members, whereas it is the law. Besides, that *hamartias* is Genitive of definition, hardly admits of a doubt. It is best therefore to render it as an adjective, and so prevent the error just named.

24. **Toil-worn man I!** The conception in the Apostle's mind is that of a battle scene, and of his being captive first to the law of sin, then to the law of his mind, and of his alternate service of the two, though of the latter mostly. Hence the proper epithet is not "wretched," as in the E. V., and in most commentators, but *toil-worn* or *laborious*. Besides, this is the primary meaning of *talaiporos*, wretched being a more remote one growing out of it.

Who shall deliver me from this body of death? Some commentators construe "body of death" to mean the same as *soma thneton*, mortal body. The sense is good and not improbable; still I am disinclined to accept it. *Soma* here I take to be identical with *tois melesi mou*, in which the law of sin dwells, or the *te sarki*, with which I serve the law of sin. If so, then "body of death" signifies the flesh, which so often impels me to commit sin; while death means, as often, the future death to which we are liable, because of sin, to be condemned. Upon the whole, I accept this view, though it is not free from difficulty. For, it may be asked, Can it be possible that the Apostle wished to be delivered from his body, because he feared condemnation for the sins he committed in it? He does not say, he *wished* to be delivered from his body, but merely asks, Who will deliver him; which, I presume, implies a willingness on his part, to say no more, if not a desire, to be free from the battle of sin. And as to his being afraid of condemnation, the fear is not unreasonable, nor wholly improbable. No man, not even Paul, so long as he is in the flesh, is absolutely safe. The danger may be safely small, still no one can say that there is really none. But then it was not fear of death that caused the Apostle to cry out for a deliverer. He shrunk from farther toil and strife. It was this that caused his cry.

25. **Thanks to God, he will, through Jesus Christ our Lord.** The reply to the foregoing question. To complete the sense I supply *he will*, as the reader sees. There is obviously an ellipsis of something; and as the preceding question leaves hardly a doubt as to what it is, it is best to supply it at once.

So then with the mind I myself serve the law of God, A summary conclusion from all that is said between v. 14 and the present. That Paul is here speaking of himself proper, or of himself simply as a christian, and not representatively, or in the character of another, is so clear that any attempt to prove it

would be superfluous. With me the fact rises above doubt. And since Paul is speaking of himself simply as a christian, it follows that what he says is true of every other christian, not surely in the high degree in which it was true of Paul, but still comfortably true. "I serve the law of God," that is, I obey it; but which law? Certainly not the law of Moses, but the gospel chiefly, though possibly not this exclusively. "The law of God" comprehends the full volume of his expressed will, in so far as it is applicable to christians, whether found in the law or in the gospel. All this I obey, not so perfectly, to be sure, as never to break it at all; but the broad characteristic fact of my life is, that I obey it. So then *with the mind* I serve the law. To serve the law of God with the mind is the same as to worship God in spirit and in truth. The service takes its rise in the mind, and consists in obedience to the divine will. Under the gospel strictly, it consists in belief in, and obedience to, Christ. Its chief traits are strictness and continuity.

but with the flesh the law of sin. To serve the law of sin with the flesh means simply to commit sin under the influence of the flesh. Now of course I can not serve both the law of God, with the mind, and the law of sin, with the flesh, at one and the same time. To serve the one is to slight the other. And since I can not serve the law of sin continually and be a christian; it follows that the service of sin is only occasional and exceptional. Hence, the meaning must be that with the flesh, and not with the mind, I serve the law of sin whenever I sin at all. I sin but seldom, suppose, but whenever I do sin, it is with the flesh as an instrument, or through its influence.

CHAPTER VIII.

SECTION I.

Οὐδὲν ἄρα νῦν κατάκριμα τοῖς ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ. ²ὁ γὰρ νόμος τοῦ πνεύματος τῆς ζωῆς ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ ἠλευθέρωσε με ἀπὸ τοῦ νόμου τῆς ἁμαρτίας καὶ τοῦ θανάτου. ³Τὸ γὰρ ἀδύνατον τοῦ νόμου, ἐν ᾧ ἠσθένει διὰ τῆς σαρκός, ὁ Θεὸς τὸν ἑαυτοῦ υἱὸν πέμψας ἐν ὁμοιώματι σαρκὸς ἁμαρτίας καὶ περὶ ἁμαρτίας κατέκρινε τὴν ἁμαρτίαν ἐν τῇ σαρκί, ⁴ἵνα τὸ δικαίωμα τοῦ νόμου πληρωθῇ ἐν ἡμῖν τοῖς μὴ κατὰ σάρκα περιπατοῦσιν ἀλλὰ κατὰ πνεῦμα. ⁵Οἱ γὰρ κατὰ σάρκα ὄντες τὰ τῆς σαρκὸς φρονουοῦσιν, οἱ δὲ κατὰ πνεῦμα τὰ τοῦ πνεύματος. ⁶Τὸ γὰρ φρόνημα τῆς σαρκὸς θάνατος, τὸ δὲ φρόνημα τοῦ πνεύματος ζωὴ καὶ εἰρήνη. ⁷διότι τὸ φρόνημα τῆς σαρκὸς ἔχθρα εἰς Θεόν· τῷ γὰρ νόμῳ τοῦ Θεοῦ οὐχ ὑποτάσσεται· οὐδὲ γὰρ δύναται, ⁸οἱ δὲ ἐν σαρκὶ ὄντες Θεῷ ἀρέσαι οὐ δύνανται. ⁹Ἦμεῖς δὲ οὐκ ἐστέ ἐν σαρκὶ ἀλλ' ἐν πνεύματι, εἴπερ πνεῦμα Θεοῦ οἰκεῖ ἐν ὑμῖν. ¹⁰εἰ δὲ τις πνεῦμα Χριστοῦ οὐκ ἔχει, οὗτος οὐκ ἔστιν αὐτοῦ. εἰ δὲ Χριστὸς ἐν ὑμῖν, τὸ μὲν σῶμα νεκρὸν διὰ ἁμαρτίαν, τὸ δὲ πνεῦμα ζωὴ διὰ δικαιοσύνην. ¹¹εἰ δὲ τὸ πνεῦμα τοῦ ἐγείραντος Ἰησοῦν ἐκ νεκρῶν οἰκεῖ ἐν ὑμῖν, ὁ ἐγείρας Χριστὸν ἐκ νεκρῶν ζωοποιήσει καὶ τὰ θνητὰ σώματα ὑμῶν διὰ τὸ ἐνοικοῦν αὐτοῦ πνεῦμα ἐν ὑμῖν.

There is therefore now no condemnation to those in Christ Jesus; ²for the law of the Spirit of life freed me in Christ Jesus from the law of sin and death. ³For what was impossible for the law, because it was weak through the flesh, God by sending his Son in the likeness of sinful flesh, and for sin, did; and he condemned sin in the flesh, ⁴that the justification of the law might be accomplished in us who walk not according to the flesh, but according to the spirit. ⁵For they that live according to the flesh attend to the things of the flesh; but they that live according to the spirit, the things of the spirit. ⁶Now attending to the flesh is death; but attending to the spirit, life and peace; ⁷because attending to the flesh is enmity against God; for he that does it is not obedient to the law of God: indeed he can not be. ⁸So then they that are in the flesh can not please God. ⁹But you are not in the flesh, but in the spirit, provided God's Spirit dwells in you; and if any one has not Christ's Spirit he is not his. ¹⁰But, though Christ dwells in you, the body is dead because of sin; yet the spirit is life because of justification. ¹¹Moreover if the Spirit of him that raised Jesus from the dead dwells in you, he that raised Christ from the dead will also make alive your mortal bodies by his Spirit that dwells in you.

SUMMARY.

No condemnation to those that are in Christ. For through him the gospel freed me, when I first became obedient to it, from the law of sin and death. This the law could not possibly do, owing to its weakness through the flesh. But what was impossible for the law, God did, by sending his Son into the world in a body of human flesh, and as a sin-offering. Moreover in this body he condemned all sin committed under influence of the flesh, by showing that such influence can be resisted. He came as a sin-offering that the

justification of the law, remission of sins, might be accomplished in us who live not in obedience to the flesh, but to the spirit. To live according to the flesh is to be led by it into sin, to live according to the spirit is to be led by it to do right. They that do the former will die, they that do the latter shall live. Attending to the flesh is continued hostility to God, and he that does it is never obedient to his will, nor can he be so long as he thus acts. We are in the spirit, under its control, provided the Holy Spirit dwells in us, and if it dwells not in us we are not Christ's. If the Holy Spirit dwells in us God will one day make our bodies alive by it.

The opening of the present chapter is a conclusion, not from any single premise, but from the general provisions and effects of the gospel as now set forth in the Letter. Under Christ, we are justified from sin; not only so, we are dead to the law, and consequently released from it; we are dead to sin, and therefore can not continue in it; we are under favor, and so are in no danger of being triumphed over by sin in the end. From the broad premises the conclusion with which the chapter begins, appears to be drawn. Indeed it seems not so much a conclusion from particular premises as a conclusion from conclusions. It is the summary conclusion from all that has now been established. The connection therefore is not, as Luther and some others insist, with the close of ch. 7, but with the great outstanding features of the Apostle's whole argument.

There is therefore now no condemnation. Most probably the meaning is, there is now no ground for condemnation. So complete are the provisions of the gospel for those who are in Christ Jesus that there remains no reason why they should be condemned. They are provisionally, at least, secure equally against danger from past sins and from future. But the expression must be taken with discrimination. The Apostle does not mean to say that should those in Christ sin, they will not be held responsible for it. For this they will certainly be. But where they sin and repent, they will be forgiven; so that it still remains true that there is no ground for condemnation. Thus the expression needs to be guarded.

to those in Christ Jesus; If we construe strictly, those are meant who have been immersed into Christ, and therefore are in him; or if more freely, those who are under Christ, or simply obedient to him. According to either construction, those in Christ are the justified, the saved. To such there is now no condemnation, none for past sins, none for future; unless the future remain unrepented of at death. In that event, of course there is

condemnation, the reason for which is wilful neglect to seek remission. For this, he alone is to blame who sins.

2. for the law of the Spirit of life "The Spirit of life," I certainly think, denotes the Holy Spirit. My reasons for so thinking will be found in what herein follows. But why is the Holy Spirit called the Spirit of life? The answer is not certain; but it is possibly so called because it endows with life. From the Spirit immediately, it may be, we derive the life of our first quickening. In the Logos, we are told, is life, universal life. This life the Spirit may be agent in imparting; and if so, the fact would justify the title here given it. Or, which is more probable, the answer may be, that the Spirit is so called because it is to quicken our bodies into life at the resurrection. This harmonizes better with the subject in hand, and hence its greater probability. Or farther, the Spirit may be so styled, because the law which emanates from it induces the new divine life of the christian in those that obey it. Or, finally, the reason for so designating the Spirit may be the sum of all the reasons here suggested.

"The law of the Spirit of life" I take to be a complex name for the gospel. It is so called, first, because it is a law in the truest sense of the word, being an expression of the divine will; and, secondly, because it is a rule of conduct. This law the Holy Spirit communicated or expressed in human speech. 1 Cor. ii: 13. It is hence called "the law of the Spirit." Moreover, this law "freed me" (the act is past and non-recurring) from the law of sin and death. This "the law" did when I obeyed it; for then my sins were remitted, and remission releases from the death which sin entails. Not only so, but being freed, my allegiance became transferred to the gospel; and I was placed under the strongest obligation to obey the law of sin no more. Now these things can be predicated of no spirit but the Holy Spirit, nor of any law save the gospel. I hence believe the Holy Spirit to be the spirit meant, and the gospel to be the law.

freed me in Christ Jesus The collocation "life in Christ Jesus" is very apt to suggest, as I conceive, a wrong idea, namely, that the life is in Christ; whereas the meaning is that the law freed me in Christ. Whether we translate *in* Christ or *by* him is perhaps immaterial. Either is correct; and it is not easy to say which is preferable.

from the law of sin and death The law of sin and

death" can not be the law of sin, which is in our members, the *heteron nomon* of chap. vii: 23; for, from that law, we have never been freed, at least, not wholly; nor shall we be till dead. Consequently, I take "the law of sin" to mean whatever law we may happen to be living under. It may be Jewish law, or Roman law, or both; and it becomes the law of sin so soon as broken, and by that act. It is also called "the law of death," for the reason that every law of actual sin is, in fact, a law of death, unless the sin be cancelled. Sin once committed must end in death unless remitted. Hence a law of sin is of necessity a law of death.

3. For what was impossible for the law. The *gar* here is clearly epexegetic, that is, it introduces a verse showing how the gospel freed us in Christ. This much is evident. But the verse itself is elliptic and anormal. Literally rendered, it reads thus: *For what was an impossibility of the law, because it was weak through the flesh, God having sent his Son in the likeness of the flesh of sin, and for sin, condemned sin in the flesh, that &c.* The sense here is obviously incomplete.

Green renders the verse thus: "For where lay the inability of the law, the matter wherein it was weak through the flesh, God, by sending his own Son under a resemblance of sinful flesh and about sin, condemned sin in the flesh, that" &c.

Alford renders thus: "For that which was not in the power of the law, in that it was weak through the flesh, God sending his own Son in the likeness of the flesh of sin, and on account of sin, condemned sin in the flesh, in order that" &c.

MacKnight thus: "For God sending his own Son in the likeness of sinful flesh, and of a sin-offering, hath condemned sin in the flesh (the thing impossible to the law), because it was weak through the flesh, that" &c. The transposition here adopted by MacKnight was probably suggested by Clericus. It gives the sense strikingly, but is not necessary.

The preceding renderings are cited here to show that while commentators are substantially agreed as to the sense of the verse, they find it not easy to translate it. The rendering adopted in the present work, though assuming and supplying an ellipsis, will, I have hope, be found true to the original and to give the sense fully. It is not submitted as perfect, but for lack of a better.

The thing impossible for the law was to free us from the law

of sin and death. The highest of human necessities demanded this liberation. Yet the law could not effect it—neither that of Moses, nor any other could. By law it was impossible.

because it was weak through the flesh. The law could not effect the needed liberation, because it was weak. But how weak—weak within itself? Certainly not; for, assuming the law of Moses to be meant, it was perfect, perfect in strength, perfect every way. The law was weak relatively; it was weak through the flesh of those under it. In other words, through weakness of the flesh, the law was not kept, not kept by any, and when once broken, it was powerless to deliver. The law could deliver only on condition of being perfectly kept; but as this never happened, its failure was complete. Had either Jew or Gentile ever perfectly kept the law under which he lived, he would of course have been sinless and so uncondemned. This would have been his deliverance. But each alike broke his law; and therefore each was alike condemned. From this, the law provided no escape. Hence the necessity for another way.

God by sending his Son in the likeness of sinful flesh, God could not deliver from sin and death except through the death of his Son. So I believe we are compelled to assume. And in order to die, his Son must become mortal; and in order to his being mortal he must become flesh, that is, he must take upon him, and live in, a body of human flesh. This he did; and hence the phrase “sending him in the likeness of sinful flesh.” The meaning of this is, that God gave his Son a body composed of simple human flesh, and having the form of other bodies of flesh. The flesh of this body was identical with that of all other human bodies. It was therefore sinful in the same sense in which the flesh of Joseph and Mary was at first sinful; and had his flesh formed the body of a mere man it would have led to sin just as does human flesh generally. In Christ, however, the flesh did not lead to sin, not because it was better than, or different from common human flesh; but because it was kept in perfect subjection. He controlled it absolutely, and thus kept it from leading to sin. The flesh of Christ was sinful, solely because it possessed the same tendency to sin as other flesh and in the same degree.

and for sin, did. Not only did God send his Son in the likeness of sinful flesh, but he sent him *for sin*; that is, to make expiation for it, and so put it away. In this sense the context

requires the clause "for sin" to be understood; for it is through Christ as a sin-offering that the law of the Spirit of life frees us from the law of sin and death. "In the likeness of sinful flesh" states how God sent his Son; "for sin," the end for which.

and he condemned sin in the flesh, A clause the meaning of which I find it difficult to discover; nor do commentators generally seem to have studied it to much advantage. The words are very common, to be sure, and their arrangement simple; but the exact import of each is not clear. What, first, are we to understand by the word sin, in the expression, "sin in the flesh"? Certainly it does not signify an act, as when we say, sin is the transgression of law; for sin in the flesh in this sense is inconceivable. Nor can the word denote any substantive thing in the flesh, such as we mean when we say, sin is a moral evil. It must, then, it seems to me, denote either the sinful tendency of the flesh, or those actual sins committed in the flesh under its influence. It can hardly denote the former; for to condemn a mere tendency of the flesh would be to condemn not only what is not sin, but what existed as certainly in the flesh of the Savior as in that of his mother. This then we can not admit; because Christ was in no part or sense, or way, the subject of condemnation. I hence conclude that the word denotes those actual sins committed by the human family in the flesh under its influence.

Now how did God, by sending his Son in the likeness of sinful flesh, condemn sin in this sense? Did he judicially pronounce upon it and assess its penalty? Hardly, I presume; for between sending his Son in the flesh, and such a procedure, there is no connection; yet a connection clearly exists between the sending and condemning. I am of opinion, then, that the sense in which God condemned sin in the flesh is the sense in which the word condemned is used in the following passage: "Men of Nineveh shall rise in the judgment with this generation, and shall condemn it; because they repented at the preaching of Jonah, and behold a greater than Jonah is here." Matt. xii: 41. Now the Ninevites will condemn the generation contemporary with the Savior by showing that what that generation did was wholly inexcusable, and therefore deserving of condemnation. This the Ninevites will do by showing that, in a given case, they themselves did right under circumstances far less favorable than those under which the generation named did wrong. This is condemnation on the principle that he who resists sin in a cer-

tain case shows him to be wrong who commits it in the same case. God sent his Son in the likeness of sinful flesh. We are in no more. Yet Christ never yielded to the flesh, though tempted in all respects as we are. He thus proved that the flesh can be successfully resisted, and a sinless life maintained. Hereby also he showed that we can resist the flesh, if we will; and consequently that we are inexcusable where we fail, and so are justly condemnable. It was thus in my judgment that God condemned sin in the flesh. He showed that it is not of necessity, but wilful, and therefore worthy of condemnation.

But in reply to this it may be said that the cases are not parallel; that Christ was all-mighty, and therefore could resist what we can not. I grant that Christ was almighty, but deny that he either found it necessary to resist as an almighty being, or that he, in fact, did it. He resisted simply as the "son of man," and thus showed what man as man is capable of. It was this very circumstance that constituted his resistance a just basis on which to condemn us. Nor is it true that we can not resist the flesh. We *will not*, not we *can not*. For if in any case we can not resist, then in that case we can not sin. Whatever must be is no sin.

4. that the justification of the law might be accomplished in us, "The justification of the law" is the justification which the law proposed and sought; but which it never realized, namely, complete acquittal from every sin. This is the justification which is now, in Christ, accomplished in us. The proper connection of the present clause is with the expression "for sin." God sent his Son "for sin," sent him to make expiation for it, that the justification of the law might be accomplished in us.

Most expositors connect and translate thus: God condemned sin in the flesh, that the requirement of the law might be fulfilled in us. But surely this is erroneous. For first, there is no dependence, in respect to sense, of the latter clause upon the former; nor is the former perceivably conducive to the latter. Second, the requirement of the law, which is perfect obedience, is no more fulfilled in us of this day than it was in those of the day of Moses. No christian ever yet achieved it. I hence reject both this connection and translation.

By far the most important word in the clause now in hand is *dikaioma*. The reader will notice that I render it *justification*. Is this rendering both demanded and tenable? I believe it is. First, it is demanded by the context. God provided his Son a body

and sent him into the world—for what great primary end? Confessedly, that he might offer himself as a sacrifice for sin. But why offer himself as a sacrifice for sin? Indisputably, that sin might be forgiven, or that men might be justified. Justification was the very object for which he made expiation. Now, as in the clause, “for sin,” expiation is the fact signified; and as *dikaioma* expresses the object of this fact, it therefore follows that justification is the very word demanded by the context.

Second. Is justification tenable; in other words, is it an authorized translation? Of seven Lexicons sitting by me, all give justification as a prominent meaning of *dikaioma*, while most of them, and they the best, give it as the second meaning. Unquestionably then it is an authorized translation. I hence feel safe in adopting it.

“That justification might be accomplished *in us*.” “In us” here does not signify *within* us, but in our case. The meaning is, in order that each one of us might be justified.

who walk not according to the flesh, but according to the spirit. The word spirit here denotes the human spirit, and not the Holy Spirit. Commentators, however, have generally construed it to signify the latter; but the construction is gratuitous. It is attributable to an erroneous theory of Spiritual influence in the work of salvation. To be thrusting the Holy Spirit forward upon all occasions and into every thing is as unauthorized as to ignore its agency altogether. We best subserve the interest of truth and of humanity when we interpret the word of God according to *its* meaning, and not according to *ours*. Flesh and spirit here are clearly the outer and inner man of the christian, and stand opposed to each other as the two great principles of action, which decide life to be good or bad, acceptable or not with God. To walk according to the flesh is to be subject to it and carried away by its tendency to sin; to walk according to the spirit is to be obedient to its constant wish to do right.

If the expression “that justification might be accomplished in us,” be taken to mean accomplished in us *in the end* or final judgment, then the clause in hand not only describes how christians are to live; but it also states a condition of that final justification. We are to walk according to the spirit, otherwise we shall not then be justified. Or if the meaning be “that justification might be accomplished in us” *at our conversion*, then the clause merely tells how christians are to live, without stating a

condition of the justification. But even in this case, though the mode of life described be no condition of the past justification, it is still a condition of the future. Of these two views, the former is preferred.

5. For they that live according to the flesh Literally, they that *are* according to the flesh. But *eimi* means not only *to be, to exist*, but, as included in these, *to live*. Now as to live is certainly its meaning here, it is best so to render it. We then have an expression true to the sense and perfectly clear.

attend to the things of the flesh; *Phroneo* signifies minding in the sense of giving attention to, pursuing, being devoted to. *Attend to* very aptly and closely renders it here. "The things of the flesh" can not include all the wants of the flesh; for many of these are lawful, and it is therefore right to gratify them. The phrase then must signify only those evil desires and tendencies which lead to sin. Hence to attend to things of the flesh means to indulge these, and so commit sin.

The *gar* of the present verse seems to have reference to a suppressed sentence; and if so, the connection and sense may be thus indicated: "That the justification of the law might be accomplished in us who walk not according to the flesh, but according to the spirit." *And unless we thus walk we shall not be justified.* For they that live according to the flesh attend to its evil inclinations, and so lead lives of sin, which will prevent their justification.

but they that live according to the spirit, the things of the spirit. "The things of the spirit" are all those holy interests which involve our welfare both for the present and the future, those right acts and pure spiritual states in which the inner man delights. To be and do these is the strongest wish of the enlightened and sanctified soul. Now to live according to the spirit is to give undivided heed to these things, to exert our whole strength to do and be these even to the minutest item. It is, in short, to live in strict accordance with the conscious bent of the soul to do right. Where we make the proper effort to live thus, and fail, God in mercy will forgive the failure, so that the justification of the law will still be accomplished in us at last.

6. Now attending to the flesh is death; Explanatory of the first part of the preceding verse. Attending to the flesh is a life of perpetual sin; and every such life, if persisted in, must end in death. There is no other alternative. The death **an** is eternal death.

but attending to the spirit, life and peace; Of course the prior duty is to become a christian. The spirit is then enlightened by the word of God; is pure, being free from sin; and strengthened by the Holy Spirit. Its perception of right, from this on, is clear, and its desire to practice it ardent. Henceforth the life must pass in attending to the spirit. But even now the spirit must be attended to, only as it attends to the truth. Attention to the truth on its part, alone renders it the safe criterion it is. The result, even in the present state, will be great peace, and hereafter, everlasting life.

7. because attending to the flesh is enmity against God. Or if any prefer it, *the minding* of the flesh. But since the minding of the flesh is simply attending to it, minding has no advantage over attending. Indeed, attending is preferable, because more familiar and clearer. The clause has reference to the first part of v. 6, and states the reason for what is there said. Attending to the flesh is contrary to the will of God, and therefore wrong. It can hence bring only death. That alone can bring life which strictly accords with the divine will. "Enmity against God" is not expressive of a feeling towards him. It merely characterizes a course of conduct. Attending to the flesh is a life, and as such is contrary to his wishes. It is therefore called enmity.

for he that does it is not obedient to the law of God: indeed he can not be. I claim the privilege of but a slight liberty with the text here, the reason for which will be presently given. The whole verse is thus rendered in our common Bible: "Because the carnal mind is enmity against God; for it is not subject to the law of God, neither indeed can be." The margin substitutes "the minding of the flesh," which is better.

Now in every case of attending to the flesh, of course there is some person who does the attending. The person is the responsible party to the transaction; and I propose so to render as to make him the subject of the verb, instead of the noun minding. True, the sense remains the same, whether we make the person who attends the subject, or his act of attending. But although we thereby certainly give a different turn to the thought, we, at the same time, secure a better expression of the sense. I grant that the new rendering creates a short ellipsis, but as this is filled in a way which merely gives boldness to the sense without altering it, no objection can lie against it. I add, as proper, that a hint found in Bengel suggests to me the rendering.

Attending to the flesh is enmity against God. As both proof and illustration, he that does it is not obedient to the law of God. That is, he is not obedient to the law so long as he attends to the flesh, for the plain reason that he can not be obedient to both at the same time. He must cease to attend to the flesh, before he can be obedient to the law. This he is required to do from his conversion on. The law of God is the same as the law of the Spirit of life—it is the gospel.

But what causes a man to cease to attend to the flesh? The gospel; or to amplify a little, the law of God as addressed to the human heart in the death of Christ for sin, and in the provisions made in the gospel for remission of sin, and the final glorification of the faithful. These things presented to the understanding and affections cause men to turn from attending to the flesh to the obedience of belief.

But the popular exposition of the passage, as based on the common rendering of the verse just cited, deserves an incidental remark. The mind of the flesh is set down as an innate corruption of human nature, resulting from the fall, and removable only by a direct and powerful operation of the Holy Spirit. Previously to this operation, man is held to be totally depraved, and as incapable of any act of acceptable obedience. Without it he is lost; with it he is regenerate and fitted for the Master's use. Being now spiritually minded, he loves Christ with his whole heart, and obeys him in a renewed will.

The only comment I have to make on this exposition is that it is without support from holy Writ. It is, I grant, a cherished and wide-spread theory, but nevertheless a mere human opinion. It wholly lacks the stamp of God, and is therefore false.

indeed he can not be. I render the *gar* of this clause *indeed* for no reason except to avoid so many *fors*. By the intensive form nothing is lost to the sense, and we have more pleasant English. The full sense of the clause is, he who attends to the flesh is not only not obedient to the law of God, but he can not be. That is, he can not be while attending to the flesh. The law of God and the evil tendency of the flesh are two antagonistic things. Hence, in order to obey that, we must turn from this. But the meaning is not, that it is impossible for him who is now attending to the flesh ever, in any event, to become a christian; for this would cut off all from salvation, since all at the first, attend to the flesh. The meaning is that obedience to

the sinful inclinations of the flesh must cease before obedience to God can set in.

8. So then they that are in the flesh can not please God. Those in the flesh here must be those that are controlled by it; for the mere circumstance of being in the flesh locally can not be offensive to God; and although it is an obstacle to pleasing him, it is not an insuperable one, as appears from the next verse. I hence conclude that to be in the flesh is the same as to be subservient to it. The reason why those in the flesh can not please God is that they are all the while sinning against him. They can not serve the flesh and God at the same time.

The *de* of the clause has given commentators great trouble. In speaking of it Tholuck says: "We must either suppose that, in an anomalous way, the *de* stands for *gar*, in which case the sentence would be of the nature of a corollary to the preceding verse; or we must, on the other hand, consider *de* as substituted for *oun*, and as deducing an inference from the whole preceding context." MacKnight considers it *illative*, and cites several passages to confirm his view; Green and Sawyer render it *and*; Alford renders it *but*, and thinks the *so then* of the E.V. erroneous. Riddle regards it as metabatic; and Stuart holds that it resumes the matter of the first clause of v. 7, and repeats it in another form. Hodge and Bloomfield both render it *so then*, while Winer says it never means *therefore*, *then*. Now in the midst of opinions so discordant as these a decision can hardly be regarded as easy. *But* and *and* are certainly the common meaning of *de*, *so then* being rare; and yet, with Hodge and Bloomfield, I prefer *so then*. My reasons are two: 1. I can find no other rendering that seems closer. 2. *So then* gives the best connection, if not the best sense.

9. But you are not in the flesh, but in the spirit, Not to be in the flesh is not to live according to it; and not to live according to it is not to allow it to control us; it is, in a word, not to sin under pressure of its influence. *But in the spirit.* The word spirit here denotes the human spirit; nor can I see how any one ever came to think otherwise. It is a sheer assumption to say that it denotes the Holy Spirit. To be in the flesh is to live the life of the sinner; to be in the spirit, to live the life of the christian. Flesh governs the one, spirit governs the other; and as the flesh is his flesh who is governed by it, so the spirit is his spirit who is governed by it. It is virtual tautology to say that

we are governed by the Holy Spirit provided the Holy Spirit dwells in us; for one very purpose for which the Holy Spirit dwells in us is control. Consequently I can not think the Holy spirit here referred to.

provided God's Spirit dwells in you; The phrase God's Spirit here means the Holy Spirit. No other interpretation, I feel sure, is tenable. To make it mean a holy disposition or temper of mind is out of the question. To say you are in the spirit provided a holy disposition dwells in you is trivial. I can not attribute such a sentiment to Paul. And as there is no other Spirit of God that dwells in the christian but the Holy Spirit, we are compelled to take the phrase as signifying the Holy Spirit. If asked why it is called the Spirit of God, I answer, we are without the means of knowing. It may be so called because it is indeed God's Spirit, the very Spirit that inhabits him, or because it proceeds from him or is sent by him. On these points we have no knowledge, and speculation is idle.

But what means the remark: "You are in the spirit *provided God's Spirit dwells in you.*" My reply will be found in what here follows: 1. The Holy Spirit dwells in the regenerate heart. This I set down as a fact too clearly taught in holy Writ to be questioned. 2. That one chief mode in which the Holy Spirit helps the christian is by strengthening his spirit. Eph. iii: 16. 3. The christian's being successfully under control of his own spirit is conditional, the condition being that the Holy Spirit shall dwell in him and help him. Hence the remark amounts to this: You are in the spirit, are under control of your own spirit, provided the Holy Spirit dwells in you to aid you, otherwise you are not. To be under the control of the spirit is to live according to it, instead of according to the flesh.

and if any one has not Christ's Spirit he is not his. He is not his for the reason that he can not be, which goes to confirm the view just taken of the preceding clause. The term Christ's Spirit denotes the Holy Spirit, and in sense is identical with the Spirit of God. To have Christ's Spirit means to have it dwelling within us; and not to have it within us is not to be under control of our own spirit, and not to be so controlled is not to be a christian. Thus having the Spirit depends on being a christian, and successfully living the christian life depends on having the Spirit.

10. But though Christ dwells in you, The whole of this

verse is thought to be unusually difficult, the difficulty consisting, not so much in the words used, as in the sentiment expressed. The *ei* of the clause I render *though*, because the sense demands it. Indeed, without this rendering, the verse seems to be inexplicable, whereas with it no serious difficulty remains. True, *ei* is seldom to be thus translated, though in peculiar connections it may be. In speaking of it Trollope says: "Both in the classics and in the New Testament it may frequently be rendered *although*." Grk. Gram. to N. T. p. 191. The present I hold to be one of the instances in which it must be thus rendered. But I shall advert to this point again presently.

From v. 9 I supply *dwells* instead of *is*, which gives a bolder sense. But how does Christ dwell in christians; for the *though* of the clause concedes the fact. The inquiry, be it noticed, respects the mode only, of the dwelling. Accordingly I reply, he *dwells not in person, but representatively*. He *dwells in christians* by his Spirit. Paul tells the disciples in Ephesus that they were built together for a dwelling-place of God in or by the Spirit. Now as God dwelt in them, so Christ dwells in us. The Spirit dwells literally in us, Christ, by the Spirit. The mode of this dwelling we do not affect to understand. It is inexplicable. The fact of it we accept, but venture on no explanations.

the body is dead The body is dead in the sense of being doomed to die; and for this reason it is said to be now what it is sure to be hereafter. This is a very common mode of speech in the Bible. By "dead" is meant simply natural death. Literally of course the body is not dead in any sense. Of necessity then we must take "dead" in some qualified sense; and no other seems admissible except the one just named. Besides, no other view appears to suit the expression "made alive" found in the next verse.

But expositors are by no means uniform in their explanation of the clause. By some; the word body is made to stand for the whole person, and "dead" for spiritually dead. According to them the meaning is: But if Christ dwells in you, you are spiritually dead, because of sin. But the objections to this view are decisive. 1. How can any one be styled spiritually dead in whom Christ dwells by his Spirit? The thing is incredible. 2. The persons here spoken of are the regenerate. How then can they be said to be spiritually dead? They are the very opposite.

By others, "dead" is taken in the sense of inactive or dead to sin. Within itself the import is good, and elsewhere is true; but

here it does not connect with the following clause. To say, If Christ dwells in you the body is inactive or dead to sin, because of sin, is not intelligible. The parts are without natural coherence and amount to a jumble.

I hence conclude that the solution just proposed is the true one. It certainly strikes me as less cumbered with difficulties than any other.

because of sin; *Dia hamartian* admits of no other rendering than this, or an equivalent one. Sin then is the cause of the death here predicated of the body. But sin causes but one death to the body, which is natural death. From this I again conclude that the preceding view of "dead" is the correct one. "Because of sin"—what sin? There is but one sin that causes death to the body, namely, Adam's. "Because of sin" then must signify because of Adam's sin. Assuming this to be correct, and the meaning is: But though Christ dwells in you, which he does by his Spirit, the body is still to die because of Adam's sin.

But here I again revert to the particle *ei*. Rendering as usual thus: If Christ dwells in you the body is dead, and the body being dead is clearly a result of the indwelling of Christ, the implication being that if Christ dwells not in you the body is not dead. According to this view, "dead" means inactive, *as if* dead, or dead to sin. So far all goes well. The sense is clear, and within itself, I believe, strictly true, though not true here. But let us now add the third clause. If Christ dwells in you the body is dead *because of sin*. Now is sin the cause of the body being inactive or dead to sin? Not at all. Here then we encounter an insuperable difficulty. From it I see no escape. Clearly then we must seek some other solution of "dead." Let us then render again, taking "dead" in the sense of being doomed to die, which I believe to be its true sense: If Christ dwells in you the body is dead, is doomed to die. But how from Christ's dwelling in us is the future death of the body to result? Obviously it in no way either depends on or results from it. Consequently we must have recourse to still a different expedient. I render by using *though*: Though Christ dwells in you, the body is dead; is doomed to die, because of sin, Adam's sin. Here every thing is faultless—the senses, dependence of clause, and coherence of thought. I add that Hodge renders much as I do, the only difference being that he places *though* in the second clause instead of in the first, which however changes not the sense.

yet the spirit is life because of justification. The *de* of this clause is best rendered by *yet* or *still*, either of which gives a good sentence, and avoids the two frequent use of *but*. The abstract *life* is here put for the concrete *alive*, the sense being, the spirit is *alive* because of justification. Nor does even this bring the meaning fully out. The word dead in the preceding clause signifies to be hereafter dead. So the word alive here means to be alive not only now but hereafter and forever. Sin occasions death alike to both body and spirit. Adam's sin causes that, our own, causes this. But justification releases us from both our own sins and their consequent sentence of death. Now in virtue of this double release, the spirit is alive now and will continue to be. It is not even exposed to death, except in cases of apostasy, and therefore will never die. Die is used here to denote the second death which is predicable alike of body and spirit. Strictly, therefore is the spirit alive because of justification.

Commentators generally render the *dikaïosunen* of this clause righteousness. For this however it is not hard to account. It is due to theories of imputed and implanted righteousness. But both the scope and sense require justification. The body is condemned to die because of sin, while the spirit lives because of release from it, not because of righteousness. "The just by belief shall live."

11. Moreover if the Spirit of him who raised Jesus from the dead dwells in you, He who raised Jesus from the dead is the Father, and his spirit is the Holy Spirit. If the Spirit dwells in you. This is the antecedent of a simple conditional syllogism. The Apostle assumes its truth; and since he assumes it we must concede it. Indeed without this, his conclusion could be denied. The Holy Spirit then actually dwells in every child of God. This granted, and we are ready for the consequent.

he that raised Christ from the dead will also make alive your mortal bodies He will make them alive in the general resurrection of the just at the last day. The identical body in which we now live is to be literally restored to life. No hope touches the christian to the quick like this. Not only so, but on being restored, the body will be peculiarly endowed. It will be a spiritual body. What this means we do not know; but we have confidence that it augurs some strange good. Into this renewed body the spirit is to return—the spirit that is a living,

conscious entity, learning all the while from the moment in which it leaves the body at death, until that in which it returns. For that is a profound stupidity which holds man to have no spirit; and that a profounder still which consigns his spirit to sleep at death.

by his Spirit that dwells in you. Shall we here read *dia pneumatos*, or *dia pneuma*—by his Spirit, or because of his Spirit? The question is not easily settled. The authorities on each side are about equal, the better manuscripts favoring the former rendering; the greater number, the latter; while doctrinal considerations, not less perhaps than critical, have played their part in the controversy. Most modern critics favor the Accusative, not it seems from any preponderance of authority in its favor, but because, of the two readings, it is the more likely to have been altered. The Genitive gives the clearer and sharper sense; and therefore it is thought that the motives to alter it would be fewer than those to alter the other. But in the present case, this is not certain. Upon the whole, I decide, after careful thought, to retain the Genitive till I have more decisive grounds than at present for rejecting it. In this decision I am influenced mainly by the better sense which the Genitive gives.

If the Holy Spirit dwells in you, God will also make alive your mortal bodies by it in the last day. This he will do by the Spirit as the immediate agent of the event. Christ himself was put to death in the flesh, but made alive by the Spirit. There is nothing novel then in ascribing the resurrection of the body to the same agent. Indeed the very reason for denominating the Spirit, v. 2, the Spirit of life is, probably, the fact that it is to make alive at last the bodies of the elect. At least I feel favorable to this opinion.

CHAPTER VIII. SECTION 3.

¹² So then, brethren, we are bound, not to the flesh, to live according to the flesh. ¹³ For if you live according to the flesh, you shall die; but if by the Spirit, you put an end to the deeds of the body, you shall live. ¹⁴ For so many as are led by the Spirit of God, these are sons of God. ¹⁵ For you did not receive the spirit of slavery ending again in fear; but you received the spirit of sonship in which we cry, Father.

¹² Ἄρα οὖν, ἀδελφοί, ὀφείλεται ἕσμεν οὐ τῇ σαρκὶ τοῦ κατὰ σάρκα ζῆν. ¹³ Ἐὶ γὰρ κατὰ σάρκα ζῆτε, μέλλετε ἀποθνήσκειν· εἰ δὲ πνεύματι τὰς πράξεις τοῦ σώματος θανατοῦτε, ζήσεσθε. ¹⁴ Ὅσοι γὰρ πνεύματι Θεοῦ ἄγονται, οὗτοι υἱοὶ εἰσι Θεοῦ. ¹⁵ Οὐ γὰρ ἐλάβετε πνεῦμα δουλείας πάλιν εἰς φόβον, ἀλλὰ ἐλάβετε πνεῦμα υἰοθεσίας, ἐν ᾧ κράζομεν, ἀββᾶ ὁ πατήρ.

SUMMARY.

We owe the flesh nothing, that we should live according to its evil inclinations. Besides, to live thus will end in death. But if by aid of the Holy Spirit we put an end to the deeds of the body, we shall live. So many, and no more, as are led by God's Spirit are his sons; and we have this Spirit, for we received it at our baptism; and in it we now cry to him, calling him Father.

12. So then, brethren, we are bound, not to the flesh, to live according to the flesh. *Ara oun* here are conclusive, and are neatly rendered by *so then*. But from what do they draw the conclusion which they introduce? Not, as Alford thinks, from the "assurance in the last verse;" but from all that has now been said upon the nature and effects both of living according to the flesh and according to the spirit. To live according to the flesh is wrong, because it invariably ends in sin. So to live, therefore, is enmity against God; and consequently, if persisted in, must end in everlasting death. We therefore owe it to God and to ourselves not to live according to the flesh.

But though not debtors to the flesh, to what are we debtors? The answer is implied, but no doubt can exist as to what it is. We are debtors to the spirit to live according to it. To live according to the spirit is, first, everlasting life, and then, everlasting peace. High then as these great interests are, so high are our obligations to live according to the spirit.

13. For if you live according to the flesh, you shall die; The matter of v. 6 reiterated and enlarged. There we have attending to the flesh, *phronema tes sarkos*; here *kata sarka zete*. Now that to live according to the flesh is the same as

attending to it, no one can doubt. The latter expression, therefore, which is perfectly clear, forms a happy comment on the former, and shows that I have rendered it correctly. Attending to the flesh is being devoted to its sinful inclinations; while living according to it is embodying these inclinations in actual sins. The phrase *mellete apothneskein* means *going to die* or *destined to die*. But as our simple *shall die* is familiar and quite true, there is no necessity for departing from it.

but if by the Spirit, you put an end to the deeds of the body, Does the word spirit here denote the Holy Spirit or the human? The question is not easily decided. The clause itself is without any verbal marks determining which is meant; and the context will admit either. In such cases we have little more to guide us than conjecture, which at best settles nothing. Nevertheless I decide in favor of the Holy Spirit. My reasons for so deciding are two: 1. The human spirit yields a difficult, if even a tolerable sense. 2. The next verse seems to require the Holy Spirit to be understood. According to this view the sense is: **But if by aid of the Holy Spirit, which dwells in you, you put an end to the deeds of the body, you shall live.** This sentiment is strictly correct, and is therefore an additional reason for thinking that the Holy Spirit is meant

“But if by the Spirit you put an end to.” Still the will is to be your will, the effort your effort, and the result your deed. To you the whole is to seem to be your own unaided act. You will hence approve or blame whenever you succeed or fail, just as though wholly unassisted. Nevertheless the Holy Spirit will aid you. But this aid will all be tendered back out of sight. It will not be pushed out so as to come under the eye of consciousness. You will hence never be able to take any sensible notice of it. You will be conscious of the effort, and you can know the result. But you are *told* merely, that you are aided. Hence the fact that you are so is matter of belief, not of knowledge.

Instead of the common rendering “put to death the deeds of the body,” I prefer *put an end to*. It is not very congruous to say put to death deeds. Besides, the obvious meaning of *thanatoute* here is put an end to. Of course the deeds meant are those sinful deeds of the body, which we commit under its influence. These we are to put an end to. Not that we may ever expect to succeed completely, but we are to make the effort to do so. If we then fail, which we are sure to do, the failure will be forgiven.

14. For so many as are led by the Spirit of God, The scope of thought seems to be this: If by the Spirit you put an end to the deeds of the body, you are led by the Spirit; and if you are led by the Spirit, you are sons of God. "For so many as are led," &c.

But what kind of "leading" is here meant—an occult, internal, inexplicable leading, or an external, explicable one by the truth? Before replying, let us ask, who are led? Certainly not the unconverted, but christians. In those led, then, the Holy Spirit already dwells. What kind of leading then is it? I answer, both internal and external. To whatever extent the Holy Spirit by its indwelling strenghtens the human spirit, to enable it to control the flesh, to that extent the leading is internal. To whatever extent the motives of the gospel, when brought to bear on the mind in the written word, enlighten and strenghten it, and so enable it to keep the body in subjection, to that extent the leading is external. The leading, then, consists of the whole of the influences of every kind, spent by the Holy Spirit on the human spirit, in enabling it to keep the body under. More definitively than this, it would not be wise to attempt to speak.

these are sons of God. That is, these remain sons of God. For the Apostle is not speaking of originally becoming sons, but of continuing such. We became sons, at first, by being born of water and of Spirit; but we continue such by being led by the Spirit.

15. For you did not receive the spirit of slavery ending again in fear; "Slavery" refers to their state of bondage to sin before their conversion. "Ending again in fear" means ending in or producing the fear of death and of the future to which they were subject in their former state. You did not receive at your baptism, for the reference is to that time, a spirit producing this fear. On the contrary, you received the Holy Spirit in accordance with the promise: "Repent and be baptized each of you, in the name of Jesus Christ, for remission of sins, *and you shall receive the gift of the Holy Spirit.*" Acts ii: 38. This Spirit produces no fear such as you formerly suffered from.

but you received the spirit of sonship in which you cry, Father. The spirit of sonship is the Holy Spirit, which belongs to a state of sonship, or which is given to those that are sons. Being sons, and besides being filled with the spirit which belongs to them, you are no longer subject to your former fears, but in

your gladness of heart and love of God, you cry out to him, Father.

The usual expression, *Abba*, Father, is gratuitous. *Abba*, is the Chaldee word for father, while *pater* is its Greek synonym. The latter is the mere translation of the former. Nor can a reason be given for retaining *abba*, which does not require us to retain *pater*, Father. If we transfer either untranslated we should transfer both; and to translate the one and not the other is arbitrary. As *pater* in Greek is *abba* in Chaldee, so father in English is both. I hence use only one word.

CHAPTER VIII. SECTION 3.

¹⁶ Αὐτὸ τὸ πνεῦμα συμμαρτυρεῖ τῷ πνεύματι ἡμῶν ὅτι ἐσμὲν τέκνα Θεοῦ· ¹⁷ εἰ δὲ τέκνα, καὶ κληρονόμοι, κληρονόμοι μὲν Θεοῦ, συγκληρονόμοι δὲ Χριστοῦ, ἕπερ συμπάσχομεν, ἵνα καὶ συνδοξασθῶμεν. ¹⁸ Λογίζομαι γὰρ ὅτι οὐκ ἄξια τὰ παθήματα τοῦ νῦν καιροῦ πρὸς τὴν μέλλουσαν δόξαν ἀποκαλυφθῆναι εἰς ἡμᾶς. ¹⁹ Ἡ γὰρ ἀποκαταδοκία τῆς κτίσεως τὴν ἀποκάλυψιν τῶν υἱῶν τοῦ Θεοῦ ἀπεκδέχεται. ²⁰ Τῇ γὰρ ματαιότητι ἣ κτίσις ὑπετάγη, οὐχ ἑκούσα ἀλλὰ διὰ τὸν ἰποτάξαντα ἐπ' ἐλπίδι. ²¹ Ὅτι καὶ αὐτὴ ἣ κτίσις ἐλευθερωθήσεται ἀπὸ τῆς δουλείας τῆς φθορᾶς εἰς τὴν ἐλευθερίαν τῆς δόξης τῶν τέκνων τοῦ Θεοῦ. ²² Οἴδαμεν γὰρ ὅτι πᾶσα ἣ κτίσις συστενάζει καὶ συνωδίνει ἄχρι τοῦ νῦν. ²³ Οὐ μόνον δέ, ἀλλὰ καὶ αὐτοὶ τὴν ἀπαρχὴν τοῦ πνεύματος ἔχοντες καὶ αὐτοὶ ἐν ἑαυτοῖς στενάζομεν, υἰοθεσίαν ἀπεκδεχόμενοι, τὴν ἀπολύτρωσιν τοῦ σώματος ἡμῶν. ²⁴ Τῇ γὰρ ἐλπίδι ἐσώθημεν· ἐλπίς δὲ βλεπομένη οὐκ ἔστιν ἐλπίς· ὁ γὰρ βλέπει τις, τί καὶ ἐλπίζει; ²⁵ εἰ δὲ ὁ οὐ βλέπομεν, ἐλπίζομεν, δι' ἰπομονῆς ἀπεκδεχόμεθα.

¹⁶ The Spirit itself testifies with our spirit that we are children of God; ¹⁷ and if children, also heirs, God's heirs, joint-heirs with Christ, provided we suffer with him, that we may also be glorified with him. ¹⁸ Now I count that the sufferings of the present time are not worthy to be named with the glory that shall be revealed for us. ¹⁹ For the earnest expectation of the creation is waiting for the revelation of the sons of God. ²⁰ Now the creation was made subject to frailty, not willingly, but for his sake who subjected it in hope. ²¹ Because the creation itself is to be delivered from the bondage of corruption into the glorious freedom of the children of God. ²² For we know that the whole creation groans together and is in pain until now. ²³ And not only it, but even we ourselves, though having the first fruit of the Spirit, even we groan within ourselves while waiting for the sonship, the deliverance of our bodies. ²⁴ For in this hope were we saved. But hope seen is not hope; for what one sees why still does he hope for? ²⁵ But if we hope for what we see not, with patience we wait for it.

SUMMARY.

The Holy Spirit testifies with our spirit that we are children of God, and if children, then joint-heirs with Christ, provided we suffer with him. But

the sufferings we are to undergo are not worthy to be named with the future glory which awaits us. So great is that glory that even creation, or so much of it as was affected by the fall, is waiting for and anxiously expecting the day when the children of God shall realize it. Creation was, by the curse, subjected to frailty much in the same way as man, and like him in hope of a deliverance from it. Under this curse creation groans together and is in pain till now; and not only creation, but we too who have the earnest of the Spirit groan with it, while waiting for the deliverance of our bodies from the grave. In hope of this deliverance we were saved, and we are cherishing it still. True we have not yet attained what we thus hope for, but we are waiting in confidence that we shall

16. The Spirit itself testifies with our spirit that we are children of God; If we are led by the Spirit of God (v. 14) then are we children of God; that is, we remain his children, for the question of originally becoming children is not here in view. We are living either according to the flesh, or according to the spirit, as led by the Holy Spirit. If the latter, then are we children of God. Are we so led? This is the decisive question. Now the Holy Spirit dwells within us to strengthen us and lead us. This is indisputable. It therefore knows whether we are so led or not, and can so say. This then is its testimony—that we are led by it.

And so with our own spirits. We know within ourselves what is our spiritual state, what our wish, intent, and effort. Are these in strict accordance with the Father's will as read in his word? Are we living closely up to this will, and holding the evil inclinations of the flesh in check? Are we keeping the body under? Over all its perverse tendencies is a spirit, enlightened and pure, dominant? All this we know within ourselves, and to it can testify. Finally, we know that we are living according to our own spirit; and the Holy Spirit knows that we are led by it. Now if led by this, and living according to that, then are we children of God. To that the Holy Spirit testifies, to this, the human. Thus the two testify together that we are children of God.

But the passage is sometimes interpreted very differently. It is maintained that the Holy Spirit lays down the conditions of the new birth, and declares that upon compliance with them, we are children. This, it is alleged, is the Spirit's testimony. And, on the other hand, it is held that we know within ourselves whether we have or have not complied with these conditions. This, it is said, is the testimony of our spirits.

Most of what is here said is certainly true, but it involves a misapplication of the passage. How we *became* children is not

the subject in hand, but how we remain such. Continuing, not becoming, is the fact in question.

17. and if children, also heirs, God's heirs, joint-heirs with Christ, If you are God's children, it follows that you are his heirs; and farther, since Christ is his Son, it also follows that you are joint-heirs with him. Whatever inheritance, therefore, awaits him as Son, also awaits you as children. There is perhaps this distinction to be taken notice of, that as Christ is Son by reason of his nature, he inherits in virtue of absolute right, while we, being children merely by adoption, inherit by courtesy. Of the nature and extent of the inheritance to which we are heirs, we shall never know much till we go hence and enter upon it. Were an effort made to explain it to us, most likely, while we are in our present condition, we should be incapable of understanding it.

provided we suffer with him, that we may also be glorified with him. We are now joint-heirs with Christ, but in order to realize the sublime inheritance with him, we must lead the life he led. We must suffer as he suffered, if we would be as he is. Not that we are required to suffer to the same extent; for in mercy we are spared this. But if fidelity to him happens to lead us into sufferings, be they great or small, we must endure them, and endure them as he did, without a murmur. But we must not court sufferings; we are merely not to decline them; for if excessive they may break us. No one can know beforehand how an untried ill will affect him. Better succeed without it if we can.

The following has been suggested as the proper clausal connection: Joint-heirs with Christ, that we may also be glorified with him. But this is clearly wrong. The true connection is: Suffer with Christ, that we may also be glorified with him.

The phrase, "provided we suffer with him," would seem to imply some doubt in regard to our suffering, or that we may escape it. But this I presume is not meant. The import I take to be: provided we suffer as becomes joint-heirs with Christ. From suffering in this life none are free, the children of God not more than others. Whatever may be the inequalities of life in other respects, suffering at least is common to all. Nor perhaps is it desirable that it should be otherwise. It is our anguish of spirit here more than all things else that causes us to sigh for the peace to come. We are all doomed to suffering in this life; but we

bear not our sufferings becomingly. We pine under them and mourn over them, But this is not Christ-like. It is divine to suffer with a brave mute heart.

18. Now I count that the sufferings of the present time There are then sufferings of the present time, mighty sufferings, sufferings in body and mind; indeed not a day, nay an hour, passes without them. The weight of years lies burdensomely on pious Simeon, while the pure and lovely Mary has her heart pierced through with many sorrows. The noble and the mean alike meet suffering in the way. Nor till the grave shuts over the good is their suffering at an end.

are not worthy to be named with the glory that shall be revealed for us. The idea seems to be, that great as our sufferings are and much as we make of them, still they are utterly insignificant, indeed not even worthy of mention in the light of the glory which is to be revealed for us. The word glory here denotes the fullness of the honor and happiness which awaits the children of God at the resurrection. "Revealed" implies that this "glory" is yet covered from human sight. No full account of it has yet been given. A vague but exciting hint is all we have. "Revealed *for* us," not *in* us, but strictly *for* us, for our benefit.

19. For the earnest expectation of the creation is waiting for The course of thought appears to be this: The sufferings of the present time, however great in our estimation, are too insignificant to be mentioned with the glory that is to be revealed for us. That glory then must be very great. Indeed so surpassingly great is it that even creation is looking forward to it with intense eagerness. Instead of the expression, "the earnest expectation of the creation is waiting," we would say, the creation is earnestly expecting and waiting for. But the Greek will not admit of being thus rendered. In *apokaradokia* the *apo* is merely intensive, the word meaning *earnest expectation*. "It is," as Hodge happily expresses it, "an expectation that waits the time out, that never fails till the object is attained."

But what is the meaning of *κτίσις* here rendered creation? On all hands the question is allowed to be difficult. Opinions on the import of the word are about as numerous as the pens used in setting them down; and they clash in hopeless confusion. Hodge enumerates no less than six distinct acceptations in which the word has been taken; while Stuart mentions eleven. The former covers seven pages in discussing it; the latter, five. From

these facts and other similar ones that might be mentioned, the reader will draw at least two conclusions: 1. That the word is regarded as highly important. 2. That its interpretation is very difficult.

The word means, 1. The whole creation, rational and irrational—every made thing. 2. Any and every creating act. 3. Any result of such act, as living creature or mere thing. From this it will be seen that the word is of very comprehensive import, and applied to an endless variety of objects. In the N. T., as verb or noun, it denotes for the most part the act of creating all things; the human race; and the new creation in Christ; to which perhaps is to be added, as special, its meaning here. It appears, therefore, that its use in the N. T. throws no decisive light on its import in the present case; and consequently that in settling its meaning we are left mainly to the passage itself.

In what acceptation, then, or rather how comprehensively does the passage require us to take the word? Before replying, a few preliminaries demand attention. Were the word wholly unattended by any limiting or qualifying circumstance, we should certainly be required to render it creation. This no one can question. Now to what extent is the word here thus limited or qualified? In other words, what things are we required to exclude from it? 1. We have certainly to exclude the redeemed; for these stand over against what the word denotes and are contrasted with it. 2. We have also to exclude the fallen angels; for these were never subjected to their present condition "*in hope.*" 3. We can not include the unfallen angels; for these have never been "subjected to frailty." 4. Nor can we include the lost of the human family; for these are not to be "delivered from the bondage of corruption into the glorious freedom of the children of God." 5. Besides, we are to exclude all things in no way connected with our mundane system, as not being before the Apostle's mind. All these things, I take it, we are to exclude from the word.

But now, on the other hand, how much of all that remains does the word include? I think it may be safely assumed, in general terms, that it includes so much of all creation as fell under the original curse on account of Adam's sin. Under that curse the earth certainly fell; for God cursed it directly and in so many words. The earth, then, I conclude, is among the things to be "delivered." From every disability under which it now lies in

consequence of sin it will be freed. Not only so, but it will be "translated" into a state of more than pristine newness and glory. It will undergo a change analogous to that which the bodies of the redeemed are to undergo. It will not become absolutely new; but it will be the old earth renewed; and as the change which the body is to undergo will render it a better body than Adam's was before the fall, so, I conclude, the earth will be incomparably better than it ever was. As far as it now is inferior to what it was previous to sin, so far, when renewed, will it excel what it then was. Whenever God has to recreate, it is ever of his purpose to make his second work immeasurably better than the first. The following from Peter confirms the truth of what has just been said: "We, according to his promise, look for new heavens and a new earth, in which dwells righteousness." 2 Pet. iii. 13. I hence feel safe in including the earth in that portion of creation which is to be "delivered."

But is the earth all that is to be included? Only a probable answer can be given. When the earth was cursed all the inferior creatures on it seem to have been involved with it, and, if so, these too may be restored. Nor can I see any thing unreasonable or inconsistent in this. If the brute of the field browsed on the pastures of Eden, and birds of the air sang in its bowers, why not in the new earth? God made them all to be companions of man at the first, and they were "very good," why not do so again. Not that he will, but only that he may, and surely there are none to wish that he may not.

I conclude then that the subjects, besides the redeemed, of the "glorious freedom" will be all that fell under the original curse, including the earth certainly, and the inferior creatures probably.

But in reply to this it may be said that the Apostle predicates of "the creation" of which he speaks, things which are inapplicable to the earth and the lower animals, such as, "earnest expectation," "not willingly," "groans together and is in pain." This however is a mistake. The earth and all inferior creatures fell under the curse with man. Together they all bowed to a common doom. Accordingly they are all represented as alike sensible of the curse, as affected alike by it, and acting alike under it. Hence if man is made subject to faulty "not willingly," so is creation; if "he desires and expects," so does creation; if he "groans," so does creation. This is both a common mode of speech in the Bible, and proper within itself. It consequently forms no objection to the views just expressed.

The expression "glorious freedom of the children of God" comprehends not only complete release from the "sufferings of this present time," but also that fullness of honor and bliss with which the redeemed are to be invested. It exhausts the blessedness of the "spiritual body," of the "everlasting kingdom," and of the "new earth." There is nothing which awaits the ransomed at the "coming" of Christ which it does not include.

In conclusion I add that Hodge, Bloomfield, Alford, and others, agree with the view here held; while Stuart, MacKnight, and others, limit the meaning of *κτίσις* to the human family. The former I think right, and the latter wrong.

the revelation of the sons of God. To reveal, *apokaluptein*, means to uncover that which is covered, to bring to light what is hid, or to make known the unknown. Of course the sons of God are not absolutely covered or hid; they are so merely as to us. Their bodies either now are, or they will be covered in the grave; and their spirits have passed or will pass into the Unseen. Now their revelation will consist in uncovering them and bringing them out to the light again, replete with the new everlasting life. And this uncovering will occur here on the surface of the earth, from which they went out the dark way. Here where they went down must they come up; here where they died must they be shown alive; here where they were victims of sin must they appear as victors over it. That will be a proud day when the sons of God shall be revealed.

20. Now the creation was made subject to frailty, not willingly, Frailty seems here a more appropriate rendering of *mataioteti* than vanity, for the reason that the latter is too vague. Assuming creation to include here both animate and inanimate nature, man excepted, and the import of frailty appears not hard to collect. When applied to the earth and vegetable products, it seems to denote weakness or inability to produce as formerly, also a tendency to premature decay or shortness of life. When applied to animal nature it has much the same meaning. It signifies feebleness of constitution and rapid tendency to death. These were the effects of sin upon man, and likewise of the curse upon nature. The whole of creation seems to have suffered alike. Man and tree and brute faded as by a blight. Life became a mere decimal of what it had been. Gray hairs and the sear leaf took the place of perpetual youth; while tree and plant either grew sterile, or aborted their diminutive and imperfect fruit. But to

all this, creation was subjected not willingly or of its own accord. It bowed to its fate not of choice, but because it was without the power to resist. "Not willingly" is predicable strictly only of things having a will, as man and the lower animals; but as the rest of creation fell under the curse in common with them, it too is represented as doing what they as chief part alone did. As to man and the brute therefore the language is literal, as to all else, figurative.

but for his sake who subjected it in hope. This rendering, though strictly correct, fails to bring out the full import of *διὰ τὸν ὑποτάξαντα*. Indeed the clause evidently contains a dual sense, it being an instance of *constructio prœgnans*. 1. Creation was made subject to frailty not willingly; but God willed it who subjected it. 2. He subjected it for his own sake, or for his honor and glory. All his acts are to exalt him in the end, and this one as surely as the others. Both these thoughts are couched in the clause. "For his sake" most likely means that his honor both required the subjection, and that it would be promoted by it. "*Subjected it in hope.*" My conception of this clause is concisely this: Not that it denotes a state of hope, known to be such only to God, but that when he subjected creation to frailty, man being here especially included, he planted in his breast at the time the hope of a future deliverance. Hence from that moment down to the present, he, with the rest of creation and for it, has always been "earnestly expecting" it and "waiting" for it. How God planted this hope is very probably not known. He may have done so, and many think he did, by the historico-prophetic declaration respecting the "seed" of the woman. But this I regard as very questionable.

21. Because the creation itself is to be delivered from the bondage of corruption The creation is, as a fact, to be delivered. This is one of the events which has always been in the counsels of the Father; and because it is certain to take place, he, when subjecting creation to frailty, did it in hope of this deliverance. Accordingly it has ever since been man's hope, as also the hope of so much of creation as is to be delivered with him. This I take to be the course of thought. "*Bondage of corruption.*" Corruption denotes that state of decay, and ruin, and death, which came upon all in consequence of sin and the curse; while bondage expresses subjection to this state. From this bondage creation is to be delivered; from every effect of sin it is to emerge. **Not a stain of sin is to remain on it in the end.**

into the glorious freedom of the children of God. This glorious freedom is the freedom which awaits the children of God at the resurrection; and it is so called because they shall then be freed from the grave, from bodily infirmity—in brief, from every consequence of sin, whether Adam's or their own. The original rendered *ad verbum* gives: *freedom of the glory of the children of God*. Alford renders thus, and adds: "beware of the fatal *hendiadys*." But I see nothing fatal in the *hendiadys* here, unless to express the same thought more compactly be fatal. I hence feel not the force of the caveat. Between *glorious freedom* and *freedom of glory*, the distinction is not quite clear.

Into this freedom creation is to be translated. The burden of the curse will be lifted from it, especially from the earth, and possibly from more; and it will be advanced to a degree of beauty and glory, of which perhaps the most fertile imagination can at present form but a poor conception. God originally intended this earth for man; and he will never be defeated in his purpose. It is still to be his inheritance forever; but it will be remolded and adapted to him, and made worthy of him in his highest exaltation.

22. For we know that the whole creation groans together, and is in pain until now. "The whole creation" denotes so much of all creation as has been cursed because of sin, with the exceptions previously specified; that is, it denotes the earth, and probably its inferior inhabitants. When man sinned, all that he was heir to and lord over was at once deteriorated. It degenerated with him, and much in the same way. Especially does this apply to the lower animals. They live by much labor as does man; they inherit like him feeble and diseased bodies; they sicken with his diseases; groan as he groans; and die prematurely. Such is man to-day, and such the animate ranks below him.

