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PREFACE TO THE AMERICAN EDITION.

The Epistle to the Romans is the Epistle of the Epistles, as the Gospel of John is the Gospel of the Gospels. It is the heart of the doctrinal portion of the New Testament. It presents in systematic order the fundamental truths of Christianity in their primitive purity, inexhaustible depth, all-conquering force, and never-failing comfort. It is the bulwark of the evangelical doctrines of sin and grace against the obscuration of the gospel, whether by judaizing bigotry or paganizing licentiousness. Addressed to the Christians at Rome, and unfolding to them the gospel as a spiritual power of God unto salvation far exceeding in effect, and outlasting in time, the temporal power of the Imperial City, it prophetically anticipates and positively overthrows every essential error of Romanism, and is to this day the best antidote against popery. No wonder that it was so highly prized by the Reformers. Luther, whom Coleridge regarded "the only fit commentator on Paul," called the Romans "the chief part of the New Testament, and the purest gospel, well worthy to be committed to memory word for word by every Christian man, and to be pondered daily and enjoyed as the daily bread of the soul. It can never be too often nor too well read and considered, and the more it is understood, the better it tastes." Those who have studied it most carefully, are most likely to fall in with the judgment of Coleridge, that it is "the most profound work in existence."

But it is certainly also the most difficult book of the New Testament, unless we except the Gospel of John and the Revelation. Meyer, the ablest philological exegete of the age, humbly confesses, in the preface to the fourth edition of his commentary, to a growing sense of our inability to do justice to "the grandest, the boldest, and, in all its depths and heights, the most complete composition of the greatest apostle." If St. Peter did not hesitate to state that there are "some things hard to be understood" in the Epistles of his "beloved brother Paul," we need not be surprised that even such divines as occupy the same general platform widely differ in their interpretations. The Epistle to the Romans, more than any other, is a battle-field; and every chapter, especially the third, the fifth, the seventh, and the ninth, is contested ground. Not a few commentators deal with it as Procrustes dealt with his victims, in adapting them to the length of his iron bedstead—either stretching out or cutting off their legs. But after all, vast progress has been made, especially within the last fifty years, toward an impartial and thorough understanding of this wonderful production of a wonderful man.
Among the many noble contributions of German learning and industry to this end, Dr. Lange’s Commentary—which is here presented, with many additions, in an English dress—will occupy an honorable and useful position. It appeared first in 1865, and in a second edition in 1868, in a small but closely-printed volume of 259 pages, as part of his Bibelwerk. It is evidently the result of much earnest labor and profound research, and presents many new and striking views. These, however, are not always expressed with that clearness demanded by the practical common sense of the English reader; hence the difficult labor of translation has been occasionally supplemented by the delicate task of explanation.

Dr. Lange prepared the Exegetical and Doctrinal parts, the Rev. F. R. Fay, his son-in-law, and pastor at Crefeld, Prussia, the Homiletical sections.

The English edition is the result of the combined labor of the Rev. Dr. Hurst, the Rev. M. B. Riddle, and the General Editor. Dr. Hurst is responsible for the translation (which was an unusually difficult task), and for the valuable Homiletical selections from the best English sources. The General Editor and the Rev. M. B. Riddle, besides carefully comparing the translation with the original, prepared the text, with the Critical notes, and the additions to the Exegetical and Doctrinal sections. The initials indicate the authorship of the various additions in brackets, which increase the volume of the German edition nearly one half. Upon no other book, except Matthew and Genesis, has so much original labor been bestowed.

I am responsible for the General and Special Introduction, and the first six chapters (exclusive of the last few verses of chap. vi.), which cover about one half of the volume. I examined nearly all the authorities quoted by Dr. Lange, from Chrysostom down to the latest editions of Tholuck and Meyer, and also the principal English commentators, as Stuart, Hodge, Alford, Wordsworth, Jowett, Forbes, &c., who are sublimely ignored by continental commentators, as if exegesis had never crossed the English Channel, much less the Atlantic Ocean. The length of some of my annotations (e. g., on chaps. i., iii., and v.) may be justified by the defects of the original, and the great importance of the topics for the English and American mind.

I had a strong desire to complete the work, and to incorporate portions of a German Commentary on Romans which I prepared years ago in connection with my lectures as professor of theology, as well as the results of more recent studies. But a multiplicity of engagements, and a due regard for my health, compelled me to intrust the remaining chapters, together with my whole apparatus, including my notes in manuscript and a printed essay on the ninth chapter, to my friend, the Rev. M. B. Riddle. As an excellent German and Biblical scholar, and as editor of the Commentaries on Galatians and Colossians in the Bibelwerk, Mr. Riddle has all the qualifications and experience, as well as that rare and noble enthusiasm which is indispensable for the successful completion of such a difficult and responsible task.

It is hoped that, by this combination of talent and labor, the Commentary on Roman has gained in variety, richness, and adaptation to the use of English students.

PHILIP SCHAFF.

No. 5 Bible House, New York, April 20 1869.
THE EPISTLE OF PAUL
TO THE
ROMANS.

INTRODUCTION.

PRELIMINARY OBSERVATION.

As the Epistle to the Romans is the most important and prominent of the Pauline Epistles, we must here discuss first the general preliminary questions connected with the life, doctrine, and writings of the Apostle. This introduction, therefore, divides itself into a general and a special introduction. The first connects with the general introduction of the "Bible-Work" on Matthew [p. 26 ff. Am. ed.] for the New Testament, and on Genesis [p. 1 ff. Am. ed.] for the Old; the second corresponds with the introductions to our commentaries on the remaining Epistles of Paul.

I. GENERAL INTRODUCTION TO THE EPISTLES OF PAUL.

§ 1. THE PAULINE PORTION OF THE NEW TESTAMENT.

The apostolic activity of the great Apostle to the Gentiles was so comprehensive and fruitful, that the greater portion of the labors of the original twelve apostles was merged into the historical current of his work. It is only the Coptic Church, and a few other isolated Oriental sects, that, as a portion of the original apostolic territory, have continued isolated from Paul’s great field of labor. Since the second century, Paul’s peculiar type of teaching began indeed to give way more and more to the forms of ancient and mediæval Catholicism; though Catholicism cannot be termed Petrine in that sense, and much less in that degree, in which the Church of Rome claims to be built on Peter. Yet Paul’s spirit continued to exert its influence through the middle ages, not only in the heretical form of Paulicianism and other sects, but also in the orthodox type of Augustinianism, until it broke forth from the innermost life of the Church as the chief organizing power of Evangelical Protestantism.*

* [Dr. Lange (Das Apostol. Zeitalter, vol. ii. p. 649) adopts substantially the ingenious view, first suggested by Joachim Floris, and recently more fully developed by the great philosopher Schelling, and favored by eminent German divines, such as Neander, Ullmann, Thiersch, that the three representative apostles, Peter, Paul, and John, are the types of three successive ages of Christianity: Peter the apostle of law and Catholicism, Paul the apostle of freedom and Protestantism, John the apostle of love and the church of the future which is to harmonize authority and freedom, unity and variety. Schelling, shortly before his death, at Baden, Switzerland, Aug. 1834, in a very interesting conversation with the writer of this note, emphatically affirmed his unshaken belief in this view, to which he had given repeated and profound reflection. It is certainly no mere accident that Catholicism professes to be founded on Peter, while Protestantism has at all times mainly appealed to Paul, the apostle of faith, of freedom, of independence, and of progress. Even the]
As far as the Pauline portion of the New Testament is concerned, it constitutes not only the greatest part of the apostolic epistles, but also a large share of the entire New Testament; especially when we include both the writings of Luke and the Epistle to the Hebrews, which were evidently written under the influence of the Apostle of the Gentiles.

An eternal triumph of Christianity, an imperishable sign and pledge of its world-conquering power, lies in the fact that the greatest part of the Christian Church, the greatest portion of the New Testament, and the most powerful expression of Christian doctrine, proceeded from a man who, endowed with a lofty genius and a heroic energy of will, had cast all the enthusiasm of his youth into a fanatical hatred of Christianity, and who had made it the great object of his life to exterminate that religion from the face of the earth. With the conversion of Paul, the noblest prince of Pharisaism was changed from an arch-enemy of Christ into his most active apostle and witness. This was a prelude to the world-historical change by which the eagle of the heathen power of Rome was converted from the work of a vulture that vexed the fold of Christ, into the service of a dove of peace for the nations of the earth. Saul became Paul. In this one word all the past triumphs of Christianity over its foes are embraced, and all its future triumphs are described in advance. To bend or to break—that is the question; to bend, like Paul, or to break, like Julian the Apostate. The cause of this wonderful power of conversion and of judgment lies in the universal triumph of Christ, against whom a Paul was not too great an enemy, nor a Julian too crafty a politician and emperor.

Concerning the signification of Paul in the New Testament, Calmet thus speaks in the introduction to his commentary on the Epistle to the Romans: "Post sacrosancta evangelica venerabile maxima ac oeterorum omnium preotissinimum monumentum Pauli epistola habenda sunt. Omnia in illis continentur, quae formandis moribus, sive ad mysteria et religionem constitutam eum Jesu Christo tradita sunt. Tamquam supplementum et interpretatio eorum, quae Jesus Christus docuit, ac veluti alterum evangelium Jesu Christi e mortuis redivivi juris meritoque reputantu." [H. Ewald, the great orientalist, commences his Commentary on the Pauline Epistles (Göttingen, 1857), with the following striking and truthful eulogy: "Considering these Epistles for themselves only, and apart from the general significance of the great Apostle of the Gentiles, we must still admit that, in the whole history of all centuries and of all nations, there is no other act of writings of similar extent, which, as creations of the fugitive moment, have proceeded from such severe troubles of the age, and such profound pains and sufferings of the author himself, and yet contain such an amount of healthfulness, serenity, and vigor of immortal genius, and touch with such clearness and certainty on the very highest truths of human aspiration and action. . . . The smallest as well as the greatest of these Epistles seem to have proceeded from the fleeting moments of this earthly life only to ennoble all eternity; they were born of anxiety and bitterness of human strife, to set forth in brighter lustre and with higher certainty their superhuman grace and beauty. The divine assurance and firmness of the old prophets of Israel, the all-transcending glory and immediate spiritual presence of the Eternal King and Lord, who had just ascended to heaven, and all the art and culture
of a ripe and wonderfully excited age, seem to have joined, as it were, in bringing forth the new creation of these Epistles of the times which were destined to last for all times." Upon the whole, St. Paul is, perhaps, the most remarkable man, and his Epistles, next to the Gospels, the most important literary production of all ages. Dr. Wordsworth strongly recommends the reading of the Pauline Epistles in their chronological order, so as to accompany the Apostle, with the help of the Acts, in his missionary career from the call at Damascus to the martyrdom in Rome, and his development of Christian doctrine from the elementary truths of the Thessalonians to the farewell instructions of the Pastoral Letters. The reader will thus trace with growing delight this spiritual river of Paradise from its fountain-head, through Syria, Asia Minor, and Greece, to Rome, diffusing purity and health, flowing onward in a majestic and ever-widening flood, fertilizing the banks, that they may bear the flowers and trees of Christian graces, and terminating at last in the ocean of eternity.—P. S.]

§ 2. PAUL THE APOSTLE TO THE GENTILES. HISTORY OF HIS LIFE.*

The history of the life of the Apostle Paul divides itself, according to great crises, into the following periods: I. The time of his youthful development to his conversion; II. The time of his apostolic training, his impulsive and enthusiastic beginnings, and his purifying retreats; III. The period of the three great missionary journeys recounted in the Scriptures, down to his capture in Jerusalem, and his transportation from Cæsarea to Rome; IV. The termination of his career to his martyrdom.

A. The History of the Youth of Paul to his Conversion.

Paul appears first before us at the place of execution of the protomartyr Stephen, under the Jewish name of Saul (שע), Acts vii. 57. He is a young man, who pursues his studies in Jerusalem in the school of the conservative Pharisees, Gamaliel (Acts xxii. 3; comp. Acts v. 34); but in consequence of his fanatical enthusiasm for the Pharisaic law, which he identified with the ancestral faith (Phil. iii. 5, 6), he became, while a student, the most bitter persecutor and disturber of the youthful Church of Christ; for he considered that Church a fatal Jewish heresy, and one which, by virtue of the rights of zealots for the law, he designed to combat, and hoped utterly to destroy. Probably Moses, Phinehas, and Eiijah were his imaginary prototypes; while he adjudged Christ to be the greatest of those false prophets against whom destruction was prophesied and appointed (Deut. xviii. 30). From an accomplice who, being present at the execution of Stephen, took charge of the clothes belonging to his witnesses and executioners (Acts vii. 58), he soon became a servant of the Sanhedrin;† and having become excited by the martyr-blood of Stephen, he not only continued the persecution, and scattered the congregation in Jerusalem, but, being clothed with extraordinary authority, he entered upon a journey to Damascus for the purpose of destroying the Christian congregation in that city. The Sanhedrin did not at that time possess authority over the life and death of the Jews (John xviii. 31), but it was nevertheless at liberty to exercise, in matters of religion, the Jewish authority to imprison, to scourge, and to arrange all the preliminaries of a trial for capital punishment. The execution of James the Just, as recounted by Josephus (in his Antiq. xx. 9, 1), explains the martyrdom of Stephen and the subsequent threats against Paul's life (Acts xxiii. 30), and shows that a tumultuous occasion could lead to the infliction of capital punishment. (On the laws of punishment, comp. WINER, art. Sanhedrin [ii. 551, and Smith, iii. 1130, art. Sanhedrin].)†

* In the following section I have borrowed considerably from my own article on Paul, in Hrano's Real-Encyklopaedie (vol. xi. 1869, pp. 239-248.—P. S.); but I have enlarged it according to necessity. Compare also the respective sections in the works of Neander, Schaff, Lang, Tischendorf, on the History of the Apostolic Church (SCHAFF, pp. 230-247), and Converse and Howson: The Life and Epistles of St. Paul. London, 1853, republished in New York.
† The proper spelling is not Sanhedrin, but Sanhedrin (תְּנַדְּדִין), formed from טורְא (torah), but there is no uniformity in this even among scholars.—P. S.
‡ (The reader will meet in this and all other parts of Dr. Lange's Commentary very frequent references to Winer's Biblical Dictionary (Biblieches Realwörterbuch zum Handgebrauch für Studirende, etc., 3d ed. Leipzig, 1845, 2 vols.}
Saul had already taken the lead in Jerusalem in the work of incarcerating the Christians but the apparent result of his efforts, which was only the wider promulgation of the gospel by means of the scattering of the congregation (Acts viii. 4), exasperated him still more. Therefore he solicited those fatal letters of authority which directed him toward Damascus. A proof of the confidence reposed in the fiery zeal of the young Pharisaic student may be seen in the fact that the Council not only gave him full authority, but also an obedient escort. The enterprising youth designed to destroy the whole Christian flock in Damascus, and to drag back to Jerusalem even women, and all who were at his mercy.

But the Divine visitation came upon him when near Damascus. Saul, by a sudden miracle, became a Paul, as we are accustomed to say; the greatest and most dangerous of all the persecutors of the Christians (for he persecuted the Church in its infancy), was transformed into the greatest promulgator of Christianity in the world.

Paul was a descendant of the tribe of Benjamin, a native of Tarsus, the polished and venerable capital of Cilicia, situated on the river Cydnus, the home of the great naturalist, Dioscorides, and of other distinguished men, and the burial place of Emperor Julian the Apostate. Jerome (De viris illustrib. cap. v.) mentions the report that Paul had emigrated with his parents from Gishala, but he afterwards declares, in his commentary on Philemon, that it is a fable. As the stock of Levi became gloriously resplendent in John the Baptist, so, under the new dispensation, did Benjamin, the son of Rachel, receive higher honor than any other tribe save Judah, which had previously risen to the greatest glory. And the same mighty energy which the blessing of Jacob ascribed to the character of Benjamin (Gen. xlix. 27), and which was confirmed by later events (Judges xx. 21), found its perfect expression in Paul. He was first a ravenous wolf in the midst of the flock that ate his prey in the morning; but in the evening he combined the strength of the wolf and the mildness of the lamb; and though he sprang like a wolf into the metropolitan cities of heathendom, his purpose was to "divide his spoil in the evening." His parents appear to have been in good circumstances. They were "Roman" citizens, though not as inhabitants of the city of Tarsus (for that city had not then obtained its freedom), but by special conditions with which we are not acquainted. Notwithstanding their high social standing, they strictly adhered to the Jewish faith, and designed their son to be a Pharisaic Rabbi. According to Jewish custom he had learned a trade; he was a tent-maker (that is, a weaver of a kind of cloth which was applied to tent-making; ἀγαπητικός, Acts xviii. 3). The great talents of Saul could be early developed in the schools of cultivated Tarsus, if we may suppose that the rigid Pharisaic sentiment of his parents (which, however, was often mollified in heathen cities far away from Palestine) permitted him to visit those schools. From Paul's philosophic analysis of heathendom (Rom. i. and ii.), from his discourse at Athens (Acts xvii.), and from other similar expressions, we may very readily infer that his acquaintance with sentences of heathen philosophers and poets (Acts xvii. 29; Tit. i. 12 sq.), is not attributable to mere popular intercourse, but to reading and study. When in Jerusalem, he became familiarly acquainted with the Old Testament, rabbinical traditions and dialectics, and probably also with the doctrines of the Jewish Alexandrian school. It is probable that he found there some family connections; at least, he was subsequently supported very earnestly by a nephew (Acts xxiii. 16). As King Saul of old is said to have gone forth to seek she-asses, but found a crown, so with the Apostle; but he took better care of his crown.

The conversion of Saul is one of the greatest miracles of the exalted Saviour—one of the

which is justly prized in Germany as a masterwork of ripe scholarship and critical accuracy. The English and American student who has no access to it, may in nearly all cases profitably consult the same articles in W. Saurin's Dictionary of the Bible, large edition, London and Boston, 1853, 3 vols.; large American edition, with many improvements and additions, by Prof. H. B. Hackett and Ezra Ames, New York, 1866 ff., to be completed in 4 vols.; the superb third edition of Kittel's Cyclopaedia of Biblical Literature, prepared by W. Lindsay Alexander, D.D., etc., London, 1865, 3 vols. These English works, being the result of the combined labor of many contributors, have less unity and symmetry than that of Winer, but are more extensive and embody the latest information (especially Hackett and Ames's edition of Smith unaltered, now in course of preparation and publication, with the help of a number of American scholars). A new German Dictionary of the Bible has been recently commenced with a considerable array of collaborators by Schmoller of Heidelberg, and will represent the liberal, semi-rationalistic school of German theology — P. R.}
greatest miracles of conversion in the kingdom of grace. The fact especially that the most earnest zealot for Pharisaic legalism became, by Divine appointment, the chief apostle of a free gospel and faith, and the most successful destroyer of Pharisaism in Judaism, and in the Christian Church through all ages, is without a parallel in history. True, some of the greatest opponents of Jesuitism have come out of Jesuit schools. Luther, the former monk, was the strongest antagonist of monastic righteousness; and Luther, the Augustinian, the strongest antagonist of intolerance, which St. Augustine unfortunately first established in theory in opposition to the Donatists; but not one of these contrasts reaches that miraculous transformation in which the glorified Christ, as with an ironical smile, changed the most formidable power of the enemy into His most victorious agency for conquest.

And yet this miracle, too, was conditioned by justice and truth. We must not ignore for the miraculous manifestation of Christ all connecting points of preparation in the unconscious spiritual life of Saul (as Baumgarten has again done). This would be as partial and untenable as the opposite extreme of rationalistic writers, who vainly attempt to explain his conversion by psychological antecedents and extraordinary natural phenomena (see Winzer, Real-Wörterbuch, art. Paulus). The history declares positively that the glorified Christ appeared to him; and we cannot interpret it in any other light. But Paul's own accounts show that the objective manifestation of Christ was mediated by a visionary or ecstatic elevation of Saul himself (Acts ix. 7; xxii. 9).

[The rationalistic interpretation, after having exploded in Germany, has been ingeniously renewed in France by E. Renan, Les Apôtres, Paris, 1866, p. 181. There is a third view on the conversion of Paul, not mentioned by Dr. Lange—the mythical—which resolves the event into a purely subjective process in Paul's own mind, and explains the supernatural light to be simply the symbolical expression of the certainty of the real spiritual presence of Christ in the Church and the believer. This view was ably defended by the late Dr. Bahr, of Tübingen, in his work on Paul, 1847, p. 68. But after a renewed investigation of the subject, the celebrated historian arrived at the conclusion that the conversion of Paul was an enigma, which cannot be satisfactorily solved by any psychological or dialectical analysis. See the second and revised edition of his work on Christianity and the Christian Church in the first three centuries, which appeared shortly before his death, a. 1860, p. 45, and the second edition of his Paul, edited by Zeller, 1867. The character and apostolic life of Paul, and the very origin and continued existence of the Christian Church, is an inexplicable mystery without the miracle of the actual resurrection of our Saviour.—P. S.]

OBSERVATIONS.—1. On the splendor of the city of Tarsus in culture and institutions of learning, see Winzer, article Tarsus. Also the particulars concerning Gamaliel, by the same author [and in Kittto's and W. Smith's Bible Dictionaries].

2. On the life of Paul in general, compare the article Paul in the various Bible dictionaries; the relevant chapters in Neander, Schaff, Thiersch, and Lange, on the Apostolic Age; the work, Die Biographien der Bibel, Stuttgart and Leipzig, 1888; and Ruuss, Die Gesch. der heil. Schriften Neuen Testaments [4th ed., 1864], p. 45 ff., where a comprehensive catalogue of literature may be found. For particular references, see below.

3. The literary education of the Apostle has been much discussed. Comp. Niemeier, Charakteristik der Bibel; Thalemann's treatise, De eruditione Pauli Judaicae non Graece (and Winzer, Real-Wörterbuch, ii. 213). The parents of Paul may have been prevented, by their religious prejudices, from sending their son to the brilliant Grecian schools in Tarsus; but it does not therefore follow that the vigorous mind of the youthful Paul did not become acquainted privately with the principles of Grecian learning. Possibly his parents may have sent him to Jerusalem for the very reason that they discovered in him a dangerous susceptibility for the charms of Grecian literature.—Paul received a learned Jewish education in the school of the Pharisaic Rabbi, Gamaliel, not remaining an entire stranger to Greek literature, as his style, his dialectic method, his allusions to heathen religion and philosophy, and his occasional quotations from heathen poets show. Thus, a 'Hebrew of the Hebrews,' yet at the same time a native Hellenist and a Roman citizen, he combined in himself, so to speak, the three greatest nationalities of the ancient world, and was endowed with all the natural qualifications for a universal apostleship. He could argue with the Pharisees as a son of Abraham, of the tribe of Benjamin, as a disciple of the renowned Gamaliel, surnamed the Glory of the Law, and as one of the strictest of their sect. He could address the Greeks in
their own beautiful tongue, and with the force of their strong logic. Clothed with the dignity and majesty of the Roman people, he could travel safely over the whole empire with the watchword: 'Vitis Romanus sum.' From Pf. Schaff, History of Ancient Christianity, vol. I, p. 68. Comp., also Charles Hodge, Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans, revised edition, first section of the Introduction: "His (Paul's) natural character was ardent, energetic, uncompromising, and severe. How his extravagance and violence were subdued by the grace of God, is abundantly evident from the moderation, mildness, tenderness, and conciliation manifested in all his epistles. Absorbed in the one object of glorifying Christ, he was ready to submit to any thing, and to yield any thing necessary for this purpose. He no longer insisted that others should think and act just as he did. So that they obeyed Christ, he was satisfied; and he willingly conformed to their prejudices, and tolerated their errors, so far as the cause of truth and righteousness allowed. By his early education, by his miraculous conversion and inspiration, by his natural disposition, and by the abundant grace of God, was this Apostle fitted for his work, and sustained under his multiplied and arduous labors."—P. S.]  


5. On the conversion of the Apostle in particular, see the Commentary on the Acts of the Apostle, chap. ix. [p. 161, Am. ed.] The objectivity of the appearance of Christ is there justly maintained. But we should, in addition to it, make proper account of the element of a vision as the medium of the appearance of Christ. Here belongs also the treatise of C. P. HoFStede De Groote, Paulus conversio, præcipua theologia Paulina fons, Groningen, 1859, ("Idaque inveni principia gravissima tria, e quibus tota Pauli theologia est orta; primum mentis, Jesu vitam novam semper cogitatis, alterum anini, gratiam divinam constantem experii et sentientis, tertium vitam, Christi ecclesiam perpetuo spectantis") Also the essay of PARER, The Testimony of the Apostle Paul concerning the Appearance of Christ, in the Jahrbiicher für deutsche Theol., vol. iv., pt. 2. For a full list of literature, see Reuss, l. c., p. 51, and Winer, ii. p. 214.

B. The Preparation of Paul for the Apostolic Office, and his Apostolical Missionary Journeys to the time of his First Captivity in Rome.

A man of such mighty genius, notwithstanding his apostolic call, was not qualified for an evangelist immediately after his conversion. His first zeal would have been too stormy, too powerful, and too much the outburst of immoderate excitement. After his first attempt in Damascus, he had to withdraw to Arabia for a quiet stay of about three years (Gal. i.)—a period over which a veil is drawn. He probably spent it, not in missionary labor, but to greater advantage in contemplative life, although he may have made some single missionary efforts during this time (see Lange's History of the Apost. Age, ii. p. 124). After his first attempt in Jerusalem, also, where Barnabas introduced him to the apostles, Paul was again required to retire to private life. But this time he chose Cilicia, his native country. We may infer from his character that he did not remain absolutely passive, but that he occasionally testified of Christ; yet he did not engage in apostolic labors in their strictest sense.

Barnabas sent for him to come from Cilicia to Antioch, to cooperate with him in that newly-arisen metropolis of Gentile Christianity (Acts xi. 23). Paul entered into the most intimate relations with the congregation of Gentile Christians living there, and the destination that he had received at his call to become the Apostle to the Gentiles (Acts ix. 15), now approached its fulfilment. But it was in accordance with the apostolic spirit that the Gentile Church should remain in perfect unity with the Jewish-Christian Church. This tendency toward unity was strengthened by the first mission of Paul to Jerusalem, in company with Barnabas (Acts xi. 30). We may therefore consider this mission as the introduction to the apostolic labors of the Apostle; and since it also constitutes one of the strongest chronological links in his career, we will now speak of the chronological relations of his life.

We pass over, as unreliable points of connection, the government of Damascus by the Arabian king Aretas (Acts ix.; 2 Cor. xi. 32), and the meeting of Paul with Aquila in Corinth, in consequence of the banishment of the latter from Rome by an edict of the Empe-
§ 2. PAUL THE APOSTLE TO THE GENTILES. HISTORY OF HIS LIFE.

The safest date at the beginning of the apostolic career of Paul is the year of the death of Herod Agrippa, A. D. 44 (Joseph., De bello Jud. ii. 11, 6); and the safest one at the end of the same is the recall of the procurator Felix from Judea in the year 60. The execution of James the Elder took place shortly before the death of Herod Agrippa (Acts xii. 2). About the same time, Paul and Barnabas went to Jerusalem as bearers of the collection taken at Antioch. If, according to the usual method, we reckon backward from this date, the year 44 (one year spent in Antioch, about one year in Jerusalem and Tarsus, three years in Arabia and Damascus), the conversion of Paul occurred about the year 39. Then, reckoning forward, let us fix the time of the Apostolic Council, under the supposition (which has been vainly contested) that the journey described in Acts xv. is identical with that of Gal. ii. (see my Gesch. des Apost. Zeitalters, i. 99), and that the fourteen years which Paul reckons as occurring previous to this journey are to be numbered from his conversion. This being the case, the Apostolic Council occurred about the year 53.† The first missionary tour of the Apostle therefore took place between the years 44 or 45 and 52 or 53. The second and third were made between the years 53 and 59–60.

In reference to the more particular dates, compare the already mentioned work of Wieseler (whose parallel of Paul's journey mentioned in Acts xviii. 22, with that in Gal. ii., does not seem to be warranted); the article Paul in Winer; G. W. Agarde, Von der Zeitrechnung der Lebensgeschichte des Apostels Paulus, etc., Stockholm, 1847. On the time of the ecstasy narrated in 2 Cor. xii. 7, compare my Apost. Zeitalter, ii. p. 8.

In regard to the credibility of the account of the Acts on the apostolic life of Paul, Schneckenburger maintained the hypothesis, that the author of that book converted the life of Paul from real historical materials into a parallel to the life of Peter. Baur has outdone this hypothesis, and endeavored to carry out the hypercritical notion that the narrative of the Acts of the Apostles is an unhistorical production, written for the purpose of bringing about a compromise between Jewish Christianity and Gentile Christianity. On this vain attempt to convert the history of the Acts into a myth, or rather a conscious fiction, compare Lechler, The Apostolic and Post-Apostolic Age, p. 6 ff.

There was no doubt a gradual approach of the two sections of apostolic Christianity, in harmony with the first fundamental principle of the Word made flesh and the working of the spirit of the apostolic history. Conscious of the essential unity of faith and hope, the Gentile Church moved towards the Jewish Church, as the Jewish Church sought and found the Gentile Church. It is from this point of view that we must study Paul's journeys to Jerusalem as they alternated with his missionary tours. Every new missionary journey to the heathen world was followed by a renewal of the bond of union with the parent society in Jerusalem; and the more deeply the Apostle penetrated the heathen world, and the more fully he kept the Gentile Church free from Jewish ordinances, the more decidedly did he afterward show, by his own conduct in Jerusalem, his respect for Jewish customs. Only those who are unable, like Paul, to distinguish between dogmatic and ethical rules, can find a contradiction in this fact, and especially in the diversity of requirements between Gal. ii. 16 and Acts xv. 29.

The farthest limit of the first missionary tour of the Apostle was Derbe, in Lycaonia, Asia Minor. The appointment of Barnabas and Saul in Antioch by the direction of the Holy Spirit, their ordination by the united act of the congregation and its leaders, the voyage to Cyprus, the triumph of Paul over the false prophet Bar-jesus, his change of name, the journey to Pamphylia, and the return of Mark, the apostolic attendant, the missionary address of

* [By Wieseler who, in his very learned and able chronology of the Apostolic Age, identifies the visit mentioned, Gal. ii. 1, with the fourth journey of Paul to Jerusalem mentioned Acts xviii. 21, 22. He has defended his view in an Excerptus to his Commentary to the Galatians, p. 552 ff. Compare against his view and in favor of the identity of the journey of Gal. ii. 1 with that to the Apostolic Council, Acts xv., my History of the Apost. Church, p. 246 ff.; and the Commentary on Gal. ii. 1—P. S.]

† [The chronologists of the Apostolic Church differ in the date of the Council of Jerusalem from 47–53. Winer, De Weiss, Wieseler, Schaff, and Alford, put it in 50 or 51; Olshausen, Meyer, Ewald, in 52.]
the Apostle in the synagogue at Antioch in Pisidia, the persecutions on the part of the Jews in Antioch and Iconia, Paul's miracle at Lystra, and his success in Derbe: these are the prominent points of the first missionary tour. We must observe especially, 1. That the apostolic men at that time, as well as later, always directed their first attention to the Jews, and consequently entered the synagogue, although at Antioch, in Pisidia, an important crisis occurred in their zeal for Gentile missions (Acts xiii. 46); 2. that Paul, the younger messenger, appears more and more decidedly in the foreground; 3. that on their return the societies of converts were organized into fixed congregations, especially by the appointment of elders (Acts xiv. 23); 4. that the free spirit with which Paul carried on the missionary work among the Gentiles produced, in all probability, that reaction of the more rigid Jewish Christians which led to the first Apostolic Council, and Paul's journey to Jerusalem in connection therewith; 5. that the enmity of the Jews against the preaching of the two men, especially of Paul, became more intense from his expulsion (in Antioch) to the attempt to stone him (in Iconium), and to his real stoning (in Lystra).

On the change of Paul's name, various views have been advanced (see Winer, article Paul; Schaff, History of the Apost. Church, p. 226; comp. Com. on Ch. i. 1.). We are of the opinion that Saul, as a Roman citizen, was already in possession of a Roman name, but that, while at Cyprus, he was induced, not only by the friendship of Sergius Paulus, but especially by his antagonism to the false prophet who called himself Elymas the Sorcerer, the mighty magician, to term himself, as that man's conqueror in the name of the Lord, Paul the small man (so far as David's victory over Goliath had repeated itself here in a New Testament character); and particularly, also, because the Apostle, being now about to enter into active intercourse with the Grecian and Roman world, could travel more conveniently under a Roman name.

The second missionary journey passes over Asia Minor to Europe, and finds its farthest limit in Corinth. It is specially characterized by the following events: (1.) The separation of Paul and Barnabas on account of Mark, and the beginning of a separate and independent mission of Paul, in which he was followed at first by Silas, and later by Timothy and Luke; (2.) the tour of visitation into the earlier missionary field (Cyprus being passed over, and left to the care of Barnabas), which was changed into a new mission of colossal proportions; (3.) the harmonization of the body of Jewish Christians and Gentile Christians by means of the ethical principles established by the Church in Jerusalem (Acts xvi. 4); (4.) the new stations: Cilicia (before the repeated visit of the elder stations), then Phrygia, Galatia, Troas; after this in Europe: Philippi, Thessalonica, Berea, Athens, Corinth; also the persecutions, which varied in strength in proportion to the greater or less results of the preaching of the gospel; (5.) the miraculous aid and manifestation of the Spirit, which led Paul to Europe (Acts xvi. 6, 7, 9); (6.) the contrast between the ministrations of the Apostle in Athens and in Corinth; but we err if we suppose that Paul corrected his learned discourse in Athens by his exclusive preaching of the Cross in Corinth; (7.) the meeting of Paul with Aquila and Priscilla in Corinth, which so greatly affected his subsequent mission; (8.) the longer stay of the Apostle in Corinth, and the importunities of the Jews against him in the presence of the deputy, Gallio; (9.) the new journey of the Apostle to Jerusalem for the accomplishment of a vow, during which he touches at Ephesus, and there makes preparation for his mission by leaving behind Aquila and Priscilla.

The third missionary tour is so far an enlargement of the second, as that Paul at this time makes Ephesus, in Asia Minor, his great object, which city he had been compelled to pass by in his journey, and which he could only touch at on his return. Apollos was his pioneer here, and the silversmith Demetrius became his principal opponent. His victory was, on the one hand, a triumph over the nocturnal magic of this city dedicated to Diana, the goddess of the Moon; and, on the other, over idolatry. This journey, which was at first supplementary in its design, assumed the character of a visitation; for Paul departed from Ephesus, and again visited the congregations in Macedonia and Greece. The supposition of a third missionary visit to the Corinthian church between the second and third missionary tours has
been shown, in a variety of ways, to rest upon a misunderstanding (see my *Apost. Age*, i p. 199). The third missionary journey is characterized by the more decided prominence of the missionary calculation and self-determination of the Apostle (see 1 Cor. xvi. 5; 2 Cor. i, 15); by his miraculous works, especially in Ephesus and Tlos (Acts xviii. 11; xx. 10); by the establishment of a metropolis of the church of Asia Minor, which was destined to become the home of John, and the maternal city of Christian speculation; by the founding of a larger association and Pauline school; and finally, by the decided premonition of his captivity which the Apostle felt, as he drew his missionary journey to a close, and entered upon his pilgrimage to Jerusalem.

The performance of a Nazarite vow in Jerusalem (a step counselled by James) grew, from a measure of accommodation to the narrow views of the Jewish Christians, into an offence on the part of the Jews. It led to the persecution of the Apostle in Jerusalem, his abduction and imprisonment in Cesarea, his appeal to the judgment-seat of Cesar, and his transportation to Rome (in the year 62; according to Auger and Winer, in the spring of 61). From this captivity he was released (in the year 64), not only according to the testimony of tradition (Euseb., ii. 22: λέγον ἡμι, Cyrill. Hieros., Hieronymus, etc.; see Winer), but also according to certain hints of the Scriptures, yet only, after a new journey for missions and visitation, to fall into a second imprisonment, and to suffer martyrdom under Nero.

**Observations.**—1. For a statement of relevant literature, see Reuss, l. c., p. 54, 55, 56 sqq. [Smith, Dict. of the B., art. Paul, at the close, vol. iii. 763].

2. Ananias at Damascus, a predecessor of Barnabas for the introduction of Paul into the Church of Christ, as Stephen had been a predecessor of Paul himself.

3. Paul's three years of instruction in the quiet solitude of Arabia, a counterpart and parallel to the three years of instruction spent by the twelve apostles in intercourse with the Lord. The latter was an external and historical communion; that of Paul was undoubtedly of a mysterious and internal character, and kindred to the great mysterious fact of his conversion. See my *Apost. Age*, ii. p. 128. [Schaff, H. of the Ap. Ch. p. 236; and Com. on Gal. i. 17.]

4. The development of the Apostle's consciousness of his specific call to the Gentiles was gradual, and commensurate with the gradual definiteness of his call to the apostolic office in general. This may be seen from Acts ix. 15, 29; comp. xxii. 21; xiii. 46; xix. 9; xxvii. 17 sqq.; Gal. ii. But this call to the Gentiles did not exclude a purpose to convert the Jews; for not only must he first seek in the synagogues those heathen who were susceptible hearers of his message, especially the proselytes of the gate (Acts xiii. 48), but Paul also recognized the conversion of the Gentiles, apart from their personal salvation, as a means for the conversion of Israel (Rom. xi. 13, 14). The gradual development of his apostolic knowledge by virtue of continued revelations and illuminations, was not precluded by the Apostle's preparation, derived from a historical knowledge of the Holy Scriptures and of the life of Jesus, and by his great miraculous illumination when his call occurred.

5. On the person of Barnabas; on Cilicia, Antioch, Asia Minor, etc., see the relevant articles in the Biblical dictionaries. Also the introductions to the respective parts of this Commentary. On Antioch in particular, see my *Apost. Age*, ii. p. 158.

6. The reciprocal action between the three missionary journeys of the Apostle, and his pilgrimage to Jerusalem at the close of each of these journeys, are in themselves sufficient to overthrow as an untenable fiction Reuss's hypothesis above alluded to.


8. The relation of the apostolic deliberations in Acts xv. to the so-called Neuchian commands, is also maintained by Reuss, l. c., p. 56. See thereon my *Apost. Age*, ii. p. 184. Reuss maintains that Acts xv. 21 avows the validity of the law for the Jewish Christians. But the absence of all dogmatic obligation in the same passage is very plain from the transactions of the apostolic council. Yet, as far as the national and ethical validity of the same is concerned, it was in perfect harmony with the apostolic spirit that the continuance of the law should not be violently abrogated. For the relevant literature, see Reuss, p. 56.

9. For a catalogue of the friends and followers of the Apostle, see the same, p. 58.

10. The Apostle's missionary method and policy: (1) A prudent adjustment of his universal mission to the Gentile world, even to Rome, and the western limit of the Old World (Spain), to the primitive historical trunk of Christianity in Jerusalem—that is, the incorporation of the missionary spirit with the vital power of the Church. (2) Perception of the historical links for communicating the gospel to the world. Therefore he first turned his
attention to the Jews, and rose in their synagogues, but made full account of the prejudices of the Jews, and the receptibility of the heathen for Christianity. Therefore he embraced in his view, and also seized upon, the points of connection in the Gentile world (see his address at Athens on the inscription of an altar), and with equal clearness he discovered and opposed all real barriers to the truth (righteousness by works among the Jews; luxurious life in Corinth, 1 Cor. i. 2; and the gloomy sorcery of superstition in Ephesus). (3.) Most careful observance of Divine guidance to go forward or to hold back (Acts xvi. 6, 9; xxv. 10; Rom. i. 13, etc.). (4.) Careful consolidation of his missionary work, by instituting congregational offices, and the organization of congregations (Acts xiv. 22, 28), and promoting the inner unity of the churches by their community of prayer and love (see especially the Epistle to the Philippians). (5.) A comprehensive and free use of all chosen companions in faith for cooperation in the form of helpers, evangelists, messengers, and pioneers in a general sense. He is surrounded by his helpers; he sends them out upon new paths; he leaves them behind in churches already organized. That they may be strengthened and encouraged, the spirits of the gospel come and go in his presence, just as the messengers come and go at the court of a prince; he sets all the powers of faith in motion, in order to set all the world in motion. (6.) He greatly advances the personal usefulness of himself and of his coadjutors, by his apostolical epistles. (7.) The marvellous concentration, development, and elaboration of his doctrine in a manner adapted to the necessities of the congregations, and in perfect harmony with a most careful preservation of the fundamental character of his doctrine. The rock-like steadfastness and adherence to the doctrine of free grace, united with that most faithful development which is exhibited also in his style as a progressive creative power, producing a rich treasure of δόγματα τῆς λόγου. (8.) The supplementing of his burning activity by sacred retreats, when he sank even into the depths of visionary contemplation; likewise his union of apostolic consecration to the demand of the moment (see his Epistle to Philemon) with his all-embracing care for the whole Church and for its whole future.


C. The Second Imprisonment and the Martyrdom of Paul.

The second imprisonment has been lately discarded even by theologians who accept the authenticity of the Pastoral Epistles, such as Wieseler, Ebrard, Schaff, Thiersch (see my Apos. Age, ii. p. 374). Yet we still hold to the testimony of the old ecclesiastical tradition for the following reasons: (1.) Because the Acts of the Apostles concludes at the time when the first imprisonment of Paul must have come to an end, without taking any cognizance of his death; (2.) because the Apostle himself, about the end of this period, anticipated his deliverance (Phil. ii. 24); (3.) because the Pastoral Epistles—whose Pauline character cannot be doubted if we take into the account an advanced development of Christianity of some years' duration—cannot be comprehended in the early career of Paul down to the year 64, without great violence; and the same is the case still more with the Apostle's stay in Crete (Tit. i.); (4.) because the development of the germs of Ebionism and Judaizing Gnosticism, which are taken cognizance of in the Pastoral Epistles, is clearly indicated by the Epistles of the Apostle written some years earlier, during his imprisonment from 62 to 64, but had not gained the strength which they possessed at the time when the Pastoral Epistles were composed; (5.) because the tradition of the Church distinguishes positively between the judicial execution of Peter and Paul, and the first great persecution of the Christians as a body under Nero; (6.) the testimony of the Roman Clement (1 Cor. v.), that Paul came ἐπί τό τέρμα τῆς δύσεως καὶ μαρτυρίας ἐπί τῶν ἡγομένων, having been written in Rome, cannot refer to Rome, and supports the tradition, harmonizing with the purpose of the Apostle (Rom. xv. 24), that Paul visited Spain after his deliverance (comp. my Apos. Age, ii. p. 386).*

*The passage of Clement of Rome, which has given rise to different interpretations, must be translated thus, "Paul ... having come to the limits [ἐπὶ τό τέρμα, not: before the highest tribunal, ὠν τό τέρμα] of the West, and having died a martyr under the rulers (others: having borne witness before the rulers), he departed from the world and went to the holy place, having furnished the sublimest model of endurance." The dispute about the true reading in the passage (somewhat obliterated)—ἐπὶ τό τέρμα or ὠν τό τέρμα τῆς δύσεως—is now settled in favor of ἐπὶ by the testimony of Professors Jacobson and Thienendorf, who have carefully re-examined the only extant and defective MS. of the
If we may judge from intimations in the Pastoral Epistles, Paul hastened, after his deliverance, first to Ephesus, where the Christian truth was threatened by the first development of Christian heresy. We cannot decide whether he was permitted to visit Jerusalem once more on this journey, as was anticipated by the Epistle to the Hebrews, and might be expected from the three visits of his earlier missionary tours. From Ephesus he went to Macedonia and Greece; then over Troas and Miletus to Crete. Afterwards he proceeded to Epirus, where he spent the winter in Nicopolis, and subsequently left Titus. He then directed his course westward, to the τέτρα γής διόρειας, where he was probably seized and taken as a prisoner to Rome, before being able to found another permanent organization [in Spain].

Meanwhile, Peter either came or was brought to Rome, and both suffered martyrdom there together (according to Clement of Rome, Irenæus, Tertullian, etc.; see the article Peter, in Herzog’s Real-Encyclopädie). The Roman Church celebrates the death of Peter and Paul on the same day—the 29th of June.

[The views on the year of Paul’s martyrdom vary from 64 to 68. This question depends of course, mainly on the question of the second captivity. Wimseker contends for the year 64, shortly before the great Neronian persecution (the only one properly authenticated by historical evidence), which broke out, according to Tacitus, Annal., xvi, 44, in consequence of the conflagration, July 19th, 64; but the general tradition of the Church connects Paul’s and Peter’s martyrdom with this persecution, which probably gave rise to several isolated executions afterwards. If we adopt the hypothesis of a second imprisonment, we may arrive at a more definite result by referring the Ἰησοῦσις in the famous passage of Clemens Rom. (1 Cor. v., μαρτυρίων ὁ τάν Ἰησοῦσις, sub profectis martyrdom subiuntis), either (with Hug, Intr. ii. 323, Heffele, Patres Apost., p. 61, 4th ed., and Dölger) to Tigellinus and Nymphidius Sabinus, or (with Pearson) to Helius Cesarianus and Polycletus, who in the last years of Nero, especially during his absence in Greece, A.D. 67, had charge of the government in Rome. In this case we get the year 67 or 68 for the martyrdom of Paul; and this agrees with the Catholic tradition based upon Eusebius and Jerome (who, in his Catal. Script., says most explicitly of Paul: “Hic ergo dixit quarto Neronis anno—i. e., A.D. 68—sedem die quo Petrus Roma pro Christo capite truncatus sepulcrusque est, in Via Ostiensis). The Basilica of St. Paul’s, in commemoration of his martyrdom, now stands outside the walls of Rome (San Paolo fuori de’ muri), on the road to Ostia, and the Porta Ostienas is called the gate of St. Paul. The traditional spot of his martyrdom, however, is a little distance from the Basilica, where there are three chapels, called The Three Fountains (Tref Fontane), in commemoration of the legend that three fresh fountains miraculously gushed forth from the blood of Paul’s head as it was cut off by the executioner, and leaped three times from the ground.
“ab eisso Pauli capite triplici saltu esse sustollente,” Acta Sanct., vol. vii., sub June 29th.)

This legend is less credible than the beautiful legend connected with Peter’s death and perpetuated in the little church of Domine quo vadis, on the Appian Way. Comp., on Paul’s death and martyrdom, my History of the Apost. Church; Conybeare and Howson, vol. ii. 593 ff. (Lond. ed.); also Prudentius, Paristephorn. Hymnus XII.; Bunsen, Beschreibung Romes, iii. p. 440; Alfred von Reumont, Geschichte der Stadt Rom (Berlin, 1867), vol. i. p. 874 ff.—P. S.]

Observations.—1. On the treatises for and against the second captivity of Paul, see Winer, Real-Lezic. li. p. 221, and Schaff, Hist. of the Apost. Church, § 87, pp. 328–343. The second captivity is also advocated by the work of L. Ruffet, Saint Paul; as second captivity à Rome. Paris, 1860; and by Gams, Das Jahr des Martyrioddes der Apostel Peter und Paulus, Regensburg, 1887. He puts the martyrdom of Peter in the year 65; that of Paul in the year 67. [Van Oosterzee (Com. on the Pastoral Epistles), Ewald (History of Israel, vol. vi., or Hist. of the Apost. Age, 2d ed. of 1858), Bleek (Intro. to the N. T., 1862), Huther (Com. on the Epp. to Timothy and Titus in Meyer’s Com., 3d ed. 1866), Conybeare and Howson, Alford, Ellicott, Wodsworth, and most of the English commentators on Paul, likewise favor the second Roman captivity. (Wodsworth, in the interest of Anglicanism, defends even Paul’s journey to Britain as well as to Spain). On the other hand, C. W. Otto (in his learned and astute work, Die historischen Verhältnisse der Pastoralbriefe, Lips. 1860), Nièderer (Kircchengeschichte, 1866, p. 114), Meyer (Rom. p. 13 ff), and again Wieseler (in his learned article on the Epistles to Timothy and Titus, in the last supplementary vol. of Herzog’s Encycl., 1866, vol. xxi. p. 276 ff.), oppose the hypothesis of a second Roman captivity of Paul. Adhuc sub judice lib est.—P. S.]

2. Further on the necessity of admitting a second captivity of Paul, see in the Bible-Work, The Pastoral Epistles, by Dr. Van Oosterzee, 2d ed., Introduction (Am. ed. vol. viii.), and my Apost. Zeitalter, ii. p. 386. Critical prejudices are often propagated, while the original motives and reasons are lost sight of, although such reasons, sprung, as they frequently are, from original misconceptions, have lost their apparent importance in the course of time. For example, the criticism against the second Zechariah has very clearly arisen from a mis-understanding. Thus many negations in the department of New Testament exegesis have arisen from some caprice of Schleiermacher, some fancy of De Wette, some rationalistic short-sightedness or some fixed idea of Baur, produced by the Hegelian theory of an officious construction of history.

The question of the second Roman captivity of Paul is simply a historical problem, which has no doctrinal or ethical bearing, and which, in the absence of sufficient data, can never be solved with mathematical certainty. Those who, like Wieseler, Thiersch, Nièderer, Otto, and others, hold fast to the Pauline origin of the Pastoral Epistles, lose nothing by denying a second captivity and trial; they save the whole extent of Paul’s known labors, and only compress them into a smaller number of years, thus intensifying rather than diminishing his activity. It must be admitted, however, that the hypothesis of a second captivity offers a considerable advantage in the defence and exposition of the Pastoral Epistles; for it is much more difficult to find a suitable place before than after the first Roman captivity of Paul for the composition of these epistles, and a number of historical facts therein assumed (such as a missionary journey of Paul to Crete, Tit. i. 5; a visit to Troas, 2 Tim. iv. 13; a pretty advanced state in the development of church organization, and of heresy, 1 Tim. iii.—vi.), and to understand their farewell tone and general spirit, as compared with the earlier writings of the Apostle.—P. S.]

D. The Character of the Apostle.

The character of the Apostle reflects itself in his work, as in his Epistles, and appears before us in the energetic and harmonious contrasts of a great apostolic spirit. He was as frank in his deep humility as the sincerest penitent (Phil. iii. 6), and equally joyous in his exclaimations over the all-prevailing faith unto salvation (2 Cor. xii. 10); steadfast in adherence to his convictions (Gal. i. 16), and at the same time cautious, considerate, and master of the finest and purest policy (Acts xxiii. 6, 7); full of enthusiasm, able to speak wondrously in tongues, and to rise to visionary and ecstatic states of mind (1 Cor. xiv. 18; comp. my Apost. Zeitalter, i. p. 199 sq.), and yet unwearied in active practical labors; speculative, profound, and at the same time a man of the people and a servant of the congregation; heroically strong and outspoken, and yet as tender and refined in feeling and taste as a virgin (comp. his Epistles to the Philippians and to Philemon); eagle-like in his universal
view and work, but not less considerate in his regard and care for the smallest details; an imperious and commanding character, and yet the most dutiful servant of the Church; a cultivated rabbinical theologian, and at the same time a modest workman at a trade; burning in his love for the Lord and his brethren, and for this very reason overpowering in his moral indignation and rebuke of all that was opposed to the honor of his Master; a great Jew inflamed by a tragic sympathy with the Jewish people (Rom. ix. 2 ff., comp. 2 Cor. xii. 7), and nevertheless the most bitter opponent of all Pharisaism, old and new; of all the apostles the most hated, and yet the most beloved and popular; the most misinterpreted and misconceived (by Antinomians, Marcionites, Paulicians, etc.), and at the same time the most studied and expounded. Thus Paul has developed the most magnificent life of a hero, whom the world could neither bend nor conquer, but whom Christ overcame with a miraculous glance of his glorious revelation. (Comp. Schaff's Hist. of the Apest. Church, p. 441 f.)

Concerning the apostolic position of Paul, two points are to be observed in particular. First of all is the fact that he did not belong to the apostles of the first foundation of Christianity, but that he was charged with the apostolate of the first historical growth and expansion of Christianity into a universal character as the religion of the whole human race. He therefore has become, in an emphatic sense, the Apostle of evangelical reform in all succeeding periods of the Church. Secondly, the great opposition presented by the Pauline apostolate to all external legalism and stagnation in Christianity, is expressly declared in his call. He was not of the number of the historical disciples, witnesses, and chosen ones of the historical Christ; not a member of the apostolic college established by Christ during his pilgrimage on earth. Hurled down as an enemy by the risen Lord in a heavenly vision, he arose at once as a witness of faith and as one of the apostles, and received his apostolic authority only in heavenly voices from the Church (Acts ix. 15); in his visions (Acts xxii. 21); in his commission from Antioch, the mother church of Gentile Christianity; in the living epistles which the Holy Spirit wrote in the form of vigorous churches of his planting (2 Cor. iii. 2 ff.); and in the decided recognition by the first apostles of the Lord (Acts xv.; Gal. ii.).

His apostolate remained doubtful to a great number of traditional Jewish Christians; the most rigid Jewish Christians rejected it, and persecuted him; and the later Ebionites loaded his memory with scorn, as an errorist and a heretic. The legalistic Christianity of the Middle Ages, while professing the highest respect for the name of Paul, has persecuted his doctrines as they have been exhibited in the principles of the Reformation, in the form of Jansenism, in the history of Port Royal, and in many other ways. Even in the Protestant evangelical Church there obtains a legalistic high-churchism, which, while it adheres to external legitimacy, traditionalism, and legalism, is opposed to the principles of Christianity, and especially to the apostolate and doctrine of Paul.

But, on the other hand, the antinomianism of all Christian ages has been based on a misunderstanding and misinterpretation of his doctrines. Amid these opposite extremes, there courses the mighty stream of pure blessings with which the Lord, by His Spirit, has sealed the testimony of the great Apostle to the Gentiles, and with which He will seal it to the end of time.

Thus Paul will still maintain his position with the other apostles in the Church of Christ. Yet we would not deny the measure of truth in the view of Schelling, that, as far as the prevailing type of the Church is concerned, the Petrine Church of the Middle Ages was followed by the Pauline Church of Protestantism, and that the perfection will hereafter appear in the Church of the Johannine type. It would be a great misunderstanding, however, to conceive of this type as a syncretism of Judaizing legalism and Pauline freedom. The higher synthesis of the genuine Petrine and the genuine Pauline theology can only be found in the deeper ideal development of the revelation of the law and the Spirit, as set forth by John.

Observations.—1. The natural disposition of the Apostle must be characterized as an even harmony of various temperaments and gifts in genial fulness and strength, and inspired by a heroic energy and vitality of soul. By virtue of this energetic vitality the same man could always remain consistent and true, and yet become all things to all men; he could
stand and shine first in this and then in that pole of his wonderful endowments; at this moment in ecstasy, at the next as a practical man of action; now reminding us of the contemplativeness of a John, then of the fiery energy of a Peter; now musically lyrical in style, then acutely dialectical even to the subllest distinctions, though possessing a tragical national sympathy for his people in his heart—the depth, where his natural melancholy was reflected and transformed—he was as susceptible of joyous sentiments as a child, or rather as a man in Christ, in whom the freshest impulses of a sanguine temper were consecrated to God. And how powerful he was in holy indignation and wrath! If the phlegmatic temperament consisted in cold indifference and dulness of spirit, Paul would be entirely free from it; but if we understand by it a natural disposition to perseverance, and tough tenacity, we must see that in this respect also he was richly endowed. His endowments reciprocally equalized and attempered themselves in his person as charismata, or gifts of the Spirit, as he himself desired (1 Cor. xii.) that all the various endowments should harmonize and concentrate in the Church.

2. The rich literature in connection with Paul and his theology is enumerated in the bibliographical works of Walch (Bibl. Theol., iv. p. 662 sqq.); Winer (Handbuch der theol. Literatur, i. p. 282 ff., pp. 294, 587; Supplement, p. 39); Danz (Universalphörerbuch der theolog. Literatur, p. 740 ff.; Supplement, p. 80); in the well-known Introductions to the New Testament [by De Wette, Cremer, Reuss, Bleek, Guericke, Davidson], as well as the appropriate commentaries. Besides, we must also compare the works on the Apostolic Age by Neander, Schaff, Thiersch, Lange, Lechler, Ritschl, Ewald; also the works [of Schmidt, Van Oosterzee, etc.] on the Biblical theology of the New Testament. Against Baun's Apostel Paul [3d edition, by Zeller, 1867, in 2 vols.] is especially directed the work of Lechler, already referred to [also, in great part, Wieseler, on the Chronology of the Apost. Age]. Of the many practical works on the Apostle Paul, we may mention: Mennan, Glances into the Life of the Apostle Paul and the First Christian Congregation (Bremen, 1829); Ad. Monod, The Apostle Paul, Five Sermons (2d ed., German, Elberfeld, 1859 [also in English]); Naumann, Paulus—The First Victories of Christianity (Leipzig); Besser, Paul (Leipzig, 1891); M. Kahler, Paul, the Servant and Messenger of Jesus of Nazareth (Halle, 1892); Oswald, The Missionary Work of Paul (2d ed., Stuttgart, 1894); Haverath (semi-rationalistic), The Apostle Paul (Heidelberg, 1895). The life of the great Apostle has also been illustrated by poets, songs, and dramas. [Of English works, besides those already mentioned, Paley's The Pauline, Lord Lyttleton on the Conversion of St. Paul, and James Smith's Voyage and Shipwreck of St. Paul (London, 1848), deserve special mention as illustrating particular points, and strongly corroborating the historical character of the Acts and the Epistles. The instructive and entertaining descriptive work of Conybeare and Howson is generally known in America as well as in England, and admirably adapted for the theological lay reader. Comp. also the literature at the close of the article Paul in Smith's Dictionary of the Bible.—P. S.]

§ 3. THE EPISTLES OF PAUL.

A. Their Historical Order.

If we except the Pastoral Letter of the Apostolic Council of Jerusalem about the year 53 [50], the two Epistles to the Thessalonians are the oldest New Testament epistles. They were written from Corinth in the year 54 or 55, not long after the establishment of the congregation, and in consequence of the chiliastic excitement of the same during the second missionary journey of the Apostle. The Epistle to the Galatians was written about 56-57, in Ephesus, during the third missionary journey. The two Epistles to the Corinthians were written by Paul from Ephesus and Macedonia, about the year 58; and soon afterwards, about the year 59, he composed the Epistle to the Romans, from Corinth. Between the years 62-64, if not a little earlier, the Epistles to 'the Ephesians, Colossians, and Philemon were written; and toward the close of the first Roman captivity, the Epistle to the Philippians. A little later still, the Epistle to the Hebrews proceeded from the company of Paul, about contemporaneously with the Gospel of Luke and the Acts of the Apostles. The First Epistle to Timothy and the Epistle to Titus must be assigned to the interval between the first and second captivity, 64-66. The last of the Pauline Epistles, the Second to Timothy, was written about the year 67. As to the untenableness of the hypothesis of a Third Epistle to the Corinthians, as well as of an Epistle to the Laodiceans, different from the Epistle to the Ephesians, comp. my Apost. Zeit., i. p. 205 [and Dr. Wing, in Com. on 2 Corinthians, p. 7—P. S.].
OBSERVATIONS.—1. Compare the Introductions to the commentaries on the various Pauline Epistles.

2. Several critics (Schulz, Schneckenhüger, Schott, Wiggers, Thiirsch, Reuss, Meyer, Schenkel) are of the opinion that the Epistles to the Ephesians and Colossians, and that to Philemon, were written during the captivity of Paul at Caesarea. The principal argument is made to lie in the circumstances relating to the slave Onesimus, who ran away from his master. Onesimus, it is assumed, could more easily have escaped from Colosse to the neighboring Caesarea, than to distant Rome. But why did not, then, Onesimus flee to some place which lay still nearer at hand? We could well imagine that a slave in Colosse would have a more decided disposition to escape to the world’s metropolis—the refuge of fortune-seekers and adventurers—than to Caesarea. Besides, in a sea-voyage it makes little difference whether the distance be long or short. It is easier for a German fugitive to flee by sea to America, than by land to Spain. All remarks on the probably greater expenses of the voyage to Rome, and on the probably greater strictness in Rome, are as inconclusive as the principal argument. The other argument is derived from the following circumstance: If Tychicus, according to the usual supposition, had made the journey from Rome to Colosse with Onesimus, then the two travellers must first have arrived at Ephesus. But now the Apostle, in Eph. vi. 21, where he recommends Tychicus to the Ephesians, makes no mention of Onesimus, while the same Onesimus is mentioned and heartily recommended, Col. iv. 9. But the latter fact admits of a simple explanation. The poor Onesimus was at home in Colosse, and must now be received as a Christian by the congregation there. To this end he certainly needed the recommendation of the Apostle. But of what use could be the recommendation of the Colossian slave to the Ephesian church, for which he had no signification whatever? If we maintain that the Epistle to the Ephesians was an encyclical letter to those congregations of Asia Minor which were subsequently grouped definitely in a cycle, then the strange assumption that Onesimus must have been introduced to all t.e seven churches, will appear still more strange. In the first argument we miss all traces of the sea-breeze; in the second, all evidence of apostolic decorum. Moreover, it would be very difficult to prove that the way from Caesarea must have led by Colosse to Ephesus, and not vice-versa, if one will only remember the advantages of a sea-voyage. We will direct attention to only one of the reasons for the composition of the already-mentioned Epistles in Rome. The Apostle, before his imprisonment, Rom. i. 10, had informed the Romans that he was just then about to come to them;—now, should he have forgotten this solemn promise in Caesarea, under delusive hopes of a speedy deliverance, and engaged lodgings among the Colossians (Philonem, ver. 22)? But the chief argument, in our opinion, lies in the very advanced development of the churches of Asia Minor both in sin and righteousness, as it is reflected in those Epistles. Such a development presupposes at least a period of from three to four years.

B. Their Contents.

Every Epistle of the Apostle bears the imprint of a historical occasion, by which the contents of the same are shaped.

The congregation at Thessalonica was misled, amid its persecutions, into a chiliasmistic excitement; hence the Epistles addressed to it partake of an eschatological character.

The Epistle to the Galatians is chiefly soteriological, or an exposition of the righteousness of faith, in opposition to the Judaistic righteousness of works, which was urged by the false Galatian teachers.

The Epistle to the Romans is also soteriological, but in view of the more general antagonism between grace and the righteousness of faith, to the general corruption which we observe in the mutual self-boasting of heathen Christians and Jewish Christians.

The Epistles to the Corinthians possess an ecclesiastical character, since the First Epistle indicates the true Church, with polemical reference to the disturbances and corruptions in the life of the congregation; while the Second establishes the true ministerial office, in apologetical self-defence against the attacks of his personal opponents.

The Epistles to the Colossians and to the Ephesians bear a decidedly christological impress; the former brings out chiefly the ante-mundane (preexistent) and exclusive mediatorialship and glory of Christ, in opposition to the Colossian errorists; the latter establishes mainly His subsequent exaltation over all things, in opposition to dogmatic perversions and dissensions.

The Epistle to the Philippians has a christological-pastoral and prominently ethical charac-
ter, in so far as the Apostle makes the favorite congregation of Philippi his special co-worker in his apostolic office; and in order to make that congregation ethically complete, he holds up for its imitation the life of Christ.

The Epistle to Philemon is decidedly pastoral, with special reference to the care of souls.

Of the three Pastoral Epistles, properly so called, the First to Timothy, as well as that to Titus, were above all designed as the apostolic regulation for pastoral church government; and the Second Epistle to Timothy was prominently designed as the apostolic rule for the pastoral conduct and call.

Observations.—1. The specific fundamental thoughts that control every one of the Pauline Epistles (as of the Biblical works in general), are still very much neglected, to the injury of a truly organic, anatomical, synthetical and analytical exegesis. These writings are often not only treated as dead objects, but they are dissected in every direction, as if they were destitute of all organic structure.

2. Dr. BAUR is not only frequently surprised when he finds a new Pauline Epistle containing something new, but he makes this point a means of suspicion.

C. Their Genuineness.

On the verifications of the Pauline Epistles by the testimony of Church history, compare the passage in the New Testament, 2 Peter iii. 15, and the testimonies of the Fathers, as Kirchhoff has collected them in his Quellenansammlung for the history of the New Testament Canon, down to Jerome (Zürich, 1842), and as they have been treated in the introductory works of CREDNER, RUES, GUERICKE, and others, as well as in the respective commentaries. On the apocryphal literature connected with the name of Paul, see WINTER, ii. p. 222.

Among these pseudo-Pauline works, deserve especial mention the spurious correspondence between Paul and Seneca the philosopher, which is contained in the apocryphal collection of FABRICIUS, ii. p. 880 ff.; and an imaginary third Epistle of the Apostle to the Corinthians, composed as a substitute for one which was imagined to be lost (see my Apost. Zeitalter, i. p. 205), together with a spurious epistle of the Corinthians to Paul, which therefore proceeded from a misunderstanding (see De WETTE, Einl., p. 271). The false conjecture of a special Epistle to the Laodiceans, on the ground of a misunderstanding of Col. iv. 16 (where we are to understand rather the Epistle to the Ephesians as intended also for Laodicea, the last of the Ephesian cycle of congregations), has given rise to a fictitious Epistle to the Laodiceans (see my Apost. Zeitalter, ii. p. 211). Certain critics have missed also another Epistle to the Philippians (De WETTE, p. 271). Compare the article in HERZOG'S REAL-ENCYCLOPEDIA, Pseudepigraphen des Neuen Testaments. The false Acts, which have been attributed to Paul, are: Acta Petri et Pauli; Acta Pauli et Thecle. The Ebionites, moreover, have caricatured the portrait of the Apostle Paul in the most shameful manner, and stamped him with the likeness of a heresiarch (see NEANDER, Kirchengesch., 3d ed., i. 198).

Appendix.—The criticism of the school of BAUR proceeds really on two pre-suppositions, with which the founder has alienated himself from the Christian standpoint, and surrendered himself fully to a pantheistic philosophy. BAUR has evidently designed to compensate for his want of respect for the matter and spirit of revelation, by a superstitious yielding to the masters of science; and his success was facilitated by the fact that his great learning and subtle acuteness, or his more scholarly attainments, have served to hide his far greater incapacity of judgment concerning the phenomena of actual life; and that gravity of his inquiry and method has blinded the readers to his frivolous undervaluing of the religious and even of the moral spirit of the Biblical writings. His superstitious veneration for the mere method and forms of science was already apparent in his Symbolik und Mythologie, which he wrote while yet a follower of SCHLEIERMACHER, in the year 1824-25. To whom else than to him could it ever have occurred to divide such a historical work after the scheme of SCHLEIERMACHER's Dogmatik, and to describe, first, "the pure and universal feeling of independence," and then the antithesis of sin and grace which enter into the religious consciousness? Such a disciple of SCHLEIERMACHER, after he had become a follower of HEGL, must, with the same slavish superstition for science, and with the same want of perception of the peculiarity of the object pervert, by his Ebionitic hypothesis, the evangelical and apostolic
history, according to the Hegelian misconception of the development of life and history. Under such circumstances there could, of course, be no proper discrimination of the different conceptions of imperfection and perfection, nor any true appreciation of original and new historical principles and factors. But his yielding was only a partial one, so long as he was not fully immersed in the pantheistic view of Hegel; or rather, it appeared only partial so long as he did not, with Strauss and his school, apply this view to the evangelical history and its witnesses, in order to judge them upon the principle that miracles are impossible. In the end, his superstition, which he had transferred from Schleiermacher to Hegel, led him to the belief that his own science and school were infallible.

Such a spirit of scholastic superstitious, which gradually arose to fanaticism, was naturally connected with a great want of practical common sense, and an incapacity of judgment concerning the real facts of life. We pass by the first indication of the same, the entire absence of faith; for “faith is not given to every man.” We do not speak, therefore, of a defect of religious, but of scientific and moral judgment.

As far as the scientific appreciation of objective facts is concerned, we ask once more: How can a scholar write a history of mythology and religion according to the classification of Schleiermacher’s Dogmatics? Further, how can a scholar, endowed with sound judgment, write a history of the Christian Gnosis, and make an unheard-of leap from the old Gnostics clear over the whole Middle Ages (Scholastics and Mystics), down to Jacob Boehm, with a very superficial touch on Manicheism and on Augustine? How can one write a history of the doctrine of the atonement, which should have its point of departure in the Gnostic dualism, and its aim in the Hegelian system? If this can be accomplished, then truly can the history of the doctrine of the Trinity, as well as of the incarnation of God, be made to run out into the desert of Hegelian pantheism. If this be possible, then can one easily interpret historical deeds allegorically (the Epistle to Philemon, for example), and, on the other hand, explain literally what is really an allegorical composition (the Apocalypse).

The worst of all inadequacies are moral ones. It betrays a very perverted taste, when one can regard the Gnostics as a central force of development in the conflict between the Pauline and Johannine theology; and likewise, when one so far misconceives the old distinction between apocryphal and canonical writings as to think that a religious romance of later date, falsely called the Clementine Homilies, is made a proper standard for the adjudication of the Biblical writings. But it is worst of all to attribute to the Biblical books studied and intentional tendencies of human parties, and even crafty fabrications. In this respect, Baüer and his school have far transcended even Strauss. This is a psychological phenomenon, which can only be saved from the charge of immorality by the largest stretch of charity, and the assumption of an excessive scholastic fanaticism in the treatment of difficult critical problems.

On these premises the value and probable fate of Baüer’s criticism of the New Testament writings, which has spread like an avalanche in Eastern Switzerland, France, and Holland, is easily determined. This false system has arisen from a diseased, superstitious worship of modern philosophy and criticism, and developed into maturity. But it is doomed to utter destruction, since it has no root in the objective facts of revelation and of the kingdom of God, but is chiefly grounded in the pantheistic and abstract idealistic conceptions of modern culture. We do not say, in the sound culture itself. The only plausible occasion and excuse of this false system is the fact that the ideality and the universality of the historical Christ, together with His roots and ramifications throughout the whole human race, have not always been sufficiently appreciated in the orthodox theology of the Church. The beginning of a better appreciation does not certainly belong to the school of Baüer, but only the heretical perversion and defacement of the same.*

§ 4. THE CHARACTER OF THE PAULINE EPISTLES.—HERMENEUTIC HINTS.

According to Tholuck (Epistle to the Romans, p. 22), strength, fulness, and fire are the spiritual characteristics of the Apostle, and they are reflected in his style. He adduces two statements from the early Church concerning the Apostle’s manner of speech. The first

* [This appendix is condensed in the translation, with unessential omissions. In the preface to the second edition, and in self-defence against Schenkel, Dr. Lange supports this severe judgment by a number of quotations from Baüer’s work on Paul, which it is unnecessary to insert here. Baüer and the Tübingen School are not likely ever to acquire the importance which they enjoyed in Germany for a brief period. This school is simply a modern phase of Gnosticism (φαντασμοί γνωσεως), 1 Tim. vi. 20), and, like the Gnosticism of the second century, it has been endured for a good purpose, in stirring up the Church to a deeper investigation and defence of the primitive records of Christianity, which have already come out triumphant, with new gain of knowledge, of this as of every other trial. I say this with all due respect for the genius and learning of Baüer, and the value of his masterly historical criticism, where he does not touch matters of faith which he did not understand (1 Cor. ii. 9-16).—P. S.]
is by St. Jerome, Epist. 48 ad Pammachium,* c. 18: "Paulum proferam, quem quotiescumque lego, videor mihi non verba audire sed tonitura. Videntur quidem verba simplicia, et quasi ingenuis hominis ac rusticani, et qui nec facere nec declarare nosterit insidiis, sed quoscumque respexerit, fulnina sunt. Haret in causa; caput omne, quod tetigerit; tum verum, ut superet; fuyam simulat, ut occidat. The second statement, from Chrysostom, De Sacerdotio, i. 4, 7, compares the Apostle to an iron wall, which surrounds, with his Epistles, the churches of the whole world; and to a noble military chief, who leads captive all modes of thought, and brings them into subjection to faith, etc. Tholuck adds, that Paul is lauded as a master of eloquence in a fragment of the heathen critic Longinus, though critics have declared the passage doubtful (see Hug, Einl. in's N. T., ii. p. 384).

Tholuck then proceeds to say: "With these oratorical gifts there are connected also defects; namely, an excessive conciseness and pregnancy of expression, and carelessness in the formation of sentences, which produce those numerous anacolutha (I). This leads us to the hermeneutical question, which has an important doctrinal bearing, whether these peculiarities of form are at all detrimental to the clearness and definiteness of the thought. In this respect, no commentator has uttered more severe complaints against the Apostle than Röckert (comp. his Christliche Philosophie, ii. p. 401, and the introduction to the first edition of his Commentary on the Romans)."† Tholuck very justly remarks against Röckert, that defects of style do not necessarily arise from obscurity of thought on the part of the author, "least of all with intuitive, and at the same time fervid characters. The thinking of Paul is intuitive, but coupled with acute penetration, which was refined and sharpened by rabbinical culture almost to the excess of subtlety; therefore, when there is a want of logical clearness in his writings, we must seek the cause partly in the overflow of his abundant ideas, and partly in the impatience of his vivacity." We must distinguish, he says, difficulty from obscurity. But when Tholuck advances the opinion, that no writer of later times stands so near the Apostle in excellencies and defects as Hamann, we must hesitate to accept the conjunction. Paul's obscurity proceeds from a fulness of vital energy, and is really only the result of a quick movement, of a clear profundity, and of a perfect originality; and must certainly be distinguished from the obscurity of a one-sided scholastic taste and defective and perverted style. Tholuck maintains the perfection of the Pauline thought, while he acknowledges an imperfection of expression.

Against this view, R. Rothe, of Heidelberg [died 1867], has raised his voice in his acute essay, New attempt to elucidate the Pauline passage, Rom. v. 12-21. "According to Rothe, the apparent irregularity of Paul's style arises solely from the depth and acuteness of his thoughts, from the carefully-wrought elaboration of his purpose, and from that preciseness of expression which, the more studied it is, the more easily it approaches abruptness." Tholuck cites a similar expression of Baur (p. 24), but endorses, on the contrary, the view of Calvin: Quin potius singulari Dei providentia factum est, ut sub contemptibili verborum humilitate altissima haec mysteria nobis tradarentur, ut non humanus eloquentia potentia, sed sola spiritus efficacia niteretur nostra fides. In favor of this interpretation, Tholuck makes use of the Apostle's own declaration, 1 Cor. ii. 1; 2 Cor. xi. 6. The second passage does not belong here at all, and the first has an ironical sound, and does not prove what Tholuck designs to establish by it.

In the treatment of this question the following points must be especially taken into consideration:

1. The New Testament idiom generally is now no longer regarded merely as the lowly

* [The original Pammachium, even in the second edition, is evidently a double error of the printer; the one is borrowed from Tholuck, i. e. Pammachium was a Roman senator and friend of Jerome.—† 8]
† [In this presumptuous disposition to criticize St. Paul, Röckert has found an English imitator in Professor Jowett, who thinks it necessary to qualify what he considers to be a blind and undiscriminating admiration of the apostle, and who misrepresents him as a confused, though profound thinker, who uttered himself "in broken words and hesitating forms of speech, with no beauty or corneliness of style." But such paradoxical views are quite isolated, especially in England and America, and are not likely to unsettle the established estimate which Christiansen, Greek, Latin, and Evangelical, has set upon the great apostle of the Gentiles for these eighteen hundred years.—P. 5.]
"form of a servant" (Phil. ii. 7), compared with the classic language; hence there is no more reason why the Pauline expression and style should be regarded in this light when compared with the classic method of composition; provided we do not apply here the standard of the taste and judgment of the world. The New Testament idiom in general is a pneumatic development or transformation of the Grecian language. The apostolic expression has thus the prerogative of its special peculiarity, conditioned by its new spiritual life. This peculiarity may be regarded in the main as the free commingling of Hebrew directness and Hellenic accommodation; or, in other words, as the primitive Christian style, whose characteristics are the highest simplicity and vivacity in conjunction with the highest penetration and consecration of soul.

2. Down to the present time the comprehension of the Biblical books has been essentially retarded by regarding them too little as original creations, and by inquiring too little into their fundamental thoughts. Several critics have applied to them the conception of ordinary book-making and book-writing, and even of book-patching—a conception which is utterly antagonistic to all understanding of the historical books of the Old Testament and of the New Testament Gospels, and which also prevents a proper comprehension of Biblical inspiration. We should conclude thus: The fundamental thought of the book is inspired by the Spirit of revelation, according to the measure of the degree of revelation in the Old Testament, and of the link of revelation in the New Testament; but all the single portions of the book are immediately inspired—that is, animated and controlled by its fundamental thought; therefore, also mediately inspired by the Spirit of revelation. But among the prevailing conceptions, the Rabbinical, lifeless, atomistic, scholastic view of the book, is reflected in the picture of the book. The dead conception casts its dark, spiritless shade upon the living object. So long, therefore, as we do not here apply the conception of single spiritual organisms, we cannot distinguish the whole from the parts, nor the parts from the whole. Most of our definitions, divisions, and anatomical dissections of Biblical books furnish the proof that our theology has not yet reached the scientific standpoint which Cuvier attained in natural science (paleontology); for he knew how to construct the whole figure of the animal from a single fossil bone. In support of this opinion, we need only to recall the opinions of Schleiermacher on the Epistle of James, De Wette's view of the Epistle to the Ephesians, and Baur's representation of the Epistle to the Romans, which he made to lie comprehended in chapters ix., x., and xi. Rückert likewise professes to find in the Epistle to the Romans, and in other books, certain obscurities and confused statements—in which charges Furrzschein justly recognizes the obscurities of the critic himself. The acceptance of numerous digressions on the part of Paul is well known; and even Tholuck does not regard the Epistle to the Romans quite free from them.

As far as the organic unity of the Pauline Epistles is concerned, we would make the following statements as a guide:

(a) Every Pauline Epistle has a clearly-defined fundamental idea which controls the entire content of the Epistle.

(b) This fundamental thought shapes not only the division, but also the introduction and conclusion, and even pervades all the slender threads.

(c) The introduction is determined by the Apostle's method, which seizes the appropriate point of connection with a congregation or a person, in order to develop the argument into its full proportions.

(d) The introduction is followed throughout by a fundamental or didactic theme (proposition), which the Apostle proceeds dogmatically to elaborate.

(e) This elaboration arrives at a final theme, from which the practical inferences are carefully drawn.

(f) The conclusion corresponds so exactly to the fundamental thought of the Epistle, that it is reflected in all the single parts.

We shall illustrate these principles by presenting our analysis of the Epistle to the
Romans. But we must first be allowed to make some observations on the remaining Pauline Epistles. The fundamental theme of the First Epistle to the Corinthians is a determination of the proper condition of a Christian congregation, as made one by the name of the Lord Jesus Christ, in opposition to the character and shades of partisanship; chap. i. 9–12. The final theme is, accordingly, a recommendation of stability and of a sound growth in conscious hope; chap. xv. 58. In the first part of the execution Paul shows that he, with his fundamental preaching, would yet not have the church become Pauline in any sectarian or partisan sense; chap. i. 13–iv. 20. He furnishes at the same time, in an apologetic form, a polemical argument against the partisan attachment to Apollo. The second part opposes the different forms of antinomianism that arose mainly from a misconception of the Pauline doctrine of freedom, chap. v. 1–xi. 1. (Disorderly marriages. Heathen tribunals. Whoredom. Mixed marriages. Meals made of idolatrous offerings. True and false freedom. Meat offered to idols.) In the third part those errors are discussed which prevailed chiefly among the Petrine Judaizing Christians, chap. xi. 2–chap. xiv. (The dress of the synagogue in the congregation. Separatism at the communion. Jewish self-boasting, especially with regard to the gift of tongues.) The fourth part teaches the real resurrection in opposition to the spiritualism of the “Christ-Party” (οἱ τοῦ Ἐμμανουήλ, 1 Cor. i. 12), chap. xv. 1–57. The final theme is a demand that the sentiment of unity become practical: a. In the collections for the Jewish Christians in Palestine. b. In the active sympathy with Paul’s labors among the Gentile Christians. c. In the proper recognition of the friends of Paul, Timothy, Apollos, Stephanas, etc. The point of connection in the introduction is the rich charismata or spiritual gifts of the congregation, placed in the light of grace, and of their necessary preservation until the coming of Christ. In the conclusion we find, together with abundant greetings of brotherly communion, an admonition to salute one another with a holy kiss, and an anathema pronounced against declension from the love of Christ; which, without doubt, applies to separatism or sectarianism, especially that of a spiritualistic character.

Having set forth, in the First Epistle to the Corinthians, the true unity of a Christian congregation endowed with the gracious gifts of the Spirit, he portrays, in the Second Epistle to the Corinthians, in form of self-defence, the proper official functions in relation to a congregation. The fundamental theme, chap. i. 6, 7. The unity of the Apostle with the congregation in all his official sufferings and joys with reference to the visit which he designed to make to them. The final theme is a demand that the congregation should be so built up by the Apostle’s word, that his visit to them might be a source of joy and not of sorrow, chap. xii. 19–21. 1. The Apostle’s official sufferings, chap. i. 8–chap. ii. 13. (His sufferings in Ephesus, and their prayers for him. His distress at being prevented from visiting the Corinthians forthwith to do them good. His affliction at the previous letter, an evidence of his love. Removal of the sorrow by the restoration of the penitent. His care for them.) 2. The Apostle’s official joys, chap. ii. 14–chap. iv. 6. (His triumphs in Christ. His epistle of commendation, the Corinthian Church. The splendor of the New Testament office, and its glorious strength which supports the official incumbents themselves. The enjoyment which his office afforded.) 3. Official sufferings and joys in close conjunction, chap. iv. 7–chap. vii. 16. (The life of the apostles in its contrasts. Their death the life of the Church. Their pilgrimage below, their home with the Lord. Their zeal in the love of Christ. Their condition in the new life. Their message of reconciliation. The conduct of the Apostle in his service of God should bless the Church by awakening and encouraging it to holiness. Certainly this should be the case, after the cheering report that the Apostle had received from Titus of the effect of his First Epistle.) 4. The common sufferings and joys of the office and the congregation, and their effect in creating sympathy and benevolence, chap. viii. 1–chap. x. 1. (The example of the Church in Macedonia. Official tenderness and prudence in suggesting and encouraging a collection, and in the institution of the diaconate. Encouragement and
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promisea.) 5. The defence of the office in opposition to the charges made against it which threatened to sunder the office and the congregation, chap. x. 2—chap. xii. 18. (Prudence in the official or self-defence of the Apostle. The epistolary form is the expression of forbearance, but not of cowardice or inequality in conduct. Enforced expression of self-respect in contradistinction from vain self-praise. The liability of congregations to be misled by false apostles. The unselshfulness of the Apostle in contrast with their selfishness. The painful self-defence that was wrung from him. His works and his weakness. His contemplation and ecstacies, and the thorn in his flesh. His signs and wonders in the midst of them. His self-denial and readiness to be offered for the Church. Also in the sending of Titus.)—The final theme, chap. xii. 19, 20. The execution: a demand of the congregation that they be so equipped as not to need the painful exercise of his official discipline, chap. xiii. 1—10. The introduction: the point of connection. Praise to God for a common comfort in a common sorrow. The conclusion: a reminder to reciprocal consolation in harmonious action.

The fundamental theme of the Epistle to the Galatians is the solemn establishment of the Pauline gospel for the Galatian Church, in view of its departure from the same, by a conditional anathema pronounced against those who preach a heterogeneous gospel, chap. i. 6—9. The admonition made in the final theme corresponds to this—chap. v. 1—to stand fast in the liberty, and not to be entangled again in the yoke of legal justification. Development of the fundamental theme. The Apostle proves the worth of his gospel: 1. By his divine apostolic call and independence, chap. i. 10—24. 2. By the recognition of the congregation at Jerusalem, and of the "pillar" apostles, chap. ii. 1—10. 3. By the yielding of Peter to his evangelical principle, chap. ii. 11—21. 4. By the personal experience of the Galatians, chap. iii. 1—5. 5. By the character of the Old Testament itself, namely, by the relation between Abraham with the promise, and Moses with the law, chap. iii. 6—24. 6. By the proof that the law, as a schoolmaster, has been abrogated by the coming of Christ, chap. iii. 25—chap. iv. 7. Paul then makes an application of these arguments: 1. To the aberration of the Galatians, chap. iv. 8—16. 2. To the false teachers, vers. 17, 18. 3. To himself, and his disturbed relation to them, vers. 19, 20. 4. His address to the sticklers for the law, and his conviction of them by the law, chap. iv. 21—27. 5. His address to the brethren in the faith. Reference to the contradiction between the bond and the free, vers. 28—31. Development of the final theme: Stand fast in the liberty of Christ. a. The consequences of legal circumcision maintained as a doctrinal principle, chap. v. 2—13. b. Warning of a misconception and abuse of freedom. The law, in its truth, is transformed into the law of love and of the Spirit, chap. v. 14—24. a. The evidence of the life in the Spirit as the law of freedom, in the practice of the virtues of love, humility, meekness, etc., for the restoration of true conduct by all. The antagonism between sowing to the flesh and sowing to the Spirit, chap. v. 25—chap. vi. 11. The conclusion, vers. 11—18: A reminder of his grief which expressed itself also in a repeated warning, preaching of the cross, and a conditional invocation of blessing. Reference to the last word, ver. 17. Appeal to their spirit, ver. 18. There is no need of showing how perfectly the short exordium—where the point of connection significantly disappears or is clothed in the expression of surprise, ver. 6—corresponds to the whole epistle.

The Epistles to the Ephesians and Colossians represent the absolute unity in Christ, to which all the faithful, and with them all humanity and the world, are called. Their difference, however, consists in this: the Epistle to the Colossians derives this unity from the fact that Christ is the principle, the άξόνιος, of all life, as well of creation as of resurrection; and this is done in opposition to the Colossian errorists who, with Christ, would also honor the angels as vital agents and mediators, and who constructed a dualistic antagonism between spirit and matter. The Epistle to the Ephesians, on the other hand, represents Christ as the άνατολήν, the glorified head, in whom all things are comprehended after the eternal purpose of God. Accordingly, these Epistles, though possessing great external resemblance, yet stand in an internal harmonious contrast, as the Alpha and Omega in Christ, which is highly
adapted to explain the relation of the elementary points of agreement and disagreement among the synoptical evangelists.

The Epistle to the Colossians institutes as its fundamental theme, the truth: Christ, as the image of God, is the ἀρχή, the παραδότος, the author both of the first creation and of the second—the resurrection, chap. i. 15–18. To this the final theme corresponds: Having risen with Christ, look forward toward the heavenly riches in the glorified Christ, chap. iii. 1, 2. Development of the fundamental theme: In Christ there is all fulness. Absolute reconciliation, even of the heathen, for the evangelization of whom the Apostle suffers and labors, being deeply concerned that they might become one in Christ. Consequently, he warns them against false teachers who make divisions between Christ and the angels, Jewish Christians and Gentile Christians, spirit and body, and who, by a false spirituality, fall into carnal lusts, chap. i. 19–chap. ii. 23. The final theme: Looking for the unity with the heavenly Christ in expectation of the revelation of his future glory. Inferences: Laying aside of fleshly lust. Unity in the life of the new man. The virtues of the life in Christ. Sanctification of the domestic life, of a home to the unity in Christ. Communion of prayer, also with the Apostle and his work. The proper course toward the world in accordance with this prayer, chap. iii. 1–chap. iv. 6. Conclusion: Sending of Tychicus. Recommendation of Onesimus. Greetings. Occasion of community of life with the Ephesian circle, vers. 7–18. The conclusion as well as the introduction is also here in full accordance with the fundamental thought. The connecting point of the introduction lies in chap i. 4, 5, together with the praise of Epaphras and the invocation of blessing, as well as the common thanksgiving for the redemption which has established a new standpoint.

The fundamental theme of the Epistle to the Ephesians represents the risen and glorified Christ as the object eternally appointed, and openly declared such by the calling of the faithful, and as the head of the congregation for the comprehension and unity of all things, chap. i. 20–23 (a truth designed to console and cheer the Church of Asia Minor). To this the final theme corresponds, chap. iv. 1–6. The unifying power of Christ declared in the fundamental theme has shown itself: (a.) In the heathen becoming with the Jews one household of God. (b.) It exhibits itself in the joy with which Paul, in conformity with the manifestation of the eternal mystery of their election, invites them to the gospel salvation and suffers for them. It should, therefore, manifest itself also in the joy and hope of the Ephesians. Accordingly, the Ephesians, chap. iv. 1–6, should preserve the unity of the Spirit. (a.) The gracious gifts of the individual, as an assigned endowment, is a bond of unity and not a ground of separation, vers. 7–10. (b.) The official organism is appointed to train up all to the perfect manhood of the body of Christ, vers. 11–16. (c.) This unity requires the separation from the heathen sinful lusts by the renewal of the life, chap. iv. 17–chap. v. 14. (1. Proper conduct toward every man, truth, meekness, justice, chastity of speech, spirituality, freedom from passion, kindness and philanthropy, love. 2. Avoiding of heathen vices.) (d.) It demands prudence, redemption of the time, caution, and a zeal which does not come from exciting stimulants, but by spiritual songs and thanksgiving, chap. v. 15–20. (e.) It demands reciprocal submission and a sacred harmony of domestic life, chap. v. 21–chap. vi. 9. (f.) It demands watchfulness, energy, equipment, self-defence, and war against the kingdom of Satan, chap. vi. 10–17. On the other hand, the advancement of the kingdom of God in all saints and in the work of the Apostle by prayer and intercession, vers. 18–20. The conclusion characterizes this sermon on Christian unity as a message for solace and encouragement by Tychicus, in connection with the sufferings of the Apostle. And in the same sense must we understand the magnificent doxology of the introduction, with its invocation of blessings.

In the Epistle to the Philippians the difference between the didactic and parenetic word appears but slightly, since the entire Epistle is pervaded by the feeling of the personal communion of the Apostle with the Church at Philippi. Nevertheless, even here it may be observed. In the words, chap. i. 8–11, he speaks of his heart’s desire that his dear Church should become perfect in every respect unto the day of Christ; that it might abound more and more, be purified, and be filled unto the glory of God. To this the final theme corre
spon's, chap. iv. 1. The call: that they might continue to be his joy and crown in the Lord. The fundamental thought, the principal theme, discloses itself first in the communication of his experience at Rome, and of his state of mind in consequence thereof, because he desired that the Philippians, by virtue of their wider unity with him, should avail themselves of it in their own experience, chap. i. 12-30. Then he exhorts them to improve their unity by means of the humility of every individual, in imitation of the example of the humble self-humiliation of Christ—a passage which gives this Epistle a specifically christological character, though it is viewed in its ethical aspect and bearing, chap. ii. 1-11. Next to humility, the Church should increase its inner spiritual tension and efforts, vers. 12-16, stimulate the members to rejoice with him,—for which purpose he will also send Timothy to them, as he sends Epaphroditus, chap. ii. 17-chap. iii. 1. But then, too, the experience which he had made in Rome concerning the opposition of the Judaizers (chap. i. 15) causes him to warn them decidedly,—after the intimation of chap. i. 28,—against their plots, with reference to his own relation to them, chap. iii. 2-6. Then follows the declaration how far he had left the legalism of these opponents behind in his knowledge of Christ, his faith in justification by free grace, and his struggle after perfection, unto the resurrection of the dead and the life in heaven; in which respect they, too, should be his companions against the enemies of the cross of Christ, chap. iii. 7-31. The explication of the final word indicates pointedly to that which the Apostle had occasion to censure. A disagreement between Evodias and Syntyche must be removed; elements of oppression, bitterness, anxiety, and division must disappear; the members must be like the Apostle in continual striving after what is good, chap. iv. 2-9. With this reminder the Apostle also connects a high recognition of the Church's Christian life of love, which it had shown, now as before, by contributing to his support—a privilege which he, in his keen sense of independence, granted to no other congregation, vers. 10-20. The conclusion corresponds, with his invocation of blessing (ver. 10), to the fundamental thought, and with his greeting, to the key-note, of the Epistle. The connecting point is found in ver. 6.

The Epistles to the Thessalonians.—The First Epistle is pervaded by the fundamental thought: The Lord will come speedily; the Second, by the thought: The Lord will not yet come speedily. Both of these are in accordance with the truth; because, in the first part, the question is concerning the coming of the Lord in his dynamic rule in a religious sense; and in the second part, concerning the coming of the Lord in a definite historical and chronologi­cal sense.

The theoretical theme of the First Epistle is contained in the words, chap. i. 9, 10 (comp. chap. ii. 12, 16, 19, etc.). Accordingly, the whole of Christianity, particularly that of the Thessalonians, is eschatological: a waiting for the coming of the Son of God from heaven, as the Saviour from future wrath. (a) The labors of Paul among them have corresponded to this waiting, and their conduct amid the persecutions of the times should also correspond to it, chap. ii. 1-16. (b) The Apostle has been careful of the condition and steadfastness of the Church, as he was so soon separated from it. His propositions to visit them again. The sending of Timothy, He has been encouraged by the account of Timothy, chap. ii. 17-chap. iii. 13. (c) Admonition of the true course of conduct in that expectation (the true "saints of the last day"). No polygamy, or lust of the flesh; no separation; no excited wandering about, instead of quiet labor, chap. iv. 1-12. (d) Instruction concerning the relation of those who are asleep to the coming of the Lord, chap. iv. 13-18. (e) The question after the times and seasons. Answer: As a thief in the night, chap. v. 1-3. The practical theme: Watch, chap. v. 4. Development: According to your spiritual nature; your daily life; your calling; your relation to Christ. Inferences: chap. v. 5-22. Conclusion: The invocation of blessing in harmony with the fundamental thoughts, ver. 23. Connecting point of the introduction. The Thessalonians are successors of the apostles and of the Lord by the joy of their faith, according to their hope amid many tribulations, chap. i. 3-6.

In the Second Epistle to the Thessalonians the fundamental thought appears: that the judgment of the Lord upon the world will first be matured—in consequence of the per­secution of the Christians; and the worthiness of the faithful must be assured before the
Lord will come for the execution of the final judgment and for the redemption of his children, chap. i. 5-8. (a.) Fuller declaration as to how the maturing of the judgment is connected with the maturing of the faithful, chap. i. 9-12. (b.) Warning against chiliasmic delusions, as if the day of the Lord were at hand in a chronological sense, chap. ii. 1, 2. (c.) How the whole development of unbelief and apostasy must precede the appearance of Antichrist (comp. Matt. xxiv. 24: the Revelation), chap. ii. 3-14. The final word, chap. ii. 15: Steadfastness, according to his instructions. Inferences: Prayer for the mission of the gospel; love and patience, discipline, industry, beneficence, and stability. The handwriting of Paul himself as a warning against chiliasmic delusions. The connecting point of the introduction: The endurance of the Thessalonians in their faith, in the midst of the persecutions, chap. i. 4.

The Pastoral Epistles constitute so far a parallel to the Epistles to the Corinthians, as that the First Epistle to Timothy, and the Epistle to Titus, teach, according to the analogy of the First Epistle to the Corinthians, how the congregation should be officially watched, directed, and further developed. In the Second Epistle to Timothy, on the contrary, Paul, in anticipation of his martyrdom, instructs his pupil to become, in his official work, his spiritual successor, and thus to reproduce the life-picture of the apostolic office which is portrayed in the Second Epistle to the Corinthians.

The theme of the First Epistle to Timothy is the renewed scriptural transmission of the Divine commission which the Apostle received when he was called to establish the real life of faith and of the Church, to Timothy, his substitute in Ephesus for that special sphere, chap. i. 18. According to the measure of this commission he expresses a wish in the greeting that he might possess a rich measure of grace, chap. i. 1, 2. Accordingly, he should remain in Ephesus and watch over and protect the pure doctrine against Judaistic errors and the germs of Gnosticism. The object of the preservation of orthodoxy was the edification of the Church in piety and pure love. The pure doctrine should maintain a pure heart, a pure conscience, and a pure faith, ver. 5. The immediate occasion was chiefly the Judaizing Christian zealots for the law. Therefore the Apostle characterizes his relation to the law. If he lays great stress on the fact that he, too, had once been a blasphemer and a persecutor, he at the same time gives his true estimate of that zeal for the latter, and declares how he has been led beyond it, by the mercy of God, to become an example of faith, whose defence he now gives over by letter to Timothy. This official call is a call (a.) to conflict, because the apostates oppose the faithful, vers. 18, 20. (b.) To the demand for universal love and intercession for all sorts and conditions of men (in opposition to Jewish particularism), chap. ii. 1-7. (c.) To the furtherance of universal custom, according to which the women should not dare to annuncce themselves as (Judaizing) prophetesses, vers. 8-15. (d.) To the promotion of the true organization of the congregation. 1. The bishop, or, which is the same thing, the presbyter and his house. 2. The deacon and the deaconess. 3. The management of the house of God in general, according to its divine nature, chap. iii. (e.) For the settlement and fighting of the germs of error which might ripen in the future. Gnostic errors and principles, chap. iv. 1-11. (f.) For the self-guidance of the ecclesiastical officer, chap. iv. 12-16. (g.) For the proper conduct toward every one, especially according to the distinction of old and young with reference to the service of the congregation (the men, women, and widows). Special direction on the treatment of the widows in general, especially on the employment of the old widows for the good of the congregation. Special direction on the proper treatment and distinction of the elders, as well as on the proper prudence at the appointment and ordination for offices. Care over his own deportment and health (chap. v. 24, 25, is said with reference to the trial, ver. 22). Care of the servants in the Church, chap. v. 1-vi. 2. The final statement, chap. iv. 3-5. Inferences: Doctrinal disputes, and their worldly motive, vers. 5-10. Renewed inculcation of the command (commission), vers. 12, 16. Concluding word, vers. 17-21.

The Epistle to Titus. The commission which the Apostle gave to Titus for Crete, is differently expressed from that given to Timothy for Ephesus. His chief task was the appointment of presbyters in the single congregations, together with a further development
of the Church at Crete, chap. i. 5. Accordingly, the Apostle describes first of all the requisites of elders, with reference, no doubt, to the new experiences at Crete, and also the intrusion of Judaizing seducers, chap. i. 6–16. Then the proper care of the congregation, and pastoral work of Titus, with reference to special relations, ages, and classes of society, chap. ii. 1–15. Finally, the guidance of Christian Cretans into proper conduct, especially in regard to the avoiding of a disturbing, quarrelsome, and passionate spirit with reference to the goodness of God in Christ, chap. iii. 1–7. The Apostle confirms this direction by his final theme, chap. iii. 8. It is in accordance with his statement of the requisites of the presbyters, chap. i. 9, 10, that he forbids him from meddling with the scholastic controversies of the errorists, especially the legalists; and admonishes him first to deal practically with sectarian men, and then to avoid them, vers. 9–11. The concluding word: The sending of Tychicus, special appointments, and greetings. The introduction is an expression of the Apostle's authority, and of the authorization of Titus.

The Second Epistle to Timothy was designed, as has been already said, to conduct Timothy further into his official life, so that he, as the favorite spiritual son of the Apostle, might enter into the footsteps of the latter after his departure from this world. This is expressed by the fundamental thought, chap. i. 6–8. The Apostle strengthens this fundamental thought, first, (a) By God's call to be saved, vers. 9, 10. (b) By his own call to be the Apostle to the Gentiles, vers. 11, 12. (c) By Timothy's relation as a scholar to him, vers. 13, 14. (d) By reference to the unfaithful and the true, vers. 15–18. He then develops the fundamental thoughts. (a) He must be strengthened by faithful co-workers, chap. ii. 1, 2. (b) His readiness to suffer, and his endurance, after the example of Paul in imitation of Christ, vers. 8–13. (c) Shunning the spirit of controversy. The injurious fruits of the same must be perceived (Hymenæus, Philetus); and oppositions and distinctions in God's house must be rightly understood. Timothy must avoid impure persons, and all lusts and fruitless scholastic controversies; he must honor, instruct, and restrain in the proper spirit, chap. ii. 14–26. The Apostle exhibits, finally, the fundamental thought by contrasting the future condition of the errorists and that of the apostolic disciple. The latter shall stand fast in the tradition of Paul—that is, in the New Testament, and in the Holy Scriptures—that is, the Old Testament, chap. iii. The final proposition, chap. iv. 1, 2, is a solemn transfer of his commission to the beloved disciple. Exposition: The future of the errorists and of the errors requires true apostolic men. Timothy must stand firm in the critical times, because his teacher is about to depart, vers. 3–9. But Timothy must soon come to him, since he is almost isolated. Account of his condition, vers. 9–18. Concluding word, invocation of blessings, supplements, and greetings. The introduction is in harmony with the Epistle; an expression of intimate relationship between the teacher and the disciple, and of reliance on the inner call of the latter. As a legacy in anticipation of early death, the Second Epistle to Timothy is related to the Second Epistle of Peter.

The single portions of the Epistle to Philemon group themselves about the recommendation that Onesimus be received again, vers. 10–12. The preceding parts are chiefly introductory to this central point; the subsequent verses are the amplification. The conclusion, like the introduction, refers to the call of Paul and the congregation at Colosee.

The directness of the Apostle, which is peculiar to him as a religious and also as a truly Hebrew genius, may be regarded as resulting from an intuitive state of mind; yet, in this respect, he stands below the festive contemplation of John, for the reason that he, being endowed with greater energy, exhibits a more fervent zeal and a more practical turn. The style of John reminds us, therefore, of the most spiritual poetry; that of Paul, on the other hand, of the most fiery eloquence. The culture of the latter conforms to this view. Already in the school of the rabbis he had learned the rabbinical, reflective form of thought—a system of dialectics which proceeds by questions, objections, and answers, and by deductiones ad absurdum from the history of theocracy. But by his intercourse with the Greeks he had also learned the Grecian method of reasoning, which meets us, for example, in 1 Cor. xv. His own manner of expression was, however, modified by two elements, which must be taken into
proper account, if one would get rid of the unfounded prejudice concerning the alleged burdened periods and obscure abruptness of the Apostle.

The first element is the liturgical, which arose in part from devotional reminiscences, and in part from prayerful attitudes of unusual depth, and from a lofty, adoring condition of his heart. The liturgical form frequently transcends the historical and dialectical structure of the periods, and this, too, in consequence of that continuity of devotional feeling which moves through a succession of rhythmic pauses. We may refer to Psalms cvii. and cxxvi. as specimens.

The most important form of this character is the long sentence at the beginning of the Epistle to the Ephesians, vers. 8-14, which has often been misjudged by the Grecian standard, and caused so many glosses. We read it liturgically as follows:

Blessed be the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ:
Who hath blessed us with all spiritual blessings in heavenly places (things) in Christ:
According as He hath chosen us in him, before the foundation of the world:
That we should be holy and without blame before Him in love:
Having predestinated us unto the adoption of children by Jesus Christ to Himself:
According to the good pleasure of his will—to the praise of the glory of his grace—
Wherein (in which grace) He hath made us accepted (called) in the Beloved:
In whom (the Beloved) we have redemption through his blood, the forgiveness of sins:
According to the riches of his grace (—justification—);
Wherein (in which grace) He hath abounded toward us in all wisdom and prudence (—the glorification on the intellectual side—);
Having made known unto us his mystery of his will, according to his good pleasure—
Which (good pleasure) He hath purposed in himself, in the dispensation of the fulness of times (epochs, καιροι);
That He might gather together in one all things in Christ, both which (all things) are in heaven, and which (all things) are on earth, even in Him:
In whom also we have obtained an inheritance, being predestinated according to the purpose of Him who worketh all things after the counsel of his own will;
That we should be to the praise of his glory, who first trusted in Christ:
In whom ye also trusted, after that ye heard the word of truth, the gospel of your salvation:
In whom also, after that ye believed, ye were sealed with that Holy Spirit of promise (—which was effective also in the Old Testament promise—):
Which is the earnest of our inheritance (—the common inheritance of God's people) until the redemption (full liberation) of the purchased possession (—from among the Jews and Gentiles—):
Unto the praise of his glory!

In the exposition of the Epistle to the Romans, we shall make the observation that the difficulty in its concluding words can only be solved by viewing them as a liturgical form (already indicated in our statement of its contents); just as the difficulty in Rom. ix. 5 can only be explained by the assumption of a liturgical reminiscence.

In the place of the burdened periods, therefore, we substitute lyrical expressions which are liturgically simple, and in place of most of the supposed anacolutha, vital and vigorous brevities. As the former arose from the religious school and sentiment of the Apostle, so the latter came from his fervid vivacity and his rapid, ecstatic feeling in the midst of his daily work. In the preceding doxology we must supply a brief statement in place of an apparent want of connection (ver. 13). Such abridged sentences are especially noticeable in the second chapter of the Epistle to the Romans, where, in vers. 28 and 29, the expressions ἵππορικος and ποταμῷ have to be repeated. Therefore, with Coccinus, in Rom. v. 12, we simply take the ἤλαθαμεν from ver. 11, and put it into ver. 12, in order to explain the much-discussed anacoluthon (ὅτι τοῦτο ἤλαθαμεν); whereby it is to be observed that Paul used the word λαμβάνω emphatically in the sense of a personal, moral appropriation, to which the ἵππος πάντως ἄμαρτων in ver. 12 corresponds.

We can, in the main, only repeat here the characteristics already referred to. As far as the Apostle's method of representation is concerned, the peculiar feature of the so-called Pauline rhetoric must be found in the union of the strictest methodical progress of thought with the richest concrete expression; the union of a wonderful, intuitive depth with the most versatile dialectics, of an exalted contemplation with the most mighty practical tendency, of the
most comprehensive view with the most minute observation, of a flight of diction often lyrical and festive with the severest didactic distinctions, of the most original power of creating language (vid. the ἄναξ λαγόμενα of the Apostle) with the most felicitous use of conventional expressions.

On the style of Paul much has been written, from St. Jerome down to C. L. Baur’s Rhetorica Paulina, 1782, and later works. Comp. the literature in Guericke, Isagoge, p. 288 [p. 278 of the 3d ed., 1868.—P. S.]; Reuss, p. 64; Schaff, History of the Apos. Church § 153, p. 611 ff., and Bern. Alc. Lasonder, Disquisitio de Lingua Paulina Idiomate, Traject ad Rhenum, 1866.

§ 5. THE PAULINE THEOLOGY.

The doctrinal system of the Pauline writings, as to its traditional or retrospective side, is connected with the system of James through that of Peter; and, as to its universal and prospective side, with the doctrinal type of John through the Epistle to the Hebrews. We must maintain at the outset, on the one hand, the essential identity of the Pauline doctrine with that of all the apostles (against the view of Baur and the Tubingen School); and, on the other hand, the most marked peculiarity of the Pauline manner of contemplation and form of expression. We agree with Neander that Paul gives us a more fully developed system of theology than any other apostle; but we confine this to the form merely. For, as regards the matter of thought, John evidently represents the perfection of New Testament theology.

The peculiar character of Paulinism has been diversely construed. We find it in the idea that Christ, as the Son of God and Saviour of the world, who finished His historical work by His atoning death and glorious resurrection, is the absolutely new man, and, as such, the principle of a new spiritual creation in man (κανών χρῖστος); that He is, retrospectively, or in His relation to the past, the principle of the election of the faithful as it began to be actualized in the creation of the world, in their appointment to salvation, and in their holy calling; and that He is, prospectively, or in His relation to the future, the principle of a new justification before God, of a new law of the soul, of a new life, of a new humanity, which, in and with Him, died because of the universal guilt of the old race, but which, being reconciled to God by the atoning death of Christ, rose with Him to a new and heavenly life.

Note.—It is utterly foolish to assign to Paul, as some have done, a middle position between the recognition of the Old Testament—with the Jewish apostles—and the Gnostic Marcion. Paul, in his own way, is just as much a believer in the Old Testament as James (comp. Rom. iv., Gal. iii., and other passages). Only his special calling was the apostleship to the Gentiles, with its antithesis to Pharisaism and to the letter of the law, as well as with its principle of the perfect freedom of the gospel in Christ. Christ was, to the Apostle, the religious law—the law of the Spirit. The external law was to him, in a religious relation, only a pedagogical or educational symbol, and was ethically limited by the religious principle—Christ. For this reason he spiritualized the Old Testament word (Gal. iii. 24), the Jewish theology, and even the Jewish rabbinical dialectics, and converted them into an instrument of Christian doctrine and instruction. He did the same thing with the fundamental forms of Grecian and Roman culture (see Acts xvii.; Rom. xiii. 1 ff.)

§ 5. THE LITERATURE ON THE EPISTLES AND ON THE THEOLOGY OF PAUL.


**Homiletic and Ascetic Literature on the Epistles of Paul.**—Bengel, Periphrasis of the 14 Epp. of Paul; Schalch, Practical Exposition of the Acts of the Apostles, in Sermons, Schaffhausen, 1839; Stier, Discourses of the Apostles, 2 parts, Leipzig, 1829 and 1830; Thies, The Journey from Jerusalem to Damascus; Gallery of Pauline Sermons, Schleswig, 1841; Couard, Sermons on the Conversion of the Apostle Paul, Berlin, 1838; Blunt, The Life of the Apostle Paul, 24 Treatises, translated from the English, Meissen, 1861. Comp. also the serial sermons on the pericopes, or Scripture lessons, many of which are selected from the Epistles of Paul. Among these we may mention the collections of Harms, L. Hopacker, Kapp, Mynster, Ranke, Stier, Nitzsch, Deichert, etc. Finally, we must remember the Repertoires by Brandt, Lisco, Schaller, and others.
II. SPECIAL INTRODUCTION.—THE EPISTLE OF PAUL TO THE ROMANS.

§ 1. ROME, AND ITS SIGNIFICANCE.

As the light and darkness of Judaism was centralized in Jerusalem, the theocratic city of
God (the holy city, the murderer of the prophets), so was heathen Rome, the humanitarian
metropolis of the world, the centre of all the elements of light and darkness prevalent in the
heathen world; and so did Christian Rome become the centre of all the elements of vital
light, and of all the antichristian darkness in the Christian Church. Hence Rome, like Jeru-
usalem, does not only possess a unique historical significance, but is a universal picture
operative through all ages. Christian Rome, especially, stands forth as a shining ideal of the
nations, which is turned into an idol of magical strength to those who are subject to its rule.

The old heathen Rome, as the residence and centre of the universal Roman monarchy,
came, as Hegel says, like the destroying tragical Fate upon the glory of the ancient world.
But the same Rome which, as the unconscious instrument, executed the Divine judgments
upon all the centres of ancient civilization, became also the spiritual heiress, the emporium
and centre of all the secular culture of antiquity, and the preliminary condition and basis for
the universal development of the congregation of Christ into the Catholic Church.

Rome was the end of the old heathen world, and for this reason it became the beginning,
the universal home and point of departure of the new Catholic Christian world—a Janus
temple on a large scale. It was Rome's appointed mission to effect the union of the Gentile
and Jewish churches, the union of theocratic faith and humanitarian culture, the union of the
Christian East and West, the union of the old civilized nations and the wandering bar-
barians; and (in historical reflection of the pedagogic Mosaic of the Old Testament (Gal.
iii.) to carry on the pedagogic, legal, and symbolical office of training the nations of young
Christian catechumens into a ripe age of faith.

But as the Roman genius was unable to thoroughly appropriate and reproduce the ancient
culture, especially in its Grecian glory, so was it unable to comprehend Christianity in all its
fundamental depth, and to give it ecclesiastical shape and form. Its calling was, to popular-
ze the old literary treasures, as well as the treasures of Christian faith, according to the
necessity of the barbarians, and to adjust them to their dawning intellect. As soon as Rome
had succeeded in bringing its pupils to a point of maturity, its status of culture was sur-
passed, in a secular sense, by the revival of Grecian letters [in the fifteenth century], and in a
spiritual sense, by the evangelical confession [in the sixteenth]. Rome, however, has never
recognized its bounds, nor the limits of its endowment and mission. In the same proportion
in which it has been eclipsed, it has resisted every progressive movement with the fanaticism
of contracted egotism, and has thus incurred the judgment of history.

Rome appears first within the horizon of the Old Testament apocalyptic prophecies as a
dismal picture of the future, in the prophet Daniel, chap. vii. 7ff. The fourth beast of
Daniel's vision—notwithstanding all modern objections—can only be the universal Roman
monarchy. This is evident certainly from the fact, among others, that the third universal
monarchy, the Macedonian (Daniel, chaps. vii. and viii.), is marked by the same symbolical
number four; apart from the consideration that the portrayed antichristianity, chap. vii., is
eschatological, while the antichristianity of chap. viii. 9 can only be a typical prelude—the
antitheocracy of Antiochus Epiphanes. And as Rome appears first in the Bible in a prophetic
light, so does it appear last in a prophetic light, in the Apocalypse (chap. xvii.). There, it
destroyes every thing as the instrument of judgment; here, it is destroyed as an object of
judgment. The first historical connection of Israel with Rome was a friendly one, I Maccab.
viii. and xii. In the apocryphal period, Judea was made a dependence of Rome by Pompey;
and the same man laid the foundation of the Jewish colony in Rome, which, though in
pitiable condition, yet had the high and universal mission to mediate the transition of Chris-
tianity from Jerusalem and Antioch to Rome (see Acts xxviii.).

Comp. the article Rom in WINER’S REAL-LEXICON, in ZESELL’S BIBLISCHEN WÖRTERBUCH (Römer, Römerbrief, Rom), and in HERZOG’S REAL-ENCYCLOPÄDIE. Special works on Rome have been written by PIRANESI, PLATNER, BÜSSEN, GERHARD, CANINA, BECKER, FOURNIER, GREGO-
ROVIIUS, etc. Special evangelical essays: CHANTEPIE DE LA SAUSAYE, Trois sermons sur Rome, Leyden, 1855; SCHÜDER, Aus 14 Tagen in Rom, Elberfeld, 1861. [ALFRED VON REU-
MONT, GESCHICHTE DER STADT ROM, BERLIN, 1867 SQU., 3 LARGE VOLS.; A LEARNED, ABLE AND INTEREST-
ing work, by one who resided many years in Rome, and had every facility for his task.—P. S.]

§ 2. THE ROMAN CONGREGATION.

The first beginnings of the congregation of Roman Christians cannot be historically
determined. The primitive Christian tradition has placed the first existence of the Church,
or, at any rate, the first preaching of Christ in Rome, even as far back as the days of the
earthly life of Christ. It is said that the wonderful career of Jesus in Judea was first made
known by rumors, then by various eye-witnesses, and then by Barnabas (see CLEMENS ROM.,
RECOGNIT. I. 6 SQU.)*

This old Christian legend is closely followed by the Roman ecclesiastical tradition, ac-
cording to which the Apostle Peter founded the church of Rome. Peter is said to have gone
to Rome in the second year of Claudius (A. D. 42) for the overthrow of Simon Magus, and to
have resided twenty-five years in Rome as the first bishop of the church established there by
him.†

The grounds against this tradition are well known: (1) When Paul wrote his Epistle to
the Romans, about the year 59, Peter was not yet in Rome, and had never been there (comp.
Acts xix. 21; Rom. xv. 20 f.; 2 Cor. x. 16). [For it was the principle and practice of Paul
not to interfere with the labors of the Jewish apostles, or to build on another man’s foundation,
—P. S.] (2) When Paul, according to the Acts of the Apostles, came to Rome, about
the year 62, he found no trace of Peter there. (3) There was likewise no trace of Peter in Rome
when he wrote from that city his Second Epistle to Timothy, which we must safely assign to
his second captivity—about the year 66. On the contrary, we find (4.) Peter still in Jerusalem
at the time of the Apostolic Council, about the year 55 (50). We meet him, (5.) still later,
in Antioch, according to Gal. ii.,—about the year 55. And latest, (6.) in Babylon (in Assyria),
where he wrote his First Epistle to the Christians of Asia Minor.‡

But the Second Epistle of Peter, composed in anticipation of his approaching death,
seems to have been written from a prison, and that a prison in Rome; and the ecclesiastical
tradition of Dionysius of Corinth (ETZEBER, HISTOR. ECCL., II. 25), which affirms that Peter died
a martyr in Rome simultaneously with Paul, cannot be set aside by any weighty arguments.
Yet MEYER makes the excellent remark, that the Epistle to the Romans—which implies the
impossibility of Peter’s presence in Rome before it was written—is a fact which destroys the
historical foundation of the Papacy, so far as it pretends to rest on that Apostle’s establishment
and episcopal government of that church.

* [The Barnabas spoken of by PSEUDO-CLEMENS, RECOGNIT. I. I. E. 7, is called a Hebrew by birth, and one of the
disciples of Jesus, sent by Him to the West to announce the glad tidings. But this and other pseudo-Clementine legends
are of no historical value whatever. It is certain, however, that the Jews of Rome were represented on the day of
Pentecost in Jerusalem (Acts ii. 10), and it is highly probable that they brought the first report of Christianity to Rome,
possibly as converts, and in this case forming the nucleus of a Jewish Christian congregation. See below.—P. S.]
† On the gradual rise of this legend, see WEISS, Chronologie des Apostolischen Zeitalters, p. 552 f.; and SCHAFF,
HISTORY OF THE APOST. CHURCH, § 33, p. 265 f. The historical value of this tradition has been given up, even by some
Roman Catholic writers [e. g., HUGO TRILIMMER, KLEB, and others mentioned by TRULZCH in his Commen on the Romans,
p. 1, who do not, like BAUH, deny that Peter was ever at Rome, but only that he founded the church of Rome.—P. S.]
But on the other hand, there are Protestant divines, such as BEERHOVL, MÜNSTER, and TUTSCHER (THE CHURCH IN
THE APOST. AGE, 1852, p. 97), who have endeavored to sustain it, and it is easy to see why the Romanists of the present day
return to the support of this legend (see HAACKEN, Die römische Kirche, Freib., p. 658 f.).
‡ On the unanswerableness of the hypothesis that Babylon means Rome, see my APOST. ZEITALTER, II. p. 350.
The tradition which transfers the Roman church back to the days of Jesus, has been carried out to an extreme in several fictions.*

Yet there is an element of truth at its root, viz., the fact that the Messianic hope of the Jews in Rome was early excited, perhaps during the earthly life of Jesus, by a historical knowledge of His appearance; for among any considerable number of Jews there were pious individuals waiting for the Messiah's coming. "It is now admitted on all hands," says Tholuck, "that the seeds of the gospel could be brought to Rome by the Jews who were present at the feast of Pentecost (Acts ii. 10), and by the Jewish Christians who were scattered in different directions after the martyrdom of Stephen (Acts viii. 1). Such an early period is substantiated by the mention of such Christian teachers in Rome as had been converted before Paul (chap. xvi. 7); by what the Apostle says of the wide-spread renown of the Church (chap. i. 8), and its wide extent, since they met together in various places of the metropolis, chap. xvi. 5; xiv. 15; and finally by the probability that, in consequence of the great influx of foreigners to Rome, Christians from a distance were early found among the number."

The Jewish population in Rome was one of the larger colonies, like those in Assyria, Babylon, Alexandria, etc. Its parent stock were the Jewish slaves that had been brought by Pompey to Rome. It increased from the beginning by Jewish travellers, and afterwards by numerous proselytes. The enslaved Jews had, for the most part, received their freedom under Augustus.†

The Emperor Tiberius (Sueton., Tib. 36; Joseph., Antiq. xviii. 3, 5), and subsequently Claudius, drove them from the city (Acts xviii. 2; Sueton., Claud. 25; but they soon returned in great numbers, and dwelt under the rule of later emperors, although severely oppressed by taxes (Sueton., Domit. 12), and, in part, miserably poor (Juvencal, iii. 14; vi. 542). "Under the reigns of Augustus, Tiberius, and Nero, there were Jews even in the imperial household; and Poppaea, Nero's wife, was herself attached to the Jewish faith. So great was the number of Jews in Rome, that the Jewish embassy sent to Augustus after the death of Herod, was joined by eight thousand Jews in Rome (Joseph., Antiq. xvii. 11, 1)." (Tholuck.) On the celebrated mystical word of Suetonius concerning a decree of the Emperor Claudius in the year 52: "Judaeos impulsione Christo assiduo tumulantantes Roma expulit," comp. Neander, Kirchengesch. i. p. 52.‡

* See Neander, Kirchengeschichte, i. p. 51. Tertullian's legend of the Emperor Tiberius. (Tert., Apolol. c. 6: Tiberius, cuius tempore nomen Christianum in societatem introverted, aduocavit sibi ex Syria Palestina, quia tute vertebat ignotum divinatia recognovit, deis ad Senatum cum praerogativa adfregit ei. Senatus, quin non ipsius praebendar, respark, Cesar in seintia manet, constiutis periculum seqtioneuribus Christianorum. In ch. 23, Tertullian traces the knowl-
edge of Tiberius to a report of Posittius Pilato, and adds that even the emperors would have believed in Christ, if other emperors were not necessary for the world, or if Christians could be emperors. Eusebius, H. E. II. 23, translates the former passage of Tertullian. Before him, Justin Martyr, Apol. i. c. 35 and 48, spoke of acts of Pilate on the last days of Christ. Comp. the Gospel of Nicodemus, and Eusebius, Hær. L. c. 1—P. S.)

† Philo, Leg. ad Caj. On their dwelling-place in the Regio transiberina, comp. Winckler, art. Rom.

‡ The edict of Claudius de poenisd Judaeis, mentioned by Suetonius, Claud. 25, and in Acts xviii. 2 (comp. Dion Cassius, Hist. Rom. ix. 6), is usually understood to embrace the (Jewish) Christians as well as the Jews, on the ground that Christus is a corrupt spelling for Christus, and that tumulantantes refers to the controversies excited by the introduction of Christianity. To this may be objected, (1.) that Suetonius (whom Pliny, Epil. x. 35, calls virum erudissimum) must have known the name of Christ as well as Tacitus (Annal. xv. 44), and Pliny (x. 38); for he called His disciples Christians (Nov. c. 10); (2) that an internal religious controversy of the Jews would require later as well tumulantanes; and (3) that such a controversy would hardly have justified an edict of expulsion, since the general opinion of the time was that of a Jewish sect called Christians, included in the general term Jews. Hence Meyer (ad Act. xviii. 2) and Winkler (Chronology of the Apost. Age, p. 12), and art. Römberbrief, in Ehrmann's Encyclop., vol. xx. p. 588) understand by Christus a Jew who stirred up a political rebellion in Rome during the reign of Claudius. But I prefer the usual opinion, for the following reasons: (1.) There is no trace of such a character, who must have been a false Messiah, and could hardly have remained unknown; (2) the use of the vulgar misnomer Christus is established by the testimony of Tertullian (Ad nat. i. 3; Apol. c. 3: "Sed et cum perperram Christianum pronunciavit a nobis—nam nec nomine certa est nattia gentes voc—de sanctitatem felicem compositum est"); and Tactitvs (Inst. liv. iv. 7: "pofter ignorantiam errorem, qui cum immutatius litera Christum solertie diurus"). But it seems that the law of Claudius was no rigorously executed, from apprehension of bad effects in view of the large number of the Jews; and that only the public assemblies were closed. This is stated by Dion Cassius, ix. 8, who probably refers to the same edict, as Lennemann and Winkler assume (Theo the Iulianos plenius non verba, utamum evaginatis 060750 χρι- αντωνιον, οι αν μεν χρι- αντωνιον ἡπελευοντας ευσήσωσιν), unless we assign this decree (with Meyer and Lennemann, ad Act. xviii. 2) to an earlier date. At all events, the edict, if it applied to the Christians at all, can only have had a temporary effect; for we find, a few years afterwards, a large Christian congregation...
At the time when the Apostle wrote his Epistle to the Romans, there were in Rome many converts who openly professed Christ (chap. i.), and met for worship in several houses (chap. xvi.). [The congregation, moreover, must have already existed several years before 58, since Paul “these many years” (καὶ πέλλαν ἐτῶν, Rom. xv. 23, comp. ver. 22 and i. 18) had a desire to visit them, and since he mentions, among the Christian teachers in Rome, such as had been converted before him, xvi. 7.—P. S.] The stock of this Christian community was no doubt of Jewish descent (iv. 1); but the Gentile Christian element also was considerable (Rom. xi 13 ff., 25), as we may expect in view of the large number of Jewish proselytes in Rome. We may safely assume that the Church was just as much founded by Gentile Christians from Antioch, as by Jewish Christians who witnessed the first Pentecost at Jerusalem. We learn, moreover, from chap. xvi., that the most prominent members of the Church were adherents of Paul. And there is every probability that Paul, in a comprehensive church policy, had prepared the way for the proper founding and organization of a united congregation in Rome, as in Ephesus, by previously sending out faithful disciples—Aquila and his wife Priscilla. As these were his pioneers in Ephesus, so were they in Rome. Says Meyer [on Rom., p. 21, 4th ed.]: “As Paul had been so eminently successful in Greece, it was very natural that apostolic men from his school should bear evangelic truth further westward, to the metropolis of heathendom. The banishment of the Jews from Rome under Claudius (Sueton., Claud. 25; Acts xviii. 2) was a special occasion made use of by Providence for that end. Fugitives to neighboring Greece became Christians, and disciples of Paul; and, after their return to Rome, were heralds of Christianity, and took part in organizing a congregation. This is historically proved by the example of Aquila and Priscilla, who, when Jews, emigrated to Corinth, lived there over a year and a half in the company of Paul, and subsequently appeared as teachers in Rome and occupants of a house where the Roman congregation assembled (Rom. xvi. 3). Probably other individuals mentioned in chap. xvi. were led by God in a similar way; but it is certain that Aquila and Priscilla occupied a most important position among the founders of the congregation; for among the many teachers whom Paul greets in chap. xvi., he presents his first greeting to them, and this, too, with such flattering commendation as he bestows upon none of the rest." The much-disputed question concerning the national and religious constituents of the Roman Church is intimately connected with the question as to the occasion and aim of the Epistle to the Romans.

In discussing this point, we must start with certain clear distinctions. The difference between Jewish Christians and Gentile Christians must not be confounded with the difference between non-Pauline and Pauline Christians. Aquila and Priscilla, for example, were Jewish Christians, but they belonged decidedly to the school of Paul. On the contrary, there were in the Galatian congregation Gentile Christians who permitted themselves to be estranged from the Apostle Paul by the Judaizing party spirit. Likewise, those weak brethren or Jewish Christians who were entangled in legalistic anxiety (isbevis), must be distinguished from the false brethren, or heretical Ebionites, who gradually come into view; and so must we distinguish, among the Gentile Christians, those who were genuine disciples of Paul from those who proudly advocated an antinomian freedom of conscience. Even among the rigidly legalistic Christians there arose very early an antagonism between the adherents of Pharisaic legality and Essene holiness.

It is clear, not only from historical relations, but also from the present Epistle, that the national Jewish element in the Roman Church must have been very important, and that it constituted the first basis of the Church; see chap. ii. 17 ff.; iv. 1 ff.; vii. 4 ff.

Mon at Rome, composed of converts from the Jews and Gentiles, as is evident from the Epistle to the Romans, from the return of Aquila and Priscilla (Rom. xvi. 3), from Acts xviii. 17 ff., and from Tacitus’s account of the Neronian persecution in July, 64. Claudius issued several edicts concerning the Jews, first favorable ones in the year 42, mentioned by Josephus, Antiq. xix. 3, 2, 3; then the edict of expulsion, A. D. 52 (Sueton., Claud. 25; Acts xviii. 2), with which probably the one mentioned by Dio Cassius, ix. 6, is identical. The silence of Josephus concerning the latter edict is the more easily explained from the fact that, like the contemporary edict de mathematlics Itaia potentidis (noticed by Tacitus, Annal. xii. 25), it was never fully executed, or else speedily recalled.—P. S.]
At the same time, however, the Gentile Christian element in the Roman Church had become very strong, and was perhaps predominant. This we must infer from the historical relation. "Christianity, which took root first among the Jews, found an easier entrance in Rome among the heathen, because, in Rome, the popular heathen religion had already incurred the contempt of both the cultivated and ignorant classes (see Gieseler, Ch. Hist. i. § 11-14); therefore the inclination to Monotheism was very common, and the multitude of those who came over to the Jewish faith was very large (Juvenal, Satyr. x. 96 ff.; Tacit., Ann. xvi. 44; Hist. v. 5; Seneca in Augustine, De Civ. Dei, vii. 11; Joseph., Antiq. xviii. 3, 5). But how much more must this liberal religion, so elevated above all the bonds of a repulsive legal rigorism, as it was preached by Aquilas and other Pauline teachers, receive attention and support at the hands of those Romans who were discontented with heathendom." (Meyer.) That this was really the fact in the Roman church, is evinced by the many appeals addressed to the Gentile Christian portion, chap. i. 5, 6, 13; chap. xi. 13 ff.

Both elements in the Church must have been strong, as appears from the fact that the Apostle places together, throughout the Epistle, Jews and Gentiles, Jewish Christians and Gentile Christians, in order to bring them into union and harmony, as, from a different fundamental thought, he did in the Epistle to the Ephesians. In the greetings and introduction we find Jewish and Gentile Christians spoken of with equal regard. The theme of the Epistle, chap. i. 14-17, expressly applies the gospel alike to Jews and Greeks. In the exposition of the unrighteousness of the human race, the Gentiles and Jews are placed together in the light of searching truth, chap. i. 18; iii. 20. Likewise, justification by faith is applied in the most positive manner to Jews as well as Gentiles, chap. iii. 21-v. 11. Also the participation in the death of Adam and in the new life in Christ, chap. v. 12-viii. 39. So, likewise, the two economies of judgment and mercy in the history of the world, chaps. ix.-xi. Even in the exhortation the distinction again appears; the weak in faith and the free; the severe and the scornful; the weak and the strong, chaps. xiv.-xv. 7; yet here the other opposition between the non-Pauline and the Pauline Christians is also taken into account.

Though we cannot say with absolute certainty that the Gentile Christian portion of the Roman church was predominant, yet it is plain that the Pauline type did predominate in such a measure that the Apostle looked upon the church, in spirit, as his church. If we look at the single congregations in private houses, which the Apostle greets in chap. xvi., we find Aquila and Priscilla at the head of the first mentioned, which was probably the most prominent; and these were Jewish Christians, and yet decidedly Pauline. Likewise the warm and friendly terms with which he greets the most of the others, prove that he could regard them as his spiritual companions in the strictest sense of the word. This can be seen here and there from the contents of the Epistle. As the Apostle regarded himself, with justice, in the most specific sense, as the chosen Apostle to the Gentiles (chap. i. 5—a consciousness which, according to Gal. ii., involved neither a conflict with the apostles of the Jews, nor a neglect by Paul of the Jewish synagogues), he must have looked very early to the Roman metropolis as a sphere of labor designed for him. Accordingly, he designed at a very early period to establish a mission in Rome (Acts xix. 21; Rom. i. 13). He also made timely preparations for the execution of this design by sending in advance his friends Aquila and Priscilla, and many other companions—among them the deaconess Phoebe, of Corinth—to Rome. For this very reason he could depart, with regard to the Romans, from his usual practice of making his personal apostolic labor precede a written communication. This time he could send an epistle first, and write to the Roman Christians τοιαύτης ἀνεπαναθητήμονος (chap. xv. 15) without being embarrassed by the thought that he was entering upon a foreign field of labor (chap. xv. 20). Nevertheless, that delicacy with which he regarded the rights and independence of others, especially of believers, induced him to characterize his visit to Rome merely as a journey through that city to Spain. He could expect, with tolerable certainty, that Rome would be his principal station; but in case the prevailing peculiarities of the church should prevent this, he could not be denied in Rome the rights of Christian hospitality, by the aid of which he could proceed further. But the Judaizing element in
the church was not important nor far advanced, as appears from the fact that he found it necessary only to oppose legalistic anxiety in reference to fast-days and the eating of food—not arrogant Judaistic dogma.

The congregation being composed of Jewish and Gentile Christians, it could easily occur that the theological opinions at one time leaned to one side, and then to another.

According to PALEY, HENKE, KOPPE, KREHL, BAUMGARTEN-CRISTUS, and THIERSCH, the Jewish Christian element predominated in the church; and BAUR, favoring his well-known Ebionitic hypothesis, has attributed to the church a mild form of Ebionism. For an extended refutation of this view, which is sustained by a distortion of different passages, see THOLEUCK’s Romans, p. 3 ff. MEYER, in his introduction, passes lightly over the attacks of BAUR. We have no right to judge the character of the congregation at the time of Paul by the Judaizing tendencies which subsequently gained the ascendancy there in conformity with the constitutional proclivity of the Roman nationality. And even in the second century the Roman church, as such, cannot be charged with Ebionism (see THOLEUCK, p. 7).

According to NEANDER, RÜCKERT, DE WETTE, OLSHAUSEN, and MEYER, the Gentile Christian element was predominant. But even MEYER confounds this view with the preponderance of Pauline Christianity in Rome. We must discriminate thus: The Gentile Christian element was strong, but the Pauline element was evidently preponderant. This was also the case still later, when Paul wrote his Epistle to the Philippians during his captivity in Rome, although here, as elsewhere in the churches after the year 60, the Jewish element increased in strength (Phil. 1). Subsequently, the short stay of Peter in Rome, as well as the larger elective affinity between Jewish Christianity and the Roman nationality, gradually weakened the Pauline type, and, in fine, obscured it.

If there had been already a large number of Jewish Christians in Rome, how could the chiefs of the Jews speak to the Apostle when he came to Rome just as they did, according to Acts xxviii. 21, 22? Their answer was plainly evasive, in which they adhere to two points: that no writing of complaint against Paul had been sent to them from Jerusalem; and that the Christians were everywhere opposed by the Jews as a sect. BAUR and ZELLER have endeavored to derive from this apparent “contradiction” between the Acts of the Apostles and the Epistle to the Romans, a decisive proof of the unhistorical character of the Acts. For a refutation of this argument, see KLING, Studien und Kritiken for 1887, p. 301 ff.; THOLEUCK, Comment., p. 10 ff.; MEYER, p. 29; my Apost. Zeitalter, i. p. 106, and others.

The argument of the late Dr. BAUR, and ZELLER (his son-in-law), is this: The flourishing condition of the Christian Church at Rome, as described in the Epistle to the Romans (i. 8, 11, 12; xv. 1, 14, 15; xvi. 19), is irreconcilable with the tone used by the leading Roman Jews (οἱ πρῶτοι τῶν ἱουδαίων) in their answer to Paul, Acts xxviii. 21, 22, where they plead ignorance of the antecedents of the Apostle, and contemptuously characterize the Christian religion as a sect (αἵτης) which met everywhere with contradiction (παραγείον ἀναλύειαν); consequently the author of the Acts must have misrepresented the real state of things in the interest of his doctrinal design, which was to effect a compromise between the Jewish Christian of Petrine, and the Gentile Christian or Pauline sections of the Church, by bringing Paul down to the Petrine or Jewish Christian standpoint, and by liberalizing Peter, and making both meet halfway. But, in the first place, the author of the Acts (which were certainly not written before 63 or 64—i. e., six or seven years after the Romans) must have known the Epistle to the Romans, and felt the contradiction, if there was any, as well as we, the more

*The same view as to the preponderance of the Jewish element has been ably defended since by W. MANGOLD, Der Römerbrief und die Anfänge der Röm. Gemeinde, 1866, p. 35 ff.; but he justly denies the hypothesis of BAUR, that the Jewish Christians in Rome were Ebionites. SCHWEITZ, on the contrary, differs from BAUR and MANGOLD in assuming that the Epistle to the Romans was mainly intended for Gentile Christians. All three agree as to the size and object of the Epistle, which was to justify Paul’s apostolate to the Gentiles, by explaining the peculiar features of his doctrine and removing the objections to it, and thus to prepare the way not only for a personal visit to Rome, but also for a new missionary activity in the West, with Rome as the centre (comp. MANGOLD, l. c. p. 141). But MANGOLD objects to SCHWEITZ that such a justification was unnecessary for Gentile Christians, and hence he presupposes Jewish Christians.—P. S.]
so as he himself had previously mentioned the existence of the Christian congregation in Rome (xxvii, 15). Hence, the apparent contradiction, far from exposing a wilful perversion of history, only proves the simplicity and veracity of the narrative, and tends, like so many similar instances, to confirm rather than to weaken our faith. (2.) The very manner in which the Jews speak of Christianity as a sect everywhere spoken against, implies its general spread at that time, and so far corroborates the statement of Paul. (3.) The Jews did not say that they had never heard of Paul at all (which would be inconsistent with their own statement concerning the contradiction raised everywhere against Christianity), but only that they had received no (official) information from Palestine which affected his moral character, or was unfavorable to him personally (τι περὶ σοῦ ποιημάτων). And this was no doubt true; for the Sanhedrin of Jerusalem could have no reason to send official communication to the Jewish community in Rome concerning the case of Paul, before he had appealed to the tribunal of Caesar, and after this appeal they could not well anticipate the arrival of the Apostle in Rome, as he left Cæsarea soon after the appeal, at an advanced season of the year, shortly before the mare clausum (comp. Acts xxv. 12, 13; xxvii. 1, 9), and, in all probability, before his enemies could even make out the necessary official papers. (4.) We must not forget the diplomatic and evasive character of the answer of the Jews, who, as prudent men, were reluctant to commit themselves unnecessarily before the trial, in view of the imperial court and authority, and the complicated difficulties of the case. The leaders of the Jews appeared on this occasion in an official capacity, and very properly (from their own standpoint) observed an official reserve.—P. S.]

§ 3. THE CERTIFICATION OF THE EPISTLE TO THE ROMANS. ITS GENUINENESS AND INTEGRITY.

The Epistle of Paul to the Romans belongs to the most indisputable books of the New Testament.

Its genuineness is certified in the strongest manner by the unanimous testimony of the ancient Church, by the harmony of its contents with the historical character of Paul, by its internal weight, and its great influence upon the Church. Even the criticism of BaUR, which rejects the most of the New Testament books, acknowledges the genuineness of this Epistle (with the exception of the last two chapters), besides the Epistles to the Corinthians and that to the Galatians. But here, as elsewhere, the testimony of this criticism is not of much account. Significant allusions to the Epistle can be found in the (first) epistle of CLEMENT of Rome; in IGNAcIUS, POLYCARP, JUSTIN MARTYR, etc. MARCION, the Gnostic, acknowledged it. A decided testimony in favor of this Epistle is rendered by the three great witnesses of the Church and of the New Testament in its principal parts—IRENÆUS, TERTULLIAN, and CLEMENT of Alexandria. ORIGEN wrote a commentary on this Epistle. Even the fact that the Judaizing sects rejected it, speaks indirectly in its favor; they hated the Pauline doctrine contained in it.*

On the other hand, the integrity of the Epistle has been variously opposed. MARCION rejected chaps. xv. and xvi. on doctrinal grounds. HEIMANN, in his exposition of the New Testament, maintains that the Epistle closed, as a first epistle, with chap. xi., and that the subsequent part is a new work of Paul. SEMLER wrote: De duplici adpendice Epistola Pauli ad Romanos. According to PAULUS of Heidelberg, chap. xv. is a special epistle to the enlightened Christians in Rome; chap. xvi. is a special writing to the officers. Diverse, and, in fact, very strange conjectures have been advanced by SCHULZ and SCHOTT on chap. xvi. J. C. CHR. SCHMIDT denied the genuineness of the doxology, chap. xvi. 25–27, because it is wanting in Codex F, etc.; because it is erased in other codices; and because, in Codex J., and in almost all the Minuscule MSS., it stands after chap. xiv. 23. REICHE supposes that the

* More recently, the Englishman EVANS, in his book on the Discrepancies of the Four Gospels, has incidentally attacked the genuineness of the Epistle to the Romans, with trifling remarks unworthy of refutation; besides him, BURNO BAUER [a half-cracked pseudo-critic of Berlin, not to be confounded with the far superior DR. FERDINAND CHRISTIAN BAUER of Tübingen.—P. S.]
public reading of the Epistle should only extend to chap. xiv. 23, because what follows is of less practical importance, and for this reason the former part has been concluded by the doxology, which subsequently was made to conclude the whole Epistle. It would have been more appropriate to reason: Since the public reading was often concluded with chap. xiv. 23, the doxology was transferred from the end of the whole Epistle to this place. This would explain the fact that it is to be found, in later codices, after chap. xiv. 23. BAUR, in his treatise on the Purpose and Occasion of the Epistle to the Romans, declares chaps. xv. and xvi. of the Epistle to be unenuine. Certainly these chapters interfere with the application of his Ebionitic hypothesis to the condition of the Roman church. He was refuted by KLING in the Studien und Kritiken (1837, No. 2), and by OLSHAUSEN (1838, No. 4). Even the circumstance that the pseudo-Clementine Homilies seem to present a different picture of the Roman Church was made by BAUR a decisive argument against the genuineness of the last two chapters of the Epistle!

As far as the language of the Epistle is concerned, many Roman Catholic theologians have made use of the note of the Syrian scholiast on the Peshito: Paul wrote his epistle in Roman, in order to assert that it was originally written in Latin. GROTRIUS, and others, with good reason, have understood the word Roman in the wider sense, as applied to the Greek language. "The Greek composition," says METER, "corresponds perfectly not only to the Hellenic culture of the Apostle himself, but also to the linguistic relations of Rome (see CREDNER, Einl. ii. p. 388 ff.), and to the analogy of the remaining early Christian literature directed to Rome (IGNATIUS, JUSTIN, IRENAEUS, HIPPOLYTUS, and others)." BOLTEN and BERTHOLD assert that the Epistle was originally written in the Aramaic language. For further information, see METER, REICHE, and others, especially also the Introductions to the New Testament.*

§ 4. OCCASION, PURPOSE, AND CONTENTS OF THE EPISTLE.

The origin of the Epistle to the Romans must be traced to the close connection between the call and consciousness of Paul as the Apostle to the Gentiles, and Rome as the great metropolis of the Gentile world. But the contents of the Epistle are determined by the fact that a church made up of both Jewish and Gentile Christians already existed in Rome, and that he had long ago prepared the way for his personal labors in Rome, and further west, by sending out his missionary assistants and companions. His Epistle starts with this preparation as a preliminary reflexion of his personal labors; that is, as the promulgation of the gospel both in its theocratic purpose and in its universal constitution. In other words, he exhibits the gospel in its eminent fitness to comprehend Jews and Gentiles in a common necessity of salvation, and to build them up, on the common ground of salvation, into a community of faith which would combine in perfect harmony both a theocratic purpose and a universal spirit.

It was natural that Paul, in view of his call to the Gentile world, should, very early in his career, look to the metropolis of Rome as his great aim. He longed and strove to go to Rome, ch. xv. 28; i. 11. The order of his apostolic labors required him first to exercise his apostolic office in the East, chap. xv. 19; Acts xix. 21. Accordingly, his three Oriental missionary journeys had to be undertaken first, though in them he gradually approached the West; and besides, after each of these missionary tours, he had to secure the connection of his work with the metropolis at Jerusalem by a return to this city. But, in addition to all this, he experienced many vexations annoyances, and therefore he could well speak of the great hindrances to the execution of his design (chap. i. 13; xv. 22). Since it was his pur-

* [On the general use of the Greek language in the age of the apostles, within the limits of the Roman Empire, comp. especially the learned work of Dr. ALEXANDER ROBERTS, Discussions on the Gospels, Cambridge and London, 2d ed. 1864, pp. 1-116. Dr. ROBERTS endeavors to prove, from the undeniable facts of the New Testament, that even in Palestine, at the time of Christ, Greek was the common language of public intercourse, and that Christ and the apostles spoke for the most part in Greek, and only now and then in Aramaic. If this be so, we have, in the Gospels, not a translation, but the original words of our Saviour as He spake them to the people and to the Twelve.—P. S.]
pose, after his third missionary journey, to proceed from Jerusalem to Rome, his arrest in Jerusalem and imprisonment in Caesarea contributed to carry out this design, although it was for a time a new obstacle in his way; and his appeal to Caesar (Acts xxv. 10) was not only a requirement of necessity, but a great step toward the consummation of his wishes. But in Rome, too, there had arisen a hindrance in the establishment of an important society of Christians without his cooperation. He removed this hindrance in a threefold way. First, by sending his spiritual friends, Aquila and Priscilla, in advance to Rome, in order to prepare a place of abode for him; secondly, by his letter; thirdly, by the extension of his missionary purpose to Spain; so that, at all events, he might visit the congregation in Rome without doing violence to his apostolic principle (chap. xv. 20). His imprisonment set aside the last difficulty, since it even compelled him to stay two years in Rome; although he did not give up his plan of going further to Spain.

The occasion and purpose of the Epistle to the Romans has been very much and very differently discussed both by commentators and in special treatises.*

"The dogmatic exposition of earlier times," says Tholuck, "which was not at all interested in inquiring after the real historical purposes, mostly identified the aim and the argument of the Biblical books; in that which the Divine Spirit directed the writer to record, there lay the purpose for Christendom in all ages. The historical exposition of modern times seeks, by comparing the contents with the historical situation from which the writings arose, to disclose the nearest purpose to the original readers, although some writers of the rationalistic school put external cause in the place of the internal, and contended themselves with merely accidental causes, such as the good opportunity to send a letter to Rome by the departure of Phoebus, the Corinthian deaconess; the sight of the Adriatic sea from the high coast of Illyria, and the desire thereby awakened to go to Rome (Paulus of Heidelberg)."

The further account by Tholuck, however, does not fully harmonize with the assumption that earlier writers had in view only a doctrinal occasion, while the more recent commentary start from an historical one.†

* Among the essays on this subject are those by Christ. Paul. Schmidt (Tübingener Weinachtsprogramm, 1834, De Paulian ad Romanos Epistole consilio et argumento); by Baur (Zweck und Veranlassung des Römerbriefs, in the Tübingen Zeitschrift, 1836, No. 2), and his followers (see Tholuck, p. 16); by Olshausen (in the Studien und Kritiken, 1838, p. 935); by Huther (Zweck und Inhalt der zwlf ersten Kapitel des Römerbriefs, 1846); and Thiel. Schott (Der Römerbrief, seinen Endzweck und Gedankengang noch ausgelegt, Erlangcn, 1858).—Since then appeared D. Wilhelm Manwood, The Epistle to the Romans, and the Beginnings of the Roman Congregation: A Critical Investigation, Marburg, 1859, pp. 153; and W. Betschla, The Historical Problem of the Epistle to the Romans, in the Studien und Kritiken for 1867, pp. 627-665. The views of the late Dr. Baur on the Aim and Occasion of the Epistle to the Romans, were first published at Tübingen, 1836, and substantially reproduced in his work on Paul, 1845, p. 303 ff.; as well as in his Church History of the first three Centuries, 2d ed., 1846, p. 62 ff.; but in this last work, and in the second edition of the monograph on St. Paul (1867), he moderates the alleged antagonism of the Jewish Christians at Rome against Paul, and no more insists on the opinion that chapters ix.-xvi. constitute the doctrinal essence of the whole Epistle, to which the rest was made to serve merely as an introduction and an application. It must be admitted that Dr. Baur, by striking critical combinations, broke a new field of investigation concerning the character and condition of the primitive Christians in Rome, and the aim and occasion of the Epistle to the Romans. Theodor Schott, of Erlangcn, agreeing with Baur as to the central significance of chap. ix., x., and xi., but differing from his untenable assumption of the preponderance of the Jewish element in the Roman congregation, represents the Epistle as an apology of the Gentile apostolate of Paul before Gentile Christians of the Pauline school. But these did not need any such apology. Manwood, in the able treatise just referred to, substantially renew the view of Baur as to the essentially Jewish Christian character of the Church of Rome, and the importance of chap. ix.-xi., but he moderates its supposed antagonism to Paul. Baur, Schott, and Manwood agree in giving the Epistle an apologetic aim, viz., the defence of Paul's apostolate of the Gentiles (Die Rechtfertigung des paulinischen Heidenauspostelats). In this, Betschla differs from them, and, without denying this apologetic aim, he yet subordinates it (with Tholuck, Olshausen, De Wette, and others) to the general dogmatic aim of a systematic exhibition of the gospel salvation to a prevailingly Gentile Christian congregation in the metropolis of the world. In doing this, however, the Apostle had evidently his eye mainly upon the settlement of the difficult problem touching the relation of God's ancient people to the recently-engraffed Gentile world on the broad basis of God's infinite wisdom and mercy in the unfolding of His plan of redemption. Thus, chap. ix.-xi. receive their proper position as an outline of a philosophy of church history, instead of being merely regarded as a parenthetical section. Compare Dr. Lang's view in the text. The English commentators do not trouble themselves much with this introductory question.—P. S.)

† (There are attempts at historical exegesis among the Greek fathers of the Antiochian school, Theodor of Mopsuestia, Celest oxyon, Theodorist, and among a few Latin fathers such as Jerome, Pseudo-Androebius, and Pelagius. On the other hand, with some of the modern commentators the doctrinal and practical element predominates.—P. S.)
As far as the historical (more properly defined, special dogmatically-historical) occasions are concerned, Ambrosiaster, Augustine, Bullinger, and Bucer have ascribed to the Epistle a polemical attitude against the Jewish Christians (Pellican likewise, though only in the way of caution); and in modern times, Eichhorn, Schmid, Baur, Schwégler, Zeller, Köstlin, Lutterbeck, Dietleini, and Thiersch have, with many modifications, regarded the Epistle chiefly as a rectification of Jewish and Judaistic principles.

Chrysostom and Theodoret would find, on the contrary, in the Epistle decided polemic references to Gentile Christian Antinomian errors such as we find among the Marcionites, Valentinians, and Manicheans.

But those are nearer right who suppose that the Epistle was designed for the conciliatory counteraction both of Jewish Christian and Gentile Christian perversions. This view has been defended especially by Melanchthon, Du Pin, Hug, and Bertholdt. Melanchthon says "It can be seen that Paul wrote this Epistle from this cause: that the Jews would appropriate to themselves redemption and eternal life by their own righteousness through the works of the law; and again, the heathen insisted that the Jews were cast off for having rejected Christ."

In opposition to the historical (or better, the special dogmatically-historical) view concerning the occasion of the Epistle, we find the theory of a dogmatic, or, more properly, a universal dogmatically-historical occasion. When the Apostle Paul, in this view, without special references to particular embarrassments in the Roman church, would give to this church an outline of the first elements of the whole gospel—according to his conception of it—he did it under the steady conviction of his universal calling as the special Apostle to the Gentiles, who must extend his labors to the specific city of the Gentiles. On this side belong Luther's Preface to his Commentary on the Romans, Heidbreder's Zuchthärt, p. 535, Tholuck, in the earlier editions of his Commentary, Olshausen, Rückert, Reiche, Kollner, Glöckler, and Philippi. On the different modifications of this view, see Schott, p. 17. That of Olshausen is the most clearly defined. "We can affirm," says he [Commentary on the Romans, Introduction, § 5, p. 53, Germ. ed.], "that the Epistle to the Romans contains, so to say, a Pauline system of divinity, since all the essential topics to which the Apostle Paul, in his treatment of the gospel, is accustomed to give special prominence, are here developed at length." Philippi: "The Epistle was designed to take the place of the personal preaching of Paul in Rome; therefore it contains a connected doctrinal statement of the specifically Pauline gospel, such as no other contains."

Schott declares: "I must oppose decidedly, with Baur, all these views." Yet his protest differs from that of Baur. By his supposition concerning the Ebionitism of the Roman church, Baur was misled to the monstrous conclusion, that the theme of the Epistle to the Romans first appears positively in the section from chaps. ix. to xi. (in direct opposition to Tholuck, who, in his former editions, would find in the same part only a historical corollary). "The ever-increasing number of the Gentile Christians received by Paul must have so far excited the pretensions of the Judaists, that even the reception of the heathen, on condition of circumcision, was no more acceptable to them, and the reception of the heathen was regarded by them as an usurpation, so long as Israel was not converted." Schott controverts the opinion that "the cause and object of the Epistle must be determined from its entire contents," and confines himself to the introductory remarks of the Apostle concerning the purpose and cause of his Epistle. The result of his inquiry into the Proemium is the following: "As Paul sets out to proclaim his gospel to the Gentiles to the nations of the West, he designs to visit the Christian congregation at Rome, and to enter into a closer personal relation to it by reciprocal acquaintance, with a view to make this congregation of the metropolis of the West a solid base of operation for his Gentile mission work, which was now to begin in the West." But that understanding with the Roman church could be reached in no other way than by "a full exposition of the nature and character of his apostolic office, and the principles by which he was governed in his conduct." Schott finds, therefore, in the Epistle, "not an exposition of the Pauline theory of Christianity, but a description and vindication of the Pauline system of missionary labors.
§ 5. PLACE AND TIME OF THE COMPOSITION OF THE EPISTLE.

We object to this view, on the whole, that it puts the historical motive and the doctrinal in a strong contrast which is untenable. Then in particular:

1. The distinction between the East and the West, by which the former is described as the sphere of Jewish Christianity, and the latter, on the other hand, is the sphere in which the Apostle's purely Gentile Christian labors began (p. 103 ff.).

2. The supposition that the Apostle desired, in his Epistle, to lay before the church in Rome a complete apologetic programme of his missionary policy, in order to gain their recognition, and thereby find in them a point of support; but not to proclaim to the church in Rome the gospel as he understood it.

3. He would place the church in Rome, by means of his admonitions, in such a condition that it could become a basis for his Western missionary labors; but he did not intend that Rome itself should be his final object, but merely serve as a point of support for his labors in the West, above all in Spain.

It is above all things improper to separate the historical and the doctrinal cause, or to bring them into opposition. The Apostle to the Gentiles was under no obligation to legitimize himself before the Roman church concerning his missionary labors in the West; yet, according to the principle of Apostolic order, he had to justify himself when he wrote to the Romans τολμήτως (which certainly does not mean by way of defence, but, with more than usual boldness), and proclaimed to them the gospel. Plainly, the first fundamental thought of the Epistle is this: The call of the Apostle to the Gentiles is a call for Rome, and therefore the Apostle had long made the city of Rome his object. But the second fundamental thought, which limits the first, is the idea of apostolic regulation. The Apostle cannot lay claim to the church as exclusively his own, since it had already long existed without his coöperation. Therefore he describes his anticipated journey as one to the heathen West—Spain, the limit of the Western pagan world—in which he designs that Rome should furnish him a hospitable stay. Nevertheless, the Apostle was filled with the confidence that he could venture to address Rome as his church, and assuredly as the church in which he had to perfect the universal union of Jewish Christianity and Gentile Christianity, of Jerusalem and Antioch. Accordingly, he unfolds the religious and moral strength of his gospel, as fully adapted to save Jews and Greeks, and therefore to unite them, since, with the same evidence, it (a.) makes Jews and Gentiles sinners alike; (b.) presents salvation in Christ with equal certainty to both; (c.) leads both from the same death to the new life, as the elect; (d.) makes plain their mutual dependence in the same divine economy of salvation (chaps. ix.—xii.); (e.) the gospel proves itself to be a power of sanctification for Jews and Gentiles, which can make both capable of being reciprocally sympathetic, and of setting them free from their Jewish and pagan prejudices (chap. xii. ff.). By these combined considerations the Apostle furnishes to the Christians in Rome a real and practical proof that he, as the universal Apostle to the Gentiles, was also called to be indirectly the Apostle of Israel (chap. xi. 13, 14), and of the unity of the Jewish and Gentile Christians; and that Rome, the universal church of Gentile Christians, was called, as such, to become the union church of Jewish and Gentile Christians. And this is to be brought about by the strength of the universal gospel, which unites all the elect, and which, after first announcing it by letter, he hopes soon to present orally, so as to make Rome the point of departure for this universal Christian Church.

The matter stands, therefore, thus: The Apostle, who began his labors as the Apostle to the Jews (Acts ix. 22, 28), and who was afterwards in a special sense the Apostle to the Gentiles (Acts xxii. 21; Gal. ii.), now enters upon the third stage of his activity as the Apostle to all nations, and devotes his attention to the development of a union Church, which should embrace in one Jewish Christians and Gentile Christians.

§ 5. PLACE AND TIME OF THE COMPOSITION OF THE EPISTLE.

It is a very general opinion, and one sustained by various indications, that the Apostle
wrote the Epistle to the Romans from Corinth, during his stay there, while on his third missionary journey.

According to Rom. xv. 25 ff., the Apostle, when he wrote this Epistle, was about to depart for Jerusalem in charge of the collection from Macedonia and Achaia. But he brought this collection to an end in Corinth, when on his third missionary tour, according to 1 Cor. xvi. 1-3; 2 Cor. ix. This combination refers to the last three months' stay of the Apostle in Achaia (Acts xx. 2), and especially in Corinth; since this city was the metropolis of the church of Achaia, and the Apostle desired to tarry here, according to 1 Cor. xvi. 1-7; 2 Cor. ix. 4; xii. 30; xiii. 2. It is also in favor of Corinth, that the Apostle sent the Epistle by the deaconess Phoebe from the Corinthian seaport Cenchrea (chap. xvi. 1, 2); that he greets the Roman Christians for his host, Gaius (chap. xvi. 23), whom we may identify with the Corinthian Gaius (1 Cor. i. 14); and also for Erastus, the treasurer of the city, who, according to 2 Tim. iv. 20 (comp. Acts xix. 22), had his home in Corinth. Dr. Paulus has no ground whatever for arguing from chap. xv. 19, that the Epistle was written in a city of Illyria. Meyer justly supposes that the Epistle was written before the Apostle—who first had the purpose of travelling directly from Achaia to Syria and Jerusalem—was compelled by Jewish persecution to return through Macedonia (see Acts xx. 3); for he mentions, chap. xv. 25-31, nothing of this important matter.

The time of the composition of the Epistle was therefore about the year 59 after Christ. The notice, Acts xxviii. 21, which seems to imply that the Roman Jews knew nothing of an Epistle of Paul to Rome, by no means justifies the inference (drawn by Tholuck) that the Epistle was written at a later time; comp. against this Flatt and Meyer.

The Epistle was dictated by Paul to Tertius, an assistant (chap. xvi. 22). “The cause why Paul did not write his Epistles with his own hand, is not to be found in his want of practice in writing Greek,—which has no support whatever,—but in the apostolic condition, when others were ready to aid him.” Meyer. See Gal. vi. 11, and the note of the Bible-Work in loc.

§ 6. The Meaning and Import of the Epistle to the Romans.

Olshausen divides the Pauline Epistles into three classes: First, dogmatical didactic Epistles, then practical didactic Epistles, and finally, friendly expressions of his heart. This division is untenable, as appears from the fact that he includes the profound christological Epistles to the Ephesians and Colossians, together with the Epistles to the Philippians and to Philemon, in the class of “letters of friendship.” It is also very insufficient to say that the Epistle to the Romans belongs to the dogmatic didactic class. Olshausen remarks correctly, that the Epistle to the Romans is most nearly related to that to the Galatians; yet he does not go quite to the point, when he says: “Both Epistles treat of the relation of law and gospel; but while, in Romans, this relation is viewed altogether objectively, the Epistle to the Galatians, on the contrary, is altogether polemical against the Judaizing Christians. Besides, the Epistle to the Galatians is limited solely to this relation, and treats of the same more briefly than is the case in the Epistle to the Romans. In the Epistle to the Romans, on the other hand, the relation of the law and gospel is developed didactically, and scientifically in the strict sense of the word,” etc.

We have already remarked that the two Epistles are to be distinguished as specifically soteriological in the narrower sense of the word; but as the Epistle to the Romans describes justification by faith in Christ in antagonism with universal human depravity, the Epistle to the Galatians, on the contrary, is directed against false justification from the works of the law. At the same time, the Epistle to the Romans is constructed on a broader basis than that to the Galatians, since it deals both with heathenism and Judaism. The Epistle purposes to show, that neither the Gentiles were saved by God's revelation in nature and in the conscience, nor the Jews by the written law of the Old Testament; and he extends human depravity and the counteracting redemption through three stages of development in the mos
universal and exhaustive contemplation, to which an equally comprehensive practical application must correspond.

Although the Epistle to the Romans belongs, in the chronological order, in the middle of the Pauline Epistles, yet its primacy has been recognized in manifest opposition to the alleged primacy of the Roman Bishop. The Epistle to the Romans, in its Pauline type, opposes, by its doctrine of justification by faith without the works of the law, the system of Rome; so that even to-day it can be regarded as an Epistle especially directed “to the Romans.”

The early Church, in its disposition of the New Testament canon, especially the so-called "Apostles [as distinct from the "Gospel"]," placed the Epistle to the Romans, because of its importance, and with regard, at the same time, to the high standing of the Roman congregation, at the head of the Pauline Epistles. Still more did the Reformation bring it into its proper light. "It was," says Tschuck, "from the fundamental truth developed in the Epistles to the Romans and Galatians, that the Reformation took its start in its opposition to the Judaism which had crept into the Christian Church. Thus the doctrine of justification by faith became its dogmatic centre. Hence the importance attached to this Epistle by the Protestant Church. The exposition of this Epistle was Melanchthon's favorite course of lectures, which he repeated again and again almost without interruption; and, as Demosthenes did with Thucydides, he twice transcribed this Epistle with his own hand, in order to impress it more deeply on his memory (Stroben, Literaturgeschichte der Locis Melanchthon's, p. 18).

Since he here found a development of the chief articles of the Christian faith, he based on the Epistle to the Romans the first doctrinal system of the renovated Church, Melanchthon's Loci Communnes, 1521. Henceforth the Epistle was regarded as a compendium of Biblical dogmatics, and under this point of view, Olshausen also advises to begin exegetical studies with the same. But following the succession of thought from chap. i. 11, we would rather find in it a Christian Philosophy of Universal History (comp. Baur, Paulus, p. 657)." By the latter construction, however, the christological ἁναπτύσσεται, as well as the eschatological ἀλώια, would receive too little attention. The soteriology is certainly pictured forth with its opposite, ponerology, in the most comprehensive way; and both heathendom and Judaism are described under a point of view which comprehends them both. Olshausen is of the opinion that Luther commented only on the Epistle to the Galatians, because the relation between the law and the gospel are treated exclusively in it, and because he would avoid discussion on the mysterious doctrine of predetermination (Rom. ix. ff.). But Luther certainly expressed himself pointedly enough elsewhere on predetermination. [De servo arbitrio, against Erasmus.] The Epistle to the Galatians lay nearer to his purpose, because this Epistle brings out the doctrine of justification by faith in the strongest and clearest contrast to the false justification by works. From Luther's own preface to the Epistle to the Romans we learn how highly he appreciated that Epistle. On the importance of the Epistle for the Church in its inclination to legalism, and in its relation to the personal experience of Paul, and on its difficulties, see Olshausen, p. 54 ff.

[S. T. Coleridge, in his Table-Talk (June 15, 1833), calls St. Paul's Epistle to the Romans "the most profound work in existence," and says : "The only fit commentator on Paul was Luther—not by any means such a gentleman as the Apostle, but almost as great a genius."—P. 8.]

§ 7. THE CONTENTS AND DIVISION.

A. The Contents.

The Epistle to the Romans—in its sixteen chapters the most comprehensive of the Pauline Epistles—unites most intimately the character of a dogmatic epistle of instruction with the character of an ecclesiastical address in a specific, personal relation. Proceeding from the standpoint of his apostleship to the Gentiles, and after a satisfactory conclusion of his apostolic labors in the East, the Apostle designs to prepare the Christian church in Rome to
be the centre and starting-point of labors reaching to the farthest West (Spain). His work in the West should be universal, not merely as it united the West and East in Christ, but also as it constituted in Rome the peculiar type for the united church of Jewish Christians and Gentile Christians. The Apostle to the heathen is, in his consciousness, perfectly ripened into the apostle for the nations; and in this sense he intends to clothe the church at Rome with the prestige of a church of the nations, which he might regard as of his own institution, and make use of as the home of his universal activity.

To this purpose, the change of the Roman church from uncertain authority into a fixed institution of Pauline authority, corresponds the universal soteriological doctrine of the Epistle, as related to the universal ecclesiastical call of Paul. All men, viewed under the antagonism of Jews and heathen, are, in consequence of the prostitution of the living Divine glory, regarded as sinners, destitute of righteousness and merit before God; and all men have a common mercy-seat for pardon in Christ; all should pass from the old life of death in sin, or in the flesh and under the law, to the new life in Christ, in the spirit and in liberty; all were included under the judgment of unbelief, and all should experience Divine compassion. On this dogmatic foundation the church at Rome should be completely based; and in accordance therewith, it should regulate its internal relation between Jewish Christians and Gentile Christians, as well as its external relation to the world; but it must also, in accordance with this principle, perceive that its call as the central city of the Western Church can only be actualized by first acknowledging the call of Paul, and committing itself to him, as a point of departure in his universal work.

This Epistle has a unique character in relation to the Apostle, since he wrote it to a church which he had not established, and had not even once visited. But the anomalous character of this fact may be thus explained: The church was, on one hand, still perfectly vacant from all apostical authority, and it was thus far not yet fully organized as a church; and, on the other hand, it was not only naturally related to the Apostle to the Gentiles as the church of the world's metropolis, but had been long previously visited by him in spirit, and was accordingly taken possession of by his pupils and assistants as his sphere of labor (see chap. xvi.). The case was similar with the Epistle to the Colossians, though the Apostle may be regarded as the indirect founder of this church (by Epaphras).

In its dogmatic aspect, the Epistle to the Romans possesses a decidedly soteriological character. As to its form, it resembles, in its cautious tone, the Epistle to the Galatians; for the Apostle probes the former church, and asks whether it be already his church? and of the latter, he asks whether it still be his church? (Rom. xv. 15, 16; Gal. iv. 19, 20).

[The Epistle to the Romans, and that to the Galatians, treat of the same theme, viz., justification by free grace through faith in Christ, or rather, the deeper and broader doctrine of a personal life-union of the believer with Christ; but the latter is apologetic and polemic against the Judaizing pseudo-apostles, who labored to undermine Paul's authority, and to enforce the yoke of legalism upon a church of his own planting; while the former, written to strangers, opposes no particular class of men, but only the corrupt tendencies of the human heart. Both supplement each other, and constitute the grand charter of evangelical freedom in Christ.—P. S.]

The Epistle to the Romans has this in common with the Epistle to the Ephesians, that it shows how salvation in Christ transforms Gentiles and Jews into one Church of God; but in the Epistle to the Ephesians he establishes this unity on the christological principle, while in the Epistle to the Romans, it is effected by the soteriology. The relation of the Romans to the Colossians is similar to the one just described. [But with this difference, that the christological element prevails in the Epistle to the Colossians, the ecclesiological in that to the Ephesians.—P. S.]

In its ecclesiastical and practical character the Epistle to the Romans resembles those to the Corinthians. But in the former case the Apostle has yet to establish an authority and institution, while in the latter he has to maintain them.

In the section from chap. ix. to xi., this Epistle approaches the eschatological contents of
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the Epistles to the Thessalonians. The greetings in chap. xvi. remind us of the Epistle to the Philippians; the practical portion reminds us of the Pastoral Epistles.

In this Epistle the idea of piety or of righteousness, as a living worship of God, is peculiarly prominent; perhaps produced by the decided predominance of the practical element in the Roman conception of cultus. The fall of man commenced with the great pecatum omisimis: Men, regardless of the natural revelation of God, forsook the living worship and praise of God (chap. i. 21). Therefore the development of corruption among the heathen is shown in an external symbolism, which more and more sinks into a mythical idolatry, and results in a growing perversion and decay of morals (chap. i. 22–32); but among the Jews, in the fearful caricature into which even its religious zeal is turned by its fleshly fanaticism (chap. ii. 17–24). Therefore is salvation for faith represented by the mercy-seat in the Holy of Holies (chap. iii. 25), and faith is a priestly free access to grace (chap. v. 2), which converts the whole subsequent life of the Christian into a song of praise (vers. 3–11). Therefore the crown of the new life is a revelation of the glory of the children of God, which is guaranteed by the spirit of prayer on the part of the faithful (chap. viii.). Therefore, finally, must the economically limited judgment of God on Israel, and the whole economy of salvation in reference to the dark history of the world, contribute to the glory of God (chap. xi. 36). The new life is consequently represented as the direct contrast to the fall of man. As the living service of God ceased with the latter, so now is the true spiritual service of God restored in the lives of Christians, since they dedicate their bodies as living sacrifices to God (chap. xii. 1 ff.). The temporal authority (chap. xiii. 1 ff.) stands in a subservient (ver. 4) and liturgical (ver. 6) relation to the living divine service of Christians. In its great moral significance, which also requires a moral and free recognition (ver. 5), it is unconsciously subject to the highest aim and goal of human history—the glory of God through Christ. The Church must be conformed to this glory; it must be an instrument for the object that all nations should praise God (chap. xv. 11). The Epistle is directed to this end: it is a priestly work to make the heathen an acceptable offering of God (chap. xv. 16). It finally corresponds to this conception of the kingdom of God as a restored and real worship, that the Apostle concludes with a liturgical doxology, in which faith in the promises and announcements of the gospel responds to the living God of revelation with an eternal Amen (chap. xvi. 25–27)—a passage which may be explained by a comparison with 1 Cor. xiv. 16; 2 Cor. i. 20; Heb. xii. 22; xiii. 18; Rev. iv. 10.

The church at Rome must, therefore, in accordance with its call, become a focus for the restoration of the living, real, and universal worship of God by the nations, as the institution of Paul, the universal Apostle of the nations. It must become the point of departure of the Church of the Western nations, in the sense in which the word catholic had been originally used; that is, in harmony with the religious and moral necessities of humanity, in harmony with the moral significance and mission of the state, in harmony with the free as well as with the anxious consciences of the faithful on the basis of justification by faith without the works of the law.

B. The Arrangement.

THE INTRODUCTION AND FUNDAMENTAL THEME.

The apostolate of Paul appointed for the glory of the name of God by means of the gospel of Christ, and of the revelation of the justice of God for faith throughout the whole world, among Jews and Gentiles, chap. i. 1–17.

1st Section.—The inscription and greeting. The Apostle; his call; his apostolic office; his greeting of the saints in Rome, vers. 1–7.

2d Section.—The point of connection. The fame of the faith of the Christians at Rome in all the world; and his desire and purpose to come to them to announce the gospel to them, vers. 8–15.
3d Section.—The fundamental theme. The joyful readiness of the Apostle to proclaim the gospel of Christ, since it is the power of God to save Jews and Gentiles—as a revelation of the righteousness of God by and for faith, vers. 16, 17.

Part First.

The doctrine of righteousness by faith, as the restoration of the true worship of God. chap. i. 19—chap. xi.

First Division.

Sin and grace in their first antagonism. The real appearance of corruption and salvation. Righteousness by faith. The wrath of God on all injustice of men; that is, the actual corruption of the world in its growth for death hastened by the judgment of God; and the antagonistic justification of sinners by the propitiation or pardon in Christ, through faith, chap. i. 18—v. 11.

1st Section.—The beginning of all real corruption in the world, and of the Gentiles in particular, and God’s judgment on the same; the neglect of the general revelation of God by the creation, in the omission of the real worship of God by praise and thanksgiving, chap. i. 18—21.

2d Section.—The development of heathen corruption under the judicial abandonment on God’s side (the withdrawal of His Spirit). From symbolism to the worship of images and beasts; from theoretical to practical corruption; from natural sins to unnatural and abominable ones, to the development of all vices and crimes, to the demoniacal lust for sin, and to evil maxims themselves, chap. i. 22—28.