If asked how the Apostle could say "we know," I reply, from observation. We have only to look around us to learn two lessons: 1. That all nature seems fearfully degraded. Take as an illustration the serpent. At first it was "more subtle" than any other mere creature of the field; and it is almost certain that its position was erect, and that it could talk. But how mean now! 2. That in the lower animals the degradation closely resembles that in man. To these facts none can be blind. Hence the "we know" of the clause.

The language "the whole creation" here means, not creation including man, but creation without him. This is evident from the next clause.

23. And not only it, but even we ourselves, though having the first fruits of the Spirit; That is, not only does creation groan together and suffer pain, but even we ourselves do the same. As if the Apostle had said: We have, it is true, the first fruit of the Spirit. But what of that? It has no effect on our common lot with the rest of creation. We still groan and suffer pain. The verse seems designed to supplement the preceding one, and therefore adds a particular or two for the sake of a completer sense. The clause, "having the first fruit," requires *though*, and I therefore insert it. "First fruit of the Spirit" means the Spirit itself as first fruit. We have the Holy Spirit as the first fruit of the future great harvest, or as a pledge that we shall attain to it.

even we groan within ourselves while waiting for the sonship, the deliverance of our bodies. Our groaning and suffering in common with creation are proof of two things: First, that both creation and we are oppressed with common burdens. Second, that no distinction in Christ frees us from these burdens during the present life. Hence though imbued with the Holy Spirit we are still suffering. The words sonship and deliverance are in apposition, and signify the same thing. The sonship will consist in the deliverance of our bodies from the grave. From this it will be seen that the word sonship is applied to two very different events in the life of the redeemed. It is applied, first, to our entrance into the family of God at our conversion. This family and the kingdom of God are the same. We therefore enter it by being born of water and of the Spirit. Sonship is applied, secondly, to our entrance into the glorified family of God. This family and the everlasting kingdom will be the same. Into that family we shall enter by being born from the grave. From a grave in the water we emerge into the first kingdom; from a grave in the earth, into the second. Hence, though the two events denoted by "sonship" stand wide apart, and are entirely distinct, they yet resemble each other very closely, so much so, indeed, that the same word is very properly used to express them both.

24. For in this hope were we saved. Literally, For in *the* hope, instead of "this hope." But the article in Greek, though

never identical with the demonstrative, sometimes performs the same office, as it evidently does here. The meaning is: we were saved in *the* hope of deliverance from the grave. "*We were saved.*" The reference is to our salvation at conversion. "He that believes and is baptized shall be saved." When we did these things we were saved. The reference is to that salvation.

But hope seen is not hope; Hope, the object of which is seen or reached, is not hope; nor in the nature of things can it be. For if the object of hope be already attained, hope itself ceases, and fruition sets in. We were saved in hope of the deliverance of our bodies; but that deliverance we have not yet realized. We are therefore still hoping for it.

for what one sees, why still does he hope for? Intended to confirm the preceding remark. When the object of hope is seen, hope ceases. Therefore what one sees he can not hope for. Hope ends in sight or realization.

25. But if we hope for what we see not, with patience we wait for it. This is precisely what we are now doing. Our bodies are not yet delivered from the grave. The event therefore is a proper object of hope. Accordingly, we are patiently waiting for it. And not only we, but creation also is anxiously looking forward to the same period. For at the time when we shall be delivered, creation too is to be delivered. Hence in patience we are both waiting together, and for very similar events—creation, for deliverance from the bondage of the curse; we, from the penalty of sin. Both shall then emerge from the burdens beneath which we now groan into the glorious freedom of the children of God. What wonder if by prayer we seek to hasten the day.

CHAPTER VIII. SECTION 4.

²⁶ And likewise the Spirit also helps our weakness; for we know not what we should pray for as we ought; but the Spirit itself intercedes in groanings not utterable. ²⁷ And he who searches the hearts knows what the Spirit's mind is, that it pleads as God desires for the holy.

²⁶ Ὡσαύτως δὲ καὶ τὸ πνεῦμα συναντιλαμβάνεται τῇ ἀσθενείᾳ ἡμῶν· τὸ γὰρ τί προσευξώμεθα, καθὸ δεῖ, οὐκ οἶδαμεν, ἀλλὰ αὐτὸ τὸ πνεῦμα ὑπερευτυγχάνει στεναγμοῖς ἀλαλήτοις. ²⁷ Ὁ δὲ ἐρευνῶν τὰς καρδίας οἶδε τί τὸ φρόνημα τοῦ πνεύματος, ὅτι κατὰ Θεὸν ἐντυγχάνει ὑπὲρ ἁγίων.

SUMMARY.

While in the flesh we are weak, and know not what we should pray for as we ought. But the Holy Spirit, which dwells in us, helps this weakness by interceding for us in inarticulate groanings. God who searches our hearts knows their true state; he also knows what the Spirit's mind is in these groanings; he knows that it always pleads for his children as he wishes.

26. And likewise the Spirit also helps our weakness; But this implies that something else already mentioned also helps. What is it? Not, I believe, our patience, as Alford thinks, but our hope. Few things strengthen us more for life's trials, or more effectually enable us to bear its ills than hope. The reference then I feel sure is to hope.

The fact of our weakness is here assumed, and very properly so; for it would be idle to attempt to prove what every one knows within himself to be true. This weakness is part of the frailty to which creation was subjected at the fall. It is a broad, keenly felt fact of life. The degree of it however is here wisely not stated; for with this we are not specially concerned. What we want is some remedy, complete or partial, for the fact itself. Accordingly, we are distinctly told that the Spirit helps this weakness; that is, it helps us in it, and so helps us that, notwithstanding it, we can be saved.

for we know not what we should pray for as we ought; The *gar* here doubtless has reference to an unexpressed sentence, the full course of thought being: Likewise the Spirit also helps our weakness; *and our weakness needs help*; for we know not what we should pray for as we ought. According to this view, the clause is intended to be confirmatory, by adding a special proof. The weakness specified consists in imperfect knowledge. But the particular fact in which it displays itself is, I presume,

to be taken in a qualified sense. For surely the Apostle does not mean to say that we can pray for nothing as we ought. When we pray for bread and other things conformably to the Savior's model, it must be held that we are praying for something as we ought. I hence conclude the following to be the Apostle's meaning: Our weakness and ignorance in this life are so great that in many respects, possibly as a rule, we know not what we should pray for as we ought. We want many things, and it may be pray for them which, were they granted, would prove our greatest misfortune; while we do not want, and never ask for many things which would be our greatest blessings. Here then is ignorance as to what we should pray for; and as to how we should pray, I imagine we are equally at a loss. Confessedly then we are weak and need aid.

but the Spirit itself intercedes in groanings not utterable. We know not what we should pray for as we ought; but the Holy Spirit knows. It knows perfectly both what we need and how to pray for it. It therefore becomes, in some measure a remedy for our weakness. The mode in which the Spirit intercedes is by prayer; and the mode in which it prays is in groanings which can not be framed into human speech, for the reason, it may be, that they embody wants for which human speech has no names. They are the deep real wants of human nature, our wants not for time merely, but for eternity. The groanings which give inarticulate expression to these wants are not the Spirit's groanings. They are our groanings. But the Spirit, if it does not cause them, which it may, so forms and directs them as to make them express our true wants and in strict harmony with the Father's will. For otherwise, I can see no advantage they would have over our common prayers. In order to excel these as prayers, our groanings must clearly possess the two following characteristics: They must pertain directly to the real want, and give exact expression to the same. Even perfection can not rise above this.

27. And he who searches the hearts "The hearts" denotes the inner man of the redeemed, and he who searches them is God. This inner man is the abode of the Holy Spirit, the temple not made with hands in which it dwells.

knows what the Spirit's mind is, *Phronema* primarily means what one has in mind, as thought, intelligence, sense, will. God knows what the Spirit's *phronema* is, what it has in

mind, what it knows, and therefore what it means in these groanings. The Spirit dwells in the heart and so knows it perfectly. God searches the heart and also knows it perfectly. Both therefore perfectly know the heart or inner man, know its states and wants. Now what the Spirit thus knows of these states and wants is its *phronema*, its mind, and what it expresses in the groanings. This mind God knows or understands; and not only so, he knows that it embodies the exact wants of his children. Hence, though these groanings can not be formed into articulate words or speech, they yet have a deep vital meaning. This meaning God understands, and to it ever responds.

In the clause "he who searches the hearts knows what the Spirit's mind is," the words heart and spirit would, at first sight, seem to be synonymous. According to this view, which has actually been held by some, the meaning is: he who searches the heart knows what is in it, its states and desires. But this I think certainly erroneous. The following I take to be the meaning: he who searches the heart knows both what is in it, and also what is in the Spirit's mind that dwells in it.

that it pleads as God desires for the holy. In these groanings, then, the Holy Spirit actually pleads, pleads with God, pleads for his children, pleads for them according to their real wants. Now when the Spirit thus pleads, it pleads as God desires. This the Spirit both can do and does; because it knows what these wants are, has them in mind, and in the groanings gives expression to them.

The literal word-for-word rendering of *kata Theou* is *according to God*, that is, according to his will or desire. The sense I believe is happily given in the simple phrase *as God desires*.

The foregoing is submitted as the best solution at command of a passage which, by general consent of commentators, is difficult. I wish I felt sure that the solution in every part is correct, but I do not. It is however the best discoverable by me. When the reader has given the passage the thought which I have; then, but not before, he will be in a condition to be distrustful as I am.

CHAPTER VIII. SECTION 5.

²⁸ Οἶδαμεν δὲ ὅτι τοῖς ἀγαπῶσι τὸν Θεὸν πάντα συνεργεῖ εἰς ἀγαθόν, τοῖς κατὰ πρόθεσιν κλητοῖς οὖσιν. ²⁹ Ὅτι οὐδὲ προέγνω, καὶ προώρισε συμμόρφους τῆς εἰκότος τοῦ υἱοῦ αὐτοῦ, εἰς τὸ εἶναι αὐτὸν πρωτότοκον ἐν πολλοῖς ἀδελφοῖς. ³⁰ Οὐδὲ δὲ προώρισε τοὺτους καὶ ἐκάλεσε· καὶ οὐδὲ ἐκάλεσε, τοὺτους καὶ ἐδικαίωσεν· οὐδὲ δὲ ἐδικαίωσε, τοὺτους καὶ ἐδόξασε.

²⁸ Besides, we know that all things work together for good to those that love God, to those that are called according to his purpose. ²⁹ For whom he foreknew, he also predetermined to be of a form like the form of his Son, that he might be the firstborn among many brethren. ³⁰ And whom he predetermined, them he also called; and whom he called, them he also justified; and whom he justified, them he also glorified.

SUMMMARY.

All things work together for good to those that are called according to God's ancient purpose; and they are thus called by the gospel. Those who he foresaw in purpose would obey him, he predetermined to be, when raised from the dead, of like form with that of his Son. Those whom he thus in purpose predetermined, he also in purpose called; and those whom he called in purpose, he justified in purpose; and those whom he justified in purpose, he glorified in purpose.

Perhaps no passage in the New Testament has given rise to more extended controversy than the brief section embraced in the three verses now to be examined. It has been the theme of the most voluminous and conflicting criticism. It forms the creed of the Calvinist and the puzzle of the Arminian; and hot and long has been the battle they have waged over it. It would not be true to say that no good has come of this strife; but I must think that the good has been fearfully disproportionate to the evil. Into this profitless word-war it is not my purpose to enter. My aim is to present, in so far as I can discover it, precisely what was before the Apostle's mind when he penned the passage. This I shall do without even pausing to think whom it is favoring or disfavoring.

28. Besides, we know that all things work together for good to those that love God, Besides the aid afforded by the Holy Spirit, and the stimulus of hope, all other things work together for good to the redeemed. "All things" I take to be a popular expression, which we are not to construe too strictly; for surely sin works no good to any one. The reference, I doubt not, is especially to the adverse events of life, to its calamities, nardships, and trials. All these, by God's overruling, work his

children good. "We know"—how? Partly, no doubt, from experience and observation; but partly also, I apprehend, from revelation. For I do not see how the Apostle could make the broad assertion he here makes unless he knew the upshot of our ills. The final effect of life's troubles must have been before him as well as their past effect. I therefore think it safe to hold that he is here speaking as the Spirit gave him vision. "Work together for good," not the seeming, but the real good, good in the longest run, good in view of eternity. "Those that love God" are the regenerate, those that are led by the Spirit, God's children. No others have any guarantee that the adverse events of life shall work them good. Such events may tend to bring the unrenewed to Christ, as no doubt in many instances they do; but only as they do this, do they work them good.

to those that are called according to his purpose. By far the most important clause in the section, because furnishing the clew, as we shall soon see, to its entire meaning. "Those that are called" is simply another mode of designating the saved. It and the expression "those that love God" are descriptive, not of different persons, but of the same. While denoting christians, the two clauses also express important facts in their lives.

Called according to his purpose—What do these words mean? The question is most important. *Prothesis* here rendered *purpose* is from *protithemi*, which means to place out or set before. Accordingly *prothesis* means a placing or setting before. Purpose, from the Latin *propono*, to place before, literally and exactly translates it. But *prothesis* is not predicated of men, but of God; and it denotes not his physical act of placing things locally before or in front of him, but his act of placing them before his mind so as distinctly to see them. The placing is before his mind, and the seeing is mental seeing.

But at what time did this *prothesis* or placing before occur? No definite answer can be given. But it may be safely assumed that it occurred far back in eternity, and therefore long anteriorly to time and man. It occurred, so to speak, when the vision of man first arose before the divine mind, or when man first took shape as man in the divine idea.

What next did the *prothesis* embrace, what entered into it and composed it; or what things were set or placed before? Man, including this world with all that in any way pertains to it, from his conception on, to say the least, until his glorification. Beyond

this period, for the present, we need not attempt to look. God as it were set before him the whole human race with their entire destiny. All that man is or shall be stood before him—sin, redemption, glorification—all were naked and open to his eye. It was there that the Logos was foreordained before the foundation of the world, 1 Pet. i: 20, to be the lamb of God that takes away the sin of the world; and from that point forward he was ever viewed as slain. There the whole gospel was ideally perfected; in a word, the whole of time, with all that shall transpire in it, was in vision as completely before God as it will ever be in fact when it is past. To us this is utterly incomprehensible; and yet we can not conceive how it could possibly have been otherwise. In that *prothesis*, accordingly, each man was as distinctly before God, as saved or lost, as he will be when the judgment is past; not because God decreed that this man should be saved and that one not, but because, leaving each absolutely free to choose his own destiny, he could and did as clearly foresee what that destiny would be, as though he himself had fixed it by unchangeable decree. To assume that God must foreordain what a man's destiny shall be, in order to foresee it, is a profound absurdity. He can as unerringly forecast the end of a perfectly free agent as he can that of a being to whom his decree has left no more of volition than belongs to the merest machine. Can any one be found so daring as to deny that he can do this?

Now it was the complete view of the future presented in this *prothesis*, that enabled the Apostle to say so confidently, "all things work together for good to those that love God." In that view it was determined that such should be the case; and from there it passed into time by revelation. Observation serves merely to demonstrate the truth of the determination.

We have now but little difficulty in explaining the clause "called according to his purpose." In the *prothesis* all things pertaining to man's redemption were set before God, and among them his predetermination that man should be called by the gospel. "To which (salvation) he called you by our gospel." Hence to be called according to God's purpose, *prothesis*, is to be called by the gospel. It is therefore not to be called by some secret impulse of the Holy Spirit; neither is it to be called "effectually" or "ineffectually," as the schoolmen phrase it. It is simply to be called by hearing the gospel preached. This call we are absolutely free to accept or reject; and accordingly as we do that or this, we will be saved or lost.

29. **For whom he foreknew,** To foreknow is to know relatively; that is, it is to know previously to some assumed or real date or period. Now let this period be located far back before time, before creation. The act of foreknowing took place before that period; it took place, in other words, simultaneously with the *prothesis*, and formed a part of it. When God set before him the human race, long before their actual existence, it was then that he foreknew. He foresaw in the *prothesis* that certain persons would, of their own choice, obey him or his Son; that they would comply with the conditions of justification, and so be saved. These were the persons "whom he foreknew." They were therefore ideal not actual persons. They existed in *prothesis*, not in fact; still all that God did of them was as real as though they had been actual persons.

"Foreknow" is here to be taken with a single qualification. It must denote more than the naked act of being cognizant of. For in this sense, of course, God foreknew every body; yet he did not predetermine every body. It must denote both knowing and accepting. God foresaw that certain persons in the *prothesis* would obey his will. These were the persons he foreknew. But besides foreknowing them, he also approved and accepted them. The Savior thus uses the word in the following passage: "Then will I profess to them, I never knew you; depart from me, you that work iniquity." Mat. vii: 23. Besides mere knowing, the word here also means approving and accepting.

he also predetermined He predetermined at the period when he foreknew, and predetermined the persons whom he foreknew. All this occurred in *prothesis*. The persons whom he foreknew were the persons who he foresaw would do his will, whether before Christ or under him, the redeemed. But he did not foreknow these and accept them because of his predetermination that they should obey him. In the matter of their obedience, he left them wholly uninfluenced by any predetermining act of his; that is, he left them free. Yet he foresaw that they would do his will; and it was because of this, their own voluntary act, that he predetermined them. In other words, their obedience was not determined by his act of predetermination; but his act of predetermination was determined by their voluntary act of obedience. Had he not foreseen their act, his act would never have taken place.

to be of a form like the form of his Son, The reference

is to the resurrection. When the *prothesis* was before God, he foresaw that certain persons would, when the opportunity was presented, become his children. These in purpose he accepted. Moreover, he then determined, which of course was an act of predetermination relatively to the thing determined, that in the resurrection their bodies should be of the same form as the glorious body of his Son. As he was predetermined to be like them before he went into the grave, so they were predetermined to be like him after they come out of it. Thus it will be seen that in the *prothesis* the Father placed before him, not only the resurrection of Christ, but also the very form he should wear after it. Nor was this all. He there also determined that this form should be the bodily form of all his children.

The reader will notice that I am a little free in rendering the clause in hand. My object is, while trying to be true to the original, to present the thought in a form which shall be intelligible to the ordinary reader, which is what he does not find in many translations of the passage. It is quite common to be so slavishly literal as to be hopelessly dark. This extreme I am willing to avoid.

that he might be the firstborn among many brethren. The *eis* here is certainly *telic*; and the word firstborn is designed to express, not so much the mere fact of being the firstborn, as the honor and distinction of the fact. In all things pertaining to the family of God, Christ is to have the pre-eminence. He is the firstborn from the grave; and to him therefore belong the honors of the firstborn son. Among these honors is that of giving the form of his glorified body to all the redeemed. His body is the type; and all their bodies will take shape after it.

30. And whom he predetermined, them he also called; Let the reader keep in mind that nothing here said is said of actuals. Every thing is yet in the *prothetic* form. The purposing is real; but both the things purposed and the beings to be affected by them, are all yet far in the future. "*Them he also called*": that is, he called them in purpose. Not that he called them in any special sense or special way, or that he called them and not others; for this is neither asserted nor implied. But he called them, if before Christ, by the preaching of prophets and other righteous men; or if under Christ, by the gospel; and just as he called them, so he called all, the difference being that they voluntarily accepted, while the others wilfully rejected.

But why, it may be asked, call those who God foresaw would reject? That it might appear in the judgment that he had made no difference; that he had made the same provision for all, the same tender to all, had left all alike free, and that each of his own accord, and with no discriminating influence from him, had chosen his own destiny. Otherwise, God could not be vindicated against the charge of arbitrary partiality. Again: all must be called to enable him to foresee who would accept and who not.

But it has been said, that it would have been better not to create man than that any should be lost; and accordingly the question has been sharply put, Why did God create, if he foresaw that some would reject the call and be lost? But the objector does not know that it would have been better not to create; and he is estopped from making his ignorance the test of the fact. As to why God created the human race, I do not know, and not knowing, shall not affect to say.

and whom he called, them he also justified; Still spoken, not of actual, but of *prothetic* persons. "Whom he called," and called just as he called those whom he did not justify." "He called"—this was God's act, what he did in carrying out his predetermination; but this done, he paused. And now those called accepted, not because they were called differently from others; but because they willed differently. That is, they willed to accept; while the others, in precisely the same circumstances, willed to reject. Upon this acceptance, which consisted in the obedience of belief, God justified them, remitted their sins, and henceforward held them as just. Now what here took place *prothetically* far back in eternity, is precisely what is now actually taking place every day under Christ.

and whom he justified, them he also glorified. He glorified in *purpose*, not actually; but the justification is just as certain as though it had occurred of actually existing persons. All things stood *prothetically* before God—the Redeemer, the gospel, the human family, the saved, the lost. As to the saved, the first act was the act of foreknowing, the act of pre-cognition and acceptance; and the last act, that of glorification. To exhaust these extremes, together with all the intermediate steps, would be to exhaust the gospel. Of course nothing of this sort can be attempted here.

The two great errors into which many expositors have fallen, who have undertaken the interpretation of the present section,

consist, first, in assuming that an act of foreknowledge necessarily implies an act of unalterable pre-figture by decree of every fact of human life; and, secondly, that the predicates of the section, as "called," "justified," glorified," are said of actual human beings. If the reader will only consent to free his mind from these two errors, he will find no serious trouble in discovering the meaning of, perhaps, the sublimest passage in the Letter; but unless he does this, he will find it a hopeless enigma. The ordinary modes of explaining the passage neither extract a ray of light from it, nor shed a ray of light upon it. The word *prothesis*, as already said, is the clew which leads us into the whole secret of the passage. The moment we lose sight of this word, the passage ceases to be explicable; while with it, its meaning opens brightly out. But with these hints and outlines the section is submitted.

CHAPTER VIII. SECTION 6.

¹¹Τί οὖν ἐροῦμεν πρὸς ταῦτα; εἰ ὁ Θεὸς ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν, τίς καθ' ἡμῶν; ¹²Ὁς γε τοῦ ἰδίου υἱοῦ οὐκ ἐφείσατο, ἀλλὰ ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν πάντων παρέδωκεν αὐτόν, πῶς οὐχὶ καὶ σὺν αὐτῷ τὰ πάντα ἡμῖν χαρίσεται; ¹³Τίς ἐγκαλέσει κατὰ ἐκλεκτῶν Θεοῦ; Θεὸς ὁ δικαίων; ¹⁴Τίς ὁ κατακρίνων; Χριστὸς ὁ ἀποθανών, μᾶλλον δὲ ἐγερθείς, ὃς ἐστὶν ἐν δεξιᾷ τοῦ Θεοῦ, ὃς καὶ ἐντυγχάνει ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν; ¹⁵Τίς ἡμᾶς χωρίσει ἀπὸ τῆς ἀγάπης τοῦ Χριστοῦ; Θλίψις ἢ στενοχωρία ἢ διωγμὸς ἢ λιμὸς ἢ γυμνότης ἢ κίνδυνος ἢ μάχαιρα; ¹⁶Καθὼς γέγραπται, ὅτι ἔνεκεν σοῦ θανατούμεθα ὄλην τὴν ἡμέραν, ἐλογίσθημεν ὡς πρόβατα σφαγῆς. ¹⁷Ἄλλ' ἐν τούτοις πᾶσιν ὑπερникῶμεν διὰ τοῦ ἀγαπήσαντος ἡμᾶς. ¹⁸Πέπεισμαι γὰρ ὅτι οὔτε θάνατος οὔτε ζωὴ, οὔτε ἄγγελοι οὔτε ἀρχαί, οὔτε ἐνεστῶτα οὔτε μέλλοντα, οὔτε δυνάμεις ¹⁹οὔτε ὕψωμα οὔτε βάθος οὔτε τις κτίσις ἐτέρα δυηθήσεται ἡμᾶς χωρίσαι ἀπὸ τῆς ἀγάπης τοῦ Θεοῦ τῆς ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ τῷ κυρίῳ ἡμῶν.

¹¹What then shall we say to these things? If God is for us who is against us? ¹²He who spared not his own Son, but gave him up for us all, how will he not also with him give us all things? ¹³Who can bring a charge against God's chosen? It is God that justifies. ¹⁴Who is he that condemns? It is Christ that died, rather that is risen, who also is at the right hand of God, and who pleads for us. ¹⁵Who can separate us from the love of Christ? Can affliction, or distress, or persecution, or hunger, or nakedness, or danger, or sword? ¹⁶Accordingly it is written, for your sake we are killed all the day; we are counted as sheep for the slaughter. ¹⁷But in all these things we more than conquer by him that loved us. ¹⁸For I am persuaded that neither death nor life, nor angels nor rulers, nor things present nor things to come, nor powers, ¹⁹nor height, nor depth, nor any other creature will be able to separate us from God's love which is in Christ Jesus our Lord.

SUMMARY.

What now shall we say to these things? God is for us; no one then can successfully be against us. After giving his Son for us, he will withhold

from us no other good. With him he will give us every thing. No one can bring a charge against us; no one condemn us; for we have Christ to plead for us, and God to acquit us. Not only so, but nothing can separate us from God's love, neither persecution nor any thing else. And although we may pass through sufferings, as we certainly shall, still over them all we shall be more than victors through Christ who gave himself for us.

31. What then shall we say to these things? The things referred to are those said of believers in the preceding section. What conclusion now do these things warrant, or what inference is deducible from them? They certainly warrant the conclusion that God is for us, or on our side. This much at least they warrant, and more we could not ask.

If God is for us who is against us? If God is for us, as he certainly is, who is against us so as to defeat our glorification? No being or thing, fallen or unfallen, is, and none can be. God is for us, therefore we are safe. All things shall certainly work together for our good.

32. He who spared not his own Son, "His own Son"—his Son in a peculiar sense, a sense in which he has no other son, his onlybegotten Son. Some have supposed that by *idion whion* the Apostle intends to designate a real son, or son by nature, in contradistinction from adopted sons; but this is not apparent. His allusion is absolute, not relative.

but gave him up for us all, Gave him up to suffer death, and thereby make expiation for our sins; not gave him up in our stead. True, in so far as we now live, Christ died in our stead; but in so far as we are to live hereafter, he died for us as a sin-offering; and the latter is the fact here meant. "Us all" signifies, not the whole human race, but the whole of the redeemed, as the next clause clearly shows. But God gave not up his Son for "us all" only. He gave him up for the whole race, and for one individual as much as for another. But this fact is not here before the Apostle's mind. He is speaking specially of the chosen.

how will he not also with him give us all things? An argument from the greater to the less put interrogatively. God has given up his Son to die for us. But his Son is his greatest and best gift. He will certainly then withhold nothing else. Consequently we may feel sure of the inheritance. "All things" signifies not absolutely all things, but all things that God intends for his children.

33. Who can bring a charge against God's chosen? God is for us as a Father for his children; he has chosen us in his

Son; has forgiven our sins; and given to us his Holy Spirit. Who, under these circumstances, can bring and sustain a charge against us? The reply is, No one.

"Chosen" here does not refer to those whom God chose in purpose (*prothesis*) before the foundation of the world, but to the actually chosen. They are those whom he has accepted as his children, because they have obeyed his Son.

Chosen, elect, from *ἐκλέγω*, means to select or pick out from; that is, to select some and reject the rest. But it means to select or pick out for a reason, and not arbitrarily. In all cases of the saved, it means to select or accept because of obedience. They who obey are chosen; they who obey not are rejected. This exhausts the subject. The old theory that obedience is consequent on election, and not election on obedience, is without foundation in the Bible. Even in the original purpose of God, in his *prothesis*, he chose those only who he foresaw would obey Christ. With him, in the matter of salvation, there is neither *prothetic* nor actual arbitrariness of choice. He chooses always for a reason, and in all cases the reason is the same. He chooses us because we first choose his Son.

It is God that justifies. A charge then against his chosen would amount to nothing; for if made, he is sure to acquit. Should the charge be false, it will not be entertained; should it be true, his chosen will repent, and he will forgive. There is, therefore, no chance to secure their condemnation. Of their own accord they may fall away, and thus effect their ruin, but another can not do it.

34. Who is he that condemns? That is, who is he that condemns God's chosen. The reply is, No one. All that Christ has ever done for the human family has been done to avert this result; and in the case of the chosen, it will certainly be averted?

It is Christ that died, rather that is risen, who also is at the right hand of God, and who pleads for us. Christ died to procure remission of our sins, these being the ground of our condemnation: and he now sits at the right hand of God, as mediator, to plead for us, and so prevent our being condemned. We shall certainly then not be condemned. The course of thought seems to be this: Who is he that condemns? Christ alone could do it, and he certainly will not; for it is he who died and now pleads with God to prevent it.

35. Who can separate us from the love of Christ? A

triumphant question, the answer to which is, No one can, the thing is impossible. No one can successfully bring a charge against us; no one condemn us; no one separate us from the love of Christ. Our glorification then is certain. "The love of Christ" is his love for us, not our love for him. The Future here is best translated, not as a simple Future, but as implying possibility or power.

Can affliction, or distress, or persecution, or hunger, or nakedness, or danger, or sword? When God's children are overtaken by great and terrible suffering, it seems to be almost universal, that some how they come to have a vague feeling that he has forsaken them. The stoutest with difficulty frees himself from the impression. But the Apostle here lets us know that such is not the case. These sufferings are the proof rather of God's presence than of his absence. They are his hand of chastening, separating the dross from the gold, and so fitting the latter for the heavenly use. Neither in this life nor in the next, can sufferings separate us from the love of Christ. They only render its realization the more sure. To the particulars here named by the Apostle, he no doubt alludes in v. 17, when speaking of our suffering with Christ. They are the mode in which the disciples of that day usually suffered.

36. Accordingly it is written, for your sake we are killed all the day; we are counted as sheep for the slaughter. A quotation from Psalm xlv: 22, as rendered in the Septuagint. The Psalm is supposed to have been written during the Babylonish captivity, when God's people had great suffering on account of their religion. Hence its application to the early christians in their sufferings. The course of thought seems to be this: In the sufferings to which you are now subjected, there is nothing peculiar. They have been the lot of the righteous in all ages. "Accordingly it is written," &c. "For your sake we are killed all the day." The appeal is to God. From morning till night we are being killed for your sake, because for the religion you enjoined upon us. So common is it thus to kill us that we are counted by those that do it, merely as so many sheep ready for the slaughter. We are slain as a matter of course, and without pity.

37. But in all these things we more than conquer by him that loved us. "In all these things"—in all these sufferings. "We more than conquer." These sufferings are a mighty

battle, but we come through them more than victors. We gloriously triumph. Our sufferings are short-lived; they quickly end. We not only live through them; but we shall live forever beyond them. Nay, we are even crowned over them, with immortality and eternal life. But all this we achieve by aid of Christ who loved us and gave himself for us.

38. For I am persuaded that neither death, nor life, nor angels, nor rulers, nor things present, nor things to come, nor powers, nor height, nor depth, nor any other creature, will be able to separate us from God's love which is in Christ Jesus our Lord. Confirmatory of the preceding verse. The particulars here enumerated by the Apostle were no doubt all regarded by him as either actually or conceivably hostile to the redeemed; for it is not supposable that he would speak of things really friendly to, and aiding them, as having the effect to separate them from the love of God. Accordingly, when he mentions life, we must understand him to mean the hard life we live in the flesh, life with its burdens, and toils, and griefs; and so with the other items named. If the word "angels" is to be held as denoting good angels, as I presume it must, then the meaning is, not that they will ever attempt to separate us from the love of God, but should they do so, they can not succeed. The case is merely a conceptional one. The design is to show that nothing can effect the separation. "God's love which is in Christ Jesus" is his love as displayed in the gift of Christ to redeem the human family.

On the several items mentioned by the Apostle, I do not think it necessary to dwell separately and at length. For the most part they need no comment. In only a few of them is the reference uncertain; nor is criticism likely to render it otherwise.

CHAPTER IX.

SECTION I.

I speak the truth in Christ, I lie not, my conscience testifying for me in the Holy Spirit, ²that I have great grief and continual sorrow in my heart. ³For I could wish that I myself were accursed from Christ for my brethren, my kin according to the flesh; ⁴who are Israelites, whose is the sonship, and the glory, and the covenants, and the law-giving, and the worship-service, and the promises; ⁵whose are the fathers, and of whom, as to his flesh, Christ came, who is over all things. God be blessed forever—amen. ⁶But I do not mean that God's word has failed; for all that are of Israel are not Israel. ⁷Nor are they all children because Abraham's offspring; but in Isaac your children shall be called: ⁸That is, the children of the flesh are not children of God, but the children of the promise are counted for children. ⁹For there was this word of promise: At this time I will come, and Sarah shall have a son. ¹⁰And not only so, but Rebecca also, having conceived by one, Isaac our father, ¹¹it was said to her (the children being not yet born, nor having done any thing good or bad, that God's purpose as to choosing might stand [and the choice be] not from works but from him that calls), ¹²the elder shall serve the younger: ¹³As it is written, I loved Jacob, but hated Esau.

¹ Ἀλήθειαν λέγω ἐν Χριστῷ, οὐ ψεύδομαι, συμμαρτυρούσης μοι τῆς συνειδήσεώς μου ἐν πνεύματι ἁγίῳ, ² ὅτι κτή μοι ἐστὶ μεγάλη καὶ ἀδιάλειπτος ὀδύνη τῆ καρδία μου. ³ Ἠυχόμεν γὰρ ἀνάθεμα εἶναι αὐτὸς ἐγὼ ἀπὸ τοῦ Χριστοῦ ὑπὲρ τῶν ἀδελφῶν μου τῶν συγγενῶν μου κατὰ σάρκα· ⁴ οὗτινές εἰσιν Ἰσραηλίται, ὧν ἡ υἰοθεσία καὶ ἡ δόξα καὶ αἱ διαθήκαι καὶ ἡ νομοθεσία καὶ ἡ λατρεία καὶ αἱ ἐπαγγελίαι· ⁵ ὧν οἱ πατέρες, καὶ ἐξ ὧν ὁ Χριστὸς τὸ κατὰ σάρκα, ὁ ὧν ἐπὶ πάντων Θεὸς εὐλογητὸς εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας· ἀμήν. ⁶ Οὐχ οἷον δὲ ὅτι ἐκπέτωκεν ὁ λόγος τοῦ Θεοῦ· οὐ γὰρ πάντες οἱ ἐξ Ἰσραὴλ, οὗτοι Ἰσραὴλ. ⁷ Οὐδ' ὅτι εἰσὶ σπέρμα Ἀβραάμ, πάντες τέκνα, ἀλλ', Ἐν Ἰσαὰκ κληθήσεται σοι σπέρμα· ⁸ τοῦτ' ἔστιν, οὐ τὰ τέκνα τῆς σαρκὸς ταῦτα τέκνα τοῦ Θεοῦ, ἀλλὰ τὰ τέκνα τῆς ἐπαγγελίας λογίζεται εἰς σπέρμα. ⁹ Ἐπαγγελίας γὰρ ὁ λόγος οὗτος, Κατὰ τὸν καιρὸν τοῦτον ἐλεύσομαι, καὶ ἔσται τῇ Σάρρα υἰός. ¹⁰ Οὐ μόνον δέ, ἀλλὰ καὶ Ῥεβέκκα ἐξ ἐνὸς κοίτην ἔχουσα, Ἰσαὰκ τοῦ πατρὸς ἡμῶν—¹¹ μήπω γὰρ γεννηθέντων μηδὲ πραξάντων τι ἀγαθὸν ἢ φαῦλον, ἵνα ἡ κατ' ἐκλογὴν προέθεσις τοῦ Θεοῦ μενῇ, ¹² οὐκ ἐξ ἔργων ἀλλ' ἐκ τοῦ καλοῦντος, ἐρρήθη αὐτῇ, ὅτι ὁ μείζων δουλεύσει τῷ ἐλάσσονι· ¹³ καθὼς γέγραπται, Τὸν Ἰακώβ ἠγάπησα, τὸν δὲ Ἠσαὺ ἐμίσησα.

SUMMARY.

The Apostle solemnly declares that he speaks the truth in what he is going to say of his countrymen, his conscience being his witness. He has great grief and sorrow on their account. Could wish that he himself was cut off from Christ and lost instead of his kin according to the flesh. Enumerates the things that distinguished them. Among them the chief is that from them Christ came as to his flesh. But although the great body of Israel is cut off, God's word of promise respecting them has not failed. Some of them will

be saved. His word of promise related to the true Israel only, and all are not true that are descended from Jacob. God counts only the children of promise as his. Accordingly Isaac and his offspring were chosen, while Ishmael and his were rejected. And so with Jacob and Esau. In these choices God was governed by reasons within himself, and not by the acts of the parties chose.

The Apostle now proceeds to consider the case of the Jews more at length than he has yet done. He first, however, very strongly asserts the interest he feels in their welfare, generously mentioning, at the same time, the things that honored and distinguished them. He vindicates God's dealings with them, especially his acts of choice, which had so much affected them. He shows that in rejecting so many of them, God had acted justly, and in accordance with prophecy; and that in receiving the Gentiles, he had done the same. He tells them that their great and fatal error had consisted in stumbling at Christ. These are the prominent features of the chapter.

But the chapter has other features which should not be overlooked. It is emphatically the artistic chapter of the Letter. In it the Apostle brings boldly out the fact that God had, at last, rejected Israel, and accepted the Gentiles. Nothing could be more offensive to the Jew than this. It was therefore necessary to conduct the painful disclosure with the skill of a master; and this the Apostle has done. He is especially happy in the mode in which he handles the fact of God's choices. He shows that no Jew at least could object to these; since he himself, not only approved them, but was proud of them in facts in his own history. It will be necessary for the reader to watch closely the Apostle in his procedure, in order to detect, at every turn, his art, and to discover how steadily he pursues his aim. Without this, the plot of the chapter will escape him.

I speak the truth in Christ, I lie not, That is, I speak the truth in what I am about to say respecting my nation. The expression, "I speak the truth in Christ," has been thought by some a virtual oath, if not one in fact. But this is a mistake. The expression is no oath, but merely a strong form of asseverating truth. The meaning is, I speak the truth as in Christ and accountable to him. As much as to say, those who are in Christ are under the most solemn obligations, whenever they speak at all, to speak the truth; and I now speak under a full sense of this obligation. "I lie not" merely reduplicates the idea in a negative form.

my conscience testifying for me in the Holy Spirit, My conscience testifying for me that what I say is true. "In the Holy Spirit" does not mean under its guidance or as moved by it. At least it is not necessary so to interpret. Rather the meaning is, my conscience testifying for me *as in the presence of the Holy Spirit*, or as open to its inspection. Thus circumstanced, my conscience dare not testify falsely.

2. that I have great grief and continual sorrow in my heart. From the incompleteness of the sense here, it is evident that there is a clause suppressed. The full meaning is, I have great grief and continual sorrow in heart *on account of my countrymen*. This is the matter about which he spoke truth and his conscience bore witness. His countrymen had repudiated Christ. This was the fact which caused his grief and sorrow. That any one should do this is painful enough; that one's own kin should do it is exquisitely so. True the Apostle does not as yet name the fact that gave him pain. He conceals it till he can bring it out with better effect.

3. For I could wish. The verb *ἠυχόμην* is the Imperfect Indicative used, if not for the Optative with *ἄν*, as nearly equivalent to it. Such is the judgment of all the most reliable critics. Indeed, I am not acquainted with an author who attempts the defense of a different view, with even a respectable show of strength. The Apostle is evidently aiming to give his unconverted countrymen a proof of his affection for them. But he completely fails if we render the verb as a simple Imperfect thus: I *was wishing*, that is, before my conversion, that I myself were accursed from Christ for my brethren. But suppose you did so wish then, what evidence is this that you now love them? You then regarded Christ as an impostor, and consequently would have deemed being accursed from him an honor, not a calamity. Therefore what you now say is no proof of present affection. This clearly will not do. Besides, the statement of a past non-recurring act required the Aorist, not the Imperfect.

The meaning of the expression is clear: I *could wish*, not that I do wish, for I do not; nor, I *could wish* provided the thing were practicable and I could have my wish. But, I *could wish* provided, first, *it were allowable*; and, second, *it were possible* to obtain my wish. But as it is neither, I in fact do not wish. I do, however, all that is in my power in the case; I show to what lengths I would be willing to go for my countrymen, if no obsta-

cle intervened. I thus give proof of the deep interest I feel in them.

But in reply it may be said: If the Apostle really does not wish, why does he say any thing about it? Why was he not rather silent? I answer, I suppose the Apostle used the word because he could not say what he desired to say without it; and that, in his case, as in all similar ones, his language is not to be judged too severely. The language of profound and intense feeling and that of accurate philosophic thought are hardly amenable to the same critical tests.

that I myself were accursed from Christ It is better to render *anathema einai* as a simple verb than as both a verb and a noun. That I myself were *a curse from Christ* is not so good as, I myself were accursed from Christ. Indeed, the former, as an English expression, is hardly intelligible.

But what is the import of the clause *anathema einai apo tou Christou*? The answer turns on *anathema*. What then does the word signify? The LXX use it to render the Hebrew *cherem* (pronounce ch as k) which primarily signifies *what is cut off, torn off, shut up*. According to this, *anathema* should signify what is cut off, shut up; and such, in substance, we find is the case. It denotes what is cut off from a common use and shut up or set apart to a religious use. It is from *anatithemi*, which means *to place up upon*, as a load upon an animal; *to lay up*, as an offering in a temple. In use, therefore, the two words have nearly the same signification.

But of things cut off from a common use and devoted to a religious use, there were two kinds: 1. Those that could not be destroyed or were not permitted to be, which it was not lawful either to sell or redeem, and which therefore remained permanently devoted. 2. Those that were to be destroyed. And of these latter again, there were two classes: things having life; and things without life. Where the devoted thing belonged to the latter class it was to be *utterly destroyed*; for thus the verb form of *cherem* is usually rendered; but where it belonged to the former, it was to be put to death. Such briefly is both the meaning and usage of *cherem* as well as of *anathema*; and with them before us, it is not difficult to answer the question in hand.

Paul clearly regarded the unbelieving portion of his countrymen, at the time of writing, as an *anathema*, as devoted to destruction, not in the sense of being put to death, though this,

it may be, in part, but in the sense of being finally condemned and banished from the presence of God forever. True, for reasons of policy, he does not here say this; but it was unavoidably in his mind. Now when he says: "I could wish that I myself were an *anathema* from Christ," he uses the word in the sense here named. He means, I could wish that I myself were cut off from Christ and banished from his presence forever—all this he could have wished *hyper, for, in behalf of, or instead of,* his brethren. That is, could he have accomplished the end by the wish, he could have wished to exchange places with them, he taking their place, and they taking his. A noble sentiment; but the world will be apt to say, rashly conceived and rashly expressed. But I dissent from the world, and stand with Paul. I have nothing but admiration for his great heart and faultless unselfishness.

The Apostle, after first expressing the deep personal interest he felt in the welfare of his countrymen, then proceeds to name some of the things which especially distinguished them. Though they had, in large part, rejected Christ, he still felt a generous pride in awarding to them their due. By this means, no doubt, he hoped to conciliate some of them, and so, if possible, gain a hearing for the things he was about to say.

4. **who are Israelites,** As Jacob was returning from his sojourn with Laban, after his long exile, an angel of God appeared to him the night before he met his brother Esau, and wrestled with him. During the mysterious interview, the angel changed his name from Jacob to Israel, which seems to mean *a prince contending or prevailing with God*. From that time on, Jacob was called Israel; and from him, the name passed to his descendants, by whom it has ever since been regarded as their most sacred and honored name. To be a descendant of Israel, and to wear his name, has always been esteemed by Jews one of their chief distinctions. Paul enumerates it as their first.

whose is the sonship, Sonship denotes the state or fact of being a son, together with its rights or privileges. Previously to christianity, this was an exclusive honor of the Israelites. But the sonship of an Israelite was quite a different thing from the sonship of a christian. That, implied no renewal of the inner man, but merely the distinction of being one of God's chosen people; this, is predicated on regeneration. Sonship with an Israelite was purely national, not individual, and therefore was

no guarantee of salvation. Its mark was in the flesh, not in the spirit; and though a peculiar distinction within itself, and implying much, it entitled to no honor under Christ. To his hereditary sonship, an Israelite had still to add sonship in Christ, as really as the humblest Gentile; otherwise he was lost.

and the glory, and the covenants, and the law-giving, and the worship-service, and the promises: By the "glory," some commentators understand the peculiar honor of being God's chosen people. But I prefer to think a special, not a general fact denoted. I hence agree with those critics, as Stuart, MacKnight, and others, who think the reference is to the *schechinah* or glorious symbol of the divine presence. The word "glory" describes no other fact so aptly as this. *The covenants*—those which God made with Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, and Moses, especially those relating to the Messiah. *The law-giving*—the word includes both the fact of giving the law at Sinai and of still having it. *The worship-service*—the whole of the Levitical ritual is meant, as connected first with the Tabernacle and afterwards with the Temple. *The promises*—those relating to Christ and the gospel.

5. **Whose are the fathers, and of whom, as to his flesh, Christ came,** That is, whose ancestors were those distinguished men, as Abraham and David, whom God delighted to honor, and whose names he has preserved for all ages. *And of whom, as to his flesh, Christ came.* "Of whom"—the Israelites, not the fathers, though of course both in fact. As to his inner man, Christ was *Thcos*, as to his outer, *flesh*. He was of Israel as to the latter, was born of them and belonged to them. They were his own, and he was their own.

who is over all things. God be blessed forever—amen. The chief difficulty of this passage is to determine how it should be punctuated. The meaning, to be sure, is perfectly clear, no matter how we punctuate, but then varying the punctuation completely changes the sense. On the difficulty, critical opinion is not agreed, and the differences are traceable, as it seems to me, more to theology than any thing else. The popular pointing and collocation are as follows: *Who is God over all things, blessed forever—amen.* This pointing and collocation, as is obvious, identify God and Christ, place the latter as supreme over all things, and ascribe to him the doxology usually ascribed to God only. Is there a necessity for this? In my opinion there is not.

I hence feel it to be in a measure gratuitous, and as due mainly to the influence of Trinitarian sentiments.

Before noticing the grounds on which this punctuation and collocation are defended, I have first a few words to say on the question of identity. With a view to this, I cite the following: "In the beginning was the Logos, and the Logos was with God, and the Logos was God." Jno. i: 1. The Logos in the flesh constituted the Christ. Here now it is distinctly asserted that the Logos was God. Let these words be accepted in their fullest intended sense, and therefore as final on the question of identity, personal equality, sameness of nature, and the like. In a word, let us concede, on other, and as I believe, safer grounds, all that the clause in hand is supposed to teach. All doubt now, as to high doctrinal soundness on the point involved, being thus removed, we may, unembarrassed, proceed to the task before us.

On what grounds, then, are the punctuation and collocation in hand defended? First, on the ground that to represent Christ who, as to the flesh, was of Israel, as being at the same time God over all things, would be to ascribe to Israel their very greatest honor, and so have the effect to conciliate them. But was this effect really likely to follow? Very far from it. No Jew denied that the Son of Mary was of Israel, but the very fact that gave them deepest offense was a claim on his part that made him equal with God. To represent Christ then as being God over all things would, instead of conciliating the Jew, have the very opposite effect. It would far more likely shock and disgust him. Hardly therefore would the Apostle needlessly obtrude it on his attention.

Second: That if the sentence ended with "things," and God were the subject of the doxology, the *eulogetos* would precede God and not follow it. The rule certainly is that where *eulogetos* is the simple predicate, and is unattended by other words influencing its position, it stands before its subject. But is the rule universal? It is not. It is only very general, but not universal, as the following instances will show: 1. "Blessed be the Lord thy God who delighted in thee." 1 Kings x: 9. Here *genoito* precedes, and *eulogemenos*, not different in sense or office from *eulogetos*, follows its subject. 2. "Blessed be the name of the Lord." Job i: 21. Here *ἐν* precedes and *eulogemenon* again follows its subject. 3. "Who worshiped and served the creature rather than him who made it, *who is blessed forever—amen.*"

Rom. i: 25. Here the relative is subject, *esti* is expressed, and *eulogetos* still follows. Besides, which is to be especially noticed, *eulogetos* is here followed by *eis tous aionas, amen*, the very words which follow it in the passage in hand, and which seem in each instance to determine its position. The design is not merely to say of the subject he is blessed, but he is blessed *eis tous aionas, forever*, which requires *eulogetos* to stand immediately before the *eis*. 4. "God the Father of our Lord Jesus, *who is blessed forever*, knows that I lie not." 2 Cor. ii: 31. Here we have \acute{o} for subject, followed by $\acute{\omega}\nu$ $\epsilon\upsilon\lambda\omicron\gamma\eta\tau\acute{o}\varsigma$, and this again by *eis tous aionas*, as in the preceding passage.

From these premises it appears that *eulogetos* does not always precede its subject. Therefore it can not be assumed that it certainly does so in the passage in hand

But, in reply to this, it may be said, that although *eulogetos* does not always precede its subject in simple affirmative assertions, it always does in ascriptions of praise. But this is begging the question, and is therefore entitled to no farther notice. The rule may be, and is, I again grant, that *eulogetos* precedes its subject; yet if in a single instance only, it is clearly shown that it follows, and this has now been done, it is then determined that it may follow in every instance. Whether then, in a given case, like the present, it does or does not precede, is a question of fact to be settled as best it can.

But my most serious objection to the passage, as usually pointed, is the sense. To say, *Who is God over all things, blessed forever*, is to my mind un-Paul-like, and wears a forced appearance. It looks artificial, and has the air of an ill-conceived accident. The context would not lead us to expect any thing like it; and it evidently subserves no purpose in harmony with the current of thought. Indeed, the very most it has in its favor, as appears to me, is the theological notion to which it lends countenance.

On the contrary, when we read, *Of whom, as to his flesh, Christ came, who is over all things*, we have a weighty Paul-like expression, which harmonizes perfectly with the scope of thought, and is just all we would expect the Apostle to say at present on the subject. Assuming this to be correct, how naturally follows the doxologic clause: Christ is over all things—*God be blessed forever*.

But again it is replied, by way of objection, that if this were correct, *Theos* would have the article. Certainly it might have

it; but at this date we are too far removed from Middleton to stake so much on the mere presence or absence of an article. I can not therefore feel the force of the objection.

I add only, that I am wholly free from any convictions touching the divinity of Christ, which lead me to adopt the view here insisted on. What alone controls me is the belief that the popular mode of pointing the passage is erroneous. I know that the view I reject is strenuously defended; and it may be true. Still, I am not so impressed at present. The weight of authority is, I grant, against me; but in the present instance even authority may not be weighty. Our weakness is to see our tenets where inspiration never placed them.

6. **But I do not mean that God's word has failed,** In saying, "I could wish that I myself were accursed from Christ for my brethren," the Apostle has indicated his view of their condition. *He regarded them as accursed from Christ.* Nor was this his view of a few only of them; for the vast body of them had repudiated Christ. This is the fact which underlies what he here says, and gives rise to his remark. *But I do not mean* in what I imply that God's word respecting Israel has failed. For such is not the case. "God's word" must here be taken comprehensively for all his promises relative to the salvation of Israel. That word has not failed; because it never contemplated the whole of Israel, and the whole are not accursed. It contemplated a "remnant" only; and a remnant are already saved. Therefore God's word has not failed.

for all that are of Israel are not Israel. Confirmatory of the preceding remark. That is, the clause is designed to show that God's word of promise has not failed. All the offspring of Jacob are not Israel in the sense in which the word is used in the promise. The word is there used of those only who are so sincere and true as to receive the Messiah. As to these, God's word has not failed. The true Israel, Israel within the meaning of the promise, have accepted Christ; and as the promise embraced no others, it has therefore been strictly kept. It never comprehended the whole unassorted mass of Israel, but those only who should prove themselves true to the gospel. The ultimate rejection of the rest, it has always contemplated.

7. **Nor are they all children because Abraham's offspring.** Of the same tenor with the foregoing clause, and like that designed to confirm the remark that God's word has not

failed. The Israelites, because Abraham's offspring, are not all children within the scope of the promise. Therefore, though God should reject a part of them, and even the greater part, it does not follow that his word has failed. His word of promise now no more includes the whole of Abraham's offspring than it did in time gone. Then it included Isaac and his posterity only, and rejected Ishmael and his. And so now. His word of promise to bless, includes those only who believe in Christ. Many of these he has already blessed, and many more he will. Consequently, his word has not failed. As for those who repudiate Christ, rejecting all of them implies no failure of his word, because he never promised to bless them.

but in Isaac your children shall be called. "Called" here is equivalent to chosen, a sense which the passive of *kalleo* sometimes has. The children of Ishmael and of Isaac were alike offspring of Abraham. But of these God chose only the children of Isaac to be his peculiar people, and rejected the others. What then if he should do likewise now? Would this imply a failure of his promise? No more than it did then. Therefore he may accept those who believe in Christ, as he chose the children of Isaac; and he may reject those who reject Christ, as he rejected the children of Ishmael; and it will all work no failure of his word.

8. That is, the children of the flesh are not children of God, An explanation relative to the preceding clauses, and a deduction as to the case in hand. The children merely of the flesh were not in the past accepted of God as his children. On the contrary, they were cast out as was the case with Ishmael. But the children of promise, as in the case of Isaac, were alone chosen as his children—not children in the sense of being regenerate, but in that of being his peculiar people. Thus is it now. The children of the flesh only, which includes all that are at present called Israel, are not children of God; that is, they are not children in Christ merely because children of the flesh; for if they have no other claim than this, God disowns them. They are none of his. To be born of the flesh, no matter whose flesh it is, is now no ground of acceptance with God. A wholly different birth is necessary.

But the children of promise are counted for children, That is, are counted for God's children. As it was in the past, so is it now. The children of Isaac, alone were children of

promise; and they alone were chosen. In like manner, those only who now believe in Christ are children of promise. For "they who are of belief, the same are the children of Abraham;" and his children alone are children of promise. Therefore those only who now believe in Christ will be accepted. All the others, no matter from whom descended, will be rejected.

9. **For there was this word of promise: At this time I will come, and Sarah shall have a son.** The promise is found Gen. viii: 10. "At this time"—at this period next year, as some think, but this is uncertain. The time referred to was a time evidently fixed in the angel's mind, and understood by Abraham. It seems therefore to have been called "this time" with reference to this fact. But the time is now immaterial, the promise being the important thing. In the preceding clause the Apostle says: "the children of promise are counted for children"; *and the present verse is designed to confirm the remark.* Isaac was born conformably to God's promise; Ishmael was not. God counted the former as his child, and not the latter. Thus the statement of the foregoing clause is shown to be correct.

10. **And not only so, but Rebecca also having conceived by one, Isaac our father, 11. it was said to her** Intended to confirm still farther that "the children of promise are counted as children." The introductory clause, *not only so*, is obviously elliptical, requiring something to be supplied. I complete the sense thus: Not only in the case of Abraham were the children of promise counted for children; *but the same thing was also done in the case of Isaac*; for Rebecca having conceived by one, Isaac our father, "it was said to her," &c. The expression, "the elder shall serve the younger," is clearly regarded by the Apostle as a promise respecting Jacob, which constituted him a "child of promise" within the meaning of the phrase. This seems the more evident, if the whole of Gen. xxv: 23 be read. Accordingly, Jacob and his offspring were counted for children, instead of Esau and his. The reader will notice that I transpose the clause "it was said to her," placing it before the parenthesis. This both improves the sentence and gives the parenthesis a better position.

(the children being not yet born, nor having done any thing good or bad, Before the children were yet born, and therefore before they had done any thing either good or bad which could in any way influence God's choice, he caused it to

be said to Rebecca, "the elder shall serve the younger." This saying both indicated his choice of Jacob, and at the same time constituted a promise respecting him

that God's purpose as to choosing might stand In the case of Jacob and Esau, God made choice of the former before the children were born, and therefore before they had done any thing that could have the slightest influence on his choice. This he did that his purpose in regard to making choices, such as he then made, might stand; that is, that in every case, without exception, it might remain determined by reasons within himself, and in no sense by the acts of the parties chosen or rejected. In other words, he chose Jacob in preference to Esau conformably with an absolute right and purpose of choice which is never conditioned on human acts.

The phrase *he kat' eklogen prothesis tou Theou* means the purpose of God in the matter of making choices. He has a certain purpose which is never to be changed. That purpose relates to making choices among men. It is this: That the reason for the choice is never to be any thing that men do, but God's own wish and will in the case.

Many interpret the phrase thus: That the purpose of God "according to election" might stand; that is, his purpose according to, or as based on a previous election, an election made away back in eternity. But this is clearly erroneous. The meaning is not, God's purpose according to or as based on a previous election, but his purpose in regard to elections, his purpose touching that matter. The position of *kat' eklogen* gives to it the force of an adjective—God's electing purpose, his purpose which relates to choosing and is exhausted in it.

[and the choice be] not from works, but from him that calls), I place here in brackets a clause which fills an evident ellipsis, and so completes the sense. *Not from works—ouk ex ergon*, not coming or springing out from works. The meaning is, that the choice is not to spring out from works as the reason for it; it is not to be conditioned on them, or even influenced by them. It is to be wholly independent of them. *But from him that calls*. "Calls" here is equivalent to chooses. The choice is to arise wholly out of him who makes it, or is to be determined solely by reasons within himself.

But in choosing Jacob and rejecting Esau, God both chose and rejected with exclusive reference to time, and with no reference

to eternity. As to the final destiny of the children, the choice and rejection had no known effect upon it. It left each as free to pursue those things which would save him, and to shun those that would condemn him, as though it had never been made. Had each changed place with the other, it would not, in the slightest degree, have altered his prospects for heaven. What men wilfully do, not the divine choice, determines their final doom. God's choice, it is true, rendered the outward, temporal circumstances of Jacob and his posterity far superior to those of Esau and his; but, at the same time, it so increased responsibility as to leave the balances of justice level, and the chances of salvation equal.

The passage in hand has had assigned to it a very notorious conspicuity in theories of election, and, in my judgment, has been greatly abused. It was not penned in the interest of dogmatic Calvinism, and therefore does not countenance its offensive tenets. Interpreted as it should be, it teaches nothing contradictory of other portions of holy Writ, and shocking to our human sense of justice. In it God stands out still in a lovely light, and not as the arbitrary, inexorable Judge, who appoints one man to heaven and another to hell, not only without reason, but in defiance of it, so far as man can see. As I do not feel called upon to hunt up and notice all the various abuses to which the passage has been subjected, I shall leave that task with those who imagine that they can derive any profit from it.

12. The elder shall serve the younger. We have no account of Esau ever having personally served Jacob. The reference then must be to their respective posterities; and with this agree the facts of history. For in 2 Sam. viii: 14 it is distinctly said that "all they of Edom [Esau's posterity] became David's servants." Indeed, the Edomites were long subject to the kings of Israel, the latter often slaying them in great numbers. But the Edomites frequently asserted their independence; and at such times they became most barbarous and cruel. They seem to have taken especial pains to cultivate Esau's ancient hatred of Jacob; and they never let pass an opportunity to display it. About the time Jerusalem was destroyed by Titus, they seem to have disappeared as a separate people. After this we hear no more of them.

13. As it is written: I loved Jacob, but hated Esau. This quotation is from Mal. i: 2, 3. The extent to which God

loved Jacob was shown in preferring him to his brother; and the extent to which he hated Esau, in rejecting him from being one of the heads of his chosen people. More than this, the words need not be supposed to mean. Hatred, especially, we may assume to be used in the bold exaggerating sense so common with the prophets. It denotes not so much positive hatred, as not love.

CHAPTER IX. SECTION 2.

“Τί οὖν ἐροῦμεν; μὴ ἀδικία παρὰ τῷ Θεῷ; μὴ γένοιτο. ¹⁶Τῷ Μωϋσεὶ γὰρ λέγει, Ἐλέησω ὃν ἂν ἐλεῶ, καὶ οἰκτειρήσω ὃν ἂν οἰκτειρῶ. ¹⁶Ἄρα οὖν οὐ τοῦ θέλοντος οὐδὲ τοῦ τρέχοντος, ἀλλὰ τοῦ ἐλεοῦντος Θεοῦ. ¹⁷Λέγει γὰρ ἡ γραφὴ τῷ Φαραῶ· ὅτι εἰς αὐτὸ τοῦτο ἐξήγειρά σε, ὅπως ἐνδείξωμαι ἐν σοὶ τὴν δύναμίν μου, καὶ ὅπως διαγγελῆ τὸ ὄνομά μου ἐν πάσῃ τῇ γῆ. ¹⁸Ἄρα οὖν ὃν θέλει, ἐλεεῖ, ὃν δὲ θέλει, σκληρύνει. ¹⁹Ἐρεῖς μοι οὖν, τί οὖν ἔτι μέμφεται; τῷ γὰρ βουλήματι αὐτοῦ τίς ἀνθέστηκε; ²⁰Μενοῦνγε, ὦ ἄνθρωπε, σὺ τίς εἶ ὁ ἀταποκρινόμενος τῷ Θεῷ; μὴ ἐρεῖ τὸ πλάσμα τῷ πλάσαντι, τί με ἐποίησας οὕτως; ²¹Ἡ οὐκ ἔχει ἐξουσίαν ὁ κεραμεὺς τοῦ πηλοῦ ἐκ τοῦ αὐτοῦ φυράματος ποιῆσαι ὃ μὲν εἰς τιμὴν σκεῦος, ὃ δὲ εἰς ἀτιμίαν;

“What then shall we say? Is there not injustice with God? Not at all. ¹⁶For he says to Moses, I will have mercy on whom I have mercy; and I will pity whom I pity. ¹⁶Son then [being chosen] is not of him that wills, nor of him that runs, but of God that shows mercy. ¹⁷For the scripture says to Pharaoh: For this very purpose I raised you up, that I might display in you my power, and that my name might be published in all the land. ¹⁸So then he has mercy on whom he will, and whom he will, he hardens. ¹⁹You will say to me then, Why then does he still find fault? For who resists his will? ²⁰Nay but, man, who are you that reply to God? Shall the thing formed say to him that formed it, Why did you make me thus? ²¹Or has not the potter power over the clay to make from the same mass one vessel for honor and another for dishonor?

SUMMARY.

Is it not unjust in God to choose one and reject another, as in the case of Jacob and Esau? Not at all; for in doing so, he acts according to his own avowed principles of conduct, which must be assumed to be right. Accordingly he says to Moses, I will make my own sense of right my rule in showing mercy. It was on this principle that he set up Pharaoh to be king. But all these choices create mere worldly distinctions. They are not choices to eternal life. But if God makes men what he pleases, why does he still find fault with them? He does not do so. He finds no fault with them for being what he makes them, but only for their own voluntary wrong. Again, in these choices, God's creatures should not presume to question him. They must take for granted that he acts justly. He has the absolute right to do what he does, and as he can do none wrong, he must not be questioned,

14. What then shall we say? What shall we say in reply to the foregoing? Is all that has been said true? Or is any thing open to objection? If so, what is it?

Is there not injustice with God? Not at all. This is not a question put by the Apostle into the mouth of an objector, but his own question. It involves a difficulty which he saw would arise in the mind of his reader, and which therefore he felt it prudent to meet.

God chose Isaac and rejected Ishmael, not because of any good the former did, or evil the latter did. He did the same in the case of Jacob and Esau. Nor did his choice in its effects end at these men themselves. It extended even to their posterity, and determined, in one sense, their temporal condition and relative distinction for an indefinite period of time. In thus dealing with Ishmael and Esau did not God act unjustly? Not at all, is the prompt reply. But can this reply be sustained? It can, provided it can be shown that God acted according to his own avowed principles of conduct. For these principles, as divine and ultimate, must be held to be right. Did he thus act? The following is the reply:

15. For he says to Moses, I will have mercy on whom I have mercy, and I will pity whom I pity. Gen. xxxiii: 19 That is, God will have mercy on whom he sees fit, and will pity whom he sees fit. Why? Because he sees fit to have mercy on none unless it is within itself absolutely right. He acted upon this principle in the case of Isaac and of Jacob. Indeed whenever he makes a choice, he acts upon it. He chose Isaac because it was in itself right; but in choosing Isaac he worked no ill whatever to Ishmael. His choice of Isaac had no more effect upon Ishmael than if it had never been made. He simply did nothing to Ishmael but let him alone. He neither cursed him nor became his enemy. He only chose Isaac—no more. And so with Jacob and Esau. In choosing the former God did the latter no injustice. Surely a kindness to the one was no unkindness to the other. In raising one end of a beam, we necessarily depress the other. But not so in making a choice. God in raising Jacob did not depress Esau, but left him as wholly unaffected by his act as though Jacob had never existed. Truly, then, there is no injustice with God.

16. So then [being chosen] is not of him that wills nor of him that runs. The clause I here place in brackets is so obviously implied as to need no defence. The ellipsis is usually

supplied, as in the E. V. by *it*, which does not even suggest the omitted thought, and is therefore unsatisfactory. In all cases like the present, it is best to supply the fact or thing itself that is omitted.

The *ara* here is strictly illative, drawing its inference from the declaration to Moses. Therefore it follows that being chosen, as Jacob was, is not determined by him whose will or wish it is to be chosen, nor by his exertion who runs, as in a race, as if to merit it by excelling others. Such choice depends neither on human volition nor human action. On the contrary, it is wholly independent of both.

but of God that shows mercy. The choice proceeds from God, and is determined by reasons wholly within himself. In making it, man's agency and merit are unknown. But as already said, such choices look to mere temporal ends and create mere temporal distinctions. They do not consist in electing one man to salvation, and in rejecting another to perdition. The salvation of the soul is never in them, nor decided by them. That is settled by what the parties to the choice themselves do. Not as God's choice is, but as each acts, so will his destiny be.

No denial is here intended of the fact that God influences, in his providences and otherwise, the whole human family for their good. On the contrary, this fact is firmly believed. All that is denied is, that the salvation of any one is, independently of his own acts, fixed by mere divine choice. This sentiment is utterly unbelieved and repudiated. *Of God that shows mercy: Hardly of God that shows mercy generally, but specially.* In other words, the mercy is that shown in the special choice made. If this be correct, then all such choices are mercies, not merely to those chosen, but upon the largest scale—mercies alike to the chosen and the rejected. And this I assume to be true. When God is author to the choice, a mercy to one is a mercy to all, and to all, only the more surely because of the mercy to the one. It will appear in the last day, I doubt not, that the choice of Jacob was best alike for the posterity of Esau and for his own. The seemingly adverse hand of God is often his kindest hand.

17. For the scripture says to Pharaoh: For this very purpose I raised you up, A still farther confirmation of the negative answer of v. 14. Is there not injustice with God? is there asked. Not at all, is the reply. "For the scripture says to Pharaoh," &c. The scripture says—popular for God says. since

he speaks in the scripture. *For this very purpose*, the purpose which he is just about to state. *I raised you up*—A clause not free from difficulty, and which has been most variously interpreted. The Septuagint employs one word to render the Hebrew, while Paul uses a different word; and these three words do not agree very closely together. It is this fact that gives rise to the difficulty. The word employed by the Septuagint I believe we may at once dismiss; for had it given the true sense, Paul would have used it and not a different word. The Hebrew word has several meanings, all of which, however, are but modifications of its one radical meaning, *to stand*. Now that the word, in some one of these meanings, or shades of meaning, expresses the exact idea which God intended, is indisputable; and equally certain is it that this meaning is signified by *exegeiro*, the word used by Paul. Which one of these meanings then does *exegeiro* denote? The Hebrew word in Hiphil, the form here used, signifies *to cause to stand, set up or erect, set, place*. *Egeiro*, from which comes *exegeiro* with the same import, except where *ex* modifies it, which is often not the case, also means, among other things, *to raise up, cause to arise*. Now these are the meanings in which the Hebrew word and *exegeiro* most closely agree. But although *egeiro* means to raise up, as children, Matt. iii: 9, neither the Hebrew word nor *exegeiro* does. I see no reason why *exegeiro* might not mean it, but the Hebrew never does. This meaning then must be rejected. *Exegeiro* can not denote it, because it is not in the Hebrew. But the Hebrew word, besides signifying *to cause to stand, set up*, also means to set up *in the sense of appointing to office*. See 1 Chron. vi: 31, Neh. vi: 7. Now this, in my judgment, is the meaning of *exegeiro* in the clause in hand. It is used in the sense of *egeiro*, and means *I raised you up*, that is, to be king; or according to the Hebrew, *I set you up to be king*. To this sense, which exactly suits the context, I can see no objection. I therefore adopt it.

But how does setting up Pharaoh to be king (tautology perhaps, but necessary here) prove that there is no injustice with God? The question should rather be, What power has the fact to prove injustice? The reply is, none. For, 1st, there was obviously no injustice in the mere act of setting up the man to be king. At least none is discoverable by us. This point then may be at once dismissed. 2d. Nor was there any injustice in God causing him to become king that he might display his power in

him, and so procure the publication of his name in all the land. This point also then may be set aside. Where then was the injustice? In setting him up, it will be replied, and in making him wicked that God might be compelled to punish him as he did. But God did not make him wicked. This is gratuitous. God set him up to be king, but as to his being wicked, God had no more hand in that than in the fall of Adam. The man made himself wicked; not only so, but he did so against both God's will and pleasure. But it may still be insisted, that God set him up to be just what he was; and as he was wicked, God therefore set him up to be wicked. But God did not set him up to be just what he was morally. He set him up to be simply king; and as to what he was morally, he made himself that. God used him as he was, not made him so. But how, the objector will still urge, about hardening Pharaoh's heart? God did that, and was *it not equivalent to making him wicked?* *Not at all.* God did not harden his heart by any direct exertion of power upon it. On the contrary, so long as God operated on him through the plagues, his heart was either inclined to relent or did relent. But so soon as God ceased thus to operate on him, he at once relapsed into his old hardness. God then hardened him, not by any direct act to that effect, but by withholding the influences which softened him. This God could do with perfect propriety, that all men might see precisely what Pharaoh, when left to himself, was, and how justly he deserved the punishment inflicted upon him. There is a wide difference between hardening a man's heart by a direct act, and not softening it when the man himself is determined to keep it hard. The former God never does; the latter he may do or not as he chooses.

Again, God's right to use wicked men to accomplish his purposes is as unquestionable as his right to use good men. A man, by making himself wicked, does not annul the divine right to use him. God used Pharaoh, and Christ used Judas, because each was worthless for any and all ends save the one for which he was used. But the use made of them did not determine their final doom. That they themselves had previously fixed by their own acts. All they were fit for was what they were used for. As God could do nothing better with them than what he did, none can question his right to do that. From all of which it results that there is no injustice with God.

that I might display in you my power, and that my

name might be published in all the land. A statement of the purpose for which God set Pharaoh up to be king. This purpose he intended to accomplish whether the man were good or bad, obedient or disobedient. If obedient, that would have been God's preference; but if disobedient, still he will effect his ends. He is not to be defeated by the wilful perversity of a man whom he is trying to get to do right, but who is nevertheless bent on doing wrong. He will always work by good men if he can; but he will work by bad ones if he must.

18. So then he has mercy on whom he will, and whom he will he hardens. But he wills to have mercy on none, when the act is unjust to others, or when it makes it more easy for those upon whom he has the mercy, to be saved than for others. The mercy he shows does not determine salvation. It still leaves all alike free to settle that by their own will and acts. He showed the mercy spoken of to Jacob; but after he had done so, it was no easier for Jacob to be saved than for Esau; and after he had rejected Esau, it was no harder for him to be saved than for Jacob. Faultless justice remains with God. *And whom he will he hardens.* But when a man has so corrupted and hardened himself, as was the case with Pharaoh, that it requires the exertion of miraculous power to subdue him; and where God has exerted that power on him once and again without its producing the desired effect; and when after this, he withholds the power, and the man still remains hard, let no one charge injustice on God. Rather let it be said, that if he was unjust at all, it consisted in his excessive kindness to the obdurate and stupid heart that never responded to it. Where, in all the annals of time, did God ever do so much to soften the heart of any man as he did to soften that of Pharaoh; and yet the world clamors—"unjust." Had God, after the first miracle, opened the earth and engulfed the stubborn wretch, should we not rather have cried, *right*. How much less then, as matters stand, can we cry, *injustice*.

But the light in which Calvinism sets the case deserves a note. It represents God as rearing up Pharaoh from his cradle to be the monster he was, and then as punishing him for being and doing precisely what he was impelled to be and do. No wonder the world is shocked with the blasphemy. The circumstance that so many have been deluded into the persuasion that the Bible teaches it, is exactly what has led so many to eschew the Bible. But the Bible knows it not.

19. You will say to me then, **Why then does he still find fault?** The Apostle propounds the question, but clearly does not reply to it. The reason for this, I apprehend, is that it involves a construction of God's dealings with the human family so glaringly unjust as to deserve no answer. The Apostle seems to have felt that those who could so treat the ways of a just God ought to be left to the darkness of their error. But let us see what reply the question admits of.

If God has mercy on whom he will, and hardens whom he pleases; if, in other words, he makes the human family just what they are, regardless of their will and agency; and if they neither can nor do resist his will, **Why then does he still find fault with them?** If God did all this, and still found fault, the faultfinding would certainly appear to us as unjust. But God does not do what is here ascribed to him. He does not make the human family just what they are, and then find fault with them for being what he makes them. Morally, men make themselves what they are, which at the first is always what they should not be. For this only, God faults them. True, God sometimes makes choices, as in the case of Jacob and Esau; but he finds fault with no one for being what his choice makes him. He found none with Jacob, none with Esau. He found fault with each only when he did wrong where he could have done right. Farther God sometimes hardens men, as he hardened Pharaoh; but he finds no fault with them for being hard when he hardens them. or for doing what he impels them to do. He found fault with Pharaoh for hardening himself and impiously resisting his will. This much he did, no more. The question then is far from being unanswerable. But it does not merit a reply.

20. **Nay but, man, who are you that reply to God?** The Apostle, as already said, takes no notice of the man's question; but he turns on him to show him his presumption and folly in raising it. He thus cuts discussion short by declining it. **Who are you that reply to the Infinite One?** A mere creature, knowing comparatively nothing. Yet you question his justice and pronounce on his ways. Your folly is simply enormous, and needs no farther reply.

Shall the thing formed say to him that formed it, Why did you make me thus? Certainly not, but what of that? What conclusion follows, or what is the application to the case in hand? The passage is cited substantially from Isaiah, either

xxix: 16, or xlv: 9, for in both places the sense is nearly the same; and the application I take to be this: Shall Ishmael, who was rejected, say to God, Why did you reject me? as if having the right to question him. Shall Esau say, Why did you reject me? as though God had done him wrong. The reply is, Not at all. What then? Shall rejected Israel reply to God, Why have you treated us thus? Certainly not. For God chose Isaac and rejected Ishmael; and you say, right. He also chose Jacob and rejected Esau; and you say, right. Moreover, he at the first chose you and rejected the Gentiles, and you still say, right. If now he choose the Gentiles and reject you, dare you say, wrong. You are estopped from so replying by the very acts you indorse. The Apostle here employs the *argumentum ad hominem* with fine skill. Whatever his position may be within itself, Israel, at least, is compelled to admit its correctness.

21. Or has not the potter power over the clay to make from the same mass one vessel for honor, and another for dishonor? This verse is of the same tenor, and to the same effect, as the preceding one. The potter certainly has the power claimed; not only so, he has the right. What now is the application? The human race is the clay; and God is the potter. Accordingly, God has both the power and the right over this clay to make from it one vessel for honor, and another for dishonor. He has the power to make Isaac honorable, and Ishmael not; to make Jacob honorable, and Esau not; to make Israel honorable, and the Gentiles not; or to make the Gentiles honorable, and Israel not. All this he has the power and right to do; and if he do it, who can complain? Can Israel? When Israel was honorable, and the Gentiles not, Israel said, right; but now when the Gentiles are honorable, and Israel not, Israel says, Is there not injustice with God? The Apostle's skill is here consummate.

In the phrase, "one vessel for honor, and another for dishonor," the "dishonor" consists solely in not being honored. It is purely negative, not positive. Esau was a vessel of dishonor; yet he was left untouched. Jacob was chosen and he was let alone. The letting alone was the dishonor.

But the Calvinistic mode of construing the passage should not be passed in silence. Calvinism agrees with the preceding view as far as it goes, but insists that it stops too soon. Accordingly, Calvinism goes the following length: The human family is the clay and God the potter. From this clay God makes one indi

vidual for honor, and another for dishonor. The individual made for honor is he whom God, of his own sovereign power, appoints to heaven; while the one made for dishonor is he whom God, in like manner, appoints to hell. It is as astounding as it is painful to see men who are both scholarly and pious, strain the word of God in order to make it subserve such monstrous tenets.

CHAPTER IX. SECTION 3.

²² Εἰ δὲ θέλων ὁ Θεὸς ἐνδείξασθαι τὴν ὀργὴν καὶ γνωρίσαι τὸ δυνατόν αὐτοῦ, ἤνεγκεν ἐν πολλῇ μακροθυμίᾳ σκεύη ὀργῆς κατηρτισμένα εἰς ἀπώλειαν. ²³ Καὶ ἵνα γνωρίσῃ τὸν πλοῦτον τῆς δόξης αὐτοῦ ἐπὶ σκεύη ἐλέους, ἃ προητοίμασεν εἰς δόξαν—²⁴ οὗς καὶ ἐκάλεσεν ἡμᾶς, οὐ μόνον ἐξ Ἰουδαίων ἀλλὰ καὶ ἐξ ἐθνῶν, ²⁵ Ὡς καὶ ἐν τῷ Ὡσηέ λέγει, Καλέσω τὸν οὐ λαόν μου λαόν μου, καὶ τὴν οὐκ ἠγαπημένην ἠγαπημένην, ²⁶ καὶ ἔσται ἐν τῷ τόπῳ οὐ ἐρρήθη αὐτοῖς, Οὐ λαός μου ὑμεῖς, ἐκεῖ κληθήσονται υἱοὶ Θεοῦ ζῶντος. ²⁷ Ἡσαΐας δὲ κρᾶζει ὑπὲρ τοῦ Ἰσραὴλ, Ἐὰν ἦ ὁ ἀριθμὸς τῶν υἱῶν Ἰσραὴλ ὡς ἡ ἄμμος τῆς θαλάσσης, τὸ ὑπόλειμμα σωθήσεται. ²⁸ Λόγον γὰρ συντελῶν καὶ συντέμων ποιήσει Κύριος ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς. ²⁹ Καὶ καθὼς προείρηκεν Ἡσαΐας, Εἰ μὴ Κύριος Σαββῶθ ἐγκυτέλιπεν ἡμῖν σπέρμα, ὡς Σόδομα ἂν ἐγενήθημεν καὶ ὡς Γόμορρα ἂν ὁμοιώθημεν.

²² But God, though determining to display his wrath and to make known his power, endured with much forbearance vessels of wrath ripe for destruction. ²³ And that he might make known his wealth of glory on vessels of mercy, which he prepared for glory, ²¹ [he showed mercy on] us whom he also called, not only from the Jews, but also from the Gentiles. ²⁵ As he says also by Hosea: I will call those my people that are not my people, and her beloved that is not beloved; ²⁶ and in the place where it was said to them, You are not my people, there they shall be called sons of the living God. ²⁷ Besides Isaiah cries over Israel: Though the number of the sons of Israel be as the sand of the sea, a remnant shall be saved. ²⁸ Now the Lord will execute this saying upon the land, fulfilling it and ending it quickly. ²⁹ And as Isaiah had before said: Had not the Lord of hosts left us offspring, we should have become as Sodom, and been made like Gomorrah.

SUMMARY.

But God, though determined to punish evil-doers in the end, has always borne long with them. Surely none can say this is unjust. He may do as he pleases. And that he might show the abundance of glory he has to bestow on those who prove themselves worthy of it, he called us disciples both from among the Jews and the Gentiles. He has thus shown himself perfectly impartial.

God did no injustice in choosing the Jews at first and in rejecting the Gentiles. Neither now does he do any injustice in choosing the Gentiles and in rejecting the Jews. He has always intended to accept those who should obey his Son, whether Jews or Gentiles, and to reject all the rest. This he long since foretold both by Hosea and Isaiah.

22. But God, though determining to display his wrath, and to make known his power, endured with much forbearance vessels of wrath, ripe for destruction, Taking this verse in connection with the 23d and 24th, and we have confessedly a difficult passage. The construction is anormal, and, as usually interpreted, elliptical, leaving the sense incomplete. Part of this difficulty, I feel sure, arises from a faulty punctuation. First, let v. 22 be made a complete sentence. This of itself brings no little relief. Second, make the sentence simply affirmative, and not conditional. Third, give *de* its common signification, and render *ei* though. Then arrange as I have done, and most of the embarrassment is gone. If it be replied that a part of this at least is unusual, I grant it. But the passage itself is unusual, and therefore necessitates an unusual exegesis.

though determining to display his wrath *Thelon* here is more correctly rendered by *determining* than by *willing*, since the latter is ambiguous. God's wrath is his sense of justice manifested in punishing the wicked. This wrath he has ever determined to display on condition of final impenitence. *And to make known his power*—Not so strictly power as ability, what he is able to do. Now although from the origin of sin to the present, God has always intended to punish it unless forgiven, still, during all this time, he has been bearing with the wicked, and not punishing them, though strictly deserving it. Here then at least, none will ask, Is there not injustice with God? Truly mercy and forbearance are with him, but not injustice.

But who are the "*vessels of wrath*"? Most commentators think them to be the wicked Jews, with whom God had been bearing so long, and whom he had now cast off. The language certainly includes the wicked Jews, and may have special reference to them; but I doubt the correctness of making it denote them exclusively. It appears safer to make it include all the wicked, both Jews and Gentiles, whom God had been enduring so long. The expression "*vessels of wrath*," is a metaphor taken from the preceding verse. It means simply the wicked. "*Ripe*" or fitted *for destruction*, as applied to the wicked, does not signify ripened or fitted by God, but by their own evil deeds. *They* were authors to their condition, not *he*.

23. And that he might make known his wealth of glory upon vessels of mercy, "Wealth of glory" means abundant glory. "Vessels of mercy" does not signify vessels of mercy by

divine decree, and previously to the obedience of belief. It signifies those who accept Christ—the pardoned. *Which he prepared for glory.* He prepared them for glory when, in consequence of their obedience to Christ, he forgave their sins, and by that act.

24. [he showed mercy on] us whom he also called. God called us by the gospel, and it was in that act partly that he showed the mercy; but he showed it chiefly in remitting our sins. "Us" signifies the whole body of the saved. I here bracket a clause, because it has nothing corresponding to it in the text. Still as it, or something equivalent, is obviously implied, I deem no defense of it necessary.

not only from the Jews, but also from the Gentiles. That is, God called us not only from among the one people, but also from among the other. In the matter of the call, then, he has been perfectly impartial. He has called both Jews and Gentiles alike. Not only so, but he proposes to make all vessels for honor, and none for dishonor. In this therefore none can say he is unjust. But he not only called us; he also had mercy on us. And the precise reason for having mercy on us, and not on the rest, is that we accepted the call, while they rejected it. In calling to salvation, God is equally merciful to all. He sends to all the same Christ, the same gospel; on them he spends the same influences, and to them presents the same incentives to duty. But beyond this, he strictly discriminates in bestowing mercy. He bestows it on those only that obey his Son. On all the rest he will one day pour out his wrath.

In the former of these two verses, the Apostle shows how God deals with vessels of wrath; in the latter, how he deals with vessels of mercy. Those, he endures with much forbearance, though resolved to punish them at last; these, he calls to the honors of the gospel, that he may finally crown them with his wealth of glory.

25. As he says also by Hosea: I will call those my people that are not my people, and her beloved, that is not beloved. The passage is compiled from Hosea i: 10 and ii: 23; and it seems originally designed to apply to reinstated Israel alone; but that it includes also the Gentiles is settled by the use here made of it. I can not see that it is used by way of accommodation as some writers insist.

The Apostle now proposes to establish from prophecy two points: 1. That the Gentiles are to become the people of God.

2. That only a remnant of Israel is to be saved. It is thus to be made apparent to the Jews that their own prophets confirm all Paul says. *I will call those my people:* I will so call or name them, because they will then be my people. The time will come when the Gentiles will obey the gospel, and be saved. They will then be my people, and I will so style them. *That are not my people:* That are not my peculiar people in the sense in which Israel are. Not that I now repudiate all Gentiles, only that as a body they are not mine in a special sense. *And her beloved, that is not beloved:* An allusion no doubt to the church. As much as to say, the Gentiles are at present not a chosen people, which is the force of "not beloved." But the time is coming when they will compose the church, the Lamb's wife. As such, they will then be beloved. Israel is now the beloved, and the Gentiles the not-beloved. But time will reverse this; and the *Gentiles will be the beloved, and Israel the not-beloved.* No fact could be mentioned more offensive to Israel than this. Yet the time had come when it must be stated.

26. And in the place where it was said to them, **You are not my people, there they shall be called sons of the living God.** To the same effect as the preceding. That the prophecy has a double meaning can hardly be doubted. When first spoken it applied to restored Israel; but God meant it to include the Gentiles also. This Hosea may not have understood; for the prophets often uttered things the full purport of which they did not comprehend. Paul's use of the passage is the best evidence of what God intended by it. Nor does the Apostle cite it in an accommodated sense, as some commentators think; that is, merely because it happened to express his own ideas. He cited it rather because it proves that God long since purposed and said that the Gentiles should become his people. This point the Apostle is anxious to establish; and he completely does so by Hosea. *And in the place*—Not in any one particular place, but among the Gentiles generally. It was the common twit of the Jews that the Gentiles were not God's people. *There they shall be called*—There they shall actually be sons of God, and therefore shall be so called. The reception of the Gentiles being now established by Hosea, the Apostle proceeds to prove from Isaiah that only a remnant of Israel is to be saved.

27. Besides, Isaiah cries over Israel: **Though the number of the sons of Israel be as the sand of the sea, a**

remnant shall be saved. That is, *only* a remnant shall be saved. This remnant, from and after Christ, consisted of those who accepted him. The vast remainder were all rejected. It was the rejection of Christ by this remainder, and their consequent anathematization that gave the Apostle the "great grief and continual sorrow" of which he speaks in the first of the chapter; and when we contemplate the spectacle we can not wonder at his emotions. The disproportion between the remnant and the remainder was fearful. A mere handful saved: millions lost. But the lost had themselves alone to blame. "O Jerusalem, Jerusalem, how often would I have gathered your children together, *but they would not,*" is the solution of the case. God placed before them the alternatives—Christ and life, or not Christ and death. They deliberately chose the latter. They were free to have made a different choice; and the pressure which it is right to use, God brought to bear upon them to induce them to make it. Yet they would not; and as they chose, so they fare.

28. Now the Lord will execute this saying upon the land, fulfilling it and ending it quickly. That *logos* refers to the saying of Isaiah in the preceding verse, I assume as certain. Accordingly, I render it *saying*, and prefix "*this*" to it, so as to render the reference definite. "The Lord will execute *this saying*"—he will fulfill it to the letter. This he will do by actually saving the remnant, and rejecting the remainder. Thus he will verify all I teach in regard to Israel. "Upon the land"—the land of Israel. "Fulfilling it and ending it quickly"—fulfilling the saying and bringing the fulfillment at once to an end. The citation in this and the preceding verse is from Isaiah x: 22, 23. The Apostle follows the sense of the passage rather than the verbiage.

29. And as Isaiah had before said: Had not the Lord of hosts left us offspring, we should have been as Sodom, and been made like Gomorrah. Here Is. i: 9; hence the rendering, "had before said;" that is, he had said what is here cited before he said what is cited in vs. 27, 28. The passage is designed as a still farther proof that a mere remnant of Israel is to be saved. *The Lord of hosts*—The Lord that rears them up and preserves them. The phrase is used with admirable propriety here. *Left us*—left to us Israelites. *Offspring*—some offspring, a remnant. *We should have become as Sodom*—we should have become wholly extinct, not even one left. *And been made like Gomorrah*—we should have been utterly cut off from

the earth, made a complete desolation. The Apostle clearly regards these two cities as instances of entire extinction, not considering Lot as belonging to them, but as a mere temporary dweller in one of them.

But the Lord of hosts has preserved us offspring, a mere remnant, it is true, in comparison with those that are lost, still enough to preserve our name from oblivion. This remnant is small in numbers, but mighty nevertheless. It has been purified in the blood of Christ, and is now the light of the world. Its name is to endure forever; and its victories are to extend to the remotest bounds of earth. All nations shall bless God for it. In the loss of Israel there is cause for "continual sorrow;" but in the salvation of the remnant, still greater cause for joy; and in the end, God's name will be more honored through this remnant, and the world more blessed, than through all the countless hosts of Israel besides. After all, then, God has not been nursing Israel to no purpose.

CHAPTER IX. SECTION 4.

³⁰ What then shall we say? That the Gentiles, who were not seeking justification, attained to justification, but justification that is by belief.

³¹ But Israel, though seeking a law of justification, attained not to a law.

³² Why? Because [seeking justification] not by belief, but as by works, they stumbled at the stumbling-stone.

³³ As it is written: Behold, I place in Sion a stumbling-stone, and a rock of offense; and he that believes upon it shall not be ashamed.

³⁰ Τί οὖν ἐροῦμεν; ὅτι ἔθνη τὰ μὴ διώκοντα δικαιοσύνην, κατέλαβε δικαιοσύνην, δικαιοσύνην δὲ τὴν ἐκ πίστεως.

³¹ Ἰσραὴλ δὲ διώκων νόμον δικαιοσύνης, εἰς νόμον δικαιοσύνης οὐκ ἔφθασέ.

³² Διὰ τί; ὅτι οὐκ ἐκ πίστεως ἀλλ' ὡς ἐξ ἔργων, προσέκοψαν τῷ λίθῳ τοῦ προσκόμματος.

³³ Καθὼς γέγραπται, Ἴδοὺ τίθημι ἐν Σιών λίθον προσκόμματος, καὶ πέτραν σκανδάλου· καὶ ὁ πιστεύων ἐπ' αὐτῷ οὐ καταισχυνθήσεται.

SUMMARY.

The Gentiles from some cause were not seeking justification. Yet they found it. Why? Because with glad hearts they sought it in Christ in whom alone it is found. But Israel were seeking justification; and yet they did not find it. Why? Because they sought it not by belief in Christ, but by works of law in which way it can never be found.

The Apostle has now shown that God, in rejecting the Jews and receiving the Gentiles, had not been unjust; that in doing so he had acted on principles which the Jews themselves approved;

that all he had done was foretold in their prophets, and therefore should not have been unlooked for by them. He is consequently ready to pass to a new topic; and accordingly proceeds to state the reasons why Israel was rejected and the Gentiles received. In other words, he is now going to account for these facts.

30. *What then shall we say? Not in the way of inference, but in the way of accounting for what has now been said. Israel is rejected; and the Gentiles are in their place. Why is it so?*

That the Gentiles, who were not seeking justification, Who were not in pursuit of it, and therefore were not expecting it. But why not seeking it? Either, I presume, because they knew in effect nothing about it, and consequently knew not how to seek it; or because they had sunk down in indifference, and cared nothing for it. Or, which is most probable, both these causes combined were at work to produce the result. The point is unalluded to by the Apostle; hence our inability to decide it.

Several commentators are of the opinion that the words *dio-konta*, *katelabe*, and *ephthase* are here used agonistically, that is, in the sense in which they were employed in the ancient public games; and they so render them. I regard the opinion as unlikely, if not fanciful.

With Stuart and Bloomfield, I here render *dikaosunen* justification, instead of righteousness. True, Riddle, in a note on Lange, thinks this rendering "altogether untenable." But assertion is a cheap form of criticism. To assert with R. is far easier than to defend the other side. Precisely what the Gentiles did not seek was release from sin and consequent acceptance with God; and release from sin is the radical fact in justification.

attained to justification, but justification that is by belief. That is, they realized it, or were justified. But they were not justified by belief alone, or as the sole condition of it. For as Bloomfield *in loc.* justly says: "Faith in Christ implies a full acceptance of his gospel, and an obedience to all its requisitions, whether of belief or practice." When the Gentiles believed in Christ and obeyed him, their sins were remitted. Being now free from sin, they were held as just or righteous, which was their justification. This justification they sought by belief in Christ, and not by works of law; but the belief by which they sought it was not a mere conviction of the heart, excluding the acts that spring out of belief and go with it. It was the belief which led

them to obey Christ, and so complement the expression "obedience of belief."

Here the reason for the reception of the Gentiles is broadly and clearly set forth. Priorly to the offer of Christ to them, they were, as compared with Israel, a rejected people, and were not seeking justification. But so soon as the gospel was presented to them, they obeyed it; and thus obtained the favor of God. Their reception of Christ, therefore, and consequent justification were the reason why they became God's people.

31. But Israel, though seeking a law of justification, If the Apostle be assumed here as intending to speak with strict precision, to speak, in other words according to the real fact in the case, then his unusual collocation *nomon dikaiosunes* instead of *dikaiousunen nomou* is significant. Israel had a law which, theoretically, was a law of justification, but which, in fact, was not one. Not one of them had ever been justified by it; nor was one of them ever to be. To them therefore it was no law of justification. Now as they had no intention of being justified save by law, what they were in reality seeking was a law which should justify them. Primarily they were seeking a law as a condition precedent to justification. Not that they were doing this knowingly and formally; but still they were doing it. They were seeking the law rather than the justification.

Or, which I deem the more probable, *nomon dikaiosunes* is simply equivalent to *dikaiousunen nomou*. In form the two expressions certainly differ, but in sense, most likely not. Hence to seek a law of justification is to seek the justification of law. This is clear; and it was obviously the fact in the case. I therefore consider it safer to conclude that, although the Apostle has varied the usual form of expression, he did not mean to vary the usual sense. In this view I feel confirmed by the clause "as by works," in the next verse. To seek justification by law is the same as to seek it by works.

In translating participles, as here, we often find it best to use, as a sort of auxiliary, some such word as *when*, *while*, or *though*. We thus obtain a bolder and clearer meaning. The reader will notice that I here use *though*, which indeed the sense seems to imply.

attained not to a law, That is, they did not find the law they sought; and as a consequence, they remained unjustified. When they sought justification they did not find it, because they

sought it by law; and when they sought a law of justification, they did not find it, because such a law is practically impossible. Their failure therefore was complete.

32. Why? Because [seeking justification] not by belief, The full connection is as follows: But Israel, though seeking a law of justification, attained not to it. Therefore they remain unjustified. Why? Because they sought it not by belief. Justification by belief is the only justification possible to man. Hence he who does not seek it thus will never attain to it.

but as by works, Clearly as by works of *law*. Indeed so many MMS. contain the word *nomou* that it seems questionable whether it should be omitted. The evidence for it and against it is about equal. Alford brackets it, while Tregelles and Green both omit it. As it is really not necessary, I shall not retain it. *As by works*—as being persuaded that by works of law they could attain to it—a fatal persuasion. Justification by belief is practicable; justification by works of law, practically impossible. The Gentiles chose that method; Israel this, which accounts for the fact that the former are accepted, and the latter not.

they stumbled at the stumbling-stone. They stumbled at Christ. They maintained that justification could not be obtained except by their law. Accordingly, they repudiated Christ. Their disastrous argument ran thus: The law alone is for justification, and we are sure of justification by it. Therefore we will have nothing to do with Christ. We will never abandon the law for him. This decided their fate.

The language of the clause is metaphorical. Israel is viewed as pursuing justification so erroneously and eagerly as to stumble at Christ, the very object in whom they should have sought it. They followed the illusion of the law, and so missed the reality in Christ.

33. As it is written: Behold, I place in Sion a stumbling-stone, and a rock of offence; That is, I place Christ in Sion; but I do not place him there *to be* a stumbling-stone. This is not what I design. I place him there to be a Savior; but should Israel reject him, to them he will prove a stumbling-stone. He is set for salvation to all; but should any become offended at him, to them he will become a stumbling-stone, and a rock of offence. They will stumble over him, and he will fall on them; and as a consequence, they will never be justified. Christ is salvation to him who accepts him; he is ruin to him who does not.

The passage is cited from Is. xxviii: 16, viii: 14; and the use Paul makes of it shows that, no matter to what else it may originally have applied, it clearly alludes to the Messiah. The Apostle seems to interpret what at bottom the prophet meant.

and he that believes upon it shall not be ashamed. He that believes upon Christ shall be justified; and therefore, in the judgment, at the last day, he shall not be condemned. Consequently he shall have no cause for shame. It is reserved exclusively for those that repudiate Christ, as Israel is doing, to be covered with shame. He gains all who accepts Christ; he loses all who does not.

CHAPTER X.

SECTION I.

Ἀδελφοί, ἡ μὲν εὐδοκία τῆς ἐμῆς καρδίας, καὶ ἡ δέησις πρὸς τὸν Θεὸν ὑπὲρ αὐτῶν εἰς σωτηρίαν. ²Μαρτυρῶ γὰρ αὐτοῖς ὅτι ζῆλον Θεοῦ ἔχουσιν, ἀλλ' οὐ κατ' ἐπίγνωσιν. ³Ἄγνοοῦντες γὰρ τὴν τοῦ Θεοῦ δικαιοσύνην, καὶ τὴν ἰδίαν ζητοῦντες στήσαι, τῇ δικαιοσύνῃ τοῦ Θεοῦ οὐχ ὑπετάγησαν. ⁴Τέλος γὰρ νόμου Χριστὸς εἰς δικαιοσύνην παντὶ τῷ πιστεύοντι. ⁵Μωσῆς γὰρ γράφει τὴν δικαιοσύνην τὴν ἐκ τοῦ νόμου, ὅτι ὁ ποιήσας αὐτὰ ἄνθρωπος ζῆσεται ἐν αὐτοῖς. ⁶Ἡ δὲ ἐκ πίστεως δικαιοσύνη οὕτω λέγει, Μὴ εἶπης ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ σου, Τίς ἀναβήσεται εἰς τὸν οὐρανόν; τοῦτ' ἔστι, Χριστὸν καταγαγεῖν. ⁷Ἥ, Τίς καταβήσεται εἰς τὴν ἄβυσσον; τοῦτ' ἔστι, Χριστὸν ἐκ νεκρῶν ἀναγαγεῖν. ⁸Ἀλλὰ τί λέγει; Ἐγγύς σου τὸ ῥῆμά ἐστιν, ἐν τῷ στόματί σου καὶ ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ σου· τοῦτ' ἔστι τὸ ῥῆμα τῆς πίστεως ὃ κηρύσσομεν, ὅτι, ἐὰν ὁμολογήσῃς ἐν τῷ στόματί σου κύριον Ἰησοῦν, καὶ πιστεύσῃς ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ σου ὅτι ὁ Θεὸς αὐτὸν ἤγειρεν ἐκ νεκρῶν, σωθήσῃ. ¹⁰Καρδιά γὰρ πιστεύεται εἰς δικαιοσύνην, στόματι δὲ ὁμολογείται εἰς σωτηρίαν. ¹¹Λέγει γὰρ ἡ γραφή, Πᾶς ὁ πιστεύων ἐπ' αὐτῷ οὐ καταισχυνηθήσεται. ¹²Οὐ γὰρ ἐστὶ διαστολή Ἰουδαίου τε καὶ Ἑλλήνος· ὁ γὰρ αὐτὸς κύριος πάντων, πλουτῶν εἰς πάντας τοὺς ἐπικαλουμένους αὐτόν, ¹³Πᾶς γὰρ ὃς ἂν ἐπικαλέσῃται τὸ ὄνομα Κυρίου, σωθήσεται.

Brethren, the desire of my heart and prayer to God for them, is for their salvation. ²For I testify for them that they have zeal for God, but not according to knowledge. ³For being ignorant of God's justification, and seeking to establish their own, they have not been obedient to God's justification. ⁴For Christ is the end of the law for justification to every one that believes. ⁵For Moses describes the justification which is of the law: that the man who has done its requirements shall live by them. ⁶But justification by belief speaks thus: Say not in your heart, Who shall go up into heaven; that is, to bring down Christ; ⁷nor Who shall go down into the deep; that is, to bring up Christ from the dead? ⁸But what does it say? The thing said is near you, in your mouth and in your heart, that is, the doctrine of belief, which we preach. ⁹—that if you will confess the Lord Jesus with your mouth, and will believe in your heart that God raised him from the dead, you shall be saved. ¹⁰For with the heart we believe in order to justification, and with the mouth we confess in order to salvation. ¹¹For the scripture says: Every one that believes on him shall not be ashamed. ¹²For between Jew and Greek there is no difference; for the same Lord of all is rich towards all that call upon him. ¹³For every one who calls upon the name of the Lord shall be saved.

SUMMARY.

Paul desires in heart, and prays for the salvation of Israel. He testifies to their zeal, but declares it to be not according to knowledge. Their zeal dis-

played itself in seeking to establish their own theory of justification, which caused them to reject that of God. No justification except to the believer in Christ. The justification of the law defined, and shown to be impracticable. No insuperable difficulties to be surmounted in order to justification by belief. On the contrary, its requirements are easy, and lie within reach of all. Belief and confession will secure it. No longer any difference between Jew and Greek in receiving God's favor. All to enjoy it on the same conditions.

In the present chapter, the Apostle considers still farther the case of the Jews. He enlarges upon their great error respecting justification, shows how it had happened, and states the remedy. He points out the relation of Christ to their law, and then enters upon some important details in the plan of salvation. The chapter contains far less of plot than the ixth, and is less complex than any one that has preceded it. It is however wonderfully compact and sentensic, resembling in these respects the viith. It opens, like the ixth, in a very conciliatory manner; and yet its tone throughout is firm, sharp, and sustained.

Brethren, the desire of my heart, and prayer to God Bengel appears strangely to misconceive the application of the word brethren here. He seems to think that it refers to the Jews, of whom the Apostle is speaking, whereas it clearly means the disciples in Rome, to whom he is writing.

Two things, mentioned by the Apostle, indicate the deep interest he felt in his countrymen who had rejected Christ—the desire of his heart, and his prayer; and the latter especially merits a thought. Both desire and prayer looked to their salvation; but from the scope of prophecy and the obstinacy of the Jews, the Apostle must have felt sure that they would be lost. Yet he prayed for their salvation. Did he pray for what he felt certain would not be? He might very consistently have done so. The loss of the Jews was not fixed by irrevocable decree. It was determined by their own wilful rejection of Christ, and although morally certain, it was not unalterably so. Hence, the Apostle could very properly ask God to avert it. No one knows, not even Paul, the resources of the infinite Father. Therefore his interposition may be invoked in whatever events are not known to be absolutely impossible. It was certain that the Jews would be lost unless they abandoned their unbelief; but it was not hopelessly sure that they would not abandon it. That they might do so was consequently legitimate matter for prayer. How the Apostle expected the result to be brought to pass he has not even hinted. That he left with God.

for them is for their salvation. The common text has "Israel," which is evidently erroneous. Yet Bloomfield says of the revised text here adopted, that it "merits little attention." Such a remark from so judicious a critic is unexpected. The reference in "them" to Israel is so direct as utterly to preclude doubt. No effort therefore is necessary to remove any supposed uncertainty. In v. 31, ch. ix, Israel are named; and in v. 32 they are referred to by appropriate pronouns, so that only one short verse intervenes between the last reference to them and the present reference, not enough to interrupt the connection. *Eis soterian*: *Eis*, with an accusative often, as here, denotes the design intended, or the event produced by an act. The desire and prayer of the Apostle looked to a certain end—the salvation of Israel, and were intended, if it were practicable, to effect it. They tended to the result, and were an effort to accomplish it.

2. For I testify for them that they have zeal for God, One good trait then, at least, remained to them, and constituted a basis, though a feeble one, for hope. Zeal when bigoted and blind is a fearful enemy of change. Still it is not in all cases an insuperable obstacle in the way of truth. The Apostle seems to have felt that it justified some hope; and it certainly warmed his prayer. He at least deemed it worthy of a faint eulogy.

but not according to knowledge. Knowledge here does not mean knowledge in general, but specific, real knowledge. It means knowing truly what God had taught on the subject of justification, or more closely still, a correct interpretation of his teaching on it. This knowledge, the great body of the Jews did not possess. Not because it was not available; but because, by their false glosses, they had eclipsed the true light touching it, and, as the result, were left in darkness. Had they read Moses and the prophets correctly, they would at once have recognized in Christ their long-expected Messiah, and have hailed him with joy. In that event, their zeal, instead of spending itself in an effort to propagate error, would have become a mighty auxiliary in spreading the truth.

3. For being ignorant of God's justification, With Stuart, Bloomfield, and Trollope, I here render *dikaiosunen* justification, and not righteousness. My reasons for the rendering are the following: Whatever the word denotes was to be obtained by belief in Christ. This is evident from v. 4. But righteousness is never thus obtained except as a result of justification. Belief in Christ

is never substituted for righteousness as being its equivalent, nor is it ever counted for it or in its stead. Righteousness is simply keeping the whole law; and there is absolutely neither an equivalent to it, nor a substitute for it. By belief in Christ, and through the efficacy of his blood, we are justified; and being sinless, we are in fact righteous. In this sense only, is righteousness obtained by belief. We are hence justified *into* righteousness (an unusual expression, but severely correct), not invested with it by, or in virtue of substitutes. But this is precisely what the Jews were ignorant of. Justification, therefore, is the meaning of *dikaio-sunen*.

and seeking to establish their own, That is, their own theory of justification. What it was, need not be reiterated here. That theory they not only sought to make good; but they shut their eyes and ears against every fact having in any measure the effect to prove them wrong. They assumed their theory to be infallible, and, as a consequence, grew impenetrable to argument against it. This blind and unreasoning obstinacy was the reef which wrecked them; and great is the regret that their error had not died with them. But it has lived in all ages since; and what half the religious world is doing to-day, is repeating it. Existing religious parties are seeking, each to establish its own peculiar theory of justification, the consequence of which is the repudiation of the divine justification. From the days of Luther down, not to say more, nothing has been more persistently, dogmatically, and proscriptively rung in protestant ears than justification by "faith alone;" and yet it is neither asserted nor implied in one sentence in the New Testament. This is an astounding fact; and it should restrain us from decrying the Jews. We have too closely imitated them to be allowed to fault them. Verily they have been examples to us; and with daintiest feet we have stepped in their steps. In zeal only have we been their inferiors.

they have not been obedient to God's justification. *Hupetagesan* here is Aorist passive, and should be so rendered. It is from *hupotasso* which, in the passive, means to be ranged under, be subject to, or very simply, be obedient to. Its simplest sense seems here the best.

Not to be obedient to God's justification is not to be obedient to Christ; and not to be obedient to Christ is not to comply with the conditions of justification, which he has prescribed. These conditions stated, one by one, in general terms, are two: 1. Be-

lief; and, 2. obedience springing out of it. No man who believes only, without obeying, can be justified; for belief without obedience is dead; and no man who obeys only, without believing, can be saved; for he that believes not, shall be condemned. By divine decree, these two things are so locked together as to be inseparable. But obedience is a very comprehensive term, embracing many specific acts; and these acts have to be performed by two widely different classes of persons. They have to be performed, some of them, by those without the kingdom of God, and, the rest of them, by those within it. In the case of those without, they are joint conditions with belief, of justification; in the case of those within, they are those acts of duty in which, as christians, we work out our final salvation. What, in the case of those without, these special conditions of justification are, will be considered farther on.

4. For Christ is the end of the law Intended to confirm the foregoing remark. Israel were not obedient to God's justification, for they were not obedient to Christ, in whom alone his justification is realized. *The end of the law*: Not its extinction or death, but its ultimate object. The great final purpose of the law, the remote end to which it looked, was justification, and so preparation for heaven. Christ is that end, because in him alone it is realized. He steps in, and achieves this ultimate object of the law for it, and so becomes its end.

for justification Justification was the end or final object of the law. Hence Christ is the law's end for its end, its end to achieve its end. Fruit is the end of a fruit-bearing tree. But whatever takes its place, and bears its fruit for it, is its end. And so with the law. Its end is justification. But Christ takes its place and accomplishes its end for it. He is therefore its end for justification.

to every one that believes. God's justification, that which he has ordained, is realized by him only, that believes in Christ. No one else ever attains to it. It is therefore never realized by him who seeks it in partial obedience to law, and none seek it in perfect obedience. Herein consisted the great error of the Jews. They never yielded perfect obedience to the law; and yet they sought justification by it. To them, therefore, in their way of seeking it, it was impossible.

But belief in Christ, unless the contrary be stated or implied, is never to be understood as insulated or alone. It is always to

be assumed that he who believes in Christ will obey him. A disobedient belief is not contemplated in the Bible. If the belief be that of the unpardoned, it must lead him to obey the conditions of pardon; otherwise, his belief is an abortion, and he remains in sin. If it be that of the pardoned, it must be continuous, leading him to do all those things which are necessary to eternal life; and as sure as the pardoned will be lost, if his belief fails, so sure will the unpardoned never be pardoned, if his belief remains alone. It must add to itself obedience or it is null.

5. For Moses describes the justification which is of the law: The *gar* here, I take it, refers to a suppressed sentence which it is necessary to supply in order to complete the connection. This sentence and the connection may be thus indicated: Christ is the end of the law for justification to every one that believes; *and justification by belief is entirely different from justification by the law*; "for Moses describes the justification which is of the law," &c. The phrase, justification which is of the law, means justification emerging, as it were, out of the law as its source; and were the law ever perfectly obeyed, this would be the exact fact in the case. Of course such justification is purely potential, there never having been an instance of it.

that the man who has done its requirements shall live by them. That *auta* here denotes the requirements of the law is conceded by all. It is, therefore, best so to translate it as to indicate this fact. To render it "them," as Alford does, translates merely the word, not its sense. This is to sacrifice meaning to mere verbiage.

Whether we shall read *en aute* or *en autois*—*by it* or *by them*, seems difficult to decide. The manuscript authority for each is about equal; but to my mind, the internal probabilities favor the former. Still, I retain, not without doubt, *en autois*, because it yields a clearer sense. To read, That the man who has done its requirements shall live by *it*, is certain to mislead. By the common reader *it* is sure to be understood as referring to the law whereas it refers to justification. To avoid the danger of this misapprehension, I think it best to retain *en autois*. Green adopts this reading, and the Textual Notes in Lange give it a hesitating preference; but Tregelles and Alford reject it and retain *en aute*. For the learned, *en aute* will be found the preferable text; for the unlearned, the other.

that the man who has done its requirements That is,

done them all without an exception. This is the justification of the law, which is justification on the ground of merit. It excludes both favor and mercy, being his due who is entitled to it. It is a debt, not a gratuity; a right which can not be withheld. How any human being should ever have expected to realize it, is inconceivable. The ignorance of the Jews concerning it must have been profound. They certainly sought it and expected it; yet a moment's thought should have taught them that it was impossible. They seem to have committed the strange blunder of supposing that they could merit, without merit, what can be bestowed only as a debt; or that they could earn by a faulty life what is due only to a faultless one.

shall live by them—by the requirements he has done. But since not one has ever done them, not one will ever live by them. The law, instead of exciting in human bosoms the hope of life, absolutely extinguishes it. It engenders and confirms despair, not hope. The word *live* here denotes both to live the life the justified now live, and to live forever hereafter. Of course the Apostle is not contemplating apostasy, which, although it may occur, and often does, is not at present before his mind.

6. But justification by belief speaks thus: Justification by belief is here personified, a mode of speech quite common with Pau', and in that character is represented as doing what the actual living teacher of justification by belief does; that is, as setting forth itself or what it is. Let us now, for the sake of being plain, drop the Apostle's rhetorical method, and substitute the actual, for the personified teacher. Moses describes the justification which is of the law, and in so doing shows it to be impossible. But the teacher of justification by belief thus speaks:

Say not in your heart, Who shall go up into heaven; that is, to bring down Christ; Say not in your heart, as if what you say were an earnest, weighty matter, that Christ must be brought back into your presence before you will believe on him. You must not demand impossible conditions for your belief. What you require is essential to knowledge, not to belief. Be but just to the evidence and facts in the case, and you not only can believe on Christ without his return from heaven, but you will find it easy to do so; and what, in this case, you can easily do, you owe it to God and yourself to do. Christ has already been here; and in his life and deeds, he has supplied all the conditions essential to belief. Not only so, he has supplied

them in such measure as to render unbelief highly criminal. His return, therefore, is not necessary to belief. With the real necessities of belief, Christ will always comply; with the exactions of an unreasonable skepticism, he never will.

What justification by belief is here represented as saying, is most probably what the infidel Jews of the time were accustomed to say, on the christian assumption of the ascension. "Go up into heaven, if Christ be there, and bring him down, and we will believe on him." But the thing demanded was not necessary, in the first place; nor was it possible, in the second. Still, for these very reasons, the demand would only the more certainly be made, as a failure to comply with it would afford a shallow pretext for the skepticism out of which it grew. When Christ was on the cross, the chief priests and elders derided him and said: "Let him come down from the cross and we will believe on him." The sentiment of the two sayings is so much alike, as to give color to the probability that they originated with the same persons and in the same feeling.

7. **nor Who shall go down into the deep; that is, to bring up Christ from the dead?** This verse is to the same effect as the preceding. Say not in your heart what is here recited, for it is not necessary. Justification by belief requires nothing either impossible or improbable. It is both practicable and easy; and its demands lie within reach of all.

The present passage embodies, I doubt not, what the infidel Jews were accustomed to say on their own hypothesis. They did not believe Christ to be risen from the dead. To the christian, therefore, their reply would be: "Go down into the deep, where Christ is, and bring him up, and we will believe on him." But this amounted to a virtual declaration, on their part, of perpetual unbelief; for they knew that the disciples had no power to go down into the deep and bring up any one. It was as much as to say, We will not believe unless you do what we know you can not do. Great as was such folly, it was yet the folly of the Jews. But justification by belief requires no such difficulties to be surmounted as are here named. What it requires, all can do by the proper effort of will.

The phrase, "the deep," denotes not the grave, but the abode of the spirits of the dead. It is synonymous with *hades*—the unseen dwelling place of departed spirits. The Jews seem to have conceived it to be either in the earth or beneath it. They hence called it the *abyss* or *deep*.

The language of verses 6 and 7 bears a very close resemblance to the following from Deut. xxx: 11-14: "For this commandment which I command thee this day, it is not hidden from thee, neither is it far off. It is not in heaven, that thou shouldst say, Who shall go up for us to heaven, and bring it to us, that we may hear it, and do it? Neither is it beyond the sea, that thou shouldst say, Who shall go over the sea for us, and bring it to us, that we may hear it and do it. But the word is very nigh to thee, in thy mouth, and in thy heart, that thou mayest do it." Indeed so close is the resemblance between Paul and Moses, that many commentators have supposed that the latter really had in mind the doctrine of justification by belief, and alluded to it in what he said. But this supposition is violently improbable. The correct view I take to be this: What Moses said of the "commandment" is, with slight alterations, precisely what Paul wished to say of justification by belief. He therefore merely borrowed it and used it as his own. In other words, substituting justification by belief for "commandment," and what is said of the latter is so true of the former that the Apostle applied it to it. Nothing is more common with preachers and religious writers than the same custom.

8. **But what does it say?** That is, what does justification by belief say? It does not say, Who shall go up into heaven to bring down Christ; nor, Who shall go down into the deep to bring up Christ—It says neither that nor this. But *if it says neither*, what does it say? The clause I here italicise, is implied in the use of *alla*, and must be mentally supplied in order to complete the sense.

The thing said is near you, in your mouth, and in your heart, It is best here to translate *to rema, the thing said*. This is its exact meaning; and it gives us a closer connection than we can otherwise obtain. *The thing said is near you*. This means that what justification by belief requires is easy. For in scripture, things hard to be done are often said to be far off; while those easy to be done are said to be near. What justification by belief says, and in what it says, it merely defines itself, is not something difficult to be done. Indeed, the thing said is so easy as to cost you only an act of belief, an act of confession.

that is, the doctrine of belief, which we preach? This clause is formally epexegetic of the phrase, *the thing said*. Accordingly, we should so render the original as to indicate this fact.

I, therefore, instead of rendering *to rema* as in the preceding clause, render it *the doctrine*, which, with the word belief, is what the phrase *the thing said* means. The thing said, then, that is so near you as to be in your mouth and in your heart, is the doctrine of belief. The expression, doctrine of belief, does not signify a doctrine respecting belief, but a doctrine in which belief is the chief component element. *Which we preach*—the doctrine of belief, which we preach. "Which" here, by the gender of the original words, has doctrine, not belief for its antecedent.

What now justification by belief declares to be near you, in your mouth and in your heart—what it declares to be easy and not hard, is the doctrine of belief. Therefore, what we now want is the doctrine of belief stated in a practicable form, a form in which we can easily do it. This done, and what justification by belief says will be verified; and this is done in the following verse:

9. —that if you will confess the Lord Jesus with your mouth, More fully stated, the thing to be confessed is, That Jesus is the Christ, the Son of the living God. This is the form in which Peter made the confession, and in which Christ in person approved it. It may therefore safely be assumed to be perfect. To confess a thing with the mouth is to acknowledge in words that it is true.

But here an important practical question arises, namely: Does the word confess denote a single act, or an oft-recurring one? The answer depends on the acceptation in which we take the word "saved" in the last clause of the verse. If "saved" be construed to mean that primary salvation which consists in remission of sins at conversion, then "confess" denotes a single act; and this most probably is the acceptation in which "saved" is to be taken, since it is here equivalent to justification. That primary salvation it must include, more it may not. I conclude, then, that "confess" denotes a single act, the act of publicly and formally acknowledging Christ in words. Moreover, this confession is here made a condition of the salvation specified. *If you will confess the Lord Jesus with your mouth, you shall be saved.* "The two requisites for salvation," says Hodge, "mentioned in this verse, are confession and faith." But the reader may ask, Do you regard this condition as indispensable? I will answer the reader by asking, Are you ready to assume the responsibility of dispensing with it? I at least am not.

and will believe in your heart that God raised him from the dead, Christ claimed to be the Son of God, died in that character, and in it was buried. But God raised him from the dead. By this act then, God confirmed his claim, and so demonstrated him to be his Son. To believe with the heart is to believe with simple, unaffected sincerity. Moreover, thus to believe is here also made a condition of salvation. The former clause makes confession a condition; the present one, belief.

you shall be saved. This is the last clause in what justification by belief says; rather, it is the last item in justification itself. To be justified by belief is to be saved; and to be saved, is to be forgiven. Remission of sin, then, and justification are equivalents. To remit sin is to make just; and to make just, is to justify.

Justification being now before us as remission of sin, or salvation in its primary sense, this seems the proper place to raise the question, What is the whole number of the conditions of justification? As the remission or salvation is primary, of course the justification is primary; and by this I mean the justification or remission which occurs when a man becomes a christian, and which makes him such. According to these premises, whatever is shown to be a condition of remission or salvation, is thereby shown to be a condition of justification. What now is the whole number of these conditions?

1st. That belief is a condition, is conceded by all. On this item, then, neither comment nor argument is necessary. 2d. Equally certain is it that repentance is a condition; for the impenitent is never justified or saved. "God now commands all men to repent;" and he who disobeys him remains in sin. These conditions I here enumerate in their natural order. No man repents, and then believes; but all believe, and then repent. Repentance is an act of obedience to Christ, which is impossible without belief. Farther, he who believes in heart and is penitent, is begotten of the Spirit, and is therefore ready to be born again. Hence, to be begotten of the Spirit is not a distinct condition of justification, but is included in belief and repentance. 3d. Confession is a condition, determined to be so by the verse just commented on. 4th. Immersion is a condition, so made by Christ himself in the following language: "*He that believes and is immersed shall be saved.*" Two acts are here appointed for salvation—*belief* and *immersion*; and this appointment constitutes

them conditions to the end, and the one as surely as the other. Again: "*Repent and be immersed each of you, in the name of Jesus Christ, for remission of sins.*" Here repentance and immersion are made joint conditions of remission, belief being assumed as already existing. Now he that is immersed, is born of water; consequently, being born of water is not a separate condition of salvation or of entrance into the kingdom, being identical with immersion.

Taking now the verse just commented on, together with the two passages here cited; and assuming salvation, remission, and justification, when taken primarily, to be in essence the same, and we have four conditions of justification, namely: belief, repentance, confession, immersion. Not only are these conditions, but they are all the conditions. Not one more can be named; and no one can scripturally name less. That he of whom all four of these acts can be predicated, is justified or saved, is as certain as is the divinity of Christ. Should any one be so daring as to deny that these are conditions, or so full of temerity as to assume to set one of them aside as being not essential, for him I am not at present writing. I am writing for him only who, when he knows his Master's will, is ready to do it, without rebating even one item. He that has complied with these conditions is pardoned, is saved, is in the kingdom, is justified. But although he is all this, he is still a babe in Christ, just beginning the new life, and he may fail. In order, therefore, to succeed in the race now set before him, he must continually add to the naked fact of being a christian, a life of holiness, and peace, and self-denial. These things done, and life ended, and the crown of immortality awaits him.

10. For with the heart we believe in order to justification, Or more literally, *with heart it is believed for justification.* The verb is Passive and impersonal; but it is best to use a little freedom, and so translate it as to make the sense plain to the common reader. The *eis* is telic, as often, denoting the end for which a thing is done. We believe—this is the fact, the end for which, is justification. To believe with the heart or in heart, is to believe sincerely. But to believe in heart, though most important, is by itself not enough. For if belief remain alone, as in too many instances it does, it is *eike*, in vain or to no purpose (1 Cor. xv: 2); and to believe in vain is to believe and there stop, and so fall short of the purposed end. It is to believe and then

allow the belief to abort; to stretch out the hand to touch the hem of the Savior's garment, but to draw it back without touching. The stretching out is to no purpose. Between belief and its object, justification, there lies the obedience of belief, which can not be dispensed with, and for which there is no substitute. Belief is for justification, and obedience is for justification; but that without this, is as surely for no purpose as is this without that. What God has twinned together, men must not sever. To believe in Christ with the whole heart, and then, in obedience, to surrender to him the whole will, is to perfect human duty. It leaves nothing to be done, and comes short of no end. It is all and accomplishes all.

and with the mouth we confess in order to salvation. With this clause I take the same liberty as with the preceding, and for the same purpose. After what has already, in this chapter, been said on the confession, it need not be enlarged on here.

But why does the Apostle connect belief and justification together, and confession and salvation together? He can not intend to imply that belief without confession will secure justification, nor that confession without belief will secure salvation. Neither is justification one thing to be secured by belief, and salvation a different thing to be secured by confession. No man can be justified and be unsaved, or be saved and be unjustified. I therefore can not think that the Apostle meant any thing special by the connection. It is, I doubt not, a mere peculiarity of style, not of doctrine—a probable imitation of Hebrew parallelism.

But although we believe *in order to* justification, and confess *in order to* salvation, it must not be inferred that we still remain unsaved and unjustified after we believe and confess. No such inference is warranted by the language. We believe and confess in order to salvation; but when we have believed and confessed, the other conditions in the case being complied with, we are saved. No appreciable time intervenes between compliance and the result; but this instantly follows that. True, the condition may be such as can not be complied with in a single act, and then of course the result is deferred, as in the case of final justification. Here the condition is a life of holiness. Accordingly the result is not realized till after death. But in the case of primary justification, the instant we comply with the conditions, the result follows

11. For the scripture says: Every one that believes on him shall not be ashamed. Proof that he who believes and confesses will realize what he believes and confesses for. He will be justified or saved. Consequently, being uncondemned, he will have no cause for shame. This is true, whether the justification be primary or final. The phrase *every one* is not designed to distribute the human family individually, but nationally—every one, whether Jew or Gentile. The citation is from Isa. xxviii: 16.

12. For between Jew and Greek there is no difference; The Apostle can not mean no difference in any respect; for in choosing the Jews to be his peculiar people, God had certainly created great religious and political differences between them and other nations; and these again had led to great social and moral differences. He must then mean no difference now under Christ. *Former differences, which were of limited duration, have passed away.* God is now no longer the especial Friend of the Jew. He is God of Greek and Jew alike. The same gospel is tendered to all; the same obedience is exacted from all; the same mercies are proffered to all; the same providence rules over all. The only differences that now exist are differences created by the voluntary conduct of the parties themselves. If the Greek obeys Christ, and the Jew does not, the Greek is accepted, and the Jew rejected; or if the Jew obeys, and the Greek does not, the rule is reversed. Christ constitutes the sole ground of discrimination. God is for him that is for Christ, and against him that is not. It is then in the light of the gospel, and in the light of that only, that there is no difference.

for the same Lord of all is rich towards all that call upon him. Proof that between Jew and Greek there is no difference. The same Lord is over all, whether Jews or Greeks; and he is alike rich towards all, whether Jews or Greeks. "Rich" here means rich in mercy, rich in the provisions of salvation. With many it is matter of doubt whether the word Lord, here denotes God or Christ. The question is not important; but I believe Christ to be meant. He is now certainly Lord over all things, is invested with all authority in heaven and on earth, and is entitled to receive the same homage, in measure and kind, that is due to the Father. *That call upon him.* In order to call upon Christ acceptably, we must recognize him as the Son of God, as divine, and so address him. Not that he requires of us all perfect

knowledge; but he requires of all perfect respect. He will therefore decline the service of lips that intentionally withhold from him due honor.

13. **For every one who calls upon the name of the Lord shall be saved.** Every one, whether Jew or Greek. To call upon the name of the Lord is to call upon the Lord himself, the name standing for the person; or more correctly perhaps, it is to call upon the Lord by name.

But the person here, who calls upon the name of the Lord, is not he who merely says to him, Lord, Lord, and does no more. If the salvation be final, which I regard as not probable, he is the person who has believed on Christ with the heart, who has obeyed him, and been justified or saved; and who, therefore, as saved, now addresses him. In a word, he is a christian. Or if the salvation be primary, which I think most likely, then the calling is of the kind enjoined upon Saul by Ananias (Acts xxii: 16) when he said to him: "Arise, and be baptized and wash away your sins, *calling on the name of the Lord.*" That is, after belief, every act of obedience, as repentance, confession, baptism, is to be performed calling on the name of the Lord. From the moment we believe on him, we are thenceforward never to ignore his name. He is to be recognized in every ac., and his guidance and blessing constantly invoked

CHAPTER X. SECTION 2.

¹⁴How now can they call upon him in whom they have not believed; and how can they believe in him of whom they have not heard; and how can they hear without a preacher; ¹⁵and how can they preach unless they be sent? As it is written: How timely are the feet of those that preach good news? ¹⁶But still all have not obeyed the gospel; for Isaiah says: Lord, who has believed our report? ¹⁷Therefore belief comes from report, and report by means of Christ's word. ¹⁸But I say, have they not heard? Yes indeed, their voice went into all the land, and their words into the ends of the world. ¹⁹But I say, did Israel not understand? First Moses says: I will make you jealous by what is not a nation, and will provoke you by a foolish nation. ²⁰And Isaiah is bold and says: I was found by them who sought me not; I became known to them who asked not for me. ²¹But respecting Israel he says: the whole day I stretched out my hands to a disobedient and contradicting people.