3d Section.—Transition from the corruption of the Gentiles to the corruption of the Jews. The genuine Jews. The higher universal antagonism above the antagonism of heathendom and Judaism: striving and opposing men. The universality of corruption, and, with the universality of guilt, the worst corruption: judging the neighbor. The guilt of this uncharitable judgment is intensified by the continuance of a general antagonism of pious, striving men, and of stiff-necked enemies of the truth throughout the world, within the general corruption, over against the righteous and impartial government of God; this, too, by virtue of the continuance of God’s general legislation in the conscience. The revelation of the antagonism of Gentiles true to the law, and of Jews who despised the law on the day of the proclamation of the gospel, chap. ii. 1—16.

4th Section.—The real Jews. The increased corruption of the Jew in his false zeal for the law (a counterfeit of the corruption of the heathen in his symbolism). The fanatical and wicked method of the Jews in handling the law with legal pride, and of corrupting it by false application and unfaithfulness, an occasion for defaming the name of God among the heathen, chap. ii. 17—24.

5th Section.—The use of circumcision: an adjustment of the need of salvation by the knowledge of sin. The circumcision which becomes the foreskin, and the foreskin which becomes circumcision; or, the external Jew can possibly become an internal Gentile, while the external Gentile can become an internal Jew. It is not the dead possession of the law, but fidelity to the law, that is of use. It does not produce a pride of the law, but knowledge of sin—that is, of the necessity of salvation. The advantage of circumcision consists herein: that to the Jews are committed those declarations of God, that law, by which all men are represented under the penalty of sin. Sin represented as acknowledged guilt over against the law, chap. ii. 25—iii. 20.

6th Section.—The revelation of God’s righteousness without the law by faith in Christ, for all sinners without distinction, by the representation of Christ as the Mediator (Propitiator); the righteousness of God as justifying righteousness, chap. iii. 21—26.

7th Section.—The abrogation of the vain glory (or self-praise) of man by the law of faith.
Justification by faith without the works of the law. First proof from experience: God is the God of the heathen as well as of the Jews; which fact is shown by the faith of the Gentiles, as well as by the true renewal of the law by faith, vers. 27–31.
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6th Section.—Second proof of the righteousness by faith: from the Scriptures, and this from the history of the faith of Abraham, the ancestor of the Jews themselves. Abraham is the father of faith to the Gentiles as well as to the Jews, because he had been justified in the foreskin as a heathen, and because he had received circumcision as a seal of justification by faith. David is also a witness of righteousness by faith. Abraham in his faith in the word of the personal God of revelation, and especially in the promise of Isaac, a type of all believers in the miracle of the resurrection of Christ, chap. iv.

7th Section.—The fruit of justification. Peace with God and the development of new life to the fulfilment of Christian hope. The new worship of God by the Christians. They have free access to grace in the Most Holy. Therefore they boast of their hope in the glory of God; and glory even in the afflictions they suffer, by which this hope is perfected. The love of God in Christ as the guaranty of the realization of Christian hope. Christ's death our reconciliation: Christ's life our blessedness. Its bloom: the joyous glorying that God is our God, chap v. 1–11.

Second Division.

Sin and grace in their second antagonism (as in their second power), according to their operations in human nature and in nature generally. The sinful corruption of the world proceeding from Adam and made the common inheritance of man; and the life of Christ as the internal vital principle of the new birth for new life in single believers, in all humanity, and in the whole created world. The principle of death in sin, and the principle of the new life; as well as the glorification of all nature in righteousness, chap. v. 12–viii. 39.

1st Section.—The sin of Adam as the mighty principle of death, and the grace of God in Christ as the mightier principle of the new life in individual human nature, and in whole humanity. The law as the medium of the completed consciousness of sin and guilt, chap. v. 12–21.

2d Section.—Call to the new life in grace. The contradiction between sin and grace. The vocation of the Christians to new life, since they, by baptism in the death of Christ, are changed from the sphere of sin and death into the sphere of righteousness and life, chap. vi. 1–11.

3d Section.—The essential emancipation and actual departure of Christians from the service of sin unto death into the service of righteousness unto life, by virtue of the death of Christ. Believers should live in the consciousness that they are dead to sin, vers. 12–23.

4th Section.—The essential transfer and actual transition of Christians from the service of the letter under the law to the service of the Spirit under grace, by virtue of the death of Christ. Believers should live in the consciousness that they (by the law) are dead to the law, chap. vii. 1–6.

5th Section.—The law in its holy appointment to lead over, by the feeling of death, to new life in grace. The development of the law from the exterior to the internal. The experience of Paul a life-picture of the battle under the law as the transition from the old life in the law to the new life in faith, vers. 7–25.

6th Section.—The Christian life, or life in Christ as the new life according to the law of the Spirit, as walking in the Spirit. The fulfilment and exaltation of the law to be the law of the Spirit in Christ. The law of the Spirit as principle of the new life of adoption, and of the exaltation of the faithful and of humanity to the liberation and glorification of the creature, to the new world of life in love, chap. viii.

a. The Spirit as the Mediator of the atonement and witness of adoption, vers. 1–16.

b. The Spirit a surety of the inheritance of future glory. (1.) The subjective certainty
THIRD DIVISION.

Sin and grace in their third antagonism (in their third power). The hardness of heart and the economical judgment on hardness of heart (the historical curse on sin), and the turning of the judgment to the rescue by the power of Divine sympathy at the progress of universal history. The historical development of sin to the execution of the judgment, and the revelation of salvation in demonstration of mercy. The intimate connection of God's acts of judgment and rescue; the latter being conditioned by the former, chaps. ix.—xi.

1st Section.—The dark mystery of the judgment of God in Israel, and its solution, chap. ix.

a. The painful contrast of the misery of the Jews in opposition to the portrayed happiness of the Christians, who, for the most part, came from the Gentiles. The sorrow of the Apostle at the evident failure of the destiny of his people, chap. ix. 1—5.

b. The ecstasy of the Apostle in the thought that the promise of God would nevertheless hold good for Israel. The proofs therefore, chap. ix. 6—33.

2d Section.—More decided explanation of the mysterious fact: The unbelief of Israel. The faith of the Gentiles, already foretold in the Old Testament, chap. x.

a. The fact is no fatalistic destiny, vers. 1, 2.

b. It rests rather on the antagonism between the self-righteousness as the supposed righteousness from the law, and the righteousness which is by faith, vers. 3—5.

c. The righteousness by faith, although proceeding from Israel, is nevertheless, according to Old Testament prophecy, accessible to all men because of its nature. Proof: The unbelief of the Jews as well as the faith of the heathen is foretold already in the Old Testament, vers. 6—21.

3d Section.—The concluding gracious solution of the mystery, or the turning of judgment to the rescue of Israel. The judgment of God on Israel is not a judgment of reprobation. God's economy of salvation in His Providence over the chosen of Israel and of the multitude—Jews and Gentiles—over the intertwining of judgment and rescue, by which all Israel should come, through the fulness of the Gentiles, to faith and happiness. The universality of judgment and compassion. Doxology, chap. xi.

a. Israel is not rejected; the elect (the kernel) are saved, vers. 1—6.

b. The hardening of the hearts of the remainder becomes a condition for the conversion of the Gentiles, vers. 7—11.

c. On the other hand, the conversion of the Gentiles became also a means for the conversion of Israel, vers. 11—18.

d. The fact itself is a conditional one. The Gentiles can yet individually become unbelieving, and the Jews, on the other hand, believing, vers. 19—24.

e. The last word, or the mystery of Divine Providence in its economy of salvation. All will contribute to the glory of God, vers. 25—36.

Part Second.

The practical theme: The vocation of the Roman Christians, on the ground of their accomplished salvation or of the mercy of God (which will be extended to all) to represent the living worship of God in the consummation of thereal burnt offering, and to constitute a universal Christian church-life for the realization of the call of all nations to praise and glorify God; so that they may also acknowledge and maintain the universal call of the Apostle. The recommendation of his companions, assistants, and friends, in the sending of his greetings: them for the purpose of the true development of the Church, and as a cou-
terpart, his warning against Judaizing or paganizing errorists. Greetings, invocation of blessings, chap. xii. 1–xvi. 27.

FIRST DIVISION.

The call of the Roman Christians to a universal Christian deportment, chap. xii. 1–xv. 18.

1st Section.—The practical theme, vers. 1, 2. The proper conduct of the Christians toward the community of the brethren for the establishment of a harmonious church life, chap. xii. 1–8.

2d Section.—The true conduct of the Christians in all personal relations. For their own life, toward the brethren, toward everybody, and even toward enemies, chap. xii. 9–21.

3d Section.—Christian universalism (Roman Catholicism in Paul's sense) in the proper conduct toward those in authority (the heathen state), which also possesses an official and liturgical service in the household of God. The object and aim of government, chap. xiii. 1–6.

4th Section.—Proper conduct toward the world in general. Legal fellowship with the world. The recognition of the rights of the world in the justice and also in the strength of the love of our neighbor. The separation from the ungodly nature of the old world (the dark character of heathendom). The universality and its sanctification by the true separation, vers. 7–14.

5th Section.—The true practice of the living worship of God in the management and adjustment of the differences between the weak or perplexed (the slaves of the law) and the strong (inclined to disregard, and Antinomian transgression in freedom). The Christian universality of social life (to take and give no offense), chap. xiv. 1–xv. 4.

a. Reciprocal regard, forbearance, and recognition between the weak and the strong. Special warning against giving offence to the weak, chap. xiv. 1–18.

b. Of giving offence, and despiring forbearance to the weak, chap. xiv. 13–xvi.

c. Reciprocal edification in self-denial after the example of Christ, chap. xv. 2–4.

6th Section.—Admonition to the harmony of all the members of the congregation to the praise of God on the ground of the grace of God, in which Christ has accepted Jews and Gentiles. Reference to the vocation of all nations to praise God even according to the Old Testament, and encouragement of the Roman Christians to an unbounded hope in this relation, in agreement with their call, chap. xv. 5–13.

SECOND DIVISION.

The call of the Apostle to a universal apostleship, and his consequent relation to the Roman church, as the point of departure for the universal apostleship in the West, chap. xv. 14–33.

a. The Apostle declares, almost apologizing, that his writing to the Romans was the result of his call to make the heathen in priestly operation an acceptable offering to God; and he gives information on the general completion of his work in the East (to Illyria), and the results of the same, vers. 14–19.

b. His principle not to invade the sphere of others (a conduct opposite to that of all sect-makers). The consequent impediment to come directly to Rome, where Christian congregations already existed. Nevertheless, his desire to labor for them, which was in harmony with his call. His hesitation not being completely removed, he describes his anticipated visit to Rome as a temporary stay for the better prosecution of his journey through Rome to Spain; that is, to the limits of the West, without doubt in expectation that the church will welcome him and commit itself to his direction, vers. 20–24.

c. His last hindrance from his journey to Rome. The mention of the collections, a proof of his love to the believing Israelites, an expression of the proper conduct of Gentile Christians to Jewish Christians. Another announcement of his journey
through Rome and of his visit in the spirit of apostolical refinement. Forbidding reference to the animosity of the unfaithful in Judæa, and a request for prayer that he might be permitted to accomplish his purpose of coming to them, vers. 28-33.

THIRD DIVISION.

The recommendation of his predecessors, companions, and assistants, in a succession of greetings, united with a warning against separatistic heretics (Jews and Gentiles), who could hinder and even destroy Rome's destiny and his apostolic mission. Yet the God of peace will shortly bruise Satan under their feet. Invocation of blessing, chap. xvi. 1-20.

a. The deaconess Phoebe, vers. 1, 2.

b. The greetings, vers. 3-16. The warning, and the invocation of blessing, vers. 17-20.

CONCLUSION.

The greetings of the Pauline circle to the church at Rome, and the invocation of blessings by Paul himself. His doxological sealing of the gospel of the justifying grace of God in Christ for all nations, vers. 21-27.

a. The greetings.

b. The doxological sealing of the gospel for eternity in accordance with the fundamental devotional thought of his Epistle. The Amen of the Church through Christ, as the response to the gospel of Christ, vers. 25-27.

Now to Him that is of power (in the gospel) to establish you According to my gospel, etc.

According to the revelation of the mystery, etc.

According to the commandment of the everlasting God,

To God only wise,

Be glory through Jesus Christ

For ever ! Amen !

APPENDIX.—Table of Pericopes, or Scripture Lessons for the Year, in the Epistle to the Romans.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1. Advent</th>
<th>2.</th>
<th>3rd Sunday after Epiphany</th>
<th>4th</th>
<th>Trinity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rom. xiii. 11-14</td>
<td>Rom. xvi. 4-15</td>
<td>Rom. xii. 1-6</td>
<td>Rom. xii. 17-21</td>
<td>Rom. xii. 32-36</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>4th Sunday after Trinity</th>
<th>6th Sunday after Trinity</th>
<th>7th</th>
<th>8th</th>
<th>27th</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rom. viii. 18-22</td>
<td>Rom. vi. 3-11</td>
<td>Rom. vi. 19-23</td>
<td>Rom. viii. 12-17</td>
<td>Rom. iii. 21-25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>5th Sunday after Trinity</th>
<th>6th Sunday after Trinity</th>
<th>7th</th>
<th>8th</th>
<th>27th</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Visitation of Mary.)</td>
<td>(Visitation of Mary.)</td>
<td>Rom. vi. 3-11</td>
<td>Rom. vi. 19-23</td>
<td>Rom. viii. 12-17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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* [In the original, this section is § 7, and precedes the one on the Contents and Division.—P. S.]
§ 8. LITERATURE ON THE EPISTLE OF PAUL TO THE ROMANS.

COMMENTARIES.—Tholuck enumerates, p. 26 ff., as expositors: *


2. Expositors of the Middle Ages: Hervetus [middle of the twelfth century], Hugo of St. Victor [†1141], Abelard [†1142], Thomas Aquinas [†1274, ignorant of Greek, but very profound and acute].

3. Roman Catholic expositors since the Reformation: Erasmus [†1536], W. Esti [†1613], a number of Jesuit expositors, among whom Ben. Justinian [†1612], Cornelius a Lapide [†1614, 14th ed., Lugd. 1688], Calmet [†1757], are prominent. For later ones, see below.

4. Protestant expositors down to the beginning of the seventeenth century:

a. Reformed (Calvinistic) commentators: Calvin [new ed., Halle, 1831], "a model of simple and precise exposition." (German translation by E. W. Krummacher and L. Bender, Frankfurt-am-Main, 1887,)† Bezze [4th ed., 1698], Zwingli [Opera, tom. iii.,], Pellicanus, Bullinger [1537], Bucer [1536], Arretius [1608], Pareus [1608], Piscator [1601].

b. Lutherans: Luther (his celebrated Preface to the Epistle to the Romans), Melanchthon (Annotationes, 1523; Commentarii, 1523),† Bugenhagen, Brentz, Cambrarius, Hussius, Balduino.

5. Protestant expositors to the middle of the eighteenth century:

Reformed: Drusius [†1612], De Dieu [†1642], Heinsius [†1655], the two Caellus, Hammond [†1653], Clericus [†1668], Cocceius [†1669], (very prominent).

* (The dates and editions are added by the American editor.)
† (Dr. Augustine has only commented on the first seven verses of the Epistle to the Romans, in his Inseunt expositio ep. ad Rom. Opera, ed. Bened., tom. iii. p. 916 seq., and on some select passages, in expositurarum propositionum ex ep. ad Rom., l. c., p. 903 seqq. It is a remarkable fact that Augustine, who, of all the fathers, came nearest the Protestant evangelical doctrine of sin and grace as taught by St. Paul, held essentially the Roman Catholic view of justification as being identical with sanctification, while his antagonist, Pelagius, like the Reformers, explained Paul’s justification as a forensic act that consists in the remission of sins. Comp. my History of the Christian Church, vol. iii. p. 813, 845. In his anti-Pelagian writings, Augustine makes frequent use of the Epistle to the Romans, and the other Pauline Epistles, which contributed much to his conversion. But he was a profound theologian rather than a learned commentator, and had a very imperfect knowledge of the Greek, and no knowledge whatever of the Hebrew. Upon the whole, the Epistles to the Romans and to the Galatians in their true genius and import remained a sealed book to the Church at large till the Reformation of the sixteenth century. The sense of the Scriptures unfolds itself gradually to the mind of the Church, and every book has its age in which its peculiar power is felt in the life, and brought out in the knowledge and exposition of congenial divines more clearly and forcibly than ever before.—P. S.)
‡ (The commentary of the heretical Pelagius on the Pauline Epistles is brief and superficial, but betrays no talent for plain, popular, and practical common-sense exposition of the Scriptures. By a singular irony of history, the commentators, together with some other writings of Pelagius in which he develops his heretical system (the Epistle ad Dematianum, and his Adullus fidei addressed to Pope Innocent I.), have been preserved as supposed works of his bitter antagonist, St. Jerome (in the eleventh tome of Vallardi’s edition ; comp. my Church Hist., iii. p. 791 and p. 903). The commentators, however, have undergone some emendations by the hand of Casiodorus (comp. Cass., De Institut. divin. Narr., c. 8.)—P. S.)
§ (The commentary of Ambrosiaster, so called, or Proto-Ambrosiaster, on the Pauline Epistles, is incorporated in the works of Ambros., and is generally ascribed to a Roman descan, Hilaris, of the fourth century (about 380). Augustine refers to it twice under the name, Contra duas Epip. Pelag. iv. 7. Opera, c. p. 472. Ambrosiaster exhibits some talent for historical exposition (like Pelagius), but is obscure and inconsistent. Upon the whole the patristic exegesis was not grammatical and historical, but dogmatical and practical.—P. S.)


[Mayne (Preface to the 4th ed. of his Com.) calls Melanchthon’s "Exegetes" of 1556, "his ripest exposition fruit." The "Commentaries" of Melanchthon appeared also in 1546, and in a new edition by Nicola in 1681. Lang following Tholuck, refers to earlier editions.—P. S.]
Lutherans of the seventeenth century: Erasmus Schmid [†1637], Calixtus [Posthumous Lectures, 1664], Calovius [†1688, author of the Biblia Illustrata, 1672, against Grotius], Spener [†1705], Christ. Wolf [Curæ Philologici et Critici, 1732], Bengel’s Gnomon N. T. (1743); “on account of its great worth, lately edited several times, both in the original Latin, and in German and English translations.”*)

Arminians: Grotius [Annotationes in Nov. Test., 1645], Limborch [†1712], Turmel [†1737], (numbered by Tholuck in this school, though perhaps unjustly), Wetstein (in his edition of the Greek Testament, with parallel passages from the classical authors, 1751).

Socinians: Crell [†1633], Schlichting [†1661], Pertzov.

6. Evangelical expositors, from the middle of the eighteenth century down to the present time:


On the merits of the most important later commentators, see Tholuck, pp. 32, 33.—[Fröszscher and Meyer are the best philological commentators; De Wette excels in power of condensation and good taste; Tholuck, Olshausen, Philippi, and Hodge in doctrinal exposition.—P. S.]

This catalogue may be enlarged, among others, by the following commentaries: Bisping (Rom. Cath.), Der Brief an die Römer, 2d ed., Münster; Beelen (Rom. Cath.), Commentarius in Ep. St. Pauli ad Romanos, Lovani, 1854; Vincke, Der Brief van den Apostel Paulus an den Romanen, 2d ed., Utrecht, 1860; Mehring, Der Brief Pauli an die Römer, Stettin, 1859; Schott, Der Römerbrief, seinem Entwecck und Gedankengang nach ausgelegt, Erlangen, 1858; Van Hengel, Interpretatio Epistolae Pauli ad Romanos, Leyden and Leipzig, 1 vol. 1854; 2d vol., 1859; Haldane, Auslegung des Briefes an die Römer, mit Bemerkungen über die Commentare Macknight’s, Stuart’s, und Tholuck’s, from the English, Hamburg, 1839–43; Umbreit, Der Brief an die Römer, auf dem Grunde des Alten Testaments ausgelegt, Gotba, 1856. [H. Ewald, Die Sendschreiben des Ap. Paulus über. und erkl., Gött. 1857.—P. S.]

Theological-exegetical monographs on the epistle to the Romans.—See Reuss, p. 95; Jäger, Der Lehrgehalt des Römerbriefs, Tüb. 1834; Winzen, Adnotation ad loca quaedam Epist. P. ad Rom., Leipzig, 1835; E. G. Bengel, Rom. ii. 11–16. Tüb.; Michelsen, De Pauli ad Rom. Ep. duobus primis capitis, Lübeck, 1835; Matthias, The Third Chapter of

* [Tholuck (p. 31) says of Bengel’s Gnomon, that it was prepared with the devotion of an enthusiastic lover, whose searching eye noticed and admired even the most unsuspected feature of the beloved, and carried out with a precision which weighed even the smallest particle.—P. S.]

† [The first edition of Tholuck’s Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans, which appeared in 1824, when the author was but twenty-five years of age, created quite an epoch in the exegetical literature of Germany, by breaking the way for a return to a reverent treatment of the New Testament as the revealed word of God, and by reopening the exegetical treasures of the fathers and reformers. In the subsequent editions it has been repeatedly rewritten and gained in ripe scholarship. The last edition is the fifth, Halle, 1856. Between the first and the fifth edition, about forty commentaries on the same Epistle have made their appearance. An English translation of Tholuck by the Rev. Robert Manser was published in London, 1842, 2 vols.; but this is superseded by the later edition of the original.—P. S.]

‡ [Fourth edition, 1865; improved and enlarged (by thirty pages). Dr. Lanez has used the third, which appeared in 1859. The American editor has throughout compared the last edition of this important work.—P. S.]

Practical Commentaries and Homiletical literature.—Among these we mention the works on the Romans by Anton (1746); Spener (new ed., by Schott, 1839); Storr (1823); Kraussold (1850); Geissler (1881); Lossius (1836); Kohlbrügge (1889); Roos (new ed., 1860); Winkel (1850); Diedrich (1859); Beisser (Bibelstunden, vol. vii., 1861); the Bible-Works of Gerlach, Lisco, Calv., and Bunsen (vol. viii., 1868); Heburn’s Practical Exposition of the N. T.; Ortlöph, Epistle to the Romans, Erlangen, 1865—66.

This list of commentaries on the Romans, by Dr. Tholuck and Lange, is almost exclusively Continental, and must be supplied by Anglo-American works, of which only three are mentioned by Dr. Tholuck—the commentaries of Hammond, Stuart, and Hodge. Comp. Darlington’s Cyclopaedia Bibliographica, London, 1859, p. 1236 ff. We notice the most important:

I. General English commentaries on the whole Bible: Matthew Poole (Synopsis Criticorum, etc., 4 vols. in 5 fol., Lond. 1669-76, and Francoz. ad M. 1712, 5 vols. f.); Annotations upon the Holy Bible, 4th ed., 1700, new ed., Lond. 1840, reprinted by R. Carter in N. Y.); Patrick, Lowth, Arnold, Whitby, and Lowman (Critical Commentary and Paraphrase on the Old and New Testaments, and the Apocrypha, a new ed., Philad. 1844, in 4 vols.); M. Henry (in many editions of 3, 4, and 6 vols., the most original, interesting, and edifying among the popular and practical commentators); John Gill (first ed., Lond. 1763, in 9 vols., full of rabbinical learning and ultra-Calvinism); Thos. Scott (several editions, in 6 vols. or less); A. Clarke (new ed., Lond. 1844, in 6 vols.); D’Oyly and R. Mant (Lond. 1845; gives the comments of the Anglican bishops and divines); Comprehensive Commentary (compiled from Henry and Scott, and other sources, by W. Jenks, Philad. 1855, in 5 vols.).

II. Commentaries on the New Testament, including the Epistle to the Romans: H. Hammond (4th ed., Lond. 1675); D. Whitby (4th ed., Lond. 1718, and often since); W. Burkit (Lond. 1704, and often since; very good for practical and homiletical use); P. Doddridge (Family Expositor, Lond. 1739, in 7 vols., and often); Albert Barnes (Notes Explanatory, and Practical, New York and Lond. 1850, and often, 11 vols., prepared for Sunday-school teachers, and circulated in many thousands of copies); S. T. Bloomfield (The Greek Testament, with Notes Critical, Philological, and Exegetical, first published in 1829, 9th ed., Lond.

* * We have omitted or abridged the German titles of these books.—P. S.
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1855); H. ALFORD (Greek Testament, with a critically revised text, a digest of various readings, marginal references to verbal and idiomatic usage, prolegomena, and a critical and exegetical commentary; first published in 1849, 5th ed., Lond. 1865, in 4 vols.; in the 5th edition, the Codex Sinaiticus has been collated. Dean ALFORD follows in the track of Tischendorf as to the text, and DE WETTE and MEYER in the exposition, yet with independent judgment, good taste, and reverent spirit); WEBSTER and WILKINSON (N. Test. Gr., with brief grammatical and exegetical Notes, Oxon., 1851, in 2 vols.); CHR. WORDSWORTH (canon of Westminster, high-Anglican, patristic, devout, and genial, but given to excessive typologizing and allegorizing, and avoiding critical difficulties: Greek Testament, with Notes, 1st ed., Lond. 1856; 4th ed., Lond. 1886, in 2 large vols.). Of these English commentators the American editor has especially compared the latest editions of ALFORD and WORDSWORTH. ELLICOTT, who is more critical than either, has not yet reached the Romans.

III. Commentaries on the Epistles of St. Paul: W. PALEY (Hora Paulina, or the truth of the Scripture history of St. Paul evinced by a comparison of the Epistles which bear his name with the Acts of the Apostles, and with one another, in many editions); JOHN FELL (A Paraphrase andAnnotations upon all the Epistles of St. Paul, 3d ed., Lond. 1703); JOHN LOCKE (A Paraphrase and Notes on the Galatians, Corinthians, Romans, and Ephesians, Lond. 1742, and in Locke’s Works); G. BENSON (Lond. 1752–56, 2 vols.); JAMES MACKNIGHT (A new literal translation, from the original Greek of all the apostolical Epistles, with a commentary, etc., Lond. 1795, and other editions of 1, 4, or 6 vols.); T. W. FEUL (Annotations on the Apostolical Epistles, Lond. 1848–52, 4 vols.); Abp. SUMNER (Apostolical Preaching considered in an Examination of St. Paul’s Epistles, 9th ed., Lond. 1845); CONYBEARE and HOWSON (Life and Epistles of St. Paul, Lond. 1852, reprinted in New York in several editions); B. JOYNET (The Epistles of St. Paul to the Thessalonians, Galatians, Romans, with critical notes and dissertations, Lond. 1855); VAUGHAN (The Epistles of St. Paul, for English Readers, Lond. 1864).

IV. Special commentaries on the Epistle to the Romans: A. WILLET (Hexapla: that is, a sixfold commentary upon the most divine epistle of the holy Apostle St. Paul to the Romans, etc., Lond. 1620); Bp. TERROT (Lond. 1829); R. ANDERSON (3d ed., Lond. 1837); Bp. PARRY (Lond. 1832); MOSES STINT (Congregationalist, 1st ed., Andover, 1882; 2nd ed., 1895, 6th ed., Lond. 1857); CHARLES HODGE (O. S. Presbyterian, 1st ed., Philad. 1833, new edition, enlarged and revised, 1866); THOMAS CHALMERS (Lectures on the Epistle to the Romans, Glasgow, 1837, 4 vols. 12mo.); R. HALDANE (new ed., Lond. 1842, in 3 vols.); Abp. SUMNER (A Practical Exposition of the Epistle to the Romans and 1 Corinthians, Lond. 1843); W. WALTER (Curu Romula, Lond. 1846); W. W. EWERS (Commentary, etc., Lond. 1850–51, 2 vols.); S. H. TURNER (Episcopalian, The Epistle to the Romans, in Greek and English; with an analysis and exegetical commentary, New York, 1853); ROBT. KNIGHT (A Critical Commentary, etc., Lond. 1854); E. PURDUE (Dublin, 1855); A. A. LIVERMORE (Boston, 1855); JOHN CUMMINS (Sabbath Evening Readings on the Romans, Lond. 1857); JOHN BROWN (Analytical Exposition of the Epistle of Paul to the Romans, Edinb. 1857); JAMES FORDE (St. Paul’s Epistle to the Romans, illustrated from Divines of the Church of England, Lond. 1802); JOHN FORBES, LL.D. (Analytical Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans, tracing the train of thought by the aid of Parallelism, Edinb. 1866). The work of FORBES is based upon the discovery that Parallelism is not confined to the poetry of the Bible, but extends also to many portions of its prose. It is not a full commentary, but an illustration of those passages alone which Parallelism seems to place in a new and clearer light.—P. S.]
CHRIST! I am Christ's, and let the name suffice you;
Aye, for me, too, He greatly hath sufficed;
Lo, with no winning words I would entice you;
Paul has no honor and no friend but Christ.

Yes, without cheer of sister or of daughter—
Yes, without stay of father or of son,
Lone on the land, and homeless on the water,
Pass I in patience till the work be done.

Yet, not in solitude, if Christ anear me
Waketh Him workers for the great employ;
Oh, not in solitude, if souls that hear me
Catch from my joyance the surprise of joy.

Hearts I have won of sister or of brother,
Quick on the earth or hidden in the sod;
Lo, every heart awaiteth me, another
Friend in the blameless family of God.

Yes, thro' life, death, thro' sorrow and thro' sinning,
He shall suffice me, for He hath sufficed;
Christ is the end, for Christ was the beginning,
Christ the beginning, for the end is Christ.

From a poem by Frederic W. H. Myers, 1868;
THE EPISTLE OF PAUL TO THE ROMANS.

THE INSCRIPTION, INTRODUCTION, AND FUNDAMENTAL THEME.

CHAP. I. 1–17.


I.

Inscription and Salutation.

CHAP. I. 1–7.*

TO THE ROMANS.¹

1 Paul, a servant of Jesus Christ,² called to be an apostle [a called, chosen apostle, ἀπόστολος], separated [set apart, ἀφορμαῖος] unto the gospel of

2 God (Which he had promised afore [which he promised beforehand, προφητεύεισθαι] by [through] his prophets in the holy Scriptures)³ [omit parenthesis],

3 Concerning his Son Jesus Christ our Lord [omit here the words: Jesus Christ our Lord, and transfer them to the close of ver. 4], which [who] was made [born] of [from,

4 ἐκ] the seed of David according to the flesh; And [omit And] declared to be [who was installed]⁴ the Son of God with [in] power,⁵ according to the Spirit of

holiness, by [from, ἐκ] the resurrection from [of] the dead⁶ [—Jesus Christ our

5 Lord]. By [through] whom we have received [we received] grace and apostle-

ship, for [unto, εἰς, i.e., for the purpose of, with a view to, in order to bring about] obedience to the faith [of faith]⁷ among all [the] nations, for his name [name's sake]:

6 Among whom are ye also the called [, the chosen ones] of Jesus Christ:¹⁷

7 To all that be in Rome,¹² beloved of God [To all the beloved of God who are in Rome], called to be [chosen] saints: [.]¹⁷

Grace to you,¹⁸ and peace, from God our Father, and the Lord Jesus Christ.

TEXTUAL.

¹ [Πρὸς Ῥωμαίους. This is the oldest and simplest title of Codd. N. (Sin.) A. B. C., and has been adopted by Lachmann, Tischendorf, Alford, Lange, &c., in the place of the title of the textus receptus Πατρών τοῦ ἀπόστολου Ἡρῴδης Ῥωμαίου ἐπιστολή. For other titles, see the apparatus criticus in Tischendorf.—F. S.]

² (It was thought best to separate the three distinct sections embraced in chap. I. 1–17, viz.: I. The Address and Salutation, vers. 1–7. II. The Epistolary Introduction, vers. 8–15. III. The Theme of the Epistle, vers. 16, 17. Dr. Leizen presents them as one whole, which, with our numerous additions, would make it too long and inconvenient for reference.—F. S.)
THE EPISTLE OF PAUL TO THE ROMANS.

3 Ver. 1.—The reading iese Xaveris is confirmed by most authorities [Codd. N. A. E. G., and adopted by Lachmann, Meyer, Alford, against the reading, Christ Jesus (Cod. B. Tischendorf)].

2 Ver. 2.—(εν υπαρξεις, εν εκ προσωπου, εν αυτω) without the article; but better, with the E. V. in the Holy Text, which was sufficiently defined by αυτω as understood by the readers as referring to the Old Testament. So is και υπαρξεις, var. 4, and και υπαρξεις repeatedly without the article. Comp. Wis., Gr. of the N. T., § 19, 2 (p. 113, 6th ed. p. 118, 7th ed. by Lünemann).

2 Ver. 7.—in the ancient versions, the clauses (ουκ ειτε προσωπου· ουκ ειτε υπαρξεις) were meant here, which contain Messianic prophecies, and he refers in proof to γραφων προφητων in ch. xvi. 26 (where, however, the prophetical portions of the Old Testament are meant).

2 Ver. 8.—Ουκ ειτε προσωπου· ουκ ειτε υπαρξεις] can only be said of the human nature of Christ which began in time, while His divine nature is without beginning (την υπαρξειν του θεου των ανθρωπων) indicated in the whole system of the Old Testament, especially in Malachi, which bears witness to Christ, comp. John v. 46.—P. S.

2 Ver. 11.—ουκ ειτε προσωπου· ουκ ειτε υπαρξεις] can only be said of the human nature of Christ which began in time, while His divine nature is without beginning (την υπαρξειν του θεου των ανθρωπων) indicated in the whole system of the Old Testament, especially in Malachi, which bears witness to Christ, comp. John v. 46.—P. S.

2 Ver. 13.—ουκ ειτε προσωπου· ουκ ειτε υπαρξεις] can only be said of the human nature of Christ which began in time, while His divine nature is without beginning (την υπαρξειν του θεου των ανθρωπων) indicated in the whole system of the Old Testament, especially in Malachi, which bears witness to Christ, comp. John v. 46.—P. S.

2 Ver. 14.—ουκ ειτε προσωπου· ουκ ειτε υπαρξεις] can only be said of the human nature of Christ which began in time, while His divine nature is without beginning (την υπαρξειν του θεου των ανθρωπων) indicated in the whole system of the Old Testament, especially in Malachi, which bears witness to Christ, comp. John v. 46.—P. S.

2 Ver. 16.—ουκ ειτε προσωπου· ουκ ειτε υπαρξεις] can only be said of the human nature of Christ which began in time, while His divine nature is without beginning (την υπαρξειν του θεου των ανθρωπων) indicated in the whole system of the Old Testament, especially in Malachi, which bears witness to Christ, comp. John v. 46.—P. S.
EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

First Section.—Inscription and greeting.—Paul, a servant of Christ Jesus, called to be an Apostle, set apart for the Gospel of God.—His gospel in harmony with the Old Testament (of the Jews): A gospel of Christ, who, in his human nature and his historical pedigree, is the Son of David; but who, in his spiritual glory, appears as the principle of the resurrection of the dead, and as the one appointed to be the Son of God in power (majesty). By this glorified Christ the Apostle has received his Christian and apostolic call, for the purpose of calling all nations to obedience to the faith.—All the believers in Rome belong to this totality. He accordingly greets the Christians in Rome with the apostolic salutation.

[General Remarks on the Apostolic Salutations.—On the grammatical structure of the two sentences, vers. 1-7, see textual note z to ver. 7. St. Paul opens his Epistles with his name and official title, by which he challenges respectful attention to his inspired teaching, and with the assurance of his brotherly regard and love for the readers, by which he wins their affections. The ancient epistolary style unites in a brief introduction what we now distinguish as address, greeting, and subscription. Paul combines the heathen and the Hebrew form of salutation, and inspires both with a deep Christian meaning.

The Greek and Roman epistolary inscription contained simply the name of the writer in the nominative, and the name of the receiver in the dative (επιστολας ανωνυμου, Obero Attico), frequently with the addition of the wish for health and prosperity, by the words ευπρεπη, or χαιρεται λεγεις, salutem, or salutem dicipis. This form we find in the New Testament three times; once in the heathen sense, in the letter of Lyssias to the Roman governor Felix, Acts xxiii. 26 (Κλαυδος Ανωνυμον τοι φιλα χαιρετε), and twice in the Christian sense, namely in the circular letter of the Apostolic Council of Jerusalem, which was probably written by James, Acts xv. 23 (οι επιστολας του αυτου χαιροντας εις τοις νεων οικουμενοι, and in the Epistle of James, chap. i. 1 (Ταονολογια... ταις δωσιν γνωσιν... χαιρετε) From 2 John, ver. 10 (χαιρετε αυτον εν σεληνει), it appears that Greek Christians were in the habit of greeting one another with the usual χαιρετε (Vulg., ave, comp. Matt. xxvi. 49; xvii. 29; xviii. 9; Mark xv. 18; Luke i. 28; John xix. 3). But the heathen formula, as implying a prayer to the gods, had in it a taint of idolatry, or, at all events, it referred only to temporal prosperity, and had to give way before long to a change in accordance with Christian feeling.

The Hebrew (and Arabic) form of salutation is סלומ, χαιρετε, Peace, or Υπηρετει, LXX., ευπρεπη σαυρα, Peace be with you; comp. Gen. xxii. 6; xiii. 23; Ex. xvi. 7; Judges vi. 23; 1 Sam. x. 4; Dan. x. 19; Luke x. 6, 6, 6. (With the later Jews the usual formula was סלומ.) The risen Saviour greeted his assembled disciples, John xx. 19, 26, bringing the true peace of the soul with God, which He, the Prince of Peace, had bought by His stoning death and triumphant resurrection (comp. John xiv. 27; xvi. 33; Matt. x. 12, 13).

Combining the Graeco-Roman inscription and the Hebrew salutation, we would have this form: "Paul to the Romans, Health and peace be with you." But Paul transforms the Greek χαιρετε and the Hebrew shalom from the prevailing idea of physical health and temporal comfort, into the deep meaning of the saving grace and peace of God in Christ, and complements it by the two words χαιρετε and shalom, the richest blessings of the gospel; χαιρες being the objective cause of the Christian salvation, and shalom its subjective effect in the soul of man. At the same time, there is, no doubt, a reference in this epistolary greeting to the Mosaic, or rather Aaronic benediction, Num. vi. 25, 26: "The Lord make his grace shine upon thee, and be gracious unto thee (שומס), from Θεον, γεννητοι θυσι, hence γεννητο, the Lord lift up His condescension upon thee, and give thee peace (שומס, LXX., ευπρεπη)." We find this salutatory grace and peace not only in the Epistles of Paul, but also in those of Peter and of John in the New Testament. In the case of Peter, 1 Tim. i. 2; 2 Tim. i. 2, and Titus i. 4 (text. rec.), Paul, with reference probably to the Greek version of the Aaronic benediction, Num. vi. 25 (λεγεται σε γε φως), adds to the prayer for grace and peace that of mercy (λεγειται), which ministers of the gospel need more than any other class of men. This threefold blessing, corresponding to the threefold Aaronic benediction, we find also in 3 John 8.

In the Epistle to the Romans, where Paul, contrary to his habit, addressed a congregation which he had not founded, or even visited, he amplifies the Graeco-Hebrew inscription and salutation still more, and inserts parenthetically some of the fundamental doctrinal ideas of the Epistle, as suggested by the mention of the "gospel of God," namely: (1.) The connection of the gospel with the Old Testament revelation, ver. 2; (2.) the divine-human nature of Christ, who is the subject of that gospel, vers. 3, 4; (3.) his call to the apostleship of all the Gentiles by Christ, which gives him a right to address himself also to the Romans, ver. 5. In the richness of this salutation we see the overflowing fulness of Paul's mind, and the importance he attached to this Epistle.

Calvin: Epistolam tibi sic methodus est, ut ipsum quoque exordium ad rationem artis compositionem sit.—P. S.]

Ver. 1.—Paul.—Salut as Paul, i. e., the Small, in opposition and contrast to Bar-Jesus, Elymas the Sorcerer of Cyprus, Acts xiii. 8. [Salu and Paul. Paulus is the Hellenistic, Paulus the Latin form for the Hebrew Saul, though differing from it in meaning. It was chosen as the nearest allusive and alliterative equivalent, and as a name already

* In post-apostolic literature, Clement of Rome wishes the Corinthians χαιρε τοις και ευπρεπη. Polycarp, ad Phil., instead of this, had έξελεων και ευπρεπη (comp. Gal. vi. 18; ευπρεπη ενσυνετο και λεγειν). The Martyrology Polycarp, in its inscription, prayers for έξελεων, ευπρεπη και δυναμη, which corresponds with the formula in June 2. In the epistle of the communities of Ephesus and Thessalon, in the Am. Epist. of Clement, in the Martyrology by Eusebius, &c. In Paul's epistles, 1 Cor. xvi. 1—4, we have ευπρεπη και χαιρετε και δυναμη. P. S.

familiar to the Greeks; while Saul, as a proper name, was unknown to them. The name Saul—the most distinguished name in the genealogy of the tribe of Benjamin, to which Paul belonged (Rom. xi. 1; Phil. iii. 5; comp. Acts xiii. 21)—the Apostle used among the Jews, the name Paul among the Gentiles, and in the later part of his life exclusively. The Jews and early Christians often had two names, either similar in sound and identical in meaning, as Silas and Silvanus (the former occurring uniformly in the Acts thirteen times, the latter four times in the Epistles), Lucas and Lucanus * (Col. iv. 14; 2 Tim. iv. 11; Phil. ii. 24); or similar in sound but different in meaning, as Jesus and Justus (Col. iv. 11); Saul and Paul, Hillel and Pollio; or different in sound but identical in meaning, as Cephas (Heb. Bre) and Peter (Greek); or different both in sound and meaning, as Jacob and Israel, Simon and Peter, Bartholomew and Nathanael, John and Mark (Acts xii. 22, 25, Simeon and Niger (xiii. 1), Barnabas and Justus (i. 23). It is possible that the name Paul, as a Roman citizen, received this name in early youth in Tarsus (Lighthouse), or inherited it from some ancestor, who may have adopted it in becoming a freedman, or in acquiring the Roman citizenship. Paul being the well-known cognomen of several distinguished Roman families, as the gens Æmilia, Fabia, Julia, Sercia, &c. It is more probable, however, that he chose the name himself after he entered upon his labors among the Gentiles, as a part of his missionary policy to become a Greek to the Greeks, in order to gain them more readily to Christ (1 Cor. ix. 19–23). At all events, the name Paul is first mentioned during his first great missionary journey, when, he, taking henceforward the direction of Barnabas in words and in acts, struck Elymas the sorcerer with blindness, and converted Scegus Paulus, the pro-consul of Cyprus, to the Christian faith (Acts xiii. 8). After this striking fact, he is uniformly called Paul in the latter chapters of the Acts, and in all the Epistles. But we have no right, for this reason, to infer (with Jerome, Olahansen, Meyer, Ewald, and others) that the name Paul was a memorial of the conversion of Scegus Paulus as his first-fruit. (For 1.) he may have converted many Jews and Gentiles before that time; (2.) pupils are called after their teachers and benefactors, and not vice versâ; (3.) Luke gives no intimation to that effect, and connects the name Paul, not with that of the proconsul of Cyprus (xiii. 7, 8), but with that of Elymas the sorcerer (ver. 9). The last circumstance favors the ingenious hypothesis of Dr. Lange, that the name expresses the symbolic significance of the victory of Paul, the small man of God, over Elymas, the mighty magician of the devil, as a New Testament counterpart of the victory of David over Goliath, or of Moses over the sorcerers of Egypt. Dr. Lange, however, admits the probability that Paul had his name before this occasion. At all events, the change of name has nothing whatever to do with his conversion; and all allegorical interpretations of Chrysostom, Augustine, Wordsworth, and others, which go on this assumption, are merely pious fancies, which are sufficiently refuted by the fact that the Apostle is repeatedly called Saul long after his conversion, as in Acts xx. 33; xi. 13; xii. 27; 1 Cor. xv. 25; xiii. 1, 2, 7, 9; and that it is said of Saul in one passage (xiii. 9), that he was "filled with the Holy Ghost."—P. S. *

A servant of Jesus Christ.—Rom. vii. 22. This is not merely the general designation of the pious man (Fritzsche : Christi eulor, Eph. vi. 6), but the designation of his office (Tholuck) : 1 Cor. i. 1; Phil. i. 1; James i. 1. Reichs: The word implies unlimited obedience. Schott: "δοῦλος denotes the Christian, so far as he, in the discharge of a special Christian calling, surrenders himself completely to God's will, and excludes his own preference." Here the Christian call in its universal character is meant, just as it appears in the apostleship, after the absolute service of the one great servant of God, in Is. iii. Nevertheless, there is no tautology in the addition: called to be an apostle. Calvin: Apostolatus ministerii est species. The same office, related to Christ, makes the δοῦλος, in the absolute sense (comp. Is. lix.). but, related to the world, it makes the ἀπόστολος. [A servant, literally bondsman (δοῦλος, from δίολος, to bind), denotes generally, like the corresponding Hebrew יִבְשָׂר, a relation of dependence on God, and cheerful obedience to His will. Paul glories in this service, which is perfect freedom.] The more we feel the necessity of Christ, the more we are free from the bondage of men. Deo servire vera libertas est (Augustine). In a wide sense, the term applies to all believers, who are both children and servants of God (Is. lxx. 13; Dan. iii. 26; Rom. vi. 22; xiv. 4; Eph. vi. 6; 1 Cor. vii. 22; 1 Peter ii. 16; Rev. xix. 5, 14); in a special and emphatic sense, it is used of the chosen office-bearers in the kingdom of God, as Moses, the prophets, and kings in the Old Testament (Deut. xxxiv. 5; Josh. i. 1; Is. xlix. 5; Jer. xxv. 4); and the ministers of the gospel in the New, particularly the apostles (so here; Phil. i. 1; Tit. i. 1; Col. iv. 12; James i. 1; 2 Pet. i. 1; Rev. i. 1). Hodge: "Servant is a general official designation, of which, in the present case, apostle is the specific explanation." Paul "rejects all human authority in matters of faith and duty, and yet professes the most absolute subjection to the authority and reverence due to the authority of Jesus Christ." Wordsworth: "Other men in the beginning of their epistles, especially those which they addressed to the Roman people, reeled their own titles as rulers, kings, or conquerors; but the apostles claim to be heard as δοῦλος, bonamun, *  

* [Lucanus does not occur in the Greek Testament, but in several Latin MSS. the third Gospel is inscribed: Recognitum secundum Lucum, with a doubtful, a contraction of the Latin Lucanus, as Λουκᾶς is of Λουκᾶς. Some commentators, however, identify the names Lucas and Lucanus (Acts xiii. 11; Rom. xvi. 21).—P. S. ]
bondmen of Jesus Christ." Comp., however, my annotation on ἀπάστολος, which is a title of dignity and authority.—P. S.]—Jesus Christ. That is, Jesus is the Christ. Dealing with the Roman Christians, the Apostle had no ground for saying the reverse: Christ Jesus, i. e., The Christ is Jesus.

Called to be an apostle.—As he had had to defend his call before the Corinthians and Galatians on account of opponents, he does it here because he was not yet personally known to the Roman Church. [Called; chosen, appointed, not self-called, but called by Christ, in opposition to an arbitrary self-consituted authority (αὐτῷ ἀπόστολος, self-appointed), and called directly by Christ, without the intervention of church authority, comp. Gal. i. 1: "Not of men (αὐτὸν ἀναγνώρισαν), nor by any man (δὲ ἀναγνώρισαν), but by Jesus Christ," &c. The word refers to the historical call, not to the eternal election. Calvin: Neque enim ille assentient, quia eam de quo loqueatur vocationem ad e ternam Dei electi onem referunt. —P. S.] The expression, apostle, has here its widest significance. Christ, the risen One, has called him; he is therefore, in the most positive sense, a witness of His resurrection, and this implies the apostolic witness of the whole of His miraculous person and work. [Apostle is a title of dignity, signifying the highest order of servant; every apostle being a servant of Christ, but not every servant of Christ an apostle of Christ. The one brings out the dependence of Paul on Christ, the other his authority over the congregations, and the latter is conditioned by the former. The term apostle may designate, etymologically, any delegate, commissioner, or missionary, but more particularly, as here, and in most passages, a chosen eye and ear witness of the life of Christ, who was personally instructed and selected by Him for the work of laying the foundation of the Christian Church, and teaching her through all subsequent generations. The apostles were inspired messengers of Christ, not to a particular charge, but to the whole world. The term is therefore generally restricted to the twelve (Luke vi. 13), and to Paul, who was likewise directly called by the Lord (Gal. i. 1, 12; Acts ix. 16; xxvi. 17). The sudden call of the preceding Paul to the apostleship of the Gentiles corresponds to the sudden call of the Gentiles to Christendom, just as the gradual instructions of the Jewish apostles accord with the long training of the Jewish nation for the gospel.—P. S.]

Separated, set apart.—Not equal to chosen of God (De Wette), nor to appointed by the Church (with reference to Acts xiii. 2; Olshausen), but directed to and appointed for this particular calling, through the whole providential course of his life (comp. Gal. i. 15). An ἀναγνώρισαν θεός is the first text in ch. x. at his birth, Gal. i. 15: ὁ δὲ ἀναγνώρισαν πατὴρ εἰς κυρίαν τῆς μεταφορᾶς μου, καὶ κυρίας, κ. θ.; then.—P. S.] when he was sent from Tarsus to Jerusalem [7]; a second [third], at his conversion and retreat into Arabia; and a third [fourth], at his special appointment as the Apostle to the Gentiles (Acts xiii. 2 ff.; Gal. ii.).

lixial ὀφείλειν must be distinguished from πρὸ γνωστότερος οὐκ ἐκλέγεται, as well as from καίειν; it denotes the Divine determination of the historical career of the man (see Acts xvii. 25). [Meyer refers ἀναγνώρισαν to the historical call at Damascus, and compares σιων ἐλπισάρ, Acts ix. 15; xxxvi. 16 ff. The word is an explanation of ἀπόστολος, and gives us the additional idea of destination. It implies that Paul was selected from the world, singled out, consecrated to, and destined for the gospel service at the time of his conversion. It refers to the Divine appointment for the apostolic office in general, while ἀφοινάσαρ, in Acts xiii. 2, refers to a special mission. ἀφοινάσαρ, like καίειν, looks to the historical call, προφοινάσις to the eternal decree, but the former is only an execution in time or actualization of the latter.—P. S.]

Unto the gospel of God.—That is, not the gospel having God for its object (Chrysostom), but the gospel given by God (2 Cor. xi. 7) for proclamation. [In, the genitive, not the word of origin and possession; God's gospel, whose author is God, and whose theme is Christ and His salvation by free grace; comp. vers. 8, 4; xv. 16; 1 Thess. ii. 2, 8, 9.—P. S.] Gospel.* Without the article.† According to De Wette and Schott, it is here not the internal matter or contents of the gospel, but the εὐαγγελισμός, which is ἐκλεγμένον εἰς τὴν ἀνθρώπων, which is also the noun. The expression in the text is, εὐαγγελίζω, ἐκλεγμένον, which is also the noun. The expression εὐαγγελίζω, however, does not stand for the infinitive εὐαγγελισμός, as we learn from the relative ὅ, but it is only an indefinite method of expression, as 2 Cor. ii. 12; x. 14." We would say, rather, that it is the concrete method of expression, implying that the knowledge of salvation cannot be without preaching, and preaching cannot be without the matter of the gospel.

Ver. 2. Which He promised before by His prophets in the holy Scriptures.—[So that God stood pledged, as it were, to reveal the gospel.] The second verse must not be read, with Beza [and the authorized English version, which often closely follows Beza], as parenthesis. The same ex;cession occurs, 2 Cor. ix. 6 [τὴν προφητείαν ἐκλέγοντος ἵματος, your bounty before promised.—P. S.] The mention of the Old Testament promise of the gospel must be seen as the apostolic promise to the Jewish Christians, but it must also enforce the gospel for the Gentile Christians. This preceding promise lay specifically in the Messianic passages (De Wette); and, at the same time, according to the New Testament view, in the meaning of the whole of the Old Testament, which promised the universal Pauline gospel (see ch. x.), The expression γεγονα, without the article, does not denote passages of Scripture (Dr. Paulus [Meyer], but γεγονα ìçγαν has become, according to De Wette, a nomen proprium.+ The second verse teaches that the gospel is no abrupt innovation or afterwards, but the forethought of God, the fulfilment of His promise, and "the desire of all nations." This harmony of the New and Old Dispensations should be a con

* [The Anglo-Saxon gospel, i.e., either good spell, or God's spell, is the precise equivalent of the Greek εὐαγγέλιον, and means not only good tidings of (salvation); Geo. P. Marsh, in his Lectures on the English Language, New York, 1860, p. 50, has a note on the two derivations, either from the name of the divinity God, or from the adjective gód, good, and lends to the latter.—P. S.]

† [Comp. Winer, A. T. Grammar, p. 118 f ed. 7th and Textual Note 3.—P. S.]

1 [Comp. Textual Note 5.—P. S.]
vincing proof of the Divine origin of Christianity, not only to the Jews, who already believe in the Old Testament, and need only be convinced that Jesus of Nazareth was really the promised Messiah, but also to the heathen, who well know that it is the exclusive prerogative of God to foresee and prearrange the future. In this view, Christianity is the oldest as well as the latest religion, going back to the first promise in Paradise, and even beyond the beginning of time, to the eternal counsel of God. Augustine says: "The New Testament is concealed in the Old; the Old Testament is revealed in the New." By his prophets, it is not to be confined, of course, to the sixteen prophetic books, but extends to the whole Old Testament Scriptures, as far as they contain the gospel, from the promise of the serpentine bush, Gen. iii. 23, to Mal. iv. 2. In fact, the entire Scripture is one organic system of prophecies and types bearing testimony to Christ; John v. 39.

—P. S.

Ver. 3. Concerning his Son.—This refers to προφέτης, gospel, ver. 1, and not to promised, ver. 2, as Tholuck, Meyer, Alford, Hodge, and others would have it. For the question further on is concerning the gospel in its complete New Testament development, and not merely in its Old Testament outline. Meyer says that the connection of προφέτης with τὸν γῆν κόσμον [instead of the gen. object] does not elsewhere occur in the New Testament. But it must be noticed that here the act of preaching the gospel of evangelization is connected with the gospel itself. Besides, the parenthesis has its influence upon the expression.

Ver. 3, 4. Who was born, &c.—The words from γεννηθης to τινι (vers. 3 and 4) are not an abrupt parenthesis (according to Griesbach and Knapp), but part of the sentence. They characterize the Son of God, not according to the antithesis of the human and divine nature of Christ in itself, but according to the revelation of this antithesis in the national Old Testament limitation and in the universal New Testament expansion and elevation of the person of Christ to heavenly majesty, in accordance with the analogy of Phil. ii. 6. Yet that analytical antithesis is reflected in this historical antithesis.

The historical Christ has a double genealogy and history, which is represented in the following analogies and antitheses:

The γεννηθης does not merely the being born, but, in a wider sense, the genealogical procession from the seed of David (see Matt. i. 1 ff.). The house of David represented the flower of the Jewish nation, and foreshadowed the kingdom of Christ. That the Messiah was to proceed from this royal family, was predicted in the Old Testament, Is. xi. 1; Jer. xxiii. 5; Ps. cxxxii. 11; and generally expected by the Jews, Matt. xxii. 42; John vii. 42; Acts xiii. 23. Meyer, without good reason, confines in αὐτὸς τοῦ δαυίδ to the male line of descent, and refers both genealogies of Matthew and Luke to Joseph; Melanchthon, on the contrary, identifies κατὰ σάρκα David with κατὰ φύσιν Μαρία; and Wordsworth infers from the words that Mary, as well as Joseph, was of the lineage of David. Comp. Com. on the genealogies in Matt. i. and Luke iii. Alford: "The words κατὰ σάρκα A. cast a hint back at the promise just spoken of. At the same time, in so solemn an enunciation of the dignity of the Son of God, they serve to show that, even according to the human side, His descent had been fixed in the line of him who was Israel's anointed and greatest king."

—P. S.

In distinction from this appearance of Christ in human nature, the idea of the exalted Christ is expressed by the words, ἐξ αὐτῶν κως τοῦ θεοῦ ἐν δόξαις, established a Son of God in power. The attempt to analyze and divide this one conception (for example, in Luther's German translation) has obscured the passage very much. The Son of God, in distinction from His Old Testament origin, is absolutely destined (διότι, Acts x. 32) to be the Son of God in majesty, or in the majestic exercise of his power (see Phil. ii. 6 ff.). The θεόν of God constitutes the central point of all kindred conceptions—of the διδασκαλία, Acts xvii. 26; of the προφήτης, Rom. viii. 29; and of the φύσις, Gal. i. 18. It expresses here God's absolute determination or establishment concerning Christ as the centre of all the historical developments of the new world, the Head of all things (Matt. xxviii. 18; Eph. i. 20 ff.). The expression refers not to the Son of God as such simply, but to the Son of God as exalted to heavenly majesty. As such, He is διότι, not merely προφήτης, προδίδοται (Ambrose, Augustine), Vulgate, &c., according to the Greek fathers, and the gloss προδίδοται. But as He is the γεννηθής κατὰ σάρκα David, His descent from David being the human and historical antecedence for his higher dignity; so is He διότι αὐτῶν κως τοῦ θεοῦ κατὰ σάρκα.

* [So Lauschmann, Tischendorf, Alford, who, in their editions, omit the parenthesis, and Meyer in loc. Comp. Winer: Grammat. N. T. p. 533, 7th ed.: Viele längerere Einschüsse sind nicht Parenthesen, sondern Deutungen, esfern sie nur den Gedankensfortschritt, nicht den Lauf der Darstellung aussetzen.—P. S.]

[De praed. sanct. c. 25. Augustine had but a superficial knowledge of Greek, and was here, as in Rom. v. 11 and in other passages, mistook by the translation of the Vulgate, which reads: προδίδοται (προφήτης).—P. S.]
The Resurrection. The  "ἐκ νεκροῦ" according to the analogy of ἐκ σπέρματος cannot properly mean since the resurrection, or through (by) the resurrection, but is indifferently used for the origin: out of the resurrection. The αὐτός ζωει is the whole genealogy, or "the root of Jesse" (ch. xv. 12), as it became manifest by the birth from the Virgin. Thus, likewise, the resurrection is not merely the fact of the resurrection of Christ, but with the fact of the resurrection there are brought to light the strength and root of the resurrection of the dead in the world, (Eph. i. 20 ff.) It is in accordance with this that Christ can say: "I AM the resurrection and the life." Deep in the heart of the first world--for which Christ is the first-born of every creature (πρωτότοκος πάσης κτίσεως, Col. i. 15) -there is at work the power, proceeding from the Logos, of a new world (Rom. viii. 23), for which Christ is the first-born from the dead (πρωτότοκος ἐκ τῶν νεκρῶν, Col. i. 18). And this world of the resurrection is not merely made manifest in His personal resurrection, consisting in His transfiguration, but will continue to do so until the flower of the new world appears in the first resurrection of the elect (1 Cor. xv. 23), and the fruit in the last general resurrection. The Apostle therefore means here the power of the resurrection as the christological principle of life in the world, which has become manifest by the resurrection of Christ, and acts and works as the historical principle of the universal resurrection of the dead. Christ arose from His death and resurrection as the fixed and established, or instituted Son of God in power. (Comp. the Messianic passage, Ps. lii.: "This day have I begotten Thee," which denotes the very day of the seditious rebellion against the Messiah as the grand day of His glorification.) The destination which Christ had from the beginning, became inauguration or institution at His resurrection. The αὐτός therefore, does not merely mean "shown," "declaratively established" (Meyer, according to Chrysostom, διόγγος); but the ἐκ does not mean merely since or after (Theodore, Erasmus, and others); and the αὐτός of resurrection does not mean merely αὐτός ἐκ νεκροῦ. And Philippi, following Melanchthon, and others, has very properly connected the ἐκ νεκροῦ with τιλος θεός, and did not follow Luther, Meyer, and others in connecting it with ὄμολογος. Meyer has therefore no ground for opposing the opinion of Bengel—that our resurrection is comprehended in Christ's resurrection—by remarking that the term the resurrection from the dead is only the general expression of the category.

In the third antithesis, κατὰ τὰ σάρκα, "according to the flesh," means the fleshly or physical origin of Christ, but not according to the first conception of σάρξ, i.e., the sensual, susceptible, body, in accordance with the literal fulness of the word of God, subjected to the spirit, or, in a more general sense, the "earthly man," ἄνθρωπος ραφίως (John iii. 9; 1 Cor. iv. 14). But σάρξ has here its third meaning, and expresses the physical human element, the influence of the flesh (Rom. vii. 19 ff.; vi. 51), yet in historical relations, or man in his historical finiteness, limitation, and qualification (Gal. iv. 4). For Christ's incarnation, and the growth of His physical nature, evidently involved no opposition to the "Spirit of holiness," but took place under its conserving influence.

Flesh (σάρξ, -ός) is here, and in all the passages where it is used of the incarnation (Rom. ix. 5; 1 Tim. iii. 16; John i. 14; 1 John iv. 2), a strong Hebrazing term for human nature, with the implied idea of weakness and frailty, though not necessarily of sin (somewhat analogous to the occasional use of the German der Sterbliche, and the English mortal, for man). It is as correct to say: Christ became man (Menschwerdung), as to say: Christ became flesh (incarnation, incarnation, Fleischwerdung), but the latter expression is more emphatic; it exhibits more strongly the condescension of Christ, the identity of His nature with our own, and the universality of His manhood. The word σάρξ, therefore, when applied to Christ, must not be understood in an Apollinarian sense, as if Christ merely assumed a human body with the animal soul, but not the rational soul, whose place was supplied by the divine Logos. It implies the entire human constitution, body, soul, and spirit, sin only excepted, which does not originally and necessarily belong to man. It is not the flesh, as opposed to the spirit, that is here intended, but the human, as distinct from the divine. The flesh, as an organized system of life, is the outward tabernacle and the visible representative of the whole man to our senses. The σάρξ of Christ was the seat of a human ψυχή, with its affections, and of a human φύσις or φυσία, with its intelligence (comp. Matt. xxvii. 50; John x. 25; xii. 49), but not of the αὐτός. He was subject to temptation, or temptation (Heb. ii. 18; iv. 15), but neither σαρκομόρος (Rom. vii. 14), nor ψυχόμορος (1 Cor. iv. 14). He appeared not "in the flesh of sin," but only "in the likeness of the flesh of sin" (Rom. vii. 2). At the same time, the limitation, κατὰ σάρκα, plainly implies the divine nature of Christ. "Were He a mere man," says Hodge, "it had been enough to say that He was of the seed of David; but as He is more than man, it was necessary to distinguish His descent from David, and His human nature."—P. S.
certainly distinguished from the άγων filesystem as sanctification is from sanctitas—in expressing the operation of the Spirit, though in a more comprehensive relation. This is the Spirit of God, who, as the sanctifying Spirit in the world, constitutes the complete opposition and counteraction to the entire corruption of sin; who was first the cause of the holy birth of Christ, and then of His resurrection; and who now comes from the glorified Christ, the principle of the sanctification of humanity and the world. Bengel: *Aute resurrectionem latet sub carnis Spiritus; post resurrectionem carmen penitus abscondit Spiritus sanctification.* We accept this statement in a wider sense. From the divina natura of Christ as sanctificativa omnis causae (Machenakon, Calov, [Bengel, Olshausen], and others), we must distinguish the expression so far as it does not denote the individual, but the universal vital principle of the new birth of humanity. And we must distinguish it from the Holy Spirit, the πνεύμα άγων (Chrysostom, and most commentators; see Mayer), so far as it denotes this principle, not merely according to its complete New Testament revelation, but also according to the Old Testament preparation of the divine-human life. But we must take the distinction so that the πνεύμα άγων will represent the difference between the absolute communication of the Spirit to Christ and the relative operation of the πνεύμα άγων (Tholuck, Baur). We shall be secure against confounding the one, σπνεύμα άγωνίζοντι, λόγον or τίου τού θεοῦ (Rieckart, Reichel), if we observe the difference between the universal and individual divine principle of life in revelation. This difference is most distinctly ignored by Baur, when he understands by the πνεύμα άγων the Messianic Spirit. When Clements Romans, Ep. ii., terms Christ the first Spirit, he means the individual designation of the divine nature of Christ, yet according to its universal relation. Just as the Spirit of a man is the individual himself, but according to his universal relation.

[Kata πνεύμα άγωνίζοντι] is evidently the title of the first or counterpart of κύριος σάρξ, and as such here describes the Holy Spirit, which must mean His divine nature, which is all Spirit, and intrinsically holy. άγωνίζοντι is the genitive of qualification, showing that holiness is the essential characteristic of Christ's Spirit, and yet it distinguishes this from the πνεύμα άγων, which is the technical designation of the third person of the Trinity. Compl. John iv. 24: "God (i.e., the divine being which the three forms of the Trinity have in common) is Spirit;" 2 Cor. iii. 17, where Christ Himself is called "the Spirit;" 1 Thess. iii. 16: "justified in Spirit" (ἐν πνεύματι); Heb. xii. ix. 14: "Who with an eternal Spirit (hιa πνεύματος αἰωνίου) offered Himself without spot to God;" and 1 Peter iii. 18, where a somewhat similar distinction is made between the flesh and the spirit, or the human and divine nature of Christ: "Being put to death in the flesh, but quickened by the Spirit;" although this passage is not exactly parallel. Meyer takes πνεύμα άγωνίζοντι to mean the ἰαμάν άνθρωπος, the whole inner life of Christ, which was elevated above all purely human spirits, filled with the Spirit of God, sinless and perfect. De Wette: "The spiritual side of the human Christ, yet with the attribute of holiness partly as a quiescent quality, partly as an efficacious power emanating from it." Substitute for this: "The Divine side of Christ's person which is the essential characteristic of holiness," &c., and we can adopt this explanation. If flesh means the whole human nature, it implies a human spirit, but not the πνεύμα άγωνίζοντι, which is essentially Divine.—P.S.

Of Jesus Christ our Lord.—"[Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ τοῦ κυρίου έμοι, ver. 4, in opposition τού θεοῦ θεοῦ, anticipated in the E. V. ver. 3.] This expresses the relation of the exalted Son of God to the Apostle and the Roman Christians as the ground and bond of their union. They together accepted Jesus as the Christ of God, and served Him as their common Master. [Alford: "Having given this description of the person and dignity of the Son of God, very man and very God, He now identifies this divine person with Jesus Christ, the Lord and Master of Christians—the historical object of their faith, and (see words following) the Appointer of himself to the apostolic office." De Wette: "Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ βασιλέως, denkend des Sohns Gottes als historisch-kirchliche Erscheinung,"] So Tholuck, Philippi. Jesus is the personal, Christ the official name; the former expresses His true character and mission and relation to the world, the latter His connection with the Old Testament and the dispensation of God. Jesus, i.e., Σωτήρ, was the Hebrew name, announced by the angel before His birth, Matt. i. 25; Luke i. 31, and given at His circumcision, Luke ii. 21; Christ, the Greek equivalent for the Hebrew Messiah, i.e., the Anointed, exhibits Him as the fuller of all the prophecies and types of the Old Testament, as the divinely promised and anointed Prophet, Priest, and King of Israel, who had for ages been the desire of all nations, and the Son of God, whose divine nature was here, and often, applied to Christ in the same sense in which the Septuagint uses κύριος for the Hebrew קֶדֶשׁ וּבִדְנָה. See the Lexicons. Christ is so called as the supreme Lord of the New Dispensation, or the sovereign Head of Christendom, to whom all believers owe allegiance and obedience.—P.S."

5. Ver. through whom we received.—After stating the common relation of believers to Christ, there follows the account of the special relation of the Apostle to Him. It is plain that neither ver. 5 nor ver. 6 can be parenthetical; but here is prepared the whole treatment of the Epistle on the relation between the call of the Apostle and the call of the church at Rome, δ' ὀ. Christ is the personal means of communicating his call on God's part (or the mediatorial agent in conferring grace from God to man, comp. Gal. i. 1; 1 Cor. i. 9—P. S.). &c. &c. denotes not only the free divine gift, but also the living religious and moral and spiritual character of the faith. It is plain that the plural here has reference to the call of Paul alone (not to the apostles in general, according to Beugen), from the following signature of his apostleship, by which he is the Apostle to the Gentiles.

* [Bengel has a large note on πνεύμα άγωνίζοντι which is well worth reading in full. He regards δημιουργος, δημιουργία, as a kind of middle term between δημιουργος, holiness, and ψυχη, sanctification.—P. S.]

* [Wordsworth and Forbes also wrongly identify the πνεύμα άγωνίζοντι with the πνεύμα άγων, the third person in the Holy Trinity, and thereby destroy the obvious contrast of κατα τον θεον, άγων, and κατα τον θεόν—P. S.]

* [Epist. ad Cor. II. p. 9: De Χριστός ο θεός, ο θεός θεοῦ, οις μεν το πρώτον πνεύμα, έφητον ζήσει, και τούτως το πρώτον θεον ίησους Χριστον τον μοναδικόν, ήταν του θεον τοποθετημένος τον μοναδικόν. The Clementine origin of the Second Epistle to the Corinthians is very doubtful.—P. S.]

* [Comp. the note of Meyer in loco against Reiche, and of Alford against Pelle, who infers that the subject of δη]
Grace [in general] and apostleship [in particular].—F. S.) Grace, as the operative call to salvation and to the full experience of salvation in justification, is the predominant condition for every Christian office, and, above all, to the apostleship. The grand unfolding of his apostleship was therefore preceded by an extraordinary degree of grace [in his conversion]. The explanation, χάριν ἀποστολής, race of ἀποστολή (Heudidaya, So Chrysostom, Beza, Philippus, and others), outliterates the force of that preliminary condition; * but when the grace is regarded merely as pardoning grace (Augustine, Calvin), the fundamental part is mistaken for the whole. Thus, also, the extraordinary apostolic gifts (χαρίσματα) to which Theodoret, Luther, and others refer χάριν, presuppose grace (χάριν) already. Meyer understands the expression to mean Divine grace in general; that is, the translation into the communion of the beloved of God.

Unto obedience of faith [καὶ πίστις τις ἡ πίστις].—Gnadengeschehen, comp Rom. xvi. 20.—F. S.) That is, for the purpose of establishing the obedience of faith. The ρήτωρ denotes not merely the purpose, but also the condition of the apostleship—an instance of Pauline conciseness. It may be asked here, whether the genitive πίστεως indicates the object, or must be read as apposition: the faith which consists in obedience [to the Word and Will of Christ].—F. S.; But this question is limited by the second, whether πίστεως can stand in the objective sense as fides qua creditur (good credenda est, Char. Christ.).—F. S.) Meyer denies this, and asserts that πίστεως, in the New Testament, is constantly subjective faith [fides qua creditur, fides credendi.—F. S.] Though it is often made objective, as here, and is regarded a power, or controlling principle. But this would give us the idea of obedience toward the faithful. The obedience here meant is either identical with faith (the obedience which consists in faith, according to Theophylact, Calvin), or it is obedience to faith in its objective form. The latter interpretation is supported by the expressions ἵππον τοῦ Χριστοῦ, 2 Cor. x. 5 [ἵππαι τοῦ θείου, 1 Peter i. 22], and particularly Acts vi. 7 ["a great company of priests ἵππον τῇ πίστει, became obedient to the faith," comp. Rom. x. 16; ἵππαι τῷ θείῳ, P. S.]. Comp. 1 Peter i. 2, 14. But this πίστεως must be the same as the preceding χάριν, overlooking the formalized character of the χάριν ἀποστολῆς χάρις. —F. S.) [Alford]: "Keep the χάριν καὶ ἀποστολήν separate, and strictly consecutive, avoiding all nomenclatural figures of Heudidaya, Hypaulemus, and the like. It was the general borsal of grace which conditoned and introduced the special bestowal (καὶ, as so often, compounding a specific portion to a whole) of apostleship; cf. 1 Cor. xiv. 13] Augustine: "G aliorum omnibus filiibus, apostolatum autem non enum erat],' tob."

[Or rather: the obedience which consists in faith, in the act of believing.—F. S.) [Meyer, 40th ed. 1885, p. 43: "πίστις καὶ ἀποστολὴν μὲν ἔχει θεός (Beza, Bedelius, Estius, Bengel, Haeurn, Coccar, Rosenmüller, Platf, Fritzsche, Tholuck, u. M.), ist durchaus der Sprachgebrauch des N. T., in welchem die πίστις das der Heilige Geistwesen oft, wie hier, Objektivum, als PoIenis gedeckt. Vgl. xvi. 25; Gal. i. 23. Die πίστις ist, nach F., die Überzeugung und Zwiefalt (sinnsinn und formal) von Jesus Christus als dem eigentümlichst vollkommenen Vermittler der göttlichen Gnade und des ewigen Lebens, durch sein Verbrechen getrieben."—P. S.] If the obedience to faith is the object which is of the faith obedience which consists in faith, or of which faith is the controlling principle. Wordsworth: "That I might bring all men to faith, and the faith itself be the foundation, the root, and in obedience to the Will, of God".—F. S.)

πίστεως cannot mean only doctrina fidei. Even obedience to the gospel (Rom. x. 16) does not express the most definite form of the objective πίστεως; this is Christ Himself. An Epistle, sent to Rome by the ambassador of a Lord and King, who declared himself appointed to call all the peoples of the Roman Empire to obedience or allegiance, must have been planned in full consciousness of the antithesis, as well as of the analogy, between the earthly Roman Empire and the Kingdom of Christ. Therefore the Apostle expresses the analogy when he characterizes himself as an ambassador who appeals to the nations to be obedient to his Lord. But the antithesis lies in his denoting this obedience as an obedience to the faith. We must admit that the idea of the subjective faith also has here a good sense in itself. Faith is not at all arbitrary, but an obligatory obedience incumbent on the individual soul and conscience; yet its obedience is not slavery, but the joyous act of free faith, as it is assensus and fiducia. And if we accept this, the expression would be an oxymoron, like the expression: law of the Spirit. But since the question is concerning a characterization of the apostleship, the fuller idea must be expected: obedience toward the object of faith, especially as the freedom of faith is thereby also declared. Even the Christian's hope can be used in an objective sense (Col. i. 5).

Among all the nations (εἴς πᾶσας τοῖς ἐθνεῖς).—Since this expression constitutes one definition with the preceding, it is an improper alternative to refer it either to ἔλθην (Benz) or to τίς ἐποίησεν πίστεως (Meyer [Hodge]). We translate here, among all the nations (with Rückert, Reiche, Bour): not among all Gentiles (Tholuck, Meyer), because, from the following salutation, the Jews are included in the designation, and because it is in harmony with the purpose of the whole Epistle to establish a united congregation from among Jews and Gentiles. With this view, the subordinate idea of heathen nations is immediately introduced, yet not clearly before vers. 18, 14, &c. [Hodge: "The apostles were not diocesan, restricted in jurisdiction to a particular territory. Their commission was general. It was to all nations,"—yet with an amiable division of the immense field of labor; comp. Gal. ii. 9; Rom. xv. 20; 2 Cor. x. 16.—P. S.]

For the sake of his name.—(See Acts v. 41.) Not for the "good" of his name; nor for the glorifying of the same (Meyer), which would have been expressed in the form of a doxology, but for the spread of his Name (Phil. ii. 10). Therefore the words are not an addition, but an explanatory parallel to the expression, "for obedience to the faith," &c., and relate, in common with this, to the antecedent. His name is the object of the faith to which the nations should render obedience in His name.

Ver. 6. Among whom are ye also? We place here a comma, and read the words, the called, the chosen ones of Jesus Christ (with Rückert, Philipps, &c.); but not, among whom are ye also called of Jesus Christ (with Lachmann, Meyer [Alford], and others). For the principal weight

* [Not necessarily; comp. Acts ix. 16; xv. 29; xx. 18, where there does not appear to be any idea of the entire race of Israel being called into the church here. This idea, in the "glory" of Christ, as it was called, (with Rückert, Philipps, &c.)—P. S.)
rests on the thought, that the Roman Christians were included in the totality of nations to which the Apostle was sent. He did not need to say much to them, that they were the called of Jesus Christ. Thus we have the beautiful antithesis: I am the chosen Apostle for all nations: you are the chosen believers in the midst of all nations: we are therefore directed toward each other.

The called of Jesus Christ.—Not, whom Christ has called (Luther, Rückert, and others); but who, as the called [by the accepted call of God through the gospel], belong to and are subjects under the possession of Jesus Christ. [Olivo, De Wette, Meyer, and others]. Paul refers the call (through Christ) to God (Rom. viii. 30, &c.; see Meyer). The Apostle seems, by this address, to anticipate the salutation itself; but the address must prepare the way for the salutation by the reminder that he can salute them as pertaining to him.

Hence, too, αληθής and εκλεκτοὶ are of nearly the same import; κατὰ προθεσίαν κλητοί, Rom. viii. 28; comp. Rom. ix. 11; 1 Cor. i. 26, 27. We accordingly find κλητοί used as a familiar designation of believers. This is not quite correct, αληθής and εκλεκτοὶ (a panromasia in Greek, like the German esvolut und ausgewählt) are clearly distinguished, Matt. xx. 16 and xvi. 14: πολλοί γὰρ καὶ μὴν κλητοὶ, δὲν εκλεκτοὶ; many are called, but few chosen; in the last passage they are even put in antithesis. All the members of the visible Church are κλητοὶ, though they may ultimately be lost; but only the members of the invisible Church, or the true believers, are εκλεκτοὶ, or κλητοί κατὰ προθεσίαν (Rom. viii. 28). Comp. the notes on Matt. xx. 16, in vol. i. 332 and 354 f. [P. S.]

Ver. 7. To all that are in Rome.—The address and the salutation.† The Epistle is addressed to all Christians in Rome. Residence in Rome and connection with the body of Roman Christians are certainly presupposed (see ver. 8). But the Roman Christians are saluted according to the condition of things, as an incipient church not yet fully organized, but ordained to become one—addressed to or directed by the Apostle. The Epistle expresses himself otherwise in the Epistles to the Corinthians, Galatians, and Thessalonians. There he salutes the Christians as a church, or churches. [The Christians residing at Rome, whether born there or not, are viewed as one community, however imperfectly they may have been organized at the time; but they no doubt worshipped in different parts of the city, and were thus divided into various domestic congregations, ἐκκλησίαι κατὰ ὀνόματος, xvi. 5. The population of the city of Rome at the time of Christ is variously estimated from one to two millions. In his earliest five epistles, Paul addresses himself ὑπὲρ εἰκοσίων, i.e., in all the others, τοις ἀγίοις. P. S.]

Beloved of God, called to be saints.—The root of their Christian faith is, that they know themselves beloved of God by the experience of His reconciliation; the goal and crown of their Christian faith is holiness. But they are not merely called to be saints (De Wette). As truly called, they are actually saints first in this sense: that, according to the analogy of theocratic holiness, they are separated from the ungodly world and consecrated to God; secondly, in the sense that Christ dwells in them as the principle of increasing holiness, and that they are characterized accordingly to the ruling principle of their new life (1 Cor. vii. 14). This general designation does not imply that the Apostle could say it of every individual, still less that he should ascribe to individuals a personal holiness of life. [κλητοὶ has the same relation to αἵματος as εκλεκτοὶ has to ἀπόστολος, in ver. 1, and expresses the vocation of the Roman Christians to holiness, which is both an actual possession as to principle, and a moral aim to be realized more and more by daily growth in Christ. P. S.]

Grace be to you, and peace.—The Greek ραβδος (Acts xx. 23; James i. 1), and the Hebrew אבות, are here reflected unitedly in the infinitely richer Christian salutation. The grace which, as the cause of peace, has its source in God and Christ; the peace, as the operation of this cause, which becomes the source of new life in believers. The more definite Christian conception is destroyed if we substitute (with Meyer, against Olshausen, Philippi, and many others) salvation instead of peace, and kindness instead of grace. [Grace and peace are related to each other as cause and effect, and constitute the chief blessings of Christianity, embracing all that we need. The profound Christian meaning of ραβδος—the redeeming love of God in Christ—and of εἰμι πέρας—the peace with God by the redemption—compared with the ordinary meaning of the Greek ραβδος and the Hebrew shalom, affords a striking example of the transforming power which the genius of Christianity exercised over ancient language and custom. See the General Remarks on p. 67. P. S.]

† From God our Father.—The expression of the specifically Christian consciousness of God. The experience of pardon through Christ produces the consciousness of the παρακλήσεως (sonship, adoption) as a result. And [from] the Lord.—[Χριστὸς Ἰ. Χρ.] is not dependent on Πατρὸς and parallel with ἀναντέτειχεν, but is ruled by ἀπό and is coordinate with Θεοὶ Πατρὸς. God is nowhere called "our and Christ's Father," and Christ never addresses God "our," but "My Father," owing to His peculiar relationship which is rooted in the ὄνομα, or equality of essence. This frequent coordination of Christ with the Father, as equally the object of prayer and the source of spiritual blessing, implies the recognition of the divinity of Christ. No Hebrew monotheist could thus associate, without blasphemy, the eternal Jehovah with a mere man. So also Philippi, Hodge, and others. P. S. Not of the Lord (Erasmus, Glueckler). Nevertheless, we would not read, with Meyer: καὶ ἀπὸ κυρίου, and not merely view Christ as κύριον, in distinction from the Father, as the cause principalis. For the designation of the exalted Saviour must be distinguished from the mediatorship of Christ as κύριον médianon. [God the Father is the author, Christ the mediator and procurer, the Holy Spirit the aplifier or imparter, of
CHAPTER I. 1-7.

HOMILETICAL AND PRACTICAL.

An apostolic salutation: 1. From whom does it come? 2. What is its import? 3. To whom is it addressed? (vers. 1-7.)—The one gospel of God: 1. From and by His prophets; 2. fulfilled by His Son (vss. 3, 4).—The missionary preaching among the Gentiles was a preaching of obedience to the faith for the glorifying of the name of Jesus Christ (ver. 5).—Every office is a gift of grace. The servants of Christ must remember this: 1. For their humility; 2. for their elevation and encouragement (ver. 5).—How can preachers of the gospel guard against bitterness toward the members of their congregation? By considering that the congregation are: 1. Beloved by God; 2. called by Jesus Christ (ver. 7).—Grace and peace: on one side different in manifestation, but, on the other, one in origin.

LUTHER.—The Spirit of God was given after Christ's ascension, since which time He sanctifies Christians and glorifies Christ in all the world as the Son of God in power, in word, miracle, and sign (ver. 4).

SCHRANK.—The preachers of the gospel must preach both the law and the gospel in their respective orders, and especially the gospel (ver. 1). He who does not become a saint on earth, will not be numbered among the saints in heaven (ver. 7).

QUISNEL.—Everything that comes to light is not therefore new: the oldest errors are continual novelties, and the newest truths are ever old.

OSIANDRI BIBL.—Christ, according to His human nature, is our brother. O great consolation! (ver. 3).

CRAKER.—Worldly peace is a great treasure, but, after all, it is not sufficient for us. When Christ communicates His peace to us (John xiv. 27), it is grace in God; and then have we peace with God (ver. 7).

BENGEL.—The Gospel of God is also the Gospel of Christ (ver. 1).—Jesus Christ is the Son of God (vers. 3, 4). This is the ground of all legitimate address of Christ to His Father and God, and of our legitimate address, through Him as our Lord, to His Father and our Father, His God and our God, who hath made us His own. He was Son of God before His humiliation; but His Sonship was veiled during His earthly life, and not fully unveiled till after His resurrection. On this rests His justification, 1 Tim. iii. 16; 1 John ii. 1, and this is the ground of our justification, Rom. iv. 25.

GROLLACH.—According to the flesh, the Son of God belonged to the Jews alone. But by the completion of His atonement, through the resurrection, He became the universal King of the human race, Lord of heaven and earth, according to the Spirit which dwelt in Him, and has perfectly pervaded His human nature (vers. 3, 4).

HEUSNER.—Prophets and apostles had one calling, one work (ver. 2).—The apostolic benediction—of what fulness of spiritual gifts of what a holy heart, does it give witness? It is grand to express such a wish for a church; it presupposes the personal possession and appreciation of these gifts, but also a serious zeal to apply them to the congregation (ver. 7).

ROOS.—If the theme of Paul's preaching had been only virtue, and a supreme Being whom we call God, he would have pleased the Greeks; and if he had preached on a Messiah yet to come, and on

DOCTRINAL AND ETHICAL.

1. The Epistle of the Apostle to the Romans on the righteousness of faith is still in a special sense a new message to the Romans, and a witness against Romanists. [It connects admirably with the concluding verses of the Acts, chap. xxviii. 30, 31, as a specimen of Paul's preaching in Rome, and to the Romans. —P. S.]

2. The significance of the Epistle to the Romans: (1.) As the first of the New Testament Epistles; (2.) in the group of the Pauline Epistles; (3.) as an original record of the missionary activity of the Apostle, and as an example for evangelical missions; (4.) as the central point of the Christian doctrine of salvation, and thus as the starting-point of the Western (Latin) Church, and especially of the Protestant Evangelical Church (see the Introduction).

3. The epistolary inscription of ancient writers contrasted with the subscription of recent ones. The former characterizes the Epistle as a substitute for personal intercourse; the latter has become an independent form of personal communication.

4. Servant of Jesus Christ, called to be an apostle. The extent of one idea is determined by that of the other. —Gospel of God: glorious unity. —Connection of the Old and New Testaments. —The apostles, unlike the Pharisees, acknowledge no traditions in connection with the Old Testament. —Grace and office must not be separated. —Just as little can we separate the experience of God's love and the beginning of sanctification. —Neither can grace and peace be separated; nor the paternal authority of God and the authority of Christ.

The importance of the inscription of this Epistle. The importance of the salutation. The adaptation of the great Apostle of the Gentiles and of the Christian congregation of the great metropolis to each other. See the Exeg. Notes.

5. The antithesis: Christ born of the seed of David, and appointed the Son of God in majesty and honor (also over the Roman world), is an economical antithesis, at the foundation of which lies the catological antithesis: that Christ is the temporal Son of David and the eternal Son of God.

6. The resurrection was historically accomplished and essentially finished in Christ. As the ideal and dynamical productive energy of the Logos, its roots and impulsc pervade the whole history of the world and of man, and especially the history of the kingdom of God. The same may be said of the Spirit of holiness. See the Exeg. Notes. The Logos lighteth every man that cometh into the world (John i. 9).

7. Paul, as the ambassador of Jesus Christ, the Son of God in regal power, announces to the believers of the imperial city of Rome that it is his business to call the world to obedience to the faith and to subscription to Christ.
the works of the law, the Jews would have been contented with him. But he preached on the Son of God. That was the voice of his gospel (ver. 4).

BEKKER:—The Spirit of holiness is the very force by which Christ has taken away the power of death, and has destroyed mortality, through the triumph of His grace (ver. 4).

J. P. LAURE:—How Christ exhibits His power as Lord by the Spirit of sanctification: 1. As the Risen One; 2. as the Son of God (vers. 1-4).—The same: Like man, like salutation. The joy with which the Apostle announces the majesty of Christ in imperial Rome: 1. How foolish this joy appeared; 2. how gloriously it was justified; 3. how it must be fulfilled once more. The internal connection between the power of the resurrection and the Spirit of holiness in Christ.

[BURKITT:—Paul declares: 1. The person from whom he received authority to be an apostle, namely, Christ; 2. how free and undeserved a favor it was; 3. the special duty and office of an apostle; 4. how he puts the Romans in mind of their condition by nature before the gospel was revealed to them and received by them; hence his官兵: the duty of the ministers and people to be mindful of what was their condition by nature.—Why is the Holy Ghost excluded in the salutation of ver. 7? He is not excluded, though He be not named; but is necessarily implied in the forementioned gifts. Besides, in other salutations the Holy Ghost is expressly mentioned; 1 Cor. xiii, 13, 14.—HENRY:—The Apostle describes: 1. The person who writes the Epistle; 2. the gospel itself; 3. the person to whom it is written; and 4. pronounces the apostolic benediction.—DODRIDGE:—We are called to partake of the privileges of God's people; we belong to the society of those who are eminently beloved of God, and who lie under great obligations, as they are called a holy nation, a peculiar people. May we not disdnoer the sacred community to which we belong, and may we finally enjoy the important privileges of that state of everlasting glory in which the kingdom of the Son of God shall be established!—CLARKE:—The Apostle invokes upon the Romans all the blessings which can flow from God as the fountain of grace; producing in them: all the happiness which a heart filled with the peace of God can possess; all of which are to be communicated to them through the Lord Jesus Christ.—Comprehensive Comm.—The Christian profession is not a notional knowledge, or a naked assent, or useless disputations; but it is obedience to the faith. The act of faith is the obedience of the understanding to God revealing, and the product of that is the obedience of the will to God commanding.—BARNES:—From Paul's connecting the Lord Jesus Christ with the Father, we see: 1. That the Apostle regarded Him as the source of grace and peace as really as he did the Father; 2. he introduced them in the same connection, and with reference to the bestowal of the same blessings; 3. if the mention of the Father implies a prayer, the same is implied by the mention of Christ, and hence was an act of worship to the latter; 4. all this shows that Paul's mind was familiarized to the idea that Christ was divine. These seven verses are a striking instance of the manner of Paul. While the subject is simply a salutation to the Roman church, his mind seems to catch fire, and to burn and blaze with special intensity. He leaves the immediate subject before him, and advances some vast thought that awes us, and fixes us in contemplation, and involves us in difficulty about his meaning, and leads us to return to the subject, and see that God is called our Father, not merely as the author of our existence and the source of every blessing, but especially as reconciled toward us through Jesus Christ.—If Jesus Christ is the great subject of the gospel, it is evident that we cannot have right views of the one without having correct opinions concerning the other.—J. F. H.]

[Schaff:—The epistolary addresses generally bear on the doctrine of the ministerial office and its relation to the congregation, and furnish suitable texts for ordination and installation sermons.—Ver. 1. Paul, a model for a Christian minister: I. In his humility—a servant (bondman) of Jesus Christ. II. In his dignity—a chosen apostle. His sense of dependence on Christ (servant) precedes and underlies his sense of authority over the congregation (apostle).—Only the true servant of Christ can be a true servant of the people. Ministers derive their authority from Christ, not from the people, but from Christ. III. A servant of Christ. The service of Christ is perfect freedom, John viii. 36. St. Augustine: "Deo servire vera libertas est."—A chosen apostle. The apostle and the ordinary minister: I. The unity: (a.) Both are called by God; (b.) both are servants of Christ; (c.) both labor for the same end—the glory of God and the salvation of souls. II. The difference: (a.) An apostle is called directly by Christ; a minister, through the medium of church authority; (b.) an apostle is inspired and infallible; a minister is only enlightened, and liable to err; (c.) an apostle has the world for his field; a minister is confined to a particular charge.—Chosen, set apart. The necessity of a Divine call for the ministry: I. The inward call by the Holy Ghost. II. The outward call by the authority and ordination of the Church. The regularly called minister contrasted with the self-constituted minister and faustian—set apart unto the gospel. The preaching of the gospel: I. The chief duty of the minister, to which all others must be subordinated. II. The highest work, in which Christ Himself and all the apostles engaged. III. The inconsistency of connecting any secular calling with the holy ministry.—Ver. 2. The close connection of the Old and New Testaments. Christianity a new, and yet an old religion. The historical character of Christianity.—in opposition to the Gnostic and fanatical theory of a magical, abrupt descent from the clouds.—Vers. 3, 4. Jesus Christ: the great theme of the gospel. His double nature, the human, earthly, historical, and the divine, heavenly, eternal—but inseparably united in one person.—The importance of the resurrection as an argument for the Divinity of Christ.—Ver. 5. Christ, the mediator of all grace.—Ver. 7. The Christians are saints.—4, e., separated from the world and consecrated to the service of God; holy in principle, and destined to become more and more holy and perfect in their whole life and conduct.—The redeeming grace of God in Christ—the fountain of peace with God and with ourselves.—First grace, then peace.—No grace without peace; no peace without grace.—The coordination of Christ with God the Father in the epistolary inscriptions—an indirect proof of the Deity of Christ.]
II.

The Introduction.


8 First of all, I thank my God through Jesus Christ for [concerning] you all, that my faith is spoken of throughout the whole world [in all the world].

9 For God is my witness, whom I serve with [in] my spirit in the gospel of his Son, that [how, etc.] without ceasing I make mention of you [how unceasingly I remember you]; always in my prayers; Making request, [; always asking in my prayers,] if by any means now at length [if haply now at last] I may have a prosperous journey [I may be prospered] by the will of God to come unto you. For I long to see you, that I may impart unto you [share with you, μεταδῷ] some spiritual gift, to the end ye may be established [in order that ye may be strengthened]. That is, that I may be comforted together with you, by the mutual faith both of you and me [among you by each other's faith, both yours and mine]. Now [But] I would not have you ignorant, brethren, that oftentimes [often] I purposed to come unto you (but was let [hindered] hitherto) that I might have some fruit among you also, even as among other Gentiles [the rest of the Gentiles]. I am debtor both to the Greeks, and to the Barbarians; both to the wise, and to the unwise [Both to Greeks and to Barbarians; both to wise and to unwise, I am debtor]. So, as much as in me is [as far as lies in me], I am ready [am ready] to preach the gospel to you [also] that [who] are at Rome also [omit also].

TEXTUAL.

1 Ver. 8.—ἐπροσώπως μὲν ἐν, primus quidem, zwoiscreis, first of all. The ἐν δὲ is omitted in the pressure of thought and flow of speech, as in Acts i. 1; Rom. iii. 2; 1 Cor. xi. 18. Comp. Winer, Grammar, p. 508 (6th ed.), and Alex. Buhmann, Grammatik des N. T. Sprachgebrauches, p. 813. Alford finds the corresponding δὲ in ver. 13, and connects thus: "Ye indeed are prospering in the faith; but I still am anxious further to advance that fruitfulness." But this anxiety was already expressed in ver. 8, and the δὲ in ver. 13 is simply μακραπαρήσεις.—P. S.

2 Ver. 8.—ἐπιστρέφεται is best supported in opposition to ἐφθανεί (The prepositions ἐπί and ἐν both occur in this connection (1 Cor. i. 4; Col. i. 3); These i. 2; These i. 9), though ἐφθανεί more rarely (Eph. i. 16; Phil. i. 4), with substantially the same meaning; the difference is, that ἐπί, concerning, implies simply that the Roman Christians are the subject of thanks; while ἐφθανεί, for, in behalf of, for the sake of, gives the idea of intercession and aid. But ἐπιστρέφεται also has the latter meaning. It is often confounded by the MSS., but the best codices (א. B. C. D. B. E. K. T. Β. Ε.) and critics, editors (Meyer, Lachmann, Tischendorf, Meyer, Alford, Wordsworth) are here in favor of ἐπί against the sweep of the textus receptus.—P. S.

3 Ver. 8.—ὁ δὲ διαφέρει from θαυμάζει and expresses the mode or degree. Comp. Phil. i. 6; 2 Cor. vii. 15; 1 Thess. ii. 10; Acts x. 29, and Meyer on Phil. ii. 10.—P. S.

4 Ver. 10.—The translation depends here upon the punctuation, which is left to critical conjecture, the ancient MSS. having no punctuation. I make a comma or semi-colon after παράκλησις, and connect πρέπει, κ.τ.λ., with διεξεχθείναι. So Meyer, Alford, Lachmann in his versions, and Lassus, however, who makes a comma after παράκλησις μου, I like the E. V. In this case πρέπει must be taken as an intensification of ἀκατάστασις = αἰσθήσεις αἰσθητάτατος, but this would require a different position of the words, ὡς, ὡς ἀκατάστατος μου, κ.τ.λ. As it is, πρέπει τινὰ τῶν προσώπων μου, διεξεχθείναι is better taken as an explanation of ἀκατάστασις μου, so as to mark at the same time a progress of the idea, the incessant remembrance of the Romans culminating in direct prayer.—P. S.

5 Ver. 10.—κατὰ οὖν ἐπιστρέφεται, οἷον ἀδικήθη κυρίως (Meyer, Olshausen, Lange, κο.) Alford: if by any means before long, now, happily, possibly, implies the possibility of new delays and hindrances. ὁ δὲ, already, may mean finally or at last, with reference to things hoped for and delayed, and in connection with more, οἷον ἀδικήθη κυρίως. See Hasting, Participle i. 338. The Apostle's desire in this respect was granted about three years afterwards, A. D. 1.—P. S.

6 Ver. 10.—(For προσώπωσ, κύριονδερμα). The original meaning of ἔσος, way, journey, is lost in the verb. See Exeg. Notes. But the parting with in Greece to travellers is even now καλῶς κατεύθυνα, as in Italy, ben viaggio, a happy journey.—P. S.

7 Ver. 11.—(Dr. Lange inserts after gift: personal, peculiar grace, and after established: for your world-historical calling. See his explanation below, which I cannot adopt.—P. S.)

8 Ver. 12.—(ἂςπαρακλησίας εἰς χάριν εἰς τὴν ἀληθεῖαν, πρόκειται, ἄφαντος εἰς και εἰς ἡμῶς). The infinitive εἰςκεκαθάρμενος (which compound verb only occur here in the N. T.) is parallel with the preceding ἐπιστρέφεται, the subject ἐν δὲ being understood from ἐπιστρέφεται, ver. 11. The σὺν is generally resolved into ἐν καὶ εἰς ἑαυτόν, you and I, but Meyer, on account of τῷ δὲ, makes ὑμῖν the only subject of ἐπιστρέφεται. This would require the omission of ἐνδεχεσθαι in the E. V. The ἐνδεχεσθαι (which is politely put first) and ἀφαντος ἐν ἀληθείᾳ, which is a little more emphatic than ἀφαντος, showing that faith dwelt in the hearts of the Roman Christians. The mutual faith of the E. V. suggests the wrong sense: faith which each has in the other. Dr. Lange, in accordance with his specific interpretation of ἀριστεύειν, adds to corded: made joyful for the common well for the conversation of the world.—P. S.

9 Ver. 13.—(For of ζητούμεν Κοτσ, Cond. D. E. G. and Ital. read εἰκαστα.—P. S.)

10 Ver. 13—The verb to ἴη, is used here, and 3 Thess. i. 7, by the E. V. in the same sense to hinder, to forbid, to prevent (κατειλήφαν, κατείληφαν), as in Tennyson's lines:

"Mine ancient wound is hardly whole,
And lets me from the saddle.

Put the word is now generally used in the opposite sense, to allow, to permit. On the contrary, the verb to prevent, in the E. V. (and in the Anglican Liturgy), means to precede, to anticipate (pro-venire); while in modern English it signifies the reverse, to hinder, to obstruct.—P. S.)
EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

SECOND SECTION.—The connecting link in the form of doxology, and the transition of the author to his designed argument in the fundamental topic.

The praise of the faith of the Roman Christians known all over the world, and the desire and purpose of the Apostle to visit them.

Ver. 8. First of all, I thank.—De Wette: "In all his Epistles, with the exception of Galatians, 1 Thessalonians, and 2 Thessalonians, the natural course of first placing himself, so to speak, in relation with his readers; and his first point of contact with them is gratitude for their participation in Christianity." [So also Alford in loc.]. Comp. also 1 Thess. i. 2; 2 Thess. i. 3; 1 Cor. i. 4. This means more definitely that the Apostle, in his epistles, with thanksgiving to God, seized the point of connection for his subsequent argument; and this point of connection is a peculiar form from the condition of the different churches. Kolbe calls this, captatio benevolentiae. Thouless: "The Apostle opens his way to the hearts of the church by a declaration of his love." [Wordsworth: "As usual, the Apostle begins with a sentiment by which he expresses his gratitude to God, and concludes the good will of those to whom he writes."—P. S.]. According to Tholuck [De Wette] and Meyer, we would properly expect also ετέλεσε δι' after προσωπον, but not in point of fact, since the προσωπον marks the emphasis of the following introductory word.—My God. Not only the expression of genuine feeling (De Wette), but also of the thought that God has shown Himself as the God of his apostolic call, by opening before him a path in Rome for the cause of Christ (Acts xxviii. 15). [The language of personal application, with a corresponding sense of personal obligation: the God who, with all His blessings and promises, belongs to me, as I belong to Him, and am bound to serve Him. Comp. Acts xxviii. 23; τοις δει οι ειναι, και λατσίναι, 1 Cor. i. 4; Phil. i. 3; iv. 19; Phil. ii. 4.—P. S.].—Through Jesus Christ. [Not to be connected with μοι (Koppe, Glöckler), but with εκ νεων.—P. S.]. Comp. Rom. vii. 25; Col. iii. 17; Heb. xiii. 15; 1 Peter ii. 5. Origin: Christ: as the mediator of the prayer, also presents the thanksgiving. ["Vivat per pontificem magnum: oportet enim, sive eam cum volo offere sacrificium Deo, quod per manus Pontificis debet offere." So also Calvin, who refers to Heb. xiii. 15. Bengel, Olshausen, and Hodge, who justly says that it is the clear doctrine of the Bible that, in all our approaches to God in prayer or praise, we must come in the name of Christ as the ground of our acceptance.—P. S.] Meyer objects to this view as not justified by Paul's usual method, and explains that he renders thanks for what has come to pass by Christ. [Similarly Alford.]. But what is meant by giving thanks for every thing in the name of Jesus Christ? (Eph. v. 23). The thanksgiving, as well as prayer, must be sanctified by the spiritual community of Christ, and thus come before God; by this means, all selfish interests, and all human and passionate joy at the obtained results are excluded.—For you all. The προσωπον is ἐν ὑμίν were often confounded or changed by the copyists; therefore the Recepta has ἐν ὑμίν here. Here, as at the beginning of ver. 7, the Apostle emphasizes the fact that he has in view all the believers in Rome, and will not appeal to or favor any partisan tendency.—That your faith is spoken of. Mention is made of it, and it has become famous among Christians in the whole world (see chap. x. 18; xvi. 19). The expression, which has the outward appearance of being hyperbolical, acquires its complete significance chiefly in consequence of the powerful position of the metropolis of Rome, by the weight which Christianity gained in all the world by the conquest of this central house of the world, and by the Apostle's views of the future of this apostolic station. See the quotations from Grotius and Calvin in Thouless. [Meyer: "ἐν ὑμίν τῷ κόσμῳ—a popular hyperbole, but admirably suited to the position of the congregation in the metropolis of the world, to which the eyes of all were directed." Remember the adage: Orbis in urbe continetur.—P. S.].

Ver. 9. For God is my witness. The for establishes the foregoing. Here, therefore, the thanksgiving through Christ is also explained (Phil. i. 3; Col. i. 3; 1 Thess. i. 2). The sense of the solemn assurance is: My declaration is before the face of God. The free assurances of this character arise in the Apostle's case from the inner character of his work and the loveliness of his position. He cannot adduce earthly witnesses of the peculiarity of the facts which he has to assure: they are of heavenly origin, and he calls on God as their witness: that is, his whole knowledge of God, and his apostolic conscience, must be pledged. Pareus: "Ignorant ad ignos scelerae juris." Against this Meyer quotes Phil. i. 18 [and 2 Cor. i. 5.—P. S.] as decisive. The necessities for such strong expressions of the fervent man were indeed very different; but one species of them is that adduced by Pareus. The general constraint of the Apostle to let his readers look into the sanctity of his inner life, is secured by the solemn assurance against all danger of profanation. Meyer adduces as a mo
tive "the strange fact that he, the Apostle to the Gentiles, had not yet become active in the church at Rome, although it belonged to his school." [Bengel: "A pious assertion respecting a matter necessary and hidden from men, especially from those, who, without real defence of Meyer's punctuation.—P. S."

"There could be no other witness to his practice in his secret prayers, but God: and as the assertion of a habit of incessantly praying for the Roman Christians, whom he had never seen, might seem to savour of an exaggerated expression of affection, he solemnly appeals to this only possible testimony. To the Ephesians, Philippians (see, however, Phil. i. 8), Colossians, Thessalonians, he gives the same assurance, but without the asseveration. The thus calling God to witness is no uncommon practice with Paul; see ref. in E. V." The Apostle's frequent appeal to God (2 Cor. i. 28; xi. 31; Phil. i. 8; 1 Thess. ii. 5, 10; Gal. i. 20) is a devout recognition of God's omniscience, and hence an act of worship. It disproves the literal interpretation of Matt. v. 33 ff., which prohibits perjury, and all useless and thoughtless swearing. Comp. Tholuck, Die Beredheit, p. 263 ff. (5th ed.).—P. S.]

Who I serve in my spirit. The idea of the real service of God, which so powerfully pervades the Epistles to the Romans, first appears with the λατεριον (see ver. 21; chap. ii. 29; iii. 28; v. 2; ix. 1; xv. 16; xvi. 25—27; comp. Acts vii. 7). As such a λατεριον, he stands before God. But he serves Him in his spirit; that is, his priesthood is not merely external, but the living service of God by a spiritually awakened, vital, and steadfast consciousness.* Grotius and Reicke have found in the λατεριον, an anachronistic relation to the Jewish priesthood, which Meyer thinks to be an inexact idea unfetched. But we are rather of the opinion that the Apostle is still thinking of all external character of worship, and especially that of the heathen Romans. [Umbreit, approvingly quoted by Alford: "The Apostle means that he is an intelligent, true priest of his God, not in the temple, but in his spirit; not at the altar, but at the gospel of His Son." λατεριον (παλατίον) and λατεριαν (παλατιαν) are used in the Septuagint of the ministrations of the Jewish priesthood in the temple (comp. Luke i. 29, LXX.); and in the New Testament, applied to the Christian ministry, and to worship generally (Matt. iv. 10; Phil. ii. 17). The words λατεριον, &c., give additional force to his solemn assurance, and attest its sincerity.—P. S.—In the gospel of his Son. (Genitive of the object.) His spirit is the temple, the sphere of his service; the gospel of the Son of God in the great work of evangelization, is the substance and form of his service of God. How without ceasing. Meyer: &c. does not stand for οὐ, (as it is usually taken, even by Tholuck), but expresses the mode (the degree). ] This thanking without ceasing is not only more precisely defined, but more exactly conditioned by what follows.

Ver. 10. Always in my prayers. His spiritual longing and striving are directed toward Rome; therefore he is ever (and everywhere. Berechneider: Ubicunque locorum et quovis tempore. In

THE EPISTLE OF PAUL TO THE ROMANS.

(Meyer), but an acknowledgment that the Romans were already in the faith, together with an intimation that something was still wanting in them.

In order that ye may be strengthened (see chap. xvi. 25). This is the object of the charismatic communication. [Paul uses the passive στηρίξασθαι, since he is simply the instrument through which God Himself strengthens and invigorates the spiritual life in man; comp. xvi. 25: του δυνατον ἢνα στηρίξασθαι, and 2 Thess. ii. 17. — P. S.]

Ver. 12. That is, I may be comforted together with you, &c. The connection of the two objects serves to explain one as well as the other. The Apostle wishes that the Romans be strengthened by him (the choice of the passive is not merely an expression of modesty, but also of the information that the matter is not of human choice, but that the blessing must come from the Lord), not only in their faith in general, but also in their peculiar calling as Roman Christians in their central relation to the world. And the result therefrom will be, that the Apostle will be encouraged and aided in his universal apostleship. The addition, that is, &c., is therefore not a sanct adulatio (Erasmus), nor a safeguard against the appearance of presumption (Meyer), but the statement of his whole purpose. This purpose is not to seek comfort and consolation among them, as the συναισθανασθαι, to feel, to become one (συναίσθησις in the New Testament) is explained by many, in harmony with the Peshito and Vulgate; but he will find Christian encouragement among them when they are strengthened (Meyer). Yet this is not only "in general," but with a view to his Western mission. The συναισθανασθαι does not include the readers (Fritzsche), but is related as a termination to the στηρίξασθαι of the Romans. This can be seen by the following: By our common (reciprocal) faith, both yours and mine. This is a brief form of expression (Reiche, Van Hengel, and others, supply the εν αὕλης with an ἐννοιμαίνειν). He declares the fact that the communion of faith should serve for the reciprocal promotion of the faith. Fritzsche and Schott miss ἐνει, but this is implied in the words of the first person in ver. 11.

Ver. 13. But I would not have you ignorant of one known form of announcement, especially of something new and important (chapt. xxv. 1 Cor. x. 1; 1 Thess. iv. 13). — That oftentimes I purposed, &c. Together with the Apostle's other impediments, it is of special consideration that, after every missionary journey, he found it necessary to return to Jerusalem in order to establish the unity of his new congregation with the mother church. Many delays were occasioned also by the necessary inspection and review of his organized churches, their internal disturbances, and the persecutions on the part of the Jews. The fact that he desired first to establish his mission in the East, he could not call an impediment. Meyer points to chapt. xxv. 22. [So does Alford.] But the Apostle seems to intimate here (according to vers. 20, 21) that he must prepare the church at Rome, as a church already existing, for his visit (by sending out of his churches a sketch of their work). — Therefore hindered neither by the devil (1 Thess. li. 18, nor by the Holy Ghost (Acts xvi. 6), for his general hinderance is specified in these terms. — That I might have some fruit. Harvest-fruit, as a laborer. The figure is frequent (Phil. i. 23) [John iv. 31; xvi. 16; Col. i. 6. The "fruit" is not the result of Paul's labor, or his reward, but the good works of the Roman Christians who have been planted to bring forth fruit to God. This fruit the Apostle expected to gather to and present to God Alford.—P. S.]. The choice of the expression is evidently a new evidence of his delicacy and modesty. We cannot urge that στηρίξαι is the antithesis of ἱημερίζεσθαι (Meyer: gelinden (καταπληκτή) and obtain (Kölner). — Among you also. The σαλιν intensifies the comparison, in lively expression. The expression, ἤδην, is used here to indicate definitely the Gentiles; first, because the Romans, as Romans, are Gentiles, from whom the remaining Gentiles are distinguished as such; then, because he has hitherto labored as the Apostle to the Gentiles. See the Exeg. Note on ver. 14. Schott: — There runs, from vers. 11-18, this thought: The Apostle Paul, in preparing himself for apostolic preaching in the midst of the Western Gentile world, regards it necessary to secure the Roman Church as a point of support and departure — so to speak, as a base of operations. While this opinion is correct enough as far as the definiteness of his aim is concerned, the Apostle was far from regarding Rome merely as the means for an end, without first having chiefly in view the purpose of edifying the Roman Church for its own sake.

Ver. 14. To Greeks and to Barbarians. What is the desire of his heart and his effort, is at the same time his calling and the duty of his office. His apostleship belongs to the whole Gentile world, and for this reason incidentally also to the Jews. Therefore, in consequence of the existing unity of Greek and Roman culture, the Greeks and the Romans are combined under the term Greeks, in antithesis to the so-called Barbarians (Cicero, De Foa. li. 15: Non solum Graecia et Italia, sed etiam omnis barbaria), just as the term wise comprehends Jews and Greeks (1 Cor. i. 26), and the unwise those barbarian nations who stood lowest in intellectual culture. — The antithesis of Greeks and Barbarians means, according to the original Greek usage, Greeks and non-Greeks — the latter as uncivilized Barbarians in a national sense. It is in this sense that this precious passage is to be understood. But a time when Greek was written in Rome, and to Rome, the word undoubtedly indicated an historical antithesis of culture, according to the expression quoted from Cicero, and Paul, with his refined feeling, could hardly have chosen the word in the former restricted sense, (Ambrosiaster, and others.) Meyer objects that the Romans were nowhere enumerated as Hellenes. But this is certainly the case in ver. 16, where the Hellenes represents heathendom in general. Comp. chapt. xlii. 10; Acts 12; and the many antitheses of a similar kind.

* [Baedeker—an onomatopoetic word imitating a rough sounding, unintelligible language—means originally simply a foreigner, a man speaking a strange tongue (1 Cor. i. 11; comp. 1 Cor. iv. 14; Barbarum, στρατηγὸν vutil' ), and does not necessarily imply reproach, but the Greeks, with their pride of race and culture, and the Romans, with their pride of race and stage, looked upon all other nations. Hellen and Barbarian refers to the distinction of language and race; wise and unwise, to the difference of natural intelligence and culture in every nation. Rome, being "an epitome of the world," included representatives of all nations and all modes of existing in other nations. It was mixed in here; the Apostle speaks simply of his indebtedness to the whole Gentile world without distinction of race and culture.—P. S.]
character in the Acts of the Apostles, and in the other Pauline Epistles. Therefore Meyer's statement is unsatisfactory, that Paul would only express his Gentile-apostolic obligation in its universality, and that he does this in double negative form, as well according to nationality as according to the degree of culture. The sense certainly is, that he is pledged to all Gentiles. In this relation, he is *διατελέσας in the sense of indededness, which he assumed at his call. See 1 Cor. ix. 10.*

Ver. 15. *So, as far as lies in me, I am ready. So far as it depends on him, he is not only willing, but determined; his inclination corresponds to his indededness (προθυμόν του προθυμου), and a substantive = προδίδωμι.—P. S.*

Ver. 16. *According to the S. Fritzsche rationalism, in confessionalism my his correct think Gentiles. variously Although truly The is "its other is and ready. —in the in tive circumstances. But From Wordsworth the De Wette and also Meyer [in the third edition of 1869, but not in the fourth. —P. S.] are for the first: As far as I am concerned, there is readiness. [This explanation connects to with κατ ἐμι, and takes προδίδωμι in the predicate, as a substantive = προδίδωμι.—P. S.] Reiche [Calvin, Philippus, Van Hengel, and Meyer, in the fourth edition of 1865, where he gives up his former view.—P. S.] are for the second: And so am I —as far as lies in me—ready. Fritzsch is for the third: My readiness, or desirability, is, that κατ ἐμι in this case is taken as a mere periphrase for ἔθνος, but it has an emphasis, and expresses Paul's sense of dependence on a higher will.—P. S.] Tholuck is for the fourth: So, for my part, I am ready. —Tholuck, though not very decisively, follows Beza (Quidquid in me situm est, id promptum est), Grotius, Bengel, and Rückert, and takes to κατ ἐμι as the subject of the sentence = ἔθνος, and προδίδωμι as an adjective and as the predicate: I am ready. But Meyer objects that το κατ ἐμι is never used as a periphrase for the personal pronoun; ἐκ ἐρωτα for ἔθνος, and κατ ἐμι for ἔθνος not being parallel.—P. S.] I think the explanation of Reiche the correct one. For further particulars, see De Wette, Tholuck, and Meyer. Theodore Schott explains the οἰκέως under such circumstances, and translates thus: Under such circumstances it is my present inclination. But Paul has not at all spoken of circumstances. He asserts that οἰκέως used absolutely, never means ἐπίθετον, but always "under this condition, these circumstances." But as the circumstances may be attending, so they may be causative; comp. Rom. v. 12.—To you also who are in Rome. Schott thinks that by these words are meant, not the Christians in Rome, but the Gentile inhabitants of Rome! The natural conclusion from this view would be, that his Epistle also must have been designed for the Gentiles in Rome. Certainly he had in view from the start, besides the Christians, those Gentiles also who were yet to be converted [ροιν ἐν Πόντῳ is emphatically added, since Rome, the "caesari et theatrum orbis terrarum," could least of all be excluded from that general apostolic commission. Bengel and Meyer.—P. S.]*

**DOCTINAL AND ETHICAL.**

1. The point of connection (ver. 8). Every Pauline Epistle has its definite point of connection. So, too, has every apostolic sermon of Peter, Paul, and John. This is as much a vital law for proper Christian preaching, as for missions. See the connecting point in Acts xvi. The doxological character of this section. Without gratitude for what is given, there is no real continuance, still less any real progress. Gratitude must also be sanctified by working in Christ.


3. The difference between the longing of the Apostle for Rome, and the longing of the modern world for Rome. If the Pauline Christianity of the Evangelical Church were not so much paralyzed by the indifference of humanitarianism, by the hatred and ignorance of rationalism, and by the morbid literalism of confessionalism and sectarianism, it would be able to wield the weapons of the Spirit as heroically against mediaval Papal Rome—which is now besieged at so many points—as Paul, the poor tent-maker, combated pagan, imperial Rome. Still, the gospel of God will triumph in the end.


5. The impediments (ver. 16). Although the Apostle knew well that on the absolute height of faith all impediments are only means of advance for believers (Rom. viii. 28), he yet speaks of impediments with a truly human feeling. But each of these impediments marks a point where he surrenders to God his desire to pass beyond those sacred limits through which an enthusiast would have violently broken.

6. How Paul subsequently attained the object of his wishes, though not according to human purposes, but according to the counsel of God; first as a prisoner, and last as a martyr.

**HOMILITICAL AND PRACTICAL.**

How the Apostle introduces himself to the Church at Rome: 1. As remembering it in prayer (vers. 8-10); 2. as desiring its personal acquaintance (vers. 11, 12); 3. as previously prevented from visiting it and fulfilling his obligation (vers. 13-15).—The truly Christian manner of introducing one's self to strange people. Praise without flattery (ver. 8).—Under what circumstances can we call on God to witness? 1. When we are conscious that we serve Him; 2. when the matter in hand is sacred (ver. 9).—We cannot always do what we would (vers. 11-13).—For what purpose should Christian friends visit each other? 1. To give; 2. to receive (vers. 11, 12).—Paul a debtor to the Greeks and to the Barbarians, to the wise and the unwise: In what did his education consist? 2. When did he as knowledge it? 3. How did he desire to discharge it?
III.
The Fundamental Theme.

16 For I am not ashamed of the gospel of Christ: \[omitting Christ\]; for it is the power of God [God's power] unto salvation to every one that believeth; to the

17 Jew first, and also to the Greek. For therein is the righteousness of God [God's righteousness] revealed from faith to faith: as it is written, The just
[The righteous] shall live by [of] faith (Hab. ii. 4).\(^1\)

TEXTUAL.

\(^1\) Ver. 6.—The Codex A. B. C. D., &c., read \(\tauο\) \(\epsilon\)\(\gamma\)\(\gamma\)\(λ\)\(ν\) \(\tauο\) \(\chi\)\(ρ\)\(ι\)\(σ\)\(τ\)\(ο\), so do nearly all the critical editors, Mill, Bengel, Grimm, Lachmann, Textorius, Alford, Wordsworth, &c. The words are found in the Complutensian Text and in Ersevit, and are defended by Web-

\(\sigma\)\(τ\)\(ο\) and Mathæus.—F. S.]
CHAPTER I. 16, 17. 78

* Ver. 17.—The σπέρμα is left out by Cod. B. and G. *not A., as Lange has it*; probably because it has an offensive appearance. [MSS. N. A. C. D. K. L. have it. Tischendorf, Meyer, Alford, and others retain it. Lachmann puts it in brackets.—P. S.]

* Ver. 17.—This is a free translation of the Hebrew (Hab. ii. 4): מְגַּמֵּר הַיִּשְׂרָאֵל. *Itt., the righteous* shall live in (by) his faithfulness. The Masoretic accentuation, however, connects the first two words: The righteous in his faith, shall live. *The Hebrew שֶׁרֶם and the Christian σπέρμα both rest on the fundamental idea of trust in God.* Paul follows in his rendering the Septuagint, but properly omits the μόνος, ἐπικατάστασις insures a τοιχον ἡμῶν ἑορτάς. Vulgate: justus in Alpha sua visu. Most commentators connect εἰς πίστεις with the verb εὐφράτευ. But Dr. Lange, with Blass and Meyer, connects εἰς πίστεις with δίκαιος, and translates: He that is righteous by faith, shall live. [See the Zeryh. Note.—P. S.]

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

**Third Section.—The fundamental theme.** The joy of the Apostle to proclaim the gospel of Christ, since it is a power of God for Jews and Gentiles as a revelation of the righteousness of God—a righteousness by faith and for the faith.

Ver. 16. For I am not ashamed [not even in the metropolis of the heathen world.—P. S.].

Evidently, this general declaration refers not merely to ver. 15, but also to ver. 14. There could be no difficulty to the Apostle to preach to the believers in Rome; but it was difficult to preach to the whole Gentile world, especially to its wise men, who were so much inclined to despise the gospel as foolishness. And finally, it was particularly difficult to preach to the Gentiles in the proud metropolis of Rome, the central seat of the culture and pride of the ancient world. It is plain from ver. 16, *you that are at Rome,* that he would not confine himself to the congregation of Christians in Rome. The designation of his disposition is exact in relation to that pride of wisdom which everywhere opposed him, as he had experienced particularly in Athens and Corinth. He is not afraid of the threats of the world; he does not avoid the offence of the Jews; nor is he ashamed in view of the contempt of the Greeks and of the wise men. And this is not only expressive of his real joy in general, but of his Christian enthusiasm, by which he could glory in the cross of Christ (Rom. v. 2; Gal. vi. 14).

*I am not ashamed,* is an answer, by anticipation, to an objection which was readily suggested by the word *Rome,* with all its associations of idolatry, worldly power, pride, pomp, corruption, decay, and approaching persecution of Christians. Tacitus, the heathen historian, says of Rome, that there *cuncta mundique atrocia aut pudenda confestim celebraturque* (Annal. xx. 44). See Chrysostom, Alford, Wordsworth, Hodge in loc. Meyer explains the term more with reference to the past experiences of Paul in other heathen cities, as Athens, Corinth, Ephesus, and to the general character of the religion of the cross (1 Cor. i. 13). It is true that human nature, as a result of sin, is ready to be ashamed of the gospel. But this carnal pride culminated at the time in Rome, and found a fit expression in the blasphemous worship of the emperors as present deities. That Paul has special reference to Rome, is also evident from his designation of the gospel as a *power of God,* which puts to shame the world-power of Rome (*δύναμις, strength*). Dealing with the Greeks, who excelled in wisdom, he defines the gospel to be the wisdom of God, which turns the wisdom of this world into folly. When afterwards *prisoner in Rome,* Paul was not ashamed of his bonds (2 Tim. i. 12), in which he felt more free, mighty, and happy than the emperor on the throne.—P. S.]

Of the gospel of Christ. Here, also, we cannot separate the concrete unity of the gospel and its promulgation.

*For it is a power of God.* The for announces the reason: it is the highest manifestation of the power of God—the highest manifestation of the compassionate love and grace of God; it is the blessing of salvation for faith throughout the world. The power of God. This cannot apply to the preaching of the gospel alone, but to the objective gospel itself, which combines with evangelization for complete operation. The question whether there is a metonymy † here (see Tholuck), becomes important only when that unity is dissolved. The gospel, in the objective sense, implies: 1. The revelation of God in Christ; 2. redemption by Christ; 3. the victory, the glory, and the kingdom of Christ; 4. the presentation of this salvation through the medium of the Church in word and sacrament, under the operation of the Holy Spirit.†

**Unto salvation.** Both the negative and positive sides of the idea of the σωτηρία must be elucidated, the former denoting redemption, the latter adoption. The operation of σωτηρία reaches from the depths of hell to heaven. When man is truly delivered, he is always delivered from the depths of hell, and raised to the heights of heaven; because he is saved from the condemnation of his condemnation, and from the judgment of wrath, and is made a participant of salvation through the righteousness of faith which leads to righteousness of life. The expression, *blessedness,* denotes the highest effect and the highest aim of the σωτηρία. Comp. Acts iv. 12; xiii. 26; Rom. x. 1. The opposite is ἀπόλους, ἄκατος, and similar terms.

*To every one that believeth.* Be Wette: "The παντικαρία is opposed to Jewish particularism, and the παντικαρία to John's καρπα. The highest object of God's power is not at all a fatalistic or mechanical operation; it is a personal dealing of love, and presupposes personal relations. For..."

*...to every one that believeth.*

† [For δύναμις, δύναμις, comp. 1 Cor. i. 24, where Christ is called δύναμις and δύναμις. P. S.]

† [i. e. Here *propertius instrumenta effectus pro instrumento,* as if we say, the knife, while it is the hand of man that cuts with the knife. So it is the Holy Spirit that operates through the gospel as the instrumentality.—P. S.]

† [δύναμις is not to be removed into divine power (Jowett), but the gospel is a power in and through which God. Himself works (see above, 8. e., so we to save the sinner by rendering him to repentance, faith, and obedience. σωτηρία is gen. autóς or rather postter. Comp. 1 Cor. 1. 18. Alford explains: The bare substantive δύναμις here and 1 Cor. 1. 24 carries a superterative sense; the highest and holiest vehicle of the divine power, the δύναμις est dEcov.] Understood power as necessary to the law in saying, *but a light or teaching, in which man must walk.*—P. S.]

‡ [Or rather: every one, implies the universality; that faith being the apprehending and appropriating organ; Paul says not: to every one who is circumcised, or heathen, or chews the lamb, but, to every one that believeth. Without faith, according to the good works avail nothing. But true saving faith is of course a living faith, including knowledge of the truth, assent to the apostolic confession, and the fruits or good works.—P. S.]
as it cannot be said, on the one hand, that faith completes objective salvation, so we cannot say, on the other, that it is a compulsory operation of salvation. It is the condition of the efficacy of salvation (John iii. 16, &c.; see Gen. xv), the cause apprehended.

To the Jew first. This priority is economical, as it rests upon the Old Testament revelation of God, and the faith of Abraham (chap. iv. 9); and as such it is: 1. The generic priority. "Salvation is of the Jews" [John iv. 22]. 2. The historical priority (Chrysostom, and others). 3. A legal priority (as to form) of the nearest claim to the gospel, in accordance with the direction given to the apostles, Acts i. 8 (Calov, De Wette, Tholuck). But notwithstanding all this, the Jew had no real right to the gospel, since salvation, 1. is not a product of Judaism, but of free grace; 2. faith is older than Judaism (chap. iv.); 3. faith itself is the reality and substance of which Judaism was only the symbol. 4. And also to the Greek. The ElVav is here the representative of all who are not Jews. Jews and Greeks here refer not to the national distinction, as Greek and Barbarian, ver. 14, but to the religious antagonism of the world at the time, so that Greek is equivalent to Gentile. "Ell. x. 2d. is the Greek, Judeo. x. "Ell. the Jewish, designation of all mankind; comp. Acts xiv. 1; 1 Cor. x. 32.—P. S.

Ver. 17. For therein is the righteousness of God. Proof of the present proposition. The δικαιοσύνη θεοίς σωτηρίας is δικαιοποίησις of the δικαιοσύνη θεοί, &c.

Preliminary Philological Remarks on δικαιοσύνη and the Cognate Terms. These are of primary importance in Paul's Epistles, especially the Romans and Galatians. Their root, according to Aristotle (Eth. Nic. v. 2), is δικαίος = twofold; hence δικαιοσύνη, to divide into two equal parts, to judge; δικαστήριον, judge, dispenser of justice. Others derive them from δικαίος (the daughter of Zeus and Themis), custom, right, judgment. At all events, the fundamental idea of δικαιοσύνη is an even relation between two or more parts where each has its due, or conformity to law and custom, a normal moral condition. According to Homer, he is δικαιότατος who best fulfils his duties to God and men. Plato develops the idea of righteousness in his Politi, and identifies it with the moral goodness of the State. To the Hebrew, the will of God, as expressed in the written law, and more fully in the perfect life of Christ, is the standard both of morals and religion, which are always viewed as essentially connected. God is righteous—i.e., absolutely perfect in Himself, and in all His dealings with His creatures, and requires man to aim at this perfection (Matt. v. 48). Accordingly, we may define the several terms (referring to the dictionaries and concordances for passages) as follows:

δικαιοσύνη, δικαιοποίησις, δικαστήριον, conform to the law, inwardly as well as outwardly, holy, perfect. It is used in the absolute sense of God, in a relative sense of man, also of things. Du Cange: "A δικαιοσύνη δικαστηρίον, de re vel de persona, in qua nec absumit aliquid nec definit, quae numeri suo par est, numeris suis abae lida."

δικαιοσύνη, δικαιοποίησις, δικαστήριον, justice, the normal moral and religious condition. If used of man, it means conformity to the holy will and law of God, godliness, or true piety toward God, and virtue toward man. If used of God, it is one of His moral attributes, essentially identical with His holiness and goodness, as manifested in His dealings with His creatures, especially with men.

δικαιοσύνη (δικαίος τις δικαιοσύνης), δικαιοποίησις, δικαστήριον, to put right with the law, i.e., to declare or pronounce one righteous, and to treat him accordingly. Etymologically, the word ought to mean, to make just (since the verbs in δίκα, derived from adjectives of the second declension, signify, to make a person or thing what the primitive denotes, as τυφλός, δολωμένον, ὀρθός, γαμφός, τείνωνος = τυφλόν, &c., ποιεῖν). But in Hebrew and Hellenistic, and often also in classical usage, it has a forensic sense, to which, however, when used of God, the objective state of things, either preceding or succeeding, must correspond, for God's justice can never act without His declaration; and His declaration is always effective. More precisely, this, ad viii. 13 and iii. 21—31. Now for the particular explanation of δικαιοσύνη theos in our passage.

δικαιοσύνη, δικαιοποίησις, δικαστήριον, a righteous decree, judgment, ordinance.—P. S.

In view of the widely divergent explanations, it is necessary to make close distinctions. The righteousness of God, understood absolutely in its complete New Testament revelation, or ἀποκάλυψις, cannot be applied immediately to righteousness before God (ἐνίσχυσιν τοῦ θεοῦ), in which case the genitive is taken objectively in a wider relation (thus Luther, Fritzsche, Baur, Philippi). For this righteousness of faith presupposes justification. Nor can the word of itself denote the act of justification, though if we connect with it the resultant, the righteousness of faith, the genitive being taken in this case subjectively* in this sense: "the righteousness which proceeds from God, the right relation in which man is placed by a judicial act of God" (Meyer, after Chrysostom, Bengel, De Wette, and others). For the justification presupposes the atonement (chap. iii. 25), and the atonement is founded on the exercise of God's righteousness. To this exercise the Apostle evidently refers in chap. iii. 25, 26, and be therefore does it here also in the theme, which, from its very nature, must encompass the whole idea of the Epistle. Absolute righteousness, like absolute grace and truth, is first revealed in Christianity. It is the righteousness which not only institutes the law of the letter, and requires righteousness in man, and, in its character of judge, pronounces sentence

* Or as genitive of origin and procession. See Meyer.—P. S.

[So also Alford : "God's righteousness—not His attribute or righteousness, but the righteousness flowing from and acceptable to Him." He then subjoins De Wette's note. Hodge: "The righteousness which God gives, and which He approves." He also quotes the remark of De Wette: "All interpretations which overlook the idea of imputation, as is done in the explanation by the Christians, and also in that of Grothus, are false." M. Stuart confounds δικαιοσύνη with δικαιοποίησις and explains: "Dikaiosuynth theoc is the justification of which God is the author."—P. S.]
The righteousness of God is the self
communication of the righteousness which proceeds from God, which becomes personal righteousness in the person of Christ, which, in His passion as propitiation, satisfies the righteousness of the law (in harmony with the requirement of conscience), and, by the act of justification, applies the atonement to the believer for the sanctification of his life.

As the δείκνυσι, which avails before God, can be none other than the δείκνυσι, which proceeds from God, and became personal in Christ, so can the righteousness which avails before God be none other than a righteousness which comes from God. It is the δείκνυσιν εκ θεοῦ, in opposition to the δείκνυσιν τοῦ νόμου, chapter x. 5. Therefore it is God's righteousness also in this sense, that man can never make out of it a righteousness of his own, though the Divine justification becomes the principle of his new life. Tholuck likewise allows a combination of the objective and subjective meanings, but decidedly rejects the interpretation of δείκνυσιν as an attribute of God, which he considers incompatible with the prophetic passage adduced. But this quotation does not explain righteousness, but faith. The statement of Tholuck, that Hofmann (Schriftheiße, i. 625 f.) describes the δείκνυσιν θεοῦ as an attribute of God, is not exact; he declares it only as a righteousness existing on the part of God.*

We go so far as to understand by righteousness of God, the perfect righteousness of God in Himself, the perfect righteousness of love—a synthesis which, as grace according to its different relations under the supremacy of righteousness, and as the grace that establishes the new and the absolute right of the Spirit, is called righteousness, but which, under the supremacy of love, as the fountain of the new life, is called love. This impartial righteousness is revealed to believers as grace, and to unbelievers as wrath. When Tholuck says that θεοῦ is not the righteousness of God in fulfillment of the promises (Ambrose), nor retributive justice (Origens), nor the essential righteousness which belongs to God (as Osiander once taught, and recently Hofmann), nor the goodness of God (Morus), nor impartiality toward Jews and Gentiles (Sculer), he has collected into one all the youxiq member of the central idea, that the δείκνυσιν (from δείκειν, a relation between two, according to the Aristotelian derivation of the word), establishes, maintains, and restores the relation between the personal God and the personal world according to their respective character (for the protection of personality). The omission of the article does not justify as in reading here, a righteousness of God; being inseparably connected with θεοῦ, it means rather the proper righteousness of God (see Winer's Grammatik).

Upon the whole, I agree with this interpretation. The majority of evangelical commentators restrict the δείκνυσιν θεοῦ to God's justifying righteousness; some even ungrammatically identify it with justification (δείκνυται), or God's "method of justification." The fundamental idea of the Epistle as set forth in the theme, every expression used in verses 16 and 17, and the contrast presented in verse 18, point to a more comprehensive meaning, answering to the definition of the gospel as "the power of God unto salvation," full and final, from "all ungodliness and unrighteousness of men." This implies a righteousness imputable as well as imputable, or sanctifying as well as justifying—a righteousness inherent in God, and manifested in Christ, which, by a living union with Christ, is to become the personal property and higher nature of the believer, so that, at the final judgment, no trace of unrighteousness will remain. Wordsworth (An American) and Forbes (a Scotch Presbyterian LL.D.) independently arrive substantially at the same view with Lange. Wordsworth in loco says: "This significant phrase, the righteousness of God, is not to be lowered, weakened, and impaired, so as to mean only the method of justification by which God acquits and justifies mankind. But it is the very righteousness of God Himself, which is both imputed and imparted to men in Jesus Christ 'the Righteous' (John i. 1), who is 'the Lord our righteousness' (Jer. xxiii. 6; xxxiii. 16), and who, being God from everlasting, and having also taken the nature of man, is made righteousness to us (1 Cor. i. 30), and does effectually, by His incarnation, and by our incorporation into Him, justify us believing on Him, and making Him ours by faith, so that we may not only be acquitted by God, but may become the righteous and perfect righteousness of God in Him (2 Cor. v. 21)." Forbes, in a long and able dissertation (Anl. Com., p. 105 ff.), combines here the three Scripture meanings of δείκνυσιν, when used of God, viz.: 1. God's retributive righteousness or justice (now manifested in God's condemnation of sin, shown in giving His Son to die for man's sin on the cross—to induce thereby the believer to concur cordially in its condemnation in himself); 2. God's justifying righteousness (now manifested in Christ's exhibition in the character of man a perfect righteousness—imputable to and appropriate by the believer, for his pardon and acceptance with God); 3. God's sanctifying righteousness (also manifested in Christ as "the Lord our righteousness," changing the believer's heart the moment he is united by faith to Christ, and progressively purifying within him all sin, and imparting eventually to him the righteousness—appropriate, if so to speak, as the manner through faith by the believer)."
THE EPISTLE OF PAUL TO THE ROMANS.

Notes on chaps. ii. 18, and iii. 21-31: Doctrinal and Ethical on iii. 21-31, No. 5; also the following works: Winter, Progr. de voces, digamma, digamma et digamma in P. ad Rom. Ep., Leipzig, 1851; Rauwenhoff, Dissertatio de loco Paulino, qui est de digamma, Lugd. Bat., 1852; Lipsius, Die hebräische Rechtsstellung, und Verschiedenheit, Gerit Vennest, van Loeper (who differs from Lipsius), Leipzig, 1853 (229 pp.); Schmid, Biblische Theologie, Stuttgart, 1875, vol. ii. p. 331 ff.; Wiesler, Com. on Gal. ii. 16, Göttingen, 1859, p. 176 ff. (who very earnestly and ably defends the orthodox Protestant view); Hodge, on Romans, ii. 20 (new ed., Philad., 1866, p. 126 ff.); Forbes, on Romans (Edinb., 1868), pp. 102-144. The doctrinal tracts on justification by faith will be mentioned hereafter, ad iii. 21-31, Doctrinal and Ethical, No. 5, pp. 138 f.—P. S.

Is revealed [ἀποκαλύφθη] is being revealed; the present tense marks the continuous, progressive revelation of righteousness.—P. S.

The apokalυφθη is distinguished from the φανερόν by being God's revelation, which proceeds from God, and addresses itself to the inward spiritual world (Gal. iv. 6). Paul, while he employs the same epithet, represents the same revelation as manifested in the outward life from the inward spiritual world (John ii. 11). The revelation of wrath is also an ἀποκαλυφθης (ver. 18), although the wrath is revealed in external manifestation; for it is only by the conscience, that the facts connected therewith are first recognized as the phenomena of wrath, and it is only in the light of the New Testament truth that they are recognized completely. *ἐν αὐτῷ.* The gospel is the medium.

From faith to faith. [It is connected with the verb ἀποκαλύφθη as by De Wette, Meyer, Tholuck (edi.), Alford; with the noun διάκωσιν (ἐκ. ὁσιά or γνώσεων) by Bengel, Philippus, Hodge, Forbes. The former agrees better with the position of the words, and with τῇ πίστει, the latter with τῷ πνεύματι, comp. Rom. i. 30; x. 6.—P. S.] The idea of faith appears here in accordance with the comprehensive idea of righteousness, and therefore as a heavenly, trustful self-surrender (to rest and lean upon, γνώσθη), which inculces both knowledge and belief, ascent and surrender, approprition and application. [Faith is neither the efficient cause nor the objective ground of justification, but the instrumental cause and subjective condition; as eating is the condition of nourishment. As the nourishing power is in the food, which, however, must be received and digested before it can be of any use, so the saving power is in Christ's person and work, but becomes personally available, and is made our own, only by the appropriating organ of faith. This appropriation and assimilation must be continually renewed; hence ἐκ πνεύματος τῆς πίστεως.—P. S.] The distinction between from faith and to faith is variously explained. Origen refers it to Old Testament and New Testament faith. [Eccen- ments [Ohlhausen, De Wette, Alford, Philippus]: ἀπό πίστεως ἐκ πνεύματος [for the believers; comp. iii. 22, where the δια. ὁσιά is said to be ἐκ πνεύματος τοῖς πνεύματος.—P. S.]. Theophrasth and others: For the promotion of faith. Luther: From weak to strong faith. *But matægraph-Crusius: From faith as conviction to faith as sentiment. Wette: 1. Faith as condition and 2. Faith as receptive. For further meanings, see Tholuck (also the view of Zwingli, that the second πίστεως means the faithfulness of God). [Meyer: The revelation of righteousness proceeds from faith and aims at faith, ἐκ ἰδιεκτερίας (similarly Fritzsche, Tholuck). Bengel and Hodge connect ἐκ πνεύματος τῆς πίστεως with διάκωσιν, and take it as intensive, like the phrase, "death unto death," "life unto life," so as to mean fides meretem, entire faith, without any works. Forth understands ἐκ πνεύματος of Divine faith, which, must meet the former.—P. S.] It may be asked, if the key to the passage may not be sought in chap. iii. 22, since the second half of that chapter is in general a commentary on this passage. Comp. Heb. xii. 2: "The author and finisher of our faith." At all events, the Apostle acknowledges, like the author of the Epistle to the H e b r o w s, the difference between degrees of faith which receives the revelation prophetically and apostolically, in order to proclaim it, and a more general degree of faith, which, through the agency of preaching, extends into the world. Comp. Heb. xi. 1 ff.

As it is written. The same quotation from Hab. ii. 4 is found in Gal. iii. 11 and Heb. x. 8. The Apostle will here (as in ver. 2 and chaps. iv. and x.) prove the harmony of the gospel with the Old Testament. The passage in the Prophet Habakkuk declares: The just shall live by his confidence, his faith (Is. xxviii. 16). Therefore the most of the elder expositors, and some of the recent ones (Philippus, and others), thus explained the maxim of the Apostle: The just shall live by his faith. But according to Beza, Meyer [Hodge], and others, the Apostle's expression must be construed thus: The man who is justified by faith, shall live. Meyer properly says: Paul had a good reason to put this meaning into the prophetic expression: since the just man, if he would live by faith, must have been justified by faith. We read in Habakkuk two concrete definitions: Behold, puffed up [τυφλὸς ἐν ἑαυτῷ], not upright is his soul [θλίψαυ] within him [ὁ ἑαυτῷ πασχόντα]. But the just man, he shall live by his faith." That is, as the puffed-up soul is puffed up because it is not upright, and has no sound life, so is it the mark of the just man that he acquires his life by faith. The additional profundity which the New Testament gives to this Old Testament expression, does therefore not really change even the expression, much less the sense. [I prefer the connection of ἐκ πνεύματος with σωτηρία, which is more agreeable to the Hebrew (although the other is favored by the Masoretic accentuation), and this is adopted also by Tholuck.

* [This is only a modification of the preceding explanation, and is substantially held also by Erasmian, Melanchthon, Calvin, Beza, Wordsworth, Forbes. The sense is: Beginning and ending with faith, from one degree of faith to another; faith is a vital principle and constant growth, receiving grace for grace, going on, till it is transformed from glory to glory. Development is the law of spiritual as well as of physical life; but in all the stages of growth of Christian life, the vital principle is the same; hence ἐκ πνεύματος ἐκ πνεύματος, from out of faith as the root, unto faith as the blossom and fruit; faith, as Bengel says, is the vital principle of salvation, the kindling of a ship—if, e. c. all in all. Comp. and ἐφέ, ἐκ μεταβατικὰς ἐκ glory to glory," 2 Cor. iii. 18, and "from strength to strength," Ps. lxxxvii. 2—Ps. 81.]
CHAPTER I. 16. 17.

De Wette, Philippi, Delitzsch (ad Hab. ii. 4), Ewald, Forsee. See Textual Note * above. The sense, however, is not essentially altered. The emphasis lies, at all events, on πίστις, which is, of course, *living* faith. τὰ γεγενέσθαι is to be taken in the full sense of the λόγος ωνόμας, as revealed in Christ. The Apostle, as Delitzsch remarks, puts no forced meaning into the words of the prophet, but simply places them into his light of the New Testament. Habakkuk ends where Paul begins.—P. S.]

DOCTRINAL AND ETHICAL.

1. The fundamental theme. The joyfulness of the Apostle in anticipation of preaching the gospel without shame even in Rome, the central seat of the conceit of human wisdom. The source of this cheerfulness: The gospel is the power of God, &c. The heroic spirit of faith, philanthropy, and hope, elevates him above all hesitation. But how far is the gospel a power of God? See ver. 7, and the Exeg. Notes thereon. Especially on the righteousness of God, and the two fundamental forms of faith (the faith which has established preaching, and the faith which is established by preaching).

2. St. Bernard: *Justus ex fide sua vivat, utique in vitam et ipse: alter quomodo vitam dabat, si ipse sit mortua* (The just man shall live by his faith, if his faith itself live; otherwise how shall that which is itself death, give life?).*—P. S.]

3. "If the subject of the Epistle is to be stated in few words, these should be chosen: τὰ ἱστογένεια, δύναμις Θεοῦ τα ἀποκάλυψες παντὶ τῷ πνεύματι. This expresses it better than merely *justification by faith," which is, in fact, only a subordinate part of the great theme—only the condition necessitated by man's sinfulness for his entering the state of salvation: whereas the argument extends beyond this, to the death unto sin and life unto God and carrying forward of the sanctifying work of the Spirit, from its first fruits even to its completion!" Alford, Forbes (Adab. Com., p. vii.) likewise denies that justification by faith, especially if presented in a bare, forensic form, is the leading doctrine of the Epistle. The grand truth here enunciated is the warm, living reality of a personal union with Christ (contrasted with the previous union with Adam), by which, in place of the sin unto death communicated by the first head of humanity, Christ's righteousness and life are communicated to the believer, and become the inward quickening mover of every thought, feeling, and action. Thus is the distinction preserved, yet the indissoluble connection clearly evinced, between *justification and sanctification*, as being but two aspects of one and the same union of the believer with Christ—just as the dying branch ingrafted into the living vine is then only reanimated, and may truly be declared to be, a sound, living branch, when the union has taken place—because the assurance is then given of its being made so finally and fully, the vital juices of the vine having already begun to circulate within it."—P. S.]

HOMILETICAL AND PRACTICAL.

Whence is it that many are ashamed of the gospel of Christ? Either, 1. They do not know it fully; or, 2. if they know it, they have not the courage to confess it. Why do we not need to be ashamed of the gospel of Christ? Because, 1. It is of Divine origin; 2. of Divine import; 3. of Divine operation. He who is ashamed of the gospel, is also ashamed of the Lord. True shame comes from God, false shame from the devil. Shame and shame. Christianity the universal religion. The shadows of the law vanished; the stars of Greece grew pale at the rising sun of the gospel. The righteousness which God approves is the chief import of the gospel. The fundamental thought of the Epistle to the Romans is also the fundamental thought of the Reformation.

LUTHER: The power of God is such a force as to elevate man from sin to righteousness, from death to life, from hell to heaven, from the kingdom of the devil to the kingdom of God; and gives him eternal salvation.

STARK: As the gospel is a power of God, he denies it who constantly appeals to his weakness, and presents it in opposition to the gospel. Though the gospel is the power of God, no one will be compelled to be saved, no one possesses his own freedom to resist, and is therefore responsible.

HENGSTENBERG: Who would be ashamed of medicine when he is sick? or of light when he is blind, and would like to see? To whom are those who are ashamed of the words and office of Christ!

LANGE: Many a person is not ashamed of the gospel of Christ; but yet, if he is ashamed to follow Christ, he is in reality ashamed of the gospel itself in its true application and appropriation. Faith is like a bucket, by which we draw grace for grace from that fulness of Jesus which contains the gospel.

SIEVER: Faith in Christ, confidence in the grace of God in Christ, is the beginning of our salvation, and will remain its instrument to the end. Therefore, faith must always endure and increase, and will thus grow from faith to faith—from one degree of light and power to another.

BENGEL: No one need be ashamed of what is mighty and Divine (ver. 16).

GROELACH: There is something in the gospel of which the natural man is ashamed; therefore the Apostle confesses that this shame is conquered in his own case. —The effective power of God is not merely in the gospel, but it is the gospel itself. It is not merely strength, from God, but it is His own strength. He works in and through the gospel.

LISCO: The gospel is a power of God; that is, a power in which He operates Himself. Therefore it is a holy, mighty, creative force, capable of saving all who believe it. On our part, faith is the condition that we must fulfill, the way to which we must conform, in order to obtain real salvation and deliverance from temporal and eternal destruction by the gospel. Each one must conquer for himself.

BRÜNNER: The danger of being ashamed of the gospel is easily incurred. Yet it is a shame which is very reprehensible; for, 1. It is a miserable weakness and want of principle to be ashamed of what is best; 2. It is the grossest contempt of God to place the world higher and fear it more than Him; and, 3. It is the meanest ingratitude toward God.

FRIEDRICH: The more the world boasts of its unbelief, the less should true Christians be ashamed of their faith. This is required: 1. For the honor of the truth; 2. the conversion of unbelievers; 3. the salvation of our own souls.

J. P. LANGFRED: How sad the contrast between the
false shame of Christians and the boldness and shamelessness of the world. — Who should be ashamed of the gospel? i. e., 1. Of God’s power and honor; 2. of the deliverance of men for their final salvation; 3. of the grand task of uniting Jews and Greeks (the law and culture) into a higher life. — The twofold confirmatory power of the gospel: 1. The first for: its Divine operation (ver. 16); 2. the second for: its Divine import (ver. 17). — The threefold for: vers. 16, 17), or the three groups of joyful, evangelizing activity. — The righteousness of faith: 1. Very old (Habakkuk); 2. eternally new (Paul, Luther); 3. always confirmed by true life.

[BEKKE]: The power of the gospel is not from the preachers of the gospel; therefore do not idolize them. But they are God’s instruments, and their words are the organ of the Spirit’s power; therefore do not think meekly of them. A justified man lives a more holy, useful, and excellent life than all others; but the life that a justified man lives is always one of faith. — Henry (condensed): The reason why the Apostle made such a bold profession was, that sinners might be saved and believers edified. — MACKNIGHT: The Apostle insinuates with great propriety that the gospel is not an institution like the heathen mysteries, which were concealed from all but the initiated. The precepts of the gospel, being honorable in themselves and beneficial to society, cannot be too openly published. — HODGE: The salvation of men, including the pardon of their sins and the moral renovation of their hearts, can be effected by the gospel alone. — The power of the gospel does not lie in its pure theism, or perfect moral code, but in the cross — in the doctrine of justification by faith in a crucified Redeemer. — Whether we be wise or unwise, orthodox or heterodox, unless we are believers and receive the righteousness which is of God as the ground of acceptance, we have no share in the salvation of the gospel. — Sermons on ver. 16, by B. Whitchurch, John Owen, Bishop Ward, G. Esty, J. Emskin, Bishop Gilbert, Isaac Watts, Bishop Stillingfleet, Zollinger, E. Brackenbury, Geo. Burner, W. Channing, R. McIntyre, and Thomas Arnold. — J. F. H.]

PART FIRST.

The Doctrine of Justification by Faith as the Restoration of the true Glorification of God.

CHAPTERS I.—XI.

FIRST DIVISION.

SIN AND GRACE IN THEIR FIRST ANTITHESIS, THE REALLY RELIGIOUS AND MORAL LIFE. THE ACTUAL ENTRANCE OF CORRUPTION AND SALVATION. GOD’S WRATH AT ALL HUMAN UNRIGHTEOUSNESS; THAT IS, THE WORLD’S REAL CORRUPTION MATURING FOR DEATH, AND HASTENED BY THE JUDGMENT OF GOD; AND THE OPPOSING JUSTIFICATION OF SINNERS THROUGH THE MERCY-SEAT, OR PARDON IN CHRIST IN RESPONSE TO FAITH. THE RIGHTEOUSNESS OF FAITH.

CHAPTERS I., 18.—V. 11.

First Section. — The beginning of all the real corruption of the world, and of the Gentiles in particular, together with the judgment pronounced on it. The neglect of the general revelation of God in creation by the neglect of the real worship of God in thanksgiving and praise (chap. i. 18—21).

Second Section. — The development of Gentile corruption under God’s judicial abandonment (the departure of His Spirit, and the decree of rigor for judgment). From arbitrary symbolism to the worship of images and beasts; from theoretical to practical corruption; from natural to unnatural and abominable sin, to the completion of all kinds of crimes and iniquities, and to the demoniacal lust of evil, and even of evil maxims (chap. i. 22—32).

For the wrath of God [God’s wrath] is revealed [in opposition to that revelation of God’s righteousness, ver. 17] from heaven against all ungodliness [godlessness] and unrighteousness [iniquity] of men, who hold [hold back] the truth in unrighteous—
ness; Because that which may be known [which is known] of God is manifest in them; for God hath shewed [God manifested] it unto [to] them. For the invisible things of him [his unseen attributes] from the creation of the world are [are, since the creation of the world,] clearly seen,' being understood by the things that are made [by means of his works], even his eternal power and Godhead [Divinity, not θεότητα]; so that they are without excuse [inexcusable, ἀναπόλοιον]. Because that, when they knew God [because, knowing God, or, although they knew God, διότι γνώσετο τὸν Θεόν], they glorified him not as God, neither were thankful [they did not glorify him as God, nor give thanks to him as God]; but became vain in their imaginations [thoughts], and their foolish heart was darkened.

22. Professing themselves to be wise, they became fools, And changed [exchanged] the glory of the uncorruptible God into an image made like to corruptible man [for a likeness of an image of corruptible man], and to [of] birds, and fourfooted beasts [quadrupeds], and creeping things [reptiles].

24. Wherefore God also gave them up to uncleanness, through the lusts of their own hearts [God delivered them over, in the lusts of their hearts, to uncleanness], to dishonor their own bodies between themselves [so that their bodies were dishonored among them].

18. For they that do such things shall receive the recompense of their error which was meet [the due reward of their error].

And even as they did not like [And as they did not deem it worthy, or worth while, οὐκ ἔδοκιμαν] to retain God in their knowledge, God gave them over to a reprobate [worthless, ἀδόκιμον] mind, to do those things which are not con-venient [becoming]; 19. Being filled with all unrighteousness, fornication, 20. wick- edness [malice], covetousness, maliciousness [badness]; full of envy, murder, 21. debate [strife, ἐρωῦς], deceit, malignity; whisperers, Backbiters [slanderers], 22. haters of God, 23. despicable undefined: proud, boasters, inventors of evil things 24. villanies, disobedient to parents, Without understanding, covenant-breakers 25. fulfills [practice, πράσοντες] such things are worthy of death, not only do the same, but have pleasure in them that do them [approve of those who practise them, συνενδοκέων τοῖς πράσοντεσ].

TEXTUAL.

1 Var. 18.—Or binder. So Lange and Meyer: aufhellen. This is the meaning of καρέχω here, as in 2 Thess. ii. 7, 8; Luke iv. 43. Comp. the Ezeq. Notes, as also the note of Alford in loc.—P. S.

2 Var. 19.—ὁ δὲ τις, contracted from ὁ δὲ τι, means (like ὁ) originally, proper quod, quam de rebus, quam re, as record of what, wherefore, and draws an inference from the preceding sentence; but in the N. T. it is always, and in the classics occasionally, used in the sense of ὁ δὲ τι, proper quod, quam, because that, because, and assigns a reason for a preceding assertion, like quia, for. It may here give the reason why the wrath of God is revealed, or it may explain the words τῶν τῶν Δα. . . . καρέχων (De Wette, Tholuck, Alford). See Ezeq. Notes. Laissmann, Thier- dorf, Meyer, Alford separate δὲ from ver. 18 simply by a comma; Tholuck, Eitsch. Thielicke, Philip. by a period.—P. S.

3 Var. 19.—τὸ γνωστὸ τοῦ Θεοῦ, quod naturae est Dei (Vulg.). This is the sense of γνωστὸ in the N. T., the Sept., and the Apocrypha (Luke ii. 44; John xviii. 16, 16; Acts 19. 12; iv. 16, &c., as ξειραμμένος means κατανοοῦσα (Acts xviii. 23); while, in the classics, γνωστός usually signifies κατανοοῦσα, erkenntner, as distinct from γνώσις, kwisòs], which word does not occur in the Greek Testament). The authorized versions, therefore, are inconsistent with the biblical (though not with the classical) usage of the term, and conveys a false idea; for the heathen did not know all that may be known of God, but, as clearly appears from what follows, they knew only that which may be learned from the general revelation in the book of nature and reason, as distinct from the special revelation in the Bible and in the person of Christ. To retain the E. V., and to supply (with Robinson, and ywqwto), without revelation, is arbitrary. Lange translates Kenntniss, knowledge; but ywqwto is objective, γνώσις is subjective, and does not suit διάκρισεν δινήν εἰς αὐτόν. There is no warrant in the same sense for identifying the two, unless it be Gn. ii. 9, 10. γνώσις σαλώ τινες νοησεῖν. The Apocalypse avoids the term ywqwto or εἰς ywqwto εἰς τοὺς θεούς which is used in the N. T. of the true knowledge of God in Christ (comp. John xviii. 3), and chose the more general and objective term ywqwto, that which is patent to all men in the works of creation.—P. S.
GENERAL REMARKS.—The whole section, in its progress to the end of the chapter, relates more particularly to the heathen world (Tholuck, Meyer). Yet it describes the corruption in its original form as a general corruption of humanity. The antithesis: Heathendom and Judaism was a subsequent development. See Ver. 22 and 23, constitutes the more definite beginning of heathenism. Tholuck recommends the treatise of Adam, Exercitationes Exegeticae, 1712, pp. 501–738, on the section vers. 18–22. Tholuck remarks: “What the Apostle says of the relations of the Gentile world, and afterwards of the Jews, to God, naturally applies to their universality, or to individuals only in a greater or less degree.” We add: So that a relative opposition is embraced within the general judgment (see chap. ii. 6 E.).

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

First Section, vers. 18–21.

Ver. 18. For God’s wrath is revealed. The ἀπαλλαγμένος of the ὄγγος θυρίου, as the revelation which was historically earlier, is contrasted with. (ἵνα) revelation of the righteousness of God from faith. It is therewith intimated that that righteousness denotes grace, or justifying righteousness; but that the ὄγγος θυρίου is an exercise of penal righteousness which precedes it. The wrath of God, as an emotion of God,
is His personal displeasure at sin as ἀποκλίνεται, as conscious transgression, as apostasy, as unbelief, and therefore as the limitation of His personal revelation in the world. It is a displeasure which is revealed by such decrees of penal justice as death and the terrors of death, especially in retribution for obstructions placed in the way of the divine life (Exod. iv. 14, 24; Ps. xcv. 7, 8), by a decree of blindness in retribution for the hinderances to His truth (the present passages; Is. vi. 10; Rom. ix.; 2 Cor. iii. 14; Matt. xiii. 14; John xii. 40; Acts xxviii. 20), by the abandonment of the lusts of the flesh in retribution for the general rebellion of His Spirit (Eph. ii. 3), and finally, by a decree of reprobation and condemnation in retribution for the hindrances to salvation by apostasy and unbelief (Matt. iii. 7; xxiii. 13; John iii. 36; Rom. v. 9). Comp. my article, Zorn Gottes, in Herzog’s Realencyclopaedie. This ἐγγίζειν ὁ θεός has its ἀποκλίνεται immediately, so far as it is declared to the conscience of man as God’s decree from heaven; but it becomes especially an ἀποκλίνεται by the witness of the law, and is perfected in this by the gospel, which, as a revelation of God’s righteousness, is a real manner from heaven, as a message from the height of the holy, supernatural world, and from the throne of Divine government. And it is revealed in an ideal way by the light of righteousness, which, like a flame of wrath from the kingdom of the Spirit, shines down into the realm of consequently guilty human life, and explains that dark fate. The older writers understood by ἐγγίζειν punishment alone, taking metonymically the operation for the cause (metonymia causa pro effectu = κλάσας, τιμωρία). But we must unite both. The opposite of ἐγγίζειν is not merely ἀγάπη (Tholuck), but ἔλεος (see my Positive Dogmatics, p. 109). According to De Wette [and Alford], wrath is only an anthropomorphical conception of the righteousness of God in punishment; but by this interpretation its procession ἀπ’ ὁμοθυμα is obliterated. The internal ἀποκλίνεται of wrath involves its external κατάρας, but it is one-sided to confine it to the punishmen which God has determined for the heathen world (De Wette), or the wretched condition of the world at that time (Köllner), or to the manifestation of the punishment in the conscience (Tholuck), or in the gospel (Grotius). From the beginning, the deeds of wrath have ever succeeded the ἀποκλίνεται in its opposition to God’s government and revelation. But the complete ἀποκλίνεται thereof does not appear before the New Testament ἀποκλίνεται of grace. The reason of this is, that the world’s guilt reaches its climax in the crucifixion and death of Christ. The ἀποκλίνεται—the rebellion of unbelief to the revelation of the divine light and life (chap. ii. 4, 5; viii. 6, 7)—sums up the whole idea of sin which incurs the guilt of God’s wrath. The idea of the ἐγγίζειν itself is God’s abandonment of man to the judgment of death. And the idea of the ἀποκλίνεται of this ἐγγίζειν is the entire revelation of the judgment of God in the corruption of the world amid the light of the gospel, for the conscience of humanity, especially the body of believers. The idea of the ἀποκλίνεται is the heavenly world in its ideal laws, which lie also at the foundation of the earthly world, and react against all normal conduct with punishment and death. The present, ἀποκλίνεται, must be emphasized; it is neither merely a historical reference to the misery of the old world (Köllner, and others), nor with Chrysostom, and others) a reference to the future day of wrath. It means, rather, a progressive revelation of the judgment in opposition to which the progressive revelation of the righteousness of salvation in the gospel acquires its perfect significance and clearest form. This άπ’ ὁμοθυμα certainly refers chiefly to ἀποκλίνεται, but it is indirectly declared thereby that the ἐγγίζειν ὁ θεός is from heaven, although, as a judgment imminent in life itself, it breaks forth from its internal state, or is caused by it. Special interpretations of the ἐγγίζειν: The religion of the Old Testament (Bengel); storms and natural disasters (Pelagius); external and internal necessities of the times (Baumgarten-Crusius). Against all ungodliness and unrighteousness. The ἀποκλίνεται (godlessness, impiety) is the fundamental form of personal misconduct toward God; but the word is more especially significant in that it describes ungodliness as the absence of reverence for God. See ver. 21. The ἀδικία (unrighteousness, iniquity) is the correspondent fundamental form of misconduct toward God’s law in life, and therefore not toward our neighbor alone. Theophylact, Tholuck, and many others: Φρονησιάς in Daem, injuria in praxim. [So Hodge. άποκλίνεται, impiety toward God; ἀδικία, injustice toward men.—P. S.] Meyer, on the contrary: Irreligiousness and immorality, which is supported by the following description. [Ἀποκλίνεται is the fountain of ἀδικία, but both act and react upon each other.—P. S.]—Of men. Antithesis of ἐγγίζειν. The word signifies, first, the universality of guilt; second, the weakness of man’s enquiry against Almighty God.

Who hold back the truth. Description of the obstructions which, as the wicked reaction against the revelation of God, cause the reaction of Divine revelation in the form of the ἐγγίζειν. The truth is the revelation of God in its most general sense, as the unity and harmony of all the single Divine acts of revelation. But a special reference here to the natural revelation of God (vers. 19, 20); although the doctrines of the gospel (of which Ammon explains ἀποκλίνεται) must not be excluded from the general idea, nor must the natural knowledge of God be substituted for the revelation of God. The κατέχειν (to grasp, to hold, here with the necessary idea of holding back) strikingly denotes hindrance, keeping back (Meyer, improperly, keeping down); as in the case with κατεκλείσαι in John i. 5.* An odd explanation is this: “Who possess the truth with unrighteousness; that is, sin against better knowledge” (Michaelis, Koppe, Baur).—In

* [Wordsworth in loc. : “Holding, keeping down, the truth in unrighteousness, as in a prison-house. Man have imitated the truth, and hold her captive under restraint and durance, with the bare and bolt of a deceived will and violent habits, so that she cannot go forth and brings the light, and do works suitable to her own nature.” The passage implies, however, that man has the remnants of the Divine Image imprinted in Adam, be may fall still deeper by obscuring and suppressing the elements of truth in his reason and conscience. The reference to κατεκλείσαι in John i. 5, is questionable. But see Lange in loc.—F. S.]
unrighteousness. Not adverbal (Reiche, et al.), but instrumental (Meyer).* The word must be understood here in the wide sense, according to which all sin is άδικία. See 1 John iii. 4. The sentence must be understood, however, in its general force, though with special reference already to the Gentiles. The history of this κατάγειν is the history of the kingdom of darkness in humanity, which is consummated in the ανάκαταλισμὸν, 3 Thess. ii. 8; comp. especially also 2 Thess. i. 8. According to De Wette, the κατάγειν operates so as not to let the truth come to appearance and development. But it also so operates as to pervert the individual elements of the truth into distortions, errors, and strong delusions, and thereby calls down the wrath of God. We must observe how decidedly the Apostle here views the ἀποστασις ethically as ἀδικία; and how he derives the errors of unbelief from unrighteousness, and from misconduct toward the ethical laws of the inner life.

Ver. 19. Because that which is known of God.† The διότι in ver. 19 may be regarded as an explanation of the statement in ver. 18, with special reference to the holding back of the truth of God; the διότι in ver. 21 as the explanation of the preceding ἀνακαταλίσμος inας; and the διό in ver. 24, as well as the διά τοῦτο in ver. 20, as the explanation of the revelation of God's wrath. Though the διότι of ver. 19 is not to be regarded exactly the same as γάρ, it does not serve specially as a proof of the motive for Divine wrath. For more particular information, see Tholuck and Meyer.†

The knowledge of God.§ Tholuck distinguishes three meanings of γνῶσις: 1. That which is known of God (Iata, Vulg., De Wette [Meyer, Philiippi, Alford, Wordsworth.—P. S.]); 2. what may be known (Philius, and many others; Rücker); 3. knowledge [≡ γνώσα. Fritzsche, Tholuck, Hodge.—P. S.] He shows that γνῶσις, according to the classical use of the language, means, what may be known; while γνώσα means, what is known. But in the Septuagint and New Testament the signification, known, is understood. Nevertheless, many expositors, from the time of Origen down to recent times, the Reformed Church (Grotius, Calvin, Beza, Grotius, Ewald), have pronounced in favor of the translation, what may be known. But this signification does not make good sense, since it may be difficult to distinguish between what may be, and what may not be known of God, and since everything that may be known of God was by no means revealed at the beginning to the nations (see Meyer). We understand what is known of God concretely as knowledge [Κατηκότως, γνώσα, notia dei—which should become true knowledge [Ερκοκοτής, ἑλγων, γνώσα] by living appropriation. Luther has made the untenable distinction, that the reason of man can know that God is, but cannot know who or what He is. Tholuck justly remarks that the Apostle immediately afterward speaks of a certain knowledge of the nature of God. [The book of nature is a παντοειδής τονωσία, as P. H. Hexameron, i.] calls it, a school of the general knowledge of God, and there is no nation on earth which is entirely destitute of this knowledge.—P. S.]

It is manifest among them.* Erasmus, Grotius, Kolliner, and Baumgarten-Crusius, adopt this explanation.† On the contrary, Tholuck, Meyer, and De Wette—with reference to chap. 11. 15; Gal. i. 16—strongly advocate Calvin's interpretation, corbidus inscriptum. [So also Beza: "In ipsorum animis, quia hoc Dei notitia recondita est in intimis mentis penetralibus;" and Hodge: "It is not of a mere external revelation of which the Apostle is speaking, but of that evidence of the being and perfections of God which every man has in the constitution of his own nature, and in virtue of which he is competent to apprehend the manifestations of God in His works."—P. S.] But αὐτοκαταλίσμος stands in Gal. i. 16; and in Rom. ii. 16, the question is God's manifestation by conscience, and not by creation. De Wette says: If the knowledge of God had been something common among them, it would not have been suppressed (κατάγειν.) But this is not conclusive. We could say with more propriety: If there had been no general knowledge of God among them, there would have been no common guilt. We must admit, however, that among them presupposes in them, or the existence of a knowledge of God in their hearts.—God manifested it to them. This was not first of all ἀποκάλυψις, but φανέρωσις—manifestation through creation. And thus there arose from individuals a manifest knowledge of God—a φανερώφι. The reference of this φανερώφι to the gnosia of the philosophers (Erasmus, Grotius) is too contracted. But there was a tradition of the knowledge of God among men which preceded the development of heathenism. (It is hardly worth while to mention the explanation of Luther, Koppe, Flatt, that τὸ αὐτοίκ is the mere dative.) [There is a threefold revelation of God: 1. An internal revelation to the reason and conscience of every man (comp. ii. 15; John i. 9); 2. an external revelation in the creation, which proclaims God's power, wisdom, and goodness (Rom. i. 20); 3. a special revelation, through the Holy Scriptures, and in the person and work of Christ, which confirms and completes the other revelations, and exhibits the justice, holiness, and love of God. The first two are here intended.—P. S.]

Ver. 20. For his invisible attributes [τὰ ἀδόκητα αὐτοῦ]. Explanation of the declaration: "God manifested it to them." Meyer: "That may not be seen of Him (sein Unschauliclu), the invisible attributes which constitute His essence, not actions Dei invisibilis." (Theodoret and Fritzsche: In relation to both creation and providence.) The pictures of creation, however, are also permanent.

* [Also Alford, who justly remarks that the pregnant διο, "is and by," implies that their διακοινα is the subject wherein, and the instrument whereby, they hold back the truth lit up in their consciences.—P. S.]
† [Vers. 19, 20, as also vers. 20-36, and vers. 21 of this chapter, are especially of the original apolopenius, only distinctly discovered Philosophumena, or Royal. omnia hæres. lib. ix. c. 6, p. 444, and v. 7, p. 140, ed. Dumler and Schneidewin.—P. S.]
‡ [These two commentaries, however, differ in their exposition of here. See Textual Note 2. The Apostle proves that the God of the Hebr. 19, 20, and then that they hbd it beco, and perverted it into a lie (21-23), and that therefore (δηδ) God's wrath came upon them (24-25).—P. S.]
§ [Dr. Lange translates τὰ γνῶσα τοῦ θεοῦ, but I cannot agree. See Textual Note 5.—P. S.]
... and no far provision is as least indicated. The διάφωτα is subsequently explained by διόνυσις and διόνυσεν, and the latter, followed by καθ' ἑαυτόν, as Tholuck remarks, does not annex a new idea (and also), but it partitions the δόμωται into the two ideas of διόνυσις and διόνυσεν. Paul has in view simply some of the Divine attributes, not the whole Divine being (which would rather require τὸ δόμωτα); the pagan knowledge of God is only partial and fragmentary, though sufficient to leave those who possess it without excuse.—P. S.

From the time of the creation of the world. Not out of the creation (Luther, and others). This idea is contained in τοῖς ποιηματίασιν, instrumental dative.—Being understood by the things that are made. An oxymoron, Arist., De mundo C. [v.]: πᾶν θερητός φαίνει γενόμενος ἀδιάφορος ἀπὸ τοῦ λόγου Θεωρίαν ὁ Θεός.† Meyer thus paraphrases the καθοπότασα: It is beheld by being perceived with the reason, and so, in the sense: Shall we have the sentence read, This invisible becomes visible by knowledge, as the means; or, it becomes visible as something known, perceptible to the reason? The latter thought is preferable here, since it is better adapted to the participle, and presupposes the import of the power, the thought-life of man. Philippi also limits himself to the middle form: "The invisible is seen; an oxymoron which is explained and qualified by the addition of ποιηματία. It is not seen by the bodily eye, but by the eye of the Spirit, the νοῦς, the reason." Our view is favored by the original sense of καθοπότασα, a conception which passes through looking down and looking over into looking at.—By the things that are made [by and in his] works, τοῖς ποιηματίσιν, instrumental dative.—P. S. These are therefore signs of the attributes of God. Schmackenburger (after Episcopius, and others) includes among them the government of God in history. But the conception of θεοτοκύς, creature, is against this view. Baumgarten-Crusius, following the Syrian and other versions, takes ποιηματία in an ablative sense—by the creature—which is quite untenable.—His eternal power and divinity. [ἀξιόθεος, from ἀξίος, ever-enduring, eternal, belongs to both nouns. Here is the germ of the physiological-argumental theology for the existence of God, as in ver. 19 the ontological argument is intimated.—P. S.] Here, as in the Creed [I believe in God the Father Almighty], omnipotence serves as the representative of the attributes of God. Tholuck: "In the contemplation of nature, the first thing which strikes man with overpowering weight is the impression of an infinite, supernatural omnipotence (Book of Wisdom xxiii. 4). All religion has its root in the feeling of dependence on supernatural powers (?). To the patriarchs God first revealed Himself as "ἐνω," as the Almighty: Ex. vi. 3" (Gen. xvii. 1).]

* [Flange: Die Ursachenbetrachtungen werden als Erlaubte angesehen. Comp. Textual Note *—P. S.]
* Similar passages are quoted from Cicero, De Divin., ii. 77. *Ex vii. aenigmatis tertium nautiae:... Pulchritudo mundi ordine verum casi uerum cognoscit effecti...* Quod. Quat. i, 29: *Dum non vides, tamque Deus prospicientem...* Comment. Also Bereng. of hoc: "Incomparabilis omnibus. Evincibilem Dei, si unum, certe in creatione facta esse vident, fortasse non nisi per intelligientiam videri cognitis..." P. S.*

[Alford: *Eternal, and Almighty, have always been recognized epithets of the Creator.*—P. S.]

—And his Divinity. Θεοτοκύς, from θεοτόκος, is the summary of the divinities, or divine excellencies, and must be distinguished from θεότης, the form which the Divinity itself has. The omnipotence is completed by the remaining Divine attributes, through which it really becomes omnipotence in the full ethical as well as metaphysical sense. It is onedif Schneckenburger refers it only to God's goodness. Reich's thought is better, that wisdom and goodness are chiefly meant.

So that they are without excuse. Meyer does not regard the τὸς as expressing a consequence—rather to what he means (see Vulg.: It ut sint inexcussabiles): Chrysostom, Luther, Reiche, De Wette, Fritzsche, Tholuck, Philippi, Ewalt, Alford, Wordsworth, Hodge—but a purpose (in harmony with Calvin, Beza, and others): In order that they may be without excuse. But this rendering leads to a monstrous view of the purpose of the creation of the world. It is too fatalistic even for the conception of predestimation, which it was once designed to support, perceived Him (in the contradiction of the Epistle to the Romans, when used with τὸ and the infinitive, has always a teleological sense, against which [De Wette and] Tholuck (p. 67) protest. Then he insists that the results must also be determined beforehand. But this would be a kind of predestimation which is self-contradictory: Predestinated—to have no excuse; that is, predestinated for guilt. The other explanation implies by no means a sufficient religious naturalis ad solution, but it permits the possibility of another form of the course of development from Adam to Christ. [The object here is to show man's guilt, not God's sovereignty. Comp. on τὸς τὸ Textual Note * P. S.]. Hodge: "Paul does not here teach that it is the design of God, in revealing Himself to men, to render their opposition inexcusable, but rather, since this revelation has been made, they have in fact no apology for their ignorance and neglect of God. Though the revelation of God in His works is sufficient to render men inexcusable, it does not follow that it is sufficient to lead men, blinded by sin, to a saving knowledge of Himself." Wordsworth: "It can hardly be thought that the conviction, confusion, and condemnation of men was any part of the Divine plan in creation, although it followed as a consequence Moral evil arose..."—P. S.]

Ver. 21. Because, although they know God, &c. The διὰ τῆς explains first of all how far they are without excuse; then, indirectly, how their guilt of holding back the truth in unrighteousness commenced. Incorrect construction: cum cognoscente potiussest (Eccumenius, Plat). Meyer has no ground for opposing the solution of the participle γνωστείς into the sentence: although they knew God (not, perceived Him). The contradiction between knowing God and the designated neglect of Him is obvious indeed; but herein precisely consists the inexcussabiles. The ignorance (ἀγνωνία) of the Gentile world, Eph. iv. 18, &c., is improperly regarded by Tholuck as an apparent contradiction; for the Gentile world was not such at the outset, and its ignorance is the result and punishment of its great sin of neglect. They lost even their imperfect knowledge (ἡγνωσία), because they did not raise it to...
full knowledge (ἐγνώρισμα) through the labor of the heart. [τὰς δὲ θυσίας, the one true God, in opposition to the false θυσία who the heathen worshipped.—P. S.]

They glorified him not as God. According to His divinity (John iv. 24). They were not wanting in worship, but in worship suitable to God. Melanchthon refers δοξάζειν to theoretical, and εἰς αὐτόν εἰς the practical conduct toward God (as recognition and reverence); but Tholuck very justly rejects such an interpretation, and regards δοξάζειν as the general term for worship, and εἰς, as the special designation of that species in which the feeling of dependence exhibits itself in the most tender and truly human way. In our opinion, the former denotes rather all worship, so far as it should be preeminently the glorification of God; the latter denotes the same worship as the grateful recognition of the Divine government for human welfare.

But became vain (μετατάσσεται δὲ διαθήκη). They became idle, foolish, in devising vanities (Is. xliv. 9), vain idols, μάρται (Acts xiv. 15). μετατάσσεται, 2271, canalis, is a characteristic term for idol-worship; Deut. xxxxi. 21; 2 Kings xvii. 5; Jer. ii. 5; Acts xiv. 16.—P. S. "As man, so his God." The axiom may also be reversed: As his God, so man himself (Ps. cxv. 9): They that make them are like unto them. The human mind is made dumb, wooden, and stone-like, by dumb, wooden, and stone idols (comp. Acts xvii. 29). But that vanity began in the inward life. In their imaginations [thoughts, reasonings, speculations, διάλογοςτηρίς]. Tholuck: "We can scarcely coincide with the Vulpagite, Fritzsche, Meyer, and Philippi, in translating διάλογος to simply by cogitativa. But since the word is used usually μαλακός, and the antithesis is more expressive, we may translate it, with Luther: 'In their imagining.' Boza: rationalis suis. We need not think exclusively of the reasonings and conclusions of the philosophers (Philipp)." Mythology was complete with its growth of ideals and images long before philosophy proper was conceived.

And their foolish heart was darkened.

The supposition that "foolish" (dαϊτητος) is used proleptically in the sense that their heart was darkened so as to lose its understanding (De Wette, etc.) is not only unnecessary (Tholuck), but altogether irrelevant (Meyer: "because it destroys the climax").\(^4\) Positive darkness was the result of the negative neglect of the heart to regard the Divine tokens, and to weigh them understandingly. The καπδία, the centre of life, is first darkened; then the διάρκος, the developed thought-life (Lph. iv. 18). Tholuck: In this section the Apostle coincides so fully in word and thought with the Book of Wisdom, chap. xiii.—xv., that Nitsch regards it as "almost impossible" to ascribe perfect originality to him. Yet he himself admits that the fundamental thought—the tracing of idolatry back to sin—was unknown to the Alexandrine author, &c. (comp. Nitsch, Deutsche Zeitschrift, 1850, p. 387; Bleek, Stud. und Kritiken, 1853, p. 340).

* [Bengel: "ationally, (τιτον) dōōmen ob bene
dιαλογητην (δοξης) ob ιππος πινακος διαλογωσ."]—

- P. S.]

\(^4\) [Alford: "Their Heart (καπδία of the whole inner man, the seat of knowledge and feeling) was so foolish (unintelligent, not retaining God in its knowledge) became dark (lost the little light it had, and wandered blindly in the mass of folly)."]—P. S.]

SECOND SECTION, vers. 22-31.

Ver. 22. Professing themselves [i.e., while not because, they professed themselves, φασάνειν τις; or pretended] to be wise. De Wette: "This is referred by many, and also by Tholuck, to the philosophers of ancient Greece and Rome. But these were above idolatry, and, besides, were later than the origin of heathendom." &c.* The latter remark requires special attention. The question here is concerning the very ancient origin of heathendom, as characterized by the false-fetched ingenuities in symbolical mythology. Nor could Paul have had in thought merely the pride of Grecian wisdom but in symbolical mythology, he could also judge concerning the origin of heathendom which characterized the far-fetched ingenuities of the philosophers who inhabited the ancient world. The wordνεφελή, or οὐκακμάζοντες καὶ καταπτιτοῦντες, is used in philosophers, etc., to denote a condition of groundless confusion. "By symbolical images—knowledgeless, and soul or commune is genius ordinarius omnium. Nemo enim fuit, qui non voluerit Dei majestatem sub cœptum communi includere, ac talen Deum facere, qualia perpessent possunt equeque sensu."—They became fools. Not, they have by this means shown themselves to be fools (Kölner), which weakens the thought. Their folly was in proportion to their boast of wisdom. There can be no greater folly than to confuse the greater than the words of the Wise: "The more the wise, the more the folly, and the more the pride is increased. The more the words of the Wise will be despised, the more the folly of the wise will be increased." This folly is no safeguard against superstition. Knowledge puffeth up (1 Cor. viii. 1). It often engenders pride, and pride is punished by God with spiritual blindness, which is the mother of idolatry."—P. S.]

Ver. 23. And exchanged, &c. They have abandoned the real δόξα [τὸν ἀληθινὸν]—the contemplation of God's glory—which was communicated to them through the spiritual contemplation of the creation, which was manifested to the Israelites in the Shekinah in the exacted emotions of vision, and which was finally communicated to Christians in the righteousness of Christ for faith. They exchanged this glory for their religious images—that is, for vanity, folly, and darkness. "The is cannot be taken for ιδι(Reiche E. V.), but is instrumental (Meyer). It denotes the external element of their exchange. [The verb ἀλλασάω, when it means to exchange, is usually construed with τινι or τωι τωι, formurare rem per rem or per aliquo, but in the text with ο�, after the Hebrew אָלָל, as in Ps. cvi. 20: ἀλλασάων την δόξαν αἰεαν ἐν μανθησι, τοι, κ. θ. Tholuck also adds Sophocles, Antig., ver. 336, for the same construction. The contrast of άρουρος and φασάνειν sets forth the folly of such an exchange.—P. S.]

Grotius: ομοιωμα τοικων καταλεγεις. But the expression seems to indicate that the worship of images proceeded from an arbitrary, self-created symbolism. They believed that they wisely expressed and maintained the δόξα of God in the symbol or likeness of a human image. For this purpose they naturally made use of the image of the external and therefore perishable form of man. This was especially the case among the Greeks. There were also the Egyptian images of beasts; of birds.
The bird is of four-footed beasts—the Apis, the dog and the cat; and of creeping things—the crocodile and the serpent. Tholuck: The Egyptian worship was at that time domesticated at Rome; * and the expression of Paul relates as well to the coloration of the symbol, generally practised by the cultivated classes, as to the adoration of the image itself, as a real idol, which prevailed among the great masses (see Tholuck). [The common people saw in the idols the gods themselves, the cultivated, heathen, symbolical representations, or, at best, only the organs through which the gods operated. A similar difference of a gross and a more refined superstition is found in the Roman Catholic Church with regard to the images of saints. The Scriptures make no account of this distinction, and denounce all image-worshippers as idolaters.—P. S.] The Apostle traces the downward tendency of heathendom, by passing, first, from the likeness to the image, and, second, from the image of man to the images of creeping animals. [Wordsworth: "—observe this repetition, marking successive stages of their moral and intellectual degradation: ending in the transmutation of the living God of heaven into the likeness of unclean reptiles crawling on the earth!"—]

Ver. 24. Wherefore God also gave them up to uncleanness. The Apostle evidently distinguishes two degrees of this abandonment; ver. 24 and ver. 26. As the unnatural sins of lust are not mentioned before ver. 26, so may we understand ver. 24 as referring to the natural forms of sensuality. But lewdness is the sin common to both degrees of corruption. That the Apostle should regard sins of lust as the immediate result of religious apostasy, rests: 1. On the Hebrew idea of whoredom, according to which religious whoredom is the object of his description. That which is idolatry—leads to moral whoredom as its most immediate result (Num. xxv.; Ezek. xxiii.); just as, reversely, moral uncleanness leads to religious lewdness (Solomon, Henry IV. [of France]). The heathen forms of worship are therefore connected in various ways with the practice of lust, or they are even the worship of lust. 2. On the ethical law, that moral uncleanness is connected in the judgments of God, with religious principles. The image of corruptible man is an image of the natural man, who, like Jupiter, indulges in love intrigues. The image of the bull likewise indicates the dedication of the generative power of nature.

Wherefore God gave them up [παρέδόθη πρὸς ἐξέρθοντας ἀδικίαν]; delivered them over]. The abandonment must not be regarded, with the Greek expositors [since Origen], as a mere permission (ἐκ παραθεωρήσεως: see Chrysostom’s remarks, quoted by Tholuck [who disents from him]), nor, on the other hand, as referring to a Divine predestination of abandonment to the judgment of condemnation. (Tholuck, the editor of Calvin’s Commentaries, calls this the Calvinistic view, according to which God is the effective author of sin;—but this he could certainly not prove

* [Tholuck quotes from Lasson (Pharr. viii. 53): Nos in templo tuam Romana recipiems imus Sententiae canones (P. S.).]

† [ἐκ παραθεωρήσεως (Ch. Exarch.), or ἐκ παραθεωρήσεως (Theodoret). This interpretation of the Greek fathers was followed by the rationalists, and is contrary to the meaning of the word (see Meyer); by the Reformed Scholastics nothing. God permits the sinner to sink deeper into vice. He does it, of course, with wise intention as a sovereign and righteous Judge.—P. S.]

from Calvin’s exposition of the present passage. The abandonment is rather the first stage in the exercise of punitive authority (see my Positive Dogmatics, p. 468). God executed this punishment on a grand scale in the origin and growth of heathendom. He allowed the Gentiles to walk in their own devices (Acts xxi. 25; xxii. 20). The permittere in this punishment becomes an efficac operation by God’s withdrawal of His Spirit; which measure His holiness requires. * Paul has already said that this withdrawal is retributive; but he now makes it especially prominent: in the lusts of their hearts, εὐθὺς ἐπειδομένης, &c. The εὐθὺς must not be understood as instrumental [by or through] (Erasmus [E. V.], and others), nor like εὐθὺς (Platc., Estina, and others) [but signifies the element or moral condition in which they were already]; for when God, by a judicial act, delivered them over to a still worse condition.—P. S.]. The negative punitive judgment becomes positive in this, that they can no longer control the lusts of their heart after God’s Spirit is withdrawn from them. It is in harmony with God’s righteousness that sin should be punished by sin.—To uncleanness. The sins of thought and heart becomes nothing else than the expression filthiness (Unfreiheit, Meyer) seemed too strong for the beginning of the development of uncleanness. In Gal. v. 19 (to which Meyer refers), the description passes from the grosser to the more subtle forms.

So that their bodies were dishonored. De Wette and Tholuck [Meyer, Alford, &c.] maintain that δύνασθαι δεσμών does not occur in the middle (Erasmus, Luther [E. V.]), but only in the passive voice. The bodies were already dishonored by natural lewdness, by which they lost their dignity as temples of God, and were degraded into instruments of sensual lust (and not merely “woman.” Tholuck). See 1 Cor. vi. 16.—Between themselves. Three explanations: 1. The εὐθὺς is instrumental (Theophylact, Kößler). Then the moral subject is wanting. 2. The εὐθὺς has a reciprocal signification equal to ἐὰν οὕς ἐκθεσθήσατο, reciprocally (Erasmus, De Wette, Tholuck, and others); Meyer: One dishonors the other. This construction is favored by the reciprocal sexual intercourse which disappears in the unnatural lewdness described in ver. 26. 3. Reflexive (Valgate, Luther, Calvin, and others). Tholuck remarks on this, that to themselves does not give clear sense. Comp., on the contrary, 1 Cor. vi. 16. We may adopt the second explanation, and the third need not be given—anymore, that in natural lewdness not only does one dishonor the other, but each dishonors himself.

Ver. 25. They who exchanged the truth of God. According to Meyer and Tholuck, Paul re-
curs expressly to the cause of the abandonment. But by this they overlook the definite progress of thought;—namely, the argument for the abandonment of the second degree which follows in ver. 26. As a punishment of the heathen for squandering the δός of God for the palpity sum of images, their own bodies have lost their δός. But they are further charged with bartering the truth of God for the lie of idolatry, since they have served the creature παρὰ τον κτίσανα. Therefore God gave them up to a lie of sexual lust, to a lust παρὰ φύσιν. It is from this parallel, which the commentators have overlooked, that this exact exegetical definition arises. They who exchanged, Οίρων, Quippe qui. The expression denotes them as the same, but characterizes them more fully. The sense is, they exchange: for (sie tauschten um), μετάλλαξαν, which is not merely "more emphatic" (Meyer) than ἤλλαξαν. It includes, with the exchange, a very strong conception of change, of variation.—The truth of God. Explanations: 1. The truth revealed to the Gentiles (Camean, Believers, and others). 2. οὐκ εστίν γενιτ. object; therefore the true knowledge of God (Piscat., Ustari. [Alford; the true notion of Him as the Creator]). 3. οὐκ εστίν γενιτ. subject; the truth or reality of God, the true Divine essence, according to the analogy την δόξαν τον θεοῦ (Tholuck, Meyer). Tholuck (with Theophylact, Luther, and others) takes it exactly as ἀληθέως θεός [see Maldor for άληθινός]. So also Hodge: a parenthesis for the true God.—P. S.) The δόξα of God is God's revelation in glory, and so is God's truth the φανερωμα (see ver. 19) of his essential truth in the truth relations of creation. The name of God is the revelation of His nature; not His nature in and of itself. But this revelation divides itself into the δόξα when we have in view the whole majesty of His name, and into the ἀληθέως when we look at the real harmony of its antitheses. They have forsaken the general manifestation of this truth of God. They have, indeed, utterly squandered it for the gain of a mere lie—for the lying idols. [ψεύδος ἔστω] is used emphatically for idols in the Scriptures; Jer. xii. 25; xvi. 19; Isa. xxvii. 15; xxiv. 20; because the heathen gods do not even exist, and yet they are worshipped in the place of the only true God, who is the Cause of all existence, and the Author of all truth.—P. S.) 1. Idols are lies not simply as διὰ οὐκ ἔγνωσεν (Grotius). They are embalmed lies. Men must make them, and they pretend to represent Him who made man (Isa. xl. 19, 20). They have mouths, but they speak not; eyes have they, but they see not (Ps. cxv. 5; xxxv. 16; Wisdom xv. 16). The worshipper of idols has a dark consciousness of this contradiction. Even his worship is mendaciously. Tholuck quotes Philo, De Vita Mosis, i. 5 [where it is said of the Israelites who had made the bolts of gold], Moses wrote and put the ψεύδεις down, with expression, and all the arts and rites. The conception of the ψεύδεις passes from fear and reverence to worship. Of kindred but not of identical character is the distinction of Theophylact, and of the exalted and exalted which all worship. Tholuck remarks that exact exegetical definitions on this passage would require the accusative.—P. S.) The παρὰ τον κτίσανα has been interpreted in three ways: 1. More than the Creator [in the sense of relative service] (Vulgate, Erasmus, Luther [E. V., Grotius], and others); 2. against the Creator [contra creatorem; comp. παρὰ φύσιν, ver. 26], (Hammond, Fritzsche, and others); 3. In the sense of comparison [and exclusion], πραεῖ, πραττέριο, or relītio creature (Hilarus, Theophylact, Beza, Tholuck, Meyer [Olshausen, De Wette, Philippi, Alford, Wordsworth, Hodge], and others). The third explanation is correct in the sense that it includes the second: being engaged by one with the disregard and rejection of the same (see Luke xviii. 14). The παρὰ φύσιν in ver. 26 perfectly corresponds to this rendering. In both cases, the statement must not be understood absolutely; otherwise heathendom would have been the negation of all religion, and unmoral lust the negation of all propagation of the human race. It denotes the outbreaking sovereignty of a religious vice, which is completed in a season, one. [Wordsworth derives from this text an argument against the Arians, who assert Christ to be a creature, and yet profess to worship Him; and against those who pay religious worship to any creature, since no one is to be worshipped, according to the Scriptures, who is not God by nature, and since there is no middle between Creator and creature.—P. S.) Who is blessed forever. Tholuck: "The doxology is added to the name of God by Jews and Mohammedans when they must state something that is unworthy of Him, as though the writer would remove all suspicion of any share in the statement." &c. It is more natural to seek the explanation of this custom in the indignation of religious feeling, and in its confidence that God is exalted above the profanation of His name.* Tholuck informs us that an Arabian writer added, after every verse which he mentioned: "God is exalted above all that they say!" The Apostle's expression, at all events, must not be regarded as a mere form, but as candid emotion (Meyer); which yet does not exclude the thought indicated above (Chrysostom, Grotius).—εἰς λογοτροπίαν, ἀμήν.† Who is blessed, with reference to all future eternity, is likewise an expression of the confident expectation that he shall be blessed (Meyer therefore rejects, without good reason, the explanation of Fritzsche: celebranda). Ver. 26. For this cause God gave them up. The διά τοῦτο recurs specifically to ver. 25, and takes its place with the διά of ver. 34 and the διά of ver. 21 as a subdivision under ver. 18. Unto shameful passions. The άμειωσα was already in ver. 24, but now it becomes a passion. Meyer: πᾶσα άμειωσ. genit. qual. Since whoredom is also a shameful passion, the substantive must be retained: Passions of the shameful and degraded

---

* [So also Meyer (Erasmus der arrogen Pindar, Alford, and others). The doxology is the natural expression of a holy indignation which puts the sin of idolatry in a more striking light and holds it up to the abhorrence of all pious minds. Comp. similis, ecclesiologica i. 5; 1 Tim. vi. 18; comp. Gen. íx. 26; xix. 26. xxvii. 27.—P. S.)

† [It is in the Bible only applied to God, while μακάριον and the corresponding Hebrew עזב, happy, is applied to men. We find, very mete, and extremely, only in the text [1 Tim. i. 11; vi. 15]. The E. V. renders εὐχάριστος (and εὐχαρίστευσιν) always and properly blessed, but varies in its translation of μακάριον between happy and blessed; using the latter in those passages where spiritual blessing is meant, or the future glory of saints or the blessedness of God is intended (Ps. x. 1; Luke 1: 48; Matt. vi. 33; 1 Tim. i. 11; vi. 15; Titus ii. 13.—P. S.)
There was first a departure from honor to simple dishonor; then still further downward, to a passionate course of dishonor, which might almost be described as passion for vitreous. The unnatural state of lust rests upon unnatural passions, and these spring from the root of the unnatural, lying defilement of creatures and images. Man is for God in a religious sense, as the man and woman are for each other in a moral point of view: this is the natural condition, the truth of the relations (Eph. v. 25). Therefore the perversion of nature, unnaturalness, or the lie of the service of the creature and of the Idols, is punished by the perversion of nature, unnaturalness, or the lie of sexual gratification. Thobuck praises the most remote vestige of the Apostle in the expression, although his expression is clear enough. He also says: "The self-degradation and self-condemnation of man appears most strikingly in the peculiarly (?) Greek sin of pederasty (ἀγοροκοίτα, 1 Cor. vi. 9), which, at the time when Paul wrote, was largely practised also in Rome. After Xenophon, De Laedam. Republ. ii. 14, has mentioned that this vice was forbidden by Lycurgus, he adds, that this was observed or by some, ἐν πολλια, γιατί ἐπεί οὐκέτι ἦν η ἀνθρωπίνη ἡμεῖς. Even the most distinguished men have incurred grave suspicions in this matter, some justly, others unjustly. Comp. Gesner, De pederastia Socratis in vol. diss. Goti. ii. p. 126. Seneca, a contemporary of Paul, writes in Rome. Ep. 38: Transse puorum injeilemm genres, quos post transitio conuevia alia cubicula consummata exspectant; transse cumina exotomia per nationes dolorose describitur. The most hideous and yet the most accurate picture of Roman licentiousness at that time, is given by Petronius, a contemporary of the Apostle. Even women (called tribades) committed the same outrage, which was called by a smoother term after a famous predecessor in the crime, "Sapphic Love." [Seneca writes, Ep. 99: "Libidine vero ne moribus quidem cedunt, pati nata; dix illa doque male perdant, adeo persor convivorum genus impudicae non ineunte."]

For even their women, θηλείας and σατυρίας, instead of γυναικῶν and ἄνδρων, on account of the sexual reference. Reiche says erroneously: In a contemptuous sense, for description of the bestial. The expression χρήσις is euphemistic for νυσσονσευς, and therefore we must not supply τοῦ χρησιας, or τῆς θηλείας (Fritzsche). Thobuck explains thus: The Apostle places the female sex first, because the abomination of the crime is most horrible in that sex, whose noblest ornament is modesty (1 Tim. ii. 9) [similarly Hedge]. It may be observed, on the contrary, that the Apostle here generally passes from the less to the more abominable crime. He probably alludes, in ver. 26 (as Thobuck remarks), to the debauchery of the tribades (πυφροθηκαί, 1 Cor. vii. 9) was inflamed by unnatural excitement. The word appears at itself. The καταφερθέν moving the complete perfection of the abomination. —Receiving in themselves the due reward of their error. According to Ammon and others, the destructive consequences of lust. According to Thobuck, the self-degradation. According to Meyer, the designated lusts themselves, as the punishment for the πλαγὶα, vers. 21-26. [Afford and Hodge go to.

ver. 27. And likewise also the men. The construction indicates that the unnatural burning (ἀφθωρίατος, 1 Cor. xvi. 2) was inflamed by unnatural excitement. The word appears at itself. The καταφερθέν moving the complete perfection of the abomination. —Receiving in themselves the due reward of their error. According to Ammon and others, the destructive consequences of lust. According to Thobuck, the self-degradation. According to Meyer, the designated lusts themselves, as the punishment for the πλαγὶα, vers. 21-26. [Afford and Hodge go to.

Ver. 28. And as they did not deem it worth while [ἀδίκος ἑρμηνευτικός] to retain God. A further and more general development of moral corruption, based on a further and more general unfolding of religious corruption. Καθισκὸς. The comparison is at the same time causal—whilst Thobuck denies. On the correspondence between the darkening of knowledge and practical corruption, see the quotations from the heathen writers, in Thobuck [and Wetstein. Cicero says, De Nat. Deor, 12: "Haec seculo, an, Pietate adversus Deos sublata, fides etiam et societates, et una excellentissima virtus juristica tolitur." The assertion of moderndelete...
THE EPISTLE OF PAUL TO THE ROMANS.

1. The expression πειραμάτων means, that every wicked person had not merely one crime. By the vices are here meant permanent and cold traits of character, in distinction from deeds of impulse, in which the guilty persons appear as ματαιοί, full and drunken.

2. Wicked characters according to their deeds, μηθυσται, whisperers, backbiters [one who slanders secretly]; καταλαλον, slanderers, calumniators; ἠτεστηκες, haters of God, despisers of God, scorning God (Gottverderter). Tholuck: Promethean characters. In the classic literature, and especially the tragic drama, the word occurs only in the passive meaning: hated by God, hateful to God [see the quotations of Meyer in loc.]; but the context plainly declares in favor of the active rendering, which has been adopted by most commentators from Theodoret down to the present, and which alone is in harmony with the Christian spirit. Classic usage also favors the active thought: ungodly, wicked. ἠρωταν, insatiable, those who perpetrate criminal évος, ἑρωτήματα, those who are proud, self-conceited, those who conduct themselves arrogantly above others; ἀλαμάνετε, boasters, who do not design, like the previous class, to crush others by the force of their greatness, but make a lying show of it; ἐφίπτεσαν ἰδαν, inventors of villainies, or crimes, swindlers, and adventurers; πονηρῶν άνέπλετος, disobedient to parents; apostasy from the piety and affection due to parents is a fountain of corruption (see Malachi iv. 6; Luke i. 17). [Hodge: "That such should be included in this fearful list, shows the light in which filial disobedience is regarded by the sacred writers." —P. S.]

3. Wicked characters according to their sentiments, in leading psychological types. ἀσεβεῖον, without understanding [for insight into moral things, blinded, besotted]; corrupted intelligence; κακοστήναω, according to Philippus, and others, quarrasome, guilty; according to Meyer, covenant-breakers [perfidious]; we construe the expression psychologically: unable, unreliable — corrupted will. ἀσεβής, destitute of affection, heartless; wanting even in natural feeling and natural love — corrupted feeling. (ἀσεβής, implacable, irreconcilable. Probably an insertion). ἀνεμίχος, unmerciful, without pity and compassion: a totally corrupted state of feeling (Matt. xxx. 31 f.).

V. Wicked maxims (ver. 32). Demoniacal pleasure in wickedness on the part of those who are conscious of the deadly guilt of sin (for example, heathen philosophers, magistrates, judges, etc.), and who not only commit sins worthy of death, but also approve them in others by their endorsement and principles. — The οἰτίνας announces a new element, a new degree. This degree was of course not reached or thoroughly accomplished by all, but the generality were guilty to this degree of wickedness which is shown by the crucifixion of Christ. Grotius has alluded to the defence of many crimes by the philosophers [e.g. ζήσεως, the defence of hatred, revenge, even pederasty and sodomy]; and Heumann [and Ewald] to lax criminal justice. The διάφορα τῆς τροποῦ. But the adjective is passive, according to the use of language: worthless (good-for-nothing) mind. [ἀδικίας, from ἀδικεῖν, receivable, worthy of reception; ἀδικος, worthless, worthy of rejection. The beastman did not lose the moral faculty of discerning between right and wrong, good and bad, but in spite of it they practised the bad, and encouraged its practices in others (ver. 29), thereby increasing their guilt. "It is the video meliora próote, which makes the deteriora sequor so peculiarly criminal." — P. S.]

IV. Things which are not becoming. The ἡ παρανομία in the technical sense of the philosophical schools, are things contrary to duty, or immoral; but in a more popular sense here, they are an expression of moral abhorrence.

Vers. 29-32. Being filled with all unrighteousness. Tholuck: "The accusers πειραμάτων, κριταί, &c., depend on ποιήσαν, as Erasmus has already remarked: because their thoughts are wicked, they also commit unbecoming things." [Some commentators take the following accusations with αἰτίας of the preceding verse, so as to express the state in which, and the reason why, God abandoned them; but it is better to connect them with the subject of ποιήσαν, understood, so as to express the consequences of such abandonment, and the various forms of tā ἡ παρανομία which they practised. ἀποστειλαμία, all manner of immorality, is general; the following terms are specifications. Similar catalogues of vices: 2 Cor. xii. 20; Gal. v. 19-21; Eph. v. 3; 1 Tim. i. 9, 10; 2 Tim. iii. 2-4. P. S.] Do Wette remarks that the following catalogue of sins, like a similar one in Gal. v. 19, is unsystematic; though ἀνάλογα stands first, as the principal conception. Likewise Tholuck (against Bengel's and Glöckler's attempts at classification) maintains that the Apostle states a συναναγεννησις [rhetorical accumulation and specification of sins], and clues the paronomasies φθονον, γέλασμα, ἁμαρτία and ἀσεβεία. But the paronomasies are no proof, and so we attempt the following construction:

I. Vices. The chief vice, ἀνάλογα, unrighteousness, at the head. This is divided into ποιησία, malice [disposition to inflict evil], wickedness—bold form; and into πλεονεκρία, avarice, covetousness; καιρία, badness, malice—passiliamouss form. On the addition of ποιησία to the

* The classification of Dr. Lange is certainly original and ingenious, and decidedly preferable to any other, although it is most artificial. The next best classification is that of Bengel in Rom. i. 29: Τὸ έναντιον, ὡς αὐτός, κριταί, etc., as mentioned above, see Textual Note [IV].
DOCTRINAL AND ETHICAL.

1. The revelation of God's salvation is at the same time a revelation of God's wrath. One conception is eclipsed by the other. It is a vain delusion to imagine that we can separate the doctrine of redemption from that of wrath. The conception of wrath is the conception of the absolute and personal energy of the Divine government of love in punitive righteousness. Redeeming love is the absolute and personal energy of Divine righteousness in the saving exercise of love. Can a soul enjoy the experience of salvation by faith, without passing through an internal judgment, and feeling of Divine displeasure? For further information, see the Exeg. Notes; Tholuck, pp. 56, 57; Meyer, p. 49; the article Zorn Gottes, in Herzog's Realencyklopädie [vol. xviii. p. 587 ff.], together with the literature on the subject enumerated there [especially the monograph on the Wrath of God by Ferdinand Weber, with preludes on the doctrine of the atonement by Franz Delitzsch, Erlangen, 1862.—P. S.]

2. The essential characteristic of all forms of unbelief consists in men's holding back or hindering the truth in unrighteousness. "Modern culture" attempts to separate the ideas ἀπίστια and ἀσέβεια utterly from each other. But the biblical view will not allow such a separation. Unbelief is misconduct toward the moral claims within the horizon of the internal life. This misconduct has its degrees. The germ and principle is sin as transgression (παραδοξασμός) in general. The definite determination is apostasy, which manifests itself also as opposition to Divine truth. Therefore the two fundamental forms of specific unbelief are: apostasy, and hostile attack. The third degree is hardness of heart. But the measure of power in human obstructions to the revelation of God is related to the power

...
of Divine reaction against these obstacles, just as the power of man (as weakness) is related to the omnipotence of God.

3. The idea of the revelation of God by nature parades the entire Bible. See Ps. viii., xix., civ., and others. Is. xl. According to Schneckenburger (Beiträge zur Erlösung in neuestem Theologen, 10th essay: "Paul's Natural Theology, and its Sources"). Philo was Paul's source. See thereon, Tholuck, p. 64.

The pamphlet of Heburt also belongs here: Die natürliche Theologie des Apostels Paulus (Nürnberg, 1880); likewise Zöckler's Theologie Naturw. or Entwurf einer systematischen Naturtheologie. [Frankfurt z. M., 1850, 2 vols.] The latter has viewed natural theology in a more primitive than usual sense. We must bear in mind that natural theology, since the revelation of salvation, has assumed a different form from what it had before the revelation of salvation, and specifically as the basis of the original revelation. The symbolic natural religion which prevailed down to Abraham is distinguished from the revelation of salvation herein, that God revealed Himself there symbolically by symbols and signs, whereas by these Words Scripture is also the Word of Reconciliation in Stabunde, in Herzog's Realencyclopdie [vol. xii. p. 571].

4. According to Paul, as according to all the Holy Scriptures, humanity has fallen from its original ideal height; but according to the majority of those who set themselves up as the advocates of "modern culture," it has risen from a rough, beast-like state. Wherefore Reiche also (p. 157) has expressed the opinion that the Apostle has here expressed only a contemporary opinion of the Jews. The testimony of history is against the view of "modern culture." It proves the gradual decay of the Hindus, the Arabs, the Ethiopians, the Indians, and, finally, even of the Greco-Roman world, with all its relative glory.

5. It is improper to regard the description of the Apostle as a description only of the corruption of the heathen world. It shows us first how the Gentile world arose, and then what became of it; but it does not commence with a Gentile world. Therefore it goes back, fundamentally, to the genesis of sin in the fall of man; but then it shows how the fall of man in its second form (with the self-assertion of man after the flood) became the genesis of real heathendom. The corruption arose from the original symbolic religion which prevailed from Adam down to Abraham. For man magnified the simple symbolism of nature—which God had given—by their own arbitrary symbolifications, and then mythologized the symbols; that is, they distanced them. Thus mythology arose from symbolism, and idolatry and then imago-worship arose from the symbolic view of nature. Recent research has commenced to exhume from the ruins of myths the gold of the original symbolism. Comp. my treatise On the Relation between General and Ecclesiastical Symbolism, in the Deutsche Zeitschrift für Christliche Wissenschaft, &c., 1855, No. 4—5; and the recent writings on heathendom by Wuttke [Geschichte des Heidentums, 1852 ab.], Döllinger [Heidentum und Judentum, 1851], Steffelhagen, Lasansy, and others. [Schelling, Philosophie der Mythologie, 1857; Fabri, Die Entstehung des Heidentums, 1859; Nägelbach on the Homer, and Post-Homerische Theologie, 1840, 1897; Gladstone, Studies on Homer, 1889; W. S. Tyler, The Theology of the Greeks, 1877—78.]

6. The description of the original form of natural religion does not justify the conclusion that the revelation of God in Christ would not have occurred under the presupposition of human righteousness. But it leads us to conclude that the progress from the one to the other would have been effected in the form of a historical continuity.

7. The explanation of Gentile corruption from the great peccatum omissionis. "They have not honored and thanked God" (ver. 21); this is a penetrating glance which sheds its light also upon the first fall, as well as upon every genesis of sin. On the significance of this passage for the whole Epistle, see the Introduction and the Exeg. Notes.

8. God's positive government, which impels evil through trial and temptation into the process of development. From righteous judgment (sin punished by sin) and to righteous judgment (Rom. xi. 32), corresponds with God's negative abandonment, in which the first ground for the punishment is revealed, not only because God, as the Holy One, must withdraw His Spirit from the consciousness of sinful man, but also because He regards man in his freedom, and leaves him to its action (see my Positive Dogmatics, p. 498).

9. [Sin punished by sin. The Rabbinical tract, Perke Aboth, c. 2, ver. 1, says: "Festina ad preceptum leve tanguam ad grave, et fugae transgrevsemem: praeceptum enim trium tante precepto, et transgressio transgressione: quid marces preceptum praeceptum est, at transgressio transgressio." Seneca (Ep. 16): "The first and greatest punishment of any commission of sin is the sin itself which is committed." De Wette, ad Rom. i. 24: "This view (that sin is punished by sin) is no mere Jewish doctrine, but it is universally true from the absolute standpoint of religion."

Schiller: "This is the very curse of evil deed, That of new evil it becomes the seed."

But this judicial punishment of sin with sin does not make God the author of sin in any sense. Dr. South (Sermon, ii. on 2 Thess. ii. 11) says: "God may make one sin the punishment of another, though it is still is to be remembered that it is one thing for God to give a man over to sin, and quite another for God to cause him to sin; the former importing in it no more than God's providential ordering of a man's circumstances, so that he shall find to check or hinderance in the course of his sin; but the latter implying also a positive efficiency toward the commission or production of a sinful act; which God never does, nor can do; but the other He both may, and, in a judicial way, very often does. . . . In all which God is not at all the author of sin, but only pursues the great work and righteous ends of His provi dence, in disposing of things or objects in themselves good or indifferent, toward the compassing of the same; howbeit, through the poison of men's vicious affections, they are turned into the opportunities and fuel of sin, and made the occasion of their final destruction; ix. 17, 22." Dr. Hodge: "God often punishes one sin by abandoning the sinner to the commission of others. Paul repeats this idea three times, vers. 24, 26, 28. This judicial abandonment is consistent with the holiness of God and the free agency of man. God does not impel or entice to evil, He ceases to restrain. He says of the sinner, Let him alone; vers. 24—28."—P. S.]

9. The deep truth in the proof of the connection between religious and moral corruption.

10. The intimate connection between the denial of the dōxa of God and the degradation of the dōxa of the human form by those who, and between the
denial of the truth of God and the degradation of the true relations of human nature, as represented by Paul, has not been properly observed. See Exeg. Notes.

11. Other enumerations of sins and crimes in the Scriptures: see 2 Cor. xii. 20; Gal. v. 19; Eph. v. 8; 1 Tim. i. 9; 2 Tim. iii. 3.

12. Sin reaches its climax in wicked maxims and principles. They are demonic in their character, and the intellectual side of the service of the devil, which may be known not only in its gross forms, but also in the subtle form of cowardly idolatry of what is base, and which in this shape is widely diffused. [Yet, even in the most reprobate sinner, the voice of conscience cannot be entirely extinguished ("knowing the judgment of God," ver. 32). It makes him uneasy and miserable on earth, and will be his condemnation in the other world.—P. S.]

13. While the Apostle has here described the dark side of heathendom, the second chapter shows that the whole of heathendom does not appear to him under this dark aspect. In the first chapter he describes the prevailing Antinomian tendency of heathenism, in opposition to the prevailing legalistic tendency of Judaism.

HOMILETICAL AND PRACTICAL.

Verses 18-21.

In what does the beginning of all the real sinful corruption of the world, and of the Gentiles in particular, consist? 1. In the neglect of the general manifestations of God by creation; 2. in neglect to worship God by praise and thanksgiving. Against what will God's wrath be sent from heaven? 1. Against all ungodliness; 2. against all unrighteousness of men who hold back the truth in unrighteousness (ver. 18).

The revelation of wrath, and the revelation of love, as they. 1. Are opposed to each other; 2. are closely connected with each other. The revelation of God in nature is a revelation of His invisible majesty, that is, of His eternal power and Godhead (vers. 19, 20). He who knows God, should praise and thank Him. —The knowledge and worship of God. Neglect of the worship of God leads to obscuring the knowledge of God (ver. 21).

LUTHER: Where there is no faith, reason falls from one depth to another, until it is totally blinded in its speculations, as is the case with all self-conceived and heated brains (ver. 21).

STARK: Even after the fall, every man has a natural knowledge of the nature and works of God; yet this is not sufficient to lead him to salvation (ver. 19).—God esteem our knowledge according to the means we have of obtaining it. Thus He demands more knowledge from the Jews than from the Gentiles, and still more from us Christians (ver. 21).—As God is a living God, so must our knowledge of Him also be vital, and express itself in praise and thanks (ver. 21).—LANGE, Op. Bibl.: Whoever denies the wrath of God, and describes God alone according to mere love, thereby obscures also the greatness of the grace and love of God, and leads others to despise this grace and love (ver. 18).—HERING: God does not leave Himself without a witness among the heathen. All creatures eloquently testify to Him his might and wisdom (ver. 20). From QUENSEL: Hugo de Arca: Omnis creatura tribus voelus nobis loguatur: prima est fumantalis, accepit beneficium; secunda admonitatis, reddes debitum veritatem; tertia comminatior, fugis supplicium (ver 20).

BENGEL: Whatever is under heaven, and not under the gospel, is under the wrath (ver. 18).—The heart of man conform to its thoughts (ver. 21).

GERLACH: The sin against which God's wrath is directed shows itself in the double form of ungodliness and unrighteousness, according as man sins more directly against God, or against himself and his neighbor (ver. 18).—As soon as man ceases to direct himself to the holy and gracious God, he worships only God's power and beauty (?), and makes Nature his God (ver. 21).

HEUBNER: The denial of God can never be excused, for man can know God (ver. 19).

THE PERIODS for the 11th Sunday after Trinity (vers. 16-20).—HEUBNER: The joy of the Christian in the confession of faith: 1. Disposition; 2. necessity; 3. how are we fitted for it?—How shall we learn to estimate properly the value of the gospel? 1. When we experience its power in our own hearts; 2. when we perceive properly the wretched condition of the human race without Christianity—its religious as well as its moral condition; 3. when we learn the insufficiency of natural religion, which reveals God's existence and power, but not His mercy toward sinners.—The relation of natural and revealed religion: 1. Harmony; 2. difference; 3. inferences.

LANGE: For the wrath of God. Wrath a proof of the gospel: 1. Of its necessity; 2. its truth; 3. its glory.—On the difference between the knowledge and perception of God. The general manifestation of God, or the relation between natural religion and revealed religion in its narrower sense.—The beginning of all sin is always at bottom a sin of neglect. —The two sides of piety: to praise God, and to thank Him.

TILLOTSON: Verses 18, 19. If it were only the wrath and displeasure of men that the sinner were exposed to, there might be reason enough for fear; but the wrath and vengeance of men bears no comparison with the wrath of God. Their arm is short, and their powers small. They may shoot their most poisonous arrows at us, and at last kill us; but they cannot pursue us into the other world. But the wrath of God has none of these limits. —The fear of God's wrath: Men may harden their foreheads, and conquer all sense of shame; but they cannot perfectly stifle and subdue their fears. They can hardly so extinguish the fear of hell, but that some sparks of that fire will ever and anon be flying about in their consciences. —South (sermon on Natural Religion without Revolution, sufficient to render a sinner inexcusable (ver. 20)): I heartily wish that all young persons would lodge this one observation deep in their minds: That God and nature have joined wisdom and virtue by such a near cognation, or, rather, such an inseparable connection, that a wise, prudent, and honorable old age is seldom or never found but as the reward and effect of a sober, virtuous, and well-spent youth. —SCOTT: Even to this day, our nations seem to be sunk into so entire a stupidity as to have no notions of a God remaining among them, this still more clearly proves, not man's want of rational powers, but his carnal enmity to God and religion, through which he becomes more and more the besotted and blind slave of Satan. —CLARKE: Paul's purpose is to show: 1. That all the heathen nations are utterly corrupt, and
deserving of punishment; 2. that the Jews, notwithstanding the greatness of their privilege, were no better than the Gentiles. — Honos: The folly and darkness of which the Apostle here speaks are expressive of want of Divine knowledge, which is but the effect and cause of moral depravity. — J. F. H.

Vers. 29-32.

Abandonment of the Gentile world: 1. Why did God abandon them? a. Because they changed His glory into something transitory and corruptible; b. His truth into a lie. 2. In what respect did God abandon them? a. In pollution of the flesh and spirit; b. in utter hardness of heart (vers. 29-32). — How dreadful to be abandoned by God! Because 1. His Spirit departs; 2. sin becomes punishment. — Has Paul described the moral pollution of the Gentile world in too dark colors? No. For what the Apostle says is corroborated by witnesses from its very midst. 1. Of ancient times (Aristophanes, Horace, Juvenal); 2. of the present day (modern Hindu literature, etc.). — He who would describe sin, must be strengthened by looking up to God (ver. 29). — The heaviest world of the present day is the same as that at the time of Paul, and therefore can be converted only by the same means (the gospel). — He who knows how to do good, and does not do it, sins (ver. 32). — What men are hardened? Those who 1. know God's righteousness, 2. yet do what deserves death, and 3. are not contented to have pleasure in those who do it (ver. 32).

Luther: The real Epicureans are those who live as if there were no God; who boast much, and would have others boast of them that they are something extraordinary, when they really are not (ver. 30).

Sarck: It was a crime of pride, when they said, We are not so foolish (ver. 22). — To consider one's self wise and shrewd, and yet to possess foolish principia, is the greatest folly; especially when exhibited by the world's wise men in published writings (ver. 29). — The wiser and most learned are often also the most perverted. — It is absolutely unreasonable to worship God under the image of a beast; for what king, prince, and honorable man would permit himself to be represented in the form of an ox, or hog (1). How much less can God be treated thus (ver. 29). — He who forsakes God, will be forsaken also by God (ver. 24). — The most direct path to other-ism, is to regard God unworthy to be known (ver. 28). — Goodness goes gently, but evil goes violently, and will be host in the house. It foams and ferments like new wine (ver. 29). — Henders: Sin is sometimes the punishment of sin (ver. 24). — Ossian-Biil: Teachers and preachers must be careful to speak of sins against God and nature in such a way that those sins be prevented and guarded against, rather than learned and committed (ver. 26). — Chur-ner: Although the neglect to know God is regarded by the world as no sin, or if a sin, the least of all, it is really a fountain of all sin, and, finally, of all the penalties consequent upon sin (ver. 28).

Henders: The ruin of the Gentile world is a warning for Christians. Apostasy from the word of God induces similar aberrations at all times — a new though more refined heathenism (ver. 29). — God for sake only those who will not hear Him (ver. 24). — A wicked state of heart leads to absolute pleasure in wickedness itself (ver. 32).

Besser: Unnaturalness follows from the deflection of nature (ver. 27).

Lange: The connection between religious and moral ruin is exhibited also in the world at the present time. — The barbarous disregard of the human person in all sexual sins, as often concealed beneath the most refined masks of culture, is closely connected with the irreligious disregard of the personality of God and man. — A fundamental sanctification of the sexual relations can arise only from the vital knowledge of the dignity of personal life. — Sin taking on the form of the devilish nature in wicked maxims.

Schorr: Religion moderates and regulates natural affections, but excess of depravity extinguishes them. It is a proof of more determined impurity for men to take pleasure in the company of the enemies of God, than to commit many crimes whilst the heart and conscience protest against them. — Clarke: We see what the world was, and what it would ever have been, had not God sent a divine revelation of His will, and established a public ministry to proclaim it. Were man left to the power and influence of his fallen nature, he would always be what the Apostle here describes as the condition of the Gentile world.

— Comprehensive Com.: No wickedness so heinous, but a reprobate mind will comply.

Honas (condensed): 1. It is the very nature of sin to be inexcusable, and worthy of punishment; 2. as the works of God reveal His eternal power and Godhead, we should acquiesce ourselves to see in them the manifestations of His perfections; 3. the human intellect is as erring as the human heart; 4. as the light of nature is insufficient to lead the heathen to God and holiness, it is our obvious and urgent duty to send them the light of the Bible; 5. sins of uncleanness are peculiarly debaseing and demoralizing; 6. to take pleasure in those who do good, makes us better; as to delight in those who do evil, is the surest way to become even more degraded than they are themselves. — Compare two sermons by H. Schorr on The Heinous Guilt of Taking Pleasure in Other Men's Sins; and sermon by G. Girlestone on Pleasure in the Sight of Sin (Parochial Sermons). — J. F. H.

[Ver. 32. South (Sermon on the text): That sin (which sympathizes with and patronizes the sinner) is a pitch beyond all other sins, and such an one as must nonsus the devil himself to proceed farther. It is in the very extremity, the fulness, and the concluding period of sin; the last line and finishing stroke of the devil's image, drawn upon the soul of man. — P. S.]
CHAPTER II. 1-16.

THIRD SECTION.—Gradual transition from the corruption of the Gentiles to that of the Jews. The universality of the corruption, and, with the universality of guilt, that worst corruption, the judgment of others. This judgment is likewise judged by the continuance of a universal antagonism, within the universal corruption, between pious, earnest men, and obstinate rebels, both among Gentiles and Jews, in view of the righteous, impartial government of God by virtue of the continuance of the universal legislation of God in the consequence. The revelation of the antagonism of loyal Gentiles and disloyal Jews on the day of the proclamation of the gospel.

CHAP. II. 1-16.

1. Therefore [Wherefore] thou art inexcusable, O man, whosoever thou art that judgest: for wherein thou judgest another [the other, thy neighbor, τὸν ἄλλον, thou condemnest thyself; for thou that judgest dost the same things.

2. But we are sure that the judgment of God is according to truth against them which [those who] commit such things. And [But] thinkest thou this, O man, that judgest them which do [those who practise] such things, and dost the same, that thou shalt escape the judgment of God? Or despisest thou the riches of his goodness and forbearance and long-suffering; not knowing [not considering] that the goodness of God leadeth [is leading] thee to repentance?

3. But, after thy hardness and impenitent heart, treasurist up unto [for] thyself wrath against [in] the day of wrath 1 and revelation 2 of the righteous judgment of God;

6. 7. Who will render to every man according to his deeds: To them [those] who by patient continuance in well-doing [by endurance in good work] seek for glory and honour and immortality [will be rendered, οὐδεμιση, ver. 6], eternal life;

8. But unto them that [to those who] are contentious [self-seeking, or partisans], and do not obey [disobey] the truth, but obey unrighteousness, [shall be rendered] indignation and wrath [wrath and indignation]. 3 Tribulation and anguish, 4 upon every soul of man that doeth evil [is working out to the end the evil, τὸν κακὸν], of the Jew first, and also of the Gentile;

10. [Greek.] But glory, honour, and peace, to every man that worketh good [is working the good, τὸ ἔργον] of the Jew first, and also to the Gentile [Greek]. For there is no respect of persons 5 with [before] God.

12. For as many as have [omit have] sinned without law shall [will] also perish without law; and as many as have [omit have] sinned in [under] the law shall [will] be judged by the law; [.] (For not the hearers of the law 6 of law are just [righteous] before God, but the doers of the law [of law] shall [will] be justified [declared righteous]. For when [whenever] the [omit the] 7 Gentiles, which have not the law [Gentiles having no law, ἡ Ἰουδαία] to which νόμον [λόγον], do 8 by nature the things contained in the law [the things of the law, τὰ τοῦ νόμου, i. e., the things pertaining to, or required by, the law], these, having not the law [not having (the) law, νόμον μὴ ἔχοντες], 9 are a law unto [to] themselves: Which [Who] shew the work of the law written in their hearts, their conscience also bearing witness, and their thoughts the mean while accusing or else excusing one another;) [their thoughts between one another, or alternately, μετὰ αὐτῶν, accusing or also, ὅ καί, excusing.] 10 In the day when God shall judge the secrets of men by [through] Jesus Christ according to 11 my gospel.

TEXTUAL.

1. Ver. 5.—[ὁ ἀλλός ἀνθρώπος, i. e., wrath which will be revealed in the day of wrath. It belongs to ἐρωτεύμασις. The B. V. confounds ἐν with eis, which is inadmissible, unless we take it as a constructio pronominis, so that it includes eis.—P. S.]

2. Ver. 5.—[καί after ἀδικίαν ζωὴν is nowise sustained either by the Cod., or by the connection. (Probably inserted to relieve the number of genitives. Meyer: The καί would make the sense: the appearance of God and His righteous judgment. But the term ἀνωτάτωτα τοῦ θεοῦ is unusual. Paul speaks only of the ἀνωτάτωμα. [Πρεσβυτέρων, 1 Cor. i. 7; 1 Thess. i. 7.—P. S.]]

3. Ver. 7.—[On the different constructions see the Eadg.—P. S.]

4. Ver. 8.—The gen. θυμὸς καί ἦργος. (The reverse order is intrinsically preferable and sustained by Ρ. A. B. D* G. Ving. ἦν, &c., and adopted by the critical editors. The change in the construction from the accusative of ὁ λόγος ἄνθρωπος (ἀνωτάτωτα ἢ ἐστα), ver. 7, to the nominative ἄργος καί θυμὸς (ἀνωτάτως ἢ ἐστιν), ver. 8, is no doubt intentional]
EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

Summary.—These are the parts of this highly important section: 1. Every judgment pronounced on another becomes the self-condemnation of the one judging; for he is in the same condemnation with the one who is judged by him. Herein the sin of the Jews is already presupposed (vers. 1–5). 2. The righteousness of God is exalted above all partial righteousness; and in its retribution it distinguishes between men who earnestly long after righteousness, and those who obstinately resist; between men who constantly look toward things eternal, and those whose principle of life is contention and party spirit (vers. 6–11). This opposition constitutes a higher ideal and dynamic opposition between pious and ungodly people, whose the historical antithesis of Jews and Gentiles, and independently of it, so that, on the day of the declaration of the gospel, Jews may appear as Gentiles, and Gentiles as Jews (verses 12–16).

First Paragraph, Vers. 1–5.

Ver. 1. Wherefore thou art inexcusable. It may be asked, To what does δόξα, wherefore, refer? 1. To the fundamental thought of the whole section of chap. i. 18–32 (Meyer, and others). δόξα refers back to the δικαιωμα in vers. 32 (De Wette, Philippi [Alford, Hodge]). 2. δόξα points prophetically to the sins of the Jews (Bengel, Tholuck). We need hardly mention Bullinger's explanation: It is continua quentia partita: praelocere. We here find a definite reference to chap. i. 32. The δόξα indicates chiefly the climax of Gentile corruption; but Gentile and Jewish corruption meet together at this climax. Gentile corruption culminates in the approval of evil, and Jewish in judging. But their common evil is the perfect moral self-condemnation: sin against better knowledge and conscience. Therefore δικαιολογησις, inexcusable, are not merely the epitome of δόξα, to be left to the reader, but those also who pronounce sentence on them. In other words, not the δόξα, but vers. 32 is prophetically, especially in connection with the αναρρητευονται in vers. 31.

O man, whosoever thou art. To whom is this address directed? 1 To the Gentiles, especially Gentile authorities (Chrysostom); their better-minded ones (Olschhausen, Melanchthon); their philosophers (Clericus). 2. The Jews (De Wette, Rückert, and others). Meyer: "Judging the Gentiles as rejected by God (Midr. Tilled. i. 8, 3; Chubb, f. 3, 2, &c.) was a characteristic of the Jews. [Alford: The Jew is not yet named, but hinted at.—P. S.]

Ver. 2. But we are sure, O Israel. Who? 1. The Jews, as knowers of the law (Rosenmüller, and others). [Thou that judgest dost the same things, τα τοιαύτα παροστασις δι καιρον. Uncharitable judging is itself a grave offence against the law which enjoins humility and charity as the very soul of virtue and piety. Besides, even the most moral men carry in themselves the seed of all vice, and if kept from open transgression, it is either by the grace of God preventing them, or by (Pharisac and Sceic pride, which is itself a sin against God, the sin of Satan and the fallen angels.—P. S.)

The addition of καιρον, "with reproachful expression" (Meyer).

Ver. 2. But we are sure, O Israel. Who? 1. The Jews, as knowers of the law (Rosenmüller, and others). 2. Universal human knowledge (Rück-
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er, Meyer, [Hodge].) 3. Jewish-Christian knowledge, with reference to chap. iii. 19; v. 14 (Tholuck). 4. Yet the consciousness here declared is the specifically Christian one, which is, however, anticipated by the better universal consciousness in forebodings of the common misery of sin.

**According to truth.** Κατὰ ἀλήθειαν, not ἀληθῆς [revera, truly] (Raphael, Köllner, it is real), but [as in E. V.] according to truth (Tholuck, Meyer [Alford]); that is, corresponding to the internal and external relations of guilt [according to justice, we must regard, with respect of [Greek].] The condemnation of God on those who judge is according to the relations of truth, by which judgment they are the most condemnable who, without knowing it, pronounce judgment on themselves. Therefore they are hypocrites. [Κατὰ ἀλήθειαν belongs not to κῆλε, as the predicate of the sentence, but to λείπει, as adverb: it proceeds according to truth, or the judgment of God, which is according to truth, against those, &c.]—Ver. 3. And thinkest thou this, O man. According to Meyer and Tholuck, ver. 2 is the proposίον major in relation to what here follows. If the Apostle had designed such a conclusion in ver. 5, the minor proposition of vers. 3 and 4 would have been otherwise expressed. We have here the beginning of the conclusion from the premise in ver. 2. Thinkest thou that, τοῦτο. Reference to the strange supposition that God will become, by way of exception, a partisan for him. Therefore also the αὐτος is emphasized. Meyer: “In opposition to Jewish conceits.” Matt. iii. 7; Luke iii. 7. Yet the expression here must not be limited to the Jews. —That thou [αὐτό, thou thyself, thou above all others, thou because a Jew] shalt escape. Not by acquittal (Bengel [Hodge]), but by exemption. So Meyer: “Only the Gentiles shall be judged, according to the false opinion of the Jews (Bertholdt, Christologie, p. 206), but all Israel shall have part in the Messiah’s kingdom as its true-born children (Matt. viii. 12).” [Comp. Matt. iii. 7; 9; John viii. 33.] The expression escape refers at the same time to an approaching actual judgment which will overtake every guilty person.

Ver. 4. Or despriesti thou. This is a different case from the preceding. [It introduces a new error or objection.—P. S.] In what does the difference consist? Thou regardedst thyself either exempt from punishment, because thou believedst thyself a favorite of the Deity, and that thou shalt escape at the coming judgment; or thou didst wickedly regard the riches of God’s goodness in delaying the punishment as a sign that the general judgment will never come to pass at all. Paul frequently uses παρέχεται as an expression for great fulness [chap. ix. 28; xii. 83; Eph. i. 17, 21; ii. 7; iii. 16; Col. i. 17.] It is not a Hebraism, but found also in Plato and other Greek classics, to denote abundance and magnitude. —[P. S.]—His goodness. The χρηστότης is, more specifically, mildness, beneficence goodness, in contrast with penal justice. It may be asked whether we should read: His goodness (χρηστότης) and forbearance (ἀνοξείας) and long-suffering (μακροθυμίας), or whether the χρηστότης is here divided by καί—καί, as well, as also, into the idea of forbearance and long-suffering. We accept the latter, since the Apostle subsequently groups all again the ἀνοξείας. In the Apostle, so ver. 20: eis τὸ χρηστότητα, for the two ideas: forbearance toward the weakness of friends, and long-suffering toward the opposition of enemies [shewness is the infliction of deserved punishment]. But Paul distinguishes between patience (πάθος, chap. iii. 25, and long-suffering, chap. ix. 22, according to the relation already indicated. The ἀνοξεία is about equal to the ἱππαμία, Col. i. 11, and the παθός. Col. iii. 12.—Compare ἀνακάμπτοντας ἀλλήλον, Col. iii. 18; μακροθυμίας πρὸς πάντας. It is thus natural that one idea should sometimes run into the other. Tholuck: “The word of Christ (Luke xix. 41; Matt. xxiv.) would cause the expectation of a judgment on Israel, which real occurred about twenty [ten] years after this Epistle. Here Paul may naturally have had this in view.”—Ἀγνώνων. The translation Not knowing is too weak. [Dr. Lange translates ἀγνωσίαν: Indem du misskennen, wilfully ignoring; while Grotius, Tholuck, Wordsworth, al., render it: not considering.—P. S.] Meyer opposes the interpretation of ἀγνωσίας as wishing not to know (De Wette [Alford]), and others. Yet wilful and culpable ignorance is certainly meant here (comp. ἀγνώστως, Eph. iv. 18).—Is leading thee to repentance. ἀγίνει means, at all events, not only the objective intention of God (Philippi), but also the real determination of Divine goodness. [Bengel: Deus ducit velentem duci; ducit suavitatem, non cogit necessitate. Wordsworth: “The word ἀγίνει, leads, intimates the will of God, but also the will of man. God leads, but man may refuse to be led.” To this Dr. Hodge assents, but adds, from his strict Calvinistic standpoint: “Who gives the will to be led? Is there no preventing grace (gratia preventiens)? Does not God work in us to will, as well as to do? Surely there is such a thing as being made willing without being forced. There is a middle ground between moral suasion and coercion. God superseded the necessity of forcing, by making us willing in the day of His power. The Apostle, however, is not here speaking of gracious influence, but of the moral tendencies of providential dispensations.”—P. S.]—Ver. 5. But, after thy hardness [Κατὰ δὲ τὴν ἀληθειάτερον σου]. Evidently not a continuation of the question (Lachmann [Alford]), but antithesis. The hardened one mistakes the benign purpose of Divine government, and by this means transforms the same into an instrument of the question, with the object of universal frustration. [Κατὰ δὲ τὴν ἀληθειάτερον σου is taken by some, in proportion to, so that the degree of punishment corresponds to the degree of hardness and impudence; but by most commentators in the sense of secondum, i.e., as may be expected from thy hardness, agreeable to its nature.—P. S.]—And impenitent heart. This takes away from the idea the harsh appearance of a fatalistic compulsion. The hardness is voluntarily continued and magnified by the impunity of heart. —Thou treasurest up for thyself [thou for thyself, not God for thee.—P. S.]—The verb θησαυρίζεσθαι is used in the wider sense of every accumulation, and denotes also ironically the keeping up of evils and punishments. It here stands in striking opposition to the πλοίως of God’s goodness. The despising of the riches of God’s goodness in forbearance and long-suffering is the keeping up of a treasure of wrath. Unto himself indicat voluntary guilt as well as completed folly. —In [or on, in] the day of wrath. The construction is not θησαυρίζεσθαι τοῦ ἀδίκου, &c. (Luther [E. V., against], Tholuck), and also not an ἀγνώστως which will break out on the day of wrath (Meyer [Alford, Hodge]). But the
meaning is, that the day of wrath is even now ready to burst forth, and that that furious and senseless διακονίας still continues; comp. James v. 3; ἐνάσσασθαι εἰς ληστέας μήπως. Every catastrophe of judgment which succeeds a period of long-suffering is designated a day of wrath (Ezek. xxi. 24; Zechariah ii. 2). But each of these judicial catastrophes is a prelude to the last day of consummated wrath. — And revelation [manifestation] of the righteous judgment. The διακονίας (in the New Testament, ἀπὸς λέγουσιν, and but seldom elsewhere). The righteous judgment of God proceeds in an emphatic way through all periods of time; but it has special epochs of its διακονίας: the whole conception of different judicial catastrophes consists in the certainty, that the time of final decision is introduced with the coming of Christ. Tholuck cites Klopstock’s lines:

“Among the ways of men
God walks, with quiet tread, His unseen path;
But drawing near the goal, He rushes on,
Decided as the gleaming thunderbolt.”

SECOND PARAGRAPH (VSS. 6-11).

[It may aid the reader in the exegesis of this paragraph to have in view the following parallel arrangement in four stanzas each, which we adopt from the Analysis of Forbes, with some changes in the translation:]

6. Who will render to every man according to his deeds;
7. A To those who by endurance in good work
Seek for glory, and honor, and immortality,
Eternal life:
8. B But to those who are self-seeking,
And disobey the truth, but obey unrighteousness,
Indignation [shall be] and wrath:
9. B Upon every soul of man that worketh evil,
Of the Jew first, and also of the Greek;
10. A But glory, honor, and peace,
To every man that worketh good,
To the Jew first, and also to the Greek.

The first two stanzas, A and B, and the last two stanzas, B and A, are antithetically parallel in each of their lines, which indicate: (1) The character of the two opposite classes to be compared; (2) their respective pursuits; and (3) the appropriate rewards. In another point of view the four stanzas are intertextually parallel, the first corresponding with the fourth, and the second with the third. The glorious reward of the righteous is put first and last in order to stimulate and encourage the reader. The lines in each stanza are also inversely parallel, as is made apparent to the reader by the typographical arrangement.—P. S.]

Ver. 6. Who will render to every man. The negative form of this declaration, see ver. 11. The righteousness of God is far above the partisan righteousness of man, and also above that partisan justice which believes that God’s government is restrained by the historical difference between Judaism and heathendom. The decision stated by the Apostle is pronounced by the fundamental law of the entire Scriptures, of all Christendom, and of all religion (comp. Ps. lxi. 12; Isa. iii. 10, 11; Jer. xvii. 10; Matt. vii. 21–24; xii. 38; xvi. 27; xxv. 35; John v. 29; Rom. xiv. 10; 2 Cor. v. 10). The supposition that there is a great difficulty here, and an apparent contradiction between this sentence and the doctrine of justification by faith, is a remarkable indication of an inadequate view of works on one hand, and of justification by faith on the other. Tholuck gives an account of the question in discussion, p. 88 seq. Solutions of the imaginary difficulty: 1. The Apostle speaks here only hypothetically of the judgment of believers, as God would judge them, apart from the standpoint of the gospel (Melanchthon, &c.). Tholuck: Here, and in ver. 10, the Apostle regards only the Divine valuation placed on men, apart from redemption. [So, substantially, Alford and Hodge.—P. S.]. 2. He speaks of the final judgment, when faith will be proved to be the absolute fulfilment of the law (Ols.hausen). This is adopted by Philippi, but under the restriction: That the διακονίας ἐκ πίστεως will remove the deficiency in the works of the regenerate. Gerhard: Opera adducuntur in judicio non ut salutis merita, sed ut fidei testimonia et effecta. 3. Pritschke: The Apostle is inconsistent, and here opens a semita per hovestaten (von der via regia of justification. 4. Luthardt: The new vital form of faith must be regarded as the product of a previous direction of life; the ἔγγα are perfected in faith (Studien und Kritiken for 1852, No. 2, p. 368). [This view seems inconsistent with the Scripture doctrine of regeneration as a new creation, and of the new life as the reverse of the old (Rom. vi. 4, 19 ff.), and with the personal experience of Paul. But see Dr. Lange’s remarks below, and consider the remarkable concession of Peter, Acts x. 34, 35, where a disposition to fear God and to work righteousness is supposed to exist before conversion, even among heathen, and to qualify them for acceptance with God.—P. S.] 5. Cocceius and Limborch: The faith in Christ must also be included as the highest work (ἔγγα). This view is undoubtedly correct; and Tholuck’s explanation, that πίστευς εἰς εὑρέθη must not be included here (with reference to chap.
CHAPTER II. 1-16.

1-16. and * work 4. 3. 11. is But viewing that S. supplied 6 " that may the also the 12), Ether speaks men as species the of the Old Testament perfect righteousness. as perfection. of the two-fold conception of works with the Apostle, should escape the confusion made by a timid species of orthodoxy. The direction of faith as well as of unbelief has, according to Paul—as Luthardt has properly remarked—its antecedents in the antithesis of the fundamental tendencies which he describes in vers. 7, 8. The one class are, in their inward frame of mind, ἰτορία, striving souls—therefore men of longsuffering expectation, part in spirit [Matt. v. 3]. Their good works constitute a unity of effort, ὑμνον ἐγγυον; their aim is the δόξα, τιμή, ἀφανσία (goodly pearls; precious pearls, Matt. xiii. 45). The other class are, in their mental disposition, ἵ ἡμισίας, contentious, even when they confess an orthodox form of faith. They are men animated by the bigotry of party spirit, and therefore wantonly rebelling against the truth, while they are the narrow-minded slaves of the unrighteousness of party spirit. But the retribution of both classes will be determined by the respective degrees of virtue and vice which they reach. As seekers, they find faith and justification by faith, which, according to chap. iii., proceeds also from righteousness. As believers, they strive for the treasure of their heavenly calling, and strive after those things which are before them, until they reach the goal of perfection. But there they do not appear with works of the law, nor with a mixture of perfect justitia inquitata and imperfect works. In the kingdom of perfect love the antagonism of merit and grace disappears in a higher unity of both. It is observable that, with the Apostle, all the ideas of the Old Testament become more profound, and are made perfect: 1. The law becomes the law of the Spirit; 2. work becomes the work of faith; 3. righteousness becomes justifying righteousness; 4. retribution becomes free, rewarding love. The observation of Meyer, that we have here the law of the Jews only, and with it the natural law of the Gentiles as the medium affecting the decision, does not relieve the matter. He indeed also adds, that Paul had good reason for this statement, since the Christian, too—because he is to be judged according to his conduct—must be judged according to the law (comp. the doctrine of the τέλος ἡμών ἐστιν, and ἀληθινὸς πόνος introduced by Christ [Matt. v. 17; xxv. 31 ff.; Rom. xii. 8-10]). He justly rejects the opinion of Reiche, that the doctrine of justification by faith implies a partial abrogation of the moral order of the world.*

* Of the English and American commentators, whom I have consulted, Dr. Dodge is the only one who takes some pains to solve this deplorable difficulty by the apparent contradiction of the doctrine of retribution according to works, and the doctrine of justification by faith. It is quite true, on the one hand, that the first, notwithstanding the doctrine of gratuitous justification, and in perfect consistency with it, the Apostle still teaches that the retributions of eternity are according to our works.

Ver. 7. To those who by endurance (or perseverance) in good work [ἡσυχία] ἐκ θείων ἁγίων, an adverbial qualification of the verb ἐγγυεῖν], &c. Where the different works are only one good work, and where there is this perfect endurance of life and effort, the direction toward higher and eternal things can only be meant. The genitive ἐγγυον ἁγίων is gent. subj. (not obj.; Meyer); that is, the endurance which is peculiar to the truly good work. [Comp. ἐγγυον τῆς ἀποκατάστασος, 1 Thess. i. 3.—P. S.]. It may be observed, however, that, with the Apostle, as with James, the good works are distinguished two kinds of faith. We must therefore distinguish a two-fold conception of works with the Apostle, if we would escape the confusion made by a timid species of orthodoxy. The direction of faith as well as of unbelief has, according to Paul—as Luthardt has properly remarked—its antecedents in the antithesis of the fundamental tendencies which he describes in vers. 7, 8. The one class are, in their inward frame of mind, ἰτορία, striving souls—therefore men of longsuffering expectation, part in spirit [Matt. v. 3]. Their good works constitute a unity of effort, ὑμνον ἐγγυον; their aim is the δόξα, τιμή, ἀφανσία (goodly pearls; precious pearls, Matt. xiii. 45). The other class are, in their mental disposition, ἵ ἡμισίας, contentious, even when they confess an orthodox form of faith. They are men animated by the bigotry of party spirit, and therefore wantonly rebelling against the truth, while they are the narrow-minded slaves of the unrighteousness of party spirit. But the retribution of both classes will be determined by the respective degrees of virtue and vice which they reach. As seekers, they find faith and justification by faith, which, according to chap. iii., proceeds also from righteousness. As believers, they strive for the treasure of their heavenly calling, and strive after those things which are before them, until they reach the goal of perfection. But there they do not appear with works of the law, nor with a mixture of perfect justitia inquitata and imperfect works. In the kingdom of perfect love the antagonism of merit and grace disappears in a higher unity of both. It is observable that, with the Apostle, all the ideas of the Old Testament become more profound, and are made perfect: 1. The law becomes the law of the Spirit; 2. work becomes the work of faith; 3. righteousness becomes justifying righteousness; 4. retribution becomes free, rewarding love. The observation of Meyer, that we have here the law of the Jews only, and with it the natural law of the Gentiles as the medium affecting the decision, does not relieve the matter. He indeed also adds, that Paul had good reason for this statement, since the Christian, too—because he is to be judged according to his conduct—must be judged according to the law (comp. the doctrine of the τέλος ἡμών ἐστιν, and ἀληθινὸς πόνος introduced by Christ [Matt. v. 17; xxv. 31 ff.; Rom. xii. 8-10]). He justly rejects the opinion of Reiche, that the doctrine of justification by faith implies a partial abrogation of the moral order of the world.*

* Of the English and American commentators, whom I have consulted, Dr. Dodge is the only one who takes some pains to solve this deplorable difficulty by the apparent contradiction of the doctrine of retribution according to works, and the doctrine of justification by faith. It is quite true, on the one hand, that the first, notwithstanding the doctrine of gratuitous justification, and in perfect consistency with it, the Apostle still teaches that the retributions of eternity are according to our works.
2. Deich [Ewald]: τῶν μὲν [to the one] καθ᾽ ἐπικομίαν ἤγου σάρκας δόξαν καὶ τιμὴν καὶ ἀφελείαν (ἀποστολ[...]ς ἑναρμόνων [ἐν τοῖς ἅμα].

3. Fritzsche [Gigid-iiaq]; also &vi67; such. Gal. Cor. Robinson Tholuck: tom; they see Men Power high 20. Qui 3

The on the The According 3. supplied y/o$a, the expressed "heavenly life," not patience, but perseverance (Tholuck [Hodge]), but dynamically. The singular indicates the general course and habit of life, or the moral character as a whole, distinct from isolated resolutions and actions, comp. Gal. vi. 4; 1 Thess. i. 3; James i. 4, &c. The E. V., patient continuance in well-doing, though not literal, is well expressed.

F. S.] Ἀδελθα, τιμή, ἀφελεία, are the phases of God's manifestation of the Sun of righteousness for those from whom it has been stricken by the judgment of God.

This matter is inverted in the case of believers: Power of life, worth of life, glory of life.

Tholuck's remark is strange, that: "the Apostle characterized here the striving of the better class of unbelievers in such a manner as he could hardly expect to find it by any possibility among them." But Paul had become acquainted with such men as Gamaliel, Sarcus, Paulus Gallio, and others.

Ver. 8. But to those who are self-seeking partisans.

[Literally, those of self-seeking is a peripheral of the subject, indicating the origin (ἐκ, out of, as from a root) and moral character; comp. ὅτι ἐν ἑπόμενοι, the legalists; ὅτι εἰ πίστις, the believers; ὅτι εἰ πίστιν ἐπισκεπτών, the circumspect, &c., and the cognate use of ὀπλον in the LXX.]

On ὦς ὁ κόσμος, compare Tholuck and Meyer. We must not, without comprehensive of the case, regard it as τιμήν ἢ ἀφελείαν [from which it is distinguished, 2 Cor. xiii. 20; Gal. v. 20. —P. S.], and therefore not identify it with ἀλληλουϊά, contentions (Vulgate: Quia sunt ex contentione, die Streitsüchtigen); but it comes from ἀλληλοῦχος, a hating; ἀλληλωτρία, to work for one's own selves, as to selfishly. Its first meaning is goodwill, then trickery, partnership. Aristot. Eth. ii. 3, &c.; see Fritzsche, Exevarsus on Rom. ii. 13. Meyer: "the latter signification (Rückkehr, Partietrieber) must be retained in all passages of the New Testament; 2 Cor. xii. 20; Gal. v. 20; Phil. i. 16; ii. 3; James iii. 14, 15." The succeeding words also establish this explanation. [The opposite of ὦς εἰ ἔργος is ὦς ἐν ἀγάπῃ, Phil. i. 16, 17. Ignatius, Ad Philad. 8, opposes ἔργος to χριστοποιήσατο.—P. S.] Tholuck: The Apostle has here in view those Jews who opposed the Gentiles in opposition to the gospel. He recalls to mind the intrigues of the Zealots, and supposes that the popular sense has extended to the meaning of contention, probably on the ground of the supposed derivation from ἔργος. Remember the contentious spirit of the Talmudists Jews. In point of fact, the party spirit is always united with the love of contention. But the ἔργος is a corruption, which exists in Gentiles and Jews alike. There are only two kinds of men: Men who are of the truth, whose ethical principle of life is a corruption, that is, the spirit of any who tem- poral object, and who for this very reason sedulously oppose the truth as partisans, and are subject to unrighteousness, as slaves to party. In this direction every contentious in the life of the Zealots, and converted into a party affair, and destroyed by party spirit; just as the Jews of that period made even ἔργος out of the Old Testament religion. Nevertheless, the definite idea is obliterated, if ἔργος is made to mean, without qualification, ungodliness, or vileness (Köhler, Fritzsche).—Disobey the truth. Aetiol. vii.; the truth has the right of a king, and Christ is King, as King of the truth. Therefore, to strive against the truth, involves not only religious opinion, but moral misconduct. Such revolters against what is high are necessarily slaves to what is low; they bow before unrighteousness (chap. i. 18) —Wrath and indignation. The nominative ὄργανον καὶ θυμός is supplied by ἀλληλοῦχον, or ἀλληλωτρία, as constructio variata. θυμὸς as ex consideranda enhances the idea of ἔργος. The historical form of the judgment pronounced on the self-seeking partisans is therefore to be measured by ἔργος and θυμὸς of the party spirit are judged by ἔργος and θυμὸς of an opposite kind; and therein the ὄργανον and θυμός of the Lord are revealed. (See the history of the destruction of Jerusalem, Matt. xviii. 33, 34).—The majority of philosophers and commentators make ὄργανον express the permanent feeling and settled disposition (comp. John iii. 36; the wrath of God abideth on him); θυμὸς, the momentary impulse or actual outburst of wrath on the day of judgment. Ammon.: ὄργανόν, πρόκλησαν, ὄργανον πολυχρόνων. θυμὸς (Genuth) is the mind as the seat of the emotions, and hence denotes vehement anger, fury. According to the correct reading, it fits follows after ὄργανον, as its execution and outburst; 1 ra exzandothetia (Cicer. Thuc. 1. 9. 18).
Third Paragraph (vers. 12-16).

Ver. 12. For as many as sinned without law. Tholuck: The Apostle here mentions the judgment only on its condemnatory side, because according to his purpose in chap. iii. 20, it was not necessary that he should take a broader view here. But he also wishes to prepare for the doctrine of justification by faith. Thus, vers. 12 and 18 establish ver. 9; and, on the other hand, vers. 14, 16, and 16 establish ver. 10.—Without law, ἀνόμως; that is, without the knowledge and norm of the Mosaic law (comp. Rom. vii. 10)—that is, without a definite consciousness of definite transgression (1 Cor. ix. 21). [Νόμος and ἀνόμως throughout refer to the written or revealed law of Moses, as the expressed will of God concerning our moral conduct. The heathen are called ἀνόμως, not absolutely—for they have the unwritten law of conscience— but as distinguished from the Jews, who were Ἰσραήλ νόμον. ἀνόμως therefore is equivalent to μηκετὶ νόμοι.—P. S.]- Shall also perish without law. Meyer: "ἀπολοίονται is the opposite of the ἁγιορεία in i. 16, of the ἀρπάζων in i. 17, of the ἱπτόμενος in ii. 7, of the ἱζόμενος, etc., in ii. 10. Comp. John iii. 15; Rom. xiv. 15; 1 Cor. i. 18." Since the ἀπολοίονται has its degrees (comp. Matt. xii. 22; Luke xii. 48), Meyer should not deny that (as Chrysostom, Theophylact, Ecumenius assert) there is something alleviating in the ἁπάθως. The external consequences of sin could be similar, yet the internal consequences would be different according to the different degrees of the knowledge of transgression; and ἁπάθως ἀπολοίονται is accordingly a stronger expression than ἀπολοίονται. We should all the more reject the barbarous view of Dodwell, Weisse, Billroth, and others, by which the ἀπολοίονται is made to express the annihilation of those who do not possess the Christian principle (see Tholuck, p. 99) It is evident that also the ἀνόμως must not be understood absolutely (see ver. 10). They only do not possess the law in the clearness and fullness of the Mosaic code. [The passage certainly teaches, 1. That the immoral heathen will not escape punishment, since they, too, are incurable, having the light of God's general revelation in nature (i. 20), and in their conscience (ii. 14, 15); 2. that they will be judged ἀνόμως, i. e., not with the rigor of the written law, as the disobedient Jews and unfaithful Christians are, but impartially, and according to the common law of reason and of conscience. The unfaithful Jews will fare worse than the Gentiles, and the unfaithful Christians worse than the Jews. The severity of punishment corresponds to the measure of guilt, and the measure of guilt depends on the amount of opportunity. The Bible plainly teaches different degrees of punishment; comp. Luke xii. 47, 48; Matt. xi. 21-24; xii. 41, 42. In the interpretation of this passage, moreover, we should not overlook what Paul says immediately afterward of the better class of heathen, vers. 14, 16, and 26-29; comp. the Notes below.—P. S.]

And as many as sinned in the law, shall be judged by the law. They shall be condemned according to the law. Νόμος, even without the article, signifies here the Mosaic law. The ἐν νόμῳ—De Wette: in the law. Tholuck: in the possession of the law. Meyer: in the possession. The sense of the word is to possess to require a stronger expression. See chap. vili. 8. [ἐν signifies the status, under the law.—P. S.]

This sentence verifies ver. 9: first upon the soul of the Jew, in contrast with the presumed righteousness of the Jew. Peter institutes a similar law for the Christian Church (1 Pet. iv. 17).

Ver. 15. For not the hearers of the law...
Griesbach and Reiche parenthesize vers. 13–15; 
Koppe, ver. 13; Lachmann, Meyer, Baumgarten-Crusius, vers. 14, 15. All these parentheticals disturb the connection. Ver. 13 proves the damnable-ness of those who sinned against the law (see ver. 17), and makes the sinner an object of sentence. They shall be just before the judgment-seat of God—pronounced just by God.  

**κακοκράτος** 

as this passage already proves, is terminus foeminus: to declare just, not to make just; for the doors of the law are already just, and need not be made just by God. **κακοκρατος** is, according to the analogy of **τυφλος** (to make blind), and other verbs in ὅσος derived from adjectives of the second declension, means properly, it is true, according to the etymology, to be just. Yet, as the Sopportuph and the New Testament usage must supply, by *declara ius*. Then **κακοκρατος** is, originally, to *make just*, on the part of the δίκη [right, righteousness, also the goddess of righteousness], and according to its tribunal; that is, to *acknowledge just*, which has throughout a forensic, but never an *absolutely* forensic sense; as **καισασμος** means also, in the classic sense, to *think or esteem just*, according to the technical sense of personal opinion. However, the innocent man also, when once he stands at the tribunal, must be *declared just*; and the guilty one, who is declared just in the tribunal of grace, receives with this declaration the δικαιοσύνη of Christ in his faith, without which he could never be pronounced just according to Divine truth. See the Bible Work on James ii. 21 [p. 68 of the German, p. 38 of the A. mer. ed.]. Even the punishment, according to the classical use of the term, becomes a δικαιοσύνη, because the punished one, by punishment, becomes again conformable to the δίκη. According to Meyer, the Apostle has here only set forth the fundamental law of God judging in righteousness. According to Philippi, *the οἱ τῶν νομον are here only placed as the true rule, in opposition to the false rule of the Jews, that the αὐθεντικος τοις νομοι should be just before God, apart from the question whether there are such οἱ τοις; but the whole argument of the Epistle to the Romans proves, that no man is by nature such a οἱ τοις τοις νομοι. This construction does not coincide with vera. 14 and 15. We should rather observe here the deeper idea of *οἱ τοις* (εις οὔτως χορηστοι αὐτοῖς) in ver. 10, and of νομοι in ver. 14; and, at the same time, with Tursenogen's view of God's different tribunals, we must acknowledge that the Apostle can also use here the δικαιοσύνη in the wider sense. Comp. 1 Cor. iv. 4. The connection of this passage with the following verses cannot be destroyed by a dogmatizing exegesis.*

* For the meaning of the terms δικαιοσύνη, δοκιμασία, δικαιωμα, see the notes on chap. ii. and iii. 24–31. Dr. Hodge holds to the strictly forensic view, and agrees here with Philippi. "To be just before God," he says, "is to be justified; is to be declared just. They are both forensic expressions, and indicate the state rather than the character of those to whom they refer. Those are the justified who have done whatever the law requires, and are regarded and treated accordingly.

**For when Gentiles [έθνη, without the article, meaning some, not all].** The confirmation of ver. 10 is introduced by what the Apostle has already said. The expositors seem here to have thoroughly wandered from the proper path, and to have been influenced by constant attestation of the position of the circumcision. The exercise of the call of the Gentiles is taken up again in ver. 16. 1. According to Bucer, Calvin, Trench [Hodge], and others, ver. 14 refers to the first half of ver. 12. While there the question is concerning those who shall perish without law, the objection here to be met is, that there is only condemnation where a νομος is present; in consequence of this, Koppe regards ver. 13 as parenthetical. Yet not only is the δικαιοσύνη of this view, but also the τοις τοις νομοι ποιον. 3. Philippi: The Apostle refers to the first half of ver. 13. "Not the hearers of the law are just before God, for the Gentiles have also a law; the Gentiles are also δικαιοτατοι τοις νομοι." But this was not the case in the opinion of the Apostle. 3. According to Meyer, he refers to the second half of ver. 13. **The Gentiles possess a certain substitute for the Moses law. Therefore they are also subject to the rule: of δικαιοσυνη, ver. 13. This fundamental rule is deduced only hypothetically by the Apostle, and not in the sense that the Gentiles actually are doers of the law. The deduction of vers. 14 and 15 will evidently establish the proposition of ver. 10. **But glory, honor, &c., and "also to the Greeks," after vers. 12 and 13 have established the proposition of ver. 9. The fundamental thought is, that also the Gentiles can obtain eternal life; for it was not necessary that he should first prove this in reference to the Jews. This thought is more explicitly neither by the first half of vers. 13 alone, nor by the second alone, but by the whole rule: Not the hearers of the law are already just before God, but the doers of the law, in the sense of ver. 7. The δικαιοσυνη, as poor in spirit, who are penitent, shall be justified in the new economy of salvation.—For they...suppose a case whose frequent occurrence is possible; in classical, as often as (Meyer [who refers to Kühner, ii. 165 f., and Matthiae, p. 1195]).—Gentiles, ἔθνη, without the article. The rule might refer, as hypothetically expressed, to the whole body of the Gentiles (according to De Wette, Reiche [Philippi, Alford, Hodge], and others); but as it is too evident from the first chapter that this case did not really occur, there is very properly no article; and the supposition that there is really an "election of

*naturally, that is, are declared to be free from condemnation, and entitled to the favor of God. In obvious allusion to the opinion, that being a Jew was enough to secure admission to heaven, the Apostle says, It is not the heathen, but the ears of the law that are justified. He is not speaking of the method of justification available for sinners, as rendered in the same verse, but of the principle of justice which will be applied to all who look to the law for justification. If men rely on works, they must have works; they must be doers of the law; they must satisfy its demands, if they are to be justified by it. For God is just and the impartial. He will, as a judge administering the law, judge every man, not according to his works, but according to his works and the knowledge of duty which he has heard. On these principles, it is his very design to show that no flesh living can be justified." (John Calvin; see also Institutes, III. VII. 5.) But the real difficulty consists in the apparent conflict of the doctrine of justification by faith alone with the doctrine of the law as the standard of the acceptable. As well as, 3 Cor. v. 19; Rom. xiv. 1; Gal. vi. 7; Eph. v. 8; Col. iii. 10; iv. 1, 2, and iv. 21; 31–46; John v. 29, Cump. the comments on vers. 5, 6.
Each Gentiles thereby gains greater probability. [Comp. Meyer in loc., and Hofmann, Schriften, p. 587, who likewise press the absence of the article, and justly reject the reference to iii. 29; ix. 30; 1 Cor. i. 23 (quoted by De Wette, Alford, and Hodge, in favor of the other view). On the other hand, Torrey is not identical with (John), but indicates a species or class of Gentiles.—P. S.]

Who have no law, τὰ μὴ νόμον ἠχοντα. The absence of the article means not only that they have not the Mosaic law, but that they have no revealed religious law whatever.—Do perchance by nature. By nature (ϕυσις) must not, with Bengel and Usteri, be referred to the preceding. For also the Jews do not have the law by nature. Nature is here the original nature, as it proves itself active, especially in the noble few—in the impulse or tendency toward the noble.—The things of the law. It is the material substance of the religious and moral law, apart from the formal definitions of the Mosaic code. The exposition of Beza and others is dogmatizing: Qua lex factii (lex judae, coniuncti, dumnat, puniat; hoc ipsum factum et elenches, &c.; Cappell.). [Hodge: "There are two misinterpretations of the phrase τὰ τῶν νόμων ποιησιν. The one is, that it means, to fulfill the law; the other, to do the office of the law, i.e., to command and forbid. The former is unnecessary, and is in direct opposition to the express and repeated declaration of the Apostle, that none, whether Jew or Gentile, have ever fulfilled the law. To do the things of the law, is indeed to do what the law prescribes (comp. x. 5; Gal. iii. 12); but whether complete or partial obedience is intended, depends upon the context. The man who pays his debts, honors his parents, is kind to the poor, does the things of the law, for these are the things which the law prescribes. And this is all the argument of the Apostle requires, or his known doctrine allows us to understand by the phrase, in the present instance. This being the case, there is no need of resorting to the second interpretation mentioned above, which was proposed by Beza, and adopted by Wetstein, Flatt, and others. Though ποιησιν τὰ τῶν νόμων might mean to do the things of the law, it is not clear whether it means to do them in accordance with sense, that would forbid evil; it certainly has not the sense elsewhere in Paul's writings—see x. 5; Gal. iii. 12—and is especially out of place here, in immediate connection with the phrase πως τι ποιησί ποιητε τῶν νόμων, in the sense of the doers of the law."—P. S.]

These, not having (the) law, are a law to themselves. οἴντος is emphatic with approbation. νόμον μὴ ἠχοντες, in distinction from μὴ τῶν ἡχοντων, indicates want. Meyer: 'Their own moral nature supplies in them the place of the revealed law (see the classical parallels in Meyer). Philippi distinguishes between τὸν νόμον ποιησιν [ver. 13, or τὸν νόμον τείλει, ver. 27, and τά τοῦ νόμου ποιησιν. They perform what belongs to the law; they observe only single outward commands of the law, one man this, another that. "Therefore they do not observe the law in its spirituality or deep inner meaning." An utter perversion of the proper relation. Without knowing the law of Moses, they observe the essential part of the law, ὡς δικαιωματα τῶν νόμων. Ver. 26, τὸν νόμον τείλεισθεν, that is, performing it according to its defined purpose, ver. 27.

* [Forbes, p. 148, fully adopts this distinction of Philippi, and thinks it essential to the proper understanding of the whole passage.—P. S.]

Ver. 15. Who shew, &c. Οἶνος is no "explaining or proving," but emphasizing, recommending, (see the antithesis in ver. 1). What and how do these prominent Gentiles show? They shew or exhibit, the work of the law; that is, the work required by the law. Not the law itself (Wolf, Keppel, &c.); for the Ten Commandments are not formally written in their heart, but the essential meaning of their requirement, the imperious "Thou shalt," the conduct corresponding to the law." More properly expressed, the conduct intended by it. Luther: "The contents of the law; likewise Seiler and Baur. According to Meyer and Tholuck, the singular stands collectively instead of ἠχοντα. "As ver. 7?" (Tholuck). But ver. 7 rather means that the ἠχοντα are only good when they proceed from the unity of a ὑπομονη ἠχοντων ἄφηθεν. In the higher aspiration of the Gentile there was this analogy to Christian faith: that it consisted really in the unity and consistency of sentiment and life.

Written in their hearts. The adjective γραπτος (supply ὅν) is stronger than the participle γραφαμεν. [It implies the idea of permanency.] Evidently a contrast to the Mosaic record of the law on the tables of stone. See 2 Cor. iii. 7; Rom. xiii. 30. Therefore a higher order of Judaism, similar to the "written and unwritten laws" of the apostolic church, is implied, in the essential features in these chosen Gentiles (see the history of the Centurion at Capernaum. [The Greek poet Sophocles speaks of "the unwritten and indelible laws of the gods" in the hearts of men; and the Platonic philosopher Phulytas speaks of a "law which is not outwardly written in books, but implanted in the heart of man."—P. S.]

Who shew, τῶν ἠχοντων. And how do they exhibit or prove this? (see chap. ix. 17, 22.)

1. By the doing of the law (Zwingli, Grothus, and the majority of recent commentators; De Wette, Meyer). 2. By the mark of their better endeavors in many ways (in a certain measure, Calvin; but better Cocceius, tom. v. p. 46. Yet both are biased by the Augustinian view.) 3. By the law of conscience. Tholuck (according to Theoret and Erasmus): "We might observe, hear, read, the word or the judgment of the law in themselves, and in correspondence therewith their consequent conscience assumes in them the office of judge. For where we find the exercise of the judicial power in man, we must also presuppose the legislative power." But this view is inconsistent not only with with in συμαρτησιος (for the extended treatment of this question, see Tholuck, p. 105, and Meyer [p. 98, ed. Iv., the note]), but also with ἡμεις γραμματει. Here the language concerning proofs of conscientiousness becoming outwardly manifest. Numbers 1 and 2 are to be united, since the well-doing, according to ver. 7, is only the perseverance in a noble endeavor (under the gratia praemionis), which attains its object only in Christianity.

Their conscience also bearing witness [συμαμαρτησιος αἰτήματι τῆς συνεργήσεως]. It gives witness with, in connection with their better manner of action. Both bear witness to the belief that they are a law to themselves, in their natural spontaneity. De Wette: "συμαμαρτησιος is neither equal to μαρτησιος (Grothus, Tholuck), nor una testari, with reference to the ποιησιν τα του νομου. (Meyer, Fritzsche, &c.). But the σιν, like εν in contextari, refers in part to the relation of the witness to him for whom he testifies; and in part, as σιν ἡμεις, to the inner relation of the conscientious.
ness." But as the αὐθανάσιος is a consciousness in man which is both objective and subjective, and hence independent of his merely subjective consciousness, so is the αὐθανάσιος an independent witness of the right, which, in the case before us, corresponds with the witness of man in his deed. It is the Gentile's cheering and often even joyous consciousness of his right direction; as, for example, of the Wise Men from the East under the guidance of their star.

And between one another their thoughts accusing or also excusing. [Dr. Lange translates: "jedes zwischen ihnen a ἐν αὐθανάσιοι, of which an anknagende oder auch entstehsende sind." He refers, with Meyer, μετατιθέναι ἄλληνων to the heathen, not to the thoughts.—P. S.] Different expositions: 1. Their thoughts inwardly accuse each other (Luther, Calvin, Tholuck [Alford, Hodge]). There are different views on μετατιθέναι ἄλληνων: at a future time, ἐν ἡμερᾷ of judgment (Koppe); post rem actam (Vater); between (two portions of time), at the same time (Bährmühl [Kölner E. V.]). But we must observe, on the contrary, that Paul does not speak of the inner facts of the consciousness, since these facts here fall under the conception of the historical ἡμερῶν. The accusations and defenses which were conducted between Gentiles and Gentiles (Schorr, Meyer). Against this interpretation Tholuck raises the question: *How can νῦν λογισμόν, without a more special indication, refer to any other subject than the one whose witness of conscience has just been mentioned?* But if the μετατιθέναι ἄλληνων refers to the intercourse between Gentiles, then the following must have the meaning: since the judgments of their thoughts are throughout accusing or excusing; that is, therefore, moral judgments, which refer to the origin of an immediate moral law. The accusing thoughts come first here, because the language refers first of all to the nobler Gentiles, whose opinions are related to the ordinary popular life as judicial ideals. But also in their excusing they often appeal from barbarian legal practices to the unwritten law (see Sophocles, Antigone). In short, the whole intercourse between the nobler heathen is a kind of moral dialectics, a continual moral process of thought. [Paul describes the moral process which takes place in the heart of man and is interpreted as a συνείδησις, sits in judgment, and pronounces the sentence in God's name according to the law; the διαγνωστοί are the several moral reflections and reasonings which appear as witnesses testifying and pleading in this court of conscience, and are often conflicting, since the sinful inclinations and passions interfere and bore the witnesses; the object of the καταγωγικός, or καταγωγικόν, is the moral action which is brought before the trial of the conscience. The ήμερα indicates that the conscience finds more to accuse than to excuse. This judicial process, which takes place here in every man's heart, is a forerunner of the great judgment at the end of the world.—P. S.]

Ver. 16. In the day. The commentators seem here to overlook the obvious, proper meaning, because they suppose that the ήμερα on which God will judge the secrets of men, must be referred to the day of final judgment. But, in the first place, the connection does not support this view, and hence an artificial connection has been variously constructed (the Gentiles show that on the day, &c.). Calvin explains ήμερα as τῇ ήμερᾳ, unto or until the day. [Others modify this by making τῇ to include τῇ "until and on that day."—P. S.] Tholuck fills up the apparent chasm between vers. 15 and 16 by supposing that the Apostle probably had in mind a transition such as καὶ τοῦτο μάλιστα, and this especially, with the remark: "This view has now become the general one." "So Stuart inclines to unite ver. 16 with ver. 10; Beza, Grotius, Reiche, &c., connect it with κρίνωντας, ver. 12; Tat. do. &c. Thus Meyer, with Lamphere, assigns the reasons for the great retribution on the last day. Ewald goes back even to ver. 5. —P. S.] Secondly, the declaration that "God shall judge according to my gospel," pronounces against the reference of ήμερα to the day of final judgment. Meyer passes over this difficulty with the remark of Calvin: Suum appellat rationes ministerii. His quotation of 1 Tim. ii. 8 does not assume any thing for his interpretation. On the contrary, that according to a number of the Fathers, the gospel of Paul must be understood to be the gospel of Luke, compare the quotation in Meyer. But the Scriptures take cognizance not merely of one day of judgment. The day on which God judges the secrets of men according to the gospel of Paul, is the day when the Apostle preaches the gospel to them. On this day, in this time of decision, it becomes manifest that there are Gentiles who are a law to themselves; that there is another opposition than that of external Judaism and paganism; that there are Gentiles who must be counted for the circumcision, and Jews whose circumcision must be counted for uncircumcision (see vers. 26 and 27). It is a thought whose root is found already in the Old Testament, that the time of the appearance of Christ and of the preaching of the gospel is a time of judgment. See Joel iii. 6, 7, and in other places; Malachi iii. 2 ff. The Lord John 12. 30. to the unbeliever; John xiv. 26; John v. 25: "The hour is coming, and now is." The time of perfect faith is denounced a day (John xvi. 23, 26). Also, in Rom. xiii., ver. 12 connected with ver. 13, the language cannot relate exclusively to the day of final judgment. The same applies to ήμερα in 1 Cor. iii. 13. Comp. 2 Cor. vi. 2; ήμερα σοφιάς. The Apostle mentions this day without the article, without the collective pronoun, he marks this day as the day when God shall judge the secrets of men. He uses the same word κρίνωντας as in ver. 29, 5 ἐν τῷ κρίνωντα "Ioudaioi. He says men—not merely the Gentiles—because the gospel, according to chaps. ix.—xi., manifests God's judgment not only on the Gentiles, but also on the Jews; and this is a judgment pronounced on their internal good conduct or misconduct toward the internal nature and spirit of

* [Similarly Alford: "Concerning by its testimony, the σῶμα signifying the agreement of the witness with the deed, as in context, in a context, confirmat; perhaps also the σῶμα may be partly induced by the σῶμα in συνείδησις—referring to the collective pronoun, in which a man confers, so to speak, with himself."—P. S.]

* [Wordsworth also adopts this connection with vers. 15, and quotes from Bishop Pearson (Art. VII. on the Creed): "Conscience is a witness bound over to give testimony for or against us at some judgment after this life to pass upon us."—P. S.

1 So do the editions of Olshausch and Knapp and E. V., who paraphrase vers. 13, 14, 15.—P. S.]}
CHAPTER II. 1-16.

the law. In this relation the gospel of the Apostle was the real medium and measure of the judgment (see 1 Cor. i. 18); and Jesus Christ was the real judicial authority. See John iii. 16; Acts xviii. 30, 31; 1 Cor. iv. 6, and other places. On the day of that transcendental of the gospel the better Gentiles manifested their ordination to salvation, just as the majority of the Jews made manifest their hardness of heart.

[According to my gospel. The μν ὁ νοὸς is to be either understood, rationes ministerii (Calvin, Meyer), or better, the gospel of free grace for the undreconstruction, which was especially committed to Paul, as the gospel for the circumcision was to Peter, Gal. ii. 7. The same expression occurs Rom. xvi. 25, 26.—Through Jesus Christ, as the appointed Judge of the world; Acts xviii. 30, 31; 1 Cor. iv. 5; 2 Cor. v. 10; Matt. xxv. 31; John v. 27, &c. While κατὰ τὸ ἐνεργείαν ὁ νοὐς favors Dr. Lange's interpretation of ὑπὲρ τοῦ δικαίου, the διὰ τοῦ Ἰσα. Qc. seems to refer rather to the future judgment; yet Christ has His hand in all the preparatory judgments of the history of the Church.—P. S.]

DOCTRINAL AND ETHICAL.

1. The common characteristic in the condemnable condition of the Gentiles and Jews is their religious and moral self-condemnation. In this self-condemnation Paul (chap. i. 21) discovers the beginning of the offence of the Gentiles, whom he represents as inexorable (ἀναπλογηγόμενοι). The same self-condemnation is consummated, on one side, in the man who approves sin against better knowledge and conscience (chap. i. 22), and, on the other side, in the man who condemns the sinner, and yet is guilty of weighty offences himself (chap. ii. 1). Therefore the expression inexorable (ἀναπλογηγόμενοι) is also repeated here. The judgment of God is ever also a self-judgment of man. See Matt. xxii. 37; xviii. 28; xxv. 26, 27. In the one who judges, the self-condemnation is completed as falsehood of the inner life in the very strongest degree. The sincere man, on the other hand (we can by no means speak of sincerity as absolute, but yet as gradually predominating), by looking into his own heart and life, arrives at that μακεδινια, in relation to human sin and misery, which is akin to compassion, and points not to the judgment of condemnation, but to the saving judgment of the gospel.

2. The condemnatory judgment pronounced by the sinner on the sinner does not only condemn him in form, but transposes him also actually to a condition similar to condemnation. Fanaticism is never more unhappy than when it would compel, by means of deceit and violence, those who think differently to adopt its pretended forms of happiness (James ii. 13).

3. The one who judges, says Paul (vers. 3, 4), has always a false idea of God. He either regards himself as the favorite of a partial God, on account of His conformity to the theoretical, ecclesiastical, or legal forms, or he is inwardly vicious and wicked, and despises the real manifestations of God (see Ps. xvi. 16-21). An atheistic element is common to both classes.

4. The long-suffering of God, or the forbearance of God's justice toward the sinner, stands in reciprocal action with the wrath of God. Both denote the polar antagonism in the government of absolute justice, which is no rule of abstract law, but has a living, pedagogic form corresponding to the relation of the Divine personality to the human personality. See my Exeget. Dogmatics, p. 119. God's forbearance and clemency, no less than His wrathful judgment, looks toward the working of repentance.

5. The unbeliever and hardened sinner, by his own deeds, transforms the works of God's forbearance and goodness into the preliminary conditions of His wrathful judgment, and accumulates for himself, out of the riches of God which he has experienced, a store of destruction.

6. The day of the rejected gospel is to man a day of inward judgment, as is proved by the destruction of Jerusalem. See the Exeg. Notes on ver. 5. But all judgments are prophecies and preludes of the last day of wrath. It is a narrow view, to suppose that the conception of historical periods excludes epochs, or that single epochs exclude the final catastrophe. This may also be applied to the idea of judgments. Just because the world's history is the world's judgment, the former pursues its course toward the latter.

7. The embarrassments of commentators on the sense of vers. 6-10, and give evidence of timid and narrow views on the doctrine of justification. The passage gains its true light from the biblical doctrine that there is a gratis praemium over the Gentile world, which even Augustine did not yet wholly ignore, but which, through his influence, was lost sight of in the orthodox theology of the Middle Ages, and, indeed, of more recent times. The seekers who are portrayed in vers. 7 and 10 will never think seriously of relying upon their works before God, because they are in a gravitation toward the Eternal, which will find rest only when they see God in Christ, either in this or the other world. But the opposite class—whose principle of life is party spirit, and reliance upon temporal association—will ever place their confidence in their own achievements, even when they vigorously reject the doctrine of the meritousness of good works. For, besides the righteouseousness of works (πρεβαλλοντος, vers. 7; χαιρετος, vers. 10), there is also a righteousness of doctrine, of orthodoxy (Léhrgerechtigkeit), a righteousness of the letter (Buchstabenbücherchtigkeit), a righteousness of negation and protest (Negationsgerechtigkeit), which have, in common with the righteousness of works, the fundamental characteristic of party righteousness (Partei-gerechtigkeit), and may be the more dangerous forms as they are the more subtle. On the salvation of the heathen, comp. Tholuck, Comm., pp. 92 ff.—The doctrine of justification cannot conflict with the doctrine of God's righteousness, by virtue of which He will reward every man according to his works.

8. Glory and honor and immortality—precious pearls; eternal life—the goodly pearl. See Matt. xiii. 45, 46.

9. It is the character of all party spirit to be a rebel upwardly against the royal right of truth, and, on the other hand, a slave downwardly to the tyrannical and terrifying spirit of party.

10. Because God, as the Righteous One, looks at the substance of personal life, He does not regard the person according to its external and civil conception, nor according to its external appearance and estimate.

11. In ver. 12, different degrees of punishment are evidently indicated. See the Exeg. Notes. 12. On δικαιοσύνη, comp. the Exeg. Notes on ver. 18 [also i. 17; and iii. 21-31]. Likewise th
Bible Work on James ii. 20 ff. Since δικαιοσύνη, even according to the idea of making just, can only mean to declare just, because the question is always concerning justification in some legal tribunal, the passages exceptions where δικαιοσύνη in the Scriptures is made to signify to make just, should be investigated anew. The passage, Isa. iii. 2, can really not otherwise be explained, than that He will, by virtue of his knowledge as the righteous servant of God, declare many just; and this because He shall bear their iniquities. The passage in Daniel, chap. xii. 3, must by all means be explained thus: That the subject is the judgment of the world which, according to the biblical representation, the righteous shall take part (1 Cor. vi. 2); and even if εἰς τὸν Κόσμον refers to this life, it no more means one who makes just, than εἰς τὴν κόσμον means one who makes wise. The reading, δικαιοσὺνη, Rev. xxii. 11, cannot be sustained against the more strongly credited rendering, δικαιοσὺνην ποιήσατο. See more on this subject ad chap. iii. 26.

13. On the occurrence of a fulfillment of the law among the Gentiles, see Tholuck, pp. 101, 102. The author, following the older theologians, very justly opposes Flaccianism [i. e., that sin is a substance, a revival of the old Manichean heresy, by Placius Illyricus, Bishop of the Moravian Church, and a Lutheran controversialist of the 16th century. —P. S.]. To speak of virtues of the heathen, is liable to misunderstanding, unless we mean thereby a search after the Infinite. As heathen virtues, they can only be virtues of progress toward poverty in spirit (Matt. v. 3), under the guidance of the gradua promissoria, or fundamental forms of the development of a desire after salvation. The attempt, in Roth's Ethik, part ii. p. 398 [1st ed.], to explain this class of virtues, is not very clear.

14. The three objective forms of seeking higher attainments in the Gentile world are: The state, as the expression of the search after righteousness in the conscience, or in the will; philosophy, as the expression of the search for an intelligent comprehension of the truth; and art, as the expression of the search for ideal contemplation, and the representation of life by means of the sentiments.

15. The three subjective forms of search for higher attainments in the Gentile world are: 1. Works of magnanimity. 2. The conscience, especially the cheerful impulses of the moral consciousness. "When they saw the star, they rejoiced with exceeding great joy." 3. An intercourse of moral judge and to, of either an accusing or accusing character. [Bishop Sanderson, as quoted by Wordsworth: Paul teaches here (ver. 15) that every man, however unholy, has a conscience, though depraved; and that, at the fall of man, conscience itself was not lost, but its rectitude and integrity were impaired; and that, when we are born again in baptism, we do not receive the infusion of another conscience, but our conscience, which was before unclean, is washed by the blood of Christ, and is cleansed by faith, and is enlightened by the Holy Spirit, in order that it may please God.—P. S.]

16. On the day of the crisis which the gospel brings to pass, it will appear that many Gentiles are really Jews, and that many Jews are really Gentiles. Likewise, many Christians of the Middle Ages were essentially believers of evangelical truth, while many so-called evangelical persons whose righteousness consists of works, and others whose righteousness consists of doctrines, and still others whose righteousness consists of their Protestantism, are, after all, only Roman Catholics at heart. And the riches for which the day of the Lord will bring to light, predominate over the historical antitheses, which possess very great significance. On the day mentioned here, see the Exeg. Notes.

HOMILETICAL AND PRACTICAL.

God's impartial righteousness is shown: 1. He does not give preference to the Jews, although they possess the law; 2. He is not prejudiced against the Gentiles, although they are without the law; but, 3. of one, just as of the other, He asks if they have done good or evil (vers. 1-16).—Because others are black, we do not become white (ver. 1).—Judging our neighbor is the worst depravity, because: 1. We are blind toward ourselves; 2. we are unjust toward our fellow-men (ver. 1).—By our judgment of others we fall under the judgment of God pronounced on ourselves (ver. 3).—What does the celebration of a day of fasting and prayer require us to do? Not to be occupied with the idea of God's goodness, patience, and forbearance; but rather, 2. to remember that His goodness should lead us to repentance (ver. 4).—God's goodness regarded as the pure source of repentance (ver. 4).—Treasure not up unto thyself wrath against the day of wrath (ver. 5).—Dies irae, dies illa, solvet sæcula in sæcula infavilla (vers. 5, 6).—What will God give to every man according to his works? 1. To some, glory and honor and immortality, together with precious peace; 2. to others, indignation and wrath, tribulation and anguish (vers. 6-11).—What is it to continue patiently in well-doing for eternal life (ver. 7).—God's indignation! 1. Not unmerited, but deserved; 2. not temporary, but eternal (ver. 8).—God's wrath; holy displeasure, not unholy anger. —No one is without law. For, 1. God has given His law to the Jews by Moses; 2. He has written the substance of it upon the hearts of the Gentiles (vers. 12-15).—The universal revelation of God in the conscience (vers. 14, 15).—The conscience, and human thoughts in their relation to each other. This relation is such that, 1. The witness of the former testifies of the work of the law; 2. the latter, in the presence of such witness, accuse or excuse another (vers. 14, 15).—Impossibility of preaching the gospel among the heathen, if they were deprived of conscience. —The revelation of God in the conscience, on the one hand, not to be despised; and, on the other, not to be overvalued.—Conscience regarded as the connecting link for every missionary sermon among the heathen.

LUTHER: * The little word "law" must not be understood here after a human fashion, that it teaches which works are to be done, and which are to be left undone; as is the case with the laws of men, which can be obeyed by works, without the feeling of the heart. God judges according to the intent of the heart, and will not be satisfied by words; but all the more punishes as hypocrisy and lying those works which are done without the feeling of the heart. Therefore Paul says that nobody is a doer of the law by the works of the law (ver. 16).

* Long-suffering is a virtue which is slow to become wrathful and to punish wrong. Patience is that which bears misfortunes in property, body, or reputation, whether they happen by sin or chance. God's patience is temporal reciprocal beneficences, and a friendly nature (ver. 4).
Stark: The ungodly are as the swine, which do not look at the tree whose acorns they gather up. Thus, with all their enjoyment of temporal mercies, they do not look up to God, who gives them richly to enjoy every good thing (Hosea ii. 7; Isa. i. 15; Jer. 24); for by his own mercy their improvement (ver. 4).—He who does not grow better, will grow worse by Divine goodness (ver. 6).

As the labor, so the reward; and each one must reap what he has sown (ver. 6).—The pious will gain in perfection in the kingdom of glory which they have sought in the kingdom of grace (ver. 10).

Heinzen: To consider others, is the same as to condemn one’s self. He who therefore loves to judge, pronounces sentence upon himself (ver. 1).— Blindness! Delay produces deception. Security follows Divine forbearance. Take care! The longer the storm gathers, the greater its devastation. The one who has received the long loan, has not therefore received it as a gift (ver. 4).—Every sin will receive its due reward. Who will trifle with it? (ver. 8).—A greater measure of knowledge brings only greater condemnation, and no excuse. This much a Gentile knows of the will of God, that as much may be condemned to death; much more may the Christian be justly condemned who can and should know perfectly the will of God in the law (ver. 14).

Nova Bibl. Tub.: The sinner can persuade himself, and by many kinds of misconception stupefy himself, so as to believe that his sins will go unpunished. Ah, how common is this deception! (ver. 3).—External life is a jewel for which we should strive, a crown for which we should fight, a gift which we should accept, hold, and keep unto the end. He who persists, will be saved. The question at the judgment-day will not be one of words, but of deeds (ver. 7).—No one is without law! If it is not written in stone, it is nevertheless engraved upon the heart. Every one knows by nature what is just and what is unjust, what is good and what is evil (ver. 4).—Cramer: God must be truly in earnest for human salvation, which He seeks by prosperity and adversity. With wise words He punishes, and waits with great forbearance and patience until the sinner is converted (ver. 4).—The law of nature is a source of the written law of God, embraced in the two rules: Whatever ye would that men should do to you, do ye even so to them; and what you would not have them do unto you, do not unto them (ver. 14).—No one can sin so that his sins shall remain concealed; for, if they are not revealed before, they will be brought to light at the last day (ver. 16).

Warteb. Bibl.: Works are witnesses of faith. We must therefore do good works, not in order to be saved, but in order that with them we may testify of our faith, and by faith may inherit eternal life (ver. 7).—Lang: Abandon all the excesses of age, or condition, or other personal circumstances, that you, with your own want of honest Christianity, bring forward; for you can derive no advantage from them before God’s judgment-seat (ver. 11).—The law of nature must be of great advantage, and be written very deeply on the hearts of all men, since its wilful transgression brings upon men so great guilt, and punishment or condemnation (ver. 15).

Bengel: As long as man does not feel the Judgment of God, he is apt to despise His goodness, Matt. xxviii. 18. Mark here the antithesis of the richness of Divine goodness despised, and the accumulated treasure of wrath.

O. v. Grébich: The goodness of God is manifested in the exhibition of blessings; His patience, in bearing with the sinner; and His long-suffering in withholding from punishment (ver. 4).—Christianity is not something lately discovered among men; but its Founder, the Son of God Himself, is the gathering and gathering of all Christians, but likewise of Jews and Gentiles, whom He, in His preparation, families of grace—the former in His Father’s house, the latter by an awakened longing for the— is seeking to train up for His kingdom, though now they are far distant from home (ver. 16).

Lisco: Merely external honesty is also punishable (ver. 1).—Glory, splendor, instead of likeness, honor and esteem, instead of contemplation, and immortality instead of the mortal condition (1 Cor. xv. 66, 64), are the reward of patience, of the continuous striving for eternal life in spite of all impediments and difficulties (ver. 7).

Heinzen: God’s judgment is righteous: 1. Objectively: in accordance with sacred laws; not arbitrarily or capriciously, without regard to the person; 2. subjectively: according to the true character of the man, taking each one for his internal and external merits (ver. 2). The dealing of God toward sinful men is simply this: He first tries each with goodness, before He pronounces punishment; it is our salvation to acknowledge this goodness, but it is our ruin to despise it (ver. 4).—The hardened heart is accusable: its operation is not that of nature, but of its own degeneration. How is it first hardened? 1. By frivolity; 2. by obstinacy and pride; 3. by actual, continued sinning (ver. 5).—The righteous impartiality of God. God does not judge: 1. By a prior advantage, favor, birth, pedigree, power, respect, wealth; nor, 2. by gifts of mind, acquisitions, skill; nor, 3. by external performances as such, by merely external works, external piety; but by the whole inward sense, by the simplicity and clearness of the heart; by faith and fidelity. He has regard to what is given to each man (ver. 11).

The Pericope (vers. 1-11) for 10th Sunday after Trinity (Memorial of the destruction of Jerusalem), instead of 1 Cor. xi. 1-11: The impotent sinner has no excuse before God: 1. Proof; 2. Application.—Man before the Divine judgment: He must, 1. Acknowledge himself guilty; 2. regard God’s judgment righteous and inevitable; 3. take refuge in God’s goodness, and listen to its call to repentance; 4. fear the future; 5. listen to revelation.—We should see ourselves reflected in the example of the impotent Jews.

Daniel Steppin: The sovereign equity of God (ver. 11).—Menken: The universal equality of men before God’s judgment.

Schenk: The whole law was written on the heart of the first man, for his soul was an image of God’s perfect holiness and righteousness. But after this complete law had been erased from the heart, there remained, so to speak, only some of the larger letters, some portion of the knowledge of the manifest evil and good (ver. 15).—Conscience is nothing else than a voice of God (ver. 16).—Roes: Conscience is the consciousness of the or the judicial declarations of the law (ver. 18).

Bessek: From man’s knowledge of God’s law written on his heart, there arises conscience, which testifies to him, as Luther excellently describes, that power which conscience produces its judicial witness upon men (ver. 16).—To the question, “What disease is killing you?” the poet Euripides makes
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matricide answer: "Conscience; for I am conscious that I have done evil" (ver. 15).

J. P. Lange: The judgment of men in the judgment of God.—The sources of judgment (vers. 4, 5).

—How the sinner changes the treasures of God's goodness into treasures of wrath.—The great judgment-days in the world's history, especially the destruction of Jerusalem.—Justification and God's righteousness: 1. Apparent contradiction; 2. perfect unity.—Two kinds of men perceptible: 1. In two purposes; 2. two kinds of seeking; 3. two results (vers. 7-10).—God does not regard the person because He looks at it: 1. He does not regard it in a worldly sense; 2. He regards it according to its spiritual significance.—The gospel reveals the thoughts of the heart: 1. As a savor of death unto death; and 2. as a savor of life unto life.—But this does not apply to every form of Christianity.

Burkitt: On the day of judgment as the time when God's character and dealings shall be displayed, ver. 5.—It will be a day when His righteousness shall be universally manifested and magnified; when all His attributes shall be glorified; His wonderful clemency sweetly displayed; His exact justice terribly demonstrated; His perfect wisdom clearly unfolded; all the knotty plans of Providence wisely resolved to glorious appeared; His counsels fully discovered; and His honored honor and glory clearly repaired, to the joyful satisfaction of all good men, and to the dreadful consternation and confusion of the wicked and impenetrable world.—On ver. 16: Here, 1. A doctrine is boldly asserted—a coming day of judgment; and 2. its proof and confirmation—"according to my gospel."—F. V. Henry (condensed) on the whole passage, vers. 1-16: The Apostle, 1. arraigns the Jews for their censoriousness and self-conceit; 2. asserts the invariable justice of the Divine government; 3. draws up a charge against the Jews; 4. describes the measures by which God proceeds in His judgment; and 5. proves the equity of all His dealings with men when He comes to judge them.

MacKenzie: Paul distinguishes between meritorious and gratuitous justification; the former being that which is unattainable by works of the law, the latter that which is attainable, as James says, not by faith only, but by works also.—Ver. 10: That there is a natural revelation made to the heathen, is proved by Paul by three arguments: 1. By many virtuous acts performed by the heathen; 2. by the natural operation of their consciences; 3. by their reasonings with one another, by which they excused or accused one another.

Jowett: These suppositions agree both with Scripture and reason: 1. All men can do that God requires of them; 2. all who do the best they can, derive help from God as far as is needful; 3. they all have Christ as their Redeemer, though He was never revealed to them.—Who knows whether the lot of the savage be not better than that of the philosopher, and the lot of the slave than that of the king? But this much we know, that every one ought to be contented with that state in which his wise and good Creator has placed him, and to conclude that it will be the best for him if he makes the best use of it. Upon this supposition the Divine impartiality stands fully justified.

Timothy Dwight: 1. Our eternal life is in itself an immense good; 2. eternal happiness consists in eternal disinterestedness and its consequences. (See sermon on Consistency of Benevolence with seeking Salvation, in which Lord Shaftesbury's celebrated theory, that disinterestedness is virtue, and the only virtue, is controverted.)

John Foster: To the present hour in each life the series of the Divine goodness may be counted by the succession of a man's sins. Not one sin, small or great, but immediately close by it were acts and proofs of this goodness. If this had been realized to thought, what a striking and awful admonition! Every sin a testimony, a representative of good; and the wonder is that the goodness goes on!—Annot. Parag. Bible (London): The question is not (vera. 14, 15) whether any of the Gentiles have actually attained to eternal life without a Divine revelation, but whether they had the law of nature or conscience. They had this; and by it they shall be judged.—Taylor: Note Paul's wisdom in appealing to Jew and Gentile: 1. If the Jew could be convinced that a right-minded Gentile might be blessed with eternal salvation, why should he not now be pardoned, and taken into the visible Church? 2. The Gentile, made despondent by the representations of his guilt in the last chapter, here finds himself placed with the Jews, and entitled to hope in God's mercy.

Hon. J. A. Barrow: The principles on which the Apostle assures us all men are to be judged, are, 1. He who condemns others in what he does himself, ipsa fata condedit se; 2. God's judgments are according to the real character of men; 3. the goodness of God, being designed to lead us to repentance, is no proof that He will not punish sin; 4. God will judge strictly according to works, not profession; 5. men shall be judged strictly according to their knowledge, not their good works (condensed): 1. The deciduousness of the heart strikingly exhibited in the different judgments they pass on themselves and others; 2. ask yourself, "How does the goodness of God affect me?" 3. genuine repentance produced by discoveries of God's mercy, legal repentance by fear of His justice; 4. any doctrine that tends to produce security in sin, must be false; 5. how vain the hopes of blessedness founded on God's partiality, or forgetfulness of sin; 6. to escape one vain, we must seek the Saviour's righteousness; 7. He who died for the sins of men, will sit in judgment on sinners.

Ver. 16. Barnes: On the propriety of a day of judgment, when all the thoughts of the heart will be revealed: 1. It is only by revealing these that the character is really determined, and impartial judgment administered; 2. they are not judged or rewarded in this life; 3. men of pure motives and pure hearts are often basely calumniated, and overwhelmed with ignominy; while men of base motives are often exalted in public opinion. It is proper that the secret principles of each should be revealed.—J. F. H.

Ver. 7. By patient continuance in well-doing. Barrow: No virtue is acquired in an instant, but by degrees, step by step; from the seeds of right instruction and good resolution it springs up, and produces forward progress and customary practice. 'Tis a child of patience; fruit of perseverance, and, consequently, a work of time; for enduring implies a good space of time.—Ver. 9. Adam: Every sin, when newly committed, anathema and terrifies the soul, though the sense of it soon wears off. How shall we bear the anguish of all our sins together, when conscience, which forgives and extenuates none, brings them to our receiv
CHAPTER II. 17-24.


PEARSON: Every particular person has a particular

resemblance in himself, as a sufficient testimony of

his Creator, Lord, and Judge. That man which

most peremptorily denieth God's existence, is the

greatest argument to himself that there is a God.

Let Caligula profess himself an atheist, and, with

that prophet of God, the king of idolatry, defile

his body, and when the thunder strikes his ears, and

lightning flashes in his eyes, those terrible works of

nature put him in mind of the power, and his own guilt,

of the justice of God; whom, while in his wilful

opinion he weakly denies, in his involuntary action

he strongly assereth. So that a Deity will either be

granted or extorted, and, where it is not acknow-
edged, it will be manifested.—Vers. 5 and 16

Bishop J. TAYLOR: There are two great days in

which the fate of all the world is transacted. This

life is man's day, in which man does what he pleases,

and God holds His peace. But then God shall have

his day too, in which He shall speak, and no man

shall answer. If we do the work of God in our

own day, we shall receive an infinite mercy in the

day of the Lord.—Vers. 16. My gospel. The gos-

pel: 1. A voice of love (vox amoris); 2. a voice of

challenge (vox contestationis); 3. a voice of cer-
tainty (vox certitudinis); 4. a voice of persuasion

and invitation (vox invitantia); 5. a voice of de-
cision and judgment (vox judicis).—P. S.

FOURTH SECTION.—The aggravated corruption of the Jew in his false zeal for the law (a side-piece to the corruption of the Gentile in his idolatrous worship of symbols). The fanatical and wicked method of the Jews in administering the law with legal pride, and in corrupting it by false application and teach-

ery—an occasion for the blasphemy of God's name among the Gentiles.

CHAP. II. 17-24.

17 Behold,' [But if'] thou art called [named, denominated, ενορωμαι] a Jew, and restest in [upon] the law,' and makest thy boast of God [boastest in God],

18 And knowest his will, and approvest the things that are more excellent [provest, 19 or, discernest the things that differ], being instructed out of the law; and art confident that thou thyself art a guide of the blind, a light of them which [those who] are in darkness, An instructor of the foolish, a teacher of babes, which hast [having] the form [the representation, model, pattern, τοιουτον μορφαν] of knowledge and of the truth in the law, [—] Thou therefore which [Thou, then, who] teachest another, teachest thou not thyself? thou that preachest a

22 man should not steal, dost thou steal? Thou that sayest a man should not commit adultery, dost thou commit adultery? thou that abhorrest idols, dost thou commit sacrificle [literally, robbery of temples]? 4 Thou that makest thy boast of [in] the law, through breaking the law dishonoureth thou God? [through

24 the transgression of the law thou dishonourest God]. 5 "For the name of God is blasphemed among the Gentiles through you," as it is written [Gen. iii. 5; Exod. xxxvi. 20].

TEXTUAL.

1 Ver. 17.—(Instead of the text, rec. 186, behold, which is not sufficiently sustained, read ει ην, but if, with N. A. B. D*: E. Griesbach, Lachmann, Tischendorf, Blass, Alford, and nearly all the recent commentators. The reading ει is either a mistake, or a change for the purpose of avoiding the masculine, which, however, is more apparent than real. The apodosis must be supplied (why dost thou not act accordingly, or, how great is thy responsibility), or it may be found in ver. 21, by simply omitting the ει, which is often epapheletic, renaming the thread of the sentence. So Meyer, who regards vers. 17-22 as the protasis, and 21, 22 as the apodosis.—P. S.)

2 Ver. 17.—(ένορωμαι το ρημα) without the article, N. A. B. D†. The later MSS. and the text rec. insert τος before ρημα, because it here clearly applies to the written law of Moses as representing the whole Mosaic system, the civil and religious polity of the Jews. where has here in ver. 14 the force of a proper name. Allart: "The article is omitted, because the 'law' is not here distributed—it is not the law itself in its entirety which is meant, but the first breach of it, the break of the covenant expressed, it would perhaps be, in the fact of possessing a law," which, condensed into our less accurate English, would be in one word, in the law, viz., 'which thou possessest.'—E. S.)

3 Ver. 18.—(On the different interpretations of διαβεβηθησαται or διαβαπτοσ, see the Eng. Notes. Lange (with Tholuck, Prisse, Reiske, Bidleker, Philippin, Alford) translates: Du bekehret die widersprechenden Dinge. 'Kohlen: Du prüft das Unterschiede. Tymanie: Hast experience of good and bad. Conybeare and Howson: Great judgment upon good or evil. Robert Young, too literally: Doest approve the distinctions. But the versions of Guizot, Geneva, James, Rheine, and Am. Bible Union agree substantially with the Latin Vulg.: Probus utulcr. So also Meyer, who translates: Du prüft das Unterschiede. Wordsworth: Thou discernest the things that are more excellent. The same phrase occurs, Phil. ii. 10, where the E. V. renders it in the same way. Grammatically, both interpretations are correct, and hence the connection must decide. διαβεβηθησαται means first to examine, to try, to prove (1 Cor. iii. 13, 2); διαβαπτοσ, to discriminate, to distil, to sift (Rom. xiv. 3; 2 Pet. iv. 22). Δια-

βεβηθησαται is: (1.) To differ; (2.) To differ to advantage, to excel. Hence το διαβεβηθησαται: (1.) The difference between right and wrong, good and bad; (2.) the excellent things, καλα—E. S.)

4 Ver. 22.—(Alford translates: Thou who abhorrest idols, dost thou rob their temples? To maintain the contrast, he refers (with Chrysostom, Meyer, Tholuck, and others) leporoimai to the robbing of idol temples (ειδους); but this is not

used in the eyes of the Jew; and hence others refer it to the temple of God in Jerusalem. See Eng. Notes.—E. S.)

5 Ver. 23.—(Lange and Meyer take this verse as a categorical charge, resulting from the preceding questions which the Jew could not deny. This view is supported by the following yap έπαθασαται, in the six other passages of the N. T where it occurs, is uniformly translated transgression in the E. V.—P. S.)
EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

The connection with the foregoing is explained by Tholuck [p. 110] thus: "The Jew was already humbled by the proof that the Gentile was also in possession of the same. But it is further charged upon him that his possession of the law has become a dishonor to Him who gave it to him." We have seen already that the connection consists in a sharp antithesis: a Gentile who is a Jew at heart; a Jew who, according to the spirit of the law, is the most wonton Gentile. [Estius justly calls the following apostrophe, "oratio splendidà ac vehemens."]

Ver. 17. But if thou art named a Jew. There seems to be an anacoluthon in the following verses, which was probably intended to remove by the reading τῇ. Tholuck: "The anacoluthon appears to be wanting to the protasis, vers. 17-20." But we may explain without an anacoluthon (Meyer): "But if thou art called a Jew, &c., thou therefore (οὐ&c., ver. 21, in consequence of what has been said, who teacheth another, teachest thou not thyself?"

We would find an easier solution, if we could read the verb ἐπονομαζε&c.; and ἐπανάπασας as conjunctives for the formation of a hypothetic, which would then constitute the anacoluthon, the following indicatives would then constitute the apodosis. But the τῇ is wanting to the τῇ. [See Textual Note 1.—Named. Jew was the designation of the Hebrew according to his religion; therefore the theocratic name of honor, which is also contained in the etymology of the word itself.* Ἐπονομαζ&c.; is translated cognominarius by the Vulgate and Bengel. [Wordsworth: έπονομαζω, thou hast a title to (τίμια) which is not alien to thy person.] But the compound verb is also used in the sense of the simple ἐπονομαζω, and the name ᾿Ιουδαίος was not a surname, although it might become a surname for the false Jew. Tholuck [Meyer, Philipp, Hodge; comp. LXX. Gen. iv. 17, 25, 26, and the classical quotations of Meyer in loc.—P. S.]—And restest. Intimation of Jewish pride. Strictly: Thou liest on it for trust. Thus the Jew abused his privilege; Ps. exvii. 19, 20.—Israel perverted into a false trust its ideal destination for the nations, according to Is. xliii. 6, 7, and other passages; and it so caricatured the single elements (which are designated in the following verses) of this destination, that the most glaring moral contradiction took place in its character.—Thou makest thy boast; in God, as thy [exclusive] guardian God; Isa. xlv. 25; Jer. xxvi. 33. [To boast or possess glory in God, or in Christ (Gal. iv. 16), is right, if it proceeds from a sense of our weakness and unworthiness, and a corresponding sense of the goodness of God, as our sure refuge and strength; but it is wrong if it arises from religious bigotry and conceit, which would monopolize the favor of God to the exclusion of others. Calvin:

"Hac igitur non cordis glorioa, sed linguae faeclia fuit." The false Jewish boasting in God amounted to a boasting in the flesh, against which we are warned, Gal. vii. 16; 2 Cor. x. 18; Phil. iii. 3. [Ἰουδαίων ἐπονομασίας—καὶ ἐπανάπασας νυμοί—καὶ παναγάσας ἐν ἀληθείᾳ, form a rising climax.—P. S.]

Ver. 18. And knowest his will [τῇ δ not a prepositional, as common in the Greek.] That is, His will in the inward part of the law; Eph. iii. 18, &c.; or rather, the absolute will which has become manifest in the law.—And discernest the things that differ [δισκοίμισις τα διαφοράστα]. Three explanations of this expression: 1. The difference between right and wrong (Theodore, Theophylact, Grotius, &c., Tholuck, Philippi, and others); 2. what is at variance with the will of God, sinful (Clerci-di, Glöckler); 3. thou approvest the excellent (Vulgates: probas utilitatem, Bengel, Meyer [Hodge]). According to the meaning of δισκοίμισις (to be prominent; to be distinguished; to excel), and διαφοράστα (the distinctions; the excellent), these different explanations are equally allowable; and the connection must therefore determine which is the best one. But the explanation: thou approvest the excellent, is not strong enough; although Meyer sees in it the completion of a climax.* The Jew was, as πρακτικά, the distinguishing, the sharply deciding between what was allowed and disallowed; he was skilled in the Law; καλοί πας καὶ κακοί, Heb. v. 14; the δισκοίμισις <τῶν νυμών τοιαύτών> [a term frequently used by Philo]. This explanation passes over into a fourth: τα διαφοράστα, the controversies (De Dieu, Wolf).—Being instructed. After his fashion he lives in the law, κατοχθονικός, not καταγόμενος. [Being instructed, not only catechetically in youth, but didactically and continually by the reading and exposition of the Scriptures in the synagogue on the Sabbath day.—P. S.]

Ver. 19. And art confident. He should be everything that follows, according to Old Testament intimations; see Isa. xiii. 6, 7, and other passages. So much less is there a reason why Reiche should find here reminiscences from the Gospels (Matt. xv. 14; Luke xx. 32). The corruption of Judaism consisted throughout in perverting the Old Testament attributes to the people, and of its future, into the literal and metaphysical. From this arose also its proselytism (Matt. xxiii. 10), which is here described.—Guide of the blind. The Jew called the Gentiles blind; σκέπου, in Isa. i. 2, means, therefore, the Gentiles; and ὑπερ ᾿ἀλόκοτων ἐννοιών in Isa. xliii. 6, means the Jews; νηπία, the proselytes (see Tholuck).

Ver. 20. Form (pattern) of knowledge. Κάθε γραμματικά — classically, ἱσχυρά; Hesychius: θηγματικά. [In the New Testament it occurs only once more—2 Tim. iii. 6—where it is opposed

* (Τῆς) is the verbal noun from the future hophal of ἐπονομάζω, to praise, and means praised, so. Jah, God (Goldl.); see Fürst, Dict. sub ἐπονομάζω, vol. i. 491; Gen. xxviii. 35 (where Leath, after the birth of Judah, says: "Now will I praise the Lord: therefore she called his name Judah.") xlix. 5; Gen. xxx. 2. To be a Jew in this proper sense was to belong to the covenant people of God selected for his praise.  

[1] ῾Ισραήλις (also in 1 Cor. iv. 7, like ᾿Ισραήλισσα, Rom. viii. 6, istringstream (for ὄνομα), Matt. v. 36, ῾Ισραήλις, Luke xvi. 15. is the original uncontracted form for ῾Ισραήλ, in use with the participle, and prose-writers, in Wicliffe, 1377, ed. The οί signifies the sphere in which the boastings move, or the object of boasting, as χαράτω εἰς.—P. S.]
to divinae, and means the mere outward form or appearance. Here, on the contrary, it is the real representation or expression, exemplar, effigies. Grocius: *forma quae vera exprimere*.—P. S.] According to Meyer, the doctrines and commandments of the law itself are the form of knowledge and truth. We are nearer right when we remember the didactic impression of the Old Testament revelation of the law in the rabbinical tradition from which the Talmud subsequently arose; for the Apostle speaks of a μόρφωσις τῆς γραμματίας, which should be indirectly μορφ. τῆς ἀληθείας ἐν τῷ νόμῳ. Ecumenius and Osiusenaven, without cause, think of the typical character of the Old Testament; others (with Theophylact) of the mere phantom of truth. The question is concerning an object of which the Jew boasts. His μόρφωσις is indeed the glorious anti-type of the personal incarnation of the truth in Christ, as in Eusebius, xi. 7, (25) we read of the θρόνος becoming a book in the Θὸρα. All these are now the characteristics of the Jew's pretensions. Ver 21. Thou, then, that teachest another. [The virtual anodosis of ver. 17. The several clauses are more lively and forcible if read interrogatively, so as to challenge the Jew to deny the charge, if he dare.—P. S.] The analogy of the following charges to the Apostle's judgment on the Gentiles lies herein: the Jews, by their pride of the law and by their legal orthodoxy, were led into the way of ruin, just as the Gentiles had been by their intellectual conceit indulging in symbols and myths. The first charge is general: Teachest thou not thyself? Ps. 1. 16. After this, three specific charges follow in strong gradation, Meyer: "The following infinitives μὴ κινέσται, μὴ μοιζεύσῃς do not include in themselves the idea of δινέναι or ἐκδινέναι, but are explained by the idea of command which is implicit in the finite verbs μιχαλεύεις, κινεῖς, κινεῖς. The verba jubendi here are μεθείματα and ἄκρων.—P. S.] In the charge of stealing, there was undoubtedly special reference to the passionate and treacherous method of transacting business adopted by the Jews (James iv. 13); in the charge of adultery, to the loose practice of divorces (Matt. xix. 8; 9; James iv. 4).—Μοιζεύς. The Talmud charges adultery upon some of the most celebrated Rabbinists, as Akiba, Meir, Eleazar.—P. S.] The strongest charge is the third: Ver 22. Thou that abhorrest idols, &c. Ἑβδομάδας, from βιβλίας, to excite disgust by a loathsome odor. In the religious sense, to abhor. The Jew called the idols βιβλίας (1 Mac. vi. 7; 2 Kings xxiii. 13, ῥαβμός). Explanations: 1. By plundering the temples of idols (Chrysostom, Theophylact, and many others; Meyer, Philippi [Alford, Conybeare and Howson]). Tholuck: "The law, in Deut. vii. 25, forbids the appropriation of the gold and silver ornaments of the images of gods; and in the paraphrase of this prohibition in Josephus (Antiq. iv. 8, 10), express reference is made to the robbing of heathen temples. Acts xix. 36, 37, shows that the Jews had the name of committing such an offence." [The charge of robbing and the seizing of sacredness to the temples of idols, regarded the despoiling of heathen temples as no sacrilege, but simply as robbery, which might be justified under certain circumstances.—P. S.] 2. ἀγαλματίων in the figurative sense: profanatio majestatis divine (Calvin, Luther, Bengel, Kolliner).—2. Embezzlement of taxes [tithes and offerings] for their own temple (Pelagius, Grocius [Ewald, Wordsworth, and others; comp. Mal. i. 8, 12, 14; ii. 8-10]). To the charge of robbing heathen temples, the idea of pollution—which this robbery carries with it—may also be added, as is done by Meyer. But it seems strange that the Apostle should have established, on isolated occurrences of such robbery, so general and fearful a charge. As in the charge: Thou stealst, thou committest adultery," he had not merely in mind occasional great transgressions, but also the universal exhibitions of Jewish avarice and concupiscence, so we must also here accept a more general and spiritual significance of his accusation. We must indeed suppose here transgressions that were an occasion of offence to the Gentiles; and Luther goes much too far in spiritualizing the charge: Thou art a robber of God; for it is God's honor that all those who rely on good works would take from Him." But the worst outrage on the temple, according to John ii. 19, consisted in the crucifixion of Christ (comp. James v. 6). It was therefore as a sign of judgment that the temple in Jerusalem itself was desecrated by the Jews in every possible way before its destruction. In a wider sense, the transgression of the Jew consisted in their cursing, for the fanaticism, not only the downfall of the temple, but in frivolously abusing and insulting the sanctuaries of Gentiles, and, where occasion offered, in converting their treasures into spoils and articles of commerce. Ver 23. Thou that makest thy boast in the law. Since this judgment is the result of the foregoing question, Meyer has good reason for reading this verse not as a question, but as a categorical imprecation. This is supported by the yap in ver. 24. Ver 24. For the name of God. That is, the Gentiles judged the religion of the Jews by the scandalous conduct of the Jews themselves, and thus were led to blaspheme their God, Jehovah. The Jews boasted of the law (which, Baruch iv. 3, is termed δέξα χεὶ ἢ ἤθελεν), and reflected disgrace on the lawgiver. For the Jews, the Apostle here seizes again, with his denunciation, a metaphor taken from the Old Testament—Isa. iii. 5: "My name continually every day is blasphemed" [in the Septuagint: δῆμος διαμαντότος τὸ ὄνομα μοῦ ἀνθρωπος ἐν τοῖς θρόνοις]. Comp. Ezek. xxvi. 29: "I will sanctify my great name, which was profaned among the heathen, which ye have profaned in the midst of them." DOCTRINAL AND ETHICAL.

1. The Apostle now passes over from his indirect representation of the corruption in Judaism, which he had given from a general point of view, vers. 10-16, to paint its life-picture from experience. In chap. iii. 10-18, he proves that the Old Testament had already testified to the corruption of the Jewish people. But this description of the actual corruption must be distinguished from the sketch of the original transgression, chap. v. 12 ff, and from the development in part of the judgment of hard-heartedness, chaps. ix. and x.

* [So Hodge: "The essence of idolatry was profanation of God; of this the Jews were in a high degree guilty They had made His house a den of thieves."—P. S.]
THE EPISTLE OF PAUL TO THE ROMANS.

2. The description of the corruption in Judaism presents only legalistic features, as the account of Gentile corruption presents Antinomian features. In the former case, the distillation of religion proceeded from legal consent, while in the latter it arose from the concept of wisdom; the root of pride is therefore common to both lines of corruption. The self-contradiction of the Gentiles was developed thus: he, the pretended wise man, becomes a fool by disfiguring his symbolical religion of nature; with all his self-glory, he becomes a worshipper of the creature, and loses the dignity of his human body; with all his fantastic notion of revelation, he sinks thereby into abominable unnaturalness; with all his efforts for vigor of life and enthusiasm, he sinks more and more into the degradation of wicked characters; and finally, with all his better knowledge, he ornament and varnish sin theoretically and aesthetically. The self-contradiction of the Jew, on the other hand, developed itself thus: he, the pretended teacher of the nations, becomes an Antinomian blasphemer, by the perversion of his religious knowledge of the law, while he teaches others, and not himself, and, by a succession of transgressions of the law, goes so far as to profane sacred things, by abusing and robbing the temples (see Matt. xxii. 13). To the profanation of the temple was added that of the high-priesthood, which reached its climax in Calaphas. Likewise the ministry of the Jew was thoroughly profaned by prosaicism and falsification of the law, and his righteousness was converted into a cloak for hypocrisy.

3. The fanatic grows ever more profane by the consistency of his course of conduct—a despiser of the substantial possessions of religion. Church history furnishes numerous examples, how fanatics of the churchly as well as unchurchly type become at last, out of pretended sainthood, profaners and robbers of the temples.

4. Priests and preachers have certainly corrupted religion as often as philosophers have corrupted wisdom, politicians the State, juris the law, &c.

5. The dogmatic and legalistic spirit of the Middle Ages, too, which, in a better form, was really a "teacher of the blind," has finally gone so far as to present the greatest variety of religious and moral hindrances to modern Gentiles. It is not without serious influence, therefore, that the Epistle to the Romans contains this very section.

HOMILETICAL AND PRACTICAL.

The false zeal for the law practised by the Jews as occasion for blasphemying the name of God by the Gentiles; so far as, 1. such false zeal knows God's will; but 2. wantonly transgresses it (vers. 17–24).

—The mere name of Christianity goes no further than the name of Judaism (vers. 17–24).—Do not depend upon your orthodoxy, if you do not act right by faith (vers. 17–24).—Notwithstanding brilliant knowledge, one is a bad teacher if he does not do what he knows (vers. 17–24).—Blasphemy of the name of God (ver. 24).—God's name has already been often blasphemed among the heathen (and Mohammedans) because of Christians.

Proof: 1. From the outrages of persons professing Christianity in the Middle Ages (Charlemagne, and the Saxons, the Brethren of the Sword, the Spaniards in America, &c.); 2. from the abuses in trade in the present time (the slave trade, opium trade, sandal-wood trade).

SPEAR: When one does any thing which has ever so good appearance, it is sin if it does not come from faith (ver. 18).—Theological learning is by no means enough for a teacher, when he is not taught in the school of the Holy Spirit (ver. 20).—That teacher cannot be an example of good works who can only say of himself: "Judge according to my words, and not according to my deeds" (ver. 21).—Boasting and vain-glory—the manner, alas, of many Christians! (ver. 23.)—CLARK: The titles and names of eminence to which we may lay claim should be to bring us a continual reminder to conduct ourselves in harmony with such titles (ver. 17).—Nova Bib. Trib.: Oh, how many external privileges a soul can have! Communion in the true Church, knowledge of God and His word, of His will and His works, the best instruction, a skilful sense of the difference between good and evil; and yet, in spite of all this, it can be at fault, and quite removed from the inner fellowship with God (ver. 17).—Look, teacher! You must commence your life anew, for yourself; you must first be your own teacher, guide, and chastiser; first preach to your own self, first break your own will, and perform what you preach. But to desire to guide, discipline, and control others, and yet steal and commit adultery yourself, &c.—that will enter in judgment against you. Oh, how great is this corruption! (ver. 20.)—QWENEL: Oh, how rare a thing it is to be learned without being proud! (ver. 19.)

BREMNER: There is a false and a true boasting on the part of a believer in revelation. He does it falsely when he imagines, 1. that he thereby makes himself more acceptable to God; 2. that merely having and knowing are sufficient, without practice; 3. when, at the same time, he despises others. He boasts properly when, 1. he gives God all the glory; 2. makes use of the revealed truth; 3. does not despise others (ver. 17).—It is a great grace when God gives a tender conscience (ver. 18).—To know the right, is in the power of every Christian; and sin does not consist in ignorance or misunderstanding, but has its root in the will (ver. 19).—Melancholy contradiction between knowledge and deeds (vers. 21–23).—The honor of Christianity is dependent upon us.—A holy life is the final vindication of faith (ver. 24).

BRASHER: Legalists, who would be righteous by their works, deprive the law of its spiritual clearness (ver. 17).

LANGE: The internal self-contradiction between knowledge and disposition extends to external life: 1. As self-contradiction between word and deed; 2. between the vocation and the discharge of it; 3. between destination to the welfare of the world, and degeneration, on the contrary, to the misery of the world.—The teacher of the law in olden times, and the (religious) teacher of the law in recent days—the offences of modern Gentiles.

[BRITT.: Vers. 17–20. Learn: 1. That persons are very prone to be proud of church privileges, glorying in the letter of the law, but not conformed to its spirituality either in heart or life; and 2. that gifts, duties, and supposed graces, are the stay and staff which hypocrites lean on. The duties which Christ has appointed, are the trust and rest of the hypocrite; but Christ Himself is the trust and rest of faith, and that others than we be instructed ourselves; 2. it is both sinful and shameful to teach others the right way, and to go in the wrong ourselves. While this is a double fault in a private person, it is inexcusable in the teacher}

FIFTH SECTION.—The external Judaism of the letter, and the internal Judaism of the spirit. The objective advantage of historical Judaism. The subjective equality of Jews and Gentiles before the law of God, according to the purpose of the law itself—to bring about the knowledge of sin. (The utility of circumcision—an accommodation to the need of salvation by the knowledge of sin. The circumcision which becomes uncircumcision, and the uncircumcision which becomes circumcision; or, the external Jew possibly an internal Gentile, while the external Gentile may be an internal Jew. Not the mere possession of the law, but fidelity to the law, is of avail. The latter does not create pride of the law, but knowledge of sin—that is, the need of salvation. The advantage of circumcision therefore consists in this, that to the Jew were committed the oracles of God—that law by which all men are represented in the guilt of sin. Sin, as acknowledged guilt, represented in contrast with the law.)

25 For circumcision verily [indeed] profiteth, if thou keep [keepest] the law: but if thou be [art] a breaker [transgressor] of the law, thy circumcision is made [has] become, or, is turned into uncircumcision. Therefore, if the uncircumcision [so called, i.e., the uncircumcised] keep the righteousness [decree, commandments, moral requirements, δικαιωματα] of the law, shall [will] not his uncircumcision be counted for circumcision? And shall not uncircumcision which is by nature, if it fulfil the law, judge thee, who by the letter and circumcision dost transgress the law? [He who is uncircumcised by nature, if he fulfils the law, will even judge thee, who, with the letter and circumcision, dost transgress the law.] 26 For he is not a Jew, which [who] is one outwardly; neither is that circumcision, which is outward in the flesh: But he is a Jew, which [who] is one inwardly; and circumcision is that of the heart, in the spirit, and [omit and] not in the letter; whose praise is not of men, but of God.

CHAP. III. 1-20.

1 What advantage then hath [What, then, is the advantage of] the Jew? 2 or what profit is there [what is the benefit] of circumcision? Much every way: chiefly, [First, indeed,] because that unto them were committed [they 3 i.e., the Jews—were entrusted with, ἐπαθεῖσθαι] the oracles of God. For what [What, then,] if some did not believe [were faithless]? shall their unbelief [faithlessness, or, unfaithfulness] make the faith of God without effect [destroy, or, nullify the faithfulness of God]? 4 God forbid: [Let it not be!] yea, let God be true, but every man a liar; as it is written, "That thou mightest [mayest] be justified in thy sayings, and mightest [mayest] overcome when thou art judged" [Ps. ii. 4]. But if our unrighteousness commend [doth
establish] the righteousness of God, what shall we say? Is God unrighteous who taketh vengeance [who is inflicting, or, bringing down, the wrath, ὁ ἐπικριτής τῆς ἀργυρίου]? (I speak as a man [after the manner of men, ἡταὶ αἰτθητονοι].)

6 God forbid: [Let it not be!] for then how shall God judge the world?

7 For [But] if the truth [covenant-faithfulness] of God hath more abounded through my lie [was made the more conspicuous by means of my falsehood, unfaithfulness] unto his glory [chap. v., 20]; why yet [still, any longer] am I also judged as a sinner? And not rather, (as we be [are] slanderously [blasphemously] reported, and as some affirm that we say,) Let us do evil, that good may come;1 whose damnation [condemnation, judgment] is just.

8 What then? are we better than they? No, in no wise [Not at all] for we have before proved [charged] both Jews and Gentiles, that they are [to be] all under sin; As it is written, "There is none righteous, no, not one: 11 there is none that understandeth, there is none that seeketh after God. 12 They are all gone out of the way, they are together become unprofitable; there is none that doeth good, no, not one" [Ps. xiv. 1-3]." Their throat is an open sepulchre; with their tongues they have used deceit; the poison of asps is under their lips" [Ps. v. 9; cxl. 5]." Whose mouth is full of cursing and bitterness, 16, 17 ness" [Ps. x. 7]:" Their feet are swift to shed blood: Destruction and misery are in their ways: And the way of peace have they not known"

18 [ Isa. ixi. 7, 8 ]: "There is no fear of God before their eyes" [Ps. xxxvi. 1].

19 Now we know that what things soever the law saith, it saith to them who are under the law: that every mouth may be stopped, and all the world may become guilty before God. [Therefore] because [by] the deeds of the law there shall no flesh be justified [by works of the law no flesh (i. e., no person) shall (can) be declared righteous] in his sight: for [ . For] by the law is the knowledge of sin [comes a knowledge of sin].

TEXTUAL.

* Ver. 27.—[The E. V. hero, as often, follows Beza, who translates ἄδικον, per, which is its fundamental meaning when it rules the genitive. But here it expresses the state or the circumstances under which the transgression takes place, i, e., such as in its effects, not only the act itself, the written law and circulation; comp. 2 Cor. 3, with, by means of, not standing, the written law and circulation; comp. the same phrase, with patience; δέ τοι ἐν συνήκρισιν, while in circulation, Rom. iv. 11; διὰ προσκολαπτόνα, with offence, xiv. 20; and Winer, Gramm., 7th ed., p. 356 f. - P.S.]

Ver. 27.—[Lange, with Erasmus, Luther, Bengel, De Wette, Meyer, Tholuck (ed. 5), Alford, and others, takes ver. 27 to be categorical, and makes a period after "law." Hence κρίνει is emphatically put first, and sa in the sense of even: For, verify, he will even condemn you. The E. V. regards ver. 27 as a continuation of the question in ver. 20, and supplies only before καίνα. So also Pritsche, Olshausen, Luther, Philippi, Ewald, Wordsworth.—P.S.]

Ver. 2.—[Πάρος οὖν ἢ νάραν. Κ. A. D.] K. L. Tischendorf, Meyer, Alford, Lange, insert γάρ, namely, after μή; B. D.* U., Vulg., Syr., Lachmann, omit it. πάρος, first, in the first place, is not followed by secondly, etc.; comp. πάρος μάρτυς, i. e. To avoid the anacoluthon, Calvin translates: præfacent; Beza: præserunt. See also the E. V. and Dr. Lange.—P.S.]

Ver. 3.—[Τι κρίνει; a phrase used to start an objection for the purpose of answering it, or to vindicate a previous assertion; comp. Phil. i. 16.—P.S.]

Ver. 3.—[i. e., κρίνει τίνα—στροφαὶ—στοριὰ, should be rendered so as to retain the paraenesis. Lange: Denn wie? Wenn eilich die Gliantstreue brechen, sollte der Teufelbruch die Trüe Gottes aufhören?—P. S.]

Ver. 4.—[Or, For be κρίνει, as from it, by no means; Vulg., chart, German: ex verbis non est, or (Luther, Lange), das sei fest! The phrase, μῆ χρίστον, is an expression of strong denial or pious horror, corresponding to the Hebrew ḥaṣá (Gen. xiv. 17; Jos. xxii. 29; 1 Sam. xx. 2), and occurs fourteen times in Paul's Epistles—ten times in Romans (li. 4, 6, 31; vi. 2, 15; vii. 17; ix. 16; x. 14; xi. 1, 11), three times in Galatians (ii. 17; iii. 21; vi. 14), and once in 1 Cor. vi. 10; but elsewhere in the N. T. only Luke xx. 16. It is also used by Polybius, Arrian, and the later Greek writers. The God forbid of the Authorized Version, (like the German Gott hört, Gott brechst) is almost proverbial, though very expressive, and in keeping with old English usage; for we find it in all the earlier E. V., including that of Wiclif, and also that of Rheims. Wordsworth's rendering: "Gott forbit that this should be so," is hardly an improvement. Remember the third commandment, as explained by Christ, Matt. v. 24.—P. S.]

Ver. 4.—[Or, in Thy judging, when Thou judgest, as the E. V. has it in Ps. lii. 4. The active rendering of εἰν τῷ κρίνεισαι (middle, in the sense of litigare) corresponds to the Hebrew תשבת, Ps. lii. 4 (comp. LXX; Job xiii. 19; Isa. xxxii. 26; Jer. ii. 35; Matt. v. 40; 1 Cor. vi. 1, 6), and is defended in this passage by Beza, Bengel, Tholuck, Meyer, and Ewald; while Vulg., Luther, Lange, Hodges, etc., prefer the passive rendering: when Thou art judget.] See Eng. Notes. The quotation is from the penitential Psalm of David, composed after his double crime of adultery and murder, and reads in Hebrew thus:

Lit.:

Lit.: "To Thee, Thine only, I have sinned, and done the evil in Thine eyes, In order that 'Thou mayest he just in Thy speaking, And pure in Thy judging."
Paul follows the translation of the Septuagint, which renders ἐνικάζων (that Thou mayest be justified—i.e., be accounted, declared just), substitutes μικρά (that Thou mayest conquer, prevail judicially in Thy cause) for the clear, pure, and takes the active ἁμαρτάνεις in the passive, or more probably in the middle sense, to ἡ ματαιότης σου. The sentiment is not materially altered. The apostles, in their citations, frequently depart from the letter of the Hebrew, being careful only to give the mind of the Holy Spirit.—P. S.

2 Ver. 5.—[Comp., to make moral with, to place together (constitutus, collectus); and hence of persons, to introduce, to sum up by letter (xvii. 1; 2 Cor. iii. 17); trope, to set forth, to make conspicuous, to prove; so here, and Rom. v. 6, συντηρεῖται οὕτως ἐν θεῷ διὸν; Gal. ii. 18, παραπλησία ἐπανειλήματος, and often in Polybius, Philo, and Josephus.—P. S.]

3 Ver. 5.—[Cod. Sin. adds, arms after λόγος, His wrath. The other authorities omit it. The article before ἀργά points to the well-known wrath on the day of judgment, and in the moral government of the world.—P. S.]

4 Ver. 7.—[The usual reading is, ἐτέρα, but Cod. Sin. reads, εἰς. Lange, in his translation, reads, seem different, but in the Exeg. Notes, it is expressed. See his explanation of the difficult passage.—P. S.]

5 Ver. 8.—[Dr. Lange makes a period after come, and translates: And so let us by no means—as we are blasphemously charged, and as some pretend that we say—do evil, but good may come! The condemnation of such is just. See the Exeg. Notes. But nearly all the commentators regard ver. 8 as a continuation of the question committed in ver. 7, and assume an irregularity of construction. ἀνέργεως, then, instead of being connected with καί (νικά) at the beginning of ver. 8, is connected by συν with the preceding λέγεις. "And why do we not rather say, as we are blasphemously reported (blasphemous), and as some give out that we do say, 'Let us do the evil things (θέον καθεκλω), that the good ones Θεοί may come!'—whose judgment is just?"—P. S.]

6 Ver. 8.—[Conybeare and Howson: Of such men the doom is just. Καίμα occurs twenty-eight times in the N. T. and is generally correctly rendered judgment; in the E. V. The word denunciation, in old English, was used in the sense of condemnation, censure, but is now equivalent to: condemnation to everlasting punishment, or state of everlasting punishment. Hence the E. V. here conveys a false meaning to the popular reader, as also in Rom. xiii. 2 ("shall receive to themselves judgment," t. e., here temporal punishment by the magistrate) and 1 Cor. xiii. 24 ("eating and drinking judged to himself")—P. S.]

7 Ver. 9.—[προανατεθμένη περισσότερα is a gloss. [D. G., Syr. On the different interpretations of προανατεθμένη, comp. the Exeg. Notes. προτύπος, in the active voice, means: to hold before, or intrinsically, to surpass, to excel; in the middle voice: to hold before one's self, either literally, c. e., a shield, or figuratively, in the sense, to use as a protest; in the passive voice: to be surprised.—P. S.]

8 Ver. 10-12.—[LITERAL version of Ps. xiv. 1-3 from the Hebrew:

"A fool hath said in his heart, "There is no God."
They are corrupt, They have done abominable things, There is not a doer of good.
Jeremiah from the heavens, Hath looked on the children of men, To see if there is a wise one, seeking God.
The whole have turned aside; Together they have become worthless: There is not a doer of good, not even one."

—P. S.]

9 Ver. 13.—[Ps. v. 9, according to the Hebrew:

"There is no stability in their mouth;
Their heart is full of mischief; An open grave is their throat;
Their tongues they make smooth."—P. S.]

10 Ver. 13.—[Ps. cxii. 3 in Hebrew:

"They have sharpened their tongues as a serpent; Poison of an adder is under their lips."—P. S.]

11 Ver. 14.—[Ps. vii. 7:

"His mouth is full of oaths, And deceit, and fraud."—P. S.]

12 Ver. 15-17.—[From Isa. lx. 7, 8, which reads literally:

"Their feet run to do evil, And they haste to shed innocent blood; Their thoughts are things of mischief; Wasting and destruction are in their highways; A way of peace they have not known, And there is no judgment in their paths. Their paths they have made prosperous for themselves; No treader in is hath known peace."—P. S.]

13 Ver. 18.—[Ps. xxxvi. 1:

"The transgression of the wicked Is affirming within my heart; Fear of God is not before his eyes."—P. S.]

14 Ver. 20.—[Διὰ τι may mean, (1.) δι' τι, proper quad, quam ob rect, quar, weshall, messages, on account of which thing, wherefore (relative), or, in the beginning of a period, desehall, therefore indicating a conclusion from preceding premises. This is the prevailing, though not exclusive meaning, among the Greek classics; while in the N. T. διὰ is used more in this sense. (2.) δι' τι, proper quad, proper shall, well, on this account that, or simply δι', quid, nam, because, for, assigning a reason for a preceding assertion. Both views suit the connection, but the latter is more common among the passages. (2.) δι' τι, in our passage, following Hezec. (propertive). See the passages in Schmid-Bruder's Concordantia, and in the Concordance, vol. i., p. 2, of our English version. (propertive), probably in allusion to Ps. xxxlii. 2, ἔργα ποιεῖν δίκαια, διακόνησιν, etc. The negation belongs not to ἄνω, but to the verb, according to a Hebraizing syntactic connection. "All flesh shall not be justified" = "no body shall be justified." Comp. Matt. xxiv. 22: οὐκ ἐν ἁλωθίν πάρα ἀμήν.—P. S.]
EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

Survey.—1. The use of circumcision. Its two-fold operation, according to the conflicting conduct of the Jews. Its spiritual significance, by which the Gentile can be a Jew, and the Jew a Gentile; vers. 25—29. 2. The objective advantage of historical Judaism. The authority of the Word of God, which remains established by virtue of God's faithfulness to His covenant, though many of the Jews become unfaithful. By this unfaithfulness they must even cause the glory of God's faithfulness to abound. Nevertheless, the unfaithful are responsible for their guilt, and the application of the sin of unfaithfulness to the glory of God would be a wicked transgression; chap. iii. 1—6. 3. The subjective equality of the Jews with the Gentiles. In a subjective relation, the former have no advantage, since, according to the witnesses of the Old Testament, they are in a severe condemnation. The conclusion: All the world stands guilty before God; vers. 9—20. The whole section contains, briefly, the three points: 1. Circumcision (Judaism) is conditionally either an advantage, or not; 2. as far as the designed mission of Judaism was concerned, it was an advantage; 3. from the conduct of the Jews, as opposed to the righteousness of God, it was no advantage.

**First Paragraph (Vers. 25—29).**

Ver. 25. For circumcision indeed profiteth (or availeth). After the Apostle has portrayed the corruption of the Jews, he comes to the objection of Jewish theology, or also to the argument from the theocentric standpoint: What, then, is the prerogative of circumcision? Does not circumcision, as God's covenant promise, protect and sustain the Jews? Answer: The advantage of circumcision is (according to the nature of a covenant) conditional. It is actually available (not merely useful); it accomplishes its complete work when the circumcised keep the law. Plainly, circumcision here falls under the idea of a covenant. It is a mark of the covenant of the law, by which God will fulfill His promise to the circumcised, while the uncircumcised stand beneath the law (Exod. xix. 7, 8; Deut. xxvi. 16). But afterward the circumcision of God is made prominent as God's institution; it remains in force, though a part of the Jews become faithless to the covenant relation. But this rests upon its inner nature or symbolic significance, as a promise and pledge of the circulation of the heart; that is, a continual sincerity and heartiness in the fulfillment of the law (Deut. x. 16; xxx. 6; Jer. iv. 4; Col. ii. 11; Acts vii. 51: "Uncircumcised in heart and ears"). The consequence is, that the one who is circumcised is received into the people of the covenant. But the idea of the people of the covenant gradually becomes more profound, just as that of the covenant and the new birth itself, as the time of their fulfillment in the New Testament approaches. It is from this point of view that the following discussion must also be explained.—It is of use—that is, it accomplishes what it should according to its original idea.—If they keep the law. Here the question is plainly not concerning the perfect fulfillment of the law in the Jewish sense (Tholuck); which is opposed by vers. 26 and 15. Nor can the Apostle anticipate here so soon the New Testament standpoint of faith, accord-

ing to which believers alone, including those from the Gentiles, have the real circumcision. He therefore means the fulfillment of the law according to the measure of sincerity and heartiness by which either Jew or Gentile is prepared to obey the truth of the gospel (vers. 7, 8).—But if thou art a transgressor. One of the mystical expositions of the Pentateuch, Shemath Laabah (from about the 6th century), expresses the frame of thought in the same figurative drapyery: "The heretics and the ungodly in Israel should not say, 'Because we are circumcised, we do not descend to the Gehenna.' What does God do? He sends His angels, and brings back their unircumcision, so that they descend to Gehenna" (Tholuck).* The expressions transgressor and uncircumcision were especially terrible to the Jews. Uncircumcision was the peculiar characteristic of the impurity of heathendom, as circumcision denoted the consecration and holiness of the Jewish people. But here it is stated, not merely that uncircumcision takes the place of circumcision, but that circumcision actually becomes uncircumcision. That is, the unbelieving Jew becomes virtually a Gentile. [What is here said of Jewish circumcision, is equally applicable to Christian baptism: it is a great blessing to the believer, as a sign and seal of the New Covenant, and a title to all its privileges, but if no advantage, it is turned into a curse, by the violation of the duties implied in this covenant.—P. S.]

Ver. 26. Therefore, if the uncircumcision. The Apostle here uses the Jew's mode of expression. Ακορποθεσια, uncircumcision, stands in the first clause of the sentence as an abstract term for the concrete ἀκροποθεσος, uncircumcised; hence the αὐτον, i.e., of such an ἀκροποθεσος after the second ἄκροποθεσια. That is, δεῖ συναγαγματα τῶν ἑαυτοῦ. The requirements of the law in essential matters, as τὰ τῶν νῦν, ver. 14; as they can be observed by the Gentile also. [The moral requirements, not the ceremonial, among which circumcision was the very first. The E. V. here misses δικαιοσύνη for δικαιοσύνην. —P. S.] Be counted for circumcision. He shall be accepted as a Jew who is obedient to the law (Matt. viii. 11; 1 Cor. vii. 19; Gal. v. 6). The clause is supposed by Philippi to apply to the Gentiles; the judgment of the law is upon them (v. 13). But these have ceased to be Gentiles in the full sense of the word. The point here throughout is not concerning the form, but the disposition. Fritzsche refers the future [ἀνορθοθεσιας] to the final judgment; but Meyer, and others, regard it as applying to the abstract future: "As often as the question concerns justification." Assuredly the Apostle has

* (Rabbi Berechias, in Shemoth Rabb., fol. 138, col. 13: "No heretic and apostate and impious or heretic, or man who is circumcised, and is a transgressor, nor one who is circumcised, or a non-circumcised one. Our Rabbis said, that, no one who was circumcised should be sent to hell." Methaht. 

1 (The reference is the case, John viii. 44: ᾧ ἐστιν ὁ ἄγιος ἁδηστής, where the abstract noun ἁδηστής must surprise the concrete ἁδηστής. Comp. Winer Gram., pp. 131, 132, 6th ed.—P. S.)
already in mind the definite future, the day when the gospel is preached.

Ver. 27. And he who is unchristianised by nature [ἐκ φύσεως belongs to ἀναφορεία, not to τιλούσα] will judge thee [χριστί, rise up in judgment by his example; comp. Matt. xii. 41, 42, where καταργέω is used]. Analogies to this bold word can be found in the Gospels, Matt. iii. 9; vii. 11; xii. 41, and others; and even back in the Old Testament. The sentence is read by many as a question, as the previous verse; while the χριστί is again supplied in thought before χριστί (Rückert, Tholuck [in the earlier editions, but not in the fifth.—P. S.], Lachmann, and others). On the contrary, as a declaration, it is a definite answer and conclusion to ver. 26 (Luther, Erasmus, De Wette, Meyer).—Unchristianised by nature. The Gentile as he is by virtue of his natural birth, as is the Jew no less. The ἐκ φύσεως is erroneously made by Koppe to relate to τῶν νόμων τιλούσα, but more artificial is Olshausen’s explanation: "The Gentile world observing the law without higher aid."

—Who with the letter [ὁ δὲ γραφόμενος]. The ὁ δὲ reminds us of the declaration in chap. vii. 11: "For sin, taking occasion by the commandment, deceived me, and by it slew me" (Eccumenius, Beza, and others). Yet it should be urged here, as Meyer properly remarks, that such a Jew, in spite of the law, transgresses it. But that he becomes a transgressor (παραπεποιήσας), and not merely a sinner (ἀμαρτολος), rests upon the fact that he is in possession and knowledge of the law (chap. v. 13, 14). The expression γραφόμενος defines the law in its specific character as written law [not in a disparaging sense, in opposition to παραπαντία; circumcision (παραπομπή) is the appropriate obligation to the same.

Ver. 28. For he is not a Jew who is one outwardly. We here have a succession of brief utterances (brevioglossum). Meyer translates: "For not he who is a Jew externally, is a [genuine] Jew." This means, in complete expression (according to De Wette and others): "Not the one who is a Jew externally is a Jew, that is, on that account already a Jew internally, or a true Jew." Thus, also, the second clause of the verse should be understood: Neither is the circumcision which is external, the sign of the covenant, the external sign not the reality: It is the symbolic mask of the reality. Tholuck: "Mark xii. 38, as well as other examples, prove that this view was not unknown to the Scriptures." Yet even this, and the expression quoted from the Talmud—The Jew conscience is in the innermost parts of the heart—is far from resembling this Pauline antithesis.

Ver. 29. But he is a Jew who is one inwardly. Explanations: 1. "He who is internally a Jew is a Jew; and the circumcision of the heart, in the spirit, not in the letter, is circumcision" (De Wette, Tholuck, with Beza, Eete, Rückert). Here the absent predicate is in the concluding word. 2. But he who is one inwardly, is a Jew, and the circumcision of the heart rests in the spirit, not in the letter (Luther, Erasmus, Frizsche, Meyer). In the first construction, the object of the predicate; in the second, circumcision of the heart creates an anticipation which is at variance with the parallelism. Therefore, 3. But he is a Jew (this is brought over from the preceding verse) who is a Jew inwardly; and circumcision (likewise brought over from the preceding) is circumcision of the heart, in the spirit, and not in the letter. We must therefore supply "Joanantes after ἀλας, and παραπεποιήσει after κόσμου."—And circumcision, ἀλας, and παραπεποιήσει after κόσμου.—A Jew in secret, ἀλας, and παραπεποιήσει after κόσμου. The true theocratic disposition—that is, the direction of legality to heaviness, truth, and reality, and thus to the New Testament. This is not quite equal in degree to ἀλας τῆς καρδιάς ἀνθρωπος (1 Peter iii. 4). Circumcision of the heart; see Deut. x. 16, &c.; Philo: αὐλοθένατι ψυχήν ἐκτροπήν. Circumcision of the heart does not mean "the separation of every thing immoral from the inner life" (Meier), but the mortification or breaking of the natural selfish principle of life, by faith, as the principle of theocratic consecration and direction. (Even the Old Testament plainly teaches the spiritual import of circumcision, and demands the circumcision of the heart, without which the external ceremony is worthless; Deut. x. 16; xxx. 6; Jer. iv. 4; Is. 29; Ezek. xlix. 9; comp. Col. ii. 11; Phil. iii. 2. The same may be applied to baptism, the sign and seal of regeneration.—P. S.)—In the spirit. Explanations: 1. In the Holy Spirit (Meyer, Frizsche, Filippus [Hodge]). Incorrect, since the question is not yet concerning the Christian new birth. 2. In the spirit of man (Eccumenius, Erasmus, Beza, Reich, and others). [Wordworth: the inner man as opposed to the flesh.—P. S.] 3. The Divine spirit, as chap. vii. 6; 2 Cor. iii. 8; the spirit which fills the heart of the new-knighted and circumcised Jew of the Jewish Church coming from God; Tholuck). 4. The new principle of life wrought by God in man (Rückert). 5. When παραπεποιήσει is placed in antithesis to γραφόμενος, or the life in παραπεποιήσει to the life in γραφόμενος—that is, the life in an external, external, contracted pursuit of the single and outward prescriptions of the law according to the letter—then by spirit we are neither to understand the Spirit of God in itself, nor the spirit of man, but the spirit as life, the spirit-form of the inward life, by which the human spirit moves in the Spirit of God, and the Spirit of God in the human spirit.—Whose praise. Explanations of the oiv: 1. neuter; ευλογεῖσθαι (Luther, Camerarius, Meyer: "ideal Judaism and ideal circumcision" [Wordworth]). 2. More figurative: masculine; reference to Ιουδαίοι (Augustine, and others, Tholuck, De Wette.
Second Paragraph, Chap. iii. 1-8.