¹⁴Πὼς οὖν ἐπικαλέσονται εἰς ὃν οὐκ ἐπίστευσαν; πὼς δὲ πιστεύσωσιν οὐ οὐκ ἤκουσαν; πὼς δὲ ἀκούσωσι χωρὶς κηρύσσοντος; ¹⁵πὼς δὲ κηρύξωσιν ἐὰν μὴ ἀποσταλῶσι; Καθὼς γέγραπται, Ὡς ὠραῖοι οἱ πόδες τῶν εὐαγγελιζομένων ἀγαθῶν. ¹⁶Ἀλλ' οὐ πάντες ἠπήκουσαν τῷ εὐαγγελίῳ. Ἡσαΐας γὰρ λέγει, Κύριε, τίς ἐπίστευσε τῇ ἀκοῇ ἡμῶν; ¹⁷Ἄρα ἡ πίστις ἐξ ἀκοῆς, ἢ δὲ ἀκοῇ διὰ ῥήματος Χριστοῦ; ¹⁸Ἀλλὰ λέγω, μὴ οὐκ ἤκουσαν; Μενοῦνγε, εἰς πᾶσαν τὴν γῆν ἐξῆλθεν ὁ φθόγγος αὐτῶν, καὶ εἰς τὰ πέρατα τῆς οἰκουμένης τὰ ῥήματα αὐτῶν. ¹⁹Ἀλλὰ λέγω, μὴ Ἰσραὴλ οὐκ ἔγνω; Πρῶτος Μωϋσῆς, λέγει, Ἐγὼ παραζηλώσω ὑμᾶς ἐπ' οὐκ ἔθνει, ἐπὶ ἔθνει ἀσυνέτῳ παροργιῶ ὑμᾶς. ²⁰Ἡσαΐας δὲ ἀποτολμᾷ καὶ λέγει, Εὐρέθη ἡμεῖς ἐμὲ μὴ ζητοῦσιν, ἐμφανὲς ἐγένεθον τοῖς ἐμὲ μὴ ἐπερωτῶσι. ²¹Πρὸς δὲ τὸν Ἰσραὴλ λέγει, Ὁλην τὴν ἡμέραν ἐξεπέτασα τὰς χεῖράς μου πρὸς λαὸν ἀπειθεῦντα καὶ ἀντιλέγοντα.

SUMMARY.

In order to call on the Lord, men must believe in him; and in order to believe in him, they must hear of him; and in order to hear of him, he must be preached. But although all have not obeyed Christ who have heard of him, still the hearing was necessary, since by it belief comes. All Jews in Judea, and many Gentiles, at the time, had either heard of Christ or had the opportunity to do so; for the preachers of the gospel had offered it to them. Israel were ignorant of the fact of their rejection, notwithstanding both Moses and Isaiah had plainly foretold it.

14. How now can they call upon him in whom they have not believed; Not propounded by an objecting Jew, as some have imagined; nor yet put by the Apostle, as others have thought, in order to afford him an opportunity of vindicating the preaching of the gospel to the Gentiles. For neither of these suppositions is there any necessity. The course of thought seems rather to be this: The Apostle had just connected salvation with calling on the name of the Lord; yet vast numbers of both Jews

and Gentiles did not believe on him. How naturally then would the question asked, occur to the thoughtful mind. The Apostle foresaw this; and he hence determined to meet the difficulty at once. The answer to the question is, They can not; that is, they can not call on him in whom they do not believe; and if they can not be saved without calling, then the necessity for belief becomes overwhelming. To us who have the New Testament, there is nothing novel or striking in this conclusion, but with many in the Apostle's day it was not so. To a Jew especially, such a conclusion would be unwelcome and strange.

and how can they believe in him of whom they have not heard; The reply is, they can not. No more can men believe without hearing, than they can call without believing. The impossibility is the same in both cases. Or if there be a difference it is this, that they *can not* believe without hearing, and they *will not* call without believing. But if belief be, as many contend, a direct gift from God, and therefore independent of hearing, then the Apostle's question is without force, and easily answered. *How can they believe in him of whom they have not heard?* They can do so without an effort; for God directly gives them belief. Thus this popular theory of the origin of belief renders the Apostle's question null, and defeats the object he had in view in putting it. He clearly intended to propound a question which should admit of none but a negative answer; but he has failed, if this theory be true. But as the Apostle is certainly correct, it follows that the theory is certainly false.

and how can they hear without a preacher; They can not. Men can not hear without a preacher, nor believe without hearing, nor call without believing, nor provide themselves with preachers. Who then is to do it? The reply is—God. But has he done it? Has he provided all nations, and kindreds, and tongues, with preachers; and if not, has not his failure cancelled the obligation to believe? To provide the world with preachers is certainly the part of God; and faithfully will he perform it. But to provide the world with preachers, is one thing; and to induce the world to hear, is quite another. Thousands *will not hear*, and therefore are not provided for. The vast body of the Jews would not hear, though preachers were sent to them; and what they would not do, others will not. God sends preachers to all nations who will hear; he sends to none who certainly will not. He never works in vain.

15. And how can they preach unless they be sent? The reply is still the same, they can not. How now are preachers sent? The answer, as to the Apostles and other inspired preachers of their day, is familiar. But how are preachers of this day sent? The popular theory has been, and still is to some extent, that a secret, divine call is necessary; and that without such call no man is entitled to preach. I reply then that no man is entitled to preach; for no man receives the call. Three things only, constitute a call to the ministry, namely: 1. That the preacher shall be a genuine christian, pious in heart and pure in life. 2. That he have the truth; for God never calls men to preach error. 3. That he possess the ability; for Christ never calls the incompetent. He who has these three qualifications owes it to Christ and the human race to preach; he that lacks them should never attempt it. The theory of a secret divine call is usually popular with people in the inverse ratio of their intelligence. The less they know, the more they insist on the call. But the wise among even those who believe in it, look upon it as a pious superstition which, being comparatively harmless, may be let alone. From this benevolent conclusion I see no reason to dissent.

As it is written: How timely are the feet of those that preach good news? The connection between this clause and the preceding one seems somewhat obscure. Still, I believe the following may be accepted as giving it with tolerable accuracy: How can they preach unless they be sent? They can not do it; nor has God ever contemplated any thing of the kind. On the contrary, he has always intended that they who preach his gospel should be sent; and he has caused it to be so foretold: As it is written: how timely are the feet, &c. *Timely* is a much more appropriate rendering of *horaioi* than beautiful, which is a secondary sense. The word signifies seasonable, happening at the proper time. The meaning is, how seasonable, or how at the right time, are the feet of those that preach good news. When God sends forth his heralds, it is always at the right time, never at the wrong—hence the epithet. How timely are *the feet*. The reason for mentioning the feet is doubtless the fact that the primitive preachers traveled mostly on foot. They were not wealthy men, but were usually sandaled for the way, as was their Master. Philip went thus to the meeting of the eunuch, and so went countless others. After the word *good*, which in

the Greek is neuter-plural, it is best to supply the word *news*. We thus obtain a phrase of the same import as the word *gospel*; and the *gospel* is the thing to be preached.

16. **But still all have not obeyed the gospel; for Isaiah says: Lord, who has believed our report?** Here, too, the connection is uncertain; so much so that Stuart complains of not having found a single commentator who gives him satisfaction respecting it. Where so many have failed, it is certainly discouraging to repeat the attempt. Still I shall present my best conception of the case, leaving the reader to pronounce on its merits. As is well known *alla* often has reference to some implied or suppressed sentence, which it is necessary to supply in order to exhibit the connection. Let this be conceded here, and I make out the connection thus: *How timely are the feet of those that preach good news.* But this is no longer an unfulfilled prediction as to the *gospel*. For the Apostles and others, the very preachers alluded to by Isaiah, have actually gone over the land of the Jews, as well as over many countries of the Gentiles, preaching the *gospel*. Consequently, all Jews in their own land, and many in other lands, have either heard it or had an opportunity to do so; and the same is true of many Gentiles. *But still all have not obeyed the gospel.* That these were the facts in the case can not be denied; and I think it probable at least that they give the true connection.

But the clause itself merits some notice. *Still all have not obeyed the gospel.* Granted: But it is certainly their own fault. God has afforded them the opportunity of obtaining his mercy; and they have refused. They consequently have none to blame for the result but themselves. Besides, although God desired their obedience, and tried in every way consistent with the principles of his government to secure it, still he foresaw that they would not yield it. Hence the saying of Isaiah: *Lord, who has believed our report?* This is as much as to say: Some have believed our report, and the rest have remained disobedient. The word "report" is used by Paul as synonymous with the *gospel*. It means primarily the report of the prophet respecting Christ, and secondarily, this same report reiterated by the preachers, which of course is the *gospel*.

But farther, in the clause, "all have not obeyed the gospel," to whom does the word "all" refer? Not to the Jews exclusively, as some have thought, but to both Jews and Gentiles. If the

reader will turn back to v. 12, he will find it said: "For between Jew and Greek there is no difference." Let him now read on, keeping Jew and Greek in mind, and he will notice a clear, close reference to them, down even to the clause containing "all." I hence conclude that "all" denotes all Jews and Greeks to whom the gospel had been preached. Of these, large numbers had accepted Christ, while among the Jews especially, many had rejected him. Hence the saying, "all have not obeyed."

17. Therefore belief comes from report, and report by means of Christ's word. The connection seems to be as follows: Isaiah says, Lord, who has believed our report? The reply is, Some have believed it, but many have not. Still the report was absolutely necessary; since without it none could have believed. Therefore belief comes from report.

The word *akoe* is correctly enough rendered report, but very strictly it means what is taken notice of by the ear, the thing heard. Hence the meaning is: Therefore belief comes from the thing heard. *Akocs* here is in the Genitive, preceded by *ex*; and the two taken together signify *out of the thing heard*; that is, arising or emerging out of it as an effect out of a cause. More fully then the meaning is: Therefore belief comes or arises out of the thing heard, the thing heard being the cause, and belief the effect. This settles the question as to how belief is produced. Moreover, the belief thus produced is the belief that leads to all acceptable obedience, and consequently to remission of sins, to justification, and finally to glorification. The whole concatenation may be thus traced: The thing heard originates in the mind of God and respects his Son; it is reported by the preachers of the gospel; it is heard; out of it when heard, comes belief; out of belief comes obedience; out of obedience comes remission of sins, salvation, justification; and out of all these, eternal life.

And report by means of Christ's word. That is, the report from which belief springs, comes by preaching Christ's word. Or still more explicitly, the gospel preached is the report which being heard, induces belief. The word is called Christ's, because he is its author, and causes it to be preached.

18. But I say, have they not heard? Who? Both Jews and Gentiles, but especially the former; for according to Christ the gospel was to be preached first in Jerusalem, next in all Judea, then in Samaria, and finally in the uttermost parts of the earth. All Jews then had either actually heard the gospel,

or had an opportunity to hear it; and so, at the time, many of the Gentiles. They might then have believed, had they been so inclined. But they either refused to hear, or hearing, refused to believe, and so proved themselves unworthy of the farther favor of God.

Yes indeed, their voice went into all the land, and their words into the ends of the world. Intended to confirm the preceding remark. "Their voice" and "their words" mean the voice and words of the preachers of the gospel. "The land" signifies the land of the Jews, and "the ends of the world" the countries more or less remote from it, and inhabited chiefly by Gentiles. At the time Paul wrote, the passage was literally true. The gospel had not only spread over the whole country of the Jews, but it had penetrated even to the remotest parts of the civilized world. Wherever the Roman eagle had gone, and that was almost everywhere, the gospel too had gone. There is not the slightest exaggeration in the statement. The Apostle takes the passage almost *verbatim* from Psalm xix: 4; but he neither cites it as a prophecy, nor appropriates its meaning. He uses its language only, not its matter, to express his own ideas. Nothing is more common than thus to use the language of the Bible. Writers and speakers, both profane and sacred, constantly do it.

19. But I say, did Israel not understand? "Understand" is here a more appropriate word than know, the term commonly used. But understand what? How God intended to deal both with the Jews and with the Gentiles. If the Jews did not understand, the fault was clearly their own; for God had fully forewarned them both by Moses and by Isaiah. But these forewarnings they either grossly misunderstood or perverted, as they did almost every thing else relating to the Messiah and his work. The proper answer to the question is, Israel did not understand. But this proves nothing save their marvelous blindness. With the words of their most illustrious prophets before their eyes, bright as the sun at noon, they still saw nothing.

First, Moses says: I will make you jealous by what is not a nation, That is, by what is no nation in your estimation. I will make you jealous by the Gentiles, a people upon whom you look with contempt, whom you regard as no body, as nothing. "I will make"—I, God; not I, Moses. But God did not directly intend the jealousy of Israel. He directly intended to accept the Gentiles on condition of obedience to Christ, and

directly intended to reject the Jews on condition of disobedience. But these acts he knew would have the effect to excite Israel's jealousy. He therefore represents himself as causing that which is not the necessary, but only the incidental result of his acts. But Israel's jealousy was utterly wrong. On the contrary, they should have rejoiced exceedingly at the change for the better in the fortunes of the long neglected Gentiles, as did their noble brethren who accepted Christ. That is a mean disposition which grudges another the good it declines. Nor can there be doubt that the effect of receiving the Gentiles has rankled in the bosoms of Israel from the time of Christ till now. To-day they hate the christianized Gentile world for their prosperity, and strangely lack the logical acumen to ascribe it to its proper cause.

and will provoke you by a foolish nation. By what you call a foolish nation. *Asunctos* here denotes not what the Gentiles were in fact, but the Jewish estimation of them. But in this instance, as in thousands of others, it was the wise nation that played the fool, and the foolish one that played the wise. He is the true wise man who accepts Christ; he the true foolish, that does not. Sarah was provoked when she saw Hagar in her place; and Israel were provoked when they saw the Gentiles in theirs. Yet Sarah counseled the act of Hagar, and Israel caused their own rejection. For their downfall they can blame neither God nor the Gentiles. They themselves worked it.

20. And Isaiah is bold and says: I was found by them who sought me not; I became known to those who asked not for me. The reference here is exclusively to the Gentiles, who had been so long and so deeply sunk in ignorance and idolatry that the true conception of God had, in many instances, perished from their minds. Therefore they sought not after God, they sought not after the knowledge of him, nor after the worship due him; they sought not to please him, nor for his mercy. They were content with the mockery and sin of an idol's house. When once the soul has exiled God, how few and mean its desires become. Yet when the true God and Christ were presented to the Gentiles in the gospel, how promptly and gladly their hungry spirits responded. They broke their idols, burned their books, confessed Christ, and began to walk in newness of life. This was *regeneration*.

But although Isaiah had thus spoken, Israel refused to see. The vail somehow hung over their eyes. They saw not in Christ

their long-looked-for Messiah; they read neither in law nor prophet their impending doom, nor ever once dreamed that the Gentiles were about to become the Lord's beloved. Nothing is more inexplicable than their blindness, unless it be their persistence in it.

21. But respecting Israel he says: The whole day I stretched out my hands to a disobedient and contradicting people. The *pros* here does not mean *to*, but *respecting* Isaiah says *respecting* Israel, not *to* them. But in what he says he merely speaks for God or reiterates his words. On the one hand, God is drawn in the attitude of an orator as stretching out his hands to his people in an earnest effort to dissuade them from their madness, and induce them to do right. On the other, Israel is drawn, not only as disobedient, but even as speaking against God. As applied to the times of the Savior, the picture is perfect.

In what Isaiah here says, we have brought before us again the ground of Israel's downfall. In disobeying Christ, they disobeyed God, and in speaking against the Son, they spoke against the Father. Rejecting Christ ruined Israel; yet they remain blind to the fact. Their inability to learn that it would certainly do so, from plain declarations of their prophets, is one of the mysteries of this mysterious people.

CHAPTER XI.

SECTION I.

I say, then, Has God rejected his people? Not at all. For even I am an Israelite, of the offspring of Abraham, of the tribe of Benjamin. ²God has not rejected his people whom he foreknew. Do you not know what the scripture says in [the case of] Elijah, when he complains to God against Israel? ³Lord, they have killed your prophets, digged down your altars, and I am left alone, and they seek my life. ⁴But what says the answer to him? I have left for myself seven thousand men who have not bent knee to Baal. ⁵Likewise then, even at this time, there is a remnant by choice of favor; ⁶and if by favor, not from works, for then favor is no longer favor. ⁷What then? That which Israel seek, they found not; but the chosen found it, and the rest were hardened. ⁸As it is written, God has given them the spirit of sleep until this day, eyes but not to see, and ears but not to hear. ⁹David also says: Let their table become a snare, and a trap, and a stumbling-block, and a requital to them. ¹⁰Let their eyes be darkened that they may not see, and do you bend down their back always.

λέγω οὖν, μὴ ἀπόσωτο ὁ Θεὸς τὸν λαὸν αὐτοῦ; Μὴ γένοιτο· καὶ γὰρ ἐγὼ Ἰσραηλίτης εἰμί, ἐκ σπέρματος Ἀβραάμ, φυλῆς Βενιαμίν. ²Οὐκ ἀπόσωτο ὁ Θεὸς τὸν λαὸν αὐτοῦ ὃν προέγνω. *Ἡ οὐκ οἴδατε ἐν Ἡλίᾳ τί λέγει ἡ γραφή, ὡς ἐντυγχάνει τῷ Θεῷ κατὰ τοῦ Ἰσραήλ; ³Κύριε, τοὺς προφῆτας σου ἀπέκτειναν, τὰ θυσιαστήριά σου κατέσκαψαν, καὶ γὰρ ὑπελείφθην μόνος καὶ ζητοῦσι τὴν ψυχὴν μου. ⁴Ἀλλὰ τί λέγει αὐτῷ ὁ χρηματισμός; Κατέλιπον ἑμαντῶ ἑπτακισχιλίου ἀνδρας, οἵτινες οὐκ ἔκαμψαν γόνα τῇ Βαάλ. ⁵Οὕτως οὖν καὶ ἐν τῷ νῦν καιρῷ λείμμα κατ' ἐκλογὴν χάριτος γέγονεν ⁶εἰ δὲ χάριτι, οὐκέτι ἐξ ἔργων, ἐπεὶ ἡ χάρις οὐκέτι γίνεται χάρις. ⁷Τί οὖν; ὁ ἐπιζητεῖ Ἰσραήλ, τοῦτο οὐκ ἐπέτυχεν, ἡ δὲ ἐκλογὴ ἐπέτυχεν, οἱ δὲ λοιποὶ ἐπωρόθησαν. ⁸Καθὼς γέγραπται, Ἐδωκεν αὐτοῖς ὁ Θεὸς πνεῦμα κατανύξεως, ὀφθαλμοὺς τοῦ μὴ βλέπειν, καὶ ὦτα τοῦ μὴ ἀκούειν, ἕως τῆς σήμερον ἡμέρας. ⁹Καὶ Δαυὶδ λέγει, Γενηθήτω ἡ τράπεζα αὐτῶν εἰς παγίδα, καὶ εἰς θήραν, καὶ εἰς σκάνδαλον, καὶ εἰς ἀταπόδομα αὐτοῖς. ¹⁰Σκοτισθήτωσαν οἱ ὀφθαλμοὶ αὐτῶν τοῦ μὴ βλέπειν, καὶ τὸν νῶτον αὐτῶν διὰ παντός σύγκαμψον.

SUMMARY.

God has not wholly rejected Israel, as the case of Paul itself would prove, if we had no other. To suppose them wholly rejected is to repeat the error of Elijah. That prophet imagined that all God's prophets, except himself, had been killed. But God let him know that seven thousand still remained true to him. In like manner, there is now a large remnant of Israel who have not been rejected. This remnant is a chosen remnant, the choice proceeding from a principle of favor, and not from works or perfect obedience. Had the choice proceeded from perfect obedience, it could not have been from favor; for favor and perfect obedience mutually exclude each other. Israel sought to be retained as God's people; but failed through unbelief.

The chosen however have been retained; because they sought the honor by belief in Christ. The rejected Jews have grown hard in heart and feeling, as well as dull in perception—all of which has happened in accordance with predictions of their prophets.

In the present chapter, the Apostle concludes the difficult and delicate case of the Jews. He formally raises the question, Whether God has wholly and finally rejected them. This he answers in the negative. As a nation, God has cast them off; but at the same time he has retained many individuals in his love, because of their obedience to Christ. The Jews are plainly told that their unbelief is the cause of their rejection. The Gentiles are reminded that by belief they stand. Thus it is shown to both, that the ground of acceptance with God is belief in Christ; while the ground of rejection is the want of it. Jews and Gentiles are thus placed on the same footing. The former, if they remain not unbelieving, will be accepted; the latter, if they become unbelieving, will be rejected. The dealing with both is the same.

I say, then, has God rejected his people? That is, has he rejected them all? for such is the force of the question. The reply is, he has not. He has rejected only the unbelieving; but these compose the nation. The believing he has not rejected; but these embrace only individuals. Hence as a nation, God has rejected Israel. To a Jew, this thought was shocking; and with it, therefore, he refused to grow familiar. By an indefeasible title he felt himself to be God's favorite. That he held his position on conditions, was a fact he seemed incapable of realizing. To it, the light of the gospel alone could open his eyes; and from this light he turned away. Nor up to the present, has even the lapse of long hostile ages had the effect to improve him in this respect. He still rejects Christ; and for the act God still rejects him. Will he never learn this fact?

Yet God's rejection of Israel as a nation, in no sense interfered with their individual salvation. It was what they did, not what he did, that fixed their fate. For disobedience to Christ, he thrust them out, but at the same time left an open door standing behind them. Into this, it has always been their liberty and duty to return, but they wilfully refuse. They alone are to blame for their downfall.

Not at all. For even I am an Israelite, *Kai* here has either to be left untranslated or be rendered *even*. The latter seems the preferable course. It thus becomes intensive, an office which most likely it was designed to perform.

God has not rejected all his people; for he has not rejected me. Such is the argument. True, Alford prefers a different construction, but, as it seems to me, on untenable ground. The view here held is simple; it is the one which first strikes the mind, and is generally adopted. I hence regard it as correct. Open to an objection or two, it may be; but as these are not decisive, it remains unaffected by them.

If it be asked, why Paul in his reply adduces but a single example, and that himself, the answer is, that more is not necessary. The force of the question he is replying to is, Has God wholly rejected his people? A single exception proves that he has not. Therefore, others being unnecessary, are not cited. However, in v. 5, the reader will notice that a large number are adduced under the word remnant. While therefore verse 1 mentions but a single exception, v. 5 alludes to many.

The expressions "offspring of Abraham" and "tribe of Benjamin," appear to be added to prevent depreciation. With these antecedents before him, no Jew could say to Paul, and who are *you*? Whatever they might think of him as a christian, as a man they had to concede his dignity and importance.

2. God has not rejected his people. The matter of v. 1 is here again denied for the sake of emphasis and greater fullness. God has not wholly rejected his people. That we are compelled by the nature of the case thus to qualify by the use of "wholly" or some equivalent epithet is evident. For, that God has rejected Israel as a nation is indisputable; and equally certain is it, that he has not rejected them all. What is true then, and all that is true is, that he has not wholly rejected his people.

But from many expositors, the clause receives quite a different turn. The question which presents their idea is, Has God *forever* rejected his people? By them it is conceded that, as a nation, Israel is rejected for the present; but, at the same time, it is strenuously maintained that, as a nation, Israel is yet to be restored to the divine favor. With those entertaining this view I can not agree. As a nation, Israel, in my opinion, will never be restored. The only restoration which awaits them is individual. They are now rejected because of unbelief in Christ; and so long as the cause continues the effect will remain. On condition alone of belief in Christ, can they ever regain the divine favor. God will never restore them so long as they repudiate his Son. But when they cease to do this, and become Christians,

it will be as individuals, and not as a nation. They will then exist as constituent parts of the church, and not dwell apart by themselves as a nation. The individual christianization of the Jews is one thing; their re-nationalization, quite another. In that, I believe up to a large number; in this, not at all.

But if I am told that there are prophecies insusceptible of explanation except on the hypothesis of a national restoration, my reply is, that I am unconfident and shy in regard to prophetic explanations, especially so, in regard to explanations of prophecies relating to the future. I have little faith in them. That a national restoration is possible, I shall not deny; but will it ever occur? I can not think it, till better informed.

whom he foreknew. The word "*foreknew*" is here used, as often in scripture, in the sense of recognize, approve, or accept. God has not wholly rejected his people whom he formerly recognized, or accepted as his. He has rejected only a portion of them. Those who believe, he still retains. Previously to Christ, Israel were God's people in virtue of descent from Abraham. No matter where they were, or what they did, they still remained his. But so soon as Christ came, the ground of acceptance was changed. Descent from Abraham went for nothing now. Belief in Christ alone secured favor. Without this, the most devout Jew was rejected; with it, not one was. Nor will this plan ever be changed till Christ shall reappear on earth.

By Stuart and others, *proegno* is thought to be used here in the same sense as in ch. viii: 29. But this is erroneous. The word there denotes an act of knowledge co-extensive with the divine existence, and relating to those who, God foresaw from eternity, would obey his Son and be saved. But surely the Apostle can not here mean to say that God has not rejected those whom he knew, before time, he would not reject. This would be irrelevant and tautological. Clearly the sentiment is this: Formerly God recognized the whole Jewish nation as his. Has he now rejected them? The answer is, Not wholly, but only in part.

Do you not know what the scripture says in [the case of] Elijah, The object of this passage is to correct a false inference touching the present rejection of the Jews, by citing a parallel case from the past. As much as to say: You who conclude that God has now wholly rejected his people are wrong. This he has never done. Elijah once committed the same error you commit. He thought that the whole of God's people.

except himself, had forsaken him. But God's reply showed him he was wrong. And so are you. God has not wholly rejected Israel. He still has a remnant that remain true to him.

The passage in hand requires a clause to be supplied to complete the sense. The original reads: *Do you not know what the scripture says in Elijah?* But Elijah wrote no book himself; nor is there any extant bearing his name. Hence the reference must be simply to his case. It is therefore best to supply some such clause as I have bracketed, to complete the sense.

when he complains to God against Israel? *Hos* in this clause should be rendered *when*, not *how*, as in E. V. It is here a particle of time, not of manner. The complaint is found in 1 Kings, xix chapter.

3. Lord, they have killed your prophets, digged down your altars, &c. According to the law of Moses, all altars had to be made either of earth or undressed stones. Hence the propriety of representing them as being "digged down." During the time of the tabernacle, whenever it was removed to a new location, there a new altar was either thrown up or built. The reference is to these lawful altars, and not to the unlawful ones which had been erected in various parts of the country.

4. But what says the answer to him? I have left for myself, &c. That is, you, Elijah, are mistaken. In casting off Israel, I have left for myself—for my worship and honor, seven thousand men whom I have not rejected, because they remain true to me. *You know nothing of them; but they have never bent knee to Baal.* From this we see that even inspired men, when giving expression to their mere feelings, and not speaking for God, may be wrong. How much more then, the uninspired when they now ask, Has God wholly rejected his people?

5. Likewise, then, even at this time, there is a remnant by choice of favor; The word *leimma* means a remainder, a remnant, what is left. In rejecting Israel as a nation, God left certain individuals whom he did not reject. These were those who believed in Christ; and they formed the *leimma* or remnant.

But these believers were a remnant of a peculiar kind. The mere act of leaving them, when the nation was rejected, constituted them a remnant. But why were they left, or in what were they peculiar? They were a remnant *kal' eklogen*, according to a choice or by it; that is, in conformity with it, or in virtue of it—they were a chosen remnant. This made them peculiar. Before

God rejected the nation, he selected, chose or picked out of it certain individuals whom he left and did not reject. The leaving conformed to the choosing or picking out; it embraced the chosen, and no others. Hence the choosing preceded the leaving; and the extent of that, determined the extent of this.

But the choosing also was peculiar. It was an *ekloge charitos*, a choice of favor, a choice proceeding from, or arising out of favor. The favor resided in God, and the act of choosing was his act; but the favor prompted the act. But although the favor prompted the choosing, the favor was not the reason for it. The reason existed in those chosen, not in him who chose; and it lay in their obedience to Christ. The nation, God rejected because of disobedience to Christ; the individuals, he retained because of obedience to him. Obedience, then, was the reason for the choosing and retaining.

And here I wish to call attention to an important distinction, and thereby aid in correcting a deep-grown error. Election or choosing, in the case of the redeemed, does not precede obedience, and therefore is neither the cause of it nor reason for it. On the contrary, obedience precedes election, and is both the condition of it and reason for it. Obedience is man's own free act, to which he is never moved by any prior election of God. Choosing, on the other hand, is God's free act, prompted by favor, and conditioned on obedience. This obedience, it is true, he seeks to elicit by the proper motives; but to this he is led solely by love of man, and never by previous choice. True scriptural election, therefore, is a simple intelligible thing, when suffered to remain unperplexed by the subtleties of schoolmen.

6. and if by favor, not from works, But the choice is of favor or proceeds from it. This is actually asserted. Then intuitively it can not be from works. For had it been of works, that is, had God chosen the remnant in virtue of perfect obedience on their part, the choice would have been something due them, a thing of merit, and consequently not of favor. But perfect obedience, the remnant never rendered; and yet they were chosen. Of necessity, then, the choice proceeded from favor.

for then favor is no longer favor. If the remnant be chosen because of works or perfect obedience, then favor ceases to be the principle from which the choice proceeds. Indeed, in that case, there can be no favor. It is at an end; or at least there can be no manifestation of it. Merit excludes favor, as favor

implies the absence of merit. Consequently, if an act proceed from merit, favor is necessarily absent; or if it be present, it has ceased to be itself and become something else.

And here another prevalent error calls for correction. Remission of sins, under Christ, depends on certain named conditions. These conditions are acts. From this, many have concluded that, under Christ, favor is excluded, and remission made a matter of merit. But this is not true. Two or three acts do not constitute the "works of the law," complement its import, or amount to perfect obedience. Such acts amount only to very partial obedience; and partial obedience admits favor. A few acts no more exclude favor, than does favor, a few acts. The only acts that exclude favor are acts amounting to perfect obedience; and the only acts that favor excludes are perfect obedience. Partial obedience, therefore, and favor are perfectly consistent; nay, partial obedience requires favor. Indeed, partial obedience by itself is wholly devoid of efficacy to save; it saves only by favor. Conditions combined with favor perfect the divine plan of remission. But let me here be understood. By partial obedience, I do not mean partial obedience to the conditions of remission. **Perfect obedience is here required.** By partial obedience, I mean obedience to a few specified conditions in contradistinction from the full and perfect obedience of the law. Partial obedience to the law is the only obedience possible to man; perfect obedience to conditions is the only obedience acceptable to God.

7. **What then? That which Israel seek, they found not;** The conclusion from the foregoing premises. **What then?** That is, what shall we now say, or what inference draw? We draw the following: That what Israel is seeking, they did not find. But what are they seeking? The usual reply is, justification. But this I think not correct. Justification is not now the subject before the Apostle's mind. Rejection and acceptance are what he is speaking of. I hence deem it safest to limit the reply to these two items. Israel were seeking to be retained as God's people, but failed. To this honor the remnant alone attained. This gives the true reply.

but the chosen found it, Literally the choice or election found it; but the abstract here is best dropped or laid aside for the concrete. The chosen, of course, were those who became obedient to Christ; and these alone were retained in the divine favor. But they were not first chosen, and then pursuantly

obeyed. On the contrary, they obeyed and pursuantly were chosen. In all cases, acceptance with God depends on acceptance of Christ.

and the rest were hardened. The rest, *loi poi*, were those who were rejected because of their unbelief in Christ. Not *blinded* as in E. V., but *hardened*. *Poroo* means to harden, petrify, as the feelings, but not to blind. But by whom were the disobedient Jews hardened? Alford says: "It, *eporothesan*, is Passive, and implies God as the agent." So, Calvinists generally. *Eporothesan* is certainly passive, but that it "implies God as the agent," is without support. It, with far greater probability, implies Satan as agent, who is so often lost sight of in cases like the present. God never yet hardened any man in order to keep him from doing right, or in order to lead him to do wrong. He is not the author of sin. He may permit other agencies, as Satan and the wickedness of men, to harden them, but he himself never does it. Alford is wrong.

8. **As it is written: God has given them the spirit of sleep until this day, eyes but not to see, and ears but not to hear.** The former part of this quotation seems to be taken from Isa. xxix: 10, and the latter from Ezek. xii: 2. "The rest were hardened; as it is written"; that is, in accordance with the scriptures, as well as in fulfillment of them. "God has given them the spirit of sleep." This he has done as a punishment for rejecting Christ. When Elymas sought to turn away Sergius Paulus from the faith, Paul, as a punishment for his sin, smote him with blindness. Thus, as a punishment for their sin, God now deals with the Jews. He has given them a spirit of sleep. The eyes of their souls are shut; they see nothing rightly. With them life is passed as in a sleep. "Eyes but not to see," because they do not want to see. God has given them eyes to see with, it is true, but not against their will; and as they are determined not to see, he leaves them to the blindness they prefer. Eyes he provides for all, but as to the right use of them, they, themselves, must see to that.

9. **David also says: Let their table become a snare, and a trap, and a stumbling-block, and a requital to them.** The citation is substantially from Ps. lxix: 22, 23; and at first it was spoken of David's enemies, but at the same time was intended as a prophecy against those who should reject Christ. It has the double meaning so common in prophecy. The word

table is thought by some to refer to the table at which the Jews annually ate the paschal lamb; but this is not probable. The reference is doubtless to the table at which they took their daily food. The meaning is: **Let the very table from which they daily eat become, instead of a comfort and joy to them, a snare and a trap in which they are caught in trouble; let it become a stumbling-block in their path of life, over which they are constantly falling—and all this as a recompense for rejecting Christ.** Now if we, of to-day, will only imagine our own table, at which we daily eat, becoming all this to us, we shall realize, to some extent, how deep the distress is which the picture implies.

10. Let their eyes be darkened that they may not see. Let the spiritual eyes of those of Israel who reject Christ become darkened; let their perception become blunt, and their understanding dull, that they may remain ignorant. They wilfully refuse to see in Christ their own promised Messiah. Let them alone in this blindness. Where men refuse to do right, God's policy is to leave them to the effect of their folly. He will not have them right against their will.

and do you bend down their back always. The rendering here is not so terse as I could wish; but clearness demands it. Lay on those who reject Christ heavy burdens of trouble, burdens which shall bend down their backs; and this do forever, unless they accept Christ. By some, the clause is supposed to allude to the heavy burdens sometimes borne by slaves. The supposition may be true, but it is not necessary. It is best, I think, not to construe, with much strictness, the separate clauses of vs. 9, 10. They are clearly to be taken as a group designed to set forth the consequences of rejecting Christ. They have their sense as a whole, rather than as parts.

CHAPTER XI. SECTION 2.

11 Λέγω οὖν, Μὴ ἔπτασαν ἵνα πέσωσι; μὴ γένοιτο. Ἄλλὰ τῷ αὐτῶν παραπτώματι ἡ σωτηρία τοῖς ἔθνεσιν, εἰς τὸ παραζηλώσαι αὐτούς. 12 Εἰ δὲ τὸ παράπτωμα αὐτῶν πλοῦτος κόσμος καὶ τὸ ἥττημα αὐτῶν πλοῦτος ἐθνῶν, πόσῳ μᾶλλον τὸ πλήρωμα αὐτῶν. 13 Ὑμῖν δὲ λέγω τοῖς ἔθνεσιν, ἐφ' ὅσον μὲν εἰμι ἐγὼ ἐθνῶν ἀπόστολος, τὴν διακονίαν μου δοξάζω, 14 εἰ πως παραζηλώσω μου τὴν σάρκα καὶ σώσω τινὰς ἐξ αὐτῶν. 15 Εἰ γὰρ ἡ ἀποβολὴ αὐτῶν καταλλαγὴ κόσμου, τίς ἡ πρόσληψις, εἰ μὴ ζωὴ ἐκ νεκρῶν; 16 Εἰ δὲ ἡ ἀπαρχὴ ἁγία, καὶ τὸ φύραμα· καὶ εἰ ἡ ῥίζα ἁγία, καὶ οἱ κλάδοι. 17 Εἰ δὲ τινες τῶν κλάδων ἐξεκλάσθησαν, σὺ δὲ ἀργιελαιὸς ὢν ἐνεκεντρίσθης ἐν αὐτοῖς καὶ συγκοινωνὸς τῆς ῥίζης καὶ τῆς πιότητος τῆς ἐλαίας ἐγένου, 18 μὴ κατακαυχῶ τῶν κλάδων. Εἰ δὲ κατακαυχᾶσαι, οὐ σὺ τὴν ῥίζαν βαστάξεις, ἀλλ' ἡ ῥίζα σέ. 19 Ἐρεῖς οὖν, Ἐξεκλάσθησαν κλάδοι ἵνα ἐγὼ ἐγκεντρισθῶ. 20 Καλῶς τῇ ἀπιστίᾳ ἐξεκλάσθησαν, σὺ δὲ τῇ πίστει ἔστηκας. Μὴ ὑψηλοφρόνει, ἀλλὰ φοβοῦ. 21 Εἰ γὰρ ὁ Θεὸς τῶν κατὰ φύσιν κλάδων οὐκ ἐφείσατο, οὐδὲ σοῦ φείσεται. 22 Ἴδε οὖν χρηστότητα καὶ ἀποτομίαν Θεοῦ· ἐπὶ μὲν τοὺς πεσόντας, ἀποτομία, ἐπὶ δὲ σέ χρηστότης Θεοῦ, εἰς ἐπιμείνῃς τῇ χρηστότητι· ἐπεὶ καὶ σὺ ἐκκοπήσῃς. 23 Κακένοι δέ, εἰς μὴ ἐπιμείνωσι τῇ ἀπιστίᾳ, ἐγκεντρισθήσονται· δυνατὸς γὰρ ἐστὶν ὁ Θεὸς πάλιν ἐγκεντρίσαι αὐτούς. 24 Εἰ γὰρ σὺ ἐκ τῆς κατὰ φύσιν ἐξκόπης ἀργιελαιῶν καὶ παρὰ φύσιν ἐνεκεντρίσθης εἰς καλλιελαιῶν, πόσῳ μᾶλλον οὗτοι οἱ κατὰ φύσιν ἐγκεντρισθῶσιν τῇ ἰδίᾳ ἐλαίᾳ.

11 I say then, Did they stumble that they might fall? Not at all. But by their fall, salvation is come to the Gentiles, in order to excite them to emulation. 12 Now if their fall is the riches of the world, and their loss the riches of the Gentiles, how much more will their fullness be. 13 And I speak to you Gentiles, inasmuch as I am apostle to the Gentiles; [and] I honor my office, 14 if possibly I may excite my flesh to emulation, and save some of them. 15 For if their rejection is the reconciliation of the world, what will their reception be but life from the dead? 16 And if the first portion be holy, the mass is also; and if the root be holy, the branches are too. 17 But if some of the branches were broken off, and you, being a wild olive, have been grafted in among them, and become a partaker of the root and fatness of the olive, 18 boast not against the branches. But if you boast, you bear not the root, but the root, you. 19 You will say then, branches were broken off that I might be grafted in. 20 Well; because of unbelief they were broken off, and by belief you stand. Be not high-minded, but fear. 21 For if God spared not the natural branches, he will also not spare you. 22 See then God's kindness and cutting off—upon them that fell, cutting off; but upon you, God's kindness, provided you continue in his kindness; otherwise you too shall be cut off. 23 And they also, if they continue not in unbelief, shall be grafted in; for God is able to graft them in again. 24 For if you have been cut from an olive, wild by nature, and grafted, contrary to nature, into a good olive, how much more shall these, the natural branches, be grafted into their own olive?

SUMMARY.

The Jews stumbled at Christ. Did they stumble merely that they might fall? Certainly not. Rather they stumbled that thereby they might con-

tribute to the salvation of the Gentiles. If now their fall proves advantageous to the Gentiles, their reception back into the divine favor will prove still more so. This implies that they may be again received. And why not? The first converts from them were accepted. Surely then the whole will be when they become converted. The Jews were rejected because of unbelief. Let them then but believe, and they will be accepted. And you, Gentiles, stand by belief. Do not grow proud and over-confident. For if God spared not the Jews when they did wrong, neither will he spare you. Towards the Jews, God has been severe in cutting them off, towards you he has been kind. Be careful now to deserve a continuance of his kindness. If not, you too will be rejected as the Jews have been.

11. I say then did they stumble that they might fall? Not at all. The *oun* here is concessive; that is it concedes the leading fact of the preceding section, namely, that the Jews are rejected. The word stumbled, *eptaisan*, is not suggested by *skandalon* in v. 9, as some have supposed. On the contrary, it refers back to the "stumbling-stone" mentioned in ix: 33. The meaning is, Did Israel stumble at Christ that they might fall? The answer is: "Not at all." But what is the precise point denied? Not certainly Israel's stumbling; for this, the question concedes. It must then be the fall, and yet unqualifiedly a fall can not be denied, for the next clause concedes one. In what sense then is a fall denied? A final fall, or fall without remedy is denied. Israel have stumbled and fallen; but their fall is not without hope. A remedy still remains in the gospel; and this remedy is as open to them as to Gentiles. The extent and duration, therefore, of their fall, will depend wholly on how long they continue to reject the gospel. They will remain fallen so long as they remain disobedient to Christ—no longer.

But was it God's intention that Israel should stumble and fall? By some, the verse is supposed to involve the question. I reply, first, that it was certainly not God's *intention* that Israel should stumble; for he can not intend any one's sin. Their stumbling was their own wilful act, to which he was in no sense a party. But I reply, secondly, that conditionally, God certainly intended Israel's fall. If they rejected Christ, then he intended their fall. In the matter of rejection, they were left perfectly free. God did every thing he consistently could to prevent it, but still left them to their choice. But in case they rejected, he then decreed their fall. Not only so, but he intends them to remain fallen so long as they continue to reject. He will do, to induce them to accept Christ, all he does in the case of Gentiles, and no more. But if they still continue to reject, he will cause them to remain fallen. Israel can rise on one condition only—acceptance of Christ.

By some, as MacKnight, and others, *iva* here is thought to be *ekbatic*, not *telic*. According to them the verse should read, I say then did they stumble *so as to fall*. But this is surely wrong. The sense obviously is—Did they stumble that, or in order that, they might fall? Again, the word *fall* has the force of lost. Did they stumble that they might be lost. Both in scripture and in common speech, the word has often this sense.

But by their fall, salvation is come to the Gentiles *Alla* here introduces not a negative on the preceding question, nor yet something merely contrary to it, but a correction of it. The Jews have stumbled at Christ, not so much that they may fall, as that by their stumbling, they may contribute to the salvation of the Gentiles. Conditionally, God intended the Jews to fall; but in case of their fall he intended the event to effect something beyond itself. Out of it, notwithstanding its disastrous character to the Jew, he still designed good to come.

But in what way did the fall of the Jews contribute to the salvation of the Gentiles? Certainly we are not to conclude that the one event was absolutely essential to the other. That the Gentiles could have been saved without the fall, none will deny. It must then have contributed to their salvation only incidentally, and by the divine overruling. God turned it to this account, not that within itself it had this tendency. 1. The Jews as a nation rejected Christ. This left the whole force of the gospel to be spent on the Gentiles. The result has been their conversion on a greatly extended scale. 2. The destruction of the Jewish nation and state has crushed out their offensive sense of superiority. But for this, they would have continued to look on the Gentiles as inferiors and as owing their whole distinction to them. This would have repelled the Gentiles, and proved an impediment to their conversion. 3. Had the Jewish nation not rejected Christ, they would have been continually corrupting and enfeebling the gospel by mixing with it their own peculiar customs and tenets. This would have impeded its spread. In all these ways, and possibly others, did the fall of the Jews incidently contribute to the salvation of the Gentiles.

in order to excite them to emulation. Better, I think, to render thus than, *to excite them to jealousy*. A spirit of emulation might prove advantageous to the Jews; but I can not see how a spirit of jealousy could. The one term implies an honorable rivalry, the other not. To emulate the excellence of my christian

brother is right; but to be jealous of him, is right in no sense. But has the conversion of the Gentiles as yet excited the Jews to emulation? Certainly it has not; nor is it clear that it ever will. It ought to have this effect, I grant, but what ought to be is not always what will be. Still, even here we should not be without hope. The Jewish mind is yet, in the future, to undergo great changes for the better. They are, in large numbers, to be brought to sight, brought to belief, brought to feeling. A noble emulation may possess them then. For such an event all the good should devoutly pray.

12. Now if their fall is the riches of the world, and their loss the riches of the Gentiles, These two classes express substantially the same thing. The term "world" denotes the Gentiles, the Jews being excluded, and the word "*Gentiles*" exhausts the world; while *fall* and *loss* merely vary the same idea. The Jews rejected Christ. This led to both their fall and loss, the fall being sudden, and the loss continuous.

Paraptoma here is rendered *trespass* by Alford, *lapse* by Stuart, and *slip* by Green. Literally the word means *a fall beside, a false step*. Here, however, it signifies simply a *fall*. Its import is exactly determined by *pesosin* in v. 11—did they stumble that they might *fall*? *Hettema*, too, has been variously rendered. By some it is thought to mean here *fewness* or *small number*. But the notion of number I cannot discover in the word. It signifies *a being inferior, worse estate, failure, defeat, loss*. The Apostle seems to use it here comprehensively, to express the whole of Israel's loss in being rejected. Accordingly, I so render it as to convey this idea.

But how did Israel's fall and loss prove the riches of the world? How, in other words, did they prove the world's benefit? for this is the meaning of riches. The Bible is silent on the question; consequently, the answer is conjectural. First, the fall of the Jews was followed by their dispersion among all nations. In this dispersion, they carried with them and disseminated the notion of the one living and true God. By this fact alone, the world was immeasurably benefited. Second, though the Jews repudiated Christ, they still showed all nations that their prophets foretold a Redeemer, and accordingly taught them to look for one. This familiarized the world's mind with the notion of a Savior, and caused them to expect one. Third, wherever the Jews went, they struck a fatal blow at idolatry. This purified the popular mind

and prepared it for better views of God. Fourth, the Jews taught all nations their true origin in Adam, and thus corrected their false history. With this disappeared a world of myths and fables. Fifth, they gave the world true knowledge touching the origin of sin and the fall of man. Sixth, they carried with them, *in the laws of Moses, the finest system of civil polity and equity in the world*, and thus aided in forming the civilization of all enlightened nations. Seventh, their prophets had foretold their downfall in case they rejected Christ. Thus, wherever they went, they became the living proofs that these prophecies were true. In all these ways, the world was benefited by Israel's fall. Wherever Israel go (and where is it they do not go?), Moses and the prophets go; and wherever Moses and the prophets go, the way lies open for Christ. Thus it was that the scattering of Israel enriched the nations.

how much more will their fullness be? *Pleroma* here means the full measure of the blessings of redemption as enjoyed in time. It is exactly equivalent to conversion. The sense is: If the fall and loss of the Jews are a benefit to the world, how much more will their conversion be. It is proper to add that *will be* is not in the original, but is supplied. I see not, however, how we could supply a different tense. A Present or a Past one is out of the question; and to render, how much more *would* their fullness be, is far-fetched. Upon the whole, I believe we are bound to adopt *will be*. True, in supplying *will be* we make the Apostle assume the future conversion of the Jews, not necessarily their universal conversion, but still their conversion on a large scale. Nor, with v. 25 before us, do I see how we could do otherwise. Certainly a general future conversion of the Jews does not now seem more improbable than did a general conversion of the Gentiles at the time of Christ. Marvelous may be the changes which a hundred years shall work out.

13. And I speak to you Gentiles, inasmuch as I am Apostle to the Gentiles; That is, I speak thus to you—I say what I have just said. As I am your Apostle, I make bold to tell you that both the fall and the loss of Israel have proved blessings to you. Whatever they are to Israel, to you they are a gain.

How the clauses of this verse stand related to each other, is not perfectly clear. It is hence not easy to punctuate them satisfactorily. Upon the whole, I give the preference to the pointing here adopted. Others point thus: I speak to you Gentiles: Inas-

much as I am Apostle to the Gentiles, I honor my office. But the colon here makes an awkward sentence. The more probable relation and dependence seem to me to be this: I speak to you Gentiles, inasmuch as I am Apostle to the Gentiles; and not, Inasmuch as I am Apostle to the Gentiles, I honor my office.

[and] I honor my office, 14. if possibly I may excite my flesh to emulation and save some of them. I bracket *and* here, to make a smoother connection, though it is not really necessary, as can be seen by omitting it. Paul honored his office by being active in it, fully up to his ability. His aim was to convert just as many Gentiles as possible, in hope that the more of them he brought into the church, the more he would stir the Jews to emulation. In small measure only, he realized his hope. The vast body of Israel still stood out. The phrase "my flesh" means simply my kin according to the flesh, my countrymen. The mode in which Paul proposed to save his "flesh," was by inducing them to obey Christ.

By some, vs. 13, 14 have been regarded as parenthetical, and so treated. They certainly seem interposed between the properly connected parts of the matter in hand, though I can see no advantage in considering them as parenthetical. They are a short episode, personal to Paul, yet closely enough connected with the main current of thought. I think it best to treat them as I have done.

15. For if their rejection is the reconciliation of the world, The connection of thought seems to be this: I honor my office, if possibly I may excite my kin to emulation, and save some of them. The salvation of the Jews is an event to be exceedingly desired. For if their rejection is the reconciliation of the world, &c. I hence regard this verse, not as connected with v. 12, but with the latter clause of v. 14. How the rejection of the Jews has proved beneficial to the Gentiles, has already been considered under v. 12. The expression "reconciliation of the world," is not to be taken too comprehensively, but as qualified by the facts in the case. The rejection of the Jews has not had the effect to reconcile the whole Gentile world. It has had this effect on only many of them. The expression, therefore, is to be taken restrictedly.

What will their reception be but life from the dead? Here again we supply *will be*, and so make the Apostle assert the future conversion of the Jews. This course seems necessi-

tated by the nature of the case. But the future reception of the Jews will not consist in restoring them, as Jews, to their former national prosperity, but in receiving them into the divine favor in virtue of their obedience to Christ. Their condition and state will then be precisely the same as the present condition and state of christian Gentiles. Between the two peoples, no distinction can exist.

The expression "life from the dead," has been very variously interpreted. By some it has been thought to signify the literal resurrection of the dead. Such was the view generally held by the more ancient commentators. According to them, the meaning is: What will the reception of Israel be but the resurrection of the dead. But this is purely conjectural. The dead will certainly be raised; and it is not impossible that the event may occur immediately after the conversion of the Jews; but that it will then occur, is not taught in the expression in hand.

The event referred to in the expression "life from the dead," will not, I take it, be participated in by the whole world, but by the Gentiles alone. The following I regard as giving the true view: For if the rejection of the Jews is the reconciliation of the Gentiles, what will the reception of the Jews be *to the Gentiles* but life from the dead? The Gentiles alone are to receive the blessings alluded to in the expression.

But when the Jews are received back into the divine favor, what event will then occur among the Gentiles that can, with propriety, be characterized as life from the dead? I answer, their general conversion. The Gentiles are now in countless numbers dead in sin, dead to righteousness, dead to Christ. Their more general regeneration will certainly be life from the dead. Besides, when the Jews accept Christ and devote themselves wholly to preaching the gospel, I look for the scenes of the primitive Pentecost to be re-enacted. Such an ingathering into the church, I expect then to occur as has never yet taken place. Christian Israel and the christian Gentiles will then be one. Their united energies will be turned against sin; and the result will be that their victories for Christ will have no parallel. The residue of mankind will flock into the church. This will be the "life from the dead," of the passage. But at the end of this great spiritual harvest, more naturally, it seems to me, than anywhere else, is the literal resurrection of the just to take place. Of course this is conjectural. But when all Jews and all Gentiles have entered

the church that will do so, I can see no reason for postponing the end. The world will then be ripe for the coming of Christ; and at his coming the holy dead will be raised, the righteous living will be changed, and the millennium will have set in.

16. And if the first portion be holy, the mass is also; *Aparche* here should not be rendered *first-fruit*, as it usually is, but first part or portion. Its meaning is determined by *phurama*. The reference is not certain, but assuming it to be to Numb. xv: 20, the facts were these: When the harvest was gathered before it could be used, it had to be consecrated or rendered ceremonially holy. This was done in the following manner: Flour was taken from the first wheat that was ground, and made into a mass of dough. This mass was the *phurama*. The first piece of dough taken from this mass was baked into a cake and offered to the Lord. This was the *aparche*, or first portion; and so soon as it was offered, the remainder, both of the dough and of the harvest, was ready for common or family use.

The "first portion" stands for the first converts from the Jews to Christ; while the "mass" signifies the remainder of the nation. The meaning is: If the first Jewish christians were accepted of God, the whole nation is capable of being accepted. They are not irrevocably rejected, but will be accepted when they obey. The word *holy* does not here signify pure or sinless, but merely appropriate or acceptable; that is, of such character or quality as to be appropriated or accepted. The Jews are capable of being accepted, and will be, when they obey Christ. This is a common use of the word *holy* in the Bible. The first-born, the vessels of the temple service, and many other things were holy in this sense. The argument is: If the first part were accepted on certain conditions, the whole will be on the same.

and if the root be holy, the branches are too. The same sentiment reiterated, with the imagery changed. The root corresponds to the first Jewish converts; the branches to the rejected nation. Assuming the root of a tree to be holy, and we naturally infer the holiness of its branches. Such is the argument. The word *holy* has here the same meaning as in the preceding clause. If God has accepted the root, or first converts from the Jews, he will accept the whole nation when converted. Such is the import of the passage. It is a short, striking simile, with a perfectly clear meaning.

Yet few passages have been loaded down with more fanciful

interpretations than it has, or made to subserve more foreign ends. Who is the root? is asked; and curious and forced are many of the replies. According to some, the root is Abraham, and the branches his posterity. Then, because Abraham and his posterity by Isaac were accepted of God, the infants of believing parents should be received into the church of Christ. No perversion could be grosser. In all of which we are shown the danger of detaching a clause from its connection, and then interpreting its several words according to some fondly cherished, but false idea. Abraham is not the root of the passage; but that word is used metaphorically, and represents the first Jewish christians. On any other hypothesis than this, the passage is inexplicable.

17. **But if some of the branches were broken off,** Another brief simile which has been much abused. In the preceding verse, the Apostle had employed the corollary root and branches. These words he now continues to employ, thus relieving his train of thought by pleasant, familiar imagery. *Some of the branches were broken off*—unfiguratively, some of the Jews were rejected, namely, those who refused to believe. This is the exact meaning of the clause, and all that is in it.

But with many, this is not enough. According to them, the olive-tree is a parable, with closely adhering parts, having opposite to each, some mystic feature in redemption. "Some of the branches were broken off"—of course, then, broken off some tree. Who or what was that tree? The answer would seem difficult. One says it was God; another, it was Abraham; another, it was Christ; another, it was the old Jewish church, and so on—all of which can have no effect but to bewilder. The Apostle has before his mind but a single fact which he is setting forth. That fact is the rejection of the unbelieving Jews. This he sets forth in the language of an olive-dresser, who breaks off and throws away such branches as he has no farther use for. Similarly, God. He breaks off, or plainly rejects those Jews who refuse to believe in Christ. This is the whole import of the clause.

and you, being a wild olive, have been grafted in among them, And you, being Gentiles, have been received in among the Jews who were not rejected, that is, among those who accepted Christ. The Gentiles are called a "wild olive," because in comparison with the Jew they had been left in a state of nature.

They were without prophets, without written revelation, and as a consequence measurably unenlightened in their duty to God. But when the gospel was presented to them, they obeyed it, and so were received into the church. In the phrase "grafted in among them," the word "them" denotes those Jews who, having obeyed Christ, constituted the church at first. "Grafted in" is a metaphor used to denote being converted or becoming christians. The Jews by being born anew entered into the kingdom of God, and at first composed it. Subsequently, the Gentiles entered it in the same way; and the two, becoming thus blended, constituted the "one body" of Christ.

But this "one body" was not the old Jewish family reorganized or reconstructed. It was wholly a "new man," a new thing. True, the materials for it were collected, in part, from the Jews, but they entered it only by being born into it. But as a body or church, it had had no previous existence. It was composed of new creatures," of "living stones," and so was a "spiritual house," and therefore a new one. It was no outgrowth from a pre-existing church, but an original, without genealogy, antecedent, or type. In foundation, structure, head, and spirit, it was new. Those writers, therefore, are wholly wrong who conceive of the church of Christ as a continuation of some supposed previous Jewish church. No such church existed.

Again, instead of "grafted in *among* them," some writers, as Stuart and others, would render "grafted in *in their stead.*" But this is erroneous. For, in the first place, the original is incapable, without great violence, of this rendering. And in the second, it is not fact that the Gentiles were grafted in in any body's stead. They came into the church just as did the Jews, and not into a place made vacant by the rejection of others. The rejected Jews had never been in the church. Hence the Gentiles could not be received into it in their stead. This erroneous exegesis grows out of the effort to make it appear that the church of Christ is a mere modified continuation of the "old Jewish church." But the effort is abortive, and the reason for it bad. Let it once be conceded that there was such a thing as an "old Jewish church" with infants in it. Then show that Christ's church is a mere continuation of the Jewish, and the inference is remarkably easy, that Christ's church should contain infants. To some, this point is the sole reason for the rendering of Stuart and others.

and become a partaker of the root and fatness of the

olive. To become a partaker of the root and fatness of the olive was to become a partaker of the blessings of the gospel. These blessings were first tendered to the Jews, and accepted by some of them. Accordingly, for a while they were confined exclusively to Jews. They were their blessings; and afterwards, when they were tendered to the Gentiles, it was by Jews. Hence to become a partaker of them, was to become a partaker of blessings pre-occupied by others, and emanating from them. It was to share in their distinction and happiness.

But the clause has been very differently interpreted; and as a metaphor, it has been forced into violent forms, and made subservient to fanciful notions. Who is the olive? has been often asked, but never satisfactorily or consistently answered. And farther, what are the root and fatness of the olive? Does root denote a person or a thing?—if a person, whom?—if a thing, what? But all these are idle questions. When the Jews became christians there was but one thing for them to become partakers of—the blessings of the gospel. And so with the Gentiles. They partook of nothing else, since there was nothing else to partake of. Hence the root and fatness of the olive are mere metaphors used to represent these blessings. They do not denote persons, nor yet each some separate good. They denote simply what the Gentiles realized on becoming christians, which was remission of sins, together with the other accompaniments of conversion.

18. boast not against the branches. The original reception of the Jews as God's peculiar people and the neglect of the Gentiles, had had the effect to render the former proud, and to fill them with a feeling of superiority. But a reverse was about to take place. The Gentiles were about to become the favored people of God, and the Jews to be neglected. The Apostle wished to prevent the Gentiles becoming affected towards the Jews, as the Jews had been towards them. Hence he admonishes the Gentiles not to boast. This the Jews had been accustomed to do. He desired the Gentiles to avoid it. "*Against the branches*"—the branches here were the rejected Jews, not the christians. There was no danger of the Gentiles boasting against the christian Jews, and consequently no necessity to protect them against it. The danger respected the rejected Jews. They alone, therefore, needed protection.

but if you boast, you bear not the root, but the root, you. But if you boast, which you may be inconsiderate enough

to do, remember this, which may serve to check you, that you bear not the root, but the root, you. The Jews owe nothing to you, but you owe much to them. From them came Christ as to his flesh; the first church was composed of Jews; the Apostles were Jews; and by Jews the gospel was first preached to you. You can not be said to bear the christian Jews, as a root its trunk, but rather as a root they bear you. This shows your relation to them and dependence on them. You must not then boast against them.

It can not, I think, be denied that to-day, much of the same ungracious feeling exists among christian Gentiles towards the rejected Jews, that formerly existed among the Jews towards the Gentiles. We have hardly heeded the Apostle's admonition as strictly as we should.

19. You will say then, branches were broken off that I might be grafted in. That is, you will still continue to boast a little, but in a lowered tone; you will have a sort of last exultant word. You will still grudge the Jews their due, and ill conceal your sense of pride and superiority. This much I can not prevent. The meaning is: You will say, then, that some of the Jews were rejected that I might be received. But this is merely the Gentile's view of the case, and not necessarily correct. The Jews were not rejected *that* the Gentiles might be received. They were rejected solely because of their unbelief. The rejection was not essential to the reception; and, therefore, the reception was not the object of it. The object in rejecting the Jews was to punish them for their sin. Hence the Gentile view, though correctly stated, is itself not correct. It is erroneous in making one event dependent on another, because the two are merely incidentally related. The reception of the Gentiles was closely consequent on the rejection of the Jews, but not dependent on it.

20. Well; because of unbelief they were broken off, On the use of the Dative, as here, to denote the cause, see Winer, p. 216. *Kalos* is here partially concessive, but not wholly so. It is nicely discriminative. It concedes the rejection of the Jews, but no more. That they were rejected *that* the Gentiles might be received, is not implied in it. The two main facts it concedes, but not their dependence.

The Jews were broken off because of unbelief. This was the great decisive ground for the act. Moreover, it settles all ques-

tions as to why they were rejected. God did not pre-ordain their unbelief. This was in whole and in part their own act. Hence God did not unconditionally pre-ordain their rejection. He left them free to choose between belief and unbelief. They chose unbelief; and for the act, he rejected them.

and by belief you stand. But not in their stead. You stand absolutely and with no reference to others. You stand in the body of Christ, just as you would have stood, had they all gone in, or never existed. The place you hold is your own, not another's. The Jews were never rejected to make room for the Gentiles.

Be not high-minded, but fear. As much as to say, though in Christ, you do not hold your place by an unalterable decree. You too may be rejected; and you will be, unless you do right. Should you become high-minded and over-confident—the faults of the Jews, you may thereby be led into error, and in the end be lost. Be humble-minded and afraid to take the slightest risk. Be so far filled with fear as to be scrupulous and exact in belief and life. Then only are you safe.

21. For if God spared not the natural branches, he will also not spare you. Natural branches are a tree's own branches in contradistinction to grafted branches. The rejected Jews are called natural branches because they were a part of God's own people, the kin of his Son, a part of the vineyard his own hands had planted. Even these he would not spare when they refused to believe in his Son. Surely, then, you Gentiles must not expect him to spare you, if you become unbelieving. Not that God is more inclined to spare the one people than the other. He is positively determined to spare neither in unbelief. Hence when he has shown that he will not spare the one, it may confidently be inferred that he will not spare the other. He accepts and spares only on condition of belief in Christ, and unconditionally rejects in its absence.

22. See then God's kindness and cutting off— *Apotomia* literally means *cutting off* or *cutting from*. Metaphorically it means steepness, severity, decisiveness. Here, however, I see no necessity for departing from its literal meaning. This may not give so smooth a sentence, or be so antithetic; but it is true, and in close harmony with the figurative style in hand.

upon them that fell, cutting off; The Jews stumbled at Christ and fell; in other words, they refused to believe in him.

and therefore God cut them off or rejected them. But as is here seen, the cutting off was not arbitrary or unconditional. It was necessitated by the unbelief of those cut off, or the unbelief determined the cutting off.

but upon you God's kindness, provided you continue in his kindness; otherwise you too shall be cut off. There is here an evident ellipsis of some sentence which it is necessary to supply in order to complete the sense. I supply it thus: See then God's kindness bestowed upon you; *and he will continue it to you*, provided you continue to use it properly, that is, continue firm in belief and obedience. But should you Gentiles prove yourselves unworthy of God's kindness, as the rejected Jews have done; should you become unbelieving and disobedient, you will be cut off as they have been. Should you become what they are, their fate will at once become yours. God's kindness is his love and mercy bestowed in Christ; and it is realized in remission of sins, the gift of the Holy Spirit, the hope of immortality, *et cetera*.