Ver. 1. What then is the advantage of the Jews [Τοιοντοι περισσωτερον Ἰουδαίοι?] After the Apostle has shown that not only the Jews are included in the same corruption with the Gentiles, but that pious Gentiles have even an advantage over ungodly Jews, he comes to the question which would naturally be presented by his hearers. Whether, then, Israel has any peculiar prerogative, and, if it is to be found, what it consists. He does not ask in the name of a Gentile Christian (Seb. Schmidt), or of the Judaist, although he must take from these every occasion for accusation, but from the standpoint of the true theology. The advantage in the sense of profit (De Wette).—Or what is the benefit of circumcision? (τις ἡ ὕλη τῆς περιστομονος?) The second question does not relate merely to circumcision as a single means of grace (De Wette). It makes the first question more precise, so far as for the Apostle the Jewish economy is different from the Old Testament in general (chap. iv.; Gal. iii.).

Ver. 2. Much every way. First of all, namely. [πολὺ refers to both περισσον and ἔφελεν; Meyer, κατὰ πάντα τρόπον, under every moral and religious aspect, whichever way you look at it; the opposite is not οὕλη τοῦ τρόπον.—P. S.] All that he could have meant he showed in chap. ix. 4. But from the outset, apart from his train of thought and purpose, he had a further object than to show the advantage that to them the λόγος τοῦ θεοῦ were committed. We therefore accept, with Theodoret, Calvin, Bengel, and others, that προέκυψε means here προεκύπτω, or προανείθαι, πραξεῖν, πρός ός; Tholuck and Meyer [Alford, Hodg.] on the other hand, suppose that he omitted to enumerate the other points (to which the μὴ refers), and quote, as examples, chap. i. 8; 1 Cor. xi. 18. —They were intrusted with the oracles of God. According to our rendering of the περισσον, τὰ λόγα (significant promulgations, γεγονός, words of revelation, Acts vii. 38; Hev. v. 13; 1 Peter iv. 11) can by no means denote the Old Testament word of God in its general aspect (Colossians: quidquid Deus habuit dicendum), but this word only in the specific direction in which the most of the Jews were unbelieving in regard to it. What is meant, therefore, is not the law alone and as such (Theodoret, Ecumenius, Beza); for the law, according to Paul, was also a typical gospel (which Tholuck seems to overlook, when he says: The contents of the λόγος divide into the twofold part, ὁ νόμος and τὰ πνευματικά); nor the Messianic prophecies alone (Grotius, Tholuck, Meyer), but properly both (De Wette), as one was the condition of the other, and both constituted a covenant of Jehovah with the people (Calvin, Calov [Hodge], and others). The unity of these elements lay chiefly in the patriarchal promises; and as the people of Israel were made a covenant people, these were committed to them as the oracles of God establishing the covenant, which Israel, as the servant of God, should proclaim to the nations at the prophecies. (The Apostle, in calling the Old Testament Scriptures the oracles of God, clearly recognizes them as divinely inspired books. The Jewish Church was the trustee and guardian of these oracles till the coming of Christ, Now, the Scriptures of the Old and New Testament are committed to the guardianship of the Christian Church.—P. S.) ἑπιστᾶν, περισσον. They were entrusted with the ἡγεμονία τοῦ in the passive. comp. Winer, § 40, 1 [§ 39, 1, p. 244, 7th ed.; also Gal. ii. 7; 1 Cor. ix. 17.—P. S.] They were federally entrusted by the faithfulness of God (πιστῶς, ver. 8) with God's promises, or were authenticated in their faith in order that they might exercise it with fidelity to faith.

Ver. 3. What then? If some were faithless, &c. In these words the Apostle intimates that the Jews, in the main, still have the advantage just mentioned. The statement is therefore neither an objection nor a proof, but it establishes the previous point against doubt. In view of the certain fulfilment of the Divine promise, even the mass of the apostate people is only a poor crowd of individuals, some; though these some may grammatically be many. Meyer, taking ground against Tholuck and Philipp, disputes the contemptuous and ironical character of the expression τίνες. The contempt and irony lies, of course, not in the word, but in the idea. Unbelief has scattered and divided Israel. According to De Wette and Fritzsche, the expression has an adiaphorizing character. Since the great mass of the unbelievers was known to the readers, the expression has rather a palpable sharpness. Meyer's translation: "If many did refuse to believe (Glauben), their unbelief (Unglauben) will not annul the credibility (Glaubwürdigkeit) of God," expresses the correlative correspondence of these designations, but it is not satisfactory to the sense. The Apostle forces us, by the πίστες, to bring into prominence here the moral force of ἀποστασία; and the assertion of Meyer, that ἀπόστασις and ἰπόστασις mean always, in the New Testament, unbelief, not unfaithfulness, rests upon a false alternative.* Köllner refers the ἰπόστασις to the unfaithfulness of the Jews in the ante-Christian time. De Wette likewise: "They have been unfaithful in keeping the covenant (Theodoret, Ecumenius, Calvin, and others); not, they have been unbelieving toward the promises and the gospel (Tholuck, Olshausen, Meyer). This view is very strange, since he correctly observes that in the word ἰπόστασις there lie two meanings; as πίστες is at the same time fidelity and faith. Meyer's objection to De Wette is equally strange: "τίνες would be altogether unsuiting, for the very reason that it would not be true. All were disobedient and unfaithful." This is against history and the declarations of the Bible (see the discourse of Stephen, Acts vii.). If we distinguish between the ideas, to be a sinner and to be an apostate.

* [Hodge: That ἰπόστασις may have the sense to be unfaithful, is plain from 2 Tim. ii. 13, and from the sense of ἰπόστασις, in Heb. iii. 12, 19, and of ἰπόστασις, in Luke xxi. 46; Rev. xiv. 9. Let us understand the passage as referring to want of faith in Christ, seems inconsistent with the whole context.—P. S.]
late, then it follows that, according to the Scripture, the numerical majority of apostates was always offset by a dynamical majority of persons faithful to the covenant, by whom the covenant was continued on the ground of the πίστις Θεοῦ; and it would have been very strange if Paul, in view of this oft-repeated history, which was truly a common experience, should have quite ignored the present. But as εἰσηγηθεὶς elsewhere (for example, John viii. 30) means, they become believers, so is ηπιστευθείς here, they have become unbelieving, not, they have been. The πίστις of God is His fidelity; His fidelity to the covenant certainly involves "credibility." (2 Tim. ii. 18; ποιήσεις ὑδιοῦ 1 Cor. i. 9; x. 18, &c.)

Ver. 4. Let it not be, ὥς γίνοντο. [Comp. Textual Note.] This expression of impatience repulsion [solemn and intense depreciation], also common to the later Greeks, is, in the mouth of the Hebrew (יְהוָה יְהוָה, od profana), at the same time an expression of a religious or moral repugnance or aversion. Therefore the Apostle repels the thought, as if the τοῖς could annul the πίστις of God, and therefore also nullify the realization of the eternal covenant of grace in the heart of Israel and in a New Testament people of God.

—But let it be: God (is) true, but every man false. [Lange: So aber seits: Gott ist wahrhaftig, aber Menschen sind lügenhaft.] Since γίνοντο relates to one sentence, the antithetical γίνοντο must relate to the sentence which offsets it, and must be marked, as announcing a declaration, by a colon. According to Meyer and De Wette, it means λογικας φανεροθεων, or ἀποδεικνύοντο (Theophylact). [Tholuck prefers ομολογηθείσας as equivalent.] But then the term would have been unhandsomely chosen. Koppe explains: Much rather let it be (vielemehr so sei es). Meyer objects that in this case we should expect τοῖς ως or τοῖς ὧς as article before the whole sentence, and remarks, that Paul did not design to introduce any sentence from the Old Testament. But Paul can nevertheless make use of a sentence of his own on the future of Israel, and the want of the τοῖς does not outweigh the consideration that the γίνοντο, as the antithesis of ὥς γίνοντο, requires a formal declaration. Moreover, Ps. cxxi. 1 (all men are liars) furnished already one half, and the conjunction the other half of the declaration. This point was to be unfolded in all its amplitude in the history of the New Testament. See 2 Tim. ii. 18. [I prefer to connect γίνοντο (Paul does not say, ἔστοι) with δείκνυς, and to take it in the subjective sense: Let God become, e. g., be seen and acknowledged, even by His enemies, as true, whatever be the consequences. So also the E. V. and the best English commentators. The parallel, 2 Tim. ii. 18, is strikingly parallel, ὥς γίνοντο, ὥς δείκνυς. If God is faithful, δείκνυς, yet He abideth faithful (προστήκοντας): He cannot deny Himself. Comp. also the phrase: 'θαυματοσώφρονα, πρεσβυτάρης, and so on.]

—God is true [according to Dr. Lange's view, which disconnects δείκνυς from γίνοντο]. According to Tholuck, ἄλλως here comprehends practical and theoretical truth; in opposition to what he denotes as the usual exposition, that the Apostle expresses the wish that God would reveal Himself consistently as true and faithful (according to Commentary), in the counsels of his plan of salvation. If the question is on the truth of God in reference to the apparent collision between the Old and New Testaments, then the sense must be that even in this powerful antithesis, which to the view of man appears to be an irreconcilable contradiction, God will remain consistent with Himself, and therefore be truthful and faithful (see 2 Cor. i. 20; Rev. v. 5, the name Jehovah). All men are liars so far as the, sinners (sin = lie); yet unbelief is emphatically a lie (John vii. 44), since, with its rejection of the truth, it becomes obedient to falsehood, and is imputed to the greatest self-contradictions (see chap. ii. 21-23). Unbelief is not the same thing as a rejection of apostles, but also a tendency and manifold fault of believers; and so far all men are liars through unbelief. Whenever the covenant between God and man is shaken or broken, absolute faithfulness is always found on God's side; He is a rock (Deut. xxxii. 8), and while all the vibrations, as well as all the breaches of faithfulness, are on the side of men. Also, in Ps. cxni, all men are represented as liars, in opposition to the faithfulness of God; and by troubling believers they oppose faith. As it is written (Ps. ii. 4).—The application of the passage quoted from the Psalms gives evidence of the most profound insight. The original, according to Hupfeld's translation, reads thus:

"To Thee alone I have sinned,
And done what is wicked in Thy sight,
In order that Thou mayest be just in Thy sayings,
Pure * in Thy judging."

The Septuagint translates, "In order that Thou mayest be acknowledged just (δικαιωμενος) in Thy words (in Thy sayings), and mayest conquer (νικης, instead of προς) in Thy ρινθασμος (τς θος θεως)." Paul quotes from the Septuagint. The sense of the original text is, that David placed himself before the judgment of God and His revelation. Viewed according to the custom of Oriental despatches, Nathan had condemned him too harshly; but when he regarded his sin in all its depths as a sin against God, and before His eyes, he perceived the justice of the prophet's charge, and the holiness of his judicial declaration of the guilt of death. The translation of the Septuagint, "that Thou mayest be justified, declared just," δικαιωμενος for the Hebrew תשקס בתר, is exegetical. [In using the word δικαιον here evidently, like the hiphil of פלט, in a declaratory sense (for God is just and cannot be made just, but only declared or acknowledged as just), Paul furnishes us the key to the proper understanding of his doctrine of justification by faith, see below, ver. 28.—P. S.] The change νικης, &c., is a periphrasis. "Thou mayest be pure in Thy judgment," means properly, "Thou wilt be recognized as pure; therefore Thou overcomest, since Thou wilt be justified in Thy judgment." The Septuagint has amplified the slight antithesis, "in Thy sayings, in Thy judgment," so that the distinction can be drawn between God's words and His judgments. The chief point is the canon: If God is to be thoroughly known and recognized as just and holy in His word and in His judgment, then, must sin, which stands committed against Him, be known in all its breadth and depth. The defect in our knowledge here is what casts a shade in part upon God's word and in part upon His judicial government. Paul's employment of the quotation from the Psalms corresponds to this.

* [προς indicates the righteousness, δικαιον (properly ιδον) be pure], the holiness of God.—P. S.1]
canon; much sooner shall all men be lars, than that a shadow he cast on God's truth oridelity to His covenant. The ψαλίων is frequently used in the judicial sense (see Meyer). Been, Fluct., and recently Tholuck and Philippi (also Meyer and Ewald), would take ψαλίων in the middle sense, for to meditate. But the Apostle could not expect that his expression would be understood in any other sense than in the Septuagint. [Comp. however, Textual Note.] —P. S.

[That thou mayest, ὅπις καὶ εὖ, τὶς ἐπὶ in Ps. li. 6 (ver. 4 in the E. V.), to the intent that, in order that (τῇθελόν). This seems to mean that God caused David's sins to take this aggravat form for the very purpose that He might appear to be entirely just, when He pronounced the sinned condemnation of it. But such an interpretation would imply the contradiction that God condemns His own act. Hence most commentators (even Calvin) take τὶς ἐπὶ here, and often, like ἐπι and ὅπις grammatically as well, or nearly always, indicate the design or purpose (see Gesenius, Thes., s. v., and Winer, Grammar, p. 426 ff., 7th ed.); and where this seems inapplicable, as here, we must assume a logical rather than a grammatical latitude. Design and effect often coincide. The Bible no doubt teaches the sole sovereignty of God, yet never in a fatalistic or pantheistic sense so as to exclude the personal freedom and responsibility of man. Hence it represents, for instance, the hardening of Pharaoh's heart, as the judicial act and punishment of God (Exod. iv. 21; vii. 3), and at the same time as Pharaoh's own act and guilt (ix. 34). David certainly could not mean to say that he sinned with the intention of glorifying God—which would have destroyed the deity of his repentance, and exposed him to the just condemnation of Paul in ver. 8—but that his sin was overruled by God for the greater manifestation of His justice. God never does evil, nor wills any man to do evil, in order that good may come out of it, but He exercises His power, wisdom, and love in overruling all evil for good. It is not the sinner who glorifies God through his sin, but God who glorifies Himself through the sinner. The remarks of Hupfeld and Hengstenberg on Ps. lii. 6—P. S.]

Ver. 5. But if our unrighteousness, &c. [A new objection which might be suggested by the ὅπις in ver. 4; namely, if man's sin redounds to the glory of God, and sets His righteousness in a clearer light (as in the case of David), it is a means to a good end, and hence it ought not to be punished. Paul admits the principle, but denies the conclusion, ver. 6—P. S.] Meyer takes here ἀδίκα in a very general and comprehensive sense, without regard to the legal element contained in it, and explains: "an abnormal ethical disposition."* By this definition the wicked, the unobliged, the bad, can be denoted; but unrighteousness is misconduct in opposition to the law and the right. On ἀποκορονάον, see the Lexica; also Rom. v. 8; 2 Cor. viii. 11, &c. [Also Textual Note].

What shall we say? Τι ἔργον. A

form which often occurs in Paul (chap. iv. 1; vi. 1, &c.). It is peculiar to rabbinical dialectics, and is very common in the Talmud (quid est discendum). It is a formula of meditation on a difficulty, a problem, in which there is danger of a false conclusion. But unless it was an integral part of the language, it was an integral part of the classics. [See Tholuck.] The sentence, if our unrighteousness, &c., is true, but the following conclusion is rejected as false. The Apostle certainly assumes that an unbelieving Jew could raise this objection, but he makes it himself. This is evident, first, from the interrogative form; second, from the position of the question in such a manner that a negative answer is expected; and third, from the addition: humanly speaking, κατά ὑμᾶς ἡ ἁμαρτία ἡ λύμος. This expression is common among the rabbis, "as men speak." (see Tholuck); the term ἁμαρτία ἡ λύμος (humane logai) also occurs in the classics [see the examples quoted by Tholuck]. The expression κατά ὑμᾶς, resting on the antithesis between God and man, denotes, with Paul, now the opposition between the common sinful conduct and opinions of men, and the conduct and opinions in the light of revelation; and now and forever. Between conduct, human rights and customs and the theocratic rights (Gal. iii. 16, and other places). From this addition it does not follow that the question, κατά ὑμᾶς, must be regarded as affirmative (see Meyer, against Philippi). [The phrase κατά ὑμᾶς proves nothing against inspiration. The Apostle here puts himself into the place of other men, using their thoughts and arguments, but expressly rejecting them—P. S.]

Ver. 6. For then how shall God judge the world? This does not mean: God would then not be able to judge the world; but, according to the usual explanation: Since it is universally agreed among religious people that God will be the Judge of the world, the conclusion alluded to must be rejected. The argument is therefore a reductio ad absurdum. (Rückert: the proof is weak!) Coccius [Reiche], Olshausen, and others, refer κάκος (according to rabbinical usage of language) to the Gentile world, and the proof is thus connected: Even Gentile idolatry must bring to light the glory of the true God; and yet God will judge the Gentile world. Therefore the unbelief of some Jews cannot escape the judgment, even though their unrighteousness corroborates the righteousness of God. But there is no proper foundation for this explanation in the text; and besides, it would only remove a smaller difficulty by a greater one, and in a way that would commend itself only to Jewish prejudice.

The New Testament idea of the general judgment is universal. Even the antithesis of κάκος and βολίκα τοῦ ἀθανατίος cannot be applied here. With the

* [Comp. Hodge: "ἐδίκα is not to be taken in the restricted sense of ἁμαρτία, ἁμαρτία, ἁμαρτία in the preceding verse, but in the comprehensive sense of unrighteousness, wickedness. It is the opposite of ἀθεοποίητος, τρισθεοποίητος, which includes all moral excellence."—P. S.]
usual explanation (Tholuck, Meyer, and others) it may nevertheless be asked, whether a sentence which has been dismissed with μὴ γίνοντο, stands in further need of a proof. According to our construc-
tion the sentence may also be explained and stand in connection with the following (see below).

Vers. 7, 8. But if the truth of God, &c. The objection of ver. 7 appears only to repeat that of ver. 5; therefore it is difficult to connect it with what precedes. The difficulty is solved as follows: (1) Calvin, Beza, Grotius [Bengel, Rückert], Philipp, and others think that the objection of ver. 5 is only continued and established in ver. 7; and the words κατά δύναμιν λέγω τὸ κόσμον (ver. 6) should be read, according to Philipp, parenthetically, as a pre-
liminary-outburst of apostolic indignation. By this means, the dialectics assume the shape of an in-
volved controversy, in which the Apostle prema-
turely interrupts the opponent. Tholuck believes that he can produce similar examples in prose of this (chap. vii. 28, and Gal. iii. 3, 4). (2) Meyer: "The τῆς πῶς ἡμείς ὑμῖν ὑδὶ τῶν κόσμων (ver. 6) is now confirmed thus: The fact already considered (ver. 4 f.), that God’s truth is glorified by the lie of man, removes every ground for supposing that an unrighteous God (sic !), who is to judge the world, will judge man as a sinner," &c. Apart from the quaint construction of the thought, the true state-
ment in ver. 5 would be treated as untrue. [De Wette, Alford, Hodge, though differing somewhat in detail, likewise regard vers. 7 and 8 as the ampli-
ification and confirmation of the answer given in ver. 6 to the objection stated in ver. 5. If this objec-
tion be valid, then not only may every sinner claim exemption, but it would follow that it is right to do evil that good may come. This is certainly a more easy and natural connection than the one under (1), and best explains the γὰρ. But if we read it δὲ, we must regard ver. 7 as introducing a new ob-
jection, as in a dialogue between the Apostle and an interlocutor—an objection which is indignantly resented by Paul as a blasphemous slander. But see the note (ver. 8) under the next heading. — P. 3.] (3) Even if we find here, according to Thodoret, the language of a Jew in dispute with the Apostle, the sentence does not appear to be the continuation of the thought of ver. 5. Then the Jew has first drawn the conclusion from ver. 5 that God is unjust If He punish sins by which He is glorified. Here he would deduce the conclusion, from ver. 4, that the man, who by his υἱὸς θεοῦ contributes to the glory of God, is neither a sinner, nor punishable; rather, that he may do evil that good may come. Thus two cases, which would constitute a parallel to chap. ii. 8,4—the first case denoting fanaticism, the other, antiimianism. But there are considera-
tions presented by the text itself against this view. First, the γὰρ at the beginning of ver. 7; which, for this reason, has been removed by many Codd. (B. D., &c, the Vulgate, &c.) as an impediment to the proper understanding of the passage. Then the word, τὴν ἐπίθεσιν, which Meyer thinks should be understood from the standpoint of the general judgment (Tholuck regards it as present, with Luther). Further, Meyer must interpose a τι before the μὴ in ver. 8 (τί μὴ, guiddi 8). Also, if Paul be permitted to speak in the name of the un-
believing Jew and Interrupt himself, an ημῖν must stand before βλασφημοῦμαι. We are therefore of the opinion that the hypothesis of the interlocu-
tion of the obstinate Jew is not correct. (4) Our explanation is contained already in the translation. [See Textual Notes 10 and 11.] The Apostle says first, God does not declare war on all who have glorified his faithfulness by their unfaithfulness. Granted that his covenant faithfulness has, by means of his unrighteousness, shown itself more powerful and conspicuous to His glory (chap. v. 9), that is, that I have finally become a believer—how am I also still judged as a sinner? Answer: No. And therefore we would by no means continue in un-
belief, as those τινες in ver. 3, in order, by wicked con-
duct, to accomplish a good purpose, God’s glory —which is the principle laid by some to our charge. Men who act thus (and the τινες do act thus) are justly condemned. Here the διήγησις of God is the agent, and νεῖκος is the object. In ver. 5 there was the reverse, the δύναμις of man being the agent, and God’s righteousness the object. In ver. 7 the question is concerning the pre
dominance or conquest (see v. 20) on the side of the διήγησις for the honor of God; in ver. 5, the question is merely concern-
ing the bringing of the truth to light. The solution of the difficulty lies in the τὴν ἐπίθεσιν. — On the different explanations of κόσμος, see Tholuck. 1 as well as others [De Wette, Alford]; even i. A Jew [Bengel]; even i. Gentile [Coccocc, Olshausen]; even i. Paul [Fritzsche]; even i. who have added to the glorification of God [De Wette, Tholuck].

Vers. 8. As we are blasphemously (not, slan-
derously) reported. The blasphemy refers not only to Paul, but in the last instance to God, whose holy, and righteous character is outraged by the im-
plausible maxim, to do evil that good may come.—In reference to the δόμα, we must observe that, in con-
sequence of attraction, the ποιησώμεθα is united with ἀγριώτητα.—The καθὼς βλασφημοῦμαι leads us to conclude that the Jews charged the Apostle, or the Christians in general, with the alleged principle: The end sanctifies the means (Tholuck, Calvin). Usual acceptation: the doctrine of superabounding mercy (chap. v. 20) is meant (see Tholuck). Meyer: "The labors of the Apostle among the Gentiles could occasion such slanders on the part of the Jews." According to the view of the Jews, the Christians converted the Gentile world to Monotheism, by betraying and corrupting the covenant of the Jews.—Whose condemnation is just. The δόμα does not refer directly to the slanderers as such, since this is an accessory notion, but to the principle, let us do evil that good may come, and to the fact lying at its root, the hardness of the Jews in unfaithfulness, as they more clearly showed the covenant faithfulness of God. But, indirectly, the charge of those slanderers is also answered at the same time. Ver. 7 favors our explanation. [δόμα refers to the subject in ποιησώμεθα, to those who speak and act according to this pernicious and blas-
phemous maxim.—P. S.]

Third Paragraph, Vers. 9—20.

The transition of the covenant of law to the covenant of grace is already indicated in the preced-
ing paragraph. This is brought to pass in part by the constant unfaithfulness of individuals, and in part by the transitory unfaithfulness of others in every case Israel’s sin is manifested in this covenant. Ver. 9. What then? It must not be read, with Gessenesius [Koppe, Hofmann, Th. Schott], τί δὲν ποιηθεὶς [omitting the interrogation sig-
after ooe]; against which is the oeo. The introduction of the result refers to the foregoing section under the point of view that Israel certainly has advantages on the objective side, but none on the subjective. This is now brought out by the gνωστά ὑπ' ὑμῖν ὃ ἔστω. Explanations: 1. The middle voice here has the signification of: Have we [the Jews] the preference? do we excel? have we an advantage? (Theophylact, Eumenius, the old commentators in general.) Also De Wette, who says: This is the only suitable sense. Therefore the rendering προφανεῖτας. Meyer urges against this view: (a) The usage of language; (b) the previous admission of Israel's disadvantage; (c) the context: πάντως, ver. 9. P. S. 2. The middle voice in the signification of: to hold before, to hold for one's protection. Henneker, Venema, &c. (Fritzsche, figuratively: Do we need a pretext?) Meyer: Have we a protection? That is, have we something with which to defend or screen ourselves? Against this, Tholuck raises the objection that the verb, in this case, should have a passive signification. Answer: Nothing (instead of: Not at all, in the least.) P. S. 3. The passive construction (Eumenius II., Wetstein, Storr.) Eumenius takes the word as the question of a Gentle: Are we surpassed by the Jews? Wetstein, as the question of a Jew: Are we surpassed by the Gentiles? Reiche and Osius: Are we preferred by God? This last form of the passive rendering agrees, as to sense, with the active rendering sub No. 1. But the Apostle is not speaking here of God's favor, but of man's sin, and shows that the Jews, though highly favored by God, are yet subjectively no better, and even more guilty, than the Gentiles. P. S. 4. The middle form was most easily applicable to the intransitive, to be prominent, to excel; therefore we translate it, Are we ahead, or better? Tholuck properly calls to mind that so many of the Greek fathers have taken no exception to the middle form. It is quite against the context when Olshausen [?] and Reiche read the word as a question of the Gentiles (shall we be preferred?).—O ὁ πάντως, Not in the least. Grotius, and others [Wetstein, Köllner], literally: not altogether, not in all respects [as in 1 Cor. v. 10, where πάντως limits the prohibition.—P. S.] This is contrary to the context. [For the Apostle proves the absolute equality of guilt before the law. oeo, πάντως is here = πάντως od 1 Cor. xvi. 12; πάντως strengthens the negation, no, in no wise; not at all; oedós (Theophylact); nequaquam (Vulgate): durchaus nicht; nein, ganz und gar, i. e., nein, in keiner Weise, keineswegs.]

* (See also the Vulgate (procellissimo), Luther, Calvin, Beza, E. V., Grotius, Tholuck, Alford (2d ed.), Keil, Philip, Bloomfield, Alford, Wordsworth, Hodge, who says, with De Wette, that this is the only interpretation which is inherent here.—P. S.)

† Sometimes, however, the middle and the active form of the same verb are used without a perceptible difference; as in Luke xv. 5, ὅσα μὲν ἔχεις ἐκ τῶν καλῶν; ver. 8, ἅμα τίμια εἶς ἧς (according to Lachmann; but Thiele-Bähr reads the active); James iv. 1. f., aevare et aerare; Acts xvi. 10, πασί πολλαῖς, rapax; Acts xviii. 6. πολλάκις (as in Tholuck); Acts xiv. 19, πολλὰ ἐν τῷ οὖς, ver. 27. Winer, Gramm., p. 240 f., 7th ed. There is, it is true, no example of the active use of προσελέγομαι. But the middle voice may have a passive signification, because the Apostle speaks of a superiority which the Jews claimed for themselves, for their benefit; comp. σαλινὸν παρεξελέγοντος τοῦ, which is a metaphor, and is derived from the passive root σαλε�λέγοντας; i.e., of a supplementation of the Latin, ver No. 4. The reading of God, Eumenius προσελέγομαι, gives the same sense.—P. S.)

This sense was probably indicated by the emphatic pronunciation of πάντως, and a stop after oeo. In 1 Cor. v. 10, on the contrary, the πάντως, non enim limits the prohibition contained in oeo. Comp. Winer, p. 816, and Tholuck, Lect. in II. Romans, § 15. For we have before charged, προφανεῖσθαι θαμ. Namely, in the previous part of the Epistle [i. 18 ff., with reference to the Gentiles; ii. 1 ff., with reference to the Jews.—P. S.] The προφανεῖσθαι [from αἰτία, motive, reason, and in a forensic sense, charge, ground of accusation] is a compound word without example.—Under sin νῦν ἀμαρτίας εἰναι. Not merely, are sinners (Fritzsche). Meyer: are governed by sin. He does not, however, that the question here is concerning the punishable or guilt of sin [which is to be inferred afterwards from the use of ἀμαρτίας εἰναι]. But this is implied in αἰτίας. The αἰτία is the ground of the charge.

Vers. 10–19. As it is written. (εὐρυπαρταῖ occurs nineteen times in this Epistle.—P. S.) Paul had previously proved the guilt of the Jews from their living experience, with only a general allusion to the Scriptures; he now confirms his declaration in the strongest way by Scripture proofs. Under the presupposition of exact knowledge of the Old Testament, rabbinical writers also connect various testimonies without specifying the place where they may be found. At the head there stands Ps. xiv. 1–3, from ver. 10 to ver. 12, where we have a description of universal sinfulness as well of the Jews as of the Gentiles. There then follows a combination from verses 13 and 14, Ps. x. 7, in vers. 13, 14, as a description of sins of the tongue. Then Is. lix. 7, 8, quoted in vers. 16, 17, as a delineation of sins of commission. Finally, Ps. xxxvi. 1, in ver. 18, as a characterization of the want of the fear of God lying at the root of all.† The quotations are free recollections and applications from the Septuagint [yet with several deviations]. Finally, in ver. 19, there follows the explanation that these changes were only just as applicable to the Jews as to the Gentiles, and indeed chiefly to the Jews. The passages quoted describe the moral corruption of the times of David and the prophets, but indirectly of all times, since human nature is essentially the same always and everywhere. In Pa. xiv. the general application is most obvious, and hence it is quoted first.—P. S.)

Ver. 10. There is none righteous. [Paul uses δίκαιος for δικαίος, LXX.: ποιόν χαράστηκα, deo deo.] Refers the ποιόν χαράστηκα of the Septuagint to the law. The want of right cosmomies is the inscription of the whole; not as Paul's word (Köllner, &c.), but as free quotation from Ps. xiv.

Ver. 11. There is none that understandeth. While διενεργεῖται represents the receptivity of the religious understanding, εἰκότως ὑμῖν denotes the de-

* (The Greek classical use προσεκτερισμός instead; Meyer.—P. S.)

† (Meyer: 1. Sinful condition (vers. 10–12); 2. sinful manifestations, in word (33, 14), and in deed (15–17); 3. the source of sin (16–P. S.)

‡ (Carr.) according to the accentuation of Lachmann or σιμώνων, as Alford accentuates. It is the usual form in the Septuagint for σιμών (comp. Rom. iii. 11; Matt. xii. 38, 39, ver.) and is derived from the obsolete root σιμωνεῖν for σιμών. See Winer, p. 77 (§ 14, § 15, § 18), where the Hebrew בּוֹיֶם, a word often used to express the right understanding of religious truth.—P. S.)

§ (Stronger than the simple verb; comp. 1 Pet. i. 10 very frequent in the LXX.; Meyer.—P. S.)
sire and effect of the spirit. See the original text, where the negation is characterized as God's fruitless request. [See Textual Note "m].

Ver. 12. They are all gone out of the way (φην ενεχουσι).—The ενεχος, down to one incl. [A Hebrewism, "γενεχουσι", for ενεχος ου, not so much as one. Comp. the Latin ad unum omnes, which likewise includes all.—P. S.]

Ver. 13. An open sepulchre. Estius [Bengel, Tholuck, Hodge]: breathing out the noxious odor of corruption. Meyer prefers the meaning: As rapacious and insatiable as a grave which awaits the corpse; in this sense, the quiver of the Chaldeans is called "an open sepulchre," Jer. v. 16—i.e., destructive (also Calvin, and others). But thus ver. 15 would be anticipated.—\They have used deceit. The imperfect διόλοιν σαρκ* denotes continuous action; they have become deceivers for the future; that is, their settled character.—The prison ofapse. Behind the cunning of falsehood there is deadly malice.

Ver. 14. Full of cursing. The gross, passionate form of ungodly speech, alternating with double-tongued, false language. The bitterness or animosity of their hateful selfishness is the standing ground of their cursing. [Paul here condenses the translation of the Septuagint, omitting the "deceit," as he had already mentioned it in ver. 13.—P. S.]

Vers. 15–17. Their feet are swift. The symbol of their excited course of conduct. [On the slightest provocation they commit murder. Paul here again condenses the sense of Isa. lix. 7.] Their many different ways, full of destruction [σιγουρία, literally, concentration, bruising together, then calamity, destruction] and misery [ταλαιπωρία], (destruction the cause, misery the result) are, as the ways of war of all against all, contrasted with the one way of peace [δύνα ionic]. By this we must undoubtedly understand not merely a way in which they should enjoy peace (Meyer), but an objective way of peace in which they should become the children of peace. [The way that leads to peace, in opposition to the ways which lead to ruin and misery.] Οίας Σφροσαρας, Grotius: Hebraei necesse est quisquis dicitur, quod non curat (Jer. iv. 22).

[Ver. 15. This quotation from Ps. xxxvi. 1 goes back to the fountain of the various sins enumerated. The fear of God or piety, is the beginning of wisdom and the mother of virtue; the want of that fear, or impiety, is the beginning of folly and the mother of vice.—P. S.]

Ver. 19. Now we know. The Jews, indeed, would not readily admit this, but were inclined to refer such declarations exclusively to the Gentiles. [But the passages above quoted from the Psalms and the Prophets, speak not of heathen as heathen, but of fallen men as such, and therefore are applicable to Jews as well.—P. S.—The law. This is the Old Testament, especially in its legal relation (as a norm or rule to which they should conform their faith and conduct; John x. 34, where our Lord quotes a Psalm as in "the law," and other passages).—Who are under the law. That is, the Jews; also particularly from the legal standpoint. Chil and others have understood, by the law, the law as distinguished from the gospel; and the expression, "those who are under the law," as mean for all. But this is application, not explanation.—That every mouth may be stopped. On the question whether λεγε may be understood λεγερασι as [so that, instead of in order that], see Tholuck and Meyer. Here it evidently designates the one purpose of the law, to produce the knowledge of sin, but other purposes are not excluded. The φρασιν το σαμαριον (Ps. 88. 42) means, in a religious relation, that it represents men as αναπτυγματος at the tribunal of Divine justice; so that they "cannot answer God one of a thousand."—The whole world. [Not to be restricted, with Grotius: maxima para hominum, but all men, Jews as well as Gentiles.] Paul has already declared this of the heathen portion in chap. i. 20, 22.—Should become (γियσαντας), in their own conviction, guilty, subject to justice. ιησους = καταφθην, ἐνας δικαι, ουκοικιιας θεωρους, i.e., not only guilty, but convicted of guilt, and therefore obnoxious to punishment (στρατάτησαι).—Before God, to whom satisfaction for sin is due.—P. S.]

Ver. 20. Because (πυκνάδιν). Since διατηρευσαι can be propera quod (because) as well as propera (therefore), Tholuck [with Beza and Morus] prefers the former, the conclusive form. But the Apostle here goes further out, and comes to that universal condemnatory judgment of the law. [See Textual Note "n."]

By works of the law. Explanations of ονόματι:

1. The ritual law (Theodoret, Pelagius, Cornæus a Lapide, Semler, Ammon, and others).—On the contrary, Augustine [and Thomas Aquinas already referred to the preceding sentence of the verse; "by the law comes knowledge of sin," Paul, moreover, understands the word law throughout in its totality, although he does not ignore its several parts and differences. [The decalogue is merely the quintessence of the whole law. The antithesis is not: the ceremonial law and the moral law, but: works of the law and works of faith.—P. S.]

2. The law alone.—Bosio as a whole, both moral and ritual is meant (Meyer). [So also Philip. i the whole revealed law as an undivided unity, yet with special regard to the moral law.—P. S.] But against this is, that Paul speaks here, and in the

* [On this important verse, Dr. Hodge (pp. 155-153) is very full and clear; while Alford and Wordsworth put it over very slightly.—P. S.]

[Several Roman Catholic and Rationalistic commentaries meet from opposite extremes on Pelagian ground, and resolve the meaning of this passage simply into this: that men are not justified by any external rites or ceremonial works, such as circumcision and sacrifices, but only by moral act of the heart and will. But the prevailing Roman doctrine is, that the works of the Mosaic law, and the Mosaic law under the dispensation of Divine grace, have the merit of conformity, while the works done after regeneration, and therefore under the dispensation of Divine grace, have the merit of conformity, and are the ground of acceptance with God.—P. S.]

[De spiritu et litera ad Marcellinum, cap. 8: Non audienti quod legis: quod non justificantur nigro corde Deus; Roman ii. 30). Postquam enim corrum hominibus, non solum corrum illo qui corruit speris et intimos voluntatis in se secat, sed etiam in corpore et sensibus, saepe caput est asseritus a me, sed etiam in sensibus a me. —continuo autem veniens Grotius: "Post quem enim cogitationes perfecti! (Rom. iii. 20)."

Augustine agrees with the Reformers in the doctrine of total depravity and salvation. In grace without works, but agree with the Protestant view of the meaning of justification, as being a continuing process essentially identical with sanctification.—P. S.]
previous verse, of the guilt of all men before the law.

3. De Wette accepts it as merely the moral law, and not also the ritual law. The works of the law, as they were performed by God and angels, and would also have been performed by the Gentiles, if they had been placed under the law (Rückert).

4. The law in a deeper and more general sense, as it was written not only on the Decalogue, but also in the heart of the Gentiles, and embracing moral deeds of both Gentiles and Jews (Tholuck [also Storr, Platt, Stuart]). Certainly it is plain from the context, that the Jewish νομος here represents a universal legislation. The Apostle includes the Gentiles as well as the Jews under the sentence of condemnation, because they do not come up to their own standard of virtue, as required by their inner law of conscience; i.e. 15.—P. S.

But what are works of the law? [ἐκ γὰρ νόμου?]

Explanations: 1. Works produced by the law, without the impulse of the Holy Spirit [νόμον as genetius actuors er causae]. So especially Roman Catholic expositors, as Bellarmine [Augustine, Thomas Aquinas]; and also some Protestants, as Usteri, Neander, Philippi (Olahusen, Hofmann, even Luther; see Tholuck, p. 187). Philippi: "Not the works which the law commands — for he who does these is really righteous (ii. 13) — but those which the law effects (or which the man who is under the law is able by its aid to bring forth)."

The deeds of the law are ἐγκλήματα (Heb. vi. 1); the νόμος cannot ἐν συνώνυμος, [Gal. iii. 21], although it is complete in its method and destination. On Luther's distinction between doing the works of the law and fulfilling the law itself, see Tholuck.

2. The deeds required or prescribed by the law. Protestant expositors, e. g., Gerhard, who includes also the bona opera ratione objecti. [So also Mellechthium, Calvin, Beza, Rücker, Fritzsche, De Wette, Meyer, Hodge. In this view, the φύαν νόμοι include all good works, those after regeneration as well as those before. Even Abraham, the friend of God, was not justified by his works, but by faith. The law of the Old Testament is holy, just, and good, and demands perfect conformity to the will of God, which is true holiness. But even our best works, done under the gospel and under the influence of Divine grace, are imperfect, and can therefore be no ground of justification. Hence the most holy men of all ages and churches never depend on their own works, but on the work and merits of Christ, for final acceptance with God.—P. S.]

3. Tholuck combines the two explanations [p. 140]: "The Apostle includes both meanings, so that, in some passages, the meaning of the deeds required by the law, and, in others, that of the deeds produced by the law, appears more prominent."

But, from the very nature of the case, the deeds required by the law, and those produced by the law, correspond to each other on the legal standpoint.

The unity of both are the works of the legal standpoint, as it may be found also among the heathen (e. g., Green in the Antigone of Sophocles). The law is, for those subjected to it, an analytical letter, which is related to the external work; but, on the contrary, for those who seek God, it is a synthetical symbol, which is related to the disposition of the heart. The former meaning applies only to the individual, to every man, but only to introduce him to the understanding of its second significance. Those who

know it only in the former meaning, always seek justification ἐκ νόμου and ἐκ λογίας, until they are ἐκ λόγίας (chap. ii. 8), and only become acquainted with an apparent righteousness of a particular character. So, on the other hand, the ἁρμανιάς καὶ ἅπατθεν, in all their efforts to fulfill the law, are more and more convinced of the impossibility of a righteousness by works. The requirement of the law, therefore, as well as its operation, continually impels — in the moral, still more in the religious sphere — by means of the knowledge of sin, far beyond the legal standpoint to fulfill itself. Therefore the remark frequently made: "not as if complete obedience to the law would be sufficient for justification" (Meyer), is apt to mislead. De Wette properly remarks: "It lies in the nature of man, and of the law, that this is not fulfilled, and consequently that righteousness cannot be obtained" (see James ii. 10). Where the Old Testament Scriptures speak of righteous persons, those are meant who, in their observance of the legal letter, are theoretically and ecclesiastically irreproachable, but yet do not thereby win their comfort (see Luke i. 6).

No flesh. No human being. [With an allusion to our weakness and frailty, as we say: No mortal. The parallel passage in Ps. cxiii. 2 has, instead: no man living.—P. S.] Not even the believer. It never occurs to him that he might perfect his justification by faith through the dead works. [The phrase ὁ πάσα σαρκίς is a strong Hebraism, "ומְנָ֣ב נָ֥бот נָּבָ֖ת.

[Shall (can) be justified, διάκανω δικαίωσαι. The future refers not to the day of judgment (Reiche), for justification takes place already in this life; nor to the indefinite, abstract future (Meyer, Philippi; Whereunto justification shall take place), but to the moral possibility, or impossibility rather (can ever be justified); comp. σωθ. ver. 6.—P. S.]

On the meaning of δικαίωσαι, to justify, comp. the Ezog. Notes on chap. i. 17; ii. 13; iii. 24. It is perfectly plain that here, and in the parallel passage, Gal. ii. 16, it can only mean, to declare or judicially pronounce just, not to make just. This appears (1) from Ps. cxiii. 2, here referred to ("Enter not into judgment with thy servant; for thy sight shall no man living be justified;"); (2), from the aim of the passage, which is to confirm by δοκεῖ the preceding sentence: "that every mouth may be stopped, and all the world may become guilty before God" (ver. 19); and (3), from the addition ἐν τοῖς αἰρόις, which represents God as Judge, coram Deo judicat.—Dr. Wieseler, in his exposition of the parallel passage, Gal. ii. 16 (Commentar. â€œ, pp. 176—204), enters into an elaborate discussion of the meaning of δικαίωσαι, of which we will give the substance in English, anticipating in part our own remarks on iii. 24:

"The verb δικαίωσαι has, in the Greek, two fundamental significations:

1. To δικαίωσαι ποιεῖν τινα (cf. κακοὶ ποιοῖ, to do any one κακοῦ, harm); that is, to do any one justice. It is used in this sense especially of a judge, and signifies, to determine justice generally; or, more especially, according to the result of the judging, on the one hand, to pronounce and condemn, as with peculiar frequency in the prose writers; or also to declare guiltless of the charge.

[Meyer says this in view of the principle: of every νόμον δικαίωσαι δικαίωσαι, that immediately adds that no human being can fully comply with the law; that the law only makes us more conscious of our moral imperfections.—P. S.]"
trift Paulus den tiefsten Kern der Sache:” i. e. with these words Paul hits the nail on the head, and penetrates to the innermost marrow of the thing. 

2. The great importance which the Apostle at

* [Pararo-Barnabas says, i. e.: “Thou (addressing the Jews) will say, ‘Yes, verify the people are circumcised for a seal,’ but so also is every Syrian and Arab, and all the priests of idols; are these, then, better than the bond of his covenant (or, according to the reading of Cod. Sin.: their covenant)?” i. e., the Egyptians also practise circumcision. —P. S.]
taches to what is within—to the sentiment of the heart—is plain from his bold antitheses. Notwithstanding his unicursalism, the Gentile, by virtue of his state of mind, can become a Jew, and vice versa.

3. The witnesses adduced by the Apostle on the universality of corruption in Israel, neither preclude the antithesis in chap. ii. 7, 8, nor the degrees on both sides.

4. On chap. iii. 3. The covenant of God is always permitted according to its stage and development. If it unreasonably fails to become apparent, the fault always turns out to be man's. The covenant of God is surely no contract social—no agreement between equal parties. It is the free institution of God's grace. But this institution is that of a true covenant, of a personal and ethical mutual relation; and whenever the hierarchy, or a Romanizing view of the ministry obliterates the ethical obligation on the part of man in order to make the sacraments magical operations, their course leads to the desecration and weakening of the covenant acts.

5. Chap. iii. 4. For our construction of the passage in Ps. ii. 4 f., see the Ezeq. Notes on chap. iii. 4. For another view, see Philip., p. 81, with reference to Hengstenberg, Psalms, vol. iii., p. 19. [Both take ἐν ὑμένα; in the usual strict sense (τιτυλον, not ἀκαταστασις), as does also Gessenius, Thes. p. 1952: "ein in ihnen percevi, ut illustraret justitia tua;" and they make the old distinction between the matter of sin, which is man's work, and the forms of sin, which is in the hands of God.—P. S.] Hupfeld also refers the passage to the holy interest of God's government in human offences, but at the same time has definitely distinguished the ethical and human parts. Without contending against the thought prov se, we would refer the ἐπορευον'to sin itself, but to the perception and knowledge of sin. Hence we infer the proposition: All want of a proper knowledge of sin on the part of man obscures the word of God, and leads to the misconception of His judgments (as in the talk about fanciful ideas of revelation, gloomy destiny, &c.).

6. On the truth of God, see the Ezeq. Notes on ver. 4.

7. On ver. 20. By the law is the knowledge of sin (see Gal. iii. 24). This purpose of the law excludes neither its usus primum nor the usus tertius.* But the three uses mark the developing progress of the law from without inwardly, as well in a historical as in a psychological view. The first stage usus politicus has also its promise. The Jew who lived according to the law is justified in the tribunal of his priesthood, and has also his earthly blessing (“that it may go well with thee,” &c.). But the subtlety of the law—not to speak of its first and last commandment—and its symbolical transparence and spiritualization, impel him, if he be upright, further to the pedagogical standpoint, which looks to Christ. And with this, he receives the whole power for the tertius usus [in regulating his life of faith].

8. While the elder theology separated the three

* (The old Protestant divines speak of a threefold use of the law: 1. Usus politicus, or civitas (in the state, which can only be governed by laws); 2. usus cælonchiticus, or passagius (leading to a knowledge of sin and misery); 3. usus donalius, or normaturus (regulating the life of the believer). Comp. the Formula Concord., p. 501 sq. Similar to this is the German sentence, that the law is Zöphel, Sippe, and Riegel, a restraint, a mirror, and a rule. P. S.)

parts of the law (morals, worship, polity) too far from each other, at present the idea of the law as a unit is often so strongly emphasized as to lose sight of the fact that, both in the Old Testament as well as in the New, cognizance is taken of the difference of the parts (see Matt. xix. 17; Rom. vii. 7). The view to the unity of the law, however, prevails in the Mosaic and legal understanding of the Old Testament revelation, as represented by the letters of the two tables.

3. The incapacity of the law to make man righteous lies chiefly in this: First, it is a demand on the work of the incapable man, who is flesh (no flesh shall be justified); but it is not a Divine promise and work for establishing a new relation. Then it meets man as a foreign will, another law; by which means his false autonomy is inclined to resistance, because he is alien to himself and to the concuring law within his inward nature. Finally, it meets him in analytical form and separateness. Man only becomes susceptible of Divine influences: 1. As they are founded in the grace and gift of God; 2. in the spontaneous action of voluntary love; 3. in synthetical concentration.

HOMILETICAL AND PRACTICAL.

(FROM CHAP. II. 25 TO CHAP. III. 20.)

Either, or. As this applied to the Jew according to his position in the Old Testament, so does it apply to the Christian according to his position in the New (ver. 23).—It is not the external possession of a saving means that produces blessings, but faithfulness in its application (vers. 25-28).—How the fact, that the Jew becomes a Gentile, and the Gentile a Jew, can be repeated in our time in various contrasts (vers. 25-27).—The Jew, proud of the letter and of circumcision, below the condemnatory sentence pronounced on the illegal and uncircumcised Gentile—a warning for evangelical Christians (ver. 27).—Inner life in religion; already the principal thing in Judaism, and much more in Christianity (vers. 28, 29).—He who is inwardly pious, receives praise, not of men, but of God.—God's pleasure or praise of inward faithfulness in piety. Herewith it must be seen: 1. How this praise can be acquired; 2. In what does it consist? (ver. 29).—The praise of men and the praise of God (ver. 29).

What advantage have the Jews? This question, and its answer, exhibit to us the infinitely great blessing of Christianity (chap. ii. 1-4).—How Paul never ignores the historical significance of his people, but triumphantly defends it against every charge (comp. chap. ix. 4, 5).—The historical feeling of the Apostle Paul (vers. 1-4).

On chap. iii. 2. God has shown His word to Jacob, His statutes and judgments unto Israel (Ps. cxlvii. 19). Why has God spoken to Israel? 1. Because He chose this people, out of voluntary compassion, for His inheritance; 2. Because by this people, specially appointed by Him for the purpose, He designed to prepare salvation for all the nations of the earth.—Do not complain too much at the unbelief of the world! For, 1. The unbelievers always remain in the minority in real significance, let their number be ever so great; 2. Not only does their unbelief not make the faith (faithfulness) of God without effect; but 3. Rather contributes thereto, by
radiantly showing God's truthfulness, in contrast with all human falsehood (vers. 3, 4).

On chap. iii. 5–8. Why is it impossible that God should have desired our unrighteousness for His glory? 1. Because God could not then judge the world; 2. Because we would be condemned as sinners by an unjust method.—How far does our unrighteousness prove the righteousness of God?—God cannot be the author of sin! This was acknowledged, 1. By Abraham, the father of all the faithful (Gen. xviii. 25); 2. By Paul, the Apostle of all the faithful.—Through God's providence, good continually comes out of evil; but we should never say, Let us do evil, that good may come!—He who says, Let us do evil, &c., 1. Blasphemes God; and therefore, 2. Receives righteous condemnation.—The principle of the Jews, that the end sanctifies the means, is nothing else than a hypocritical cloaking of the plain words: “Let us do evil, that good may come.”

On vers. 9–18. The sinfulness of all, both Jews and Greeks: 1. Proved by Paul himself in his description of their moral depravity; 2. Corroborated by the proofs of Holy Scripture from the Psalms, Proverbs of Solomon, and the Prophet Isaiah.—As Paul appeals to the Old Testament, so should we, in order to authenticate truths, appeal to the whole Bible, though first and continually to the New Testament.—Every doctrine must be spiritual.—Paul a master in the application of Scripture: 1. So far as he grasps the fulness of the scriptural expression; but, 2. He does not thoughtlessly arrange quotations from the Scriptures; but, 3. He skillfully connects kindred passages into a beautiful whole.

On vers. 19–20. The severe preaching of the law (chap. ii. 19). To whom is it directed? 2. What does it accomplish?—How far does the law produce knowledge of sin?

LUTHER: Spirit is what God supernaturally effects in man; letter is all the deeds of nature without spirit (chap. ii. 29).—“God is a sure support; but he who trusts in man will want” (chap. iii. 4).—David says (Ps. li. 4): “Against Thee, Thee only, have I sinned, &c.” These words would seem to mean that man must sin in order that God might be justified, because Paul words it (Rom. iii. 24). Yet this is not the case; but we shall acknowledge the sin of which God accuses us, that He might thereby be confessed truthful and just in His law.

STARK: A true Christian must not despise the means of grace: as, attending church, making confession, and partaking of the Lord's Supper; nor should he speak derisively of them because they are misused by most persons as a false hope (chap. ii. 26).—He who will be comforted by the consideration that he has been baptized in the name of Christ, must examine himself whether he has also been newly born, and walks after the new man: where this is not the case, holy baptism is of just as little use to him, as circumcision was to the unbelieving Jew: 1 Peter iii. 21 (chap. ii. 29).—In worldly courts, injustice often rules; but God will judge the world in the justest manner (chap. iii. 6).—When our misery is properly uncovered, compassion is not, and when we are truly compassionate ourselves, compassion is not far from us (chap. iii. 13).—The way to grace is open when we stand dumb before God (chap. iii. 19).—There is only one way to salvation, by which men, before, at the time of, and after Moses, can be saved (chap. iii. 20).—LANG: Oh, how many Christians are put to shame at this day by honorable beathen! And how the latter will rise up against the former on the judgment-day! (chap. ii. 26).—HEIDINGER: The new creature must be all in all. If this be not the case, there is no godly sorrow, no faith, no Christ, no hope of salvation (chap. ii. 25).—There is only one way to salvation, yet God is at perfect liberty to say in what people He will build His Church, and what measure of grace and gifts He will give (chap. vii. 2).—Here stands the pillar of the evangelical Church, the text and corner-stone of the pure, saving gospel (chap. iii. 20).—QUEENEL: A strong proof of original sin, because no one who comes into the world is righteous, or without sin (chap. iii. 10).—Let love be in the heart, then will loneliness be also in the mouth (chap. iii. 14).—CHAMBER: Learn to distinguish well between true and false Jews, true and false Christians; the external profession does not constitute a true Jew or Christian (chap. ii. 28).—It is not all gold that glitters, and not all show is wisdom. Although the natural reason can devise many conclusive speeches and subtleties, these must not be regarded as wisdom in divine things (chap. iii. 5).—NOSA Bibl. Tub.: The dead members of the Church depend upon its external advantages, take their comfort in them, and make their boast of them, without remembering that they can derive no good from them without a sound and true faith (chap. iii. 16).—Though we be unfaithful, God remaineth faithful. Oh, let us therefore rely upon His faithfulness and promise, and take comfort in the fact that we always have a ready entrance to the faithfulness of our God (chap. iii. 3).—OSLUND: If God is truthful, but men false, why do some men believe folly sooner than the word of God? But to God alone belongs the praise of righteousness and truth (chap. iii. 4).—Those who boast of their righteousness before God, know neither God's will nor themselves (chap. iii. 19).

GEIACH: The usefulness of the covenant of grace extends on all sides and encompasses all the relations of life (chap. iii. 2).—God's wisdom, omnipotence, justice, and love, are glorified either in the punishment or conversion of the sinner; the more wicked the sinner, the greater the glory. But this glory consists precisely in the death of the sinner, since he either dies to sin, having once lived to it; or, with all other sinners, suffers eternal death in perdition (chap. iii. 4).—Description of men of malignant feeling, who strive to injure others by their language. Throat, tongue, and lips—three instruments of speech, which utter the words from within (chap. iii. 12).—The more complete and deep the command, the stronger is its declaration of condemnation, and the less can it awaken in us faith and hope for salvation (chap. iii. 20).

LIBSO: The Christian is aided by the sacraments only when he lives in faith (chap. ii. 28).—On what the moral worth of man before God depends (vers. 26, 26).—Israel's advantages (chap. iii. 1–4).—He who adopts the principle: “Let us sin, that good may come,” will receive righteous condemnation: for God threatens to be glorified only by our obedience, and the wicked becomes His glory. But terminates also with the sinner’s destruction and likewise extends to the justification or glorification of the holy and righteous God (chap. iii. 8).

HEFNER: External eclecticism and confession has value only when it leads to religion of the heart and life; otherwise, it is only the same as
heathenism (chap. ii. 25).—The great difference between outward and inward Christianity. True Christianity is internal (chap. ii. 28).—The true worshipper of God is inward, is concealed from the world, and is known only to God (chap. ii. 29).—The worth and merit of the pious person is exalted above all opinion of the world: 1. Because true piety by no means passes in the world for the highest good, but only that which is profitable, and shrewd; 2. Because man cannot discern this inner, pure condition of heart, neither can they credit it to others; 3. Because the world cannot reward this piety (chap. ii. 29).—God's word is committed to us; use it rightly, support it, propagate it. In many places it has disappeared through the fault of men (in Asia and Africa), chap. iii. 2. God's honor cannot be touched. Nothing can be charged against God; it would be blasphemy to charge Him with blame of any kind (chap. iii. 4).—God's righteousness becomes the more apparent in proportion to the manifestation of man's unrighteousness (chap. iii. 5).—Every feeling of hatred is the root for a willingness to shed blood (chap. iii. 15).—Every man is guilty before God, and subject to His punishment; but he should also know and confess it (chap. iii. 19).—The law requires obedience to all its commands (chap. iii. 20).

SECKEN: Circumcision of the heart is real circumcision (chap. iii. 29).—The evangelical theme of joy in the Epistle to the Romans is, that God, in grace, is just in His words to sinners whom He has justified by faith in Jesus (chap. iii. 4).

LAKE, on vers. 16-24. The fearful picture of warning in the fall of the Jews.—How this picture was again presented in the Church before the Reformation, and now appears in many forms.—Vers. 25-29. Comparison of this passage with Matt. xxii. 21-28.—The great vindication here for the believer.—God, in His grace, does not confide in Him in a certain measure; God, in His faith; His children, a rock.—How unbelieving is against God, and yet must serve God's purpose.—Chap. iii. 1-8. To have an advantage, and yet not to have one. —The testimonies of Scripture on the sinful depravity of man. —Vers. 8-19. How vain is the effort to be justified by the law: 1. Because "by the deeds of the law," &c. 2. "For by the law," &c.

BARKER: Considered, ii. 26. The heathen have abused but one talent, the light of nature; but we, thousands; even as many thousands as we have slighted the tenders of offered grace. What a fearful aggravation it puts upon our sin and misery! We must certainly be accountable to God at the great day, not only for all the light we have had, but for all we might have had in the gospel day; and especially for the light we have sinned under and rebelled against.—Chap. iii. 1. Great is that people's privilege and mercy who enjoy the word of God—the audible word in the Holy Scriptures, the visible word in the holy sacraments. It enlightens the eyes, rejoiceth the heart, quickeneth the soul. It is compared to gold for profit, to honey for sweetness, to milk for nourishing, to food for strengthening:—Chap. iii. 3-7: God is never intentionally, but is something accidentally glorified by man's sins. There never was such a crime as crucifying Christ, but nothing by which God has reaped greater glory.—Chap. iii. 10. The unrighteousness of man: 1. There is none originally righteous; 2. None effe enthy righteous; 3. None meritoriously righteous; 4. None perfectly righteous.—MATTHEW HENRY: The Jews had the means of salvation, but they had not the monopoly of it.—On the righteousness of God, observe: 1. It is manifested; 2. It is without the law; 3. It is witnessed by the law and the prophets; 4. It is by the faith of Jesus Christ; 5. It is to all, and upon all them that believe.—DONNING: We play the Gentiles, and justly so; but let us take heed lest those appearances of virtue which are to be found among some of them do not condemn us, who, with the letter of the law and the gospel, and with the solemn tokens of a covenant relation to God, transgress His precepts, and violate our engagements to Him; so turning the means of goodness and happiness into the occasion of more aggravated guilt and misery.—OLANGE: The law is properly considered the rule of right; and unless God had given some such means of discovering what sin is, the darkened heart of man could never have formed an adequate conception of it. For as an acknowledged straight edge is the only way in which the straightness or crookedness of a line can be determined, so the moral obliquity of human actions can only be determined by the law of God, that rule of right which proceeds from His own immaculate holiness.

HODGE: When true religion declines, the disposition to lay undue stress on external rites is increased. The Jews, when they lost their spirituality, supposed that circumcision had power to save (ii. 28).—Paul does not deny, but asserts the value of circumcision; for, by and large, the Christian sacraments, baptism and the Lord's Supper, are of the utmost importance, and to neglect or reject them is a great sin (ii. 25; iii. 1).—It is a mark of genuine piety to be disposed always to justify God, and to condemn ourselves. On the other hand, a disposition to self-justification and the examination of our sins, however secret, is an indication of the want of a proper sense of our own unworthiness and of the Divine excellence (iii. 4, 5).—There is no better evidence against the truth of any doctrine, than that its tendency is immoral (iii. 8).—Speculative and moral truths, which are self-evident to the mind, should be regarded as authoritative, and as fixed points in all reasonings (iii. 8).—BARNES: If all men were willing to sacrifice their opinions when they appeared to impinge on the veracity of God; if they started back with instinctive shuddering at the very supposition of such a want of fidelity in Him; how soon would it put an end to theblings of error, to the pride of philosophy, to the folly of rebellion against the authority and the divinity of God! No man with this feeling could be a Universalist for a moment; and none could be an infidel.

* [Comp. Archbishop Tillotson, Sermon on 2 Tim. ii. 19 (quoted by James Ford on Romans): "Baptism verily profanes, if contrary to the precept of it, our baptism is not baptism, and our Christianitv is heathenism." We would say: "sovere than baptism, worse than heathenism. For in proportion to the blind- ing intended, is the curse incurred by abuse. The case of an apostate Christian is for more hopeless than the case of an unconverted heathen. When the one has Christianity behind him, the other before him; the one has the sacred character cast off, the other may thankfully embrace it.—P. S.]

[On chap. ii. 29, see Wesley's sermon The Cir
SIXTH SECTION.—The revelation of God's righteousness without the law by faith in Christ for all sinners without distinction, by the representation of Christ as the Propitiator ("mercy-seat"). The righteousness of God in Christ as justifying righteousness.

CHAPTER III. 21-26.

SEVENTH SECTION.—The annulling of man's vain-glory (self-praise) by the law of faith. Justification by faith without the deeds of the law. First proof: from experience: God is the God of the Gentiles as well as of the Jews—proved by the actual faith of the Gentiles. True renewal of the law by faith.

VERSES 27-31.

21 But now the righteousness of God without the law is manifested [But now, apart from the law, the righteousness of God hath been made manifest], being
22 witnessed [testified to, attested] by the law and the prophets; Even the righteousness of God which is by [by means of, through] faith of Jesus Christ unto all and upon all [them that believe]; for there is no difference: For all have sinned [all sinned, i.e., they are all sinners], and come [fall] short [περιστρέφεται, in the present tense] of the glory of God; Being justified freely by his grace
23 through the redemption that is in Christ Jesus: Whom God hath [made] set forth [προέθετο] to be a propitiation [mercy-seat] through [the ] faith, in his blood, to declare [for a manifestation (exhibition) of, εἰς ἐνδεικνύει τις δικαιοσύνης his righteousness for the remission of sins that are past [because of the pretermision (non-visitation, passing by) of the former sins, διὰ την (not τίς) πάρευσιν (not ἄρεσιν) τῶν προέγευσεν ἀμορφηματίστων] through [in, εἰς] the forbearance
24 of God; To declare, I say, at this time his righteousness; that he might be just, and the justifier of him which believeth in Jesus [with a view to the manifestation (exhibition), προεθετο τις δικαιοσύνης of his righteousness at this present time, in order that he may be (shown and seen to be) just and (yet at the same time) be justifying him who is of the faith of (in) Jesus, εἰς τὸ εἰσάγειν δικαιοσύνην καὶ δικαιώσεως τὸν ἔν πιστεύειν Ιησοῦ].

27 Where is [the] boasting then? It is excluded. By what law? [By the law of works?] Nay; but by the law of faith. Therefore [For] we conclude [judge] that a man is justified by faith without the deeds [without]
28 works] of the law. [Or,?] Is he the God of the Jews only? Is he not also
29 of the Gentiles? Yes, of the Gentiles also: Seeing [it] is one God, which shall [who will] justify the circumcision by faith, and uncircumcision through faith.
30 Do we then make void the law through faith? God forbid: [Far be it!] yea, we establish the law.

TEXTUAL.

1 Ver. 21.—Or: independently of the law. Luther: ohne Zutun des Genten. χωρίς νόμου, opposed to the νόμος, ver. 20, is emphatically put first and belongs to the verb. The transposition in the E. V. obscures this connection and destroys the parallelism.—P. S.

2 Ver. 21.—πεφανερωτα. The perfect has its appropriate force and sets forth this revelation of righteousness as an accomplished and still continued fact. Comp. the ἀκολουθεῖντα, I. 17. Meyer: "ist offenbar gemacht; zu Tage getreten; so dass sic jedem zur Erkenntniss sich darstellt; das Prinzip der vollendeten Handlung, Heb. ii. 26. Bernhardy, p. 376.—P. S.

3 Ver. 22.—(Even or, I say, nonquam, and ideo) is the best rendering of δι' εος here, since it is not strictly adversative, but explanatory and reconstructive (if I may coin this term for epanalepsis), as in ix. 26; Phil. ii. 8. The contrast is not between the righteousness of God and the righteousness of man (Wordsworth), but between the general idea of the righteousness of God and the specific idea of righteousness through faith now introduced.—P. S.

Ver. 23.—The article τουτο, not the perfect лατρεύω, is supported by Cod. B. and A., Chrysostom and Theodoret. [The text rec. also reads τοις; but Cod. C. * D. * E. G. Orig. Exe. Bas., &c., Lachmann, Tischendorf, Alfred, omit it. Meyer thinks it may have been omitted in view of δας παραπτωμα, ver. 22. — P. S.]

Ver. 23.—(As Alford translates: on account of the overlooking of the sins which had passed, in the forbearance of God.) Conybeare and Howson: because in His forbearance God has passed over the former sins of men. Lange: von wegen der Völligsauber (Nichtleichtschaum) der vorher gezeigten Sünden. The Authorized Version here, following Beza (per remissionem), is a mistranslation. ραπατεία (from ραπατείον), which occurs but once in the N. T., differs from δέφος (from δέφημ), which occurs seventeen times, in this, that in 1. a temporary remission or overlooking, not a total remission or pardon; 2. a work of the Divine άντιχειρ, forbearance (ii. 4), not of the Divine ψάρα, grace (Eph. i. 7); 3. it leaves the question of future punishment or pardon undecided, while the δέφος removes the guilt and remits the punishment. The same idea Paul expresses, Acts xxviii. 10: ραπατεία μεν τῶν χάμαρ, τῆς ἡμῶν ἁμαρτίας (having overlooked) δέ τε, &c., &c. δας with the accusative cannot mean through, by means of, or for, but on account of; for Paul clearly distinguishes between these (Rom. viii. 11; Gal. iv. 13) δας with the accusative and δας with the genitive. The Vulgate correctly renders dat propter, but misses τῶν δας for δας, remittunt. So also Luther: in dem dens er Sünden vergeben. —P. S.

Ver. 23.—τυπος [before διακόνη] in Cod. A. B. C. D. * (Θ. * E. G. Orig. Exe. Bas., &c., Lachmann, Tischendorf, Meyer, Alfred. The article was omitted to conform to εις διακονην ver. 22. But the article distinguishes the διακονην of ver. 26 from the former as the fuller and ultimate object. Dr. Lange ingeniously distinguishes between των δας and προς την διακονην. See Exe. Notes.—P. S.

Ver. 24.—The addition τισων is found in Cod. A. B. G. K. [and Sin.], Lachmann (Alford. Omitted by F. G. 32, It., Fritzsche, Meyer, Tischendorf; while other authorities read Χορος ήταν, ή του καιρου ήταν τα. A usual insertion. The force of του των ματωματων is weakened by the E. V. The και indicates that πιστος, or Christ rather as objector, is the root or fountain of his spiritual life; comp. the και in i. 17; i. 18. Conybeare and Howson: "It means 'him whose essential characteristic is faith,' the child of faith;" comp. Gal. iii. 7, διακονων: "It would perhaps be better rendered by righteousness, but we have no verb from the same root equivalent to διακονων." —P. S.

Ver. 25.—The rendering γαρ is supported by Cod. A. and Sin.; but B. C., &c., and especially the context, are in favor of the recepta αν. [The external authorities are decidedly in favor of γαρ. Alfred regards αν as a correction from misunderstanding of λατρεύω (conveying a conclusion. See Exe. Notes.—P. S.]

Ver. 26.—The reading διακονης ημας άλμωτος, instead of διακονων, which probably arose because the former occurs more here in the N. T. (see Meyer). [But διακονων is better supported by A. B. C. D. * Sin., &c., and preferred by Alford.—P. S.]

Ver. 26.—(Indicative from ισχαρων, a less usual form for ισχαρων, from ισχαρον, is the reading of Ν. D. K. L. and Sin., and is defended by Fritzsche, for the reason that it closes the sentence with more gravity and power, and corresponds more exactly in sense with διακονης. As a large form of the same verb) is better supported by A. B. C. D. * E. Orig., &c., and is recommended by Gillis and adopted by Lachmann, Tischendorf, and Alfred. The sense is the same: to make stand fast, to establish, to confirm, ἐβεβαιωθει, stabilem.—P. S.]

Forbes arranges the important section, vers. 21-26, in this way, which may assist somewhat in the exegesis:

21. Νυν δε χωρις νομον, διακονης θεων πασχάντων.
22. Μαρτυρομενος υπο του νόμου και του προφητων.
23. Διακονης δε του δια πιστευς ηθους Χριστου.
24. Α διακονης ανωτερων του αυτου χερες.
25. Β Δια της απολυτρωσεως της εν εσχατω τιμην.
26. Α Γαι δια της παρεχομενης ανευρεσεως λατρευων σωτηριασων ματωματων.

24. Α Διακονησαν δυνατα την αυτου χερες.
25. Β Γαι δια της απολυτρωσεως της εν εσχατω τιμην.
26. Α Γαι δια της παρεχομενης ανευρεσεως λατρευων σωτηριασων ματωματων.

5. Προς την διακονης της ανωτερων τιμης.
6. Α Ει το εορτα ανωτερων.

24. Δια της απολυτρωσεως της εν εσχατω τιμην.
25. Β Γαι δια της παρεχομενης ανευρεσεως λατρευων σωτηριασων ματωματων.
EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

First Paragraph, Chap. iii. 21-26.

Contrast between the saving time of justification and the old time of sin and death.

Ver. 21. But now, νῦν δὲ. — Explanations of νῦν: 1. Contrast of times [at this time, under the gospel dispensation, = ἐν τῷ νῦν καὶ μετ᾽ αὐτῷ, ver. 26]; (Grotius, Tholuck, Philippi [Ohlhausen, Wordsworth, Hodge]); and others; 2. contrast of circumstances [as things are]: earlier dependence on the law, now independence of the law [διὰ τῆς νόμου — χωρὶς νόμου]. (Parens, Fliscat, Meyer, De Wette [Fritzsche, Alford]. In this sense the classics use only νῦν, not νῦνι, but the latter is so used repeatedly in HebraicGreek); 3. in soteriology the two contrasts of time and condition coincide. — Apart from the law [of Moses, χωρὶς νόμου]: 1. It is referred to περιστέρας (Luther, Tholuck, Meyer, and others); 2. to δικαιοσύνη (Augustine, Wolf [Reiche, Hodge]), and others): the righteousness of God which the believer shares without the law [or rather, without works of the law, χωρὶς ἡγουμένου, Gal. ii. 16]. The latter view is not correct. [Comp. διὰ νόμου in ver. 20, which likewise belongs not to the noun ἐκκριτωμένος, but to the verb to be supplied. Also Text. Note 1.—P. S.]

The righteousness of God. Comp. the Exeg. Notes on chap. i. 17. It is the righteousness which proceeds from God (gen. auctoritas), which personally appeared in Christ, “who is our Righteousness,” and which is communicated to the believer for Christ’s sake in the act of justification by faith. It is both objective, or inherent in God and realized in Christ, and subjective, or imparted to man. It is here characterized by a series of antitheses: independent of the law, yet authenticated by the law and the prophets (ver. 21); freely (δωρεὰ) bestowed on the believer, yet fully paid for by the redemption price (διὰ τῆς ἀπλοτροπίας) of Christ (24); intrinsically holy, yet justifying the sinner (26); thus uniting the universe of the moral governor of the universe, and the merciful Father who provided a full salvation.—P. S.

Has been manifested, περιστέρας. This is now the complete revelation of righteousness: as John i. 17 represents the complete revelation of grace and truth; and as Eph. i. 19 represents the complete revelation of omnipotence. All are single definitions of the completed New Testament revelation itself. The expression does not absolutely presuppose the previous concealment in God’s counsel (Meyer). For the Old Testament was the increasing revelation of God, also in reference to righteousness. But compared with this completeness, the growing revelation was still as a veil.—Being testified to [καρποφορίων, but first with reference to χωρὶς νόμου, which it qualifies] by the law and the prophets [i. e., the Old Testament Scriptures; Matt. v. 17; vii. 12; xxi. 40, &c.; just as we now say the Bible. νόμον has here, as Bengel remarks, a wider sense than in the preceding χωρὶς νόμου.—P. S.] There is therefore no contradiction between the Old and New Testaments.

The Old Testament is in substance a prophetic witness of the New, and therefore also of the righteousness of faith (see chap. iv., and x. 6; Acts x. 43; chap. xv. 25). And not only do the prophets (Isa. xxviii. 16; Hevi. ii. 4) testify to this righteousness, but so does the law also in its stricter sense (the patriarchs, &c.); i.e., even its strictest sense; for example, the law of the sin-offering (Lev. xvi.), [Augustine: Novum Testamentum in Vetræ latet; Vetus T. in Novo patet. See the proof in chap. iv. from the case of Abraham and the declarations of David.—P. S.]

Ver. 22. Through faith of Jesus Christ. — The usual explanation is, through faith in Jesus Christ [genitive of the object],† Meyer produces in its favor the usage of language (Mark xi. 22; Acts iii. 16; Gal. ii. 10; iii. 23; Eph. iii. 12, &c.), as well as the essential relation of the πίστεως to the δικαιοσύνη. [These parallel passages, to which may be added Gal. ii. 16; Eph. iv. 13; Phil. iii. 9; James i. 1; Rev. xiv. 12, seem to me conclusive in favor of the usual interpretation that our faith in Christ is meant here; thus also to διὰ τῆς πίστεως Ἰησοῦν, ver. 26. But Dr. Lange strongly fortifies his new interpretation: Christ’s faithfulness to us, taking Ἰησοῦν Ἱησοῦς as the genitive of the subject.—P. S.] The explanation of Benecke, the faithfulness of Christ is overlooked even by Tholuck. We make it, Christ’s believing faithfulness [Glaubensdurchein]. Reasons: 1. The πίστεως Ἰησοῦ (chap. iii. 3), and the coherency of the ideas, παντιασία, παντιασία, and πίστεως Ἰησοῦ, in opposition to the ideas: ἀπαντησία, ἀπαντησία, and corresponding with the ideas: righteousness of God, righteousness of Christ, righteousness by faith. 2. The addition in this passage of εἰς πάντα καὶ εἰς πίστιν; with which we must compare chap. i. 17, εἰς πίστιν εἰς πίστιν. The passages, Gal. iii. 22; Eph. iii. 12; comp. Heb. xii. 2. As to his knowledge, Christ of course did not walk by faith, but by sight; but as regards the moral principle of faith—confidence and faithfulness—He is the Prince of faith. 4. We cannot say of the righteousness of God, that it was first revealed by faith in Christ. The revelation of God’s righteousness in the faithfulness of Christ is the ground of justifying faith, but faith is not the ground of this revelation. 5. So also the διὰ τῆς πίστεως ἐν τῷ αἰτίῳ αἰμάτω, ver. 26, cannot be regarded as substantiating the δικαιοσύνη, but as a proof of speaking generally.

Unto all and upon all. The εἰς denotes the direction, the ideal dynamic determination of the δικαιοσύνη: the εἰς, the fulfilment, the appropriation. [This must, of course, not be understood in a Universalistic sense. See Textual Note 1.—P. S.] Both prepositions have been combined in various ways as identical, and explained as strengthening the thought for all (thus Rückert, and others); on the contrary, Trench, Wordsworth, (Meyer, his new interpretation: Christ’s faithfulness to us, taking Ἰησοῦς σωτήρος as the genitive of the subject, and Ἰησοῦς δικαιοσύνης) the Gentiles; according to Morris, and others, καὶ εἰς, &c., is construed as a further explanation of the εἰς πάντα.

For there is no difference. On account of γὰρ, this clause refers to the former. There is

* [διὰ πίστεως, by means of, through; not διὰ νομοῦ, on account of. Faith is the appropriating organ and subjective condition, not the ground and cause of our justification.—P. S.]

† [Berlage, Scholten, V. Hengel, take Ἰησοῦν Ἱησοῦς as gen. of the author; Keil puts our Jesus Christ, Das hahleu. See against this Meyer in loc. footnote.—P. S.]
neither a difference between Jews and Gentiles, nor, in reference to the necessity of justification, is there a difference between those who have shown themselves, according to chap. ii. 7 ff., doors or transgressors of the law. L. T. B.

Ver. 23. For all sinned [they are all sinners; Luther: sie sind allesamt Sünden]. They sinned, in the sense that they have become sinners. Therefore aor. (II), and not perfect. They sinned in such a way that they are still sinning.* But their righteousness was altogether lost when their transgression began.—And fall short of the glory [ἵστεροντας, in the present tense. All sinned, and consequently fall short of the glory]. Explanations: 1. Glorying before God, gloriatō † (Erasmus, Luther, Rosenmüller, and others). 2. The δικαιοσύνη as the image of God (Flacius, Chalmers, Rücker, Olshausen; see 1 Cor. xi. 7). 3. The glory of eternal life [as in ver. 2]. (Gruenemius, Gläckler, &c., Beza, Bengel, as sharing in the glory of God). 4. Honor before God, e., in the estimation of God (Calvin (gloria que coram Deo honorem habuerint). The honor, i.e., the approbation of God (the genit. absol.; Piscat., Grotius, Philippi, Meyer [Fritzschte, De Wette, Alford, Hodge]). Tholuck: The declaration of honor, like the declaration of righteousness. ‡ This would give the strange sense: because they lack the declaration of righteousness on the part of God, they are to be declared righteous. It must not be overlooked that men belong here who, as inward Jews, according to chap. ii. 29, have already δικαιοσύνη in δικαιοσύνῃ. Certainly, the question is concerning righteousness before God, because the question concerns God's judicial tribunal. But what men were wanting since Adam's fall, is not the righteousness of justification—far is it by this that want is to be supplied—but the righteousness of life (not to be confounded with the righteousness by the works of the law), as the true glory or radiance of life [δικαιοσύνη in the sense of splendor, majesty, perfection. Lange translates it: Gerechtigkeit, Erleuchtung, Lebenswahrheit. —P. S.]. But as the δικαιοσύνη of man must come from the δικαιοσύνη of God in order to avail before Him, so also the δικαιοσύνη. Therefore the alternative, from God or before God, is a wrong alternative. § But the supply is equal to the want: the δικαιοσύνη of Christ becomes the δικαιοσύνη of the believer, and therefore Christ's δικαιοσύνη his δικαιοσύνη (Rom. viii.).

Ver. 24. Being justified freely. The par
diπλον δικαιοσύνην, in connection with what

follows, specifies both the mode by which their

of Divine δικαιοσύνη becomes perfectly manifest, and the opposite which comes to supply this want. The δικαιοσύνη, which is not merely the want of glory (according to Luther's translation; and are justified [Peshito, Fritzsche, = και δικαιοσύναι], but by the δικαιοσύνα, the fact of that δικαιοσύνη becomes perfectly apparent. The individual judgment and the individual deliverance are, in fact, joined into one: repentance and faith; hunger and thirst after righteousness, and fulness.

[Note on the Scripture Meaning of δικαιοσύνη. — δικαιοσύνη means grammatically on ἰστέροντας, but contains in fact the main idea: ut gni justificantur (Beza, Tholuck, Meyer). This is the locus classicus of the doctrine of justification by free grace through faith in Christ, in its inseparable connection with the atonement, as its objective basis. The verb δικαιοσύνη occurs forty times in the New Testament (twice in Matthew, five times in Luke, twice in Acts, twenty-seven times in Paul's Epistles, three times in James, once in the Apocalypse. In the Gospel and Epistles of John, as also in Peter and Jude, the verb never occurs, although they repeatedly use the noun δικαιοσύνη and the adjective δικαιός. It must be taken, as nearly always in the Bible, in the declaratory, forensic, or judicial sense, as distinct from, though by no means opposed to, or abstractly separated from, a mere executive act of pardoning, and an efficient act of making just inwardly or sanctifying. It denotes an act of jurisdiction, the pronouncing of a sentence, not the infusion of a quality. This is the prevailing Hellenistic usage, corresponding to the Hebrew בקַלָּת. Comp., for the Old Testament, the Septuagint in Gen. xxxviii. 26; xiv. 16; Ex. xxix. 7 (ου δικαιοσύνης τον δαρῆς); Deut. xxv. 1; 2 Sam. xv. 4; 1 Kings viii. 32; Ps. lxxiii. 34; Deor. xxvii. Isa. v. 28; for the New Testament, Matt. xii. 37; Luke x. 29; xvi. 15; xviii. 14 (where δικαιοσύνης evidently refers to the publican's prayer for forgiveness of sin); Acts xxxii. 30; Rom. ii. 13; iii. 4, 20, 24, 26, 28, 30; iv. 2, v. 1, 9, viii. 30, 33; 1 Cor. iv. 4; vi. 11; Gal. ii. 16, 17; iii. 8, 11, 24; v. 4; Titus 7; James ii. 21–25; Apoc. xxii. 11. There is, to my knowledge, no passage in the New Testament, and only two or three in the Septuagint (Ps. lxxiii. 18: δικαιοσύνη δι' ἑαυτοῦ μιᾶς μιᾶς μιᾶς, or, Isa. lii. 11: δικαιοσύνα δικαιοσῦνοι; comp. Dan. xii. 3: ψευδής ψευδής ψευδής, where δικαιοσύνη means to make just, or, to lead to righteousness. The declarative sense is especially apparent in those passages where man is said to be justified God, who is just, and cannot be made just, but only accounted and acknowledged as just; Luke vii. 20, 25; Matt. xi. 19; Rom. iii. 4 (from Ps. ii. 5); comp. also 1 Tim. iii. 16, where Christ is said to be justified in spirit.

The declarative and forensic meaning of the phrase, δικαιοσύνη, δικαιοσύνη, δικαιοσύνη, may be proven (1) from the opposite phrase, δικαιοσύνης τοῦ θεοῦ, τοῦ θεοῦ, τοῦ θεοῦ, which is equivalent to δικαιοσύνης παρὰ τοῦ θεοῦ, τοῦ θεοῦ, τοῦ θεοῦ, Gal. iii. 11 (or έίδη θεον τοῦ θεον, Gal. iii. 10), or έις πνεύμαν αἰνηθε, Rom. iii. 20; i.e., to be justified in the sight or in the judgment of God; (2) from the term λόγιον εἰς δικαιοσύνην, to account for righteousness, which is used in the same sense as δικαιοσύνη, Rom. iv. 3, 5, 8, 20, 24; Gal. iii. 6; James ii. 23, and is almost equivalent with σωτηρία, to save (comp. Rom. v. 9, 10; x. 9, 10, 13; Eph. ii. 8, 17); (3) from the use of the opposite word to condemn.
t. g., Prov. xvii. 15; "He that justifieth (προτιστειν), LXX: δίκαιον κείσαι) the wicked, and he that condemneth (προκατεχομαι) the just, even they both are condemnation to the Lord." In the translation of the Vulgate: "Qui justificat impium et qui condemnat justum, absolvitur est utrque apud Deum." He who would imitate righteousness in a wicked man, or lead him into the way of righteousness, would destroy the grace of God. Matt. xii. 27; "By thy words thou shalt be justified (δικαιοσυνήσθητ), and by thy words thou shalt be condemned (καταδικασθήσητ).

The corresponding noun, δικαιοσύνης (which occurs only twice in the New Testament, viz., Rom. iv. 25; v. 19), justification (Reformation), is the opposite of κατάκαρπος, condemnation; comp. Matt. xii. 37; Rom. viii. 1, 3; 24; hence the antithesis of κόμια εἰς δικαιοσύνην and κόμια εἰς κατάκαρπος, Rom. v. 16, 18. Justification implies, negatively, the remission of sins (ἀφαίρεσις τῶν δακρύων), and, positively, the imputation of Christ's righteousness, or the adoption (πιστολογία, Gal. iv. 5; Eph. i. 5).

No human being can so keep the law of God, which demands perfect love to Him and to our neighbor, that on the ground of his own works he could ever be declared righteous before the tribunal of a holy God. He can only be so justified freely, without any merit of his own, on the objective ground of the perfect righteousness of Christ, as apprehended, and thus made subjective by a living faith, or life-union with Him. This justifying grace precedes every truly good work on our part, but is at the same time the actual beginning of all good works. There is no true holiness except on the ground of the atonement and the remission of sin, and the holiness of the Christian is but a manifestation of love and gratitude for the boundless mercy of God already received and constantly experienced.

This I take to be the true evangelical or Pauline view of justification, in opposition to the interpretation of Roman Catholics and Rationalists, who, from opposite standpoints, agree in taking δικαιοσύνη in the sense of making just, or sanctifying, and in regarding good works as a joint condition, with faith, of progressive justification. The objection that God cannot pronounce a man just if he is not so in fact, has force only against that mechanical and exclusively forensic view which resolves justification into a sort of legal fiction, or a cold, lifeless imputation, and separates it from the broader and deeper doctrine of a life-union of the believer with Christ. Certainly God, unlike any human judge, is absolutely true and infallible; He speaks, and it is done; His declaratory acts are creative, efficient acts. But mark, the sinner is not justified outside of Christ, but only in Christ, on the ground of His perfect sacrifice, and on condition of true faith, by which he actually becomes one with Christ, and a partaker of His holy life. So, when God declares him righteous, he is righteous potentially, "a new creature in Christ;" old things having passed away, and all things having become new (1 Cor. v. 7). And God, who sees the end from the beginning, sees also the full-grown fruit in the germ, and by His gracious promise assures its growth. Justifying faith is itself a work of Divine grace in us, and the fruitful source of all our good works. On the part of God, then, and in point of fact, the actus declaratorius can indeed not be abstractly separated from the actus efficient: the same grace which justifies, does also renew, regenerate, and sanctify; faith and love, justification and sanctification, are as inseparable in the life of the Christian, as light and heat in the rays of the sun. When God doth justify the ungodly," says Owen (on Justification, vol. v. p. 127, Goold's ed.), "on account of the righteousness imputed unto him, He doth at the same instant, by the power of His grace, make him inherently and subjectively righteous, or holy." Nevertheless, we must distinguish in the order of logic: Justification, like regeneration (which is the corresponding and simultaneous or preceding inner operation of the Holy Spirit), is a single act, sanctification a continuous process; they are related to each other like birth and growth; justification, moreover, depends not at all on what man is or has done, but on what Christ has done for us in our nature; and, finally, good works are no cause or condition, but a consequence and manifestation of justification. Comp. Doctrinae et Ethical, No. 5; below; also the Exeg. Notes on i. 17; ii. 13; iii. 20.—P. S.

Freely, δωρίαν, as a gift, gratis, not by merit (chap. iv. 2; comp. 2 Thes. iii. 8). [Comp also 5. 3, δωρίαν, δημοτικός, δημοτικήν, and θυσία το δόμων, Eph. ii. 8—P. S.]

By his grace. The idea of grace denotes the union of God's love and righteousness, the highest manifestation of His favor, which, by its voluntary operation, as love, destroys the sinner's guilt freely, and which, as righteousness, destroys the guilt on conditions of justice. [Grace—i. e., God's love to the sinner, saving love, is the efficient cause, redemption by the blood of Christ the objective means, faith the subjective condition, of justification. αἰτιόμα is emphatically put before χάριμ. Justification on the part of God is an act of pure grace (Eph. ii. 8—10; Gal. ii. 21), and χάριμ is the very opposite of ματάκις θέρμην αν δικαιοσύνη (iv. 4; x. 6). Faith, on our part, is not a meritorious act, but simply the acceptance and appropriation of God's free gift, and is itself wrought in us by God's Spirit, without whom no one can call Jesus Lord (1 Cor. xii. 9)—P. S.

Through the redemption, ἀπολύτωρος. The grace of God is marked as the causality of this ἀπολύτωρος. This is therefore to be regarded here as the most general view of the fact of redemption, as is also plain from the addition, τῆς ἐν X. [in Christ, not through Christ; comp. Eph. i. 7; ἐν ὧν ἐγένετο τὴν ἀπολύτωρον διὰ τοῦ αἵματος αἰτίων]. The ἀπολύτωρος, or redemption,* in the wider sense, and viewed as a fundamental and accomplished fact, comprehends: 1. καταλαγή [change from enmity to friendship, reconciliation]. Rom. v. 10; 2 Cor. v. 19; freedom from the enmity and rancor of sin. 2. ἀποστασία [propitiation, expiation], 2 Cor. v. 14; ver. 21; Gal. iii. 13 [ἐξηματέον εἰς τὴν κατάστασιν τοῦ νομοῦ]; Eph. i. 7 [τὴν ἀπολύτωρον... τὴν θερμήν τῶν παραπτωμάτων]; Col. i. 14; Heb. ii. 17; freedom from the guilt of sin. 3. ἀπολύτωρος in the narrower sense, Rom. v. 17; vi. 2; vi. 18, 22; viii. 21, 22; Gal. v. 1; Titus ii. 14; Heb. ii. 15; ver. 18; freedom from sin.

* [Literally, release or deliverance of prisoners of war or others from (ἀπο) a state of misery or captivity by the payment of a sum of money, or deāτωρ, an equivalent: the ransom in our case is the life or blood of Christ, Matt. xx. 28; Eph. i. 7; 1 Tim. ii. 6; Titus ii. 14; 1 Peter iii. 18, 21; 1 Cor. vi. 20; vii. 23; ἐφοροται, Gal. iii. 13; καινοτομίας, Acts xx. 20; ἀποτελεσματικός, Titus ii. 14, all imply the payment of a price.—F. S.]
the dominion of sin. The same ἀπολίπθαι, viewed in its ultimate aim and effect, means the transposition from the condition of the militant to the triumphant Church; Luke xxx. 28 ["the day of redemption draweth nigh"]; Rom. viii. 23; Eph. i. 7, 14; iv. 30. The ἰδιαίας is justly represented here as the central saving agency of the whole ἀπολίπθαι. [Hodge: Redemption from the wrath of God by the blood of Christ. Philippi, Alford, and Meyer, distinct from the guilt and punishment of sin by the propitiatory sacrifice of Christ. The one of course implies the other.—P. S.]

Ver. 25.* Whom God set forth. Explanation of ποιησις: 1. Previously purposed, designed, decreed (Chrysostom, Eunpides, [Forbes], and others, with reference to Eph. i. 9); § 2. Kyrie: substitutus, nostro loco detulit. Against the meaning of προτέκτω, \(\text{§} 3.\) Purse, Luther, Bengel, De Wette, "Philippi: 'This signification of προτεκτω, well known from the Greek usage (Herod. iii. 148; vi. 21; Plato's Phaedr. p. 116, E. & c.), must be decidedly accepted, because of the correlation to εἰς ἱδίαν.' The peculiar interest of God is indicated by the middle voice. It was manifested through the propitiatory sacrifice, compare the discourse of Jesus in John, where he compares Himself with the serpent of Moses; John iii.

This explanation acquires its full weight by the following ἰδιαίας, a substantive of newer form, made from the adjective ἰδιαίας, which relates to expiative acts; see the Lexicon. In the Septuagint especially it is the designation of the mercy-seat, or the lid or cover of the ark, \(\text{υποβύς,}\) which was sprinkled by the high-priest with the blood of the sin-offering once a year, on the great day of atonement (and over which appeared the shekinah, ὁ ἀπερχόμενος έλιεία); Ex. xxxiv. 18-26; Comp. Bähr: Symbols des mosaischen Cultus, 1837, vol. i, p. 379 ff., 387 ff., and Lundius,

* [Oehler calls this verse the "Apollinaris of the Christian faith." Among English commentators Wordsworth and Hodge are very full on this verse, especially the former, whose commentary is very unequal, passing by many matters of exposition and dwelling upon others with disproportionate length. Hodge is much more symmetrical, but equally dogmatical. Of German commentators, comp. Oehler, Tholuck, Philippi, Meyer,—P. S.]

† [Where προτέκτω is used of God's eternal purpose. In the parallel where Paul employs this verb, Rom. i. 18, he means his own purpose. The E. V. translates correctly, (both) set forth, but engagers in the margin, foreordained. This translation would not necessarily require, as Meyer asserts, the infinitive clause (quem esse voluit Deus), comp. προτεκτω, ἐκλεγέναι πατριά τι, and Rom. viii. 29; James ix. 15. But it is indissoluble with the context; for Paul refers to a fact rather than a purpose, and emphasizes the publicity of the fact; comp. παραπομπή, ver. 21, and εἰς ἱδίαν, ver. 25.—P. S.]

‡ [Kyrie quotes Euripides, Iphig. Arg. v. 992; but in this passage προτέκτω means either simply: Diana set forth (with sacrificial animal), or she preferred. See Meyer.—P. S.]

§ [Mayer adds examples from Euripides, Thucydides, Demosthenes, and also from the LXX., and remarks as an note, that the Greeks use προτέκτω especially of the expanse of space to public view, and that the Apostle may place the Roman readers in mind of this.

† [Pροτεκτω means to set forth something as his own to others. Comp. J. Chr. K. v. Hofmann: Der Schreib- und Ausdrucks-Wandel, i. 181; "Nicht Interesse hat Gott dabeis (Meyer, Schmitz), sondern sein ist von ihm Kommt der, den er hierthalt, und er mach ihn zu dem, als woa er ihn hinzugaben."—E. S.]

Jüd. Heilighemer, Hamb. 1711, p. 33 ff.—P. S.]

Besides, the settle, or lower platform \(\text{τῷ θύρᾳ}\) of the altar of burnt-offering [Rzkek. xliii. 14, 17, 20] was so named [because the Asarab, like the Κυνορρηθηθή, was to be sprinkled with the blood of atonement, or because it was the platform from which the sin-offering was to be conducted.—P. S.]. See also Exod. xxv. 22, and other places. Explanations: 1. Expiciatory sacrifice, sin-offering (Leslie). 2. For which, it is unnecessary, ἰδιαίας being used as a noun. (So Clericus, Rüede, De Wette, Kölner, Fritzsche [Meyer, Alford, Conybear and Howson, Jowett, Wordsworth, Hodge, Ewald]). 2. Means of propitiation [Sühnmittel] (Vulgata: propitiatio; Castellio: placentamentum; Morus, Usteri, Rückert).† 3. The mercy-seat, or covering of the ark of the covenant [Origen, Theodoret, Tho- phylact, Augustine], (Erasmus, Luther, Calvin, Grotius, Calv., Oehler, Oehler, Philippi [Tholuck, Forbes]). Against the first exposition it may be urged: (a) The expiatory offering is not brought to man on God's part, but man brings it to God by the high-priest (see Philippi).† (b) The offering is not public: set forth. (c) The permanence of the operation of the offering requires another expression, and this is Christ crucified as the permanent atonement itself. This acts aside also the second explanation, which, moreover, shows too close a connection in favor of the third explanation: (a) The Septuagint (literally) has translated ἰδιαίας, ἰδιαίας (Exod. xxv. 18, 19, 20, 21, &c. [twenty-six passages according to Fürst's Hebrew Concordance]).§ (b) In Heb. ix. 5, ἰδιαίας means the

* [This meaning of ἰδιαίας does not occur in the LXX., but often in the later Greek writers. See the examples quoted by Mayer in loco, who himself adopts this explanation. Comp. also the analogous terms χαρακτητικος and εἰσορθητικος, thank-offering, καθαρθις, offering for purification, παρακολούθωσιν, παρακολούθησιν παρακολούθησιν. The sense then is this: God set forth Jesus Christ, in the sight of the λευκοτριγυνου, as a propitiatory sacrifice for the sins of the world. The choice lies between this and the third view; the second having no support in the use of language, besides being too abstract. Dr. Lange has made the third choice (mercy-seat sacrifice) as the only other explanation, or any other commentator. See below. Comp. also Philippi, p. 105 f., and Forbes, p. 166, for the same view.—P. S.]

§ [So are προτέκτω and προτέκτω, to be essentially the same as ἰδιαίας; in John iv. 16: ἵνα ἑστηκέναι πάντων μιᾷ ἁλόμονος. The E. V. translates both words propitiation. Dr. Morrison, in a manuscript on Rom. iii., as I learn from Forbes (p. 160), maintains that ἰδιαίας is never used substantively in the meaning of propitiatory sacrifice, and concludes for the adjectival meaning of "set forth as propitiatory," which, as applied to Christ, would designate Him as the antitypical fulfillment of all the symbols of propitiation.—P. S.]

† [Philippi, p. 168, remarks: "The Scripture says, that Christ offered Himself to God as a propitiatory sin-offering. In I John i. 16, 24, 26, the E. V. vs. 20, 22, but not, that God offered and exhibited Him to mankind as a sacrifice. The sacrifice is not offered by God, but to God." But there is a difference between the God offering and exhibiting Him. God offering and exhibiting Him to mankind, as a sacrifice. The sacrifice is not offered by God, but to God."

† [The LXX. uses ἰδιαίας in no other sense, except in the isolated passage, Exod. xlix. 14, 17, 20, so that every Jewish Christian reader of the Romans must at once have been reminded of the Κυνορρηθή. See also Cyprian, Hodge, p. 143, asserts that this use of ἰδιαίας in the LXX., arose from a mistake of the Hebrew term, which means a place where before the altar of the Lord, was sacrificed! (compare, administr. ziehung, Flirsteke, De Wette, and Bleek, Concord. on Heb. ix. 4, vol. i. p. 499, note b.) But \(\text{ἡλί}^2\) is not derived from the unusual Kal of the verb ἔκπληκτος (to crowd, Gen. vi. 14) but from the πληκτος, which always means, to crowd, to propitiate, to alone (Lam. v. 23; Deut. xxxii. 43; Ezek. xxiii. 20, 25, &c.), and is the technical term, in the Mish..]
mercy-seat. (c) This view is sustained by the idea pervading the whole Epistle, of the contrast between the old worship, which was partly heathen and partly only symbolical, and the real New Testament worship. The verb πίστος ἔτι τοῦ [ad spectandum, proponere] likewise favors it. As, according to John i. 14, the Ἰησοῦς, or Ἰησοῦς, openly appeared in the person of Christ from the beginning, and the Holy of holies, and has dwelt among men, so, according to the present passage, is the ἱερατεύμονα set forth from the Holy of holies into the publicity of the whole world for believers. See Zech. xii. 1; the open fountain. (d) The ἱερατεύμονα unites as symbol the different elements of the atonement. As the covering of the ark of the covenant was, it is the throne of the divine government of the cherubim above, and the preservation of the law, with its requirements, below. But with the sprinkled blood of expiation, it is a sacrifice offered to God, and therefore the satisfaction for the demands of the divine law below. Also Philo called the covering of the ark of the covenant the symbol of the gracious majesty [ἴδιος διάνοιας] of God [Vit. Mos., p. 668; comp. Josephus, Antig. iii. 6, 5.—P. S.].

Meyer [admits that this interpretation agrees with the usage of the word, especially in the LXX., and gives good sense by representing Christ as the antitype of the ark. Hence he] urges against it the following objections:† (c) That ἱερατεύμονα is without the article. But this would exclude the antitype, the Old Testament ἱερατεύμονα. The requisite articulation is found in τῶν αἰωνίων αἰῶνας. [With more reason we might miss ἅπαθον or ἃ�όμα. Christ may be called our pascha, or the true pascha, or the true mercy-seat, rather than simply pascha or mercy-seat. Yet this is by no means conclusive.—P. S.] (d) The name, in its application to Christ, is too abrupt. Answer: Since there must be a place of expiation for every expiatory offering, the conceptions of places and offerings of expiation must have been quite familiar to the readers, not merely to the Jews, but also to the Gentiles, although here the idea is connected with the Old Testament symbol. (c) If Christ should be conceived as Capporeth, then the εἰκόνια, for the object and intent of sacrifice. If the word were formed from the Και, it would be τῆς ἱερατεύμονας. "The ark of the testament did not exist in the Old Testament, but covered the open ark, but because it subserved the act of expiation which was here performed" (Bähr, Symbolik des Mo. Cultus, L, p. 381). The Capporeth was the centre of the presence and revelation of God, and His glory dwelt over it between the two cherubim which overshadowed the ark, and represented the creation. Hence the Holy of holies was called τῆς τῶν αἰωνίων αἰῶνας (1 Chron. xxviii. 11). The Φυγιώθιον and Πηγάδειον (propitiatories) have followed the LXX. (Gen. xxv. 18, 26 ed., Tholuck, 8th ed., Meyer, etc.; and Ewald, All., p. 165. But Ewald and Meyer derive τῆς ἱερατεύμονας in the sense of σωτηρίας, to rub off, to forgive; against which Tholuck protests in favor of the usual derivation from τῆς ἱερατεύμονας. Ewald (c. p. 163, 8 ed. of 1856) maintains that Capporeth cannot mean the plain cover, as the ark had no other, but a second cover or a separate settle (the booth of Jehovah), which was even more important than the ark itself, and is so described, Ezek. xxv. 17-21; xxvi. 24, 25. He derives it from τῆς ἱερατεύμονας, as σαμανναίον, or sacrificial vessels, from εἰκόνια of sacrificial vessels, and refers to τῆς ἱερατεύμονας, 2 Chron. ix. 18, and to an Ethopic verb.—P. S.)

† [Wottonsworth, on the contrary, urges propōrēta as an excipit against this interpretation, since the mercy-seat was never fort, but concealed from the people and even from God. Ewald has no P. S.]

‡ [Repealed by Joewett in loc.—P. S.]
ing forth streams through the channel of faith to wash away the guilty stains of sin.—P. S.

For the demonstration of this righteousness [ἐγένετο δὲ τῇ δικαιοσύνῃ αὐτοῦ]. In order to perfectly reveal and establish it, the divergent interpretations of the word δικαιοσύνη indicate how difficult it has been for theology to regard God's righteousness as grace which produces righteousness. Truthfulness [contrary to the meaning of δικαιοσύνη, (Ambrose, Beza [Turscan], Hammond), and others; goodness (Theodoret, Grotius [Koppe, Reiche, Titzmann], and others); holiness (Neander, Fritzsche [Lipsius]); judicial righteousness (Meyer)] De Wette, Thuck, Philip; Alford, Wordworth, Hodge]; justifying, or sin-forgiving righteousness (Chrysostom, Augustine, and others); the righteousness which God gives [which would be a superfluous repetition of ver. 21, and inconsistent with ver. 26, (Luther, and others); [Stuart, and others: God's method of justification, which δικαιοσύνη never means.—P. S.]. It is rather the righteousness of God in the fulfillment of His promise, which proceeds from God, requires and accompanies through Christ the expiation of the law, and institutes the righteousness of faith by justification as the principle of the righteousness of the new life. For the righteousness of God, like His truth, omnipotence, and love, forms an unbroken and direct beam from His heart, until it appears in renewed humanity.

Because of (or, on account of) the pretermission (passing over), [i. e., because He had allowed the sins of the race which were committed before Christ's death to pass without punishment, whereby His righteousness was obscured, and hence the need of a demonstration or manifestation in the atoning sacrifice, that fully justified the demands of righteousness, and at the same time effected a complete remission of sins, and justification of the sinner.—P. S.]. The πάθος αὐτοῦ must not be confounded with the ἀγωγή, as Coccineus has proved in a special treatise, De utilitate distinctionis inter πάθος et ἀγωγή (Opp. t. vii). [Comp. Textual Note]. The judicial government of God was not administered in the ante-Christian period, either by the sacrificial fire of the Israelitish theocracy, or by the manifestations of wrath to the old world, both Jews and Gentiles, as a perfect and general judgment. Notwithstanding the relative punishments and prophecations, God allowed sin, in His full measure, especially in its inward character, to pass unpunished in the preliminary stages of expiation and judgment, until the day of the completed revelation of His righteousness. For this reason, the time of the πάθος αὐτοῦ is denoted as the time of the ἀγωγή. God permitted the Gentiles to walk in their own ways (Ps. lixx. 12; civi. 20; Acts xiv. 16); He overlooked, or winked at, the times of this ignorance (Acts xvii. 30). But among the Jews, one of the two goats which was let loose into the wilderness on the great day of atonement, represented symbolically the πάθος (Lev. xvi. 10). This is not only a transcendent fact, but one that is also immanent in the world. The fact that the administrators of the theocracy, in connection with the Gentile world, have crucified Christ, proves the inability of the theocracy to afford a fundamental relief of the world from guilt. Of sins previously committed. The sins of the whole world are meant, not an aggregate of individual sins; for if the cause of righteousness does not punish sin until it has become manifest and mature in actual individual sins. [Comp. the similar expression, Heb. ix. 22: εἰς ἀπολύτωσιν τῶν ἐπὶ τῆς προτέτηθας παραβάσεων. This parallel passage, as well as the words ἐν τῷ κυρίῳ, in ver. 26, plainly show that the προτέτηθας παραβάσεως are not the sins of each man which precede his conversion (Calov, Moring, and others), but the sins of all men before the advent, or, more correctly speaking, before the atoning death of Christ. Comp. also Acts xv. 30: τοῖς γέροντος ἄγωγοις ἑπικυρών ὁ θεός. Philip] confines the expression to the sins of the Jewish people, in strict conformity to Heb. ix. 15; but here the Apostle had just proven the universal sinfulness and guilt, and now speaks of the universal redemption of Christ.—P. S.

Vers. 25, 26. Consider the forbearance of God for the demonstration [Unter der Gerechtigkeit zu der Erlösung, in τῇ ἀγωγῇ τοῦ θεοῦ, etc.]. Construction: i. Ecumenius, Luther [Räckert, Ewald, Hodge], and others, refer the αὐτοῦ to προτέτηθας, viz. to ἀμαρτίαν ἐπικυρώνειν, in τῷ κυρίῳ, τ. ἐρ. etc.—P. S.]. Meyer refers the forbearance to πάθος αὐτοῦ, in accordance with indulgence or tolerance, as the ground of the passing over. [So also Philip]. 3. Reiche: ἐγένετο τῇ δικαιοσύνῃ; the δικαιοσύνη having been manifested partly in the forgiveness of sins, and...
partly the delay of punishment. [This implies a wrong view of δἰαὶ and δικαιοσ.; Meyer.—P. S.]

4. We connect the ἀνοχή with the following πρὸς τὴν ἐνδείκσιν (ver. 25) into one idea, and suppose hence the brief form of expression, by which παρά-νοσον must be again supplied before ἀνοχή. The παρά-νοσος must by all means be connected with the ἀνοχή; but it is not operative by virtue of this alone. The ἀνοχή denotes the old time as the period of God's prevailing forbearance, to the end that He may reveal His perfect righteousness in the future decisive time. The παρά-νοσος, on the contrary, appeared at that time as the supplement of the prophetic and retributive judgments which had already commenced as preliminaries. For this reason, the ἐς ἐνδείκσιν (ver. 25) is not the same as πρὸς τὴν ἐνδείκσιν (ver. 26). The first ἐν-δείκσις as the judicial righteousness revealing itself in the blood of Christ, has supplemented the παρά-νοσος. The second ἐνδείκσις is the purpose of the ἀνοχή, the fully accomplished ἐνδείκσις, which branches off in penal righteousness, and in justifying righteousness to him who is "of the faith of Jesus, and draws faith from His fountain of grace and truth." This whole should therefore be, as it were, compounded with the παρά-νοσος (Meyer).

Ver. 26. [At this present time, ἵνα τῷ ἐν αἷς ἰδοὺ, not opposed to ἵνα τῷ ἐνδείκσιν (Bengel, Hodge), but rather πρὸς ἐν παραγωγόντων, and added emphatically. The time of Christ is a time of critical decision, when the παρά-νοσος is at an end, and man must either accept the full remission (ἀφορμήσ) of sin, or expose himself to the judgment of a righteous God. P. S.—That ἵνα may have just and the better signification. [ἐν τῷ ἑαυτῷ δίκαιον καὶ δικαίωσιν τὸν ἐκ παραγωγοῦντος. The εἰς expresses not merely the result, but the design of God in exhibiting Christ to the world as the mercy-seat.—P. S.] We emphasize αἰτία, one and the same (eis und derselbe). That He may be—that is, that He may plainly appear [and be recognized by men in this twofold character as the Just One and the Justifier of the sinner]. The righteousness of God in the death of Christ has fully revealed that which the human view of the early and later times found so difficult to grasp; namely, righteousness and forbearance or love in one spirit, condemnation and deliverance in one act, killing and giving new life in one operation.

[Bengel: "Summum hic habetur paradoxon evangelicum; nam in lege conspicitur Deus justus et con-demnans, in evangelio justus et justificans voca- torum." This apparent contradiction is solved, objec-tively, in the love of God, which is the beginning and the end of his ways; and, subjectively, in faith (τὸ εἰς πιστεῦν), by which the sinner becomes one with Christ. In the death of Christ, God punished sin and saved the sinner, and Divine justice was vindicated in the fullest display and triumph of redeeming love. Not that the Father poured the vials of His wrath upon His innocent and beloved Son (as the doctrine is sometimes caricatured), but the Son voluntarily, in infinite love, and by the eternal Saviour and with the consent of the holy and merciful Father, assumed the whole curse of sin, and, as the representative head of the human family, in its stead and for its benefit, He fully satisfied the demands of Divine justice by His perfect, active and passive obedience. His sacrifice, as the sacrifice of the eternal Son of God in union with human nature, without sin is of infinite value both as to extent and duration while the Old Testament sacrifices were merely an anticipatory, preparatory, and temporary. Justification is here represented as the immediate effect of Christ's atoning death. On διακόνιον, comp. the Ezey, Notes on ver. 24, and also Doctrinal, below, No. 5. Wordsworth has a long note here on the doctrine of justification. He likewise maintains that διακόνιον (and πληρώτατον) in the LXX. and in the New Testament means, not to make righteous, but to account and declare righteous, and to regard and treat as such, in opposition to condemning and pronouncing guilty. But he insists also, that this did not actually unite righteousness by our union with Christ, and that God's righteousness is not only imputed, but also imparted to us in Him who is "the Lord our Righteousness." This work of infusion of grace, however, is not properly called justification, but sanctification. Comp. vi. 22: 'Being freed from sin, and made servants unto God—i.e., being justified—ye have your fruit unto holiness'—this is sanctification.—P. S.]

SECOND PARAGRAPH (VER. 27-31).

Ver. 27. Where, then, is the boasting? This announces the great conclusion from the foregoing. The lively expression of the paragraph arises from the triumphant confidence of the Apostle. [Bengel: παρὰ, particula vici-riorum.] The καίγανσας (gloriati) is certainly not the same as καίγαμα (gloriandi materia), subject of boasting (Reiche); but yet it is not exactly bragging (Meyer), since in many persons boasting of the law arose from dogmatic error. Jewish boasting is entirely absent here, but not exclusively, for the general conclusion is here drawn in reference to the righteousness of the Jews and Gentiles (see ver. 19). With the negation of the καίγας, the καίγαμα is also denied at the same time.—It is excluded. Perhaps the expression is here chosen with reference to the limits of the court of justice. The law excludes unqualified plaintiffs and defendants. —By what law? (By the law of works?) Since the Mosaic law is a law of works in form only, and not in spirit (see chap. vii.), the question presupposes that there is no such law of works; the spirit of the law is the law of faith. But the meaning of the question itself is: the law, as such, erroneously made a mere law of works, is too imperfectly developed in its operation to exclude boasting (see

* [Hence Dr. Lange, in his translation, makes a period after ἐπεραίωσαν. I prefer the construction of Meyer and Philippi as being more natural. The ἐπεραίωσα must not be confused with τῶν: the former suspends and puts off the judgment by ἀνοχή, the latter abolishes the guilt of sin by ἄφεσιν.—P. S.]

* [Meyer: ἵνα τῷ ἐνδείκσιν. Wiederentwaffnung de[e eis eνδείκσις, ver. 25, und zwar ohne de[; ver. 22, meinte ich mit der vortrefflichen Beobachtung (ll. 19), an welcher ich mich nicht absolute bereits vorbeischritt, der Artikel aber der Vorsicht der bestimm-ten, geschickte gebrachten ἐνδείκσις dient, was dem Pars-ten, wie ich denke, die Beobachtung der Mose-Apokalypse nicht, welches die genannte Auslegung Philippi's. Der letzterer kommentator erklärte die expressio ἐνδείκσις als für die van puffy, to avoid the threfold repeti- tion (eis eνδείκσις, ver. 15; eis ἄφεσιν, ver. 22;—P. S.) * [Meyer takes them simply as the prepositional third person. It evidently belongs both to δικαιοσύνε and δικαίο-σύνε.—P. S.]
Matt. xix. 20.—By the law of faith. According to Meyer, the Apostle speaks of the law of faith because the gospel preaches faith as the condition of salvation. According to Tholuck and De Wette, the word νόμος has here the idea of a religious rule (νομιμός). But, according to ver. 21, the Apostle will completely establish the same law, for the meaning void of which the Jew charged him. The same revealed law which, in its analytical character—that is, in its single commandments—bearis the appearance of a law of single works, is, in its synthetical character, recognized as a law of faith (Deut. vi. 5; Mark xii. 29; James ii. 10); because, as our schoolmaster led us to Christ, it leads to faith, and in Him first comes to man as the objective principle of faith, and then, as the subjective principle of faith, it becomes the law of the new life. [With νόμος πιστεύω, comp. ἡμικαίος πίστεως, i. 5; νόμος τοῦ πνεύματος τῆς θεοτ. viii. 2; ἱστογος Χριστος, 1 Cor. ix. 21; νόμος τῆς ἤλειθυς, James i. 25; I. 10; without going to show that the liberty of the gospel has nothing to do with license and antinomism.—P. S.]

Ver. 28. Therefore [For we judge. 20. ἐν γνώσει ἐμοι (concessio, comp. ii. 3; viii. 18; 2 Cor. xi. 5), is not, we infer, nor merely, we think, reckon (Tholuck [Alford, Hodge]), which, with the reading γνώσει, would not even make good sense. The expression, "For we think," would be an odd method of demonstration. It is not the subjective fact of justification which establishes the objective economy of salvation alone; but it is this objective economy which, on the other hand, excludes false justification, namely, that which is by works; and, on the other hand, establishes real justification, that which is by faith. We must consider also that the Apostle lays down the statement of ver. 28 as the principal proposition to the entire following argument, but will not apply it as proof for the negative statement, that man is not justified by works.—By faith [πιστεύω διὰ πίστεως, instrumental cause]. Luther’s addition of alone [durch den Glauben allein] is defended by Tholuck (the Kurenrem edition of the Bible of 1483 also reads, only by faith). Meyer properly remarks: It does not belong to the translation, but it is justified by the context as an explanation.—Without works of the law. This naturally refers to διὰ κανονισμοῦ, but not to faith. In the process of justification, the works of the law do not come into cooperation. (Hodge: "To be justified without works, is to be justified without any thing in ourselves to merit justification. The works of the law must be the works of the moral law, because the proposition is general, embracing Gentiles as well as Jews. The Apostle excludes externalizing subjective. He places the ground of justification out of ourselves.” Yet faith is something subjective, by which the objective ground of justification is personally appropriated, and made available for our benefit.—P. S.)

Ver. 29. Or is he the God of the Jews only? [Or, in case that what was said in ver. 28 should be called in doubt. Ver. 29, 30 furnish an additional striking proof for ver. 28. Meyer.—P. S.] εἶναι τινος, to belong to some one. The Rabbinical, and subsequently the Talmudic Jews, certainly assumed that God was merely the God of the Jews (see Tholuck, p. 162. Meyer refers to Eisenmenger’s Entdecktes Judenthum. i. p. 587.).—Paul can declare, without further proof: Yes, of the Gentiles also. The Apostle does not have here in mind chiefly the utterances of the prophets, as Tholuck supposes, but the same fact of Christian experience to which Peter refers, Acts x. 35, to which he has referred nowhere in Gal. iii. 5. The Old Testament witnesses were explained and confirmed by the fact of the salvation of the Gentiles by faith, by which fact also his apostleship to the Gentiles was first completely sealed (see 1 Cor. ix. 2). (God is not a national, but a universal God, and offers salvation to Gentiles and Jews on precisely the same terms. Hodge: “These sublime truths are so familiar to our minds, that they have, in a measure, buried their power; but as to the Jew, enthrallled all his life in his narrow national and religious prejudices, they must have expanded his whole soul with unwanted emotions of wonder, gratitude, and joy.”—P. S.)

Ver. 30. Seeing it is one God. The εἰς τὸν, since [alludieret, introducing something that cannot be doubted]. According to Meyer, the weight with the verb, not with τίτις. The Bible never says: “faith justifies,” but “we are justified by faith (λογισμῷ), because faith comes into view here simply as a means, or as the hypostatic principle, which salvation is obtained from the hand of Christ; and hence it is by faith, without the cooperation of works, that we are justified. But faith is nevertheless the fruit and end of all good works, which, as the principle of justification, at the same time, contains the necessary condition, at which we must arrive. And it is not from the works that the springing up of faith, but from the faith which is the root of works, that all are justified. In other words, it is not by faith as an active or working principle, but by faith as a receptive or appropriating principle, by which we are justified; yet that which faith receives is a power of life which must at once manifest itself in good works. It is but just to Luther to add, that he taught most clearly and forcibly this inseparable connection between faith and works. I shall quote but one passage from his exposition of Eph. ii. 8: ‘οὐτὶ ἐν ἑαυτῷ ἔχεις ποιῆσαι διὰ ἅμα τοῦ εὐαγγελίου ἐπανάλημπτος, ἀλλὰ τοῦτο μένει πίστις ἡ ὑποστατικὴ, τῇ ἣν ἀποκεφαλέσθη τῷ προδρόμῳ τοῦ ἔργου. Οὕτως ἡ πίστις ἁπάντως ἐπανάλημπτης, οὐκ ἐπίλεγον τὸν ἔργον ἀλλ’ ὀνείριον τὸ εὐαγγέλιον, ἀλλ’ ἐπὶ τὸν ἔργον, καθὼς ἔστω καὶ ἐπάλληλον λόγου. Οὐκ ἐπείγετο, κατά τί προσέρχετο, οὕτως ἐπείγετο οὐκ ἐπιτελεῖται. Οὐ γὰρ ἐπείζομαι ἢ θαυμάζειμαι, οὐδ’ ἐπηρεάζομαι, οὐδ’ ἐπιθυμῶ παρέξως ἢ μὴ παρέξως ἐκεῖνον. Οὐκ ἔχεις ἐν αὐτῷ ἐξουσίαν, διὰ τεταρτήν ἐναλλοτρίαν, ἀλλὰ τὸ εὐαγγέλιον ἐπανάλημπτος."}
of the proof rests on the unity of God, Monothelitism; but the context puts the weight upon the fact that the justification of the Jews and Gentiles as one divine fact—which therefore appears to be divided into two parts—must be traced to one and the same God. The future δικαίωμα is certainly not used (as Abbt [Grotius [more Hebrewmen], and others], still less does it refer to the universal judgment (Beza, Fritzsche); but it assumes the experience that Jews and Gentiles are already justified, in order to give prominence to the future established by it; namely, that Jews and Gentiles will be justified. [The future (= present futurably) expresses the permanent present and continued power of justification in every case that may occur; comp. the future in var. 20 and v. 19. Erasmus: "Receptavit ad eos qui adhuc essent in Judaismo seu paganismo."—P. S.]—Circumcision by faith. It is remarkable that there is not only a change of the prepositions εν and ὑπ', but also that the article stands with the latter, but not with the former. Meyer regards the change of prepositions, as well as the disappearance of the article from εν, as a matter of indifference. * Calvin observes in the change of the prepositions εν and ὑπ' a certain irony: "Si quis vult habere differentiation gentilis a Judaeo, hanc habba; si quis veram justificacionem habere, qua non prosunt Gentiles, qui neque adhuc excipiuntur" (from Tholuck, p. 169). Meyer properly regards this explanation as strange. But indifference as to the form of expression would be equally strange. There seems in reality to be a double form of breviloquence here: He will justify the circumcision (which is a circumcision by faith) by faith; for the real Jew has already a generating faith; and He will justify the uncircumcision (that is, a person who has not been circumcised) through the faith. Or, more briefly: To the genuine Jew, saving faith, as to its germ, is something already at hand, and justification arises from the completion of the same, just as the fruit from the tree. But to the Gentile, faith is offered as a foreign means of salvation.†

Ver. 31. Do we then make void the law? The question here arises, whether ver. 31 constitutes the conclusion of the proceeding train of thought, or whether it opens the new train of thoughts which begins with chap. iv. 1, and extends throughout the chapter. The former acceptance has prevailed since Augustine as the preferable one (Beza, Melanthon, Tholuck, Philippus [Hodge]); the latter (conformably to Theodoret, Pelagius) has been maintained by Semler, and others, and by De Wette and Meyer. According to Meyer, the Apostle, from chap. iii. 31 to iv. 25, proves the harmony of the doctrine of justification by faith with the law, by what has been said in the law about Abraham's justification. Meyer urges against the former view, that then this very important sentence appears merely as an abrupt categorical assertion; and Philippus' reply, that chap. viii. 1 continues it further, certainly does not relieve the matter. But Tholuck justly remarks against the second view, that then a ψευδος, instead of of εις, would be naturally expected in chap. iv. 1. Besides, the main object of Paul here is to show the true method of justification, and not the agreement of the law and the gospel.—P. S.] This much is clear: that ver. 31 constitutes the transition to chap. iv. But, in itself, it serves as the conclusion of the paragraph from vers. 27-30, in that it brings out the relation of the experimental fact that there are believing Gentiles—to the law. Paul had shown that the justification of the Gentiles, with the justification of the Jews, is to be traced back to one and the same God. By this means, he says, the law is not made void, but established. How far established? The answer is furnished by the preceding answer to the question: And to this first answer is subjected a second. The law, is glorified by the harmony of His saving operations among Jews and Gentiles. Particularism weakens the law, because it makes the law the statute of a national God. The universal Monothelitism of Christianity, proved by the universal justification of believers, first properly establishes the law in its true character, by making plain the universal character of the lawgiver.—The sentiment, Do we then make void the law? is sufficiently repelled by the emotional expression, μὴ γάρ δικαιομαχεῖτε, &c, &c. by no means! But the opposite sentiment, We establish the law, has been already proved by the fact that the law is defined as the law of faith, and has been traced back to the God of the Jews and Gentiles. This is indeed extended further in what follows, yet not in the form of a continued proof, but in the form of a new scriptural argument. The question, How far does Paul, or Christianity, establish the law? has been variously answered; see Tholuck, p. 163. Chrysostom, and others, say, that the salvation in Christ is the end of the law. Most expositors hold that the law is fulfilled by the new obedience, chap. vi. and vii. 4 [by love, which is called "the fulfillment of the law;" xiii. 10. Augustine, Luther, Calvin, Beza, Calov, Philippus.—P. S.] Tholuck thinks that the testimony of the δικαιομα αυτοῦ is meant. But this is not a new γενεα, nor would the continuation in chap. iv. be a new γενεα from this point of view; it is only a new proof for the righteousness by faith; the proof from Scripture. The Apostle glorifies and establishes the law on a new and broader foundation, by representing it as a unit, by tracing it to its principle of life, and enlarging its contents from the Jewish particularism to the universality of the living God through all the religions of all men in all ages. As far as the Mosaic law, as the type of the Mosaic religion, is glorified so far as it is the representative of all the legal elements of religion in general.*

* [So also Hodge, since Paul uses both forms indiscriminately: εις, in i. 17; iii. 9; iv. 16; and ὑπ', in ii. 23, 25; Gal. ii. 16, and sometimes first the one and then the other, in the same connection. Comp. the English prepositions by and through. According to De Wette and Alford, εἰς, by faith, expresses the objective ground: ηδε γενεα, through (his) faith, the subjective medium of justification. John connects εἰς γενεα with προφητεία, the circumcison which to by faith, and thereby destroys the correspondence to the other member. Green (G., p. 500, as quoted by Alford) refers ἐν γενεας τοις προφηταις justly, by the instrumentality of the identical faith which operates in the case of the circumstances. Bengel: "Judentum problem in fide fuerunt; gentiles sibi ab illis separatio est."—P. S.] Very similar is the interpretation of Wordsworth: The Jews, or children of Abraham, are justified out of or to the faith which Abraham their father had, and which they have, in order to have in their own children that faith which was already in the covenant with God in Christ. The Gentiles, or εἰς, must enter that door of the faith of Abraham, and pass through it (which is faith) to be justified; but not to the Church from the beginning. Abraham and are seed are in the household of faith in Christ, but they must live and act from its spirit; the heathen must enter the house through the door of that faith in Him.—P. S.]

† [Comp. a long note of Wordsworth in loc., who assigns no less than twelve reasons for the assertion of ver. 31, viz., because the doctrine of justification is grounded on the circumcision of the law that all are under sin; because the sacrifice of Christ was pre-announced by the passover, and other sacri
THE EPISTLE OF PAUL TO THE ROMANS.

DOCTRINAL AND ETHICAL.

First Paragraph (Vers. 21-25).

1. As the Old Testament, according to ver. 31, has testified of the righteousness of faith contained in the New Testament, so does the New Testament— as the perfect revelation of God's righteousness—bear witness to the holiness of the law in the Old Testament.

2. It is a defective and inorganic view to believe that, as far as the single attributes of God are concerned, in the New Testament His justice is less prominent than in the Old, in that His love may appear more prominent. On the contrary, the revelation of His justice is first completed in the New Testament. It is here completed so grandly, that, in proportion to this completion, the Old Testament revelation of justice may be regarded as still veiled. The same may be said of all the Divine attributes. In the New Testament they have a killing and a vivifying—i.e., creative effect. The justice in union with love is grace. In the Old Testament, however, justice appears mainly in its punitive aspect.

3. On the double form and kind of faith, see the Esg. Notes on ver. 22.

4. Also on the δόξα θεοῦ, see Esg. Notes on ver. 23. As the δικαιοσύνη is the internal part of the Divine δόξα, so is the want of δόξα on man's part the evidence of his want of δικαιοσύνη. The same connection is likewise exhibited in the life of faith. The δικαιοσύνα arises from the δικαιοσύνη (chap. vii. 20).

5. The doctrine of justification. On the δικαιοσύνη, see chap. ii. 13, and the section relating there-to. On the fact that it is under the δικαιοσύνη that man's utter want of personal righteousness first becomes prominent, see the Esg. Notes on ver. 21. The evangelical definition per fidem is opposed to the Roman Catholic definition proprie fidem. The form proprie fidem has a double sense. If faith is understood as merit, the order of the work of salvation is reversed, and its causality is transferred to man. It is very clear from the present tense δικαιοσύνη (ver. 28), that the Apostle distinguishes here, and throughout, between redemption and justification. Christ is, indeed, effectually the righteousness of believers, and virtually the righteousness of humanity, and so far could the redemption be once loosely denominated justification. Yet the Apostle's usage of language is far above this indefiniteness, and chap. viii. 30 proves conclusively (comp. chap. v. 18) that he regards justification as a part of the plan of salvation. The connection between the δικαιοσύνη—which grace effects in every believer after the πίστις—and the δικαιοσύνη, consists in this: that Christ, as the perfect δικαιοσύνη, is, by the gospel, offered to men, that He is set forth as δικαιοσύνη. (Lipsius, in a monograph entitled The Pauline Doctrine of Justification, 1862, holds that the δικαιοσύνη is the condition of righteousness, and that every one is δικαιοσύνη, who is just what his destination requires he should be. The author's conclusion is, that Paul, in no single passage, compels us to divide the divine operation—the result of which is the (preliminary) human δικαιοσύνη—into two distinct and separate acts, the actus efficiens and the actus declaratorius, in such a manner that the latter only may be called δικαιοσύνη.)—The way for the Protestant doctrine of justification was prepared by the sound productions of the mysticism of the Middle Ages; for example, in "German Theology."* This book contrasts selfish, or egoistic, with entire self-surrender to God and His will, and thereby indicates the deepest ground for the sinner's justification by faith. Justification, as the appropriation of Christ's δικαιοσύνη, makes the gospel, through the power of the Holy Ghost, an individual and special absolution from the guilt of sin, which the believer experiences personally. In this it contains the principle of conscience and freedom. It makes the objective δικαιοσύνη in Christ his subjective δικαιοσύνη. Justification is essentially a pronouncing righteous, but by the creative declaration of God; therefore it is also a making righteous, in the sense that it is the communication of a new principle of life, yet in such a way that this new principle of life must ever be regarded as the pure effect of Christ, and not in any way as the cause of justification. The one gracious act of justification is divided into two acts: 1. The offer of the δικαιοσύνη for faith until faith is awaked by free grace; 2. Accounting faith as righteousness. The effects of justification are, negatively, liberation from the guilt, the curse, and punishment of sin; and, positively, adoption or sonship, by which the believer's filial relation—that is, the decision of his individual regeneration, and his translation into the state of peace—is pronounced. In the old Protestant theology, justification has been variously identified with the remission, with the redemption itself; while in our day, as was already the case with Osiander [died 1552], it has often been far too much identified with sanctification. [Additional remarks on the doctrine of justification by faith, or rather by free grace through faith in Christ. (n.) Its importance and position in the theological system. It belongs to soteriology, the appropriation of the salvation of Christ to the sinner. It presupposes the fundamental truths of the Trinity, the incarnation, total depravity, the atonement, all of which were revealed before, as the Gospels and Acts precede the Epistle. It is therefore not, strictly speaking, the articulus stantis et cadentis ecclesiae (Luther), but subordinate to the article of Christ, who alone can be called the one foundation and rock of the whole Christian system (1 Cor. iii. 11). The doctrine that

* [The Deutschen Theologie, or Theologia Germanica, the work of an unknown author of the fifteenth century, and was edited by Dr. Luther with a highly commendatory preface in 1516, one year before the commencement of the Reformation. Recent editions by Platten, 1835, and Bisfenrath, 1853. There is also an English translation by Susanna Winkworth, with introductions by Bunsen and Kingsley, London, 1855, reprinted at Andover, 1865.]
Christ is the Son of God, and came into the flesh—

i.e., was born, died, and rose again, to save sinners

—is emphatically “the mystery of godliness” (1 Tim. iii. 16), and forms the burden of the first Christian confession (Matt. xvi. 16–19); its assertion or denial is the criterion of true Christianity and of antichrist (1 John iv. 2, 8). But justification by faith is undoubtedly a fundamental article of subjective Christianity and of evangelical Protestantism, as distinct from ecumenical Catholicism, and as opposed to Greek and Roman sectional Catholicism. It constitutes the material or life-principle of Protestantism (principium essendi), as the doctrine of the supreme authority of the Holy Scriptures in matters of faith and practice constitutes its formal principle (principium suprascendi). It was never properly understood in the Christian Church, not even by Augustine, until Luther, and the other Reformers brought it out into clear light from the Epistles of Paul, especially those to the Romans and Galatians. The unbiassed philological exegetes of modern times has fully justified the scripturalness of this doctrine of the Reformation. Yet the best men in the Church of all ages, and the profoundest divines before the Reformation, such as Augustine, Anselm, Bernard, have, In fact, always come to the same practical conclusion in the end, and, disclaiming all merit of their own, they have taken refuge in the free grace of God, as the only and sufficient cause of salvation. “Our righteousness,” says St. Bernard (Sermo V. de verbis Euxene Proph., vil. 1, 2), “our righteousness, if we have any, is of little value; it is sincere, perhaps, but not pure, unless we believe ourselves to be better than our fathers, who no less truly than humbly said: All our righteousnesses are as filthy rag.”

(b.) Definition of justification. It is a judicial act of God by which He freely acquits the penitent sinner, and adopts him as His child on the ground of Christ’s perfect righteousness, and on condition of a living faith. Paul has in his mind a judicial process: The righteous and holy God is the Judge; man is the guilty culprit; the law, or the expressed will of God, is the accuser; Christ, with His perfect sacrifice, steps in as a substitute; the sinner accepts Christ’s perfect righteousness, as Christ did into His God, on the ground of this relation, acquires the sinner, and treats him as His own child; the sinner, being one with Christ, no more lives unto himself, but, the grace of God enabling him, unto Christ, who died for him, and rose again. This is justification.

(c.) Relation to the atonement, regeneration, and sanctification. Justification differs:

(a.) From the atonement (iustitia, iustification, expiation, propitiation, Verheissung) and the consequent reconciliation (reconciliation,)[bracketed] of the sense of the term, as used in the E. V., Rom. v. 11, in German Verheissung), i.e., the reconciliation of God and the sinner by the self-sacrifice of Christ, which fully satisfies the claims of Divine justice, and draws men to God by the attraction of superhuman love. The atonement is the objective ground of justification; it was accomplished once for all time, but justification is repeated in the case of every sinner.

(b.) From regeneration, or the new birth. This is a creative act of the Holy Spirit in man preceding or accompanying the subjective act of justification by God the Father, and resulting in a subjective change of heart, which corresponds to the new relation of the believer as justified in Christ.
6. On Ἰουλίαμαι, Ἰσοροπή, and ἀναλογίας, see the Exeg. Notes on ver. 28. For more detailed information, see my Positive Dogmatics, p. 812 ff. As recent efforts have been made to set aside the true doctrine of atonement itself by refuting the view of Amselm;* it should be remembered that the defects in Anselm's theory were acknowledged even in the Middle Ages, but that they cannot destroy its relative truth and value. The real idea of the atonement cannot be clearly apprehended without understanding the meaning of compassion, of conciliation in Christ, of the divine judgment seat in the sinner's conscience, and of the connection of judgment and deliverance in the sufferings of Christ as well as in the sinner's conversion.

7. God is the righteous Judge and the justifying God: (1) In the same grace; (2) In the objective work of redemption, or in justification by faith.

8. When the Apostle, in ver. 27, contrasts a law of works and a law of faith as excluding each other, and then says in ver. 31: "We abolish the law," it follows that he only recognizes the antithesis of ver. 27 as one which the external legism of the Jews had made; or as the appearance of the antithesis between the economy of the Old and New Testaments, but that his own view was based upon a deeper unity.

9. It is well known that very much has been written about Luther's sola, ver. 28. This word is perfectly true so far as it is contrasted with τοιγος των ονων, for the reading is γανε ης τοιγος των ονων, without works of the law. Therefore the sola is even positively exclusive. But does it also exclude works of faith? Answer: As soon as a work of faith is added to faith, it is made a τοιγος των ονων, a work of the law. If the work remains a mere phenomenon or manifestation of faith, it has no separate significance in itself.

[Dr. Donne, a standard divine of the Church of England, originally a convert from Romanism (died 1631), in Serm. ii. on John xvi. 8-11, makes the following apt remarks on this sola fide: "Faith is but one of those things which in several senses are said to justify us. It is truly said of God, Deus solus justificant: God only justifies us—efficienter; nothing can effect it, nothing can work towards it, but only the mere goodness of God. And it is truly said of Christ, Christus solus justificant: Christ only justifies us—instrumentaliiter; nothing enters into the substance and body of the ransom of our sins but the obedience of Christ. It is also truly said, sola fides justificant; only faith justifies us—instrumentaliiter; nothing apprehends, nothing applies the merit of Christ to thee, but thy faith. And lastly, it is as truly said, sola opera justificant; only our works justify us—declaratoriiiter; only thy good life can assure the consequence, and the world, that thou art justified. As the efficient justification, the gracious purpose of God, has done us no good without the material satisfaction, the death of Christ, that followed; and as that material satisfaction, the death of Christ, would do me no good without the instrumental justification, the apprehension by faith; so neither would this profit without the declaratory justification, by which all is pleaded and established. God enters not into our material justification; that is only Christ's. Christ enters not into our instrumental justification; that is only faith's. Faith enters not into our declaratory justification (for faith is secret), and declaration belongs to works. Neither of these can be said to justify us alone, so as that we may take the chain in pieces, and think to be justified by any one link thereof—by God without Christ, by Christ without faith, or by faith without works. And yet every one of these justifies us alone, so as that none of the others into that way and that means by which any of these are said to justify us." Comp. my foot-note on ver. 28, p. 186.—P. S.]

10. Ver. 29. Paul did not need any longer to prove from the Scriptures that God was also the God of the Gentiles. The first phenomenon of the New Covenant: Blessedness of faith, speaking with tongues, and a new life, was, with the Apostles, equivalent everywhere to scriptural proofs, and served for the exposition of the Old Testament. It was, indeed, the specific New Testament evidence which precedes with Paul the argument from the Old Testament in chap. iv.

11. On the means by which Christianity chiefly establishes the law, see the Exeg. Notes on ver. 31. The Judaism of the Old Testament first attained its universal historical glory by Christianity, and its thanks are due especially to Paul, who was so hated by the Jews. [Bishop Sanderson (Sermon on 1 Peter ii. 16, as quoted by Ford): "The law may be considered as a rule; or, as a covenant. Christ has freed all believers from the rigor and curse of the law, considered as a covenant; but He has not freed them from obedience to the law, considered as a rule... The law, as a rule, can no more be abolished or changed, than can the nature of good or evil be abolished or changed."

HOMILETICAL AND PRACTICAL.

CHAP. VII. 21-36.

The revelation of the righteousness of faith through Jesus Christ which is efficacious in God's sight. It comes to pass: 1. Without the assistance of the law, although testified by the law and the prophets; 2. For all sinners, without distinction, who believe; 3. By the redemption effected by Jesus Christ, the Mediator, who proffers the righteousness which is acceptable to God (vers. 21-26).—The testimony of the law and the prophets concerning the righteousness which is acceptable to God: 1. Of the law by its typical reference to the atonement; 2. Of the prophets by the Messianic prophecies (ver. 21).—The Apostle takes from the law what does not belong to it, and concedes what does belong to it. He doles: 1. Its alleged cooperation in the righteousness which is acceptable to God. But he concedes to it: 2. The testimony of the future atonement (ver. 21).—The universality of grace corresponding to the universality of sin (vers. 22-24).—What sort of confession should we make to God daily as evangelical Christians? Two kinds: 1. We are altogether sinners, and come short of the glory we should have before God; 2. We are justified freely by His grace, &c. (vers. 23-24).—Christ set forth by God to be a propitiation (mercy-seat) through faith in His blood. 1. To what end? To offer His righteousness at this (present) time; 2. Why? Because in time past He could pass over sin.
by His Divine forbearance, and thereby shake faith in His justice (vers. 23, 26).—Divine forbearance (ver. 25).—God the only just One, and therefore the only Justifier (ver. 21).

Euther: "All have sinned," &c. This is the object and principal part of this Epistle, and of the whole Scripture. Therefore understand this text well, for the merit and glory of all works,—as be himself says,—are done away with, and God’s grace and glory alone remain (ver. 23).—Sin could be removed neither by laws nor by any good works; that must be done by Christ and His forgiveness (ver. 25).—Faith fulfills all laws, but works cannot fulfill a single tittle of the law (ver. 21).

Starker: There is only one kind of justification in the Old and New Testaments; namely, that which is by faith in Christ (ver. 21).—To have a believing heart, is to hunger and thirst after the grace of God in Christ, and to appropriate the righteousness of Christ for our spiritual satisfaction and refreshment (ver. 22).—Do not make a wrong use of this passage against active Christianity, for God’s image must be restored in us in the order of the new birth and daily renewal (ver. 23).—Grace and righteousness are the two principal attributes of God which are proved in the work of our salvation. Therefore one cannot be separated from the other, either in the cause or order of our salvation (ver. 24).—The faith which appropriates the blood of Jesus Christ and His expiratory death, and presents them to God the Lord, is the only means by which Christ becomes also our mercy-seat (ver. 25).—If you are ever so distinguished and wealthy, and are deficient in true and living faith, you cannot be justified nor saved (ver. 26).

Gisander: No doctrine must be accepted in the Church of God to which God’s word does not bear witness (ver. 21).—Lange: The merit of the blood of Christ is not only the object which faith grasps, but also the foundation on which it firmly rests (ver. 25).—Rheing: Christ our righteousness! Oh, the glorious consolation, which screens us from the wrath of God, the curse of the law, and eternal death! No work, no perfection out of Christ; but faith alone makes us dear children of God—righteous, holy, and blessed (ver. 25).

Bengt: Under the law, God appears just and condemning; under the gospel, just, and yet justifying the guilty sinner.

Lisco: The nature of evangelical righteousness is, that it is obtained by faith in Jesus Christ; and it comes to all and upon all who believe in Him. Like a flood of grace it flows to all, and even so overflows as to reach even the heathen. It is therefore a righteousness by faith, and not a righteousness by works.—In the work of redemption, God’s holiness and grace, justice and forbearance, are revealed (vers. 25, 26).

Heusner: The difficult question is now solved: "How can the sinner find redemption from his sins?" Christianity replies: Believed in Christ (ver. 22).—How is the righteousness which God accepts testified by the law and the prophets? 1. By this means only. All other means, all redemption,—that is, whatsoever described in the Scriptures as the free work of God’s grace,—neither the offering, nor man’s own merit, was sufficient for this end; 2. In the emphatic prophesies of a future Redeemer (ver. 21).—Unworthiness before God is universal. This is the first strangling word of revelation: Know that thou art a sinner, a poor sinner; that is, he who hast nothing, and must get something from God (ver. 23).—Christ’s redemption is: 1. A ransom (Matt. xx. 28) from the guilt of sin (Eph. i. 7); 2. A ransom from the punishment of sin (Rom. v. 9); 3. A ransom from the dominion of sin (1 Peter i. 18; ver. 28).—The subjective condition of redemption is faith as a faith of the heart, which reposes its confidence on Christ’s sacrificial death—a faith that Christ died for me. This for me is the great thing! (ver. 26).—On vers. 23–25, renewed his celebrated Reform Denomination Sermon (ii. 276) in the year 1800: "The great reason why our Church should never forget that it owes its existence to the renewal of the doctrine of God’s free grace in Christ.

Disser: The law impels toward righteousness, but it does not confer it. There are not two orders of salvation, one for Jews and honorable people, and the other for heathen and publicans; but there is only one for all. We are justified: 1. Without merit; 2. By God’s grace; 3. Through the redemption that is in Christ Jesus (ver. 24).—The highest declaration of God’s grace is at the same time the highest declaration of His justice.

J. P. Lange: The fact of salvation is also a miraculous work of God (ver. 22).—Redemption as the second and higher work of Christ, is the foundation on which is the natural world of miracle.—Golgotha is more exalted than Sinai in respect also to God's justice.—The lightning-flash of New Testament justice: 1. Killing; 2. Making alive.

Burkitt: Vers. 24–26. We see here: 1. A glorious privilege for believers, justification; 2. Its efficient cause, God; 3. The moving or impulsive cause, free grace; 4. The meritorious cause, the blood shedding and death of Christ; 5. The final cause, the declaration of His righteousness; 6. The instrumental cause, faith.—Oh, glorious and all-wise contrivance, whereby God made sufficient provision for the reparation of His honor, for the vindication of His holiness, for the manifestation of His truth and faithfulness, and for the present consolation and eternal salvation of all repenting and believing sinners to the end of the world.—Matthew Henry: Vers. 23–25. Christ is the propitiatory sacrifice, and is the healing plaster provided. Faith is the applying of this plaster to the wounded soul.—Faith is the bunch of hyssop, and the blood of Christ is the blood of sprinkling.—Dwingel devotes six sermons to the subject of Justification, in which he treats of its nature, source, and means; duty of believing; nature of faith; influence of faith on justification; reconciliation of Paul and James on justification; influence of works on justification; and justification by faith no dissipation of motives to obedience (Theology, vol. ii., pp. 515–605).—Clarke: vers. 23–24. As God is no respector of persons, all human creatures being equally His offspring, and there being no reason why one should be preferred before another, therefore His mercy has embraced all.—The redemption of Christ comprehends whatsoever He taught, did, or suffered, in order to free men from evil.—Hooger: As the cardinal doctrine of the Bible is justification on the ground of faith, so the turning-point in the world’s history, the saving act, is the reception of Jesus Christ as the propitiation for our sins. All modes of preaching must be erroneous, which do not lead sinners to feel that the great thing to be done, and done first, is to receive the Lord Jesus Christ, and to turn unto God through Him. And all religious experience must be defective, which does not embrace distinctly a sense of the justice.
of our condemnation, and a conviction of the sufficiency of the work of Christ, and an exclusive reliance upon it as such. —J. F. H.]

**THE EPISODE OF PAUL TO THE ROMANS.**

**ON CHAP. III. 27-31.**

The exclusion of man's self-glorification. Its results: 1. Not by the law of works; but, 2. By the law of faith (ver. 27).—How are we justified? 1. Not by the works of the law; but, 2. By faith alone (ver. 28).—Only by faith.—Luther's watchword, and also the watchword of the evangelical church of the present day (ver. 28).—The righteousness of the law and the righteousness of faith (ver. 28).—God, a God of all people, because He is only one God (vers. 29, 30).—Faith in the one God considered as the source of the true kind of universalism (vers. 29, 30).—The popular saying of religious indifference: "We all believe in one God," is only true when we also believe that this God also justifies those who believe (ver. 30).—The proof that the law is not made void through faith, but established, is supplied by both the doxology and doctrine: 1. Of the Lord; 2. Of His apostles, and especially of Paul (ver. 31).

**LUTHER:** Faith keeps all the laws, while works keep no point of the law (James ii. 10).—(A passage in the preface to the Epistle to the Romans is also in place here.) Faith is not that human folly and dream which some take for faith. But faith is a divine work in us, which changes us and creates us anew in God, &c.

**STARK:** Faith alone justifies and saves; but you must not take away works from faith in order to beautify your sinful life, or it will become unbelief. There are many forms of arbitrary will on earth, and yet but one way to salvation. God would save all men, and yet by only one way.

**HEDNOR:** Christianity, with its doctrine of faith, opens no door for sin, but shows how we can be obedient to the law with a filial spirit for God's sake (chap. iii. 31).—**QUESNEL:** The more faith in a soul the less pride there is in it.

**GERLACH, FROM CHURCH:** What is the law of faith? Salvation by grace. Herein God's power is declared, not only in delivering men, but also in justifying them and raising them to glory; for God did not stand in need of works, but sought faith alone. True, the word alone is not in the text literally, but yet it is there in sense, as it is expressly declared in Gal. ii. 16, 17; without faith, nothing can justify.

**HEUBNER:** Christianity unites humanity by one God, by one Father, who is the Saviour of all.—The unity of faith in grace should also establish the unity of hearts.

**SPEAR:** Looking at the subject in its true light, faith is not that which itself justifies man—for its strength would be far too small for this work—but faith only accepts the most powerful grace of God as a proffered gift, and thus permits man to be saved by it, instead of its really justifying and saving him. This is the great doctrine of this Epistle, on which every thing rests, and from which every thing must be derived.

**LANG:** Therefore we judge, &c., and thus it stands (vers. 28, 29). True salvation of the inner life & witness: 1. Of the true faith; 2. Of the true gospel; 3. Of the true God.

[BURKITT: Ver. 31. The moral, not the ceremonial law. The moral law is established by the gospel; Christ has relaxed the law in point of danger, but not in point of duty. —HENRY: Ver. 27 If we were saved by our own works, we might put the crown upon our own heads. But the law of faith, the way of justification by faith, doth forever exclude boasting; for faith is a depending, self-emptying, self-denying grace, and casts every crown before the throne: therefore it is most for God's glory, that thus we should be justified. —MACCARTHY: Ver. 26. Faith is nothing but those who believe it to believe every thing made known to them by God and by Christ, and to do every thing which they have enjoined; so that it terminates in the sincere belief of the doctrines of religion, and in the constant practice of its duties, as far as they are made known to the believer. —OLARKE: Why did not God make known this grand method of salvation sooner? 1. To make it the more valued. 2. To show the performance of His promises. 3. To make known the true and efficacy of the blood of Christ, which sanctifies the present, extends its influence to the past, and continues the availing sacrifice and way of salvation to all future ages. —HODGE: The doctrine of atonement produces in us its proper effect, when it leads us to see and feel that God is just; that He is infinitely gracious; that we are deprived of all ground of boasting; that the way of salvation, which is open for us, is open for all men; and that the motives to all duty, instead of being weakened, are enforced and multiplied. —In the gospel, all is harmonious; justice and mercy, as it regards God; freedom from the law, and the strongest obligations to obedience, as it regards men. —BARNES: One of the chief glories of the plan of salvation is, that while it justifies the sinner, it brings a new set of influences from heaven, more tender and mighty than can be drawn from any other source, to produce obedience to the law of God. —J. F. H.]

Eighth Section.—Second proof of the righteousness of faith: from the Scriptures, and particularly from the history of the faith of Abraham, the ancestor of the Jews. Abraham is the father of faith to the Gentiles as well as to the Jews, because he was justified in uncircumcision as a Gentile, and because he received circumcision as the seal of the righteousness of faith. David is also a witness of the righteousness of faith. (He is particularly so, since his justification was that of a great sinner.) Abraham, by his faith in the word of the personal God of revelation, and particularly in the promise of Isaac, is a type of believers in the saving miracle of the resurrection.

Chap. IV. 1-25.

1 What [then] shall we say then that Abraham our father, as pertaining to the flesh, hath found [found according to the flesh]? For if Abraham were [was] justified by works [as is assumed by the Jews], he hath whereof to glory [he hath ground of boasting]; but not before God. For what saith the Scripture? Abraham believed God, and it was counted [reckoned unto] him for righteousness [Gen. xv. 6]. Now to him that worketh [to the workman] is the reward not reckoned of [according to, as, a matter of] grace, but of a debt [according to, as a]. But to him that worketh not, but believeth on him that justifieth the ungodly, his faith is counted [reckoned] for righteousness. Even as David also describeth the blessedness [happiness] of the man, unto whom God imputeth righteousness without works, saying, Blessed [Happy] are they whose iniquities are forgiven, and whose sins are covered [atoned for]. Blessed [Happy] is the man to whom the Lord will not impute [reckon] sin [Ps. xxxvii. 1, 2].

9 Cometh this blessedness [happiness] then upon the circumcision only, or [also] upon the uncircumcision also? For we say that faith was reckoned to Abraham for righteousness. How was it then reckoned? when he was in circumcision, or in uncircumcision? Not in circumcision, but in uncircumcision.

11 And he received [Gen. xvii. 2] the [a] sign of circumcision, [as?] a seal of the righteousness of the faith which he had yet being uncircumcised [of the faith in the uncircumcision, τῆς πίστεως τῆς ἐν τῇ ἄμαρτωσίᾳ, of, the faith which he had while in uncircumcision]: that he might be the father of all them that believe, though they be not circumcised [while yet in uncircumcision]; that righteousness might be imputed [reckoned also] unto them also: and the father of circumcision to them who are not of the circumcision only, but who also walk in the steps of that faith of our father Abraham, which he had being yet uncircumcised [which he had while in uncircumcision].

13 For the promise, that he should be the heir of the world, was not to Abraham, or to his seed, through the law [For not through (the) law is the promise to Abraham, or to his seed, that he should be heir of the world], but through the righteousness of faith. For if they which [who] are of the law [οἱ ἐκ νόμου] be heirs, faith is made void, and the promise made of none [no] effect [rendered powerless]: Because the law worketh wrath: for where no law is, there is no transgression [but where there is no law, neither is there transgression of the law]. Therefore it is of faith, that it might be by grace; to the end [in order that] the promise might be sure to all the seed; not to that only which is of the law, but to that also which is of the faith of Abraham; who is the father of us all, (As it is written, I have made thee a father of many nations [A father of many nations have I set thee; Gen. xvii. 5]) before whom he believed, even God, who quickeneth the dead, and calleth those things which are not as though they were:

18 Who against hope believed in hope, that he might become the [cast the] father of many nations, according to that which was spoken, So shall thy seed be 19 [Gen. xv. 5]. And being not weak in faith, he considered not [as] being about a hundred years old, neither yet the deadness of Sarah's womb: He staggered not at the promise of God through unbelief [But with regard to the promise of God he wavering, or doubted not in unbelief]; but was [made] strong in faith, giving glory to God
21 And being fully persuaded, that what he had [hath] promised, he was [is]
able also to perform. And therefore [Wherefore also] it was imputed [reck-
oned] to him for righteousness.

23 Now it was not written for his sake alone, that it was imputed [reckoned]
to him; But for us also, to whom it shall be imputed [reckoned], if we believe
on him that [who] raised up Jesus our Lord from the dead; Who was delivered
[up] for our offences, and was raised again [emis again] for our justification.

TEXTUAL.

1 Ver. 1.—The reading in Lachmann, εἰρηνικαῖα Ἀρπ., τὸν προτάτορα τῶν ἔγγ., is not only not authenti-
cated (A. B. C., &c.), but, if well understood, it also gives the best sense; and we regard the opposite reading, which is now
generally favored, as an expository transposition. See the Exeg. Notes. [The text, rec. puts Ἀρπακαῖα τῶν ἔγγ., not ἐρη-
nικαῖα] 1 time before εἰρηνικαῖα, Cod. Sin., sustains the reading of Lachmann, which is also adopted by Alford, who, however,
brackets εἰρηνικαῖα as being of doubtful authority, since it is omitted by the Vatican Cod. (see Tischendorf's ed.
l. p. 1448). But it is indispensable, and abundantly sustained by the other usual MSS. Meyer admits the weight of
external authority in favor of Lachmann's reading, but is disposed, nevertheless, to regard it as a later transposition to
suit the connection of εἰρηνικαῖα with τὸν προτάτορα τῶν ἔγγ. The E. V., following the text, rec., adopts this connection,
and Dr. Lange defends it in the Exeg. Notes. But with the majority of modern commentators, including Meyer, Alford,
Hodge, I prefer to join εἰρηνικαῖα with εἰρηνικαῖα. This is indeed necessary, if we follow the lecta recepra, and it is
perfectly allowable, though not so natural, if we adopt the reading of Lachmann. In this case we must translate: What,
them, shall we say that Abraham our father (forsother) found (or, gained, attained) according to (the) flesh (or, to
the action of the flesh) e., through his own natural efforts as distinct from the grace of God. Grutus: properis viribus;
De Wette, and others: now say meehblicher Werke. Meyer takes σαρκι here as the weak, unspiritual, sinful human
nature. Abraham did indeed attain righteousness, but by faith, not by works. Cod. X. A. B. C. * sustain προτάτορα
for the sake of the οἰκ. [P. S.]

2 Ver. 2.—[Lange translates: or hat Bahn, glory. καυγαία (as also καυγαία) in the N. T., and in the LXX.,
means generally (not always, as Meyer says, p. 160) the object or ground of boasting, materia gloriant; Rom. iv. 2; 1
Cor. ix. 15; 10; 2 Cor. i. 14; Gal. v. 4; Phil. i. 26; R. 10; and sometimes, as in the classics, the act of boasting or
exulting, gloriantio; 1 Cor. v. 6; 2 Cor. x. 12; ix. 3.—P. S.]

3 Ver. 4.—τὸ ἐργασμός is well rendered by Luther: dem der mit Werken umgeht. Lange: dem welcher dem
Werktreibenden. Meyer: dem Werktreibenden. The word is frequent, and signifies a workman who works for pay.
Cowper and Howson, too freely: if a man earns his pay by his work. Young: too literally: to him who is working.
—[P. S.]

5 Ver. 5.—[Τῇ] εἰρηνικαῖα, to him who worketh not for hire—der nicht Werkstat treibt.—[P. S.]

6 Ver. 6.—[παραπώρημα,] in allusion to the Hebrew form "תָּמִיק. Oh, the blessedness, or, happiness of. The N. T.
of the Amer. Bible Union, and Robert Young, render ἡμερομέρια, here and elsewhere, even in the Sermon on the Mount,
by happy, instead of blessed, which properly corresponds to ἡμερομέρια. There is the same difference between the
German glücklich and selig. In a popular English Bible, I would retain blessed and blessedness where religious or eterna-
happiness is spoken of. The E. V. is inconsistent, and, without a fixed rule, alternates between happy and blessed.—
[P. S.]

Vers. 7, 8.—(From Ps. xxxiii), which describes the happiness and the condition of the forgiveness of sins.
The following is a literal version of vers. 1 and 2:

Blessed (Happy) is he whose transgression is forgiven,
Whose sin is covered.

Blessed (Happy) is the man
To whom Jehovah imputeth not iniquity,
And in whose spirit there is no guile.

Ewald (Die Peizjimens, 3d ed., 1866, p. 65) renders the passage thus:

Selig dessen Missatheit vergolten,
Dessen Schuld ist verschiößt!—
Seliger Mensch des Jhohn nicht anrechnet Schuldt,
Und in dessen Geiste keine Täuschung!—[P. S.]

Ver. 11.—The acquisitive προτάτορα [A. C. * Syr.] does not really change the thought, but rather strengthen-
it. It is probably an alteration or correction [caused by the surrounding acquisitives. The genitive προτάτορα is
attested by x. B. C. D. F. K. L., &c.—P. S.]

Ver. 12.—αινεῖ must be retained, contrary to Lachmann. [leaf is wanting in x. B. Meyer defends it.]
—[P. S.]

Ver. 13.—The ἐν (τῆ) δέκα τριάντα πιάτασι [N. A. B. C. D., &c., Lachmann, Tischendorf, Meyer, Alford].
The opposite reading is τὸν ἐν. τῆς ἐν. [Recommended by Griesbach, adopted by Schoi.—contrary to the
majority of the usual MSS. It looks like a mechanical adjustment to ver. 11. τῆς is also to be omitted.—P. S.]

Ver. 19.—οὗ ὁ ἄνευ is probably an exegetical correction; though strongly attested by a. B. A., Griesbach,
Lachmann. [The text, rec. reads ὁ γὰρ, ὃς, where, which is supported by N. D. F. K. L., while N. favors ὁ ὡς, but
where.—P. S.]

Ver. 17.—κατα-στορισμῶν, Clofd. E. G., Luther [credibiliti, dem du gegnebt hast, as if it was part of the Scripture
quotations, instead of ἁρμονία, connivat, which is sustained by Cod. Sin.—P. S.]

Ver. 13.—The oν is wanting in the corrected Goll. A. B. C. [and Sin.]. Also in Lachmann. According to
Meyer, this omission arose from regard to Gen. xvii. 17. It could also have been occasioned by the antithesis in ver. 20.

Ver. 19.—The δῦς is wanting in W. E. G., and (shorn out by Frissehe and Tischendorf, but sustained by
K. A. D. K. L., Lachmann and Alford bracket it.—P. S.]

Ver. 21.—The και is sustained by A. B. C. &c., Lachmann. [Cod. Sin. likewise favors και, and Alford retains
it.—P. S.]

Ver. 27.—[The και after δοκι is omitted by B. D., F., but inserted by N. A. O. D. K. L., Lachmann
and Alford bracket it.]

Ver. 25.—Luther, to whom above all others the Christian world is indebted for a lucid and forcible exposition of
Paul's doctrine of justification by faith, has made a strange mistake here by translating δικαιοσύνη: Gerechtigkeit
(Richtigkeit, Rechtigkeit), instead of Rechtfertigung (justification). δικαιοσύνη is the divine act of setting a man right, or putting
him into the state and possession of δικαιοσύνη.—[P. S.]
EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

General Remarks.—The theoretical Scripture proof for the righteousness of faith promised to the Gentiles as well as the Jews, Enlargement of the Mosaic economy of particularism by the development of the germ-like universality of the Abrahamian religion. Survey: 1. Abraham's justification was a justification by faith, and excluded justification by works. It was therefore only a justification of the sinner, as is shown by the distinction pronounced by David (verses 1-8). The opposite is the Jewish righteousness of works. 2. It was independent of circumcision and the law. Abraham did not obtain the blessedness of justifying faith in circumcision, but in uncircumcision; circumcision was then added to it as a seal of justification. Abraham was thereby set forth to be the father of the faithful, as well of the uncircumcised as of the circumcised (verses 9-12). The opposite is Jewish particularism. 3. Justification is as universal as the promise, which constitutes even an antithesis to the law. Abraham's justification is to him and to his seed a promise of the inheritance of the world. This promise is not limited by the law. Such a limitation would make the promise void; for the law produces that wrath (�םי, which looks rather to the destruction than to the inheritance of the world. The promise is both conditioned and established by faith and grace (verses 13-17). The opposite is Jewish legalism. 4. Abraham and Christians have in reality the same righteousness of faith. The analogy between Abraham's faith and that of his believing children,—Christians; a. In relation to the same wonder-working God (God, p. 17); b. In relation to the same conduct of faith: looking away from the contradiction of the natural life; strong confidence in the Divine word of revelation and promise (verses 18-21). c. In reference to the same operation (verses 22-25). The opposite is the external and superficial contemptuation of the worldly sense,—Or also: a. The faith of Abraham (verses 17-22); b. Application to the faith of Christians (verses 23-25). The opposite, in general, is the hierarchical formalism and ceremonialism.

FIRST PARAGRAPH, VERS. 1-8.

Paul exhibits Abraham as a truly evangelical character, as a man of faith, in order to confirm the doctrine that the ground of our salvation lies not in us, but outside of us in the free grace of God, and that this must be apprehended first by faith, before we can do any good works. James, on the other hand (11. 21 ff.), in opposition to a barren orthodoxy and mere notional belief, represents Abraham as a man of holy obedience, who proved his faith by works. In the one case he appears as the champion of the righteousness of faith, in the other as the champion of the righteousness of life. Both views are right. Paul goes to the root of the matter, the vital principle, which animated Abraham; James looks at the fruit produced thereby. Faith and works, righteousness and holiness, are inseparable as light and heat, as the tree and the fruit, as cause and effect. Paul himself, after laying the only true foundation, as strongly insists upon a holy life as James. There is, in the Old Testament, an evangelical as well as a legal element; and the gospel, or promise, precedes the law which came in after the promise and the fulfilment (verse 90). Abraham represents the evangelical element, as Moses does the legal. Abraham's faith differs from the Christian faith, as the promise differs from the fulfilment of the gospel salvation, and as hope differs from fruition; but the essential element, the ethical key-note, in both is unconditional confidence and trust in God's truth and God's mercy.—P. S.]

Ver. 1. What, then, shall we say. The αὐτοί announces an inference from the previous statement (III, 29), that God is the God of the Jews as well as of the Gentiles, considered in relation to Abraham's history and its significance. But our inference is not a corroboration (Meyer), or conformation ab exemplo (Calvin). We have here rather a new proof, as deduced from the foregoing, namely, the explanation of Abraham's history and of David's words of faith. Likewise Tholuck observes, the αὐτοί cannot be explained if, in accordance with the view of recent expositors, this verse be connected immediately with verse 31 of the previous chapter. The construction: It may be asked, first, whether the question should be read as one question, or two? Grotius and others have placed an interrogation mark after ἡ ἐρωτήσεως, and thus made two questions out of the sentence. Then διακόνησιν is supplied to ἐν εἰσιν.—If the εἰσιν is taken absolutely, in the sense of the Grecian philosophy, this division could be made more easily. Yet the chief question here is not, what should be said, but what is Abraham's advantage?—It may further be asked, whether κατὰ σάρκα relates to προσπάθεια (πατέρα) or to ἐν εἰσιν. Lachmann's reading: τι ἐν ἐρωτήσεως εὐσκόρπια ἀπίτυς, &c., [see Textual Note 1], is the one most favored by the Codd. (A. C. D., &c., and also the Sin.). “The suspicion that the transposition of the κατὰ σάρκα (of such a question. rather.—P. S.) is to be laid to the charge of the copier, is strengthened when we see that such expositors as Chrysostom, Theophylact, Genadius in Cocomenius, who read εἰσιν κατὰ σάρκα, nevertheless connect the latter with πατέρα ἐρωτήσεως” (Tholuck, p. 167). De Wette, Meyer [Tholuck, Alford, Wordsworth, Hodge], and most commentators, with the Peshito, connect κατὰ σάρκα with εἰσιν, and not (according to Origen, Ambrose, Calvin, &c.) with πατέρα ἐρωτήσεως. But in verse 7 the subject is circumcision; while in verses 1-8, it is only the contrast between righteousness by works and righteousness by faith. Therefore, according to Meyer's construction, κατὰ σάρκα should correspond to the εἰσιν ἐρωτήσεως, yet not so that the two ideas should be identical, but that works should be embraced in the more general idea of κατὰ σάρκα. The σάρξ, in antithesis to the divine πνεῦμα, should then denote humanity given up to itself. Polagon, Ambrose, and others, refer κατὰ σάρκα still to circumcision. Rückert understands the word as embracing both circumcision and ἐρωτήσεως. While Tholuck consents to the now customary connection of the κατὰ σάρκα with ἐν εἰσιν, he does not grant that the works of faithful Abraham were ἐρωτήσεως κατὰ σάρκα; although Fritsch would include likewise the opera remati, as performed by men and not imputed by God, in the opera carnis; and Bullinger and others would make σάρξ equal to 

[Hodge quotes Calvin for the opposite view, explaining κατὰ σάρκα in the sense naturaliter, ex seipso. But Calvin goes on to say: "Probabile lamen est epistolae locis Patri conjungy;" and gives the preference to the construction with εἰσιν.—P. S.]

But Calvin on that point: "Sequitur ex ordine progressu, Quomodo Deus sanctificaret Abraham, qui...—Si quis..."
Tholuck, therefore arrives at the conclusion, that Paul did not design to apply Christian justification in all its consequences to the patriarch. But how could he represent him here as the father of the faithful, if he would belittle or limit his justification? We go upon the supposition that, in accordance with the best Cod., Ἰδοὺ δὲ παράστω σοί ἀπὸ τοῦ πατρὸς πάντων τῶν πατρίσιον, &c. (ver. 15), the principal subject is, therefore, Abraham, the natural ancestor of the Jews; and if it be asked, What hath he found? the emphasis rests on ὁ, and this refers to the ἀνακοινώσεως πιστεύων ἡμῶν (chap. iii. 28), and especially to ver. 29 also. As God is a God of the Jews and Gentiles, Abraham, the πατέρα of the Jews, has become a πατέρα of Jews and Gentiles.

Ver. 2. For if Abraham was justified [ἐν πίστει] by works [ἐν τῷ νόμῳ] (in the opinion of the Jews). The answer assumes that the view that Abraham was justified by the works of the law, was already denied in the question. Yet this very thing was believed by the legalistic Jews. "In the Talmud it is even deduced from Gen. xxvi. 5, that Abraham observed the whole Mosaic law." (Meyer.) The answer does not therefore assume an οὐδὲν [omitted before εἰ γὰρ] or an οὐδὲν-οὐδὲν (Tholuck), because it does not stand in connection with τις ἄνθρωπος [τις ἄνθρωπος, ? comp. Verbal Note 1—P. S.]

To the question, Which of the two kinds of righteousness? it assumes the conclusion, that it was not the imaginary righteousness of works, but the true righteousness of faith. The supposition is so plain, that the Apostle proceeds at once to the proof:—Was justified by works. The sense can be: if he should be so justified, it could only be as a human tribunal, and not at the tribunal of God—has been already described. But it can also be understood thus: if Abraham, according to the national prejudice of the Jews, has been really justified by works. This is the more obvious view. Conceding this kind of justification, Abraham has a κατάκεισαι (materiam gloriandii), but not before God. Not before God, first, because no flesh is justified by works in His sight (chap. iii. 20); second, because works from the human tribunal that Abraham was justified in God's sight, or at His tribunal, the ἀνακοινώσεως is made by Beza, Grotius, and others, to refer to a general opinion pronounced on Abraham; but by Calvin, Calov., and others, to an imaginary opinion, under the supposition of an incomplete conclusion (the major: he who is justified by works hath whereof to glory. The minor: but not before God. The necessary concluding statement: therefore Abraham is not justified by works.

* (Meyer quotes Kudbow, f. 83; 1 Rom. f. 28; 1; Bereh., rabbi, f. 57, 4. Tholuck says: "The justification of Abraham before God was a locus communis of Jewish theology." P. K.)

† (Calvin's interpretation is given by him (ad Rom. iv. 2) in these words: "Epiceremis [ἐπερείμπην, an attempted proof on the opposite ground] et de inaniter ratius, quoniam in hanc formam colligit debet: Si Abraham speritus justificatus est, potest quo morte gloruitur; sed non habet nocumentum sibi. Abhinc non ex speritus justificatus est. Ilia memoriam tribulat. Sed non omnes Deum, est minor proposito sagittans. Haec uterrum debet conclusio quia spermatum, tametam a Paulo non expressa."

Similarity Fritzsche: "Si suis bona facta Dei Dóbem modo est, habes, quod apud Deum gloruitur . . . sed non habes, quod apud Deum gloruitur, quam libera, proprii strom, non proprius pulchro facta sunt Deo probatus . . . itur igitur ab ob bene facta Deo probatus." So also Krause.
yet, under the supposition of the substantial identity between the faith of Abraham and that of Christians, we shall need to lay stress on the difference in form: The faith of Abraham is the essential beginning of the specific faith of salvation in the Old Testament; the faith of Paul and his companions is the completion of the same in the New. Faith in general, as well as in each of its particular parts, undergoes a great metamorphosis in its passage from that initial point to this terminal point.

But it remains the same faith in substance. And the peculiarity of this substance is, that the Divine object, and its human organic reception, constitute an indissoluble christological synthesis. The objective parts are: 

1. The personal God of revelation in His revelation; and especially as the creative, wonder-working God, who can call forth new salvation and life; 
2. His word of promise; 
3. The import of His word of promise—the future salvation of the nations with the seed of Abraham. Corresponding with these, are the subjective parts: 

1. The living knowledge, perception, and reception of the revealed God; 
2. Confident submission to the word of promise, against all the contradiction of sense and worldly appearance; 
3. The appropriation of the object of the promise as the principle and energy of the renewed life.

The operations correspond to this harmony of object and subject: 1. Justification. Freedom of conscience before God, according to the measure of the condemnation of conscience. The peace of God, Gen. xv. 2. The sacramental, symbolical seal, Gen. xvii., see ver. 11. 3. Confidence, and acquisition of new life from condemnation to death, or even from death itself—internal death.

All these separate parts exist as gerns in Abraham's faith. De Wette, after an ill-founded remark on the Apostle's arbitrary dialectics and scriptural application, admirably says: "When the Apostle in this way unites the climax of religious development with the historical point of connection—for the developing series commenced with Abraham—he gives evidence of great historical penetration." Comp. the Commentary on Genesis, iv. 6.