Stuart is strangely wrong when he renders *ean epimenes to chrestoteti* "provided you maintain a state of integrity." *Chrestoteti* does not signify a state to be maintained, but kindness bestowed. Of this kindness the Gentiles were to show themselves worthy by continued fidelity to Christ.

23. **And they also, if they continue not in unbelief, shall be grafted in;** Accordingly, the probability that the Jews will, at any time future, be received back into God's favor is exactly equal to the probability that they will then be believers in Christ. At present, this probability certainly seems low. God will never work any special miracle on the Jews to induce them to believe; nor will he ever increase the power of the gospel for their sake. He will do for them no more than he is doing for the Gentiles. The fact, therefore, of their believing rests with themselves. If, of their own accord, they become believers, well; but if they still refuse, they will remain rejected. But when time and degradation have utterly extinguished in them all hope of a coming Messiah, I still expect them to come to themselves, and in large numbers to accept Christ. To this effect, at least, I think I understand Paul.

for God is able to graft them in again. There is then no insuperable obstacle on his part. He is not only able, but willing and anxious. But since he can not compel, he must await the

pleasure of the Jews. On their act of belief, depends his act of reception.

24. For if you have been cut from an olive, wild by nature, and grafted, contrary to nature, into a good olive, The Gentile world is here called "an olive wild by nature," because they had been left to grow up in a state of nature, without the superintending care which God had bestowed upon the Jews. Converting them from idolatry and ignorance is termed cutting them from this olive; while receiving them into the church is called grafting them into a good olive. In grafting, the tame or improved tree is always grafted into the wild or unimproved. According to this, the Jews should have been added to the Gentiles, not the Gentiles to the Jews. Yet the latter was the order. It is therefore called grafting "contrary to nature." Nature here is equivalent to custom.

how much more shall these, the natural branches, be grafted into their own olive? The Jews had been accustomed to God's dealings. They had his laws, heard his prophets, knew his will, were familiar with the promises of a Messiah, and lived in daily expectation of one. But not so the Gentiles. Certainly then it was more natural and far easier for the Jews to accept Christ than for the Gentiles. Yet the former rejected him, while the latter accepted. This was not to have been expected. Far more naturally would we look for Jews to become christians than for Gentiles. Moreover, when their unbelief is broken, and they begin to turn to Christ, they will turn in numbers and with an ease that will be astounding. It has always been difficult to christianize Gentiles; hence the slowness of the process. But when the Jews shall break away from their darkness and obstinacy, they will rush into the kingdom like a flood. That day will have no parallel in the past.

CHAPTER XI. SECTION 3.

²⁵ For I do not wish you to be ignorant, brethren, of this mystery, lest you be wise within yourselves, that hardness in part has happened to Israel, until the full sum of the Gentiles come in. ²⁶ And so all Israel shall be saved; as it is written: The deliverer shall come out of Sion, and shall turn away impiety from Jacob. ²⁷ And my covenant with them is this—when I shall take away their sins. ²⁸ With respect to the gospel they are hated for your sake; but with respect to the choice, beloved on the fathers' account. ²⁹ For God's favors and calling are not regretted. ³⁰ For as you were formerly disobedient to God, but now have obtained mercy through their disobedience; ³¹ so also they are now disobedient that they may obtain mercy through the mercy shown to you. ³² For God has shut up all in disobedience that he may have mercy on all.

²⁵ Οὐ γὰρ θελω ὑμᾶς ἀγνοεῖν, ἀδελφοί, τὸ μυστήριον τοῦτο, ἵνα μὴ ᾔτε ἐν ἑαυτοῖς φρόνιμοι, ὅτι πάρωσις ἀπὸ μέρους τῶ Ἰσραὴλ γέγονεν ἄχρις οὗ τὸ πλήρωμα τῶν ἔθνῶν εἰσέλθῃ. ²⁶ Καὶ οὕτω πᾶς Ἰσραὴλ σωθήσεται, καθὼς γέγραπται, Ἦξει ἐκ Σιὼν ὁ ῥυόμενος, ἀποστρέψας ἀσεβείας ἀπὸ Ἰακώβ. ²⁷ Καὶ αὕτη αὐτοῖς ἡ παρ' ἐμοῦ διαθήκη, ὅταν ἀφελῶμαι τὰς ἀμαρτίας αὐτῶν. ²⁸ Κατὰ μὲν τὸ εὐαγγέλιον ἐχθροὶ δι' ὑμᾶς, κατὰ δὲ τὴν ἐκλογὴν ἀγαπητοὶ διὰ τοὺς πατέρας. ²⁹ Ἀμεταμέλητα γὰρ τὰ χαρίσματα καὶ ἡ κλήσις τοῦ Θεοῦ. ³⁰ Ὡσπερ γὰρ ὑμεῖς ποτε ἠπειθήσατε τῷ Θεῷ, νῦν δὲ ἠλεήθητε τῆς τούτων ἀπειθείας. ³¹ οὕτω καὶ οὗτοι νῦν ἠπειθήσαν τῷ ὑμετέρῳ ἐλέει, ἵνα καὶ αὐτοὶ ἐλεηθῶσι. ³² Συνέκλεισε γὰρ ὁ Θεὸς τοὺς πάντας εἰς ἀπειθειαν ἵνα τοὺς πάντας ἐλεήσῃ.

SUMMARY.

Hardness in part has happened to Israel until the full sum of the Gentiles come into the church. By that time the hardness of Israel will give way; they will then become believers; and so a great many of them will be saved. You Gentiles should know this mystery to keep you from becoming puffed up with self-importance. The rejected Jews are still beloved on their fathers' account; and you Gentiles have now to preach the gospel to them, and so convert them to Christ. They are thus at last to realize the divine mercy through you. Their fall has proved a blessing to you; and your conversion is to prove a blessing to them.

In this section, the Apostle explains still more fully the present condition of the Jews, and points out more clearly than he has yet done what their future will be. Indeed, the section is full of the future. It throws much light on the hereafter of both Gentile and Jew, and hence possesses uncommon interest. In it we see, as in a mirror, the probable destiny of these two great divisions of mankind. It may carry us forward even to the first resurrection. At least, we can think of no other event that is so likely to happen as that, immediately beyond the time it covers.

25. For I do not wish you to be ignorant, brethren, of this mystery, lest you be wise within yourselves, that hardness, in part, has happened to Israel, until the full sum of the Gentiles come in. *I do not wish you to be ignorant*; that is, I wish you to know or understand. "Mystery" here does not signify what is unintelligible, but what is undiscov-erable by human reason or observation. It signifies what is knowable by revelation only. The Apostle wished the Gentile christians to know the mystery alluded to, in order to keep them from being puffed up with self-conceit on account of being accepted of God. With this knowledge, they would be enabled to take a correct view both of their own condition and of that of the Jews; without it, they were in danger of over-estimating their own importance, and of cultivating a feeling of contempt for the rejected Jews. This feeling is inconsistent with the christian spirit, and therefore needed to be guarded against.

The following is the mystery: *That hardness*—not blindness, as in E. V. *Porosis* does not mean blindness, but hardness or hardening. The Jews had grown hard in heart and feeling. They had become petrified in the inner man; and as a result, they were insensible, cruel, and dull of perception. *In part*—hardness had not happened to the whole of Israel, but to a part only. Some of them accepted Christ, but the great body rejected him. Those rejecting were the hardened. *Has happened*—*gegiven* signifies to come into being, come to pass, happen. Hardness has come into being in Israel, or has sprung up in them. But how? Did God appoint it or bring it to pass, as some assert? Certainly not. He did all he rightly could to prevent it. It consequently came into being in spite of him. It grew out of Israel's wilful abuse of themselves, or was an effect to which they alone were cause. They only, therefore, were to blame for it. But, when at its hight, God took advantage of it, to send Christ into the world, and call the Gentiles. He thus, in a measure, defeated it by bringing good out of it. From this it would seem that the rejection of the Jews was favorable to the bringing in of the Gentiles. Indeed, there can hardly be a doubt of the fact. Had the Jews in a body come into the church with the Gentiles, they would still have looked on the Gentiles as inferiors, would have cumbered them with rites of the law, and have corrupted the gospel by incorporating into it elements of Judaism. The only way to keep the gospel pure was to confine it in large

measure to the Gentiles, until the Jews should become thoroughly weaned from their own religion. *Until the full sum of the Gentiles come in.* That is, come into the church. *Pleroma* I here render *full sum*, which is apt and clear. The word denotes that portion or large number of Gentiles that are to enter the church before the conversion of the Jews takes place. The hardness, then, of the Jews is not to last forever, but is to wear itself out after awhile. It will continue, however, until the full sum of the Gentiles come in. Not that of necessity it must last this long; but the time required to bring in the Gentiles is the time required to exhaust the hardness. When the full sum has come in, the hardness will be at an end. Then will be the time of Israel's conversion to Christ.

26. And so all Israel shall be saved; *Houtos* signifies *thus, in this way, in this manner.* And so, or in this way, all Israel shall be saved. In what way? Hardness has happened to Israel until (but no longer) the full sum of the Gentiles come in. But by the time the full sum is in, the hardness will have ceased. So soon as this occurs, Israel's unbelief will give place to belief; belief will be followed by obedience, and in obedience they will be saved. Such is the way. *All Israel* shall be saved. But the phrase "all Israel" need not be so construed as to include every individual even to the last. "All" often signifies, in scripture, the greater part, very many, a large number. This is its import here. The meaning is, that the great body of Israel shall be saved. Nor does the word "saved" here signify "to put in the way of salvation," or "to have the means of salvation bestowed upon them," as some maintain. It means saved in the sense of being pardoned, or being a christian. The great body of Israel shall become christian.

Here then the future salvation of the great body of the Jews, who shall then be alive, is distinctly asserted. This is the clearest scripture we have yet had on this point; and it is quite clear. Israel is yet to be born of water and of the Spirit, and so to enter the kingdom of God. Their unbelief and hardness are to die out. Their heart of flesh is to return, the vail is to drop from their eyes; and they are yet to see in him whom they pie-ced, their true and only Messiah.

But it is not necessary to suppose that the Jews will be converted all at once or suddenly. Their conversion may be going on through ages. The full sum of the Gentiles has been a long

time coming in, nor are they all in yet. So it may be with the Jews. Still, I can not but think that their conversion will take place rapidly. At least, I can see no reason why it should not. The circumstances which shall revolutionize one mind will revolutionize many. I hence look for a short work in their conversion.

But in endeavoring to forecast the probable future of the Jews, two things are to be steadily kept in mind. 1. That no miracle will be worked in order to effect their conversion. The gospel is God's power for salvation. Consequently, he who is not saved by it will never be saved at all. All will be done to save the Jews that is now being done to save Gentiles, but no more. 2. That the future salvation of Israel does not imply their restoration to their ancient home in Palestine. The former is a great necessity, the latter is none. When converted, the Jews can be just as happy, dispersed as they now are, as though they were all crowded back into Judea; and certainly they can be far more useful. The gospel is not designed to prepare men for an earthly Canaan, but for a heavenly.

as it is written: **The deliverer shall come out of Sion, and shall turn away impiety from Jacob.** For substance, the citation is from Isa. lix: 20, 21; but taking it in connection with the next verse, and the whole quotation seems to consist of two or more passages so blended as to express the Apostle's idea, not in his own words, but in those of prophecy. The down-fall and rejection of Israel, ch. ix, he had spoken of mostly in language of the prophets. In the same language, he now seeks to set forth their reception.

The object of the whole quotation evidently is to sustain the assertion that "all Israel shall be saved." This salvation will consist of two parts: 1. Turning Israel from impiety, which here includes the whole volume of their sins, especially unbelief. 2. The remission of their sins. The first part of this salvation is foretold in the present passage; the second, in the next verse.

But who is the "deliverer"; and how are we to understand the phrase "shall come out of Sion"? The deliverer is certainly Christ; for he alone is appointed for salvation to all. But Christ has already come; how then is he yet to come? He is not yet to come in the sense here meant; but this part of the prophecy must be regarded as already fulfilled, and the whole as being quoted for the sake of the other part. This is a common method of citing

scripture. We ourselves often quote a whole verse for the sake of a single clause. Christ is here said to "turn away impiety from Jacob," because this is to be effected by his gospel; and whatever is effected by it is properly ascribed to him. "Jacob" here stands for his descendants, or rather the rejected part of them.

27. And my covenant with them is this: In the Hebrew we have simply "my covenant." *Par' emou*, then, is evidently a circumlocution for *mou*. In rendering it, therefore, it is best to be a little free, as I have been. It would certainly be awkward to read: This is *from me* the covenant with them. In the expression, "this is my covenant," *this* refers to what follows, not to any thing preceding.

when I shall take away their sins. *Hotan* in this clause is not easily accounted for, when *hoti* seems so clearly required. With the latter, the verse would read thus: And my covenant with them is this, *that* I will take away their sins. But since no suspicion rests on *hotan*, we must have recourse to some other method of explanation. The best that suggests itself is to assume an ellipsis of some brief clause, and supply it, as in the following: And my covenant with them is this, *which will be accomplished*, when I shall take away their sins. This solution, though not entirely satisfactory, is still sufficient for Paul, whose object is to establish the future salvation of Israel. This salvation, as already said, will consist of two parts: turning Israel from impiety, and remitting their sins. The former verse establishes the turning; the present one, the remitting. Thus the two confirm the assertion that "all Israel shall be saved."

28. With respect to the gospel they are hated for your sake; The word *echthroï* here is not the noun, but the adjective, and consequently means *hated* or *being hated*, and not enemies. Viewed from the gospel stand-point alone, the Jews are hated, hated by God, actually hated, but hated only to the extent of being rejected, and that for their unbelief. But the hatred of the Jews is not an absolute hatred, having no end in view but their rejection. It looks at the same time to the welfare of the Gentiles. It is double in its purpose—on the one hand, acting on the Jews to their rejection, and, on the other, studying the salvation of the Gentiles. It is an economic hatred, turning the disastrous event to one party, to the good account of another. Accordingly the Jews are hated for the sake of the Gentiles, that is, for their benefit.

but with respect to the choice, beloved on the fathers' account. With respect to the choice of whom? Not the rejected Jews, as so many erroneously suppose, but their fathers. That is, the choice was of those on whose account the rejected Jews are still loved; and not of the rejected themselves. In other words, viewed from the stand-point alone of the choice God formerly made of their fathers, the rejected Jews are still loved in virtue of that choice. Their fathers were chosen and loved; and on their account their rejected descendants are still loved.

The reader will notice that I render *di' humas*, in the former clause of this verse, *for your sake*, but *dia tous pateras*, in the latter clause, *on the fathers' account*. The rejected Jews are not still loved for the sake of their fathers, that is, for their benefit, but because of them or on their account. This distinction should be made to appear in the translation.

29. For God's favors and calling are not regretted. That is, are not regretted by him. This verse is confirmatory of the last clause of v. 28. God chose Abraham and the other Jewish fathers, and bestowed upon them many great and special favors. Among these favors, he promised Abraham to be to him a God and to his posterity after him. The calling of these fathers and the favors bestowed upon them are still not regretted. Accordingly, God's mind is unaltered in regard to covenants and promises then made and entered into. He will yet, therefore, be a God to the rejected Jews whom he still loves, not because of themselves, but because of their fathers. When these Jews shall become obedient to his Son, he will bless them with the fullness of salvation. This he has always been ready to do, and still is ready. He awaits only their abandonment of their unbelief.

The Calvinistic mode of interpreting this verse is as follows: When God purposes to call and favor a people, his purpose is unalterable. He long since purposed to call and favor Israel; and therefore he will yet certainly do it. This is partly true and partly not. When God purposes unconditionally to call a people, he will certainly call them; but he purposes unconditionally nothing more than the call. He never unconditionally purposes salvation. This he confers only on condition of obedience to Christ. But he has already called the Jews by the gospel, and is still calling them. Thus far, then, his purpose has been executed. But whether he will ever favor them with salvation depends, not

on any unconditional purpose of his, but on their own voluntary acceptance of Christ. This done, he will bless; this not done, he will not.

30. For as you were formerly disobedient to God, The period referred to is that preceding their conversion to Christ. *But now have received mercy*—Received it in having the gospel preached to you, and in being accepted as God's children. *Through their disobedience.* The Dative, *apeitheia*, is here used to denote the occasion, or that in consequence of which. The disobedience of the Jews led to their rejection. This left the apostles and other primitive preachers to bestow their whole time upon the Gentiles; and the more the Gentiles heard the gospel, the more they obeyed it; while the smaller the number of the Jews that came into the church, the less the Gentiles were distracted and corrupted by them. Thus the disobedience of the Jews became the means and occasion of benefit to the Gentiles.

31. so also they are now disobedient Disobedient to God in not believing on his Son. Formerly the Jews were obedient; and you were disobedient; but now the case is reversed. You are obedient, and they are disobedient. *That they too may obtain mercy*—the same mercy which you have obtained; that is, receive remission of sins, enter the church, be filled with the hope of eternal life—in a word, be invested with all the blessings of the gospel. The clause expresses, not what the Jews intended, in being disobedient, but what God intended should come out of it. It expresses the end as purposed by him, not by them.

The position of *hina* in this verse is unusual; and it has prevented uniformity among writers both in translation and exposition. Properly, it should stand before *to humetero*, though we have instances of its being placed precisely as here. See 1 Cor. ix: 15; 2 Cor. ii: 4; Gal. ii: 10. I arrange and translate in agreement with the best critics.

that they may obtain mercy through the mercy shown to you. Your mercy would be more literal, but it is ambiguous. It may mean either the mercy which you show, or the mercy shown to you. The latter alone is correct, and I therefore adopt it. As the rejection of the Jews proved a blessing to the Gentiles; so in turn, the reception of the Gentiles is to prove a blessing to the Jews. But how? The Gentiles have now to preach the gospel to the Jews, and induce them to obey it. At first the

gospel came from the Jews to the Gentiles; now, however, it must go from the Gentiles to the Jews. Thus the Jews are to obtain mercy through the mercy shown to the Gentiles.

32. For God has shut up all in disobedience By "all" is here meant all Jews, and all Gentiles. At first God shut up the Gentiles, but now he has also shut up the Jews. *Sun akleisen* here signifies to shut up, or embrace, in one common sentence. God has embraced both Jews and Gentiles in one sweeping sentence of condemnation; and this, because of their common disobedience. Not, he has shut them up, as some assert, in order to disobedience, or that they may become disobedient; for this would implicate God in their sin. But he has shut them up because of disobedience. Their disobedience was their own act.

that he may have mercy on all. Both Jews and Gentiles are alike disobedient, and consequently, alike without merit. Both therefore are equally objects of mercy. Hence God can bestow it upon both, and neither can feel that it is not needed. The special mode in which he proposes to show mercy, is in remitting sin through the blood of Christ. Consequently, whether the mercy will ever be actually realized or not, depends on belief in Christ. With this, all can realize it; without it, none can.

CHAPTER XI. SECTION 4.

33 O the depth of God's riches, and wisdom, and knowledge. How unsearchable are his decisions, and untraceable his paths! ³⁴For who has known the Lord's mind, or who has been his counsellor? ³⁵Or who has first given to him, and it shall be repaid to him? ³⁶For all things are of him, and through him, and for him. To him be glory forever—amen.

³³Ὁ βάθος πλοῦτου καὶ σοφίας καὶ γνώσεως Θεοῦ. Ὡς ἀνεξερεύνητα τὰ κρίματα αὐτοῦ καὶ ἀνεξιχνίαστοι αἱ ὁδοὶ αὐτοῦ. ³⁴Τίς γὰρ ἔγνω νοῦν Κυρίου; ἢ τίς σύμβουλος αὐτοῦ ἐγένετο; ³⁵Ἡ τίς προέδωκεν αὐτῷ, καὶ ἀναπαροδοθήσεται αὐτῷ; ³⁶Ὅτι ἐξ αὐτοῦ καὶ δι' αὐτοῦ καὶ εἰς αὐτὸν τὰ πάντα. Αὐτῷ ἡ δόξα εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας ἀμήν.

SUMMARY.

Great is the depth of God's resources, and wisdom, and knowledge, in working out the redemption of the world. We can not know before hand what his decisions are, nor how he moves in effecting his ends. No one has ever been privy to his counsels, nor any imparted to him aid. All things originate in him; and all things are for his honor and glory.

33. O the depth of God's riches, and wisdom, and knowledge. The word depth belongs as much to wisdom and

knowledge as to riches. The full form would be: O the depth of God's riches, and of his wisdom, and of his knowledge. But this fullness is unnecessary as the briefer rendering is perfectly clear.

The phrase depth of riches, *bathos ploutou*, denotes the infinite resources which God has at command to effect the salvation of the world; wisdom directs or adapts these resources to the accomplishment of the end; while knowledge comprehends the whole of the resources and the end, and supplies material to the wisdom. Accordingly, if the Jews reject Christ, such are the divine resources, that the rejection is made to contribute to the salvation of the Gentiles; while if the Gentiles obey, this again is made subservient to the saving of the Jews. Thus all things, whether good or bad, are made conducive to the one great end.

How unsearchable are his decisions, The word *krimata* here does not seem so much to denote God's judgments in the sense of sentences pronounced, as his decisions how he will control the affairs of men, so as to make them aid in the work of salvation. I hence prefer to render it decisions rather than judgments. These decisions are unsearchable; that is, they can not be discovered or found out till they are developed or executed. They lie beyond the reach of human insight.

and untraceable his paths? *Ichnos* means a track, step, foot-print. From this comes *exichniazo* to track up, trace out, follow up foot-prints. To the adjective formed from this, prefix *a* privative, and we have *anexichniastos* signifying untrackable, or incapable of being traced out or followed up. The word *hodoi* means road-ways, paths—the paths along which God moves in executing his plans and purposes. These paths are undiscoverable by us; we can not trace them out. We can not track God or follow his foot-prints. When his work is done, we may know something about it, but not before.

34. For who has known the Lord's mind, Designed to confirm the two preceding remarks. The answer is, No one. No one has ever known the Lord's mind; for no one can know it. Therefore his decisions remain undiscovered; they can not be searched out.

or who has been his counsellor? Not who has given the Lord counsel; but whom has he taken into his confidence, and to him imparted his secrets. Again the answer is, No one. Therefore no one can follow his steps or trace out the paths in which

he moves. He keeps his counsels to himself, and conceals his ways from observation.

35. Or who has first given to him, Who has given to the Lord before the Lord gave to him? No one has ever yet had any thing to give to him, which he did not receive from him. Consequently no one can make him an original present. This question, I think it likely, contains a reference to the expression, O the depth of God's riches. So vast is his wealth that he gives to all, but receives from none.

and it shall be repaid to him? But no one can be found who has first given to the Lord. There is then no one to whom repayment is to be made. God is no debtor. On the contrary, all receive from him; he, from none.

36. For all things are from him, Proof that no one has first given to him. All things are from him as their first cause. *And through him.* Through his power all things have been brought into being, and by it they are sustained. *And for him.* All things are for his honor and pleasure. This is their ultimate end, and nothing can prevent them subserving it.

To him be glory forever—amen. That is, since all things are of him, and through him, and for him—since this is so, to him, as his absolute due, be glory and honor forever; and be this from all minds, and hearts, and tongues.

CHAPTER XII.

SECTION I.

I therefore beseech you, brethren, by the mercies of God, to present your bodies a living, holy, well-pleasing sacrifice to God, which is your reasonable service; ²and not to be fashioned after this world, but to be changed by the renewing of your mind, that you may judge of what God's will is—of what is good, and well-pleasing, and perfect. ³For by the favor bestowed upon me, I charge every one who is among you not to be high-minded beyond what he ought to be in mind, but to take care to be right-minded, as God has divided to each a measure of belief. ⁴For as we have many members in one body, and all members have not the same use; ⁵so we, the many, are one body in Christ, and are each members of one another. ⁶Having then gifts differing according to the favor bestowed—whether prophecy, let us exercise it according to the measure of belief; ⁷or ministry, let us serve in ministering; or let him who teaches, attend to teaching; ⁸or let him that exhorts, continue in exhortation; let him that imparts, do so with liberality; let him that rules, rule with diligence; let him that shows pity, do it with cheerfulness.

Παρακαλῶ οὖν ὑμᾶς, ἀδελφοί, διὰ τῶν οἰκτιρῶν τοῦ Θεοῦ, παραστήσαι τὰ σώματα ὑμῶν θυσίαν ζῶσαν, ἁγίαν, εὐάρεστον τῷ Θεῷ, τὴν λογικὴν λατρείαν ὑμῶν ²καὶ μὴ συσχηματίζεσθαι τῷ αἰῶνι τούτῳ, ἀλλὰ μεταμορφοῦσθαι τῇ ἀνακαινώσει τοῦ νοῦς, εἰς τὸ δοκιμάζειν ὑμᾶς τί τὸ θελημα τοῦ Θεοῦ, τὸ ἀγαθὸν καὶ εὐάρεστον καὶ τέλειον. ³Λέγω γὰρ διὰ τῆς χάριτος τῆς δοθείσης μοι παντὶ τῷ ὄντι ἐν ὑμῖν, μὴ ὑπερφρονεῖν παρ' ὃ δεῖ φρονεῖν, ἀλλὰ φρονεῖν εἰς τὸ σωφρονεῖν, ἐκάστῳ ὡς ὁ Θεὸς ἐμέρισε μέτρον πίστεως. ⁴Καθάπερ γὰρ ἐν ἐνὶ σώματι πολλὰ μέλη ἔχομεν, τὰ δὲ μέλη πάντα οὐ τὴν αὐτὴν ἔχει πρᾶξιν, ⁵οὕτως οἱ πολλοὶ ἐν σώμα ἑσμέν ἐν Χριστῷ, τὸ δὲ καθ' εἰς ἀλλήλων μέλη. ⁶ἔχοντες δὲ χαρίσματα κατὰ τὴν χάριν τὴν δοθείσαν ἡμῖν διάφορα, εἴτε προφητεῖαν, κατὰ τὴν ἀναλογίαν τῆς πίστεως, ⁷εἴτε διακονίαν, ἐν τῇ διακονίᾳ, εἴτε ὁ διδάσκων, ἐν τῇ διδασκαλίᾳ, ⁸εἴτε ὁ παρακαλῶν, ἐν τῇ παρακλήσει. Ὁ μεταδιδούς, ἐν ἀπλότῃ, ὁ προϊστάμενος, ἐν σπουδῇ, ὁ ἐλεῶν, ἐν ἰσότητι.

SUMMARY.

We are continually to present our bodies a living, holy sacrifice to God. This is made our reasonable service by all the facts and teachings in the foregoing part of the Letter. As to our minds, they are to be changed by being renewed. This change is necessary in order to a correct judgment in regard to God's will. We may not be high-minded because we are gifted, but we must be right-minded, that we may place a proper estimate upon every thing, especially upon gifts, as well our own as those of others. If we have a gift, we must exercise it, neither being proud of it, nor looking down upon others as inferiors, because they have a less shining gift. Whatever we are best qualified to do, that we must do, and nothing else. This alone gives success.

With the eleventh chapter, the Apostle closes the more weighty and more argumentative portion of his great Letter. With doctrine and mystery he is now done. He is consequently prepared for those practical lessons which grow out of the broad basis he has been laying down. With these the present chapter is replete; and although it is lighter than any of the preceding chapters, and lacks their consecutiveness, it is still Paul throughout. It is sententious, pertinent, elliptical, and strong. It opens with an exhortation to consecrate our persons to the service of God. After redemption, this is the next step.

I therefore beseech you, brethren, by the mercies of God, The *oun* here is both inferential and continuative. It infers the several duties specified from the preceding premises, and continues the discourse. I "*beseech*" you, not I command you, which he certainly might have done; but authority is never more lovely than when concealing itself in affectionate entreaty. "*By the mercies of God.*" The word mercies denotes the sum of the provisions which God has made in the gospel for our salvation. Each of these provisions is the expression of mercy. Hence the whole are called mercies. They originate in mercy and embody it. These mercies constitute the high consideration by which the Apostle beseeches his brethren.

to present your bodies Not present them once and no more, but present them continually; present them once for all, or present them and let them remain presented. These bodies are to be "living," not dead and inactive, but alive to and active in the service of God. In doing his will, they are to be constant as the pulse of life. I do not see that "living" here stands opposed, as many seem to think, to "dead" as applied to the bodies of animals offered under the law. It denotes a positive, not a relative characteristic. Moreover, these bodies are to be "holy." They are to be pure or free from immorality; not merely without defect or blemish, as had the legal victims to be, but without defilement or sin. They are also to be "well-pleasing." This they can be only by being constantly employed in doing those things that are well-pleasing to God; in a word, by doing his will. When our bodies are full of life as a fact; when they are kept free from sin; and are actively employed in doing God's will, then, as offerings, they are well-pleasing to him.

Some writers hold that "bodies" here stands for the whole person, the meaning being: Present *yourselves* a living sacrifice

But this is hardly correct. The Apostle, I doubt not, had some special reason for using the word "bodies." With them, more particularly than with any other part, we serve the law of sin. I hence imagine the intention to be, that we should present those very bodies, which are the seat of sin, a holy sacrifice to God. Certainly nothing could be more proper.

which is your reasonable service; This clause is in apposition with the expression "present your bodies a living sacrifice," and to a certain extent is explanatory of it. Presenting our bodies to God in the manner prescribed, is *latreia*, service, or worship paid to him. This much is clear. But it is more than this; it is *logiken* service. What kind of service is this? The usual reply is: It is service according with reason, or our spiritual nature, and sanctioned by it. The service certainly accords with reason; but is this the fact denoted by *logiken*? I doubt it. *Rather logiken here seems to have the force of logical or consequential, and to denote a service which results logically from what precedes.* Presenting our bodies a living, holy sacrifice to God, is a service growing logically out of the premises furnished in the foregoing part of the Letter. In other words, it is a consequence from those premises, or it follows from them in accordance with the laws of reason. This I take to be the fact signified by *logiken*. Nor do I see how its correctness can well be doubted. The former clause of the verse, with which this one is in apposition, is undoubtedly a logical deduction—"I therefore beseech you, brethren." This is certainly an inference; and if so, then clearly must the clause be an inference which is in apposition with it. Accordingly, I translate *logiken* reasonable, as denoting that which results from foregoing premises, according to the laws of reason. As much as to say: In view of all the facts and teachings of the former part of the Letter, presenting our bodies to God, in the manner named, is a reasonable service.

2. and not to be fashioned after this world, That is, I beseech you by the mercies of God not to be fashioned after this world. But clearly the exhortation is not to be taken without qualification. The world contains many things in themselves right and proper. These we must regard as excluded. But things which are evil in themselves, or of an evil tendency; in a word, every thing inconsistent with, or hostile to the christian life—after these we are not to be fashioned. On the contrary, we are to avoid them, oppose them, and try to correct them.

In this and the following clause, Wordsworth, Tregelles, and Green retain the Imperative of the received text, while Tischendorf, Alford, and others accept the Infinitive. The weight of authority seems to me to be clearly against the former and in favor of the latter. Accordingly I decide in favor of the Infinitive.

but to be changed by the renewing of your mind *Metamorphousthai* signifies to change the *morphe*, the material or visible form of a thing. But where the thing is without visible form, as the mind, it is best to dispense with the word "form," and render simply by *changed*. The "transformed" of the E. V. is altogether too material, and should therefore be dropped. In the present case, the mind is the subject of the change, or undergoes it; while the change itself consists in renewing or renovating the mind. In other words, the mind, instead of being fashioned after this world, is to be so changed in belief, desire, and purpose as to lead to a life unlike the world in the particulars meant. The old, unrenewed mind fashions the life after the world; the renewed mind refuses, because of the antagonism between it and the world. The renewed mind induces a new life.

that you may judge of what God's will is—of what is good, and well-pleasing, and perfect. You are to be changed in your mind by its being renewed. This is the fact. But you are to be changed, not alone for the sake of the change itself, but for the sake of something beyond it. The change looks to an end. You are to be changed that you may judge of God's will, that you may be enabled to place a correct estimate upon it, or decide as to its excellence. *Dokimazo* is often a hard word to translate. It is an assayer's term, and primarily means to try or test metals in order to ascertain how pure they are. Here, however, it means to *judge of* or *decide respecting*. In order, therefore, to judge correctly of God's will, the mind must be renewed. But the will to be judged of is not his will at large, but his will in regard to the things that enter into, and make up the christian life. It is his will respecting what, in christian conduct, is in itself good, what is well-pleasing, because right; what is perfect, or without flaw or defect. In regard to these things, God has an expressed will, and to judge of it correctly, the mind must be renewed.

The terms good, well-pleasing, and perfect, are, I imagine, to be taken very comprehensively. They embrace the whole of christian life. Not only so, but they define the character of that life. It

is to consist of conduct good within itself, or absolutely good; of conduct so closely conformed to God's will, as to be well-pleasing to him; and of conduct, perfect. Truly these three terms erect a high standard of christian duty.

3. **For by the favor bestowed upon me, I charge every one who is among you** Stuart says, "*gar* here stands before specific reasons given for a general principle urged in the preceding context." I prefer to regard it as epexegetic, and used to introduce an example showing the need of things good, and well-pleasing, and perfect. *By the favor bestowed upon me*—by my apostolic office. "I charge"—*lego, I say*, but here evidently used to express authority, and therefore requiring to be more strongly rendered. *Every one who is among you*, whether high or low, whether endowed or not, whether wise or unwise—I charge all, not one excepted. The charge is thus made universal, and yet, no doubt, it was intended to have a specific bearing, a bearing upon those having spiritual gifts.

not to be high-minded above what he ought to be in mind, *Huperphronein* means to have high thoughts, to be high-minded, be proud, which of course leads to looking on others, especially the humble in station and life, as inferiors and beneath notice. Such pride is wholly inconsistent with the example and spirit of Christ, and needs to be completely subdued. Even where great mental endowments are possessed, the endowed must demean himself as though unconscious of his gifts, and without evincing the slightest air of superiority.

but take care to be right-minded, Study or be careful to be fair-minded, to be just in your judgment of things, and to place a true estimate upon them. Make it matter of thought not to overestimate your own gifts, nor to underestimate those of others. The one talent has its value, and is entitled to it, no less than the ten.

as God has divided to each a measure of belief. The belief here spoken of was not the ordinary belief which comes by hearing, and saves the soul. It was clearly a miraculous belief; because it was imparted to persons already in possession of the ordinary belief; it was imparted immediately to the soul, and endowed it with one or more supernatural powers. This belief with its accompanying power constituted the *charisma* of which the Apostle speaks in v. 6. In what the belief consisted or what its precise nature was, we have no means of knowing. Whether

it differed in any material respect from the common belief, or was merely a higher degree of it, we are not told. It seems not to have been usually given as a whole, but only in measures or parts. The Apostles alone most probably possessed it as a whole, and them it endowed with all spiritual powers. Others, it endowed with one, two, or more gifts, according to their ability to use them wisely, and the necessities of the case.

4. For as we have many members in one body, and all members have not the same use; A familiar illustration, not of what goes before, but of what follows. The human body is composed of many members, and each member performs a function peculiar to itself. Yet no one can claim superiority over the others, and all are essential. So with the church. It is composed of many members; and every one is necessary to its growth and perfection. Not one can be dispensed with, nor can any claim superiority.

5. so we, the many, are one body in Christ, and are each members of one another. So we, the disciples, are many individuals; yet, in Christ, we compose but one body. To this body Christ is head; and of it, each individual of us is a member. Moreover, inasmuch as we compose the body, we are, in virtue of that fact, necessarily members one of another. Our relation, then, to one another is so intimate, and our dependence so close, that no one of us can afford to feel proud over another, or think him mean.

6. Having then gifts differing according to the favor bestowed— That is, *we* having gifts. Not that all the disciples had gifts; for this was not the case, it not being necessary. The word *we* includes only those who had gifts. The meaning is: all we who have gifts, have each a different gift. The favor bestowed was the *metron pisteos*, the measure of belief. To each of the endowed a measure of belief was given, and with the measure, a gift. To one was given one measure, and with it some special gift or power; to another, a different measure, and with it a different gift; and so on to the last.

It was the possession of these gifts that led to the high-mindedness against which the Apostle delivers his charge. Certain of these gifts were regarded as more honorable than others. Those having these grew proud of them, and, as a consequence, bore themselves with an air of superiority towards others having, as they deemed, either inferior gifts or none. To correct this

pride and false view was the object of the Apostle's charge. He farther charges those thus endowed, to be right-minded, and estimate their gifts as God himself estimated them. They were all alike necessary, and within themselves alike honorable. The possession of them, therefore, was no ground of pride.

In the primitive churches, these gifts took the place, and answered the purpose of the present written word. By them the churches were built up and kept in order. In a word, every thing was done by them—the gospel was preached, the disciples instructed, and the churches ruled. They were then indispensable; but now they are not, the New Testament supplying their place.

whether prophecy, let us exercise it according to the measure of belief; The present chapter is here very elliptical. Indeed, in some instances, half the words we use or more have to be supplied. Still, as there is no doubt in regard to the sense of the original, there can be none in regard to what words we are to supply. The name of each particular gift readily suggests the other words to be used in speaking of it. For example, the present clause, rendered word for word, stands thus: *whether prophecy, according to the measure of belief.* This completely filled out, evidently is: *whether we have the gift of prophecy, let us exercise it according to the measure of belief bestowed.*

Upon each of the persons here enumerated, a measure of belief was bestowed. With this measure, some particular gift was imparted. The Apostle now directs that each of these persons shall confine himself to his special gift. In other words, he is to do exactly what he is empowered to do, and no more. If he is empowered to prophesy, he is to do that and nothing else. He is not to attempt to rule or exhort. He must do the one thing only

But prophet in Paul's day hardly meant just what it means in our day. With us, it means one who simply foretells future events. With Paul, it meant any one who gave expression to the divine mind or will, whether that will respected the past, the present, or the future. It meant any one who, being furnished immediately from God with divine ideas, communicated them to the people. The prophet might teach history, might instruct in present duty, or foretell the future. The word, therefore, meant in that day far more than it means now. It was synonymous with inspired teacher, foretelling being added.

7. or ministry, let us serve in ministering; If our gift

be that of ministering, let us serve in it. Moreover, we must be content with it, and not attempt any thing else. Nor is this all, we must not grow high-minded over it, but serve in it with a just appreciation of it. We must be right-minded, estimate our gift at its true value, and deport ourselves accordingly.

But what particular work does "ministry" here denote? The question can not be very definitely answered. *Diakonia* signifies any kind of *attendance, ministration, or service*. Of course it here signifies religious service, or service done the church or its members in some special way. It may, I think, be assumed as almost certain that the word refers to service done by the *diakonoi* or deacons. These served the church in many ways, especially in ministering to the poor. But whether this is the particular service here meant, can not be confidently said. Obviously the term can not signify teaching, exhorting, &c., since these are separately mentioned. The service was certainly an important one, since those who performed it had to be specially endowed for the purpose. But beyond the fact that it existed, that it was most probably performed by the deacons, and that they had to be divinely qualified for it, we know nothing.

or let him who teaches attend to teaching; Here the construction of the original changes. Instead of an Accusative of the gift, we have the participial nominative of him who exercises it. The change, though anomalous, involves nothing difficult or doubtful. It merely leads to a slight change in the rendering. The meaning is: Let him upon whom a measure of belief has been bestowed, endowing him as a teacher, attend strictly to his gift. Let him teach, and do nothing else, and let him not become high-minded towards any one having a less showy gift; nor let any one look on him with envy. All gifts are essential to the upbuilding of the church. Hence none are to be despised.

The teaching here mentioned, I doubt not, consisted strictly in instructing the church. It did not include preaching the gospel to those without. This was the work more particularly of the prophet. The *didaskalia* was for members of the church, and had for its object their complete enlightenment in duty. It bore the same relation to those within the church, that preaching did to those without. The design of preaching was to bring men in; the design of teaching, to perfect them when in. Teaching was the work chiefly of the overseers of the congregation.

8. or let him that exhorts, continue in exhortation; *Parakaleo* means, among other things, *to call to duty*; and this is the essential idea in exhortation. It consists in a stirring appeal to men to do their duty. It is confined to no one class of persons, but embraces the sinner and the saved. Wherever there is remissness or hesitancy, exhortation is in place. The sinner needs to be exhorted to obey Christ; the christian, to do his duty.

Nor will the church of Christ ever be enabled to discharge her whole duty to the world, till she adopts the division-of-labor system here laid down by the Apostle. We must have the prophet to preach the gospel and expound it to those without; the teacher to instruct those within, and the exhorter to assist both. The largest possible measure of success will never be realized from preaching until the preacher is attended in all places by his exhorter; nor will the church ever be fully edified till the teacher is constantly aided in the same way. No one man combines in himself the qualifications for all these different kinds of labor. A man for each, is the way for each man to become a master and when each man is a master, his work will be a success. This is the divine plan; and no degree of departure from it can ever result well.

let him that imparts, do so with liberality; The *eite* is I take it, not accidentally, but designedly dropped before this clause. It has stood before, and tied together the four preceding clauses; and each of them denoted the presence of some special gift. But beyond these four clauses, special gifts do not extend. With the fifth clause, the Apostle begins to name other duties which required no special endowment; and he therefore drops *eite*. In the present and two following clauses, he speaks of duties which might be performed either by the endowed or unendowed; but which were not general, or were not performed by all the members of the body. They were performed by a select class; still they were of so much importance as to require separate mention.

let him that imparts, *Metadidomi* means to impart, or give a share of what one has. But I see no reason to conclude that the *metadidous* was an officer of the church. He may have been certainly; but then any one else could be a *metadidous* just as well as an officer. He was any member of the church who had to give, and gave of it. Let him give *haploteti*. How was that? The usual reply is, Let him give with simplicity. But this is

almost, if not quite without meaning. I therefore agree with those writers who render the word *liberality*. Robinson so renders it; and Hodge, and Alford, and some others, evidently agree with him, though the meaning is rare. The *metadidous* was most probably every wealthy member of the church, who was in the habit of giving regularly to it for any purpose. The direction to him is to impart with *liberality*. The admonition is certainly needed in the present day; and doubtless it was needed quite as much then.

let him that rules, rule with diligence; This clause may include every person who exercised authority in the church; but the probability is that it refers more particularly to the overseers or elders. The ruling signified was permanent or continuous, and not accidental or occasional. It is therefore directed to be done with diligence, that is, with unremitting attention and zeal. It allowed of no indifference or delay.

let him that shows pity, do it with cheerfulness. The duty here prescribed was general, and not necessarily confined to a class. Usually, however, it was the especial work of the deacons; but any one might perform it. It consisted in acts of kindness done to the sick, the poor, and the unfortunate. It was strictly the manifestation, not of mercy, but of pity. Mercy consists in showing kindness to the erring, pity, in showing it to the unfortunate. The present duty respected the latter. *Do it with cheerfulness.* This clause prescribes what the external manner shall be of those showing the pity. They must show it with a cheerful, happy countenance and air, an air that inspires hope and brightness. A depressed and melancholy manner serves merely to deepen the pain it would alleviate, and therefore should never accompany the manifestation of pity; while a sunny face and genial manner often afford the greatest relief the case admits of.

CHAPTER XII. SECTION 2.

⁹Let love be unfeigned; abhor what is evil; cling to what is good. ¹⁰As to brotherly love, be very affectionate to one another; in esteem, be examples to one another. ¹¹Be not slow in zeal; fervent in spirit; serving the Lord. ¹²Be joyful in hope; patient in affliction; constant in prayer. ¹³Be sharers in the wants of the holy; keeping on in love for strangers. ¹⁴Bless those who persecute you; bless, and curse not. ¹⁵Rejoice with the rejoicing; weep with the weeping. ¹⁶Be of like mind one towards another; mind not high things, but be led along by lowly things. Be not wise in your own eyes. ¹⁷Repay not evil for evil; take forethought for things right in the sight of all men. ¹⁸On your part, be at peace, if possible, with all men.

⁹Ἡ ἀγάπη ἀνυπόκριτος ἀποστ-
γόντες τὸ ποιηρὸν, κολλώμενοι τῷ
ἀγαθῷ. ¹⁰Τῇ φιλαδελφίᾳ εἰς ἀλλήλους
φιλόστοργοι τῇ τιμῇ ἀλλήλους προηγού-
μενοι. ¹¹Τῇ σπουδῇ μὴ ὀκνηροί, τῷ
πνεύματι ζήοντες, τῷ Κυρίῳ δουλεύοντες.
¹²Τῇ ἐλπίδι χαίροντες, τῇ θλίψει ὑπομέ-
νοντες, τῇ προσευχῇ προσκαρτεροῦντες.
¹³Ταῖς χρεῖαις τῶν ἁγίων κοινωνοῦντες,
τὴν φιλοξενίαν διώκοντες. ¹⁴Εὐλογεῖτε
τοὺς διώκοντας ὑμᾶς, εὐλογεῖτε καὶ μὴ
καταρᾶσθε. ¹⁵Χαίρειν μετὰ χαιρόντων,
κλαίειν μετὰ κλαίοντων. ¹⁶Τὸ αὐτὸ εἰς
ἀλλήλους φρονούντες, μὴ τὰ ἰψηλὰ
φρονούντες, ἀλλὰ τοῖς ταπεινοῖς συναπα-
γόμενοι. Μὴ γίνεσθε φρόνιμοι παρ'
ἑαυτοῖς. ¹⁷Μηδενὶ κακὸν ἀντὶ κακοῦ ἀπο-
διδόντες· προνοοῦμενοι καλὰ ἐνώπιον
πάντων ἀνθρώπων. ¹⁸Εἰ δυνατόν, τὸ ἐξ
ὑμῶν μετὰ πάντων ἀνθρώπων εἰρηνεύ-
οιτες.

SUMMARY.

Our love must be unfeigned; for otherwise it is hypocrisy. It is no enough that we simply oppose evil; we must abhor it. We must cling to what is good at every cost. Our love for the brotherhood must be very tender; while in the matter of showing esteem, we must be examples to one another. In serving the Lord, we must be full of zeal, and fervent in spirit. In affliction, we must be patient, constant in prayer, and full of hope. We are to share each others' wants; and take to our homes in love, and entertain strangers. We must bless even our persecutors, and never curse them. We are not to pattern after proud ways and high life, but evince a preference for lowly ways and meek life. Injuries, we must not retaliate; and we are to be thoughtful to do what, in every one's estimation, is right. As christians we must strive for peace.

The preceding section treated chiefly of special duties, or the duties of particular classes and particular individuals. The present section treats exclusively of general duties. Whether a disciple was a prophet, or an overseer, or a deacon; whether he was rich or poor, gifted or not; whether he was fortunate or the reverse the following duties were incumbent upon him.

9. **Let love be unfeigned;** No duty is more prominently inculcated in the New Testament than the duty of christians to love one another with a tender, constant love. But this love to

be acceptable to God, and to insure a crown to him who cultivates it, must be unfeigned. It must be sincere. A dissembled love is detestable to God, and detested by good men. It is much to be feared that the love of the primitive disciples is without a parallel in the present day. Our love does not lead us to do for one another what theirs led them to do. Then no man called any thing he had his own, if his brother had need. It is not so with us.

abhor what is evil; A most important precept, and much needed in the present day. There are many christians, and among them many preachers, who oppose evil, it is true, but they do it so faintly as virtually to countenance it. They will not publicly endorse evil; but they will either go quietly home, or get out of its way, and leave it to riot unrebuked. They do not abhor it. Not that they sanction it; for they do not; they merely do not stand in its way. They convert it into a jest, and turn it over to rougher hands to deal with it. These men are not obeying Paul.

cling to what is good. In opposition to what is evil. Cling to what is good, no matter in what it consists or where it leads. The precept has reference to those things that make up the morals of the pious, that compose christian life. To these we are to cling, not feebly, but with a hold which no earthly power or temptation can break. Not to cling to what is good, and not to abhor what is evil, are two converging lines which do not have to be produced very far before they meet in open sin. Our safety lies in keeping them separate.

10. As to brotherly love, be very affectionate to one another; Or in the matter of loving the family of God, be very affectionate. *Philostorgeo* signifies to love as parents their children. It hence denotes love of the tenderest kind. Such is the love that the disciples are commanded to cultivate one for another. Nor is this love to be confined to members of the particular congregation to which we happen to belong. It must embrace the universal brotherhood of the redeemed. No matter to what kindred or tongue a christian belongs, or where he is met, this love is his birth-right. It can not, therefore, be withheld from him.

in esteem, be examples to one another. *Time* signifies *valuing, estimation, honor, reverence, respect.* Here it denotes the esteem in which one christian should hold another. That esteem should be high, unselfish, and free from every taint of

envy *Progeomai* signifies to go before, take the lead; and from this it comes very readily to mean leading by example, or simply being or setting an example. In the matter of showing esteem or respect, be examples to one another. This clause and the preceding one are closely related—the one denoting the love, and the other, the esteem we are to show one another.

11. Be not slow in zeal; Be not slow to evince zeal or to come forward with it; be always ready to show it whenever it is demanded. The common version, “be not slothful in business,” is without authority; while to translate as Anderson does, “in what requires diligence, be not slothful,” is not to translate, but to make a commentary instead of it. The present clause and the two following ones compose a group by themselves, and define the manner in which we are to discharge our religious duties. No disciple can be true to Christ, and fail to copy it.

fervent in spirit; Spirit here denotes the human spirit, not the Holy, as some have imagined. It is equivalent to mind. The meaning is: be ardent in mind or in deep earnest in your religious duties. Do nothing coldly or with indifference.

serving the Lord. *Douleuo* means to be a slave or serve as one; it means to be wholly subject to the will of another. *Douleuontes*, the word here used, is the participle of the Present, and signifies that the act of serving is now going on, and that it is continuous, or is never to cease. The meaning is: be constant in serving the Lord, never intermit it for an instant. The reference, I doubt not, is more particularly to the state of the mind or spirit, though it includes the whole service of life. “With the mind I serve the Lord.”

12. Be joyful in hope; Be joyful by reason of hope; in other words, the hope is the ground of the joy, or gives rise to it. Here again we have a cluster of injunctions, all, I venture to think, related, and having a common point of union in affliction. Assigning to each a wholly independent position, obscures their meaning and weakens their force. Not that I would tie them together and interpret them with exclusive reference to affliction. I would rather assign to each first a general signification, and then merge their joint import in a common centre. This is certainly better than to understand no relation.

patient in affliction; In an age when persecution was common, this precept was peculiarly necessary. It closely copies the life of Christ. Heroic endurance amidst sharp distresses is

of the essence of his religion. *Thlipsis* means *pressure, straitness, narrowness of life*, caused by surrounding trials. It denotes, as we familiarly say, life's close rubs. In all these, the child of God is to be patient. Not a murmur is to escape his lips. Not one escaped his Master's.

constant in prayer. Whether in affliction, or in the liberty of a glorious life, this injunction is in place. No where is the child of God safe without prayer; no where is he in much danger with it. It is the divine talisman which secures against every evil.

13. Be sharers in the wants of the holy; When the children of God fall into want, take a part of their wants upon yourselves. Make their wants your wants to the full extent of your ability to relieve them. It is much to be feared that this precept will never again be revived; for I am assuming that where it is not wholly forgotten, it has at least fallen into desuetude. I have never seen it practiced except upon a scale so parsimonious as to render it a virtual nullity. The scanty manner in which the rich disciples of the present day share the wants of the poor is a sham. From their thousands, they dole out dimes; and from storehouses full, mete out handfulls. This is no compliance with the precept; and it were better for a christian that he were without a coat to his name than to have two, and not give to his brother who has none. Such precepts as the present will, in the day of eternity, prove the fatal reef on which many a saintly bark has stranded.

keeping on in love for strangers. Webster defines the phrase *to keep on*, thus: "To go forward, to proceed, to continue to advance." This is very just to *dioko*, which I here render *keeping on*. The common version, "given to hospitality," is lacking in closeness to the original, and is therefore objectionable. *Philoxenia* is literally love for strangers, from which comes very naturally the idea of entertaining them. The Apostle enjoins love for them, well knowing that from this all else would follow. In an age when persecution was continually raging somewhere, as in the early history of the church, the children of God would be all the while either wandering from one country to another, or wandering about in the same country. Usually they would be destitute, because of being hurriedly driven from home, before they could dispose of their effects, and so provide for their wants. This would be the time *to keep on in love for strangers*, and as a

consequence, afford them food and shelter. The precept, therefore, was more applicable to the past than it is to the present, though it is never to be lost sight of even now. The strangers referred to were no doubt especially strange christians, but the injunction must not be limited to them. It includes also others.

14. Bless those who persecute you, bless, and curse not. From time immemorial, blessing and cursing, by divine authority, had been customary, good following the former; evil, the latter. From this custom the practice spread even to the common people; and it has prevailed ever since. Even christians at the present day are very much addicted to blessing, and as a rule, very idly. Now in cases of cruel persecution, where the disciples would feel themselves outraged, they would naturally become very much exasperated. The consequent temptation to imprecate evil on their enemies would be very great. But the Apostle allows nothing of the kind. The reasons for disallowing the practice were, no doubt, first, that the curse being unauthorized was followed by no evil; and, secondly, it fostered a vengeful spirit. On the contrary, christians are to bless their persecutors; that is, they must invoke blessings upon them. This, though in practice hard, is according to the high standard of Christ. It is, therefore, to christians their rule of conduct.

15. Rejoice with the rejoicing; weep with the weeping. When great good fortune descends upon a brother, and fills his soul with joy, do not envy him, but rejoice with him; and when, on the other hand, sorrows overwhelm him like a flood, do not be glad, but weep with him. Be nobly unselfish, and show a true, heart-felt interest in your brother's state, be it prosperous or adverse.

16. Be of like mind one towards another; That is, be of the same disposition one towards another; or have the same sentiments and feelings. Do not love one brother and hate another; do not honor one and slight another; do not wish one well and another ill. In mind be *to auto*, the same to all. And if it be said that this is impossible, seeing that all are unlike among themselves, I reply, that the Apostle assumes all to be *to auto* in Christ, and therefore as entitled to *to auto* from us.

mind not high things, but be led along by lowly things. The general sentiment seems to be: Be not proud in your views and conduct, but be content with an humble, unostentatious life. Set not your heart on high places, high life, high company; for

much of these are hollow and insincere; but be led along in life by lowly thoughts, lowly ways, and things that comport with a spirit of humility. Christ was meek and gentle to all men: be like him.

Be not wise in your own eyes. Literally, be not wise *before* yourselves. That is, when sitting in judgment upon yourselves, be not wise merely before yourselves. Such conduct is the manifestation of mere vanity and self-esteem. Rather, labor to be wise in the sight of God, by doing his will, and in the sight of wise and good men, by always doing right.

17. Repay not evil for evil; An eye for an eye, and a tooth for a tooth, is one of the most natural sentiments of the human heart. It is the true *lex talionis*; and although the very embodiment of naked justice, it is unchristian, because wholly unmixed with mercy. To do good for evil, though hard, is a far nobler sentiment. It is hence the law to us. Besides, injuries received have the effect to arouse our feelings and cloud our judgments. In this condition, we are not qualified to determine either the kind or degree of punishment due our injurers. Retaliation, therefore, is wholly taken from us.

take forethought for things right in the sight of all men. *Pronoeo* means to *foreknow, foresee, take care beforehand, provide*. I render it *take forethought*, which is very close. We are not merely to do those things which are right in the sight of all men; but we are to make them the subject of previous thought. We are to study beforehand what things they are, or make an effort to find them out. For when we have found them out, the presumption is that we will admire them; and when we admire them, we will practice them; and constant practice is habit; and confirmed habit is second nature. After this, we will practice the things meant, because they have become a necessity in our daily life.

This injunction of the Apostle very much resembles some of the wise maxims of the Grecian sages, though I call to mind no one of which it can be said to be a copy. As a practical admonition it certainly is one of the wisest of the Bible. Indeed, it stands but little below the "golden rule."

18. On your part, be at peace, if possible, with all men. The Apostle clearly foresaw the impossibility of christians being at peace always; and the whole history of the church proves him to have been right. Others will force difficulties on them. For

this they are not responsible; but in all such cases they must be careful that no part of the blame attaches to them. By no improper conduct of theirs must difficulty be provoked. It must come gratuitously and wantonly from others. Not only so, but christians must make every proper effort to avert difficulty. If it be *possible*, they must be at peace.

CHAPTER XII. SECTION 3.

¹⁹ Beloved, avenge not yourselves, but give place to the [Lord's] anger; for it is written: punishment is mine, I will repay it, says the Lord. ²⁰ But if your enemy be hungry, feed him; if thirsty, give him drink; for in doing this you will heap coals of fire upon his head. ²¹ Be not conquered by evil, but conquer evil by good.

¹⁹ Μὴ ἑαυτοὺς ἐκδικοῦντες, ἀγαπῆτοι, ἀλλὰ δότε τόπον τῇ ὀργῇ· γέγραπται γάρ, Ἐμοὶ ἐκδικησις, ἐγὼ ἀνταποδώσω, λέγει Κύριος. ²⁰ Ἀλλ' εἰ ἐὰν πεινῶ ὁ ἐχθρὸς σου, ψώμιζε αὐτόν· εἰ ἐὰν διψῶ, πότιζε αὐτόν· τοῦτο γὰρ πλιοῶν ἄνθρακας πυρὸς σωρεύσεις ἐπὶ τῆν κεφαλὴν αὐτοῦ. ²¹ Μὴ νικῶ ὑπὸ τοῦ κακοῦ, ἀλλὰ νικά ἐν τῷ ἀγαθῷ τὸ κακόν.

SUMMARY.

We must never attempt to avenge ourselves, but leave that wholly to the Lord. On the contrary, if our enemy be hungry, we must feed him; if thirsty, we must give him drink. We must be God-like in dealing with him. We must not allow his evil to conquer us; rather we must conquer his evil by our good.

19. Beloved, avenge not yourselves, This precept certainly bears a very close resemblance to the first one of v. 17—repay not evil for evil. The distinction between them I thus draw: Repaying evil for evil is simply retaliation for its own sake; whereas in avenging ourselves, the procedure is judicial. Here we sit in judgment on our injurer, decide on the kind and degree of punishment due him, and mete it out. For this, in the circumstances, we are not qualified; it is, therefore, disallowed to us. When injured, we are meekly to submit to it, declining either to retaliate or be avenged. So acted Christ; and so must we act.

but give place to the [Lord's] anger, Let the Lord's anger take the place of yours, and let him avenge you. His mind is unclouded by passion, yours never is when you are injured; he can justly judge your injurer, you can not; he can temper punishment with mercy; there is much danger that you will not. When you are injured, therefore, stand back, and let the Lord punish the wrong. Never attempt it yourselves.

for it is written: punishment is mine, I will repay it, says the Lord. The right of punishment belongs absolutely to me, and in no sense or degree to you. You must therefore never attempt it. True, it is you who are injured; but it is I alone who must redress the wrong; and I will surely do it. You must therefore be patient, and wait for me to avenge you.

20. **But if your enemy be hungry, feed him; if thirsty, give him drink;** Make no attempt to avenge yourselves on your enemy. On the contrary, if he be hungry, feed him. This is a noble sentiment, and designed to construct life upon a high plane; but it can not be denied that the instincts of fallen humanity mutiny against it terribly. It stands stiffly against the whole current of natural feeling. Indeed, it annuls both our human instincts and human feelings, and takes their place as the divine rule of life; and although we feel it to be difficult in practice, *still we can not but admire the magnanimity that is equal to it in act.* It is God-like to feed our enemy when hungry. He does it daily, and he is our law. Not to feed him is a retort in the nature of vengeance, which is never allowed us.

for in doing this you will heap coals of fire upon his head. A bold expression, which has been variously interpreted, but seemingly without good reason. The meaning evidently is: If your enemy be hungry and thirsty, feed him and give him drink. Your good deeds will restore him to his right mind and right feelings. They will bring him to himself, and enable him to see how undeserved the evil is he has done you. In this restored state, his conscience will give him keen pain. His evil acts will torture and distress his soul. They will burn in him like fire. The end may be his repentance. Your generous conduct towards him will give you control of his ear; and when once you get control of this, you may soon come to control his heart. He is now in your power, and with skill, you may save him.

21. **Be not conquered by evil, but conquer evil by good.** Be not conquered by the evil conduct of your enemy towards you, which you will be, whenever you allow it to lead you to attempt either to avenge yourself on him, or to repay him with evil. In that event, you are conquered by evil. *But conquer evil by good.* Conquer your enemy who has done you wrong by feeding him when hungry, and giving him drink when thirsty. By this course you will certainly conquer the evil which is in yourself, and you may conquer that which is in him.

CHAPTER XIII.

SECTION I.

Let every soul be obedient to ruling authorities; for there is no authority but from God; and those in being have been set in order by God. ²So that he who resists the authority resists the appointment of God; and they who resist will receive sentence against themselves. ³For rulers are not a fear to good work, but to bad. I do wish then not to be afraid of the authority? Do what is good, and you shall have praise from it. ⁴For [the ruler] is God's servant for good to you; but if you do bad, be afraid, for he wears not the sword to no purpose. For God's servant is an avenger for anger upon him who does bad. ⁵Therefore it is necessary to be obedient, not only because of anger, but also because of conscience. ⁶Now for this reason also you pay tax; for they are God's ministers attending to this very duty. ⁷Give to all their dues, tax to whom tax is due, custom to whom custom, fear to whom fear, honor to whom honor.

Πᾶσα ψυχὴ ἐξουσίαις ὑπερεχούσαις ὑποτασσέσθω· οὐ γὰρ ἐστὶν ἐξουσία εἰ μὴ ἀπὸ Θεοῦ, αἱ δὲ οὖσαι ὑπὸ Θεοῦ τεταγμέναι εἰσὶν. ²Ὡστε ὁ ἀντιτασσόμενος τῇ ἐξουσίᾳ τῇ τοῦ Θεοῦ διαταγῇ ἀνθέστηκεν· οἱ δὲ ἀνθεστηκότες ἑαυτοῖς κρίμα λήψονται. ³Οἱ γὰρ ἄρχοντες οὐκ εἰσὶ φόβος τῷ ἀγαθῷ ἔργῳ, ἀλλὰ τῷ κακῷ. Θέλεις δὲ μὴ φοβείσθαι τὴν ἐξουσίαν; Τὸ ἀγαθὸν ποιεῖ, καὶ εἴεις ἔπαινον ἐξ αὐτῆς. ⁴Θεοῦ γὰρ διάκονός ἐστι σοὶ εἰς τὸ ἀγαθόν· ἐὰν δὲ τὸ κακὸν ποιῆς, φοβοῦ· οὐ γὰρ εἰκὴ τὴν μάχαιραν φορεῖ. Θεοῦ γὰρ διάκονός ἐστιν ἔκδικος εἰς ὀργὴν τῷ τὸ κακὸν πράσσοντι. ⁵Διὰ ἀνάγκη ὑποτάσσεσθαι, οὐ μόνον διὰ τὴν ὀργήν, ἀλλὰ καὶ διὰ τὴν συνείδησιν. ⁶Διὰ τοῦτο γὰρ καὶ φόρους τελεῖτε· λειτουργοὶ γὰρ Θεοῦ εἰσὶν εἰς αὐτὸ τοῦτο προσκαρτεροῦντες. ⁷Ἀπόδοτε πᾶσι τὰς ὀφειλάς, τῷ τὸν φόρον, τὸν φόρον τῷ τὸ τέλος, τὸ τέλος· τῷ τὸν φόβον, τὸν φόβον· τῷ τὴν τιμὴν, τὴν τιμὴν

SUMMARY.