Ver. 4. Now to the workman [τὸ ἐργαζόμενον. Lange: Dem aber, welcher den Werkdienst treibt]. The statements of vers. 6 and 7 are two sentences, which establish the doctrine of justification by faith, as well as in its divine as in its human character. The work does not reach up to God, His grace, or His heaven; but it belongs to the sphere of gain, and makes the remunerator the debtor—which cannot be said of God without impiety. But as God's grace is exalted above the claims of merit, so is man's faith exalted. The believer does not rely on merit, but on the gracious strength of Him who justifies the ungodly, and he receives the righteousness in proportion to his faith. The first sentence establishes negatively, that Abraham, according to his relation to God, could not be justified by works; the second sentence establishes positively, that justification presupposes a reception of God's grace to the sinner. It is therefore clearly intimated that Abraham was a sinner; besides, the introduction of David and his testimony proves conclusively that the justification is that of the sinner. But the root of the antithesis is in the ἐργαζόμενος and the μὴ ἐργαζόμενος; it is the continuation of the contrast in chaps. 2, 7, 8. Those who strive unceasingly, seek God as their only end; but partisans oppose God by their claims. The ἐργαζόμενος is not "the active man, whose characteristic is works" (Meyer), but he whose righteousness consists only of works, who relies on the merit of his works, and whose basis of confidence and pride are works. Therefore, his counterpart is not an ὡς ἐργαζόμενος, but a μὴ ἐργαζόμενος.
make of his external work. Therefore, the mere worker becomes a culpable debtor in the judgment of God. Faith is the return to the normal relation with God. Here God is the absolute majesty, the justifier, the source, the giver of all things, the infinitely merciful; and before Him the believer stands in the sense of absolute need, dependence, poverty, impurity, and guilt. But when the believer commits himself to the burning and delivering arms of God's love, his guilt vanishes as the cloud before the sun.—Not according to grace, but according to (as a) debt. The ἀφανίσεως really declines grace; he claims a reward for his merit. And in the same way will his reward be reckoned according to his debt. *Ὁστίς ἡμῶν, the débatum, according to the relations of reward.—It is plain that such a relation did not apply to Abraham, from the fact that, according to ver. 3, he obtained God's grace; and this in a definite case, where the question could not be one of merit (Gen. xv.).

Ver. 5. But to him that worketh not (for hire), &c. Meyer properly remarks, in opposition to Reiche, who refers the statement directly to Abraham,* that the sentence is a locus communis, and that it is left to the reader whether he will include Abraham or not. But according to Paul, Abraham has certainly included himself. In the same way, Meyer properly observes that ἀφανίσεως, ungodly, must not be diluted into ἀφανεία, unreasonable. Faith perceives that the foundation of the ἀφανεία is the ἀφανίσεως (chap. i. 21), alienation from God; and, because of its deeper knowledge of sin, applies to the grace of God. The προστίμονα ἐκ τινα cannot merely denote a faith in the direction toward something, but only self-subjection on the ground of God's grace (Acts xvi. 31, &c.).

Ver. 6. Even as David. The introduction of David completely establishes the fact that the justification of man is a justification of the sinner, and that the believer perceives his sins; for, in relation to David, both his guilt and pardon were conceded by the Jews. And now David must also testify to this truth. Even as (καί ὡς ἀποκρισία) indicates that David is quoted for the elucidation and proof of what has been said already in vers. 4 and 5. He is quoted, not as a universal example of justification in general, but in special proof that it is such a justification of the sinner as excludes the works of merit. [Vers. 7 and 8 prove clearly that the forgiveness of sins belongs to justification; but this is only the negative part, with which is inseparably connected the positive part, namely, the imputation and application of the righteousness of Christ, and this contains the germ and power of sanctification.—P. S.] Tholuck: "By the negative statement, Calvin was led to insist that the idea of the justification is exhausted with the condonatio pecatorum (Inst. iii. 11). The same thing is done by the Protestant doctrinal theology before the Formula Concordia—which first expressly added the νεωσία—which is really included therein." Compare, however, the Heidelberg Catechism, Question 60.† The beatitude from Ps. xxiii. 1 and 2 is quoted from the Septuagint. [See Textual Note.] The choice of verbs in ver. 7 corresponds to the substantives. The ἀφανίσεως is a debt doomed to prison; it is released, and thus abolished; the ἀφανεία is the ground of it, and is covered from God's eye (Acts ii. 22, 23)—that is, abolished by Him.

SECOND PARAGRAPH (VERB. 9-12).

Justification applies also to the Gentiles. It is a justification for all.

Ver. 9. (Is) this blessedness [ὅ μαρτυρίον, the pronouncing happy, congratulation, Selig- preisung], then, upon the circumcision? The question now is, whether the beatitude described by David applies only to the Jews. The expositors have supplied different words: Tholuck [Stuart, Philippus, Meyer, ed. 4.]; and others, ἱερος; Meyer [Fritzsche, De Wette, Alford, Hope]; ἱερετας [comp. Heb. vii. 18; Mark ix. 12], with reference to ver. 8 (others, πιστις [Theophyliac]; ἱερετας [Eiconomus]; ἱερετις [Olshausen]; ἱερετας). The ἱερετας has less foundation than ἱερος. [It is always safer to supply the simplest word.] P. S.—Or also upon the uncircumcision? The question of the apostle to the uncircumcision is to be understood in the exclusive sense: upon the circumcision only. [Some MSS. add μόνον.—P. S.]—For we say. The γάρ presupposes that the Apostle has already mentally expected an affirmative reply to the question, Or upon the uncircumcision also? [The form of the question, too, with ἔτι, presupposes an affirmative answer to the second clause, and this implied affirmation is made the ground of the argument, vers. 10-12. De Wette and Alford.—P. S.] The τὸ ἀγαθία is certainly emphatic, as Fritzsche, De Wette [Alford], and others, maintain, though Meyer denies it; for the whole of the following argument proceeds from the person of Abraham. [For we say that to Abraham faith was reckoned for righteousness.—P. S.]

Ver. 10. Not in circumcision, but. According to Gen. xv., Abraham was justified about fourteen years before his circumcision, Gen. xvii. [Consequently, the circumcision was not the efficient cause and condition, but the Divine ratification of grace already received.—P. S.]

Ver. 11. And he received a sign of circumcision [και ἀνωπείαν ἐλαφρος πιθοτύγχανος]. Genitive of apposition [και, a sign which consisted in circumcision. Van Hengel and Hofmann, preferring the reading πιθοτύγχανος, explain: As a sign he received circumcision, as a seal (σημαίνοντας εἰς σημαίνοντας). Meyer objects that

thus: *How art thou righteous before God? Answer: Only by true faith in Jesus Christ. That is: although my conscience accuses me, that I have grievously sinned against all the commandments of God, and have never kept any of them, and that I am still prone to all evil, yet God, without any merit of mine, of mere grace, granteth and imputeth to me the perfect satisfaction, righteousness, and holiness of Christ, as if I had never committed nor had any sin, and had myself accomplished all the obedience which Christ has fulfilled for me, if I only accept such benefit with a believing heart.*

* [This must refer to a former edition; for, in the 4th ed. of 1855, Meyer gives the preference to kore: *Alt dat me recht veronrechtende Verbond wil om allencket een gedacht (vgl. Hebr. ii. 9, 10a iv. 33, alt.); woniger achteloget ιερετης vor μόνον.—P. S.]

† (The words are simply rhetorical and euphonic, and give no emphasis to σημαίνοντας. See Tholuck and Philippus.—P. S.)
in the first case, σήμειον, in the second, πιστολόγιον, ought to have the article, and explains: Ein Zeichen mit welchem er durch die Beschneidung versehen ward, empyning er als Siegel—i. e., a sign, with which he was provided in circumcision, he received as seal. But the article is sometimes omitted where the reference is specific, and where there is no danger of mistake; comp. Winer, p. 118 f. σημεῖον, sign, token, symbol, γῆς. Circumcision was the sign of the covenant God made with Abraham, Gen. xvii. 11; God, on His part, promising the Messianic κηρύγγιον (Gen. xv. 18), and Abraham, on his part, excising the obedience of faith which was reckoned to him for righteousness (Gen. xx. 6). Hence Paul represents it as a seal of the righteousness of faith. This was not only a "legitimate dogmatic inference" (Mayer), but, as Tholuck remarks, a historical necessity, since the sign of the covenant was granted in consequence of the faith previously shown. 

—P. S. —The seal. The seal denotes here the symbolical and sacramental sealing; from this, the real sealing of Abraham, which was given him after the offering of Isaac, Gen. xxii. 1, is still to be distinguished (see the Bibliotheca on Genesis xxii.). "It is also represented in the Talmud as the sign and seal of the covenant. See Schützgen and Wetstein in loc. These words belong to the formula of circumcision: 'Beneficium sit, qui sanctificaret silectum ab utero, et signum (R.N.) ponit in carne, et filios suos sigillavit (σημεῖον) sigmo federis sancti,' Berachoth, f. xiii. 1." Mayer [footnote]. Christian writers [Acta Thoma, § 26; Grahe, Spicileg. Pair. 1, p. 333] speak in the same way of the water of baptism as a seal 

νεφελης τον λαον. A seal here means a mark of Divine ratification of a judgment already received, a "seal the act," not a "pignus rei agendae," comp. 1 Cor. ix. 2; 2 Tim. ii. 19. We have here an intimation of the true idea of sacraments: they are signs, seals, and means of grace, but not the grace itself. Circumcision is not the covenant, neither is baptism regeneration. A sign and seal can never be the substitute for the thing signed and sealed, nor should it be made a ground of confidence and hope; but it is all-important as a Divine ratification, and gives, so to say, legal validity to our claims, as the governmental seal to a written instrument. Without the seal of circumcision, Abraham would have had no certain guarantee of the Divine favor; and if justification by faith is abstractly separated from the church and the means of grace, it becomes a subjective fiction of man. 

—P. S. —That he might be the father. The spiritual father is meant here. Abraham is the father of faith. "The conception of author, flounder, is also contained in that of father," comp. Joh. xxxviii. 28; Gen. iv. 21; 1 Macc. ii. 54. Tholuck. —On the idea of Abraham's spiritual children, see Matt. iii. 9; John viii. 37, 38. Gal. iii. 8, 29, is a parallel. —That righteousness might be reckoned also to them. This means the sense in which Abraham, as a believing Gentile, has become the father of believing Gentiles.

**Ver. 12. And the father of circumcision. Prominence is here given to the life of faith, the proof of faith, in connection with circumcision for faith.** We remark on the language: 1. τό τῆς αἰωνίας αἰωνίου must be mentally repeated after καί. 2. τός, his definite common [for those], comes in the place of faith. 3. Instead of άλλα καί τός, στοιχεῖον, we should expect ἄλλα καί στοιχεῖον without the article. Tholuck: "The καί τός is an anapæstic solecism in the Apostle's language." Theodore, Hervaeus, Luther, and others, have assumed a transposition: τοῖς οἴν, instead of οί τοίς. Meyer and Tholuck reject this. Rückert defends the supposition of a transposition; Fritzsche excuses the article; Reiche defends it [so does Stuart; both regard it as a resumption of the sentence begun with the preceding τοῖς, and interrupted by the οίν, to πιστολόγιον μόνον, άλλα καί—P. S.]. It may be asked, whether τοῖς αἰωνίοις πιστολόγιον, άλλα καί οί στοιχεῖον should be said. And this would certainly be practicable, if we could place διά τοῖς ἀπόστολοι πρίονον. They are not only the people of the circumcision, but also those who walk, &c. The faith of the real Jews is not only here made prominent, but also their life of faith; no doubt with reference to the fact that these believing Jews, like Abraham, should be the humane publishers of salvation to the Gentiles. [τοῖς ἰνακιστ., the dative after εἰσάγειν is not local, but associative; comp. Gal. v. 16, 26; vi. 16; Phil. iii. 16; Mayer.—P. S.]

**Third Paragraph (Vers. 12-17).**

**Ver. 13. For not through (the law) is the promise to Abraham, or to his seed, that he should be the heir of the world.** (See Gal. iii.) Ver. 13 does not simply establish the preceding (Meyer), since that is established of itself. The foregoing statement is indeed strengthened by the discussion which now follows (therefore: for); but the latter also sets forth a new privilege of the righteousness of faith, namely, its release from the law. See De Wette.—Not through the law. The law declared only the possession of Canaan by the Jews; but the promise which Abraham received pledged him to his and his believing children the whole earth as an inheritance. —Through the law; that is, not per justitiam legis (Pareus, and others), but with the Mosaic legislation. [De Wette and Alford: "αἰὼν γὰρ, not, 'under the law,' nor, 'by works of the law,' nor, 'by the righteousness of the law'; but, through the law, so that the law should be the ground, or efficient cause, or medium, of the promise."—P. S.]—The promise (το σήμειον) to Abraham, or to his seed. This is the great Messianic ἑκάστεια καὶ ἐκάστου. The 5, or expresses the indivisibility of the promise to Abraham and his seed—that is, his believing seed (Gal. iii. 9)—and cannot be replaced by καί, or be divided thus: neither to Abraham nor his seed (Meyer). Abraham inherits with his seed, and his seed inherits with Abraham (see Matt. viii. 11; Heb. xi.). According to Estius, Olshausen, and others, the seed is Christ, conformably to Gal. iii. 16. Meyer says: "Not Christ," which is just as incorrect as the limitation of the seed to Christ.—That he should be the heir of the world [το δέ κηρύγγιον αὐτοῦ ἐπαγαγέτης καὶ κύριος]. The το introduces an explanatory declaration of the import of the promise. The αὐτός refers to Abraham, because he, in his person, represents also his seed. "In the promises, Gen. xiii. 15; xvii. 6; xxii. 17, 18, the blessing bestowed on Abraham in chap. xii. is expressly transferred to his seed; Tholuck asks: May it have been so now, Where has the promise of the possession of the world been given to Abraham? The promises which the Old Testament furnishes in reference to the hereditary
The possession of Abraham seems to include only the land of Canaan; Gen. xii. 7: "Unto thy seed will I give this land" (Canaan); chap. xiii. 14, 15: "Lift up now thine eyes, and look from the place where thou art, northward, and southward, and eastward, and westward: for all the land that the sun riseth upon, shall be thine and thy seed forever;" chap. xv. 18: "From the river of Egypt unto the great river, the river Euphrates;" chap. xvii. 8: "All the land of Canaan;" chap. xxii. 17: "Thy seed shall possess the gate of his enemies" (comp. chap. xxvi. 3, the repetition of the promise to Isaac; and Exod. vi. 4, the legal establishment). In all these there is no promise of the inheritance of the world. It is not correct to consider σώματος and πηγάς as identical. Thus Meyer says: "The hereditary possession of the land of Canaan, which was promised to Abraham and his posterity (Gen. xii. 7, &c.), was regarded in the Jewish chrestology as the ground work of the world by the Messianic theology, which was supposed to be typically indicated in Gen. xxii. 'Abraham patri meo Deos pessidandum dedit celem et terram;" Tanchum. p. 165, 1; see above. The idea of the Messianic supremacy of the world, which underlies this Jewish partialistic view, is not set aside in the New Testament, but it is brought out by Christ Himself (Matt. v. 5) in allegorical form (Matt. xix. 28 ff.; Luke xxii. 30; Matt. xxv. 21), divested of its Judaistic notion, and elevated to christological truth. It is necessary, because of the universal sovereignty to which Christ Himself is exalted (Matt. xxvi. 18; John xvii. 5; Phil. ii. 9; Eph. iv. 10, &c.) and because of the necessary communion between His disciples and Himself."

But we can hardly suppose that the Apostle would here apply against the Jews the promise of the land of Canaan to the Jews, in its higher signification. We must keep in view the significant passage, Gen. xxii. 17, 18: "Blessing I will bless thee, and multiplying I will multiply thy seed as the stars of the heaven, and as the sand which is upon the sea-shore; and thy seed shall possess the gate of his enemy. And in thy seed shall all the nations of the earth be blessed." Here we have the germ of the same promise (Origen, Chrysostom, Bengel, and others). Superiority is declared by the very position of the one who blesses, and the earth itself is meant by the nations of the earth. Touluck remarks, on the contrary, that we must not understand the σώματα itself, so far as it is led to faith, and that this cannot be regarded at once as κληρονόμοι and κληρονομία. But the σώματα, as the organism of the world's conversion, must be distinguished from the σώμα, as the converted world. God is the inheritance of believers, as believers are the inheritance of God. De Wette, in summing up the different explanations, says: "κληρονόμοι τοῦ κόσμου is not an indefinite allegorical expression, but the reception of all nations into the theocracy (MelANCHTHON, BEXI, Bengel, Chrysostom, Theodoret, &c.); not the possession of Canaan and some adjacent countries, 'qum felicitas arcanam generat ina- quisim aeternam felicitatis' (Grotius); nor of the earth (Rosenmüller, Koppen, Köllner, Rickert), in the sense of the political sovereignty of the world; nor is it a possession of the future world (Calov.); still less of the beneficia spiritualis (Bald.), or sub typo terrae Canaan non modo speraret virum, sed plena et solida Dei benedictio (Galvin), but it is the dominion over the world, which shall be subordinated to Christ and the Christians (Reiche, Meyer, Frizthese)." Obviously too many negations!—We must bear in mind, that in the Messianic promise given to Abraham, the struggle and the dominion are indicated only finally; the chief idea is the blessing. If all the nations of the earth were to be really blessed by Abraham's seed, then his seed must be able to dispose of a world of blessing. [The promise will be literally fulfilled when the kings of the world must be subject to the people of the Most High, and Christ will rule with His saints forever and ever; Dan. vii. 27; Apoc. x. 10; xii. 10; Matth. v. 5; 2 Tim. ii. 12.—P. S.]—"By the righteousness of faith. This was the fundamental gift by which the promise of the world was conditioned. Meyer thinks, because of the date of the justification, Gen. xv. [i. e., after the promise had been given; Gen. xi. 7; xii. 16.—P. S.], Paul must have here in mind only the later date. [Wisdom 18. xiv. 18, xvi. 8, where the promise is repeated.—P. S.] But, according to Gen. xii., Abraham's life of faith had begun at the time of his emigration. [The faith of Abraham covered the whole period of the promise, which was made and repeatedly confirmed to his faith.—P. S.]

Ver. 14. For if they who are of the law. Proof that Abraham's believing children, but not they who, in contrast with them, rely on the law and its deeds, shall inherit the world. The νόμος, according to Flatt, the moral law; according to Meyer, the Mosaic law; both, according to Touluck. The Apostle is certainly not concerned here exclusively with the idea of the Mosaic νόμος, as such, but rather with the idea of the legal standpoint, or of the law, considered abstractly in itself, and in contrast with the promise. And it may be said of the natural moral law, too, that it wrought wrath. οἱ ξυν νόμου are not people who are still under the law as such, but whose life-principle is the law, and who wish to be justified by the law. [οἱ ξυν νόμου, those of law = adherents of the law, legalists. This phrase is of frequent occurrence; comp. οἱ ξυν ἀπόστολοι, those of self-seeking = self-seeking partisans; ii. 8; οἱ ξυν προφητῶν, the circumcised; iv. 12; Tit. i. 10; Acts x. 49; xi. 2; οἱ ξυν ασανδρῶν, those of the law; xvii. 9; Rom. iv. 16; οἱ ξυν Ἰαγωβ, the Israelites; Rom. ix. 6, &c.; comp. Xenoph. Anab. i. 2, 18, οἱ ξυν ἀκριβῶς, the market people. The proposition ξυν (out of) indicates here the origin and character.—P. S.]—"Be heirs, faith is made void. At the time when this decisive word was uttered, it had not only a great spiritual, but also a great prophetic meaning. Judging from external signs, it was more probable that the Jews, rather than the Christians, would inherit the earth. They had a powerful prominence, wide dissemination, and synagogues all over the world. But the Apostle was sure of his cause, and wished clearly to distinguish the future of faith from the future of that darkened legalism. Yet his thought is not: if the legalists are heirs, believers cannot be; but, if the legalists are heirs, there will be no inheritance of the promise at all. Faith is made void—that is, it loses its import, the righteousness of faith—by wrath in the midst of the Gentiles; the promise is made powerless by the wrath of historical judgments, because it was only intended for faith."

Ver. 15. Because the law worketh wrath.
The operation of the law is to reveal sin and to represent it, as transgression, as well in the conscience as in the life itself. Therefore it produces wrath, which, according to the Divine sentence and government, bursts forth from the internal and external life as the severe judgment of dissolution and of death. For where there is no law, neither is there transgression (of the law); and where there is no transgression, there is no wrath. But inversely, the law fully reveals transgression, and, with transgression, wrath and condemnation to death. This proof that we have here is essentially negative. This operation is meant to apply first of all to the Mosaic law, as is proved by Rom. v. 13, 14, particularly by the distinction between ἁμαρτία and παραδίκης (see 1 Tim. ii. 14; Gal. iii. 19). Tholuck quotes Augustine: "Sine leges potest esse quis iniquus, sed non praeventor." and says that "this difference has generally been observed ever since. But where it has not been observed, such παραδίκην δὲν αὐτοί ἔλλογον μή ἄνωτος νόμον, can be understood only relatively of a less quantity of guilt, as is proved by the judgment of the Deluge, and other judgments. He quotes Thomas Aquinas: "Et tamen nonne precatum potest dici praeventarium in quantum legem naturalem transgressit?" (But The has added: "Gravius tamen est transgressum simul legem naturalem et legem scriptam, quam solam legem naturae. Et ida leges datae erit praeventarium et majorem eram promeruit.") Yet the έλλογον of chap. v. 13 is to be emphasized so as to denote God's real reckoning with the sinner by His law, which first causes the natural punishment of the sinner to appear the clear blaze of wrath. Man can obtain salvation only by this passage through the judgment of death. For this reason the Apostle does not deny the necessity of the law; but with him it is a means for an end, and constitutes the pedagogic point of transition for the pious under the law (κατὰ νόμον, chap. vi. 14, 15). But people of the law (οἱ κατὰ νόμον), who seek justification εἰς νόμον (chap. iv. 2) because they are in feeling διὰ νομίμων (chap. ii. 8), make the means an end. They seek their life in the single precept and observance of the law, in the possession of the law, and in the settlement of their account with God; and by this course they find their existence in the fire of wrath, but, unlike the sinner, they find no comfort in the fire. They do not make the law their preparation for faith, but the antithesis of faith; and they endeavor, by the fire of their fanaticism, to entice from a joyous and bright life those who are happy in faith, and to draw them into their own gloomy heat. For other explanations of ὅργανον see Tholuck. Concerns: The ceremonial law is the emana-

of wrath. J. Müller: ὅργανον must be understood subjectively—the consciousness of wrath; Ma.-Lancthon: The ὅργανον is the sinner's wrath toward the avenging God.

Ver. 16. Therefore it is of faith. The inference from vers. 14, 15. That cannot be; therefore this must stand true. "Ex πίστεως... Supply: ἡ λεγομένη γίνεται (Benz, Beugel); ἡ ἀπαντήσεις ἐκ τοῦ Ἰησοῦ... (Lange, Tholuck in earlier editions, and others); ἐναποκαλομένη (Luther); or, better, οἱ λεγομένοι (Meyer, De Wette, and Tholuck, referring to ver. 14, where ἐκ πίστεως and ἐν τοῖς ὄνομασι appear as an ethнoic). This last seems the most appropriate; ye, in ver. 14, is read not ἐκ λεγομένων, but ἐκ τοῖς ὄνομασι—λεγομένωσι; and further on it is ἐκ πίστεως. Therefore, we must merely supply either λεγομένωσι or ὄνώσατο.—That it might be by grace. Faith is here plainly denoted the homogeneous organ of grace. It is grace, and not man's faith, that is the source of that general surety of God's promise; but grace makes faith the organ, just as wrath manifests itself in the work of the law. ὄνωσι denotes the consciusness of the principle of faith, which certainly rests upon a Divine determination. The lack supplies ὅνωσα.

In order that the promise might be sure to all the seed [τοις τοῖς βίβλοις της ἐπιγραφῆς πατήρ τις σπῆφα]. The τοις denotes the result designed by God—that the promise of His grace be communicated to faith. By this determination the fact is secured, that the promise holds good for his collective seed, whatever that is, in his entire spiritual po-

sity. —Not to that only which is of the law, ἢκ. The τοις τοῖς νόμον denotes here the historical origin of the whole body of faithful Jews. The τοις τοῖς πίστεως, as antithesis, denotes the faithful Gentiles. They form a totality by which Abraham is the father of all (see vers. 11, 12). Ver. 17. As it is written. Gen. xvii. 5; where a natural possession of many nations is promised to Abraham in relation to his name. Yet this promise has its ground in his faith (vers. 18, 19), and hence Paul very properly regarded it as the type of his spiritual posterity. The spiritual relation is also implied in the Divine appointment, τοιμασθείσα.—It was in the sight of him whom he believed [κατανεμαντον οὐ κατεστάνσανθε θεον]. On account of the connection with what has preceded, the difficult word κατανεμαντον must be here explained [as far as the construction is concerned]. 1. Luther follows the reading καταστάσας [before God, whom thou hast believed] of the Cod. F. G. It, and others, and finds here a continuation of God's words. An attempt to explain the connection, 2. Bretschneider: "in view of which word," οὐκ εἰς αἴτημα. 3. Meyer, Tholuck [Alford, Hodge], and others: The quotation, καταστάντον οὖν καταστάσας, is paraletic. I. So also in the E.-version, καταστάντον καταστάσας must be connected with ἐκ τοῖς πάντων ημῶν [i. e., Abraham is the father of us all, not physically, but spiritually, in the sight and estimation of God, with whom there are no obstacles of nature or time.—P. S.] Meyer [and also Winer, Gramm., p. 156, 7th ed.] thus resolves the attraction: καταστάντον τοῦ θεοῦ, καταστάντον οὖν καταστάσας [i. e., before God, before whom, or, in whose sight he believed], according to the analogical attraction of Luke i. 4; and rejects the more common resolution [adopted also by Fritzsche] of the attraction καταστάσας τοῦ θεοῦ, οὖν καταστάσας [before God, whom he believed—a form of attraction with the dative, which is very unusual; see Winer, p. 156, and Meyer in loc.—P. S.] See Meyer, for other attempts at construction. But what are we to

[Abraham, αὐγήθευς = ἀβαγήθευς, father of a multitude, the new significant name given to Abraham by God, Gen. xii. 2, 3, father of elevation, high father, Gen. xvii. 5. 18.—P. S.]

[Longe makes a period after the quotation from Gen. xvii. 5, and then translates: Angestütz [towards] des Guten, denn er Gott beliebt. He supplies further, and commences here a new paragraph. See his interpretation below. —P. S.]
understand by the expression; he is the father of us all before God? The idea of a substitution by Abraham, which might easily be inferred from the language, would be foreign to the Apostle. 4. We supply ἐγνώριον [before καταίγαι], and explain thus: As it is written, "I have made thee a father of many nations," it took place in the presence of God, or, it came to pass there, in the place where he stood believing on God, that he was made the father of many nations; before Him, namely, God, &c. He who is justified, who receives God's promise, stands before God. [Philippi, without parenthetical καταίγαι—ας, supplies after this quotation: And as such—viz, as father of nations—he stands in the sight of God, &c.—P. S.]

FOURTH PARAGRAPh (VERs. 17-22).


Ver. 17. Before him whom he believed, even God. Explanations of coram [καταίγαι], literally, doubtless, refers to, like, the classical καταίγαιον; then = καταίγαι coram, so here, and often in the LXX, for "εἰς... P. S.]: 1. According to the will (Reiche). 2. According to the decision (Rückert, and others). 3. Vt aquire potestate divina (Koppe). 4. Before God's omniscience (Olschhausen). 5. Meyer [p. 173, footnote]: "We must leave it without explanation. Abraham is represented as standing before God who has appeared to him." But it denotes the first element of the Abrahamic faith. Abraham, as the friend of God, stands in the view of the living God of revelation, the speaking God, who is at the same time the God of miracles and new creations; and it is while Abraham is there, that he is appointed the father of many nations. (Theodoret, Theophylact, and others, have explained καταίγαι as equal to ἱστορίαν; Grotius has divided the sentence into question and answer; see Meyer).—Καταίγαι, standing before Him, he believed the promise on the spot.

Who quickeneth the dead. [The present tense ἐκοποιοῦσατος καὶ καλοῦσατος is used to indicate the continued manifestation of God's creative power in every physical and in every spiritual birth.—P. S.]: "The ἐκοποιοῦσατος τοῖς νεκροῖς is the solemn characteristic of the omnipotent God," says Meyer. The doctrine of the omnipotence of God, as the wonder-working power of God it revelation, has been directed from the beginning to the consummation of the revelation in the visibility of Christ, and subsequently to the special and general resurrection (Eph. i. 19 ff.). This is evident from those passages of the Old Testament which represent the wonder-working power of God as a power to bring the dead to life, produced by it (Deut. xxxii. 29; 1 Sam. ii. 6; Ism. xxvi. 19; iiiii. 10; Ezek. xxxvii. 1 ff.; Hosea xiii. 14; Dan. xii. 1, 2; comp. Book of Wisdom, xvi. 15; Tobit xiii. 2; John v. 21; 2 Cor. i. 9; I Tim. vi. 13). The Apostle, with profound penetration, sees this miraculous power which raises the dead to life, foreshadowed already in the promise of Isaac. For he does not have in view the offering of Isaac (according to Erasmus, Grotius, Baumgarten-Crusius), although the stronger expression seems to have been selected also with reference to that last believing act of Abraham. Neither is the awakening of the spiritually dead chiefly meant (according to Origen, Anselm, and others). Nevertheless, we would not, with Meyer, altogether reject these explanations as false; for the external awakenings stand in the most intimate reciprocal relation with the internal. In fact, the former are generally conditioned by the latter; as we see that Abraham had to believe first in the promise given to him.

And calleth his things, which are not, as though they were [literally, calling things not being, as being, καλοῦσατος τὰ μὴ ὄντα ὡς ὄντα. Τὰ μὴ ὄντα differs from τῶν ὃν ὄντα in that it presents the non-existence as conditional: if they are not; or as relatively only, inasmuch as all things preexist ideally and subjectively in the Divine mind before they are created and set forth objectively.—P. S.]. Two explanations: —1. Reference to the creative agency of God (Tholuck, and most expositors). Καλεῖν often denotes God's creative call, to summon into being, into existence (Isa. xii. 4; xlvii. 13; 2 Kings viii. 1; Book of Wisdom, xvi. 25; comp. Ps. xxxii. 9). Philo [De creat. princ. p. 728 B.]: τὰ μὴ ὄντα καλεῖναι εἰς τὸ ὄν. This explanation admits of several modifications: a. The first creative act is thought of (Estius). b. God's continued creation is in mind (Schlieren: reference to the particip. pres.). c. A constant attribut. of God is employed (Tholuck). Meyer holds that this whole interpretation is destroyed by the ὡς ὄντα; for, in the New Testament, ὡς is nowhere the same as ἐκ. Yet Tholuck adduces proof in favor of the signification εἰς τὸ ὄντα ὡς ὄντα. [He refers to 1 Cor. i. 8; 2 Cor. iii. 6; 1 Thess. v. 23; Jude 24. Comp. Phil. iii. 21, where the accusative σύνεραγωγήν, like unto his glorious body, is the accusative of effect = so as to be like.—P. S.]. De Wette: ὡς ὄντα can indeed not be a substitute for εἰς ὄντα = εἰς τὸ ὄντον, but it can be a substitute for ἐκ ὄντας, or for εἰς τὸ ὄντον ὡς ὄντα (Reiche, and others). 2. Meyer, and others (Rückert, Philippi): Who pronounces his enacting command over what does not exist, as what over what does exist. It is not necessary to prove that, even in reference to the creation, this is the full sense (see Heb. xi. 3); the ideal preexistence of things in the mind of God is therewith introduced. Nevertheless, the idea of the καλεῖν as a call into existence, or into appearance—must be retained. Meyer holds that the things which are not, that God called into existence, are, according to Gen. xxv., the posterity [Or three, rather; but the third, which refers καλεῖν to the effectual calling of unborn men by the Holy Spirit, and explains: "God calls to be it children those who were not children," is entirely foreign to the context. It is strange that even the rationalistic Eitscheke explains: "καλεῖναι νομίμων νικούσας εἰς καταλαμβάνειν εἰς ἀποδέχεσθαι νόμιμα. Τὸ δὲ καθολικὸν καὶ πρόγνωμα τοῦ θεοῦ προφέρεται τὴν καλεῖσθαι τὰ προ τοιάσθαι, ἀλλὰ ἐκείνα, ἱνα τοῖς παθοῦσιν τὸν χειραμώμενον τὸν κόσμον, τὸ νομίμον εἰς τὸ νωπόν. Ἡ δὲ γηγορία καὶ πρόγνωμα τοῦ θεοῦ προφέρεται τῇ καλεῖσθαι τὰ προ τοιάσθαι, ἀλλὰ μή καναν εἰς τοιαύτα."

[Tholuck doubts that καλεῖν, ἐκάλεσε, over means, to command, to dispose of; but comp. Ps. 1. 1; Isa. xi. 9; xiv. 3; xlviii. 3. Meyer and Philippi quote two striking parallel passages in Ps. 1. 1, Deut. 32. 14, 44, 45, where he speaks of the imagination as forming τὰ μὴ ὄντα ὡς ὄντα, and Artemidorus, i. 58, where it is said of the painter that he raised the unknown to the known in his productions. To these quotations I may add the famous lines of Shakespeare in the creative power of the poet's genius (Midsummer-Night's Dream, Act v. Scene 1): "The poet's eye, in a fine frenzy rolling, Doth glance from heaven to earth, from earth to heaven. And, as imagination bodies forth, The forms of things unknown; the poet's pen Turns them to shapes, and gives to airy nothing A local habitation and a name."—P. S.]
of Abraham. But Abraham's faith undoubtedly presupposed earlier deeds of omnipotence. The elements of God's creative power, and of His renewing power, are comprehended together in the conception of His miraculous power. The creative word is a symbol and pledge of every new creative word which is spoken subsequently.

Ver. 18. Who against hope believed in hope [δια παραμετρον εις ελπίδον επισκέψεως]. Faith in miracles, which is itself a miracle, corresponds to the absolute God who works all miracles. Established on the ground of hope, he believed against the appearance of hope. Meyer solves the oxymoron incorrectly: Abraham's faith was against hope in an objective relation, and yet it was established on hope in a subjective relation. Tholuck's view is better: His faith is a "You" established on the word of God, in opposition to the No" in the sphere of finite causes. 'Επισκέψεως, 1 Cor. ix. 10. 'Επισκέψεως is not adverbial = confidently, but signifies the subjective ground of his faith. Faith is the organ of the supernatural, and holds fast to the Invisible as if it saw Him. Hope is faith itself, as directed to the future.—P. S.

That he might become. Three explanations of 1εκ: 1. Of the result—so that he might become (Flatt, Fritzsche, and others). 2. He believed that he should be. That is, 1εκ τον εν is the object of εις. (Beza, Reiske, and others). 3. It contains the purpose of the ημερας ordained by God (Meyer, and others). This is favored by the following κατα το ευθυγραμμα. (So also Alford, Hodge: He believed in order that, agreeably to the purpose of God, he might become the father of many nations.)—According to that which was spoken. See, in Gen. xv. 6, the reference to the stars of heaven. Gen. F. and G. insert the comparison: as the stars of heaven, and as the sand upon the sea-shore (the latter from Gen. xxii. 17).

Ver. 19. And being not weak in faith, a melos [μηδεμα, diminution], according to Theophylact and Beza, [εκ, the negative form for the positive: being strong. So also Tholuck and Meyer.] The sense is rather that, in the long trial, his faith did not grow weary, but stronger, in spite of the difficulties in his path. He considered [not, ου], κατανωμασθης. Tholuck says: "The omission of the ου in important MSS., such as A. C. [to which must be added Cod. Sin. and B.—P. S.], the Syriac Version, and others, was occasioned by the following κατα το ευθυγραμμα. According to Gen. xvii. 17, where Abraham does certainly reflect upon finite causes. For this reason the sense was thought to be, that he reflected without being weak in faith. But Paul had in view only Gen. xvi. 5, 6, according to which Abraham accepted the promise at once without hesitation." [So also Meyer.] But Paul means plainly a steadfast faith, which became more vigorous by the trial of many years of waiting, and whose strength was produced by the temptations occurring in the meantime.—

* [Stuart, Hodge, and Wordsworth take no notice of this important difference of reading. Alford breaks off, but permits, but suggests it as being better suited to the context, the object being Abraham's faith. Omitting φετ, the sense will be: "And not being weak in the faith, he was indeed well aware of, etc., but (ος) did not stagger at the promise." Though the object be weak, etc., yet did he not." This agrees better with δια in ver. 30; but we miss in this case μετα after κατανωμασθης. The dogmatism which is characteristic of the language used by Origen, who is followed by Philippi and Hodge. A similar obstruction of faith, as the one recorded of Abraham, Gen. xvii. 17, occurred in the life of John the Baptist; Matt. xvi. 23.—E. S.]

His own body now dead. Abraham was more than ninety-nine years old when the promise was fulfilled (after the circumcision, Gen. xvii. 24), and Sarah was more than ninety years old. The verb νεκρομενου καὶ νεκρος, in reference to generative death (Hob. xi. 19), must not be taken absolutely, but be considered according to the measure of experience and the usual course of nature. Bengel: "Post Semenem (Shem) nemo centum annorum generasse Gen. xi. legisuit." [The difficulty concerning the later children of Abraham and Keturah, Gen. xxv. 1, 2, Augustus (De cœl. Døt, xvi. 28) and Bengel removed, by assuming that the generative power miraculously conferred upon Abraham continued to his death. Bengel: Novus corpus virum etiam nonis in matrimonio cum Keturah. So also Philippi and Meyer.—P. S.]

Ver. 20. He staggered not at the promise of God. The δια, which is an expression of antithesis, appears at first sight to favor κατανωμασθης, the reading of the Cod. A. C., instead of νο κατανωμασθης. But it is manifestly used as an antithesis, and the Antithesis is established in the verse. Ver. 19, says, that he continued steadfast in faith, in spite of the contradiction of senseless experience: that he did not regard natural appearance. Ver. 20, on the contrary, expresses the idea: Neither was he doubtful by unbelief concerning the promise itself. For unbelief is not produced merely by reflecting doubtfully on the contradiction of senseless experience, but also by an immediate want of confidence in the miraculous promise itself, which belongs to the sphere of invisible life. He was not only not weak in faith in his disregard of senseless improbability, but, while looking at the promise, he grew even stronger in faith; for he overcame the temptation of a subtle misinterpretation of the promise. According to Meyer, the δια is only explanatory; but Tholuck, and most expositors, regard it as expressing an antithesis. According to Rückert, the article in της αμησος denotes the unbelief common to man; but it denotes unbelief as such, whose nature is to doubt the promise of God. Therefore other explanations are superfluous (Meyer; in consequence of the unbelief which he would have had in this case).—The passive form, κατανωμασθης, arises from his undoubting aim toward the promise. The promise has the effect of always strengthening the faith of him who looks at it. Therefore Grotius discards the real meaning of the word, when he takes it in the middle voice, αυτος strengthened himself. Even the intransitive meaning which Tholuck accepts, "to grow strong," fails in the same way to satisfy the relation between the promise and the steadfast gaze of faith.

Ver. 20. Giving glory to God. To give God the glory (Γενομενος της θεου, των θεου, της θεου); a mark of faith which God, as the revealed God, can demand. John ix. 24 was spoken hypocritically; John xii. 43 is indirectly expressed. Comp. also Luke xvii. 18, 19; Rom. i. 21; 1 John v. 20; Rev. xix. 7; comp. Philippi and Meyer on this passage, both of whom see the meaning. Tholuck says better: "Then unbelief is a robbery of God's glory. It does not easily occur except in a state of trial (φεμ), but it does so occur in such a state. Therefore Calvin: "Ex autem tarnem quidem nonem Deum omnima posse negat; verum simul occultum aliud,

* [Meyer and Philippi take της αμησος as an instrumental dative; της δια as a dative of reference: "Er schwindet nicht verborgen des Unklaren (den er in diesem Falle gehei-hen haben sollte), sondern vorab stark an Gläuben (den er hatte)."—E. S.]

Chapter IV. 1-25.
quod cursum promissionum Dei impediat, Dei virtutem, e sa graec deo, die,"

Ver. 21. And being fully persuaded. According to Laehmann (contrary to Tischendorf), the καὶ before πίστις εὐφράω is strongly attested by the Κ. A. C., & c. If the καὶ is omitted, we have here the reason for the fact that he gave God the glory. With the καὶ, the words suitably explain the manner in which he gave God the glory; for he was fully convinced that he was the El Shaddai, and that, by virtue of His omnipotence, He was able to fulfill what He in Truthfulness had promised. It was by this confident looking at the El Shaddai’s word of promise that he was made strong ("heroic;" Meyer) in faith. The πίστις denotes intellectual activity, knowledge in living faith.

Ver. 22. Wherefore also it was reckoned to him as righteousness. We must retain καὶ, as authorized by the Κ. A. C. [x.], and others. But we must not overlook the fact that we have here a justification of justification in its essential adaptation, the δύναμις δόξης. This faith is a return to the paradoxical or angelic (Isa. vi. 5) attitude to God (Rom. i. 21). Since man gives God the glory, he again participates in the δύναμις δόξης which he had lost as a sinner (Rom. iii. 23). In justification, believers embrace in their hearts the righteousness of Christ as the principle of the δύναμις (Rom. viii. 30; comp. ver. 18). Therefore the spirit of δύναμις rests upon them (1 Peter iv. 14) until the revelation of the δύναμις of the Lord (1 Peter iv. 13).

B.—The Faith of Christians (vers. 23-29).

[Application of the Scripture testimony of Abraham, the father of the faithful, to the believers in Christ. His method of justification is our method of justification. Calvin: "Abraha persona specimem communitis justiciae, qua ad omnes spectatur." This completes the argument for the vindication of the law through faith; iii. 31. —P. S.]

Ver. 23. Now it was not written for his sake alone. Explanations: 1. Not to his praise, non in ipsius gloriarn (Beza, Thorlack). 2. To explain the manner of his justification (Meyer). The sense is: not only for the purpose of a historical proclamation of Abraham (Rom. xv. 4; 1 Cor. x. 11; Gal. iii. 8), but also to represent him as the type of believers. In the same way the entire Bible has a universal destination for the believers of all times. Meyer quotes Berech R. 40. 8: Quodquid scriptum est de Abrahamo, scriptum est de fìlliis ejus. [The aorist ὕποστή, it was written, denotes the past historical act of writing, and is used here in order to emphasize the design of God’s Spirit in the time of composition; while the more usual perf. ὑποστήσας, it is written, is used in quotations of Scripture passages as we now find them, and as valid for present purposes. Comp. Philippi.—I. S.]

Ver. 24. But for us also, to whom it [viz., the faith in God, or Christ, τό πιστεύειν τῷ θεῷ] shall be reckoned [supply: for righteousness, εἰς δικαιοσύνην, as ver. 22]. The μέγας refers to the divine determination of Christianity as righteousness by faith in all time to come: but, contrary to Fritzschel, it does not refer to justification at the general judgment.

If we believe on him who raised up Jesus our Lord from the dead. [τοῖς πιστεύσωσιν "specifies the ἡμέρα: and the belief is not a mere historical, but a fiducial belief;" Alford.—P. S.] Christian faith is specifically a faith in the risen Christ, or also in the living God of resurrection who raised Him from the dead. It is in this its central point that the finished faith of the New Testament is perfectly in harmony with the central point of Abraham’s faith. The germ and fruit of this faith are identical in substance, though they differ very much in form and development. The nearest formal analogy to Abraham’s faith is the birth of Christ from the Virgin. The highest exhibition of omnipotence was at the same time the highest exhibition of grace. [Christ’s resurrection was a triumph of God’s almighty power, similar, though much higher, than the generation of Isaac from the dead body of Abraham; by faith in the miracle of the resurrection, the resurrection is spiritually repeated in us, as we become new creatures in Christ, and walk with Him in newness of life; comp. vi. 3; Eph. i. 19, 20; Col. iii. 1.—P. S.]

Ver. 25. Who was delivered up, &c. ["If these words the Apostle introduces the great subje of chaps. v.—viii., Death, as connected with Sin, and Life as connected with Righteousness;" Alford and Forbes. "Ver. 25 is a comprehensive statement of the gospel;" Hodge. The διά means in both clauses, on account of, for the reason of, but with this difference, that it is retrospective in the first, prospective in the second: διά τά παραπτώματα, because we had sinned, or, in order to secure the remission of our transgressions; διά τήν δικαιοσύνην, not because we had been, but that we might be justified. To the first διά we must supply: for the sinner; or, for the destruction of, to the second; for the procurement of. De Wette zur Bussung—zur Bestigung, παραπτώματα, a frequent designation of the self-surrender of Christ to death; Isa. lii. 12; Rom. viii. 32; Gal. ii. 20; Eph. v. 25; απόκτενον ἑαυτοῦ ἄνευ νόμου. δικαιοσύνης, from δικαιοσύνη, (only here and v. 18, in opposition to κατακρίμα, justification, i. e., the effective declarative act of putting a man right with the law, or into the status of δικαιοσύνη, righteousness.—P. S.] The antithesis in ver. 25 [παραπτώματα διά τά παραπτώματα διά τήν δικαιοσύνην, the neg. αὐτοῦ and the positive δικαιοσύνης] is difficult. Thorlack [p. 194]: "This separation, as also that in chap. x. 10, is generally taken as a rhetorical μετανοία."

[ Bishop Horae, as quoted by Alford and Wordsworth, takes διά, in the second clause, in the sense that in the Old Testament the word meant, "we have accepted our justification had already been effected by the sacrifice of His death. But this is inconsistent with 1 Cor. xv. 17. Newman explains: because our justification is by the Second Comforter, whom the resurrection brought down from heaven."—P. S.]

* (Dr. Hodge, after quoting from Calvin, makes the following excellent remarks on παραπτώματα: "It is a very great error for men to suppose that to doubt is an evidence of humility. On the contrary, to doubt God’s promises is no proof that He is upholding them, because it is a question of his Word. Multitudes refuse to accept his grace, because they do not regard themselves as worthy, as though their worthiness were the ground on which that grace is offered. The thing to be believed, is, that God accepts the unworthy; that, for Christ’s sake, He justifies the unjust. Many find it far harder to believe that God can love to not-withstanding their sinfulness, than the hundred-years-old patriarch did to believe that he should be the father of many nations. Confidence in God’s word, a full persuasion that He can do what seems to us impossible, is as necessary in the one case as in the other. The sinner honours God, in trusting his grace, as much as Abraham did, in trusting his power."—P. S.)
2. Here, as in the Epistle to the Galatians, and especially in chap. iii., the Apostle characterizes the Old Testament according to its real fundamental thought—the promise of God, which was revealed in Abraham's faith, and perfectly fulfilled in the New Testament covenant of faith. Accordingly, the Mosaic legislation is only a more definite Old Testament signature; but, as a stage of development, it is subordinate to Abraham's faith (see chap. v. 20; Gal. iii. 17).

Some errors of the present day concerning the Old Testament have in many ways obscured its true relation by the following declarations: (1) "The Old Testament is essentially Mosaic." In this way the patriarchal system in the past, and the prophetic system in the future, are abolished. (2) "Mosaism is legal and statutory stationariness." But, on the contrary, the Old Testament is a continuous and living development. (3) "This stationariness is theoretical despotism; the Jew is absolutely enslaved under the law." This is contradicted by Moses' account of his repeated federal dealings between Jehovah and His people, by the introduction to the Decalogue, as well as by the whole spirit of the Old Testament. It is particularly contradicted by the fact that Jehovah abandons the people to their apostasy, in order to visit them in justice.

3. The significance of Abraham for the doctrine of justification by faith is supplemented by David's example and testimony. Abraham was justified by faith, notwithstanding his many good works; David was likewise justified by faith, notwithstanding his great offences. The righteousness of faith is therefore thus defined: (1) It does not presuppose any good works; but, (2) It presupposes a knowledge of sin. On the signification of the passage, vers. 8-6, for justification by faith, see Tholuck, p. 176.

4. As Abraham became the natural father of many nations he, so did he become the spiritual father of the believing people of all nations, both Jews and Gentiles.

5. The designation of circumcision as a seal of the righteousness of faith, is important for the doctrine of the sacraments. See the Exeg. Notes.

6. The great promise of faith (ver. 18). Its development (chap. viii.; Isa. lv. lvii.; Rev. xx., xxx.). There is a grand view in the reasoning of ver. 14. The men who are in râhon, of the line, cannot be the heirs of the world: (1) Because they are particularists. But also, (2) Because the legal, human ðeph, provokes the historical, divine wrath—the destruction of the world. Thus did legalistic fanaticism bring on the destruction of Jerusalem, the fall of Byzantium, the exhaustion of Germany by the Thirty Years' War, the disorders in Spain, Italy, Poland, and other countries (see Matt. v.

7. The identity of the faith of Abraham with that of Paul. We must define: (1) Its object; (2) Its subject; (3) Its operations. The difference, on the contrary, must be determined according to the developing forms of the revelation of salvation, and in such a way that the initial point will appear in the faith of Abraham, and the concluding or completing point shall appear in the saving faith of the New Testament. But it is a mistake to suppose that faith can be the same thing in a subjective view, and another in an objective. The objective and subjective relations will always thoroughly correspond to each other, and the operations of faith will be shaped in accordance with them. For
nastorical information on the question under consideration, see Tholuck, p. 178.

8. On the nature of saving faith, see the Exeg. Notes on ver. 19. Likewise, on the signification of the resurrection for faith, those on ver. 25.


10. On ver. 25. This important and comprehensive passage clearly shows the inseparable connection between Christ's death and Christ's resurrection, as also the connection between the remission of sins and justification to a new life (comp. v. 10; vi. 4). By His atoning death Christ has abolished the guilt of sin (v. 25), and secured our pardon and peace; and hence it is generally represented as the ground of our justification (σωτηρίας) — i.e., the non-imputation of sin, and the imputation of Christ's merits; comp. iii. 24, 25; v. 9; 2 Cor. v. 21; Epiph. i. 7; 1 John i. 7.

But, without the resurrection, the death of Christ would be of no avail, and His grace would be the grace of all our hopes, as the Apostle clearly says, 1 Cor. xv. 17. A gospel of a dead Saviour would be a miserable failure and delusion. The resurrection is the victory of righteousness and life over sin and death. It is by the fact of the resurrection that Christ's death was shown to be the death of the innocent and righteous One for foreign guilt, and that it was accepted by God as a full satisfaction for the sins of the world. If man had not sinned, Christ would not have died; if Christ had sinned, He would not have been raised again. In the next place, as the resurrection is the actual triumph of Christ, so is also the necessary condition of the enjoyment to the present benefits of His death. It is only the risen Saviour who could plead our cause at the mercy-seat, and send the Holy Spirit to reveal Him, and to apply the benefits of the atonement to believers. Just as little as the death and the resurrection, can we separate the effects of both — the remission of sins and the new life of Christ. The sinner cannot be buried with Christ, without rising with Him as a new creature; the death of the old Adam is the birth of the new, and the life of the new presupposes the death of the old. — P. S.

HOMILETICAL AND PRACTICAL.


—What hath father Abraham found? 1. No reward by works; but, 2. Righteousness by faith (vers. 1-5).—Abraham not only the natural, but also the spiritual father of his people (vers. 1-5).—Glory before God is better than the glory of works (ver. 2).—If the reward is reckoned of debt, man loses; but if it is reckoned of grace, he gains (vers. 4, 5).—How blessed is the man to whom God imputeth not sin, but righteousness! (vers. 6-8).—Two beautitudes from the mouth of David (vers. 6-8).

Vers. 9-12. Why must even the Jews acknowledge the Gentiles' righteousness of faith? Answer: Because, 1. Faith was not counted to Abraham for righteousness while in circumcison; but, 2. His faith had already been counted to him for righteousness. —As the sign of circumcision was to the Jews a seal of the righteousness of faith, so are the signs of the supper to Christians of the righteousness of faith. —Abraham, a father of all believers: 1. From among the Gentiles; 2. From among the Jews.

Walking in the footsteps of Abraham (ver. 12). — The promise to Abraham of the inheritance of the world is, first, obscure, as a germ-like word. But, second, it is of infinitely rich meaning; for, in addition to the possession of the world, it also om. acc. to the world and the heavenly inheritance. — To what extent does the law work wrath? (ver. 15). — It is only by faith that the promise holds good for all (ver. 16).

Vers. 18-22. The strength of Abraham's faith. It is shown: 1. In his believing in hope, where there was nothing to hope; 2. In holding fast to this hope against external evidence; 3. He did not doubt, but trusted unconditionally in the words of promise. — Believing in hope, where there is nothing to hope (ver. 18). — We must not grow weak in faith, even if it be long before our hopes are realized (ver. 19). — The worst doubt is doubting the promises of God (ver. 20). — How precious it is to know to a perfect certainty that God can perform what He has promised (ver. 21).

Vers. 23-25. As Abraham believed that life would come from death, so do we believe in the same miracle; if God has given us a pledge in the resurrection of Christ; 2. Because this God is a living and true God, who will keep His promises for ever. — Our faith in the Lord Jesus Christ is a faith in the Redeemer, who: 1. Was delivered for our offences; and, 2. Was raised for our justification (vers. 24, 25).

LUKE: Faith fulfils all laws; but works cannot fulfil a tittle of the law (James ii. 10). A passage from the prologue to the Epistle to the Romans is in place here: "Faith is not the man's debasing and dream which some mistake for faith. . . . But faith is a Divine work in us, which changes us, and gives us the new birth from God (John i. 13); which says the old Adam, and makes us altogether different men in heart, spirit, feeling, and strength; and which brings with it the Holy Spirit. Oh, faith is a living, creative, active power, which of necessity is incessantly doing good! It also does not ask whether there are good works to perform; but, before the question is asked, it has already done them, and is continually doing them," &c. — He who believes God, will give Him the glory, that He is truthful, omnipotent, wise, and good. Therefore faith fulfils the first three (four) commandments, and justifies man before God. It is, then, the true worship of God (chap. iv. 20).

STARKER: The Holy Scriptures must not be read superlatively, but with deliberation, and with careful reference to their order and chronology (chap. iv. 10). — The holy sacraments assure believers of God's grace, and forgiveness of sins and eternal salvation (chap. iv. 11). — It is vain to boast of pious ancestry, if you do not walk in the footsteps of their faith (chap. iv. 12). — God has His special gracious gifts and rewards, which He communicates to one of His believers instead of another (chap. iv. 17). — We should rely on and believe in God's word, more than in all the arguments of the world. It should be enough for us to know, "The faith of the Lord is sufficient" (chap. iv. 18). — The heart can be established by no other means than by grace. But there can be no grace in the heart except by faith, which brings in Christ, the source of all grace (chap. iv. 21). — Blessed are they who only believe, though they see not (chap. iv. 22). — The Epistle to the Romans was also written for us, and it has been preserved until our day.
given to us as a precious treasure by Divine Providence. — If Christ has been raised from the dead by the glory of the Father, His death is truly a sufficiency, offering and propitiatory sacrifice for our sins (chap. iv. 25).

Huyser: Away with the leaves of Pharisaic delusion, that our own righteousness must build a ladder to heaven! God will glorify His compassion to publicans and sinners, but not to proud saints. — Faith is in its highest degree, strength, and adornment, when it beholds nothing but heaven and water, God and despair, and yet believes that all will be well, glorious, and happy (chap. iv. 18).

Queensel: The more faith in a soul, the less pride there is in it (chap. iii. 27). Ye magistrates, fathers, and mothers, if you set an example of faith, fear of God, love, righteousness, and other virtues, before those committed to you, you will truly become their fathers, just as Abraham became the father of the faithful by his faith (chap. iv. 11). — He who makes a parade of himself, may easily despair afterwards because of his insufficiency in every respect; but he who trusts in the omnipotent God, gets strength and consolation from his own nothingness (chap. iv. 18). — Clerk: The sacraments do not help for the work’s sake; otherwise Abraham would have been immediately justified and saved on account of circumcision (chap. iv. 10). — All promises spring from the fountain of eternal grace (chap. iv. 18). — Nova Bibl. Tub.: The laws of nature are set by God for nature, but they are not binding on God Himself. Faith looks beyond them (chap. iv. 19).— Lange: As sin, because of its magnitude and multiplicity, is denoted by different words, so is justification, as something great and important, explained by three words: to forgive, to cover, and not to impute (chap. iv. 7). — The creation and resurrection of the dead are those great works of God which confirm and explain each other. Therefore he who believes in creation will find it easy to believe in the resurrection of the dead (chap. iv. 17).

Brose: The divine promise is always the best support of faith and confidence (ver. 20). — Why do we believe in God? Because He has raised Christ (ver. 20).

Gerlach: Abraham only received the promise that his seed should possess the land of Canaan; but beyond the earth, there lies the heavenly Canaan—the renewed world—which he and his real children, the believers, shall possess in Christ, his seed. The earthly Canaan was the propitious type of this heavenly Canaan; it was the external shell which enclosed the kernel—the bud which bore and enclosed the still tender flower (chap. iv. 13). — By the clearer knowledge of the commandment sin becomes more sinful, destruction appears more prominently, lust is not subdued but becomes more violently inflamed; therefore transgression increases (chap. iv. 18). — If Abraham’s clear eye of faith could penetrate the veil with so much certainty of God’s majesty, how powerfully should we—to whom God has spoken by His own Son—be kindness by this love to raise our idle hands and to strengthen our weakness, a supernatural grace (chap. iv. 19).

Lisco: Abraham’s faith is an example worthy of our imitation by faith in Christ (chap. iv. 18-25). — The resurrection of Jesus was a testimony and proof of what His death has accomplished for us (for, without the resurrection, He could not have been considered the Messiah, and His death could not have been deemed a propitiatory sacrifice for the blotting out of our sins), Isa. lili. 10 ff.; chap. iv. 25.

Heubner: The appeal to Abraham’s example is 1. Right in itself; 2. Was important for the Jews (chap. iv. 1-8). — Why does Paul cite Abraham’s circumcision, and not rather the offering of Isaac? — Answer: 1. Circumcision was the real sign which Abraham received by the command of God Himself. 2. It was that which all the Jews, equally with Abraham, bore in their own person, and on which they founded their likeness to Abraham and their glory (chap. iv. 1). — David’s feeling in the Psalm is humble, and was exalted only by grace. — The universal confession of God’s children is, We are saved by grace (chap. iv. 6-8). — In the historical statement of ver. 10 there is an application to us; namely, that justification by faith must precede all good works because no good work is possible without the attainment of grace. — The preaching of the law alone with the threatened penalty repels our heart from God; and when carried to excess, it makes us angry with God, because he is driven to despair (chap. iv. 15). — Yes, if every thing were brought to us on the terms of the law, we would have no room for faith (chap. iv. 18). — Abraham is an example of a holy paternal blessing, of holy paternal hopes, and the founder of the most blessed family among men (chap. iv. 18).

Dreesen: Easter; the Amen of God, the Hallelujah of men. — Our faith must be preserved, and grow amid temptations (chap. iv. 20). — The object of his faith is just as certain to the believer, as a demonstration is to the mathematician (chap. iv. 21, 22). — All the history of the Old Testament is applicable to us. The circumstances are different, but there are the same conflicts, and it is internally and fundamentally the same faith which is engaged in the struggle (chap. iv. 23, 24). — Similarity of the Christian’s faith to that of Abraham.

Bessee: Luther calls ver. 25 a little covenant in which all Christianity is comprehended. — J. P. Lange: Abraham, the original, but ever-new witness of faith; 1. As witness of the living God of revelation and miracle; 2. As witness of the perfect confidence and divine strength of a believing heart; 3. As witness of the great operation of faith—righteousness through grace. — The life of faith not dependent: 1. On natural ancestry; 2. On works of the law; 3. On visible natural appearances. — Justification and sealing. — All faith, in its inmost nature, is similar to that of Abraham: 1. As faith before God in His word; 2. As faith in miracles; 3. As faith in the renewal of youth; 4. As faith in the rejuvenation of life from righteousness as the root. — The glorious operation of Christ’s resurrection.

Burr: We must bring credentials from our sanctification to bear witness to the truth of our justification. — On the sacraments in general, and circumcision in particular. There is a fourfold word requisite to a sacrament—a word of institution, command, promise, and blessing. The elements are ciphers; it is the institution that makes them figures. Circumcision was a sign: 1. Representative of Abraham’s faith; 2. Demonstrative of original sin; 3. Discriminating and distinguishing of the true church; 4. Initiating for admission to the commonwealth of Israel; and 5. Prefigurative of baptism. — On faith. It has a threefold excellency: 1. Assenting to the truths of God, though never so improbable; 2. Putting men on duties though seemingly unreasonable; and 3. Enabling to endure sufferings, be they never so afflictive. — Does
THE EPISTLE OF PAUL TO THE ROMANS.
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8. one soul, and the spirit which is limited to the
difficulties wherewith it is to wrestle, and will most
effectually answer the objections. It is faith indeed
to build upon the all-sufficiency of God for the
accomplishment of that which is impossible to any
thing but that all-sufficiency. —Clarke: Ver. 18.
The faith of Abraham bore an exact correspondence
to the power and never-failing faithfulness of
God.

18. The faith of Abraham bore an exact correspondence
to the power and never-failing faithfulness of
God.

1. The renunciation of a legal self-righteous
spirit is the first requisite of the gospel; 2. The
more intimately we are acquainted with our own
hearts, and with the character of God, the more
ready shall we be to renounce our own righteousness,
and to trust in His mercy; 3. Only those are happy
and secure who, under a sense of helplessness,
cast themselves on the mercy of God; 4. A means
of grace should never be a ground of dependence
5. There is no hope for those who take refuge in a
law, and forsake God's mercy; 6. All things are
ours, if we are Christ's; 7. The way to get your
faith strengthened, is, not to consider the difficulties
in the way of the thing promised, but the character
and resources of God who has made the promise;
8. It is as possible for faith to be strong when the
thing promised is most improbable, as when it is
probable; 9. Unbelief is a very great sin, as it
implies a doubt of the veracity and power of God;
10. The two great truths of the gospel are, that
Christ died as a sacrifice for our sins, and that He
rose again for our justification; 11. The denial of
the propitiatory death of Christ, or of His resurrec-
tion from the dead, is a denial of the gospel.—
Barne's: On the resurrection of Christ (ver. 25).
If it be asked how it contributes to our acceptance
with God, we may answer: 1. It rendered Christ's
work complete; 2. It was a proof that His work was
accepted by the Father; 3. It is the mainspring of
all our hopes, and of all our efforts to be saved.
There is no higher motive that can be presented to
induce man to seek salvation, than the fact that he
may be raised up from death and the grave, and
made immortal. There is no satisfactory proof that
man can be thus raised up, but by the resurrection
of Jesus Christ.—J. F. H.

5th Section.—The fruit of justification: Peace with God, and the development of the new life into the experience of Christian hope. The new worship of Christians: They have the free access to grace into the Holy of holies. Therefore they rejoice in the hope of the glory of God, and of the revelation of the real Shekinah of God in the real Holy of holies. They even glory in tribulation also, by which this hope is concommated. The love of God in Christ as security for the realization of Christian hope; Christ's death our reconciliation; Christ's life our salvation. The bloom of Christian hope: The solemn joy that God is our God.

1. Therefore being justified by faith, we have peace with God through our
2 Lord Jesus Christ: By [Through] whom also we have [have had the] access
3 by faith [for omit by faith] into this grace wherein we stand, and rejoice [tri-
4 umph]° in [the]° hope of the glory of God. And not only so, but we glory [tri-
5 umph];' in tribulations also; knowing that tribulation worketh patience
6 [constancy];' And patience [constancy], experience [approval];' and expe-
7 rience [approval], hope: And hope maketh not ashamed; because the love of
8 God [God's love] is shed abroad [has been poured out] in our hearts by [by
9 means of] the Holy Ghost which is [who was] given unto us.
10 For when we were yet without strength, in due time [xató xαυτόν, at the
11 proper time] Christ died for the ungodly. For scarcely for a righteous man
will one die: yet peradventure for a good man some would even dare to die
12 [though, for the good man, perhaps some one may even dare to die]. But
13 God is commended [doth establish] his love toward us, in that, while we were
14 yet sinners, Christ died for us. Much more then [therefore], being now justi-
15 fied [by] his blood, we shall be saved from wrath through him [or, through
16 him from the wrath]. For if, when we were [being] 16 enemies, we were recon-
17 ciled to God by [through, μέσῳ] the death of his Son; much more, being recon-
18 ciled, we shall be saved by [in, εἰς] his life. And not only so, but we also joy
19 [And not only that—μέσῳ, reconciled—but also triumphing] 1° in God through our
20 Lord Jesus Christ, by [through] whom we have now received the atonement
[the reconciliation].

*
CHAPTER V. 1-11.

TEXTUAL.

1 V. 1.—[The reading ἐκμα θείμα (subjunctive, with a hortatory sense) is strongly attested by N. A. B. D. C. K. L. many εἰπεῖν and versions (including Syriac and Vulgate), also by many fathers; adopted by Lachmann (in the margin), Schoeck, Alford, Wordsworth (56th ed.). This array of witnesses would compel us to adopt it instead of ἐκμα θείμα (Rec. Β. F. Ε.), were it not for the following considerations: 1. The early tradition frequently interchanges a and ε. The change having been made, it would be retained by the fathers, since it "indicates the inborn darkening of the doctrine of the righteousness of faith" (Lange). 2. The historic meaning is not kept in keeping with the context. Even Alford, after adopting the subjunctive, and alleging that it can only have the force of the imperative, denies this meaning. An exhortation on a new subject just is, would introduce a foreign element (Meyer). Those reasons have been denied, by many of the best editors, sufficient to outweigh the preponderant MSS. authority. Comp. the Exeg. Notes. —R.]

2 Ver. 2.—[The perfect ἐκμα θείμα is rendered εἰπεῖν haben by Lange; here hab is the literal meaning, implying continuous action. We obtain (Amer. Bible Union) is open to the objection urged in Exeg. Notes. The article should be retained with εἰπεῖν, as conveying a slight emphasis.—R.]

2 Ver. 2.—[Lange rejects τῇ πίστει. (Rec. N. C. K. L. many versions.) It is not found in B. D. F. G. and is rejected by Lachmann, Tischendorf, Swete, Alford. Meyer retains it, deeming it superfluous after ver. 1; but for that very reason it is omitted by modern critics, as being the more genuineness, since it might readily be supplied from the preceding ἐκμα θείμα. It may be regarded as doubtful, but we are scarcely warranted in rejecting it.—R.]

3 Ver. 2.—[Lange's view of this passage requires the insertion of the article, which is not found in the Greek. See Exeg. Notes. —R.]

3 Ver. 3.—[Recs: καλήμα θείμα, n. a. D. F. K. Alford considers this a mechanical repetition from ver. 2, and reads καλήμα θείμα (B. C.), but the other reading is to be preferred.—R.]

5 Ver. 3.—[Τεθελοκοινός, Σταυροφόρος (Lango) endorses (Alford); patient endurance (Wordsworth); Ausdauer, perserveranz (Meyer). The idea of patience is implied, but the result is referred to here.—R.]

4 Ver. 4.—[Approval is certainly preferable to εσπερισμεν; and yet it is not altogether satisfactory, Lange, Meyer: Bousset: Wortsword: profct: Alford, Amer. Bible Union: as elsewhere.—R.]

6 Ver. 5.—[The text is disputed at two points in this clause. Rec. with n. a. C. D. J. K. and some fathers, read εἰπεῖν γὰρ; which is adopted by most modern editors. B. (followed by Alford) reads ἔγερεν, however, the MSS. authority for the former is better. The text adopted with very slight hesitation is, ἔγερεν εἰπεῖν, viz., the insertion and omission of a second εἰπεῖν after ἐκμα θείμα. The authority for it (N. B. C. D. J. K.) is even stronger than for the first. But this repetition has been condemned, and many critical editors have therefore reduced it to εἰπεῖν alone. The advantage of the former, that εἰπεῖν was used out of the fact, that an ecclesiastical portion began with Χριστοῦ κα. R. But the uncial authority is too strong to warrant its rejection. Alford justly remarks: "We must either repeat εἰπεῖν, or adopt the reading of B. He takes the latter (εἰπεῖν) and makes it safe, with Griesebach, Lachmann, Wordsworth, to take the former. In that case, εἰπεῖν may either be regarded as repeated for emphasis (see Exeg. Notes), or Wordsworth's view be adopted: Besides, when we were yet weak. The former is preferable.—R.]

7 Ver. 5.—[Εἰς αὐτόν is wanting in A. Its position varies in other MSS. n. a. C. K. insert it after τῇ πίστει (see Rec.). D. F. J. B. before (see Tischendorf, Meyer). Alford rejects it, mainly on account of this variation in position. It is far more likely to have been omitted, because it was thought that Christ should be the subject. The most probable view is, that the Apoc. intended to emphasize the fact that God thus showed His (εἰς αὐτόν) love; hence the position at the head of the clause. The text as understood, it was moved forward and thus rejected.—R.]

11 Ver. 9.—[Literally: having been then justified. The E. V. means to convey that thought. It should be noticed that it follows (E. V., yqg). The idea of instrumentality is not prominent; the sense seems to be preparatory. So also in ver. 2.—Try to understand by his life.—R.]

12 Ver. 10.—[The parallelism is marred in the E. V.—R.]

12 Ver. 11.—Rec.: καλήμα θείμα, poorly attested. Nearly all MSS. read καλήμα θείμα, which is adopted by modern critics. But, on the meaning, and for justification of the above emendation, see Exeg. Notes.—R.]

14 Ver. 11.—[Reconciliation is a correct rendering etymologically, but not theologically. Reconciliation is preferable also on the ground that it corresponds with reconcile (ver. 10), as the Greek noun does with the preceding verb.—R.]

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

General Survey.—1. Peace with God arising from justification, as hope of the glory of God (vers. 1, 2). 2. The continuance in, and increase of, this peace, even by tribulations, amid the experience of the love of God (vers. 3—5). 3. The proof of the continual increase of the peace, and the certainty of salvation of Christians (vers. 6—9). 4. Reconciliation as the pledge of deliverance (salvation), and, as the appropriated atonement, the fountain of blessings. On vers. 1—8, Winzer, Commentat., Leipzig, 1832. [Chap. v. 1—12 and chap. vi. describe the effect of justification upon the feelings, or the emotional man; chap. vii., the effect upon the will, or the moral man. It produces peace in the heart and boldness in the character of the believer.—P. S.]

Ver. 1. Therefore, being justified by faith [ἀκοινωνίας οὗτος ἐκ πίστεως]. The oúv expresses the conclusion that arises from the preceding establishment of the truth of the ἀκοινωνίας by faith [vii. 21—iv. 25]. Therefore ἀκοινωνίας is closely connected with ἀκοινωνίας. [The aorist tense ἀκοινωνίας, which is emphatically placed at the head of the sentence, implicates that justification is an act already done and completed when we hold laid hold of Christ by a living faith, but not necessarily at our baptism (Wordsworth), which is a sealing ordinance, like circumcision (iv. 11), and does not always coincide in time with regeneration and justification (remember the case of Abraham and Cornelius on the one hand, and, more recently, of Marcion and Magnus on the other), ἐκ πίστεως, out of faith, as the subjunctive or instrumental cause and appropriating organ, while the grace of God in Christ is the objective or creative cause of justification, by which we are transferred from the state of sin and damnation to the state of righteousness and life.—P. S.] Meyer: "The extent of the blessedness of the justified (not their holiness, as Rothe would have it) shall now be portrayed." It is a description of the blessedness of Christians in its source, its maintenance, its apparent imperfection yet real perfection, its certainty, and its ever more abundant development. The condition of one who is not justified is that of fighting with God (see ver. 9).

[We have peace with God through our Lord Jesus Christ, ἐν δικαιοσύνῃ ἐκμα θείμα πρὸ τοῦ θεόν, κα. The bearing of the difference of reading here deserves more attention than it has yet received. We reluctantly adopt, for internal
reasons, with Dr. Lange and the great majority of commentators, the indicative εἰρήνη (Vulg.: habemus) for the subjunctive εἰρηνίζω (Vulg.: habemus). The latter, it must be admitted, has in its favor not only the overwhelming weight of ancient MSS., Versions, and Fathers,* but also the critical grounds: lectio difficilior; being the more difficult reading, its alteration into the easier εἰρήνη can be better accounted for than its introduction. If we retain εἰρηνίζω (with Lachmann, Tregelles, and Alford, 5th ed.), we must consistently take καυχώμεθα, ver. 2, 3, likewise in the subjunctive mood; and thus the whole passage, instead of being, as usually understood, a statement of the blessed effects of justification upon the heart, is turned into a declaration that we should go on from peace to peace and from glory to glory, on the ground of the accomplished fact of justification. Different explanations, however, may be given to εἰρηνίζω. (1. The deliberative sense: shall we have? But the deliberative subjunctive is only used in doubtful questions, as Mark xii. 14: δόμην ἵνα δομῆσιν; Rom. vii. 1: εἰπαντώμεθα τῇ ἀγατίᾳ; (2. The concessive sense: we may have, it is our privilege to have. Thus would give excellent sense. But such a use of the Greek subjunctive approaching the meaning of the future, though easily derived from the general principle that the subjunctive mood signifies what is objectively possible, as the indicative expresses what is actual, and the aorist what is desirable or subjectively possible, is somewhat doubtful, and not mentioned by Winer (p. 266, 7th ed.), who, in independent sentences, admits only the conjunctive authorities and the conjunctive deliberations; comp. Kühner, §§ 468, 464, and Jell, § 415. (3.) There remains, therefore, only the hortative sense: let us have peace. But here arises the doctrinal difficulty, that peace is not the result of man's exertions, but a gift of God bestowed, and the object of prayer in the epistolary inscriptions; comp. 1 and 2 Peter i. 2: "Grace and peace be multiplied unto you;" yet two analogous passages might be quoted—viz., 2 Cor. xiv. 19: ισταλλεσθε τῷ Θεῷ, reconciliamini Deo; and especially Heb. xii. 28: ξοίμαχον γάρων, let us have grace (where, however, some MSS. read ξοίμαζον, the Vulg., habemus, and where γάρων is understood by some in the sense of gratitudo).† It might be said, also, in support of this explanation, that faith, hope, love, and all Christian graces, are likewise gifts of grace, and yet objects to be pursued and obtained. (4.) A few commentators, quite recently Forbes (but in the translation, but in the comments, p. 179), take εἰρηνίζω = καυχώμεθα, let us hold fast and enjoy peace; comp. Heb. xx. 28: καυχώμεθα τὴν ομολογίαν τῆς εὐλογίας τῆς ζήλης ἀληθείας. But in this case we should expect the article before εἰρήνη, and a previous mention of peace in the argument.† The use of the indicative εἰρήνη, on the other hand, is free from all grammatical, and doctrinal difficulty, and is in keeping with the declaratory character of the section.—

Peace with God, εἰρηνίζην πρὸς τὸν Θεόν, in our relation to God. It expresses the state of reconciliation (opposite to the state of condemnation, viii. 1), in consequence of the removal of God's wrath and the satisfaction of His justice by the sacrifice of Christ, who is our Peace; Eph. ii. 14–16. Comp. Herodian 5, 7: σύναπολέμων μὲν εἰρήνης ξοίμαζον πάντων, and other classical parallels quoted by Meyer and Philippi. On πρὸς τὸν Θεόν, comp. Acts ii. 17; xxiv. 16; 2 Cor. vii. 4. This objective condition of peace implies, as a necessary consequence, the subjective peace of the soul, the tranquillitas animi, the pax conscientia, which flows from the experience of pardon and reconciliation; Phil. iv. 7; John xvi. 23. Sin is the source of all discord and war between man and God, and between man and man. That sin has been removed, there can be no peace until this curse is removed. All other peace is an idle dream and illusion. Being at peace with God, we are at peace with ourselves and with our fellow-men. Paul often calls Gbd the "Gof of peace;" xv. 23; 2 Cor. xiii. 11; 1 Thess. v. 23; 2 Thess. iii. 16; Heb. xii. 20. Comp. also Isa. xxxiii. 17: "the work of righteousness is peace."—P. S.]

Ver. 2. Through whom also we. These words do not amount to a climax in the description of the merit of Christ (Köllner); nor do they state the ground of the preceding δι' Ἰησοῦ X. (Meyer), but the immediate result of the redemption. [εἰς τὸν γὰρ, itself a legitimate consequence of justification, is the ground of εἰρήνη.—P. S.].—Have obtained access. [ἡ προσαγωγὴ πρὸς τὸν γὰρ, literally, have had the (well-known, the only possible) introduction (in the active sense).] for, and better, also.‡ The perfect refers to the time of justification and incorporation in Christ, and implies the continued result, since in Him and through Him, as the door and Mediater, we have an open way, the right and privilege of daily approach to the throne of grace; in distinction from the one yearly entrance of the Jewish high-priest into the Holy of Holies. This is the universal priesthood of believers.—P. S.]. Explanations of the προσαγωγὴ: 1. Meyer: admission, introduction (Eisabückh.) This is claimed to be the only grammatical signification. It certainly denotes the entrance effected by mediation, where it means admission, audience. But this requirement [the προσαγωγὴ, sequenter, the mediator or interpreter, who introduces persons to sove-
The verb καίριον [usually with εἰς, also with ἐν, ἐντῷ, and with the accusative of the object] denotes the expression of a joyous consciousness of blessedness with reference to the objective ground of blessedness; in which true glory is most completely contrasted with its caricature, vain boasting in a very state of inward, and from a vain ground or occasion. Reiche emphasizes the rejoicing, Meyer the glorying. The ἐν, explained as propter (by Meyer), denotes more definitely the basis on which Christians establish their glorying.* The ground of the glorying of Christians in their present state is not the ὑπὲρ οὗ θεὸς itself, but the hope of the glory of God, as one conception; indeed, the whole Christianity of this ἐν is a joyous anticipation of beholding the glory.* Tholuck: "...dōxa θεοῦ is not, as Origen holds, the genitive of object, the hope of beholding this glory, which would need to have been expressed more definitely; still less is Chrysostom's view right, that it is the hope that God will glorify Himself in us. Neither are Luther, Grotius, Calixtus, Reiche, correct in calling it the genitive of author, the glory to be bestowed by God; but it is the genitive of possession, possession in the glory promised to believers, comp. 1 Thess. ii. 12." But more account should be made of beholding, as the means of appropriation. To behold God's glory, means also, to become glorious. This is definitely typified in the history of Moses (2 Cor. iii. 13; Exod. xxxv. 33). Tholuck also remarks: "The θεωρεῖν τὴν δόξαν τοῦ Χριστοῦ, John xxi. 24, is the participation in the δόξα θεοῦ, the συγγένεια, the συμμετοχή, and συνεργία τοῦ Χριστοῦ; Rom. viii. 17; 2 Tim. ii. 11. Coccicius: "Hanc est gloriosi filiadelphiam, quod persuersum habent, fore, ut Deus gloriosarum et admirabilis in ipso fiat illuminando, sanctificando, glorificando, glorificando in ipso; 2 Thess. i. 10." As the seeing of man on God's side perfectly the vision of man, according to 1 Cor. xii. 12, it is the beholding of the glory of the Lord on man's side by which he shall become perfectly conformed to the Lord, and by which he shall be glorified, according to 1 John iii. 2; Matt. v. 8; comp. 2 Peter i. 4. The goal of this reciprocal δοξάσωσι καὶ δοξαζόμεθα is, in a conditional sense, the removal to the inheritance of glory in the future world; 2 Cor. v. 1; and, in the absolute sense, the time of the second coming of Christ; Rev. xx.

This triumphant assurance of faith is incomparably the most sublime, most glorious, and the most certain; for it is absolute, and it is immediate assurance. But also, between assurance of a present state of grace, which is necessarily implied in true faith, as a personal apprehension of Christ with all His benefits, and assurance of future redemption, which is an article of hope (hence εἰς ἐλπίδα), and must be accompanied with constant watchfulness. Christ will lose none of those whom the Father has given Him (John xvii. 12; x. 28, 29); but God alone knows His own, and to whom He chooses to reveal it. We must give diligence to make our calling and election.
sure to ourselves (2 Peter i. 10), and work out our own salvation with fear and trembling, because God worketh in us both to will and to do of His good pleasure (Phil. ii. 12, 13). The possibility of ultimate failure was a powerful motive and stimulus to faithfulness and holiness even in the life of an apostle, who exercised severe self-discipline, lest, having preached to others, he might himself at last be rejected, and lose the incorruptible crown of the Corinthian race (1 Cor. ix. 27). How much more, then, should ordinary Christians, who stand, take heed lest they fall (1 Cor. x. 12)—P. S.]

**Ver. 3. And not only so [εἰς, do we triumph in the hope of glory; comp. the parallels in Meyer].** Tholuck appropriately says: "This hope of the Christian—sure of its triumph—seems to be put to soon by the present condition, as those first Christians had to bear the scorn of the Gentiles by contrasting their gloomy present with their abundant hope. [Quotations from Minucius Felix, Arnobius, and Melanchthon.] But the Apostle's lofty mind shows how that ἐκκλησία is not an outward accident, but a moral glorification, having its root in this δύναμις; therefore this itself, is the subject of triumph."

See vii. 17, 28, 35; 2 Cor. x. 3; Phil. iii. 10; 2 Tim. iii. 10; 1 Pet. ii. 21; 1 Tim. iv. 10; Acts xx. 24; 2 Cor. x. 3; 1 Peter iv. 12; James i. 3, 12. [It is a universal law, acknowledged even in the world, that no great character can become complete without trial and suffering. As the firmness of the root is tested by the storm, and the metal is purified in the heat of the furnace, so the strength and purity of character is perfected by trial. The ancient Greeks and Romans admired a good man struggling against misfortune as a specimen worthy of the gods. Plato describes the righteous man as one who, without doing injustice, yet has the appearance of the greatest injustice, and proves his own justice by perseverance against all calumnies unto death; yea, he predicts that the perfect man, if such a one should ever appear, would be scourged, tortured, and nailed to the post (Plutarch, p. 74 sq. ed. Ast.). Seneca says (De pro eis), "Quid si viri rebus adversa non alter quan fortes milites bellis trv-\(\text{raphant.}\)"

Edmund Burke: "Obliguary is a necessary ingredient of all true glory. Calumnies and abuse are essential parts of triumph." But what a difference between the proud ostentation of the heathen, who overcomes the misfortunes by haughty contempt and unfeeling indifference, and the Christian's gentle patience, forgiving love, and cheerful submission to the will of God, who ordered tribulation as a means and condition of moral perfection! Comp. my book on The Person of Christ, p. 90 ff., 216 ff.—P. S.

**Approval (proof), δικαίωμα.** [Comp. 2 Cor. ii. 9; vi. 13; Phil. ii. 22.] Not trial (Grocius), for the δύναμις itself is trial; nor experience (Luther [E. V.]), for experience is the whole Christian life. It is the condition of approval, whose subjective expression is the consciousness of being sealed; Eph. ii. 13. [Engel: "δικαίωμα est qualitas ejus, qui est δίκαιος."

Hodge: "The word is used metonymically for the result of trial, i. e., approbation, or that which is proved worthy of approbation. It is tried integrity, a state of mind which has stood the test." James i. 3: τά δικαίωμα ὑπὸ τῆς πίστεως κατεργάζεται ἡ ἀσθένεια, does not contradict our passage; for δικαίωμα, as Philippi remarks, corresponds to ἡ ἀρετή, and is a means of trial, or δικαίωμα, trial, probation, the result of which is δικαίωμα, approval.—P. S.]

**Hope [ἐλπίς, viii., τῆς ὀρατῆς τοῦ θεοῦ, is required for our sugestion.** 2. Hope, like faith and love, and every other Christian grace, is never done in this world, but always growing, and as it bears flower and fruit, its roots strike deeper, and its stem and branches expand. Every progress

*We add the comments of Hodge: "Afflictions themselves are to the Christian a ground of glorying: he feels them to be an honor and a blessing. This is a sentiment often expressed in the word of God. Our Lord says: 'Blessed are they who mourn;' 'Blessed are the persecuted,' 'Blessed are ye when men shall revile you.' He calls on His suffering disciples to rejoice and by exceeding glad when they are afflicted; Matt. v. 4, 10-12. The apostles departed from the Jewish council, rejoicing that they were counted worthy to suffer shame for Christ's name! Acts ix. 41. Peter calls upon Christians to rejoice when they are reproached and reviled, for the reason that Christ's name is pronounced happy to them when they are reproached for His sake; 1 Peter iv. 11, 12. And Paul says: 'Most gladly therefore will I glory in (on account of) my infirmities' (I. e., my sufferings). 'I take pleasure,' he says, 'in infirmities, in reproaches, in persecutions, in distresses, for Christ's sake;' 2 Cor. xii. 10. Oh, the simple Christian not irrational and functional. Christians do not glory in suffering, as such, such as their suffering, but as the Bible teaches: 1. Because they consider it an honor to suffer for Christ's sake; 2. Because they rejoice in being the occasion of manifesting His perfections, His power, and His grace; 3. Because suffering is made the means of their own growth and preparation for usefulness here, and for heaven hereafter. The whole of these considerations is to that which the Apostle refers in the context."—P. S.]
m Christian life strengthens its foundations. — P. S. j
Thus the apparent opposite of Christian hope, affliction, or tribulation, is changed into pure hope, so that the stock of Christian hope ever becomes more intensive and abundant. Eternal profit is derived from all temporal loss.

Ver. 5. Maketh not ashamed. Strictly; it does not shame, by causing to be deceived. [Calvin: *Habent certissimum salutis eum.* Bengel: *Spes erit res.* Comp. Ps. cxix. 116: αὐθεντικη διέξεις; Sept.: μὴ κατασκέυησθε μὲ αὐτὸ τῆς προοδος μην. Meyer quotes parallels from Plato. — P. S.] Christian hope is formed from the same material of divine spiritual life as faith and love; it is really faith itself, tending toward completion; or it is love itself as it here lives in the principles of perfection. Therefore it is inoffensive.

Because God's love [genitive of the subject, not of the object, as in ver. 8; την κατοικον ἀγάπην εἰς ἕμας. The ground of our assurance that hope shall not put us to the shame of disappointment, is not our own strength or goodness, but the free love of God to us and in us. — P. S.] It is plain from the context that God's love to us is meant (Origen, Chrysostom, Luther, Calvin, and down to Philippi [Meyer, De Wette, Tholuck, Stuart, Alford, Hodge]). For God's love is the richest experience and sense of God's love. [Comp. Acts ii. 17; x. 45; Titus iii. 6, where πληροφορίας is added. Philippi: "The love of God did not descend upon us as dew in drops, but as a stream which spreads itself throughout the whole soul, filling it with a consciousness of His presence and favor." — P. S.] — In our hearts. Strictly: throughout them: εἰς αὐτόν, not εἰς τίνας. [ἐν τοῖς καυδιαῖς denotes the motion in loco, as καυδιαίς, or the rich diffusion of God's love in us.] Comp. Ps. cxiv. 2. Septuagint: ἐκσκόλισιν ἐν χώρασιν. Alford (after Olshausen): "εἰ may be taken pregnantly, εἰς, εἰς καὶ μὲν εἰ — or better, denotes the locality where the outpouring takes place — the heart being the seat of our love, and of appreciation and sympathy with God's love." — P. S. — By means of the Holy Spirit who was given unto us [οἱ θυγατεροί τοῦ θεοῦ τῶν θεοῦν ὑμᾶς]. The gift of the Holy Spirit is the causality of the experience of the love of God. Chap. viii. 15, 16; Gal. iv. 6. [The Holy Spirit mediates all the gifts of grace to us, and glorifies Christ in us. Olshausen and Alford refer the aorist participle to the pente- costal effusion of the Spirit. But this could not

* Similarly Olshausen: "*Die Gottesliebe zum Menschen, das aber in ihm die Gegenliebe weckt (1 John iv. 19), und wird hier mit der göttlichen Kraft, sondern mit den höheren Kräften des göttlichen Gutes.*" Forbes: "The love here spoken of is not God's love, as merely outwardly shown to us, but as shed abroad in our hearts as a gift, and is placed in connection with other Christian graces — patience and hope." — P. S.

[Meyer: Der Begriff des Rechtes springt schon in der sündischen Verstellung des Ausschüttens, kann aber auch wie Tit. iii. 6 als besonders ausgedrückt worden." — P. S.]

Ver. 6. For Christ, when we were yet [ἐπεις γαρ Χριστός ἦν ὑμῖν, κ.τ.λ. On the different readings, ἦν γαρ; (for ye are); ἦν δὲ γαρ; with a second ἦν after αἰτίαν (D. F.), ἦν γαρ, if indeed, with the second ἦν (B.); ἦν γαρ, without the second ἦν (text. rec., εἰ τι γαρ (D F.), εἰ γαρ, εἰ δὲ, see Textual Note. — P. S.) The ἦν [were adverb], according to the sense, belongs to ὑμῖν, &c. [Comp. Matt. xii. 45; ἦν αἰτία λαλοῦσιν; Luke xv. 20: ἦν δὲ αἰτία μακάρις ἐπιθύνουν.] Similar transpositions of ἦν among the classics. See the quotations of Meyer in loc., and Winer, *Gramm.,* p. 515. — P. S.] Schlech, Schmid, and others, have incorrectly understood ἦν as inuenor [moreover, furthermore; but this would be ἦν δὲ, Heb. xli. 36, not ἦν γαρ. — P. S.;] contrary not only to the meaning of the word, but also to the context. They hold that the ἦν does not enhance the preceding, but gives the ground why the confidence of salvation is an ever-increasing certainty. Tholuck, with Meyer, states the ἦν at the beginning of the verse, saying that ἦν has been removed at the beginning because a Bible-lesson began with the verse [with the word ἡμοίος]. The result was, that it was partly removed, partly doubled, and partly corrected. We hold that the twofold ἦν, which Lachmann reads [and which Cod. Sin. sustains] has a good meaning as emphasis.

When we were yet weak, or, without (spiritual) strength [ὑπὸ τῶν μικρῶν ἀδύνατων ἦμας]. The state of sin is here represented as weakness or sickness in reference to the divine life, and consequently as helplessness, in order to declare that at that time, believers could not do the least toward establishing the ground of their hope. [Comp. Isa. iii. 4, Septuagint: τὰς ἀμαρτίας ὑμῶν εἰς, with Matt. viii. 17: τὰς ἀδυνατίας ἡμῶν ἔλαβε. Sin is here represented as helpless weakness, in direct contrast with the saving help of Christ's love. — P. S.] The ἀδυνατίας are then denominated ἀσθενίας, ungodly, in order to express the thought that we, as sinners, could not add any thing to the saving act of Christ, but did our utmost to aggravate the work of Christ. Sinfulness is represented, therefore, not merely as "the need of help," and thus as "the motive of God's love intervening for salvation" (Meyer), but as the starting-point of redemption, where the love of God accomplished the great act of salvation without any cooperation of sinners; yea, in spite of their greatest opposition.

* Or three, rather; for the words have also been connected by some with ἦν = ἦν τῶν, adhuc ce tempus, at the time of our weakness. — P. S.]

At the proper time (or, in due season). Κατὰ καιρὸν. Two connections of the κατὰ καιρὸν. 1. It is united to ὑμῖν, &c. We were week according to the time, in the sense of excuse (Erasmus); in the sense of the general corruption (according to Calvin, Luther, Hofmann). Against this are both the position of καιροῦ, and the significance. 2. It is referred to ἀπειθείας, but in different ways. Origen: at that time, when he suffered. Abardel: held awhile in death. [Kypke, Reiche, Philippi, Alford, Hodge: at the appointed time, foretold by the prophets. — P. S.] Meyer: As it was the full time [proper
time] for the deliverance of those who lived at that time. Better: "It was the fit time in the history of humanity. This by no means weakens the principal thought, which rather requires the definite statement that the sacrificial death of Christ was according to Divine wisdom; since the necessity for salvation and the capacity for salvation were decided with the fulness of natural corruption. The highest heroism of the self-sacrifice does not exclude its reasonableness. See Rom. xvi. 25; Gal. iv. 4; Eph. i. 10; 1 Tim. ii. 6; Titus i. 3. [κατὰ καυδῶν is = ἐν καυνῷ, ἐπὶ καυνῷ, καυνῷ, τέμπερ ὀρφανῶν; in opposition to παρὰ καυνῷ, τέμπερ ἀθεόν, unthinkingly. Here it is essentially the same with the πλήρωσα τῶν καυνῶν, Eph. i. 10, and the πλήρωσα τοῦ χρόνον, Gal. iv. 4; comp. Mark i. 15. Christ appeared when all the preparations for His coming and His kingdom in the Jewish and Gentile world were completed, and when the disease of sin had reached the crisis. This was God's own appointed time, and the most, or rather the only, appropriate time. Christ could not have appeared with divine fitness and propriety, nor with due effect, at any other time, nor in any other race or country. We cannot conceive of His advent at the time of Noah, or Abraham, or in China, or among the savage tribes of America. History is a unit, and a gradual unfolding of a Divine plan of infinite wisdom. Christ is the turning-point and centre of history, the end of the old and the beginning of the new humanity—a truth which is confessed, wittingly or unwittingly, by every date from A. D. throughout the civilized world."—P. S."

For the ungodly. ιετίζω, for, the good of. It is a fuller conception than the idea instead of, ἀντί, if we remember that, where the question is concerning a dying for those who are worthy of death, the conception naturally involves a well-understood ἀντί. See Matt. xx. 28. The terms ιετίζω and πιαίζω [which Paul uses synonymously, Gal. i. 4] are more comprehensive; but the expression ἀντί is the most definite one. [Meyer contends that ιετίζω and ιετίζω always mean for, in behalf of, for the benefit of; and not the plain of, loco, although, in the case of Christ, His death for the benefit of sinners was a vicarious sacrifice; ii. 25; Eph. v. 2; 1 Tim. ii. 6. Sometimes the ιετίζω, like the English preposition for, to the context, necessarily involves the ἀντί, as in 2 Cor. v. 13, 20; 21; Gal. iii. 13; Philom. 13. The Apostle says ιετίζω δεσπότης, instead of ιετίζω θεοῦ, in order to bring out more fully, by this strong antithesis, the amazing love of Christ.—P. S.] Ver. 7. For scarcely for a righteous man will one die, though, for the good man, perhaps some one may even dare to die [Μόλις γὰρ ιετίζω δικαίων (without the article) τὰς ἀπο- θανατίς ιετίζω γὰρ (the second γὰρ seems to be exceptive, and introduces a correction of the preceding with reference to μόλις with difficulty, I say, for it is a fact that) τοῦ ἀγαθοῦ (with the article) τὰξιν καὶ τοῦ ὑψιτοῦ ἀποθανάτων. P. S.]. The difficulty of this verse has led to various conjectures.* The Peshito reads ιετίζω αδικῶν (ungodly), instead of ιετίζω δικαίων; Erasmus, Luther, Melanchthon, &c., read δικαίων and ἀγαθάδων as neuter words; Hofmann [formerly, not now.—P. S.]: at least the latter is neuter; Origen, on the contrary, held merely δικάς as neuter, and understood by ἄγαθὰδες Christ as the perfectly good One. But, as Meyer properly observes, that both substantives are masculine, is evident from the antithesis ἀγαθίκη, by which the question is generally concerning a dying for persons. [⊿καίων, without the article, must be masculine; a righteous person (not the right, τὸ δίκαιον); but τοῦ ἀγαθοῦ, with the article, may, grammatically, be taken as neuter = νομίμον bonus (the country, or any good cause or noble principle for which martyrs have died in ancient and modern times). Yet, in this case, the antithesis would be lost, since Christ likewise died for the highest good, the salvation of the world. The antithesis is evidently between men who scarcely are found to die for a δίκαιον, though occasionally perhaps for ᾧ (their) ἀγαθῶν, and Christ who died for ἀγαθίκη, ver. 6; or ἀγαθοτοῖοι, ver. 8; and even for ἔστροφι (the very opposite of ἀγαθοτοῖοι), ver. 10. In both cases, the death for persons, not for a cause, is meant.—P. S.]

Explanations of the masculines: (1) There is no material difference between δίκαιος and ἀγαθός. "After Paul has said that scarcely for a 'righteous' man will one die, he will add, by way of contrast, that there might occur instances of the undertaking of such a death." Meyer, in harmony with Chrysostom, Theodor., Erasmus, Calvin,* &c. But δίκαιος is not ἀγαθός, and μόλις (scarcely) is not τὰξιν (possibly).

(2) ὁ ἀγαθός is the benefactor. Knauthbell [Animad. in libros N. T., 169, p. 120], Estius [Coccetus, Hammond], and many others; Reiche, Tholuck: The Friend of Man. This is too special.

(3) The ἀγαθός stands above the merely righteous or just. A metaphorism: the noble one, that ἀγαθός by nature; Bengel: homo innoxxus exemplo gratia, &c. ["δικαίος, indifferently, implies a harmless (guiltless) man; ὁ ἀγαθός, one perfect in all that piety demands, excellent, bounteous, princely, blessed—for example, the father of his country."—P. S.]

Meyer regards all these as "subtle distinctions." [He quotes, for the essential identity of δίκαιος and ἀγαθός, Acts xxi. 45; Luke xxii. 50; Rom. v. 12, where both are connected.—P. S.]. Then the difference between the Old and New Testament would also be a subtle drawing of distinctions. The Old Testament, even in its later period, scarcely produced one kind of martyrdom; but the New Testament has a rich martyrdom. Yet we would understand the ἀγαθός in a more general sense. The δίκαιος instills respect, but he does not establish, as such, a communion and exchange of life; but the ἀγαθός inspires Paul's acknowledgment here, which was supported by heathen examples, is a proof of his apostolic considerateness, and of his elevation above all slavery to the letter. An ecclesiastical rhetorician would have suppressed the concession. The selection of the expression with τὰξιν and τοῦ ἑπίσημου is admirable; such self-sacrifices are always made headlong in the ecstasy of sympathetic generosity.

* [Calvin: "Eπειδὴ quod minus inter homines exemptum est, ut pro justo quis moriatur: quoniam tamen mustarda, accideri possit?" The exception establishes the rule. F. W. F. Deissmann (in the second edition of his Schriftbeweis, ii. 1, p. 348), and Mowinckel (3rd ed. of his Testament) have restored this view. In the 1st ed. (which Hodges, p. 214 added, alone, to have established this assumption), Meyer took τοῦ ἀγαθοῦ, on account of the article, as neuter (as did Jerome, &c.), and rendered the latter clause of the verse interjectively: "i.e., the word's use inclines sich für das Gute zu sterben!—P. S."
4. It is hardly necessary to mention the view [maintained by Meyer in the first edition, but now given up by him.—P. S.] that the second member of the sentence is interrogative: for who would dare to die ready even for the good?

[It can be seen no material difference between interpretations 2 and 3. The principal point in both of these is that distinction between just and kind. Such a distinction is made by Ordo in Trenchus, Act. and. Rom. i. 27; quoted also by Eusebius, H. E., iv. 11: "si vir bonus est qui protest quislibet potest, necet nemini, recte (certe)ustum virum, nonum non facile reperemus." (but some editions read: "certe latum virum bonum").] The righteous man, who does all that the law or justice requires, commands our respect and admiration; the good man, the benefactor, who is governed by love, inspires us with love and gratitude. Then we would have the following sense: "It is hardly to be expected that any one would die for a righteous man, though for the good man (i.e., for a kind benefactor or intimate friend), this self-denial might possibly be exercised, and does occasionally occur. So Olshausen, Tholuck, Philippi, Turner, Stuart, Hodge, Alford, Wordsworth. The latter refers to the death of Grecakes for Pyidaes, his al epi ego, and of Aegates for Admetus, her husband. Webster and Wilkinson: "To make the admission less at variance with the first assertion, he substitutes for δικαιον, τον ἄγαθον, the man of eminent kindness and philanthropy, the well-known benefactor, ἐρωτοσ, 'bonus,' in advance of δικαιον." The article before ἄγαθον may be pressed as justifying the distinction: a righteous man, the good man, good to him, his benefactor. I confess, I am not quite satisfied with this interpretation, but it is better than any other.—P. S.]

Ver. 8. But God doth establish [giveth proof of, συντειχών, as in iii. 5; comp. Tactual Note a, on p. 118.—P. S.] God proves not merely His love in the death of Christ for sinners, according to ver. 6, but He makes it conspicuous and prominent; He exhibits it; He makes it the highest manifestation of His gospel. See John iii. 16; 2 Cor. v. 19-21. Luther: He promises [E. V., He commends] His love toward us [τού ἐν τοίο ἂν ἄγαθον ἰδων, His own love, in contrast with the love of men, ver. 7.—P. S.]

Ver. 9. Much more, therefore, being now justified by His blood, we shall be saved through him from the wrath [ἀπὸ τοῦ ἐαυτού, from the well-known and well-deserved wrath to come. —P. S.] According to Estius, a conclusion a minori ad majus; according to Meyer, a conclusion a majore ad minora. Both are in part right and in part wrong, because neither view exactly applies. It is a conclusion from the principle to the consequence, and a conclusion from the truth of the almost incredible to the truth of that which is self-evident. The conclusion is still further strengthened by the antithesis: as enemies, we were justified by His blood, and as being His fellow-participants in peace, we shall be preserved from the wrath by the glorious exercise of His authority, and then by His life Preservation from wrath is a negative expression of perfect redemption. 1 Thess. i. 10. Compare the positive expression of 1 Tim. iv. 18.—[By His blood. άιμα is the concrete expression for the stoning death of Christ, which is the meritorious cause of our justification. This does not rest on our works, nor our faith, nor any thing we have done or can do, but on what Christ has done for us comp. iii. 28.—P. S.]

Ver. 10. For if, being enemies [εἰς γάρ ἐκ των ἄνευς.] It may be asked whether ἐκ των —that is, God's enemies—is to be explained actively or passively; whether it denotes the enemies [haters] of God, according to chap. vii. χ [ἐκ των τῶν θεον κατασκευασμον, Col. i. 21 (Eph. ii. 16 does not belong here), or those who are charged with God's wrath [hated by God], for which view Rom. xi. 28 [where ἐκ των is the God of the ungodly; comp. also διότινας, i. 13, and τίκλιν ἐκεῖνος, Eph. ii. 3.—P. S.] has been cited. The passive interpretation has been supported by Calvin, Reiche, Fitzsche, Tholuck, KrebL, Baumgart-Crusius, De Wette, Philippi, Meyer [Alford, Hodge], and the active or subjective interpretation by *Spener, Tittman, Usteri, and Rückert [among English commentators, by Turner]. Meyer says in favor of the first view: 1. "Christ's death did not destroy the enmity of man toward God; but, by effecting their pardon on the part of God, it destroyed the enmity of God toward men, whence the cessation of man's enmity toward God follows as a moral consequence, brought about by faith. 2. And how could Paul have been able to infer properly his πολιτω ἀλλων, since, the certainty of the συνιστασθήσεως rests on the fact that we stand in a friendly relation (grace) to God, and not on our being friendly toward God?"

These two arguments have a very orthodox sound, but are without a vital grasp of the fact of the atonement, and else without force. For, first of all, the death of Christ is as well a witness and seal of God's love, which overcomes man's enmity and distrust, as it is an offering of reconciliation, which removes the ἐρωτοσ των in His government and in the conscience of man. This element constitutes the force in the living proclaiming of the gospel; for example, among the Moravians. In the next place, if we look away from God's work in man, we have no ground for assuming an increase [πολιτω μετασχεσιν] in God's love and grace in itself. God is unchangeable; man is changeable. The changed relation of man to God is indeed conditioned by a changed relation of God to him; but it is by virtue of God's unchangeableness that the work of God, which has been accomplished in him, is the pledge of its completion. See Phil. i. 6. The sealing signifies, not a sealing of God, but of man by God's grace. It is not biblical to say, that Christ, by His death, has removed God's enmity toward us. And yet the Apostle is alleged to say that here, just after he has said: But God sets forth and commends His love, &c., Then the odd sense would be: We

* [Tholuck (and Stuart after him) quotes a number of passages from the classico and the Talmud, which to my mind have no force at all.—P. S.]
* [The original, by mistake, mentions here Tholuck, who holds the opposite view, at least in the fifth and last edition of his Comm., p. 210, and says that the οὖσι πολυδιν necessarily implies that to be πολιτω μετασχεσιν an argument a fortiori. If the greater benefit has been bestowed, the less will not be withheld. If Christ has died for His enemies, He will surely as 'e His friends.'—P. S.]
have been even reconciled when we were not yet reconciled!

We were reconciled to God [καταλαλάγηται εἰς Γείγην].

(Some preliminary philological remarks on this important term, which occurs here for the first time, may be found useful. The verbs διαλαλάσσω, καταλαλάσσω, ἀποκαταλαλάσσω, συναλαλάσσω (from ἀλάσσω, to change), express the general idea of a change of relation of two parties at once into a relation of peace, or the idea of reconciliation (Versuchung, Auswehung), with a slight modification indicated by the prepositions όποια, ἐν τῷ ... διὰ, between; ἐπί, from; σύν, with, but without reference to the question whether the eminence be mutual, or on one side only—which must be decided by the connection. The noun διαλαλήσις is more frequently used in the classics than καταλαλήσις, but nowhere in the New Testament; the verb διαλαλάσσω, or διαλάττω occurs only once; in the pass. aor. 2 imperfect., Matt. v. 24: διαλαλάσσετον τῷ ἀδικώ σου, be reconciled to thy brother. The noun καταλαλήσις is used four times in the New Testament; Rom. v. 11 (E. V., atonement); xi. 15 (the reconciling); 2 Cor. v. 18, 19 (reconciliation, twice); the corresponding verb καταλαλάσσω occurs six times—Rom. v. 10 (twice); 1 Cor. v. 11; 2 Cor. v. 18, 19, 20—and is always rendered in our E. V. to reconcile. The translation atonement, at the close of Rom. v. 11, is etymologically correct (at-one-ment = reconciliation), but theoretically wrong in the present use of the term = propitiation, expiation (which corresponds to the Greek εἰσαγωγή; 1 John ii. 2; iv. 10). The καταλαλήσις, in the Christian sense, signifies the great change in the relation between God and man, brought about by the voluntary atoning sacrifice of Christ, whereby God's wrath has been removed, His justice satisfied, and man reunited to Him as His loving and reconciled Father. Some confine the word simply to a reconciliation of man to God, on the ground that no change can take place in God, or that God never hated the sinner. Others forget that the death of Christ is itself the most amazing exhibition of God's love, whereby He attracts the sinner to Him. The two sides must not be abstractly separated. It is God who, in His infinite love, establishes a new relation between Himself and man by the propitiatory sacrifice of His Son, and removes all legal obstructions which separated us from Him; and on the ground of this objective and accomplished expiation (ἰεισαγωγής) and reconciliation (καταλαλήσις), we are called upon to be reconciled to Him (καταλάλησθε τῷ Θεῷ; 2 Cor. v. 20; comp. σωθήται ἄποικοι, Acts ii. 40), i. e., to lay aside all enmity and distrust, and to turn in love and gratitude to Him who first loved us. Both sides are beautifully set forth in 2 Cor. v. 18-20 (which is often one-sidedly and wrongly quoted against the doctrine of the vicarious sacrifice), viz., the reconciliation effected once for all by God Himself through the death of His Son, having the world for its object and remission of sins for its effect; and the reconciliation of men to God as a moral process, in which men are exhorted to take part. The first is a finished act of infinite mercy on the part of God towards us Christians, and the second a spiritual condition and a constant duty of man in consequence of what has been done for him. Comp. Kling and Wing on the passage in Lange on 2 Cor., p. 98 f., Amer. edition, Archbishop Trench (Synonymes of the New Testament, Second Part, p. 187 f.) gives the following judicious explanation of the term: "The Christian καταλαλήσις has two sides. It is first a reconciliation, 'qua Deus nos sibi reconciliavit,' laid aside His holy anger against our sins, and received us into favor—a reconciliation effected once for all for us by Christ upon His cross; so 2 Cor. v. 18, 19; Rom. v. 10; in which last passage καταλαλήσις is a pure passive, 'ab eo in gratiam recipit, quod quem in opio factum est.' But καταλαλήσις is secondly, and subordinately, the reconciliation, 'qua nos Deus reconciliavit,' the daily deposition, under the operation of the Holy Spirit, of the enmity of the old man toward God. In this passive middle sense καταλαλήσις is used; 2 Cor. v. 20; and cf. 1 Cor. vii. 11. All attempts to make this, the secondary meaning of the word, to be the primary, rest not on an unjustified exegesis, but on a foregone determination to get rid of the reality of God's anger against sin. With καταλαλήσις connects itself all that language of Scripture which describes sin as a state of enmity (ἐχθραί) with God (Rom. viii. 7; Eph. ii. 15; James iv. 4); and sinners as enemies to Him, and alienated from Him (Rom. v. 10; Col. i. 21); Christ on the cross as the Peace, and Maker of peace between God and man (Eph. ii. 14; Col. i. 20); all such language as this. 'Be ye reconciled with God' (2 Cor. v. 20)."—F. S.]

Meyer. "Accordingly it is necessary to understand καταλαλήσις in a neuter sense, and not actively, but passively: reconciled with God, so that He is no more hostile to us, having given up His wrath against us." On Tittmann's attempt to distinguish between διαλαλήσις and καταλαλήσις, see Tholuck on The Sermon on the Mount, Matt. v. 24. The definition of these expressions is certainly connected with the explanation of ἐξαγωγή. It may be asked, however, whether the meaning is: God has been reconciled toward us (Meyer, Philipps); or: we have been reconciled toward God; or: there has been a mutual reconciliation? The first cannot be said [7], since the καταλαλήσις denotes a change from enmity to friendship]; also the καταλαλήσις in 2 Cor. v. 18, "τού καταλαλατήντος ἐμάς κατοίκον," must be carefully distinguished from the ἐκαταλαλήσις (see my Angewandte Dogmatik, p. 858).* The sense is, therefore: While we were still enemies, adversaries of God, we were delivered by the death of Jesus, and the etymological correction (καταλαλήσις) is inserted, to free us from the guilt of the ἐργα, and have been made objects of His conquering operation of love; and now, in the light of this operation of love, we have a heart delivered from the enmity of alienation from God—a heart which, in the train of love, has joy in God. But how can we distinguish between the objective and subjective change of humanity? It is plain, from the risen Redeemer's salvation of peace, and His gospel-message, that the love of Christ on the cross conquered the hatred of humanity. The risen Saviour's salvation of peace contains the "peace on earth." Add to all this the difference and antithesis between vers. 8, 9, 10, which are completely oblique.

* [And also the note of Fritzsche on Rom. v. 10. Tittmann, De Synom. N. T., i. 102 (approved by Robinson καταλαλήσις), makes διαλαλήσις to mean "offices ut quae fuit honestatiae gratiae, una ratione et unam sesponsam cum exiatur alter ita, medicus animae deponent." This distinction is arbitrary and fanciful. Comp. the preceding remarks.—P. S.]

† [In vol. iii., p. 858, of his work on Dogmatics, Dr. Lange distinguishes between καταλαλήσις as belonging to the prophetic, ἐκαταλαλήσις to the priestly, and ἐκκαταλαλήσις to the kingly office of 'Christ. F. S.]
The rising climax is the following: 1. We are delivered from the wrath. 2. We are safely harbored in the life of Christ. 3. God, in His love, has become, through Christ, our God, in whom we glory. We glory not only in the hope of the δόξα of God, and not only conditionally in tribulations, &c., but we glory absolutely in God as our God; see chap. viii.

Through whom we have now. Reference to the future glory, as it is grounded in the experience of the present salvation, and ever develops itself from this base.—Have appropriated [τὴν καταλλαγὴν ἐλαμβάνομεν]. So we translate the ἐλαμβάνομεν (angelicized haben), to emphasize the fact of the ethical appropriation, which is very important for the beginning of the following section.

It is safe to infer from ἐλαμβάνομεν that καταλλαγὴ primarily means here a new relation of God to us, which He has brought about and which we receive, not a new relation of man to God, or a moral change in us, although this is a necessary moral consequence of the former, and inseparable from it. Hence καταλλαγήν, in Rom. v. 10, is parallel with διανοωθέντες, ver. 9: διανοωθέντες σωθόμενα—καταλλαγήν σωθόμενα. The article before καταλλαγή indicates the well-known, the only possible reconciliation, that which was brought about by the atoning sacrifice of Christ. The E. V. was excepted. Bengel, however, assigns it to the καταλλαγή in its old sense (= at-one-meant), meant reconciliation, but is now equivalent to expiation, propitiation, satisfaction. The expiation of Christ (ἰδιαῖς, ἵδον, the German Verfassung) is the condition of the reconciliation of God and man (καταλλαγὴ, Verfassung). Bengel says, on Rom. iii. 24: "Propitiation (ἰασός) takes away the offence against God; reconciliation (καταλλαγὴ) has two sides (ἐστὶ διάλυσις): it removes (ἀ) God's indignation against us; 2 Cor. v. 19; (b.) our alienation from God; 2 Cor. v. 20." In the same place Bengel distinguishes between καταλλαγὴ and ἀπολύσια (redemption, Erlösung), by referring the former to God, the latter to enemies—i., e., sin and Satan. He remarks, however, that ἵδος and ἀπολύσια are fundamentally one single benefit, namely, the restituto peccatoris perditi.—P. S."

DOCTRINAL AND ETHICAL.

1. Ver. 1. The effect of justification is peace with God. Peace with God takes the place of our guilty relation, in which God seemed to be our enemy, because He was hostile to our sins—with which we were identified—and in His love separated us from Him, in order to separate us from sin. In this relation of guilt we were really His enemies, although we wished to appear to be the contrary. God, in His government, likewise seemed to oppose us unto death, as we opposed Him. And therefore we were at variance also with the best portion of the world, and with the kingdom of all good spirits, as we were at variance with ourselves and with God. But, with our justification, peace is established, as with it the reverse must hold of all these respects. We should not speak of the peace of God as of a mere sensation; in the feeling of peace, the most glorious actual relation is reflected. We are not only in harmony, but in covenant union with God; not only in harmony with ourselves, but true to ourselves; not only in harmony with God's presence and government in the world, and in all events, but also in con
connection with and under the protection of "all the stars of heaven."

The access to the throne of grace.

The high-priest, who went into the Holy of Holies in the hope of beholding there the glory of God, was chiefly a type of Christ, who has gone into the real Holy of Holies for His own people, and has become the new atonement for us (Heb. ix.); but he was also the type of believers, who, through Christ, likewise have free access to the Holy of Holies of grace, in the hope of beholding there the glory of God, and being glorified in it (see chap. viii. On the certainty of the Christian's hope, see Tholuck, p. 202.

We glory in tribulations also, ver. 3. Tribulations—subjectively, sorrows; and, taken together, the cross which the Christian must bear after His Saviour—are not only the ordained way to glory, but also the means of promoting glory. For believers shall attain not merely the glory of the Adamic paradise, but rather the higher glory of Christ's paradise; and this they reach because they are similarly situated, and become like Him in death as in life. The Cross effects the enriched and established consummation.

The glorying of Christians is their joyous testimony of a blessed experience—the personal shape which the gospel takes. It is always conditioned according to its changing form by a fundamental form of salvation; that is, established on the glory of God and Christ, in opposition to all the forms and disguises of self-glory.

The sorites, tribulation worketh constancy, &c. (vers. 3—5), represents tribulation also as a spiritual experience. Therefore a merely external suffering, such as any body may have, is not meant thereby, but the cross as a consequence of Christian faith. Faith leads into tribulation, because, as peace with God, it leads into conflict with the kingdom of darkness, and also with sin in ourselves, because it enforces the ordinary suffering of this life with a spiritual character. Such a bearing of the cross looks to constancy, or steadfastness (passive patientia has active patientia as a result); steadfastness reaches its preliminary issue, as well as its final issue, in approval (experience); approval converts hope to confidence, assurance, because it is itself the prophecy of approval and victory. The Apostle's sorites describes a chain of blessed experiences, which cannot be broken unless the first links to approval are rendered brittle by insincerity, but whose strength increases from link to link to that unconditionally approving assurance of hope.

The elder dogmatics, especially the Reformed, have made prominent the doctrine of approval and perseverance in grace; or, what is the same, the doctrine of sealing. They made sealing the true justification. If this great truth had been carefully guarded, the controversy between the Lutheran and Reformed theology, as to whether a pardoned person can fall from grace, could have been regarded as a mere question of words, to be solved by the further inquiry as to whether the question concerns Christian justification, or not; and they are sealed. The heart's experience of justification must be put to proof, in which it becomes the historically established experience of life. Steadfastness in such proofs results inwardly in the Holy Spirit (2 Tim. ii. 19; Rev. vii. 3; ix. 4; Eph. i. 18; iv. 30), and outwardly in the establishment of the Christian in the character of his new nature (Rom. viii. 29). The moment of approval is the moment of baptism, confirmation, and ordination, becomes the real character indestructible only by approval, or sealing. This is ethically connected with the fact that, by the test of tribulation and steadfastness, a purifying process has taken place, by which a separation of the most combustible material has been effected.

The way which Christians pursue with Christ goes downward, according to appearance, and often according to feeling; but it goes upward, according to the experience. This occurs in a twofold relation: (1) Since all the high points of worldly consciousness are without support, the Christian's position in the fellowship of Christ, who is above, is established as his second nature. (2) The persevering fellowship in the historical ignorance of Christ, is fellowship in the historical honor which shall be received in the harvest of the world. (3) There is forming a dynamical nature of light and heat of the inner man, which, by its impulsive and sustaining power, as well as by the still stronger upward attraction, ascends to the kingdom of glory.

The experience of the love of God in Christ for us is changed, with its joy, into pure reciprocal love; and from the complete life of love of this new birth there arises pure salvation, which, in this world, is divided into hope and patience. See chap. viii. 24, 25; 1 John iii.

As the Holy Spirit caused the birth of Christ, so does He cause the new birth of Christians: ver. 5.

The contemplation of the love of God for us, which was revealed in the death of Jesus, in His dying for us (ver. 8), remains the ground of the life of love of believers. See Philippi, p. 166. On the ἐπίσκοπος, see Meyer, p. 150. [P. 189 f., fourth edition.]

Meyer maintains here that in all the passages which treat of the object of the death of Christ (as Luke xxii. 19, 29; Rom. viii. 32; xiv. 16, &c.), the propositions ἀπέκτεινεν and ἥν ἔχειν mean in commodum, for the benefit of, and must not be confounded with ἀπέκτεινεν, loco, instead of, which Paul never uses (but Christ Himself uses it, Matt. xx. 28, δοῦναι τὴν ψυχήν αὐτοῦ λείτους ἁπλῶς, comp. Mark x. 45, λείτους ἀντὶ πολίων); but that Paul nevertheless teaches a satisfaction vicaria, by representing Christ's death as a propitiatory sin-offering, Rom. iii. 25; Eph. v. 2, &c.—P. S.]

After the Apostle has represented the sorites of the Christian's subjective certainty of salvation (vers. 1—5), he makes a sorites of his objective certainty of salvation (vers. 6—11). The thesis from which he proceeds is the fact that, among men, there is scarcely one who will die for a righteous man, though perhaps one would die for the good man (see the Exeg. Notes; comp. Tholuck, p. 208).

The sentence must be enlarged by the farther definition: Not one who would die for the ungodly, or for his enemy; but God has performed this miracle of love in the death of Christ. For Christ died for us when we were, in a negative view, incapable, and, in a positive view, even ungodly. Therefore the objective certainty of salvation is established in the following conclusions: (1) We were sinners, debtors, for whom Christ died; much more shall we, since we are justified and reconciled, be preserved from the wrath to come. (2) The death of the Son of God has overturned the condemnation, and reconciled us; much more shall His life perfectly be glorified as reconciled until the consummation. (3) Since we have obtained reconciliation, we are happy even now in the triumphant joy that God is our God.
12. On the difference between the ἁλασρός and the αὐτάλαγγες, see the Evag. Notes [p. 166].

[Bishop Horsley (Serm. on Rom. iv. 26) on the
atone and recombination: “Those who speak
of the wrath of God as appeased by Christ’s suf-
fers, speak, it must be confessed, a figurative lan-
guage. Scripture speaks figuratively when they
scribe wrath to God. The Divine nature is insus-
cceptible of the perturbations of passion, and, when
it is said that God is angry, it is a figure, which
conveys this useful warning to mankind, that God
will be determined by His wisdom, and by His
providential care of His creation, to deal with the
wicked, as a prince in anger deals with rebellious
subjects. It is an extension of the figure when it
is said that God’s wrath is appeased by the suffer-
ing of Christ. It is not to be supposed that the
sins of men excite in God an appointment of veng-
ce, which could not be diverted from its purpose
of punishment till it had found its gratification in the
sufferings of a righteous person. This, indeed,
were a view of our redemption founded on a false
and unworthy notion of the Divine character. But
nothing hinders but that the sufferings of Christ,
which could only, in a figurative sense, be an
appesement or satisfaction of God’s wrath, might be,
in the most literal meaning of the words, a satisfac-
tion to His justice. It is easy to understand that
the interests of God’s government, the peace and
order of the great kingdom, over which He rules
the whole world of moral agents, might require
that His disapprobation of sin should be solemnly
declared and testified in His manner of forgiving
it. It is easy to understand that the exaction of
vicarious sufferings on the part of Him, who under-
took to be the intercessor for a rebellious race,
amounted to such a declaration. These sufferings,
by which the end of punishment might be answered,
being once sustained, it is easy to perceive that the
same principle of wisdom, the same providential
care of His creation, which must have determined
the Deity to inflict punishment, had now determine Him to spare.
Thus, to speak figuratively, His anger was ap-
peased; but His justice was literally satisfied, and
the sins of men, no longer calling for punishment,
when the ends of punishment were secured, were
literally expiated. The person sustaining the suf-
ferings, in consideration of which the guilt of others
may, consistently with the principles of good policy,
be remitted, was, in the literal sense of the word—
so literally, as no other victim ever was—a sacrifice,
and His blood shed for the remission of sin was
literally the matter of expiation.”]

13. This section, contains, in narrow compass, a
sketch of the whole development of Christian salva-
tion, in which its principal perfection* is made
emphatic at the beginning as well as at the conclu-
sion, in order that the peripheral imperfection of
the state of faith in this world may not be regarded
in an Ebionitic way as a principal one. We must
observe that, in Rom. viii., this designation is further
elaborated under a new point of view, and that there,
too, the subjective and objective certainty of salvation
can be distinguished.

14. The idea of the real worship of God reap-
pear definedly here in the beginning as well as at
the end of the section.

HOMILETICAL AND PRACTICAL.

The fruits of the righteousness of faith, They
are: 1. Peace with God through our Lord Jesus
Christ (ver. 1); 2. Hope of future glory in the
tribulations of the present time (vers. 2-5); 3. Con-
fidence of salvation established on the love of God
for us as made known in the propitiatory death of
Christ (vers. 6-11).—Peace with God: 1. In what
does it consist? 2. By whom do we obtain it?
(ver. 1).—The peace of heart with God is the source
of all other peace: 1. In homes; 2. In churches;
3. In nations.—By Christ, we have obtained access
to the grace of justification. In this are comprised:
1. A strong consolation (we are no more rejected
from God’s face; the door is opened; we can come
in); 2. A serious admonition (we should not disre-
gard this access, but make use of it; and 3. We
should often come with all our burdens.)—In what
should and can we glory as Christians? 1. In the
future glory which God shall give; 2. But also in the
tribulations which He sends us (vers. 2-5); 3. In God Himself as our God.—Why should we, as
Christians, glory also in tribulations? Because we
know: 1. That tribulation worketh patience (endur-
ance); 2. Patience (endurance) worketh experience
(strictly, approval); 3. Experience (approval) worketh
hope; and 4. Hope maketh not ashamed (vers.
2-5).—Why does Christian hope prevent shame?
1. Because it is not a false hope; but, 2. It has its
ground in the love of God, which is shed abroad
in our hearts by the Holy Ghost which is given unto
us (ver. 5).—In what respect does God commend (prove)
His love toward us? 1. In Christ’s dying at the
appointed time for us; 2. But still more in His
dying for us when we were yet sinners (vers. 6-8).—
It is noble to die for a benefactor, but it is divine
to die for evil-doers (ver. 7).—The importance of
Christ’s life and death for men: 1. His death brings
reconciliation when we are enemies; 2. His life
brings salvation when we are reconciled (vers. 9-11).
—Christ’s life our salvation (ver. 10).—Salvation by
the life of Christ is necessary for Christians of the
present time.—Let us speak of Christ’s death, but
let us also speak continually of His life (ver. 10).
LUTHER: One has experience when he has been
well tempted, and can therefore speak of it as hav-
ing been in himself (ver. 4).—God is our God, and
we are His people, and we have all good things in
common from Him and with Him, in all confidence
(ver. 11).

STARKE: Ver. 2. Future glory is connected with
justification by an indissoluble chain; chap. vili. 18,
30, 32.—Ver. 2. Nothing can make so happy as
the hope of the incorruptible, undeceived, and imper-
ishable inheritance which is reserved in heaven
(vers. 2-5); 1 Peter i. 4.—Ver. 5. He who has the Holy Spirit,
is the only one who is certain that God’s love is shed
abroad in his heart.—Ver. 10. The death of Christ is
the principal reconciliation which our government
is desired toward our salvation; but His resurrection
is the seal and assurance that we are truly reconciled to God.—Ver. 10. Christ’s resurrection
is the ark of life and royal city of our
salvation.—Ver. 11. No one can glory in God but
he who has Christ; for He is the way by which we
come to the enjoyment of God; John xiv. 6.
therefore, who does not have Him, is also without God in the world, Eph. ii. 12.—HERRINGER: To be certain of the forgiveness of sin, is the fountain of all joy and consolation (ver. 1).—Beware of the hypocrite's hope, which destroys! The believer clings to God's love, as a Christian an anchor to the rock; Heb. vi. 19. Would God we understood this well! If we did, nothing could grieve and afflict us (ver. 5).—A Christian must regard the suffering of Christ not only as a mirror of wrath, but also as a mirror of love (ver. 8).—What a glory! God's child, and in good favor with Him! How incomprehensible, how glorious, and how blessed! (ver. 11).—Cramer: If we are justified by faith, we have free access to God, so that we do not need any patron or saint to prepare the way for us (ver. 2).—The suffering of Christians is their glory; for they suffer without guilt, and for Christ's glory (ver. 3).—Osiander: The cross and tribulation make us humble and patient; they are therefore the most precious gems and best ornament of the children of God (ver. 3).—Novus Bibl. Tub.: Oh, how blessed is the cross! Though it paineth the soul, it brings eternal good. We are better purified by it, than God is by fire; our hope is strengthened, and the love of God is shed abroad in the heart (ver. 5).—Love is rare among men, yet there are remarkable examples of some who have given up their lives for their fellow-citizens and brethren. But there is no comparison between all this and the love of Christ (ver. 7).—Who would not love in return a God so full of love, and prefer fellowship with Him to that of all others? (ver. 10).—Gerlach: Justification by faith not only gives free access to God's grace at the present time, but it also confers the certainty of future glory (ver. 2).—In justification the believer receives the first germ of the whole new life. But since the germ grows into a tree, and the tree ever becomes more firmly rooted amid storms, all that the believer had at the beginning is renewed and established at every new stage of trial (ver. 5).—Since God has performed for sinners and enemies the greatest service, His will certainly not leave unfinished for the reconciled and righteous the much smaller remaining part of His work (ver. 9).—The Apostle begins to indicate here what he treats more at length in chap. vi.: Faith so transposes us into Christ, that His life, death, resurrection, and glory, become ours. Each circumstance from His history becomes the history of mankind believing in Him, as well as of each individual believer (ver. 10).—Lisco: The saving fruits of the righteousness acquired by faith in Jesus Christ (vers. 1-11).—The fruit of this righteousness (vers. 1-5).—The most certain sign of the love of God toward us just mentioned, is the redemption made by Christ (vers. 6-8).—The blessed result of this love of God and Christ, is the certain hope of the eternal duration of this love, and, finally, of our attainment of glory (vers. 9-11).—Hünter: Paul here strikes the note of the triumphal song of the justified. Listen: His reader should participate in his joy; we are reconciled, we are pardoned.—Without justification, there is no joy, no love, no happiness in life; without it, nothing can make us happy.—n'ther nature, nor the love of men (ver. 1).—Grace is prepared, and offered to us. But not merely for us, but for all believers (ver. 2).—Re on whom God has placed many burdens, has much entrusted to him. God has made him an object of distinction. Therefore, the higher and more joyous the Christian's spirit is in suffering, the greater will be the increase of his joy and strength in conflict (ver. 3).—What influence does suffering exert on the Christian? (ver. 3).—The sacred hope of the Christian maketh not ashamed; it is holy in its object and ground. Faith in the love of God is the ground of all hope (ver. 5).—The helplessness of the unimproved heart is followed by the saddest results of sin; just as severe sickness is succeeded by weakness (ver. 6).—God's holy love of His enemies (ver. 8).—The greatest misery of a created being is to bear the wrath of God (ver. 9).—God's love of us is a prevent't love (ver. 10).—Christ's life is the ground of our salvation (ver. 10).—Besser: The salvation of those who are justified by faith. It is: 1. A present salvation; 2. Also a future one (vers. 1-11).—Reconciliation is praiseworthy, because the evergreen of hope is sprinkled with the tears of tribulation (vers. 3-5).—God's wrath is not human; God is love, and Divine wrath is connected with the love which takes no pleasure in the wrath of the sinner, but is an ardent, compassionate desire to save the sinner. Reconciliation is the execution of this loving determination of God by means of the atonement through the death of His Son (ver. 10).—God unites in the Church with pardoned sinners—who have faith in Jesus, and glory in God as their God—more intimately and gloriously than in Paradise with innocent man (ver. 11).—Schlegelmann, on vers. 7, 8: The death of Christ is the highest glorification of God's love toward us. 1. God imposed death on our Redeemer as the most perfect proof of obedience; 2. Many are justified by this obedience.—Spener: 1. The fruits of justification: (a.) Peace; (b.) Access to God; (c.) The joy of future hope; (d.) Victory in tribulation and the cross; (e.) The gift of the Holy Ghost. 2. The causes of justification (vers. 1-11).—Burkitt: One grace generates and begets another; graces have a generation one from another, though they all have one generation from the Spirit of God. He that does not seek reconciliation with God, is an enemy of his soul; and he that rejoices not in that reconciliation, is an enemy to his own comfort. —Logan (sermon on Jesus Christ Dying for Sinners, Rom. v. 7, 8): The greatest trial and exercise of virtue is when an innocent man submits to the imputation of a crime, the sufferer may be free from the punishment. This Christ did. He was betrayed like an impostor by one of His own disciples, apprehended like a robber by a band of soldiers, led like a malefactor through the streets of Jerusalem, nailed like a murderer to the accursed tree, and, in the sight of all Israel, died the death of a traitor and a slave, that lie might atone for the real guilt of men.—Comp. Comm.: He that puts himself to the charge of purchasing our salvation, will not decline the trouble of applying it. Homer: As the love of God in the gift of His Son, and the love of Christ in dying for us, are the peculiar characteristics of the gospel, no one can be a true Christian on whom these truths do not exert a governing influence.—Annot. Paragraph Bible: God establishes His love toward man by demonstration; it is a love worthy of Himself, and which none but Himself can feel. —Comp. Chrysostom, De Gloria in Tribulationibus; Aylesbury, Four Sermons, Works, vol. xiii. 226; John Hossian, Inflam. of Hope, Works, vol. vi. 277; Bishop Mant, The Love of God the
SECOND DIVISION.

SIN AND GRACE IN THEIR SECOND ANTITHESIS (AS IN THEIR SECOND POTENCY): ACCORDING TO THEIR NATURAL EFFECTS IN HUMAN NATURE, AND IN NATURE IN GENERAL. THE SINFUL CORRUPTION OF THE WORLD, PROCEEDING FROM ADAM, AND INHERITED IN COMMON BY ALL MEN, AND THE LIFE OF CHRIST AS THE INWARD LIVING PRINCIPLE OF THE NEW BIRTH TO NEW LIFE IN INDIVIDUAL BELIEVERS, IN ALL MANKIND, AND IN THE WHOLE CREATED WORLD. (THE PRINCIPLE OF DEATH IN SIN, AND THE PRINCIPLE OF THE NEW LIFE; AS WELL AS THE GLORIFICATION OF THE NEW LIFE, AND OF ALL NATURE, IN Righteousness.)

CHAPTERS V. 12-VIII. 39.

First Section.—Adam's sin as the powerful principle of death, and God's grace in Christ as the more powerful principle of the new life in the nature of individual men, and in mankind collectively. The law as the direct medium of the complete manifestation of sin, for the indirect mediation of the completed and glorious revelation of grace.

Chapter V. 12-21.

12 Wherefore, as by one man sin entered into the world, and death by sin; and so death passed upon all men, for that (ap. 2.1, &c., on the ground that, because) all have sinned: (omit parenthesis.) For until the law was sin in the world; but sin is not imputed when there is no law [where the law is not]. Nevertheless death reigned from Adam to Moses, even over them that had not sinned [those that sinned not] after the similitude [likeness] of Adam's transgression, who is the figure [a type] of him that was to come [the coming one, i. e., the second Adam]. But not as the offence [fall, transgression], so also is the free gift: for if through the offence [transgression] of [the] one [the] many be dead [died], much more [did] the grace of God, and the gift by grace, which is by one man [the gift by the grace of the one man], Jesus Christ, hath abounded [abound] unto [the] many. And not as it was [omit it was] by [the] one that sinned: so [omit so] is the gift: for the judgment was [came] by [reference to] one (fall, transgressions) unto justification [Oukios, sentence of acquittal, righteous decree, or, righteous act]. For if by one man's offence [by one transgression, or, by the transgression of the one] death reigned by [through the] one; much more they which [who] receive [the] abundance of [the] grace and of the gift of righteousness shall reign in life by [the] one, Jesus Christ.

18 [omt parenthesis.] Therefore, as by the offence of one judgment came upon all men to condemnation; even so by the righteousness of one the free gift came upon all men unto justification of life [So then, as through the transgression of one, or, one transgression, it came upon all men to condemnation; so also through the δικαιοσύνης, righteous act of one, or, one righteous act, it came upon all men unto justification of life]. For as by one man's disobedience [through the disobedience of the one man] [the] many were made [constituted] sinners, so [also, otnos hcat] by the obedience of [the] one shall [the] many be made [constituted] righteous. Moreover the law entered [came in besides], that the offence [transgression] might abound [multiply]. But where
21 sin abounded [multiplied], grace did much more [exceedingly] \(^{11}\) abound: That as sin hath [omit, hath] reigned unto [\(\hat{e}v\), in] death, even so [so also] might grace reign through righteousness unto eternal life by [through] Jesus Christ our Lord.

**TEXTUAL.**

1 Ver. 12.—[\(O\ \theta\iota\nu\pi\tau\omicron\sigma\) (Rec.) is found in N. B. C. K. L, some versions and fathers; it is adopted by Lachmann, Meyer, Wordsworth, and Lange. Tischendorf and Alford omit it, on the authority of D. E. G., and many fathers. Alford concludes it a marginal gloss, thus thrice the subject of parenthesis.] But the external authority for it is sufficient to overcome the doubt arising from the variation in position found in some authorities, especially as the omission may have really arisen from the transcriber's mistaken -\(\omega\nu\), which precedes, for the close of the word he was about to write: -\(\tau\omicron\nu\) (Mayer).]  

2 Ver. 13.—[On the parenthesis of the E. V. This is to be omitted; for, although it might be a help to the ordinary reader, it is inserted on the view that ver. 18 is strictly demonstrative, which is not in accordance with Lange's exegesis. Even were it the case, ver. 12-17 compose an argument so important, that it does not deserve the subordination implied in a parenthesis. The E. V. is frequently unfortunate in this regard: e. g., Gal. 1. 7, where the very theme of the Epistle is put in parenthesis.]

3 Ver. 14.—[Some cursives and fathers omit \(\mu\nu\dot{\iota}\). This probably arose from a wish to make this verse correspond with ver. 12, the meaning of which was misunderstood. There is no question as to the correctness of its insertion.—The pluperfect of the E. V. is to be changed to the simplest past: \(sinned\), as a more correct rendering of the asacri participle. The other emendations are not absolutely necessary, but are offered as more literal, and perhaps preferable for other reasons.]

4 Ver. 15.—[The word παράπτωμα, occurring five times in this section, is rendered offence in the E. V.; by the Amer. Bible Union: trespass. Both are etymologically correct, but more modern usage compels us to reject offence. Trespasses would be preferable to transgression, on the ground that παράπτωσις (ver. 14) must also be rendered by the latter word; yet trespass has at present a technical meaning, which is legal, transgression being more theological. The very slight distinction between παράπτωμα and παράπτωσις is sufficiently noticed in the clauses where the words occur. Lange renders the latter: \(\Sigma\iota\iota\eta\iota\nu\pi\tau\omicron\delta\iota\iota\).]

5 Ver. 15.—[The sorist, \(\epsilon\iota\pi\rho\iota\sigma\nu\epsilon\nu\sigma\nu\), is to be rendered did abound, and the auxiliary did placed after much more, as indicating more plainly that much more is rather quantitative than logical.—The articles are unfortunately omitted throughout in the E. V.; the one, the many, express the definiteness of the Greek.]

6 Ver. 16.—[Lange adopts the reading \(\alpha\iota\mu\rho\iota\chi\iota\mu\rho\iota\sigma\tau\iota\mathrm{mos}\) (D. E. G., some fathers, cursives, and versions, Griesbach), urging that it is required as an antithesis to παράπτωμα \(\varepsilon\iota\sigma\nu\). But this is the very reason for deeming it a gloss. \(\alpha\iota\mu\rho\iota\chi\iota\mu\rho\iota\sigma\tau\iota\mathrm{mos}\) is found in N. A. B. C. K. L, adopted by Tischendorf, Meyer, Alford, and Wordsworth.]

7 Ver. 17.—[The two renderings correspond to two various readings; in any case, man's, of E. V. must be rejected. A. E. G. have \(\varepsilon\iota\sigma\nu\ \pi\alpha\rho\iota\pi\tau\omicron\pi\omega\tau\iota\mathrm{mos}\) (D. E. G., \(\varepsilon\iota\sigma\nu\ \pi\alpha\rho\iota\pi\tau\omicron\pi\omega\tau\iota\mathrm{mos}\), adopted by Griesbach, Tischendorf, Meyer, Lange. N. A. B. C. K. L, many versions and fathers, read \(\varepsilon\iota\sigma\nu\ \pi\alpha\rho\iota\pi\tau\omicron\pi\omega\tau\iota\mathrm{mos}\); adopted by Lachmann, Meyer, Wordsworth. It is a question which is correct, and the auxiliary did placed after much more, as indicating more plainly that much more is rather quantitative than logical.—The articles are unfortunately omitted throughout in the E. V.; the one, the many, express the definiteness of the Greek. Lange supplies παράπτωμα and \(\varepsilon\iota\sigma\nu\). On all the points, see Emph. Notes.

9 Ver. 19.—[So Amer. Bible Union. Lange: \(\iota\nu\alpha\gamma\sigma\tau\iota\nu\eta\sigma\iota\iota\iota\iota\). The rendering given above is correct; any dogmatic questions that arise cannot affect this.]  

10 Ver. 20.—[\(\Pi\alpha\rho\iota\kappa\iota\iota\iota\kappa\iota\iota\iota\) only. Gal. ii. 4; there, in malum partem. The above rendering is literal and exact. Lange translates: \(\tau\omicron\nu\sigma\nu\ \kappa\iota\iota\iota\iota\). See Emph. Notes.]

11 Ver. 20.—[Alford suggests that words compounded with \(\delta\iota\pi\epsilon\) have a superlative, not a comparative force.—The change is the \(\delta\iota\nu\) verb in English is to indicate that two different words are used in Greek.—II.]
CHAPTER V. 12-21.

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.


[Introductory Remarks.—This section is difficult in proportion to its depth, grandeur, and world-historical comprehensiveness. Only a mind of the very highest order—to say nothing of inspiration—could conceive such vast thoughts, and compress them within so few words. The beginning, the middle, and the end of history, are here brought together in their representative moral powers and principles. Paul deals with religious truths and facts, which are much broader and deeper than the after-thoughts of our logic and theology, and cannot be squeezed into the narrow limits of particular schools and schemes. The exegesis of this part of the Romans began in earnest with Augustine, in his contest with the Pelagian heresy; it was resumed in the Reformation period, and carried further, philologically and doctrinally, in the present century, but is by no means exhausted, and puts exegetical skill again, and again to the severest test. Every line bears the marks of theological controversy about original sin, free agency, imputation, limited atonement, universal salvation, and other questions which will occupy the human mind to the end of the world. The section is not a mere history, but a progress in the argument from the doctrine of justification to the broader doctrine of a life-union of the believer with Christ, which prepares the way for the doctrine of sanctification, in chap. vi., and glorification, in chap. vii. Like a skilful physician, the Apostle goes not only to the root and fountain-head of the evil, but also to the root and fountain-head of the cure. In bold antithetical contrasts, and on the basis of a vital, organic union of humanity, both in the order of fallen nature and the order of redeeming grace, he presents the history of the fall by the first, and the redemption by the second Adam. Adam and Christ are the two representative heads of the whole race, the one the natural, the other the supernatural; from the one, the power of sin and the power of death have proceeded upon all men through their participation in his fall; from the other, righteousness and life have come upon all on condition of faith, or a living apprehension of Christ. But the gain by the redemption greatly surpasses the loss by the fall. The main stress lies on the idea of life in its progress from Christ to the believer. The same parallelism be-

* [As Chrysostom remarks in the beginning of his tenth Homily on Romans, Opera, tom. xx. p. 519, ed. Montfaucon, but he omits the positive part, which is more important. — P. S.]
The principle of sin and death in humanity.

Ver. 12. Wherefore [Αδ δι θνό του]. Rückers, Köhler [Tholuck, Reiche, Stuart], &c., refer δι θνό του to the entire discussion from chap. 1, 17. * Roth, to the previous section, v. 1–11, which he claims to treat of holiness; Tholuck, to vers. 11, 10, 9, &c.; Meyer, to ver. 11 alone. † We refer it merely to ἐλάφιαν in the previous verse. The verb λαμβάνει does not denote, in the New Testament, a passive reception, but an ethical, religious, and moral appropriation; for example, John i. 12. And this is here the point of comparison between vers. 9 and 12.

Because this point has been overlooked, an incredible amount of vexation has been produced in reference to the presumed anacoluthon, or ἀνακόλουθον [an incomplete sentence, a prothesis without an apodosis]. Conjectures [concerning the construction or the apodosis corresponding to ὁ πρεπέω, like as]:

1. According to Calvin, Tholuck, Philippi, and others, the conclusion is indicated in the words ὁ πρεπέω τούτου ἐν μέλλοντος, ver. 14. [Meyer also regards the clause: "who is a type of the future (Adam)," as a substitute for the apodosis, which was swept away by the current of ideas in vers. 13 and 14.—P. S.]

2. According to Rückert, Fritzsche, and De Wette [?], Paul dropped the comparison between Adam and Christ after enumerating the points of analogy, because their dissimilarity occurred to his mind (ver. 15). De Wette translates ver. 12: Therefore (is it) as by one man, &c. According to Origen, Bengel [Rothe], and others, the Apostle designedly omitted the apodosis, saying simply: "Apodosis, variata oratione, latet in sequentia." See below.—P. S.

3. According to Grotius, [E. V., Stuart, Barnes, Hodge], &c., vers. 15–17 are parenthetical; and the conclusion follows in ver. 18. [Against this construction may be urged, with Meyer, the unexampled length and importance of the supposed parenthesis, and that ver. 18 is not so much a reassertion as a recapitulation.—P. S.]

4. According to Clericus, Wolf, and others, the conclusion is already in ver. 12, and begins with καὶ πρεπέω [as if this could be synonymous with ωτοι πρεπέω, so also, which is impossible.—P. S.]; according to Erasmus, Beza, and others, it begins with καὶ δεῖ [which makes δεῖ ὑποτασία superfluous, and sets aside the comparison between Adam and Christ.—P. S.]

5. The proper view is the one defended by Koppe, in harmony with [Coccceius] Elamer, and others. The apodosis begins as a comparative statement with ὁ πρεπέω, since ἐλάφιαν κατάλαγγε ἰδι άιότου is brought over from ver. 11. [In other words, ὁ πρεπέω introduces the second member of the comparison, while the first must be supplied from ver. 11 in this way: The comparison has received and appropriated the reconciliation through Christ in the same manner] as by one man sin entered into the world, &c.—P. S.

* [This construction is favored, upon the whole, by De Wette (who, however, objects to it): "Ergeben man πρεπέω [κατέλαγγε] εἰς αἰότου, so wolte man nicht recht, was man und der Vergleichung anfangen sollte." Umbreit, Theo. Schott, Wordsworth, Alford, Jewett, Conybeare and Howson, &c., join Alford's note in full, though I dissent from it: "This verse is in itself equivocal. The two questions meeting us directly, are: (1) To what does δεῖ πρεπέω refer? (2) δεῖ πρεπέω, ὑπερ αὐτοῦ, may introduce the first member of a comparison, the second being to be discovered; or may introduce the second, the first having to be discovered. I shall endeavor to answer both questions in connection. I conceive δεῖ πρεπέω to refer to that blessed state of confidence and hope just described: 'this account, here meaning, quamcum sua se sit,' "this state of things, thus far will justify the following analogy." Thus we must take πρεπέω as beginning the comparison, and then supply, 'so by Christ, in His meritorious justification, and the resurrection, and justification into the world; and by justification, life;' or (2) as concluding the comparison, and supply before it, 'it was, or 'Christ wroth, to himself, not me.' This seems to me far the best. For none of the endeavors of commentators to supply a limb of the comparison from the following verses has succeeded: and we can hardly suppose such an ellipticism, when the next following comparison (ver. 16) is rather
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Tholuck remarks, that then we do not know exactly what is meant by the comparison. But the comparison is contained in the already indicated comparison of the ethical appropriation of the principle of the reconciliation on one hand, as of the principle of sin and death on the other. The antithesis, more fully extended, is the following: Λόγος τοῦ ἐλάφρος εὖ τοῖς παντὶς ἁμαρτίας—οὕτως ὡς ἐν ἀνθρώπω καὶ ἁμαρτίας εἰς τόν κόσμον ἀκάθιναι καὶ διὰ τῆς ἁμαρτίας ὁ θάνατος, καὶ οὕτως ὁ θάνατος εἰς πάντας ἀνθρώπους διέλθεν, ὡς ἡ πάντες ζήσασθαι. It is very plain that, without the comparison, the whole of the following antitheses would appear as a series of blind natural necessities; see Book of Wisdom i. 16; ii. 24, and the explanation of ἕως φῶς, which follows below. Rothe thinks that the Apostle's supposed anacoluthon was even premised—according to the idea of Origen—in order to conceal the doctrine of the apocatastasis which might be deduced from the protasis. See thereon Tholuck, p. 218.

I cannot bring my mind to adopt Dr. Lange's construction, which evades a grammatical difficulty but gives room for a more serious logical one, and mars the beauty and completeness of the analogy: It seems to me that the most natural solution of the difficulty is either (1) to take ἐνακκλησία elliptically: "This is therefore the case when;" comp. Matt. xxv. 14: ἐνακκλησία γὰρ ἀνθρώπως, as a man going abroad, where ἐνακκλησία neither has, nor necessarily requires, a corresponding σύντομος (see Tertullian in the Αμεν. edition of Lange on Matthew, p. 442); Gal. iii. 6; 1 Tim. i. 8, where καθφῶς, Mark xiii. 34, where ὥς is used elliptically; or (2) to assume an intentional anacoluthon (comp. Winer, Gramm., p. 527 f.), on the two kinds of anacolutha, involuntary and intentional. I prefer the latter solution. The complete antithesis would read thus: "As (ἐνακκλησία) by one man (Adam) sin (ἡ ἁμαρτία) entered into the world, and death (ὁ θάνατος) through sin, and thus death extended (ἐπίλειψην) to all men, insomuch as all sinned (ἐμμετρησάμενοι) so also (ὁπίσω καταλύεται) by one man, Jesus Christ, righteousness (ἡ δικαιοσύνη) entered into the world, and life (ἡ ζωή) through righteousness, and thus life shall extend (ἐπιλειπτόμενοι) to all men, insomuch as (κατὰ ὑποστάσιν) all shall believe (πιστεύομεν)." We might also supply, after the second "righteousnesses": "in order that all, being justified by faith, may be saved." Rothe (p. 51) supplies as the last clause of the apodosis: ἐν ὑπερτερία τοίς διακάταστησάμενοι; Philippus: ἐν ἐν πάντες διακάταστησάμενοι. But these are unessential differences. The great points of comparison are: (1) Sin and death, as a principle and power, proceeding from Adam; righteousness and life, as a countering and conquering principle and power, proceeding from Christ, upon the whole human race. (2) Death passing upon all men by participation in the sin of Adam; life passing upon all men by participation in the righteousness of Christ. But the analogy is not absolute; for (1), the participation in Adam's sin is universal in fact, while the participation in the righteousness a weakening than a strengthening the analogy. We have examples of this use of ἐπίλειψις in Matt. xxiv. 14, and of ἐπειπέλειψην, Gal. iii. 6. [P. S.]  

[This objection was made by Dr Wette, from whom Tholuck, p. 216, quotes. Meyer justly remarks that this explanation of the universality of Adam's corruption, which is the prominent idea in ver. 12, has no corresponding parallel in the protasis which is supplied from the preceding verse. [P. S.]

* And also the efficient cause in the same sense in which Christ, through his righteous and propitiatory sacrifice, is the efficient cause of righteousness and life. According to the Pelagian and Unitarian theory, Adam was merely the occasion; he sinned, and set a bad example. Here Christ stands in the position of a mere teacher. [P. S.]
membered, also, as Forbes remarks, that in Genesis the very name of Adam, with the article prefixed (ὁ άνθρωπος), is to be treated as an appellative more than as a proper name, and that, in Gen. i. 27, it includes genetically both sexes: "So God created Adam (in Hebrew) in his own image, in the image of God created he him: male and female created he them. God saw every thing that he had made, and, behold, it was very good." Gen. ii. 1. It was man, or human nature which we have in common with him, that was put on trial in Adam. Paul draws a parallel between Adam and Christ, but never between Eve and Mary. The latter analogy is an unjustifiable inference, first hinted at by Irenaeus, and more fully developed by Roman Catholic divines, and became a fruitful source of Mariology, which virtually makes the human mother of Christ the fountain of the Christian salvation.—P. S.

Sin. [ἡ αμαρτία]. The definite article before ἡ αμαρτία, and also before θανάτος, denotes sin and death as a power or principle which controls the man and reveals itself in hedonistic glorification, and in every form of actual sin. So ἡ διακοσμησθεὶς, which corresponds to it as its opposite, vers. 17, 21, is not a single righteous act, but the power of good as a state and as a working principle. Sin is personified as a fearful tyrant, who acquired universal dominion over the human race; he "reigns in death," ver. 21; "works death in us," vili. 15; "lords it over us," vi. 14; "rules in all manner of conceit of itself," vii. 8; "deceives and slays" the sinner, vili. 11, &c. In all these cases the force of the definite article can be rendered in German, but in English, on the contrary, the absence of the article has the force of generalizing, not so much, as I know, from any rule of grammar, as from usage, and perhaps for euphony's sake.—P. S.

In what sense? Explanations: 1. Original sin, or natural depravity (Augustine, Calvin); 2. Sinfulness (Sinnhaftigkeit, baldus pecaminali), (Koppe, Olshausen [also Webster and Wilkinson: sinfulness personified; a sinful disposition, our sinful nature; vi. 12, 14]); 3. Actual sin (Limborch, Fritzsche): 4. Sin as a ruling power (Meyer [De Wette], Tholuck), or better as a principle (Roths). Philippi, on the contrary, understands sin as the unity of propensity and deed, as also Are, Schmid, J. Muller. But sin, as an individual deed, is expressed by ἁμαρτία, &c. It is therefore the principal or fundamental power (die principiell Macht) of sin as the mother of death (James i. 16). [The Apostle very carefully, throughout this whole section, distinguishes between ἁμαρτία, as the generic idea, and παρακώνος ἡ αμαρτία, as a concrete act, the transgression of a law; compare vers. 13, 15, 20, 21, with 15, 16, 17, 18. By the παρακώνον of Adam the ἁμαρτία entered into the human world, and this ἁμαρτία again became the fruitful mother of the innumerable παρακώνων of his descendants.—P. S.]

Entered into the world. [ἐν τῶν κόσμων ἦσαν ζῶντες; comp. the Book of Wisdom ii. 34 (in explanation of Gen. iii.): γὰρ διὰ τουτεσσαρών θανάτων ἐσθησάντες εἰς τὸν κόσμον. Sin ἦσαν, came in; ἐν τῶν παγίων, passed through; the Moses law παρακώνον (vili. 10), is in the world, in the world, between.] Limborch: a popular personification. On the excess personification of sin and death in Fritzsche, see Tholuck, p. 219.—Into the world. Not merely into the human world (Meyer), or into human nature (Roth) but as ruin and destructive power in the whole sphere of humanity in general (see Rom. viii. 20). It is plain that the human sphere of the world alone is assumed here (according to Abelard: in hunc partem mundi sae. terram, in qua homines habitant). As such remarks, from the form, "according to the Apostle's conviction, evil was already in existence in another world." [Comp. 1 Cor. xi. 3; Gen. iii.; Book of Wisdom ii. 24; John viii. 44.—P. S.] The expression indicates not only the tendency to sin and death in human nature (Roth), but also the propagation of sin (Augustine), because the παρακώνον is a conjunction of things, and means an organic connection. The words ἡμεῖς and ἐν refer to the individual and ethical appropriation of sin which is in the παρακώνον since Adam's fall.

Death (namely, entered into the world). Explanations: 1. Physical death (Chrysostom, Augustine, Calov, Meyer. Reference to Gen. i. 17; iii. 19); 2. Spiritual death (Pelagius); 3. Physical, spiritual, and eternal death; or the collected evil result of sin (Olshausen, De Wette, Tholuck [Philippi, Schmid, Jon. Edwards, Alford, Stuart, Hodge]). This is not the physical death, for physical death in itself has no biblical and ethical significance (see Rom. viii. 6; 1 Cor. xv. 56; James i. 15).

[The Bible uniformly connects sin and death as cause and effect; comp. Gen. ii. 17; Ezek. xvii. 8 ("The soul that sinneth, it shall die"); Jer. xxxi. 30; Rom. vi. 13, 15, 24; vii. 10; viii. 13; James i. 16, &c. "Jeder Sündenfall," says Dr. Nitzsch, "ist ein Todesfall," and "jeder Fortschritt in der Sünde ein neues Sterben." Without sin, there would be neither spiritual nor physical death. This was symbolically intimated by the tree of life in paradise, of which fallen man was forbidden to eat, "lest he live for ever." Adam, if he had not sinned, might have passed to higher forms of life, but without a violent separation of body and soul, without being "unloth." but by being "clothed upon" (2 Cor. v. 4); or, in the beautiful figure of the Rabbinists, "by a kiss of the Almighty." Death and life are very deep and comprehensive terms in the Scriptures, and the connection must decide whether all, or which of the meanings are exclusively or predominantly kept in view. There are three kinds of death: (1.) The death of the soul (1 John iii. 14; comp. Matt. xxv. 22; Eph. ii. 1), which is properly the first and immediate effect of sin, since sin is a separation of the soul from the fountain of life; (2.) The death of the body (Rom. vi. 10; Matt. xxv. 46; John xi. 4, 13; Acts xiii. 28; Phil. i. 20; ii. 8), which is the culmination and end of all physical malady and evil in this world; (3.) The eternal death of soul and body (Rom. i. 32; 2 Cor. iii. 16; vii. 10; James v. 20; 1 John v. 16), which is also called the second death, ὁ θανάτος ὁ διάβας (in 1 Cor. i. 21; xx. 14, xxvi. 68 John xi. 4, 13; Acts xiii. 28. &c. Phil. i. 20; ii. 8), which is that final and consummate death of which both soul and body are delivered by the resurrection from the dead; (4.) ο ἁμαρτίας is as comprehensive as ἡ αμαρτία, its cause, and as ἡ ἀθυσία, its opposite. It embraces all physical and moral evil, as the penal consequence of sin; it is death temporal and spiritual, viewed as one united power and principle ruling over the human race. That the Apostle means physical death, is clear from ver. 14, and from his unmistakable ref.

* (Gen. ii. 17, where death is mentioned for the first time, speaks rather for a more corporeal, physical view, see below, sub (b); since the first parents were threatened with the penalty of death to be inflicted on the very day of their fall, and long before their physical death.—P. S.)
erence to Gen. ii. 17; iii. 8, 19; while from vss. 17, 21, we may infer that he had also in mind spiritual and eternal death, as the contrast to eternal life, *ζωή αιωνίου*, in which the Scripture idea of life culminates, as the idea of death culminates in eternal damnation. Ewald has an excellent note on this passage (Die Schriften des Ap. Paulus, p. 873): "Paul knew that, notwithstanding the words Gen. iii. 17, Adam did not literally die immediately after his sin; consequently he must mean by death that entire inner corruption (jenen ganze innere Verderben) by which even the physical death only becomes possible; just as, on the other hand, he ascribes true life to the genuine Christians even now before the resurrection of the body. All this is so well founded in his constant use of language, that it needs no explanation." Comp. also the remarks of Philippi in loc. and Cremer, Bibl. Theol. Worterbuch, sub *θανάτος*. p. 233: "Daher ist Tod zusammenfassender Ausdruck für die gesamte gerichtliche Consequenz des Bösen. Rom. v. 12, 14, 17, 21; vi. 16; James v. 20, in welchem alles durch die Sünde begonnen, alle Konzentrit, synom. Verderben, απώλεια."

And so (death) passed upon all men. The second θανάτος was left out probably because διήλθε would be referred equally to sin and death. But both are comprehended in the θανάτος in its spiritual character. The διήλθε δια connotes the extension, the universal progress; though a germ-like development is not contained in the word, but in the thing itself. οἱ νόμοι (deanulphos, digesta, consequently) connects the universal reign of death, chronologically and logically, with the universal reign of sin, as its preceding cause. Some make καὶ οἱ νόμοι, and thus, equivalent, by transposition, to οἱ νόμοι καὶ, so also, and regard this as the apodosis of the first clause of the twelfth verse; but this is entirely ungrammatical, and inconsistent with the main object of this section, which is to draw a parallel, not between Adam and his posterity, or sin and death, but between Adam and Christ.

In such a manner that [solche Art, dass, or, on the ground that; better: inasmuch as]. *ἐν* θανάτῳ is as much as εἰς τοίχῳ οὐτί. It can therefore mean here: on the ground that; διήλθε, proper ad quod (Meyer); under the supposition that (Baur); on condition that (Rothe); in conformity with it, that. Tholuck [p. 284] favors the meaning because, with reference to 2 Cor. v. 4; Phil. iii. 12; yet he makes the because relative, and translated, so far as they all.

(1) It is almost unanimously agreed now, that ἐν θανάτῳ, for which the Greeks generally use the plural, ἐν θανάσις (proper ad quod), has here the sense of a conjunction, and that ὁ is the neuter, not the masculine to be referred back either to ἵνα ἐνθρώπου (with Augustine, some Roman Catholics, older Lutherans and Calvinists), or to θανάτου (with Glöckler, Hofmann). It can mean neither in quo, ἐν ὑπό (Augustine), nor per quem, ἐν ὑπό (Grotius), nor proport quem or cum quo, ἐν θανάτῳ (Chrysostom, Theophylact, Eunomius, Elssner). But it must be resolved either into εἰς τοίχῳ οὐτί, or, ad conditionem, ut, under der Voraussetzung, un der der nützlicher Bestimmtheit des, on the preposition, on the definition of the condition that (so Rothe, in a learned and subtle discussion, loc. pp. 17-38, and Schmid, Bibl. Theol. des N. T., ii. 296); or into εἰς τοίχῳ οὐτί = διήλθε (Thomas Magister and Phavorinus; ὡς, ὡς τοίχῳ διήλθε, proper td quod, auf Grund dessen dass, dass das, deals with, this account that, because; comp. 2 Cor. v. 4; Phil. iii. 12, and classical passages quoted by Meyer, p. 204 f. [so Fritzsche, Rom. i. 239 sq., Meyer, Thrasybul, Philippi, Grimm., p. 368, who are followed, with still further discussion, by Alford, Webster and Wilkinson, Stuart and Hodge). The latter explanation gives the plain sense, that the universal reign of death is caused by universal sin; while Rothe's explanation conveys the more subtle idea that the actual sin of individuals is a consequence of the same proceeding by which death, through Adam's sin, passed upon all men, or that the sin of Adam has caused the sin of all others in inseparable connection with death. I prefer the translation, so far as, inasmuch as, which gives good sense in all the Pauline passages (2 Cor. v. 4: ἐν θανάτῳ, ὡς τοίχῳ διήλθε; Phil. iii. 12: ἐν θανάτῳ καὶ αἰτία θανάτου). It is not so much a causal, as a qualifying and conditioning conjunction (a relative or modified ὡς), which in our passage gives more clearly the connection of death with sin. It implies that a moral participation of all men in the sin of Adam is the medium or cause of their death; just as faith on our part is the moral condition of our participation in Christ's life. It is unfavorable to the doctrine of a gratuitous imputation. The legal act of imputation is not arbitrary and unconditional, but rests on a moral ground and an objective reality. —P. S.]

All sinned (not, have sinned, E. V.), *πάντες ἤμαρτον*. The aor. presents the sinning of all as a historical fact, or a momentary action of the past; comp. ἀπήλθαν, in ver. 19; οἱ πάντες ἀπέθαναν, 2 Cor. v. 14; and especially Rom. iii. 23, where precisely the same phrase occurs: "all sinned," as in one act (in Adam), and consequently became sinners (comp. Textual Note*, p. 128). Some take the aorist in the sense of the perfect ἤμαρτος, = ἐν θανάτῳ ἐδίκωκα; but the aorist was chosen with reference to the past event of Adam's fall, which was at the same time virtually the fall of the human race as represented by him, and gernically contained in him.* Aμαρτάνων cannot mean: to be, or, to become sinful (= ἐμαρτύρων εἰναι, or, γίνεσθαι), although this is the necessary result of the first sinful act; still less, to suffer the punishment of sin; but it means real, actual sinning. In what sense? The choice in the following list lies between the interpretations (4) and (6), which are both equally consistent with the natural grammatical sense of ἤμαρτον; while the other interpretations are more or less strained or false. —P. S.]

Explanations of *πάντες ἤμαρτον*:

1. *In quo*, namely, in Adam, the whole race * * * *[Winer, p. 259, denies that the aorist is ever confined with the perfect. Even in Luke i. 1 (ἐγείρεσθαι); John xviii. 4 (ζυγάω, ἐπιτίθησα); Phil. iii. 12 (ἐλάβον), and similar cases, the action is related simply as passed. The past express an action in its relation to the present, so that the result of the action is generally, though not necessarily (see Krüger, i., and Winer, 394), supposed to be continued.—P. S.]*
sinned. (Origen, Chrysostom, Theophylact, Augustine [Benza, Brenz, Bucer, Erasmus Schmid], and, as probably 'the last among Protestant expositors' [J], Benjamin Carpozov, 1768). The supposition here is the organic unity of the human race.

(2.) Because all have become sinful [vitati sunt, pecatorum facti sunt] — that is, sinners by original (Gen. Malach. Finst., Flinst.).

(3.) Metonymically, because all have been punish-

ished as sinners, or are involved in the consequences of the fall (Chrysostom, Grotius, Arminians and Socinians and Calvinists of the federal school, Mauknight, Hodget). The same supply even Adamo peccatores (P. S.)

(Grotius himself, to suffer punishment. He appeals to Gen. xxxi, 30; Job vi. 24; 1 Kings i, 33, for this assumption of the effect. He takes through whom. The whole is very nicely defended by Whitby, as Arminian, on Rom. vi. 13— P. S.)

[Meyer calls this interpretation 'ungrammatical arbitrarians (our sprachgeldigt Widerspruch); ...' They are called sinners, and nothing else (p. 204). Nevertheless it is defended by Dr. Hodge, of Princeton, even in the revised edition of his (p. 241), with a great deal of vehemence, as if there could be no doubt about it. He holds that all men sinned in Adam merely in a representative or passive, not in an active sense; and that the supposition: 'They became legally guilty, and were regarded as sinners on account of Adam's sin by virtue of a natural and paternal relationship between Adam and his posterity.' The necessity of the possibility, he says, 'in which all men can be said to have sinned in Adam, is putatively.' (This is begging the question.) But for some good and proper reason, they all received this act as the act of an agent is regarded as the act of his principal, or the act of a representative as that of his constituents' (although in this case they never elected him). 'This is the act of the one legally binds the other. It is, in the eye of law and justice, their act.' But haspravan never has this meaning of passivity arbitrators. It is absolutely impossible in haspravan, ver. 14. In the parallel passage, ii. 23, Hodge himself understands it of actual sinning ('all have sinned, and are fallen short of the glory of God'). He quotes and adapts the solitary passages which he quotes from the Septuagint (Gen. xiii. 9, comp. xxiv. 32: haspravan eis logos, and I Kings i. 21): 'we are sinners, i.e. in the view of the reigning prince'), are neither parallel nor decisive, as has often been shown by older commentators. When Hodge confidently appeals to the authority of the theologians of every grade and class of doctrine, Calvinists, Arminians, Lutherans, and Rationalists, in favor of his interpretation of (p. 241), he is greatly mistaken. I know of no recent commentator of note, German or English, who agrees with him on this point. Philipp and Wordsworth are recent instances. The Arminian Scotch Commentary, the divine, who says (p. 211 of the American edition): 'Adam's sin was as truly the sin of every one of his posterity as if it had been of Adam himself. It is only in this way that all could be involved in it. The sin was, in the eyes of others, on the law the duty in Him by their union or Oneness with Him. It belongs not to us to inquire how these things can be. We receive them on the testimony of God.' If God deals with men as sinners on account of Adam's sin, then it is evident that they are sinners on that account. The just God could not deal with men as sinners on any account which is said to be 'the true sin.' The moral and legal interpretation arose from opposition to the doctrine of original sin. Hodge tries to define the dogma of imputation on a moral and legal theory, for no one can define in some one, or by one, is without example. For a modification of the Augustinian interpretation, see (4) below — P. S.)

(Calvin: 'Nemo, iniquus, quia omnium peccatorum, error fatalis pecore est corruptus est, quia subcrescit anima, quia ossis in ossibus, quia sententia in sententiam, quia experientia in experientiam, quia tractus in tractu, quia action in action, quia ratio in ratio, quia anima in animam. This is, as a certain in the doctrinal theology, is theoretically true, but in practice false, i.e. the doctrine of original sin, or total depravity as derived from Adam, is in the whole passage, especially in regard, not in p. 5. For of is not equivalent to to see above; adhucque is too far separated from the relative on, and is not parallel, as in this passage, for which in some one, or by one, is without example. For a modification of the Augustinian interpretation, see (4) below — P. S.)

(Calvin: 'Nemo, iniquus, quia omnium peccatorum, error fatalis pecore est corruptus est, quia subcrescit anima, quia ossis in ossibus, quia sententia in sententiam, quia experientia in experientiam, quia tractus in tractu, quia action in action, quia ratio in ratio, quia anima in animam. This is, as a certain in the doctrinal theology, is theoretically true, but in practice false, i.e. the doctrine of original sin, or total depravity as derived from Adam, is in the whole passage, especially in regard, not in p. 5. For of is not equivalent to to see above; adhucque is too far separated from the relative on, and is not parallel, as in this passage, for which in some one, or by one, is without example. For a modification of the Augustinian interpretation, see (4) below — P. S.)
22 [in τῷ Ἄδμῃ πάντες ἀποθέωσαν] has been alleged as proof of this.  

(*) The expression must be understood of the personal sins of individuals (Reiche, Rückerl, De Witt, Tholuck [Fritzsche, Ban, Van Hengel, Stuart], etc.).  

Meyer calls this interpretation, false in view of the many millions of children who have not yet sinned [i.e., committed actual transgression]. Tholuck refers to the disposition of children to sin [which, however, is inconsistent with θέατος—P. S.]. But he who finds no difficulty in conceiving that children sinned in Adam, should find less difficulty in thinking that Jesus was in the womb of his mother, and least difficulty in sinking their individuality in the solidarity of their sinful ancestry. Meyer objects further, that the view that the death of individuals is the result of their personal sins, would vitiate and even contradict the whole parallel between Adam and Christ. For as the sin of Adam brought death to all (therefore not the simple result of a sin), so the obedience of Christ (not their own virtue) brought life to all (comp. 1 Cor. xx. 29).  

Thus an absolute necessity prevailed on both sides! The proper consideration of the parallel, on the contrary, leads to this conclusion: As in the actual appropriation of the merits of Christ a personal ethical appropriation mon consciousness of men  

We hold that all men sinned in Adam, not indeed personally by conscious actual transgression, but by a virtual sin (as is meant; see the passages quoted in the third foot-note on p. 178, but virtually or potentially; in other words, it seems that Adam fell, not as an individual simply, but as the representative head of the human race, and that his fall vitiated human nature itself, and prospectively his whole posterity, in the same manner in which the disease of the germ and root will affect the tree and branches proceeding from it. This may be uncommon sense (as is the whole fifth chapter of Romans), but it is certainly no nonsense, which may be held to perfect consistency with the interpretation of original sin, and defend the doctrine of original sin, the imputation of Adam's sin, and of Christ's righteousness. Without an actual conception of life, imputation is an arbitrary legal arrangement. We readily admit that the Augustinian view is liable to objections (see Lange's and our strictures in Doctrinal and Ethical, Nos. 2 and 3), and it is far preferable to the legal fiction theory.—P. S.]

[So Theodore: οἱ γὰρ τὴν τοὺς προστάτες ἁμαρτίαν ἀκολούθησαν ἢ διὰ τοῦτο ἀκολούθησαν ἂν ἦσαν ἡ μητέρα τῆς ἁμαρτίας. Meyer, Polagius may be ranked here, for in his brief comments on Romans he explains ἡ συνήθεια of the form of the argument, and the meaning at all events, as follows: "It is a monstrous evil to make the Bible contradict the common sense and common
It is evident that the most of these explanations are attempts, from doctrinal considerations, to avoid the idea of individual personal guilt, and by this means a relation of death, clear enough in the genealogy of Adam and Eve, is now obscured.

The Apostle's assumption is the priority of sin in relation to death, and the causal connection of the two. Accordingly, the meaning is, since sin came into the world as an abnormal ethical principle, death came into the world with it as the corresponding abnormal physiological principle. Therefore the propagation of the abnormal principle of death presupposes the preceding propagation of the principle of sin in the beginning of all. From the unity and solidarity of humanity, that certain cases of death—e.g., children born dead, or dying [and idiots]—do not here come into consideration. The definition of the ἐκ τοῦ, under the presupposition that, is therefore the most natural. In view of the death of innocent children, we may assume different degrees of life and death: "in proportion as," or "in what measure, the soul sinned?"

Ver. 13. For until the law, &c. [Ἀγγέλεος γὰρ τῶν άνθρώπων 1, i.e., from Adam to the Mosaic legislation, comp. ver. 14—ἀμαρτία ἐκ τοῦ 1] according to what. Alford: "How, consistently with chap. iv. 15, could all men sin, before the law? This is now explained." But iv. 15 is too far off, and treats of παράνοιας, not of ἀμαρτίας. ἀμαρτία connects this verse with παράνοια, ver. 12. [P. S.] The Apostle did not need to show first that the death of all was grounded in Adam's sin (Meyer): this he could presuppose from Jewish and Christian knowledge. But he proves rather that the actual extension of death took place always under the supposition of preceding sin in the world. Therefore his first proposition: Even in the period between Adam and Moses, sin was universal in the world. It was indeed not imputed, not placed directly in the light of the conscious judgment of God, because the law, as the rule of conduct and the accuser, was not yet present. But, indirectly, its presence was made manifest by its effect, the despotic government of death; although a transgression in such a definite way as that committed by Adam could not occur in the period designated (notwithstanding many analogies: Cain, the Cainites, Ham, Ishmael, Esau). Even the transgression again made manifest by the Mosaic law does not remove the great antagonism by which, in principle, sin and death proceeded from Adam, the type of Christ, the antitype, from whom, in principle, righteousness and life proceed. Meyer supposes the Apostle to say: "The death of individuals, which passed also upon those who have not sinned, as Adam did, against a positive commandment, cannot be derived from sin committed before the law, because the law was not being present, the imputation takes place absolutely;" and the conclusion which Paul draws therefrom is, that it is by Adam's sin (not by individual sins) that death has been produced (1). Now, how does this agree with the history of the Deluge, and of Sodom and Gomorrah? Here, definite death is everywhere traced to definite offenses. Tholuck's view of the whole context [p. 238 f] is similar to Meyer's. The most of the later commentators, on the contrary, properly regard vers. 13 and 14 as an argument for παράνοια ἀμαρτίας (Rücker, De Wette, Niesner, and others; and formerly Diodorus, Calvin, and others). Calov, has correctly concluded: Since they were punished because of sin, they must have had some law.

But sin is not imputed [reckoned, in Recknung gebracht, ἀμαρτία οὐ ἐλλογίσταί]. (Philom. ver. 18 [text, rec.] is the only other place). Meyer explains: Is brought to account by God for its punishment [sein in Recknung gebracht, viz., zur Bestrafung]. And φημι, explanation (chap. iv. 15) is sufficient to correct it. It is with this verse the idea of the sinfulness of the, that the ἀμαρτία (which is also transgression, according to the meaning of the natural conscience) first receives the impressed character of conscious transgression, παράνοια, and therewith the ἀμαρτία first finished by the καταγείρωσις of the νόμος. Therefore even the sin of the generation before the flood was not yet definitely settled by its overthrow (1 Peter iii. 20; iv. 6); therefore the people of Sodom and Gomorrah were guilty of less sin than the contemporaries of Jehovah. The ἐλλογίζω of sin constitutes therefore the reverse side of the ἀμαρτίας, according, it does not denote any preliminary attribution, but the final imputation, or settlement. —Explanations: Is not imputed, a. By God; (1) Not in general (the Deluge).

* [In his Johnshöcher der bild. Wissenschaft, ii. p. 171, Ewald explained, with the rejection of the second 6 διώκειν: "And so each, being seduced by viole, suggests the innocent (which is a general definition); in the sense that... is Condoned, i.e. 6, during the very time of death all sinned. He, quotes, in support, Heb. ix. 15: σάρκα τε καὶ σώματι, "etc., the preservation of the punishment of sin, so that whoever sinned unto death... must die. But subsequently, in his Comm. on the Pauline Epistles (1857, p. 327), Ewald translated: "come upon, and opposes, translated, "come upon, etc., and all sinned," and remarks (in a foot-note on p. 327) that this meaning of τοῦ (as a conjunction) is similar to the preceding ὑποταγή, showing death to be the consequence of sin. [P. S.]

† Hofmann, Schriften, vol. i. p. 529, 23 ed., takes ἐκ as a preposition of 5 me, and refers to the preceding αὐτοῦ (which is not the subject in several MSS.) in the sense: for dost Condone, i.e. σάρκα, during the very time of death all sinned. He, quotes, in support, Heb. ix. 15: σάρκα τε καὶ σώματι, "etc., the preservation of the punishment of sin, so that whoever sinned unto death... must die. But subsequently, in his Comm. on the Pauline Epistles (1857, p. 327), Ewald translated: "come upon, and opposes, translated, "come upon, etc., and all sinned," and remarks (in a foot-note on p. 327) that this meaning of τοῦ (as a conjunction) is similar to the preceding ὑποταγή, showing death to be the consequence of sin. [P. S.]

‡ Hofmann, Schriften, vol. i. p. 529, 23 ed., takes ἐκ as a preposition of 5 me, and refers to the preceding αὐτοῦ (which is not the subject in several MSS.) in the sense: for dost Condone, i.e. σάρκα, during the very time of death all sinned. He, quotes, in support, Heb. ix. 15: σάρκα τε καὶ σώματι, "etc., the preservation of the punishment of sin, so that whoever sinned unto death... must die. But subsequently, in his Comm. on the Pauline Epistles (1857, p. 327), Ewald translated: "come upon, and opposes, translated, "come upon, etc., and all sinned," and remarks (in a foot-note on p. 327) that this meaning of τοῦ (as a conjunction) is similar to the preceding ὑποταγή, showing death to be the consequence of sin. [P. S.]

§ [Hodge makes the whole doctrine and argument of the Apostle clear by saying that there are penal evils which come upon men antecedently. But this is not any special consideration of the divine goodness and as the infliction of those evils implies a violation of a moral principle: hence they are regard and treated as sinners, on the ground of the disobedience to a moral law. —P. S.]

|| Outside of these two passages in the New Testament the word, according to Meyer, occurs but once, viz., in Isai. Incip. A. 28, 17. Neamo in λαόν, λαότας, to reckon in, to put to one's account. —P. S.]
CHAPTER V. 12-21.

Sodom and Gomorrah, &c., were exceptions); (3.) Not in the usual manner of sin (Bengel: peccatum non notat scelera insignia [qualia Sodomitae ante Moses tempora iuerant, sed malum commune]); (3.) The Armians: the θανατος was only natural evil; (4.) Calov, better than all: the word must be understood only hypothetically. The men of the antemosaic period also had a kind of law. δ. By man (Amarose, Augustine, Theodore Mopsuestia, Luther: "Sin is not minded," man achtet ihrer nieht). 1. There is no such accus. as "sin" in any Jewish, or Christian, writer. All who object to the use of sin, or to the transgression of a definite command of God. The και may be understood as antithetical to Adam, or better, as making a distinction between sinners in the general sense, and the wicked transgressors of special laws of God, who effect, as it were, new falls of man, such as Cain, Ham, &c. Athanasius explains thus: those who committed no mortal sin (Grosios: no gross sins; Croll, and others: transgressed no law), but which the law had yet attached. But the measure is simply the παραβαςας, as in chap. iv. 16. The elder expositors have included here also the children [and idiots] subjected "by Adam's sin to the pæna damnation." Bremz makes this the exclusive reference [against which Calvin correctly protests. Children are included, but not specially intended.—P. S.] Indirectly, this verse refers directly to the connection between sin and death: the first period from Adam to Moses, as has been also perceived by De Wette, Fritzsche, and Banr, but is opposed in vain by Meyer.

Who is a type of the coming one [i. e., the second Adam, ος ἐλευθερωσε τοις μελλον τοις]. Koppe comes in positive conflict with the context, when he takes μελλον as neuter; of that which should come. The first Adam is the type of the second (1 Cor. xvi. 40), and is the principle of the first, as Christ is the principle of the second, but according to the antagonism between the first and second sons. See Meyer, for similar expressions of the Rabbits; e. g., Adamus postremus est Messias. According to Tholuck, the deduction of the antithetical side should now have followed, but Paul was contented with the ος ις, &c., in order to indicate the other half. But in our view the antithesis has already preceded (vers. 9-11), and is fully elaborated in chap. vi.-viii., after the transitional individual antitheses that now follow.

This important clause points back to ver. 12, and indicates the apodosis, the other member of the comparison. Τιπος, from τιπτον, to strike, to wound, has a variety of significations which are closely related, and yet may seem, in some cases contradictory (cf. the German Bild, Urbild, Vorbild, Vorbild). Pfeiffer (1) a blow; (2) a print, or impression, made by a blow (John xx. 25, τοις τιπτον των ιων; (3) a form, image, figure (Bild, Urbild; so often in the classics, and in Acts viii. 43, τοις τιπτοις, οις επουκατα λεγουνοι αιτους); (4) a pattern, model (Muster, Modell, Urbild; Rom. vii. 17, τιπτον διαταγης, Acts vii. 49, Heb. viii. 5); in the two last passages, however, τιπτον is taken only in the sense of copy: comp. Bleek on Heb. viii. 5, vol. iii. p. 489 f.); (5) a moral or example for imitation (Vorbild; 2 Thess. iii. 9, Εαν εννοους τιπτον δομην ιναι το μητιστους οιμας; 1 Tim. iv. 12; Tit. ii. 7, Phil. iii. 17; 1 Pet. v. 3); (6) a historical prefiguration (Vorbild), or type in the usual theological sense—ε., a person or thing designed to foreshadow or symbolize a future person or thing which is the true fulfillment (cf. Grotius); so 1 Cor. x. 6, 11, and here. Generally the New Testament antitype is related to the Old Testament type, as the substance is to the shadow, or the

equivalent of ἀναφέρεται τῷ παραβατεῖ. It must not be connected with ἀναφέρεται (Chrysostom and Bengel), but as is usually done, with ἀναφέρεται.
original to the copy.* But Christ corresponds to Adam in the antithetical sense: Adam being the author of death for all, Christ the author of life for all. The prefigurative feature in Adam was his central and universal significance for the whole race, which was fulfilled in a much higher sense and with opposite effect in Christ, the absolute and perfect Man. In 1 Cor. xv. 45, Paul likewise contrasts διαονος Ἰαμων and διαονος ἴαμων, with reference, no doubt, to the Rabbinical theology, in which the Messiah is called συνοικισμος, Adamus pro-treminus, in opposition to συνοικισμος.† To this personal contrast corresponds the contrast of two epochs and orders of things, διαονος ἴαμων and διαονος ἴαμων. The coming one (τοῦ μικροντος) is not to be referred to the second coming of Christ (Fritzsche, De Wette), but to the first. Paul speaks from the historical standpoint of the first Adam.—P. S.]

SECOND PARAGRAPH (VER. 15-19).

Tholuck remarks on the train of thought to ver. 19: In the explanations of the elder expositors there is no attempt to trace the connection and progress of thought to ver. 19; many of the latter ones doubt altogether the possibility of such a connection.

Morus says: "De hac dissimilitudine agitur jam per quinque versus ita, ut quinque idem videlicet repetatur, variatis quidem verborum, ut si manente sequens eadem." Köllner and Rickert similarly: against whom, see Rothe. According to Tholuck, the train of thought is as follows: In ver. 15, the quantitative "more" on the side of the operation proceeding from Christ; in vers. 16, 17, the qualitative "more"; in vers. 18, 19, resumption of the parallel, including the differences pointed out. Our construction is given above.

[Ver. 15-17 occupy an intermediate position between ver. 12 and vers. 18 and 19; and as vers. 13 and 14 are explanatory of the reign of death in connection with sin, asserted in ver. 12, so vers. 15-17 are qualifying, by stating as briefly and tersely as possible the disparity in the parallel between Adam and Christ, in favor of the superabounding grace of Christ. The admirable symmetrical adjustment of parts will appear from the following arrangement of the text in literal translation:

15. But not as the fall (παραπτωμα);

16. And not as by one guilty transgression (αμηχανεια);

17. For if by the fall of the one (δι᾽) Death reigned through the one;

18. But not as the fall (παραπτωμα), so also is the gift of grace (τως ζητεος και τως ἁμαρταια);

19. For as by one man [αιτιται των] all [αιτιται των] died;

† Tholuck, p. 218, quotes a remarkable passage from the book, News Shalom R. Abraham Ben Isaac (died 1590), which shows the reflex influence of Paul upon the Rabbinical theology: "The last Adam is the Messias; he will be higher than Moses, higher than the angels who serve him, and him, by which death has been introduced will be abolished by him. Thus the death's the devil will rise. This was the Divine intention at the creation of man, that he should be eternal; but sin occasioned death; now the Divine intention is fulfilled by the second Adam, who is the antitype of the first."—P. S.

* Tholuck thinks that we should expect ἀναλογιος [ἀναλογιος] to correspond better.—P. S.

† [Or, "by the one that sinned," if we read ἄναλογος. See Tractate Neth., and Exeg. Notes below.—P. S.]

‡ [τως ζητεος παραπτωματος, the reading of God. Sin. Lechman, Lachmann, and others. Longe prefers, with Meyer, the reading: εν τω παραπτωματω, "by one fall." See Tractate Neth., and Exeg. Notes below.—P. S.]

‡ [Alford translates: "Aber nicht allein..."

§ See Tractate Neth., and Exeg. Notes below.—P. S.]

* [See Tractate Neth., and Exeg. Notes below.—P. S.]

‡ See Tractate Neth., and Exeg. Notes below.—P. S.]

Δ. The contrast in the effects of the principles made manifest. 1. The natural consequences in relation to persons (ver. 15); 2. The positive consequences in relation to the intensity, the essential gradation of the effects (ver. 16). Ver. 15 refers to the opposition of Christian salvation to the ruin in the non-legal period and sphere; ver. 16, to its opposition to the ruin in the legal world.

Ver. 15. But not as the fall (παραπτωμα), so also is the gift of grace (τως ζητεος και τως ἁμαρταια).

We hold that the Apostle, in his brief and pregnant expressions in vers. 15 and 16, lays down axioms in negative construction. Meyer translates ver. 15: "Not as the trespass, so also the gift of grace;" and quite unintelligibly ver. 16: "And not as by one who sinned is the gift." The παραπτωμα is ἅμαρταια ἄνευ τῆς ἁμαρτάνοντος. As principles which enter humanity and permeate it, Adam and Christ are alike; but in the nature of their effects they constitute contrasts.—Rosenmüller, and others, would neutralize the negation by regarding ἄνευ as interrogative; but this, as Meyer remarks, is forbidden by the contrasting character of the contents. We see no reason for taking the παραπτωμα, contrary to its most natural signification, as "offence," it denotes, with sin, a full, an ethical defeat; yea, the fall as a medium of the fall, just as the ἁμαρτάνοντος of Christ is not merely χαρακτης, but a medium of the χαρακτης. [Παραπτωματος, from παραπτωπος, to fall, is not a sinful state or condition, but a concrete actual sin, the transgression of the law (παραβασιας), the act of disobedience (παρακολουθησα) by which Adam fell; comp. vers. 16, 18, 19, and Book of Wisdom x. 1, where it is likewise used of the fall. τω ἁμαρταια and ἅμαρταια mean nearly the same as ἅμαρταια in this verse, τω δοιμα, ver. 16, δοιμα, ver. 18, but they emphasize the idea that salvation is of free grace. Forbes ingeniously refers to τω δοιμα, the Grace which pardons the sinner, antithetically to Death, the penalty of transgression, and τω δοιμα, the Gift of righteousness, antithetically to Sin, which it removes and supersedes; the one is mainly the grace that justifies, the other the grace that sanctifies. See his note. p. 245 f.—P. S.] Tholuck thinks that we should expect ἀναλογιος [ἀναλογιος] to correspond better.—P. S.
instead of χάριμα. But the question here is concerning the natural or historical effects of both principles, while in ver. 16 they are presented in their relation to law and right.

For if through the fall the one the many died [Εἰ γάρ τι ἐν τῷ ἀνθρώπου, which is overlooked in the E. V.] ινός αὐτῶν, οἱ πολλοὶ (the many, i. e., the immense multitude of all the descendants of the one Adam) ἀπέθανον.—P. S.] The ινός is not hypothetical. There is an oxymoron in the expression: one fell, many died (not only the one). Why οἱ πολλοὶ, and not πολλοί, as in vers. 12 and 18? Meyer: "The antithesis to the ινός is made more sensible and stronger by marking the totality as multitude; for 'passunt aequa esse omnia, qua non eunt multa,' Augustine. Grossthius wrongly: "fere omnes, excepto Noého," which is contradicted by vers. 12 and 18." [ἀπέθανον must be taken in the same comprehensive sense as θάνατος in ver. 12; see p. 176. It is parallel to ἀμαρτον, ver. 12, and must be explained accordingly; see p. 177.—P. S.]

Much more. Is πολλοὶ μᾶλλον the expression of a logical plus, that is, of an inference: [Chrysostom, πολλοὶ γὰρ τοῦτο εὐλογοῦσιν Theodoret, Philippo [Fritzsche, Hodge, Stuart], and others, or of a real plus, a comparison (Calvin [Bengel]), Rothe [Alford: much more abundant], &c.] In other words, does πολλοὶ μᾶλλον express a stronger degree of evidence, as an argumentum a minori ad majus (here a pejor ad melius), as it certainly does vers. 9 and 10, or a higher degree of efficacy?—P. S.] Meyer: This latter is contrary to ver. 17. This is so far right as death, viewed absolutely, is an absolute negation, and a real plus [a higher degree of abundance] is comprised already in πολυότις. But the logical plus involves also a real plus. [So also Tholuck.] It rests on the following antitheses: 1. The ινός introduced without name, contrary to it, δὲ θεός and οἱ ινοὶ ἀνθρώπων Ἶησοῦς Χριστός; 2. παραπτώματα, and the opposite ἡ χάρις and ἡ δωρεά ἐν χάριτι; 3. ἐπιρρήσασις, in opposition to the simple fact, ἀπέθανον. The χάρις τοῦ θεοῦ is the source and spirit of the universal and personal charisma, which is Christ himself; the δωρεά ἐν χάριτι, &c., is its form and appearance, the positive gift of Divine gifts. But the δωρεά alone inheres in the promise of God, is the pardon of sin. Both must not be resolved into ἐν δικά δοκίμα (Rosenmüller, and others). According to Rothe, Tholuck, and others, εὐδοκία must be connected with δωρεά; according to De Wette and Meyer, δωρεά stands absolutely, and ἐν χάριτι, &c., belongs to ἐπιρρήσασις, on account of the antithesis to παραπτώματα. But in that case the article should be expected before χάριτι. Besides, δωρεά ἐν χάριτι forms the idea of δωρον, which the aporia indicates an event which had already taken place.

Ver. 16. And not as by one transgression [Καὶ οἶνος ὡς δὲ ἐνός αὐτῶν, which Lange reads Verschuldung, transgression accompanied with guilt.—P. S.] We must first of all substitute the reading αὐτῶν of the Codd. D. E. F. G., and of the Ital. [Vulg.: Et non sicut per unum peccatum] for αὐτῶν or αὐτός [by one that transgressed], although the latter has better.

P. S.

authority.* The reason lies in the text; ver. 16 contains only definitions of things, not persons. The opposite of αὐτῶν is παραπτώματα; besides, we have δωρεὰ, χάρις, κατάκριμα, γάμως, and δικαίωμα. Tholuck observes: "Those Codd. present frequently a corrupted text, one conformed to the Latin translation; and as αὐτῶν is not even sufficiently attested by external authorities, it must give way to the more difficult reading." But, at first appearance, δὲ ἐνός αὐτῶν was the easier reading, for it was supposed that in every antithesis Adam himself must be mentioned again. Meyer explains: "And no one by that sinned (ἀμαρτισάτος) so is the gift; that is, it is not as if it would be caused δὲ ἐνοῦ αὐτῶν;" † Tholuck: "The gift has an other character than that which came by one who sinned." These explanations are no recom mendation to the reading αὐτῶν: For, first, the thought that the δωρεά may have come by one that sinned himself, is far from the text. Second, the antithesis between the effects of the two principles is obliterated. These who adopt the reading ἀμαρτισάτος, propose different supplements Grossthius, and others, θάνατος ἤκολον [after ἀμαρτ.]; Bengel [Webster and Wilkinson, Stuart, Hodge], and others, τὸ χάριμα; Reiche, after Theophylact, τὸ κατάκριμα; Fritzsche, and others, παραπτώματα; Beza, and others [after δὲ] τὸ (De Wette: and not like that which resulted from one who sinned, is the gift.) Rothe, Tholuck, and Meyer, supply merely ἐδοκινεῖ [after δοκίμα]: Philippo, ἐγκέντρον [after αὐτός], and ἐδοκεῖ ἀμαρτ. P. S.] This which ἐδοκεῖ, etc. δοκέω.—P. S.] is sufficient with ἀμαρτία, which means more than ἀμαρτία, and expresses the idea of guilt (Verschulden) in connection with sin (see Mark iii. 28; Luke iv. 12, &c.).

For the judgment (passes) from one (transgression) to condemnation [τὸ μὲν γὰρ κρίμα ἐνός ἐς κατάκριμα. Lange supplies, from the preceding clause, ἀμαρτίας into ἐς ἐνός, and translates it, in both cases, Verschul dung.—P. S.] Here, too, the verb is wanting Meyer supplies ῥήγατον, or resulted; De Wette turned out. But the verb is indicated by the μὲν, ἐς requires the idea of progress, development. (For, unison, which is the antithesis with the first line in the middle, is the undeniable division, τὸ μὲν, τὸ δὲ.) The κρίμα might mean judgment in general (Meyer),§ if it did not refer to ἀμαρτία, by which it becomes judgment to punishment. Explanations: reatus (Beza, a

P. S.

* [The Codex Sinaiticus, in the octavo edition of Tischendorf (1865), reads ἀμαρτίας, but this is a correction of the second or third hand. In the large sienal edition the word is broken by the line, and reads, ἀμαρτί-τοι, which may be a mistake for ἀμαρτίας, as well as for ἀμαρτίας. The absence of the article before ἐνός is in favor of Lange's preference for ἀμαρτίας, for Paul always uses the article when ἐνός refers to a person except in ver. 16, where it is first introduced and connected with δοκιμάω.—P. S.]

† Meyer: "Es ist damit nicht so, als wenn es δὲ ἐνός ἀμαρτ. [after A., durch Adam] verursacht werde δέ ἐν ὑπάρχουν παραπτώματα, το δὲ διακοινόσα, κατακρίματα, γάμος, κατακρίματα, κατακρίματα," Meyer emphasizes the one and many, and supplies simply ἐνός after ἐνός. Sinaiticus reads: Reiche, Ew., Hor, Hengel.—P. S.]

§ [So also Alford, who supplies τὸ γνωμένον: "And so (that which took place) by one that sinned, so is the gift.

P. S.]

‡ Meyer: "Τὸ καίμα γας γενείων: das Urtheil, welches Gott als Richter fällt. Denn recht für einen, dessen sich angemessen ist, so ist es für jenes κατάκριμα, κατάκριμα."—P. S.}
Coccetus; the threatened punishment, Gen. ii. 17 (Fritzsche, Tholuck); the sentence of punishment pronounced on Adam and his wife, Gen. iii. 19 (Reiche, Bamgarten-Cruising [Rieckert, De Wette], and others).—From one (transgression). We simply supply the foregoing ἡμῶν, and translate the incurring of guilt, because the deed is connected with its consequence, and the word is connected with the idea of guilt. ζητοῦσιν is taken by Meyer as masculine.—To condemnation [ἵνα ἡμῶν]. Explanation of the antithesis τι κάτακριμας: 1. Fritzsche: The threat of punishment, Gen. ii. 17, and the sentence of punishment, Gen. iii.; similarly Tholuck. Reiche: the sentence of punishment pronounced on Adam, and that on his posterity. 2. Rieckert: The Divine sentence and its result, death, was declared against the one who had sinned; but from him the sentence has extended to all. Piddix, the αἵμα, as the principle of judgment, proceeds from the one ἡμῶν of Adam, and passes through gradations of judgment to the κάτακριμα, which is completed ideally as the sentence of fitness for condemnation by the appearance of the gospel, and will be actually completed as real judgment to condemnation at the end of the world. Yet the antithesis here does not pass beyond the ideal judgment to condemnation. The antithesis of the one Adam and of the whole race, which Baumgarten-Cruising finds here, is only assumed; the moral antithesis, rather, in this passage is θεματικά, από τοποκατάκριμα. It must be borne in mind that the expression παρατόπωσις is much stronger than ἡμῶν, and denotes the gradations of the one fall by many new apostasies (see the Second Commandment).

But the gift of grace (passes) from many falls (lapses) unto the good of justification [τοῦ δὲ ἡμῶν ἐκ πολλῶν παρατόπωσιν εἰς δικαίωμα], which Lange translates: das Gnadebekenntnis steht bis vor vielen Sündenfällen aus Fort bis zum Rechtfertigungsgot; or, in the Exeg. Notes, Rechtfertigungsmittel. [—P.S.]. The personal charisma is Christ himself (see ver. 15), the source of all special gifts of grace (see Tims ii. 11).—From many falls, or lapses (Sündenfallen). Caused by them. As the αἵμα of Adam has become the universal corruption of humanity, so has the ἡμῶν of Christ grown through the many lapses into an absolute δικαίωμα. As Christ, as the Risen One, has come forth ἐκ πολλῶν, so has He, as the Just One, the personal δικαίωμα, come forth from the place of the παρατόπωσις. It was thus with the advent of Christ on earth; but the finished παρατόπωσις was the same crucifixion by which He was perfected as δικαίωμα. The usual explanations rest mostly on a misinterpretation. Meyer: Since God declared sinners righteous. Augustine: Qua quidem illum illud um solvit, quod originaliter trahitur, sicut etiam quae in quoque homine motu proprio voluntatis adductur. Better De Wette and [Alford]: the gift of grace became, by occasion of many transgressions, justification. Philippi: "From out of many lapses." The δικαίωμα is neither the condition of righteousness (which would be δικαίωσιν); Lange and others, nor the declaration of God by which He externalizes the δικαίωμα (Meyer), but, according to Rieckert and [Adelbert] Meyer, the means or medium of justification (Rechtfertigungsmittel), which is in harmony with the form of the word. Meyer asks for the empirical proof; it lies right before us: Were δικαίωμα the real justification of mankind, κάτακριμα would be its real condemnation, and that would be a contradiction. Comp. also ver. 18, where the δικαίωμα is the precise supposition of the δικαίωμα. (The explanation of Rieche, after Calvin; legal compensation in the sense of satisfacio is partly too general, and partly im- piles very much on δικαίωμα.) An elaborate discussion see in Tholuck, p. 258.

(Δικαίωμα, in Hellenistic usage, means usually statutum, ordo, a righteous decree, or righteousness, judgment (Rechtspruch, Rechtsbestimmung); comp. Tholuck, p. 229, § 2, n. 5; Lake i. 6.; Heb. ix. 10; Apoc. xiv. 4; or also 2 in (as in classical usage) a righteous act, a just deed, as Rev. xix. 8 (το δικαίωτα τῶν ἁγίων); Barnab. ii. 6. (δικαιοτάτος δόξα καὶ δικαίωμα τοῦ κυρίου); comp. the Hebrew עָנָה as distinct from הַנֶּאֶס in Prov. viii. 20, where both are translated δικαίωμα in the Septuagint, while the Vulgata distinguishes them as iudicium and justitia. I see no good reason for departing from this meaning. It is either, in opposition to κάτακριμα, the righteous decree which God declared on account of the perfect obedience of Christ; or it is, as ver. 18, in opposition to παρατόπωσις, the righteous decree of Christ as the objective basis (or, as Lange has it, the means) 2 in (as in classical usage) in Tholuck, after a full discussion of the various interpretations, favors (p. 261) the translation, Rechtfertigungsmittel, actio justificativa, which would differ from δικαίωμα, justificatio, as the accomplished fact differs from the process. Wordsworth explains it here, and in ver. 18, to mean a state of ascertainment as righteousness by God, a recognized condition of approval but this is without any authority. The Latin Valentinus (justificatio, ver. 18, but justitia, ver. 18), the E. V., and even De Wette, Olshausen, Robinson (sub δικαίωμα, No. 3), Stuart, Alford, and Hodge, take δικαίωμα in ver. 16 as equivalent to δικαίωμα. (Alford: "As κάτακριμα is a sentence of condemnation, so δικαίωμα will be a sentence of acquittal. This, in fact, amounts to justification." Hodge: "It means justification, which is a righteous judgment, or decision of a judge, pronouncing one to be just."") The (p. 262) makes this interpretation a piece of "ex egetical levity," and it can be read through that, in ver. 18, δικαίωμα is distinguished from δικαίωσις. He goes back (with Pareus, J. Gerhard, Calov, Wolf, B. Carpzov) to classical usage, quoting a passage from Aristotle (Eth. Nicon. v. 10), who defines δικαίωμα to be τὸ ἕπανομωμα τοῦ ἑκάστου, the amendment of an evil deed. Rothe consequently translates it, full satisfaction of justice, legal adjustment (Rechterfüllung, Rechtsguattmachung, Rechtsausgleichung). This meaning suits admirably here, and in

* (This passage affords a striking parallel, and has some bearing on the question whether Paul was acquainted with the works of the great Stairite (which, from a remote resemblance of style, the mode of close, didactic reasoning, from Paul's educational advantages in Tarsus, from his acquaintance with the spirit and working of the Hellenic philosophy, and even with inferior Greek authors, as Aris-"
12-21. 18£

In ver. 18, *δικαιωμα* is opposed to *παραπτώμα* (justifications) instead of *συμπληρωμα* as in Lange, and does not materially differ from the explanation of Lange.

Ver. 12-18. 18£

(1) 18£

*Τερ.* 18£

*where,* however, the word is opposed to *παραπτώμα,* not, as in ver. 16, to *κατάκειμα,* and does not materially differ from the explanation of Lange. In ver. 18, *δικαιωμα* being the opposite of *παραπτώμα* and essentially equivalent to *ιτραπόν* in ver. 19, must denote the righteous deed, i.e., the perfect obedience of Christ, and is so understood by Calvin, Esti, Grotius, and Bengel. As it is not likely that the same word should be used in one breath in two different senses, it is safe to explain *δικαιωμα* in ver. 16 from its more obvious meaning in ver. 18. I prefer this (with Lange) to the other alternative chosen by Meyer (Rechtstiftungsspruch), Ewald (Gerechtigungsspruch), Van Hengel, Umbri, who give it in both verses the meaning, righteous decree. I quote, in addition, the excellent note of Bengel on


A. B. C. D.

\begin{align*}
&\text{Ver. 16.} \\
&\text{κατάκειμα}^* \quad \text{κατάκειμα}^* \\
&\text{Ver. 18.} \\
&\text{παραπτώμα}^* \quad \text{παραπτώμα}^* \quad \text{δικαιωμα}^* \\
&\text{κατάκειμα}^* \quad \text{δικαιωμα} \\
\end{align*}

\begin{align*}
&\text{B.} \\
&\text{Ver. 16.} \\
&\text{χάρις} \quad \text{κατάκειμα}^* \\
&\text{Ver. 18.} \\
&\text{παραπτώμα}^* \quad \text{παραπτώμα}^* \\
&\text{κατάκειμα}^* \quad \text{κατάκειμα} \\
\end{align*}

\begin{align*}
&\text{C.} \\
&\text{Ver. 18.} \\
&\text{δικαιωμα} \quad \text{δικαιωμα} \\
\end{align*}

\begin{align*}
&\text{D.} \\
&\text{Ver. 16.} \\
&\text{χάρις} \quad \text{χάρις} \\
\end{align*}

The contrast of *potential, prospective effects.*

1. The contrast between the enslavement and negation of all personal life by personified death, and of the future glory of pardoned persons in the new life (ver. 17).

2. The contrast in all its ideal magnitude: owing to the power of the fall of one, judgment and condemnation came upon all men; all men can attain to justification of life (that is, not merely of faith) by the justifying righteousness of one (ver. 18).

Ver. 17. For if by one man's fall, &c. [E] *ετ' αγά τη του ενδο παραπτώματα* &c. [E.]

This verse (which Rothe has improperly treated as a parenthesis, and which Er. Schmid has even conceived to be the contradiction of an opponent) is, in form, first of all a proof of the *δικαιωμα* and *κατάκεις* in ver. 16; but it develops the consequence of the *δικαιωμα* as of the *κατάκεις* to a new and glorious contrast. Here, now, the personal element in ver. 16 is united with the material one in ver. 16; yet the personal predominates. From one by nature or by ordinance. But the very same thing which, when done, is an unjust act, is not so before it is done, but is unjust. The same may be said of *a just act.* But the same term is rather a just deity done (δικαιωμα) but the correction of an unjust act is a just act (δικαιωμα).—*F. G.*

*This is a slight mistake, occasioned by a statement of Tholuck (p. 261 E). Dr. Rothe regards not ver. 17, but ver. 16, as a parenthesis (1 Cor. iv. 132, and ver. 17 as a corollary and explanatory reassertion of ver. 15, to which it corresponds in all its parts as follows:*}

\begin{align*}
&\text{Ver. 16.} \\
&e. e. τη του ενδο παραπτωματα οι πολλοι άπεθανον, \\
&\text{πολλο λαλοπον} \\
&\text{η χαρα του ενεκ του δωχεν εν χρηστον} \\
&\text{τη του ενδο ανθρωπον Ιησους Χριστος ως την την επερανενκ} \\
\end{align*}

\begin{align*}
&\text{Ver. 17.} \\
&e. e. τη του ενδο παραπτωματα ο θεων εμαξ, \\
&\text{πολλο λαλοπον} \\
&\text{η την περιποιησις της χριστον κ τη δωρεσ τη δικαιωμα} \\
&\text{η τη του ενδο Ιησους Χριστος, κτλ.} \\
\end{align*}

Proceeded, through one offence, the tendency toward destruction; death tyrannized over and defaced the personal life, and threatened to extinguish it; but much more such believers become by the one Christ, on the ground of the *δικαιωσια,* the *πεντολιντος,* the ruling, royal personalities in eternal life. The point of the antithesis is therefore *βασιλειον* and *βασιλειον.* The *πολλοι* *μαλλον* is also here a logical conclusion, which involves the higher degree of real power, as brought out in the antitheses: *ἐν παραπτωμα* and the opposite *πεντολιντος* της *κυριοτης* των χριστων of the former slaves of death (Heb. ii. 14); then again, the nameless 1° and the one Jesus Christ; and finally, to a certain extent, δ *θανατος* and *θητη.* Meyer will remark: "Bear in mind that Paul does not say in the paragraph, in conformity with the promise: "*εκ της βασιλειοι* επι τοις . . . λαμβανοντες, but, in harmony with the matter in question, and corresponding to the active nature of the relation, he places the subject in the active first." This is the chief point just here. (Menochius: "συναίνει et gloriosus sonat.")" Tholuck: "To be ruled, is a bound and passive condition, while, on the other hand, the quality of free movement lies in life. The eschatological idea, a ruling in the finished kingdom of God, was brought over by Christ in a more profound sense from Jude (Matt. xix. 28; Luke xxii. 29). Paul has espe-
This verse is, as Meyer and others remark, a resumption of the preceding contrasts expressed in one sentence (συλλογίζεται εἰσαύτη τὸ πᾶς, Theodore of Mopessus). But we must not overlook the contrast here brought out here. (On the use of ἀλλά, see Meyer.) As far as the verb that is wanting is concerned, De Wette remarks: It is usual to supply here (likewise Rückert and Fritzsche), in the first member, τὸ χρύσιν ἔγεντο, and in the second, τὸ χάραμα ἔγεντο; but better, something indefinite, as ἔγεντο (thus Meyer and Tholuck); Winer, ἦλθεν. "Wordsworth renderei the present expressions in each ii. 10 and 11 contract accordingly πίστεως after παραπτώματος, and δικαίωμα after δικαίωματος. ἦλθεν is sufficiently contained in εἰσ.

The contrast in this case is simply this: The fall of one man came ideally and dynamically as a fall upon all men unto condemnation; that is, by the common fall, all men would, without redemption, be subject to condemnation; on the other hand, the δικαίωμα of one came ideally and dynamically as doxology to justification of life in the last judgment; that is, by the individual justification of Christ is sufficiently powerful to justify and perfect all men. Meyer [with Rottlet, Ewald, Alford, Wordsworth.—P. S.] construes δικαίωμα here both times as neuter (one trespass, one sentence of justification), which Tholuck has properly rejected. The Greek writers, Thedoret and Theophylact (as also Erasmus, Luther, Calvin, E. V., Bengel, Fritzsche, Philippus, Hodge.—P. S.), have taken it as masculine. Here, as in

sides the verb came, two nouns, τίνος, judgment (κρίσιμος) and free gift (δωρομένα), from ver. 16. Lange supplies παράπτωμα and δικαίωμα from ver. 18, and translates: "Doomed man, vile, worthless, fell (of himself) on all the members (comit) to Verdammtum, so (comit) through a Righteousnessgiven (ein Rechtfertigungsgut) of all men unto Rechtfertigung des Lebens (whose life it is)." Ewald takes ἦλθεν both times in both classes not in the masculine, but in the neuter gender, and supplies only the verb came. "We say it, and a sentence of justification, which Tholuck has properly rejected. The Greek writers, Thedoret and Theophylact (as also Erasmus, Luther, Calvin, E. V., Bengel, Fritzsche, Philippus, Hodge.—P. S.), have taken it as masculine. Here, as in

ver. 16, Meyer makes the δικαίωμα to mean judgment of justification (Rechtfertigungsspruch), and rejects the translation: ot. (Rechtfertigung, Rothe and Philiplii); heel of justification (Rechtfertigungstitel, Tholuck); virtuousness (Tynehead/tight, Baumgarten-Crusius); obedience (Geschmack, De Wette); the recte factum of Christ (Fritzsche). It is simply the same everywhere. If it be said that Christ is our righteousness, it is the same as saying that Christ is the personal medium of our justification. [Comp. the remarks on p. 184 f.—P. S.] The future ἔρχομαι is supplied in this way by Winer and Philippus in the apostles, is sufficiently implied in τίνος δικαίωμα ἦλθεν. We hold that the Apostle here means the final δικαίωμα, justification, which, in the general judgment, constitutes the antithesis of the κατάκριμα, condemnation. The δικαίωμα is offered to all men, and the δικαίωμα ἦλθεν is its purpose; but the realization of the purpose takes place merely according to the measure of faith. The Roman Catholic expositors assert that justification of faith itself is denoted here as justification of life (vel sim., potius); also: non esse sanctification. — P. S.) According to Calvin, and others, it is the justification whose result is life. Tholuck: The δικαίωμα with the effect of the future completion of life. Augustine likewise. Thomas Aquinas describes correctly the ideal universality of the δικαίωμα: "Quamvis posset dicì, quod justitiae Christi transit in justificationem omnium, ad sufficiendam, in eodem quantum ad effectum consequendum posse, in eadem quantum ad effectum consequendum posse."

"πάντες ἀνθρώποι are, in both classes, all men without exception, as in ver. 12; but this does not justify a Universalist inference, for Paul speaks of the objective sufficiency and intention of Christ's δικαίωμα, not of its subjective application to individuals, which depends upon the λαβηματος of faith, as intimated in ver. 17. The distinction drawn by Hofmann and Lether between πάντες ἀνθρώποι, all men without distinction, and πάντες ἡ δικαίωμα, all, without exception, lacks proof (Meyer calls it, rein erdichtet). More of this in ver. 19.—E. B."

C. The Contrast of the Final Effects, Ver. 19. For as through the disobedience of the one man, &c. [ἀλλ΄ οὖν γὰρ διὰ τὴν παρακολούθησιν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ἀμαρτήσεως καταστάχθησαν οἱ πολλοί].

also. According to Meyer, ver. 19 furnishes only a grand and conclusive elucidation of ver. 18 (πάντες...). Tholuck likewise, in harmony with Calvin. But this contrast denotes the final antithesis of the judgment and of justification as made manifest by the gospel (see chap. ii. 16). The sense is: As, in consequence of the disobedience of the one man Adam, the many (as many as there are) have been presented in the light of the gospel as sinners subject to condemnation, so, in consequence of the obedience of the one man Christ, shall the many (as many as believe) be

the article (ver. 15, τοῦ τοῦ ἄνθρωπον... τον τοῦ ἀνθρώπου...; ver. 17, three times; ver. 18, twice, except in ver. 12, where it is connected with a noun (νῦν ἀδικά...)), and therefore unnecessary; we take in this verse, where ἦλθεν ἦλθεν, in opposition to παρ' ἀνθρώπων... καταστάχθησαν... , as here, without the article. The Apostle is therefore quite as careful and consistent. The decision that the comparison is between Adam and Christ, rather than between the fall of one and the righteousness of another, does not need proof, for it is implied in a comparison of both persons and effects. The E. V. has much obscured the force of this section by omitting the article throughout before ἦλθεν, as also before πολλοί. — P. S.]
presented in the same light as just. It is self-evident that the effect of the gospel is included in the second clause; but Ps. 19:11 and 21 we must infer that it is presupposed also in the first clause. It is only through the gospel that this ideal general judgment is brought to pass, by which all men are presented and exposed as condemned sinners in consequence of their connection with the sin of Adam (see John xvi. 8, 9; comp. Ps. ii. 5, 6). We are so utilized by the language in maintaining that καταστάσεως possesses here the full idea of setting down, exhibiting, making to appear as what one is. [See below.]

(2.) Peter the see has ISLa

[Through the disobedience of the one man, δι' τῆς παρακοῆς τοῦ ἑνὸς ἀνθρώπου. The trespass, or fall, of Adam, το παράπτωμα, is here definitely described as an act of disobedience, which is the mother of sin, as obedience to the Divine will is the mother of virtue; for disobedience is essentially selfishness in actual exercise, the rebellion of the human will against the Divine, the false self-sufficiency or independence in opposition to God, to whom every man is and all, and whose service is true freedom.—P. S.]*

The many were constituted sinners [ἀραρτολοι καταστάσεις].† Meyer: "According to ver. 12, they were, through Adam's disobedience, actually placed in the category of sinners, because they sinned in and with Adam's fall." This is Augustinian dogmatism, but no exegesis warranted by the context. [† see below.—P. S.] Tholuck: "Were made sinners, or made condemned, in the sense of being accounted as. denominationi, and in this element of spontaneity is included. On the further complications which have arisen between Romish and Protestant commentators on the supposition of really becoming, see Tholuck, p. 268. The παρακοή of Adam himself has certainly set forth the many as sinners, but only because it has come into the light of the law, and finally of the gospel, and so far as it has now become clear: 1. As an ethical-physical causality, but not as a purely physical fatality; 2. So far as the offence of Adam has become the clear type of the sinfulness and sin of every man; 3. So far as the judgment of the finished revelation comprehends the many as in one. So by the obedience of one shall all be made (constituted) righteous [ὁμοιομαντίους καὶ δι' τῆς παρακοῆς τοῦ ἑνὸς δίκαιος καταστάσες αἵ πολλοί]. That is, not merely by the death [the passive obedience] of Christ, but also by the [active] obedience of His whole life, which was finished in His death. But why the future? Meyer: "It relates (corresponding to καταστάσεως to the future revelation of glory after the resurrection (Reiche, Fritzsche, Hofmann)." Tholuck, also, together with other Arminians, Abaelard, Cocceius, and others, refer the future to the final judgment. But the setting forth of believers as right extends from the beginning of the gospel through all subsequent time. Böza properly observes, that the future denotes the continua via justificandi; and Grotius, Calov, Rückert, De Wette, and Philipps, regard it similarly as a presentis justificandi. Tholuck objects: It is not objective justification, a single event. Certainly, but only for individuals; but in the kingdom of God these acts are repeatedly through all the future to the end of the world.

[The interpretation of ἀραρτολοι καταστάσεως (passive Λογ. 1.) and δίκαιος καταστάσεως has been much embarrassed and obscured by preconceived dogmatic theories. Καταστάσεως (also καταστάσεως καὶ καταστάσεως) means: (1.) to set down, to place (any individual) among the number of the sinners in the rank of sinners; but see below); (2.) to appoint, to elect (this is inapplicable here, as it would make God directly the author of sin); (3.) to constitute, to cause to be, to make (reddere aliquem agnoscere) and hence the passive: to be rendered, to become; (4.) to conduct, to accompany on a journey (only once in the New Testament). Reiche has spent much learning to establish a fifth meaning: to show, to exhibit; but this is somewhat doubtful. The verb occurs twenty-two times in the New Testament, three times only in Paul (twice here, and once in Titus i. 5). In sixteen of these cases (including Titus i. 5) it clearly refers to official appointment, in one it means, to accompany (Acts xvii. 15); in the remaining five, viz., Rom. v. 19 (twice); James ii. 6; iv. 4; 2 Peter i. 8, it is, to constitute, to render. So it is taken in this verse by nearly all the recent commentators. But in what sense? Figuratively, or really? Chrysostom, and the Greek commentators who did not believe in original sin, started the figurative or metonymic interpretation, which was subsequently more fully developed by the Arminians and Socinians (Grotius, Limborch, Wetstein, Socinus, Crelj), and advocated also by Stritt and Flatt, of the school of the older German supernaturalism, namely, that καταστάσεως δικαιου means: they were only apparently made sinners, or accounted, regarded, and treated as sinners—i.e., exposed to the punishment of sin, without actually being sinners.‡ The same view has been stenug-

* [Tholuck quotes here the quaint and pointed remark of Luther: "Wohl setz Adam seinen Namen in einen Apfel, aber in Wahrheit setz er ihn in einen Stachel, welcher ist das falscheste Gebot." Bengel says that, in παρακοή, very aptly points out the principle of the initial step, which ended in Adam's fall, namely, the carelessness of his understanding and will, which simultaneously gave way; as the first step towards the capture of a city is reminiscences on the part of the guards on watch.—P. S.]

† [Properly construed, "constituted, made." Also Calvin, E. V.: were made sinners. Lange translates: as Sünde herausgestellt worden sind, set forth, made to appear in their right place as sinners. So also Meyer and Philipps: "als Sünde hingestellt, in die Kategorie von Sünden versetzt worden," set down in the rank, or category, of sinners. Alford (with) Wettstein: "were made actual sinners by practice here; we were accounted as" (Grotius, al.); nor "became by imputation" (Bengel, Sorgel); nor "were proved to be" (Koppe, Reiche, Fritzsche).—P. S.]
ously advocated even by so sound and orthodox a commentator as Dr. Hodge, but from the very opposite doctrinal standpoint, and in the interest of immediate personal advantage (to his converts makes Pan 17, 14, like ἢσαΐας, ver. 12, in a purely legal and forensic sense; they were regarded as sinners independently of, and antecedently to, their being sinners, simply on the ground of the sin of Adam, their federal representative; as, on the other hand, they are regarded as righteous solely on the ground of Christ's righteousness, without any personal righteousness of their own. This interpretation, though less artificial than the other, is not without weakness in the meaning of ἵσαΐας, ver. 12, is not supported by a single passage of the New Testament where σαρκιστία or σαρκιστίματος occurs, and conflicts with the connection for ver. 19. gives the reason (γιὰ) for the statement in ver. 18, why "judgment came upon all men to condemnation," and it would be sheer tautology to say: they were condemned because "they were regarded and treated as sinners." The phrase, then, can be taken only in the real sense, like ἵσαΐας in ver. 12.

It means: they were made sinners either by virtual participation in the fall of Adam, or by actual practice, by repeating, as it were, the fall of Adam in their own persons. Both interpretations are perfectly grammatical, and do not exclude each other. Even if the verb under consideration, in the passive, could be made out to mean: to be exhibited, to appear (κατασταθησάται = ἢσαΐας-θησάται, see Wetstein, Reiche, Fritzsch.) it always presupposes actual being; they were made to appear in their true character as sinners, or what they really were. Comp. Lange above. This is very different from, they were regarded, treated as sinners, without being such. The metonymy interpretation confounds the effect with the cause, or reverses the proper order that death follows sin.

We are regarded and treated as sinners because we are sinners in fact and by practice. So, on the other hand, διότι σαρκιστίαν ἢσαΐας is more than the declaratory διὸ ἢσαΐας-θησάται, and means, that by Christ's merits we shall be actually made righteous, and appear as such, before His judgment seat. It denotes the righteousness of Christ's obedience, a justification by faith (comp. ἢσαΐας κατασταθήσεται, ver. 18). Luther says: "Wie Adam's Stünde unsre EIGEN geworden ist, auch Christi Gerechtigkeit," as Adam's sin has become our own, so also Christ's righteousness. Calvin correctly translates: "pecadorea constitutis sunt... justi constituuntur," and remarks in loc.: "Unde sequitur, justitia quotidiani esse in Christo: sed nobis acceptum ferri, quod illi proprium est." David Porree, one of the ablest among the older Reformed commentators, explains διότι σαρκιστίαν: "nullo plus est, quam justificationem. Non justificari est una condemnatione absua justitia impudata, justum constitutum est etiam justitia habendi sanctificata, hic est, simul justificationes et sanctifications beneficium complectitur." Bengel in loc.: "Apostolus tamen justa-rum constitutinum videtur praedicare, qua justificationibus actum substantiatis, et verbo INFERNI inc Insertur" (Phil. iii. 9; coll. Gal. ii. 17)."

* * *

But Dr. Hodge, though otherwise a strict Calvinist, rejects the realistic Augustinian view of a fall of the whole race in Adam, and yet makes all the descendants of Adam legally responsible for his fall. To maintain this ground of an exclusively forensic imputation, he must resort to this forced interpretation of ἵσαΐας and κατασταθησάται. "For the passage in the New Testament does not mean to make, in the sense of effecting or causing a person or thing to be in its character or nature other than it was before. ἵσαΐας means, and does not mean to make one sinful, but to set him down as such, to regard or appoint him to be of that class." (To regard, and to appoint are two very different things—P. S.) "Thus when Christ is said to have been constituted the Son of God, He was not made Son, but declared to be such." (But in this passage, Rom. i. 4, ἁγνόποις is used, not κατασταθησάται, and even that means more than declared—see Paul Note § on p. 36.) "Who constituted thee a ruler or judge and appointed the yudgeship of that office? So, "Whom shall our Lord made ruler." (These two passages, Matt. xxv. 45; Acts vii. 35, imply that neither was a ruler before being appointed, and they would be forced to be a judge, if we were to substitute regarded for constituted.) "Wherefore, therefore, the Apostle says that the many were constituted (κατασταθήσεται) into the office of the tabernacles, but does not mean to say, that the many thereby were rendered sinful, but only that his disobedience was the ground of their being placed in the category of sinners. It constituted a good and sufficient reason for so regarding and treating them. The same remark applies, of course, to the other clause of this verse: διὸ κατασταθήσεται σαρκιστία σαρκιστίας. This cannot mean, that by the obedience of one the many shall be made holy. It can only mean, that the obedience of Christ was the ground on which the many are to be placed in the category of the righteous—e. g., shall be so regarded and treated. It is not our personal righteousness which makes us righteous, but the imputation of the righteousness of Christ. And the sense in which we here are hereby declared to be sinners, is not that we are such personally (which indeed is true), but by the imputation of the righteousness of Christ. And the sense in which we are hereby declared to be righteous, is not that we are such personally (which indeed is true), but by the imputation of the righteousness of Christ. And the sense in which we are hereby declared to be righteous, is not that we are such personally (which indeed is true), but by the imputation of the righteousness of Christ. And the sense in which we are hereby declared to be righteous, is not that we are such personally (which indeed is true), but by the imputation of the righteousness of Christ. And the sense in which we are hereby declared to be righteous, is not that we are such personally (which indeed is true), but by the
as an effect of, the sinfulness of that head, but not merely by transference of the sinfulness of that head."—P.S.]

On the question raised by Tholuck, and others, whether this passage does not lead to the doctrine of the ἀποκατάστασις, see Doct. and Ethical, No. 12. [The inference of a universal salvation from this verse, as also from ver. 15 (ἐκ τοῖς πολλοῖς ἐπιφώσκοις) and 18 (ἐκ πάντας ἀνθρώπους τοῖς διακόσιοις ἐπιγραφήσατο), is very plausible on the surface, and might be boldly put forth; but such a conclusion could be isolated from the rest of Paul's teaching on the terms of salvation. The same difficulty is presented in 1 Cor. xv. 22: "As in Adam all die (πάντες ἀποθνῄσκουσιν), so in Christ shall all be made alive (πάντες ἀναστάσις ἐποτισθωσίν)." It has been urged by some that the apocatastasis is implied partly in the indicative future, κατασταθήσεται and ἐποτισθήσεται, but especially in the fact that, as πάντες, all, and οἱ πολίοι, the many, are confessedly unlimited in the present time, and have no right to limit them in the second clause. (The advocates of eternal punishment forcibly derive the same argument for their doctrine from the double αἰώνος, Matt. xxv. 46). The popular explanation that πάντες and οἱ πολίοι means, in one case, Adam's natural seed (οἱ ἄνθρωποι), in the other, Christ's spiritual seed (i.e., οἱ πιστευοντες), though true as to practical result, fails to do justice to the superabundance of God's grace over man's sin. Paul unquestionably teaches expressly the universal sufficiency of the gospel salvation, without any restrictions which might break the force of the parallel between Adam and Christ. All men are capable of salvation, or savable (erlösbare), which must by all means be maintained against Manichæism and fatalism. If any are ultimately lost, it is not from metaphysical or constitutional inability, nor from any defect in Christ's atonement, which is of infinite value in itself, and was made for the sins of the whole world (1 John ii. 2), nor from any unwillingness on the part of God who, according to His benevolent purpose, will have all men to be saved, and to come unto the knowledge of the truth (1 Tim. ii. 4; comp. iv. 10; 2 Peter iii. 9). But we must make a distinction between the objective sufficiency and the subjective efficacy of Christ's atonement, between the possibility and the actuality of a universal salvation. All men may be saved, since abundant provision has been made to that end, and under this view we must approach even the worst sinner; but which, and how many, will be saved, is a question of the future which God only knows. From the great stress which Paul lays in this passage on the superabundance of grace which greatly exceeds the evils of the fall, we have a right to infer that by far the greater part of the race will ultimately be saved, especially if we take into consideration that the half of mankind die in infancy before having committed actual transgression, and that, in the days of imminent glory, the knowledge of Christ will cover the earth. It is a truly liberal and noble sentiment of Dr. Hodge when he says (p. 279): "We have reason to believe that the lot shall be saved to a greater proportion than the inmates of a prison die to the mass of the community." But from all our present view of corruption, as well as from the word of God (comp. Matt. vii. 13, 14), we know that many, very many,—yes, the vast majority of adults even in Christian lands—walk on the broad path to perdition, although they may yet be rescued in the last moment. Paul himself speaks of the everlasting punishment of those who obey not the gospel of Christ (2 Thess. i. 9), and teaches a resurrection of the unjust as well as of the just (Acts xxiv. 15). We know, moreover, that none can be saved except by faith, which is God's free and own express condition. For salvation is a moral, not a mechanical process, and requires the free consent of our will. Now Paul everywhere presents faith as the subjective condition of justification; and in ver. 17 he expressly says, that those who receive (λαμβανοντες) the abundance of the grace and of the gift of righteousness, shall reign in life by the one, Jesus Christ. He contrasts the whole generation of Adam and the whole generation of Christ, and, as the one die in consequence of their participation in Adam's sin, so the other shall be made alive by virtue and on condition of their union with Christ's righteousness. In Gal. iii. 22 he states the case beyond the possibility of mistake: "The Scripture hath concluded all (καὶ πάντα) under sin, that the promise by faith of Jesus Christ might be given to them that believe (καὶ πιστευοντες)."—Universalism must assume a second probation after death even for those who lived in Christian lands, with every opportunity of saving their soul. But such an assumption is contrary to Gal. vii. 7, 8, and the whole practical tenor of the Bible, and is in itself untenable and illusory. A new trial, instead of improving, would greatly lessen the chance of building up a good character. For as it is impossible, without a new creation, to return to the mother's womb and live the old life over again, the second trial would have to commence where the first left off—that is, with a dismal outfall of neglected opportunities, broken vows, and reminiscences, abused faculties, bad habits, and in the corrupting company of moral bankrups, with every prospect of a worse failure and a more certain ruin. God wisest and mercifully gave to men but one state of probation, and those who improved it best, would shrink most from running the risk of a second.—P.S.]

Third Paragraph (verse 20, 21).

How the law is designed to bring about directly this process of the development of sin, in order to bring about indirectly the revelation of grace.

Ver. 20. But the law. [Νόμος δι, κ.κ. The Mosaic law is meant, though the article is wanting, as is often the case where there can be no mistake.—P.S.] The Apostle now cannot avoid to state the relation of the law or of Moses to this antithesis—Adam and Christ—especially since he has
already intimated this relation in ver. 15. Grotius thought the following discussion induced by an objection. But shaping argument, show the Paul could not avoid to answer this question.—*In the* between [zuweisen, parenthetically, as it were] παρασηθησαν. Not besides, thence (Meyer); nor subirntrared (Vulg.); nor incidentally, subordinately (ubemachhtig, Rothe,* Tholuck [Reiche, Philippi], and others [contrary to the pedagogic mission of the law; iii. 30; Gal. iv. 24]). The coming to, in relation to, lies in the τοαόα; the coming into, in the εις. Therefore, one shall come between [Adam and Christ] (Theodore, Calvin, Luther [Estius,§ Grotius, Usteri, Ewald, &c.,] which Meyer opposes without warrant. The reference to the position of Moses between Adam and Christ may, indeed, be only an Intimation; but to say that sin merely supervened in addition to sin (Beza, De Wette, &c.,) is not satisfactory, because the question in the foregoing is not concerning sin alone, but the antithesis of sin and grace; and therefore, concludes incorrectly from this consideration, that the law is characterized as an incidential factor. The law incidental? (Chrysostom [Theophylact, Cornellus a Lapide, without any foundation, have understood παον as denoting obiter, ad tempus). The Apostle has evidently the idea of an ethic-chemical process. The law had to enter into the process of the development of sin, in order to force it to a crisis. [Olahausen: "Paul regards the law as a salutary medicine, which forces the disease that rages in the inward, nobler parts, to the surface." So also De Wette and Rothe.—P. S.]

*That the fall might multiply [ίνα πιαύοι το παραπτωμα; Lange: damit der Staudenfall vieller werde (erchaine); Alford: in order that the trespass might multiply, The Apostle uses παραπτωμα here (not παρασηθησαν, nor ἀμαρτία), because the law does not aim to multiply sin as such, but to make it appear and to reveal it to the conscience as a παραπτωμα—i. e., a transgression of the positive will of God; comp. iii. 20; iv. 15; vii. 7; and Rothe, p. 167.—P. S.] The boldness of this thought has troubled the commentators. It is indeed not satisfactory to alleviate it by supposing that the law is intended merely to enhance the knowledge of sin (Grotius, and others); but this is one important element of its function (see chap. vii.), and must not be rejected, with Meyer, as false. To explain ίνα of the consequence or result [merely ἐκπατανω, with Chrysostom: ουιν αναλαξαν, αλικτρασαν; Estius: "non esse detest. . . sed conditi.;"—P. S., Koppe, Reiche [Stuart, Barnes],) is likewise unsatisfactory; yet the Apostle has certainly inferred from the result the design and intention in the ίνα.* Gal. iii. 19 does not serve as an elucidation of this passage, as Meyer would have it; and Rom. vii. 14 proves that, by the law, the knowledge of sin comes; while 1 Tim. i. 9 shows that the law constitutes a weapon against the ungodly. Reiche has called the telic construction παραπτωμα to the idea of μετατροπή between, by Meyer [p. 224]. He properly remarks, that sin had to reach its culminating point, where it will be outdone by grace. Only this culminating point should not be merely objectional, but subjective also, in accordance with the sentence quoted from Augustine, on Ps. ciii.: "Non crudeliter hoc fecit Deus, sed consiliis medicabilis; . . . auxerit morbus, crescit multitudo, quaerit medicus et totum sanatur." It is a fact both that the mission of the law, according to God's decree, increased the cruelty of Christ—the climax of the world's guilt—and that the same law, well understood, prepared the way for the saving faith of the New Testament. For this reason there is truth in Rothe's explanation: All sin should ever stand out more complete under the form of the παραπτωμα. Tholuck also takes ground with Olhausen, De Wette, and Neander, in favor of the telic rendering. Reasons: 1. Nittinur in etittam; 2. Thomas: "When the passions dare not manifest themselves, they become more intense." Does this apply here? Sin, even in the form of anti-Christianity, undoubtedly becomes more intense in opposition to the gospel, but still this is mostly ecstatic consequence; 3. Luther: The accusing and condemning law awakens enmity to God. For this reason, Judaism, like all fanaticism, is angry at God. It is a prime consideration that here the law is specifically understood as the law of the letter, as designed to finish, both objectively and subjectively, the sinful process of the old world. Therefore the second ίνα in ver. 21, as Tholuck well remarks, takes the sting from the first. [In other words, the first ίνα indicates the mediate, the second ίνα the ultimate end and purpose.—P. S.] Philippi understands by παραπτωμα merely the παραπτωμα of Adam inhiring in sinners. But it denotes here rather the actual beginning of the fall of humanity itself.

But where sin multiplied [ου δε ειπει. ναιν η άμαρτία. What was it completed, came to full revelation. It is very strange that Rothe regards the head of the whole deduction from ου δε to γάρ as parenthetical. ου δε is not temporal (Grotius [De Wette, Fritzsche, Stübting]), but spatial (Meyer, Tholuck)—perhaps both; time being considered as an expansion—[Grace exceedingly more, much more, E. V.,] ἕπειξε [συναρτήσας καταγίρω] is superlative [not comparative; comp. επιπρεπές E., ἐπιπρεπές, ἐπιπρεπές, ἐπιπρεπές, επείξεις] (2 Cor. vii. 4 [the same verb]; 1 Tim. i. 14; Mark vii. 37; 2 Thess. i. 8).

Ver. 21. That, as sin reigned in [not unto, E. V.; Lange, interred, by means of] death [ινα, *Meyer, who is a philosophic purist even to occasional pedantry, leaves out, as elsewhere, thus, and that seems to justify even the supralatival "καταγίρω." Alford likewise insists on the uniform teleic meaning of ίνα. It undoubtedly denotes the design here, but the mediad, not the ultimate design, as in ver. 21.—P. S.]
CHAPTER V. 12-21.

The second Adam indicates the more remote and ultimate purpose of the coming in of the law, as the first Adam, ver. 20, denotes its nearer and mediate aim and effect; the increase of sin served merely as a means for the triumphant and eternal reign of grace. Hodge: “The design of God in permitting sin, and in allowing it to abound, was to bring good out of evil; to make it the occasion of the most wonderful display of His glory and grace, so that the benefits of redemption should infinitely transcend the evils of the apostasy.”—[F. S.]

As sin wrought death, so again did death work sin (see Heb. ii. 14). But here the priority in the psalms is ascribed to sin. It reigned [Sor., the historic past]. It reigned no more. In before the resurrection is not a substitute for in (Beza, and others). Meyer opposes also the explanation; by death (Tholuck, Philippi). Death denotes the sphere of the dominion of sin. But death is also the medium of the reign of sin; see the antithesis, thus: διὰ διανοιγένσας. So also may reign, αὐτῶν οί διὰ χάρις βασιλείαν, etc. The second Adam reigned to pass the dominion of grace; and it now reigns in reality. The material medium is righteousness unto (leading to) life eternal; the personal medium is Jesus Christ our Lord; and both are identical. The διὰ, and not the κατ’, is named as the medium of the dominion of grace, because the κατ’ αἰώνων is the goal. The righteousness of faith and the righteousness of life are compared here in the idea of the διὰ. (See important, not future. Meyer against Reiche, see Col. iii. 4.)

The last word in this section is, Jesus Christ our Lord, the one glorious solution of the Adamic fall and the dark problem of sin. Adam disappears, and Christ alone remains master of the field of battle, having slain the tyrants, Sin and Death. Forbes concludes his notes on Rom. v. 12-21 with the explanation (p. 267): “Who can rise from the study and contemplation of this wondrous passage, full of such profound views and pregnant meanings, with all its variously complicated yet beautifully discriminated relations and interlacings of members and thoughts, without an overpowering admiration and irresistible conviction of the superhuman wisdom that must have dictated its minutest details!”—[F. S.]

DOCTRINAL AND ETHICAL.


1. On the internal connection of the section, as well as its organic relations to what precedes and follows, compare the inscription and the introductory foundation of the Keryg. Notes.

2. Historical Statements on the different Theories of Original Sin and Imputation.—The Apostle clearly teaches, and our religious experience daily confirms, the fact of the universal dominion of sin and death over man, a race, which dominion goes back in unbroken line to our first parents; as, on the other hand, the power and principle of righteousness and life go back to Jesus Christ, the second Adam. Sin existed before Christianity, as disease existed before the science and art of healing; and, however explained, the stubborn, terrible fact remains. It is all-important, as we stated in the introductory remarks, to distinguish clearly between the fact itself and the different forms of explanation, or between the primitive truths of the Bible and the after-thoughts of human philosophy and theology. Here lies the reason why Christian men, holding very divergent views on the why and wherefore, or the rationale of Scripture truths, may yet in their inmost heart and religious experience be agreed. The commentators have so far dwelt mainly on the negative clause of Paul’s parallelism, viz., the propagation of sin and death from Adam; but he lays the chief stress upon the positive clause, the antitype, and the life-union of the justified believer with Christ, which prepares the way for chap. vi.

The following are the principal theories on this subject:

(1.) The Pantheistic and Neceessarian theory regards sin as an essential attribute (a limitation) of the finite, and a necessary stage in the development of character; it consequently destroys the radical antagonism between good and evil, and places itself outside of the Christian system. Where there is no real sin, there is no room for redemption.

(2.) The Pelagian heresy denies original sin, and resolves the fall of Adam into an isolated and comparatively trivial childlike act of disobedience, which indeed was a bad example, but left his character and moral faculties essentially unimpaired, so that every child is born into the world as innocent and perfect, though as fallible, as Adam was created. It offers no explanation of the undeniable fact of the universal dominion of sin, which embraces every human being with the one solitary exception of Jesus of Nazareth. It rests on an atomistic anthropology and hamartology, and is as anti-scriptural as the opposite extreme of pantheism. Socinianism, Unitarianism, and Rationalism likewise deny original sin and guilt in the proper sense of the term.

(3.) The assumption of a pre-Adamite fall of all men, either in time—i.e., in a state of individuaJ, preexistence of the soul prior to its connection with
the body (as Origen held it), or timeless and transcendental (so Dr. Julius Müller: ein ausserzeitlicher Ursprung und Urgrund). This is a mere hypothesis, without support in human consciousness, and inconsistent with the plain sense of Rom. v. 12, which, in harmony with Gen. iii., derives from the sin of the historical Adam.

(4.) The Augustinian or Realistic theory of a real, though impersonal and unconscious participation of the whole human race in the fall of Adam, as their natural head, who by his individual transgression vitiated the generic human nature, and transmitted it in this corrupt and guilty state to his descendants by physical generation. As an individual act, Adam's sin and guilt was his own exclusively, and is not transferable to any other individual; but as the act of mankind in their collective, undistributed, and individualized form of existence, it was, virtually or potentially, the act of all who were germinally or seminally contained in their first parent, as Levi was in the loins of Abraham (Heb. vii. 9, 10). Personae corruptum naturam, natura corruptit personam. In other words; Adam's individual transgression resulted in a sinful nature; while, in the case of his descendants, the sinful nature or depraved will results in individual transgressions. Thus the views of Augustine quoted on p. 178, third foot-note. His view rests on his deep religious experience and his interpretation of Rom. v., but it presupposes, as a necessary prerequisite, the original organic unity of the human race, a distinction between person and nature (which must be made also in the doctrine of the Trinity and the Incarnation), and may be philosophically supported by the Platonic-Aristotelian realism concerning the doctrine of the general conceptions, as the original types of individual things.

This realistic view of the fall of the race in Adam became the orthodox doctrine of the Latin Church. It was defended by the great schoolmen, Anselm, Peter the Lombard, Thomas Aquinas, etc. (yet with a material modification of Augustine's conception of original sin and guilt, which scholastic theology made to consist only in the loss of original righteousness; viewing it more as a negative state of privation than as positive corruption.) It was even more strenuously and vigorously maintained by the Reformers, both Lutheran and Calvinistic (who advocated afresh the Augustinian view of hereditary sin and guilt in all its severity). The various writings of Luther, Melanchthon, Calvin, and the symbolic books of the sixteenth century, abound with quotations and reminiscences from Augustine on the doctrines of Sin and Grace.

But within the Augustinian system different views of imputation were developed, especially in the Reformed Church:

(a.) Imputation, immediate and mediate,* conjoined and inseparable. This makes the guilt of Adam's first sin imputed, and the guilt of inherent depravity inseparable and conditional to one another. Both kinds of imputation are held in fact; but the distinction was not made before the seventeenth century. Participation is assumed as the ground of imputation. Noble corruption is itself sin, and likewise punishment for guilt incurred in Adam's sin. Hereditary guilt coexists with hereditary sin; man is condemned, both on account of the act of disobedience which he committed in the loins of Adam, and for hereditary depravity.

Here we must distinguish again a minor difference relating to the order of the two kinds of imputation:

(aa.) Some put immediate imputation before mediate in the order of things. So Augustine and his strict followers in the Catholic Church, and the Calvinists of the Montanist school, David Pars, Andrew Rivet, the elder Turrettin, and Hagedoorn;—with this difference, that the Dutch and French Calvinists of the seventeenth century combined, with the Augustinian theory of participation, the Federal theory of representation, (see below, No. 5); and, while still holding to both kinds of imputation, they laid the chief stress upon immediate imputation—thus preparing the way for exclusive immediate imputation.

(bb.) Others give mediate imputation, or the imputation of inherent depravity, the logical priority, so that Adam's sin is imputed to us only because it becomes our own by propagation. (To which some add, by actual transgression). Here belong, in all probability, Anselm among the schoolmen, Calvin, etc.

* (In opposition to Placanis, and in vindication of the decree of the Synod of Constance, the distinguished Professor Rivet, of Leyden, made a collection of passages on the dogmatics of imputation to show the Reformed church in opposition to the Calvinists, and prominent divines, as Calvin, Beza, Bullinger, Wolfgang Musculus, Viret, Buscalus, Peter Martyr, Wöllen, and others, as Davenant, J. Calvin, J. De Thou, the Zanchini, J. J. Remon, Pascot, L. Crocius, Molemaenich, Cheiman, Hinsh, and many others (including also Roman Catholics). But these testimonies are to a great extent general, and make no distinction between immediate and mediate imputation. The collection of Rivet is translated in part to the Princeton Review, vol. xi. (1839), pp. 533-579.)

† (Turrettin (I. c. Pars i. p. 537) defines imputation thus:

imputation vel est nisi alienis, vel propriis. Aliquando impugnatur nolam id quo nondum est personalitas, quae sequitur Deum impugnatur pecus pecorum propriorum, quod proprius proprii crimina puni, et in bonis dicatur audit Phineh illis impugnatur a justicia sui; alibi impugnatur id quo adeo non est nec a nobis est pecus propriorum, qui Christi dicatur nobis impugnati, et pecus nostra ipse impugnat, nec id esse pecus sim in se habebit, nec nos justificavit.

‡ (The Formula concordis Helvetici, a stronglyortistical dogmatics, drawn up in 1673 by Hagedoorn of Zürich, at the exhibition of Zurich and Constance, and of Basel, in opposition partly to the modius imputation of La Place, asserts that the imputation eis peccatum is not the consequence, but the cause of the propitiation of Christ, or the imputatio hereditaria, and condemns the doctrine of those who "sub imputatione medicinae et consequentiae presupponunt peccatum, nec imputationem duarum, ac peccati seculi, sed hereditaria imputationem assentia con gnavo periculo objectionem." Arc. x-xi. (In Niemeyer's Collect. p. 733.) The same Consensus teaches also a limited atonement, verbal, even punctual imputation; but it soon lost all authority. Eberhard (Kirchen- und Dogmengeschichte, iii. p. 300) calls it, rather too severely, the "ridiculous after-birth of a symbolic book.

§ Anselm (De coen. vig. c. 7) says we are not condemned because our consciences were in Adam, as we did not yet exist, but because we were descended from him (sed quia de illa futuri criminis)."

* Calvinism (civ. Dei lib. 12, § 1): "We are condemned for the sin of Adam not by imputation alone, as if the punishment of the sin of another was exacted of us (peccato Adam notae semel damnati, neque alius peccati cecipientur a nobis pena); but we bear the punishment of it also (peccato Adam notae semel damnati). We are guilty of the sin also (quem et eumsum remittat), in so far as our nature is contained in his; we are held bound with the guilt of infidelity before God (et cuncta nostra in suo visitate insponsitiva remis obstrictibus aequo aedificat); he says: with respect to that, we are in a different manner restored to salvation by faith in Christ, viz., not because it is in us, but it is freely given ...
bulldog among the reformers;* and, more clearly and expressly, Stapier and President Edwards,† who are often inaccurately quoted as "mediate imputations;" also the orthodox Lutherans of the seventeenth century.‡ It is certain that we have all to bear the consequences of Adam's sin, and this sin is therefore the cause of our native corruption; but it is not our personal guilt independently of this corruption, and our assent to it.

(b.) Mediate or consequent imputation makes inherent depravity derived from Adam, and this, in turn, this imputation of Adam's sin is prior to, and independent of, inherent depravity, but who claimed to be in full harmony with the teaching of Calvin on this subject. This view, "so far as it restricts the nature of original sin to the mere hereditary corruption of Adam's posterity, excluding the imputation of the first sin by which he fell," was consistently held by French Reformers, as Synod at Charlestown, near Paris, in 1646, yet with the same title, the name of Placetus, who contended that he was not touched by this decree, since he admitted a mediate imputation of Adam's sin, consequent and dependent on corruption.

(c.) Immediate or antecedent imputation as opposed to mediate imputation, makes, on purely legal grounds, the sin of Adam, as the sin of the federal use by gratuitous imputation (gratulare justitiam imputaciones). Erhard (Dogmatik, I, p. 512 f.) and Hodge (on Romans, I. c.) admit that the imputation of Adam's sin is immediate imputation; the former assuming, the latter dissenting. Calvin and the Reformed Confessions draw no line of demarcation between themselves and original sin. Calvin always guards against the supposition that we are condemned by an arbitrary imputation of a foreign act personal to Adam.‡

* [Erhard says, I. c. i. p. 513: "BuUinger knows of such a reatus which only takes place in consequence of the corrupio or vitiositas, but not of a reatus which is the cause of the innate vitiositas. This would be likewise mediate imputation only. But compare the passages of BuUinger quoted by Rievet, &c.]

The sin of Edwards, in his treatise on Original Sin, written against the Arminians, Dr. John Taylor, of Norwich, was to show that it is no absurd or impossible thing to believe that the race could be truly in the sin of the first apostasy, so that this, in reality and properly, shall become their sin; and therefore the sin of the apostasy in which man is involved is not the sin of God imputed it to them, but it is truly and properly theirs (by virtue of a real union between the root and the branches of mankind, established by the Author of the universe), and on that ground God imputed it to them" (Works, ii. p. 599). He says, moreover, that the arguments which prove the depravity of nature, establish also the imputation of Adam's first sin, and that both are included in the usual conception of original sin. "The first depravity of heart, and the imputation of that sin of Adam are both the consequences of that establishment of union between Adam and his posterity; but yet in such order, that the evil disposition is first, and the charge of guilt consequent thereby. as is Adam himself" (p. 544). Then, in a footnote, he quotes with approbation a long extract from Stuarts Theologia Polonica, to the effect that the mediators and the immediate imputation are inseparable, and that one should never be considered without the other. Dr. Sheed, History of Christian Doctrine, ii. p. 165, seems to hold the same view. Edwards says: "In point of fact, however, of immediate imputation, in this sense, his main object was to defend the doctrine of innate depravity by the theory of identity; s.e., a divinely constituted oneness of Adam and his race, by which he would be held to reveal a moral image, whether good or bad, according to the law that like begats like."

[The Lutherans hold that the imputation is immediata: in quantum existimatis adhuc in Adamo (qui Adam representavit full genus hominum); mediata: mediate putatio quae in Adamo est et suae alterius dispositionis sui et individualium consideratur, the first is mediated through the second. (Comp. Luther, Oecumenism der Dogmatik, p. 114 (2d ed. 1866).)

head of the race, the only and exclusive ground of condemnation independently of, and prior to, native depravity and personal transgression; so that hereditary guilt proceeds hereditary sin, and not vice versa. This exclusive imputation is held by Calvinists of the supralapsarian and federal school, and gives up the Augustinian ground of participation. See below, No. (b.) (6). In antagonism to this view, the New School theology of England has departed to the opposite extreme of rejecting imputation under any form. (See No. 6.)

(b.) The federal theory of a vicarious representation of mankind by Adam, in virtue of a covenant made with him, as opposed to the doctrine of the seven-teenth century, simultaneously with the development of representative federal government, and gained advocates among Calvinistic or Presbyterian divines in France, England, Scotland, and the United States. It supposes a (one-sided, non-depleatum) contract or covenant of the sovereign Creator with the first man, called the covenant of works (fœus operum, fœus naturae), as distinct from the covenant of grace (fœus zygodromos) in which the race should stand a moral probation on behalf of all his descendants, so that his act of obedience or disobedience, with all its consequences, should be judicially imputed to them, or accounted theirs in law. Adam's position is compared to the relation of a representative to his constituents, or rather of a guardian to his wards, since in this case the wards were not consuited; and did not even exist at the time of his appointment. The transaction must be resolved at last into the sovereign pleasure of God.*

Here again we must distinguish two schools:

(a.) The Augustino-federal school is a combination, and superseded the federal scheme on the realistic basis of participation, so that imputation is made to rest on moral as well as legal grounds. This was the view of the founders and chief advocates of the federal theory, Cocceius (originally John Koeh, or Coky, born at Bremen, 1602, died as profssor at Leyden, 1699), Burmann, Witsius, and is taught by the Westminster standards; and even in the Consensus Helveticus, although in this the Augustinian idea of participation is almost absorbed by the idea of the covenant.†

(b.) The purely federal school (from nominalistic premises, according to which the general conceptions are mere names, not things, subjective abstractions, not objective realities) denies the Adamic unity of the race in the realistic sense, consequently also all participation of Adam's descendants in the

* [See the different definitions of this fœus operum from the writings of Cocceius, Witsius, Heidegger, &c., in Hoppa's Dogmatik, pp. 204 ff. It is called fœus non depleatum, fœus naturae, quidam tamen partis dispositionum propositiones pro condimento, as distinct from a fœus munus autom al si non depleatum. There is no Scripture proof whatever for such a primal covenant. The solitary passage quoted is Gen. ii. 7."

† [For there] (Ephraim and Judith) "like men" (not "like Adam") have transgressed the covenant," refers to the Mosaic covenant. Even Turrettin (first théol. scholas, Tom. ii. p. 319, of the Edinb. and N. Y. ed. 1847) admits that it is inconclusive, and may be explained of the inconstancy of men, "ut decensor transgressus fœus simul hominum" (which fits into the natural view), and not analogous to Adam's simpe fallitum.”

‡ [On the Westminster divine, see Baird, Elokia Re- thead, pp. 238 et seq. (especially the articles of Dr. Landis in the Danville Review for 1861-62.)

† [Art. X.: "Sicut Deus fœus operum cum Adamo initio non tunc sanctus sed etiam humano... tunc Adamo tristis prodigatus, non sibi dutum sed toti etiam humano generi... bone in fœus promesse perditio." (Rec. also the passage quoted by Hoppa, b. a. pp. 226 f.)]
act of the primal apostasy; yet it holds that, by virtue of his federal headship on the ground of a sovereign and embraces all the sins of his posterity, and insinuates it to him. This imputation of Adam’s sin, and in the same way also the imputation of Christ’s righteousness or justification, is thus made a purely forensic process, which affects our legal relation, but by no means our moral character.

This forensic theory of imputation, which excludes participation in Adam’s sin, dates from the latter part of the sixteenth century,

* (Turretin, like Heidelberg, holds indeed to a double unity of the race with Adam, a natural or real, and a federal or formal, unity; but he believes that this act upon the latter, and prepares the way for giving up the former. He says (in his Institutes, first published in 1688, Pars I. p. 557, Concerning the Covenant of Grace, Sec. 13), “The race of man is purely moral.”)

(1.) Naturalis, quodammodo patet et est, nos quisquis; (2.) Politico or terrestrial, quodammodo primum et caput representationis humanarum. Pecationem ergo imputationem non est tantum communi naturalis, quem nobis cum Adamo interdictum est, sed omnes ipsae pecata doberent nobis impunita—sed praecipue moralis et generalis, per quam factum est, ut Deus cum illo, ut cum nostro capite, fatus populi.

Unde Adamus se habuit in illo peccato, non ut reum privatissimae, sed ut publicae et communis, quod omnes suos posteriores in actibus ilia re praemiserint, cujus praeceps deterrim ad omnes pertinent.” In Qu. XI. he quotes Augustine’s explanation of the sentence from Augustine, “pro multis et diversis hominibus,” adding, “by way of explanation, ‘ante sacros ante sacros simulacrum, quos omnes etiam unitatibus, quos omnes unitates unitatum,’ that is, What is a general, is a particular in a general.”

He proves this from the analogy of Christ: “In Christo justitiam constituitur per justitiam imputationem: ergo et pecationem omnium hominum constituitur ipse per unitatem unitatum. In this it is precisely the expressness of Dr. Hodge, except that Turretin translates it, with Augustine, in quo, vel, Adamo, whom, by a figure, takes the place of God.

† (Dr. Hodge, Haldane, Watts, and Cunningham, of Scotland (in his Historical Theology, Edinb., 1863, vol. I., pp. 276–277, on the Covenants and the Theory of the Reformation, Edinb., 1893, pp. 371 ff.), are counted on this side. Dr. Hodge, of Princeton, is the ablest advocate of immediate forensic imputation. He states it (on Romans, p. 278) as follows: “The doctrine of imputation is clearly taught in this passage (Rom. v. 12–18). This doctrine does not lose the idea of a mysterious identity of Adam and his race, nor that of a transfer of the guilt and punishment of his sin to his descendants. It does not teach that his offense was per se, or directly, the sin of all men; nor, in any mystical sense, was it the act of his posterity. Neither does it imply, in reference to the righteousness of Christ, that His righteousness becomes personally and inherently ours; for His righteousness is in any way transferred from Him to believers. The sin of Adam, therefore, is the ground of its remission; and the righteousness of Christ is the ground of our justification in those to whom it is imputed. This doctrine merely teaches that, in virtue of the personal, representative and natural, and not of the moral, union between Adam and his race, we are brought into the ground of their condemnation—that is, of their subject to penal evil, and, from the union between Christ and His people, His righteousness is the ground of our justification. This doctrine is taught almost in the same words in Rom. v. 14–18. It is so clearly stated, so often repeated or assumed, and so firmly established in the Christian church, that it is the doctrine of any class fail to acknowledge, in one form or another, the doctrine of the Apostle. The last is a mistake, as the confession of the doctrine in the Augsburg Confession, Dr. Hodge’s hostility to the realistic Augustinian view pro-

view. It involves, undoubtedly, an element of truth, but, if detached from the idea of moral participation, it resolves itself into an absurdity, and greatly exaggerates the difficulty of the problem, by removing the best reason for imputation. For how can an infinitely just and holy God punish countless millions of human beings simply and solely for the sin of another, in which they had no part whatever? The passage, Ezek. xvii. 1–4, where God rebukes the Israelites for using the proverb of the sour grapes, which Julian of Eclanum and his disciples have quoted as anæan against the Augustinian theory, returns here with double force. The analogy of forensic justification is not to the point, for the righteousness of Christ is not imputed to the impenitent sinner, but only on the subjective condition of faith, by which Christ is apprehended and made our own. Justification presupposes regeneration, or an action of the Holy Spirit, by which He creates repentance of our sins and trust in Jesus Christ, and makes us one with Him. By “being in Adam,” not merely a nominal, passive, or constructive relation, but a real spiritual union; so also our “being in Adam,” by which the other relation is illustrated, is real and vital. This analogy, therefore, leads to the opposite conclusion, that moral participation, either potential or personal, or both, must be the ground of the imputation of Adam’s sin.

(6.) The New School Calvinists of New England (since the days of the younger Edwards), in radical opposition to Princeton, reject imputation altogether; but maintain that the sinfulness of the descendants of Adam results with inextricable certainty (though not with necessity) from his transgression; the one class holding to hereditary depravity, prior to sinful choice, the other class teaching (with Dr. N. W. Taylor, of New Haven) that the first moral choice of all is universally sinful, yet with the power of contrary choice. This is a peculiar modification of the Pelagian conception of liberation adversarium, but differs from it in making a nice distinction between natural ability and moral inability.

(7.) The semi-Pelagian, and the cognate ARMINIAN theories (of which the former, since the fifth century, has gained large influence in the Latin, the latter, since the seventeenth century, in a considerable portion of the Reformed Churches, and was adopted by the Wesleyan Methodists), though by no means explicit and uniform on this point, agree in that they admit the Adamic unity, and the disastrous effects of the primal apostasy upon the whole posterity of Adam, but regard the native or hereditary corruption not properly as sin and guilt exposing us to just punishment, but only as an evil, an infinity, malady, and misfortune, for which the most benevolent God provided a sufficient remedy for all. Zwingli taught a similar view, and distinguished original sin as a moral defect or disease (he called it, in the Swiss dialect, Bösem), from sin proper. Semi-Pelagianism holds a medium position between Pelagian

coeds, I think, from a misunderstanding. He does not dis-
which remains even within the material bondage and slavery, and which, under the power of sin, he comes a λαθανίον of death by means of unbelief but, under the exercise of the gnatia praevenientia, becomes a λαθανίον of the marks of salvation by the new-born peace of sin forgiven! Tears of such pure and deep delight, Ye angels! never dimmed your sight."

* [Comp., however, my remarks on pp. 178 and 182.]
tine consigns even all unchristian children to damnation, although in the mildest form (De pec. orig., c. 36: "Iasus perditiose proxius, quia perisset ad manus perditonis." Erich., c. 93: "Mitsaliva sans omnium pana etor eorum, qui prater pecatum quod originale transrunt, solum inesper abdederunt.") In this respect even the strictest Calvinistic divines of our age decidedly dissent from them, and are disposed to hold that all children who die in infancy, whether baptized or not, will be saved by the infinite mercy of God. This charitable belief and hope has a strong support in the universal sufficiency of the atonement, and especially in the words of our Saviour concerning little children, spoken without qualification or limitation (Matt. xix. 14; Mark x. 14). There can be no salvation without Christ, even for children; but God is not bound to the use of His own appointed means, by which the benefits of Christ are ordinarily applied to men.—P. S.] 4. On the question why Eve is not the one being by whom sin came into the world (Pelagius and Ambrosiaster have really held that Eve is meant), compare, in addition to the Exeg. Notes, Tholuck, p. 216. 5. The Apostle does not speak here of the first origin of sin, or of the fall of Satan, as Christ does, John viii. 44. He acknowledges the doctrine of the devil as by no means wanting in his writings, it does not stand out very prominently. He here speaks merely of the entrance of sin into our human world from an unknown world beyond this, where it is assumed that it already existed in personified form. Now, this human world is neither the whole universe, nor merely human nature, but the human race in connection with the earth and the cosmic nature as far as it is organically connected with man (see 2 Peter iii. 10, and other passages). The personification of sin and of death exhibits both as (pseudo-formative) principles which have pervaded the organism of the human world, but under the ethical conditions under which they can alone become thoroughly dominant. The individual man, in his organic nature, is connected with humanity, but as an individual intellectual being he has an existence in himself. Pelagius denied the former, while Augustine has largely ignored the latter. The organic connection implies the propagation of the sinful propensity and guilt, according to John iii. 6, as well as according to chaps. vi.—viii. of this Epistle. In the broader sense, Christ also stood in the organic connection of humanity as the Son of Man, but only in the historical sense. Therefore he bore the burden of humanity for its reconciliation. 6. Paul calls the sin of Adam παραβαίασεως, as the transgression of the Divine commandment standing clearly before him; παραπτωμα as the sin which resulted in a fall; ἀνάγνωσμα, as a starting-point of many sins; παρακολουθησία, as disobedience to the known will of God. These designations and statements set aside such theories on the origin of sin as that of J. Müller (that there was a previous or timeless fall of the human soul), and that of Reimarus (that sin was the original, abnormal condition of humanity proceeding from their material constitution). 7. The relation of sin to death. Sin is death, says John (1 John iii. 14, 15); sin brings forth death, says James (chap. i. 15); sin has, as its wages or punishment, death as a consequence, says Paul (Rom. vi. 23). This is all the same relation, but from different points of view. The physical dying of the creature in itself is not thereby meant, but the perishableness of the creature is increased by ethical or spiritual death (Rom. viii.); and the original word, the last word for mankind (2 Cor. v. 1 f.), has, by sin, become fearful death, in connection with corruption, and the gloom of Sheol. Therefore death itself is conquered by the death of Christ, because its sting is taken from it (1 Cor. xv. 55, 56). The ethical character of death and the salvation of the redeemed from death are brought to light not only in the resurrection, but also in the revelation of the original transformation at the end of the world (1 Cor. xv. 51); while the ungodly, in spite of the general resurrection, are subject to the second death (Rev. ii. 11; xx. 6, 8c.). 8. In the period between Adam and Moses, death appeared to be merely the order of nature, because the paradigmatical law had disappeared from knowledge by the fall, and the Mosaic law had not yet appeared. Nevertheless, sin was also at that time the causality of death, but not as transgression in the light of legal knowledge. The concealed sin against the law dwelling in all men (chap. ii. 14, 15) was, indeed, esteemed by the manifest, tyrannical, and terrible dominion of death. Sin, says Paul, is not imputed where there is no law—that is, not fully settled until the law. But since it is with the gospel that the full significance of the law becomes clear, it follows that condemnation can only come with final hardening of the heart against the gospel. 9. Adam and Christ appear here as principles of the old and new humanity, of the first and second man, so far as their posterity is determined by their life. Yet it is not Adam in himself who is the principle of sin and death, but Adam in his deed—his disobedience. From the nature of sin, the disobedience (παρακολοθησία) cannot coincide in him with personality. In Christ, on the contrary, personality and the obedience (παραπτωμα) are one. In reference to personal issue, Adam is the natural ancestor of the whole human race. Christ is the spiritual founder—second of the human race. Both constitute together a harmonious antithesis in consequence (1 Cor. xv. 45). But they represent the principal antithesis in so far as sin and death proceeded from one (through him), and righteousness and life from the other. The Apostle sets forth these antitheses in a series of parallels, in which, first, their homogeneity comes into consideration (the through one, the organic development), and second, the dissimilarity (the over more on Christ's part); then the removal of sin by grace, and the triumph of the new principle (so far as by means of the law it makes sin itself serviceable to its glory). On the construction of these antitheses, compare the general groundwork of the Exeg. Notes. 10. While doctrinal theology has ascribed to the law a threefold use or purpose (law or bridle, mirror, rule—Zöger, Spiegel, Regelf. The Apostle seems here to add a reminiscence of the misprinas, in so far as he says that the law must have brought sin to full manifestation and development. This thought is not altogether included in the use of the mirror (see the the Exeg. Notes), but it is most intimately connected with it. As the knowledge of sin must come by the law, so also the revelation, the bringing of sin (ἐξουσίας)
light, must come by the law. The law has not produced real inward sin, but, like a chemical element, it has introduced a fermenting process into humanity, in which human nature and sinfulness seem to be identical; and by this means the external manifestation of sin is finished, in order to render possible its distinction and separation from human nature itself. The holiness of this effect is properly understood when we distinguish properly between the inward sin and its outward realization, its phase, in which the judgment has already commenced. Hence it is clear that the use of the law is the effecting of the knowledge of sin. The manifestation of sin for bringing to pass the knowledge of sin, comes by the law. The law, as letter, has completed the development of sin; the law, as the word of the Spirit, has brought the perfect knowledge of sin.

11. Although Paul, in this section, has mostly contrasted the many on the one side with the many on the other—because this expression makes more apparent the grandeur of the fundamental developments from the one—he yet declares definitely, in ver. 15, that the διανοίαμα of the one Christ is available for all men, with the tendency to become for them the διανοίαμα θεοῦ.

12. The Apostle makes prominent in many ways the great preponderance of the antitheses of grace over the theses of sin. The author of sin becomes to him a nameless being, who is opposed by God in His grace, and by the man Jesus Christ as the personal gift of grace. Sin itself falls immediately into the φύσις and meets the κατάκτημα. But the work of grace breaks through many offences, as if invited and augmented by them, like a mountain stream from the rocky cliff; and the dominion of death on one side is only a measure of the much more powerful revelation of grace on the other. But the so-called ἀποκατάστασις, as a necessary, natural result of salvation, is no more declared in the πάντες of ver. 15, than the expression οἱ πολλοί is designed to abridge the universality of grace. The ethical part of the organized process, the λαμβάνειν on one side and its antithesis, is opposed to each other, and is a conclusion, Moreover, it is the Apostle's aim to glorify the unfathomableness, immeasurableness, and illimitableness of the stream of grace, and its absolute and universal triumph in the history of the world.

"Sin reigns in death, grace reigns unto life." On this, Dr. Hodge remarks (p. 279): "That the benefits of redemption shall far outweigh the evils of the fall, is here clearly asserted. This we can in a measure comprehend, because, (1.) The number of the saved shall doubtless greatly exceed the number of the lost. Since the half of mankind die in infancy, and, according to the Protestant doctrine, are heirs of salvation; and since, in the future state of the Church, the knowledge of the Lord is to cover the earth, we have reason to believe that the lost shall bear to the saved no greater proportion than the inmates of a prison do to the mass of the community. (2.) Because the eternal Son of God, by His incarnation and mediation, exalts His people to a far higher state of being than the race, if unfallen, could ever have attained. (3.) Because the benefits of redemption are not to be confined to the human race. Christ is to be admired in His saints. It is through the Church that the manifold wisdom of God is to be revealed, throughout all ages, to principalities and powers. The redemption of man is to be the great source of knowledge and blessedness to the intelligent universe."—I add a fine passage from Dr. Richard Clarke (Sermon on Titus ii. 13, quoted by Ford): "Grace will not be confined. For God's goodness cannot be exhausted. He is richer in grace than the Apostles, rich enough for all (x. 15). It is an excellent attribute, which is given St. James, πολυτελείας [in some MSS., but the usual reading in James v. 8 is πολύπλοκος.—P. S.] In God's mercy, there is both οἶδα and πολίς: it is both free and rich; both gratis et copiosa (Ps. cxxx.), both bountiful and plentiful: not only περισσότερον, bursting forth round about, round about all ages, round about all nations, round about all sorts, but περισσότερον (ver. 20), surrounding all these rounds, and with surplus and advantage overflowing all. I say, not only πλουτούς, an abounding grace, abounding unto all, to the whole world, but ἐπετελεύσατο (1 Tim. i. 14), a grace superabounding; that, if there were more worlds, grace would bring salvation even unto them all. St. Paul's own parallel shall end this point (1 Tim. ii. 4). It is God's will that all men should be saved."—P. S.

HOMILETICAL AND PRACTICAL.

What follows from the comparison of Adam with Christ? 1. That by the one Adam, sin, death, condemnation, and the dominion of death have come; 2. But by the one Christ, life, righteousness, and the dominion of grace have come upon all men (ver. 12-21)—in all and death passed upon all (vers. 12-14).—Sin as the cause of death: 1. Original sin; 2. Sin of commission (ver. 12).—They too have sinned who have not committed the same transgression as Adam; comp. chap. ii. 12 (ver. 14).—All sin is transgression of the law, but not in the same way (ver. 14).—Adam is a figure of Him that was to come (ver. 14).—Man a figure of the Son of Man (ver. 14).—The first and second Adam: 1. Resemblance; 2. Difference (vers. 14-19).—The difference between sin and gift. It consists herein: 1. That, through the sin of one, many have died, but that, on the other hand, God's grace and gift have freely abounded unto many; 2. By one man's sin many have become condemned, but one gift has abounded from many offences to righteousness; 3. By the sin of the one, death has reigned over many; but by the one Jesus Christ will many more rejoice in the dominion of life (ver. 15-17).—The sole man Jesus Christ; not only (1.) one, but also (2.) the only one of His character (ver. 18).—Yet how different are the fruits of sin and righteousness! 1. The fruit of the former is condemnation; 2. The fruit of the latter is justification of life (ver. 18).—As condemnation is come unto all men, so also is justification of life (ver. 18).—The universality of Divine grace brought to pass by the righteousness of Christ (ver. 18).—The different effects of Adam's disobedience and Christ's obedience (ver. 18).—For what purpose did the law enter? 1. Not merely to make sin prominent; but, 2. To bring it to a crisis; and so, 3. To prepare for grace by Jesus Christ our Lord (vers. 20, 21).

LUTHER: As Adam has corrupted us with foreign sin without our fault, so has Christ saved us with foreign grace without our merit (ver. 14).—Notice that he speaks here of original sin, which has come from Adam's disobedience; therefore every thing is sinful which pertains to us (ver. 18).—As Adam's
sin has become our own, so has Christ's righteousness become our own (ver. 19).

BENGEL: God's gift is grace, flowing from the Father upon Him, and through Him to us.

STERKE: Believers are, by the spiritual life of the new birth, reigning kings over sin on earth, as they shall also be fellow-kings in the heaven of glory (ver. 17).—O universal grace of God, by which all may be saved by Christ! 1 Tim. ii. 4; Acts xvii. 30, 31 (ver. 18).—A small drop of grace can calm and engulf the raging waves of corruption (ver. 20).

Cramer: As no one can deny that he is mortal, so also must no one say that he is not sinful (ver. 14).—Neu Bbl. Tub. Sin has a mighty kingdom and dominion. Let nobody regard it as small and contemptible! Yet the kingdom of grace is much more mighty. The purpose of the latter is to destroy the former; where the kingdom of grace increases, the kingdom of sin declines. The former brings life, the latter death.

GRILLO: There is this great difference between the effects of the fall and of redemption: the effects of the former consist in a strongly legal judgment, which must ensure condemnation as a consequence of a single transgression; but the effects of the latter are a free gift, which made amends not merely for one sin, but for all the repetitions of Adam's transgression that have arisen from that first one; and it has made amends so completely, that it has really affected in fallen men the righteousness required by the law (ver. 16).—So powerfully does grace operate on those who have received its fulness, that they, by grace, become rulers in life through Jesus Christ (ver. 17).

Lisco: Mankind is united in Adam and Christ; therefore the sin of Adam became the sin of all, and Christ's offering became the propitiation for all. As every leaf of the tree suffers by disease of the root, so does every one recover by its restoration; thus it is with mankind in Adam and Christ (vers. 12–21).

Death is the great evil that was begotten by sin (ver. 15).—As Adam's sin has become ours, so has Christ's righteousness become ours (ver. 19).

Rieken: This little passage is as the pillar of fire in the wilderness; dark and threatening toward the Egyptians and impotent, but bright and clear toward the Israelites. This passage lightens and thunders against hard sinners, who treat everything lightly; but it shines with the lovely splendor of grace upon penitent and anxious souls (ver. 20).

Harracker: The dominion of sin in the world is not God's work, but man's guilt. The universality of corruption should not comfort, but humiliate us: 1. We should each be ashamed before all the rest; 2. We should be ashamed before the inhabitants of other worlds, who perhaps do not know any thing about sin; 3. We should so much the more bear in mind, that, amid the universal sinfulness, we shall not be the only pure ones; 4. We must therefore work out our salvation the more earnestly by prayer, and faith in Christ (ver. 12).—Adam is the natural, Christ is the spiritual ancestor; the former is the transgressor of the Divine commandment, the latter the fullfiller of the whole Divine law; the former is the cause of death and human corruption, the latter the author of life, redemption, and holiness (ver. 14).—The real ground why the operation of Divine grace is as universal as the sinful corruption from Adam, is this: that grace knows no other limits than those which man himself acts by unbelief (ver. 17).—The more men is pervaded by the knowledge of his sin, the richer will be his reception of grace (Luke vii. 47).

Besser: By one upon all (vers. 12–21).—The saving counsel of God has always been one and the same to sinners; not only to the children of Abra- ham, but to all the sons of Adam (ver. 12).—Death, having once stepped its foot into the world, has forced its way to all men (ver. 12).—Sin has become a natural power over persons, which cannot be dislodged by the blows of any club; but grace—which does not enter with compulsory power, but with the evangelical drawing of the word of God—is so powerful that it breaks the power of nature (ver. 12).—Death is the former, the latter is the Lord; this is death as of a ruler who is dead (ver. 17).—The new decree, "You shall live," which is warranted by the empty grave of Jesus Christ, is higher and stronger than the old decree, "You must die," which is confirmed by millions of graves (ver. 17).—The Apostles once more recapitulates the abundance of doctrine which he has demonstrated all along from ver. 12: Sin, death, grace, righteousness, life. These five stand thus: grace rises highest in the middle; the two conquering giants, Sin and Death, at the left; the double prize of victory, Righteousness and Life, at the right; and over the buried name of Adam the glory of the name of Jesus blooms (ver. 21).

Schliermacher, on ver. 19: The effects of the death of the Redeemer, so far as it was a work of His obedience.—Deichert: Has the Christ who died for us become the Christ within us?—How much more blessed to live under grace than under the law!

Lang: Adam and Christ in the internal and historical life of mankind. As all men are compartments in the fall of Adam, so, and still more, are they in the righteousness of Christ. As sin and death have assumed the appearance of personal, princely powers, in order to extinguish the personal life of mankind, so does the personal God again elevate men, by the glorious personality of Christ, to a personal life in royal freedom. The antitheses between Adam and Christ: 1. Personal effects (ver. 15); 2. In essential effects (ver. 16); 3. In the destruction of the apparently personal life of sin, and the restoration and glorification of the true personal life of grace, or the false and the true βασιλείαν (ver. 17); 4. In the final aims of both (ver. 18); 5. In the full manifestation of both in the light of the gospel (ver. 19).—The glory of God's grace in the exercise of its authority. How it has not only, 1. Conquered sin and death; but, 2. Even made them of service. The Divine art of distinguishing the effect of the law. The twofold character of the law: 1. Apparently a promotion of sin; but, 2. Really a communication of grace. Adam, Moses, and Christ. How far does Moses appear to stand on Adam's side; but how far does he rather stand on Christ's side?—The twofold effect of the law and of legality in the history of the world. The twofold curse of the law: 1. The curse of the law, well understood, leads to salvation; 2. The curse of the law, misunderstood, leads to ruin.

Burkitt (condensed): Every sin we commit in defiance of the threatenings of God is a justifying of Adam's rebellion against God. Our destruction is in ourselves, by our actual rebellion; and at the great day we shall charge our sin and misery upon ourselves—not on God, not on Satan, not on instruments, and not on our first parents.—Henry: We are by Christ and His righteousness entitled to, and
CHAPTER V. 12-21.

Instituted in, more and greater privileges than we lost by the offence of Adam. The plaster is wider than the wound, and more healing than the wound is killing —Scott: Instead of perplexing ourselves about the incomprehensible but most righteous dispensation of God, in permitting the entrance of sin and death, let us learn to adore His grace for providing so adequate a remedy for that awful catastrophe. —As our children have received a sinful and suffering nature from the first Adam, let us be stirred up by their pains and sorrows to seek for them the blessings of the second Adam's righteousness and salvation. —Wesley (Sermon on God's Love to Fallen Man, Rom. v. 18): The more we deal our bread to the hungry and cover the naked with garments, the more kind offices we do to those that groan under the various ills of human life, the more comfort we receive even in the present world, and the greater the recompense we have in our own bosoms.—Dwight: The subject of moral evil is too extensive and mysterious to be comprehended by our understanding. Many things connected with it lie wholly beyond our reach. But where knowledge is unattainable, it is our duty and interest to trust humbly and submissive to the instructions of Him who is the Only Wise.—Clarke: The grace of the gospel not only redeems from death and restores to life, but brings the soul into such a relationship with God, and into such a participation of eternal glory, as we have no authority to believe would have been the portion of Adam himself, had he been eternally retained his innocence.—Horsen: We should never yield to temptation on the ground, that the sin to which we are solicited appears to be a trifle (merely eating a forbidden fruit), or that it is but for once. Remember the one offence of one man. How often has a man, or a family, been ruined forever by one sin! —Compare Isaac de la Peyrere's Men before Adam (London, 1650), in which the author attempts to prove that the first men were created before Adam, and builds up a curious theological system on that supposition.—Compare also W. Buckland's Inquiry whether the Sentence of Death pronounced at the Fall of Man included the Whole Animal Creation, or was restricted to the Human Race. London, 1838. —J. F. H.]

PRELIMINARY REMARKS ON THE CONSTRUCTION OF CHAPTERS VI.–VIII.

After the Apostle has exhibited the antithesis of Adam and Christ in its principal or fundamental form and significance, chap. v. 12-21, he passes on to exhibit the same antithesis in all its consequences, first of all for believers, but then also for the whole world.

The negative side of this consequence is exhibited in chaps. vi. and vii.: The dying with Christ to sin and to the entire old form of life.

The positive side is exhibited in chap. viii.: The new life in Christ.

I. The first division is again divided into four parts.

A. As Christians have fundamentally (objectively) by the death of Christ himself, and subjectively through the faith sealed by baptism) died with Christ to sin in order to walk in newness of life, so should they act as those who are dead to sin. For their new life is an organic connection with Christ, an organic development; yet it is not a life subject to fatalistic natural necessity, but, in conformity with fellowship with Christ, it is a life in true freedom, as life after Adam has been one in false freedom, or the seeming freedom of hard service. It is a religiously or ethically organic relation; chap. vi. 1-11.

B. Because believers are dead to sin, they are free from its dominion. They should therefore take knowledge of the fact that they are delivered, and keep themselves from the bondage of sin; and in the power of their freedom, they should yield themselves under grace to be the servants of righteousness; chap. vi. 12-23.

C. But their being dead to sin means also that they, as those who passed into newness of life, have received in themselves the new principle of life, which is righteousness, or the inward substance of the law. Therefore, by Christ, they are dead to the law in the narrower sense, in which they lived in matrimonial alliance. They should serve, not in outward ordinances, but inward principle—from the force of grace, the impulse of the heart; chap. vii. 1-6.

D. But if to be dead to sin means also to be dead to the law, as well as the reverse, there follows nothing therefrom contrary to the holiness of the law. The law, rather, was designed, by its constant operation in awakening and increasing the conflict with sin, to effect the transition from the state of sin to the state of grace; chap. vii. 7-25.

II. The second or positive part is thus prepared. The condition of believers is free from all condemnation, because, in harmony with its character, it is a life in the Spirit of Christ. But it is a life in the Spirit which is prepared by the Spirit through the glorification of the body and the whole nature; for the Spirit, as the Spirit of adoption, is the first security for it, and the believer is certain of it beforehand in blessed hope; chap. viii.

A. This life in the Spirit now demands, first of all, the laying off, in the conduct of the Christian, of all carnal lusts, which must, however, be distinguished from a positively ascetic mortification of the body; chap. viii. 1-10.

B. As the Spirit of God testifies to adoption, so does it, as the Spirit of the risen Christ, secure the inheritance—that is, the removal of the body, and the glorification of life; vers. 11-17. The certainty of this blessed hope is established: a. On the development of life in this world, vers. 18-20; b. On the future or heavenly administration of the love of God and the grace of Christ, which make all the forces that apparently conflict with salvation even serviceable to its realisation; vers. 21-29.

Meyer's inscription over chaps. vi.–viii. is: "Ethical Effects of the διανοιανος δωρον. Chap. vii. 7 shows that the δωρο, far from giving aid to immorality, is the first to exclude it, and to promote, restore, and vitalize virtue; and chap. viii. exhibits the blessed condition of those who, being justified, are morally free." Tholuck: "It has been shown down to this point how much the Christian has received by that δωρο, δωρον. chap. i. 17. It is the mention of the fulness of grace called forth by the
power of sin, that now leads the Apostle to exhibit the moral consequences of this communication of grace, which in turn leads him further (chap. vii.), to the statement of the insufficiency of the legal economy; and in antithesis thereto (chap. viii.), to the moral effects of the economy of grace and its legal issue; so that the Apostle, after amplifying and enriching the explanations between chap. i. 18 and chap. v., returns to the same point with which chap. v. concluded. 14 The Apostle does indeed, return to the same point with which, not the whole of chap. v. concluded, but with which chap. v. 11. concluded, but in a sense altogether different, inasmuch as from chap. v. 12 on, the Apostle brings out, not merely the actual antagonism of sin and grace in humanity, as before, but the _principial_ antagonism of the two principles in its ethical and organic aspect.

**SECOND SECTION.**—The contradiction between sin and grace. The calling of Christians to newness of life, since they were translated by baptism into the death of Christ from the sphere of sin and death into the sphere of the new life.

**CHAP. VI. 1-11.**

1 What shall we say then? Shall [May] 1 we continue in sin, that grace may 2 abound? God forbid [Let not it be]. 2 How shall we, that are dead [who died] 3 to sin, live any longer therein? Know ye not, that so many of us as [all we who] 4 were baptized into Jesus Christ [Christ Jesus] 5 were baptized into his 4 death? Therefore we are [were] buried with him by [through] baptism into death: that [in order that] like [sent like] as Christ was raised up from the dead by [through] the glory of the Father, even [sent even] so we also should 5 walk in newness of life. For if we have been planted together in [become united with] 6 the likeness of his death, we shall be also in [with] the likeness 6 of his resurrection: Knowing this, that our old man is [was] crucified with him, that [in order that] 7 the body of sin might be destroyed, that henceforth 7 we should not serve [be slaves to] 8 sin. For he that is dead [hath died] 8 is freed [ acquitted] from sin. Now if we be dead [died] with Christ, we believe 9 that we shall also live with him: 9 Knowing that Christ being raised from the dead dieth no more; death hath no more dominion over him [dominion over him no more]. For in that [or. the death that] 11 he died, he died unto sin once 11 [for all]; but in that [or. the life that] he liveth, he liveth unto God. Likewise [Thus] reckon ye also yourselves to be [sent to be] 12 dead indeed unto sin, 11 but alive unto God through Jesus Christ our Lord [es Χριστον εσώσται, in Christ Jesus. Omit our Lord]. 19

**TEXTUAL.**

1 Ver. 1.—[The reading of the Rev. (Ἰσωσύνης) is poorly supported. A. B. C. D. E. read ἑαυτῶν; adopted by Griechenh. Lachman. Tischendorf. Meyer, Alford, Wordsworth. The above emendation is supported by the last two editors. N. K., and some cursives, have ἐσώσων.] 2 Ver. 2.—[ὁ δὲ τὸ γάμον ἐσώσων is a very forcible negative. How it should be rendered, is perhaps a matter of taste, but the _god forbid_ expresses its forbadness as no other English phrase can. Comp. Galatians, ii. 17; p. 49, note.] 3 Ver. 3.—[The E. V. is literally correct, but the reference seems to be to those baptized as a whole (Meyer); hence the emendation, which is adopted by Alford, Wordsworth, Amer. Bible Union.] 4 Ver. 3.—[ὁ, and a number of cursives and fathers, omit ἐσώσων. The order in almost all authorities is Χριστὸς ἐσώσται.] 5 Ver. 5.—[Wordsworth renders σύνεφορος, σύνεφορος; have become connate with. This is literal and exact, but connate would scarcely be proper in a popular version. Meyer, Lange: "summum gemeinsamen, gemein zusammen. United (Alford, Amer. Bible Union) is adopted in lieu of a better word. The E. V.: planted together, is based on a wrong view of the etymology of σύνεφορος.] 6 Ver. 5.—[In of the E. V. is not found in the Greek. With, in both clauses, is borrowed from σύνεφορος. Any further emendation must be based on exegetical views of the verse.] 7 Ver. 6.—[Ἰνα, bela, in order that. The next clause is tense also; but as a different form is chosen in Greek. It is better to let the simple that remain. Amer. Bible Union reverses the position of ἵνα order that, that, leaving it indefinite whether the first clause is telic. 8 Ver. 6.—[The verb δουλεύειν means, first, to be a servant; or slave, then, to serve. The personification of sin, implied in this passage, makes the primary meaning more correct here, and δουλεύειν is preferable to σερβεῖς, for obvious reasons.] 9 Ver. 7.—[This verse has a sorist (εὐσεβοῦς) in the first part, and a perfect (ἐξελευθέρωσεν) in the second. Yet the rendering: He that died has been justified from sin (Amer. Bible Union) does not convey its meaning properly. The sorist refers to something antecedent to the perfect, while the perfect states what continues to be true; hence, in English, we must invert, rendering the sorist by has died, the perfect by is acquitted. The Apostle is stating a general proposition, which is not theological, but legal; hence, acquitted is preferable to justified.] 10 Ver. 8.—[The reading σύνεφορος is found in N. B. D. E., and is now generally adopted. Rec. σύνεφορος, found in B. L. C. K., have σύνεφορος; which Lange considers a legal correction to the hororty. F. has συνεφορος.]
EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

a. The effect and demand of grace: death and life, vers. 1, 2.

b. According to baptism, vers. 3, 4.
c. According to the connection with Christ in His death and resurrection, vers. 5, 6.
d. According to the power and import of death, especially as a dying with Christ, vers. 7, 8.
e. According to the power of the new life as an incorruptible life with Christ, vers. 9–11.

Ver. 1. What then shall we say? The ζεῖν introduces the true conclusion from the previous verses, chap. v. 20, 21, by repelling the false conclusion which might be deduced from what is said there. [ἐν ἀπειθεὶς, the deliberative subjunctive. See note on ἐξετάζων, 150.—P. S.]

Ver. 2. Let it not be [ἐραυνήσας]. See chap. iii. 4, 6 and [Textual Note e, p. 112.—P. S.].

How shall we who died to sin [ὁμοίως ἀπειθανόην τῇ ναυτίᾳ. Ὁ μεταγίνησιν], describing the quality, as such who. Living in sin is utterly contradictory to the character of Christians. And the contradiction is very intense, not simply because of the aversion and repulsion between natural death and life referred to by Rungius (see Tholuck)?* The Christian is specifically dead to sin; and the life in sin, as a definitely false life, is opposed to this definite death. We have here an expression, therefore, not merely of “freedom from all life-fellowship with sin” (so Meyer), but also of the positive contradiction and repulsion between sin and Christian life. The reality of this contradiction is decided, figuratively exhibited, and sacrificially sealed by baptism. Yet the Apostle does not simply borrow his expression of it from baptism; but, rather, he identifies the death and resurrection of Christ underlie the figurative meaning of baptism.

[ἀπειθανόην, we died (not, are dead, E. V.), is the historic aorist, as ἠγαλλίω, v. 2, and ἀπειθανόην σιν τῷ Χριστῷ, Col. ii. 20; comp. Gal. ii. 19, ἕρωμα ἀπειθανόν; Rom. vii. 4. The act of dying refers to the time of baptism, vers. 3 (Bengel, Meyer, Philipp, Alford, Wordsworth), which, in the Apostolic Church, usually coincided with conversion and justification, and implied a giving up of the former life of sin, and the beginning of a new life of holiness. The remission of sin, which is divinely assured and sealed by baptism, is the death of sin. Sin forgiven is hated, sin unforgiven is cherished. This, too, shows the inseparable connection between justification and sanctification; and yet they are kept distinct: the justified is sanctified, not vice versa; first we are freed from the guilt (restitus) of sin, then from the dominion of sin; and we are freed in one order to be freed from the other.]

* [Tholuck quotes from Rungius: “Significant non modo quandoquam abstinuatur a propone pecado, sed quandoquam abstinuatur, quae est inter mortuos et vivos.”—P. S.]

Ver. 3. Know ye not [Ἰστορεῖτε]. This form of speech, like chap. vii. 1, is undoubtedly a reminder of something already known to the readers (Tholuck), yet it imparts at the same time a more definite consciousness and a fuller view of what is known. “It is very questionable,” says Tholuck, “whether other apostles exhibit baptism with the same mystical profundity as Paul did.” But 1 Peter iii. 17–22 is a modification of the same fundamental thought. So, too, 1 John v. 4–6. [Paul evidently regarded baptism not merely as a sign, but also as an effective means of grace (comp. Gal. iii. 27; Col. ii. 12; Titus iii. 5; Eph. v. 26); else he would have reminded his readers of their conversion rather than their baptism. We must always remember, however, that in the first missionary age of the Church the baptism of adults implied, as a rule, genuine conversion—the baptism of Simon Magus being an exception.—P. S.]

That so many of us (all we who were). “Ὁσοὶ, quos quippe. It denotes universality, as many of us as, all without exception, but it is not stronger than οἱπότες, which indicates the quality, such as we as,—P. S.°] The phrase παντὶς εἰς retains the most direct figurative reference of baptism. It means strictly, to immerse into Christ (Rückerl) that is, into the fellowship of Christ. [Comp. ver. 4; ἔκτος εἰς τόν ἄνατον; Gal. iii. 27; εἰς τόν ἄνατον εἰς ἔκτος. Matt. xxviii. 19: τῷ θεῷ θρούμα. Alford: “Into participation of, ‘into union with’ Christ, in His capacity of spiritual Mastership, Headship, and Pattern of conformity.”—P. S.] The explanation of Meyer (accepted by Hodge), that it never means any thing else than to baptize in reference to, with relation to, and that the more specific definitions must arise from the context, fails to do justice to this original meaning. [Comp. Lange and Schaff on Matthew, pp. 366 (Textual Note b), 367, 558, 656.—P. S.] But the baptizing into the full, living fellowship of Christ, is, as the Apostle remarks, a baptism into the fellowship of His death. And there is implied here, according to the idea of a covenant, the Divine adunction of this saving fellowship on the one hand, and the human obligation for an ethical continuance of the fellowship on the other. The explanation of Grotes and others, that the idea of limitation, is digressive, and weakens the sense. See Gal. iii. 27; Col. ii. 11; Titus iii. 5.

Ver. 4. Therefore we were buried with him [ὑποσταθήσοντες διὰ τοῦ].
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The purpose of dying with Christ. The power that raised our Lord was the δόξα of the Father. Thus the resurrection of Christ is traced back to the highest Cause. God is the Father, as Origin and Author of the spiritual world comprehended in Christ. Before the Father's name the creature-world ascends into the spiritual world, and the spiritual world is conjoined in the Son. The glory of the Father is the concentrated revelation of all the attributes of the Father in their unity, especially of His omnipotence (1 Cor. vi. 14; Eph. i. 19), wisdom, and goodness; or of His omnipotent love in its faithfulness, and of His personification in its most glorious deed.* Before the glory of the Father the whole living world goes to ruin, is doomed to death, in order that the dead Christ may be made alive as Prince of the resurrection. Application of the δόξα to the divinity of Christ (Theodore [ὁ αἰωνία θερίς], and others); in gloriām patris (Boza [inadmissible on account of δόξα with the genitive]); in paterna gloria resurrecti (Castalio).

From the dead, εἰς νεκρῶν. The world of the dead is regarded as a connected sphere. Also antithesis to εἰς δάκτυλον.

So we also should walk in newness of life [νεωτέρας καὶ ἡμέρας ἐν καιρῷ γέννησες ἡ ἡμέρα]. The expression σιμφέντευς, denoting originally inborn (inmate); born with (congenial, connate), means here the same as συμφέντευς, grown together by nature. [Grotius: coaetaneus; Tholuck, Philipp, Meyer: zusammenwachsen, verwechschen mit, concreta; Stuart: become homogeneous; Alford: intimately and progressively united.—P. S.] The expression conplecti (conclusi) with κατακλήσις (chastened, corrected) after Luther (R. V.) goes too far, and is not justified by the language; while the interpretation graffio into (Erasimus [Calvin, Estius, Conybeare and Howson], and others) does not express enough here [and would require ὑψιτώτευτος, insinuit.—P. S.] The figure denotes believers as a unity of different branches in one root or one trunk. These characters, which are united in one spirit, as the grapes of a cluster, have sprung from one gospel or new principle of life. Thus believers have grown into an image or analogue of the death of Jesus (τῷ διά διαμόρφωσε, dative of direction), but not with such an analogue (Meyer, Tho-

* [All commentators of note (except Stuart and Hodge) expressly admit or take it for granted that in this verse, especially in συνετικῶς and ἁγιάζω, the common prevailing mode of baptism by immersion and immersion is implied, as giving additional force to the idea of the going down of the old and the rising up of the new man. Chrysostom on John iii., Hom. xxv. (α. xxiv. Orat. tom. vii. p. 151): Κατά τόν δίκαιον κατά τόν διώκοντα, ἐν σάρκι καὶ συνετικῶς, ἂν πάντα ἐξαριστήτων, καὶ τοιαύτας κρίνεται ὡς καθήκουσα. ἄνευ αὐτοῦ σωματικῶς ἴκετα, καὶ διώκοντας κάτωρ καθηκόντως (ῥήμα ἐκ τῆς ἡγεμονίας Θεοῦ) έποίησαν μεταμόρφωσις. During the 3d to 5th century monks wore a long tunic reaching the floor, which was known as a καθήκοντας. Bloomfield: There is a plain allusion to the ancient mode of baptism by immersion; on which, see Suarez's Thees. and Believing in Jesus, p. 81; and the Treatise of Baptism, p. 19. Conybeare and Howson: This passage cannot be understood, unless it be borne in mind that the primitive baptism was by immersion.] Webster and Wilkinson: 'Doublets there is an allusion to immersion, as the usual mode of baptism, introduced to show that the baptism symbolized also our spiritual resurrection, συνετικῶς κατά τόν δίκαιον.' Comp. also Bengel, Rückert, Tholuck, Meyer. The objection of Philippi (who, however, himself regards this allusion probable in ver. 4), that in this case the Apostle would have expressly mentioned the simbolic act, has no force in view of the daily custom of baptism. But immersionists, on the other hand, make an unwarranted use of this passage. It should be remembered, that immersion is not conchaded here, but simply alluded to, and that the immersion, or κατακλήσις, is only one part of the baptistical act, symbolizing the going down of the old man of sin; and that the σεβαστήριόν, of the new man's righteousness, is just as essential to complete the content. Hence, irrespective of other considerations, the substitution of the casuistic and secular term σεβαστήριον for baptism, in a revision of the English Bible, would give a merely negative view of the meaning of the sacrament. Baptism shews the passing of the old man, and the beginning of the new man, and the idea of resurrection as well as of death and burial with Christ. Immersion is undoubtedly a more expressive form of the idea of resurrection, when the efficacy of the sacrament does not depend upon the quantity or quality of water, nor upon the mode of its application.—P. S.]

* [δόξα and δόμαμε are closely related; comp. the ἱεροτος and τέος δόμαμα, Col. i. 11. Meyer explains δόξα, die gloriehhe Gesammttheilkommenschaft Gottes.—P. S.] [So also Koppa, Reicha, Stuart: 'Καθήκοντας τῆς ᾿Ιδών I regard as a Hebraistic form, in which the first noun expresses the idea of the subject,' Against this dilution, comp. Winter, p. 21. Meyer and Alford in loc. note the abstract noun καθήκοντας gives greater prominence to the qualitative idea, which is the chief point here; comp. 1 Thess. i. 11; 1 Peter iii. 17.—P. S.]

* [συμφέντευς is not derived from φένειον, to plant (φένομ, used by Plato), but from φένοι, or φένω, to grow. Comp. on the different meanings of συμφέντευς. Reicha, Fritzsche, and Philippi in loc.—E. S.]
lack), with which we cannot connect any clear thought. [Philippi and Meyer explain: grown together, or, intimately connected with the likeness of His death; the ὄμωμα being spiritual death, so that the meaning is: If we are spiritually dead to sin, as Christ was physically dead, &c. So in the other clause our spiritual resurrection is the ὄμωμα of the bodily resurrection of Christ.—P. S.].

Neither can τα θεωματια be the dative of instrument: We have grown together with Christ [τὸ Χριστὸν being understood as in ver. 6] through the spiritual communion of His death-baptism, the likeness of His death (Erasum, Calvin, Olshausen, and others). [Van Hengel, and most others]. For [this would require αὐτός after σῶμα, and] believers are not together by the likeness of the death of Christ, but by His death itself in a religious sense, as cause (through the medium of the gospel), in order that, as an organism, they should now exhibit as a copy His death in the ethical sense.

We shall also be with his resurrection [αὐτότω καὶ τῷ θανάτῳ αὐτοῦ ἀναγεννήθημεν]. The antithesis is thus understood by all, which is used sometimes also by the classics for the rapid and emphatic introduction of the antithetical idea in the apocope after a hypothetical protasis; see Meyer in loc., and Hartung, Partikellehre, ii. p. 40.—P. S.]. We shall also be grown together with Him into the likeness of His resurrection (Beza, Grotius, Meyer, Philipp, Tholuck; “abbreviated comparative”:

Not σώματα τῆς άναπτυξιας (Erasmus, Calvin, Olshausen, and others). The reference of the expression to the resurrection of the body (by Tertullian, and others) is not in harmony with the context (see ver. 4); yet is altogether authorized by ver. 9, if we regard the new life as continuing to the bodily resurrection (therefore an ethical and physical resurrection, which Meyer and Tholuck oppose). The future, ἀναγεννήθημεν, is indeed not imperative (Reiche [Olshausen, Stuart: expressive of obligation]): nor does it denote willingness (Fritzschke), but the certainty of the result, the necessary consequence of dying together with Christ [Tholuck, Meyer, Hodge], if we understand thereby not merely a natural consequence, but an ethical one, which involves an ever-new willingness. This is likewise indicated by what immediately follows.

Ver. 6. Knowing this. That objective relation of the resurrection is not only confirmed by the subjective consciousness (Meyer), but it is also conditioned by it.

That our old man [ὁ παλαιός ἡμῶν ἀνθρώπων]. Meyer: our old ego. This is liable to misunderstanding, and expresses too much. Meyer further explains: “Personification of the entire state of sinfulness before the παλαιωσις (John iii. 3; Titus iii. 5; Eph. iv. 22; Col. iii. 9).” This expresses too little. The old man is the whole sinfulness of man, which proceeding from Adam, and pervading the old world and making it old, has become, in the concrete human image, the pseudo-plasmatic phantom of human nature, which is the κάθος, and the body human form (see chap. viii. 3). Tholuck’s explanation is almost unintelligible: “Indication of the ego of the earlier personality; as in εἰς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου, ἀναγεννήθημεν, 2 Peter iii. 4.”

Was [not in, as in the E. V.] crucified with him [σὺν αὐτῷ σκιάθῳ, comp. Gal. ii. 20: Χριστῶν αὐτοῦ ἀναγεννήθημεν, τὰ ἀναθεωματα, ἐν τούτῳ Χριστός].“Namely, at the time when we were baptized,” says Meyer [referred to vers. 3, 4]. But this is rather a superficial view. Baptism has actually and individually realized a connection which had already been realized potently and generally in the death on the cross; see 2 Cor. v. 14, 15; Gal. ii. 19; Col. iii. 1. Tholuck: “Gallus says very properly against Grotius: ὅτι καὶ συμβατικαί οἰκονομίαι δεσποτεί, μετά τοῦ δεικτα ἄναπτυξεις. The accessory idea of pain, or of gradual death [advocated by Grotius, Stuart, Barnes], could hardly have been thought of in this connection by the Apostle.” Yet we are also reminded of the violence and effective energy of the death on the cross by the following: in order that the body of sin might be destroyed. The destructive power of the death on the cross involves not merely pain and sorrow, but the dissolution of the body of Christ. According to Meyer, Paul only used the expression because Christ had died on the cross.

In order that the body of sin might be destroyed [ἐνα καταραγθῇ τῷ σώματι τῆς άναπτυξιας; comp. τὸ σώμα τῆς σαρκός, Col. ii. 11, and τὸ σώμα τοῦ θανάτου τούτῳ, Rom. vii. 24]. It is self-evident, from Paul and the whole Bible, that there is not the slightest reference here [as in Meyer, and others] to the physical dissolution of the body [i.e., of the physical body]. The physical self, which is only dissolved in physical death, and which, instead of being annihilated, is to be sanctified: comp. 1 Cor. vi. 20; 1 Thess. v. 23; Rom. xiii. 14.—P. S.]. As “the old man” is the pseudo-plasmatic phantom of man, so is “the body of sin” the phantom of a body in man consisting of his whole sinfulness; and so, further on, is the body of death (chap. vii. 24) the phantom of a corporeal power of death encompassing man. It is remarkable that most of the later expositions (with the exception of Philipi, p. 210 ff) reject the constructions which are most nearly correct, to substitute for them others which are dualistic.

1. Figurative explanations. Sin under the figure of a body.

a. The totality of sin (Origen, Grotius). [Crysostom: ἡ διάλεκτος άναπτυξις. Calvin: “Corpus fisciien Scheinbilder der Menschenwahrheit und Menschenzustand geworden ist.” In like manner he explains “the body of death,” v. 3, and “the law in the members,” v. 23, with reference to the physical and moral doctrine of plasma and pseudo-plasm, as if Paul had by intuition anticipated modern science.—P. S.].

The expression αὐτοῦ τῆς σκιας is the σκια persomified, or the ἐνα σαρκας, chap. vii. 14, 18—i.e., the fallen, sinful nature before regeneration, in opposition to the σάρκας ζωοματος, or the σάρκας ἀναγεννηθημεν, the renewed, regenerated man: [Col. ii. 9, 10; Eph. iv. 22-24; 2 Cor. v. 17]. The term man is used because sin controls the whole personality, as, on the other hand, regeneration is a radical change of the whole man with all his faculties and dispositions. The phrase, the old man, the man of sin, is traced to the rabbinical or rabbinical origin (Meyer); Bloomfield, Grotius; but the passage quoted by Schöttgen from the comparatively recent Shōkr-chaḏōṣet (first published in 1589) has a different meaning, according to Lucas, p. 291. The Shōkm, however, calls prolethes "new creatures," and says of them: “they became as little children;” see Schöttgen, loc. cit. p. 304, 104, 5; Weiss, p. 302, notes 1, 2. But also: Meyer: “The passage indicates: ‘The form of the expression (sacrificium) is rabbinical; for the Rabbinim considered a convert to Judaism as γινεται ἐναιμονή. The Christian idea of the παλαιωσις of course, is far deeper.”—P. S.]
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The natural or substance of sin (Schöttgen).

The figure of sin with reference to the figure of the crucifixion (Calv., Wolf, and others).

The tendency of alienation from God and conformity to the pleasures of the world (J. Müller, and others; Tholuck, p. 290).

More strongly: The whole man in his departure from God; the natural man (Augustin, Luther, Calv. [Hodge: 'The body of sin'] is only another name for 'the old man', or rather for its concrete form).

Reduced to a minimum: Bad habit (Pelagius).

2. Literal explanations:

a. The flesh as flesh of sin, σάρξ ἁμαρτίας (Rossmüller).

b. "The body belonging to the principle of sin, the body ruled by sin." The old man had such a body, and this σάρξ, as far as it is a body of sin, should be contrasted with the later body of sin crucified with Christ" (Meyer). An utter confusion of the figurative and literal construction. [Winer, Gramm., p. 177]: the body which belongs to sin, in which sin has its existence and dominion, almost the same with σῶμα τῆς ἁμαρτίας, Col. i. 22. Similarly Alford, after De Wette: the body, which belongs to or serves sin, in which sin rules or is manifested, = τὰ μῆκη, ver. 13, in which is ὁ σῶμα τῆς ἁμαρτίας, vii. 23. Wordsworth: the body of sin is our body, so far as it is the seat and instrument of sin, and the slave of sin.—P. S.

c. The body as σῶμα τῆς σαρκός, and the latter the seat of sin (Somler, Usteri, Rückert, Rieechl, Rothe, Hofmann; see Tholuck, p. 290).*

3. The anti-dualistic expositors, who interpreted this σῶμα as the real body or the natural man, were compelled to render improperly the καταργηθῇ, as: εἰσαγωγή might be made inoperative and powerless. [Tertullian, Augustin; also Stuart and Burgon]. The effect might be deprived of efficiency, power, life. Alford: rendered powerless, annulled, as far as regards energy and activity. —P. S.

That henceforth we should not be slaves to sin. [Calvin: "from abolitionis notat."] Sin is regarded as the controlling power (see ver. 16); John viii. 44. If this power is to be broken, the body of sin must be crucified. The reason for this is given in what follows. [τῶν μετὰ τὸν λόγον ἡμῶν τῆς ἁμαρτίας is a more concrete expression of the sin than the preceding clause, Ἰνα καταργηθῇ, x. l. See Winer, p. 569.—P. S.]

Ver. 7. For he that hath died is acquitted from sin.

'Ὁ γὰρ ἀποθανόν ἐδικαιώθη ἀπὸ τῆς ἁμαρτίας; comp. 1 Peter iv. 1: ὅτι ὁ παθὼν ἐν σαρκὶ, πέπωθα εἰς ἁμαρτίας. The interp. of this passage depend upon the meaning of ἀποθανόν, whether it is to be taken in a physical, or in a moral (legal), or in a spiritual (mystic) sense.—P. S.] The chief and only question here is not ethical dying, or dying with Christ (Eras- mus, Calvin, Cocceius, Bengel, Olshausen [De Wette, Philippi], and others. And the reason for this is, first, because justification must not be regarded as the consequence, but the cause of the ethical dying with Christ. Second, because, not merely the being justified or freed from sin should be proved, in and of itself, but the being justified or freed from sin by death. An earlier, already present, universal, moral, and theological law of life is thus used to illustrate the new, religious, and ethical law of life in Christianity, in the same way that chap. vii. 1–6 has reference to such a law. The universal principle which the Apostle makes his groundwork here in the figurative expression, is the word in ver. 23: The wages of sin is death. The Græcian and Roman form of this antithesis was: by execution the offender is justified and separated from his crime (Aletheus, Wolf, and others). The theoretic form was the same decree of death for sin, according to Gen. ii. 17; ix. 6; Lev. xxiii. 1 ff. The sinner who was made a curse-offering, Cherem, was morally destroyed in a symbolic sense, but, at the same time, his guilt also, as well as his life of sin, was destroyed in a symbolic sense. According to Gen. ii. 17, the destruction of the former should be the death of the latter. The sin is put as a momentary power, put an end to the sinner's present life (Chrysostom, and others), but rather because it made a penal suffering extending into eternity (Shool) the punishment of sin. All these modifications are grouped in the primitive law: death is the wages of sin; and this is the law which the Apostle makes the image of the Christian law of life. The Christian dies to sin by being crucified with Christ. Now, the being justified does not mean here justification by faith in itself (although dying with Christ is connected therewith), but justification as a release from sin by the death of the sinner himself. Because Meyer ignores the complete Old Testament idea of death, he attacks the statute of Jewish theology: death, as the punishment of sin, atones for the guilt of sin. He explains the Apostle's declaration thus: "He is made a δίκαιος by death, not if he were merely free from the guilt of his sins committed in life, but so far as he sins no more." The explanation of ethical death with Christ (Roth, Philippi, and others already mentioned) here makes what is to be proved the proof itself (as Meyer properly remarks). Meyer refers the passage to physical death as death from the present life—a view in which regard is not paid to penal suffering. Better than this is the view: As activity ceases in the dead, and sin with it, so should it also be with you who have died with Christ (Theodoret, Melanchthon, Grotsch). But there is the same inadequacy of the comparison. Tholuck's exposition is utterly untenable (with reference to Calvin, Bengel, Spenner, and others), that sin should here be regarded as a creditor who has just claims on man, κ. có.; for, while a debtor is released by death from his creditor, there is by no means a δικαιοσύνα of the debtor from his debt.†

* [Meyer's view is, that he who physically dies is free from sin, because he is free from the body, the seat of sin. But this, as Philippi remarks, is contrary to the biblical and Pauline anthropology. —P. S.]

† [We add the views of leading English and American commentators; Scott, Macknight, and Hodge: He who is dead with Christ is freed from the guilt and punishment of sin, not by justification but by sacrifice; and Apology applies a common Jewish proverb concerning physical death,
Ver. 8. Now if we died with Christ, &c. [El de ἀποθανον εν σιν Χριστω:] denote the transition to the new thought, that believers, having died with Christ, shall also live with Him. But this is not a mere conclusion from the being dead to the new life; the accent rests on the qualification with Christ, because Christ lives. As we are dead with Christ in His death, in its profoundest meaning and effect—which death comprises the separation from the entire old world, and its sin and vanity—so do we believe that we shall also live with him [πνευμα του και συνοι- σομεν εν αυτω:] in the supremely highest and most intense life—which life is eternal, and is an eternal life. Meyer emphasizes simply the inference from the ethical death with Christ to ethical participation in the new and enduring life of Christ. He is much in error in excluding here [with philippi] the idea of the Christian's future share in the blessedness of the glorified Saviour (see chap. viii.), as Origen, Chrysostom, Grotius, Reiche, and others are in confessing συνοίσομεν τουν to the future life. Rosenmüller, Beich, and others have properly comprised both these elements: the death and the life; there rests upon the assurance of the new ethical life as implying the full freedom from all sin in the fellowship of Christ, Tholuck, with Erasmus, Calvin, and others, emphasizes once for all [ἐνίκανε, ver. 10] as an eternal destination to new life. This destination is commensurate with the certainty of being dead with Christ. Yet, granting full force to the conclusion, it is still an object of faith (πνευματικος), which rests mainly on Christ as the risen One. (Different interpretations of πνευματικος: confidence in Divine assistance, Fritzsch; in the Divine promise, Baumgarten-Crusius; in God as the Finisher of the commenced work of grace, Philippi [comp. 1 Thess. v. 24; 2 Thess. iii. 3; 2 Tim. ii. 11].)

Ver. 9. Knowing, &c. From faith in the risen One there arises the certain knowledge that henceforth He can never die; because He could die but once, inasmuch as, with the guilt of sin, He had assumed also the judgment of death. (Alford: Death could not hold Him, and had no power over Him further than by His own sufferance; but power over Him it had, inasmuch as He died. Meyer: The θανατος of death over Christ was decreed by God (v. 8-10), and brought about by Christ's voluntary obedience (John x. 18; Matt. xxv. 28). The conviction that Christ lives for ever furnishes the ground and support to our own life-union with Him.)

Ver. 10. For in that he died, or the death which he died. The expression, ὅ ἀποθανον, may mean: as far as His death is concerned (Winer); or, as far as the death which He died is concerned (De Wette); or that wh.ch He died, so that δι is viewed as the subject [or rather as the accusative of the object; comp. Gal. ii. 20: δε νυν δι'.—P. S.]

We prefer the last exposition, but do not refer the δι' with Bengel (after Hilarius, and others) to the mortal part of Christ, but that which died in Christ, but to Christ's great and unexampled experience of death. All his dying was abhorrence of sin, induced by sin, directed against sin. Unto sin he died [την ἀμαρτιαν ἀποθανον]. Explanations: ad expianda peccata (Grotius, Olshausen); or, ad expianda et tollenda p. (Tholuck [Reiche, Fritzsch], Philippi); or, to destroy the power of sin (Chrysostom, Beza, Calvin, Bengel, Ewald). Indefinite reference to death (Rückert, De Wette [Alford], and others).

Meyer: His death paid the debt to sin, and now it can have no more power over Him. Hofmann: With His death, all passive relation to sin has ceased. Certainly the parallel in ver. 11 τεν μοι την ἀμαρτια seems to require a similar rendering. Yet we must not merely bring out prominently the repulsiveness of sin to the life of Jesus, but rather the repulsiveness of His life to sin—which repulsiveness was consummated in His death. Both together constitute the absolute separation.

Once [ἐνε πασι]. Once for all. The one sacrifice on the cross, as the sacrifice of the infinite Son of God, has infinite value both as to extent and time, and hence excludes repetition; comp. Heb. vii. 27; ix. 12, 26, 28; x. 10; 1 Pet. iii. 18.—P. S.]

But in that he liveth, or, the life that he liveth ([3 δε την ζωην την οτι θανατη, etc. All His life, His whole glorious life, is for God. His death consisted wholly in the ethical reaction against sin, so His life consists wholly in consecration to God, His honor, and His kingdom. (Christ's life on earth was also a life for God, but in conflict with sin and death, over which He triumphed in the resurrection.—P. S.) Theophylact's view is wrong: by the power of God.

Ver. 11. Thus reckon ye also yourselves (account yourselves) dead indeed unto sin [ὅν τις και μεισ η λογισθη ξανα τινι προς μεν την ἀμαρτιαν]. A λογισθη of Christ does not simply mean a parallel to λογισθη (which is impossible, and not indicative, as Bengel would have it). It should rather be derived from the meaning of the death of Christ, according to ver. 10.

But alive unto God in Christ Jesus [αυτω Ἰησου]. That is, in fellowship, or living union with Him (not merely through Him). It refers not simply to living up to God (Rückert, De Wette [Alford]), but also to being dead to sin (Reiche, Meyer). The λογισθη requires of Christians that they should understand what they are as Christians, as members of Christ, according to the duties of common fellowship (Tholuck, Philippi); but not that they should attain to this condition by moral effort.

[The dative of reference or relation; in point of fact, in the case of θανατος it is the Dativus commodi, or distributum; while in the next clause τη σε is the Dativus commodi.—P. S.]

[The positive would rather require: οὑς και μεισ η λογισθη, instead of the second person, Alford is quite mistaken; when he says: "Meyer only holds it to be indicative," Meyer, on the contrary, takes λογισθη to be the imperat., in harmony with the imperative character of what follows.—P. S.]

[The σε is not per Christum (Grotius, Fritzsch, al.), but denotes the element in which the being dead and being alive holds. Comp. Winer, Gramm., p. 304.—P. S.]
grafting into Christ, of regeneration, of remission
of sins, and of his giving up unto God, through
Jesus Christ, to walk in newness of life.” (Comp.
the Larger Catechism, Qu. 165, and Shorter Cate-
chism, Qu. 94). Calvin says: “In treating the sac-
raments, two things are to be considered: the sign
and the thing signified. Thus, in baptism, the sign
is water; but the thing signified is the cleansing
of the soul by the blood of Christ, and the mortifi-
cation of the flesh. Both of these things are com-
prised in the institution of Christ; and whereas
often the sign appears to be ineffectual and fruitless,
that comes through men’s abuse, which does not
antil the nature of the sacrament. Let us learn,
therefore, not to tear apart the thing signified from
the sign; though, at the same time, we must be on
our guard against the opposite fault, such as prevails
among Papists. For, failing to make the needful
 distinction between the thing and the sign, they stop
short at the outward element, and there confidently
rest their hope of salvation. The sight of the water,
accordingly, withdraws their minds from Christ’s
blood and the grace of the Spirit. Not reflecting
that, of all the blessings there exhibited, Christ alone
is the Author, they transfer to water the glory of His
death, and bind the hidden energy of the Spirit to
the visible sign. What, then, must be done? Let
us not separate what the Lord has joined together.
We ought, in baptism, to recognize a spiritual
act; we ought in it to embrace a witness to the remission
of sins and a pledge of our renewal; and yet so to
leave both to Christ and the Holy Spirit the honor
that is theirs, as that no part of the salvation be
transferred to the sign.”—Dr. John Lillie, in his ex-
cellent posthumous Lectures on the Epistles of Peter
(New York, 1859, p. 232), in commenting on 1 Peter
iii. 21, remarks: “But what, you will ask, is bap-
tism, then, a saving ordinance? Certainly; that is
just what Christ’s Apostle here affirms. Nor is this
the only place, by any means, in which the New Test-
ament speaks of baptism in a way that would now
offend many good people, were it not that the per-
xplexing phraseology is unquestionably scriptural.
Recollect, for instance, Peter’s own practical applica-
tion of his pentecostal sermon: ‘Repent, and be
baptized, every one of you, in the name of Jesus
Christ, for the remission of sins.’ And so Annanias
in Damascus to the humbled Saul, ‘be baptized, and
be washed away thy sins.’ Paul, too, expressly calls baptism ‘the laver of the water’ by which Christ purifies His Church; and again,
the laver of regeneration’ by which God saves us.
Frequently, also, he represents it as that by which
we are united to Christ, and made partakers of His
death and resurrection. Nay, Christ Himself, in
committing forth His gospel among all nations, named
baptism as one of the chief conditions of salvation.
Should we need not, then, hesitate to call it a saving ordinance? But
how does it save? Just as any other ordinances
save—not through any inherent virtue of its out-
ward signs and ceremonies, but solely as it is a channel
for the communication of Divine grace, and used in
accordance with the Divine intention. On the
one hand, while grace is ordinarily dispensed through
through the outward ordinances, it is not confined to them, God being
over higher things, to his own appointments and acting,
when it so pleases Him, independently of them along-
together. And, on the other hand, there must be on
the part of man, besides the observance of formal
precept, a yielding of his whole nature to the quick-
ening and transforming influence. Take for an ex-

DOCTRINAL AND ETHICAL.

1. See the Preliminary Remarks on chaps. vi-
dii., and the inscription to the present section, chap.
vi. 1–11.
2. On chap. vi. 1. The false conclusion which
anomianism has ever derived from the fact that sin,
in its complete development, occasions a still more
glorious revelation of grace, rests on the erroneous
supposition that the ethical and organic relation on
both sides is a purely natural relation, which justifies
an altogether passive conduct in religious and
moral things. This anomianism appears in Indian
heathenism, as well as in modern humanitarianism,
chiefly in a pantheistic form. But in Christian re-
ligionous it appears only sporadically in this form;
yet mostly, on the other hand, in dualistic forms.
This is as much as to say, that if the flesh be indul-
ged in its sphere, the spirit will likewise maintain
the ascendancy in its sphere; or, grace will over-
come sin, and the like. But in every form this ano-
mianism is to the Apostle an object of religious
and moral abhorrence, which he expresses by μη γενο
στα. He opposes this false conclusion by the truth of the
relation according to which the whole of Christianity
is rooted in a thoroughly religious and moral act—
the death of Jesus.

3. Baptism, in its full meaning, is a dying with
Christ, which is potentially grounded in the dynamic
meaning of His dying for all (2 Cor. v. 14), and is
actually realized in the dynamical genesis of faith.
It follows from this that it is not only a partial puri-
fication of the living sinner, but his fundamental
purification by a spiritual death and burial; that,
further, it not merely represents sensibly and seals
the single parts and acts of the Christian life, but its
whole justification, in all its acts; and therefore
that it is available, operative, and obligatory once
for all. It follows, finally, that baptism is not sim-
ply an ecclesiastical act performed on the individual
when the individual is passive, but an ethical cov-
enant-transaction between Christ and the one who is
baptized; wherefore even the baptism of children
presupposes in the family, the parents, or the spon-
sors, a spirit of faith which represents and encom-
passes the child.

From all this it will be seen how very much bap-
tism is obscured and deexcrated by regarding it either
as a mere ceremony which certifies the Christian life
of the person baptized, or, on the other hand, as a
onesided and magical act which is supposed to create
the Christian life.

[In opposition to the low and almost rationalistic
views now prevailing in a large part of Protestant-
ism on the meaning and import of Christian baptism, it
may be well to refer to the teaching of the sym-
bols of the Reformers down to the Westminster
standards, and of the older divines, which is far deep-
er. Take, for instance, the Westminster Confession of
Faith (chap. xxviii.): “Baptism is a sacrament of the New Testament, ordained by Jesus Christ, not
only for the solemn admission of the party baptized
into the visible Church, but also to be unto him a
sign and seal of the covenant of grace, of his in-
ample that greatest ordinance, the Word of God.
It "is able," says James (i. 21), "to save your souls.
But how? Not simply as it is preached, or heard,
or read. That it may be the power of God unto
salvation, it must first be accompanied with the
demonstration of the Spirit, and then received with
meekness, and so become the well-conceived word.
It is not the foolishness of preaching that saves; but
it pleases God by the foolishness of preaching to
save them that believe." Now, just so with baptism:
equally with the gospel itself, it is a Divine institu-
tion, whereby God ordinarily dispenses His grace.
But its whole efficacy is due to that grace of God,
and to our fitting reception and use of the rite—not
to its mere external administration, by whatsoever
priestly or apostolical hand."—P. S.

4. According to the Apostle, the burial as well as
the death of Christ is represented in the meaning
and effect of baptism. But as the burial of Christ
not only seals His death, but also brings to pass the
mysterious form of His transition to new life, so is
it also with the world's renunciation of the secret
inward life of the Christian, which develops from
a germ in mysterious growth, and is bid with Christ in
Gethsemane. (For fuller information on being baptized into
the death of Christ, see Tholuck, p. 286, and Phil-
lippi, p. 202.)

5. Christianity is not only a new life, but a newness
of life—a life which never grows old, but has
ever a more perfect and imperishable renewal. But
as the resurrection of Christ rests on a deed of the
glory of the Father, so is it with the new birth of
the Christian. See the Exeg. Notes.

6. Although believers are so intimately connected
dead in transgression, or broken off from the same
branch, they are nevertheless not grown together in
the form of natural necessity. While unchurcably
and unhistorical sectarianism ignores the organic
internal character and historical structure of the
Christian communion, hierarchism, on the other
hand, disregards its ethical and free inward charac-
ter. The life of Christ is repeated and reflected,
after His death and resurrection, in His image—the
Church; but not in the sense that it is quantitative-
ly a supplement or substitute for Him, but that it
completely unites itself qualitatively with Him as its
living head. Because the Christian suffers death in
Christ, rises, and is justified, Christ, as the crucif-
ied and risen One, lives in him. (See chap. viii. 29;
Eph. i. 4; Col. i. 22, 23, 24; ii. 11; iii. 1, &c.)

7. The Apostle's doctrine of the old man, the
body of sin, the body of death, the law in the mem-
bers, &c., shows a divinatory anticipation of the idea
of the pseudo-plasmas, which has first appeared in the
modern science of medicine. The old man is
not the real man, nor the natural man, but sin,
which has pervaded man as the plasmatic phantom
of his nature, and, as an ethical cancer, threatens to
consume him. (On the various theological interpre-
tations of the old man, see Tholuck, p. 287. For
a more complete interpretation of Paul's pseudo-plas-
matie ideas, see Exeg. Notes on chap. viii. 24.)

8. The doctrine of the new creature in Christ,
as the source of sin, abolishes the real idea of sin.
Even the expression, that the body is not the source, but
the seat of sin, is not correct in reference to the ten-
dency of the wicked, and is only conditionally cor-
rect in reference to the life of the pious, in whom
sin, as sinfulness, as a tempting propensity in the
bodily part of the being has its seat, and will con-
tinue to have its seat, until the old form of the body
is laid off.

9. On being free from the debt of sin by death,
see the Exeg. Notes. Death removes guilt—a def-
tition which may be further formalized thus: the
kind of death corresponds as justification to the
kind of guilt; the depth of death corresponds to the
depth of guilt. Therefore the death of Christ is
the potential justification of humanity, because it
plunged the absolutely guiltless and holy life into the
absolute depth of the death of mankind.

10. On the expression body of sin, in ver. 6,
compare the elaborate discussion by Tholuck, p. 288
ff. Likewise the same author, on ver. 9, or the re-
lation of Christ to death; p. 306.

HOMILETICAL AND PRACTICAL.

On the relation of sin and grace: 1. It is true
that the more powerful sin is, the more powerful is
grace also; but it cannot be inferred from this, 2.
That we should continue in sin. But, 3. We should
wish, rather, not to live in sin, to which we died
(vers. 1, 2).—To what would continuance in sin lead?
1. Not to grace, for he who sins wilfully, trifles with
grace; but 2. to the terrible looking for of judgment
and fiery indignation, which will consummate the
rebellious (vers. 1, 2). Heb. x. 26.—Of Christian
baptism. 1. What is it? a. a baptism into Christ;
b. a baptism into the death of Christ, 2. Of what
service is baptism to us? a. We die and are buried
by it in repentance; b. we are raised by it in faith
(vers. 3, 4).—By baptism we enter into a double
union with Christ: 1. Of His death; 2. Of His
resurrection.—Christians are, 1. Companions in
the death of Christ; but also, 2. In His resurrec-
tion (ver. 5).—The crucifixion of our old man: 1.
The manner and form of the old man; 2. his cruci-
fixion.—The glorious immortality of Christ: 1. Its
foundation; 2. Its importance to us (vers. 8—10).
We should reckon ourselves dead in relation to sin,
but alive in relation to God; that is, 1. We should,
by faith, be ever taking our stand-point more per-
fecly in Christ; and 2. farther than all in His death,
but also in His life (ver. 11).

STARKE: The suffering and death of a Christian
are not to destruction, but a planting to life.

HEDINGEN: Under the grace of God we are not
permitted to sin.—MÜLLER: Life and death cling
together; the more the old dies and goes to ruin,
the more gloriously does the new man arise.—Either
you will slay sin, or sin will slay you.—Where faith
is there is Christ, and where Christ is there is life.

GERLACH: The baptism of Christians is a baptism
into Christ's death; that is, into the complete
appropriation of its roots and fruits.

BESSER: Paul places the gift of baptism first,
and connects with it the duty of the one baptized.

HEUNER: Recollections of our former covenant
of baptism: 1. What has God done for us in baptism?
2. What have we to do in consequence of baptism?
—TROMMEL: The power of baptism in its per-
mission for the exercise of the Christian life—Florey:
We are baptized into the death of Christ. Namely:
1. Upon the confession that He died for us; 2. On
the pledge that we should die with Him; 3. In the
hope that we shall live by Him.—HARLES: The im-
pediments to Christian life: 1. The pleasure of life,
which is terrified at evangelical preaching on death;
2. The dulness and unbelief of spiritual death, which
is terrified at evangelical preaching on life; while yet, reversely, 3. The pleasure, power, and pious conduct of the Christian rests upon the death which he has died for newness of life.

[SHERLOCK: As the death of Christ was not barely a natural death, a separation of soul and body, but a sacrifice for sin, to destroy the dominion of it, so our dying to sin is the truest conformity to the death of Christ; and as we must consider His resurrection as His living to God and advancement into His spiritual kingdom, so our walking in newness of life is our conformity to His resurrection, and makes us true subjects of His spiritual kingdom.—HENRY: As natural death brings a wrat of ease to the weary, so must we be dead to all the sins of our former rebellious life. We must be as indifferent to the pleasures and delights of sin, as a man that is dying is to his former diversions. As natural death cuts off all communication with life, so must sanctification in the soul cut off all communication with sin.

—MACKNIGHT: We should daily recollect our baptism, and be stirred up by it to every religious act and thought possible, for it is this that sets before us the death and resurrection of Christ.—CLARKE: The sacrificial death of Christ is the soil in which believers are planted, and from which they derive their life, their fruitfulness, and their final glory.—HORER: It is those who look to Christ not only for pardon, but for holiness, that are successful in subduing sin; the legalist remains its slave. To be in Christ is the source of the Christian's life; to be like Christ is the sum of his excellence; to be with Christ is the fulness of his joy.—J. F. H.]

### Third Section.

**The principal freedom of Christians from the service of sin to death, and their actual departure therefrom and entrance into the service of righteousness unto life by the power of the death of Jesus.** (Believers should live in the consciousness that they are dead to sin, just as even the slave is freed by death.)

**Chap. VI. 12-23.**

12 Let not sin therefore reign in your mortal body, that ye should obey it in lusts thereof. Neither yield ye [Nor render] your members as instruments [or weapons] of unrighteousness unto [to] sin: but yield [render] yourselves unto [to] God, as those that are alive [as being alive] from the dead, and your members as instruments [or weapons] of righteousness unto [to] God. For sin shall not have dominion over you: for ye are not under the [omit the] * law, but under grace.

15 What then? shall we sin, because we are not under the [omit the] law, but under grace? God forbid. [Let it not be!] Know ye not, that to whom ye yield yourselves servants to obey, his servants ye are to whom ye obey; whether [either] of sin unto death, or of obedience unto righteousness?

17 But God be thanked [thanks to God], that ye were the servants of sin, but ye have [omit have] obeyed from the heart that form of doctrine [teaching], which was delivered you [whereunto ye were delivered];[a] Being then [And being] made free from sin, ye became the servants of righteousness. I speak after the manner of men because of the infirmity of your flesh: for as ye have yielded [rendered] your members [as] servants to uncleanliness and to iniquity unto iniquity; even so now yield [render] your members [as] servants to righteousness unto holiness [or sanctification].

20 For when ye were the [omit the] servants of sin, ye were free from [as regards] righteousness. What fruit had ye then in those things whereof ye are now ashamed? [What fruit had ye then therefore? Things whereof ye are now ashamed:][b] for the end of those things is death. But now being [having been] made free from sin, and become servants to God, ye have your fruit unto holiness [or sanctification], and the end everlasting life. For the wages of sin is death; but the gift of God is eternal life through Jesus Christ [in Christ Jesus] our Lord.

### Textual

1 Ver 12.—[The correct reading seems to be : ὁμοιαὶ ταῖς ἐπιθυμίαις αὑτοῦ, found in m. A. B. C.], many others, most versions and fathers; adopted by Lachmann, Thschendorf, Meyer, Alford et al. Griesbach, on insufficient authority, omits all after ὁμοιαὶ. D. F. insert αὑτῷ, omitting the rest. C. K. L., some further insert αὑτῷ ὁμοιαὶ before ταῖς ἐπιθυμίαις. So Rec.; hence it is of the E. V. All these variations are accounted for by Meyer, who supposes that αὑτῷ was added, first as a marginal gloss, to direct attention to sin as the source of "the lusts," then incorporated in the text, and subsequent changes made to avoid confusion.

2 Ver 13.—[The idea of military service found in εἰρηνάρχης is better expressed by render, since yield implies a previous resistance, not found in the Apocryph's thought.
EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL

Ver. 12. Let not sin therefore reign [Μὴ δὲν βασιλεύσῃ ἡ δικαιοσύνη]. The Apostle conducts the following discussion in a hortatory manner, but without actually entering the sphere of exhortation, as Tholuck thinks. [The negative part of the exhortation, ver. 12, 13, corresponds to νικῶν μὲν τῇ δικαιοσύνῃ, ver. 11; the positive part, ἀλλὰ παραστάσει, ver. 13, answers to ἄρας δὲ τῷ Θεῷ.] So Meyer, Alford, Philipi, Alford, Hodge, &c.-F. S.] In a didactic respect he teaches that believers, by their transition from a state under the law to a state under grace, are first properly qualified and pledged to the service of righteousness, but are not free for the service of sin. That is, the true emancipation from outward legalism leads to an inward and free legalism, but not to Antinomianism. The οὐν indicates that ver. 11 shall be elaborated. But as the previous section has shown what is conformable to the state of grace in itself, the present section shows what is according to faith from the hard service of the law, which was presupposed by bondage under the law. Let not sin now reign (imp.). The true sovereign command of grace is opposed to the false sovereign command of sin, which is still present as a broken power (Luther: Observe that holy people still have evil lusts in the flesh, which they do not follow). Tholuck: "Philippi and Meyer correctly remark, that the Apostle does not expressly make any concessions to the conceptu criticisms [καταδεικνύει], yet his admonition does not extend any further than that lust must not become a dead. Sin is represented as ruler in the body, which ruler is served by the μιση as organs." That is, however, as the one who has been the ruler; and the methods are at the same time given for destroying the lusts of the flesh, that they—by the life in the Spirit, which also changes the members into instruments of righteousness—should not only be continually ignored, but also annulled. [Alford, in opposition to Chrysostom, who lays stress on δικαιοσύνῃ, says: "It is impossible to separate, between reigning and indwelling morally, but between reigning and being depose.]—P. S.

In your mortal body [ἐν τῷ θανάτῳ ὑμῶν σώματι]. The σῶμα as θανάτος must be distinguished, on the one hand, from the σῶμα τῆς ἁμαρτίας of ver. 6, and, on the other, from the σῶμα νεκρόν of chap. viii. 10. The σῶμα τῆς ἁμαρτίας is the pseudo-physical apparent body of the old man, and, as the sensual side of all sinfulness, is devoted with it to destruction. The body is a σῶμα νεκρόν so far as it is more assets itself as a second principle of life with or even superior to, the principle of the Spirit, but yields itself purely to the service of the Spirit. But a σῶμα θανάτου is the body so far as it, as the sensual organ of the earthly existence, has living organs, which shall be purified from the former service of sin and transferred to the service of righteousness. The σῶμα as a false principle is destroyed; the σῶμα as a secondary principle is dead, absolutely helpless; and the σῶμα as the organ of the spiritual principle is transformed into instruments of righteousness. It is called mortal, because its earthly propensity is toward sin and death, and it must be compulsorily brought into the service of righteousness, and exercised as for a spiritual military service in antithesis to the body of the resurrection, which will be the pure power and excellence of righteousness. Meyer is therefore correct in rejecting the interpretation, that θανάτου is the same as νεκροῦ (dead to sin; Turrettin, Ernesti, and others).

But it may be asked, For what purpose is the adjective θανάτου?

1. Calvin: per contemptum vocat mortales [νυν δοειτη των ἁμαρτιῶν ναυματίων καὶ εἰς μούρατα καταδίδεα υμᾶς.] Köllner: It is dishonorable to make the spirit subject to this frail body.

2. Grotius: De vita altera oportere, nos fornicationes abeant et sanctam usuram inveniamur. [Chrysostom, Theodoret, Reiche, likewise suppose that the word reminds us of the other life, and of the shortness of the conflict.—P. S.]

3. Flatt: Reminder of the brevity of sensual pleasure. [Comp. Theophrast.]

4. Meyer, obscurely: It is absurd to make sin reign in the mortal body, if the Christian is dead to sin and alive to God.

5. Philipi: To call to mind that the wages of sin is death. [Philippi takes σῶμα in opposition to τοιχία.]

6. Tholuck, with Bullinger and Calixtus: Because sensual enticements are regarded as inapplicable from the present sensuous organism, &c.

7. Photius, Turrettin, Ernesti: θανάτου is figuratively = dead; i.e., corrupt (in which sense νεκρόν is often used.)

In all these definitions the relative dignity and estimate of the "mortal body," which are definitely declared in ver. 15, are not regarded; the same.
members, which until then had been instruments of unrighteousness, henceforth being instruments of righteousness. The organism of earthly existence and action, which has become mortal by sin, is naturally an organism for the service of the spirit. By the dominion of sin in it, its mortality became still more intense; but by the normal subjection of sin to the service of the Spirit, it shall be brought with it on the course toward everlasting life (ver. 22).

That ye should obey the lusts thereof [τίς τῷ ὑπαντεῖν τοῖς ἐπιθυμίαις αὐτοῦ]. According to the sentence, we must supply ἐν, to ὑπαντεῖν. To the end that ye obey its lusts. Even if the body were holy, its impulses would have to be subject to the dominion of the spirit; much more must they be subject to the spirit, since they are diseased, irritable, excitable, and inclined to self-assertion and demoniacal self-distraction.

Ver. 13. Nor render your members [Μὴ ἔργαστε τὰ μέλη ὑμῶν]. Without doubt παραστατεῖ is here reference to enlistment or delivery for military service. The Apostle is writing to Rome, the metropolis of military affairs, and therefore derives his figure from Roman customs (comp. chap. xiii. 12); just as he admonishes the Corinthians by expressions that call up the Jewish games (1 Cor. ix. 24), and speaks to the spiritual city of Ephesus concerning the battle with spirits ( Eph. vi. 11, 12). Sin is already distinguished as the false ἁσάλεια, who causes the false summons to be promulgated that the members shall be ordered into his warfare against righteousness. — Your members.

If the body has ceased to be an independent principle, only its members come into consideration (in the good sense of the principle: Divise et impera). According to Erasmus, Philippi, and others, the intellectual forces and activities (perception, will, understanding) are included in the term. According to Meyer, only the physical members are meant (the tongue, hand, foot, eye, &c.), "for which, however, intellectual action is a necessary supposition. The physical members are plainly meant as organs and symbols of ethical conduct (different from the pseudo-platonic members; Col. iii. 6).

As weapons [or instruments] of unrighteousness [ἡ ἀδικίας]. Meyer says, of immorality. But, in the sense, we mean for the right or the wrong; therefore the expression ἀδικία must be strictly retained. — ὑμῶν, according to the Vulgate, Theodoret, Luther, Calvin, Bengel, and Meyer: weapons. Callixtus and De Wette [Stuart, Robertson, Hodge,Ewald, Alford], on the other hand: instruments. The former construction can by no means be favored by appealing to the fact that the ἄμαρτία suggests warriors in service, for the trope is already obliterated (?) in that term, but it is favored by the consideration that the Apostle also elsewhere—when he uses ὑμῖν in the ethical sense—employs it in the meaning of 'weapons;' Rom. xii. 12; 2 Cor. vi. 7; x. 4 ('Tholuck'). [Meyer insists that ὑμῖν, while so frequently used in the sense of instruments by classical authors, is never thus used in the New Testament.—R.]

But render yourselves [ἀλλὰ ἐν παραστατεῖσιν ἑαυτοῖς]. We must observe here a double antithesis: first, the aorist παραστατεῖσις in opposition to the previous present, παραστατεῖσις; second, ἑαυτοῖς in connection with the following καὶ τὰ μέλη, in opposition to the previous τὰ μέλη. Both are quite in harmony with the antithesis. For believers have already fundamentally placed themselves as such in the service of righteousness, and in complete unity with the centre of their life, while the man in the opposite service of sin yields his members individually to a foreign power. At all events, the Christian, as the servant of sin, would be led into the contradiction of wishing to remain free himself while he placed his members at the service of sin. On the aorist παραστατεῖσις, comp. Winer, p. 298; and Tholuck, p. 511. (It denotes, "according to Fritzschel, what happens in the moment; according to Meyer, that which occurs forthwith; and according to Philippi, that which appears once;"

Tholuck). Tholuck does not attach importance to the difference between the aorist imperative and the present imperative, since he concurs with those who disregard the temporal reference. We hold, with Herm. Schmidt (De imperat. Wittenberg, 1839): "The imperative present commands to obey oneself with something: the imperator imperative, to accomplish something." We add to this: That something already under consideration, or already undertaken, must be carried through. [The greater definiteness implied in the aorist must not be lost sight of, whatever view be adopted.—R.]

As being alive from the dead [ὅς εἰς νεώτερον ζωτάς]. The aorist does not introduce a figure, but means rather (comp. ver. 11): regarding yourselves as those who are alive, almost as if you are. The phrase is a condensed description of the state of ἑαυτοῖς. While the reference is undoubtedly ethical, yourselves must be taken in its widest meaning—body, soul, and spirit; and the implication is, that the whole man was once dead in sin (not to sin, as ver. 11), but now is alive; hence the pertinence of the exhortation. The reference to a field of battle is extremely doubtful, since it introduces a new figure so soon after vora. 2—11.—R.]

Meyer: Those who, from dead persons, have become living. We assume the figure of a field of battle. The Christians lay there as dead or slain persons, and from dead persons they became alive; therefore they can and should go over to the banner of righteousness.

And your members [καὶ τὰ μέλη ὑμῶν]. Hodge paraphrases end: and especially; but ζὰ seems to have an inferential force here.—R. Because they have become themselves the warriors of God, they must also regard their members as God's weapons, the weapons of righteousness for God. *

Ver. 14. For sin shall not have dominion over you [ἄμαρτία γὰρ ὑμῶν ὁ νόμος ὑμῶν]. The future, according to Melanchthon: dulcisina consolatio; erroneously regarded by Rosenmüller, Flatt, and others, as imperative. If we were to distinguish between the expression of confident supposition (Calov., and De Wette) and consoling promise (Chrysostom, Grosch, and Tholuck), we would prefer the former meaning, since the predicate.

* [The German commentators generally take the second τὸ θεόν as dat. commodo, and render τὸ θεόν. They advance no special reason for it. This view unnecessarily disturbs the agreement of the clauses, since the second τὸ θεόν is in strict verbal contrast with the first τὸ θεόν. The τὸ θεόν is undoubtedly the simple dative after παραστατεῖσις, as the same verb must be supplied in this clause, it seems unnecessary to substitute any other regimen here. We render to God in both clauses; the more confidently, since the second clause is but a particularisation of the first, to carry out the antithesis. Comp. Stuart.—R.]
CHAPTER VI. 12-23.

nant train of thought throughout is didactic; yet the latter is also included.

For ye are not under law [οὐ γὰρ ἐστε ἤπω νὰ νὰ ἡμῶν]. Notwithstanding the preceding declaration in chap. v. 20, the expression continues to be an oxymoron, since the law is recognized as a carrier to sin. The sense is: Freedom from the law gives you so little freedom to sin, that it is only by the exercise of grace upon you that your freedom from sin has begun. [Meyer: "Were they under the law, Paul could not have given this promise (i. e., in the preceding clause), for the law is the strength of sin (1 Cor. xv. 56), multiplies sin (v. 20), in which aspect he intends to explain it further in chap. vii.""] Law is here used in its widest significance. See Hodge.—R.]

Under the dominion of grace [ὑπὸ γὰρ ἡμῶν], which operates as an inward and new principle of life; while the law, as such, confronted the inward life only as an outward demand—threatening, arousing, and casting down; and in this form it presupposed the dominion of Bondage under the law, betokening bondage under sin, without being able to remove it; but it is removed by the dominion of grace, which has become an inward life of law. [The general idea undoubtedly is: "Ye are not under a legal dispensation, but a gracious one" (Stuart); yet the whole context forbids the exclusive reference to the method of justification. "Grace" is here used in its widest sense; "the Divine grace, shown in Christ, is the power under which ye stand" (Meyer), and which assures that ye shall not be under the dominion of sin.—"Gratia non solum pecesse divinit, sed et non pecessum factit" (Augustine).—R.]

Ver. 15. What then? May we sin [Τί οὖν; ἀμαρτήσωμεν. See Textual Note].—R.]

According to Rickert, Meyer, and others, a new section should commence here; which Tholuck is right in opposing. The unity of the following with the foregoing is the fundamental thought: freedom from sin. Also the reference to the members continues throughout what follows (ver. 19). There is, however, a modification. Down to ver. 14 the antithesis was rather an ethical demand; but now a religious confirmation predominates. There, the new life was contrasted with the old as a voluntary entrance into the military service of righteousness over against the wicked, mercenary service of sin; here, the Apostle (speaking according to human analogy) presents the obligation of a new service in contrast with the old service. In the present verse Paul therefore brings out prominently the fearful consequence of the impure Antinomian view of the state of grace, in order to condemn it forthwith. To this earnest rejection of a horrible consequence, arising so frequently in ancient and modern times, the conjunctive ἀμαρτήσωμεν corresponds better than the fut. v. [Dr. Hodge well remarks: "Such has been the objection to the doctrines of grace in all ages. And the fact that this objection was made to Paul's teachings, proves that his doctrine is the same with that against which the same objection is still urged."] This consideration should also prevent any limitation of "grace" to justification.—On μὴ γενόστα, see li. 4, Textual Note*. p. 112; comp. Comm. Gal., p. 49, foot-note.—R.]

Ver. 16. To whom ye yield yourselves. With the know ye not;* the Apostle points to the analogy of a principle of civil law; but he gives the application in the same sentence with it. To whom you once freely gave and pledged yourselves for obedience [with the view to obedience; Alford] as servants [slaves], his servants, and him. By ye obey; be it as servants of sin unto death, &c. Thus the two services preclude each other, since the masters deny each other (Matt. vi. 24). According to De Wette, Philippi, and Tholuck, the emphasis rests on ἔστε; according to Meyer, on δοῦλος. But the actual being and awaiting, with its consequence, is principally the principal idea here; the being servants is at the same time connected with it. The ὑπακοή is explained by Reiche: to whom you have to obey. But this weakens the sense.