All civil governments derive their origin and authority from God, and when doing right, have his sanction. He therefore requires his children to be obedient to them; and where they fail, they resist not merely the government but him. Civil officers, too, are designed to be for good to God's children, and not a source of fear. Neither therefore must they be resisted. Consequently there are two reasons why we should obey the constituted authorities of the State. First, that we may avoid being punished; and, second, that we may not violate our conscience. Moreover, for these same reasons we pay tax, customs, &c.; and besides, whenever it may be necessary, we must go farther and even honor those in authority. By all these acts we shall please God and promote our own happiness.

The present chapter is mostly occupied with our duties to the civil authorities. These, as being from God, are to be obeyed so long as they exact nothing inconsistent with our christian duties. Beyond this, the obligation to obey them ceases. But of these

duties I shall treat more in detail under the several clauses which speak of them. The chapter also re-announces the ancient law of our neighbor, on which so much stress is uniformly laid in the Bible. The propriety of obeying it is briefly argued, and then the subject is dropped. The chapter closes with a few words of weighty advice respecting several things which, as christians, we may not do. It hardly contains a more important section than this last.

Let every soul be obedient to ruling authorities; The Apostle is speaking of christians only; and the phrase *every soul* is the same in sense as *every individual*. His meaning, therefore, is: Let every disciple of Christ be obedient to ruling authorities. *Exousiais* is, in the common version, and by many commentators, translated powers, but it signifies simply civil authorities, and should be so rendered. The word implies nothing in regard to the character of the authorities. They may be monarchic, oligarchal, or republican. Their nature is not here taken into consideration. They are the constituted or governing authorities of the country. Moreover, they are the *huperechousais* authorities; that is, the authorities which are over the people and govern them. To these every christian is to be obedient.

The object of all civil governments is to protect their subjects in their great natural rights of person, property, and liberty, and suitably to punish evil-doers. In regard to religion, civil authorities must leave their subjects to do precisely what God requires of them, without the slightest interference. So long as they confine themselves within these limits, and to these necessary duties, they are to be scrupulously obeyed. But when they fail in any of these respects, the obligation of christians ceases, and the duty of disobedience arises. No earthly power can require the children of God to do wrong. But even where the requirements of the government are oppressive, if not inconsistent with christian duty, it is still to be obeyed. Neither must the circumstances and reasons which lead to disobedience be doubtful or trivial; they must be weighty and clear. In a doubtful or indifferent case, I should hold obedience to be the rule.

for there is no authority but from God; This clause must be understood as qualified by the nature of the case. There is no *legitimate* or *rightful* authority but from God. Authority of a different kind is never from him. He no more appoints governments to do wrong, or sanctions wrong in them, than he

sanctions sin in men; and whenever one assumes to do wrong, it abuses itself, and is, so far, no more from God than is man for purposes of evil. God may and does tolerate governments in doing wrong, just as he does men in sinning, but he sanctions neither the wrong nor the sin. Hence, from mere tolerance a government can not be inferred to have the divine sanction. This it has in so far only as it does right.

and those in being have been set in order by God. This clause is almost identical in sense with the preceding one. That asserts that existing authorities are from God; this, that he sets them in order. The one relates to origin, the other, to disposition. God disposes the governments of the earth according to his will; that is, he gives to one nation one form of government, to another, a different form. Not that he always gives the best form, for he does not; because the people will not have it. The best form of government for ancient Israel was a pure theocracy; yet they desired a kingdom, and God gave them one. But in giving them a kingdom, he gave them that form of one which was, in all the circumstances, the best for them. And so in other cases. If God gives a people a republic, he gives them the best form of a republic that they can or will use wisely. But in giving governments, God seems never wholly to disregard the will of the people. His policy appears to be to allow them to choose, and then comply with their choice. If the choice be a wise one, well; if not, he still complies in the best way left him. But these questions can not be discussed at length here.

2. So that he who resists the authority, resists the appointment of God; To any one, no matter who, forced from home against his will, and into a foreign country with a strange government, strange laws, and strange customs, obedience is not a perfectly easy and pleasant task. To a christian Jew it was especially hard. The rulers of countries into which persecution drove him were usually idolaters. This was peculiarly offensive to him. Besides, the laws of the land he would regard as wholly human, while he knew those of Moses to be wholly divine. He would accordingly look upon the latter as immeasurably superior to the former. This would render his obedience reluctant and tardy. Moreover, holding himself to be a citizen of the kingdom of God, he would naturally feel himself absolved from allegiance to earthly authorities. This would incline him to refuse obedience to them, especially where the obedience in any way

inconvenienced him. Under these circumstances, opposition and disobedience to ruling authorities would be almost certain to occur, and that frequently. It was to correct this state of things, and to insure obedience in all proper cases, that the Apostle wrote. He plainly tells his brethren that resistance to the ruling authority was resistance to God. This of course would check it. Thus not only would peace and immunity ensue, but in many instances even protection.

and they who resist will receive sentence against themselves. Not only from rulers but also from God. As the authority is from God, it follows that to resist it is to resist him. But the authority is, at the same time, invested in the hands of rulers. Hence, to resist it, is likewise to resist them. Consequently, he who resists the authority, resists both God and the rulers. By both, then, will he be condemned, and by both he may be punished. On every account, therefore, it is best to obey the authority.

3. For rulers are not a fear to good work, but to bad. Rulers are no cause of fear to them who do good, but to those only who do bad. This, as a rule, has been true of rulers in all time; but to it there have been many exceptions. Rulers have often been a source of fear, not to the bad, but to the good. Where such is the case, they are not to be obeyed, neither should they be feared. Matt. x: 28.

Do you, wish, then, not to be afraid of the authority? Certainly it is most reasonable for the children of God to wish to be free from fear of the ruling authority of the State; and in the case of upright conduct, it is unquestionably their natural right to be so. Where they do right, and still have ground to fear, the authority itself is wrong, and God will hold it to a strict account.

Do what is good, and you shall have praise from it. That is, the authority. Do what is right, and you will have no cause to fear the authority of the State. On the contrary, you will obtain from it praise for being a good and dutiful citizen. It will, in case you do right, not only protect you, but honor you.

But crises often occur in which the seeming interests of the State and the duty of christians clash. What is then to be done? For example, where a State is engaged in war, and commands its christian subject to bear arms and fight, what is his duty? My opinion is that he must refuse obedience to the command of the

State, even at the expense of his life. For no christian man can, according to the New Testament, bear arms and take human life. Such are my judgment and conscience, after much thought upon the subject.

4. For [the ruler] is God's servant for good to you; The ruler is not appointed to be a source of fear to you, but of good; and whenever he fails to subserve this end, your allegiance to him ceases. You owe him nothing when he assumes to control you for evil. Your welfare is the very object of his official being. He exists not to play tyrant over you, nor to serve himself, but you. How much to be regretted it is that rulers do not more generally recognize the fact here stated by the Apostle. Instead of this, however, they appear seldom even to dream that they are placed in office merely as God's servants. Rather they seem to think that they are placed there solely for their own benefit. The fear of God is often not before their eyes, nor yet the good of the people a title as much as their own. Too frequently they serve merely self, with no regard for God, and but little for any one else. Such rulers serve not God, but Satan.

but if you do bad, be afraid, for he wears not the sword to no purpose. Wearing a sword was anciently an emblem or badge of the authority with which the civil officer was invested. If instead of living a life of uprightness and peace, you are found arraying yourself against the constituted authorities of the country, and resisting the officers when engaged about their appointed duties, then be afraid. In that event, God is not pledged to your protection; you will consequently fall into the hands of the law and be punished. For it is for this very purpose that the officer wears the sword. You will certainly suffer the due reward of your disobedience.

For God's servant is an avenger for anger upon him who does bad. The expression *an avenger for anger* signifies an avenger to inflict anger. God's servant is the civil officer, who is the appointed avenger of the State, to punish all wrongs perpetrated against it; and it is his duty to do this by inflicting both the divine anger and that of the State upon the evil-doer. To inflict anger is to inflict punishment.

5. Therefore it is necessary to be obedient, not only because of anger, but also because of conscience. A summary conclusion from the preceding premises, with the reasons for it stated. It is necessary to be obedient to ruling authorities

for two reasons—punishment and conscience. If we are not obedient, anger or punishment will be inflicted upon us. Punishment, therefore, becomes a reason to induce the obedience. We must obey in order to escape it. In the next place, we must be obedient that our conscience may be left at ease. Our conscience is our sense of right, formed by the word of God. Ruling authorities are appointed by God, and civil officers are his servants. God having now told us this, we know it within ourselves. This knowledge forms our sense of right, and this sense is our conscience. If now we do not obey the civil authorities, this sense or conscience is violated. This will not only cause us pain, but it is wrong in itself. God forms within us our conscience as a rule of conduct. It must therefore not be broken; and in order that it may not be, in the case in hand, we must obey the civil authorities.

6. **Now for this reason also you pay tax;** As nothing is gained by treating *teleite* as Imperative, I take it as Indicative. The *gar* is epexegetic, introducing a detail, in part, of what has already been said. It is therefore best to render it *now*. Besides to render it *for*, and *dia touto*, *for the reason*, gives us an awkward reading. This it is desirable to avoid. For this reason: That is, because of anger and of conscience. In other words, you pay tax for the reason that if you do not, anger will be inflicted upon you, and your conscience will be violated.

for they are God's ministers attending to this very duty. That is, those officers whose business it is to collect taxes are God's ministers attending to this duty. Civil governments are ordained of God; and if so, taxes are too; for governments can not be carried on without them. Besides if taxes be necessary, so also are tax-collectors. Consequently, we dare not resist them by refusing to pay them taxes; for, in so doing, we disobey God. The taxes here spoken of were the common taxes of the country, which every citizen had to pay. They were levied on lands and personal property, as in this country, and collected annually.

7. **Give to all their dues,** Of course this could be enjoined on the principle of common justice; but it is here said with special reference to those legal dues, such as taxes and customs, of which the Apostle is speaking. The verse sums up the whole of what has just been said in a few short clauses. It is not an inference, but a generalization.

tax to whom tax is due, This clause I think it best to supplement with *is due*, which serves to complete its sense, and so render it clear. But on the injunction itself, nothing farther need be added here, as its subject-matter has already been noticed under the last clause in v. 6.

custom to whom custom, The customs were duties imposed by law upon merchandise, whether imported or exported. They formed an important part of the revenue of the State; and it was therefore necessary to have them collected punctually.

fear to whom fear, You must cultivate for those in authority, that just fear of punishment which will restrain you from disobeying them. This fear you must at all times exhibit by the strictness with which you discharge your civil obligations.

honor to whom honor. You must not only fear and obey civil officers, but where they are high in authority, as the king, or where from any cause they are entitled to it, you must even honor them. You must pay them a high and sincere respect.

The wisdom of these injunctions must be apparent to all who will reflect. From compliance with them would result the following several advantages to christians: 1. Respect and praise from civil officers; 2. peace to pursue their duties; 3. exemption from legal prosecutions and fines. Obligations supported by such considerations as these can never be contemned by the pious and orderly.

CHAPTER XIII. SECTION 2.

⁹ Owe no one any thing, except the love of one another; for he who loves another has fulfilled the law. ⁹ For the [law is]: You shall not commit adultery; you shall not murder; you shall not steal; you shall not desire; and if there is any other commandment it is summed up in this saying, namely, you shall love your neighbor as yourself. ¹⁰ Love works no evil to a neighbor; therefore love is the fulfillment of the law.

⁹ Μηδενι μηδεν ὀφείλετε εἰ μὴ τὸ ἀγαπᾶν ἄλλους ἀγαπᾶν ὁ γὰρ ἀγαπᾶς τὸν ἕτερον νόμον πεπλήρωκε. ⁹ ὅτι γὰρ ὅσα μοιχεύσεις, οὐ φονεύσεις οὐ κλέψεις οὐκ ἐπιθυμήσεις, καὶ εἴ τις ἕτερα ἐντολή, ἐν τῷ λόγῳ τούτῳ ἀνωφελισθεῖται ἐν τῷ ἀγαπήσεις τὸν πλησίον σου ὡς σεαυτόν. ¹⁰ Ἡ ἀγάπη τῷ πλησίον κακὸν οὐκ ἐργάζεται· πληρωμὴ οὖν νόμου ἡ ἀγάπη.

SUMMARY.

Christians must pay to all whatever is due them, whether tax, customs, or honor. The only exception is that we must be always owing one another a

debt of love, which we are to be constantly paying, without ever paying it. In other words, we are never to feel that we have finally discharged the debt. The reason is, that he who loves another is sure to keep the whole law towards him. We will not only never injure him whom we love, but will do him whatever good we can.

8. Owe no man any thing, Owe no tax, no custom, no fear, no honor; pay to all their dues. By some this clause has been regarded as wholly prohibiting going in debt. Green, who is usually very literal, renders it thus: "owe no one any debt." In this view I have myself usually concurred, but upon farther reflection, I question it. What the Apostle appears to prohibit is not, contracting debt, but owing a thing after it is due. *Pay to all what you owe*, not *you must not owe at all*, seems to give the true sense. Besides, the context will hardly justify our insisting on more. Upon the whole, I am ready to rest in this view as correct.

Upon the general subject of going in debt, considered in a prudential light, it is, of course, not my business to speak. The subject belongs, not to the critic, but to the department of morals and political economy. Often, going in debt is certainly wrong; while in many instances it seems almost unavoidable. It appears dangerous only when abused, and beneficial when not. The question is a discretionary one, which each is left to decide for himself.

except the love of one another; Owe no debt except the debt of loving one another. This debt you must always owe, and be always paying. You must never fail to contract it in the case of every disciple, nor must payment ever cease. Love ever and pay ever is the law here.

for he who loves another has fulfilled the law. *Nomon* nere, though anarthrous, is nevertheless definite in sense from the very nature of the case. It does not signify law in general, nor necessarily the law of Moses, but specifically *the* law, whatever it is, and the whole of it, relating to *me* and "*another*," and governing us. It denotes this law, and this much law, no more. The word "*another*" signifies every one between whom and myself there exists any legal relation, or to whom I owe any obligation growing out of law. It is therefore very comprehensive, including not only my neighbor, but also all others to whom I am in any way legally bound. *Has fulfilled the law.* Not the whole law, but so much of it as relates to *me* and "*another*." This limitation is imposed by the nature of the case. *Has fulfilled*

Not actually, it may be, but in effect; for so certain is he who loves another to fulfill the law towards him, that he is here regarded as having already done it. The thing is treated as done, because sure to be done.

9. For the [law is]: you shall not commit adultery; The *gar* here introduces the confirmation of the last preceding clause. The connection is as follows: He who loves another has fulfilled the law towards him; for the [law is], you shall not commit adultery; and this no man will do against one whom he loves. Therefore love is the fulfillment of the law. And so on to the end of the law relating to "another."

The *ro* at the commencement of the present clause has given rise to some diversity of opinion. Stuart thinks it the article prefixed to a quotation introduced as such; while Bloomfield regards it as used for *ōri*. It is certainly the article; and it is placed before a clause to give it, as I consider, a Substantive character.

The clause is evidently elliptical requiring *gegrammenon*, or something of the sort, to be supplied. The best supplement seems to be the one I place in brackets. This is very simple, and, as I conceive, gives the exact sense.

you shall not murder; you shall not steal; you shall not desire; The argument on these clauses is the same as on the last one. He who loves another will not commit against him any of the offences here named. Consequently, he who loves another has fulfilled the law as to him.

you shall not murder; The frequency with which this crime is committed in this country is positively alarming. Moreover, if the person committing it stands high, and has plenty of money, there is, as every one knows, literally no punishment for him. He is merely annoyed with the form of a trial—that is all. The shocking extent to which the crime prevails, loudly calls for a remedy; and for murder there is but one remedy. Whenever every murderer atones for his deed by the certain loss of his own life, murders will well-nigh cease, not before. The pulpit and the press should ring with efforts to create a public sentiment that will be satisfied with nothing short of the adequate punishment of the crime. "Whoso sheddeth man's blood, by man shall his blood be shed." Gen. ix: 6. This is God's own decree against the murderer, a decree enacted for the whole human race, and which has never been repealed, revoked, or set aside. The State

or court, therefore, that is daring enough to presume to disregard it, is false alike to God and to society. No degenerate sentiment should be allowed to supplant the law. On the contrary, nothing but the sturdy execution of it is just to the murderer or to society.

you shall not desire; We are so accustomed to the word "covet," that *desire* is not apt to strike us as sufficiently strong but since we are without another more appropriate single word, we must remain content with this. Of course the desire either has reference to an object which we can not lawfully desire, or it is indulged to an unlawful degree. In either case it is wrong, but not otherwise. The temperate desire of a lawful good is certainly right. Such desire therefore is not the kind prohibited here. Two illustrations will set the subject in a proper light. 1. To desire another's wife is wrong in itself, and therefore prohibited. 2. To desire excessively another's lamb is wrong, because of the certainty attending it, that it will lead to the use of unlawful means to obtain it. It is hence forbid. But to desire a woman, not married, to make her a lawful wife is right; as it also is to desire moderately another's lamb for which I am ready to pay an equivalent. In neither case, therefore, is the desire inhibited. However, in the case of the lamb, if the owner did not wish to part from it, I should then deem it wrong to desire it in any degree. The case, I should say, is to be taken with this qualification.

and if there is any other commandment That is, if there be any other commandment respecting *another*; for this is the subject in hand. Not, if there be any other commandment on any subject, for the Apostle knew perfectly that there is.

it is summed up in this saying, namely, you shall love your neighbor as yourself. Not, you shall love your neighbor as much as yourself; for this is neither possible nor necessary; but you shall love him in like manner as you love yourself. You love yourself so truly that you would never have your neighbor injure you. In like manner, you must love him so truly as never to injure him. Thus loving him, you will do him no harm; and so far you fulfill the law towards him. But if we love our neighbor as ourselves, we shall not stop merely at not injuring him. We will go farther; and whatever good our self-love prompts us to wish him to do us, that good our love for him will prompt us to do him. This much the case of the Samaritan, as put by the Savior, clearly demands.

But who is my neighbor? Long since the question was put, but not always since has it been correctly answered. My neighbor, then, is not my enemy; for my enemy is appropriately named, and special directions are given as to how I shall treat him. Neither is my christian brother alone my neighbor; for neighbor comprehends more than christian. *Plesion* means *near, near by, close at hand*; and from this comes *ho plesion* neighbor. My neighbor, therefore, is any human being or fellow creature who chances to be near me, whether for the moment or permanently. This human being I am so to love that I would no more harm him, than I would have him to harm me; and more than this, I am to do him whatever good, if in my power, I would wish him to do me. Such is my neighbor, and such the law which regulates my conduct towards him.

The reader will notice that I render ἐν τῷ in the present clause *namely*, which I do merely to avoid repetition. Fully rendered the clause would read thus: it is summed up in this saying, *in the* [saying], You shall love, &c. But this is inadmissible, and hence should be avoided.

10. Love works no evil to a neighbor; therefore love is the fulfilment of the law. The law requires me not to murder my neighbor, not to steal from him, not to commit adultery against him, not to desire his goods; in a word, not to do him harm of any kind; and if I love him, I will not do him any. Hence, the love of my neighbor is the fulfilment of the law towards him.

CHAPTER XIII. SECTION 3.

“Καὶ τοῦτο εἰδότες τὸν καιρὸν, ὅτι ὄρα ἤδη ἡμᾶς ἐξ ὕπνου ἐγερθῆναι. νῦν γὰρ ἐγγύτερον ἡμῶν ἢ σωτηρία ἢ ὅτε ἐπιστεύσαμεν. ¹²Ἡ νύξ προέκοψεν, ἡ δὲ ἡμέρα ἤγγικεν. Ἀποθώμεθα οὖν τὰ ἔργα τοῦ σκότους, ἐνδυσώμεθα δὲ τὰ ὄπλα τοῦ φωτός. ¹³Ὡς ἐν ἡμέρᾳ εὐσχημόνως περιπατήσωμεν, μὴ κώμοις καὶ μέθαις, μὴ κοίταις καὶ ἀσελγείαις, μὴ ἔριδι καὶ ζήλῳ. ¹⁴Ἀλλ’ ἐνδύσασθε τὸν Κύριον Ἰησοῦν Χριστόν, καὶ τῆς σαρκὸς πρόνοιαν μὴ ποιεῖσθε εἰς ἐπιθυμίας.

“And this [let us do] knowing the season, that it is already time for us to awake from sleep; for now our salvation is nearer than when we believed. ¹²The night is far spent, the day is at hand. Let us then lay off the works of darkness, and put on the arms of light. ¹³Let us walk becomingly as in the day, not in revels and drunkenness, not in beds and lewdness, not in strife and envy. ¹⁴But put on the Lord Jesus Christ, and make no provision for the desires of the flesh.

SUMMARY.

It is now time for us to awake from the sleep of the old unregenerate night through which we have been passing, and to do our whole duty in every thing. The reason is, that the day of salvation will soon be upon us, and for it we must be ready. All our former evil deeds must be utterly abandoned; and the new life in Christ fully assumed. Henceforth we must live for the Savior, not for the flesh.

11. And this [let us do] knowing the season, *This* refers to all the Apostle has just been enjoining. The meaning is: Let us be obedient to ruling authorities; let us pay tax; let us love our neighbor; let us do all this, knowing the season; or let us do this because we know the season. After the word *this*, some clause is evidently necessary to complete the sense; and as I know of none more appropriate than *let us do*, I adopt it, placing it in brackets. *Knowing the season*, that is, the season of life; or more correctly still, perhaps, the season of night—the long night of life, through which we have been sleeping, or doing virtually nothing in the service of God.

that it is already time for us to awake from sleep; If we purpose doing any thing in the way of preparation for our departure hence, it is time we were about it. Heretofore we have done but little; we have been asleep. We should now awake and go to work. But little time remains; consequently not another idle sand must drop from our glass.

for now our salvation is nearer than when we believed. The salvation here spoken of is our final salvation, the salvation

which awaits us in the future state, on which we enter at death, when we pass into the light and rest of the Unseen. This salvation is now nearer than when we first began to struggle for it, nearer than when we first believed; and it draws still nearer every day. At most it is not far off. How profound then the necessity to be at all seasons ready for it.

With the discordant views of commentators on the word salvation, as here used, I think it not necessary to acquaint the reader. In few of them could he feel any interest; in some, none at all. The view here adopted is the one sanctioned by the best authors.

12. The night is far spent, the day is at hand. Night here signifies the period of this life, the dark period in which at best we see but dimly. It is far spent, and therefore, as to us, is ready to pass away. Let not the children of God mourn; rather let them be glad. *The day is at hand.* The day of translation into the joys of the righteous dead, and not the day when Christ shall return to this earth, as some have thought. This day, though distant to many, more than half a life time, is still at hand. Hardly can we, by every possible effort, get ready for it soon enough. So near is it, that even the most active have none too much time to prepare for it. It is at hand; let all be warned.

Let us then lay off the works of darkness, Lay them off as we lay off clothes. The night is far spent; let us then cease from its dark conduct, and prepare for a better season and for better work. In a word, let us lay aside the deeds of the old unregenerate life, and enter thoroughly on the duties of the new life in Christ.

and put on the arms of light. The day is on us in which, as soldiers of Christ, we must battle for the life to come. This battle we wage, not in darkness, but in light. Let us then be appropriately clad for the conflict. Let us put on the arms of light, the arms of those who fight in the light, because in the right.

13. Let us walk becomingly, as in the day, Let us live in a decorous or becoming manner, that is, soberly, chastely, and circumspectly. Let us, in other words, live as in the broad light of day where every eye is upon us, or evince extreme care in our daily conduct. Let not a fault be discoverable in us.

not in revels and strong drink, The *komos* was a sort of carousal in which a number of persons participated, and which

commonly ended by the whole party parading the streets with music, songs, and dancing. It was simply a noisy drunken frolic. The *komoi* were very common among the idolatrous Gentiles, particularly among the devotees of Bacchus. The *komos*, especially in its grosser forms, was invariably attended with drunkenness. Accordingly the two are here mentioned together. Pagans accustomed to these frolics from infancy would hardly, on becoming christians, abandon them all at once. By degrees only would they give them up, and that after much instruction. Hence the necessity for the Apostle's admonition.

not in beds and lewdness, The beds here alluded to were those in which impure males and females committed their unchaste acts, those in which the lewdness named was practiced. The inveterate evil habits of a former life were not always wholly laid down on entering the church. Sometimes unhappily they reappeared in it. On these the Apostle now wishes to impose a final check. Therefore his present remark.

not in strife and envy. *Eris* means strife, contention, wrangling. Among the children of God nothing can be more unlovely or profitless. It is the very opposite of that peace which is so dear to the truly pious, and shows that the spirit is not yet subdued. Not a dreg of it should be allowed to remain in the sanctified heart. *Zelos* in a bad sense, in which it is used here, means secret enmity, jealousy, envy. The last word seems best to render it here. Certainly nothing can be more unlike Christ than to be always chafing in spirit and fretting at another's excellence or good fortune. So contrary is it to that noble magnanimity which is ever ready to rejoice with another in his prosperity, and cordially and brightly to wish him distinction and success still, that the christian who is afflicted with it should mourn, and pray for its exorcism as for that of an unclean demon. It should find no place in the heart that has been purified by the generous blood of Christ.

14. But put on the Lord Jesus Christ, Lay off the works of darkness, and put on Christ in their stead. To put on Christ is a familiar metaphor, borrowed from the practice of putting on clothes. Its meaning is, Let your whole exterior life, as seen by the world, be but a reproduction of the temper and conduct of Christ. Be Christ over again, both in the inner man and the outer life. Plainly and without figure, be all that Christ requires you to be, and do all that he requires you to do. Beyond this, you can not go; short of it, you must not stop.

and make no provision for the desires of the flesh. That is, make no provision to gratify them. The desires of the flesh here meant are clearly those unlawful desires or desires of unlawful objects which are everywhere prohibited in the Bible. They are, in other words, those desires which find their gratification in revels and drunkenness, in beds and lewdness, in strife and envy. Such desires we must make no provision to gratify. On the contrary, we must wholly refuse them indulgence, and so, day by day, put them to death.

It is impossible not to feel how sublime christian life would be, were it closely modeled after the precepts herein laid down. Were such the case, I have a deep belief that the conversion of the world would not go tardily on as at present, and the millennial dawn still flit before us in the far off as now. The glorious future would rush rapidly upon us, and we should soon be rejoicing in the fruition of the end.

CHAPTER XIV.

SECTION I.

Τὸν δὲ ἀσθενοῦντα τῇ πίστει προσλαμβάνεσθε, μὴ εἰς διακρίσεις διαλογισμῶν. ² Ὃς μὲν πιστεύει φαγεῖν πάντα, ὁ δὲ ἀσθενῶν λάχανα ἐσθίει. ³ Ὁ ἐσθίων τὸν μὴ ἐσθίοντα μὴ ἐξουθενείτω· ὁ δὲ μὴ ἐσθίων τὸν ἐσθίοντα μὴ κρινέτω· ὁ Θεὸς γὰρ αὐτὸν προσελάβοτο. ⁴ Σὺ τίς εἶ ὁ κρίνων ἀλλότριον οἰκέτην; τῷ ἰδίῳ κυρίῳ στήκει ἢ πίπτει· σταθήσεται δέ, δυνατεῖ γὰρ ὁ κύριος στήσαι αὐτόν. ⁵ Ὃς μὲν κρίνει ἡμέραν παρ' ἡμέραν, ὃς δὲ κρίνει πᾶσαν ἡμέραν· ἕκαστος ἐν τῷ ἰδίῳ νοὶ πληροφορεῖσθω. ⁶ Ὁ φρονῶν τὴν ἡμέραν Κυρίῳ φρονεῖ, καὶ ὁ ἐσθίων Κυρίῳ ἐσθίει, εὐχαριστεῖ γὰρ τῷ Θεῷ· καὶ ὁ μὴ ἐσθίων Κυρίῳ οὐκ ἐσθίει, καὶ εὐχαριστεῖ τῷ Θεῷ. ⁷ Οὐδεὶς γὰρ ἡμῶν ἑαυτῷ ζῆ, καὶ οὐδεὶς ἑαυτῷ ἀποθνήσκει· ⁸ εἴαν τε γὰρ ζῶμεν, τῷ Κυρίῳ ζῶμεν, εἴαν τε ἀποθνήσκωμεν, τῷ Κυρίῳ ἀποθνήσκομεν. ⁹ Ἐάν τε οὖν ζῶμεν, εἴαν τε ἀποθνήσκωμεν, τοῦ Κυρίου ἐσμέν. ¹⁰ Εἰς τοῦτο γὰρ Χριστὸς ἀπέθανε καὶ ἔζησεν, ἵνα καὶ νεκρῶν καὶ ζώντων κυριεύσῃ. ¹¹ Σὺ δὲ τί κρίνεις τὸν ἀδελφόν σου; ἢ καὶ σὺ τί ἐξουθενεῖς τὸν ἀδελφόν σου; πάντες γὰρ παραστησόμεθα τῷ βήματι τοῦ Θεοῦ. ¹² Γέγραπται γάρ, Ζῶ ἐγώ, λέγει Κύριος, ὅτι ἐμοὶ κάμψει πᾶν γόνυ καὶ πᾶσα γλῶσσα ἐξομολογήσεται τῷ Θεῷ. ¹³ Ἄρα οὖν ἕκαστος ἡμῶν περὶ ἑαυτοῦ λόγον δώσει τῷ Θεῷ.

And accept him who is weak in belief, but not to decisions of thoughts. ² One believes that he may eat all things; while he who is weak eats vegetables. ³ Let not him that eats, despise him that eats not; and let not him that eats not, judge him that eats; for God has accepted him. ⁴ Who are you that judge another's servant? To his own master he stands or falls; and stand he shall, for the Lord is able to make him stand. ⁵ One esteems one day above another; another esteems all days alike. Let each be fully satisfied in his own mind. ⁶ He who keeps the day, keeps it to the Lord; and he who eats, eats to the Lord, for he gives God thanks; and he who eats not, to the Lord eats not, and gives God thanks. ⁷ 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 die, we die to the Lord. Whether therefore we live or die, we are the Lord's. ⁹ Because for this purpose Christ died and lived, that he might be lord of both dead and living. ¹⁰ But why do you judge your brother? or why despise your brother? For we shall all stand before the judgment-seat of God. ¹¹ For it is written: As I live, says the Lord, every knee shall bend to me, and every tongue confess to God. ¹² So then, each of us shall give account to God respecting himself.

SUMMARY.

A brother who is weak in belief, and consequently narrow in his views, we are nevertheless cordially to accept; but in receiving him, we must let alone those thoughts of his which arise out of his weakness. Their correctness or incorrectness is not a question for our decision. And where one brother re-

gards certain days as sacred, while another holds all days to be alike, the rule is to let each be fully satisfied in his own mind, and act accordingly. In this case, the strong who esteems every day alike, is not to despise the weak; nor is the weak, who thinks one day better than another, to judge the strong. The same rule applies also in the case of meats thought to be clean or unclean. In matters of indifference, each man is a law to himself. Accordingly, in such cases we must leave each to act out his own sense of right. And as to judging one another in such matters, we must wholly abstain from it. We are accountable to God only, and he will judge us.

The preceding chapter is mostly taken up with our duties to civil authorities. The present one is devoted almost exclusively to the reciprocal duties of brethren who happen to be respectively strong or weak in belief relative to the use to be made of certain meats and days. It is pre-eminently the chapter of duties in regard to things indifferent in themselves; and it is of great importance because of the principles it lays down for the government of a large section of christian life. It shows what liberty we have in the absence of divine command, and yet how, even here, we may be bound; how free we may be when alone, and how under law in the presence of a weak brother. In a word, it shows how the strong must act towards the weak, and the weak, towards the strong. From the former, it takes away the right of contempt; from the latter, the right of ignorant crimination.

And accept him who is weak in belief, *Proslambanesthe* means more than simply to receive. It means to receive to one's self, to receive into close communion, or to accept and hold in christian fellowship. The disciple who is weak in his belief is not to be spurned or treated with contempt. On the contrary, he is to be received into our very bosoms, as it were, and cherished in love. *Weak in belief*: The weakness spoken of does not belong so much to the man as to his belief. He is weak in the matter of his belief, or it is his belief itself that is weak. But this weak belief reacts upon him and renders him weak, so that both are weak together, both he and it.

But it is not in belief as to Christ that the person alluded to is weak. As to Christ he must be strong in belief. No half measure will suffice here. But he is weak in regard to other things besides Christ, such as eating meat and keeping days. It is touching these only, and others like them, that he is weak. I need hardly add, that the person alluded to is not some one out of the kingdom, with weak belief, who is about to be received into it, but a disciple in it. He is the christian with weak belief in regard to certain days and meats; and he may be either a Jew or

a Gentile. The question, however, of his nationality is indeterminate and immaterial.

but not to decisions of thoughts. *Eis diakriseis dialogismon* is a clause not easy of a perfectly satisfactory rendering. Indeed, no two of the critics appear to agree perfectly in regard to it, although the more reliable of them seem not to differ very widely. The Vulgate renders it *in disceptationibus cogitationum*, *in discussions of thoughts*, or *as to thoughts*. Beza gives it, *ad certamina disceptationum*, *to contests of discussions*. But neither of these strikes me as bringing out the true sense. *Diakrisis* signifies *separating, distinguishing, deciding, interpreting*. Of these I take deciding. *Eis* before this in the plural literally means *into deciding* or *decisions*. *Dialogismos* means *thought, reasoning, balancing, conversing, discussion*. Taking now the whole phrase together, we get, as its most probable and appropriate meaning, *into decisions of thoughts*. But what can this signify? The decisions, be it observed, belong to him who accepts; the thoughts, to him who is accepted; while the decisions relate to the thoughts. Accordingly, I take the meaning of the clause to be this: Accept him who is weak in belief, but *not to decide on his thoughts or for that purpose*. *Eis* denotes the end. Accept him, but not to the end of deciding relative to his thoughts in regard to certain things. These thoughts are his own private opinions respecting things about which there is no command. He, therefore, has the right to hold them without interference from others. The things which his thoughts respect are in themselves indifferent; and therefore the thoughts which relate to them are indifferent. Consequently, so long as the thoughts do not lead him who holds them into wrong, he is not to be disturbed in them. Upon the whole, I feel ready to accept this interpretation as the true one. It certainly seems to fit the nature of the case more closely than any other.

2. **One believes that he may eat all things;** Literally, *one believes to eat all*; that is, so strong is his belief that it enables him to eat every thing set before him. He has no scruples of conscience about the meat he eats. Of course this is the strong man, and not the weak. The phrase "all things" must be restricted to meats and vegetables; and meats again, to meats offered to idols, since there was no controversy about any other. The christian who was strong in belief knew that the character of meat is not changed by its being offered to an idol. He could

therefore, eat it without compunction. Whatever the act of eating might be to others, to him it was the mere act of eating meat with no reference to an idol. For him the meat had no special character, neither had the eating. Whether offered or not, the meat was all the same to him. He ate it, thanked God for it, and had no farther thought about it.

while he who is weak eats vegetables. That is, he eats vegetables only. He holds it to be wrong to eat meat offered in sacrifice to an idol, and consequently eats it not. With him, such eating is an act of homage to the idol. It is, therefore, abhorrent to his conscience. Now, this is the weak brother in belief, whom the Apostle commands us to accept. He is weak in belief, his weakness showing itself in his thoughts on meats offered to idols. This brother, we are to accept without deciding on his thoughts. They are no matter of concern to us; and with them, therefore, we must not meddle. We must accept him, regardless of them.

Here now we have the case of the strong man in belief and of the weak one fully made out. How is each to act towards the other? This is the question which the Apostle now proceeds to answer.

3. Let not him that eats, despise him that eats not; The strong man in belief, eating his meat with a clear head and without a qualm of conscience, would be very apt to look down with something of contempt upon his weak and finikin brother who should refuse the meat as being sinful, and consequently confine himself to vegetables. The weakness the Apostle concedes; but at the same time he forbids the strong looking with contempt on the subject of it. Thus he protects the weak by restraining the strong. How lovely is the act!

But the rule of conduct here laid down for the strong is not to be confined exclusively to the case in hand. In all similar instances of life it must prevail. But here caution is necessary. The case in which the scruple and act of the weak are to be regarded, must be one of pure indifference. In a necessary case, the scruple is to go unheeded. If, for example, the scruples of the weak led him to refuse obedience to baptism, on the ground that the baptism of the Holy Spirit supercedes it, then his scruple must be disregarded, and he himself be rejected. And so in all similar cases. Where Christ speaks, conscience ceases to be a criterion of conduct; and although we may not be at liberty to condemn its scruples, we are neither to allow them to control our-

selves nor others. In a case of pure indifference, scruples are to restrain us; in a necessary case, we are to constrain them.

and let not him that eats not, judge him that eats, On the other hand, the weak brother who eats vegetables only, and who looks on eating meat offered to an idol as idolatry, is sure to **adjudge** the strong a sinner whom he sees eating it. He will consequently feel deeply hurt with him, and be ready to refuse him fellowship. For it is a notable fact that the weak are always more exacting and sensitive than the strong, as well as more ready than they to press their grievances to extremes. But the Apostle interferes, and wholly denies to the weak the right to judge. He is in no sense to pronounce on his strong brother whom he sees eating. The strong is not doing wrong, and is therefore entitled to protection against censure, and the Apostle protects him.

But where the weak sees the strong eating meat, and feels hurt, has he no remedy? For the present I reply, but not in full, that he certainly has the right to inquire with what intent the strong eats; and if the strong disavows eating in honor of the idol, the weak must accept the disavowal, and here the matter should end. But should the weak still feel hurt, especially if he be unable to feel otherwise, the remedy is for the strong to abstain, as we shall see hereafter.

for God has accepted him. God has accepted the strong man who eats. His case then has already been decided. It is consequently to no purpose for the weak to be judging him.

4. Who are you that judge another's servant? The strong man in belief who eats meat is God's servant. How dare you then think of judging him? He is not amenable to you. You exhibit only presumption then in assuming to decide on his case. You have no right to judge the servant of even another man. How much less then the servant of God!

To his own master he stands or falls; The strong man is accountable to God alone, and not to you. Accordingly, God will judge him; and by that judgment he will stand or fall. Your judgment, consequently, can not reach him. Be wise then and repress it.

and stand he shall, for the Lord is able to make him stand. He can fall by the Lord's judgment only, not by yours. But the Lord's judgment will not be against him, but in his favor. He will therefore stand. But the Apostle does not mean to say

that even the strong man shall unconditionally stand. He will stand without regard to the judgment of the weak, but not otherwise unconditionally. By his own conduct he may fall; and by it he will fall, unless it be right; but he can fall by nothing else.

When the Apostle says "and stand he shall," I presume he means he shall stand in the judgment at the last day. He has no reference to standing in this life; for standing in this life is guaranteed to no one except on condition of his own determination not to fall. Whenever the strong decides not to stand, God decides to let him fall.

Again, when the Apostle says "for the Lord is able to make him stand," I apprehend that moral and not physical ability is referred to. The meaning I take to be this: You, the weak, can not see how the strong who eats meat can be saved. But God sees how. He can both acquit him in Christ, and cause him to stand in the last day. This you may not be able to see; but your weakness is no measure of divine ability.

5. **One esteems one day above another,** The person here alluded to has been assumed by many to be the christian Jew, and the days to be Jewish sabbaths and other sacred days. The christian Jew is certainly referred to, but it will not do to say that he exclusively is referred to. Nor will it do to say that the word "day" includes only Jewish sacred days. Such limitations are without warrant either from the nature of the case or any thing else. The term "one" includes every christian, whether Jew or Gentile, who esteemed one day better than another; while "day" includes every day so esteemed, whether it be a Jewish or a Gentile day. At the time when Paul wrote, it was customary for certain christians to esteem one day above another. This they had, and they still have an absolute right to do, whether the day were a Jewish sacred day or a Gentile sacred day, a sabbath or a first day of the week, a Wednesday or a Thursday; and no one was at liberty to pronounce them wrong, or in any way to interfere with them. And what was then the liberty of christians is their liberty still. Had we Jewish christians among us now, and did they choose to esteem and treat the ancient sabbath as better than any other day, no one among us would have the right to move a lip against them. Only in keeping their days, they could not be allowed to do any thing violative of the law of Christ.

another esteems all days alike. The person here alluded

to, and placed over against the other, was either a Gentile or a very enlightened Jew who knew and conceded that the whole Jewish ritual, worship, and service had been set aside for the gospel. But no matter who he was or what his nationality, he esteemed, and with the sanction of both God and Christ, all days alike. With him the Jewish sabbath was no better than the day before it or the day after it; the first day of the week was no better than the last day or the second day; and he was just as certainly right as the person who esteemed one day above another. Both were right, and neither wrong. And so is it, so far as the New Testament is concerned, even now. As for myself, I esteem all days exactly alike. Sunday with me is no better than Monday; and Monday is no better than Tuesday. There is not a vestige of sanctity attaching to one day which does not attach to all. Moreover, in this view and right, I am as completely protected by divine authority against all criticism and intermeddling, as is my brother who esteems the first day of the week better than the last day. I am not the weak man merely to be tolerated by him; nor is he the weak man merely to be tolerated by me. As to the character which days have, we are both alike weak and alike strong; or if not, the contrary can not be known.

But although all days are in character exactly alike, all days are not to be indiscriminately used for the same purpose. The primitive disciples met on the first day of the week to break bread and for other acts of worship. On this same day then, are we to meet for the same purposes; for, in the premises, the conduct of the primitive disciples is precedent to us. If the purposes and acts for which we meet, consume the whole day, then no part of it can be otherwise used.

Besides, the laws of the land make it obligatory upon us to observe the first day of the week as a rest-day, or day of exemption from ordinary or secular labor. These laws are consistent with the gospel. In other words, they contravene no law of Christ. They are, then, to be scrupulously obeyed by all christians. Hence, although our religious duties may not consume the whole of the first day of the week, still we are not at liberty, in virtue of these laws, to devote any part of it to purely secular work. Consequently, we are to keep the day, not because it is better than any other day, but in compliance with divine precedent, and the laws of the land.

Of the prudential or philosophic reasons for setting apart one day in every seven as a day of rest from common toil, it is no part of my present business to speak. These reasons, I may add, have always seemed to me to be valid and conclusive. Such a rest-day, the well-being of both man and brute makes necessary I here speak only to the position that one day is more sacred than another. With any other question touching days, I have nothing to do.

Let each be fully satisfied in his own mind. Let each be fully satisfied in his own mind, and so let him act. If one christian esteems one day above another, be it so. He has the right, and no one can interfere. If another esteems all days alike, be it so. He is judge for himself, and no one may question him. Both are right, when both are satisfied.

6. He who keeps the day, keeps it to the Lord; He who esteems the Lord's day above any other day, and so keeps it as a holy day, does right. He keeps the day as in obedience to the Lord, though the Lord has no law on the subject, and so satisfies his sense of right. He is free to do as he pleases in the case.

and he who eats, eats to the Lord, for he gives God thanks; When the christian who is strong in belief eats meat offered to an idol, he does not eat it in recognition of the idol, but as in obedience to Christ. He hence gives God thanks, and not the idol. God accepts his thanks and Christ approves his act. He is consequently right, and neither to be judged nor blamed.

and he who eats not, to the Lord eats not, and gives God thanks. In like manner, when the christian, who is weak in belief, abstains from meat, he does so as in compliance with the Savior's wish. He too gives God thanks for his vegetables, satisfies his sense of right, and is happy. God accepts his gratitude, and suffers not the strong to condemn him. But now, for a few verses, the question of meats will be dropped out of sight.

7. For no one of us lives to himself, To live to one's self is to live solely to serve self, or to make self the supreme end of life. It is to live with no reference to any one else, not even the Lord. But of course no christian lives thus to himself, provided he is living right. On the contrary, he lives to the Lord, if not exclusively, in dutiful part, as well as to self. In an act of taking food, for example, he eats to himself in so far only as food

is necessary to his well-being; but as showing his gratitude, and in recognition of the hand that supplies him, he at the same time eats also to the Lord. In eating, therefore, he has the Lord in view as well as self. And so in all he does. He hence lives not alone to self, but also to the Lord; and therefore in eating he gives God thanks.

and no one dies to himself; That is, no *christian* dies to himself, for the Apostle is not speaking of others. Not in living only, but also in dying, we are to have the honor and good pleasure of the Lord in view. Our very death is to be an act which shall enhance his glory. This it can not be unless we so live that when we come to die we can die, giving him thanks for the honor and happiness into which death is but the sure introduction. On this condition, our death no less than our lives will glorify the Lord.

8. for whether we live, we live to the Lord, or die, we die to the Lord. In the preceding verse, the Apostle declares that no christian lives to himself or dies to himself; but he leaves the question unanswered, To whom does he live and die? In the present verse he answers that question. We live and die to the Lord, that is, to promote his honor.

Whether therefore we live or die, we are the Lord's. While this, logically, is an inference from the three preceding clauses, it is nevertheless the ground of them all, or the premise from which they emerge. We are the Lord's whether living or dead, no matter for the present how we become so. This is the fact. If now we are absolutely his, his property, then *a fortiori* whether we live or die, we must constantly have his honor and pleasure in view. Every act of life, and even death must tend to promote these as an ultimate end. And farther, if while living, we are to live to the Lord, or dying, we are to die to him, then *a fortiori* again, whether we eat we are to eat to the Lord, or abstain, we are to abstain to him. In even an indifferent act, he is to be kept in view. In both the 7th and 8th vs., the word Lord denotes Christ. This is made evident from what follows in the 9th.

9. Because for this purpose Christ died and lived, that he might be lord of both dead and living. This clause assigns a reason for the preceding one. It is there said that whether we live or die we are the Lord's. Here we are told how we become his. Christ died that he might redeem us with his

blood, and so be lord of us or own us; and he rose from the dead that he might rule over, and so finally save those whom he thus came to own. To be lord of, here means to own completely, or to be lord of in the sense of both owning and controlling. The "living" denotes the whole sum of the disciples living at any one time since the death of Christ; while the "dead" comprehends the whole of the dead who have been redeemed by his blood, and who will consequently be subjects of the resurrection of the just. All these living and these dead Christ is now lord of, or owns and controls.

In the phrase "died and lived," lived denotes lived again, or came to life. For this purpose Christ died and came to life, i. e., at his resurrection. *Kuriouse*, which is Subjunctive, I translate *that he might be lord of*; and the word lord, I print with a small l, to signify, not the person of Christ, but the mere fact of ownership.

10. **But why do you judge your brother?** The person here judging is he who is "weak in belief;" while the judged is he who is strong, and "believes that he may eat all things." The Apostle appears to return to the subject for the purpose of *assigning an additional reason to prevent judging*.

or why despise your brother? The person despising is of course the strong, while the one despised is the weak; and both questions are put, not with the expectation that an answer will be framed to either, but in order to afford the Apostle the chance of answering.

For we shall all stand before the judgment-seat of God. Upon this seat Christ will sit, to whom the Father has committed all judgment. To him, therefore, are we responsible for our conduct and thoughts in the premises, and not to one another; and by him we shall be judged. Let us then refrain from both judging and despising. In assuming to do the former, we usurp the prerogative of Christ; and in venturing on the latter, we do what even he himself does not. Let us then attempt neither.

11. **For it is written: As I live, says the Lord, every knee shall bend to me, and every tongue confess to God.** Adduced to confirm the foregoing clause, and cited *ad sensum* from Isa. xlv: 23. By bending the knee to the Lord, we shall recognize his authority over us as supreme judge; and in confessing to God, we shall acknowledge that all his dealings with us have been just. And although the passage is cited to prove only

that all christians, whether strong or weak, will stand before the judgment-seat of God, it proves as well that all the wicked will likewise stand there. The former, however, will stand there to be crowned with eternal honor, the latter to be condemned.

Instead of "to confess to God," it has been suggested that we should render, *give praise to God*, on the ground of an intended conformity of the Greek to the Hebrew. But I do not believe that the Greek word ever means to give praise, and, therefore, can not accept the suggestion.

12. So then each of us shall give account to God respecting himself. A general conclusion from what has just been said about appearing at the judgment-seat of God. As each of us will have to account to God for his conduct, and be judged accordingly, it is idle to be judging and despising one another here. Our judgments are not final, nor will any one either stand or fall by them. As they can affect no one but ourselves, we had better repress them.

CHAPTER XIV. SECTION 2.

¹⁸ Therefore, let us no longer judge one another. But rather do you decide on this, not to place a stumbling-block or means of falling before a brother. ¹⁴ I know and am persuaded in the Lord Jesus that nothing is unclean in itself; but to him who thinks a thing unclean, it is unclean. ¹⁵ If now your brother is grieved by food, you no longer walk according to love. Destroy not him with your food for whom Christ died. ¹⁶ Let not your good then be evil spoken of. ¹⁷ For the kingdom of God is not food and drink, but righteousness, and peace, and joy in the Holy Spirit. ¹⁸ For he who in this [way] serves Christ, is acceptable to God and approved by men. ¹⁹ Now therefore let us follow the ways of peace, even the ways that build up one another. ²⁰ For the sake of food, pull not down the work of God. All [food] is clean, but [food] is an evil to the man who, in eating it, occasions stumbling. ²¹ It is good not to eat flesh, nor drink wine, nor [eat or drink] any thing by which your brother stumbles, or falls, or is made weak. ²² You have belief: keep it to yourself before God. Happy is he who condemns not himself in that which he judges proper. ²³ But if one eats while doubting, he is condemned, because [his act is] not from belief; and every act which is not from belief, is a sin.

¹³ Μηκέτι οὖν ἀλλήλους κρίνωμεν, ἀλλὰ τοῦτο κρίνατε μᾶλλον, τὸ μὴ τιθεῖναι πρόσκομμα τῷ ἀδελφῷ ἢ σκανδαλον. ¹⁴ Οἶδα καὶ πέπεισμαι ἐν Κυρίῳ Ἰησοῦ ὅτι οὐδὲν κοινὸν δι' αὐτοῦ, εἰ μὴ τῷ λογιζομένῳ τι κοινὸν εἶναι, ἐκείνῳ κοινόν. ¹⁵ Εἰ γὰρ διὰ βρώμα ὁ ἀδελφός σου λυπείται, οὐκέτι κατὰ ἀγάπην περιπατεῖς. Μὴ τῷ βρώματι σου ἐκείνον ἀπόλλυε ὑπὲρ οὗ Χριστὸς ἀπέθανε. ¹⁶ Μὴ βλασφημείσθω οὖν ὑμῶν τὸ ἀγαθόν. ¹⁷ Οὐ γὰρ ἔστιν ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ Θεοῦ βρώσις καὶ πόσις, ἀλλὰ δικαιοσύνη καὶ εἰρήνη καὶ χαρὰ ἐν πνεύματι ἁγίῳ. ¹⁸ Ὁ γὰρ ἐν τούτῳ δουλεύων τῷ Χριστῷ εὐάρεστος τῷ Θεῷ καὶ δόκιμος τοῖς ἀνθρώποις. ¹⁹ Ἄρα οὖν τὰ τῆς εἰρήνης διώκωμεν καὶ τὰ τῆς οἰκοδομῆς τῆς εἰς ἀλλήλους. ²⁰ Μὴ ἕνεκεν βρώματος κατάλυε τὸ ἔργον τοῦ Θεοῦ. Πάντα μὲν καθαρὰ, ἀλλὰ κακὸν τῷ ἀνθρώπῳ τῷ διὰ προσκόμματος ἐσθίονται. ²¹ Καλὸν τὸ μὴ φαγεῖν κρέα, μηδὲ πιεῖν οἶνον, μηδὲ ἐν ᾧ ὁ ἀδελφός σου προσκόπτει ἢ σκανδαλίζεται ἢ ἀσθενεῖ. ²² Σὺ πίστιν ἔχεις· κατὰ σεαυτὸν ἔχε ἐνώπιον τοῦ Θεοῦ. Μακάριος ὁ μὴ κρίνων ἑαυτὸν ἐν ᾧ δοκιμάζει. ²³ ὁ δὲ διακρινόμενος, εἰς φάσιν, κατακρίνεται, ὅτι οὐκ ἐκ πίστεως· πᾶν δὲ ὁ οὐκ ἐκ πίστεως, ἁμαρτία ἐστίν.

SUMMARY.

Instead of judging one another in questions respecting days and meats, let each decide, rather that he will be very careful not to place a stumbling-block or occasion of falling, in the way of his brother. This is the proper kind of judging for christians. But in the matter of meats, and in all similar cases, if eating it grieves a brother, an effect which he may be unable to prevent, we are to abstain from it in deference to his feelings. Should we not do so, we may either drive him from the church, or induce him to follow an example which he is in danger of following too far, and so ruin him. In order to avoid these results, we must abstain from eating meat, where any one is hurt by it. We must not do any thing that will imperil the salvation of a brother.

The strong belief which enables us to do many things that the weak can not do, we must keep to ourselves. We are not at liberty to use it, when by so doing we injure others.

In the present section, the Apostle points out the limit beyond which we are not to push our liberty in Christ. The strong man may eat his meat, and his weak brother is not permitted to judge him; but in one event, even the strong must not eat. That event is herein named.

13. **Therefore, let us no longer judge one another.** The reference here is to the weak in belief. We shall all have to appear before the judgment-seat of God, and there render our account and be judged. Judging one another here, then, is of no avail. It is not allowed to us, and, therefore, should not be attempted by us.

But rather do you decide on this, not to place a stumbling block or means of falling, before a brother. Here the reference is to the strong; and although the transition from the weak to the strong is abrupt, it nevertheless is made. Do you, the strong, instead of despising your weak brother, rather decide on this, not to place a stumbling-block in his way. The stumbling-block consisted in eating meat. But how could eating meat become a stumbling-block in the way of the weak, or how was the weak in danger of falling over it? There are but two ways conceivable by me: 1. He might either be driven off from the church, and so become an apostate; or, 2, be emboldened to eat meat himself, and so become an idolater. Either way would prove his ruin; and that he was in danger of one or the other is evident from the Apostle's admonition. I render *proskomma* a *stumbling-block*, and *skandalon* a *means of falling*, merely for the sake of variation. The two words have nearly the same meaning, though possibly the latter was meant to be rather exgetic of the former.

14. **I know and am persuaded in the Lord Jesus that nothing is unclean in itself;** From being in Christ and the general knowledge I have of his mind, I know that no food is unclean *di' autou*, *by itself*, or *within itself*. The old Mosaic distinctions, then, are abolished under Christ. Consequently, christians are at liberty to eat whatever they please. They should deem nothing unclean, and so abstain from nothing. "Unclean" here signifies unclean in the old legal or ceremonial sense. It denotes a distinction created by law, and not existing in nature.

but to him who thinks a thing unclean, it is unclean. If a christian regards meat as unclean, and yet eats it, the eating has the same effect on him as though the meat were really unclean. By the act he violates his conscience and wounds his feelings, and so weakens those restraints that are essential to his safety. The effect on him of the eating, is the same as though it were an actual sin.

But what of the eating upon its merits? Is it a sin before God? Clearly not; for that which is not wrong in itself can never be made so by a merely human view of it. Our conceptions no more convert right into wrong than wrong into right. The Apostle does not decide what the eating is in itself, but simply says what it is to the eater. If the eater deems the eating wrong, he should abstain from it; for we are not at liberty to violate conscience even in a right act in itself. How much less then in one wrong in itself.

15. If now your brother is grieved by food, you no longer walk according to love. That is, if your brother is grieved by your eating certain food, you no longer walk according to love if you persist in eating it. But you are bound to walk always according to love. The conclusion is inevitable. You must refrain from eating, at least when your brother can be cognizant of the act. Your brother is not to judge you for eating; nor are you to despise him for not eating; but if through weakness, he is unable to keep from feeling hurt when you eat. You must, then, in deference to his feelings, refrain.

A church, suppose, is composed of one hundred members, and I among them. Ninety-nine of these members decide to put an organ into our house of worship. The use of an organ in worship grieves my conscience, and is offensive to my feelings. Do the ninety-nine walk according to love when they put the organ in?

Fifty members of the same church frequent theatres. Five members, good and pious, *but weak*, are grieved by the practice. Do the fifty walk according to love when they walk into the theatre?

Five members of the same church traffic in whisky. Twenty members, and they among the best, *but weak*, are grieved by the trafficking. Do the five walk according to love when they persist in their trade? These are practical questions of some significance.

But in reply to this, it may be said: Suppose the weak should continue, and still continue, to be grieved with our conduct, item by item? Where would the matter end? Would not all our liberties in Christ at last be taken from us? Have the weak ever heretofore been thus unreasonable? Never. And what they have not heretofore done, they are not likely hereafter to do. An imaginary case is no basis for argument.

Destroy not him with your food for whom Christ died. How can the strong by eating meat destroy the weak? Already in this section the question has been answered. It is only then necessary to epitomize here that answer. Should the weak become so grieved with the strong as to feel unable to live in the church with him, and so abandon it; or should he himself become emboldened by example to eat, which with him would be an act of idolatry, in either case the result would be fatal to him. But unless the act of the strong should lead to one or other of these results, it would evidently be harmless.

16. *Let not your good, then, be evil spoken of.* *To agathon* here, is held to signify one of two things: Either our christianity, which is our highest general good, or the liberty we have in Christ to eat meat, and do other similar things, which is a special good. Some commentators have held the former view, others, the latter. The context clearly, it seems to me, points to the latter as the true view. The connection is this: You have the liberty, *to agathon*, to eat meat or not, as you see fit; but you must not so use this liberty as to destroy your brother; for in that event, your *agathon* becomes an evil. So use your liberty, then, that it shall prove to all a good, and to none an evil. It will then be well, and not evil spoken of.

The principle of conduct here brought out is of so much importance as to justify an additional remark. As strong christians in belief, we may have the liberty to do many things which the weak may think wrong. But if by doing those things, we subject our liberty to unfriendly criticism, we must refrain. It is better to seem not free than that our freedom should lead to mischief.

17. For the kingdom of God is not food and drink, but righteousness, and peace, and joy in the Holy Spirit. The kingdom of God here spoken of is the present kingdom or church. Food and drink, as such, do not belong to this kingdom, or they are not a characteristic of it. They are mere accidents.

and hence our rights in regard to them, as well as our prejudices against them, must not be pressed too far. On the contrary, the kingdom of God consists, 1, in righteousness, or the general righteous conduct of those who are in it; 2, in peace, or such a considerate course of action on the part of all as shall insure peace; and, 3, in joy, or that delicate regard for the feelings of one another which, under the strengthening presence in all of the Holy Spirit, shall give joy and not grief. These are the weighty matters of the kingdom, and, therefore, the matters of chief concern to us, and not the indifferent and trivial questions of eating or not eating meat. But as it was in the kingdom in those days, so is it still. There is a large class of professors who are never through with homilies and scruples of conscience on meat and drink, but who either never can know any thing, or never will care any thing about righteousness, peace, and joy. They, of course, are always righteous themselves, and their peace and joy must ever be consulted, but as for others, *nil*.

18. For he who in this [way] serves Christ, is acceptable to God and approved by men. He who serves Christ by being righteous and by doing those things which induce peace and joy, is acceptable to God and approved by men. *En touto* means in this matter or way, that is, in the way of righteousness, peace, and joy.

The connection between vs. 18, 19, indicated by *gar*, is not very obvious. I make it out by assuming a suppressed sentence, thus: The kingdom of God consists in righteousness, peace, and joy. For, (i. e. in confirmation of the assertion) he who in these three things serves Christ, is accepted and approved as said. *But no one can be thus accepted and approved unless he does the things in which the kingdom consists.* Therefore, it consists in these three things.

In the expression "approved by men," it is not necessary to restrict the word "men" to christians. The meaning appears to be this: It is the general sentiment of mankind that he is worthy of approval who is righteous in conduct, and who at the same time so acts as to occasion others peace and joy, and not grief. Such a man is approved by the world.

19. Now therefore let us follow the ways of peace, even the ways that build up one another. Since the kingdom of God consists in righteousness, peace, and joy, let us follow the ways of peace. Such is the connection. *Ta tes eirenes* literally

signifies *the things of peace*; that is, those things which produce it. The phrase however is closely rendered by *ways of peace*. That the ways of peace are those ways that build up, I assume as certain. It is therefore better to render the intervening *kai*, *even*, noting sameness. The meaning is: If eating meat, or doing any other similar thing, grieves a brother, and thereby causes trouble, it is better not to eat. Rather let us do what will lead to peace; for peace secured in this delicate way is of far higher importance than the mere circumstance of eating meat. In the phrase "build up one another," the Apostle evidently has before his mind the church under the conception of a house. Accordingly, the phrase to build up "one another" is the same as to build up the church.

20. For the sake of food pull not down the work of God. That is, for the sake of eating food. The "work of God" is clearly the church viewed as a building or house. "You are God's building." 1 Cor. iii: 9. Now merely for the sake of eating meat, and by implication doing other things like it, pull not down this house, which you do whenever, by eating, you grieve your weak brother, and so drive him from the church. Where eating meat produces this result, it must not be eaten.

All [food] is clean; but [food] is an evil to the man who, in eating it, occasions stumbling. This clause is so constructed as to render a little freedom unavoidable in translating it. The following is as literal as a rendering, to be intelligible, can be made: All [food] is clean, but it is evil to the man who eats *through occasioning offence*; and even here, the last two words are quite free. But although a very close translation seems not easy, the sentiment is clear. It is this: All food within itself is clean; but even clean food becomes an evil to the man who, by eating it, causes his weak brother to stumble or fall. In other words, we do wrong whenever we use our liberty at the expense of another's injury. We may eat meat or not, just as we please, provided no one is hurt by it; but whenever eating harms an other, we must abstain. That which is right in itself injures us when we so use it as to injure others.

21. It is good not to eat flesh, nor drink wine, nor [eat or drink] any thing by which your brother stumbles, or falls, or is made weak. The whole subject summed up in one sentence. We are to do nothing in the way of eating and drinking, in other words, nothing in things strictly indifferent, where

the act injures another. The question is not, What is the nature of the act in itself, but does it injure another. If so, we must abstain from it.

22. You have belief: keep it to yourself before God. You have belief, or you are rendered strong by it in regard to meats, so that you can eat them or not, as you please. This is all well. But it is better to keep your belief, or the knowledge and freedom it gives you, to yourself, as something known only to you and to God. Say nothing about your liberty, or what you can eat; especially be careful not to eat any thing when the eating causes grief. You can eat when alone; but be silent in regard to your superior privileges, lest by speaking of them or using them, you wound the weak, and so drive them off. He is a good man who, though free, can seem to be otherwise rather than give pain.

Happy is he who condemns not himself in that which he judges proper. The allusion is clearly to the strong. You judge all meat to be clean, and judge correctly. Accordingly, you can eat it or not as you see fit. Be careful now, not so to use your liberty as to bring condemnation on yourself, which you will do in case you eat, and thereby injure the weak. To condemn one's self, here means so to act as to provoke condemnation or bring it upon one's self.

23. But if one eats while doubting, he is condemned, The Apostle now changes to the weak. Should the weak be induced to follow the example of the strong, and so eat while doubting the propriety of his act, he is condemned, not so much for his act, as for eating before feeling sure that he is right. We must not do a thing till we know it is right. In this case, it is the doer that is condemned, not the deed.

because [his act] is not from belief, It does not spring out of belief as moving it, but is a weak following of another in a case, the rightness of which we question. The danger of such a principle of action lies here, that if we allow ourselves to act till convinced that we are right, we shall be found wrong about as often as right. No such precarious principle of conduct is admissible.

and every act which is not from belief is a sin, That is, every act of eating, or act in a case similar to that of eating (for I presume we must limit to the subject-matter in hand), which is unaccompanied by belief that it is right, is a sin. But how is it

that such an act can be a sin? It is a sin because it is reckless and presumptuous—reckless, in being rash and careless—presumptuous, in being performed as to God without conviction that it is right. Admit that we may do things as to God in this manner, and what may we not do? The principle is clearly vicious.

CHAPTER XV

SECTION I.

Now we, the strong, ought to bear with the weaknesses of the weak, and not to please ourselves, ²Let each of us please his neighbor in what is good, for the purpose of building up. ³For even Christ pleased not himself, but as it is written: The reproaches of those reproaching you, fell on me. ⁴For whatever was formerly written, was written for our instruction, that through patience and through comfort from the scriptures, we might retain hope, ⁵Now may the God of patience and comfort grant to you to be of this same mind in regard to one another, according to Christ Jesus, ⁶that with one soul, you may, with one mouth, glorify God, even the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ. ⁷Therefore accept one another, even as Christ accepted you to the glory of God. ⁸For I say that Christ became a minister of the circumcision, for the sake of God's truthfulness, in order to make good the promises to the fathers, ⁹and that the Gentiles might glorify God for his mercy. As it is written: for this reason I will confess to you among the Gentiles, and will sing to your name. ¹⁰And again he says, Be glad you Gentiles with his people. ¹¹And once more, All you Gentiles praise the Lord, yes, all you peoples praise him. ¹²And farther, Isaiah says, There shall be a root of Jesse; and he shall rise up to rule the Gentiles, yes, in him the Gentiles shall trust.

Ὁφείλομεν δὲ ἡμεῖς οἱ δυνατοὶ τὰ ἀσθενήματα τῶν ἀδυνάτων βαστάζειν, καὶ μὴ ἑαυτοῖς ἀρέσκειν. ²Ἐκαστος ἡμῶν τῷ πλησίον ἀρεσκέτω εἰς τὸ ἀγαθὸν πρὸς οἰκοδομήν. ³Καὶ γὰρ ὁ Χριστὸς οὐχ ἑαυτῷ ἤρεσεν, ἀλλὰ, καθὼς γέγραπται, Οἱ ὀνειδισμοὶ τῶν ὀνειδίζόντων σὲ ἐπέπεσαν ἐπ' ἐμέ. ⁴Ὅσα γὰρ προεγράφη, εἰς τὴν ἡμετέραν διδασκαλίαν ἐγράφη, ἵνα διὰ τῆς ὑπομονῆς καὶ διὰ τῆς παρακλήσεως τῶν γραφῶν τὴν ἐλπίδα ἔχωμε. ⁵Ὁ δὲ Θεὸς τῆς ὑπομονῆς καὶ τῆς παρακλήσεως δῆψ ὑμῖν τὸ αὐτὸ φρονεῖν ἐν ἀλλήλοις κατὰ Χριστὸν Ἰησοῦν, ⁶ἵνα ὁμοθυμαδὸν ἐν ἑνὶ στόματι δοξάζητε τὸν Θεὸν καὶ πατέρα τοῦ Κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ. ⁷Διὸ προσλαμβάνεσθε ἀλλήλους, καθὼς καὶ ὁ Χριστὸς προσελάβετο ἡμᾶς εἰς δόξαν τοῦ Θεοῦ. ⁸Λέγω γὰρ Χριστὸν διακονοῦν γενέσθαι περιτομῆς ὑπὲρ ἀληθείας Θεοῦ, εἰς τὸ βεβαιῶσαι τὰς ἐπαγγελίας τῶν πατέρων, ⁹τὰ δὲ ἔθνη ὑπὲρ ἐλπίου δοξάσαι τὸν Θεόν. Καθὼς γέγραπται διὰ τοῦτο ἐξομολογήσομαι σοὶ ἐν ἔθνεσι καὶ τῷ ὀνόματί σου ψαλῶ. ¹⁰Καὶ πάλιν λέγει, Εὐφράνθητε ἔθνη, μετὰ τοῦ λαοῦ αὐτοῦ. ¹¹Καὶ πάλιν, Αἰνεῖτε πάντα τὰ ἔθνη τὸν Κύριον, καὶ ἐπαινεσάτωσαν αὐτὸν, πάντες οἱ λαοί. ¹²Καὶ πάλιν Ἰσαΐας λέγει, Ἔσται ἡ ῥίζα τοῦ Ἰεσσαὶ καὶ ὁ ἀνιστάμενος ἄρχειν ἐθνῶν, ἐπ' αὐτῷ ἔθνη ἐλπιοῦσιν.

SUMMARY.

The strong are under obligation to bear with the weak even although it subjects them to inconvenience. This was the course pursued by Christ, and he is our example. As the Savior has accepted us, notwithstanding our imperfections, so must we accept one another regardless of differences on mat-

material questions, such as eating meat and the like. The whole section is devoted to unity of feeling, forbearance, and harmony in action. Every form of alienation among the children of God is wrong, and therefore to be studiously guarded against.

The subject of the preceding chapter is still continued in this. Accordingly, we are farther told how the strong are to conduct themselves towards the weak. This being done, the example of Christ is adduced as showing the conduct to be right. How we are to receive one another, whether Jews or Gentiles, strong or weak, is reiterated, and the reason for it assigned. Without regard to national distinctions or educational weaknesses, Christ has received all who have obeyed him; and as he has done, so must we. The chapter indicates still farther the deep interest the Apostle felt in the welfare of the Roman disciples, and closes with some intimations of his future purposes. Upon the whole, the chapter, as compared with some others, is a light one, having much more of the easy air of a friendly letter than any thing we have yet met with.

Now we, the strong, ought to bear with the weaknesses of the weak, The connection between this verse and the conclusion of the last chapter is so close as to render their separation violent and improper. They should clearly stand together in the same section. "We, the strong," are we who are strong in belief, and who consequently recognize no distinctions of clean and unclean in meats. We are therefore hampered by no scruples in indifferent matters. "Ought to bear with the weaknesses of those not strong." This is simply asserted, no reason for it being assigned. But is there really no reason, or must we bear without one? I presume the reason to be this: One or other of the parties must yield, the strong to the weak or the weak to the strong. The weak can not yield without a violation of conscience; the strong can; and God has ordained that in an indifferent case, conscientious scruples shall prevail over the want of them. If a reason be sought still back of this, none can be given; for the will of God is ultimate. The "weak" are those who esteem one day above another, and regard some meats as clean, others as not. They are the immature or unschooled of the church.

and not to please ourselves. The christian man lives not for himself alone, but also for others. His brother's good therefore should lie near his heart as well as his own. Accordingly he is not at liberty to wound his brother's feelings in a case where

nothing is at stake but mere self-indulgence. As God is tenderly considerate of his infirmities, so must he be of those of others. Besides, the pleasure which comes from pleasing others is often greater than that which comes from pleasing self. Magnanimity marks the one, often only a questionable selfishness the other.

2. Let each of us please his neighbor in what is good, *Eis* here signifies *in regard to, respecting*, but it is curtly and neatly rendered simply by *in*. Each of us is to seek to please his neighbor in that only which is right. In what is wrong we have no discretion. Here we must stand against him, and even wound him rather than yield. I am to be without countenance for the weakness that demands of me to do wrong.

for the purpose of building up. *Pros* here means *with a view to, for the purpose of*. That is, it denotes the end for which we are to please our neighbor. We are to please him with a view to building up. But building up what—our neighbor, or the church considered as a house? In v. 20, last ch., the Apostle says, "For the sake of food pull not down the work of God;" and by the work of God, I understand the church. Now I think it most likely that "building up" here has reference to the same subject. Let each of us please his neighbor in what is good, for the purpose of building up, not pulling down, the work of God. If we wound or displease our neighbor, we drive him off, and so pull down the work of God. But if, on the other hand, we please him by showing proper respect for his feelings, he remains in the church. Ultimately he grows strong, and so the work of God is built up. This view I regard as the more probable one; although to make "build up" refer to "neighbor" gives a good and strictly appropriate sense. Indeed, the difference between the two views is not wide, since to build up our christian neighbor is clearly much the same as to build up the church.

3. For even Christ pleased not himself, *Gar* here introduces a reason for pleasing our neighbor. Even Christ, while in the flesh, pleased not himself alone. The good of others was the great characteristic of his life. It should, whenever necessary, be so with us. What Christ did is our law.

but as it is written: *Alla* here, as often, implies an omitted clause. The following is the course of thought fully expressed: For even Christ pleased not himself, but *he pleased others*, as it is written.

the reproaches of those reproaching you, fell on me.

The word "you" refers to God. The proof that Christ did not always please himself is found in the fact of his receiving and enduring the reproaches aimed at his Father. The citation is from the 69th Ps.; and it strikingly illustrates that constantly recurring peculiarity of prophecy, which renders its interpretation so difficult—a double or even a three-fold meaning. In the expression "fell on me," "me" primarily denoted David; here it denotes Christ.

4. For whatever was formerly written, was written for our instruction, The connection between this verse and the preceding one is obscure. I can make it out only by conceding an ellipsis, thus: The reproaches of those reproaching you, fell on me;" and this scripture is applicable also to us, in our relations to the weak; "For whatever was formerly written," &c. This is also Stuart's view, who is ordinarily accurate in the matter of connections.

that through patience and through comfort from the scriptures, we might retain hope. The word "scriptures" in the original is Genitive of source. Hence the patience and comfort are produced by the scriptures, or they result from reading and studying them. This I indicate by the use of *from*, instead of *of*. The patience consists in bearing kindly the "weaknesses of the weak;" the comfort, in the consolation arising from a sense of doing right. *That we might retain hope*—not merely have it, that is, possess it, but having it already, retain it, or hold it fast.

5. Now may the God of patience and comfort grant to you to be of this same mind in regard to one another, *De* here is not adversative, but simply continuative. It is well rendered by *now*. *To be of this same mind*—to be of the mind of Christ just spoken of, or the mind which is ready to please others for their good.

according to Christ Jesus, *Kata Christon Iesoun* may mean either *after the example of Christ*, or *according to his will*; or it may include both meanings, as it most likely does. The example of Christ has just been adduced; and it is certainly his will that we should be "of this same mind." It would, therefore seem safer to include both meanings than to reject either, especially since no satisfactory reason could be given for the rejection. Hodge explains the clause to mean "agreeably to the example and command of Christ." This I regard as the import of the clause, and therefore accept it.

6. that with one soul you may, with one mouth, glorify God even the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ. The phrase "one soul" signifies unanimity of sentiment and feeling; that of "one mouth," unanimity in praise or public worship. The two together, therefore, denote perfect union; and this was the union which Paul prayed might characterize the disciples in Rome. How profound the regret that such union is purely ideal with us, having no counterpart in the present day! Instead of God *and* Father, I prefer to think *kai* epexegetic, and, therefore, to render God *even* the Father. The difference is not material; but in regard to the latter rendering, Riddle in Lange says: "Those exegetes who are most delicate in their perceptions of grammatical questions adopt it."

7. Therefore accept one another, even as Christ accepted you to the glory of God. "You" comprehends both Jews and Gentiles. "Therefore," or in consideration of the fact that the glory of God will be promoted thereby, *accept one another*. As much as to say, Be not divided among yourselves in sentiment and feeling, but be one. Your union augments the glory of God; your alienations can only detract from it. The full import of the clause, I doubt not, is this: Therefore accept one another *to the glory of God*, even as Christ accepted you to that glory. In both instances the glory of God is the end looked to in the acceptance.

8. For I say that Christ became a minister of the circumcision, *Gar* here introduces the explanation of how Christ came to accept both Jews and Gentiles. "Circumcision" stands for the Jews. Christ became a minister of the Jews or belonged to them, in order to save them.

for the sake of God's truthfulness, Or that his truthfulness might be absolutely maintained. The truthfulness referred to is that of the promises mentioned in the next clause. Two considerations demanded its maintenance: 1. The character of God; 2. The salvation of the human family. These were the high ends that induced Christ to become a minister under circumcision.

in order to make good the promises to the fathers. This clause depends on both the preceding ones, and on neither exclusively. Christ became a minister of the circumcision for the sake of God's truthfulness—all this he did in order to make good the promises, not merely to confirm them, but to place their realization beyond even a contingency. Now these promises to the

fathers being thus made good, secured salvation to so many of the Jews as obeyed Christ. Thus Christ accepted them; and he did it from the heart, or without reservation. So must we Gentiles accept the Jews.

9. and that the Gentiles might glorify God for his mercy: That is, Christ became a minister of the circumcision for the sake of God's truthfulness, not that the Jews alone might be saved, but also that the Gentiles might; for the promises respect both; in other words, that the Gentiles, being saved, might have reason to glorify God for his mercy. Thus Christ accepted the Gentiles also; and he did it as cordially as he accepted the Jews. In like manner, consequently, must the Jews accept the Gentiles; for the injunction is, "accept one another, even as Christ accepted you." The expression "his mercy," denotes the mercy of God, not of Christ; and "minister" comprehends Christ in the fulness of his official character.

as it is written: for this reason For what reason? Because both Jews and Gentiles were to be accepted by Christ, and to compose one united and happy people. David looks forward to that time, and represents himself as among the Gentiles and rejoicing with them.

I will confess to you among the Gentiles, and will sing to your name. Ps. xviii: 49. When David represents himself as among the Gentiles, as confessing to God, and singing with them, he foreshows that the time was coming when Jews and Gentiles would mutually accept each other; nay more, that they would be so completely one as to recognize the same God and sing the same songs; and mutual cordial acceptance is the point before the Apostle's mind. His admonition is, "accept one another, even as Christ accepted you."

10. And again he says, Be glad you Gentiles with his people. The words of Moses taken from his great song, Deut. xxxii: 43. In the former citation, David represents himself as singing to God among the Gentiles; here the Gentiles are represented as being glad among the Jews. The design of both passages is the same, to establish mutual acceptance.

11. And once more: All you Gentiles praise the Lord, yes, all you peoples praise him. Ps. cxvii: 1. The intervening *kai* here is better rendered *yes*, as I have done, making it simply intensive. All you Gentiles praise the Lord because he has accepted you, and filled you with the spirit of joy. The

passage is conclusive proof that not the Jews alone, but also all nations were to share in the redemption of the Messiah. The application is obvious: Christ has accepted all; do you then accept one another.

12. And farther, Isaiah says: There shall be a root of Jesse; and he shall rise up to rule the Gentiles, yes, in him the Gentiles shall trust. Proof still to the same effect, but this time from Isaiah. "There shall be a root of Jesse"—of course this is Christ. This root was to rise up, or be exalted to the throne of God, and invested with dominion over all nations, Gentiles as well as Jews. "*In him the Gentiles shall trust*"—trust for salvation equally with the Jews, and as successfully. Christ was to be Lord over and Savior to the one people as fully as to the other. The passage is from Is. xi: 10, and corresponds *verbatim* with the Septuagint, except that it omits the clause "in that day," because not material to Paul's purpose.

Thus, five verses have now been devoted to the confirmation of v. 7. Here however the Apostle drops the subject, and returns to his supplications in behalf of the disciples in Rome. From his amplification of proof we must conclude that he regards the point before him as of great importance. That point is, that we must accept one another. Judging and despising on account of meats are to be at an end. The more lovely course of accepting and holding one another in fraternal affection must take their place.

CHAPTER XV. SECTION 2.

¹³ Ὁ δὲ Θεὸς τῆς ἐλπίδος πληρώσαι ὑμᾶς πάσης χαρᾶς καὶ εἰρήνης ἐν τῷ πιστεῦναι, εἰς τὸ περισσεύειν ὑμᾶς ἐν τῇ ἐλπίδι ἐν δυνάμει πνεύματος ἁγίου.

¹⁴ Πέπεισμαι δέ, ἀδελφοί μου, καὶ αὐτοὶ ἐγὼ περὶ ὑμῶν, ὅτι καὶ αὐτοὶ μεστοὶ ἐστε ἀγαθωσύνης, πεπληρωμένοι πάσης γνώσεως, δυνάμενοι καὶ ἀλλήλους νοουθετεῖν. ¹⁵ Τολμηρότερον δὲ ἔγραψα ὑμῖν ἀπὸ μέρους, ὡς ἐπαναμνήσκων ὑμᾶς, διὰ τὴν χάριν τὴν δοθείσάν μοι ὑπὸ τοῦ Θεοῦ, ¹⁶ εἰς τὸ εἶναί με λειτουργὸν Χριστοῦ Ἰησοῦ εἰς τὰ ἔθνη, ἱεροουργοῦντα τὸ εὐαγγέλιον τοῦ Θεοῦ, ἵνα γένηται ἡ προσφορὰ τῶν ἐθνῶν εἰπρόσδεκτος, ἡγιασμένη ἐν πνεύματι ἁγίῳ. ¹⁷ Ἐχω οὖν τὴν καύχησιν ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ τὰ πρὸς τὸν Θεόν. ¹⁸ Οὐ γὰρ τολμήσω τι λαλεῖν ὧν οὐ κατεργάσατο Χριστὸς δι' ἐμοῦ εἰς ὑπακοὴν ἐθνῶν, λόγῳ καὶ ἔργῳ, ¹⁹ ἐν δυνάμει σημείων καὶ τεράτων, ἐν δυνάμει πνεύματος. ²⁰ Ὅστε με ἀπὸ Ἱερουσαλὴμ καὶ κύκλῳ μέχρι τοῦ Ἰλλυρικοῦ πεπληρωκέναι τὸ εὐαγγέλιον τοῦ Χριστοῦ, ²¹ οὕτως δὲ φιλοτιμούμενον εὐαγγελίζεσθαι, οὐχ ὅπου ὠνομάσθη Χριστός, ἵνα μὴ ἐπ' ἀλλότριον θεμέλιον οἰκοδομῶ. ²² Ἀλλὰ, καθὼς γέγραπται, Οἷς οὐκ ἀνηγγέλη περὶ αὐτοῦ, ὄψονται, καὶ οἱ οὐκ ἀκηκόασιν συνήσουσι.

¹³ Now may the God of hope fill you with all joy and peace in believing, that you may abound in hope by power of the Holy Spirit. ¹⁴ But I am persuaded, my brethren, even I myself, respecting you, that you also yourselves are full of goodness, being filled with all knowledge, able even to admonish one another. ¹⁵ Yet I have written to you the more boldly in places, as one recalling things to your memory, because of the favor bestowed upon me by God, ¹⁶ in order to my being a minister of Christ Jesus for the Gentiles, administering the gospel of God, that the offering up of the Gentiles might be acceptable, being purified by the Holy Spirit. ¹⁷ I am therefore enabled to boast in Christ in matters relating to God. ¹⁸ Yet I shall not venture to speak of any thing which Christ has not effected through me, by power of the Spirit, ¹⁹ by word and deed, by the power of signs and wonders, in order to the obedience of the Gentiles. So that from Jerusalem, and around, as far as Illyricum, I have fully preached the gospel of Christ; ²⁰ thus being moved by love of honor to preach the gospel where Christ had not been named, that I might not build upon another's foundation. ²¹ But as it is written: They to whom nothing was told respecting me, shall see; and they who have not heard, shall understand.

SUMMARY.

The Apostle prays that the God of hope may fill the disciples in Rome with all peace and joy in believing what he has written; and although he has spoken plainly to them, and signified his disapprobation of certain things among them, still he is far from thinking meanly of them. On the contrary, he is persuaded that they are full of knowledge, and altogether able to teach and admonish one another. His bold manner in places is assumed in virtue of his apostolic office. The great object of his labors is that he may be enabled at last to present the Gentiles as a glorious and acceptable offering to God. He mentions the vast extent of his labors, and assigns the reason for wishing to preach where Christ had never been named.

13. **Now may the God of hope fill you with all joy and peace in believing,** God is here called the God of hope, because he is author to it, somewhat remotely, it is true, but still author. Hope has exclusive reference to the future. This conceded, and the intermediate links between hope and its author may be thus arranged: God makes a promise; this promise is believed; and on this belief rests hope, it being necessary, at the same time, to keep in mind that belief has strict reference to the promise, hope, to the thing promised. "Fill you with all joy and peace in believing"—not in believing on Christ, but in believing what the Apostle had just been saying. By believing that, the disciples would be brought to desist from judging and despising one another, and instead, would be led to accept and love one another in Christ. It was by their acting thus that the Apostle expected them to realize the "joy and peace" of which he speaks.

in order that you may abound in hope by power of the Holy Spirit. By believing what the Apostle had said, the disciples were to be filled with all joy and peace; while on both believing and being filled, depended their abounding in hope by power of the Holy Spirit. These disciples, be it recollected, were christians, and consequently the Spirit dwelt in them. By power of this Spirit they were to abound in hope. How was this? On condition of believing and being filled, the Spirit, which was in them, so energized their spirits as to augment their hope, or cause it to abound. This I presume to be the answer to the question. What the object of their hope was, we are not told, but doubtless it was the same as with us, namely, the resurrection from the dead, and eternal life. In all time since Christ, and under all circumstances, these have been the absorbing objects of christian hope.

14. **But I am persuaded, my brethren, even I myself, respecting you, that you also yourselves are full of goodness,** The *de* at the commencement of this verse has its strictly adversative meaning, and must, therefore, be rendered *but*, not *and*. The course of thought I take to be this: But although I have written to you, brethren, as I have, pointing out to you your whole duty, yet I, even I the very person thus writing, have no mean opinion of you. On the contrary, I am persuaded respecting you, that you also yourselves, equally with myself, are full of goodness; and that you are consequently ready, of your own

accord, to accept one another, as I have exhorted you, and to do every thing else that is right. The whole passage was, I presume, intended as a compliment, designed to conciliate the feelings of the disciples in the proud metropolis. It has much the air of a delicate piece of diplomacy.

being filled with all knowledge, able even to admonish one another. It must not be supposed that this language was applicable to every individual in the church in Rome; but only that it was true of them as a whole. Their knowledge is conceived of as aggregated, not as distributed. Nor again, is the phrase "all knowledge" to be construed absolutely, but as limited by the subject in hand. It means all knowledge essential to the highest form of christian life and to salvation. As if to say, I have not written to you as I have, because of your ignorance; for, on the contrary, I know the state of your knowledge, and it is high. *Neither have I admonished you because I supposed you incapable of admonishing one another.* But in what I have said, I have been influenced by other reasons, as you will immediately see.

15. Yet I have written to you the more boldly in places, *Apo meros*, when denoting manner, as here, signifies *in part, partly*. The sense is, I have written to you the more boldly, not everywhere in my Letter, but only in part, that is, here and there, or in certain places. Assuming this to be the meaning of the phrase, it is best to render it as I have. Thereby we obtain a clear definite sense.

as one recalling things to your memory, This, though full and free, is correct, and demanded by perspicuity. The meaning is not, I have written to you the more boldly *as one recalling, &c.* The clause "as one recalling" does not contain the reason for using "more boldly," as we shall presently see. But the meaning is, I have written to you *simply and without qualification*, as one recalling, &c. You are "filled with all knowledge." It is not, therefore, necessary that I should write to you as one instructing you at first hand. It is only necessary that I should write to you as one recalling to your memory those things which you have already learned; and this is what I have done.

because of the favor bestowed upon me by God, This is the clause which contains the reason for "more boldly." I have written to you the more boldly *because of* the favor bestowed upon me. This "favor" was unquestionably his apostolic

office. Hence the full import is: I have written to you the more boldly because of my apostleship, as I had the right to do.

16. in order to my being a minister of Christ Jesus for the Gentiles, "Minister" here is exactly equivalent to apostle. The sense is: The "favor" was bestowed upon me in order to my being an Apostle of Christ Jesus. A minister *for* the Gentiles is a minister appointed for their benefit, or devoted to their service. The distinguishing difference between Paul and the rest of the apostles was, that he was the Apostle "for the Gentiles." To convert them was his vast peculiar work. No wonder, then, that he labored "more abundantly" than all the other apostles.

administering the gospel of God, That is, the "favor" was bestowed upon me in order to my being a minister, *administering the gospel of God*, which is the same as to say, in order to my being an apostle, executing the duties of my office. *Hierourgeo*, I minister, is a sacerdotal term, borrowed from the Temple service, and denoting to officiate as priest, or perform priestly duties. But that it is here used in any peculiar sense growing out of that circumstance is not apparent. It means simply to minister, or execute the functions of an apostle.

that the offering up of the Gentiles might be acceptable, The "offering up" of the Gentiles does not signify their offering up any thing, but their being offered up. They themselves constitute the offering to be made.

being purified by the Holy Spirit. The Gentiles here spoken of, who are to be offered up, are of course christians. In them, therefore, the Holy Spirit dwells; and by it, while in them, they are purified in mind and thought, and so rendered an acceptable offering to God. In what way, or by what means, the Spirit effects this purification, we are not informed. The fact is asserted, but without being explained. The Spirit may effect it by so strengthening those in whom it dwells as to enable them to live obedient lives to the divine will. So living, God will, through favor and the blood of Christ, forgive them, and when they die, accept them. But it must be acknowledged dangerous to speculate on these abstruse spiritual facts. It is no doubt wisest to rest contented with them as asserted, without attempting their solution. In the latter work, we shall satisfy neither ourselves nor others. Indeed, we shall simply fail.

17. I am therefore enabled to boast in Christ in matters

relating to God. To translate *echo kauchesin* here simply *I have boasting* is tame, and in my opinion inadequate. Nor will it do to render it *I have ground of boasting*. *Echo kauchema* might be thus rendered, but not the present clause. *Echo*, among many other things, signifies *to have power* or *to be able*. See Liddell & Scott. Still more frequently its meaning is merged wholly in that of the word it stands connected with. Thus, *thauma echo* is not to be rendered *I have wonder*, but *I wonder at*. Also *echo dromon* does not mean *I have running*, but *I run* or *can run*. Farther, *echei ten diken* hardly signifies *he has punishment*, but *he is punished*. Accordingly, *echo kauchesin* should not be rendered *I have boasting* or *ground of boasting*, as is usually done, but *I can boast* or *I am enabled to boast*. This rendering is both elegant and, as I believe, true to the sense, which is more than can be said for the usual one. To "boast in Christ" means to to boast, both as being under him, and in virtue of what he had enabled the Apostle to accomplish.

But what, more fully, were the things which enabled Paul to boast in Christ. The reply doubtless is, both what he was as an apostle, and what he had done. A special "favor" had been bestowed upon him by God; he was a minister of Christ Jesus; the Gentiles were to become an acceptable offering through his instrumentality; and then he had labored as no other apostle had labored, and effected what no other apostle had effected. All these things taken together formed no mean ground of boasting. That this is correct, in part, at least, is evident from what follows.

18. **Yet I shall not venture to speak of any thing which Christ has not effected through me,** The connection seems to be this: I am therefore, or in consequence of what I am and have done, enabled to boast in Christ in matters relating to God; but in doing so, I shall not mention one thing which Christ has not actually effected through me, and me alone. I shall confine myself strictly to my own work. For giving to *gar*, in the present clause, an adversative sense, I have the authority of both Pickering and MacKnight, the latter of whom has studied the particles with unusual care. In the following passage it is clearly thus used: The chief priests and scribes sought how they might kill him, *gar*, but they feared the people. Luke xxii: 2.

19. **by power of the Spirit, by word and deed, by the power of signs and wonders,** I arrange these clauses thus for no purpose except to exhibit them in the order of their de-

pendence on one another. What Christ effected through Paul was effected first by power, not *the* power, of or from the Spirit as the immediate agent; next by word and deed; and finally by *the* power, *the whole power*, of signs and wonders, authenticating both him and his teaching. The three clauses, therefore, cover the whole of Paul's ability and work as an apostle.

in order to the obedience of the Gentiles. This was the proximate earthly end for which the Apostle toiled, the end for which the Spirit exerted its power, the end of word and deed, of sign and wonder—the ultimate end, of course, being the salvation of those obeying, and the glory of God.

So that from Jerusalem, and around, as far as Illyricum, I have fully preached the gospel of Christ; The Apostle does not mean that he preached around Jerusalem in Judea, but in the other countries lying around that city. In Judea, his labors seem never to have resulted in any thing but tumult. But from Jerusalem, not as centre of labor, but as a centre of reckoning, he preached in all the circumjacent countries, chiefly however in those north of Jerusalem, in Asia Minor, and to the west of it. The expression "fully preached the gospel," justifies the conclusion that the Apostle did his work very thoroughly as he went. When he left a country, there remained in it but little primary work for others to do; nor has time since, ever suggested an improvement on the plan.

20. thus being moved by love of honor, to preach the gospel where Christ had not been named, The love of honor, then, for such is the meaning of *philotimoumenon*, is seen to be a legitimate motive of christian action, when, at the same time, the glory of God and the good of humanity are kept in view. When I am working primarily for the fair name of my Maker and the good of my neighbor, I may be moved to action, up to the height of my capacity, by love of personal honor; and it is right. Nor is any christian preacher fit to act the part of an evangelist who is unactuated by it. Ambition of honor and love of a spotless name should never be absent from the breast of the public servant of Christ.

But why should Paul have been thus moved to preach the gospel *where Christ had not been named?* Several considerations may have influenced him. 1. Ability to accomplish more good than where Christ had already been preached; 2. The conviction that he could do better work than was usually done; 3. That the

influence he acquired over his own converts enabled him to control them more successfully than he could the converts of others. That these were the considerations which influenced the Apostle can not be confidently said, but certainly they are plausible.

that I might not build upon another's foundation. This was the main point to which the Apostle's love of honor moved him. He wanted his work to be an original work, and not a mere gleanings after other men. The sentiment I should not think a suggestion from the Spirit, but merely the Apostle's own feelings as a man. "To build upon another's foundation" is metaphorical, signifying to preach and found churches where others have been doing that work.

21. But as it is written: They to whom nothing was told respecting me, shall see; and they who have not heard, shall understand. The connection seems to be as follows: "That I might not build upon another's foundation," *still in all this I have been doing right, for I have been working both in accordance with prophecy and so as to fulfill it*, "as it is written," &c. The quotation is from Isa. lii: 15, and has reference to the conversion of the heathen, the very work to which the Apostle himself is referring.

CHAPTER XV. SECTION 3.

²² For this reason also, I have often been hindered from coming to you; ²³ but now having no longer a place [to preach] in these regions, and having had a desire for many years to come to you [I purpose doing so], ²⁴ whenever I go into Spain. For I hope while passing through to see you, and to be by you helped forward thither, provided I am first partly filled with you. ²⁵ But now I am going to Jerusalem, ministering to the holy. ²⁶ For Macedonia and Achaia thought good to make a contribution for the poor of the holy who are in Jerusalem, ²⁷ yes, thought good, and they are debtors to them. For if the Gentiles shared in their spiritual things, they ought to minister to them in fleshly things. ²⁸ When now I have finished this service, and secured to them this fruit, I shall depart by you into Spain. ²⁹ And I know that in coming to you, I shall come with the fullness of Christ's blessing. ³⁰ But I beseech you, brethren, by our Lord Jesus Christ, and by the love of the Spirit, to strive with me in prayers to God for me, ³¹ that I may be delivered from the unbelievers in Judea, and that my service, which is for Jerusalem, may be acceptable to the holy, ³² that with joy I may come to you by God's will, and be refreshed among you. ³³ The God of peace be with you all—amen.

²² Διὸ καὶ ἐνεκοπήμην τὰ πολλὰ τοῦ εἰσελθεῖν πρὸς ὑμᾶς, ²³ νυνὶ δὲ μηκέτι τόπον ἔχων ἐν τοῖς κλίμασι τούτοις, ἐπιποθίαν δὲ ἔχων τοῦ εἰσελθεῖν πρὸς ὑμᾶς ἀπὸ ἰκανῶν ἐτῶν, ²⁴ ὡς ἂν πορεύωμαι εἰς τὴν Σπανίαν. Ἐλπίζω γὰρ διαπορευόμενος θεάσασθαι ὑμᾶς καὶ ὑφ' ὑμῶν προπεμφθῆναι ἐκεῖ, εἰάν ὑμῶν πρῶτον ἀπὸ μέρους ἐμπλησθῶ. ²⁵ Νυνὶ δὲ πορεύομαι εἰς Ἱερουσαλὴμ διακονῶν τοῖς ἁγίοις. ²⁶ Εὐδόκησαν γὰρ Μακεδονία καὶ Ἀχαΐα κοινωνίαν τινὰ ποιήσασθαι εἰς τοὺς πτωχοὺς τῶν ἁγίων τῶν ἐν Ἱερουσαλὴμ, ²⁷ εὐδόκησαν γάρ, καὶ ὀφειλέται εἰσὶν αὐτῶν. Εἰ γὰρ τοῖς πνευματικοῖς αὐτῶν ἐκοινώησαν τὰ ἔθνη, ὀφείλουσι καὶ ἐν τοῖς σαρκικοῖς λειτουργῆσαι αὐτοῖς. ²⁸ Τοῦτο οὖν ἐπιτελέσας καὶ σφραγισάμενος αὐτοῖς τὸν καρπὸν τούτου, ἀπελεύσομαι δι' ὑμῶν εἰς Σπανίαν. ²⁹ Οἶδα δὲ ὅτι ἐρχόμενος πρὸς ὑμᾶς ἐν πληρώματι ἐύλογίας Χριστοῦ ἐλεύσομαι. ³⁰ Παρακαλῶ δὲ ὑμᾶς, ἀδελφοί, διὰ τοῦ Κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ καὶ διὰ τῆς ἀγάπης τοῦ πνεύματος, συναγωνίσασθαι μοι ἐν ταῖς προσευχαῖς ὑπὲρ ἐμοῦ πρὸς τὸν Θεόν, ³¹ ἵνα ῥυθθῶ ἀπὸ τῶν ἀπειθούντων ἐν τῇ Ἰουδαίᾳ, καὶ ἡ διακονία μου ἢ εἰς Ἱερουσαλὴμ εὐπρόσδεκτος γένηται τοῖς ἁγίοις, ³² ἵνα ἐν χαρᾷ ἔλθω πρὸς ὑμᾶς διὰ θελήματος Θεοῦ, καὶ συναπαύσωμαι ὑμῖν. ³³ Ὁ δὲ Θεὸς τῆς εἰρήνης μετὰ πάντων ὑμῶν—ἀμήν.

SUMMARY.

The Apostle's multiplied labors in different countries had often hindered him from executing a purpose long since formed of one day visiting Rome. But now being without a place in those regions, to preach the gospel where it had not before been preached, he decides to make the visit soon. But first, he must go into Judea to carry a contribution from Greece and Macedonia to the poor brethren in Jerusalem. This service performed however, he proposes next a journey to Spain, and decides to see Rome on his way. He very ardently desires to be delivered, while in Judea, from the unbelieving Jews there, and that his alms may be acceptable to the poor disciples for whom they were intended.

22. For this reason also, I have often been hindered from coming to you; "For this reason," namely, because I have found so many places to preach the gospel where Christ had not been named. And so long as he could find such a place he preached in it. It was the number of these places that hindered him *ta polla* much, or often.

23. but now having no longer a place [to preach] in these regions, For the reason that he had so thoroughly preached the gospel over them as to render a longer stay in them comparatively unprofitable. As Paul is now writing from Corinth, he must allude chiefly to those countries lying north, north-east, and east of Greece; for they formed the scene of much the greater part of his labors; and how wisely that scene was chosen is apparent at a glance. For east of the Adriatic and along the northern shore of the "great sea," lay, at the time, one of the most densely populated, as well as one of the most highly cultivated countries in the world. All over these, the Apostle traveled "fully preaching the gospel."

and having had a strong desire for many years to come to you, [I purpose doing so], 24. whenever I go into Spain. Alford thinks that the participles here used "stand as direct verbs." But for this assumption there is no authority. Neither perspicuity nor elegance is promoted by abandoning the participial form. To complete the sense, it is necessary to bracket a short clause, as I have done. But this is the only departure from literalism, necessary.

As to a visit to Rome, Paul obtained his wish, but under circumstances very different, no doubt, from what he anticipated when penning the sentence in hand. But that he ever visited Spain, there is no satisfactory evidence. That he proposed such a visit, we know; but he was most likely defeated in regard to it, as he often was. At least, if the visit was made, the evidence of it has perished.

For I hope while passing through to see you, and to be by you helped forward thither, provided I am first partly filled with you. I think it probable that Paul's intention was, after visiting Jerusalem, to return immediately by way of Rome on his way into Spain. Hence the phrase, "while passing through." To be "helped forward" means to be fitted out for going forward, in whatever way he might need their aid, especially to be supplied with money and other neces-

saries for a journey. "Partly filled with you"—by this, Paul means to see you, talk with you, preach to you, and enjoy your society generally, till he is satisfied. Not that he expected to remain with them till he was fully satisfied; for he uses the word "partly." I will stay with you only till I am partly filled: I can not stay longer. Perhaps even in regard to Rome, he was also ambitious not to build upon another's foundation, and, therefore, may have determined not to remain long. This would account for his use of "partly."

25. But now I am going to Jerusalem, ministering to the holy. To contend, as some writers do, that the going itself was part of the ministering, is puerile. The meaning clearly is: I am now going to Jerusalem *to minister* to the holy. The ministering consisted, in no part, in the going, but in supplying the poor brethren with food and clothing, or the means to buy them

26. For Macedonia and Achaia thought good to make a contribution for the poor of the holy who are in Jerusalem. That is, the churches in those countries have thought good. This contribution was taken up at the instance of Paul himself. See 1 Cor. xvi: 1-3; and it was intended to have the double effect of relieving the wants of the poor among the disciples in Jerusalem, and of causing the Jewish brethren, generally, to think more kindly of the Gentile christians than they were accustomed to think; and we know that it had this effect. 2 Cor. ix: 12-15. But Greece and Macedonia were not the only countries that took part in this contribution. On the contrary, it seems to have been gathered from the whole region stretching from Corinth around through Macedonia, and along the northern shore of the Mediterranean as far as into Galatia, and probably even beyond. The fact that it was collected from so extensive a tract of country, and that it was more than a year in being taken up, would justify the conclusion that, in the aggregate, it must have been very great; indeed, of this there can hardly be a doubt. Besides, the character of the preparations made for carrying it up to Jerusalem greatly strengthens this conclusion.

27. Yes, thought good, and they are debtors to them. The meaning is, that those christians, who were mostly Gentiles, living in the regions from which the contribution was taken, were debtors to the Jewish christians in Jerusalem. The reason why they were debtors, and the particulars in which, are stated in the next clause.

For if the Gentiles shared in their spiritual things, By the "spiritual things" of the Jewish christians is meant the gospel, together with its attendant blessings. This gospel derived its redeeming efficacy from Christ, a Jew; and it had, at first, been preached to the Gentiles by Jewish christians. In a word, it had its origin among the Jews; it was in the beginning wholly in their hands; and from them, and by them, it had been sent abroad into the world. With much propriety, therefore, it and its blessings are called "their spiritual things."

they ought to minister to them in fleshly things. By fleshly things are meant things pertaining to the flesh, or beneficial to it, as food and clothing. If the Gentiles had received the gospel from the Jews, it was a small matter for the Jews in return to receive from the Gentiles something to eat and wear.

28. When now I have finished this service, and secured to them this fruit, I shall depart by you into Spain. The two expressions "finished this service," and "secured to them this fruit" have substantially the same import. They mean to deliver the contribution in question safely into the hands of the poor brethren in Jerusalem. Whenever the Apostle had finished this work, he proposed to set out from Jerusalem for Spain, and in passing, to call at Rome. "This fruit" signifies the contribution, which is here called "fruit" because it was the fruit of the benevolence of the churches sending it. *Sphragizo* literally means to seal, and when followed by a Dative of object, as here, to seal to, that is, to deliver to any one as securely as if under seal. It is more perspicuous to translate as I have done, not by the primary, but by the more remote meaning of the word. The expression "sealed to them this fruit" is hardly intelligible to the common reader, if indeed it is quite so to any.

By what route Paul expected to return from Jerusalem to Rome is not known, but most probably by sea, as that would be the most expeditious way; and he was evidently anxious to make the trip as soon as practicable. It is not at all likely that he proposed returning through Syria, Asia Minor, and Macedonia. He had already preached over those countries about as much as he felt at present inclined to do. But in no event could he have expected to reach Rome very soon. Whatever route he might decide to take, he intended to stop, as was his custom, at friendly points, and preach. This of necessity would occasion much delay. It is questionable, then, whether he expected to see Rome, at nearest, short of a year, if even that soon.

29. **And I know that in coming to you, I shall come with the fullness of Christ's blessing.** Because he expected to come with the whole volume of the blessings of the gospel. Beyond these blessings, he had nothing to bestow, nor they any thing to ask. That *charisma pneumatikon*, ch. i: 11, he was anxious to impart; but it is by no means probable that this constituted more than a part of that "fullness" he speaks of. He was coming to the Romans, as he had gone to others, by "power of the Spirit, by word and deed, and by the power of signs and wonders." That all this expectation was realized during the two subsequent years which he spent at Rome, may be safely taken for granted. True, he was a prisoner during that time, but in preaching the gospel he was free, and therein lay his success.

30. **But I beseech you, brethren, by our Lord Jesus Christ, and by the love of the Spirit,** Stuart thinks the *de* here continuative, and this it doubtless is, in part, but it evidently is at the same time adversative. I beseech you *by* our Lord Jesus Christ, not *for the sake of*. Christ and the love of the Spirit were the motives by which the brethren were to be moved to prayer. The love of the Spirit is that love for one another which the Spirit pours out in the hearts of those in whom it dwells.

to strive with me in prayer to God for me, *Sunagonizomai* means to carry on a combat or conflict in company with another; and from this it readily comes to denote any form of striving in which two or more take part. To strive with one in prayer means to join him in a deeply earnest effort at prayer. The solemnity with which the Apostle requests this prayer, and the high motives by which he urges it, show how profoundly he desired it to prevail.

31. **that I may be delivered from the unbelievers in Judea,** These were those Jews who still persisted in rejecting Christ. Clearly the Apostle had now ceased to expect their conversion. He looked upon them as hopelessly lost, and consequently had nothing to ask for, in regard to them, but deliverance from their merciless hands. And yet, notwithstanding his own prayer, and that of the disciples in Rome, it was into the hands of these very unbelievers that he fell. Even the prayers of an apostle were not always answered, because at times not according to the will of God. When Paul's arrest and imprisonment redounded, in the end, more to the glory of God and the good of

men than his freedom, then his arrest and imprisonment are what God wills, notwithstanding the adverse prayers. It was, after all, the wicked instrumentality of these same unbelievers that enabled the Apostle to see Rome. Under the ills from which we pray to be delivered, God often hides a rich vein of real good.

and that my service, which is for Jerusalem, my be acceptable to the holy, Obviously the Apostle had fears that even the poor christians in Jerusalem might, through their Jewish prejudices, decline relief from Gentile hands. He greatly desired its acceptance, knowing the good effect it would have in softening animosities and inducing love for those that sent it. In this particular, at least, he was not disappointed.

32. that with joy I may come to you by God's will. The Apostle felt that if he could only be delivered from the unbelievers in Judea, and his service prove acceptable, he could with joy return to Rome. His service was accepted with gratitude and thanks; he was not delivered; and he returned to Rome, but presumably, not the joyous man he expected to be. Even the wisest of men should not too confidently plan the future; for the mysterious hand of God is always in it. The absolute in will, alone can certainly say what he will do.

and be refreshed among you. How delightful the dream, that after his long and laborious trip to Jerusalem and return, he should be honorably and gladly welcomed by the disciples in Rome; and that there, among them, enthroned in their esteem, and ministered to in every way which culture and affection could suggest, he should rest, and refresh his wearied spirit in their generous society. But alas, for all the golden dreams of the true servant of Christ, so long as he is in the flesh. There *remains* a rest for the people of God.

33. The God of peace be with you all—amen. The sum of all prayers and the embodiment of all good wishes. Even the fertile brain of Paul could not ask for more, and the church in Rome had no capacity for any thing else. The "God of peace" is the God who wills peace among his people, and who sets his face against all who disturb it. The song of angels over the birth of Christ was "peace on earth;" and the benediction for the church in Rome is "the God of peace be with you"

CHAPTER XVI.

SECTION I.

Now I commend to you, Phebe, our sister, who is deaconess of the church in Cenchrea, ²that you receive her in the Lord, as becomes the holy, and help her in whatever business she may need you; for she herself also has been a helper of many, and of me myself.

³Greet Prisca and Aquila, my co-laborers in Christ Jesus, ⁴who, for the sake of my life, laid down their own neck; to whom not only I give thanks, but also all the churches of the Gentiles; and [greet] the church in their house. ⁵Greet my beloved Epenetus, who is a first fruit of Asia to Christ. ⁶Greet Mary who labored much for you. ⁷Greet Audronicus and Junias, my kinsmen and my fellow-prisoners, who are of note among the apostles, and who were in Christ before me, ⁸Greet Amplias, my beloved in the Lord. ⁹Greet Urbanus, our co-laborer in Christ, and my beloved Stachys. ¹⁰Greet Apelles, the tried in Christ. Greet those of the family of Aristobulus. ¹¹Greet Herodion, my kinsman. Greet those of the family of Narcissus, who are in the Lord. ¹²Greet Tryphena and Tryphosa, who labor in the Lord. Greet the beloved Persis, who labored much in the Lord. ¹³Greet Rufus, the chosen in the Lord, and his mother and mine. ¹⁴Greet Asyncritus, Phlegon, Hermes, Patrobas, Hermas, and the brethren with them. ¹⁵Greet Philologus and Julia, Nereus and his sister, and Olympas, and all the holy with them. ¹⁶Greet one another with a holy kiss. All the churches of Christ greet you.

Συνίστημι δὲ ὑμῖν Φοίβην τὴν ἀδελφὴν ἡμῶν, οὖσαν διάκονον τῆς ἐκκλησίας τῆς ἐν Κενχρεαῖς, ²ἵνα προσδέξησθε αὐτὴν ἐν Κυρίῳ ἀξίως τῶν ἁγίων, καὶ παραστήτε αὐτῇ ἐν ᾧ ἂν ὑμῶν χρήσῃ πράγματι· καὶ γὰρ αὐτὴ προστάτις πολλῶν ἐγενήθη καὶ ἐμοῦ αὐτοῦ.

³Ἀσπάσασθε Πρίσκαν καὶ Ἀκυλιαν, τοὺς συνεργοὺς μου ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ, ⁴οἵτινες ὑπὲρ τῆς ψυχῆς μου τὸν ἑαυτῶν τράχηλον ὑπέθηκαν· οἷς οὐκ ἐγὼ μόνος εὐχαριστῶ, ἀλλὰ καὶ πᾶσαι αἱ ἐκκλησῖαι τῶν ἐθνῶν· ⁵καὶ τὴν κατ' οἶκον αὐτῶν ἐκκλησίαν. Ἀσπάσασθε Ἐπαίνετον τὸν ἀγαπητὸν μου, ὃς ἐστὶν ἀπαρχὴ τῆς Ἀσίας εἰς Χριστόν. ⁶Ἀσπάσασθε Μαριάμ, ἣτις πολλὰ ἐκοπίασεν εἰς ὑμᾶς. ⁷Ἀσπάσασθε Ἀνδρόνικον καὶ Ἰουλίαν, τοὺς συγγενεῖς μου καὶ συναϊχμαλωτοὺς μου, οἵτινες εἰσὶν ἐπίσημοι ἐν τοῖς ἀποστόλοις, οἱ καὶ πρὸ ἐμοῦ γεγόναν ἐν Χριστῷ. ⁸Ἀσπάσασθε Ἀμπλιαν τὸν ἀγαπητὸν μου ἐν Κυρίῳ. ⁹Ἀσπάσασθε Οὐρβανὸν τὸν συνεργὸν ἡμῶν ἐν Χριστῷ, καὶ Στάχυν τὸν ἀγαπητὸν μου. ¹⁰Ἀσπάσασθε Ἀπελλὴν τὸν δοκιμὸν ἐν Χριστῷ. Ἀσπάσασθε τοὺς ἐκ τῶν Ἀριστοβούλου. ¹¹Ἀσπάσασθε Ἡρωδίωνα τὸν συγγενὴν μου. Ἀσπάσασθε τοὺς ἐκ τῶν Ναρκίσσου τοὺς ὄντας ἐν Κυρίῳ. ¹²Ἀσπάσασθε Τρύφαιναν καὶ Τρυφῶσαν τὰς κοπιώσας ἐν Κυρίῳ. Ἀσπάσασθε Περσίδα τὴν ἀγαπητὴν, ἣτις πολλὰ ἐκοπίασεν ἐν Κυρίῳ. ¹³Ἀσπάσασθε Ρούφον τὸν ἐλεκτὸν ἐν Κυρίῳ, καὶ τὴν μητέρα αὐτοῦ καὶ ἐμοῦ. ¹⁴Ἀσπάσασθε Ἀσύγκριτον, Φλέγοντα, Ἐρμῆν, Πατρόβαν, Ἐρμᾶν, καὶ τοὺς σὺν αὐτοῖς ἀδελφοὺς. ¹⁵Ἀσπάσασθε Φιλόλογον καὶ Ἰουλίαν, Νηρέα καὶ τὴν ἀδελφὴν αὐτοῦ, καὶ Ὀλυμπᾶν, καὶ τοὺς σὺν αὐτοῖς πάντας ἁγίους. ¹⁶Ἀσπάσασθε ἀλλήλους ἐν φιλήματι ἁγίῳ. Ἀσπάζονται ὑμᾶς αἱ ἐκκλησῖαι πᾶσαι τοῦ Χριστοῦ.

SUMMARY.

Phebe, a deaconess of the church in Cenchrea, is commended to the disciples; while they, on their part, are requested to receive her as the holy should receive the holy; and to aid her in whatever business she might need them. After this, various brethren, several of them Paul's kinsmen, and also various sisters are most honorably mentioned; and the brotherhood requested to greet them. Usually, as each person is named, some distinguishing trait or circumstance is named with him, showing how closely the Apostle studied characters, and how generously he awarded praise. The section sheds much light upon the religious life and social habits of those primitive days.

The present chapter is taken up mostly with friendly greetings to individuals, to groups of individuals, and to churches. These greetings are usually interspersed with epithets descriptive of some personal excellence, or distinguishing trait of the individual named. The chapter is valuable as throwing no little light upon the condition and customs of the disciples in those early times. Besides, it contains a most important paragraph upon the manner in which those persons are to be dealt with, who cause divisions and stumblings in churches. Indeed, this is one of the most valuable disciplinary paragraphs in the New Testament. The chapter closes with a doxology of remarkable comprehension and power.

I commend to you Phebe our sister, As no one else but Phebe is commended to the brethren in Rome, the presumption is that she was going alone; and consequently that by her the Letter was sent. Had other brethren been going with her, it is not likely that Paul would wholly have ignored them.

who is a deaconess of the church in Cenchrea, Deaconess literally means a *female servant*, but without determining the nature of the service rendered. Phebe was a servant of the church in Cenchrea. This much is actually asserted. Was she appointed to the service by the church, or did she assume it of herself? The question is not material. For whether she assumed the service of her own accord, or was appointed to it, she performed it with the Apostle's sanction. This stamps it as right. If the church appointed her to the service, then other churches may do likewise; for the action of that church, being sanctioned by the Apostle, becomes a precedent. Or if she merely assumed the service, then for the same reason, other good women may also assume it.

But did Phebe belong to an order of official women in the church? She certainly belonged to an order of women called *servants of the church*, who performed their service by apostolic sanction; and the duties of this order were the same as those

usually ascribed to deaconesses. I am, therefore, of the opinion that Phebe was a deaconess in the official sense of that word.

What the special duties were of this order of women, it would seem not difficult to conjecture. Their work consisted in serving the sisterhood. This much may be accepted as certain. In all churches there would be among the females, the poor, the sick, the untaught, the erring, and unfortunate. These would need attentions which no order of persons could so delicately and successfully give as the deaconesses; and to this class of duties they seem to have been devoted. Indeed, even in the present day, wherever the necessities of the churches are such as to demand it, the order of the deaconesses should be re-established. They are often of as much importance to a church as the deacons, if not even more. Certainly the need for the one order is seldom less than that for the other.

Cenchrea was the eastern harbor of Corinth, situated about nine miles from it on the Saronic Gulf. East of it, and across the Ægean sea, lay Asia Minor. Between this country and Corinth, an immense trade was carried on, all of which passed through Cenchrea. It was from this port that Paul sailed into Syria on his return from his second missionary tour. Between that time and the writing of the Letter, a church had been formed there, of which, as already noticed, Phebe was a deaconess. By whom the church was planted, we are not informed. Even Paul himself may have sown the seeds of it, before sailing for Syria, as just stated. If he and Priscilla and Aquila remained there but for a day, they were not idle. A single discourse would leave the leaven of truth in the place to do its work.

2. **That you receive her in the Lord as becomes the holy,** That you receive her as a christian which she is. "As becomes the holy"—as it becomes the holy to receive such, and therefore as it becomes you. Instead of rendering *axios ton hagion, in a manner worthy of the holy*, I prefer to be a little freer for the sake of brevity. "As becomes the holy" gives the sense more clearly, and is sufficiently close.

and help her in whatever business she may need you; That some special business, *pragmati*, is here alluded to, which was taking Phebe to Rome, seems most probable; but what it was we can never know. Some have conjectured it to be the collection of a debt; others, the prosecution of a lawsuit; and still others, that it was to obtain redress for some grievance

suffered in the province. Some one of these conjectures may certainly be the true one; but then, again, they may all be idle. Hence they amount to nothing.

for she herself also has been a helper of many, and of me myself. This clause, no doubt, sheds much light upon the especial work performed by the deaconesses. Among other things, they were "helpers of many." Wherever any children of God needed "help," these the deaconesses served. Their noble and unselfish devotion is entitled to high praise. The fact that Phebe had been a "helper of many," constituted the ground of her claim for help on the brethren in Rome; for as we do to others, so others are under obligation to do to us. The probability seems to be that Phebe was wealthy; hence her ability to be a "helper of many;" while the fact that no mention is made of her husband, justifies, in a low degree, the conclusion that she had none. She was probably a widow. She was doubtless a woman of age; for a young woman could hardly have attained the distinction she enjoyed at the time.

3. Greet Prisca and Aquila, my co-laborers in Christ Jesus. Immediately after Paul left Athens, on his second missionary tour, he came to Corinth. Here, for the first time, he met with Aquila and Priscilla (a diminutive of Prisca); but whether the two latter were then christians is not certain. Paul sojourned with them for a year and a half, and worked with them at their common trade of tent-making. But when the Apostle left Corinth, they left it with him, and accompanied him across the Ægean to Ephesus. Here Paul left them and went to Jerusalem. How long they remained at Ephesus is uncertain; but at the time of writing the Letter in hand, they were back in Rome and living there.

As to Prisca being here named before Aquila, I presume there is nothing in it. Twice out of five mentions in the New Testament, Aquila stands first—Acts xviii: 2; 1 Cor. xvi: 19. Certainly it is not wholly improbable that Prisca may have been the more distinguished of the two; and that this is the reason for her being named first, but the supposition is a weak one.

But whatever may have been the relative superiority of these two excellent disciples, one thing is certain, they were both Paul's "co-laborers in Christ." In what this labor consisted we are not told. But as they were so thoroughly acquainted with the gospel as to be qualified to instruct even Apollos, the inference is a

fair one that they were capable of teaching almost any one—Aquila publicly, Prisca privately. I should think it thus that they labored chiefly. Their long and intimate acquaintance with Paul goes far to strengthen this conclusion.

4. **who, for the sake of my life, laid down their own neck,** What the particular event was to which reference is here made, or where it occurred, we are not told. Some have conjectured that it occurred at Ephesus, and so it may; but then it could just as well have taken place at Corinth. Of its whereabouts we know absolutely nothing; and as to its nature, all we know is what the clause itself asserts. The event clearly consisted in Aquila and his wife offering their own lives to save that of the Apostle. The heroism which the act displays is simply sublime. Could Paul possibly have had it in mind at Rom. v: 7?

to whom not only I give thanks, but also all the churches of the Gentiles; We all give thanks to Aquila and Prisca for what they did in my behalf. And in case they actually saved the Apostle's life, which seems most probable, the debt of gratitude was boundless then, and it is boundless still. The churches of the Gentiles, here spoken of, were no doubt chiefly planted through Paul's own labors. They especially, therefore, would feel grateful for his deliverance, and in every available way would be ready to manifest the feeling. This the Apostle had learned, and hence felt free to mention it.

and [greet] the church in their house. The word "greet," which I here bracket, is not absolutely necessary; but its presence greatly improves the perspicuity. It is inserted for this purpose alone. As yet, in that early day, the disciples were without meeting-houses, and hence had to meet for worship wherever they best could. The private houses of brethren were often the only places open to them. In these houses, therefore, they would meet, principally upon the Lord's day, and hold their simple service. The house of Aquila and Prisca was one of these meeting places; and the congregation assembling in it, is called "the church in their house." Thirty years ago, the same custom prevailed extensively, with many denominations, in north-western Missouri. Indeed, in countries where the gospel has been but recently introduced, it is the only remedy. And from no hearts on this earth, I venture to think, has purer or more acceptable worship ever ascended to God than from these unwordly little groups. More of art and splendor can certainly be found

in great fanes erected at much cost to God; but from these great houses, with their gorgeously appareled crowds, he often delights to turn away, I doubt not, as from a sham, and find a delightful seat amidst the "poor in spirit," who make the "church in their house." The lowly Master, with his solitary seamless coat, and without a place to "lay his head," presents a humiliating contrast to many of the "churches" of the present day, piled up in gratification of folly, and, with no notice from him, "dedicated" to his name.

5. Greet my beloved Epenetus, who is a first fruit of Asia to Christ. Of Epenetus we know nothing, beyond what is here said. He was the first, or among the first, most likely the latter, to embrace the gospel in Asia; and he was held in high esteem by Paul. There is a tradition to the effect that he was the first bishop of Carthage; but like many similar traditions, it is entitled to no credit. How sincere the regret is, that we have not a fuller account than we have, of some of the excellent men named in this chapter. But thus it is on earth. Single, short sentences tell the story of those who have prepared its inhabitants for eternal life; while huge tomes are insufficient to record the exploits of those who have often turned it into a slaughter house.

6. Greet Mary, who labored much for you. You the disciples in Rome. Nothing beyond what is here said is known of this laborious woman. In what particular capacity, or under what circumstances she had bestowed the "much labor," is wholly unknown. Is there no work to be done by christian women of the present day, which would rank them among the noble women named in this chapter? I confess to think the question worthy of something more than a sarcastic smile. We have Marys capable of work, and more than willing. Whose tyrannous hand, then, is it that lets? Dreams are not the only things in which crooked lines and errors blend. Granitized church life might reveal some of them, if closely inspected.

7. Greet Andronicus and Junias, my kinsmen and fellow-prisoners, who are of note among the apostles, and who were in Christ before me. Of Andronicus and Junias, the sum of our knowledge consists in what is here said. As to the myths of Hyppolytus and Dorotheus, they are just possibly true, no more. I do not think it worth while to name them. Junias I take to be masculine, not feminine. The joint descriptions of the two persons named, seem to demand this. They were

Paul's real kin, according to the flesh, and not kin merely in the loose sense of being of the same tribe or of the same nation. Where they and Paul had been imprisoned together, is not known. We have not even a hint from any source upon the subject. *Who are of note among the apostles:* That is, among the other eleven. They were both distinguished men among the apostles, distinguished no doubt as preachers of the gospel. *Who were in Christ before me:* That is, they became christians before Paul. The phrase "in Christ," therefore, was, in that day, equivalent to being a christian. It frequently occurs in the New Testament in this sense; and it is much to be regretted that it has, in faulty measure, fallen into comparative disuse among us of the present day. It should be revived in the lips of the holy, and become one of their standing titles. Most important questions of fact are implied in the expression "in Christ." A whole tract of most luminous matter can readily be evolved from it. Let it be restored to its primitive office, with its primitive meaning.

But farther: these very two men, Andronicus and Junias, were not improbably among those "strangers of Rome," mentioned Acts ii: 10. At that same Pentecost, they may have become christians, and there have formed the acquaintance of the apostles. This would account both for their being "of note" among them, and for their being "in Christ" before Paul. Besides, their case may throw no little light on the question, By whom was the gospel first preached in Rome? In them, we may have a clew to the answer.

8. Greet Amplius, my beloved in the Lord. That is, either my beloved brother, or my beloved child in the Lord. That, more likely than this. Amplius must have been a most lovely man to be spoken of as he here is. And, by the way, nothing gives us a fuller insight into Paul's real nature and heart, than these epithets. He was great in intellect, ardent in feeling, and tender in affection as a woman.

9. Greet Urbanus, our co-laborer in Christ, and my beloved Stachys. Where Urbanus, or Urban, had met the Apostle, and labored with him, is unknown. They must have been together for some length of time; for "co-laborer" would not have been applied to a comparative stranger, or to a mere casual acquaintance. From his name, it appears that Stachys was a Greek; but whether he was merely a good man, or a

"beloved" teacher, is uncertain. He must have been a man "of note;" for an obscure, unworking disciple would never have received the mention he has. According to tradition, he once held the office of bishop of Byzantium, for fifteen years, and was then succeeded by Onesimus. This is most likely fabulous.

10. Greet Apelles, the tried in Christ. Of this "tried" and honored christian man, we have no account except the present. He had evidently passed through some fierce ordeal, or possibly through many; and out of them all he had come firm and true. Hence the epithet "tried." He is a noble character.

Greet those of the family of Aristobulus. From the fact that Aristobulus himself is not greeted, it has been inferred that he was either dead, or not a believer. But this is an inconsequence. He may have been in Corinth at the very moment of sending the greeting. This only shows that nothing conclusive can be inferred from his not being greeted. He was, most likely, simply absent from home at the time; and this being known to Paul, he greets his family only, not him. Had he been dead, it is not probable that his name would have been mentioned at all. That Aristobulus may have been dead, I certainly do not deny. I deny only, that the fact of his death is a legitimate inference from his not being greeted.

11. Greet Herodion, my kinsman. Greet those of the family of Narcissus, who are in the Lord. Of Herodion, Paul's kinsman here named, nothing whatever is known. He was most probably a man of no special distinction, or the fact would have been indicated by the use of some appropriate epithet, as in other cases. Who the Narcissus was, who is here alluded to, is unknown. The conjecture of some, that he was a powerful freedman of Claudius, who bore that name, is incorrect; for that Narcissus had, at the time of writing, been dead about three years. True, the family mentioned may have been his family; but in these conjectures, no confidence can be placed. Only a part of his family were "in the Lord;" and these only were to be greeted.

12. Greet Tryphena and Tryphosa, who labor in the Lord. *Kopiosas* is the participle of the Present; and it implies that these two christian women were engaged in their special labor, at the time of writing. They were most probably deaconesses. Public teachers they could not be; for this Paul himself disallows; but then there is always a vast and good work to be

done for Christ outside of the pulpit. Prisca taught Apollos in a tent; and the world is full of tents, and every tent has in it either an Apollos, or some one else needing instruction still more than he. Private instruction is peculiarly adapted to meet and remove difficulties. Indeed, in no other way can they be so effectually removed. Privately, then, at least, and most profitably, could Tryphena and Tryphosa have "labored in the Lord." In the matter of laboring for the Lord, however, the difficulty usually lies, not in finding the work to do, but in finding the will to do it; and this difficulty lies quite as much in the way of men as in that of women. Many a Tryphena has her talent hid in the ground.

Greet the beloved Persis, who labored much in the Lord. The labor here referred to, appears to have been performed at some time previous to the writing of the Letter; but whether in Rome or elsewhere, we can not tell. By it Persis had *greatly endeared herself to the Apostle; and for it, he has immortalized her name.* With the evidences which we now have before us, of Paul's high appreciation of female excellence and work in the church, how any one can hold him capable of underrating them, as has been done, or of thinking meanly of them, it is difficult to see. Nothing could be more unjust than such an imputation.