Either, or. The disjunctive ἀθώσ occurs only here in the New Testament. It lays special emphasis on the first alternative (Meyer). "Either this alone, or that; there is no third;" Hartung, ii. 856 f.—R.] The ἡτώσ, a strong either, or. Sin is personified here too. But the ἰπακοή is personified, in opposition to it, as the πάντωμι (1 Peter i. 14); and this is a better rule for the Christian's freedom in his obedience.* Plainly, the Apostle here makes the freedom of choice precede the servum arbitrium; according to ver. 17, the former was bound a long time ago.

Of sin unto death [ἀμαρτίας εἰς τάνατον.] According to Fritzsche and Reiche, physical death is meant; but according to Meyer and Tholuck (the early view of which latter was that it is spiritual death), after Obyssoyhm, eternal death is spoken of. Meyer's ground against the acceptance of physical death is, that it is not the consequence of individual sin, and cannot be averted from the δοῦλος ἰπακοῆς—an argument which Tholuck accepts. But how could this occur, if there were not in earthly life a hundred-fold gradations of physical death? The death of the suicide, for example, is not to be explained simply by the fall of Adam. And thus spiritual death has its degrees also. Therefore the Apostle speaks of death in general (so also Philippis);* as, according to 1 Cor. xvi., his thorn is sin, which has eternal death in prospect. Even the forms of the misery of sin which precede death are not to be overlooked.

Of obedience unto righteousness [ἵπακοή ἐν δικαιοσύνῃ.] Meyer, just as incorrectly, presents the δικαιοσύνῃ as the final result for the servants of obedience, in contrast with exclusively eternal death. The righteousness of faith believe," Jowett paraphrases thus: "Know ye not that what ye make yourselves, ye are?" This view he takes to avoid taunting, yet this seems to depart from the Apostle's line of thought.—R.]

* [Forbes calls attention to the deviation from the strict parallelism of this verse: "of obedience unto righteousness" instead of "of righteousness unto life." He intimates that thus Paul marks this distinction: To sin we give ourselves of our own free choice and power as bondmen, but we cannot of our own free choice, and by any effort of will, give ourselves to the service of righteousness; hence all we can do is toyield ourselves up to God's grace, to serve, as servants of righteousness, for the righteousness, as a "gift" to be bestowed upon us, and incouraged into us by His Spirit. He also notices that the direct expression presents to righteousness does not occur until ver. 19—"the caution being attributable to anxiety lest such an expression be turned to legalistic account."—S.]
is certainly assumed here; but the "uprightness which is adjudged to believers in the judgment" is gradually developed to its completion from obedience as the form of the new life. [On the construction of this verse with ver. 17, 18 [Rückert and Reiske], by which ver. 16 is the proposito major, ver. 17 the minor, and ver. 18 the conclusion: "Comp. Tholuck."—V.]

Ver. 17. But thanks to God, 

[χαίρε γάρ δὲ τῷ θεῷ, &c. It may be asked, whether the first proposition is a mere introduction to the second as the principal proposition, so that the thanksgiving refers merely to obedience (Grotius, Estius, and others); or whether the thanksgiving refers to both propositions (Meyer, Tholuck).—Tholuck says, in favor of the latter view: "Since θεῷ proceeds, and μόνον is wanting, θεῷ must be read with all the more emphasis; as 1 Cor. vi. 11: καὶ τάκα τίνος θεός; Eph. v. 8: ὁ θεός ἀμώμων αὐτοῦ, and the immediate object of thanksgiving is that time of the bondage to sin is past." Evidently, the deliverance from the service of death is in itself already a satisfactory ground for praise and thanksgiving; yes, we naturally thank God for this with the greatest emotion (God be praised! delivered!), although this negative side of salvation cannot be regarded as separable from the positive.] But ye were delivered [ἐγέρθησαν δὲ ἐκ αἰματίας]. They were only conditionally voluntary in their bondage to sin; but they have become obedient from the very bottom of their heart.

That form of teaching whereunto ye were delivered [τίς δὲ παρελθήσατε τίποτον διὰ τῆς ἁμαρτίας. The simplest solution of the attraction [ἐξ ἀμαρτίας], t. ἁμαρτίας. t. ἁμαρτίας, is διὰ τῆς ἁμαρτίας.]—Explanations:

1. Christian doctrine in general (the most common). Meyer says properly to the contrary: By this the expression τίποτον would not be explained, Beza, indeed, explains it: A seal under which we are placed to receive its impression.—

2. The doctrinal form of the gospel according to Paul in opposition to anti-Paulinism (De Wette, Meyer, and others).—

3. Ecumenius, Calvin, and others, have taken the word in the sense of the ideal which the doctrine holds up. For a still more untenable explanation by Van Hengel, see Meyer.

* [Prof. Stuart here also confounds διακοσμησθαι with διακοσμησθαι, and unfortunately paraphrases: obedience which it unto justification. This is open to textual as well as theological objections. Διακοσμησθαι, we are subject to (Hodge).—R.]

† [Tholuck agrees with Meyer, who takes ver. 16 as the major, ver. 17 as the minor, but regards the conclusion as self-evident, and hence not expressed.—R.]

‡ [So Philippi, Hodges, Alford, and modern commentators generally, taking the first clause as meaning: that it is ceaselessly; thus, Wessel, finds here a "mode of speaking, where a bad thing is represented as comparatively good, so that the superiority of what is contrasted with it may appear more clear." This seems totally irrelevant.—R.]

§ [Stuart prefers to find no attraction, since pronoun governs the accusative, but there seems to be a modification of the meaning in such cases. On the grammatical difficulty, see Meyer in loco, Winer, p. 155.—R.]

† [Wensinck thus carries out the metaphor of the verse: "you have been the object of grace, as it were, like soft, ductile and malleable metal, in order to cast and take its form. You obeyed this mould; you were not rigid and obstinate, but were plastic and pliable, and assumed it readily."—R.]

Adhering to this view, we are to understand that the reference here seems to be to definite forms of instruction.—R.]

Tholuck first repudiates the presumption of anti-Paulinism. Yet it does, indeed, come into consideration, so far as it judiciously obscured the Pauline doctrine of free grace. Tholuck is then inclined to accept the explanation of Beza, and says: "that it is by no means a common expression 'to be delivered to a doctrine,' even if, with Chrysostom and Olshausen, we consider at the same time the guidance of God as the active factor." But the Apostle says in Gal. i. 6, what he holds concerning this type of doctrine in opposition to its obstructions.

God himself has committed them to this school of faith.

Παρελθήσατε is not middle (Fritzsche), but passive. [Winer, p. 245, seems to justify the change to the active form which the E. V. adopts, but there is a good reason for the choice of the passive, viz., the activity of God in committing them to this type of teaching. This thought appropriately follows "Thanks to God." So Meyer, comp. Philippi.—R.] It follows, from what has been said, that the Church was already won over by the Apostle's friends to the Pauline form of the gospel. But here the matter treated of is the essential element; the true energy of freedom from the law is the true energy of life in obedience unto righteousness.

Ver. 18. And being made free from sin [ἐλευθερότεροι δὲ ἐκ τῆς δομήσεως.] Aorist participle, referring to the definite act of deliverance. The clause stands in close connection with ver. 17, not as a conclusion (since ὁ πάνω would occur in that case), but rather as an expansion.—R. The δὲ leads us to emphasize the expression: ye are enslaved, or made servants, &c. From the nature of the case, they knew the negative past—free from sin—much better than the full consequence: ye became the servants of righteousness.

Ver. 19. I speak after the manner of men. The ἀνθρώπινον is analogous to the κατ' ἀνθρώπον in chap. iii. 6.° By slavery, which was in full bloom in Rome, the Apostle clearly explains to them the absolute force of the new principle of life.

Because of the infirmity of your flesh [ὁ δὲ τὴν ἀνθρώπιναν τῆς σάρκος ἐν]. The flesh, as the sensuous and susceptible fulness of the body, is not only negatively weak, but also positively diseased and disturbed, both of which facts are expressed by the σάρκα. It may be asked, however, whether the Apostle means here the weakness of intelligence arising from this infirmity, by which he was compelled to represent to them the highest liberty under the figure of servitude (Bengel, Meyer, and De Wette, with reference to 1 Cor. iii. 1); or whether he meant their practical infirmity. The first view—that is, the reference to intelligence—appears also in the intent, that the Apostle announces a popular explanation (Vanstraelen, Nesti, and Rosenmüller). The latter view is favored by Origen, Chrysostom, Theodoret, Calvin, &c.: "I require nothing which your fleshly weakness could not do," or the like. The thought here could not be unintelligible to the Roman Christians; therefore the practical reference by all means preponderates; but not in the sense already given: "I require of you nothing too difficult; I require only the degree of obedience which you formerly rendered to sin."
The Apostle’s thought can rather be explained by what follows: “Yield your members servants.” etc. That is, even in your spiritual life, you feel that you are as freemen, you must nevertheless restrain your members strictly in discipline and obedience on account of the infirmity of your flesh. With all freedom, the question in reference to the bodily members is an appropriate ascetic discipline, such as the Apostle exercised in reference to his own body (1 Cor. ix. 27; comp. Gal. v. 24); and therefore the figurative form of his expression does not merely correspond to the antithesis as denoting an unlimited obedience, but is established in a more special form as the requirement of a strict discipline. This view obviates Meyer’s reminder: λύγω cannot mean require. The Apostle does not express a requirement, but a principle; by which analogize the Christian, in his freedom, has to make his bodily life absolutely subject. Lachmann [apparently Olshausen] and Fritzsche unjustifiably make a parenthesis of this clause, ἀνθρώπινως, &c.

[With Bengel, Olshausen, De Wette, Hodge, Alford, I am disposed to give a decided preference to the first view, viz., that this clause refers to what precedes. Commentaries differ as to the force of the terms, but the following positions seem most tenable. Infirmitas means intellectual weakness, growing out of their carnal condition (σάραρος, gen. auctoris). The ethical reference is in αὐθεντής, not in ἀσάρχης. On αὐθεντής, see chap. vii.—R.]

For as ye have rendered your members [ἀπεικόνισε παράπληκτος τὰ μὲν ἰῶνιν. Ἄθροισις is explicative (Tholuck, Meyer). Ἀπεικόνισε, used as an adjective, only here in New Testament (Hodge).—R.] To servitude. The apparently free pleasure was, in fact, a hard bondage under sin.—To uncleanness [τῇ ἁκάσάραρτίᾳ]. We hold that ἁκάσαραρτία has especial reference to the heathen portion (according to chap. i.), and to Iniquity, ἁμαρτία, on the contrary, to the Jewish portion (according to chap. ii.). Meyer makes this distinction: ἁμαρτία is sin as ethically defiling man; and ἁμαρτία, is sin as violation of the Divine law. Spener, De Wette, and others, distinguish thus: Uncleanness as defilement of themselves and of sin toward others. Tholuck considers ἁμαρτία as species, and ἁμαρτία as the generalizing genus of sin. But the genus is declared in what follows. The ἁκάσαραρτία, or fleshly sin in the narrower sense, and the ἁμαρτία, or violations of the law in the narrower sense, converge in the ἁμαρτία in the wider sense in guilt and condemnation before the law—which constitute the antithesis to ἁμαρτία. Therefore the explanation of unto inquity, * ἐκ τῆς ἁμαρτίας, as from one sin to others, is incorrect (Ecumenius, Erasmus, Luther, and Grotius). The duality of the service of sin is worthy of note: a service in part to uncleanness and in part to insubordination. This could not be the case (according to the axiom that no man can serve two masters) if both were not connected.

Even so now render your members as servants to righteousness unto sanctification.

* A question arises as to the exact meaning of the phrase ἐκ τῆς ἁμαρτίας. It may mean, for the purposes of an exposition, in order to show that no man can serve two masters. If both were not connected, the antithesis is, as we infer from its use in ver. 22.—R.

[The difficult connection of the verse is satisfactorily explained in Webster and Wilkinson: “ἐκ ἀνθρώπινως repeats the view given of their former condition in respect to sin and righteousness, in preparation for the final and most accurate statement of their present spiritual condition (ver. 22).” Meyer (who has changed his views), in 2nd ed., also finds in this verse a preparation for the following statement of ver. 10. He groups vers. 20-22 as one in thought, calling attention, however, to the somewhat tragi-comic form of our verse, with its emphatic words in the parallel clauses.—R.]
must be the bondmen of righteousness. The fearful expression, free as regards righteousness [ἐλευθερισμὸς ἐπὶ τῇ δικαιοσύνῃ, dative of reference], does not mean that righteousness had no claims upon you (Tholuck), but that it had no part in you.* According to Koppe and Reihe, this is ironical; a position opposed by Meyer, and now also by Lachmann. There is certainly nothing ironical in the sentence, but there is in the word ἐλευθερισμός. For we can no more accept it in a strict sense, than that they should be the slaves of righteousness. As this latter bondage is not only freedom, but also spontaneity, so was that freedom the deepest slavery. [That was a sorrowful freedom! Why find irony, then?—R.]

Ver. 21. What fruit had ye then therefore? Things whereof ye are now ashamed [ἐναποιείσθατε, ἐναποιείσθαι]. See Textual Note."—R.

Here are two divergent constructions:
1. The question closes with τοίτο. Then follows the answer. (Thus the Pesh., Theodore of Mopsuestia, Theodoret, Erasmus, Luther, and many others, down to Do Wette, Lachmann, Tischendorf, and Philippi.) [So Alford, Webster and Wilkin-son.]

2. The question continues to ἐπαγγέλθηντες. What fruit had ye then in those things whereof ye are now ashamed? Answer: None; for the final result of them (these things) is death (thus Chrysostom, Gommeus, Boza, Calov., Grotius, &c.; Bengel, Meyer). [So Stuart, Hodge, Wordsworth.]

Reiche, in conjunction with the latter construction, explains thus: What deeds, of which ye are now ashamed, proceeded from your service of sin (namely, your bringing forth fruit). This third construction is utterly untenable; καρπός would then recur as plural in ἐν αἷς, and καρποὶ ἔμαθεν would mean: to bring forth fruit. There are the following reasons against Meyer's explanation: 1. First of all, he must insert an ἀπείρωμα before ἐν αἷς, and introduce a negation into the question, in order to explain the form of the answer, τοίτο. 2. The question is, What fruit had ye then? not, What will ye have now? 3. After the antithesis, it should be made emphatic that they had formerly no fruit, but rather pernicious and horrible deceptions, but that now they bring forth their fruit. 4. By Meyer's construction, ἐναποιείσθαι would be converted into an eneruating remark. Meyer says, against explanation No. 1: 1. According to ver. 22, the question, in antithesis to τοίτο, is the having the fruit, and not the quality of it. This is wrong: the καρπός is qualified, ἐς ἀγαθάν. 2. Paul must have written τινὰς καρποὺς, or ἐν αἷς, if the metaphoric idea of fruit, or gain, could not be represented in a variety of things. 3. Paul never ascribes καρποῦς to immorality; he attributes ἔργα to it (Gal. v. 19); he predicates καρποῦς of only what is good (Gal. v. 22; Eph. v. 9; Phil. i. 1); indeed, he even designates the ἔργα τοῦ σάρκως ἡμῶν ἢ ἀκαρποῦ (1 Cor. x. 26). But the Apostle says the same thing here, when he asks, What fruit had ye then? But he even declares that they had real fruit—the true gain of life. On the other hand, they reaped, instead of true fruit, base deceptions, things of which they are ashamed, and in which their future death is announced. Comp. Gal. vi. 8. Tholuck thinks that between the two constructions there is no demonstrative decision. For the end of those things is death [ἀπὸ τῶν τύλλος ἐκινδύνων θάνατος]. Death must be understood here in its complete and comprehensive meaning; not eternal death exclusively (Meyer).

Meyer, with Lachmann, accepts μὴν, and translates: for the end is indeed death; but without observing that this contradicts his own construction of the passage. It is only on the first construction that μὴν has any meaning. [See Textual Note"

Having already accepted μὴν on diplomatic and critical grounds, before carefully considering the exegetical results, I am now disposed to insist upon retaining it, and using it as decisive in regard to the construction of the verse.—R.]

Ver. 22. But now having been made free from sin [ἐναποιείσθαι ἐπὶ ἕλευθερον ἐπὶ τῷ άναποιείσθαι]. The evil relation has been completely reversed by faith. And become servants to God [δοῦλοι θεοῦ ἐναποιείσθαι ἐπὶ τῷ θεῷ]. Notice the definiteness of the aorist participles.—R. Meyer himself here takes the place of δικαιοσύνην for their relation is now one of personal love,—Thou have your fruit unto sanctification [ἐπαγγέλθηντες ἐπὶ τὸν καρπὸν ἐπὶ τὸν ἡσυχάσμαν τοῦ αἰῶνος]. The present indicates fruit already. The sense: your reward, seems unjustifiable here. Ἔλει is consecutive here (Meyer), as I hold it to be in ver. 19 also. Ἀγαθάν, sanctification, as above, a progressive state, the immediate issue of the fruit of their personal relation to God, the final issue follows.—R. They have fruit already in this new relation. Meyer: the αὐτοτύπως ἔσονται, ver. 4.—Or the peace, chap. v. 1. But as, in the Old Testament, the firstlings served for the ἄγαθαμ, so, in the New Testament, this is done by the whole fruit of the life of faith. Tholuck translates here also: υποτελεία [without excluding the idea of sanctification, however.—R.]

And the end everlasting life [τῷ δὲ τοῦτο τὸν ἀπὸ τῶν ἁλώνων]. That is, ye have everlasting life. Meyer says, this possession is still an ideal one. It is rather an essential one; John iii. 36; Matt. v. 6; Rom. vi. 23; Heb. xii. 14; 1 John iii. 2. [We must take "life" here in its most extended sense, as "death" in ver. 21. Meyer's difficulty arises from his limiting the meaning of these two words throughout. We have already eternal life in germs; in its fulness it is the τὸ τῆς all our fruit and fruitfulness. No, however, by natural, inherent laws of development. The next verse sets forth the two ends, and the inherent difference.—R.]

Ver. 23. For the wages of sin is death [τὰ γὰρ ὁμοίως τῆς ἁμαρτίας ἡμῶν]. Tholuck: "Οὐχ οὕτως, and in the plural ὁμοίως, wages of the servant and the soldiers; therefore possibly, though not necessarily, a continuation of the figure of military service; comp. ἐδίκησαι, ver. 15. Under this supposition, Grotius, Bengel, and Wetstein made ὁμοίως to mean the donationem militarem. Yet the technical word for such a gift is ἐκδίκησαι (Fritzsche)." The figurative character of the antithesis lies in the fact that sin pays its soldiers and slaves misery and wages (Erasmus: οὐχ οὕτως, vit verbum), namely, death; but God (as King) pays His children and servants, not a reward, but the honor-gift of His favor, which is eternal life. Tholuck defines the antithesis thus: as far as sin is concerned, her due is according to justice; but, on the other hand, what is received by the believing accept
ance of God's saving blessings can be regarded only as a gift—namely, the imparting of salvation, the eternal completion of life. This antithesis is correct so far as it is not pushed beyond the proper measure, so that justice does not appear as mere arbitrary authority. In the present passage, however, this antithesis recedes; for the question is not concerning the righteous punishment of sin, but the way in which sin itself, regarded as false dominion, pays the reward. The gift of God also, at all events, presupposes the merit of believers, but yet remains a gift, because the whole idea of gain falls to the ground where merit is not considered, and where even the preliminary conditions of good conduct are bestowed as a gift. For the idea of wages, see 1 Cor. ix. 7. "The plural (more usual than the singular) may be explained from the manifold elements of original natural reward, and from the numerous coins of later money-wages." Meyer.

In Christ Jesus our Lord [ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ τοῦ κυρίου ημῶν]. Stuart follows the inexact sense of the R. V. "through the redemption oraton to" Christ." True; but not what Paul says here. In Christ Jesus is an expression which has a full, rich meaning of its own. In this case, we may ask whether the phrase limits God, or gift of God, or is used more generally. Meyer says: in Christ it rests, is causally founded, that the gift of God is eternal life. Webster and Wilkinson; "in Him, by virtue of His relation to Deity, God is the giver; in Him, we, as united with Him, having an interest in Him, are recipients." He is not only the source, but also the central treasure of our eternal life.

DOCTRINAL AND ETHICAL.

1. It is certainly not accidental that the word to rule, βασιλεία, occurs so frequently in the Epistle to the Romans (chap. v. 14, 17, 21; vi. 12); likewise the word weapons, ἀρμά, here, and in chap. xiii. 12. See the Exeg. Notes, where reference is made to the Apostle's similar allusions to local relations in the First Epistle to the Corinthians, as well as in the Epistle to the Ephesians. His epistles in general abound in these evidences of truth to life. In the Epistle to the Galatians, for example, we see very plainly the Galatian fickleness; in the Epistles to the Corinthians, we see the city of Corinth portrayed; and in the Epistle to the Colossians, the Phrygian popular spirit, &c. Such evidences of authenticity are regarded by the critics of Baur's school as mere cobwebs, while they convert cobwebs of the harshest probability into important and decisive evidence.

2. In this section the Apostle passes from the figure of military service to that of servitude, in order to portray, in every relation, Christian freedom in its contrast with the bondage of man in sin.

3. On ver. 12. The despotic dominion of sin in the mortal body of the unregenerate, is an ethical copy of physical demoniacal possession. Sin, as a foreign force, has penetrated the individual life, and riots there as lord and master. Christianity now consists essentially in raising the shield of the Spirit against this usurping despotism, in the power of the triumph, dominion, and fellowship of Christ.

4. Ver. 13. If the real Christian should again serve sin, his conduct would be a voluntary, cowardly, and inexcusable surrender of his arms to a restless power already overthrown. But, according to the Apostle's view, the whole life of humanity is a moral struggle of the spirit between righteousness and unrighteousness, in which all the human members are arms that contend for either righteousness or unrighteousness. Man, physiologically regarded, is born naked, without weapons or arms; ethically considered, he is "armed to the teeth;" his members have throughout the significance of moral arms.

5. The conclusion made by non-legal impetuosity, that sin is made free, because we are not under law, but under grace, is reversed by Paul, who says that, for this reason, sin is to be regarded as abrogated and excluded. The law does not make sinners, but it suits sinners; bondage under the law corresponds to bondage under sin, and the law cannot annul this bondage. To him who stands under the law, his own inmost nature is still a strange form; for the most inward and secret character, of the inwardness of the law, freedom from the letter of the law, liberty. To be estranged from one's self is, therefore, to be still in the bondage of sin, and therefore under that of the law also, as the foreign form of the inmost norms of life. But in grace, man has become at once free from sin and the law, because by grace he has come to himself (Luke xv. 15). But because it has written the law, as the word of the Spirit, on his heart. On the power of the word, see Tholuck, p. 313; on the v. 16, obedience, p. 314.

6. On ver. 16. Life is throughout a consequence of an established principle, either for death or for life, whether man may have made this principle—his self-determination—more or less clear to himself. Christianity is a thoroughly synthetical view of life—a view of life in its grand, complete, and fundamental relations. Adam, Christ—the state of bondage, the state of freedom, &c.

7. On ver. 17. When the Apostle thanks God that the Romans have not merely become Christians in a general sense, but have become obedient to the doctrinal form of the freedom of the gospel from the law, the application of this to the evangelical confession lies very near. The Apostle speaks here of definite doctrinal types, not so much in the formal as in the material sense. The antithesis is judicial Christianity.

8. On vers. 19, 20. That the members should be servants to righteousness, is not merely a figurative expression arising from the antithesis that they were enslaved to sin. Rather, this is a demand which follows from the fact that, in consequence of serving sin, they are afflicted with weakness of the flesh; and therefore, notwithstanding the freedom of the Christian spirit—yea, by virtue of the morbid and blunted natural forces, the animal na

[On χριστος, see v. 15 ff.—The antithesis is different here, yet related—there, full, transgression; here, wages, but of sin.—B.]
HOMILETICAL AND FORMAL.

The well-established apostolical admonition to a moral course of life: 1. To whom is it directed? 2. What does it require? 3. By what is it established?—Our body is mortal (ver. 12).—In whose service should our members be? 1. Not in the service of unrighteousness; but, 2. In the service of righteousness (ver. 18).—In which service do our weapons hold out better? 1. Many believe in the service of unrighteousness; but there they are destroyed; 2. Christian experience teaches, on the other hand, that it is in the service of righteousness, for there they always remain untouched (ver. 18).—Under the law there is death, but under grace there is life (ver. 14).—Law and grace.

Should we sin, since we are not under the law, but under grace? God forbid! Because freedom from the law is (1.) not lawlessness, but (2.) obedience to righteousness [comp. Luther's work on the Freedom of a Christian Man, (ver. 18–29)].

What is it to be obedient in heart to the form of doctrine with which we are acquainted? 1. Not only to be orthodox, but also believing (ver. 17).—The form of apostolical doctrine. 1. What must we understand thereby? (The Apostle Paul's doctrine of justification by faith.) 2. How far is this form of importance for us? (ver. 17).—Christian preachers should never forget to so speak after the manner of men that everybody can understand, chap. iii. 5 (ver. 19).—The fruits of serving sin and serving God: 1. The fruit of the former is death; 2. The fruit of the latter is eternal life (ver. 21).—What is the fruit of sin? 1. A fruit of which the heart must be ashamed; 2. One whose end is death (ver. 21).—What is the fruit of righteousness? 1. One of holiness; 2. One whose end is eternal life.

* (It is well to note here the saying of Augustine: Gratia non est grata usque usque subsolet, nisi qua vestris membris modo. "Grace is not grace in any sort, if it be not free in every sort." E. B.)

Luther: In His death, that even we should die like Him. —By that death there have been wicked lusts in the flesh, which they do not obey (ver. 12).—So long as grace rules, the conscience remains free and controls sin in the flesh: but without grace, sin rules, and the law condemns the conscience (ver. 14).

Stark: Sin still arises even in the regenerate, and they can again fall under its dominion; therefore they need the warning (ver. 12).—The pious are never without law, and yet not under the law, but in it (ver. 14).—Whoever still permits sin to rule over him, cannot be under grace (ver. 14).—To be a servant of sin, is the greatest misery; but to have been a servant of sin is the greatest blessedness (ver. 17).—Justification impels, moves, and powerfully awakens toward the exercise of godliness; Ps. xxx. 5 (ver. 18).

Heding: To have field from compulsion, fear, or politeness, in order to please others, or through one's own inclination, desire, praise, and advantage, was the delusion and bondage of Ishmael. The children of God are not under the law; 1 John iv. 18 (ver. 15).—Christians are not libertines, who can do what they please: they are servants, but servants of God! But where are such servants? How great is their number? Servants of court, fashion, passion, men, the state, self, and the devil, can be seen in abundance.

Cramer: We shall never have a better fate than Paul, all of whose words have been perverted, misinterpreted, and made sinful.—Nothing is more becoming in a servant than obedience. Because we are now the servants of God, we must be steadfastly obedient from the heart until the end, according to God's word, and not according to our own notion (ver. 16).—Quesnel: As the heart is, so is the use of the body. He serves the Lord who has chosen Him from the heart. A true Christian dedicates himself wholly to God, his heart by love, and his body by good works (ver. 19).—A blessed servitude with which we serve God! The service of men makes miserable; but the service of God makes us saints in time and kings in eternity; Isa. xiv. 3 (ver. 22).—Muller: God will have no compulsory service; a willing heart is the best offering; In the weak flesh a willing spirit, in the small work a great will; Ps. ex. 3 (ver. 19).—He who is free from righteousness has no part in Christ (ver. 20).—As the fruit grows from the seed, so does ignorancy grow from sin, outwardly before the world and inwardly in the conscience before God (ver. 21).

Spener: Earnest and true Christianity consists herein: although sin is present, it does not reign (ver. 12).—We dare not think, that though the wages of sin is death, Christ has redeemed us from death, so that it will not finally injure us. For the redemption wrought by Christ will not help us any, if we do not become obedient to Him (ver. 23).—Gerlagh: The body, with its impulses and members, is like a house full of servile impetuses, for war or every kind of labor. In the service of men, these members, the sinful impulses, then become themselves members unto sin (ver. 13).—The servitude of obedience is also true freedom (ver. 17).—Since, by the gospel, man becomes a servant as well as a freeman, license is just as much excluded as...
slavish obedience to a foreign power (ver. 18).—If righteousness, so rules in us that all our members become its instruments, they will work together for the increase of our holiness (ver. 19).—A single glance at the fruit and the reward of sin must fill the Christian with shame, and therefore with abhorrence of the false freedom which abuses grace (ver. 21).—The perfect sanctification of man in body and soul is also his true, eternal life; for by the perfect communion of his whole nature with the Fountain of all life, God himself pervades him spiritually and bodily with the fulness of everlasting life (ver. 22).

Luke: Earnest admonition to holiness (ver. 12-23): 1. Its import (ver. 12-14); 2. The impulsion to a more zealous sanctification is the grace of redemption (ver. 15-22).

However: Freedom from the law is not liberty to sin, or lawlessness (ver. 15).—In Christianity, the law of the letter, with its worldly power, does not rule, but the free law of love (ver. 15).—Obedience, the practice of God’s will, awakens in us increasingly the spiritual power of life, and obtains spiritual health (ver. 16).—Purity and beauty of soul arise only from sinlessness (ver. 19).—The remembrance of earlier sins never becomes wholly effaced, but, 1. It keeps the converted person humble and watchful; it awakens, 2. thankfulness for the love and grace of God; 3. sympathy for others.

Besses: Believers are servants of righteousness (ver. 12-23).—Unrighteousness is a tyrannical master, who does not release his slaves according to their pleasure, but drives them ever farther from God’s commandments (ver. 19).—Servitium Dei summa libertas (ver. 19).—The wages of sin is as manifold as the wages with which a general rewards his soldiers (bread, clothing, money); but its sum is death, empty death.

Lange: The service of sin, at first apparently a voluntary life of warfare, but afterwards plainly a mercenary condition, and finally a state of slavery. The fearful self-deception in surrendering one’s self to sin: 1. At the outset, slavery instead of freedom; 2. In continuance, always backward instead of forward; 3. Finally, death instead of life. —Voluntary return to bondage is the deepest guilt of sin. Real death is explained by its opposite. It is not contrasted with the present, but with eternal life. —Eternal life as the fruit of the true service of God in righteousness: 1. As redemption; 2. As gift.

Tillotson: Sin is the blindness of our minds, the perverseness and crookedness of our wills, and the monstrous irregularity and disorder of our affections and appetites, the misplaced of our powers and faculties, and the setting of our wills and passions above our reason; all which is ugly and unnatural; and, if we were truly sensible of it, a matter of great shame and reproach to us. —Berruyer: Sin, as a raging and commanding king, has the sinner’s heart for its throne, the members of the body for its service, the world, the flesh, and the devil for its grand council, lusts and temptations for its weapons and armory; and its fortifications are ignorance, sensuality, and fleshly reasonings. —Death, as the punishment of sin, is the end of the work, though not the end of the worker. —Grotius: It is the nature of all vices to grow upon a person by repetition.

Clark: Let God have your hearts, and, with them, your heads, your hands, and your feet. Think and device what is pure; speak what is true, edifying, just, and good; and walk steadily in the way that leads to everlasting felicity. —Every sinner has a daily pay, and this pay is death. The sinner has a hell in his own bosom; all is confusion and disorder where God does not reign. If men were as much in earnest to get their souls saved as they are to prepare them for perdition, heaven would be highly populated; and devils would have to be their own companions. —Hoder: The motive to obedience is now love, and its aim the glory of God. —When a man is the slave of sin, he commonly thinks himself free; and, when most degraded, is often the most proud. When truly free, he feels himself most strongly bound to God, and when most elevated, is most humble. —J. F. H.]

**FOURTH SECTION.**—The transition, in principle and reality, of Christians from the service of the letter under the law into the service of the Spirit under grace, by virtue of the death of Christ. Believers should live in the consciousness that they are dead to the law. —Tholuck: “Your marriage with Christ, having taken the place of the dominion of the law, necessarily leads to such a dominion of God in a new life.”

**CHAP. VII. 1-6.**

1 Know ye not, brethren (for I speak to them that [those who] know the law), how [omit how] that the law hath dominion over a man as long [ἐγέρθη] 2 χρόνον, for as long time] as he liveth? For the woman which hath a husband [the married woman] is bound by the law to her husband so long as he liveth [to the living husband]; but if the husband be dead [have died], she 3 is loosed from the law of her husband. So then if, while her husband liveth, she be married to another man, she shall be called an adulteress: but if her husband be dead [have died], she is free from that law; so that she is 4 no [not an] adulteress, though she be married to another man. Wherefore [Accordingly], my brethren, ye also are become [were made] dead to the law by [through] the body of Christ; [that] [in order that] ye should be married to another, even to him who is [was] raised from the dead, that we should bring
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5 forth fruit unto [to] God. For when we were in the flesh, the motions [passions] of sins, which were by [by means of] the law, did work [ἐνεγκύρω, were efficient, wrought] in our members to bring forth fruit unto [to] death. But now we are [have been] delivered from the law, that being dead [having died to that] wherein we were held; that we should serve [so that we serve] in newness of spirit [the Spirit],

INDEX.

1 Ver. 2.—[The E. V. renders ἐνεγκύρω, which hath a husband; which is less forcible than the simple word married. It is true that neither renderings convey the exact sense of the original, so well as: das mense unter- schiede Wuth (Lange); yet, as the idea of submission, expressed in the Greek, is still, to some extent, implied in married, it is the best rendering that can be given.—The prepositional phrase: so long as he liveth, is altogether unnecessary; the living husband, is both more forcible and more exact.

2 Ver. 2.—[The active verb δίος should be substituted for διό. The question arises, How can we best express the delicate shade of the Greek conditional proposition: εἰ ὁ ἡμείς, διό; Alford gives: have died; Wordsworth: shall have died; Amer. Bible Union: die. The first seems preferable; the second is strictly literal, since the aorist implies something which takes place antecedent to what is affirmed in the apodosis, but is not so elegant; the last is that held by Recepta, which should be reserved for the Greek equivalent of the optative or indicative. These remarks apply to the same clause, as it occurs in ver 3.]

3 Ver. 5.—[The negation belongs to the verb, and is joined to the noun, at the expense of forcibleness. For as remarks, that here the E. V. destroys the regularity of the parallelism. The first, second, and third lines in the original correspond exactly to the fourth, fifth, and sixth respectively.

4 Ver. 4.—[We are made dead (Amer. Bible Union), though not very elegant, is perhaps the best rendering of ἐνεγκύρω. Marriage, would be ambiguous here. Were it so, is preferred by Alford, because the more violent Greek verb is used, recalling the violent death of Christ; but this would point to the act of killing, rather than to the fact of being deprived of life, which is the prominent thought here.]

5 Ver. 5.—[Both clauses are final, though differing in form. By changing the first that of the E. V. into in order that, the force of the Greek is preserved, and its varied form in a measure reproduced.

6 Ver. 5.—[As unto God is the usual rendering of ὲ τῷ θεῷ, to God will serve to represent the simple desirer: τῷ θεῷ. The meaning seems to be: to the glory of God. The desirer, τῷ θεῷ is also found at the close of ver 3.]

7 Ver. 5.—[The E. V. usually renders παθήσασθα, sufferings. Here, passions (Wordsworth, and others; Lange: Leidenschaften) is etymologically exact, and, on the whole, preferable to motions, etc. (= Amer. Bible Union, stirrings (Amer. S. B. C. E. L.), many versions, and fathers, warrant the correctness of παθήσασθα, which is now almost universally adopted. (The English text is emended to correspond.)

8 Ver. 6.—[The clause is elastic and present: διὰ τούτου δεσποινήσετε.]

9 Ver. 6.—[If the reference be to the Holy Spirit, the above emendation is necessary. If not (as Dr. Lange holds), the clause should read: in novissimis spirit and not in oldness of letter. See Epp. Notes on both views.—R.]

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

Summary.—a. The figure of marriage and the law of marriage to describe the relations of believers to the law (vers. 1–3); b. The application of the figure: the marriage did not remain pure, because sin, whose motions were by the law, insinuated itself. It was dissolved by death (vers. 4–6).

1 Ver. 1. Know ye not. [Ἡ ἀγνοεῖς. Comp. vi. 3. The particle ἦ implies a doubt, and connects always with some preceding categorical clause (Winer, p. 474.).—On the connection. Meyer denies it a resumption of vi. 14, but immediately linked to last main thought (vi. 29), viz., that the Christian had his fruit unto holiness, and the end, eternal life (which is proved in vi. 23).—R. Since the ἦ assumes a doubt at the beginning (chap. ii. 29; vi. 3); the Apostle intimates that not all the believers in Rome are conscious of the whole conclusion, that the gospel has made them free from the service of the Mosaic law—a conclusion that he will now make clear to them by the figure of the law of marriage. Therefore the question, Should you not fully know the consequence of the right of marriage in case one of the couples dies? has this meaning: Should you not fully know the consequence of the death of believers by and for the law? The course of treatment is this: After having shown that they are no more under sin, with more particular reference to the Gentiles, the Apostle now declares, with more particular reference to the Jews, that they too are no more under the law. The unity warranting this transition consists in the fact, that one cannot be under sin without being under the sense of the law, and that he cannot be under the law without being under the sense of sin. So far, therefore, our deduction extends back not only to chap. vi. 14, but even to chap. v. 20; iii. 9; ii. 17. That is, the law comes into consideration here so far as it is the power of the letter, which kills (2 Cor. iii. 6).—The

[On the difficulty respecting the figure, see the full remarks of Prof. Stuart in loco.—R.]
That the law hath dominion. We must not connect ὅποιος τεθ. ἀνθρώπων (Moses, and others), but ὅποιος with κυρίων. Men it certainly, doubt not, the one man question placed under the law. [Wordsworth explains: "The law (of Moses) is lord over the man—the human creature—whether man or woman. Comp. Chrysostom, Theodoret, Augustine." This takes the verb in the literal sense: to be lord, and introduces the figure of the marriage at once, thus avoiding any difficulty about the special law, for the whole law is personified. Meyer seems to favor this view also.—R.]

For as long time as he liveth [ὁ δὲ ζωντ. κ. γάρ]. According to ver. 2-4, the ἀργόν evidently refers to the man himself, and not to the law, so that, in a metaphorical sense, it would have the force (as Origen, Erasmus, Bengel and others think) of making the figure itself plainer. This would have been to prove first that the law has no more force. Philippus understands the ὁ ζωντ. to be the old, natural life. See Tholuck on the contrary; in this connection he takes the appeal to legal knowledge is an event com- propitiate, and the figure already violated. The law is personified as master, just as sin is in the foregoing section. [And the point of the figure is not affected by referring the verb to the man, for which ever party dies, the relation ceases. Comp. Hodge.—R.] Meyer gives prominence to the point, that ὅποιος κ. γάρ is emphatic.*

Ver. 2. For the married woman is bound by the law to the living husband [ἢ γάρ ἡ πάσας γυν. τῷ ζώντ. ἀνδρί διδάσκαλος τῇ ἀργῷ]. A concrete explanation of the proposition of ver. 1 (Meyer), introduced by γάρ, which has here the force of for example (Hodge, Alford). The perfect διδάσκαλος here denotes the continuing character of the binding (Winer, p. 256), which agrees with the emphatic ὃς ἀνθρώπου (ver. 1). 'Ὑπὸ τοῦ ἀνδ. κ. γ. κατ᾽ ἡμᾶς, ἱεράς, κατ᾽ ἀνδ. κ. γ. κατ᾽ ἡμᾶς, ἱεράς,

For I speak to those who know the law. [Parenthetical, as in the E. V. Explanatory of brethren.—R.] Of what law does he speak? It must not be overlooked, that what the Apostle further addresses as the definition of the law, already reminds of the law of nature. Therefore Kopp: every law is meant. Glöckler: the moral law. But though the Roman law might have a similar pur- pose, the Apostle nevertheless means the Mosaic law itself; for the point of his argumentation is, that, according to the principles of the Mosaic law itself, Christians must be regarded as having been made free by this law. It is not necessary to prove that the Mosaic law in general, but not the law of marriage in particular (Beza, Carpzov [Bengel], and others), is meant here. The Jew did not have a se- parate marriage-law; yet the Mosaic law, with refer- ence to the marriage-law, is meant.—And who are those who know the law? Explanations: 1. The Roman Christians, the majority of whom were Jew- ish Christians; 2. The Jewish-Christian portion, to whom Paul addresses himself in particular (Philippi, and others); 3. In addition to these, the Gentile Christians, who, as Jewish proselytes, had been entrusted with the law (De Wette, and others); 4. Tholuck calls to mind, that the Gentile Christians became acquainted with the law. [As the customs of the synagogue remained to a large extent those of the ancient assemblies, the Old Testament was read to all believers, as indeed was necessary to their Christian instruction. One could not be a Christian even then, and remain ignorant of the law.—R.] The question in general here is not a difficult specialty of the Mosaic law, but a principle evidenced also by natural law, which, for this very reason, does not result from one passage, but from the connection of the Mosaic law. Tholuck: "One of the legal maxims current among the Jews; Este endeavors in vain to prove it from the Old Testa- ment." Yet the example of Ruth, Abigail, and even of the second marriage of Abraham, is more than one legal maxim current among the Jews. Moreover, the legal principle in chap. vii. 7 is of kind- nered nature.

* [Meyer’s note is excellent. *Not before he dies* does the law lose its dominion over him; *so long as he lives*, he remains subject to it. If this is considered, and an entirely irrelevant *only so long as he lives* be not interpolated, the thought seems neither trivial nor disparaging to the appeal made to the legal knowledge of the readers. For *peculiarity of the *ripar* consists in this, that it cannot, as human laws of the same period, or even of the same field, be suspended, nor can one be exempt from it for a time, &c. No, so long as man lives, the dominion of the *ripar* over him remains. Of course this means proxima to the death to the law (ver. 4).—R.]

**CHAPTER VII. 1-6.**
THE EPISTLE OF PAUL TO THE ROMANS.

self as the dead part? Clearly, because of the second marriage. This explanation of Fritzschche and Meyer (concinunity) is established by the Apostle, and also rendered emphatic by his language. As the woman is not dead, but is killed in respect to her marriage relation, or is stunted as dead, by the natural death of her husband, so believers have not died a natural death, but are made dead to the law, since they are crucified to the law with Christ. The idea, deal in a marriage relation, is therefore the term comparisonis. The σαραωνοςα in vers. 4 is therefore like the καταργονια of a widow, in which also a death-like orphanage is indicated. That the law itself is also dead, as a letter, by its statutory application to the crucifixion of Christ, follows, without anything further, from what has been said. Tholuck, not being satisfied with Meyer's removal of the difficulty, seems desirous of placing himself on the side of those who give an allegorical interpretation to the passage commencing with ver. 2. Explanations:

1. The wife is the soul, the husband is sin; sin dies in the fellowship of believers with Christ's death (Augustine, and others ; Olshausen).

2. Only the νομίων can be regarded as the husband (Origen, Chrysostom, Calvin, Philippi). Like-worse to preserve with special reference to the guilt (Luther); with special reference to sin (Spener).

De Wette and Meyer have properly rejected the introduction of allegory in vers. 2, 3; it destroys all legal evidence of the figure. The Apostle did not avoid saying διαωνονθε το νομινο because he wished to give a more pregnant expression to the thought, and to include in one the other side also, because διαωνονθε is different from a simple ἀποτρπαται, and because the retroactive reference from the act which the administration of the law has committed on the body of Christ is proximate to the dying of the law (according to Heb. viii. 13; decayed and waxed old). The gospel is eternally now, because it refers to only eternal relations. The law grows old from the beginning, because, in its outward and national character, it relates to transitory and ever-changing relations. Application to Catholicism and Protestantism. (All that they take the sword, &c.) "Υπανωθεν, νιόν συμβται; the wife had no right to separate herself.*

But if the husband have died, she is loosed from the law of her husband [ἐὰν δὲ ἀποθανεί τὸ γένος, καταργεῖται ἀπὸ τοῦ νόμου τοῦ ἁνόην]. On the conditional clause, see Textual Note. On the verb, comp. Gal. v. 4, ἀνεγείρεσα, p. 127. The genitive is one of reference, of the object respectively, as Winer, p. 177.—R.] That is, which relates to her husband. On the relation of the expression καταργεῖται to the διαωνονθε, comp. Meyer's translation: "It has become undone, and thereby free and absolved from the law which related to her husband (united her to him)." (See Gal. v. 4.)

Ver. 3. She shall be called an adulteress. She receives not the same in a formal and legal way. And therewith she is subject to the severest punishment of the law—stoning. [Lev. xxi. 10; comp. John viii. 5.]

*She is free from that law, ἐλευθερια.*

1. The article shows that the reference is to the law of the husband, hence the E. V.: that law, is correct.—R.]

So that she is not an adulteress. Meyer insists upon the idea of design: in order that she be no adulteress; and declares this to be the design of the Divine legal ordinance—which Tholuck there pedantically finds. Yet the expression here might certainly have been chosen with reference to this application. The Judaists assuredly charged the believing Jews with apostasy, and therefore with religious adultery. Hence Paul says εἶναι instead of ψωφιοτετελεσθαι; and Fritzschche has strikingly made the τοι νη ἐνακο dependent on ἐλεφθερια. [All these views are alike grammatical. That of Fritzschche is harsh, however, while Meyer's seems to be adopted more to prepare the way for the parallel he makes (ver. 4): in order that ye should be married to another. It is not necessary to press the figure to this extent, however.—R.]

Ver. 4. Accordingly, my brethren. ["And, see Winer, p. 283.—R.] The explanation follows here first; this is not allegorical, but symbolical, because marriage represents, in the external sphere of life, what religion does in the inward and higher (Eph. v. 32).—Ye also, as the widow, wife.

We're made dead to the law [σαραωνονθε το νομινο. See Textual Note. The verb is aorist, referring to a definite act in the past, viz., the release from the law at justification.—R.] That is, in relation to the marriage-covenant. The expression το νομινο is chosen, not merely because Christ's death was a violent one, but also because it describes the death of Christians to the law as a death incurred by virtue of the administration of the law.

Through the body of Christ [ἐὰν δὲ σαραωνονθαι το νομινο Χριστον. In, and, at the same time, with Him, as He was put to death. The stoning effect of the sacrificial death cannot, at all events, be the premise here, although it is included. (The aorist shows that the reference is definite; the proposition indicates the means of the death to the law. Two opinions prevail: (1.) That it refers to the stoning death of Christ as the ground of justification. All Hodge, and others. It may be urged in favor of this, that this is the true ground of justification, and that thus the antithesis to was "raised" is preserved. But the Apostle generally speaks of the death of Christ in plain terms, when he refers to it. Col. i. 22, which Hodge quotes as an instance of "His body," meaning His death, adds the qualifying phrases, "of His flesh," "through death." (2.) With Tholuck, Meyer, Lange, and others, it may be referred to the fellowship with Christ in His death. This view accords better with the point which the Apostle has reached in his argument, as well as the idea of union with Christ underlying this passage. This does not deny, but implies the stoning efficacy of His death, which is always latent, if not patent, in the Apostle's argument. It has been the fault of some commentators, to insist *That is, they might be and were so called, but yet were not guilty of religious adultery.† [Dr. Hodge at some length combines the view, that the Mosaic law (or rather the Jewish economy) is alone referred throughout this passage. He rightly says: "Paul here means by the law, the will of God, as a rule of duty, however revealed." See on iii. 20, p. 122 (also Galatians, ii. 16, pp. 43, 52). The most unmeaning of all views is that which limits τοι νη to the Ritualistic Jewish observance —R.]
on finding an expression of it, where it is only implied.—R.

Christians are dead, buried (chap. vi.), and risen (Col. iii. 1) with Christ; indeed, they are even, in the sight of God, declared as such (Phil. iii. 20). Therefore, since they are dead with Him, they are, like Him, "dead to the law through the law" (Gal. ii. 19). [Comp. Commentary in loco, pp. 50, 51.—R.] Calvin, Grotius, Koppe, and others, have explained, that the ἐνασελθόντως τῷ νόμῳ is a milder expression of ἐν νόμῳ ἐνασελθόντως ἀπέδαινον νῦν. This explanation does not regard the difference between natural and violent death, nor self-destruction. The law could not be dead; this would have been revolution. As a Divine form of revelation, it had to grow old and vanish away (Heb. viii. 13); but as a human ordinance it has itself inflicted death. Therefore the law still retained its former historical and ethical (not religious and essential) force toward those who were not dead to it by the fellowship of Christ.

Through the body of Christ, ἀνὰ τὸν πάθος τοῦ ἀναστασιούντος. It may be asked, in what relation this being dead with the body of Christ stands to the being reconciled by the body of Christ. Tholuck: "Fellowship with the death of Christ includes freedom from the κατάρα γενεσίας (Gal. iii. 10), and this latter, which is brought to pass by thankful love in return, includes the death of the old man to sin (chap. vi. 6) and strengthening to a new life." The becoming free from the νόμος νόμου is consummated with the development of resistance and faith—that is, with justification; the having become free from the old law is decided when the new law, the law of the Spirit, the righteousness of faith, appears (Eph. ii. 16).

In order that ye should be married to another [εἰς τὸ γενέσιαν ἵνα ἔτερον]. The purpose of the death to the law was union to Christ. —R. Γίγνεσθαι πίνον, to become the possession of a husband. The figure of conjugal communion of the believing Church with the Lord (2 Cor. xi. 2; Eph. v. 2, 6; Rev. xxi. 8). To another. The stronger ἕτερον is here used. [And it is more closely defined, even to him who was raised from the dead, τῷ ἐκ πάνων ἔγερθέν.]

With good reason is this added.—R. Not only do Christians belong to the risen Christ because He has acquired them by His death (1 Peter i.), but also because they themselves, having been dead with Him, have become a heavenly race, a super-terrestrial people, who, as risen ones, can be united only with the Risen One; therefore their continued connection with the law of this life would be a miscellany. The common element of this new communion is the new life.

That we should bring forth fruit to God [ἵνα καρποφόρουσιν τῷ δίκῃ]. Final clause (so Tholuck, Meyer, De Wette, Alford). The dative is dat. commodi apparent. [—R.] The figure of marriage leads to that of the fruit of marriage (Theodore, Erasmus, Meyer, and others). Tholuck, on the contrary: "Since a reference to καρπός (chap. vi. 20) occurs, and since καρπόν ποιεῖται, φέρεται, and even καρποφορίζεται (Mark iv. 20; Luke viii. 15; Col. i. 10), frequently occur in a metonymy derived from the fruits of the field, as a technical Christian phrase for the practical effects of the life of faith, and the allusion recurs in ver. 6, where the figure is not that of marriage, it seems very unsafe to accept the figure of the fruit of children. Reiche and Frischatz have even rejected this interpretation, because an undignified allegory arises; they have therefore construed the figure as referring to the field, or fruits of the field. Plumptre likewise: "Old Woman, on this occasion, accepts the former view. But the allegory of an unfruitful marriage cannot be more dignified than that of a fruitful one. Yet the spiritual fruit of righteousness, in accordance with its supersensuous nature, is produced for God, for glorifying God. [The figure must not be so pressed as to make the fruit of the marriage to God, as Father; to His glory, is the meaning.]—R.

Ver. 5. For when we were in the flesh [ἀπὸ γονοῦ ἐν τῷ σάρκωτα]. Meyer: "The positive and characterizing expression for the negative: when we were not yet made dead to the law." Alford: "Very equally ' under the law.'" Hodge: "When in your unrenovated and legal state." For a more thorough discussion, see the Excursus in the next section.—R. The antithesis of ver. 5 should serve to explain the last conclusion in ver. 4. The same aραφέων tells us: According as we were situated in our fleshly tendency, we must now also be situated in the Divine tendency. The σάρξ denotes the stand point of personality; the outward tendency of life from a definite principle. Here, therefore, the tendency of life is from the principle of the flesh. Explanations: 1. Meyer: The aραφέων, the humanity in us (what, then, would not be human in us?), in its opposition to the Divine will; the element of life in which we exist. The opposite to the αραπατισμόν of ver. 6. 2. Theodore, Oecumenius: In the σάρξ νόμου πολιτεία. The flesh is the material and external part of the body and the life. Therefore, since we stood in this external tendency, which, as an external and analytical form of life (dependent on the individual ἐναστάσις), also in its better form, took the law as a combination of external and analytical precepts. [Of these, (1.) is much to be preferred. Dr. Lange does not make it clear whether he adopts the view of flesh, given immediately above. There are very strong objections to it in any case.—R.]

The passions of sins [τὰ παθήματα τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν]. According to Meyer and Tholuck, the genitive of object. "From which the sins arise." Tholuck cites James i. 16 as proof. We hold, however, that sins are here denominated producers of the passions. For the passions, παθήματα, are not, as Tholuck holds, the same as the ἐναιμίησις (according to which Luther translates lusts), but they are the ἐναιμίησις enhanced by the impulse of the law. Then, in the case of sins arising as consequences of the παθήματα, the idea would follow that abortions to death have been produced from the marriage-bond of the law itself with man. The connection with the law assumes, therefore, at the same time, a connection with the ἁμαρτία (see chap. vi. 13), and this, in the isolation of individual ἁμαρτίας, was operative as producer by the sinful passions excited by the law in the members. The law itself did not bring forth the fruit of death; but it stirred up sin, so that the latter made the ἐναιμίησις into παθήματα, and thus into productive forces [Either view is preferable to the Henchydus: sinu.]

* To this interpolation it may be rejoined: What, then, would not be σάρξ in us? What is not carnal, sinful, is it?
feelings (Olshausen, Hodge), which is forbidden by the plural 

\( \lambda \alpha \sigma \iota \mu \alpha \tau \alpha \), not to serve holds ever the Tholuck. It is perhaps better to take the genitive, as that of the object (which led to sins), so as to accord with what is predicated in ἐν ἐγγύτητι.—R.

Which were by means of the law. Τὰ διὰ τοῦ νόμου. Grotius supplies ἀνακάθυκα, which is too little; Meyer, in which is far too much. According to ver. 2, ἀνακάθυκα. Tholuck: "Many of the other commentators, in order not to let the law appear in too unfavorable a light, explained thus: of the knowledge of sin communicated by the law (thus Chrysostom, Ambrose, Bullinger, and others). Yet, thus construed, διὰ τοῦ νόμου would stand beyond the pragmatism of the passage." Tholuck, like Meyer, would also supply the verb, sublot. [The proximity of ver. 7 supports the obvious meaning: occasioned by the law (Meyer: verminum); not caused, however.—R.]

In our members [ἐν τοῖς μέλεσιν ἤμων]. Middle. Were efficient in a fruitful manner.

In our members [ἐν τοῖς μέλεσιν ἤμων]. Middle. Were efficient in a fruitful manner.

To bring forth fruit to death [ἰς τὸ καπνὸν ἀπὸ τοῦ θανάτου. This expression expresses not merely the result (Hodge), but the final object of the energizing (Meyer, Alford), being parallel to the last clause of ver. 4.—R. Meyer: "To lead a life terminating in death. Expressing but little, almost nothing, here. That false fruit, abortions, or miscarriages, might arise (wherefore the subst. κάπνος itself must be avoided). Erasmus: ex infelici matrimonio infelices falsus sustulitum, quidquid nasceretur morti evincit gigantes. Luther: Where the law rules over people, they are indeed not idle; they bring forth and train up many children, but they are mere bastards, who do not belong to a free mother. Meyer would also here limit death to the idea of eternal death; see above. [He also carries out the figure of progeny, which Lange retains here, so far as to make the "death" here a necessary result. This is in less justifiable than the reference to eternal death, which conveys a truth, and forms a fitting antithesis to τῷ θαν. (ver. 4).—R.]

Ver. 6. But now we have been delivered from the law [γενιέθεται (anathesis to διέ, ver. 5) καταγγελθήσονται ἀπὸ τοῦ νόμου. Notice the aorist, which Paul uses so constantly in reference to the accomplished fact of justification.—R.]. We are annull'd in relation to the law, and therewith the law is annull'd to us. (On the reading ἀποκατατάσσεται, see the Critical Note on the Text; also Tholuck, p. 330.)

Having died to that wherein we were held [ἀποδιδόται ἐν θανάτω καταγγελθήσονται]. We must understand τοῦ νόμου before ἐν θανάτω. Meyer explains: in which we were confined as in a prison. More in harmony with the former view is this: whereby we were confined by a legal and even matrimonial obligation. Wherefore we certainly do not need to refer εν θανάτῳ merely to νόμος (with Origen, Koppe, De Wette, Philippi [Hodge], and others). Tholuck: "The law, therefore, is regarded as καταγγελθήσονται, as a chain, analogously to the ἐνεργηθήσοντα, Gal. iii. 28, as far as it holds its subjects in διέκτητα (Rom. viii. 15; 2 Tim. i. 7). The direct reference of the εν θανάτῳ to sin (according to Chrysostom, Ecumenius, and others) is too strong on the opposite side.—The cause of the chaining of man by sin on one side, as well as by the law on the other, was the totalty of the καταγγελθήσονται, as it expressed itself in mere divisions of lust and legality. This is clear from what follows: in the oldness of the letter.

So that we serve [ὑπὸ δολιτίας ἡμᾶς. The clause is not final, as the E. V. indicates; the service is a present state, already resulting from the accomplished fact of deliverance from and death to the law. Serve God, is the meaning, the omission of θεὸς being due to the self-evident difference of reference in the two phrases which follow. The consciousness of the readers would tell them that the old service was one to sin, the new one to God (so Meyer).—R. The δολιτίας can be spoken ironically in only a conditional manner. We have really our external life to enslave, but not after the old way, in single portions and acts, according to individual precepts, motives, and affections, but in the newness of the Spirit; therefore by virtue of the perfect principle of the Spirit, which is ever new, and always assuming a new form. The ἐν does not merely the sphere of activity (Meyer), but the power, the principle of the new formation.

In newness of the Spirit [ἐν καταγγελθήσονται πνεύματος. Untenable views: That ἐν is redundant, and the dative the object of the verb δολιτίας; that there is a Hendiadys (new spirit, Hodge). The E. V. is fond of Hendiads, and very often misconstrues ἐν, but has avoided these mistakes in the present instance. Alford correctly remarks, that the dative as are not as in vi. 4, ἀντίτικα τῶν of the genitives which follow them, but ἐν ἐν τοῖς in which these genitives are the ruling elements.—What is the precise force of πνεύματος?—R. Meyer: "It is the Holy Spirit, as the operative principle of the Christian life." Clearly, it is the spirit as itself the inward Christian principle of life, which is certainly not to be thought of without the communion of the Holy Spirit. For the Holy Spirit as πνεύμα simply, operating objectively, was also the producer of the γένος, which here constitutes the antithesis. This principle of eternal newness, and has, as a result, an eternal newness as the principle of the absolute renewal. Tholuck: "The spirit of grace produced by God's gracious deed." [With Meyer, Alford, and others, it seems best to refer this to the Holy Spirit. The absence of the article is not against this view; as the opinion of Harless, that πνεύμα without the article is subjective, is not well established. (Comp. Meyer on Rom. viii. 4; Harless, Eph. ii. 23; Lange's Comm., Gal. v. 16, p. 137.) This passage seems to point to chap. viii., where πνεύμα occurs so frequently, in the sense of the Holy Spirit; the more so as ὡς ἄνειρος occurs just before (ver. 5). The objection, that the Holy Spirit, working objectively, was the author of the letter, and hence that the antithesis requires another meaning, has not much weight. See notes on Rom. viii. 4 ff.—R.]

And not in the oldness of the letter [κατὰ ψεύτων παλαιότητα (only here) γράφματος. Not old letter (Hodge), nor yet in the flesh, though these latter thoughts are implied. The genitive seems to be gen. auctoris, as πνεύματος in the previous clause.—R. On the γράφμα, see chap. ii. 29; 2 Cor. iii. 6. The law
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viewed externally, and, by its historical and subjective externalization, become an old and dying object, παλαιοτέρας. Meyer writes somewhat unintelligibly: The παλαιοτέρας, according to the nature of the relation in which the γράμμα stands to the principle of sin in man, was necessarily sinful (see ver. 7 ff.), as, on the other hand, the κανονικός must be necessarily moral in consequence of the vitally influencing πνεῦμα. [The service which resulted from the rule of the letter, was not merely their old service, but a service having in it an element of decay. The service under the law, precisely the written law (when viewed as the γράμμα), was a killing yoke, is still, when the service is in the oldness of the letter. Meyer evidently means, that a law with external precepts, of the letter, necessarily so acts upon man's sinfulness, that the very service he attempts to render is sinful. The letter killeth (2 Cor. iii. 6).—Such a characterization of the service under the law forms a fitting warning against a return to legalism—an appropriate conclusion to this section, and a point of connection with ver. 7.—R.]

DOCTRINAL AND ETHICAL.

1. The connection with sin, according to chap. vi. 12-23, was a slavish state; the connection with the law, on the other hand, according to the present section, was comparable to an earthly marriage-state. The connection of believers with Christ now appears, in comparison with this, as a super-terrestrial marriage-covenant (see Eph. v. 32).

2. It is only by keeping the figure of the law of marriage free from an allegorical interpretation, and by distinguishing between the figure itself and its historical application, that the evidence clearly appears which the argumentation of the Apostle contemplated, and particularly for the Jewish Christians. But this evidence still continues in force. The standpoint of external legality, and that of living faith, cannot be confused as religious principles. Both standpoints are answered by the death of Christ. Where they seem to be united, the confession of the law, or the legal confession of faith, is the dominant religious principle; while the opposite principle has the meaning only of a historical and ethical custom, which, from its nature as a legal custom, as much limits the Catholic man of faith, as it, in the character of an evangelical custom, burdens the legal, Romanizing Protestant.

3. Tholuck: "The law is annullèd in relation to believers, not in its moral import, but, as Calvinius remarks, quod rigorem exactationis, quod malisdicationem et quod servilium coactionem." According to the Sermon on the Mount, as well as according to Paul, it is done away so far as it is fulfilled; it is annulled in a negative sense so far as it is annulled in Christian principle, the law of the Spirit. An inward principle has come from the external precept; an inward rule from the external form; an inward tendency from the external law; a unity from multiplicity; a synthesis from the analysis; and from the ordinance, "Do this and live," the order, "Live and do this." It must be borne in mind, that Paul here speaks of the finite, formal character of the law, and not of the law as a type of the New Testament, as it has become transformed into the law of the Spirit. [Comp. Doctrinal Notes on Galatians, iii. 25-29 p. 88, 89.—R.]

4. The figure of marriage, which extends through the Old Testament in typical forms, is here employed in reference to the relation between Christ and the whole body of believers. The individual believer participates freely in the marriage-bond of this body, yet not in a mystical, separative isolation of his relation to Christ.

5. In ver. 5 Paul speaks especially concerning the passions of sins, which are excited and occasioned by the law; and there is no reason for understanding among them the abnormal forms of passionate excitement. The history of Pharisaimism, and of fanaticism in general, from the crucifixion of Christ down to the present day, teaches us how very much additional weight is also added by the normal forms. In this direction there has arisen the odiun generis humanis, as well as the increasingly strong warfare of hierarchical or ecclesiastical party-law against the eternal moral laws of humanity, in which the nature of God himself is represented, while in the statute only the distorted apparent image of the Church, and not its eternal pith, is reflected.

6. The abominations of ordinances at enmity with the gospel and humanity reached the centre of their manifestation in the crucifixion of Christ; but they everywhere reappear, where Christ is again crucified, in a grosser or more refined sense. And this not only occurs where the written revealed law is perverted into fanatical ordinances, but also where the ideals of the natural law (Rom. ii. 14) are distorted to fanatical caricatures, as is shown in the history of the Revolution of 1848.

7. On ver. 6. Tholuck: "γράμμα, πνεῦμα (chap. ii. 29). The former is chiefly a designation of the external principle; the latter, of the inwardly operative principle. And this inwardly operative principle is the gracious spirit produced by God's gracious act. Calvin: Spiritum litterae opposuit, quia antequam ad dei voluntatem voluntas nostra per spiritum sanctum formata est, non habemus in l scopo externam litteram, quae nonem quidem externis nostris actionibus insit, concupiscens autem nostra furorem canitate exorbit. And Melanchthon: Ideo dictu littera, quia non est versus et vitia motus animi, sed est opus imitationis interioris vel exterior, nec ibi potest esse vera invocatio, ubi non apprehendit remissionem peccatorum.

8. How the law, in its letter or finite relation, began to grow old immediately after the beginning of legislation, is shown to us clearly by the history of the Israelites; and Deuteronomy even gives the canonical type of this truth. Thus in the Church, the Christian Church teaches, on the other hand, how the newness of the spiritual life becomes constantly newer in its power of renewal. But the same antithesis is again manifested in the continual obsolescence of the Church in the Middle Ages, and in the continued rejuvenating of the Evangelical Church.

HOMILETICAL AND PRACTICAL.

On Chap. vii. 1-6.

As Christians, we belong no more to the law, but to Christ. 1. Because we are dead to the law by Jesus, who abolished the power of the law; 2. Because we are united to Him by the same fact, in order to bring forth fruit to God (vers. 1-6).—Marriage as a type of spiritual union. 1. As a type of our relation to the law; 2. As a type of our relation to Christ (vers. 1-6).—As the relation of man
to Christ is altogether different from that to the law, so is Christian marriage, on the other hand, altogether different from that of the Old Testament (vers. 1–6).—How death divides, but also unites (ver. 4).—Union of heart with Christ the Risen One is the condition of the happy union of human hearts with each other so as to bring forth fruit unto God (ver. 4).—How miserable it was to live under the law in the flesh; how happy it is to live under grace in the Spirit! Proof: 1. Description of the state under the law: a: we were in bondage; b: sinful lusts worked in our members to bring forth fruit unto death; c: we served the letter. 2. Description of the condition under grace: a: we are free; b: the newness of the Spirit invites us to bring forth fruit unto God; c: we serve the Spirit, and not the letter any more (vers. 5, 6).

Starkie: As a thistle-bush is full of thistles, so are unconverted and carnal men full of the fruits of the flesh (vers. 5).—Christ frees us from the burden of the law, that we may take His yoke upon us (vers. 6).—Eddinger: We are free from the law, not as a precept of duty—which remains perpetually—but in its condemnation, compulsion, and sharpness (ver. 1).—Where there is not a heart and readiness, there is only external labor and weariness; where conversion of the life and spiritual increase are not exhibited in the inner man, it is lost work and the service of the letter, even if one should wear out the temple-floor with his knees, give his body to be burned, and become a beggar and a hermit!

Spener: Our perverted nature is such, that, when any thing is forbidden, we have all the greater desire to have it. We have often seen children think less of, and have no desire for, a certain thing, for which they have all the more desire when forbidden. So, when the law for bids this and that, we are prompted toward it by our wicked nature (ver. 5).—We are not so free that we do not have to serve any more; only the kind of service is different. Formerly it was compulsory, now it is remissed with a joyful will; then it was the letter, now it is the spirit (ver. 6).—Rose: The truth which Paul here portrays (vers. 1–4) is this: that nothing but death annuls the dominion of the law.

Lucio: The complete freedom of man from the law promotes his true sanctification (vers. 1–6).—The relation of man to the law.—Application of this relation to believers (ver. 4).—Advantages of the new state above the old one under the law (vers. 5, 6).

Eddinger: The Christian is free from the coercion of the law (vers. 1–6).—The death of Christ became freedom from the compulsory power and curse of the law: 1. As abrogation of the Levitical sacrificial system; 2. As inducement toward free and thankful love toward God (ver. 4).—Irreligious politicians express only their ignoble and servile manner of thinking, when they deem all religion to be only of service as a bridge for the people (ver. 4).—The nature of the Christian is spirit: 1. In reference to faith; 2. In reference to actions. The latter stands in contrast with this spirit in these same respects (ver. 6).

Beuker: Here, for the first time since chap. i, 13, Paul addresses the saints at Rome as brethren—brethren "in Christ Jesus our Lord" (ver. 1).—"But now"—his now is an evangelical key-note of the Epistle to the Romans; comp. chap. iii. 21, and other places (ver. 6).

Lange: The death of Christ a serious boundary between the legal and the evangelical, believing, standpoints: 1. The meaning of this boundary itself; 2. The application: no religious confusions of the two standpoints. By a customary connection of them, one is made to mean only a moral limitation, which, after all, is not in conformity with the internal relations.—The sensuous power and spiritual weakness of legalism consists in its being an earthly relation, confined to this life, though in the fear of God (in this life the head, the city of God, the apparent image of the kingdom, &c.). The marriage-bond of the free Church of God is a super-terrestrial relation, and therefore the power of the renewal of the earthly life: a. Christ in the next life and in this one; b. Faith also; c. The Church as well.—The reciprocal action between the law and sin unto death, a counterpart to the reciprocity between the Spirit of Christ and faith unto new life.—The contrast between the Old and New Testament in its full meaning: 1. The Old Testament growing old and making old from the beginning; 2. The New Testament renewing itself and the world from the beginning.—But a New Testament is in the essence of the Old, as well as an Old is in the manifestation of the New.

Burnet: All the wisdom of the heathen, and of the wisest persons in the world, was never able to discover the first sinful motions arising from our rebellious natures; only the holy law of God makes them known, and discovers them to be sin. Such is the holiness of the law of God, that it requires not only the purity of our actions, but also the integrity of all our faculties.—Scott: Self-righteous pride and antinomian licentiousness are two fatal rocks on which immense multitudes are continually wrecked, and between which none but the Holy Spirit can pilot us; and the greatest objections of open enemies to the doctrines of grace derive their greatest plausibility from the unholy lives of many professed friends.—Clarke: The law is only the means of disclosing our sinful propensities, not of producing it; as a bright beam of the sun introduced into a room shows millions of motes in all directions—but these were not introduced by the light, but were there before, only there was not light enough to make them manifest—so the evil propensity was in the heart before, but there was not light sufficient to discover it.

CHAPTER VII. 7-25.

FIFTH SECTION.—Synopsis: The law, in its holy design, by the feeling of death, to lead to the new life in grace. The development of the law from externality to inwardness. The experience of Paul: a sketch from life of the conflict under the law, as well as of the transition from the old life in the law to the new life in the Spirit.

7 What shall we say then? Is the law sin? God forbid. [Let it not be!] Nay, [but] I had not known [i.e., recognized] sin, but by [except through] the law: for I had not known lust [evil desire], except the law had [if the law had] not said, Thou shalt not covet. But sin, taking occasion [], by the commandment, [omitted comma] wrought in me all manner of concupiscence [evil desire].

9 For without the law sin was [is] dead. For [Now] I was alive without the law once: but when the commandment came, sin revived [sprang into life], and I died. And the commandment, which was ordained to [was unto] 2 life, I found [the same, or, this, was found by me] to be unto death. For sin, taking occasion [the comma by the commandment, [omitted comma] deceived me, and by it slew me. Wherefore [So that] the law is holy, and the commandment holy, and just, and good.

13 Was [Did] then that which is good made [become] 4 death unto me? God forbid. But sin, that it might appear sin, working death in [to] me by [through] that which is good; [that] sin by [through] the commandment might become exceeding [exceedingly] sinful.

15 For we know that the law is spiritual: but I am carnal, 4 sold under sin. For that which I do [perform], 4 I allow [know not]: for what I would, that do I not [not what I wish, 4 that I practise]; but what I hate, that do I.

16 If then I do that which I would not [But if what I wish not, that I do], I consent unto [I agree with] the law that it is good. Now then it is no more [longer] I that do [perform] it, but sin that dwelleth [dwelling] in me. For I know that in me (that is, in my flesh), dwelleth no good thing [good doth not dwell]: for to will [wish] is present with me; but how [omitted how] to perform that which is good I find not [or, is not]. 7 For the good that I would [wish], I do not: but the evil which I would [wish] not, that I do [practise]. Now [But] if I do that I 8 would [wish] not, it is no more [longer] I that do [perform] it, but sin that dwelleth [dwelling] in me. I find then a [the] law, that, when I would [wish to] do good, evil is present with me. For I delight in the law of God after the inward man: But I see another law in my members, warring against the law of my mind, and bringing me into captivity to the law of sin which is in my members.

24 O wretched man that I am! who shall deliver me from the body of this death [or, this body of death]? 9 I thank God [or, Thanks to God] 10 through Jesus Christ our Lord. So then with the mind I myself [I myself with the mind] 11 serve the law of God; but with the flesh the law of sin.

TEXTUAL.

6 Ver. 7.—[The E. V. renders ἐστὶν τὸν ὄργανον here but, in ver. 8, concupiscence, and the verb ἐπιθυμῶνς, cover.] In order to preserve the correspondence, the Amer. Bible Union translates the noun coveting in both places. We are forced to retain covet in rendering the verb, but it seems better to give the noun a more exact translation, even at the cost of variation from the text. Last is too specific, concupiscence too rare, desire would be indefinite without an adjective added. "The misfortune is that we have no English noun that corresponds well to the generic sense of the very word." (Stuart).

9 Ver. 10.—[The Halley of the E. V. are virtually a gloss. Was only need be supplied. Far is a favorite emendation, but unite brings out the full force of εἰς quite as well.—The passive form of the Greek is restored in the second clause.]

10 Ver. 13.—[N. A. B. C. E., Lachmann, Meyer, Alford, Wordsworth, Tregelles, read ἔχειν τίνος instead of ἔχειν τίνος. (Rev. K. L.)] The correction probably arose from the misunderstanding the historical aorist (Alford). The Amer. Bible Union follows the latter reading, which is now considered incorrect.

12 Ver. 14.—[N. A. B. C. E. F. G., Griesbach, Lachmann, Scholz, Thesleffendorf, Meyer, Wordsworth, Tregelles, and Lange, read ἅταξεν οὖσαν instead of ἅταξεν οὖσαν (Rev. K. L.) the latter being very naturally substituted to correspond with ἀπεριήγατον. It was also more familiar. On the meaning, see Dep. Notes.]

13 Ver. 15.—[Three Greek verbs of kindred signification κατεργάζεσθαι, πρᾶττεν, ποιεῖν, occur in this verse, recurring throughout the section. The E. V. renders all three, except in ver. 18, where the first verb is translated perform. It is better to retain this throughout, and render πρᾶττεν, præcītum, as etymologically exact. Alford desires any distinction between the last two verbs.]

15
The Holiness of Life Under the Law as Development of the Knowledge of Sin.

Summary. — 1. The law in relation to sin; vers. 12, 13. a. The holiness of the law in its relation to the sinfulness of man; vers. 7-12. b. The effect of the law in harmony with its design: Disclosure of the deadly effect of sin, in causing it to complete itself as well in facts as in the consciousness; ver. 13.-2. The sinner in relation to the law; vers. 14-23. a. The revelation of man's carnal nature or tendency under the spiritual quality of the law; ver. 14. b. The disclosure of the sinful obscuration of the understanding; or the dispute of knowledge; vers. 15, 16. c. The disclosure of the sinful obscuration of the will; or the dispute of the will; vers. 17, 18. d. Disclosure of the sinful obscuration of feeling; or of the unconscious ground of life; vers. 19, 20. e. Disclosure of the darkening of the whole human consciousness by the opposition of God's law and a mere seeming law; or the deadly rent in the whole man; vers. 21-23.—3. The unhappiest premonition of death, in the sense of the entanglement by the seeming body of death, and the release from it; ver. 24. 4. The transition from death to life; ver. 25. a. The redemption, in the former half of the verse. b. Conclusion in relation to the starting-point of the new life; second half of ver. 25.

B. — The same development as transition from the law to the Gospel, from ruin to salvation.

(Eph. v. 18: "But all things that are reproved are made manifest by the light: for whatsoever doth make manifest is light.") a. The holy design of the law to discover the root of sin, and with the sense of guilt to awaken the sense of death; vers. 7-12.—b. The wholeness of this complete unmasking of sin in its absolute sinfulness; ver. 10.—c. View of the conflict between the spiritual and divine character of the law, and the carnal character of the sinner; ver. 13.—d. Consciousness of the want of clearness and supremacy of understanding; vers. 15, 16.—e. Consciousness of the want of firmness and energy of will; vers. 17, 18.—f. Consciousness of the weakness of the nobler sentiments, and the superior power of the lower; vers. 19, 20.—g. The consciousness of the chaos between the inner man and the outer man's life; of the rent between the two, by the two reciprocally contradictory laws; vers. 21-23.—h. The fruit of this development: the consummated consciousness of the necessity of deliverance; ver. 24.—i. Deliverance and the new law of life: clear distinction between knowledge and flesh; ver. 25. The I is distinguished, first from sin in knowledge, then in the will, then in the feeling, then in the whole consciousness of the inward nature, but finally in the inquiring cry for the Redeemer.

General Preliminary Remarks. — We come first of all to the question, In what sense does the Apostle speak in the first person singular? what does the eγένω mean? Different views: The expression is a μεταφυσική, see I Cor. iv. 6—that is, the representation of one εγένετο in another. Thus the Greek fathers applied the passage to the fall of Adam, or of the human race (Tholuck: "By way of example, the introduction of man into the paradigmatical condition").—Others believed the Jewish people before and under the law denoted (Chrysostom, Turrettin, Westein, Reiche). The view of the Socinians and Arminians (Grotius, and others) was a modification of this one, that the οίνινες πληρεί are meant, who, under the legal economy, have surrendered themselves to a gross life of sin. But the Apostle evidently speaks of a human condition of soul, in which the inward conflict of life is very earnest and great; and the language of his own experience is unmistakable. Even if he spoke of the human race in general, or of the Israelite people in particular, he could not speak of a mere μεταφυσική, which would be excluded from the organic connection by the Apostle's theological view. But since the Apostle uses the most forcible language of his own experience, his expression is idιος (κοινοποίητος); that is, he expresses in his experience a universal human experience of the relation of man to the law (Meyer, and others).* For it is self-evident that the Apostle could have no occasion to describe a special experience concerning himself alone.

But now the second question arises: What state of the soul has the Apostle portrayed? Does this

* [Wordsworth, less correctly, says: "By the pronoun J, the holy Apostle personifies Human Nature, and identifies it with Himself: and says, in his own name and person, what he means to be applied to Mankind generally, in their unregenerate state." This author follows his usual patriotic bent, in implying that this is a description, not of what was, but might have been Paul's experience. This soil for the honor of "the holy Apostle!" is undoubtedly at the expense of his sincerity. — Ed.]
passage refer to the condition of the unregenerate, or of the regenerate?

Views.—1. The unregenerate: The Greek fathers, Augustine before his controversy with the Pelagians (prop. 44 in Ep. ad Rom.); also Jerome, Abelard (to a certain extent), and Thomas Aquinas; then Erasmus, Bucer, Musculus, Ochino, Faustus Socinius, Arminius (on Afflament, see Tholuck, p. 239); the Spener school (according to the suggestions of Schenck); and later exegetical writers. Among these, Julius Müller, Neander, Nitzsch, Hahn, Tholuck, Krehl, Hengstenberg, Rückert, De Wette, Ewald, Stier, Stuart, Ernesti, Messmer, Schmid, Lechler, Kabius, and Meyer (most decidedly). Some of these, however, really support the modified view upheld below (4).—R.

2. The regenerate: Methodius in the Origenes (see Tholuck, p. 396); Augustine in the controversy with the Pelagians (on account of vers. 17, 18, 22, 23; Retrac. i. 23, &c.); Jerome, Luther, Calvin, Beza, the orthodox school; recently Kollbrügge, Das 7te Kapitel des Briefes an die Römer (1839).

3. The first section, from vers. 7—13, treats of the unregenerate; vers. 14—25, of the regenerate: Philippi [whose careful and thorough discussion (Comm., pp. 249—253) is one of the ablest in favor of this reference.—R.]. The identity of the subject is against this view. Hofmann, Schrifttheorie, i. p. 470-471, declares that, "The earlier view does, indeed, speak of his present condition, but apart from the moral ability to which he had grown in Christ." According to Meyer, this is the earlier Augustinian view (of the unregenerate); but it seems to be scarcely an intelligible one. This view (referring only vers. 14—25 to the regenerate) is that of most Scotch expositors (latterly Brown, Haldane, Forbes); of Deltitzsch (Bibl. Psychol., pp. 388 ff., 2d ed.), and is ably defended by Dr. Hodge. As the current Calvinistic interpretation, it requires further consideration. Mention must be made also of the modified form of it held by Alford. The arguments in favor of making the 

sharp transition at ver. 14, are as follows, as urged by Hodge: (1) The onus probandi is on the other side (on account of the first person and present tense). (2) There is not an expression, from the beginning to the end of the section, ver. 14—25, which the holiest man may not and must not adopt* (3) There is much which cannot be asserted by any unrenewed man. (4) The context is in favor of this interpretation. The positions (2) and (3) must be discussed in the exegesis of the verses as they occur (especially vers. 14, 15, 22). It will be found that there is very great difficulty in applying all the terms in their literal sense exclusively to either class. Philippi is most earnest in upholding the 3d position of Hodge. In regard to (1), it may be observed, that the first person is used in vers. 7—13, so that the change from the past to the present tense alone enters into the discussion. Is this change of tense sufficient to justify so marked a change in the subject? A consistent attempt to define the subject throughout on this theory, leads to the "confusion," which Alford admits in the view he supports.—The context, it may readily be granted, admits of this view; for in chaps. v. and vi. the result of justification, the actual deliverance from sin, has been brought into view, and ver. 6 says: we serve, &c. But, on the other hand, it must be noted vers. 7—13 recur to the anti-Christian, legal position. Not until ver. 25 is there a distinct Christian utterance, while chap. viii. sounds like a new song of triumph. If the Apostle is holding the distinctively Christian aspect of the conflict in abeyance, though describing the experience of a Christian, in order that he may give it more force in chap. viii., he is doing what is not usual with him as a writer, still less with a struggling believer in his daily experience. The context, we hold, points most plainly to the view given next, and adopted by Dr. Lange.—R.

4. The Apostle is not describing a quiescent state, but the process in which man is driven from the law to Christ, and an unregenerate person becomes a regenerate one. So Olshausen: "The state under the law cannot coexist with regeneration, and without question, therefore—as chap. vii. 24 is to express the awakened not the regenerated state. 25 the conclusion of redemption itself—vers. 14—24 are to be referred to a position before regeneration, and to be understood as a description of the conflict within an awakened person. Since, however, the Apostle makes use of the present for this section, while before and afterwards he applies the aorist, we are led to the idea that he does not intend to have this state of conflict regarded as concluded with the experience of redemption. In the description (vers. 14—24) itself, also, as will afterwards be more particularly shown, an advance in the conflict with sin is clearly observable; the better I stand out in the man, more and more the pleasure in God's law gradually increases. This is the case in a still higher degree, as ver. 25 expresses, after the experience of the redeeming power of Christ, where the conflict with sin is described as for the most part victorious on the side of the better part in the man. But a battle still continues, even as all this, the antithesis, under the law and being free from the law, does not bear being confounded. It only admits of the condition, that the Christian must again feel that he is weak, so that

* [Forbes defends this view, however, from the parallelism in the latter part of ver. 25.—R.]
as he falls momentarily under the law of the flesh, and thereby under the law of death. Even Bengel finds in this section a progress, but he does not correctly describe it: "Sensus suspitio, convitior, etiam ad libertatem. Inde paululum sequitur fil oratio. But after the combatant experiences deep conviction, he declines, rather, into despair; but then this is the way to complete deliverance.

Tholuck properly remarks: "As the question is usually raised, whether the regenerate or the unregenerate person is spoken of, it produces misunderstanding so far as the status irregenerabilis comprehends in itself the very different states of soul of the status exaez cornuadis and of the status legalis; then, how far the relation of Old Testament believers to law and regeneration is regarded differently; and finally, how far the idea of regeneration has been a self-consciously variable one."

This view is, on the whole, the most satisfactory. It admits the conflict after regeneration, but guards against the thought that this is a description of distinctively Christian experience. It is rather that of one under the pedagogy of the law "unto Christ," whether for the first time or the hundredth time. It is the most hopeful state of the unregenerate man; the least desirable state of the regenerate man. Of course, it cannot be admitted that there is a third class, a tertium gaudit, the awakened. This view seems to be the one which will harmonize the polemics of the past. Jowett adopts it, Schaff also, while Delitzsch, after advocating (3), says: "He speaks of himself the regenerate—i. e., of experiences still continuing, and not absolutely passed away—but he does not speak of himself qui quisque regenerate—i. e., of experiences which he has received by the specifically New Testament grace of regeneration." He further admits that such experiences might occur in the heathen world, according to Rom. ii. 15. The advantages of this view are very numerous. It excludes the exegesis of a constant constraint, viz., the attempt to press the words into harmony with certain preconceived anthropological positions. It agrees best with the context. Its practical value is beyond that of any other. See Doct. Notes.—R.

On the literature, see the Introduction. Also Tholuck, p. 228, and the exposition of Hort and Acretius may also be found. Winzer, Pro-

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

First Paragraph, Vers. 7-12.

Ver. 7. What shall we say then? [Τί λέγεις; see the note on this expression, iii. 6. p. 118. Comp. also ix. 30, where the use is differ-
ent.—R.] Intimation that another false conclusion must be prevented. Though the Christian be dead to the law, it does not follow that the law is not holy. But it belongs to a preceding stage of development.

Is the law sin [διὰ νόμος ἡμῖν;? Origen [Jerome]: the lex naturae. Tholuck: the Mosaic law. Certainly the question is respecting the justification of the latter. [Jowett paraphrase: Is conscience sin?—which seems almost an exegetical caprice. His reason for it, that the consciousness of sin, rather than a question of new moons and Sabbath, is under consideration, betrays an entire misapprehension of the ethical purpose of the law of Moses. It may be added that an inferential reference to all law can be found here, but the passage is an account of an historical experience, which took place under the Mosaic law.—R.]

Sin. The usual interpretation: cause of sin Metonymically, the operation named, instead of the cause, as 2 Kings iv. 40; Micah v. 1; Samaria is sin for Jacob. On the other hand, De Wette and Meyer say: Is the law sinful, immoral? After what precedes, it may well mean: Is it the real cause of sin, and as such, itself sinful? [Bengel: "causae pecati peccaminosa,"] O λέγεις itself being abstract, that which is predicated of it is abstract also (Alford).—R. Even this conclusion is repelled by the Apostle with abhorrence, υπὸ γνώσεως.

Nay, but. The διὰ λέγεις is taken by some in the sense of ἀλλήλου: but certainly. He rejects the thought that the law is sin, but yet he firmly holds that it brought injury (Stuart, Kullner, and others; Meyer, Hofmann). Tholuck, on the other hand (with Theodorus of Mopsuestia, Abelard, and others), sees, in what is here said, the expression of the opposite, viz., that the law first brought sin to consciousness. It may be asked whether this alternative is a real one. If the law he really holy, because it has driven sin from its concealment and brought it to manifestation, then there is no alternative here. [This seems decisive against Stuart's view. Meyer (4th ed.) renders διὰ λέγεις, sonderne. The law is not sin, but its actual relation to sin is that of dis-
coverer of sin. This is much simpler than Alford's view: I say not that, but what I mean is that. The objection that this implies a praise of the law (De Wette) is without force. He might well praise it as leading toward ver. 25; vili. 1.—R.]

But it may be asked, in connection with this view, How are the words, I had not known sin [τὰς ἁμαρτίας ὅλους Καινών], to be ex-
plained? According to Cyril, Winzer, De Wette, Philippi, and Tholuck, this refers to the knowledge of sin alone; but, according to Meyer, and others, it refers to the becoming acquainted with sin by experience. Meyer: "The principle of sin in man, with which we first become experimentally acquainted by the law, and which would have remained unknown to us without the law, because then it would not have become active by the expenditure of desires for what is forbidden, in opposition to the law." This explanation lays too much stress upon the second point of view. According to chap. v. 20, vi. 15, and ver. 8 of this chapter, it is, however, not doubtful that the Apostle has here in mind not only the knowledge of sin, but also the excitement of sin. But he does not have it in mind as the increase of sin in itself, but as the promotion of its manifestation and further punishment.

Exeget through the law [ἐπὶ μὴ διὰ νόμον ἡμῖν]. Olschausen: "The law in all the forms of its revelation." Meyer properly rejects this. Although the law further appears as immanent in man, yet, ever since the Mosaic law, by which it was awakened, it has the character of the second, threatening, and deadly law. The moral law of nature, ideally conceived, is one with human nature. [The citation from law to law, Tholuck, immediately following, shows what the reference is.

For I had not known evil desire [τὰς τὰς γὰρ ἐν αὐτῷ ἐπελευθερώθην. See Textual Note 1. Γάρ confirmatory; not = for example. On οὐ, see Tholuck, Stuart, Winzer, p. 404. It is
untranslatable in English; here a sign of close logical connection. On the distinction between the verbs, Bengel says: 

*\[\text{διώκω μάχεσαι, αίδος minus.}\]

Hence, posterior, even though it is not a negation, is increased. The verb is strengthened also, in this conditional clause, by the absence of *ἐκ*, which would usually be inserted.—[R] We cannot translate this, with Meyer: *"For I would not have known desire," &c.* This would make the law the producer of lust, which is not the Apostle’s meaning. That lust was present without the law, he had sufficiently asserted in chaps. i. and v. But now he has become acquainted with the corrupting and condemnatory character of wicked lust, under the prohibition of the law.

Thou shalt not covet (Exod. xx. 17). [O ιτις ἐπιδοξιασθησθαι.]

On the prohibitory future of the law, as quoted in the New Testament, see Winer, p. 296; Buxton, N. T. Gramm., p. 251.—[R] As this was to him the principal thing in the law, he thus first understood the inner character of the law and the inward nature of sin; but thus also was the propensity to evil first excited, in the most manifold way, by the contradiction in him. The desire was now to him universally and decisively the principal and decisive thing. The first view of the inner life, of or of the interior of life, had now occurred. Tholuck remarks, that Augustine and Thomas Aquinas regarded the concupiscencia as the generale peccatum from which all the others proceeded; but he observes, on the contrary, that the *ἐκ* in the sentence suggests rather a subordinate relation. But is the *διώκω* subordinated or separated in relation to the whole sentence? For I never once understood the meaning of wicked lust without the law.

To what period of Paul’s life does this belong? To the time of his childhood (Origen); or of his Pharisaical blindness (“the elder Lutheran and Reformed exegesis down to Carpzov”)? Tholuck gives reasons for the latter. According to Matt. v., Pharisaism was narrowed to the act. He cites pertinent expressions of Kimchi, and other Jewish writers (see also above, note, p. 392). In Jarchi, the explanation of the Tenth Commandment is wounding; in Aben Ezra there is a dwarfish construction. But then he raises the objection, that a person like Paul must have earlier come to a knowledge of the sinfulness of the *ἐπιδοξια*. But the knowledge of the sinfulness of the *ἐπιδοξια* has its first awakening significance, when wicked lust is recognized as the root of supposed good works, and thereby leads to a revolution of the old views on good works themselves. Even the fanatic rejection of such good works in themselves, but also their root—wicked desires. But he defines wicked desires and good affections according to evil and good works, while the awakened one begins to proceed from the judgment on inward affections, and afterwards to define the works. Therefore we cannot say, that *οίκοι ἐν γνώσει* and *οίκοι ἐπιδοξεῖ* stand here merely hypothetically; the question as to the subject of this declaration must be raised first in ver. 9 (Tholuck), Vers. 7 and 9 denote the same experience through which Paul, as the representative of all true contestants, passed under the law: ver. 7 on the side of the perception of sin, ver. 9 on the side of the excitement of sin.

Ver. 8. But sin. The *δι* is, indeed, “continuative” (Meyer), [not adversative (Webster and Wilkinson).—[R],] yet not in reference to the history of the development of the sinful experience, but so far as its second stage is given.—Sin, ἡ ἁμαρτία; that is, sin inwardly present as pecunia; the *ἐπιδοξια*, as it was just shown to be sin. [The principle of sin in man, as in ver. 7. To admit a personal sin, as held by Fritzsche and Stuart,* is unnecessary; to refer it to actual sin (Rendel), is contrary to the context. Comp. Olshausen, Koppe, Philippi, Hodges.—[R].] Taking occasion [ἀφορητὴν δέ λαβούσαν αὐτοῦ]. The *ἀφορητὴν* denotes the external impulse or occasion, in opposition to the inner. [Not merely *opportunity*; “it indicates the furnishing the material and ground of attack, the wherewith and whence to attack” (Alford). Its position is emphatic, though the whole phrase is probably that rendered comment.—[R].] The *λαβαρία* in λαβοῦντα, as free, moral activity, must be made emphatic here. Therefore Reiche says, incorrectly: it received occasion.

By the commandment wrought in me [διὰ τῆς ἐντολῆς καταγγέλασαν εἰς ἐμοῦ]. The *διὰ τῆς ἐντολῆς* must be connected with καταγγέλασαν. (Rückert, Tholuck, Meyer), and not with ἀφορητὴν λαβούσαν. (Luther, Olshausen, Tholuck). The sentence contains the declaration how sin took an occasion for itself. It operated just by the commandment [the single precept referred to ver. 7], since it regarded the categorical commandment as a hostile power, and struggled and rebelled against it.

The immediate design of the commandment in itself was the subjectivity of the sinner; but the prospective result was the rising of sin, and this result should bring sin clearly to the light in order to incapacitate the sinner for deliverance. Meyer says ambiguously: “Concupiscence is also without law in man, but yet it is not concupiscence for what is forbidden.” Certainly the positive prohibition first appears with the law; but the variance of the sinner with the inner law of life is already perfectly present. But now refractoriness toward the positive command makes its appearance, and enhances and consummates sin.

All manner of evil desire [πάντας ἐπιθυμίας]. The *ἐπιθυμία* was already present; but it now first unfolded and extended itself to the contrast. Zwingli, and others, interpret this as the knowledge of lust; Luther, Calvinus, Philippi, and others, interpret it properly as the excitement of lust.

Tholuck: “According to ver. 11, sin deceives, as is exhibited in the history of the fall of man; to man every thing forbidden appears as a desirable blessing; but yet, as it is forbidden, he feels that his freedom is limited, and now his lust rages more violently, like the waves against the dyke;” see 1 Cor. xv. 46. (Philippi well says of this: “An immovably certain psychological fact, which man can more easily reason away and dispute away, than do away.”) —[R].

* [Stuart makes ἁμαρτία here almost = ἁμαρτία σαρκικήν (ver. 14 f.). If an equivalent is necessary, *σάρκικα* is a preferable one. For full, almost fanciful, notes on the presumed personalization, see Wordsworth in loco.—[R].] The second of this connection is, that *διά* is never joined with ἀπείρον (ἐς is usual) that verse 11, 13 seem to require. 1 The following citations from the classics support the universality of the principle set forth in this verse (comp. Prov. ix. 21).

Crito (Livy xxxiv. 4): *Nolite codem loco existimare, Quirite, futurum rem, quo full, antequam lece de hoc retor.”* Et hominem ingenuum non accursed talibus est, quam oblivisci, et *consensum non metu tolerabiliter esset, quam enim tene* ss us vindicat, sius fora bestia turritas, daeide emissa. Seneca (de Clementia, l. 23): *Perfidios cum inigo corporum, ut ilia facinus jusse manuisset.* Moro (Burn., l. 3):
For without the law sin is dead [καρδι: γάρ γονόνναναμαρτίαννεκρά. A general proposition, hence, with the verb omitted. Boza and Reiche incorrectly supply ἁ; so E. V., was. It will readily be understood that νεκρά is not used in an absolute, but relative sense, = inoperative (or unobserved, if the reference be limited to the knowledge of sin). Against this the antithesis of the following verse may be urged. — R.] Meyer, incorrectly: "not actively, because that is wanting whereby it can take occasion to be active." Rather, sin cannot mature in its root; it cannot come to πανοράμας. Man has, to a certain extent, laid himself to rest with it upon a lower bestial stage, which is apparently nature; the commandment first manifests the demoniacal contradiction of this stage, the actual as well as the formal contradiction to God and what is divine (see chap. viii. 3). It is incorrect to limit the statement, with Chrysostom, Calvin, and others, to knowledge — it was not known; or, with Calvisius, to the conscience (terrores conscientiae); or, finally, to limit the idea to the sphere of desire (Tholuck). It has not yet acquired its most real, false life, in the πανοράμας. Reference must here be made to the antithesis: Sin was dead, and I was alive. [The clauses, however, are not strictly antithetical. — R.]

Ver. 9. Now I was alive without the law once [γάρ δὲ ἐκ νόμον χαρία λόγον ποιήσατε. For (E. V.) is incorrect; δὲ must then be rendered but or now (i. e., moreover), as it is taken to be adverbial or continuous. The latter is to be preferred, on the ground that this clause continues a description of the state without the law, while the real antithesis occurs in the following clause, for which the particle ἀλλά should be reserved. — R.] In order to define the sense, we must apply the twofold antithesis. Paul could only have lived first in the sense in which sin was dead in him, and also be dead in the sense in which sin was alive in him.

I was alive. The γάρ must be emphasized: "the whole expression is pregnant (Reiche, on the contrary, merely ἁ). Explanation:

1. Tochar mihi visere (Augustine, Erasmus [Barnes], and others).
2. Securus evam (Melanchthon, Calvin, Bengel [Hodge], and others), I lived securely as a Pharisee.
3. Meyer says, to the contrary: "Paul means the life of childlike innocence which is free from death (ver. 10), (comp. Winzer, p. 11; Umbreit in the Studien und Kritiken, 1861, p. 687 f.), where (as this condition of life, analogous to the paradisial state of the first parents, was the cheerful ray of his earliest recollection,) the law had not yet come to knowledge, the moral spontaneity had not yet occurred, and therefore the principle of sin was still in the slumber of death. This is certainly a status securitatis, but not an immoral one." — Tholuck re-

mind us of the fact, that the Jewish child was not subject to the law until his thirteenth year; but he accedes (and properly so) to the views of the elder expositors. Paul first perceived the deadly sting of the law when he was forbidden to lust. The child, as a child, has childish devices; 1 Cor. xiii.; but it can here come into consideration only so far as its religious and moral consciousness began to develop. But the status securitatis, which the Apostle here speaks, first begins where the innocent child's status securitatis ceases. It consists in the sinful life being taken, after the course of the world, as naturalness instead of unnaturalness. And this can also continue under the law, so long as the law is regarded as something external, and is referred to mere action. The Apostle first dates the true existence of the law for man from the understanding of the θνηόν shall not covet. As, therefore, Meyer has above given too Augustinian view of original sinfulness, so here constructs it too much on the opposite side.

In a historical reference, this text, according to Rom. v. 13, has especially in view the period from Adam to Moses. It has, therefore, even been said that Paul here speaks, in the name of his people, of the more innocent and pure life of the patriarchs and Israelites before the gift of the law (Grotius, Lachmann, Fritzsche, and others). Undoubtedly, that history, indeed, is included. But this psychological point of view predominates: the life of the individual up to the understanding of the Mosaic expression, θνηόν shall not covet. The law also points, by the ὡσιν ἐπιθύμην, beyond itself; as the sacrificial offering, &c.

Now I was alive. This means, according to May-
er, "Man, during the state of death (Τοινίνθ̯) of the principle of sin, was not yet subject to eternal death. Certainly he became subject to physical death by the sin of Adam." We have already re-

But when the commandment came [τοινίνθ̯ θνηόν ἐπιθύμην ἐσθιόν. The specific com-
mand, not the whole law. ὡσιν — e., was brought home to me. — At this point the older Lutheran and Calvinistic expositors refer a reference to the conviction of sin immediately preceding conversion. But the use of ἐπιθύμης is against this, as well as the drift of the whole passage. A writer, so loving in his repetition of the name of Christ, and in direct reference to the work of Christ, would not have left such a meaning obscure. Comp. Philippus on the psychological objections. — R.] When its inward character became known. This certainly has an his-
torial application to the gift of the Mosaic law (Reiche, Fritzschke), but a psychological application to the designated moments of introspection.

Sin sprang into life [ἡ ἀμαρτία ἀνίσχεσθαι]. The explanation of the ἀνίσχεσθαι, revised by Rückert, De Wette, and others. Tholuck: *The ἀνίσχεσθαι stands, as elsewhere in compound words, in the strengthened meaning of sursum; comp. ἀναβάτων in John ix. 11,* etc., is opposed by Meyer, in accordance with the elder expositors, and also by Bengel and Philippi. Bengel makes this explanation: 'sin of sin is not Adam, but intrasse in mundum. Certainly the ἀμαρτία became perfectly alive first in Adam as παράφαγον, and then as such πρώτο γεγονός, until the gift of the Mosaic law again brought it to life. But this is also repeated psychologically in the individual so far as the Adamic παράφαγον is psychologically reflected more or less strongly in his first offences; thus an individual ἀνισχεσθαι of the fall takes place, but then, until the awakening light of the law penetrates the conscience, a false state of nature enters, connected with an active sense of life. [Here, too, must be included both the knowledge of and excitement to sin.—R.].—Some Codd. read ἀναφέρω, because the expression ἀναβάτων did not occur in the classical Greek and in the Septuagint. Origen thought there was here a reminder of a pre-terrestrial fall. Cocceius: evidenter apparet.

And I died [χωρὶς ἀπάθειαν]. In the same sense as sin become alive, did the sinner die. That is, with the sense of conscious [and increasing] guilt, the sense of the penalty of death has made its appearance. Meyer makes an inadequate distinction here: *We must understand neither physical nor spiritual death (Seneler, Böhme, Rückert, and others), but eternal death, as the antithesis, ἐν ζωή, requires.* The sense of the penalty of death makes no distinction of this kind. [The aorist points to a definite occurrence. He entered into a certain spiritual state, which he calls death. Calvin: Moris postulcavi vita est hominis; sursum vita postcui mortem hominis.—R.]

Ver. 10. And the commandment, which was unto life, the same was found by me to be unto death [καὶ εὐφνοίαν ἡ ἐντολή ἡ τὰς ζωήν, ἀπὸ τῆς θανάτου. Kai introduces the verse as an epexegeesis of died, with the addition of a new circumstance (Stuart).—R. Supply οἴκος before unto life. In what sense was the commandment thus found? The commandment was certainly promised life to the one observing the law; Lev. xviii. 6; Deut. v. 38; Matt. xix. 17. It is, however, easily misunderstood when there is such a general explanation as this: *the promise of life was connected with the observance of the Mosaic commandments* (Meyer). The sense is rather from the beginning, that the kind of promise is conditional on the kind of observance. External obedience has also only an external promise, or a promise of what is external (Exod. xx. 12). But this is, for the pious, only the figure of a higher obedience and promise. The self-righteous man, on the other hand, made a snare for himself out of that promise. Now, in the highest sense, life according to the law of the Spirit—that is, in faith (which is the end of the law)—results in the ζωή αἰωνίων. Only the transition

* (It is more difficult than important to decide this point. ἀπόφεωσις, here; ἀπόφθεγμα, the same. The former, though not in itself so emphatic, here takes the preceding subject, this very commandment, giving it a tragic force (so Meyer and Philippi, whom Lange cites in favor of the other view). The analogy of verbs, 15, 16, 19, 20 (τροφή is against Lange's preference.—R.]

† [So Hodge: *The reference is not to the promised joys of sin, which always mock the sinner, but rather to the utter failure of the law to do what he expected from it.* This view consists with the assumption, that the point of experience, which had reached its eleventh and immediately preceding conversion. Dr. Hodge does not thus assume, yet he appeals to Christian experience in confirmation. If the experience to be set is set forth throughout the rest of the verses, the interpretation, adopted by Dr. Lange, is preferable. Comp., however, a beautiful setting forth of the first view in Neander, Pfaffenang., ii. 681 (quoted in Tholuck).—R.]

It is just the most intense effort to fulfill the law that results in death. This is a circumstance which seems to contradict the ζωή αἰωνίων, and yet it does not contradict it, but is quite in harmony with it.

The same. We hold that, according to the sense, we must read αἰτή (with Lechmann, De Wette, Philippi), and not αἰτῆς, with Meyer and Tischendorf [Alford, Tregelles]. For the law has only temporarily become transformed, as the same law of life, into a law of death; it has not permanently become changed into a law of death, the ζωή αἰωνίων.

Ver. 11. For sin, κ. ἡ γὰρ ἀμαρτία, οτάλι. The γὰρ introduces an explanation of ver. 10. The first words are similar to ver. 8, but ἀμαρτία here stands emphatically first. The position of διὰ τῆς ἐντολῆς is also slightly emphatic. —R. Not the commandment itself has become a commandment unto death; sin has rather made it thus. How far? Sin took occasion, or made itself an occasion. That it took it of the commandment, is assumed, and is explained in the following καὶ δὲ αἰτής, κ. εἰς τὸν καταδίκην με, deceived me. It first made the commandment a provocation, and then a means of condemnation. Thus what applies to Satan, that he was first man's tempter, and then his accuser, applies likewise to sin. This passage calls to mind the serpent in Paradise, as 2 Cor. xi. 6. But in what did the deception of sin consist? Philippi: *Since sin made me pervert the law, in which I thought that I had a guide to righteousness, into a means for the promotion of unrighteousness.* † Not clear. It deceived me, in that it represented the law to me as a limit which seemed to separate me from my happiness. Behind that limit it charmed me to transgression by a phantom of happiness. Accordingly, it is not satisfactory to explain the following clause: And by it slew me [καὶ δὲ αἰτής δὲ ἀντικείμενον, thus: sin gave me over to the law, so that it slew me. In this respect sin rather falsified the law, since it represented to me my well-merited death as irreparable, or my judge as my enemy (see Gen. iii.; Heb. ii. 15; 1 John iii. 20). [*Brought me into the state of sin and misery,* already referred to in ver. 10. The allusion to the temptation is to be admitted here also.—R. Tholuck: *Exposition of Simeon Ben Laichish: The wicked nature of man rises every day against him, and seeks to slay him (Vitringa, Obserr. Sacer., ii. 599); also by the γὰρ κατ’ ἀντικείμενον is denoted the angel of death.]

Ver. 12. So that the law is holy, κ. [ὅτε ἐνῷ νόμος ἀγάπη, κ. οτάλι. The ὅτε introduces the result of the whole discussion, vers.
7-11. It is not σεργο, yet of a more general conclusive character. To με, the corresponding δε is wanting. The antithesis we should expect, according to Meyer, is: but sin brought me to death through the law, which was good in itself. This is the thought of ver. 13; but as the form is changed, δε does not appear.—R.

Not only innocent (Tholuck), but also absolutely separated from, and opposed to, sin. And this applies not only to the law in general, but also to its explanation in the single commandment.

[And the commandment holy and just and good, και η ἄγαθος αἰγα καὶ δικαιος καὶ ἀγαθὸς. The commandment is first holy in its origin: God's commandment; secondly, just, as the individual determination of the law of the system of righteousness (Meyer: "rightly constituted, just as it should be"); and good—that is, not in the vague sense of excellent (Meyer, Philippi, and others), but according to the idea of what is good: beneficial promotion of life in itself, in spite of its working of death in me; indeed, even by its working of death. The term good refers to the blessed result as in sorrow, and to the gospel. The elaborate apology for the commandment is certainly (according to Meyer) occasioned by the fact that the ἄγαθος has been described as precisely the object of sin, in ver. 7.

SECOND PARAGRAPHER (ver. 13).

The Law in relation to the Sinner.

Ver. 13. Did then that which was good become death unto me? [Το ov ἄγαθον ἦν ἐνεργόν ἵνα δικαιώθη σάινατος: See Textual Note.]

Tholuck: "The μεν in ver. 12 prepared for the antithesis Ἰ ἐν δικαιοσύνῃ, κ.τ.λ. Yet the Apostle again presents his thoughts in the form of a refutation of an antagonistic consequence. The ἄγαθον should lead us to expect only wholesome fruits."

Undoubtedly, the expression ἄγαθος (ver. 12) is the new problem now to be solved. It was not so much to be wondered at that the commandment, as holy and just, brought death; but it was an enigma that it, as ἄγαθος, should bring forth death. The explanation of this enigma will also show how the law has brought about the great change: Through Death to Life! Was that which is good, of itself and immediately, made death unto me? This conclusion, again, is to be repelled by Λετ it not be μη γίνοσται. But sin [ἀλλά ἡ ἁμαρτία (supply ἤν ἐνεργόν ἵνα δικαιώθη σάινατος). So au modern commentators. —R.] Namely, that was made death unto me, "The construction of Luther, Heumann, Carpzov, δο, is totally wrong: ἀλλά ἡ ἁμαρτία διὰ τοῦ ἁγαθοῦ μοι κατηχηγομενήν (ἐν) ἰνακαθαρισθήσῃ σάινατος [καὶ] ἀγαθὴ ἁμαρτία" (Meyer); so also the Vulgate.

That it might appear sin [ἴνα φανῇ ἁμαρτία. Τὸ ἢνα τετελεῖ: φανῇ, be shown to be (Alford). This second ἁμαρτία is a predicate: anarchists, therefore, and also as denoting

character.—R.] This was therefore the most immediate design of the law: Sin should appear as sin (Eph. v. 13; Gen. iii.: Adam, where art thou?). [Working death to me, by that which is good, διὰ τοῦ ἁγαθοῦ μοι κατηχηγομενή ἰνακαθαρισθήσῃ σάινατος.] The idea of perfectly discarded sin is just this; that it works death by the misconstruction and abuse of what is good. Thus the law is first made to serve as a provocation to sin unto death; second, the gospel is a savor of death; and third, the truth is made a mighty anti-Christian lie (2 Thess. ii. 11). Tholuck: "The nature of sin should here be properly manifest, that it should appear as something which makes use of what is even good as a means of ruin, and in this manner the commandment should become a means of exhibiting sin in all the more hideous light." Scholium of Matthews: "ἴνα αἰτήσῃ ἐνεργή, ἱνα δὲ τῆς ἁμαρτίς παραίνει ἐκκαθαρισθήσῃ." In addition to this, these pertinent words: "In fact, as it is the sovereign right of good to overrule evil results for good, so it is the curse of man to pervert the effects of what is good to evil ends?"

Then the force rests on the διά τοῦ ἁγαθοῦ, for which reason it comes first.

Meyer correctly urges, against Reiche, that this ἵνα is telic, in opposition to the ecstatic view. Death was already present before the law, but sin completed it by the law: κατηχηγομενή. The law is not sin; sin disclosed itself completely as sin in making what is good a means of evil.

That through the commandment might become exceedingly sinful [ἴνα γίνηται καθ’ ὑπερβολὴν ἀναρτολος ἡ ἁμαρτία διὰ τῆς ἐνέργειας. Parallel clause to the last, of increased force: "Observe the plathy, sharp, vividly compressed sketch of the dark figure" (Meyer). —R.] Καθ’ ἐπερημομένην. Frequently used by Paul; 2 Cor. i. 8; iv. 17; Gal. i. 13. The ἀναρτολος appears to be an imitation that sin, as an imaginary man, should be driven from real human nature to destruction. [The telic force of these clauses is thus expanded by Dr. Hodge: "Such is the design of the law, as far as the salvation of sinners is concerned. It does not prescribe the conditions of salvation. Neither is the law the means of sanctification. It cannot make us holy. On the contrary, its operation is to excite and exasperate sin—to render its power more dreadful and destructive."—R.]

[EXCURSES ON BIBLICAL-Psychological Terms—

The exact significance of the terms σάρξ and πνεῦμα, as used so frequently by the Apostle in this and the eighth chapters, requires careful consideration at this point. But such a discussion must necessarily be preceded by some remarks on the words, σῶμα, ψυχή, πνεῦμα, body, soul, and spirit, as used by Paul in a strictly anthropological sense.

Σῶμα, Barr. This term is readily understood as generally used in the New Testament. Still it refers, strictly speaking, to the bodily organism, and has a psychological meaning almost "sense the sensational part of man's nature. As distinguished from σάρξ (in its physiological sense), it means the organism, of which σάρξ is the material substance. (Kopf) differs from σάρξ, in not including the idea of an organism.) That σῶμα must not be restricted to the material body, irrespective of its organism and vital union with the immaterial part of man's nature, is evident from the numerous
passages (Rom. xii. 5; 1 Cor. vii. 27; Eph. i. 28; Col. i. 18, &c.), where the Church is called the body of Christ. This expression would convey little meaning, if σῶμα had not this psychological sense. No difficulty arises in regard to this term, except in the interpretation of a few passages which seem to imply an ethical sense; e.g., Rom. vi. 6 (q. v.); vii. 24; viii. 10, 13; Col. ii. 11. It must be remarked that in most of these the ethical force really belongs to some attributive word, σῶμα being in itself indifferent. We may explain most of these cases by giving the word a figurative sense, the organism of sin (Rom. vi. 6; Col. vii. 11), analogous to the old man; or by admitting a reference to the body as the chief organ of the manifestation of sin. This term μέλη, members (which is usually associated with σῶμα, rather than with σῶμα, because the idea of an organism is more prominent in the former term), must be interpreted accordingly (see Col. iii. 5; Böse, p. 64, Amer. ed.). In any case, the thought that the body is the chief source and seat of sin, must be rejected as unscriptural, unpauline, and it must also avoid the sacrilegious and sensual understanding of the material and immaterial in man's nature.

II. Ψυχή, Soul. This term is from ψυχο-, to breathe, to blow, and, like ἵππος, its Hebrew equivalent, originally means animal life (See the New Testament usage, especially in the Gospels), but, like the Hebrew word, it is also frequently put for the whole immaterial part of man's nature, in distinction from σῶμα. By synecdoche, it is put for the whole man, in enumeration (Acts ii. 41: about three thousand souls), and in the phrase, σάκας ψυχῆς, every soul. As the word occurs but four times in the Epistle to the Thessalonians in the sense of life, and twice in the phrase, every soul—it would not be necessary to discuss it further, did not the precise meaning of πνεῦμα depend upon a further discrimination. Twice in the New Testament (1 Thess. v. 23; Heb. iv. 12) the word is distinguished from πνεῦμα. As both passages may be regarded as Pauline, the one occurring in his earliest written Epistle, and the other in an Epistle of much later date, which is Pauline, even if not written by Paul, the question of a Pauline use of ψυχή must be avoided. The fuller discussion will be found under πνεῦμα below, but here we must define ψυχή more closely. Although it is true that the term does mean the animal soul, it is very doubtful whether it means simply this in the two passages above referred to. If "animal soul" be restricted to the principle of life, then σῶμα, in such a connection, should include this; and a wish that the principle of life be preserved blameless is singular, to say the least. If, however, "animal soul" be taken to include more than this—viz., what we share with the brute—then it is highly probable that this largely includes the intellectual part of our nature, and ψυχή must then be the seat of the Understanding, in distinction from the Reason. That some wide sense is involved, is evident both from 1 Cor. xv. 46, "the first Adam was a living soul," and from 1 Cor. ii. 14, where the adjective ψυχικός undoubtedly includes the intellectual part of man's nature. In both cases the antithesis is πνευμικός in the ethical sense; hence the greater necessity for enlarging the idea of ψυχή.* Passing over many distinctions which have been made, we consider the view of Osiander, who makes ψυχή the centre of our personality, the battlefield of the flesh and human spirit. In this view, also, σατήρ and σῶμα are almost identical, though he admits that in the unreconciled man, the ψυχή is under the dominion of the σῶμα. It excludes the ψυχή from the ψυχή, making it the organ of anima, for the human spirit. This view still restricts ψυχή too much, even admitting the trichotomy.* It confuses psychological and ethical terms. It leans toward the error which makes the body the source of sin, while, on the other hand, it excludes the human spirit from the dominion of sin (and its organ, the ψυχή). It cannot be justified by Paul's language, and as with ψυχή, it denies the trichotomy imply the sinfulness of the human spirit, while it is altogether unpauline, as already remarked, to refer sin to the body as its source. The use of the word ψυχή, as quoted above, is equally opposed to this view, which probably grows out of the attempt to find in ψυχή and πνεῦμα terms analogous to the Understanding and Reason. We therefore object to this view, and claim a still wider sense for ψυχή. How much can be claimed for it, will appear from what follows.

III. Πνεῦμα, Spirit. This term, from πνεύμονα, to blow, to breathe, means (like the Hebrew נפש יסוי) breath, then wind, then anima, lastly animus, spirit, in all the various meanings we give it that word. It must first be discussed in its strictly psychological meaning.

A. Besides the secondary meaning, temper, disposition, it is used by most of the New Testament writers to denote man's immaterial nature, including, together with σῶμα (Rom. viii. 10; 1 Cor. vi. 20; vii. 34), and also with ψυχή (Acts vii. 51; Col. ii. 5), the whole man. In the phrase, "gave up the ghost," it is doubtful whether it means the whole immaterial nature, or simply life; in Luke xxiii. 46; Acts vii. 59, the former seems to be the meaning. But there are a number of passages where the exact signification turns on the previous question: Do the Scriptures assume or teach a trichotomy in human nature—that man is a unity made up of body, soul and spirit? It is essential to the proper understanding of chaps. vii. and viii., that this question be discussed.

1. First of all, it must be admitted as a fact that the Scriptures recognize the duellism of spirit and matter, and that man is both material and immaterial, without any tertium quid, which is neither material nor immaterial. The presumption, then, is against the trichotomy, so far as it would ignore this fact. The presumption is also against any view which classes soul under the material part of the complex nature, since both soul and spirit are used to indicate the whole immaterial part of man.

On the other hand, Plato and Aristotle undoubtedly immateriality of the soul, and makes a living body ante cedent thereto. Hegelianism regards the soul as only the body that connects body and spirit. * [Against so limited a view of ψυχή, see Thieluck, p. 320, who includes under it the ψυχή and the ἐνέργεια. Comp. Tweed, p. 304.]

edly held that there was a trichotomy (for their views, see Delitzsch, p. 93; Eng. ed. p. 213). This fact may be used to explain 1 Thess. v. 23 as popular language, but "we must needs turn to the Holy Scriptures, and accept without prejudice what it answers to us, be it Platonic or anti-Platonic." Some such view was held by Origen, by the Apollonarians and semi-Pelagians. All these, like the modern rationalistic notions on the subject, were extenuations of human corruption. Vain speculations on the subject are abundant, but this should not be to the prejudice of truth.†

Turning to 1 Thess. v. 23, we find a distinct assumption of a tripartite nature in man, all the more weighty because it is not in didactic form. To say that this is merely popular language, does not meet the case. For, while it may be said that Paul does not profess to teach metaphysics, the question then recurs: Was the popular language of that day correct, or that of another age? Besides, it is a hazardous method of dealing with a writer so uncommonly exact, and with a book which concerns itself with human salvation. Experience has proven how largely the diffusion and acceptance of biblical truth are dependent on correct anthropological views. If we believe that Paul chose his words with care, more, much more, if we hold them to be inspired, this text, taken by itself, assumes "that in the original structure of man there is something—yet remaining, needing and capable of sanctification—corresponding to the three terms, body, soul, and spirit." † The same is implied in Heb. iv. 12.

Leaving these passages, we find little else in the New Testament to support this view. Of course, when accepted, it must modify to some extent the signification given to these terms in other places; but there is no other passage in the New Testament which could be relied on to prove the trichotomy were these absent. Hence we infer that the distinction, if real, is not of such importance as has been thought, and cannot be made the basis of the startling propositions which human speculation has deduced from it. This does not deny that, from other sources, the trichotomy may receive important support; it refers simply to the passages it should take in biblical psychology. Judging from the rare allusions to it, the prevailing dichotomic tone of the Scriptures, we infer that, while it may be necessary, in order to explain these passages, to accept a trichotomy, the advantages of so doing are incidental, rather than of the first moment.‡

2. Admitting that there is a tripartite nature in man, the main difficulty is a precise definition of these three parts. Here the German authors are in a very Babel of confusion. For the sake of clearness, we first of all reject

(a) All views of the human spirit which make it the real soul over against a brute soul, termed ψυχή, for the reasons given above under II.
(b) All views of the human spirit which make it a higher unfallen part of man's nature, over

* (The anthropology of Swedenborg assumes a trinity rather than a trichotomy, and by his doctrine of correspondences, spirit seems to lose its real significance. R.)
† (It must be noted how this passage is used by (1), that the spirit needs sanctification; (2) that body and soul are also to be preserved for God; thus guarding against Pelagianism and rationalism on the one hand, and asceticism and tyrosinism on the other.—R.)
‡ (Any argument from the analogy of the Trinity must be left out of view, since it can mean nothing, though it may be pleasing to some minds to trace such an analogy.—N.)

against a soul under the power of the σώμα. This which is the view of Olshausen, and, with modifications, of many others, is not borne out by the anthroplogy of Scripture; is contradicted by the very passages which alone can establish a trichotomy, and is in the very face of 2 Cor. vii. 1, where "the fleshiness, χαράκτερον, defilement, stain, is attributed to the human spirit. Did such an unregenerate spirit, in any sense, exist in man, we might expect that term to be used in this chapter instead of ψυχή and οἵ ἐστιν ἄγνωστος, whatever the reference may be. Jul. Müller (i. p. 450) well remarks: "Πνεύμα in this anthropological sense is itself exposed to pollution (2 Cor. vii. 1), and needs sanctification and cleansing just as ψυχή and σῶμα (1 Thess. v. 23; 1 Cor. v. 5); this spiritual sphere of life is the one which, in the work of regeneration, most needs to be renewed ( Eph. iv. 23, compared with Rom. xii. 2). The notion that man's spirit cannot be depraved—that it is only limited in its activity from without—and that sin is the consequence of this limitation, cannot be attributed to the Apostle." This excludes, also, the view of Schöberlein and Hofmann (since given up by him), that the third term of the trichotomy is "the Spirit of God immanent in the soul." (c) But it would also exclude the view of Philipp, Schmid (apparently of Tholuck, Romans, p. 301), that the third term is the pneumatic nature imparted to the believer at regeneration. If it be this, how can it need sanctification? Besides, this involves the theory of regeneration, which makes the impartation of an entirely new nature, not in soul and body, but in addition to soul and body, as the third term in one complex being. This view cannot satisfactorily explain the trichotomy in 1 Thess. v. 23; Heb. iv. 12.

(d.) There remains, then, this view, which meets all the requirements of exegesis: that man has a body in vital connection with his soul, which latter term includes all the powers of mind and heart, having as their object the world and self (hence including νοῦς and ὁ ἔστιν ἄγνωστος, in this chapter). That, besides, he has, in his unity of nature, a spirit which is of the same nature as the soul, of a greater capacity, yet not separated or separable from it. This is the capacity for God, God-consciousness (Heard); but in man's present condition it is dormant, virtually dead in its depravity, needing the power of the Holy Spirit to renew it. After such renewal it becomes spirit in the sense intended in the proposition: "that which is born of the Spirit is spirit" (John iii. 6). This seems to be, in substance, the view of Müller, Delitzsch, and Heard. It admits a dichotomy, and also a trichotomy; claims that the soul is spiritual rather than material; that there is no gulf between soul and spirit; that the human spirit is powerless for good, yet that here, where depravity is really most terrible, redemption begins. "In consequence of sin, the human spirit is absorbed into soul and
flésh, and man, who ought to pass over from the position of the ψυγή ἐβαθοσ into the position of the πνεύμα ζωοσ, has become, instead of πνευματικός, a being ψυγής and σαφικός; and further, just for that reason, because the spirit stands in immediate causal relation to God, all the Divine operations having redemption in view, address themselves first of all to the πνεύμα and hence first attain to the ψυγή; for when God manifests himself, He appeals to the spirit of man" (Bibl. Psych., p. 96, Eng. ed., p. 117). It may be urged that this presents no real distinction; I reply, that it is not claimed that the distinction is of essential importance. But as Paul uses the word πνεύμα in preference to ψυγή, when he speaks of man's immaterial nature, especially as regenerated by the Spirit of God, there seems to be no other way of accounting for it except on this view. (The objections to that of Philippi have been considered above.) Delitzsch very properly remarks: "Should any prefer to say, that the Apostle, by πνεύμα and ψυγή, is distinguishing the internal condition of man's life, and especially of the Christian's life, in respect of two several relations, even this would not be false." It is, indeed, the nearest expression of the truth; for the human spirit is not brought into any special prominence by Paul, save as in a given relation in the Christian's life. Hence we have a second meaning of πνεύμα.

B. The human spirit as acted upon by the Holy Spirit, and thus becoming the seat of those Divine impulses, which are the means of redeeming the whole man. Of course, as opinions differ respecting the first meaning, they will vary from our definition. Philippi makes this identical with A, while others would claim that we should distinguish here rather a new principle of life (Lange), than a part of our renewed nature. Dr. Lange seems to prefer this meaning throughout chap. viii. There, however, the reference seems to be mainly to the Holy Spirit, the objective agent. In vers. 10, 16, the subjective meaning is implied by the correct one, as in John ii. 6; iv. 23, 24 (so Rom. ii. 29, see p. 115, where Dr. Lange gives a different view), 1 Cor. vi. 17; Phil. iii. 3. In many other passages this meaning is implied, as indeed it is even in 1 Thess. v. 23, though this cannot be explained satisfactorily, without presupposing a human spirit antecedent to regeneration.

C. The most common use of the term is obviously the strictly theological one: the Holy Spirit. Opinions vary as to the propriety of this meaning in certain passages. No definite rule can be laid down. The absence of the article is by no means a certain indication that the reference is subjective (against Harless). The reason for preferring this meaning, rather than "spiritual life-principle" (Lange), in chap. viii., is that, in vers. 2, the Holy Spirit is undoubtedly referred to, over against sin and death. When, then, σάρξ afterwards occurs as the antithesis to πνεύμα, there is still more reason for taking the latter term as the Holy Spirit, since the σάρξ is, as it were, personified and externalized, and the correct antithetical term must be an objective agent. We can thus far more definitely fix the meaning of σάρξ, since to admit any such antithesis, we are virtually forced to admit also some remnant of unfallen nature in the subject, for which the use of the word πνεύμα in the New Testament gives no ground whatever.

IV. Σάρξ, Flesh. This term is used by the LXX. to translate the Hebrew word תָּאוּר. This Hebrew word, in its simplest meaning, is applied to the material substance of the body, then occasionally to the human body itself. Out of this grows the application to all terrestrial beings who possess sensual life. But a more frequent use is in the sense of human nature, with the personal life attached to it (Gen. vi. 12; Deut. v. 26; Ps. lxxviii. 39, exilv. 21; Isa. xlix. 26; lxvi. 16, 28, 24, and in numerous other passages). In Deut. v. 26; Isa. xxii. 3; Jer. xvii. 5; Ps. lii. 5, human nature is contrasted with God, His Spirit, eternity, and omnipotence, and the more prominent thought is therefore "that of the weakness, the frailty, the transitoriness of all earthly existence" (J. Müller). We reach, then, this sense: "Man with the adjunct notion of frailty" (Tholuck). There does not appear, however, any distinct ethical sense, still less any implication that man's sensual nature is the seat of sin, or of opposition to his spirit.

1. Passing to the New Testament, we find also the narrower physiological meaning (1 Cor. xv. 39; Eph. v. 29; in the phrase, "flesh and blood," Matt. xvi. 17; 1 Cor. xv. 50; Gal. i. 16; Eph. vi. 12). It is also used as = body, the sensational part of man's nature, in Rom. i. 18; 1 Cor. v. 5; vii. 29; 2 Cor. iv. 11; vil. i. 5; xii. 7, &c., the antithesis being spirit, or the immaterial part of man's nature, never, however, with a distinctly ethical import. The prevailing use of the word in the New Testament undoubtedly is, that which corresponds with the wider meaning of ψυγή, human nature, sometimes, as Müller holds, with a reference to the earthly life and relations (Gal. ii. 20; 2 Cor. x. 3; Phil. ii. 22, 24; Col. i. 22; Eph. ii. 15, and a number of other passages, where the whole earthly side of man's life are contrasted with his relation to God in Christ); but also in the sense of man, with the idea of frailty more or less apparent (Rom. iii. 29; 1 Cor. i. 29; Gal. ii. 16; Acts ii. 17, which is a citation of תָּאוּר in this sense; John xvii. 2; Luke iii. 6). Here we must class those passages which refer to the human nature of Christ (John i. 14; Rom. i. 3; iv. 5 = 1 Tim. iii. 16; 1 John iv. 2 (comp. p. 61). This list might be enlarged, but it is only necessary to establish the New Testament use of σάρξ in the wide sense of the Hebrew equivalent. Up to this point we find no distinct ethical meaning—only a basis for it.

2. The ethical sense. Our inquiry here is of a twofold nature. A. How much is included under the term? B. What is its precise significance?

A. How much is included under this term? (1) If we choose a few passages where the ethical sense is admitted by all commentators, such as Rom. iii. 4, or vii. 14 (σαρκος); viii. 8, and attempt to substitute "body," or "sensational nature," for σάρξ, it will be evident that such a meaning does not at all meet the case. It is not only contrary to the scriptural anthropology throughout, but in the passages themselves the antitheses are not of a character to justify it, especially in view of the wide meaning of σάρξ already established. (2) Nor can we limit it to the body and soul, and exclude the human spirit. It has already been shown how little prominence is given to this distinction in the New Testament, how

* [In Rom. viii. 3, where the term occurs three times, it is highly probable that in the last two cases this sense is the more correct one.—R.]
there is no evidence whatever that the spirit is not under the dominion of the sacerdotal tenet, but, that, on the contrary, an immoral tendency is implied.* Nor will this view find support in the use of the adjective πυρικός in an ethical sense as = σατανικός; for in the only case where such an interpretation is undoubted (1 Cor. ii. 2), it is applied to spiritual things and persons as proceeding from, or influenced by, the Holy Ghost, but also "the things of the Spirit of God." (3.) Whatever ethical sense is to be attributed to the word σατανικός, must include the whole man, body and soul, or body, soul, and spirit. This agrees with the spiritual delineations of human nature, the use of the word above referred to, and its usual antithesis, when the ethical meaning is intended, viz., the Spirit of God; never the human spirit irrespective of the influence of the Spirit of God. This antithesis is not always expressed, but it is invariably implied. (Comp. Rom. vii. 5; viii. 3, 4 f.; Gal. iii. 8; v. 16, 17, 19, 24; vi. 8; Col. i. 18, 23.) If it be claimed that, in Rom. vii. 18, 23, the expressed antithesis is, in the former case, the inward man (ver. 22), then we reply, that the real antithesis is stated in ver. 14: "spiritual," "human," and that, under the influence of this spiritual law, any antithesis to the σατανικός has been awakened. Of course, if the reference to the regenerate be admitted, this objection disappears. So in ver. 25, although νοῦς is the expressed antithesis, it is the νοῦς under the influence either of the Holy Spirit, or the spiritual law. 2 Cor. iii, to its ethical sense, therefore, means, not merely an earthly or fleshly tendency, or direction of life, but the whole human nature; not, as Oehler thinks, so far as God is separated from God, but as it is separated from God, body, soul, and spirit, as sinful. Being in the flesh, is being in an ungodly state, a state of sin. (This view has obtained from the times of Augustine until now, among the mass of theologians.)

B. What, then, is the precise significance of this ethical sense of σατανικός?

If its antithesis indicates what the Scripture demands of us, so strongly asserts, that human nature, thus described, has become alienated from God. As love to God is the only true moral impulse, apostasy from God is sin, and the natural carnal condition, is thus to be regarded. The Decalogue, Rom. i. 5, are sufficient to support this position. In the law, holy, just, and good, love to God is the chief requirement; in Rom. i. 21, wilful rejection of God is described as the seed of all the vices, subsequently catalogued, ending in the most fearful sensual excesses; in Rom. v. 12-21, sin is described as entering through one man, through his act of disobedience, and this is the immediate cause of the carnal condition of humanity. Yet this does not exhaust the meaning; it is rather its negative expression.

2. The positive principle of sin and the ruling principle of the flesh is undoubtedly selfishness, for, God being rejected, some personal object is required by the human personality. It is found in self; its interests become paramount. This is not, however, very prominent in the ethical term under consideration, but must be assumed in order to reach the further idea which it involves.

* [Comp. Delitzsch, Bib. Psych., pp. 371 ff., Eng. ed., pp. 410 ff., against the view of Günther, that there is a fleshly soul in distinction from the spiritual soul.—B.]

3. The human nature, thus alienated from God, with selfishness as its ruling principle, must, however, seek gratification. There is but one resource, the creature. As σατανικός means man in his entire earthly relations, which are relations to the creature, its usual antithesis must include devotion to the creature, if the use of the term is to be fully justified. This, then, implies slavery to the creature in the search for self-gratification. Carnality, then, is as truly the moral state of one absorbed in intellectual and aesthetic pursuits, as of one sunk in sensualit.

As services and sensual are cognate terms, so we find, not only in the teachings of the Scripture, but in the history of humanity, that the development of selfish devotion to the creature is in the direction of sensuality (fleshly sins, in a narrower sense). "Without God," has, as its positive expression, "in the world" (Eph. ii. 12). And the very want of satisfaction in worldly things leads to ever fiercer longing after the creature, to sin in its lowest forms. Sinking God in the material, or natural world, over which He rules, is, in effect, sucking man into the deepest slavery to the creature. To be "in the flesh," is therefore to be under the law of sin and death. Sin is not, in its essence, devotion to the sensuous, nor is carnality essentially sensuality, but toward these as their manifestations they inevitably tend. We thus guard against both asceticism and materialism.

Flesh is, then, the whole nature of man, turned away from God, in the supreme interest of self devoted to the creature. It is obvious that this is biblical, in linking together godliness and morality, ungodliness and sin, in implying both the inability of the law, and the necessity of the renewing influence of the Holy Spirit, in order to human holiness. Hence the propriety of the choice of this term to express man's sinful nature in this part of the Epistle, where sanctification and glorification are the themes.

On σατανικός, see J. Müller, Christliche Lehre von der Sünde, especially pp. 454 ff.; Dultzsch, Bib. Psychol., pp. 975 ff.; Tischl, Römervversible, pp. 288 ff.; Wiedeler, Galaterbriefes, pp. 443 ff. (a very clear discussion); Lange's commentary on Galatians, p. 142, Amer. ed. This list might be increased by referring to works on Doctrinal Theology and Ethics, but it is limited to discussions of an exegetical character.—R.]

**Third Paragraph, ver 14-28.**

**The Sinner in relation to the Law.**

Ver. 14. For we know. Οὐδεὶς μὲν, not οὐδὲ μὲν (Jerome, ec.). [The former reading is almost universally adopted.] Dr. Hedge, who inclined to the latter in earlier editions, now rejects it, on the ground that there is no δὲ to correspond with μὲν. The singular would imply that the subject was aware of the spiritual nature of the law at the time of the conflict; hence it would favor the reference to the regenerate. The plural, we know, simply means that Christians recognize this.—R.

That the law is spiritual. [Τὸν δέ τό νομὸν πνευματικὸς ἐστὶ.] It is the specific knowledge peculiar to Christians that religion is inward, that law is not, in the more strictly spiritual sense, is contrary to us, when it is changed by the σατανικός of external feeling into a σατανικός of external precepts—a complication of finite objects, while its nature is of a spiritual character;
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that is, revealing in every tithe the infinity of God's Spirit, and relating to the Spirit. The γὰρ declares the stiff-necked and malignant nature of sin. In the law is ἡ ἁμαρτία only in form; its nature is divine and spiritual (Meyer). Explanations:

1. Inspired by the Holy Spirit (Theodoret).
2. Requiring a heavenly and angelic righteousness (Calvin).
3. Relating to the higher spiritual nature of man in different applications, by Beza, Reiche, De Wette, and Rücker.
4. In suo genere proclaram et egregium (Koppe, and others).
5. The spiritual, and not the literal sense of the law, is meant (Origen).
6. Operating spiritually, ἀδάκωλος ἀρετῆς, &c. (Chrysostom).
7. Presupposing the presence of the Spirit as the condition of its fulfillment (Tholuck).
8. Identical in its spirit with that of the Holy Spirit (Meyer). Περί πολυ άνίδανος describes its whole spirituality (James ii. 10), the absolute unity of its origin, its elements, and its purpose in the Divine Spirit (which reveals itself in the human spirit), in contrast with the presupposition of its finite force, its finite and tender parts of membership, and its finite design. [The view of Meyer is the simplest and best: in its nature it is divine. (So Hodge.) This undoubtedly accords best with the antithesis, σάρκις, made of flesh.—R.]

But I am carnal [ἐγὼ δὲ σάρκις ἐμ]. See Textual Notes; and below.] The ἐγώ, in accordance with the λόγος, mentioned above, is Paul himself, in the exhibition of his standpoint under the law, for the exhibition of the historical development of man standing under the law. Meyer: "The still undelivered ἐγώ, which, in the great need that presses upon it in opposition to the law, groans for deliverance;" ver. 24. The same writer properly maintains, against Philippi, that the subject is identical through the entire section. On the other hand, Meyer, properly distinguishes the past tenses of vers. 7-13, and the present tenses of vers. 14 ff., by saying that, in the former case, Paul has described his psychological history before and under the law, and in the latter, that he portrays his nature standing in opposition to the spiritual character of the law. But down to ver. 18 he has rather portrayed the genesis of the really internal and legal standpoint: But after ver. 14, he describes the whole development of this standpoint; that is, the inward conflict of the sinner who has perceived the inward character of the law.

Carnal (fleischern). Σάρκις, made of flesh, like flesh (2 Cor. iii. 3; 1 Cor. iii. 1). The word could also be translated fleshly, if this were not a conventional term for carnally minded, σαρκίς. Meyer thinks that σαρκίς "gives a deeper shade" than σαρκίς, with reference to John iii. 6; but the case is about the reverse, since we must understand by σαρκίς, carnally minded, and by σαρκίς, carnally formed, inclined, and disposed; a being whose natural spontaneity and view of things are external, according to the σαρκίς. (On the opposition of the readings, comp. Tholuck, p. 365.)

* (The Greek adjective ending in -ίς (with the accent on the antepenult) describes the material out of which any thing is made. The English, earl, hard, and so forth. Σάρκις is therefore carnitas, made of flesh; σαρκικός, carnalis, fleshly, of this character. Adopting the former reading, three modes of view present themselves: (1.)

The σάρκις is immediately afterwards explained as:

- Sold under sin [πνεύματι εἰσόδου τοῦ τῆς ἁμαρτίας]. On the one hand, this state of slavery declares the complete subjection of the sinner to sin; but, on the other, it reveals his unwillingness and opposition to his being sold. This will probably be the case, if, with Tholuck and Meyer, we regard the σάρκις merely as a higher degree of σαρκίς. Therefore Tholuck regards Bengel's expression as too refining: Servus venditus maiorier est quam verna, et venditus decet homo, quia ab initio non fuerat servus. Meyer correctly observes, that this opinion is in conflict with Augustine's explanation of the passage, as referring to the regenerate. Similar passages, 2 Kings xvii. 17; 1 Mac. i. 15. Revelation of the obscuration of perception (vers. 15, 16).

Ver. 15. For that which I perform I know not [δὲ γὰρ κατέχομαι αὐτὸν γινώσκω]. There is wanting in this condition the authority of the conscious spirit; but the consciousness of this duty has made it his desire, and Meyer calls up the analogy of the slave, who acts as the instrument of his master, without knowing the real nature and design of what he does. But this slave here is not altogether in such a condition, for he knows at least that he cannot effect (πιάσω) what he will, or would like, and that he rather does (ποιώ) what he hates. Thus one thing dawns upon him—that he acts in gloomy self-distraction, and in contradiction of a better, but this slave derives it from the sense of the passage is removed, if, with Augustin, Beza, Grotius, and others, we explain γινώσκω to be ιπρακοηγοτα (Appeal to Matt. vii. 23; John x. 14; 2 Tim. ii. 19, and elsewhere.) Here, moreover, the emphasis does not yet rest on the δέλτοι (which Tholuck applies to a mere velleitas, and Meyer to a real and decided wish, but which, after all, remains only theory!) and μετανοεῖν, but on the αὐτογνωσία. [For δέλτοι is the word of the preceding clause, there seems to be an advance here, a step toward the light of self-knowledge.—The meaning of δέλτοι is open to discussion. It means, I will (within the sphere of spontaneity, Dr. Hitchcock claims). The two questions to be decided are:

That the Apostle has here purposely chosen the stronger word (so Meyer), and thus a reference to the regenerate, spiritual man is necessarily excluded. (2.) That here, σαρκίς is αὐτογνωσία. (So Lange.) This is also adopted by those who insist on the interest of the reference to the believer. (3.) Delitzsch even finds the former the weaker word: "σαρκίς is one who has in himself the bodily nature and the taint; but in the interest with the context," the immediate context has to be so limited in the same way to make this applicable, especially to a regenerate person.—R.
(1.) Has it here a reference to the will in the strict sense (either = volitatos, Tholuck, and others, or = a full determination of the will, Philippi); or does it mean, I desire, wish? The former is, perhaps, favored by the psychological character of the whole passage; but the latter is preferable, since μετὰ is so opposed, that both words must be referred to the same faculty; and it is easier to class θέλον within the region of the emotions, than to transfer μετὰ to that of the will. (2.) How intense is its meaning? Here μετὰ is undoubtedly in itself a stronger word. Perhaps the use of two different verbs (προῆκτε, ποιεῖ) in the main clauses would justify a difference of intensity in the antithetical verbs θέλω, μετὰ (i.e., the desire for good is less strong than the hatred of evil); or μετὰ may be taken as ὅπως θέλω (I do not wish). Ver. 16 strongly favors the latter. Either of these views is preferable to that which strengthens the antithesis into I love, I hate (Hodge). For this forces a meaning upon θέλον which the Apostle could have expressed far more plainly by another term.—R.

The wish here is the better desire and effort of the man awakened to his inward state. First of all, the sinner becomes a gloomy enigma to himself in the contradictions of his doing and leaving undone. (Stuart on the other hand of the explanation of Reich, that the sinful Jew does the wickedness which the sinless Jew does not approve of. Also on statements kindred to the foregoing, in Epictetus: ὃς μὲν θέλει (ὁ ἄρρητος) ὃ ποιεῖ, καὶ ὃ μὴ θέλει, ποιεῖ; and in Ovid: Vide meliora proboque, deteriora negamus. Still other examples in Tholuck, p. 386.) On Philippi's interpretation of this passage as applicable to the regenerate, see Tholuck, p. 356. The choice of the expressions is very delicate; from the real θέλει in spirit he does not come to the consistent and vigorous πράσινες; but even the μετὰ cannot prevent a weaker ποιεῖ of the rebellious one.

Ver. 16. But if what I wish not, that I do [τι δὲ οὐ θέλει, τούτο ποιεῖ. Αἱ is perhaps logical, and marks a step in self-discovery with respect to the law.—R.] The mental consent to sin is here brought about by a particular discussion between willing and doing. As the sinner judged himself, with his judgment, on the side of his awakened will, he places himself, with his judgment, on the side of the law.

[I agree with the law that it is good, σύνισκουσα δὲ τῷ νόμῳ ὅτι καλὸς. The verb may not here imply more than an intellectual acquaintance in the high moral character of the law, yet that acquaintance extends as far as the θέλει. That this must be actual in the case of an awakened man, is evident. How, else, could the sense of sin arise?—R.] This is the first step on the way of self-knowledge: Acquaintance in the law in opposition to his own actions. But at the same time, the law is acknowledged to be good in an eminent sense, as noble, standing ideally above the life—καλὸς. Meyer: "The usual construction, I grant that the law is good, neglects the σύνισκον. Against the reference of the τῶν νόμων to συν, see Tholuck; see him also for quotations from Chrysostom and Hugo St. Victor on the innate nobility of the soul.

The illumination of the darkness of the will (vora. 17, 18). Ver. 17. Now then it is no longer I that perform it [ἐννει δὲ οὐκέτα πληρεῖς τῷ φασματίζομαι αἰτίο. Νομίμοις is logical, not temporal (so all modern commentators). If temporal, then it might mark the transition into a state of grace. The same is true of οὐκέτα. See Winer, p. 574. "Since I consent to the law, that it is good, it can no longer be affirmed that I," etc. (Meyer).—R.] Tholuck: "Nou Aug. non in statu gratie—rath-er a designation of the infusion." But it denotes not merely a continued movement in the treatment, but also in the subject discussed. The understanding has first entered upon the side of the law; now this is done also by the real will of the ego. The sinner distinguishes between his ego—which now emerges from the darkness of the personality—and the sin [the principle of sin personified] dwelling in him—now viewed as a foreign and wicked co-habitant. He places himself, with his ego and his will, on the side of the law, and abjures the bad part of his condition. The έγὼ, as well as the καταγράμμα, must be emphasized. The αἰτίο is that which he, according to ver. 16, now no more wills with his real will. [As yet, however, there is no indication that this state of things does or can lead to "what is good," save in powerless desire, even if, with Meyer, we take the ego here as = the moral self-consciousness. Ver. 18 acknowledges this.—R.] But sin dwelling in me [ἀλλὰ ὁ λόγος ἐν ἐμοὶ ἀμαρτίᾳ]. The Apostle distinguishes between the έγὼ and an individuality in a wider sense, described by in me, in which sin dwells. [Stuart takes in me as referring, not to the wider individuality, but to the carnal self, which here begins to appear over against the better self. It may be doubted whether there is such a better self as is referred to in the first clause of this verse, in the unregenerate man. But all men under the law feel such a discord as this.—As the attributing of the doing to indwelling sin by the Christian is not a denial of responsibility, so, in the case of one not yet a Christian, it is not the assumption of a power to do right. There is no sign of release as yet. Even if we limit in me to the narrower sense it has in ver. 18, the whole personality seems to be under the power of sin.—Wordsworth finds here, and in the succeeding verses, a vindication of God from the charge of being the author of sin!—R.]

Ver. 18. For I know that in me, that is, in my flesh, good doth not dwell [οὐδὲ γὰρ ὁ οὐκ ἐστιν ἐν ἐμοὶ, τοῖς ἁμαρτίαις ἐν τῷ σώματί μου, ἁμαρτών. For I know, is regarded by Philippi as an expression of Christian consciousness; yet some such consciousness is the very result which the law is designed to produce.—R.] More properly a definition of the dwelling of sin in him. This arises from the preceding verse, that good does not dwell in him—that is, in his flesh. The negative expression is noteworthy: If in a moral being no good dwells, the opposite (sin) does dwell in him. The οὐκ ἐστιν is here established as the other side of the ego, which, with this, constitutes the whole man. But we cannot identify the οὐκ ἐστιν, either with the
body, or with the lusts of the body alone (the Greek father). Tholuck cites, in favor of this view, the different expressions, "body of death," ver. 24. But these terms must not be understood materially. The σαρκίς is the external, finite nature and mode of relation and view; it is the finite tendency in both its immaterial and sensuous character, which certainly has its substantial basis in the external σαρκίς. Calvin interprets σαρκίς here as human nature. It would be better to say: in my naturalness.

See, on σαρκίς, the Excursus above. The word may have been used in the physiological sense (Wieseler). But this seems strangely out of place. It is assumed to escape the difficulty that arises, if the reference to the unregenerate be held. In the case of a Christian, the limitation is made, because he has a spiritual nature, over against his carnal nature, in which good does dwell. But since σαρκίς, in the ethical sense, includes the whole natural man, why should any limitation be made, if the reference be to the unregenerate? The grave objection must be admitted, but it need not be raised. I refer to the unregenerate man, why this studious avoidance of mentioning the πνεῦμα? and why such a powerlessness as is expressed in the next clause? The only satisfactory explanation is, that the distinction between unregenerate and regenerate is not in question, but the man of the law is here represented as conscious of being σαρκίνως, made so more fully by the conflict which the law has awakened. The immediate antithesis (which is not strongly marked here) is simply the better desire, the ego longing to be better, powerless, however, in every case, until escaping from the law to Christ; yet this implies, as the real ethical antithesis, the spiritual law here acting on the man.—R. The Apostle's declaration is far removed from the Flavian, Gnostic, and Manichean definitions. He could not have sought a real "moral willing and doing" (Meyer) as "good" in his "flesh," but only religious morality and excellence. But he does not even find this in it; and hence there arises this contrary propensity, a pseudo-physical will of the flesh.

For to will is present with me [τοῦ γὰρ θέλειν παράκειται μοι]. Not, "is present in me," as Meyer says, who defends himself when he also says: Paul represents the matter as if he were looking about after it in his personality—as if seeking himself in a spacious sphere. The θέλειν is present with him—before his gaze. To will is immediately before his eyes, but he can nowhere find the treasure of performing that which is good.

To perform that which is good I find not, τὸ δὲ κατεργάζεσθαι τὸ καλὸν οἶχοι eὐφεσόν. See Textual Note 1. If the brasher reader he accepted, παράκειται must be supplied. The meaning is then obvious.—R. Explanation: I do not gain it; I can not, &c. (Estius, Flatt, &c.). We must first emphasize the κατεργάζεσθαι σάρκα, and secondly, the καλὸν. The question is not concerning the justitia civilis, but the carrying out of the ideal. The évω is not yet the new man of the spirit (Philippi); it is the better self as an awakened moral will, from which the aim is removed and the way stopped up by the accustomed propensity of the flesh.

The revelation of the obscurity and dispersion in the unconscious ground of life—that is, in the life of feeling (ver. 19, 20). According to Tholuck and Meyer, we have in these verses only proofs of the preceding. Meyer: Ver. 19 is a proof of ver. 18, and ver. 20 of ver. 17. (Stuart: If what I have said in vers. 18 and 19 be true, then what I have affirmed in ver. 17 must be true.)—R.

Ver. 19. [For the good, &c.] I ἐὰν is confirmatory. "If I find not," is proved by acts which are not according to the better desire. Dr. Hodge presses the meaning of θέλειν. That Paul, as a Christian, would mean more by these words than Seneque or Epictetus, is undoubtedly true; but whether he does mean more than is true in every case, to a certain extent, of a man awakened under the law, is very doubtful.—R. But the evil which I wish not, that I practise, ὁ δὲ θέλειν καθάρον, τὸντο πράσσον. This strong expression is new. It points to a fountain of wicked action which proceeds immediately from the unconscious life in opposition. And this is the darkness of the sensuous (the carnal) life.

Ver. 20. [Now if I do that I would not, τι ἔσω συνεφεσάν, περιτοντο ποιεῖ. Εἰ δὲ τὸντι συνεφεσάν, περιτοντο ποιεῖ. It is not, only in form. On ἐσω, see Textual Note 2. There is here a real powerlessness in thought. Alford thinks the ἐσω is here perceived to be the better ego of the inward man; but this progress is perceptible in the case of the awakened, only, however, to produce the cry of ver. 24.—R.] This verse, then, specifies also the real author of these actions of the man against his will: it is sin dwelling in me [ἡ ἁλοπία ἐν τῷ ἔσω ἁμαρτίᾳ], the habitual life of sense [κ. α. κ. of the flesh]. This, in his obscurity, he now recognizes in his consciousness; in his ἔσω. But now, to a certain degree or apparently, a foreign personality with a foreign law arises in him, against the awakening personality of his inner man. [The condition is not in itself, as yet, more hopeful. The progress is still toward wretchedness, despite or even because of the better desire.—R.]

Disclosure of the inward rent in man in general; the dissension between the true personality and the false personality with its false law (vers. 21, 22).

Ver. 21. I find then the law [ἡ ἁλοπία ἐσω ἀτέρος τὸν τόν νόμον]. The difficulty of the passage has led Chrysostom to call it ἀσέβεια τῆς ἐθνικῆς, and Rückert to give up its explanation. Explanations: a. The Mosaic law is meant; ἐσω for because. "I find then, the law for me, so far as I am willing to do good, because evil is present with me." That is, the law is designed for me, because I have the will to do good, but evil, &c. (origen, Chrysostom, Theodore of Mopsuestia, Theophy- luct, Bengel, &c.; Meyer; &c. and even Ufisal. See Tholuck's Note, p. 387: Invenio nunc legem, volenti nīhi bonum factum, nam nihi odes malum). We may say, in favor of this, that it certainly describes also the origin of the law; that contradiction has made the law necessary.

Still, this exposition is thoroughly untenable.

1. Since the beginning—that is, from ver. 7—

* [Meyer (4th ed.) holds that the article requires me to understand the Mosaic law, but his view of the construction is as follows: the law is joined with the participle, the infinitive is the infinitive of design, and the last clause introduced by a is the object of ἔσω. "I find then, while my will is directed to the law in order to do good, that evil is present with me." As he well adds, a careful misapplication of the same noun must mean must mean the Mosaic law. See, however, his full grammatical justification.—R.]
the speaker has known that the law is appointed for him.

2. Here the question is no more concerning the law for the sinner, but the relation of the sinner to the law; the explanation is thus totally against the connection.

3. The explanation, now I have discovered the law to be a law for me, would be strange.

4. The law is previously for him also, whose willingness to do what is good has not yet developed, while the legal stage for the condition here described soon terminates. Hofmann's modification does not meet the matter. Thus evil is present with me, shows me that the law is good to me, who am willing to do it. He has already said this more plainly in ver. 12. But, strictly, it is not yet decided here that the law is also good to him. Another view of the Mosaic law: I find, then, for me, who am willing to do the law, the good (namely, the law) may evil be present before me (Homberg, Knapp, Klec, Olshausen, * Fritzche, &c.). Unimportant repetition of the slighting. Likewise the ποιεῖν τὸ καλὸν must not be separated.

b. "The law denotes here a general rule, a necessity." I find, then, for me, who am willing to do good—the law—that evil is present with me (Luther, Beza, Calvin, and many others; De Wette and Philippi [Stuart, Hodge]). Thus the sense would be the same as in the expression, ἡγεῖσαι τόμος ἐν τῷ μὴλίσσ. Meyer remarks, on the other hand, that, according to the whole context, ὑμᾶς can be nothing else than the Mosaic law. Another law appears first in ver. 23. Also, the ὡς ἐν τῷ κακῶν παράδειγμα could not be described as ὑμᾶς: It is something empirical—a phenomenon. But why, then, can the Apostle call even the motions in the members a law? Why can he call the old man, who is nevertheless not a man, a man?

Accepting this view in general, we may ask whether the sense is: I find in me, or, for me, willing to do good—the law, &c.—as formerly; or, I find the law, that, when I would do good, &c. (Grotius, Limborch, Winer). This construction is decidedly preferable, because it suits the expression as well as the sense. For here the one law resolves itself even into a group of laws. The law of God now becomes to the Apostle the law of his mind; the inner man, the members becomes in its effect the law of sin. But this antithesis of the law to law is so fearfully strong, that it appears to the Apostle himself as in itself a law of moral contradiction; and this a terribly strong contradiction, for, just when he would do what is good, and high, and great (for example, protect the Old Testament theocracy), evil is present to him (persecution of the Christians).

Therefore the one law is resolved into two

This view involves a slight transgression of ἡμᾶς, but an anacolouthon is accepted, which causes the repetition of ὑμᾶς. Though, in general, the view is the same as that of Luther and Calvin, yet this law is thus distinguished as neither the law of the mind nor the law in the members, but the contradiction of the two. Ver. 22, 23, taking up, as they do, the two sides of this contradictory, favor our view.

It may be added: (1.) The presence of the article does not decide that the Mosaic law is meant; for the article appears in ver. 23, where it is certainly not meant. (2.) The article has a sufficiently denon strative force (this law) without τοῦτον being inserted. (3.) The phrase, law of God (ver. 22), seems, by its definiteness, to point to another sense here. Our English version, therefore, presents the best sense — R.

Ver. 22. For I delight in the law of God [στοιχεῖαν ἡμάς τῷ μὴλίσσ τοῦ θεοῦ]. The γὰρ introduces the two verses as an antithetical explanation of ver. 20. The σὺν in συνήθειας is as in συνήθειας, Mark iii. 6, after the analogy of συνάδελφοι = apud animam (Tholuck). No thought of delighting with, as Meyer holds. It is undoubtedly stronger than συνήθεια, ver. 16 (against Stuart). It belongs to the sphere of feeling. See further below.— R.

Tholuck: "The two contending forces in the one personality (ver. 17) are locally divided, one being in the inward man, the other in the outward members; the will is taken captive in the way from the inward to the outward man—that is, to the executing organs." But the powers named here assume a concrete form. The moral judgment, in vers. 15 and 16, the moral will, or the I, in vers. 17 and 18, and the moral inwardness, in vers. 19 and 20, have now become the inward man, who delights in the law of God. But just now sin in the members comes in, with the power of a strange law, so that a chasm pervades his whole being, in which even he, who at the beginning of the process was a slave, is now, in consequence of his helpless resistance, become a military captive of sin. [After the inward man, κατὰ τὸν ἐνδυρμὸν.] The ἐνδυρμὸν is not so much the νοῦς or τὸ μὴλίσσ (Theod., and Gaunard,) itself, as the man choosing in the νοῦς his standpoint, his principle (which is not really gained until the conclusion of ver. 25). It is also so far the inner man as that he withdraws almost desperately from the outwork of his external life. Lyna explains similarly to the Greek writers: In homine duplex pars, ratio et sensibilis, quae alter nominatur caro et spiris, homo interior et exterior. This reminds us of the Platonic use of language: In Plato and Plotinus we find the termi, ὁ ἐνδυρμὸς, ὁ ἐν τῷ ἐνδυρμῷ, ὁ ἐν τῷ ἐνδυρμῷ τῆς καρδίας. (1 Peter iii. 4), rather the inward I of the man than a single attribute—the inward man, who permits himself to be controlled by his conscience, the man of conscience. But this does not remove the difficulty. For the question is not, that the real and true man is created for God; for this holds good of flesh and blood, ontologically considered. But it may be asked, What actual standpoint does the Apostle here denote? According to his antithesis, it is this: he distinguishes his inward nature, as the true man, from the antagonism and conflict of the law in his members. It is in this self-comprehension that he now has his delight in the law, which is more than the συνήθεια of ver. 16. Meyer also sees in the συνήθεια, the law designated as also rejoicing with him; Tholuck, p. 387. Luther, Calvin, and others, have thought the new-born man here described. The standpoint here denoted is true as a point of transition, yet the dualistic have erro-
necessarily attempted to establish it as theory and fundamental law.

The strong expression, συνηθομα, seems to indicate that the inwards man is the new man, under the influence of the Spirit (see Philipp, Hodge, Alford in loco), but this view is beset with difficulties also. Why is this influence purposely kept in the background? Alford answers: To set the conflict in the strongest light. But that is not like Paul, who can hardly refrain from his references to grace in Christ. As a matter of fact, the conflict under the law produces a divided state, where something in the man does not only consuet the law, but, in aroused feeling, delights in the law. Such a state may be the result of gratia praeventionis, or may always result in deliverance; but its present effect, as here described, is only "captivity," helplessness. An abnormal condition in the case of the Christian, though his delight, even in this introspective quasilegal condition, is more pronounced. This inwards man, under the influence of gracious influences, leads only to misery. Notice, too, that when, as here, an apparent reference to the Christian occurs, it is immediately followed by language that seems totally inapplicable to him. This confirms the view that this distinction is not prominent. —R.

Ver. 28. But I see another law [διά τον δέ ἐκείνον τὸν ματισμόν]. Paul here represents himself as a looker-on upon his own personality (Meyer), δια adversative or subjunctive. —R.] His seeing indicates his surprise. Gal. 1: 6 and 7 serves to explain how the ἐκείνον is here distinguished from the διάλον. As there the ἐκείνον εἰμι, is not a true gospel, so this ἐκείνον νόμος is not a true νόμος. How could the one real law of God be in perpetual conflict with the other? [As indicated above (ver. 21), this is not the law there found, but that law is the rule of contradiction between the two here referred to.] —R.

In my members [ἐν τοῖς μυαλί τοῖς μου. This is to be joined with νόμοι, rather than with the participle ἀντιστοιχίας. —R]. Namely, operative in my members. Fritzschel construes thus: Which opposes in my members. Incorrectly: For the conflict is not decided in the members. The σάρξ, which, being spiritually disordered, has become the basis of the desires, has its essence in its dismemberment, in the division of its members; therefore the false law is operative in the members.*

[Warring against the law of my mind, ἀντιστοιχίας τοῦ νόμου τοῦ νοσίου. The form νοσίου belongs to later Greek (Meyer). See Winer, p. 61. —R.] Earlier, this law was master, and the ἔγω servant; now, after the ἔγω has become distinct from the sinful σάρξ as the inner man of himself, sin carries on a formal war by the members, but with the force of a law which it describes, as the law of nature, or one similar to it. Simultaneously with the fact that the combatant has recognized the Mosaic law again as the expression of his inward steadiness, and has made it the νόμος of his νοσίου, of his personal consciousness, sin has assumed the semblance of a law of nature dominant in the members.*

[And bringing me into captivity to the law of sin which is in my members. See Textual Note.* The participle αἰχαλωτικοῦ (later Greek: to take by the spear in war, to take prisoner) is very strong. —R.] Sin, in this semblance, opposes the inwards man, and conquers him; the I finds itself the captive of another law, which now audaciously appears as the law of sin; that is, sin will now assert itself as an insurmountable fatality.— Meyer will not accept the genitive νόμος τοῦ νοσίου as subjective, but local. He would distinguish it further from the νόμος τοῦ θεου (against Usteri, Kollner, &c.), without observing that "the law of God" has reproduced itself in "the law of the mind." [The difference is thus expressed by Bengel: δια τὸν μεγάλον τὸν δει νον διὸνα δεικτείται. There seems to be two pairs.of laws here, each pair closely related: The law of God, with its answering law in the mind (taken locally); the law in the members, subservient and causing subserviency to the law of sin. The parallelism is not strict, for the conflict is evoked by the law of God, and ends in the law of sin. It is unlikely that this is a peculiarly Christian state. —R.]

The νοσίου denotes the thinking and moral consciousness, which constitutes the essence of personality. [Meyer: "the reason in its practical activity." Olshausen, and others, find here the organ of the unfulfilled spirit; the Augustinian interpreters, the organ of the renewed man, the spiritual nature; all agree that it answers to the inwards man (ver. 22). If that means renewed nature, we would expect here some expression of the Spirit's influence. The choice of another word, as well as of another phrase than "the law of God" here, where it would seem so appropriate were the reference to a Christian, confirms the view held throughout in our exegesis. —R.]

Meyer says further: The inwards man is not brought into captivity, for he, considered in and of himself, always remains in the service of God's law (ver. 25); but the apparent man is. Then the warfare would be carried on by the apparent man! It is indeed correct, that in τῳ νόμῳ τῷ ἀνομίῳ the dative is not instrumental (according to Chrysostom, and others), but is dat. commodi.*

On the different distinctions between the law in the members and the law of sin, see Meyer, p. 288 (Kollner: Demands of the desires, and the desires themselves). We distinguish between the first appearance and the final manifestation: The law in the members passes itself off for, or appears to the sinner first as, the law of nature; therefore it brings him into captivity, and appears to him finally as the law of sin—the law of anomaly, of unnaturalness. Pareus' understanding of the μέγας as the pars nondum regenerata, coincides with the reference to the new-born man. When Calvisius and Socinians held that the facultates interiores are included, they interpreted that not the μέγας of itself, but only in connection with spiritual dispositions, could form the semblance of another and wicked law.

FOURTH PARAGRAPH (VERS. 24, 25).

The Transition from the Law to the Gospel.

It is a characteristic of the interpretation of this passage, that some have made vers. 24 and 25 paren-
other hand, thus sets him right: They have not in
 tended, on the negative side, the wish for deliver
 ance from the body of death, but, on the positive
 side, the wish for the glorification and clothing-upon
 of the body. b. Olshausen: the spirit would like
 to make the mortal body living, &c.

 3. Death as a monster personified with a body,
 which threatens to swallow up the εἷμα (Reiche).

 Connection of the θάνατος with θρόνος.

 From the body of this death. (Vulgate, Ullius, Luther, Fritzsche, De Wette, Tholuck, Mey-
er.) [So E. V., Hodge, Alford, Jowett.] a. θάνατος
 is the same as νίκατος (Calvin, and others),
 b. "He means here that death is the misery
 and labor endured in conflict with sin" (Luther);
 c. De Wette: Who will deliver me from the body of
 this death? that is, from the body which, in
 consequence of sin dwelling or reigning in it, is
 subject to death and misery. Reference to 2 Cor. v.
 Fritzsche similarly. d. Meyer gives as much as two explanations:
 Who will deliver me, so that then I shall be no more
dependent upon the body, "which serves as the seat
for so ignominious a death?" Or, in other words:
"Who will deliver me from dependence upon the
law of sin to moral freedom, so that then my body
will no more serve as the seat of so ignominious a
devil death?" If we understand the body to be a real
body, with all these contortions, we do not find our
way out of the external desire of death.

 Of the expositors under 1, Krehl approaches
nearest to our view. The "body" is the organism
of sin. [The most natural construction is: the body
of this death. The stress, then, lies on the word
"death." The context forbids a reference to physical
dead and future glorification, which would be
far-reaching. Death seems to mean: the whole con-
dition of helplessness, guilt, and misery just
described, which is, in effect, spiritual death. How,
then, shall "body" be understood? Rejecting the
allusion to the custom of chaining a living man to
a corpse, but two views remain:

(1.) The literal sense, the body as the seat of
this death; against this is the fact that this gives
the word a dual etymology, which is unsatisfactory.
In its favor is the preceding phrase: "the law of sin in
my members." If it be adopted, we must limit the
meaning thus: "the body whose subjection to the
law of sin brings about this state of misery" (Al-
ford); but this is really a desire for death.

(2.) We prefer the figurative sense (with Calvin,
Hodge, and others): "this death" has an organism,
which is not only like a body in its organism, but
is in close clinging to me: in upon this death (thus
represented) who shall deliver me? The genitive
is then possessive; the unity of the thought is pres-
served, and many difficulties avoided. This
figurative sense of θάνατος is certainly more Pauline
than the ethical one (comp. Excursus above, and vi. 6;
excursus 10.)

We here group the single elements of the idea
of a pseudo-plasmonic human image, which sin has
set up as a power that has become inherent in human
nature:

1. The old man, who is not a real man; chap.
vi. 6, and elsewhere.

2. The νοεις της σαρκας, which is not a real
νοεις; Col. ii. 18.

3. The φρονημα της σαρκας, which is not a real
φρονημα; chap. viii. 6.

4. The σωμα της άμαρτιας, which is not a real
σωμα; chap. vi. 6.
5. The σῶμα τοῦ σωτῆρος, which is not a real σῶμα; the present passage.
6. The νόμος ἐν τοῖς μισής, which is not a real νόμος; chap. viii. 23.
7. The μισή, which are not real μισή; Col. iii. 5.
8. The σῖγξ, which is something else than the external σῶμα; Rom. viii. 8.
9. The άνθρωπος, which is something else than physical death; Rom. viii. 6.*

Tholuck: On the exclamation of ver. 24: "The exclamation does not appear to us explicable merely from transition to earlier occurrences, but only because the continuously felt reaction of the old man has, so to speak, set off the preceding description." [Alford thinks, with De Wette, that the cry is uttered "in full consciousness of the deliverance which Christ has effected, and as leading to the expression of thanks which follows." A turning-point is reached, whatever be the reference, and no view is correct which does not admit that Paul here expresses what he feels, as well as what he has felt.

Ver. 25. Thanks to God [ξαγρεμένος τῷ θεῷ, εἰ μὴ εἰνεργοῦντος τῷ θείῳ. See Textual Note]. This reading corresponds to the previous exclamation much more than εἰνεργοῦντος does. Those who continue the reference to the un-regenerate to the conclusion, get into difficulty with this second exclamation. Hence the adoption of a parenthesis (Rickert, Fritzsche), or of a conditional construction (Erasmus, Semler). If that had not been taken place, I would have been snatched asunder, with the spirit to serve the law of God, but with the flesh the law of sin. Meyer observes: "For what he thanks God, is not mentioned." But the for what is plainly enough indicated by the context, as Meyer himself subsequently brings out. It is also indicated by his thanking God through Jesus Christ.

So then I myself with the mind [ἀρνεῖται τῷ νόμῳ, τῷ μὲν νοι]. In the consideration of this difficult passage there are two questions: 1. Is what is here said connected with the previous thanksgiving, or with ver. 24? 2. What, accordingly, is the meaning of αὐτός ἐγώ?

1. Some think that the thanksgiving does not come at all into consideration; the words are connected with ver. 24 (Rickert, Fritzsche). This makes the passage only a final opinion on the miserable condition under the law, a declaration of the consummated dissension in which man is situated under the law. Others (De Wette, Meyer, and others), on the contrary, very properly take the thanksgiving also into consideration, although both De Wette and Meyer find in the passage only a recapitulation of what has been said from vers. 14–24, which, according to Meyer, should follow from the immediately preceding εἰνεργοῦντος. But the Apostle's language does not declare the dissonance previously described, but the antithesis newly established. By accepting the probable breviloquence, and supplying the words which are at hand, we are relieved even here of the apparent obscurity. We read τῷ μὲν νοὶ [δουλεῖν] δουλεῖ; the Apostle has even omitted the δουλεῖν from τῇ διακοσμΗθαι—the proof that both can be mentally supplied.

Τὸ καθαρτικόν ψυχή ὑμῶν. In Chap. vii. 10, it is said, "If I am in the flesh, I serve the law of God;" but if I serve (σέβωμαι, would serve) in the flesh, then I serve the law of sin. Either, or! This is favored, first of all, by the αὐτός ἐγώ. A recapitulation of the foregoing cannot be united with this view. For in ver. 20 we read: νῦν δὲ οἰκίστης ἐγώ, &c. (comp. ver. 20). The following is the inference from the previous verses: that now there is a definite distinction between standing in the σῶμα (that, in the principle of the νομός) and standing in the flesh (that is, in the principle of the flesh); but that, through Christ, he has gained the power to stand in the principle of the νομός. From this there arises the following thesis: 1, the same man, can have a double standpoint. If I live with the νομός, I serve the law of God in truth; but if I live in the flesh, even in the form of the service of the law, I serve the (false) law of sin. In other words, the life in the νομός is the life in Christ, one life in the Spirit, and, like love, the fulfillment of the law (see chap. xiii. 8). It follows, therefore, on the one hand, that there is nothing condemnatory in the man of this standpoint. But there also follows the conclusion that they must live decidedly in harmony with their principle. But if they live purely in the νομός, the body, as a principle, must be dead—that is, rendered merely indifferent as a principle, and have nothing to say, on account of the sinfulness inherent in it (see chap. viii. 10). But this applies only to the present body, which is burdened with the propensity to sin. It is not to be trusted; it is devoid of pure harmony with the law of the Spirit, and therefore the Christian must keep it, as a bond-servant, under discipline and oversight. But this order is also temporary, so far as mortal bodies shall again be made alive by the Spirit of the risen Christ. As now the resurrection itself belongs to the future and the one period, so also does the completion of the purity of the body, its removal to the glorious liberty of the children of God, belong to the same future. But as the germ of the resurrection-body has already been made alive and increased in the believer in this life, so is it also the case with religious and moral purity in his body. In every conflict of the body with the law of the Spirit, it would be decidedly carnally, in legal mortifications, but spiritually, in a dynamical reckoning of ourselves to be dead (see chap. vi. 1 ff.). That is, in a powerful departure beyond the παθήσεως of the body with the works of the Spirit (see chap. viii. 18).

2. Different explanations of the αὐτός ἐγώ.
(1.) I myself, Paul. The Apostle's description of himself as an example for others (Cassian, Porcus, Umbreit); (2.) Εγώ ίδιος. The life is one, in one place, in one future (Erasmus, Calvin, and others); (3.) οὐ εγώ. Reference to what he had earlier said of himself (Fritzsche, De Wette); (4.) I alone; that is, so far as I am without the mediation of Christ (Meyer, Baur, Hofmann); (5.) What he had heretofore described as the experience of mankind, he now describes as his own (Kölner).* * * Olshausen's explanation is the nearest approach.