13. Greet Rufus, the chosen in the Lord, and his mother and mine. Dr. Hackett (Bible Dictionary) seems to favor the idea that the Rufus mentioned here is the same as the Rufus spoken of by Mark, in ch. xv: 21. Possibly this is correct; but if so, the fact is incapable of verification. Rufus was not an uncommon name in those days; and therefore the chances were many that the two should not be the same. "Chosen in the Lord" does not mean *elected* in the technical sense of the term. It means excellent or highly valued. He was a *choice man*, as we familiarly say. *His mother and mine*—his mother literally, mine by courtesy. Paul calls her mother in the same fond sense in which the word is often applied to aged females. "Give my love to mother A. or mother B." is very common in friendly letters. Paul speaks in the same style. No doubt he had somewhere either met or sojourned with this good woman, when she had actually proved herself a mother to him. This gave rise to the epithet.

14. Greet Asyncritus, Phlegon, Hermes, Patrobas, Hermas, and the brethren with them. Of Asyncritus nothing

whatever is known beyond the present mention. Phlegon, by the merest tradition, is handed down to us as one of the seventy, and also as being at one time bishop of Marathon. He is said to have suffered martyrdom. Hermes, too, has been represented as one of the seventy, as has also Patrobas. To each of these, as a matter of course, has been assigned some imaginary bishopric, of which, most likely, neither ever heard the name. Hermas is supposed, upon what seems to be more reliable authority, to have been the author of a mystical work, called "the Shepherd," now found entire only in a Latin translation. By others, this work is thought to have had a later origin; but Irenæus, Origen, and Tertullian ascribe it to Hermas. *And the brethren with them*—most probably members of their respective families, consisting of wives, children, and domestics. It seems not likely that these "brethren" had been formed into churches, or the fact would have been mentioned, as in the case of Aquila.

15. Greet Philologus and Julia, Nereus and his sister, and Olympas, and all the holy brethren with them. Who Philologus and Julia were, or what the relation was, which subsisted between them, if any, we know not. It has been conjectured that they were either husband and wife, or brother and sister; but of the truth of the conjecture, no evidence exists. The former has also been assumed to have been one of the seventy, and by some critics, it has been held that Julia should be Julias, the name of a man. The question can not be settled. Of Nereus and his sister, we know nothing reliable beyond what is here said. Some legends exist in regard to the former, of a nature so unsatisfactory that they need not be repeated. As to Olympas, he too has been set down as one of the seventy; and it is related of him that he suffered martyrdom at Rome in 69. I place no confidence in these accounts. *And the holy brethren with them:* Who these "holy brethren" were is utterly unknown. Possibly they, with the others named in the verse, formed a sort of neighborhood in some particular district of the city, where they met together and worshiped. This fact would account for their being grouped together as here. The same remark applies to v. 14.

16. Greet one another with a holy kiss. Among intimate friends, and as an expression of sincere affection, the kiss was common among the Jews. Indeed, the custom appears to have been general among oriental nations. Thus when Joab slew Amasa, he took hold of his beard, as if to kiss him. 2 Sam. xx: 9.

And the Savior said to Simon: "Thou hast given me no kiss; but this woman, since the time I came in, has not ceased to kiss my feet." Luke vii: 45. Judas also kissed the Savior in the act of betraying him. And in speaking of the meetings of the early christians, Justin Martyr says: "Prayers being ended, *we salute one another with a kiss*; and then the bread and wine are brought to the president." The custom seems to have prevailed in the church, if not from its very founding, certainly from a very early day, where it assumed peculiar sanctity; and it seems to have been completely promiscuous. Is it binding on us of the present day? The question has been much discussed; and it appears not easily settled. If it be assumed that the Apostle enjoined it upon the christians in Rome, as something to be done by them in virtue, solely, of their relation to one another in Christ, then I should hold that his injunction has the force of law for us. And that the case in hand has much of this look, I am candid to say, I can not deny. On the contrary, it seems to me a most improbable thing, that the Apostle would enjoin upon the holy in Christ, a custom which it appears to me impossible to indulge promiscuously, without certain and widespread abuse. I am therefore averse to think he has done it. Upon the whole, the view I prefer to take of the case is this: The Apostle, by his injunction, did not create the custom; for it was prevalent at the time. He meant merely to *purify* it. He hence says, "Greet one another with a *holy* kiss." Only therefore where the custom exists, is his injunction applicable. Where the custom does not exist, his injunction is not designed to create it. It hence does not bind it upon us. If we do kiss, it must be a *holy* kiss; but we are not compelled to kiss. This is my best answer to the question. Were promiscuous kissing the vogue in churches of the present day, the results would be disastrous in the extreme. In the case of the young especially, it would soon degenerate into the grossest abuse. It would become, in the shortest time, as carnal as the flesh pots of Egypt, and the sure precursor of infinite scandal. In no land or case, in my opinion, is promiscuous kissing among the children of God, a tolerable thing. It must be utterly eschewed.

All the churches of Christ greet you. That is, all those in this region of country. The presumption is, that the churches of Achaia had been informed of Paul's purpose to write to Rome; and that they had availed themselves of the opportunity

to send their greeting. At least, I should not think it likely that he would venture to speak for them without their sanction.

CHAPTER XVI. SECTION 2.

¹⁷ Παρακαλῶ δὲ ὑμᾶς, ἀδελφοί, σκοπεῖν τοὺς τὰς διχοστασίας καὶ τὰ σκάνδαλα παρὰ τὴν διδασχὴν ἣν ὑμεῖς ἐμάθετε, ποιοῦντας, καὶ ἐκκλίνετε ἀπ' αὐτῶν ¹⁸ οἱ γὰρ τοιοῦτοι τῷ Κυρίῳ ἡμῶν Χριστῷ οὐ δουλεύουσιν, ἀλλὰ τῇ ἐαυτῶν κοιλίᾳ, καὶ διὰ τῆς χρηστολογίας καὶ εὐλογίας ἐξαπατῶσι τὰς καρδίας τῶν ἀκάκων. ¹⁹ Ἡ γὰρ ὑμῶν ὑπακοὴ εἰς πάντας ἀφίκετο· ἐφ' ὑμῖν οὖν χαίρω. Θέλω δὲ ὑμᾶς σοφοῦς εἶναι εἰς τὸ ἀγαθόν, ἀκεραῖους δὲ εἰς τὸ κακόν. ²⁰ Ὁ δὲ Θεὸς τὴν εἰρήνης συντριψέει τὸν σατανᾶν ὑπὸ τοὺς πόδας ὑμῶν ἐν τάχει. Ἡ χάρις τοῦ Κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ μετ' ὑμῶν.

²¹ Ἀσπάζεται ὑμᾶς Τιμόθεος ὁ συνεργός μου, καὶ Λούκιος καὶ Ἰάσων καὶ Ζωσίπατρος οἱ συγγενεῖς μου. ²² Ἀσπάζομαι ὑμᾶς ἐγὼ Τέρτιος ὁ γράψας τὴν ἐπιστολὴν ἐν Κυρίῳ. ²³ Ἀσπάζεται ὑμᾶς Γάιος ὁ ξένος μου καὶ ὅλης τῆς ἐκκλησίας. Ἀσπάζεται ὑμᾶς Ἐραστός ὁ οἰκονόμος τῆς πόλεως καὶ Κούαρτος ὁ ἀδελφός. ²⁴ Ἡ χάρις τοῦ Κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ μετὰ πάντων ὑμῶν—ἀμήν.

²⁵ Τῷ δὲ δυναμένῳ ὑμᾶς στηρίζαι κατὰ τὸ εὐαγγελίον μου καὶ τὸ κήρυγμα Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, κατὰ ἀποκάλυψιν μυστηρίου χρόνιαις αἰωνίοις σεσχημένου, ²⁶ φανερωθέντος δὲ νῦν διὰ τε γραφῶν προφητικῶν κατ' ἐπιταγὴν τοῦ αἰωνίου Θεοῦ εἰς ὑπακοὴν πίστεως εἰς πάντα τὰ ἔθνη γνωρισθέντος, ²⁷ μόνῳ σοφῷ Θεῷ, διὰ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, ᾧ ἡ δόξα εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας—ἀμήν.

¹⁷ Now I beseech you, brethren, to look after those that cause divisions and stumblings, contrary to the teaching you have learned, and turn away from them; ¹⁸ for such as they, serve not our Lord Christ, but their own stomach, and by good talk and fair speech deceive the hearts of the innocent. ¹⁹ Yet your obedience has come abroad to all men. I therefore rejoice over you; but I wish you to be wise as to what is good; and harmless as to what is bad. ²⁰ And the God of peace shall soon crush Satan under your feet. The favor of our Lord Jesus Christ be with you.

²¹ Timothy, my co-laborer, and Lucius, and Jason, and Sosipater, my kinsmen, greet you. ²² I Tertius, who wrote this Letter, greet you in the Lord. ²³ Gaius, the entertainer of me, and of the whole church, greets you. Erastus, the treasurer of the city, and Quartus, the brother, greet you. ²⁴ The favor of our Lord Jesus Christ be with you all—amen.

²⁵ Now to him who is able to establish you according to my gospel, even the preaching respecting Jesus Christ, according to the revelation of the mystery, ²⁶ kept secret in times gone, but now manifested through the prophetic writings—made known by command of the everlasting God, to all nations, in order to the obedience of belief—²⁷ to God the only wise—to him be glory through Jesus Christ, for ever—amen.

SUMMARY.

In this section, the subject of divisions or factions is strangely insulated, and made to receive special notice. The brotherhood are commanded to watch such as cause divisions and occasion stumblings, and to turn away

from them. Such persons are severely characterized as not serving Christ, but their own stomachs. After this digression, the Apostle returns to the subject of personal greetings. These ended, he closes his great Letter with a most wonderful outburst of praise—wonderful, because of its comprehension, complexity, and strength.

17. Now I beseech you, brethren, to look after those that cause divisions and stumblings, That divisions, of the kind here named, either actually existed in Rome; or that there was danger of their existing, may be safely inferred from their being here mentioned. Had none existed and none been in prospect, the Apostle would have said nothing about them. But why he should have introduced the subject of divisions just in this particular connection, is not easily seen. It has no perceptible connection with any thing either immediately going before, or immediately following. The question of days and meats would very naturally produce divisions, and no doubt had done it; but then why were not divisions disposed of in connection with that question? Most likely the Apostle wished to give them quite an independent notice, in order to stamp them, on their merits, with his condemnation. At all events, he has done this.

“Divisions”—*dichostasias*—These were neither schisms nor apostasies. They rather consisted of little factions or parties in the congregation. They are contrary to the teachings of Christ, are destructive of peace, and imply a want of brotherly love. They are to the single congregation, in effect, what sects are to the whole body of the believers—disastrous in their results, and deeply sinful in their nature. Yet all over the land, divisions exist.

But is there no remedy for the popular divisions or partyisms of the day? There is an infallible one. Let every man take his belief and practice strictly from the Bible, in its own terms; let him abandon all creeds, and drop all party names; then let all unite on the Bible and on that alone, regardless of differences in mere matters of opinion—let all do these things, and the work of union is an accomplished fact. But is this remedy practicable? Not till believers are brought to see the sinfulness of sects, and to cherish a profounder regard for the word of God than at present. Will they ever be brought to do this? My candid opinion is they never will. Satan has too deep an interest to prevent union; and God will not interpose by miracle to effect it. I therefore never expect to see it.

“And stumblings”—*skandala*. A *skandalon* is any false doctrine, circumstance, fact, or thing placed in the way of a christian brother, over which he stumbles or falls, or which causes him to err either in belief or practice.

contrary to the teachings, you have learned, The teaching they had learned consisted in the gospel they had heard. Where the gospel, correctly presented, produces divisions, as it always will, the divisions are right. We are not responsible for the legitimate effects of the truth. But where we, by our own errors of teaching or conduct, produce divisions among the children of God, we sin against Christ. Nor is it a less offence to countenance and defend divisions, than it is to cause them. They must be utterly disfavored by the christian. He is not at liberty even to feel indifferent towards them. He must actively oppose them, where they exist, and actively endeavor to prevent them, where they do not exist.

and turn away from them; This turning away amounted to a withdrawal of fellowship; and the withdrawal was to continue, so long as those withdrawn from, continued to produce divisions. It was a separation of true brethren from false; and, without a reformation, it was final.

18. for such as they serve not our Lord Christ, but their own stomach, This shows that those who caused the divisions and stumblings were bad men. They were usually teachers, no doubt, who, upon some false or trivial pretense, got up divisions in order, in the end, to draw off disciples after them, and so derive a living from them. **“They serve their own stomach”**—They serve it in producing divisions, because they expect the divisions they produce, to feed it. This shows the end they had in view. *Koilia*, the word here used, denotes, says Sophocles, “the stomach, strictly so called.”

and by good talk and fair speech, deceive the hearts of the innocent. Whenever a man wishes to produce a division among the children of God, he is certain to put on the air of excessive sanctity, and to use the most honeyed words and gracious speech, the sure signs of a hypocrite, but, at the same time, the sure means of deceiving the innocent and unsuspecting. The arts practised in Rome, in the Apostle's day, have been the arts practised in all time since, for the same end.

19. Yet your obedience has come abroad to all men. The *gar* here is clearly adversative; and I therefore so render it

If we translate it otherwise, we have then to supply an adversative clause, and render the particle *for*, as assigning the reason for the clause. I prefer the former course as being the more direct, though it is not so well sustained. It appears to have occurred to the Apostle, that what he had just said was a little too strongly put, for the case of the brethren in Rome. Accordingly, he threw in the present verse apologetically, as it were, or as a sort of saving clause. As much as to say, Although I thus speak, my remarks are not meant exclusively for you; for your obedience, in the matter of being united, has come abroad to all men. This would seem to imply, not so much the existence of actual divisions, as the existence of danger of them; and that the Apostle's remarks were designed to be rather anticipative than corrective.

I therefore rejoice over you; I rejoice over you, because you are obedient to that teaching which requires you to be a united, not a divided people; and because your good name, in this particular, has come abroad to all the brethren as an example for them.

but **I wish you to be wise as to what is good, and harmless as to what is bad.** This delicate hint, occurring here, clearly implies that they had neither been wholly wise, as to what is good, nor wholly harmless, as to what is bad. Plainly, they were not entirely free from those divisions of which the Apostle is speaking. To be intentionally united, and resolutely to resist faction—this, on the one hand, was to be wise as to what is good: to foment faction, or in any way to be a party to it—this, on the other, was *not* to be harmless as to what is bad. On the contrary, to be or do the latter was to be criminally implicated in it. Could the whole professing world be induced to follow the Apostle's wish, the act would prove the end of sects and parties; and the end of sects and parties would soon prove the conversion of the world. For I set it down as fearfully true, that the most hostile obstacle, now in existence, to that great end, is the partyism of the day. Down with this; and down will go infidelity and paganism, in so far as they are ever to go down before the truth.

20. And the God of peace shall soon crush Satan under your feet. After speaking of divisions and stumblings, it was in fine taste on the Apostle's part, to subjoin God as the God of peace. He is not the God of sects, and of parties, and of divisions; nor is there any peace where they have footing. We

must banish respect for God, before we can foster faction. It flourishes only in repudiation of the divine will. The sect-maker, whether he intends it or not, is at enmity with Christ, and the subverter of the peace of the church. He is no friend of the best interests of humanity. *Shall soon crush Satan under your feet.* An allusion to what God said to Eve in the garden. Satan was the prime instigator of those "divisions and stumblings;" and what he was prime author to then, he has been prime author to ever since. But for him, divisions would never exist; and he who becomes a divider of God's children, is a tool in Satan's hand for mischief. This of itself should shock every one who is engaged in the work, and cause him to desist from it. The expression "crush Satan under your feet," means to put an end to his evil work of inciting divisions, and so give you the victory over him. This implies that many brethren were opposing the divisions, and striving to prevent them. The Apostle promises them a victory; but when it came, we know not.

the favor of our Lord Jesus Christ be with you. The last and best of prayers, which is repeated in v. 24. If the favor of Christ prevail, Satan will be crushed and division will cease.

21. Timothy, my co-laborer, and Lucius, and Jason, and Sosipater, my kinsmen, greet you. These brethren formed part of Paul's suite at the time of writing the Letter. Indeed, he appears seldom to have been alone. So vast were his labors that they always afforded employment for several assistants. Besides, attending Paul was the very best possible school in which to fit these brethren for successful, independent work. Lucius, Jason, and Sosipater were kinsmen of Paul, of possibly not a closer relationship than that of tribesmen. Lucius has been supposed to be the same as Lucius of Cyrene, mentioned Acts xiii: 1, which is not improbable. Jason is also supposed to have been the Jason of Thessalonica, who entertained Paul and Silas. These suppositions, though probable, must be received with allowance. Who Sosipater was, is wholly unknown, although it has been conjectured that he was the same as Sopater of Berea, which seems to me very improbable.

22. I Tertius, who wrote this Letter, greet you in the Lord. Tertius was Paul's amanuensis, who wrote the present Letter; and from the fact that he sends his own independent greeting to the disciples in Rome, it has been inferred that he was personally known to them. The inference is an exceed

ingly slender one, though it may be true. Beyond the present brief line, nothing whatever is known of Tertius. The supposition that he and Silas were the same, merely from the resemblance between a Latin and a Hebrew word, is an idle conjecture.

23. Gaius, the entertainer of me and of the whole church, greets you. It is almost certain that this was the Gaius whom Paul himself had baptized. 1 Cor. i: 14. His home was in Corinth; and he appears to have been a man of wealth and great liberality. He entertained, not only Paul and his companions, but on stated occasions, the whole church. He must have been a noble and lovely man.

Erastus, the treasurer of the city, and Quartus, the brother, greet you. Of Erastus nothing is confidently known, beyond what is here said. He can hardly have been the Erastus who was with Paul at Ephesus, Acts xix: 22; but he may be the one named in 2 Tim. iv: 20. Of Quartus we have no account whatever, except the usual legend that he was somewhere a bishop, a legend in which no confidence can be placed.

24. The favor of our Lord Jesus Christ be with you all—amen. The Apostle's fervent love for his brethren, together with his deep solicitude for their peace and prosperity in the divine life, prompts him to bestow on them, a second time, his benediction. It is proper to add, that this verse is omitted by Tregelles and Tischendorf, and bracketed by Alford. Green retains it; and although the weight of authority is against it, it is not clear to my mind that it should be rejected. In the present state of the text, I shall retain it.

CONCLUSION.

25. Now to him who is able to establish you according to my gospel, The genuineness and proper location of this concluding doxology have been much discussed. Upon the former, I believe it is now generally conceded, that a well founded doubt can not be entertained; and as to the latter, it is not material. Certainly the natural position of the doxology is at the end of the Letter; and here, accordingly, the most reliable critics place it.

The doxology itself is a lofty ascription of praise, difficult in its construction, and very complex. Still, it strikes me as Paul-like in every lineament. It is elaborate, and exceedingly comprehensive. *Now to him:* Who, of course, is God, as the end of the

passage shows. *Who is able to establish you*—render you immovable from Christ, and from the truth as it is in him. This is the end for which Paul wished to impart that *charisma*, mentioned in the first chapter. *According to my gospel*—not by my gospel, but conformably to it, or in agreement with it.

even the preaching respecting Jesus Christ, That is, even my preaching respecting him, or the preaching which I do respecting him. With Stuart, I regard the clause as merely epexegetic of the preceding one. *Iesou Christou* are both Genitive of object, and not of source. The meaning is not the preaching which Christ does, or causes to be done, but the preaching which respects him, or has him for its object. It is best to indicate this office of the Genitive by the use of *respecting*, as I have done. Here, as often, it is better for literalism to yield to perspicuity, than the reverse.

according to the revelation of the mystery. The revelation of the mystery is simply the mystery revealed, which is but another title for the gospel. The full sense is, Who is able to establish you according to the mystery revealed.

26. kept secret in times gone, This circumstance seems to be added merely for the sake of description or greater fulness. *Kept secret*, or not revealed in all the ages *preceding the prophets*. This limitation is made necessary by the next clause.

but now manifested through the prophetic writings, The *te* of this clause is obviously redundant, as it often is. To render it *and*, as is usually done, serves no purpose but to enervate the sense. It appears to me best to leave it untranslated. This procedure may not be very normal, and I grant it is not; but no critic with whom I am acquainted has suggested any thing better. *Manifested through the prophetic writings:* Not fully, but sufficiently so to justify the remark. The mystery *began* to be revealed by the prophets; but this is the most that can be said. It was fully disclosed only by Christ and the Apostles. The *nun, now*, of the clause covers the whole period from the beginning of prophecy down to the time of Christ.

made known by command of the everlasting God, That is, the mystery or secret is now *fully* made known. Through the prophets, it began to be manifested; by Christ and the Apostles, it is fully brought to light. And the distinction is a nice one. The prophets merely *intimated*; the apostles *made known*. The mystery fully made known is the gospel respecting Christ.

By command: When the time had fully come for the wondrous secret of redemption to become known, God *commanded* it to be made known; and it was done.

to all nations, in order to the obedience of belief— The mystery or gospel is now made known to all nations for the two following ends: 1. To enable and to induce all men to believe. 2. To induce an obedience springing out of this belief, an obedience never preceding it, but in all cases following it, and rendered available only by it. On this belief and the obedience growing out of it, depends remission of sins—they are, in other words, the two terms of salvation.

27. to God the only wise, to him be glory through Jesus Christ, for ever—amen. The gospel, with all its sublime achievements, the songs and thanksgivings of the saved—all these must culminate in glory to God, through Jesus Christ. As this outburst of lofty praise seems the most fitting of conclusions to the present great Letter, I simply repeat—*amen*.

PAUL'S LETTER TO ROMANS.

CHAPTER I.

Paul, a servant of Jesus Christ, a called apostle, set apart to the gospel of God, ² which he formerly promised through his prophets, in the holy Scriptures, ³ concerning his Son, who, as to his flesh, was born of the seed of David, ⁴ but, as to his pure spirit, was determined, by power, to be the Son of God, by the resurrection of the dead—Jesus Christ our Lord, ⁵ through whom we have received favor and apostleship, in order to the obedience of belief, in all nations, for his name's sake, ⁶ among whom you also are called of Jesus Christ, ⁷ to all the beloved of God, who are in Rome, called holy, favor to you and peace from God our Father, and the Lord Jesus Christ.

⁸ First, I thank my God through Jesus Christ respecting you all, that your belief is spoken of in the whole world. ⁹ For God is my witness whom I serve in my spirit, in the gospel of his Son, that I constantly make mention of you, ¹⁰ always entreating in my prayers that, somehow, I may, at last, be favored by the will of God to come to you. ¹¹ For I long to see you that I may impart to you some spiritual gift that you may become steadfast; ¹² and this is, that I may be comforted in you through the belief which is in us both, in you and in me.

¹³ Now I wish you not to be ignorant, brethren, that I often proposed to come to you, (and that I have been hindered to the present,) that I might have some fruit among you also, even as among the other nations. ¹⁴ Both to Greeks and barbarians, both to wise and foolish, I am debtor. ¹⁵ So, as to myself, I am ready to preach the gospel even to you who are in Rome. ¹⁶ For I am not ashamed of the gospel; for it is God's power for salvation to every one who believes, to Jew first, and to Greek. ¹⁷ For in it is revealed God's justification by belief in order to belief; as it is written, he who is just by belief shall live.

¹⁸ Now God's wrath is revealed from heaven against all impiety and injustice of men, who keep down the truth by injustice. ¹⁹ Because that which is known of God is manifest among them, for God has made it clear to them. ²⁰ For his unseen traits are perceived since the creation of the world, being known by the things that are made—both his everlasting power and divinity, so that they are without excuse. ²¹ Because they, knowing God, did not glorify him as God, nor did they thank him; but became foolish in their reasonings, and their stupid heart was darkened. ²² Professing to be wise, they acted as fools, ²³ and exchanged the glory of the incorruptible God for an image like corruptible man, and fowls, and fourfooted beasts, and creeping things. ²⁴ Therefore God gave them up, in the lusts of their hearts, to uncleanness, to dishonor

their bodies among themselves, ²⁸ who exchanged the truth of God for a lie, and worshiped and served the creature instead of him that made it, who is blessed forever—amen.

²⁹ For this reason God gave them up to vile passions. For even their females changed the natural use into one contrary to nature. ³¹ Likewise also the males, quitting the natural use of the female, burnt in their lust one for another, males practicing with males indecency, and receiving in themselves the reward of their error, which was fit. ²⁹ And inasmuch as they did not judge fit to keep God in their knowledge, God gave them up to a rejected mind to do unbecoming things: ²⁹ being filled with all injustice, malice, greediness, evil; full of envy, murder, strife, deceit, malignity; whisperers, ³⁰ slanderers, Godhaters; insolent, proud, boastful, inventors of evil, disobedient to parents, ³¹ stupid, faithless, without natural affection, pitiless—³² who knowing the decree of God, that they who practice such things are worthy of death, not only do them, but are even well pleased with those that practice them.

CHAPTER II.

Therefore you are without excuse, O, man, whoever you are that judge; for in that in which you judge another, you condemn yourself; for you that judge practice the same things. ³ But we know that God's judgment is according to truth against those that practice such things. ⁴ Do you then count on this, O, man, who judge those that practice such things, and do them yourself, that you will escape the judgment of God? ⁴ Or do you despise the abundance of his goodness, and forbearance, and patience, not knowing that God's goodness leads you into repentance? ⁵ And according to your impenitent heart and hardness do you heap up for yourself wrath in a day of wrath and of disclosure of the just judgment of God? ⁶ who will render to each according to his deeds—⁷ everlasting life to those who, by continuance in good works, seek for glory and honor and incorruption—⁸ anger and wrath to those who are contentious, and obey not the truth, but obey injustice. ⁹ Affliction and distress will come upon every soul of man who works evil, of Jew first, and of Greek. ¹⁰ But glory, and honor, and peace will be given to every one who works good, to Jew first and to Greek. ¹¹ For there is no respecting the person with God.

¹² For as many as have sinned without law shall also be lost without law; and as many as have sinned under law shall be condemned by law, ¹³ in the day when God shall judge the secrets of men, by Jesus Christ, according to my gospel. ¹³ For not the hearers of law are just with God; but the doers of law shall be justified. ¹⁴ For when nations who have not law do by nature the deeds of the law, these not having law are law to themselves; ¹⁵ who show the law's work written in their hearts when their conscience testifies in agreement, and their reasonings among one another accuse or even defend.

¹⁷ But since you call yourself Jew, and rely on the law, and boast in God, ¹⁸ and know his will, and approve the better things, being instructed by the law, ¹⁹ and are confident that yourself are a leader of the blind, a light of those in darkness, ²⁰ an instructor of the ignorant, a teacher of babes, having in the law the form of knowledge and of the truth—²¹ you then who teach another, do you not teach yourself? You who preach, steal not, do you steal? ²² You who say, commit not adultery, do you commit adultery? You who abhor idols, do you rob temples [*of them?*] ²³ You who boast in the law, dishonor God by breaking the law. ²⁴ For as it is written, God's name is, because of you, spoken evil of among the nations.

²⁵ For circumcision is of service, provided you practice the law; but if you are a breaker of the law, your circumcision becomes uncircumcision. ²⁶ If then the uncircumcised keep the precepts of the law, shall not his uncircumcision be counted for circumcision? ²⁷ And the uncircumcision, which is natural, will, by fulfilling the law, condemn you who, with the letter and circumcision, are a breaker of the law. ²⁸ For he is not the Jew who is one simply without; nor is that circumcision which is merely without in the flesh. ²⁹ But he is the Jew who is one within, whose praise is not of men, but of God; and circumcision is of the heart, in spirit, and not in letter.

CHAPTER III.

What then is the advantage of the Jew? or what the profit of circumcision? ³ Much in many a way. For, first, they were entrusted with the revelations of God. ⁴ What then?—inasmuch as some were not faithful. Will their unfaithfulness render God's fidelity of no effect? ⁵ Not at all. On the contrary, let God be true, but every man false; that, as it is written, you may be justified in your words and overcome when judged. ⁶ But if our injustice display the justice of God, what shall we say? Is not God unjust who inflicts wrath? I speak as a man. Not at all. ⁷ For how then shall God judge the world? ⁸ For if God's truthfulness abounds the more to his honor by my being false, why am also I still condemned as a sinner? ⁹ And should we not do evil that good may come? as we are falsely said [*to do*], and as some declare we say, whose condemnation is just.

¹⁰ What then? Do we excel? By no means. For we have already charged that both Jews and Greeks are all under sin, ¹¹ as it is written: there are none just, not one; ¹² there are none who understand; there are none who seek God; ¹³ all have turned aside; together they have become useless; there are none who do good; there is not even one. ¹⁴ Their throat is an open grave; with their tongues they deceive; the poison of asps is under their lips; ¹⁵ their mouth is full of cursing and bitterness; ¹⁶ their feet are swift to shed blood; ¹⁷ ruin and misery are in their paths; ¹⁸ and the way of peace they have not known; ¹⁹ there is no fear of God

before their eyes. ¹⁰ Now we know that whatever the law says, it says to those under the law, that every mouth may be shut, and the whole world become guilty before God. ¹¹ For by works of law no flesh shall be justified in his sight; for by law is the knowledge of sin.

¹² But now God's justification without law is revealed, being attested by the law and the prophets, ¹³ even God's justification by belief in Jesus Christ, for all who believe—(For there is no difference; ¹⁴ for all have sinned and come short of the glory of God)—¹⁵ they being justified freely by his favor, through the ransom which is in Christ Jesus; ¹⁶ whom God has set forth as an atoning sacrifice through belief in his blood, for a proof of God's justice, on account of remitting the sins formerly committed ¹⁷ during his forbearance; also for a proof of his justice at this time, that he may be just while justifying him that believes in Jesus.

¹⁸ Where then is boasting? It is shut out. By what law—of works? No indeed; but by the law of belief. ¹⁹ For we conclude that man is justified by belief, without deeds of law. ²⁰ Is he the God of Jews only, and not of Gentiles? Yes, of Gentiles also; ²¹ since there is one God who will justify the circumcision by belief, and the uncircumcision by belief. ²² Do we then render law of no effect by belief? Not at all; but we establish law.

CHAPTER IV.

What now shall we say that Abraham our father obtained according to the flesh? ¹ For had Abraham been justified by deeds, he has ground for boasting. ² But he has none before God. For what says the scripture? Abraham believed God, and it was counted to him for justification. ³ Now to him who works, the wages is not counted as a favor, but as a debt. ⁴ But to him who works not, but believes on him who justifies the wicked—his belief is counted for justification. ⁵ Even as David also speaks of the man's blessedness to whom God counts justification without deeds: ⁶ Blest are they whose iniquities are forgiven, and whose sins are covered; ⁷ blest is the man to whom the Lord will not count sin.

⁸ Now is this blessedness for the circumcision [only]? or for the uncircumcision also? For we say that to Abraham belief was counted for justification. ⁹ How then was it counted to him?—while he was in circumcision, or in uncircumcision?—not in circumcision, but in uncircumcision. ¹⁰ And he received the mark of circumcision, as a seal of the justification of the belief which [he had], in uncircumcision, that he might be the father of all who believe, in uncircumcision, that to them also justification may be counted; ¹¹ and the father of circumcision, not to those who are merely circumcised, but to those who also walk in the steps of the belief which our father Abraham had, in uncircumcision.

¹² Now the promise, that he should be the heir of the world, was not made to Abraham, nor his offspring, through law, but through justification by belief. ¹³ For if they of law be heirs, belief is rendered of no

effect; and the promise is a failure. ¹⁴ For the law works wrath; but where no law is there is no transgression. ¹⁵ Therefore, it is by belief, that it may be by favor, that the promise may be sure for all the offspring,—not to him only, who is of the law, but to him also who is of Abraham's belief, who is the father of us all; ¹⁷ (as it is written: I have made you a father of many nations), before God in whom he believed, (who, makes alive the dead, and calls things not existing as existing), ¹⁸ who, against hope, believed in hope; so that he became the father of many nations; according to the saying: So shall your offspring be. ¹⁹ And being not weak in belief, he did not mind his own body, now dead, being nearly a hundred years old, and the deadness of Sarah's womb; ²⁰ and he did not decide against God's promise through unbelief. But he grew strong by belief, (giving glory to God), ²¹ being also fully convinced that what he had promised, he is able also to do. ²² Therefore it was counted to him for justification.

²³ Now it was not written, that it was counted to him, for his sake alone, ²⁴ but for our sake also, to whom it is to be counted—to us who believe on him who raised Jesus our Lord from the dead, ²⁵ who was given up because of our sins, and was raised for our justification.

CHAPTER V.

Therefore being justified by belief, we have peace with God through our Lord Jesus Christ; ² through whom also we have access into this favor in which we stand; and [through whom] we rejoice in hope of the glory of God. ³ Not only so, but we even glory in afflictions; knowing that affliction produces patience; ⁴ and patience, approval; and approval, hope. ⁵ And this hope makes not ashamed; because God's love is poured out in our hearts by the Holy Spirit that is given to us. ⁶ For while we were still without strength, Christ died, at the set time, for the wicked. ⁷ (Now hardly for the just will any one die; yet for the good, may be, some one might venture even to die. ⁸ But God shows *his* love for us in this, that while we were still sinners, Christ died for us.) ⁹ Much more then, being now justified by his blood, we shall be saved from wrath through him. ¹⁰ For if, while we were enemies, we were reconciled to God by the death of his Son; much more, being reconciled, we shall be saved by his life. ¹¹ And not only so, but we also rejoice in God, through our Lord Jesus Christ, through whom we have now received the reconciliation.

¹² Therefore, as by one man sin entered into the world, and death by sin; and thus it spread to all men, because all sinned. ¹³ For until the law sin was in the world; but sin is not counted when there is no law. ¹⁴ Yet death reigned from Adam to Moses, even over those that had not sinned in the likeness of Adam's transgression, who is the type of him that was to come. ¹⁵ But not as was the sin, so also is the gift. For if by the sin of the one, the many died; much more have the favor of God and the gift by favor of the one man, Jesus Christ, abounded to the many.

¹⁰ And not as was the sentence which was by the one that sinned, so is the gift. For the sentence was because of one sin to condemnation; but the gift is to justification from many sins. ¹¹For if by one sin death has reigned through the one man; much more are they, who receive the abundant favor, and the gift of justification, to reign in life through the one, Jesus Christ. ¹²Therefore, then, as by one sin sentence came upon all men to condemnation; so also by one righteous act the gift came upon all men to justification of life. ¹³For as by the disobedience of the one man, the many were constituted sinners; so also by the obedience of the one, the many are to be constituted just.

¹⁴Now the law entered in besides, that sin might increase. But where sin increased, favor abounded exceedingly more; ¹⁵that as sin reigned in death, so also might favor reign through justification to everlasting life through Jesus Christ our Lord.

CHAPTER VI.

What then shall we say? Must we continue in sin that favor may abound? ¹Not at all. We who died to sin, how can we still live in it? ²Or do you not know that all we who were immersed into Christ Jesus were immersed into his death? ³We were then buried with him by the immersion into death, that as Christ was raised from the dead by the glory of the Father, thus we also should walk in newness of life. ⁴For if we have become united with him by the likeness of his death, surely we are also to be by that of his resurrection, ⁵knowing this, that our old man was crucified with him, that the sinful body might be rendered inactive, that we should no longer serve sin. ⁶For he that is dead is released from sin. ⁷Now if we died with Christ, we believe that we should also live like him; ⁸knowing that Christ, being raised from the dead, dies no more, death lords it over him no more. ⁹The death, then, which he died, he died to sin once; but the life which he lives, he lives to God. ¹⁰Thus do you also account yourselves dead to sin, but alive to God in Christ Jesus.

¹¹Therefore let not sin reign in your mortal body, to obey its desires. ¹²Nor present your members to sin, as instruments of wrong; but present yourselves to God, as alive from the dead, and your members to God, as instruments of righteousness. ¹³For sin shall not lord it over you; for you are not under law, but under favor.

¹⁴What then? May we sin because we are not under law, but under favor? Not at all. ¹⁵Do you not know that to whatever you present yourselves as servants for obedience, its servants you are which you obey, whether of sin to death, or of obedience to justification? ¹⁶But thanks to God that though you were slaves of sin, you yet obeyed from the heart the model of teaching to which you were delivered; ¹⁷and having been freed from sin you became servants to righteousness—¹⁸I speak humanly on account of the weakness of your flesh. For as you presented your members as slaves to impurity and to lawlessness, in order to lawlessness; so now

present your members as servants to righteousness, in order to holiness. ²⁰ For when you were slaves of sin, you were free as to righteousness. ²¹ Well, what benefit had you then from those things of which you are now ashamed? For the end of those things is death. ²² But now having been freed from sin, and become servants to God, you have your fruit in holiness, and the end, everlasting life. ²³ For the wages of sin is death, but the gift of God is everlasting life in Christ Jesus our Lord.

CHAPTER VII.

Do you not know, brethren, for I speak to men knowing law, that the law rules over a man so long as he lives. ¹ For the married woman is bound by law to her living husband; but if her husband dies, she is released from the law of the husband. ² Therefore, if while her husband lives, she becomes wife to another man, she will act the adulteress. But if her husband dies, she is free from the law; so that she is not an adulteress in becoming wife to another man. ³ And so, my brethren, you also died to the law by the body of Christ, that you might become bound to another, to him who was raised from the dead, that we might bear fruit to God. ⁴ For when we were in the flesh, the sinful desires which were by the law worked in our members, to produce fruit to death. ⁵ But now we are released from the law, having died to that in which we were held, so that we serve in newness of spirit, and not in oldness of letter.

⁷ What then shall we say? Is the law sin? Not at all. On the contrary, I had not known sin but by the law. For I had not known desire to be sin, had not the law said, You shall not desire. ⁸ But sin, taking advantage through the precept, worked up in me every desire; for without law sin is dead. ⁹ And I was once alive without law, but when the precept came, sin revived, and I died; ¹⁰ and the precept which was given for life was found by me to end in death. ¹¹ For sin, taking advantage through the precept, deceived me, and by it killed me. ¹² So then the law is holy, and the precept holy, and just, and good.

¹³ Did then that good thing become death to me? Not at all. But sin did, that sin might be seen working death to me by what is good, that sin might, by the precept, become excessively sinful. ¹⁴ For we know that the law is spiritual, but I am fleshly, sold under sin. ¹⁵ For what I do, I approve not; for I practice not what I wish, but what I hate, that I do. ¹⁶ If then I do what I do not wish, I agree with the law that it is right. ¹⁷ But now it is no longer I that do this, but the sin which dwells in me. ¹⁸ For I know that no good dwells in me, that is, in my flesh; for the wish is present with me, but doing right is not. ¹⁹ For I do not the good which I wish, but the evil which I do not wish, that I do. ²⁰ If then I do what I do not wish, it is no longer I that do it, but the sin which dwells in me. ²¹ I find it, then, the rule with me that, when wishing to do right, evil is present with me. ²² For I delight in the law of God in the inner man; ²³ but I see another law in my members, at war against the law of my

mind, and making me captive to the sinful law which is in my members.
² Toil-worn man I! Who shall deliver me from this body of death?
³ Thanks to God, he will, through Jesus Christ our Lord. So then with the mind I myself serve the law of God, but with the flesh the law of sin.

CHAPTER VIII.

There is therefore now no condemnation to those in Christ Jesus; ¹ for the law of the Spirit of life freed me in Christ Jesus from the law of sin and death. ² For what was impossible for the law, because it was weak through the flesh, God by sending his Son in the likeness of sinful flesh, and for sin, did; and he condemned sin in the flesh, ³ that the justification of the law might be accomplished in us who walk not according to the flesh, but according to the spirit. ⁴ For they that live according to the flesh attend to the things of the flesh; but they that live according to the spirit, the things of the spirit. ⁵ Now attending to the flesh is death; but attending to the spirit, life and peace; ⁶ because attending to the flesh is enmity against God; for he that does it is not obedient to the law of God: indeed he can not be. ⁷ So then they that are in the flesh can not please God. ⁸ But you who are not in the flesh, but in the spirit, provided God's Spirit dwells in you; and if any one has not Christ's Spirit he is not his. ⁹ But, though Christ dwells in you, the body is dead because of sin; yet the spirit is life because of justification. ¹⁰ Moreover if the Spirit of him that raised Jesus from the dead dwells in you, he that raised Christ from the dead will also make alive your mortal bodies by his Spirit that dwells in you.

¹¹ So then, brethren, we are bound, not to the flesh, to live according to the flesh. ¹² For if you live according to the flesh, you shall die; but if by the spirit, you put an end to the deeds of the body, you shall live. ¹³ For so many as are led by the Spirit of God, these are sons of God. ¹⁴ For you did not receive the spirit of slavery ending again in fear; but you received the spirit of sonship in which we cry, Father.

¹⁵ The Spirit itself testifies with our spirit that we are children of God; ¹⁶ and if children, also heirs, God's heirs, joint-heirs with Christ, provided we suffer with him, that we may also be glorified with him. ¹⁷ Now I count that the sufferings of the present time are not worthy to be named with the glory that shall be revealed for us. ¹⁸ For the earnest expectation of the creation is waiting for the revelation of the sons of God. ¹⁹ Now the creation was made subject to frailty, not willingly, but for his sake who subjected it in hope. ²⁰ Because the creation itself is to be delivered from the bondage of corruption into the glorious freedom of the children of God. ²¹ For we know that the whole creation groans together and is in pain until now. ²² And not only it, but even we ourselves, though having the first fruit of the Spirit, even we groan within ourselves while waiting for the sonship, the deliverance of our bodies. ²³ For in this hope were we saved. But hope seen is not hope; for what one sees why still does

he hope for? ²⁶ But if we hope for what we see not, with patience we wait for it.

²⁷ And likewise the Spirit also helps our weakness; for we know not what we should pray for as we ought; but the Spirit itself intercedes in groanings not utterable. ²⁸ And he who searches the hearts knows what the Spirit's mind is, that it pleads as God desires for the holy.

²⁹ Besides, we know that all things work together for good to those that love God, to those that are called according to his purpose. ³⁰ For whom he foreknew, he also predetermined to be of a form like the form of his Son, that he might be the firstborn among many brethren. ³¹ And whom he predetermined, them he also called; and whom he called, them he also justified; and whom he justified, them he also glorified.

³² What then shall we say to these things? If God is for us who is against us? ³³ He who spared not his own Son, but gave him up for us all, how will he not also with him give us all things? ³⁴ Who can bring a charge against God's chosen? It is God that justifies. ³⁵ Who is he that condemns? It is Christ that died, rather that is risen, who also is at the right hand of God, and who pleads for us. ³⁶ Who can separate us from the love of Christ? Can affliction, or distress, or persecution, or hunger, or nakedness, or danger, or sword? ³⁷ Accordingly it is written, for your sake we are killed all the day; we are counted as sheep for the slaughter. ³⁸ But in all these things we more than conquer by him that loved us. ³⁹ For I am persuaded that neither death nor life, nor angels nor rulers, nor things present nor things to come, nor powers, ⁴⁰ nor height, nor depth, nor any other creature will be able to separate us from God's love which is in Christ Jesus our Lord.

CHAPTER IX.

I speak the truth in Christ, I lie not, my conscience testifying for me in the Holy Spirit, ² that I have great grief and continual sorrow in my heart. ³ For I could wish that I myself were accursed from Christ for my brethren, my kin according to the flesh; ⁴ who are Israelites, whose is the sonship, and the glory, and the covenants, and the law-giving, and the worship-service, and the promises; ⁵ whose are the fathers, and of whom, as to his flesh, Christ came, who is over all things. God be blessed forever—amen. ⁶ But I do not mean that God's word has failed; for all that are of Israel are not Israel. ⁷ Nor are they all children because Abraham's offspring; but in Isaac your children shall be called: ⁸ That is, the children of the flesh are not children of God, but the children of the promise are counted for children. ⁹ For there was this word of promise: At this time I will come, and Sarah shall have a son. ¹⁰ And not only so, but Rebecca also, having conceived by one, Isaac our father, ¹¹ it was said to her (the children being not yet born, nor having done any thing good or bad, that God's purpose as to choosing might stand [and the choice be] not from works but from him that calls), ¹² the elder shall serve the younger: ¹³ As it is written: I loved Jacob, but hated Esau.

¹⁴ What then shall we say? Is there not injustice with God? Not at all. ¹⁵ For he says to Moses, I will have mercy on whom I have mercy; and I will pity whom I pity. ¹⁶ So then [being chosen] is not of him that wills, nor of him that runs, but of God that shows mercy. ¹⁷ For the scripture says to Pharaoh: For this very purpose I raised you up, that I might display in you my power, and that my name might be published in all the land. ¹⁸ So then he has mercy on whom he will, and whom he will, he hardens. ¹⁹ You will say to me then, Why then does he still find fault? For who resists his will? ²⁰ Nay but, man, who are you that reply to God? Shall the thing formed say to him that formed it, Why did you make me thus? ²¹ Or has not the potter power over the clay to make from the same mass one vessel for honor and another for dishonor?

²² But God, though determining to display his wrath and to make known his power, endured with much forbearance vessels of wrath ripe for destruction. ²³ And that he might make known his wealth of glory on vessels of mercy, which he prepared for glory, ²⁴ [he showed mercy on] us whom he also called, not only from the Jews, but also from the Gentiles. ²⁵ As he says also by Hosea: I will call those my people that are not my people, and her beloved that is not beloved; ²⁶ and in the place where it was said to them, You are not my people, there they shall be called sons of the living God. ²⁷ Besides Isaiah cries over Israel: Though the number of the sons of Israel be as the sand of the sea, a remnant shall be saved. ²⁸ Now the Lord will execute this saying upon the land, fulfilling it and ending it quickly. ²⁹ And as Isaiah had before said: Had not the Lord of hosts left us offspring, we should have become as Sodom, and been made like Gomorrah.

³⁰ What then shall we say? That the Gentiles who were not seeking justification, attained to justification, but justification that is by belief. ³¹ But Israel, though seeking a law of justification, attained not to a law. ³² Why? Because [seeking justification] not by belief, but as by works, they stumbled at the stumbling-stone. ³³ As it is written: Behold, I place in Sion a stumbling-stone, and a rock of offence; and he that believes upon it shall not be ashamed.

CHAPTER X.

Brethren, the desire of my heart and prayer to God for them, is for their salvation. ¹ For I testify for them that they have zeal for God, but not according to knowledge. ² For being ignorant of God's justification, and seeking to establish their own, they have not been obedient to God's justification. ³ For Christ is the end of the law for justification to every one that believes. ⁴ For Moses describes the justification which is of the law: that the man who has done its requirements shall live by them. ⁵ But justification by belief speaks thus: Say not in your heart, Who shall go up into heaven; that is, to bring down Christ; ⁶ nor Who shall

go down into the deep ; that is, to bring up Christ from the dead ? ⁸ But what does it say ? The thing said is near you, in your mouth and in your heart, that is, the doctrine of belief, which we preach : ⁹—that if you will confess the Lord Jesus with your mouth, and will believe in your heart that God raised him from the dead, you shall be saved. ¹⁰ For with the heart we believe in order to justification, and with the mouth we confess in order to salvation. ¹¹ For the scripture says : Every one that believes on him shall not be ashamed. ¹² For between Jew and Greek there is no difference ; for the same Lord of all is rich towards all that call upon him. ¹³ For every one who calls upon the name of the Lord shall be saved.

¹⁴ How now can they call upon him in whom they have not believed ; and how can they believe in him of whom they have not heard ; and how can they hear without a preacher ; ¹⁵ and how can they preach unless they be sent ? As it is written : How timely are the feet of those that preach good news ? ¹⁶ But still all have not obeyed the gospel ; for Isaiah says : Lord, who has believed our report ? ¹⁷ Therefore belief comes from report, and report by means of Christ's word. ¹⁸ But I say, have they not heard ? Yes, indeed, their voice went into all the land, and their words into the ends of the world. ¹⁹ But I say, did Israel not understand ? First Moses says : I will make you jealous by what is not a nation, and will provoke you by a foolish nation. ²⁰ And Isaiah is bold and says : I was found by them who sought me not ; I became known to them who asked not for me. ²¹ But respecting Israel he says : the whole day I stretched out my hands to a disobedient and contradicting people.

CHAPTER XI

I say, then, Has God rejected his people ? Not at all. For even I am an Israelite, of the offspring of Abraham, of the tribe of Benjamin. ¹ God has not rejected his people whom he foreknew. Do you not know what the scripture says in [the case of] Elijah when he complains to God against Israel ? ² Lord, they have killed your prophets, digged down your altars, and I am left alone, and they seek my life. ³ But what says the answer to him ? I have left for myself seven thousand men who have not bent knee to Baal. ⁴ Likewise then, even at this time, there is a remnant by choice of favor ; ⁵ and if by favor, not from works, for then favor is no longer favor. ⁶ What then ? That which Israel seek, they found not ; but the chosen found it, and the rest were hardened. ⁷ As it is written, God has given them the spirit of sleep until this day, eyes but not to see, and ears but not to hear. ⁸ David also says : Let their table become a snare, and a trap, and a stumbling-block, and a requital to them. ⁹ Let their eyes be darkened that they may not see, and do you bend down their back always.

¹¹ I say then, Did they stumble that they might fall ? Not at all. But by their fall, salvation is come to the Gentiles, in order to excite them to

emulation. ¹³ Now if their fall is the riches of the world, and their loss the riches of the Gentiles, how much more will their fullness be. ¹⁴ And I speak to you Gentiles, inasmuch as I am apostle to the Gentiles; [and] I honor my office, ¹⁵ if possibly I may excite my flesh to emulation, and save some of them. ¹⁶ For if their rejection is the reconciliation of the world, what will their reception be but life from the dead? ¹⁷ And if the first portion be holy, the mass is also; and if the root be holy, the branches are too. ¹⁸ But if some of the branches were broken off, and you, being a wild olive, have been grafted in among them, and become a partaker of the root and fatness of the olive, ¹⁹ boast not against the branches. But if you boast, you bear not the root, but the root, you. ²⁰ You will say then, branches were broken off that I might be grafted in. ²¹ Well; because of unbelief they were broken off, and by belief you stand. Be not high-minded, but fear. ²² For if God spared not the natural branches, he will also not spare you. ²³ See then God's kindness and cutting off—upon them that fell, cutting off; but upon you, God's kindness, provided you continue in his kindness; otherwise you too shall be cut off. ²⁴ And they also, if they continue not in unbelief, shall be grafted in; for God is able to graft them in again. ²⁵ For if you have been cut from an olive, wild by nature, and grafted, contrary to nature, into a good olive, how much more shall these, the natural branches, be grafted into their own olive?

²⁶ For I do not wish you to be ignorant, brethren, of this mystery, lest you be wise within yourselves, that hardness in part has happened to Israel, until the full sum of the Gentiles come in. ²⁷ And so all Israel shall be saved; as it is written: The deliverer shall come out of Sion, and shall turn away impiety from Jacob. ²⁸ And my covenant with them is this—when I shall take away their sins. ²⁹ With respect to the gospel, they are hated for your sake; but with respect to the choice, beloved on the fathers' account. ³⁰ For God's favors and calling are not regretted. ³¹ For as you were formerly disobedient to God, but now have obtained mercy through their disobedience; ³² so also they are now disobedient that they may obtain mercy through the mercy shown to you. ³³ For God has shut up all in disobedience that he may have mercy on all.

³⁴ O the depth of God's riches, and wisdom, and knowledge. How unsearchable are his decisions, and untraceable his paths! ³⁵ For who has known the Lord's mind, or who has been his counsellor? ³⁶ Or who has first given to him, and it shall be repaid to him? ³⁷ For all things are of him, and through him, and for him. To him be glory forever—amen.

CHAPTER XII.

I therefore beseech you, brethren, by the mercies of God, to present your bodies a living, holy, well-pleasing sacrifice to God, which is your reasonable service; ² and not to be fashioned after this world, but to be changed by the renewing of your mind, that you may judge of what God's will is—of what is good, and well-pleasing, and perfect. ³ For by

the favor bestowed upon me, I charge every one who is among you not to be high-minded beyond what he ought to be in mind, but to take care to be right-minded, as God has divided to each a measure of belief. ⁴ For as we have many members in one body, and all members have not the same use; ⁵ so we, the many, are one body in Christ, and are each members of one another. ⁶ Having then gifts differing according to the favor bestowed—whether prophecy, let us exercise it according to the measure of belief; ⁷ or ministry, let us serve in ministering; or let him who teaches, attend to teaching; ⁸ or let him that exhorts, continue in exhortation; let him that imparts, do so with liberality; let him that rules, rule with diligence; let him that shows pity, do it with cheerfulness.

⁹ Let love be unfeigned; abhor what is evil; cling to what is good. ¹⁰ As to brotherly love, be very affectionate to one another; in esteem, be examples to one another. ¹¹ Be not slow in zeal; fervent in spirit; serving the Lord. ¹² Be joyful in hope; patient in affliction; constant in prayer. ¹³ Be sharers in the wants of the holy; keeping on in love for strangers. ¹⁴ Bless those who persecute you; bless, and curse not. ¹⁵ Rejoice with the rejoicing; weep with the weeping. ¹⁶ Be of like mind one towards another; mind not high things, but be led along by lowly things. Be not wise in your own eyes. ¹⁷ Repay not evil for evil; take forethought for things right in the sight of all men. ¹⁸ On your part, be at peace, if possible, with all men.

¹⁹ Beloved, avenge not yourselves, but give place to the [Lord's] anger; for it is written: punishment is mine, I will repay it, says the Lord. ²⁰ But if your enemy be hungry, feed him; if thirsty, give him drink; for in doing this you will heap coals of fire upon his head. ²¹ Be not conquered by evil, but conquer evil by good.

CHAPTER XIII.

Let every soul be obedient to ruling authorities; for there is no authority but from God; and those in being have been set in order by God. ² So that he who resists the authority resists the appointment of God; and they who resist will receive sentence against themselves. ³ For rulers are not a fear to good work, but to bad. Do you wish then not to be afraid of the authority? Do what is good, and you shall have praise from it. ⁴ For [the ruler] is God's servant for good to you; but if you do bad, be afraid, for he wears not the sword to no purpose. For God's servant is an avenger for anger upon him who does bad. ⁵ Therefore it is necessary to be obedient, not only because of anger, but also because of conscience. ⁶ Now for this reason also you pay tax; for they are God's ministers attending to this very duty. ⁷ Give to all their dues, tax to whom tax is due, custom to whom custom, fear to whom fear, honor to whom honor.

⁸ Owe no one any thing, except the love of one another; for he who loves another has fulfilled the law. ⁹ For the [law is]: You shall not commit adultery; you shall not murder, you shall not steal; you shall not de-

sire; and if there is any other commandment it is summed up in this saying, namely, you shall love your neighbor as yourself. ¹⁰ Love works no evil to a neighbor; therefore love is the fulfillment of the law.

¹¹ And this [let us do] knowing the season, that it is already time for us to awake from sleep; for now our salvation is nearer than when we believed. ¹² The night is far spent, the day is at hand. Let us then lay off the works of darkness, and put on the arms of light. ¹³ Let us walk becomingly as in the day, not in revels and drunkenness, not in beds and lewdness, not in strife and envy. ¹⁴ But put on the Lord Jesus Christ, and make no provision for the desires of the flesh.

CHAPTER XIV.

And accept him who is weak in belief, but not to decisions of thoughts. ² One believes that he may eat all things; while he who is weak eats vegetables. ³ Let not him that eats, despise him that eats not; and let not him that eats not, judge him that eats; for God has accepted him. ⁴ Who are you that judge another's servant? To his own master he stands or falls; and stand he shall, for the Lord is able to make him stand. ⁵ One esteems one day above another; another esteems all days alike. Let each be fully satisfied in his own mind. ⁶ He who keeps the day, keeps it to the Lord; and he who eats, eats to the Lord; for he gives God thanks; and he who eats not, to the Lord eats not, and gives God thanks. ⁷ 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 die, we die to the Lord. Whether therefore we live or die, we are the Lord's. ⁹ Because for this purpose Christ died and lived, that he might be lord of both dead and living. ¹⁰ But why do you judge your brother? or why despise your brother? For we shall all stand before the judgment-seat of God. ¹¹ For it is written: As I live, says the Lord, every knee shall bend to me, and every tongue confess to God. ¹² So then, each of us shall give account to God respecting himself.

¹³ Therefore, let us no longer judge one another. But rather do you decide on this, not to place a stumbling-block or means of falling before a brother. ¹⁴ I know and am persuaded in the Lord Jesus that nothing is unclean in itself; but to him who thinks a thing unclean, it is unclean. ¹⁵ If now your brother is grieved by food, you no longer walk according to love. Destroy not him with your food for whom Christ died. ¹⁶ Let not your good then be evil spoken of. ¹⁷ For the kingdom of God is not food and drink, but righteousness, and peace, and joy in the Holy Spirit. ¹⁸ For he who in this [way] serves Christ, is acceptable to God and approved by men. ¹⁹ Now therefore let us follow the ways of peace, even the ways that build up one another. ²⁰ For the sake of food, pull not down the work of God. All [food] is clean, but [food] is an evil to the man who, in eating it, occasions stumbling. ²¹ It is good not to eat flesh, nor drink wine, nor [eat or drink] any thing by which your brother

stumbles, or falls, or is made weak. ²² You have belief: keep it to yourself before God. Happy is he who condemns not himself in that which he judges proper. ²³ But if one eats while doubting, he is condemned, because [his act is] not from belief; and every act which is not from belief, is a sin.

CHAPTER XV.

Now we, the strong, ought to bear with the weaknesses of the weak, and not to please ourselves. ² Let each of us please his neighbor in what is good, for the purpose of building up. ³ For even Christ pleased not himself, but as it is written: The reproaches of those reproaching you, fell on me. ⁴ For whatever was formerly written, was written for our instruction, that through patience and through comfort from the scriptures, we might retain hope. ⁵ Now may the God of patience and comfort grant to you to be of this same mind in regard to one another, according to Christ Jesus, ⁶ that with one soul, you may, with one mouth, glorify God, even the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ. ⁷ Therefore accept one another, even as Christ accepted you to the glory of God. ⁸ For I say that Christ became a minister of the circumcision, for the sake of God's truthfulness, in order to make good the promises to the fathers, ⁹ and that the Gentiles might glorify God for his mercy. As it is written: for this reason I will confess to you among the Gentiles, and will sing to your name. ¹⁰ And again he says, Be glad you Gentiles with his people. ¹¹ And once more, All you Gentiles praise the Lord, yes, all you people praise him. ¹² And farther, Isaiah says, There shall be a root of Jesse; and he shall rise up to rule the Gentiles, yes, in him the Gentiles shall trust.

¹³ Now may the God of hope fill you with all joy and peace in believing, that you may abound in hope by power of the Holy Spirit. ¹⁴ But I am persuaded, my brethren, even I myself, respecting you, that you also yourselves are full of goodness, being filled with all knowledge, able even to admonish one another. ¹⁵ Yet I have written to you the more boldly in places, as one recalling things to your memory, because of the favor bestowed upon me by God, ¹⁶ in order to my being a minister of Christ Jesus for the Gentiles, administering the gospel of God, that the offering up of the Gentiles might be acceptable, being purified by the Holy Spirit. ¹⁷ I am therefore enabled to boast in Christ in matters relating to God. ¹⁸ Yet I shall not venture to speak of any thing which Christ has not effected through me by power of the Spirit, ¹⁹ by word and deed, by the power of signs and wonders, in order to the obedience of the Gentiles. So that from Jerusalem, and around, as far as Illyricum, I have fully preached the gospel of Christ; ²⁰ thus being moved by love of honor to preach the gospel where Christ had not been named, that I might not build upon another's foundation. ²¹ But as it is written: They to whom nothing was told respecting me, shall see; and they who have not heard, shall understand.

²² For this reason also, I have often been hindered from coming to you;

²² but now having no longer a place [to preach] in these regions, and having had a desire for many years to come to you [I purpose doing so],
²³ whenever I go into Spain. For I hope while passing through to see you, and to be by you helped forward thither, provided I am first partly filled with you. ²⁴ But now I am going to Jerusalem, ministering to the holy. ²⁵ For Macedonia and Achaia thought good to make a contribution for the poor of the holy who are in Jerusalem, ²⁶ yes, thought good, and they are debtors to them. For if the Gentiles shared in their spiritual things, they ought to minister to them in fleshly things. ²⁷ When now I have finished this service, and secured to them this fruit, I shall depart by you into Spain. ²⁸ And I know that in coming to you, I shall come with the fullness of Christ's blessing. ²⁹ But I beseech you, brethren, by our Lord Jesus Christ, and by the love of the Spirit, to strive with me in prayers to God for me, ³⁰ that I may be delivered from the unbelievers in Judea, and that my service, which is for Jerusalem, may be acceptable to the holy, ³¹ that with joy I may come to you by God's will, and be refreshed among you. ³² The God of peace be with you all—amen.

CHAPTER XVI.

Now I commend to you, Phebe, our sister, who is deaconess of the church in Cenchrea, ¹ that you receive her in the Lord, as becomes the holy, and help her in whatever business she may need you; for she herself also has been a helper of many, and of me myself.

² Greet Prisca and Aquila, my co-laborers in Christ Jesus, ³ who, for the sake of my life, laid down their own neck; to whom not only I give thanks, but also all the churches of the Gentiles; and [greet] the church in their house. ⁴ Greet my beloved Epenetus, who is a first fruit of Asia to Christ. ⁵ Greet Mary who labored much for you. ⁶ Greet Audronicus and Junias, my kinsman and my fellow-prisoners, who are of note among the apostles, and who were in Christ before me. ⁷ Greet Amplias, my beloved in the Lord. ⁸ Greet Urbanus, our co-laborer in Christ, and my beloved Stachys. ⁹ Greet Apelles, the tried in Christ. Greet those of the family of Aristobulus, ¹⁰ Greet Herodion, my kinsman. Greet those of the family of Narcissus, who are in the Lord. ¹¹ Greet Tryphena and Tryphosa, who labor in the Lord. Greet the beloved Persis, who labored much in the Lord. ¹² Greet Rufus, the chosen in the Lord, and his mother and mine. ¹³ Greet Asyncritus, Phlegon, Hermes, Patrobas, Hermas, and the brethren with them. ¹⁴ Greet Philologus and Julia, Nereus and his sister, and Olympas, and all the holy with them. ¹⁵ Greet one another with a holy kiss. All the churches of Christ greet you.

¹⁶ Now I beseech you, brethren, to look after those that cause divisions and stumblings, contrary to the teaching you have learned, and turn away from them; ¹⁷ for such as they, serve not our Lord Christ, but their own stomach, and by good talk and fair speech deceive the hearts of the innocent. ¹⁸ Yet your obedience has come abroad to all men. I therefore

rejoice over you ; but I wish you to be wise as to what is good ; and harmless as to what is bad. ²⁰ And the God of peace shall soon crush Satan under your feet. The favor of our Lord Jesus Christ be with you.

²¹ Timothy, my co-laborer, and Lucius, and Jason, and Sosipater, my kinsmen, greet you. ²² I Tertius, who wrote this Letter, greet you in the Lord. ²³ Gaius, the entertainer of me, and of the whole church, greets you. Erastus, the treasurer of the city, and Quartus, the brother, greet you. ²⁴ The favor of our Lord Jesus Christ be with you all—amen.

²⁵ Now to him who is able to establish you according to my gospel, even the preaching respecting Jesus Christ, according to the revelation of the mystery, ²⁶ kept secret in times gone, but now manifested through the prophetic writings—made known by command of the everlasting God, to all nations, in order to the obedience of belief—²⁷ to God the only wise—
to him be glory through Jesus Christ, for ever—amen.