* (Many will feel that Dr. Lange here gives an explanation which is not a real explanation. Sin, and flesh, and the old man, are real enough; but if he means that over against them is something, which is the ideal man, to be made real through the grace of Christ, then his remarks are significant. That the true explanation of this passage is to be sought in a discovery of modern science, anticipated by Paul is improbable. Conv. Doctr. Note 14 *)

* (The explanation of Jowett is altogether untenable: "I am my true self serve the law of God; the remainder of the sentence may be regarded as an afterthought." The presence of αὐτός totally overthrows this. Jowett accepts it in his text, too, without even taking advantage of its omission in ε. F. to give a seeming propriety to his interpretation.)
to correctness: "He thanks the Author of the work of redemption, God the Father, through Christ, whom he can now call his Lord from the heart. With this experience there now appears a totally changed condition in the inward life of the man, whose nature the Apostle describes in what follows until its perfect completion, even the completion of the moral body" (chap. viii. 11). He further holds, that the Divine law was reflected in the \( \sigma\omega\iota\sigma\varsigma \); and in the inward man there arose the wish, yea, even the joy, to be able to observe it; but the principal thing was wanting—the \( \kappa\alpha\epsilon\tau\epsilon\gamma\alpha\delta\iota\sigma\sigma\alpha \). "But by experiencing the redeeming power of Christ, by which the \( \sigma\omega\iota\sigma\varsigma \) is strengthened, man finds himself able, at least by the highest and noblest power of his nature, to serve the Divine law." Yet the \( \sigma\alpha\iota\gamma\varsigma \) still remains subject to the law of sin. Therefore the conflict in the regenerate still continues, but yet it is generally victorious in the strength of Christ. Here Osiander is led, to a certain extent, away from the Apostle's train of thought. As the Christian should die on the supposition of his being dead with Christ, so should he live on the supposition of his resurrection with Christ, and, therefore, he should fight on the supposition of victory (see 1 John v. 4). "This is the victory that overcometh the world, even our faith." If the watchword for the sanctification of the Christian gains its point, to fight for victory, it is nevertheless in conformity with the gospel standpoint that this takes place on the supposition of \( \pi\acute{\omicron}\tau\omicron\acute{\omicron} \sigma\tau\omicron\sigma\nu\nu\sigma \), or in conformity with the principle, \( \tau\omicron\varsigma\nu\omicron\nu\sigma \tau\omicron\iota\varsigma \upsilon \varsigma \chi\rho\omicron\sigma\varsigma \). But Osiander, not without reason, regards ver. 25 as the beginning of the section commencing with the first of chap. viii.; it constitutes, at least, the transition to it.

Serve the law of God \( \delta\omicron\upsilon\kappa\acute{\iota}t\upsilon\omicron\upsilon \ \nu\omicron\rho\acute{\omicron} \ \upsilon\omicron\nu \ \sigma\tau\omicron\iota\varsigma\). It is when man has become free from the law in its external form, that he truly serves the law of God in its real import (see chap. iii. 31; xiii. 8). (Relche: the \( \nu\omicron\rho\omicron\sigma \) is the ideal Jew; the flesh, as it were, is the empirical Jew.) Yet we may remark, that the \( \nu\omicron\rho\omicron\sigma \nu\omicron\rho\omicron \upsilon \omicron\sigma \) expresses the fact, that the time for decision is now come. A vacillation between the better and the false \( \nu\omicron\rho\omicron\sigma \upsilon \omicron\sigma \) would take place under the law; but, after acquaintance with Christ, the real and complete \( \nu\omicron\rho\omicron\sigma \upsilon \omicron\sigma \) will live either in the \( \nu\omicron\rho\omicron\sigma \), or in the flesh; will either serve God, or sin. But external legality, placed over against Christ, is now also a life in the flesh (see chap. vi. 14; Gal. v. 3 ff.; Col. ii. 18).

[Note on the final sentence of ver. 25. The interpretation is beset with difficulties.

1. Taking \( \upsilon\omicron\alpha\rho\upsilon\upsilon \) as summing up the whole preceding section, and referring it to the regenerate, the service with the mind is of course the result of the new spiritual life, and, with the flesh, the result of indwelling sin. But why such a statement as this between the thanksgiving and the triumphant utterances of chap. viii.? It looks like taking this discord as the normal condition of the Christian life. If \( \iota\omicron\mu\acute{\omicron} \iota\varsigma \) be taken, with Meyer, and others, as opposed to "in Christ Jesus," then Forbes' explanation is satisfactory: "I in myself, notwithstanding whatever progress in righteousness the Spirit of Christ may have wrought in me, or will work in this life, am still most imperfect; with my mind indeed I serve the law of God, but with my flesh the law of sin; and, therefore, the law, could not be justified, but would come under condemnation, if viewed in myself, and not in Christ Jesus." But this view of \( \iota\omicron\mu\acute{\omicron} \iota\varsigma \) is somewhat forced, as De Wette, who formerly adopted it, confesses. On doctrinal grounds, this interpretation is open to the same objections as those which refer the section to the unregenerate.

2. We may, with Lange, accept a future reference, in consequence of the turning-point being reached in the Thanksgiving. But this requires us to supply a great deal, and to force the alternative meaning on \( \nu\omicron\tau\omicron\iota\varsigma \), \( \delta\iota \). It also confuses; for \( \nu\omicron\tau\omicron\iota\varsigma \) and \( \sigma\alpha\iota\gamma\varsigma \); already used in contrast, on this view present a new distinction; and yet that new distinction is immediately afterwards repeatedly set forth by the terms, \( \nu\omicron\tau\omicron\iota\varsigma \), flesh. The only escape from this confusion is the assumption that, all along the \( \sigma\alpha\iota\gamma\varsigma \) was really in the interest of spiritual life, and now, being delivered, it acts on its impulses. This, for obvious reasons, we reject.

3. We may take \( \delta\iota\varsigma \), as summing up the preceding (as is done by the Augustinian expositors), \( \iota\omicron\mu\acute{\omicron} \iota\varsigma \) as the same man—i.e., I, the man there described, under the law, with my mind, &c. It is not necessary to suppose a parenthesis; but, having depicted the experience up to, and inclusive of, the doctrine, he gathers up in meaning words from the whole conflict, to contrast with it the normal state of the Christian; chap. viii. To this it will, of course, be objected, that "with my mind I serve the law of God" is too strong an expression to be referred to the man of the law; but it is precisely this service to the law that is the aim of the awakened conscience, the better desire, and it is precisely this he finds he cannot do, because the flesh is the ruling power by which he is brought into captivity, in every case where the more service of law, even of the law of God, is all that is sought for. Should he seem to reach this aim, and be "touching the righteousness which is in the law, blameless" (Phil. iii. 6), yet the service of the mind is not, by any means, the service of the Spirit. And, moreover, we must expect to find here, even after the thanksgiving, a quasi-confession of defeat as the point of connection with, "There is now, therefore, no condemnation," &c. Were the reference previously solely to the Christian, this would seem unnecessary. There are difficulties attending this view; it must be granted, but they are not so numerous as those I find in the others. The whole passage seems, by its alterations, its choice of words, as well as its position in the Epistle, to point to an experience which is produced by the holy, just, and good law of God, rather than the gospel of Jesus Christ; so that even the outburst of Christian gratitude is followed by a final recurrence to the conflict, which is, indeed, ever-recurring, so long as we seek holiness through the law rather than through Christ. See Doct. Note 1.—R.]

DOCTRINAL AND ETHICAL.

1. See the above Summary; also the Preliminary Remarks. [Paul here enters into a very remarkable psychological analysis of the working of the law, in order to show that it, although holy and good in itself, cannot effect the sanctification of man, on account of the power of indwelling sin, which can be overcome only through redeeming grace. He gives a chapter out of his own experience, especially out of the transition period from the law to the gospel. In this experience, however, is reflected, to a certain
extent, the history of the religious development of humanity as a whole. What is here so vividly individualized, repeats itself also in the experience of every earnest Christian. The law, instead of slaying sin, first brings it to a full manifestation (vers. 7-13); in the internal contest it is proven powerless; but it leads to the painful confession of helplessness (vers. 14-24); no other hope remains, save the grace of Jesus Christ (ver. 25).

These expositors who follow the later Augustinian view, viz. vers. 14-25 to the regenerate, because they are unwilling to ascribe to the natural man even this powerless longing after higher and better things.* On the other hand, those who refer them to the unregenerate, urge this reason, that the regenerate man is not so powerless, so captive to sin, as the person here described, but has overcome the dominion of sin, as the Apostle clearly indicates both in chaps. vi. and vii. The correct interpretation lies between these two. Paul describes his state, not when sunk in sin, but when awakened to earnest struggles against sin under the scourge of the law, under preparation for a state of grace—i.e., in the period of transition from the law to the gospel, in the Judaeo-legalistic state of awakening.

Thus much, however, must be conceded to the Augustinian view, that this contest is repeated in modified form in the regenerate. So long as they are in the flesh, the old life of Adam rules beside the new life in Christ. Temptations from the world, assaults of Satan, disturb; not unfrequently sin overcomes, and the believer, feeling deeply and painfully his own helplessness, turns in penitence to Christ's grace, to be the victor at last. It must be remembered, too, that there are many legal, dependent, melancholy Christians, who never pass out of the contest here described into the triumph of grace, the full freedom, the peace with God and assurance of salvation. The temperament and physical condition have a great influence in many such cases, but the main reason is, that such Christians depend too much upon themselves, and do not look sufficiently to the cross of Christ.—P.S.

2. According to the above, the passage treats throughout neither of the unregenerate nor the regenerate, nor partially of the former and of the latter; but it describes the process, the living transition, of a man from the unregenerate to the regenerate state, who inwardly, and therefore properly, understands the law, and regards the commandment, Thou shalt not covet, as the root of all commandments. The question is not concerning a permanent condition, but a movement and a crisis; therefore first in the preterite, then in the present tense. The cooperation of the promise as well as the hope in this process of death which leads to life, is indeed assumed, but not described with it, because, to the combatant of the law, every thing, even the promise, the gospel-element itself, is transformed first of all into law; while, reversely, the finally triumphant faith, and then even the law (according to Origen), are transformed into pure gospel.

3. We must not overlook the fact that the Apostle here describes a gradation, whose stages are brought out prominently in the explanations—a gradation which apparently leads backward to despair and the sense of death, but, at the same time, truly upward to the true life. It is the way of godly sorrow to salvation; according to Luther, the descent of self-knowledge into hell, which is the preliminary condition to ascension to heaven with Christ. "Alas, what am I, my Redeemer? I find my state of soul daily worse." The full appearance of the leprosy on the surface of the body is the symptom of its healing.

["Paul means to show how utterly unavailing are all efforts to get rid of sin by mere nature, I bow even much intensified by views of law and the absolute powerlessness of the law to regenerate, until the power of sin is broken by faith in the Source of spiritual life. No convic-

itions of the excellence of the law, no acknowledgment of its purity and rightful obligation, no assent or consent to it as good, no approbation of it in the real ego, no preference for it nor temporary delight in it as commending itself to the judgment, and no strivings after obedience to its precept nor fear of its penalty admitted to be just, will avail against the law of sin and death, till it is superseded by another law of spiritual life derived from Christ by faith."—R.

4. The law effects not only the knowledge, but also the revelation of sin—its full development and manifestation, but not its genesis. It accelerates its process to judgment, in order to make the sinner susceptible of, and fully in need of, deliverance. Thus it corresponds with the trials and appointments of God's government, which also impel man more and more to the development of his inward stand-

point. The only difference is, that the law, as a spiritual effect, impels to the ideal saving judgment ("for if we would judge ourselves, we should not be judged"), while the guidance of man by trials and temptations results principally in real condemnatory judgments. But here, too, God's law and ordina-

tion agree. To the elect, the my of the law becomes a flash of lightning which prostrates them before the throne of grace; to harder natures, the flash of lightning which destroys their earthly glory must first become, in many forms, an illuminating beam. It is a fundamental thought of the Apostle, that the \(\text{μαχαίρια} \), which has unmasked itself in the nature of man, is compelled by the law to reveal itself in human life as \(\text{μαχαίριασα} \)—as deadly unnaturalness. Thus the law drives the serpent from its concealment.

5. On the different definitions of the idea of the unregenerate and the regenerate, see Tholuck, p. 344. From Rom. viii. it is plain that the \(\text{λειψανα} \) is the result of the original new birth, which is thus decided by justification. This new birth must be distinguished prospectively from the broader and final new birth in the resurrection (Matt. xix. 23), and retrospectively from the spiritual production of man by the word of God as the seed of the new birth, which begins with the strong and penetrating call of man by law and gospel (1 Peter i. 23). It must be distinguished laterally from its sacramental sym-

bolization and sealing, which is, at the same time, its normal foundation, as the ideal and social new birth, as in the apostolical sphere it coincided identically with it, and it accorded with it in normal ecclesiastical relations, but, amid ecclesiastical corruptions, can also go to ruin with it.

6. A description of three stages of the vita sancta-
torum, in Bucer, see Tholuck, p. 337. See also the views on the practical effects of the twofold expo-

sition of this passage, as applying to the regenerate and the unregenerate, in the note, p. 338. Also, a further treatment of this question, Tholuck, p. 341 ff.
(Dr. Hodge rightly reprobates the saying of Dr. A. Clarke (quoted approvingly by Tholuck in the note referred to by Lange): "This opinion has most pitifully and shamefully not only lowered the standard of Christianity, but destroyed its influence and disgraced its character." The danger from an exclusive reference to the unregenerate, is discouragement to weak believers; but that from the other reference is not false security in sin, so much as a tendency to keep the Christian under the scourgery of the law. It does encourage a morbid, unrelieved state of conscience, and legal efforts after sanctification. (Comp. the latter part of Doctr. Note.) To refer it to a movement possible both before and after conversion, a state with reference to the law, encourages unbelievers to go to Christ, and rovesa believers to go to Him, since the existence of the conflict shows that the schoolmaster is nearer than the delivering Master. Here Delitzsch is excellent: *Every Christian is compelled to confirm what the Apostle here says, from his own personal experience. And well for him if he can also confirm, on the fact that Christ's law is, in His words, 'the law of God's will,' is, in this respect, that He desires the good, and hates the evil; and, indeed, in such a way that the sin to which, against his will, he is hurled away, is foreign to his inmost nature. But woe to him, if, from his own personal experience, he could confirm only this, and not also the fact that the spirit of the new life, having its source in Christ Jesus, has freed him from the urgency of sin and the condition of death, which were not abrogated through the law, but only brought to light; so that his will, which, although powerless, was by the law inclined toward what is good, is now actually capable of good, and opposed to the death still working in him, as a predominating, overmastering power of life, to be finally triumphant in glory."—R.)

7. The prohibition, "Thou shalt not covet" (ver. 7), is known to be of very great weight in dividing the Ten Commandments. If it be divided into two commandments, the objects of the lust (coveting) are the principal thing. But the Apostle views it as a prohibition of wicked lust itself, and thereby it becomes a complete commandment, which extends, in sense, even through all the commandments. (Comp. Tholuck, p. 380.) On the shallow constructions of the doctrine of the sinfulness of weak lusts, see Exeg. Notes: see also p. 381.)

In a similar way, a regard for a life of feeling recedes to an ever-increasing distance in the dogmatics of the Middle Ages, in consequence of the stress laid on the merit of good works.

8. On ver. 8. Different variations of the miti-mur in vetitum among the classical writers (see Tholuck, p. 353; see Prov. ix. 17). The law produces reflection on the forbidden object, envy, desire, distrust of the lawgiver, imaginations, lusts, susceptibility of the seed of temptation, and of seduction, and, finally, the production of rebellion—the παρακλήσεως. The history of childhood, of Israel, and the Antinomianism of the early Christian period (Nitschke, *Die Gesammterscheinung des Antinomismus*); the history of Antinomianism in the time of the Reformation (the Münster Anabaptists, the Genevan Libertines, &c.); and the whole history of Divine and human legislation furnishes proof of the Apostle's proposition (Balaamites, Nicolaitans). Nevertheless, the law is holy, just, and good (see the Exeg. Notes); its design and operation are saving. Because Christ was the law of God personified, He has experienced in Himself the full Divine revelation of the opposition of sinful humanity to the law; He was proscribed as if He had been sin personified. But with this complete revelation of the power of sin, grace attained its still more powerful revelation.


11. The law is holy in its principle (the will of God); just in its method (establishing and administering justice); good in its design (promoting life itself by the ideal death in self-knowledge). The sinner had to be delivered from death by death—objectively by the death of Christ, subjectively by the reception of the death of Christ in his own life—by his spiritual dying. Calovius: *Sankt dictator lex ratione causa efficientia et materialis: quia a deo sanctissimo est et circa objecta sancta occupatur: justa est formaliter: quia justitia divina universa, non est regulus est: bona est rationes finis, quia bona temporali et aeterna promissi.* The last definition is the weakest. Of justa, Tholuck uses these words: "more correctly, since it produces 'righteousness.'"

12. On the manner in which sin misconstrues the law, in order to make it misoister to its own ends, and also on the gradual development of self-knowledge, see the Exeg. Notes. Either the individual figures in question are volatilized into hyperbolical metaphors, or people have fallen into dualistic and Manichæan notions, which have been made to underlie the Apostle's thoughts, new in order to appeal to him, now to govern him. See "Sydenham," by Jahn, *Eisenach,* 1840, p. 56: As diseases in the vegetable world are known to show themselves in inferior and parasitical organisms (fungi, mosses, mistletoes, &c.), so does disease in man show a lower, half-independent vital process and inferior organism, secreted as a germ and parasite in the original life. Similar expressions by Paracelesus, on the inferior organisms undermining the healthy life.—Comp. Schuh's *Pathologie und Therapie der Pseu- toplasmen,* Vienna, 1854.—False organic forms pervert the functions and material substance of natural life into noxious shapes and poisons. The false spiritual form—sin—perverts the true life of man into a luxuriant growth of false spiritual images of this life.

HOMILETICAL AND PRACTICAL.

Acquaintance with sin is effected by the law, so far, 1. as the law, as a prohibition, provokes sin; 2. but also that the consciousness of sin be complete (vers. 7—12). What does sin take from and give to man? 1. It takes life from him; 2. It gives him death (vers. 7—12). The answer is, 1. It is indeed horrible, but yet, 2. what is holy is not itself destructive (vers. 7—12).—The destruction of the state of innocence; 1. Apparently produced by
the Divine prohibition; 2. Actually produced by human sin (vers. 7-12).—How the best teacher can become a tempter against his will, when he, 1. exempts from a well-meant prohibition; 2. but when this very prohibition awakens the desire for transgression (vers. 7-12).—We should not prohibit children from too much,—The best thing we have is corruption (John 10:10).—The fearful deception of sin (ver. 11).—The holiness of the Divine law.

It is shown to us when we, 1. look at the lawgiver; 2. carefully prove the principal statements of the commandments; 3. have in mind the design for which it was given (ver. 12).—Whence does it come that what is good is made death unto me? 1. The fault does not lie in the law, which is spiritual; but, 2. in me, who am carnal (properly, "flesh-like"), sold under sin (vers. 13, 14).—Proof of how sin, aiming at the ruin of man, prepares its own overthrow (ver. 13).—What is, "to be sold under sin"? 1. Not to know what we do—blindness of self-knowledge; 2. Not to do what we will, but to do what we hate—perversion of our own spontaneity (vers. 14, 15).—Even in his sin, man must testify to the goodness of the law (ver. 16).—In the flesh there dwell no good things (ver. 16).—To will and to perform! 1. How near the willing of what is good is to us; 2. But how far from us is the performance of it (vers. 18, 19).—The deep sorrow expressed in the confession, "for to will is present with me, but how to perform," &c.; because we then say as much as: 1. I wish the good very much; but, 2. I am just as much devoid of the power to do it (ver. 18).—The surprising discovery of man on the way to his conversion (ver. 21).—The double law in man: 1. The true law in the mind; 2. The false law in the members (vers. 22-25).—The divided state of the human heart; 1. Caused by sin (vers. 18-20); 2. Manifesting itself in the conflict of the two laws (vers. 22, 23, 25); 3. Calling forth the longing for deliverance (ver. 24).—The thanksgiving of the Apostle for the peace of deliverance (ver. 25); comp. chap. i. 25.

LUTHER: To do does not mean here to perform the work, but to feel the excitement of the lusts. But to perform, is to live without lust, totally pure; this does not take place in this life (vers. 15, 19).—He here calls death the misery and pains endured in the conflict with sin (as Exod. x. 17). Pharaoh says: "That he may take away from me this death only" (this was the locusts).

STARK: The natural man is like the earth since the curse has been pronounced upon it. The earth has the seeds of all kinds of weeds in it; and although they seem, in Winter, to lie perfectly dead in the earth, yet, by the warm rain in the Spring, they will again germinate and grow (ver. 8).—Sin is a real highway robber; it associates in a friendly way with us, and strives to lead us off from the right road, but afterwards kills us (ver. 11).—When sin has become suddenly powerful, does not despond; God does not wish the death of the sinner. Flee in penitence to Christ, and you shall be holy (ver. 13).—Believers do many good works, but not all that they should; and what they do, is far from being as perfect as it should be (ver. 15).—How Christians, lament more over the weaknesses still cleaving to them, than over temporal torments, chains, and bonds (ver. 20).

OSLANDER: The law is a beautiful mirror, which shows us our sins, in order that, when we perceive such great evil, we may get counsel and help from Christ (ver. 7).—If believers sin, and it occurs against their will, they do not lose the favor of God (ver. 17).—Cramer: Innate wicked lust a fountain of all sins, and it is also against God's law; we should not allow ourselves to lust at all (ver. 7).—There are two characteristics of true Christians, so long as they are in the world: they give themselves trouble about their wretchedness, but they rejoice and take comfort because of the deliverance (redemption) that has taken place through Jesus Christ (ver. 25).—Nova Bibl. Tab.: There is nothing so good that it cannot become evil by abuse. In this way the blessed gospel becomes to many a savor of death unto death (ver. 10).—Speaker: Our nature is so sinful that we do not take as much pleasure in any thing as in what is forbidden (ver. 8).—It is a most eminently attainable, and one necessary for a right understanding of the law and sin, that we properly understand the spiritual character of the law (ver. 14).—Those can profit by this Pauline example (ver. 26) who strive with all earnestness to do what is good; but those who do not strive with all earnestness to do what is good, but still sin frequently with the will, cannot employ the language of Paul, for they are not in harmony with his example. —In short, if one will have a pattern, let him take this: No one must lay claim to any comfort in this chapter who has no counterpart is found in chaps. vi. or viii.; but these three chapters must harmonize.

Bengel: We have here a figure from military life: The soul is the king, the members are the subjects, and sin is the enemy whom the king has admitted. The king is now punished by the insurrection of his subjects, who rise in rebellion with the enemy.—Galac.: The law is spiritual, means: it is an emanation from God, who is a Spirit (John iv. 24); that is, omnipotent, personal, and holy love. It is, further, spiritual in its import—that is, divine and holy. It pertains to the inmost being of man, which it would fully conform to God.—There stands in opposition to it the carnal sense of man; that is, his desire, which is directed, by virtue of sin, to the world, finiteness, and sensuousness, and makes him who is sundered from his Creator a servant of the creature (ver. 14).—An Apostle glowing with love, like Paul, humbles himself, and trembles and groans without; and he, in turn, of the suffering tie which binds us together, with the judgment and judgment and shall we, who sin, cheaply expose ourselves, and boast of whatever can awaken lust in us? (ver. 14).—The incapacity of man to do good, is an incapacity of the will; this, and not an incapacity of spiritual disposition, has necessitated it; it is therefore a weakness, which is continually attended by the sense of guilt (ver. 18).—The exclamation of the Apostle is the cry for help of all humanity, which, in despair of all help through and of itself, looks for aid from without. The law leads to this desire, but it cannot deliver from the wretchedness (ver. 24).—He who sighs most deeply over the bondage in the body of this death, stands nearest to deliverance (ver. 24).—What Paul here makes clear in itself, is a truth of universal human experience,—namely, that there are two successive states of man that has been produced in chap. vi. (ver. 9), where sin slumbers in us, because we are not fully conscious of the moral law; the other (vers. 14-24), where, having a clear knowledge of the law, but yet without the grace of redemption, we become acquainted with the profound corruption of our heart, which is opposed to the law of God, and feel wretched in this condition
—The conflict described in vers. 14–25 occurs, before
the new birth, in the heart of a man awakened
by the law; yet, in the life of the regenerate per-
son, similar conflicts and phenomena arise, in which,
however, he is ever triumphant.—The Apostle was
far from holding the erroneous view, that sin dwells
only in man's body, and not also in his soul (ver.
24).—I thank God through Jesus Christ our Lord! Through Him, He has delivered me in and from all
this wretchedness (ver. 25).—HöNNER: The best
thing can be made an injury to the wicked will (ver.
13).—Every thing becomes impure in the impure
heart. Corruptio options est generatio peccati (ver.
13).—Description of the evil propensity (vers. 14–
25).—It is the best people who confessesthat strong
sensuous impulses in them are sinful (ver. 14).—
The inward contradiction of man with himself.
The conflict between knowing, willing, and doing
(vers. 15).—Even the immoral man feels that it
would have been better if he had kept the law
(vers. 16).

BESSEN: The twofold way in which sin becomes
exceeding sinful by the commandment: 1. Its wick-
edungodly nature, plays a prominent part in the
transgression of the plain commandment; 2. The
sentence of death which transgression effects, drives
sin into the conscience of man; so that he feels
and perceives it to be a horror and abomination before
God (vers. 15).—The conflict between spirit and flesh in believers (vers. 14-25).—"Believers know and feel," says Luther (Works, viii., 2747), "that no
good thing dwells in their flesh, so that they may
become more humble, and let their peaccktall fall;
that is, do not depend on their own righteousness
and good works," &c. (vers. 16).

LAKE: The way of the law from sin to grace: 1.
Apparentiy, ever darker and deeper toward death;
2. Really, always nearer to light and life.—The sad
revelation of sin a preliminary condition of the joy
—bringing revelation of salvation.—The develop-
ment of selfknowledge under the law: 1. Clear
view which reason has of the authority of the law;
2. Earnest wrestling of the will; 3. Outburst of
deeply-affected feeling (oh, wretched man that I
am).—How the proverb, "Man's extremity is God's
opportunity," is most gloriously verified in the con-
version of man.—The struggle between sin and the
law: 1. The deception which sin practises with the
law; 2. The unmasking effected by the law through
the apparent charm of sin.—How the law becomes
always more inward to the candid person, until he
has perceived it as his spiritual, i.e. his consciousness,
his reason.—The fearful, false power of evil: 1. It
assumes all the features of personal life; 2. In
order to exhaust and destroy personal life in all
its features.—The cry for deliverance occurs in close
proximity with thanksgiving and praise to God.—
On ver. 25: Either, or? [JEREMY TAYLOR (condensed from sermon on the
Christian's Conquest over the Body of Sin, Rom. vii.
19): The evil natures, principles, and manners of
the world are the causes of our imperfect willings
and weaker actions in the things of God. Let no
man please himself with perpetual pious conversa-
tion or ineffective desires of serving God; he that
does not practise, as well as talk, and do what he
desires and ought to do, confesses himself to sin
greatly against his conscience; and it is a prodigious
folly to think that he is a good man, because, though,
he does sin, it was yet against his mind to do so.
Every good man can watch always; running from
temptation is a part of our watchfulness; every
good employment is a second and great part of it.
and laying in provisions of reason and religion be-
forehand is a third part of it; and the conversation
of Christians is a fourth part of it.—MATT. HENRY,
on vers. 24, 25: When, under the sense of the
remaining power of sin and corruption, we shall see
reason to bless God through Christ and for Christ.
Through Christ's death, an end will be put to all
our complaints, and we shall be waited to an etern-
ity without sin or sigh.—It is a special remedy
against fears and sorrows, to be much in praise,—
SCOTT: A proper knowledge of the holy law of God
is the two-edged sword which gives the death-wound
to self-righteousness and to Antinomianism; for it
is perfectly fit to be the rule of our duty, written
in our hearts, and obeyed in our lives.—CLARK: We
never find that true repentance takes place
where the moral law is not preached and enforced.
The law is the grand instrument, in the hands of a
faithful minister, to alarm and awaken sinners; and
he may safely show that every sinner is under the
law, and consequently under the curse, who has not
flled for refuge to the hope held out by the gospel.—
HORNE: It is an evidence of an unenewed heart to
express or feel opposition to the law of God, as
though it were too strict; or to be disposed to
throw the blame of our want of conformity to the
Divine will from ourselves upon the law, as unrea-
sonable.—The Christian's victory over sin cannot
be achieved by the strength of his resolutions, nor
by the plainness and force of moral motives, nor
by any resources within himself. He looks to Jesus
Christ, and conquers in His strength. The victory
is not obtained by nature, but by grace.—BARNES:
We have here: 1. A view of the sad and painful
conflict between sin and God. They are opposed
in all things; 2. We see the raging, withering
effect of sin on the soul. In all circumstances it
tends to death and wo; 3. We see the feebleness
of the law and of conscience to overcome this.
The tendency of both is to produce conflict and wo;
4. We see that the gospel only can overcome sin.
To us it should be a subject of ever-increasing than-
kfulness, that what could not be accomplished by
the law, can be thus effected by the gospel; and that
God has devised a plan that thus effects complete
deliverance, and gives to the captive in sin an ever-
lasting triumph.—J. F. H.]
CHAPTER VIII. 1-17.

1. There is therefore now no condemnation to them which [those who] are in Christ Jesus, who walk not after the flesh, but after the Spirit. [omit all after Christ Jesus].

2. For the law of the Spirit of life in Christ Jesus hath made me free [freed me] from the law of sin and death. For what the law could not do, in that [because] it was weak through the flesh, God sending his own Son in the likeness of sinful flesh [literally, the flesh of sin], and for [or, on account of] sin, condemned sin in the flesh: That the righteousness [or, requirement] of the law might be fulfilled in us, who walk not after [according to] the flesh, but after [according to] the Spirit.

3. For they that [those who] are after [according to] the flesh do mind the things of the flesh; but they that [those who] are after [according to] the Spirit, the things of the Spirit. For to be carnally minded [the mind of the flesh] is death; but to be spiritually minded [the mind of the Spirit] is life and peace.

4. Because the carnal mind [the mind of the flesh] is enmity against God; for it is not subject [doth not submit itself] to the law of God, neither indeed can be [fit]. So then [And] they that [those who] are in the flesh cannot please God.

5. But ye are not in the flesh, but in the Spirit, if so be that the Spirit of God dwell in you. Now if any man have [hath] not the Spirit of Christ, he is none of his. And [But] if Christ be [is] in you, the body is dead because of sin; but the Spirit [spirit] is life because of righteousness. But [And] if the Spirit of him that raised up Jesus from the dead dwell [dwelleth] in you, he that raised up Christ from the dead shall [will] also quicken [quicken even] your mortal bodies by [on account of] his Spirit that dwelleth in you.

6. Therefore, brethren, we are debtors, not to the flesh, to live after the flesh.

7. For if ye live after the flesh, ye shall die: but if ye through [by] the Spirit do mortify the deeds of the body, ye shall live. For as many as are led by the Spirit of God, they are the [omit the] sons of God. For ye have not received [did not receive] the Spirit of bondage again to fear; but ye have [omit have] received the Spirit of adoption, whereby [ἐν φίλαθλοις, wherein] we cry, Abba, Father. The Spirit itself beareth witness with [or, to] our spirit, that we are the [omit the] children of God: And if children, then [also] heirs; heirs of God, and joint heirs with Christ; if so be that we suffer with him, that we may be also glorified together [glorified with him].

TEXTUAL.

1. Oδηγεῖ ἢμας τῶν κατέκριμα

2. οἱ γὰρ νόμιμοι τὸν κυρίον τῆς γῆς

3. Τὸ γὰρ ἐνδώτων τοῦ νόμου.

4. ἐν φίλαθλοις διά τῆς σφαγῆς

5. Τὸ γὰρ ἐνδώτων τοῦ νόμου.

6. οἱ γὰρ νόμιμοι τοῦ κυρίου τῆς γῆς

7. Τὸ γὰρ ἐνδώτων τοῦ νόμου.

8. οἱ γὰρ νόμιμοι τοῦ κυρίου τῆς γῆς

9. οἱ γὰρ νόμιμοι τοῦ κυρίου τῆς γῆς
The first and tenth lines correspond; the parallesms of second and fourth, third and fifth, sixth and eighth, seventh and ninth, are obvious, and the strain in interpretation is considerable. Prisseche avails himself of it also.

Ver. 2—The weighty MSS., G., B., and some fathers, read ἐντός τοῦ σώματος, as might reason be expected from the context. E. V. D. K. K. and some versions, give ἐν τῷ σώματι, now generally adopted. There is slight authority for the former. Freed ms. is literal, and to be preferred to both made me free, set me free. It refers to a definite past act (sácrit).

Ver. 4—(The E. V. uses righteousness, very indetermined, to translate τὸ ἱερόν ἐξ ὁριστοῦ ἔργου, literally, a need for a perfectly righteous standard of righteousness. In this case refers to the summing up of all the requirements of the law, as fulfilled by Christ. Lange: Gerechtthetn, requirement, is not strictly exact, but is adopted by Alford, Amer. Bible Union. Version of five English clergymen: righteous demand. See Errg. Notes.)

Ver. 4.—(According to, is the phrase which now best expresses the meaning of κατὰ, though after (German, nach) is literal. It is becoming unusual in this sense.

Ver. 6—VII. subject to the law of man is Christ, which is in every respect better, for he is the word of God. The E. V. with its usual readiness for headadways, has departed from a literal rendering in vers. 6 and 7, at the expense of both accuracy and force.

Ver. 6.—I am not (E. V.). It is, however, the above emendation brings out the middle force of ὅπως.

Ver. 8.—So then, is a gloss, rather than a translation. It is a difficult matter to reproduce all the delicate shades of antithetical force expressed by the frequently recurring ὅπως. Some alterations in the verses immediately succeeding have been made with this view.

Ver. 9.—Here is conditional, but both is preferable, as intimating more decidedly that the state of things really exists.

For the same reason, dwelleth is preferable to dwell, in ver. 11.

Ver. 11.—(The better supported reading is [ἔπειτα]); the article is inserted in some MSS., as also before ἑπετάν. There is also the usual number of variations, so common when these words occur in the text.

Ver. 11.—Will, to express the simple future in the third person. The E. V. seems to prefer shall in such cases, and indeed, some still hold to it. The usage of the present time is undoubtedly against it.

Ver. 11.—Here two readings presented themselves, supported by authorities of equal weight. The genitive: διὰ τοῦ ἑαυτοῦ τοῦ θεοῦ σώματος is found in E. C., N. A. C., many versions and fathers, as is adopted by Loeneman, Dr. Wette, Kreil. The accussive: διὰ τοῦ θεοῦ οὐσίαν περιήγησει is adopted by B. D. E. F. K. L., many cursives and fathers, by Griesbach, Scholz, Fritzsche, Mill, Bengel, Tischendorf (in later editions), Meyer (who cites Loeneman also in its favor). Troluck, Böckst, Alford, Wordsworth, Tregelles, Lange. It will be seen that a major version, the E. V., has not adopted this latter reading. The reason for this is plain: neither of two such readings could not have existed without one being ^a premeditated corruption. The question then arises, which reading would best serve a polemic purpose, and hence be most likely to have been corrupted one? That question is resolved by the opinion of the fathers, and their present (and even the N. T.) usage respecting the Divinity of the Holy Spirit. The Macedonians charged the Orthodox with an alteration of the text into the genitive. The genitive can only mean, by means of His Spirit, &c.; while the accusative may indicate that idea more strongly by connecting the thought, on account of the several words of kindred meaning. The Macedonians were perhaps more anxious to alter the text than the Orthodox. Alford thinks the variation dates back of this controversy, and is not due to either of the disputant parties; but the same reason would hold good at a previous point of theological discussion. These cases mark, that in such cases, "the saying of God is distinguished in this verse from the working of the Spirit." Hodge sums up the internal evidence in favor of the common reading; but all his remarks only prove that the other is a more unusual reading, and hence likely to have been altered. It is better to follow the current reading, and adopt the accusative.

Ver. 12.—The simple dative περιήγησιν is best rendered, by the Spirit. Through should be reserved as a translation of διὰ.

Ver. 12.—(D. E. F. G., many fathers, have ὅτι ἐκείνος; but τὸ σῶμα is supported by N. A. B. C. E. L., and nearly all modern editors. The former was probably a correction, arising out of a misunderstanding of the passage.

Ver. 14.—(E. C., N. A. C., D. C. G., and most of the rest read: B. E. G., viòi eiov ti cóv. The adoption of this reading is last adopted by Lachmann, Tischendorf, Meyer, Alford, Wordsworth, Tregelles. It is supported by the majority of the fathers, and the variations are more readily accounted for upon the supposition that it is the original reading; but, if once passed over, would be inserted at the beginning or end (Meyer).

Ver. 16.—See Esg. Notes.

Ver. 16.—(With him, is as proper here as in the preceding clause. See Esg. Notes.—R.)

EXEGESIS AND CRITICAL

FIRST SECTION.—The life in the Spirit * as the new life, in opposition to the life in the flesh (vers. 1—17).

Summary.—a. The vital principle of Christians, or the law of the Spirit as freedom from the antagonistic law of sin (vers. 1—4). b. The principle of carnal life in contradiction to the Spirit and to God (vers. 5—8). c. Application of what has been said to the fundamental standpoint of believers (vers. 9—11). Their life in the Spirit excludes life in the flesh. This Christianity amounts to nothing, if the spirit is wanting. If Christ is the spirit, the body is nothing. But the body shall be renewed at the resurrection by the Spirit. d. Translation from the ideal and fundamental standpoint to the practical application. The conflict resulting from the victory, and the maximum of this conflict (vers. 12—16). No obligation to the flesh.—Spiritual life means of destroying the surprises of involuntary carnal motions.—Following the guidance of the Spirit.—No fear of the power of the flesh the Childlike recourse to the Father.—The sense of adoption strengthened by the Spirit of God. Ver. 17: transition to the following section.*

Meyer: chap. viii. Happy condition of man in Christ.—De Wette: Blessed results of newly-animated morality. Troluck: For thus the Christian, who has become freed from the law, has also become free from condemnation, and is subject to the guidance of the Spirit of adoption, by virtue of which he will become a joint-heir with Christ (vers. 1—17). The same: "We are here at the climax of the Epistle, 'at the heart and kernel of the whole Epistle,' as Spener says: Si scripturam sacram annula compararent, epistolam Pauli ad Romanos gemman credo, summae summam austissimam in capitale octavo censuravit (Spener, Consilia Theol. Lat., iii. 596)." [Bengel: Nunc venit ad liberationem et libertatem.]

R.

Ver. 1. There is therefore now no [Οὔτε]

* [Alford thus heads the section: "Although the flesh is still subject to the law of sin, the Christian, serving not the flesh, but walking according to the Spirit, shall not come into condemnation, but to glory with Christ." Hodge, in his exposition of the Apostle "the security of believers," gives the first verse a weighty and important character, and future, and considers the whole chapter a series of proofs of this proposition.—R.]
The force of ὁ δὲ ... must not be overlooked—an absolute negation, with an undoubted reference to the complete freedom from condemnation (Forbes).—R.

The ἀνατίθεμαι is quite plain, if we have perceived the alternative in the preceding verse: If I am in the νοῖς, I serve God.

If we ignore this alternative, the meaning of the present passage must be doubtful. Tholuck: The older expositors do not generally furnish any proof of the connection of this ἀνατίθεμαι with the preceding chapter. Yet the following connection of it with chap. vii. 25, by Augustine, is, in the main, convincing: "To him, now, who, as a Christian, non amplius convenit pravis desideria, and is planted in Christ by baptism, the prava desideria can no more be condemnation."

The Catholic expositors follow him. Bucer, Beza [Alford], and others, connect ver. 25 with the thanksgiving; but this assumes that the second half of ver. 25 is an interruption. Calixtus, Bengel [Stuart], and others, go back even to chap. vii. 6; others [Hodge, Huldanus], to the whole argument, from that point. If I am an enemy to myself to serve the law of God with my reason, but the law of sin with my flesh, then it follows that, since Christ has interposed, there is no condemnation, &c.—[The question of connection is mainly decided by the view of the preceding section. Those who refer it to the regenerate, connect this either with the whole preceding argument, or with Philippi, with the preceding verse, in the sense: Although I am thus divided in service, still, being in Christ Jesus, there is now, therefore, &c.; or with the thanksgiving. If Lange's view of the alternative be admitted, we must also accept his view of the connection. It seems to be an unwarranted breaking up of the current of thought, to go back as far as chap. vii. 6; and to refer to the whole train of argument, seems out of keeping with the continuous experimental character of the whole passage. It is best to connect, therefore, with the thanksgiving.—R.].

No condemnation [κατάχωμα, Verdammmungswelle, sentence of condemnation (Lange). See p. 184 (v. 16), where it is used in antithesis to δικαιοσύνα. It may be limited to the justifying act of God at the beginning of the Christian life, but, joined with ἀνατίθεμαι, seems to have a wider reference here.—R.].

Origin, Erasmus, Luther, and others, explain: nothing worthy of condemnation; but this is opposed by the νοῖς. See also ver. 34. Comp. chap. v. 16. Koppe generalizes nulius peccati [Alford: no penal consequence of sin, original and actual], which so far at least belongs to the affair that even the temporal punishment, as punishment, and as prelude to the final condemnation, is abolished in the case of Christians. And this is so, not only because their sins are forgiven (Pareus), but because they are in Christ in consequence thereof.

[The question of the reference to justification or sanctification must affect the interpretation of condemnation, since ver. 2, beginning with ὁ γὰρ, seems to introduce a proof. The position of the chapter in the Epistle, as well as a fair exegesis of the verses, sustain the reference to sanctification. (Not to the entire exclusion of the other, any more than they are in Christian experience.) We must then, take no condemnation in a wide sense, either as deliverance both from sin and death (Forbes), or as having indeed a reference to the justifying act already past, but meaning, rather, the continual maintenance of the state of justification, culminating in final acquittal and glory.

... connection with ver. 24 ("death"), is the former reference; with the succeeding proof, the latter. This avoids sundering salvation into two distinct parts. The significant phrase which follows favors this view. Still, the position of the verse warrants us in finding a distinct reference to the act of pardon, as preceding (and involving as a gracious consequence) the work of sanctification.—R.].

[To those who are in Christ Jesus, τοῖς ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ. This does not mean precisely, to have the Spirit of Christ, or Christ in you (Meyer), but it denotes the permanent continuance in justification—a life whose effect is the life of Christ in us. [This deeply significant Pauline phrase must never be weakened or limited. As to its beginnings, Augustine is excellent: Christus in homin- ne, nihis fideis in corde. As to its continuance, Bucer: A Christian preceeds at the time of the Spirit with omittimus agi. But the best explanation is John xv. 7-10, and Eph. ii. 22, &c. Hodge says: In Him federally, vitally, by faith; but the vital union seems always prominent; especially is it so here.—R.].

On the addition, see Textual Note. [Besides what is there remarked, the question of connection suggests, that the interpolation may have been occasioned by a desire to relieve the apparent difficulty in making ver. 2 prove the justification of the believer. To do this, the clause which makes prominent: the Christian walk, so easily borrowed from ver. 4, was inserted.—R.]

Ver. 2. For the law of the Spirit of life, &c. [αὐτὸς νόμος τούτῳ πνεύματος τῆς ζωῆς ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ]. Ver. 2 specifies the ground why Christians are free from condemnation. The principal question here is, whether ἡ ἐν Χριστῷ is to be referred to the following Ἰδιο τικ χρίσμα, or to the foregoing, and how far to the foregoing? Meyer, in accordance with Theodoret, Erasmus, Rückert (not "Tholuck"), Olsshausen, Philippi, and De Wette, has also connected the ἐν Χριστῷ with ἡ ἐν ἀνατιθέμαι. But this distorts the thought, as if that Spirit of life could possibly deliver without Christ. Certainly ἡ ἐν Χριστῷ refers not alone to the foregoing ζωῆς (Luther, Beza, and others); and so here it act the believer's subject, life in Christ, but Christ's original divino-humain life itself. We must also not go back to τοῦ πνείν τῆς ζωῆς alone (Flatt), but to the whole ὁ νόμος τοῦ πνεύματος τ. θ. (Calvin, Koller, Tholuck). The fullness of life in Christ is the Spirit (see John vi. 63); it is complete in itself, conscious, actual, and commun. The internal life with the Holy Spirit is just for this reason, also, the glorification of the νόμος, the personal righteousness; and as it has proved itself to be the completed νόμος, the ideal and dynamical principle of the Divine law in the obedience of Christ, so does it now prove itself to those who are in Christ; that is, justification becomes in them the principle of sanctification. But

[Dr. John Brown renders νόμος, moreover, or would connect it with the thanksgiving in v. i. He refers it to sanctification, and ver. 1 to justification; hence would avoid making the former the ground of the latter.—R.].

[The absence of the article is not decisive against this connection, though it favors more the connection with αὐτῷ. Still, the parallelism strongly supports that view which joins it with the verb.—R.].
because this life-giving law takes the place of the Mosaic law—which could not deliver, but was completed by sin and death—there lies in the appropriation of this glorified law freedom from the law of sin and death.*

The law of the Spirit is not identical with the νόμος τοῦ ἁμαρτία (Küllner, Schröder), but still the latter is connected with the former. The νόμος of the ἁμαρτία is the ontological disposition which has attained its complete historical and concrete realization in the νόμος of the Spirit. Meyer observes, that the Christian institution of salvation is not meant, as νόμος πιστεύω in chap. iii. 27. Yet it is surely identical, to a certain degree, with the νόμος ἁμαρτία, but not with the Christian institution of salvation.†

† Of the Spirit. Meyer explains; of the Holy Spirit. And this is, indeed, substantially the fact; but the Holy Spirit is spoken of so far as He reveals himself concretely in the vital plentitude of Christ. Tholuck’s exposition is in the same direction: ‘The Spirit of life is that by which the spiritual life is sustained and perfected in Christ. The law of the Spirit is the impulse and guidance of the Spirit, under the reciprocal action between the principle of faith and the administration of God’s government in the occurrences of life.

Freed me [ἐλευθεροποίησε μέ]. The verb is aorist, referring to a past act, viz., the deliverance both from sin and from death, which took place at regeneration. Not completed, but begun when in Christ Jesus, and to be completed in Him.—R.] This expression constitutes an antithesis to the bringing me into captivity, just as the law of the Spirit of life is an antithesis to the law of sin and death [τοῦ νόμου τῆς ἁμαρτίας καὶ τοῦ θανάτου].‡ Because the false law of sinful propensity in the members is, according to chap. vii. 22, a law, so is it also a law which tends to death, according to ver. 24. Although the Apostle designs to say that this freedom is followed by freedom from the Mosaic law (chap. vi. 14), it is nevertheless utterly wrong to understand, by the expression before us, the moral law (Wolf), or the Mosaic law (Pareus, and others). How far has the believer been made free from this law? Evidently, freedom from the dominion of sin (Greek and Roman Catholic expositions), effected by freedom from the penalty of sin (Protestant expositions), is meant. Yet the νόμος ἁμαρτία is not altogether identical with the νόμος πιστεύω. (Calvinus.) In the law of faith, the emphasis rests on the faith, but here on the νόμος; there, the question is the principle of justification, but here, the principle of holiness. The individualizing μέ ceases here.

Ver. 8. For what the law could not do [τοῦ νόμου δὲ ἀδύνατον τοῦ νόμου]. The Mosaic law was incapable of effecting this liberation; therefore redemption took its place. On account of the connection of thought with the foregoing, the explanatory and appositional conclusion, what to the law was impossible, is made antecedent as apposition by Winer, it is defined as an accusative, governed by εἰκονίζεται (Winer, p. 217, § 317. 7); by Olshausen, as accusative absolute (“as far as the possibility of the law was concerned”), [Hodge: in view of the impotency of the law.—R.]; and by Rückert, Meyer, Fritzsche, and De Wette, as an antecedent nominative. For analogous forms, see Meyer* and Tholuck; particularly κυρίακος ἁμαρτία, Heb. viii. 1. As nominative, the word acquires the character of a superscription, to be introduced with a colon; yet not as “rhetorical emphasis,” but as making prominent the difference between law and gospel. Erasmus and Luther supply an εἰκόνιζε before νόμον, not invariable, but frequently to the forms, yet certainly in harmony with the thought. The genitive νόμου denotes the inca-pacity of the law to deliver from sin (Vater has referred the νόμου, to the law of the Spirit; Schultheiss, to the law of Divine and human love).

In that it was weak. The ἀδύνατον cannot mean while here; Meyer translates, in so far as, which appears too limited. [Luther, Calvin, Tholuck, De Wette, Philippi, Stuart, Hodges, render because, which is demanded by the context.—R.] The ἀδύνατον again takes up the idea of incapacity.

Through the flesh [*διὰ τῆς σαρκὸς]. Meyer: Through the guilt of the flesh. Besser: Through effect of the flesh. We must not forget the fact, that the division of the σαρκός has also made out of the law a division of the carnal letter. [The preposition διὰ with the genitive here marks the medium through which the law proved its weakness and inability, viz., the flesh (in its strict ethical sense). The law acted not on spiritual, but carnal men, and, through this medium, its inability to do what God did in sending His Son was proven.—R.]

God sending his own Son. The Apostle describes the redeeming act of God both in its pertinent meaning and in its medium. The medium was: God sent His own Son (in antithesis to the sending of the law of man by angels; Gal. iii. 19; Heb. ii. 2); and He sent him in the likeness of sinful flesh, or, of the flesh of sin, and on account of sin.—He sent him, Declaration of pre-existence. [Philippi rightly finds in this verse not only a declaration of the preexistence of Christ, but of His existence as Son; the description which follows having a soteriological, rather than a christological reference.—R.]

In the likeness of sinful flesh [*ἐν ἁμαρτίαις σαρκὸς]. Sinful flesh is not altogether exact. Σαρκὸς must mean the whole hu-
man nature; the ethical force, however, lies in the

generative, which defines it: whose attribute and character was sin (Alford). The Orthodox fathers (comp. Theodorot, Theophylact, Tertullian) rightly use this text: "Christ did not appear in the flesh of sin, which was the Bollandite view, nor in the like-

ness of flesh, which was Docetic, but in the likeness of the flesh of sin, which is the Biblico-Pauline view" (Philippi).—R. As He became truly man, He appeared in the full likeness of sinful flesh (Phil. ii. 7), and yet not in equality with it. Meyer: "So that He appeared in an external form, which was similar to human nature, contaminated with sin. Christ did not appear in εἰκόνα ἀμαρτίας, but also not Docetically (contrary to Keph)." See Tholuck's citation of the views of the Docetists, and of the Mystics (for example, Valentine Weigel, who held that the external body of Christ came from the Virgin, but His inward body from heaven), as well as the opposite views of Dippel, Hasenkamp, Menken, and Irving. "According to them, ὁμοιότης does not denote likeness, but equally. But although ὁμοιότης combines both meanings, yet that of likeness alone belongs to the substantives of nature and ἀμαρτίας; besides, the other meaning is contradicted by the analogy of Scripture in Heb. iv. 16."

And on account of sin [καὶ περὶ ἀμαρτίας. The καὶ connects with the preceding. If this be forgotten, the interpretation may be too largely affected by the clause which follows.—R.] This was the motive of His mission. But the connection by καὶ expresses a second condescension of God and His Son. The first was, that Christ appeared in the form of a sinner, of the servant of sin (see chap. viii.), of the σάκχαρος ἀμαρτίας, of the false σάκχαρος; the second, that a mission on account of sin was undertaken by the Son of God himself (see Matt. xxi. 37). "Καὶ περὶ ἀμαρτίας has been connected with κατάσκευα by the Itala (per carmen), Tertullian (de res carm., c. 66), the Vulgate (de pecato), Chrysostom, Theodoret, Luther, Baldwin, and Bengel. But the καὶ is against this. Tholuck. The ἀμαρτίας in περὶ ἀμαρτίας has been vari-
ciously interpreted. Thomass Aquinas, of the passion of Christ on account of its likeness to sin; Her-

væus, of death; Origen, Pelagius, Melanchthon, Cal-

vin, Bucer, Baumgarten-Crusius, of the sin-offering; Tholuck, Maier, and others, the de-

struction and removal of sin. Meyer: "It is rather the whole relation in which the mission of Christ stood to human sin; and this is already indicated by the foregoing explanation (see 1 John iii. 9). The mission of Christ was to sin; its sin on every side was its abolition. But the immediate effect of his mission was, that God, by the in-

neces of Christ's life in the flesh, distinguished and separated sin, as a foreign and damnable object, from the flesh.

Condemned sin in the flesh [κατάσκευας τῆς ἁμαρτίας εἰς τὰ σακχαρία.] The article is

used here with ἀμαρτίας, the sin already re-

ferred to. This is a final argument against inter-

preting "sin" as = sin-offering in the clause above. Whether in the flesh is to be John, and with John, or with "sin," is a matter open to discussion (see below).—R. To the general idea of the mission of Christ; or account of sin, this declaration is now added, as a specific idea, to describe what His mission effected in relation to sin in the flesh. And we must criticise the various interpretations accordingly. Since the Redeemer, or God through Him, performs a condematory deed, we must especially avoid an incorrect generalization of the idea. Erasmus, De Duin, and Christiansen, have very appropriately pointed out the thought, that He represented sin as damnable; yet we must emphasize sin in the flesh, and add: He separated it from the flesh fundamentally in Christ, in order thereby to cast it out from the flesh in the life of believers. This is, therefore, the sense: Christ, by becoming man in the flesh (which appeared to be the source of sin), and yet having a sinless fleshly nature, also and ever maintaining this sinlessness and immortality of His flesh, through His whole life, that He could give His flesh to His followers as a seal of His favor and as the organ of His Spirit. By this means He made it manifest: 1. That sin does not belong to the flesh in itself, but is inherent in it as a foreign, unnatural, condemnable, separable, alienable, and abstractly spiritual element; 2. That sin in the flesh is con-

demned and rejected in its carnal appearance; 3. That sin in the flesh should be separated from the entire human nature by means of the Spirit proceed-

ing from Christ.

Other explanations: 1. Allusions to the en-

uliation of the guilt of sin. This "is the prevai-

ing ecclesiastical view in Origen, Chrysostom, &c. So,

too, the Catholic expositors, with the exception of

Justin; the Protestant, with the exception of Beza; even the Arminian and Socinian writers, and, in-

deed, the most of the later ones—Usteri, Rückert,

Baumgarten-Crusius, Philippi, and Schmid (Bibl.

Theol.); Tholuck. For what has been and can be said in favor of this explanation, see, at length, in

Tholuck, p. 292 f. "Yet the absence of the αἰσθή-

τρία from εἰς τὰ σακχαρία (comp. on the contrary, Eph. ii. 8) is an obstacle." We may add, that the context is also an obstacle. The question has been, chap.

ili., concerning Christ as the propitiator. Here He is represented as a "fountain of holiness."

2. Allusions to the removal of sinfulness. "The

procurement of the delivering Spirit of life from Christ is only clearly proved by ver. 8, in case there is in this verse the thought that Christ has gained the victory over sin by His pure and holy personality in His own humanity, and that this sinless Spirit now passes over by faith to believers;" Tholuck. The same writer adds a number of the defenders of the obediencia activa; especially Beza, of the Reformation period; the following later expositors seem also to belong here: Winzer, Stier, Neander, Meyer, De Wette, and Hofmann.—Yet Tholuck finally turns to the allusion of this passage to the guilt of

* [Wordworth finds in our phrase an argument against the dooms of the Immaculate Conception.—R.]

† [This interpretation, adopted by Hodge and Stuart, is rejected by every German commentator, like Note, sect. Philippi and Alford. The passages in the New Testament (Heb. x. 6, 8, 18; xiii. 11; Gal. i. 4) which seem to favor it, all contain a distinct reference to sacrifices of propitiation. In Phil. i. 20, the "gave himself" introduces the same thought. The wider mean-

ing, of course, implies such an exposition; but it is

brutually and obviously out of place. Philippi: um die Sünde aufzunehmen zu tigern; to which Meyer unne-

cessarily objects, since his own view includes this.—R.]

* [See Philippi's view below. Hodge is decided in his preference for this interpretation, regarding all others as arbitrary or independent of the context.—R.]

† [So Alford, Schaff. Stuart makes this antithesis with ver. 1: "There is no sin in Christ; but there is sin in others." (see below). This he justifies by finding here "a paramantal use of words;" but this mode of interpretation is of dubious propriety.—R.]
sin, and we must understand by σαρκι (p. 394) not the σαρκι of Christ, but "the sinful human nature, which, although only κατ' ἰδιότητα, was also possessed by Christ (Philippi, De Wette)." The latter does not belong here. But then there would also follow from this an atonement κατὰ ἰδιότητα. The interpretation of the κατὰ ἰδιότητα interjects (Grotius, Heidenreich, &c.) does not suit the nature of Christ. Meyer properly observes, that the κατὰ ἰδιότητα has been chosen in reference to the κατὰ ἰδιότητα in ver. 1. If we thus condemn ourselves, we shall not be condemned; and if that condemnatory process against sin in the flesh has passed from Christ upon us, the object of the future condemnation is removed.

[Besides these views, Philippi advocates a primary reference to the death of Christ, but includes the fact that thus sin is eo ipso done away and extirpated, so that those who are in Christ Jesus have both the pardon and the removal of sin, because of the indissoluble unity of both in Him.* This suits the wider meaning of no condemnation (ver. 1). All interpretations deviate from the strict meaning of the verb; the reference to punishment involves an added thought, not less than that to the extermination of sin. The law could not save sin, and, to a certain extent, punish it; but its great weakness was its inability to remove sin. It is perfectly gratuitous to infer that the modern interpretation implies that we are justified on the ground of inherent goodness, since this assumes that ver. 1 refers only to declarative righteousness, and overlooks the fact that the controlling thought is union to Christ. Still, should any prefer to find here an allusion to Christ's passion as a partial extermination of sin, it must be allowed as involved, though this must not then be used to force the same meaning on the next ver. — R.]

In the flesh. This is referred by many to the human nature of Christ. Were this the exclusive reference, we would probably find αὐτῷ. The ethical sense must be adopted by those who join it with sin; but against this is the meaning of sin as a principal part of the verb, and also the idiosyncrasy of σαρκι in the earlier part of the verse. It is better, then, to join it with the verb, and include in it human nature, our human nature, which Christ shared.† This seems to be Dr. Lange's view, though he adds to it some remarks which seem to echo his pseudo-plastic interpretation of chap. vii. We paraphrase the whole verse: "What could not be done by the law (was thus done), God sending His own Son in the likeness of that flesh, which was characterized by sin, and, on account of sin, condemned entirely (both as to punitive and polluting effects) in that flesh (which He shared with us) that sin." Yet this is not an accomplished fact as respects our release from the power of sin; that is to be fulfilled, and this end (ἔργα) is set forth in the next verse.—R.]

Plainly, this verse declares the condemnable and the sinful propensity. An expression of Ireneeus is important for the interpretation of this passage: *condemnableness is extra carmen. The beautiful words of Augustine denote the objective medium by which the sinlessness of Christ becomes our liberation; Quomodo liberabatur? Nisi quia reatum iudicii omnium remissione dissolvit, statu usque, quamvis adhuc malean, in peccatum non imputetur. Yet Beza properly observes: Neque nunc Apostolus agit de Christi morte, et nostrorum peccatorum expiatione, sed de Christi incarnatione, et natura nostra corruptione per eum sublata. Only, as far as the transmission of sinlessness from Christ to us is concerned, this verse must be considered in mind chap. vi. 1 f. By virtue of the connection of Christ with us, He has redeemed us; by virtue of His connection with us in our guilty misery, He has stoned us for us; and by virtue of the connection of His nature with our flesh, He has given His flesh to die, in order that, in His spiritual position toward us, He might make us free from the flesh by the communion of His Spirit as spiritual man, and, with the flesh of His risen life, implant in us a sanctified nature for the future resurrection.

Ver. 4. That the righteousness [or requirement] of the law [大量的 ἀνακάτακτος of the law [i.e. ἀνακάτακτος τοῦ νόμου. Ἱνα τε, telic, introducing the purpose of the condemnation of sin in the flesh. Lange renders δικαιομα: Gerehsteins. On the word, see p. 184. Stuart: the precept of the law; Hodge: the demands of the law (and also, the sentence of justification); Alford (following Meyer): all the requirements of the law combined here as one. Perhaps it is more exact to paraphrase: that righteous act (viewing all the acts as a unit) which meets the requirements of the law. This is Lange's view.—R.]. Meyer explains the ἀνακάτακτος ("quite simply, as chap. i. 32; ii. 26; comp. also chap. v. 16") as the requirement of the law; that which the law stipulates. Yet we have seen above, that ἀνακάτακτος is that which satisfies and fulfills the law. The righteousness of life shall proceed from the righteousness of faith. Or, as the former proceeds originally from the latter as freedom in Christ, so shall it also proceed actually from it in more gradual fulfillment—in the holiness of our life. The surprise of the expositors at the explanation of Chrysostom and Theodoret, ὁ σκοπός τοῦ νόμου (see Tholuck, p. 396), is therefore without ground. Certainly that cannot mean, that the purpose of the law is to justify, but that it is its limit and end; see Rom. xii. 10. Explanations:

1. The imputatio of Christ's righteousness. Calvin: The transference to us of the destruction of guilt which Christ effected (Bullinger, Beza, Calixtus [Hodge], and others). Also the transference of Christ's obedience to us (Benz, Arrétius [Haldane, apparently]: therefore also the obedientia activa). Köllner, Fritzschke, and Philippi: The sententia absolutionis is meant. Tholuck properly suggests, that the πληρωθηνη and the ἐν are against these interpretations.

2. The principle of the righteousness of life imparted to believers. This view seems to indicate a slight fear of the thought that Christians shall be holy in the form of believing spontaneity. Tholuck cites Meyer's view: "in order that this fulfilment of the law become apparent in the whole conduct," and adds (in accordance with Oldhaensen), "then Christians would be regarded as though they were only the possessors of a principle fulfilling the law."
3. The real holiness of believers proceeding from the principle of the righteousness of faith. [So Tholuck, Olschhausen, Meyer, Alford, John Brown, and many others; among them some who refer the previous verse to the vicarious sacrifice of Christ.—R.]

The passive form (instead of πηροήσιμος) is a safeguard against a semi-Pelagian misconstruction. De Wette: in our inward activity of life. Reiche and Klotz give special prominence therewith to the real awareness of the fulfillment of the law.

[Might be fulfilled in us, πηροήσιμος ἐν ἡμῖν. The verb is passive. The fulfillment is wrought by God. In us; not by us, not on us (some shade of this meaning is involved in all those interpretations which refer the verse to imputed righteousness or holiness), and certainly not among us. The only objection to be considered is that of Calvin, and others: that, in this sense, the fulfillment does not take place. Granted—not at once, nor in this life, perhaps; but surely this must be the end (comp. Eph. ii. 10; Col. i. 29), and that it is in the Apostle’s mind here, is evident from the latter part of the chapter.—R.]

Who walk not according to the flesh, &c. [τοις μὴ κατὰ σάρκα περιπατοῦσιν, ἀλλὰ κατὰ πνεῦμα. Κατα may be expanded into: according to the impulses of (so Meyer). These phrases express the actual life of those in the flesh and in the Spirit,—R. This addition states not only the characteristic, but also the necessary condition * of believers. Tholuck holds that the participial clause does not contain the condition, as many of the earlier expositors maintain, but only the specification of the method. Meyer holds, that κατὰ πνεῦμα designates only the sanctifying Divine principle itself, as objective, and different from the human πνεῦμα! But it must not be viewed subjectively as the pneumatic nature of the regenerate, restored by the Holy Spirit, as (in accordance with Chrysostom) held by Bengel, Rückert, Philippi, and others. We would then have to ask at once, whether there is not another expression for the human spiritual life in the fellowship of the Holy Spirit? Further, whence the antagonism of the Holy Spirit and the human σάρξ, since the most direct antithesis would be man’s unholy spiritual life? Universally, wherever the question is the antithesis of spirit and flesh in man himself, man is nevertheless considered as man, and not merely as flesh. [To this position of Dr. Lange there are decided objections. On the whole subject, the reader is referred to the Exerciscus, p. 235. It is better to hold (with Meyer, Alford, Hodge, and many others, against Stuart, Philippi, Lange, &c.), that πνεῦμα here refers to the Holy Spirit, and not to the spiritual nature imparted by the Holy Spirit, or the subjective spiritual life-principle (Lange). This seems to be required by ver. 2 (“the law of the Spirit of life”) and ver. 5 (”the things of the Spirit”), where πνεῦμα evidently means the Holy Spirit. The E. V. has very properly expressed this by the use of the capital letter.—R.]

SECOND PARAGRAPHS, vers. 5-8.

Ver. 5. For those who are according to the flesh [οι γὰρ κατὰ σάρκα δι’εστιν]. The εἰναι κατὰ σάρκα is identical with the εἰναι ὑπὸ σαρκός, and the latter means, to be in the carnal principle, under the supposition that the σάρξ is the absolute principle of life. This εἰναι, as the controlling tendency of life, is the source of the ψυχικός, and the ψυχικός is the cause efficient of the πνευματικός. Meyer says that this expression is a wider notion than that conveyed by “who walk after the flesh,” which is not the case.* Tholuck explains εἰναι κατὰ τί: “To bear in one’s self the qualities of something; therefore = oi σαρκοῦντες.” But it is these, first of all, in their principle of life, which then certainly results in the walk in the flesh. [It may be admitted that the principle of life is more prominent than the ethical state in this verse. Yet the phrases, “in the flesh” and “according to the flesh” (especially the former) include the characteristic state as well. Hence the view of Tholuck is preferable.—R.]

Do mind the things of the flesh [τὰ τῆς σαρκὸς φθονοῦν]. The verb means, think of, care for, strive after (Alford). Meyer notices the absence of the article, making σαρκός indefinite, as though it were something independent. This accords with the view, that Spirit here is the objective and operative Holy Spirit.—R. The false objects of the desires of the false independence of the flesh. The antithesis, those who are according to the Spirit, οἱ δὲ κατὰ πνεῦμα, completes the thought that the two tendencies totally exclude each other.—[It also follows that τὰ τοῦ πνευματος, the things of the Spirit, which belong to the Holy Spirit, and hence to the spiritual life, exclude the things of the flesh. Dr. Hodge well remarks, therefore, that the latter phrase means “not merely sensual things, but all things which do not belong to the category of the things of the Spirit.”—R.]

Ver. 6. For the mind of the flesh is death [τὸ γὰρ φθονία τῆς σαρκὸς θανάτος]. The connection here formed by γὰρ is singular. Tholuck: It could serve to prove the second half of ver. 5, while the correspondence of the members of the sentence leads us to expect a proof of both halves of ver. 5. Thus the view gains probability, that, according to the Greek and Hebrew (‘") use of language, the proof in ver. 6 performs for that in ver. 5 the parallel service of assigning reasons for the τοις κεντρικὸς, &c., In ver. 4). Meyer makes the γὰρ the proof of the second half of ver 5, οἱ δὲ κατὰ πνεῦμα. “Motive why they make the interests of the πνεῦμα the end of their efforts.” † We regard, however, the γὰρ as proof that the εἰναι κατὰ οὗ η ὑπὸ σαρκός & φθονίας, as a result. For the σαρκός has a φθονίας, yet all its φθονίας is nothing but death; * [It were better to say that it is the same idea under a different aspect. In ver. 4, with reference to the outward life; here, with reference to the actual state.—R.]

† [In 4th ed., Meyer agrees with Tholuck, taking the second γὰρ as indicative, according to classical usage. So Rückert, Stuart, Hodge. (De Wette, Alford, follow the view attributed to Meyer above.) The contrast, already indicated in ver. 4, is confirmed here.—R.]

‡ [φθονία (Lange: θέννυσιν; Bengel: sentimentum, in the French) means the disposition, which manifests itself in the σαρκὸς (ver. 5). The τὸ γὰρ, is therefore correct in thought, though not in form.—R.]
not only arising at death against its will, but also proceeding from death, moving in the element of death; that is, in constant dissolution of the unity between life and its source of life, between spiritual and physical life, and even between the opposites of the desires of the individual members. [The copula, to be supplied here, is not, has as its results, but, is amounts to: Philippi: "Death is here conceived as present (comp. 1 Tim. v. 6; Eph. ii. 1, 5), not merely as a result, but as a characteristic mark, an immanent definition of the carnal mind."—R.]

[But the mind of the Spirit, to δέ φρονήμα του πνεύματος.] The opposite is the φρονήμα του πνεύματος (the εἰναι κατα πνεῦμα; it is itself πνεῦμα); it is life and peace.* It is therefore true from life to life, in movement, directed to life. Peace means the soul of life. Opposition is the separation and dissolution of life; peace with God is connection with the source of life; peace with one's self, a blessed sense of life; peace with the government of God and His world, an infinitely richer life. The third characteristic must be specifically emphasized in both clauses: directed to the end: life and peace.

Ver. 7. Because the mind of the flesh. [Αὐτοὶ introduces a proof, here confined to the former half of ver. 6. This proof hints at an antithesis to both life and peace, the latter being more evident, as it is in human consciousness also.—R.] The reason why φρονήμα, &c., is δέ, lies in its opposition to the source of life, its enmity against God [εἰς τὸ κράτος τοῦ ἐννοι][, with which the dis-pleasure of God necessarily corresponds.† Since the Apostle does not prove the second half, it follows that here the effort of the flesh constitutes the principal point of view. Enmity against God is, in the first degree, the actual opposition to God in almost unknown (but not unconscious) form; but afterwards the opposition established also in the consciousness. Melanchthon appropriately says: "Loquatur Paulus principaliter de cogitationibus de deo, quales sunt in montis non rarae, in qua simul magna confusio est dubitationum, desidie et de affectibus erga deum. In securis est contentus judicialis dei, in perpetuo indignatio et fremitus adversus deum."—B.

For it does not submit itself to the law of God [ἐν τῇ γάρ ἄριστῃ τῷ Θεῷ εὐγνώμονα ἑταίρασιν]. The word is mixed, and the law of God is emphatic position. The clause proves what precedes, by adding a fact. This mode of proof concurs with the statements already made respecting man's character and that of the law.—R. Paul's positive declaration of the manifestation of this enmity. This enmity, which is very deep-seated, becomes manifest in disobedience to, and rebellion against, God's law.

Neither indeed can it [οὐ δέ γάρ δίστασι]. Subjection to the law of God is not possible on the carnal standpoint. Or rather, it cannot be effected by carnal effort. A divided life, according to the blind course of the lusts, is in outright contradiction to the central procession of life from within, according to the principle of the Spirit.

* [Meyer, who, as usual, limits "death" to eternal death, must define "life" in the same way. Life is the direct antithesis to death; but a subjective characteristic is added, as Rendtorff, to procure the way for the following description of enmity.—R.]
† [It is easy to construct this inference: The mind of the flesh, which is the antithesis to the mind of the Spirit, therefore, enmity against God: therefore, enmity against God = death.—R.]

Tholuck justly opposes Zeller, by bringing out the fact, that the antithesis is not man's sensual and spiritual nature in itself, but that σαρκίς denotes human nature with the accessory idea of its sinful character. But to this it may be said, that the question is not here, in itself, but a σαρκίς της σαρκός; that is, a σαρκίς morbidly excited and demonized by a selfish spirituality. [Comp. the Exclusus in chap. v. That chapter is a proof of this declaration. The fact is undoubted. Paul is but declaring the manifestation of enmity to God in the form of opposition to His law, the inability of the carnal man to be subject to it. The question of ability to believe is not under discussion, yet Pelagianism and legalism are obviously precluded by this statement.—R.]

Ver. 8. And those who are in the flesh cannot please God [οἱ δὲ ἐν σαρκὶ ὁστις σιὼ ὑφιστάσις ὁι σαρκῶν ὑποστάσεως]. The E. V strengthens δέ into so then, following Beza, Calvin, and others, who made it = οὖν. (So Hodge.) It is much better, with De Wette, Philippi, Meyer, to consider it metabolic. It continues the thought of the first clause of ver. 7. There seems to be no necessity for assuming a suppressed μην, as Alford does. On this account we render and instead of but.—R.] ὁστις ἐν σαρκὶ = ὁστις κατὰ σάρκα, but the expression here is stronger; see above. The incapacity in ver. 8, then, follows from the incapacity of ver. 7. It is said, in a mild way, that they are objects of the Divine displeasure, children of wrath. But the expression is significant, in that it destroys the notion of those who are legalists, and rely on the righteousness of their works, and who, although ὁστις ἐν σαρκὶ, fancy that they can merit the pleasure of God by their works and endeavors. For we must by no means lose sight of the fact, that the Apostle does not speak merely of the gross service of sin, but also of an observance of the law, which accepts the law as merely external, as φαντασμά and σάρκ. [The connection renders obvious what is distinctly stated elsewhere, that this is no negative position, involving only negative results. The mind of the flesh is death.—R.]

Third Paragraph, vers. 9-11.

Ver. 9. But ye are not in the flesh, &c. [ἐν τῇ γάρ ἄριστῃ τῷ Θεῷ εὐγνώμονα ἑταίρασιν]. Subjection to the law of God is not possible on the carnal standpoint. Or rather, it cannot be effected by carnal effort. A divided life, according to the blind course of the lusts, is in outright contradiction to the central procession of life from within, according to the principle of the Spirit. [Meyer, who, as usual, limits "death" to eternal death, must define "life" in the same way. Life is the direct antithesis to death; but a subjective characteristic is added, as Rendtorff, to procure the way for the following description of enmity.—R.]

If so be that the Spirit of God dwell in you, εἴπη πνεύμα Θεού ὁ ὑπό θεοῦ εὐγνώμονα. The antithesis. The more specific exhortation does not appear here, but in ver. 12. The εἴπη may be thus distinguished from εἴπη: it (= "provided that") generally expresses slight doubt, while εἴπη expresses rather an assurance in the sense of if indeed. Yet the εἴπη here must be understood as not only purely conditional, in conformity with the antithesis by which the Apostle represents the standpoint of the spiritual life of believers as purely fundamental and ideal. With such a representation, the application to individuals can only take place with an εἴπη; likewise without positive doubt. Chrysostom and Oehlerhausen take it as ἐν τῇ γάρ εἴπη, quando quidem; Tholuck and Meyer prefer the homologity construction, on account of the antithesis. [It seems most natural to account for the conditional form, by admitting an indirect incitement to self-examination (Meyer). Πνεύμα is without the article, yet it must mean the Holy Spirit; hence
we claim this as its usual meaning throughout the passage. The use of πνεύμα, seemingly in distinction from πνεῦμα, is not against this, since, in the first clause, the Spirit is represented as the element in which they live; in the second, as the indwelling power enabling the body to pass away.

- On οὐ&ep;ξ &izes, comp. 1 Cor. iii. 16; vi. 17, 19; 2 Tim. i. 14; John xiv. 23. —In you must not be weakened to among you. —R.

**Now if any man hath not, &c. [εἶ δὲ τις πνεύμα Χριστοῦ οὐ&ep;ξ ἤ&ekpar;ξεν.] The antithesis is not very strong; δὲ may well be rendered now (E. V.). The unconscious negative belongs to the verb (Alford). See Textual Notes. —R.** This antithetical declaration certainly expresses the possibility, that what has been said has no reference to particular individuals, and that here no half measures are of any avail.

**The Spirit of Christ. The question here is, belonging to Christ; hence, the Spirit of Christ. It is the Spirit of God as the Spirit of Christ, the Spirit of His righteousness of life as brought home to the inward life of believers.** [There can be no reasonable doubt that it is identical with Spirit of God, above; though the connection with "son of Life" has occasioned the use of this particular phrase. The genitive is possessive, Spirit belonging to, or proceeding from, Christ. Comp. Phil. i. 19; Gal. iv. 6; 1 Peter i. 11. Notice the terms, "Spirit of God," "Spirit of Christ," "Spirit," all applied to the Divine spiritual indwelling. Hence Bengel well says: Testimonium illustra de sancta Trinitate ejusque aequalis auctoritate in corde fideli. It must be admitted that such statements generally have reference to the economy of grace, but they form the basis for the doctrinal statements of the Church. This text is therefore a dictum probabile for the Western doctrine of the procession of the Holy Ghost from the Father and the Son (Justin, Synod of Toledo, A. D. 689). This was the final contribution to the doctrinal statement of the Trinity. On its importance, &c., see Schaff, History of the Christian Church, iii. pp. 688 f.; comp. Kähnis, Lehre vom Heiligen Geiste, Halle, 1847. Philippi has an excellent note in loco. On the relation of the Holy Spirit to Christ, comp. John xiv. 26; xv. 26; xvi. 7, 13, 14. —R.]

**[He is none of his, οὐ&ep;τος ἦν οἷς ἄντιον ἄντιον.] The Apostle does not regard a merely external belonging to Christ as of any value. Where the Christianity of the inward life is extinct, there the Christianity of the whole man is extinct. Meyer: "Not those who are not Christians, but nominal Christians."**

Ver. 10. **But if Christ is in you [ἐὰ δὲ Χρι&stou ἦν ἤ&ekpar;ξεν.] That is, as a principle of life. [-relative contrast with the last verse. (It is substituted for ἐὰ, to indicate the strong probability that this is the case.) Comp. John vi. 56; xv. 4; 2 Cor. xiii. 3; Gal. ii. 20; Eph. iii. 17; Col. i. 27; also John xiv. 23, as justifying the remark of Bengel: Qu&st; Spiritum habet, Christum non habet; quem Christum habet, Deum habet. The mystical union of Christ and the believer has, as its underlying basis, the yet more mysterious unity of the Persons of the Godhead. —R.**

**The body is dead [τὸ μὲν σῶμα νεκρόν.] Explanations of vers. 10, 11:* *Death and life in their strict sense.**

fore the body lapsed to death (Augustine, Boss, Bengal [mortum pro mortuimm], Usteri, Rückert, and Fritzsche). [So Hodg, Alford, Wordsworth.] According to Meyer, the νεκρόν is proleptic. "To have the following blessed results to enjoy; although the body lapsed to death because of sin, yet the spirit is life because of righteousness. But He who raised Christ will also raise your mortal bodies, because the Spirit of Christ dwelleth in you." [In favor of this view are: the natural sense of dead, the connection with vers. 11, and the subsequent course of thought; its not attaching an ethical meaning to body. Against it: the comprehensive meaning of death throughout this part of the Epistle, the necessity for a wide meaning in its antithesis τ&upsgr;ο&upsgr;η, as well as in ἄνθρωπον (ver. 11, not ἄνθρωπος); also the use of σῶμα in an implied technical sense in ver. 18. —R.]

2. The body is dead, slain by sin (Chrysostom, Theodoret, Erasmus, Grotius, Baumgarten-Crusius [Stuart], and others. These, for the most part, take ver. 10 in a moral or spiritual sense. This view is most objectionable, since it disturbs the harmony of the two verses, takes σῶμα in a strict ethical sense, and makes it seem to have been chosen rather to avoid a direct antithesis to τ&upsgr;ο&upsgr;η the widest possible meaning. —R.]

3. The misery of sin as bearing in itself the germ of death (De Wette, and others). [De Wette claims that the physical and ethical senses must be combined here, as in John v. 21 ff. This view is sufficiently correct if properly restricted. The physical death of the body is to be viewed as a moral result of the indwelling sin, but only because the body has not yet shared in the full results of redemption. —R.]

But all this does not furnish us with the definition, that, on account of sin—that is, because of sinfulness—we have to lead a divinely partial life from the principle of the Spiri&tp;re, in which the body is declared to be dead in an ideal and dynamical respect (see chap. vi. 4). But thereby the spirit as life, and the principle of life, is concentrated still more in itself. [The objection to this view is, its confusion of human spirit and Divine Spirit, on which the whole interpretation rests. —R.]

**But the spirit is life [τ&ep;&ep;το δὲ πνε&upgr;μα ζω&upsgr;ς.] Meyer also holds, that here the spirit is not the Holy Spirit (as Chrysostom, Calvin, and others suppose), but the human spirit. Although the human spirit is here regarded as filled by the Holy Spirit, we must not include (with Philippi, following Theodoret and De Wette) the pneumatic nature of the regenerate. For, says Meyer, that must remain there. [The meaning is evidently that under III. B. in the Excursus above, p. 235. —R.] ζω&upsgr;ς, life; not merely living, but life which is thoroughly actual, life-giving, and life-supporting. Whatever view be taken of dead, the change in the form here, from the adjective to the noun, warrants an extension of meaning; as indeed the word ζω&upsgr;ς itself, and its reference to the human spirit permeated by the Divine Spirit, demand. —R.**

**Because of sin [ἐὰ δὲ ἄνθρωπον, on account of sin, as an indwelling principle. Not the special sins of the body, nor that the body is the special seat of sin; but, having shared in the results of sin, it has not yet shared in the results of redemption. How and when it will, is afterwards stated. —R.] As this can only mean, to constitute a pure opposition to the sinful propensity cleaving to
the members, so can because of righteousness [διὰ δικαιοσύνην] only mean, to maintain and develop the righteousness of faith in the righteousness of life. According to Meyer, the justicia imputata is meant, as the foundation of the ζωή. (The most of the elder expositors, together with Rückert, &c., favor the same view.) But then the διὰ would have to be construed with the genitive. The reference to the righteousness of life (Erasmus, Grotsch, De Wette, Philippi [Hodge, Alford, and others] is opposed by Meyer in the words: "Because the righteousness of life can never be perfect, it can never be the ground of the ζωή. But the question is not the ground of the ζωή, but the greater promotion of life, so that it may prove itself to be purer life. The concern is, to preserve spotless the white robe of beataeval righteousness, and, being clad in it, to strive for the crown of righteousness." (Meyer holds, according to this, that the υἱός θεοῦ does not imply our own individual sin, and thus, too, that the διὰ does not imply our own "righteousness." "In harmony with the sense, many expositors, particularlyCalixtus, connect the justitia imputata with the inchoda.*

Ver. 11. But if the Spirit [ἐὰν δὲ τὸ πνεῦμα]. The Apostle here prepares his transition from his description of adoption, regarded as a partial spiritual life, to his description of the perfect glory in which body and spirit shall be in perfect harmony, when the body shall be glorified in the perfect organ of the Spirit. Meyer thus construes the connection: "After ver. 10, death still retains some power—that over the body; Paul now removes this."

Of him that raised up Jesus from the dead, &c. [ἐὰν εἰρήκατος Θεοῦ ἐκ νεκρῶν, κ.τ.λ.] The spiritual resurrection must be followed by the physical; it is a prophecy of the general resurrection. For the author of the spiritual resurrection is the Spirit of the wonder-working God, which has raised Christ, and elevated Him to the majesty of the glorified life. What the Spirit [now dwelling in you] has done to Him, in conformity with the connection and body of spirit, He will also do to His members (see Eph. i. 19 f). He has raised Jesus from the dead—that is, as, the first-fruits of the resurrection. Therefore He;

Will quicken even your mortal bodies, &c. [ἀνακοινωνοῦται καὶ τὰ θνητὰ σώματα ὑμῶν, κ.τ.λ.]. The use of the word θνητά, mortal, immediately after νεκρῶν (ver. 10) seems to justify the reference of the latter to physical death; as, indeed, σώματα here opposes any ethical sense of that word in ver. 10. Since, however, the word θνητά is one of wide meaning, a large number of commentators (Calvin, Stuart, De Wette, Philippi, and others) refer this verse also to something which takes place even here, to be completed, indeed, at the time of actual resurrection. Against this is the καὶ, also, even, which is unnecessary, unless the reference be to something which has not yet taken place, and which seemed most unlikely to take place. The quickening of the body, as a tool of unrighteousness, has already begun. The objection of Stuart, that this then would only mean to declare the bodily resurrection, a truth already well known, betrays a want of appreciation of the importance attached to that truth by the Apostle. Furthermore, even admitting a secondary reference to a present moral quickening of the body, the primary reference to the actual physical resurrection seems to be demanded by the experience of Christians, which certainly shows them that the last seat, both of the strength and the effects of sin, is in the body. It does not revive; no spiritual power here revives it. It is mortal, yet even it shall share in the life-giving influence. The verb means more than raising from the dead indeed, but, as used here, the emphasis rests on this.—R."

[On account of his Spirit that dwelleth in you, διὰ τὸ ἐνοχικήν αὐτοῦ πνεῦμα ἐν ὑμῖν. See Textual Note] We have decided above for the accusative, διὰ τὸ ἐνοχικήν, in opposition to the genitive. We do this for important reasons. The Spirit which dwells in believers prepares the resurrection-body; but the resurrection is thereby only provided for. The resurrection itself is still to be the final deed of God. And this is the question here (see ver. 18). But it is a miraculous deed of God, which is not only occasioned, but also brought to pass, by the presence of the Spirit of life in believers.

The closing of terms is remarkable: Jesus and Christ. [Bengel: Appellatio Jesus speeat ad ipsam; Christi, referitur ad nos; true even to its eschatological reference (Meyer).—R.]

If, now, the ζωογόνος also refers to the resurrection, the choice of the expression yet indicates, at the same time, the holiness of the corporeality by the operation of the resurrection-power of the Spirit, as this holiness constitutes the transition and interposition for the final miracle of the resurrection (see 2 Cor. v. 5). From the very nature of the case, the question here can be neither an ethical vivification alone, nor a physical one alone; but the idea of vivification comprises both these (according to Calvin, De Wette, Philippi, and others).

Calvin: "Non de ultima resurrectione,* quan momenta fies, habebur sermo, sed de continua spiritus operatione, quan religiai curas paulatim morteis concursum in nobis instituatur." But De Wette properly observes, against Meyer in the notion that the spiritual power of resurrection alone can consummate the process of renewal (in conformity with the reading διὰ τοῖς, &c.), that the Jewish opinion that the Holy Ghost quickens the dead (Shamoth Rabba, &c.) cannot prove any thing here.

Fouth Paragraph, vers. 12-17.

Ver. 12. Therefore, brethren [ἀδελφοί]. An inferential exhortation. In chap. vi. 12 a similar exhortation is found, but without ἀδελφοί. The first person naturally follows.—R."

The ἀδελφός draws an inference from the necessity of leading the life in the Spirit in opposition to the life in the flesh, in hope of the reanimation of the body. Tholuck sees, though not in the sense of the textual construction: "The Apostle allows himself to be led off from the train of thought commencing with

* [Accepting διὰ as immanent righteousness, we paraphrase as follows: But if Christ be in you, (though) your body indeed is dead (bowing in it the seeds of death, and about to die) on account of sin (whose effects are not yet totally removed), but your spirit (pervaded by the Holy Spirit, and may therefore truly say to be yet the actual count of righteousness (implanted in you by the Holy Spirit, in virtue of your union to Christ).—R.]

* [As Alford suggests: non solum de ultima resurrectione, would be more correct. For a very full discussion, both of the textual variations and the exegetical opinions, see Meyer in loc. The defence is the exclusive reference to the resurrection of the body.—R.]
Verses 10 and 11, by the necessity of an exhortation, and afterwards returns from another point to the
sextological expression.

We are debtors, not to the flesh (ἡ φύσις τοῦ σώματος). The negative applies to the succeeding clause as well. The antithesis is obvious. Σώματος has the article here, where it is personified, but not in the next clause, where it corresponds with the use made of it in verses 4 and 5. —R. According to Meyer, the Apostle has suppressed his antithesis in consequence of the vivacious movement of his language. But he was prevented from something else, namely, a desire to guard against misunderstanding, as if Christians had no duties in reference to their flesh or their physical life (comp. Eph. v. 29). [So Chrysostom; see Alford in loco.—R.] Therefore he defines his proposition more specifically: not to live after the flesh (τοῦ κατὰ σώμα τῆς φύσεως); that is, not to live according to the principle of carnal desires, or of external motives at all. The genitive τοῦ is sufficiently explained as designating the indefinite and anonymous one, for which the Apostle takes another view; see Meyer. The antithesis, after the Spirit, follows indirectly in verse 18.

Ver. 13. Ye shall die (μέλλετε ἀπονεώσεσθε). Strictly, then ye shall go continually to death, or, toward death (μέλλετε). Meyer understands this to mean here only eternal death. This is contrary to Philippi, who properly retains the general idea of death. —R. According to Rüetker, this declaration would exclude the resurrection. But the Apostle takes cognizance not only of the difference between the first and second resurrection (1 Cor. xv. 23), but also of a resurrection which begins immediately after death (2 Cor. v. 1); and pure life is in antithesis to a final resurrection to judgment. The explanation of 1 Corinthians, του δυνατον διανοετον εν τη γενεσιν, precludes neither the resurrection on the one hand, nor, on the other, a constant connection of physical and psychical corruption with ethical corruption.

But if ye through the Spirit (εἰ δὲ πνευματι). Πνευματικα. This is unheard of by anything, not even by the apostles.beatification.—R. By means of the life of the Spirit, by virtue of the Holy Spirit, says Meyer. Therefore the Apostle says, the deeds of the body should be mortified, not by bodily exercise, restraint, and penance, but by the power of the life of the Spirit.

The deeds (τας πράξεις). The stragglers. Machinations (Luke xxii. 31; Col. iii. 9). These consist in the predominance of illegitimate impulses as irresistible necessities, as proofs of liberty, as the poetry of life, &c. The word occurs in the later Greek writers in the meaning of cunning designs, especially in relation to sins of lust (see Tholuck). Yet the general treatment in the present section requires a general interpretation of the word.

[Of the body, τοῦ σώματος. See Textual Note 14.] The expression σώματος has been very strange to many; therefore Dodd, D. E. F. G., and the Vulgate, read σώματος. To σώματος τῆς σωματίας, chap. vi. 6, cannot be cited in favor of the expression, since the question here is a real body, but not there. Yet Meyer correctly asserts, contrary to Stirn, that Paul remained true to his customary use of language. The body has its autonomous desires, which express themselves faithfully in the normal habits of man, and willingly subordinate themselves to the dominion of the Spirit. In the sinful man, who is not converted, these express themselves as impious commands. In the believer, on the contrary, from whom the law in the members is removed, they can morbidly express themselves still, though in only deceptive forms, and so far as the body, which should be the organ of the spirit, is autonomous in unguarded moments. But the πράξεις are then monopolized by the Spirit, which appears as πράξεις of the body, because the body has lost its physiological rights. [Thus we avoid giving an ethical sense to body. If the bad sense of deeds be emphasized, then the ethical force is found there. We must avoid, on the other hand, taking the phrase, " deeds of the body," as metonymy for sinful, carnal deeds (Stuart, Hodge); for there must be a reason for the choice of this word. Alford, following De Wette, explains it: "the πράξεις, but here concrete, to give more vivid reality." —R. Θανατοτύτε (comp. chap. vii. 4, and the stronger expression, ημωριστει, Col. iii. 5; Lange's Comm., p. 68, 64.—R.) Mortify can only mean: exhaust and abnegate to the very root. Wicked practices, as roots of sin, are included.

Ye shall live (ζωγραφισθείτε). Alford: "not μέλλετε ἀπονεώσεσθε, but here concrete, to give more vivid reality." —R. The word, therefore, in the form of an assurance, 'ye shall live,' from Christ's Apostles." —R. In the higher, and even highest sense.

Ver. 14. For as many as are led by the Spirit of God (οἱ οὓς πνευματι μετατρέπει θεός ἄνοιγται). Comp. Gal. v. 18. Lange's Comm., p. 187. ἔκαστος introduces the reason why they shall live, implying, at the same time, that the correction was the result of the Spirit's influence, as is expressed in ver. 13. Hence πνευματι, in the former case, must refer to the Spirit of God. That this leading means a continued and special influence of the Divine Spirit, is obvious.—R. The Spirit of God is not identical with the Spirit in ver. 13 (Meyer); but it is Christian spiritual life, to be led by the Spirit of God. The passive form expresses its complete domination, without at the same time denying the voluntary being led on the part of the human will.

They are sons of God (οὗτοι οἱ ἐποίησις θεοῦ). See Textual Note 14. The reading adopted here places the emphasis on οὗτοι, these, and none other, but gives a secondary emphasis to ἐποίησις; comp. Gal. iii. 7. Philippi finds no essential difference between ἐποίησις and τέκνα θεοῦ, except that, in the former, the idea of origin is more prominent. Hence Christ is called θεοῦ, never τέκνα θεοῦ. (So Alford.) On the significance of the phrase, see Driscoll, Note 15, and the Exeg. Notes on vers. 16, 16, 15, 15.—R. Sons, in the real sense, in contrast with the
symbolical children of God of the old theocracy. It is those alone, who bear in themselves the mark that the Spirit of God leads them. On the other hand, the merely symbolical adoption by God under the law is strictly a bondage, according to ver. 15. Comp. Gal. v. 18.

Ver. 15. For ye did not receive the spirit of bondage (καὶ ἐλάβετε πνεῦμα δουλείας)....An appeal to Christian consciousness, to confirm (γέγραμν) his statement. The verb is aorist, referring to a definite time (when they became Christians).—R.] Meyer translates: "A spirit of bondage, adoption." We hold that the definitions are sufficiently united by the exclusive antithesis. What must we understand by the expression, spirit of bondage? Tholuck: "The negative form of this clause caused the earlier expositors great difficulty, since the question is not a communication of the spirit in the Old Testament, and since the spirit there imparted, so far as it was a spirit of bondage, could not be derived from God; and finally, as the πνεῦμα, which, in view of the antithesis of πνεῦμα νιόριας, must be viewed as the Holy Spirit, could produce the spirit of bondage." Explanations:

1. Augustine incidentally: The devil is the author of the slavish spirit (Heb. xii. 14), Luther: The spirit of Cain in opposition to Abel's spirit of grace (Fritzscbe: mensa daemon, &c.).


3. Most of the later expositors: The same Holy Spirit is described in His twofold operation; here, as far as He exercises His penal office (John xvi. 8). In that case, the operation of the mere attrition not designed by the Spirit is made prominent.

4. Grotius, Philippi, and others: πν. in both cases a subjective spiritual disposition. [Philippi defends this view very ably. Smarr: a servile spirit; a filial spirit; Allord admits also the subjective element. De Wette remarks, that the objective source is indicated in the verb "received,"—R.]

5. Fritzscbe, Meyer, and Tholuck: πν. δωλ. denotes what the received filial spirit is not. Likewise Monnachus, in the seventh century. Therefore the spirit of bondage is regarded as a hypothetical antithesis. This is undoubtedly correct, in a measure, so far as the Spirit which they have received can be regarded only as a Spirit of adoption; but a spirit of bondage would be really a perverse spirit. [It should be remarked, that all views which give πνεῦμα a subjective meaning, must either take it in the first case as disposition, and, in the second, as the human spirit as influenced by the Holy Spirit, thus having no exact correspondence; or, assume a hypothetical antithesis in the first case. It may be added, that it is difficult to account for the use of the word "receive" (especially the definite aorist, if these views be accepted, since the servile spirit was the natural spirit. We are thus driven to the interpretation, that πνεῦμα means the same spirit in both cases, defined first negatively, then positively. The probability of a reference to the Holy Spirit is very great in that case.—R.]

But yet the Apostle intimates that Judaism has made of the Old Testament a spirit (a spirit-like, complete system) of bondage, and that it might attempt to make such a perverse spirit of the New Testament. This intimation is brought out prominently by the πάλιν εἰς φόβον, which denotes a fact. At Sinai the Jews made of the law a law εἰς φόβον in the bad sense (Exod. xx. 19, &c.). On the other hand, the repetition of the ἐλάβετε forms the view given above: ye have received the spirit of bondage, because that would be a contradiction.

Again to fear. This denotes the bound: wicked fear of servile legalism. [De Wette, Meyer, Philippi, join πάλιν with εἰς φόβον as in order again to fear. The πάλιν may imply that the condition under Judaism was one of fear, but it does not follow that the Roman Christians were mainly Jewish (Philippi), for this fear is a result of all un-Christian religiousness. The πάλιν points to their previous condition in all cases.—R.]*

But ye received the Spirit of adoption (αλλά ἐλάβετε πνεῦμα νιόριας). Meyer finds in the repetition of ἐλάβετε πνεῦμα a something solemn. The force of the genitive must be determined largely by the meaning of πνεῦμα. Meyer: A spirit which is the ruling principle in the condition of adoption. Philippi, arguing from Gal. iv. 6, that adoption precedes the impartation of the Holy Spirit, finds another reason for the subjective sense of spirit; but the adoption may be taken, not as the act, but the state, which is more accordant with the context, since εἰς φόβον, wherein, refers to a state or element of life. Out of this comes the subjective feeling, the cry, Abba, Father. The genitive then points to an effect as in bondage, which also has a descriptive clause appended.—R.]

De Wette: "νιόρια, strictly, adoption instead of a child," which meaning can be so urged, that they who were by nature the children of wrath (Eph. ii. 3), have been adopted, or appointed (Eph. i. 15), the children of God (Fritzscbe, Meyer, and Olshausen). The same commentator says: "But it is a question whether—as even in the Old Testament (Deut. xxxii. 6), and in the New Testament (John i. 12; 1 John iii. 9; 2 Peter i. 4), and also in Paul, and more especially in this passage, the idea of transformation into children of God occurs—is not, consequently, in νιόρια, rather the idea of sonship, of the real relation of children to father (Luther, Usteri, &c.), than of adoption (Fritzscbe, Meyer, and Tholuck). The expression, πνεῦμα νιόριας, and the use made of the word in ver. 23, harmonizes better with this view." Tholuck, on the contrary, appeals to Eph. v. 1; Rom. ix. 4; to the designation of the adopted child by τὸν δοθήν (τὸν ἐνσαίμου); and to the adoptive filio- rum of the Vulgate. But Chrysostom, Theodoret, and other Greek expositors, on the other hand, have taken the word also in the sense of νιόριας. It is easy to see that the Apostle chose the expression in order to distinguish the children of faith, as adopted through grace, from τὸν ἐνσαίμου. But he had the further reason of not wishing to press the idea: for then he could not have said, with reference to the Hebrew law of inheritance, "And if children, then heirs." Likewise, the new birth by Christ and His Spirit denotes real νιόρια. [The actual sonship has already been mentioned in ver. 14. It seems more natural, then, to take this expression in the confirmatory verse in its literal sense, adoption, as implying the method of their becoming sons; the more so, as an appeal is made to the experience of the readers,
which experience would revert out of one state into the other.—R.

Wherein we cry (1 Cor. ii. 8) [ἀστ. τ. πνεύμα]. The E. V., whereby, is not exact. Hodge: "which enables us to address God as our Father." Such an instrumental sense of the preposition is very doubtful. The first person is here used, probably from the deep feeling of fellowship which the thought awakens.—R.] The τε in here designates the Spirit as the principle [element] of life, which has the full πνευματική as its result (Heb. x. 19-28).

καθὼς ονειρεύετο; the voluntary, childish exclamation. "Chrysostom raises the doubts, that, even in the Old Testament, God is called the Father of Israel; and he replies to it, by saying that the Jews did not use this term in their prayers; or, if they did, it was only ἐν οἴνοια δαίμονι, and not ἀπὸ πνευματικῆς ένεργείας κακῶςιν. Yet God certainly has the name of Father in the Old Testament, only in the same incomplete sense as the people the name of son, namely, as founder and protector (ver. iii. 16, and elsewhere), and always in reference to the temporal, and not to the relation of the individual;" Tholuck.

In the Apocrypha, He is first addressed thus by individuals (Book of Wisdom xiv. 8; Sirach xxiii. 1; ii. 14). But we must not overlook the fact that, even in the Old Testament, the centre of the filial relation is the Messiah (2 Sam. vii.; Ps. ii.; Isa. ix.); and that, consequently, from the perfect New Testament centre of the relation of the Father to Christ, all νοησία extends.

Abba, Father. 'Aββα [Ἀββᾶ], the Syriac name for father (Gal. iv. 6; Mark xiv. 36). Why is the πατήρ added? Explanations:

1. The usual view (Rückert, Reiliche, Köllner, etc.) is, the πατήρ helps to explain the Syriac abba. So Hodge: "Paul chose to call God his Father, in his own familiar tongue. Having used the one word, however, the Greek, of course, became necessary for those to whom he was writing." But Paul does not always deem it necessary thus to translate (comp. 1 Cor. xvi. 22); and in the three cases where this phrase occurs, the usual mark of interpretation (τοῦτο εἰρηνή) is left out. —R.

2. The repetition of the name is an expression of childlike fondness (Chrysostom, Theodore of Cappadocia, and Grotius [Alford]).


4. The name "Abba" has passed from Jewish into Christian prayer, and has received, through Christ himself, the consecration of a special sanctity. Therefore the Greek-speaking Christians retained the word as a proper noun, and added thereto the πατήρ as an appellative, so that the Abba, Father, remained in force; Meyer. [So De Wette, Philippi, Lightfoot; comp. Lange's Comm. Galatians, p. 98. —R.] This would be, in reality, a duplication arising from misconception. Tholuck unites with Luther, in favor of Chrysostom's view. Luther: "It is the calling to, just as a young child lips to its father in simple, childlike confidence." If it be necessary to refer to the passage in Mark, the πατήρ there understood serves as an explanation. It is without any admixture of misconception that a liturgical use (as Hallelujah, Hosanna, Amen) has been made of this passage, because, in the most significant manner, there is in one salutation an invocation of the Father of Christ and the Father of Christians, the Father of the believers of the Old Testament and the New, the Father of Jews and Gentiles, and thus of the Father of all believers in all ages.

Ver. 16. The Spirit itself [αὐτὸ τ. πνεύμα]. The parallel passage, Gal. iv. 6, is conclusive in favor of a reference to the Holy Spirit, even if the context did not demand it.—R.] Αὐτὸ. Not the same (Erasmus, Luther), but the Spirit itself (Vulgate: εἰς πνεῦμα; Beza: εἰς τ. πνεῦμα ποιήμα). We cry in the spirit, and the Spirit itself beareth us witness.

Bear witness with [or to] our spirit [συμμαρτυρεῖτι τ. πνεύματι ἡμῶν]. It may be asked whether συμμαρτυρεῖτι is to be taken in the sense of the strengthened, uncompounded word: He beareth witness to our spirit, as the Vulgate, Luther, Grotius, Koppe, De Wette [Alford]; and many other expositors hold; or, whether it should read: He bears witness with our self-consciousness: I am God's child. Meyer holds this opinion, in the three cases here, as everywhere (chap. ii. 16; ix. 1). But the latter view would give rise to the question, To whom do both bear witness? And thus there would follow the conclusion: even self-consciousness bears witness to self-consciousness.* This view is hardly tenable. Chrysostom distinguishes as the two witnesses, the Holy Spirit and the grace given to us; and Hervaeus, Calvin, Tholuck, and others, take the same position. Paresa even applies the legal maxim, "out of the mouth of two witnesses." *According to this old Protestant interpretation, the witness of our own spirit consists in the communication of the declaration of Divine pardon to the believing subject; but the witness of the Holy Spirit is regarded as a twofold one. On the one hand, it consists in the general witness by the Scriptures and the sacraments, and then in the applicatio and obsequium produced by the Holy Spirit, while the declarations of the designate fidélion are applied here.*

Yet it seems clear from the antithesis, the Holy Spirit and our spirit, that the Holy Spirit should be regarded as the testifying part, but that our spirit, on the other hand, should be regarded as the part which is testifyed to. For the witness of our spirit has, as a special witness, no value beside that of the Holy Spirit (see Tholuck, p. 416, 417). And yet the question ever arises. To whom is the witness given? We hold that the expression συναντιαρίστησιν (ver. 26) is an illustrative parallel, and must give importance to the consideration that there the ex planatory word ἐνεργείαν is added. But we thereby approach nearer the explanation, that the σπν in both cases has the meaning of a strengthened simple word. But it yet remains for us to conclude concerning a twofold function of the same Holy Spirit in the life of the soul. He operates in the filial life of the soul of believers as an impulse to

* [Dr. Lange does not seem to determine definitely in favor of either view. But his objection here is based on the assumption that our spirit is = self-consciousness. If we place not our spirit, during this time of witness-bearing, such a division still remaining, as to justify the interpretation which accepts a twofold witness! The witness is to the man as self-conscious, needing such testimony and born both by the Holy Spirit, and the renewed nature, over against the remaining sinful nature. With our view (ver. 16), we can distinguish of this kind be introduced here. Philippi accepts the twofold witnessing here, claiming, however, that the other sense is possible only in case the reference in ver. 18 be to a filial spirit —R.]
prayer, but He also operates as the sealing witness of adoption. And thus He hastens in advance of our consciousness of faith with groanings which cannot be uttered (ver. 28). The σωμα, though it be not a mere simple prefix, does not always signify the equality of two different parts in one function. Sometimes it denotes the effect (σωματικός, συναγωγικός), and sometimes the conjoint conclusion of the act is specified in the verb with a prefixed fact σωματικός. This is the case here.

It is important that the earlier theologians regarded this passage as a proof of the certitude præfiosa, in opposition to the Catholic doctrine. Meyer very properly refers to the fact, that it is a witness against all pantheistic confusion of the Divine Spirit with that of man. It testifies to the living unity of both. Melanchthon correctly observes against Faustus, that “the efficacy of the Spirit enters into the believer profusely, not very ungraciously.”

[That we are children of God, ὑπὲρ δὲ τίταν ἢρι. The purport of the testimony. Alford: “not ἔρι, because the testimony respects the very ground and central point of sonship, likeness to and desire for God.”—R.] The word τίταν emphasizes the heartiness of the filial feeling.

Ver. 17. And if children, also heirs. [ἐν τίταν καὶ ἐπιτίται] We must supply τίταν both times. The being heirs arises from the very right and lot of a child (Gal. iv. 7).†

Heirs of God [κληρονόμοι μὲν δὲ θεοῦ]. The inheritance is the kingdom of glory. God, as the eternally living One, is like the earthly testator, in that He gives His children every thing for an inheritance; but He gives them himself as the treasure of all treasures. He will be their inheritance, as they are to be His inheritance—a relation presupposed already in the Old Testament (Exod. xix. 5: Israel the peculiar treasure of God. Num. xviii. 20: Jehovah is the inheritance of the Levites, as they are His inheritance, clerus). As He himself will be all in all, so shall His children receive with Him, in His Son, every thing for an inheritance (1 Cor. iii. 21 ff.). In Luke xv. 12 the inheritance, in another sense. In Luke xvi. 19—23, in this the highest idea of eternal life, the declaration of the Apostle (ver. 13): ye shall live, is abundantly proven.—R.

And joint-heirs with Christ [κοινοκληρονόμοι δὲ Χριστοῦ]. Conformably to the νοθεία, the νοθοὶ are in the most intimate fellowship with the νοθός, to which the common inheritance corresponds; Gal. iv. 7. The second designation characterizes the Divine inheritance of believers in its majesty, its infinite extent, and its nature, as the kingdom of perfect love in the glorified world. The view urged by Frizches, Meyer, and Tholuck, that here Paul does not have in mind the Hebrew, but the Roman right of inheritance (with reference to adopted children), Philippi correctly terms “an untheocratic reference to the Roman right of inheritance.”†

If so be that we suffer with him [εἰπεῖς συνεκατάγοντες]. On the particle, see ver. 9. Here, as there, it implies a slight admonition, since it introduces a condition πείθει ὑποκάτων. The order, not the reason, of obtaining full salvation, is set forth (Calvin).—R.] Suffer with Christ—for Him, His gospel, His witness (1 Peter iv. 18; 2 Cor. v. 5; Phil. ii. 10; Col. i. 24; * 2 Tim. ii. 11). Suffering with Christ has the promise of being glorified with Him. Meyer says, strangely, that “Olshausen (comp. also Philippi) intermixes something totally wrong: ‘Share in the conflict with sin in ourselves and in the world.’ Just this is the very nerve of the suffering with Christ.

[That we may be also glorified with him, ὑπὲρ δὲ νῦν καὶ κυριακοῦσαν.] As Meyer properly says, against Tholuck, the ὑπὲρ is not dependent on “joint-heirs,” but on “suffer with Him.” [This view is now given up by Tholuck, who correctly adds, however: “That does not describe the subjective, but the objective, divine design.” (So Alford).—R.] On the relations of the right of inheritance in Rome, and other nations, see Tholuck, p. 419 [and the note on “joint-heirs”]. We must here hold to this much, at least, of the idea of adoption: that the joint-heirs of Christ become heirs of God through Christ, in and with Him as the truly Universal Heir.

Doctrinal and Ethical.

1. The correct understanding of this eighth chapter of the Epistle to the Romans depends essentially on the following conditions: (1.) It must be regarded in connection with the whole section beginning with chap. v. 12; (2.) The antithesis in this chapter must be perceived. The fundamental thought is indicated in the superscriptions: Sin and the life of Christ, as opposite principles of life in the world. The foundation is given in chap. v. 12—21. The abrogation of the old principle in its two fundamental forms: Service of sin, service of the law; chap. vi. 1 to viii. 3. The new principle, from the death of the old to the new nature; the inwardness of the law; chap. vii. 7—25. With chap. viii. there appears the new life of believers in Christ, and of Christ in believers. This new life itself constitutes again an antithesis. It is: a. An exclusively spiritual standpoint, in opposition to the flesh, and contemplates the extirpation of the old, sinful motions; b. A standpoint of renewal—whose object is the resurrection and the glorification of the world—proceeding from the Spirit, and embracing the flesh and the whole created world.

2. The Spirit of Christ's life being communicated to believers, it becomes to them a law of the Spirit for the new life. The law of the Spirit is a potency which extends further than the spirit of the law; much less is it a nova lex in the sense of the Catholic, far-fetched, incongruous.” Meyer and Tholuck think it appropriate in an Epistle to the Romans, and say that the only legal basis for the illustration is the Roman law. On the other hand, the genitive ἀνθρώπον, where the subject might properly be used, may be urged in favor of the other view. In any case, the right of the adopted children is through the mediation of Christ. The context points to fellowship with him, so that heareth to him is an appropriate thought. Schmoller (Galenism, p. 93) deems the whole controversy pedantic.—R.]

* [In Col. vi. 14, the genitive is the same as the accusative, and is termed “the affection of Christ;” so intimate is the fellowship of Christ and his body, the Church. See also Heb. ii. 10.—R.]
He dogmatist. Life in the entire spiritual view and experience of Christ's life constitutes a universal principle of life, which becomes the rule for every more general relation of life, and an \emph{entelechy} of the living Divine will for every individual situation.

3. On ver. 3, see the Exeg. Notes. It is totally foreign to the context to give this passage a special application to the propitiation for the guilt of sin (for the discussions on the subject, see Tholuck). Those who thus do, are careful to defend their position against antinomianism; but, practically, the danger from a too exclusive application of all possible passages to justification, lies in another direction, viz., that of legal efforts after holiness. The connection between pardon and holiness is thus obscured; the believer fails to see Christ as his life-giving Saviour; the law is again sought; "the spirit of bondage" returns, and the conflict of chap. vii. 14-26 is all too common. Whatever may be the logical and theological antithesis, the Christian pastor finds this to be the practical effect.

4. It is likewise a disregard of the definite expression to overlook the real meaning of the \emph{entelechy}. Because Christ appeared in the \emph{truth and reality} of \emph{σάρξ}, He also appeared, according to the universal human view, in the \emph{likeness of sinful flesh}. The Apostle expresses exactly the same thought in the words, \emph{εἰς \φυσιν \ανθρώπους \γενέσθαι}; Phil. ii. 7. The reality of His human nature resulted in the \emph{likeness} of His appearance and suffering life to the picture presented by the life of men. Bear's spiritualistically gross misconception of this declaration (Phil. ii.) makes a sort of Gnosticism out of it; the realistic obscuration of the term, on the other hand, allows Christ himself to have assumed sinful flesh. The simple thought is too grand for both these standing and mutilating tendencies. God has unmasked and judged sin in the flesh, and condemned it to be cast out as a foreign element, a ruinous pseudo-plasma in the flesh, by Christ's assuming a pure and consecrated \emph{σάρξ}, and by His keeping His white robe spotless on the whole filthy road of His pilgrimage, and maintaining its holiness until it was illuminated in glorified splendor. Thus the question, whether Christ assumed human nature in its paradisiacal state before the fall, or the fallen nature of Adam, is a thoroughly incorrect one, for restitutions arguments are satisfied. Christ's humanity assumed neither the fallen nor the fallen human nature, but the nature raised from the fall and made holy. See the Bible-Work on John i. 14.

4. On the connection of the doctrine of the \emph{obedientia activa} to ver. 3, see Tholuck, p. 396.

5. On ver. 4. The righteousness of Christ should be realized also in believers, from the principle of the righteousness of faith to the righteousness of life. See the Exeg. Notes.

6. The antithesis, walking in the flesh and walking in the Spirit, separates into these elements: a. Being or living in the flesh; being or living in the Spirit; 5. The seeking of the flesh as enmity against God; the seeking of the Spirit as enlivened and impelled by the Spirit of God; 6. The end—on one side, death; on the other, life and peace.

7. Those who live in the flesh cannot please God. How imagine that they please God who, following the letter of an law, lead an hypostatically divided, sentient and fragmentary life, or a false life in outward observances. But God is one; His Spirit is one; His law, as the principle of life, is one; and salvation lies in the dynamical synthesis of life from a shedding abroad of the Spirit. See Mark xii. 32 ff.

8. The real, fundamental thought of this section appears in ver. 10. See the Exeg. Notes. The body is dead by the necessarily positive standpoint of Christian life in the Spirit, and it is dead in its precondition to sin and death, in order that it may be raised from its state to a new life, and inherit the resurrection (1 Cor. ix. 27; 2 Cor. iv. 14; Eph. ii 8; Col. ii. 12; Phil. iii. 11). Also John vi., and the doctrine of the Lord's Supper, belong here. The efficacy of the future resurrection by the renewal of the inner life is questioned by Meyer, against De Wette and Philippus, for he does not place a correct estimate on the real relations of the kingdom of God (p. 246). On pneumatic corporeity, see Tholuck, pp. 485, 486.

9. On ver. 13. By the Spirit, and not by the sorcerer \emph{mit dem Geist, nicht mit der Geister}, should the deeds of the body be mortified. See the Exeg. Notes.

10. On the difference between the symbolic and real children of God, see the Exeg. Notes on ver 14 On \emph{viēs}, see Tholuck, p. 408. That the \emph{viōría}, in the Apostle's sense, can be adoption only in form and mode, and not in its essence and substance, arises from the fact that believers, as the children of God, have the Spirit of God and of Christ; that they pray in filial confidence; and that they are destined to be heirs of God and joint-heirs with Christ. In interpreting the phrase, "sons of God," two errors must be guarded against: (a.) limiting it to something like this objects of God's favor; (b.) extending it so as to obliterate any real distinction between the Son and the adopted children. The latter may occur, either through a denial of the specific and eternal Sonship of Christ, or through some too spiritualistic view of the work of Redemption, which makes the children of God in essence and substance children. Pantheistic fancies follow the same tendency. Between these two lies the true definition. A Christian, as a son of God, is new-born of the Spirit of God; hence, has a likeness to God in character, is the object of God's special love, and entitled to special privilege and dignity. Yet even this is not all. The term is not merely figurative, as this passage shows, save as all language questioning of the union questioned by Meyer. The relation is real—grounded on, yet differing from, the relation of the Eternal Son. Only those in Him are "sons." They are "sons" in such a sense as to become partakers of the Divine nature (1 Peter i. 23). A further definition is now impossible. "Now are we sons of God; but it doth not yet appear what we shall be" (1 John iii. 3). The fact remains established; the manifestation of its full significance is to come; ver. 10—R.

11. The dogmatic spirit of the Middle Ages made of Christianity a religion \emph{πάντως ὑπὸ φόβον}. Rome in particular did this, in spite of these words to the Romans, in ver. 16. Even the Old Testament and its law aimed at a higher fear of God, as the beginning of wisdom. See Ps. i. and Ps. xix. on communion with the law of God.

12. On the \emph{viōría}, and its origin in the Old Testament, see the Exeg. Notes.

13. In relation to adoption, the Spirit is our \emph{wisdom}; in relation to future glory, it is our \emph{pledge}. [On the \emph{viōría}, the Spirit. This consists in the gracious fruits and effects wrought in us by the Holy Spirit. "His whole inward and outward efficacy
must be taken together; for instance, His comfort, His incitement to prayer, His censure of sin, His impulse to works of love, to witness before the world," &c. (Olschausen). Yet filial feelings of those happy moments when we are conscious that we live by the Spirit, love God, and grow in grace and in the knowledge of Him, must not be excluded; since, whether the witness be to or with our spirits, such results may be expected. Because enthusiasm has pushed this matter to an extreme at times, the assurance of salvation is not to be deemed unattainable, nor filial emotions toward God checked by the sneer about fanaticism. "That the world deny any such testimony in the hearts of believers, and that they look on it as a sinner and treat it with derision, proves only that they are unequainted with it; not that it is an illusion. It was a sensible and true re-mark of the French philosopher Hemsterhuyse, in regard to certain sensations which he was discussing: 'Those who are so unhappy as never to have had such sensations, either through weakness of the natural organ, or because they have never cultivated them, will not comprehend me' (Stuart).—R.] The conclusion, "and if children, then heirs," connects this section with the following.

HOMILETICAL AND PRACTICAL.

Why do we, as those who are in Christ Jesus, have no more fear of condemnation? 1. Because the law of the Spirit of Christ has made us free from the law (that is, the power) of sin and death; 2. This has been effected by the act of God in condemning sin in the flesh.—Contrast between the law of the Spirit of Christ and the law of sin: 1. The former brings life; 2. The latter, death (ver. 2).—The appearance of the Son of God in the form (likeness) of sinful flesh: 1. In its meaning; 2. In its effects (vers. 3, 4).—The sending of God's Son an act of God (ver. 3).—He who becomes united with Christ ever more fully performs the righteousness required by the law (ver. 4).—Why is carnal-mindedness death? Because: 1. It is enmity against God; and, 2. As such, it is disobedience to God's law (vers. 5-7).—All who have Christ's Spirit are not carnal, but spiritual. This is shown thus: 1. Christ's Spirit reigns in their spirit; and therefore, 2. Their spirit reigns in their body (vers. 9-11).—If any man have not the Spirit of Christ, he is none of His.” This declaration is: 1. Perfectly true; but, 2. Fearful in its truth (ver. 9).—A question of conscience in two forms: 1. Have we Christ's Spirit? 2. Are we His? (ver. 9).—The Spirit of God as pledge of our resurrection from the dead (ver. 11).—The preparation of our bodies for the day of resurrection by the Spirit of God (ver. 11).—The glorification of physical life by God's Spirit (ver. 11).—The opposition between carnal and spiritual-mindedness one of death and life: 1. Demonstration (vers. 5-8); 2. Reference to the members of the Christian communion (vers. 9-11); 3. Inference for their moral life (vers. 11-13).—If we allow ourselves to be led by the Spirit of God, we are God's children, heirs of God and joint-heirs with Christ. Reasons: 1. Because this spirit is not slavish, but filial; 2. Because He bears witness with us that we are children of God; 3. Because we are assured by Him of eternal glory (vers. 14-17).—The leading power of the Spirit of God (ver. 15).—The line of the Divine adoption in the Old Testament and the New (ver. 15).—The Spirit of God a spirit of prayer (ver. 15).—The Abba-Father cry of believing Christian souls: 1. So filially humble; 2. So filially joyous (ver. 16).—The inward witness of the Spirit: 1. Who bears witness to us? 2. To whom is it borne? 3. What is its import? (ver. 16).—How rich the children of God are! They are: 1. Heirs of God; 2. Joint-heirs with Christ (ver. 17).—Let us suffer with Christ, in order that we may be raised to glory with Him.

LUTHER: Although sin still rages in the flesh, we are not condemned, if the spirit is righteous, and fights against it. But where sin is, there is death; the law is.sacred and overpowerd by the flesh, so that it is impossible for the law to help man, except to sin and death. Therefore God sent His own Son, and placed upon Him our sins, and thus helped us to fulfill the law by His Spirit (vers. 1-4).

STARKÉ: Sin and death are connected together; who will separate them? Therefore, if you would escape death, you must flee from sin; James i. 18; Sirach xxi. 2, 3 (ver. 2).—Is sin sweet to thee, O man? Then remember that its fruit is bitter (ver. 2).—HIDINGER: It is a false trust, to wish to be righteous in Christ, and, at the same time, to desire to walk after the flesh. Wherein reigns, there is condemnation, though Christ had died a thousand times. The flesh must die on the cross with Him, and His Spirit must live in the sinner; otherwise the salvation purchased by Christ will be of no use; 1 Peter ii. 24 (ver. 1).—STARKÉ: Adam (merely) out of us does not injure us; and Christ (merely) out of us does not help us (ver. 10).—People of the world seek immortality in wrong ways. Seek the right way, which is, to let God's Spirit dwell in you; Isa. lv. 2 (ver. 11).—It is better that we kill sin, than that sin kill us (ver. 12).—Nihil vitius, quam a carne vinci, nihil gloriesius, quam carnem vincere: JEROME. Qui sequuntur carnem, flagellatur in carne: in ipso est censura supplici, in qua fulit causa peccati; BERNARD (ver. 12).—STARKÉ: One may speak of God without the Holy Spirit; but he cannot speak to Him in a way that the prayer will be granted (ver. 15).—If little children can move their parents' hearts by "papa," and "mamma," so can believers move God by the word "Abba" (ver. 18).—HIDINGER: To suffer, and to inherit, stand together. Very well! Heaven is worth a toilsome pathway. Si vis regnare mecum, porta crucem remem brevem; GERSHON.

SPENER: God sent His Son to assume flesh; for the Word became flesh, not merely outwardly, but truly and in very deed. But such flesh in Him was not sinful; but it was only in the form of, or uniformity with, sinful flesh, so that he who saw it only outwardly might regard it just as sinful flesh as ours (vers. 3, 4).—Christianity enjoins not only that we do good, and thus perform spiritual works, but that we should also be spiritually, and not carnally, minded (ver. 5).—The witness of the Holy Spirit is as glorious as it is necessary. . . . This witness is the foundation of the highest glorification of the child of God. Yet but little can be told of it, for no man can understand it except him who feels it. It is "a new name," which nobody knows except him who receiveth it; Rev. ii. 17 (ver. 16). It is a great dignity, indeed, to be heirs of God, and to stand with Christ as though in the possession of equal rights. For it is the Inheritance of the Almighty God, and therefore consists of eternal possessions. Yet such an inheritance has the certain
condition of having previously suffered with Christ (ver. 17).—

Roes: Being in Christ Jesus presupposes longing for Christ Jesus; flowing to Him; submission to Him; being planted in Him as the Vine; union with Him; and, consequently, faith in Him; just as even the continued being, or remaining, in Christ Jesus, rests upon a continuous faith in Him (vers. 1-4).—The man who is in Christ Jesus does not walk any more after the flesh; but the righteousness, or righteous requirement, of the law, which is spiritual, is fulfilled in him; it is so fulfilled as his spiritual life and walk in the Spirit extend (ver. 4).—In short, just as the Spirit comprises spiritual-mindedness, and walking after the Spirit comprises every thing which is good, praise-worthy, holy, and well-pleasing to God; so do the words flesh, carnal-mindedness, and walking after the flesh, comprise every thing wicked and sinful (vers. 5-8).—Suffering does not precede glory by mere accident; it does so by God's design, and makes fit for great glory. It is only a nature crushed by suffering that can be glorified. But the suffering must be: 1. A suffering with Christ; 2. In fellowship with Christ; 3. In the likeness of the suffering and mind of Christ. Then will he also raise us to glory with Christ, in whom we are by faith (ver. 17).—Bengel: The carnal mind cannot, and may not. Hence comes the pretext of impossibility with which those seek to excuse themselves who are even here convicted as carnal (ver. 17).

Gerlach: What seems remote and difficult to man under the law, is made easy by grace; indeed, is even accomplished by grace (vers. 2, 3).—Both flesh and spirit are mighty and active forces in man (ver. 5).—The Spirit should be as much the Lord of our life, as the helmsman is guide of the ship, and the driver is guide of his team;" Chrysostom (ver. 14).—The Spirit of adoption is the Spirit of the Son of God. In Him we cry, Abba, dear Father! He encourages us to call, with childlike joy and confidence, upon God, whom Christ thus called on (Mark xiv. 26); and whom Christ, after the atonement was completed (John xx. 17), calls His God and ours, His Father and ours (ver. 16).—The witness of the Spirit of God consists in the consciousness of peace with God, and of access to Him in childlike, believing prayer, which we have received through faith in Christ (ver. 16).—The believer enters upon the inheritance of God as "joint-heir with Christ;" but it is not a dividing joint-heirship, by which one receives what another is deprived of. It is a possession like that of the sunlight, which every one enjoys to the full, without any robbery of another (ver. 17).—The life of the Christian is really a life of suffering, both inwardly and outwardly, except that the consciousness of Divine adoption rises high above suffering and oppression (ver. 17).—Lisco: The certainty of the attainment of perfect salvation by believers, rests upon their fellowship with Christ, and upon their being and living in Him; and it is from this true fountain that their ever-progressive sanctification flows (ver. 1).—What prospects, what hopes! Yet the order is, that we, like Christ, shall attain future glory through suffering.—Luther: "He who would be Christ's brother and share His sufferings, be not afraid; but rather rejoice in the law, martyr and joint-sufferer; not feeling Christ's sufferings and shame after Him, but with Him, as vers. 10, 32, 33, declare" (ver. 17).—

Heuser: The godliness of true Christians (ver. 9).—We must preach duties so conformably to the gospel, that they will be a pleasure (ver. 9).—Faith in Christ, gives us no aid to indulgence. The design of the atonement is our sanctification (ver. 4).—The carnal mind and religion do not agree to gether (ver. 7).—Christ's Spirit is the true Spirit; men out of Him are spiritless, however full of the Spirit such unchristian people may fancy themselves (ver. 9).—Life after the flesh destroys all Christian prosperity, spiritual enjoyment, vital force, and eternal salvation (ver. 15).—The Spirit can overpower the flesh; therefore no Christian can say, that the power of the flesh is too great, too insurmountable (ver. 18).—The guidance of the Spirit of God is: 1. Not irregular, but regular, and its traces are to be found rather within than without; 2. Nor a sudden impulse, an emotion; but a continuous guidance, extending through the whole life, and operating in all acts; 3. And finally, this guidance is effected by means of the Word; it is free, and without compulsion (ver. 14).—It was cry is an uninterrupted thinking upon God, and longing after Him. No cross, no crown.—Besser: The impulsive power of the Holy Spirit is twofold: He leads us to receive in faith, and give in love.—The glorification of Christians begins with Christ under the cross.

The Perioeps (vers. 12-17) for the 8th Sunday after Trinity.—Besser: The adoption of Christians with God: 1. It is holy; 2. It is saving.—The difference between the children of the world and the children of God.—Gensler: Those whom the Spirit of God leads, are God's children. The Apostle praises: 1. The filial mind; 2. The filial joyful¬ness; and, 3. The filial hope of those who allow themselves to be led by the Spirit of God.—Peter: The children of God: 1. Their nature; 2. condition; 3. and inheritance.—Harkess: The poverty and wretchedness of the legacy of Jesus Christ.—Trollop: The witness of Divine adoption is the surest pledge of eternal life. 1. In what is the witness of Divine adoption manifested? 2. Why is it a pledge of eternal life?—Kappel: The healing of sinful corruption by Jesus and His Spirit. Through Him we become: 1. Children of God; 2. Praying men of the Spirit; and, 3. Joint-heirs with Christ.

Burkitt (condensed): All men show the true temper of their minds, and natural disposition, by willing, cheerfully, and constantly minding either the things of the Spirit or the things of the flesh. Three things are implied in our being glorified with Christ: 1. Conformity—we shall be like Him in glory; 2. Concomitancy—we shall accompany Him, and be present with Him in glory; 3. Conveyance or derivation—His glory shall be reflected upon us, and we shall shine in His beams. He who was holy should be made in the likeness of flesh: but much greater, that He who was holy should be made in the likeness of sinful flesh. The Spirit witnesses the privileges of children to none who have not the nature and privileges of children. —Doddridge: The Spirit of God will not dwell with those whom He does not effectually govern.—McKnight: The minding of the things of the flesh, is the neglecting of the things of the Spirit, disqualifying men, standing in direct opposition to God's friendly intentions; consequently, is enmity against God, and is deservedly punished with death. —Wesley (sermons on the Witness of the Spirit): The witness of the Spirit is a consciousness of our having received, in and by the Spirit of adoption
II. Life in the Spirit in connection with nature as the Resurrection-life, and the Spirit as security of glory.

CHAPTER VIII. 18-39.

A. The present and subjective certainty of future glory, or the glorification of the body and of nature by the Spirit (verses 18-27).

18 For I reckon that the sufferings of this present time are not worthy to be compared [insignificant in comparison] with the glory which shall be revealed in us [εἰς ἡμᾶς]. For the earnest [patient] expectation of the creature [creation] waiteth [is waiting] for the manifestation [revelation] of the sons of God.

20 For the creature [creation] was made subject to vanity, not willingly, but by reason of him who hath subjected the same [who subjected it] in hope; [.] Because [That] the creature [creation] itself also shall be delivered from the bondage of corruption into the glorious liberty [freedom of the glory] of the children of God. For we know that the whole creation groaneth [together] and travaileth in pain together until now. And not only they [so], but [even we] ourselves also [συμμετ.] also, which [though we] have the firstfruits of the Spirit, even we ourselves [those] groan within ourselves, waiting for the adoption.

24 to wait, [συμμετ. to wait.] the redemption of our body. For we are [were] saved by [in] hope: but [now] hope that is seen is not hope: for what a man seeth, why doth he yet [still] hope for? But if we hope for that we see not, then do we with patience wait for it [with patience we wait for it]. Likewise the Spirit also helpeth our infirmities [weakness]: for we know not what we should pray for [as we ought: but the Spirit itself maketh intercession [intercede] for us [συμμετ. for us] with groanings which cannot be uttered. And [But] he that [who] searcheth the hearts knoweth what is the mind of the Spirit, because he maketh intercession [pleadeth] for the saints according to the will of God.

B. The future and objective certainty of glory (verses 28-37).

28 And we know that all things [συμμετ. for us] work together for good to them that [those who] love God, to them [those who are the called according to his purpose. For whom he did foreknow [foreknew], he also did predestinate [predestined]
to be conformed to the image of his Son, that he might be the firstborn among many brethren. Moreover, whom he did predestinate [predestinated], them he also called: and whom he called, them he also justified: and whom he justified them he also glorified. What shall we then [What then shall we] say to these things? If God be [is] for us, who can be [is] against us? He that [Who] spared not his own Son, but delivered him up for us all, how shall he not with him also freely give us all things? Who shall lay any thing to the charge of God's elect? "It is God that justifieth. [!]" Who is he that condemneth? It is Christ [or, Christ is Jesus] that died, yea rather, that is risen again, who is even at the right hand of God, who also maketh intercession for us.

Who shall separate us from the love of Christ? shall tribulation, or distress, or persecution, or famine, or nakedness, or peril, or sword? As it is written, For thy sake we are killed all the day long; We are [were] accounted as sheep for the slaughter.

Nay, in all these things we are more than conquerors through him that [who] loved us.

The unity of the subjective and objective certainty of future glory in the already attained glorious life of love, the Spirit of glory (vers. 38, 39).

For I am persuaded, that neither death, nor life, nor angels, nor principalities, nor powers, [omit nor powers,] nor things present, nor things to come, [insert nor powers.] Nor height, nor depth, nor any other creature [created thing,] shall be able to separate us from the love of God, which is in Christ Jesus our Lord.

TEXTUAL.

Ver. 18.—(It is difficult to render εἰς ἦν καὶ literally. In us (E. V.) implies that we are the subjects of the revelation, and this is the main thought. Alford renders: with regard to us; Lange: εις auf and on us.

Ver. 19.—Krie occurs twice in verses 18-20, with the same meaning. In ver. 22 it is best to render it creation, and in the other cases it should conform. Lange: die Kreaturwelt, Kreatur-Welt. On the various limitations of meaning, see Eng. Notes.

Ver. 20.—Lange renders οὐσίας, univ.ανιν receptive to the middle sense; but as this sense is doubtful, the English text has not been altered.

Ver. 20.—(In hope is not to be joined with what immediately precedes, hence a comma must be inserted. Orischak and Knapp make ὑπὲρ... ὑπεράνων parenthesis, but without sufficient reason. Amer, Bible Union, Noyes, five English versions, &c., favor this, introducing the purport of the hope.

19. a. Η γὰρ ἀνακαταβολὴ τῆς κτίσεως.

b. η ἀνακαταβολὴ τῶν ζωῶν τοῦ Θεοῦ ἀνέκδοτος.

c. τῷ γὰρ μαρτυρεῖν ἐτις ὑποτάγη,

κοινονοὶ ἀλλὰ διὰ τὴν ὑπεράνων,

d. εἰς ἤλεγχον ὅτι καὶ οὕτως ἐτις εἰρήνη θεοῦ ἀνὴρ.

19. a. In the earnest expectation of the creation.

b. In waiting for the revelation of the sense of God.

c. For the creation was made subject to vanity.

20. a. In hope, that the creature itself shall also be delivered from the bondage of corruption,

b. Into the liberty of the glory of the children of God.

This makes the whole of ver. 20, except in hope, parenthetical, and connectes ver. 21 with that phrase, as giving the purport of the hope. On this last view, Forbes does not insist, however. In hope is thus made to refer to both lines of the parenthesis, yet with a main reference to ἀνεκδοτος, is waiting. The two lines of ver. 19 find their parallges in vers. 21, while a. a. refer to the expectation or hope that animates creation; b. b. to the final consummation to which it points. At the beginning of vers. 21, Lange reads denn, Alford: because, but Tholuck, Phillipps, Meyer, Amer. Bible Union, Noyes, five English versions, &c., favor that, introducing the purport of the hope.

Ver. 20.—No, or he should be supplied; the meaning is: Not only is this so. The E. V. is therefore incorrect.

The latest revisions adopt so.

20. a. In hope puts a full stop after hope. Meyer, and many others, a comma, connecting the next verse: that the creation, &c. (the purport of the hope). Forbes give the parallelism thus:

This makes the whole of vers. 20, except in hope, parenthesis, and connects ver. 21 with that phrase, as giving the purport of the hope. On this last view, Forbes does not insist, however. In hope is thus made to refer to both lines of the parenthesis, yet with a main reference to ἀνεκδοτος, is waiting. The two lines of ver. 19 find their parallels in vers. 21, while a. a. refer to the expectation or hope that animates creation; b. b. to the final consummation to which it points. At the beginning of vers. 21, Lange reads denn, Alford: because, but Tholuck, Phillipps, Meyer, Amer. Bible Union, Noyes, five English versions, &c., favor that, introducing the purport of the hope.

Ver. 20.—No, or he should be supplied; the meaning is: Not only is this so. The E. V. is therefore incorrect.

The latest revisions adopt so.

20. a. In hope puts a full stop after hope. Meyer, and many others, a comma, connecting the next verse: that the creation, &c. (the purport of the hope). Forbes give the parallelism thus:

This makes the whole of vers. 20, except in hope, parenthesis, and connects ver. 21 with that phrase, as giving the purport of the hope. On this last view, Forbes does not insist, however. In hope is thus made to refer to both lines of the parenthesis, yet with a main reference to ἀνεκδοτος, is waiting. The two lines of ver. 19 find their parallels in vers. 21, while a. a. refer to the expectation or hope that animates creation; b. b. to the final consummation to which it points.

At the beginning of vers. 21, Lange reads denn, Alford: because, but Tholuck, Phillipps, Meyer, Amer. Bible Union, Noyes, five English versions, &c., favor that, introducing the purport of the hope.
EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

Summary.—The witness of Divine adoption, imparted by the Holy Spirit to believers, comprises at the same time, according to ver. 17, the security that they will be heirs of future glory. Then, too, the physical body—which, in their spiritual life in this world, they mistrust, because of its enervation through sin, which they must strictly control by walking in the Spirit, but in which, even here, according to ver. 11, a germ of its glorification into the psychico-physical existence is formed—shall be transformed into the glory of the Spirit; and all nature, at present made partaker of corruption, yet groaning and travelling to be spiritualized, shall share in the glory also, as the transformed, illumined, and appropriated organ of the kingdom of spirits. Ver. 17 serves as a foundation for the section which now follows, as it terminates the previous section as a final inference.

A. The present and subjective certainty of future glory.

Believers, from their present and subjective sense of life, are certain of future glory; accordingly, all the sufferings of the present time are to them as birth-pangs for future glory. This holds good, first, in respect to the pressure toward development, and the longing and pining, wailing of all their hearts in its present state; and this pressure toward development corresponds with that of God's kingdom. It holds good, secondly, in regard to the birth-pangs of God's kingdom, as manifested, first, in the groanings, longings, and hopes of believers, and in the unutterable groanings of the Spirit, who intercedes for them. Although believers have the Spirit of adoption, it is because they feel that they still groan for its consummation (2 Cor. vii. 3, 4). The human salvation is not their final salvation; but the latter is testified by their hope and confirmed by their patience. But the Spirit proves himself in their hearts by unutterable groanings, as a vital pressure, which harmonizes in this life with the sense of the future exercise of God's authority, and points to the future objective certainty of glory as founded in the will of God (vers. 18-27).

B. The future and objective certainty of glory.

The love for God by believers is the experience of God's love for them. But therein lies the security of an omnipotent power for its completion—a power which nothing can oppose, but to which every thing must serve. The certainty of the decisive αὐθεντής is the centre and climax of the life, from which the groundwork, as well as the future of life, is glorified. It points backward to God's purpose, and forward to its consummation. The periods between the pre-temporal, eternal purpose of God, and its future, eternal coaccomplishment, are the periods of the order of salvation (ver. 29). That way of salvation leads through suffering to glory, according to the image of Christ's life, is secured by the omnipotent decision with which "God is for" (ver. 31) His children—a decision which is secured by the gift of Christ for them, by their justification, their reconciliation, redemption, and exaltation in Christ; in a word, by the love of Christ. This love leads them in triumph through all the temptations of the world, because it is the expression of Christ's own conquest of the world (vers. 28-37).

C. The unity of the subjective and objective certainty of future glory in the glorious life of love already attained.

Life in the love of Christ is exalted above all the powers of the world (vers. 38, 39).—Kindred sections: John xvii.; 1 Cor. xv., and others.

Tholuck: "This inheritance will far outweigh all suffering, and must be waited with steadfast hope (vers. 18-27). But as far as we are concerned, we can suffer no more injury; the consciousness of God's love in Christ rests upon so impregnable a foundation, that nothing in the whole universe can separate 'him' from it" (vers. 28-39).—Meyer finds, in vers. 18-31, "grounds of encouragement for the συμπαθής, ινα α. συμπαθής. To wit: 1. The future glory will far outweigh the present suffering (vers. 18-36). 2. The Holy Spirit supports us (vers. 26, 39). 3. Everything must work together for good to them that love God" (vers. 28-31). Undoubtedly these things are grounds of encouragement, yet the Apostle evidently designs to encourage by a copious and conclusive didactic exposition of the certainty of the Christian's hope of future glory, in face of the great apparent contradictions of this hope—an exposition which, in itself, has great value.
son to fear, but all reason to hope; for nothing can separate him from God's love in Christ."—Hodge, making the theme of the chapter "the security of the believer," finds, in ver. 18-28, a proof of this "from the fact that they are sustained by hope, and aided by the Spirit, under all their trials; so that every thing eventually works together for their good." In vers. 29, 30, another proof "founded on the decree or purpose of God." In vers. 31-39, yet another, "on His infinite and unchanging love."—R.

**First Paragraph, vers. 18-27.**

**Ver. 18. For I reckon, &c.** [λογίζομαι γάρ, k. k.] Γάρ connects this verse with ver. 17, introducing a reason why the present sufferings should not discourage (De Wette, Philippi, Calvin: Nicene). With the note of disaster, Paul ad calorem gloriam per variis officiis procedent om est, quantodiacuidem, &c. Stuart prefers to join it to "glorified with Him;" "we shall be glorified with Christ, for all the sufferings and sorrows of the present state are only temporary." The connection seems to be with the whole thought which precedes. The verb is thus explained by Alford: I myself am one who have embraced this course, being convinced that it is used as in chap. iii. 23; see p. 136.—R.

Now by his view of the magnitude of future glory, as well as by his conviction of its certainty, he estimates the proportionate insignificance of the sufferings (certainly great when considered in themselves alone) of the present time, since they, as birth-throes, are the preliminary conditions of future glory.

**Insignificant, ὀλίγος ἄξιος, not of weight; a stronger expression for ἄνασις. They are not synonymous.** The νῦν καυγὸς is the first, decisive time of development, with which the αὐτὸς οἴνος will terminate.

**In comparison with the glory which shall be revealed [πρὸς τὸν μελλόν θανάτον ἀποκαλυπσθήσει]. On πρὸς after ὅποιον ἄξιον, in the sense of in relation to, in comparison with, see Tholuck, Philippi in loco.—R.** Ἔκ της μελλόνου οὐκ ἔσται an antecedent, with emphasis. [To this Alford objects:] That glory is ever promising, and therefore near at hand, though Paul does not regard its presence near in the sense of Meyer, and others.

In us [see Textual Note]. The τε ἡμᾶς does not mean, as the Vulgate and Beza have it, τε νοῦς [so E. V.]; it is connected with the ἀποκάλυψις. If it is imparted through the inward life of believers and through nature, it nevertheless comes from the future and from above, as much as from within outwardly, and it is a Divine secret from eternity in time—therefore ἀποκάλυψις.

**Ver. 19. For the patient expectation [ἐκ τῆς ἀποκαραδοκίας]. On ἀποκαραδοκία, comp. Phil. i. 20. The verb καραδοκῶμεν means, literally, to expect with uplifted head; then, to expect. The noun, strengthened by ἐκ, refers to an expectation, which is constant and persistent until the time arrives. The idea of anxiety (Luther) is not prominent. (So Tholuck, Philippi, De Wette, Meyer.)**

*On the controversy between the Protestant and Catholic theologians in regard to the meruitum condigni, as evidenced with this passage, see Tholuck, p. 421. [Comp. Philippi on both meruitum condigni and meruitum eomprum. Also Calvin. As Dr. Hodge remarks, the idea of merit "is altogether foreign to the context."—R.]*

See below also. Tholuck remarks, that the strength of the attributive notion into a substantive makes a double prosopopeia, "not only the creature, but the expectation of the creature waifs."—R. The γάρ introduces the first proof of his statement from the course of the whole κτίσις. It may be asked, Shall the future glory be shown in its grandeur (Chrysostom [Hodge, Alfini], and expositors), its certainty (Kretschke, Meyer), its nearness (Beza), or its futurity (Philippus)? Tholuck, in its grandeur and certainty. If both must combine in one idea, then it is the truth or the reality of the glory, as such. The elements of its grandeur, as of its certainty, are united in the fact that the developing pain of the external κτίσις, as of the inward life of believers—indeed, the groaning of the Divine spiritual life itself—labors for it and points toward it; it will consist in the removal of all vanity and corruption in the whole natural sphere of mankind.

**Of the creation, τῆς κτίσιος. The great question is, What is the κτίσις? Lexically, the word may mean the act of creation, as well as what is created, the creation; † but actually, the question here can only be the creation in the broader or more limited sense. Tholuck: κτίσις in the passive sense can mean the same as κτισμα, the single creature; vers. 29; Heb. iv. 15. If κτίσις, Book of Wisdom ii. 6; xvi. 24; Heb. ix. 11; or even ἡ κτίσις, Book of Wisdom xix. 6; πᾶσα ἡ κτίσις, Judith xvi. 17, the created world. But in that case, as also with οὐκ ὁ κόσμος (John xii. 19), it is metaphysically confined to the human world (Col. i. 23; Mark xv. 16; and also with the Rabbis, ἡκτίσις, &c.), or to irrational nature, exempting man.

The explanations are divided into different groups:

1. The natural and spiritual world. The universe. Origen: Man as subject to corruption; souls of the stars. Theodoret: also the angels. Theodorus of Mopsuestia, Olshausen: The whole of the universe. Köllner, Koppe, Rossmeuller (tota rerum universae).

2. Inanimate creation. (Chrysostom, Thopylact, Calvin, Beza, Fritzsche: mundi machinæ).

3. Animal creation.
   a. Humanity (Augustine, Tertullian, &c.; Baumgarten-Crusius; still unbelieving men); b. exempting heathen (Lowth, and by the Rabbis); c. animal language: the heathen: ἡκτίσις, the Jewish people, because the Jews were called God's creation (Cramer, and others); d. the Gentile Christians, because the proselytes were called new creatures (Clerusus, Nösselt); e. Jewish Christians (Gockel; for the same reason as under c.); f. Christians in general (κτισμα κτίσιως, Socinians and Arminians). Evidently there

* [The primary reference seems to be to its greatness; but a secondary reference to its certainty and futurity would necessarily be implied in "the patient expectation."—R.]

† [The English word creation has precisely the same twofold sense; but it always has a general reference when used in the passive sense. Kriew in many cases, but it would seem that the more general signification preceded the more special one, and hence that the limitation of meaning may always be derived from the context.—R.]

‡ [This is the view adopted and defended at some length by Professor Stuart on an Exordium, notwithstanding his able argument, the interpretation is entirely too restricted to meet with general acceptance. At least the necessity of immortality is assumed, and pressed as the main thought. Comp. Hodge, in opposition to Stuart's view.—R.]
is no reference, on one hand, to the mathematical or
astronomical character of the heavenly bodies, nor,
on the other, to the real rational or spiritual world,
but to a creature-life, which can grow and earnestly
expect.
4. Inanimate and animate nature, in contradistinc-
tion from humanity (Irenæus, Grotius, Calvinius,
Neander, Meyer, De Wette) (Hodge, Allford).—
[Schubert: "Even in the things of the holy world
about us there is a life-element which, like that
some of Memnon, unconsciously and in accord
when touched by the ray from on high."—P. S.]
But the distinction from mankind must be confined
to the distinction from the spiritual life of renewed
mankind; for sinful mankind is utterly dependent
upon nature, and even believers have their natural
side (2 Cor. v. 1 ff.). Nor can the universe, in its
merely natural side, be altogether meant, since the
Holy Scriptures distinguish a region of glory from
the region of humanity in this life.
5. Tholuck: "The material world surrounding
man." The Scriptures very plainly distinguish be-
tween an earthly natural world related to mankind,
and a region of glory. (See the ascension; 1 Cor.
xv.; Heb. ix. 11, &c.) The former alone is subject
to vanity, and hence it alone can be intended.
But there is no ground for making divisions in re-
terence to this human natural world. The Apostle
assumes, rather, that this creature-sphere is in a state of col-
lective, partial striving for development, which ex-
presses itself as sensation only proportionately to
the sensational power of life, and hence is more defi-
nitely expressed, appears more frequently, and reach-
es its climax in living creatures and in the natural
longing which mankind feels (2 Cor. v. 1). The real
personification of nature in man is the final ground
for the poetical personification of nature.
6. The whole creation, rational as well as irra-
tional, not yet redeemed, but needing and capable of
redemption, here opposed to the new creation
in Christ and in the regenerate. The children of God
appear, on the one side, as the first-fruits of the new
creation, and the remaining creatures, on the other,
as consciously or unconsciously longing after the
same redemption and renewal. This explanation
seems to be the most correct one. It most satis-
factorily accounts for the expressions: expectation,
waiting (although ver. 20), and the whole creation
(ver. 22). The whole creation, then, 
looks forward to redemption; all natural birth, to
the new birth. As all that is created proceeded
from God, so it all, consciously or unconsciously,
strives after Him as its final end. What shows itself
in nature as a dim impulse, in the natural man,
among the heathen, and yet more among the Jews,
under the influence of the law, it tries to distinct
consciousness and manifests itself in that loud cry
after deliverance (chap. vii. 24), which Christ alone
can satisfy; and then voices itself in happy gratitude
for the actual redemption. Olschawen aptly says:
"Paul contrasts Christ, and the new creation called
forth by Him, to all the old creation, together with
the unregenerate men, as the flower of this creation.

The whole of this old creation has one life in itself,
and this is yearning for redemption from the bonds
which hold it, and hinder its glorification; this one
yearning has forms different only according to the
different degrees of life, and is naturally purer and
stronger in unregenerate men than in plants and ani-
mals; in them, the creation has, as it were, its
mouth, by which it can give vent to its collective
feeling. Yet the most of these men know not what
the yearning and seeking in them properly mean;
they understand not the language of the Spirit in
them; nay, they suppress it often, though it is,
meanwhile, audible in their heart; and what they
do not understand themselves, God understands,
who listens even to prayers not understood. But how-
ever decided the contrast between the old and new
creation, yet they may not be considered as sepa-
rated thoroughly. Rather, as the new man, in all
distinctness from the old, still is in the old, so is the
new creation (Christ, and the new life proceeding
from Him) in the old world. The old creation,
therefore, is like an impregnable mother (comp. ver.
28), that bears a new world in her womb—a life
which is not herself, neither springs from her, but
which, by the overmastering power that dwells in
it, draws her life, with which it is connected, on
and on into itself, and changes it into its nature,
so that the birth (the completion of the new world)
is the mother's death (the sinking of the old)."

P. S.

[This last view seems to be that of Dr. Lange
himself. It is ably defended by Forbes, pp. 310-330.
The limitation to creation, as capable of redemption,
implies that only so much of creation as is linked
with the fall of man, and subject to the curse,
should be included. Thus it differs from 1. Col. i. 20,
however, gives a hint as to the extent of this con-
nection with man. The context renders such a limi-
tation necessary. On the other hand, it differs from
4, in including man in his fallen condition.
The reasons for excluding humanity have been given
above. It will appear that, against this view, they
are of comparatively little weight. Certainly the
burden of proof rests with those who adopt 4; for
man is the head of the creation, to which they apply
urias; not merely as the final and crowning work
of the repeated creative agency which brought it
about, but also in the occasion of its present groan-
ing condition. Besides, man, viewed on one side as
his nature, is a part of this material and animal cre-
a tion. It seems arbitrary to sunder him from it in
this case. At all events, we may admit that his ma-
terial body involuntarily shares in this expectation,
to which its unregenerate soul responds with an
indefinite longing. In this view the degradation of
sin is fearfully manifest. Nature waits, but the
natural man is indifferent or hostile. The very body
which, in his blindness, he deems the source of sin,
waits for glorification, while his soul uses its power
over it to stifle the inarticulate desire. On the whole
subject, see Usteri, Stud. und Krit., 1832, pp. 835 ff.,
Tholuck, Meyer in loco, Delitzsch, Bibl. Psych.,
pp. 87 ff. and pp. 476 ff. (a most profound and eloquent
sermon on vers. 18-23). Comp. Doct. Notes, and
Dr. Lange, Das Land der Herkunft.—R.]

For the earnest expectation of the creature. As
the nagadosis (impatience), strictly, to expect with raised
head, it is very proper to translate the nagadosis
(intense expectation), and the aktarodois (Acton's
intense longing, waiting for satisfaction), as an allusion
to the conduct of irrational creatures in
reference to the future transformation of the sphere of nature.

Is waiting [ἀνακαλάντας]. Here, also, the preposition implies the continuance of the waiting until the time arrives.—R.] Even the poor creatures, whose heads are bowed toward the ground, now seized by a higher impulse, by a supernatural anticipation and longing, seem to stretch out their heads and look forth spiritually for a spiritual object of their existence, which is now burdened by the law of corruption. Certainly this representation has the form of a poetical personification; but it cannot, on this account, be made equivalent, as Meyer holds (p. 256), to the usual proopositions in the Old Testament, although these declare, in a measure, the sympathy between the natural and human world. Meyer would exclude from the idea not only the angelic and demoniac kingdom, but also Christian and unchristian mankind. But how, then, would Paul have understood the groaning of the creature, without human sympathy?

The revelation of the sons (children) of God [γινεῖται ἡ ἀπακολούθησις τῶν υἱῶν τοῦ θεοῦ]. The children of God in the pregnant sense of the New Testament, are those who are in nature wont to manifest a new impulse, that is, for the coming of its δόξα to full appearance (1 John iii. 2) with the coming of Christ (Matt. xxv. 31), which will be the appearing of the δόξα of the great God (Titus ii. 13); therefore the absolute ἀπακολούθησις itself, the fulfillment of all the typical prophecies of nature—and not only as complete restoration, but also as perfect development.—Ver. 20. For the creation was made subject [κατά τὸν θεόν] unto vanity. Dr. Lange takes the verb as middle. It is the historical sorites, at the fall of man. See below. Comp. Gen. iii. 17, 18.—R.J. God was the one who subjected (so say all expositors)—[This is evident from the curse, if the reference be to the time of the fall.—R.]—not Adam (Knaasb., Capellus); nor man (Chrysostom, Schneemeckenburger); nor the devil (Hammond).

To vanity. Ματαιώσεται. The Sepuqagint, instead of לכב, יככ, קך. The word does not occur in the pesharim Greek; it means the superficial, intangible, and therefore deceptive appearance; the perishable and duplicitous impression having the above quality. Earlier expositors (Tertullian, Bucer, others) have referred the word to the ματαιός = idols, understanding it as the defacement of the creature. Yet the question here is a condition of the creature to which God has subjected it. Further on it is designated as δούλια τῆς φθορᾶς. Therefore Fritzsche's definition, perseveratia (Adam's sin), is totally untenable. But what do we understand by "subject to ματαιώσεται"? Explanations:

1. An original disposition of creation; the arrangement of the corruption of the creature. (Grotius, Keck, De Wette. Theodorot holds that this original disposition was made with a view to the fall.)

2. A return of the fall of man. (The Hebrew theology, Bercovich Rabbi, many Christian theologians, Gessner, Calvin, Meyer, and others). No. 1 is opposed by the ἐπανάγνωσθε, of. [by ὑπερανάγνωσθε, δι' αυτοῦ,] which presupposes a different present condition, and by the historical fact (Gen. i. 31); Meyer—R.] and No. 2 by the originality of the arrangement between a first created and a second spiritual stage of the cosmos (1 Cor. xv. 47, 48).

3. We must therefore hold, that Paul refers to the obscurity and disturbance of the first natural stage in the development of our cosmos produced by the fall. As, in redemption, the restoration occurred simultaneously with the furtherance of the normal development, so death entered, at the fall, as a deterioration of the original metamorphoses, into the corruption of transitoriness. Tholuck approaches this explanation by this remark: "As the Rabbinical theology expresses the thought that man, born sinless, would have passed into a better condition 'by a kiss of the Highest,' so, in all probability, has Paul regarded that ἀλληγέρων of which he speaks in 1 Cor. xv. 53 as the designation of the first man, Adam. Tholuck seems, in reality, to adhere to De Wette's view.

Not willingly. The οἱ ἔχοντες cannot mean merely the natural necessity peculiar to the creature-world; it applies rather to an opposition of ideal nature, in its ideal pressure toward development, to the decree of death and of the curse of their real developing progress (Gen. iii. 2 Cor. v. 1 ff.). Bucer: Contra quam furt ingenium orum, a natura est etsi res est corruptione abhorrent. [But by reason of him who hath subjected it, ὡς δέ τον ἐπορευόμενον. But by reason of him who hath subjected it, in hope. The force of διά with the accusative is on account of; but the E. V. is correct, indicating a moving cause, i., the will of God.—R.] This unwillingness is expressed, according to what follows, in the groaning of the whole creation. The translation: "it was made subject (ὑποτάγη, passive), by reason of Him who hath subjected the same," is opposed to the logical conception. The simplest grammatical as well as logical interpretation accepts the verb as passive, with a reference to God as "Him who subjected the same." (So Meyer, Tholuck, Hodge, De Wette, Alford, and most commentators.)—R.] Moreover, the reference of the διά τον ὑποτάγημα to man, to Adam, does not remove this logical difficulty, since, in that case, the ὑποτάγημα would have to relate to another subject than the ὑποτάγημα. We therefore find ourselves driven, with Fritzsche, to the middle construction.

* [The difference between 2 and 3 is slight. Both point to an actual curse at the fall; the latter only adds the thought, that the previous condition was not, after all, the final one, thus preparing the way for an explanation of "not willingly." Both should, it seems, include the thought that the glorification to ensue will transcend the original state in that which could be afflicted by a normal development.—R.]
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Thereby we gain the idea, that even the disharmony which nature had suffered has become, in turn, a kind of order, since nature has been found in the service of corruption by virtue of its elasticity, relative dependence, plasticity, and pliability, and its absolute dependence upon God; and price nature is all the dearer to God because it is subjected in hope. [So Hodge, accepting the middle sense: the creature submitted to the yoke of bondage in hope of ultimate deliverance.—R.]

In hope, επικίνδυνος. Not precisely in a state of, which would be expressed by εἰς, but resting on hope (De Wette; auf Hoffnung hin.—R.) This means not merely, “hope was left to it” (Tholuck), but it is also a motive of positive hope in suffering nature. Just as the fallen human world shall be led in its ἀναστάσεως beyond its primitive paradisaical glory, so shall nature come through this humiliation to a richer elevation, namely, as the transformed organism of the glorified Christ and His joint-heirs. The επικίνδυνος must be joined with ὑπερτάγμα, not with διὰ τ. ἐποστ. (Vulgata, Luther, and others). [The question of connection is a difficult one. Of the two views here mentioned, Dr. Lange rightly prefers to use the latter, because he would attribute the hope to the one subjecting, not the one subjected (Alford). Ewald, making all that precedes in this verse parenthetical, joins in hope with ver. 19, and thus finds a reason for the emphatic repetition of κτίσις in ver. 21. See Textual Note 1, where the view of Forbes is given. It seems to give greater clearness to the passage as a whole, —R.]

Ver. 21. That the creation itself also [ἀπό εἰς και αὐτῆς ἡ κτίσις]. See Textual Note 1. The current of exegesis sets strongly in favor of the view which connects ἐπικίνδυνος with επικίνδυνος, in the sense of that. Alford, who, in his commentary, defends because, is one of the authors of a revision which adopts that. Meyer says that the purport of the hope must be given, in order to prove the expectation of the κτίσις as directed precisely toward the manifestation of the sons of God. Alford indeed objects, that this subjective signification of the clause would attribute “to the yearnings of creation, intelligence and rationality—consciousness of itself and of God,” but the same objection might be urged against the reference of κτίσις to inanimate creation, in vers. 19, 20, 22, as well as here. If the speculative idea of longing be admitted at all, it may be carried out to this extent with equal propriety. The repetition may be readily accounted for, either by considering ver. 20 parenthetical, or by regarding αὐτῆς ἡ κτίσις as emphatic,—R.] This explains the hope of the creature-world introduced in the preceding verse. With Chrysostom, Theophylact, and others, we regard the και αὐτῆς as a higher degree, itself also, and not merely as an expression of the former, also it. Meyer says, that the context says nothing of gradation. But the gradation lies essentially in the fact that the creature-world constitutes a humiliation in opposition to spiritual life, especially for contemplating the old world.

Shall be delivered from the bondage of corruption [ἐλευθέρωσιν ὑποθήκης ἀπὸ τῆς δοῦλες τῆς φθορᾶς]. We do not hold (with Tholuck, Meyer, and others) that τῆς φθορᾶς is the genitive of apposition. For the question is, in the first place, concerning a bondage under vanity; so that, the creature, even in its deliverance, will remain in a state of the δοῦλες in relation to the children of God himself. The φθορά is not altogether the same as παρασκήνω, but its manifestation in the process of finite life is sickness, death, the pang of death, and corruption; while the παρασκήνω, as such, is considered in the condition of a blooming, incorruptible life. [There seems to be no good reason for rejecting the view of Tholuck, Meyer, and others, that the bondage, which results from the vanity, and is borne not willingly (ver. 20), consists in corruption. This preserves the proper distinction. The corruption is the consequence of the vanity; the unwilling subjection to a condition which is under vanity, and results in corruption, is well termed a bondage.—R.] The alteration of the expression φθορά into an adjective, “corruptible bondage” (Küllner), is as unwarranted as the translation of the ἐλευθερία τῆς δοῦλες by glorious liberty (Luther [E. V.]).

[Into the freedom of the glory of the children of God, ἐν τῷ τῇ ἐλευθερίᾳ τῆς δοῦλες τῶν τικὼν τοῦ δούλου. The construction is pregnant. (So Meyer: Aecht Griechische Erklärung. See Winer, p. 977.) We may supply: και εὐθύς παρασκήνως, which shall be brought or introduced into, &c. The freedom is to consist in, or at least to result from a share in, the glory of the children of God. Hence the heading of the E. V. (glorious liberty) is totally incorrect. It makes the most prominent idea of the whole clause a mere attribute. Besides, were the meaning that expressed by the E. V., we should find this form: ἐν τῇ ἐλευθερίᾳ τῆς δοὐλείας τῶν τικὼν τοῦ δούλου. —R.] The ἐν τῷ τῇ ἐλευθερίᾳ contains only the sharing in the liberty of God’s children by the organic appropriation on their part, and by the equality with the children of God produced by means of the transformation; but it cannot mean an independent state of liberty beside them. Their freedom will consist in its helping to constitute the glory, the spiritualized splendor of the manifestation of God’s children. As Christ is the manifestation of God’s glory because he is God’s illumination in, through, and for his children, and the sons of God are the glory of Christ as lights from His light, so will nature be the glory of God’s sons as humanized and defined nature. Yet we would not therefore take τῆς δοῦλες as the genitive of apposition, since the glory proceeds outwardly from within, and since it is here promised to nature as recompense, so to speak, in opposition to the corruption. It shall therefore share, in its way, in the glory belonging to God’s children. But why is not the ἐλευθερία, corruption, mentioned (1 Cor. xv. 45), in opposition to the φθορά, corruption? Because the idea of corruption has been preceded by that of vanity. The real glory of the manifestation in which its inward corruption shall hereafter be externally revealed, is contrasted with the deceptive, transitory glory of the manifestation in which the creature-world in this life appears subject to vanity. The elevation of the children of God themselves from the condition of corruption to the condition of glorification, constitutes the centre of the deliverance into this state of glory; but the creature is drawn upward in this elevation, in conformity with its dynamical dependence on the centre, and its organic connection with it.*

*This verse, which, taken in its subjective sense, as the purport of the hope, seems to furnish the reference that εἰς τὸν κόσμον ἀνθρώπων, and the longing to the insinuation of immortality (as Stuart throughout), loses its force if thus un-
CHAPTER VIII. 18-39.

Ver. 22. For we know that the whole creation [όλα τά σκατά καὶ τά σκάτω] resounds with groanings. The Apostle furnishes, in ver. 22, for we know, the proof of the declaration in ver. 21. Since he has proved the proposition of ver. 19 by ver. 20, and of ver. 20 by ver. 21, Meyer, without ground, goes back with this for to ver. 20: ἐν ἀληθείᾳ; De Wette [Philocal.] to ver. 19. [If ver. 21 be taken as stating the purport of the hope, then Meyer's view is the most tenable. Philippi finds here a more general affirmation of the existence of the "patient expectation," as an admitted truth.—R.]

Tholuck asks, Whence does the Apostle have this we know? and he opposes the view that it is an assumption of the universal human consciousness (according to most expositors), rather, that the Apostle seems (according to Böuer, Brix) to speak from the Jewish-Christian hope which rested on the prophets, as, even in chap. ii. 2; iii. 19; vii. 14; viii. 28, the σκατός is understood best as the Christian consciousness.* We must not subject the Apostle to the modern sense of nature. But we can still reduce the Apostle's knowledge to that of the prophets. The modern sense of nature, in its sound elements, is a fruit of apostolical Christianity; and as the harmony between spirit and nature has been essentially conditioned in Christianity, so, too, has the knowledge of the language (that is, the spiritual meaning) of nature been consummated in Him—a knowledge which was reproduced in the apostles as a fountain, and ready for enlargement. This knowledge is, indeed, universally human chiefly in elect souls alone, under the condition of Divine Illumination.

Groaneth together and travailleth in pain together [σκατά εἰς καὶ σκατάν]. The σκατά in σκαταστάσεις and σκατάν has been referred, by Ecumenius, Calvin, and others, to the God of children; Köllner, and others, have viewed it as a mere strengthening of the simple σκατά. Tholuck and Meyer explain it, in harmony with Theodor de Mopsuestia, as a collective disposition of the creature. The latter: ἄφησαν δὲ εἰς τι υποφέρον, τούτου πάσα ἡ κόσμος. Estius: gennesse et dolor eis inter se creatus est. On the linguistic tenableness of this explanation, by accepting the presumed organization of nature in single parts, see Meyer, against Fritzschel. It is, indeed, against the reference of the σκατά to the groaning of Christians that this

denoted. The striking phrase: "the freedom of the glory of the children of God," becomes very vague, unless we adopt the view that nature is here personified as in expectation. And it is easier to believe that the verse is true of all nature, than of all men. Whatever may be our wishes, the sharing of nature in the future glory is more probable, judging from the facts of the material world, than the participation of all men in the same, judging from the facts of the spiritual world. The sight after immortality among the heathen is audible enough; but had Paul referred to these, he would undoubtedly have spoken more distinctly of the future of the Messiah. The text, too, is not so well of references to his personal Saviour and His work, to omit allusion to these, where his thought ran, to the salvation of people. Of sense, there is, therefore, in the highest degree improbable that mankind (as distinguished from the natural world) is referred to at all.

* [Professor Stuart urges that the longing of the natural world was not so familiar to all, that the Apostle could thus assume, to have been acquainted with that term of faith, as only in case the meaning of σκάτω be extended to human consciousness in general. That Paul uses it in appeals to Christian consciousness in this event from Rom. ii. 28; iv. 19; vi. 14; viii. 28; 2 Cor. v. 1; I Tim. i. 8; comp. the frequent use of σκάτω in I Cor. vi.—R.]

Reiche holds that σκατάν refers to the eschatological expectation of the Jews, the δολορεσία; dolores messiae; against which Meyer properly observes, that those δολορεσία are special sufferings which were to precede the appearance of the Messiah; but the suffering of nature had taken place from the beginning, since Gen. iii. 17. Yet Tholuck remarks, with propriety, that the Apostle must have been acquainted with that term of Rabbinical theology. Likewise the developing suffering of nature will ascend toward the end to a decisive crisis (see the eschatological words of Jesus). But the "δολορεσία" comprises also ethical conflicts. Therefore this continuous suffering of the world's development is related to the dolores messiae, as the preparation is to the fulfillment, or as the judgment of the world, imminent in the history of the world, is related to the Final cataclysm which denotes the birth-pangs of a woman in labor. The figure is happily chosen, not only because it announces a new birth and new form of the earth, but because it reflects in travailing Eve the fate of the travelling earth, and wise viri. Tholuck: "By path, it will wrust the new out of the old; perhaps σκατάν has reference to bringing forth (comp. Jer. iv. 31), but better, as Luther explains the σκατάν, the groaning, return expectation, which is intensified by the being in travail which follows." Yet the groaning also indicates the painful announcement of positive sufferings, which subsequently arise from the groaning of Christians for redemption (σκατάν αἴτια δολορεσίαν). Until now, we are not only so, but even we ourselves [οὐ νῦν δὲ, ἀλλὰ καὶ αἴτια]. See Textual Notes* and *1. The reading of the Vaticanus is followed here. Meyer's mode of stating the connection with the preceding verse is utterly incorrect: "Climax of the previous proof that the κόσμος in ver. 21 is correct in the ἐν ἀληθείᾳ, ὁτι. Even we Christians would, indeed, do nothing less than unite in that groaning." The principal thought is, not the deliverance of the world, vers. 20, 21, but the future glory of the children of God, ver. 18. The first proof therefor is the groaning of nature; the second, which now follows, is the groaning of spiritual life. Therefore Christians do not unite in anywise in the groaning of creation, but wise viri: the groaning of creation joins in the groaning of Christians. Consequently, we must not translate: "But also we (Christians on our part)," but, we Christians ourselves—namely, we who are most intimately concerned. The expression καὶ οὕτως is

* [Calvin: "Particular Jactatus, ut eum quaeque dies, descendens distinctius linguarum, in sacro corpus curium, quaque incursibus et nostrae molitiae vel ignes, in brevi usque vitam curriculo defixisse."—B.]
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Holy Spirit is himself the gift of the first-fruits, if the completion of Christian life is regarded as the harvest (Bengel, Winer, Rückert, and others). The Spirit is the earnest, δῶρον, of the future perfection (2 Cor. i. 22; v. 5; Gal. vi. 8). Eph. i. 14; iv. 30; and 1 Peter iv. 14, τὸ πνεῦμα τῆς δόξης, are of special importance. Meyer's only objection to this explanation is, that the Apostle's expression would have been misunderstood, since the ἀπαρχή would have to be understood as a part of a similar whole. But the sheaves offered as first-fruits are not merely the first portion of the first sheaves collectively; they are the precious tokens and sure pledges of the full harvest, to which they constitute, if we may so speak, a harmonious antithesis. But the δόξα must be regarded as commensurate with the spiritual life; yet not as a new and higher outpouring of the Spirit, but as the perfect epiphany of the operation of the Spirit. Tholuck admits, at least, that this third explanation is also admissible with the Thond. On the singular explanations of Fritzsche and Schneckenburger, see Meyer.

Even we ourselves groan within ourselves [καὶ αὐτοί εἰς ἑαυτοῖς στίχωσιν]. We, although we have the first-fruits, are far from being complete; despite this, we groan within ourselves. The inward, profound nature of the feeling is thus emphasized.—R.] Groaning is the expression of the longing which feels that it is delayed in its course toward its object; expression of the inclination contending immediately with its obstacles.

Waiting for the adoption [νικοθείαν ἀπελευσόμεθα]. Wait for, await, wait to the end of (Alford). The adoption is already ours (ver. 15) as an internal relation, but the outward condition does not yet correspond (Meyer). Alford paraphrases: we are ting the fulness of our adoption.—R.]. The object of the longing is the νικοθεία, which believers wait for in perfect patience. This is here identified with the redemption of our body. It is the perfect outward manifestation of the inward νικοθεία; it is the soul's inheritance of the glorified life which is attained on the perfect deliverance of the body from the bondage of the first state of nature, and from subjection to death and corruption; see 2 Cor. v. 4. The Apostle's addition of the redemption of our body, proves that he does not mean merely the entire salvation, but this νικοθεία viewed specifically as complete.

[The redemption of our body, τὴν ἀπολύτωσιν τοῦ σώματος ἡμῶν. Exegetical clause.] Τοῦ σώματος is explained by Erasmus, Luther, and others (also Lutz, Bibl. Dogm.), as redemption from the body; but this is totally foreign to the connection, and also to the matter itself. [Were this the meaning, there would probably be some quality of the entire antithesis, but this νικοθεία viewed specifically as complete.]

The view of Lange seeks in view 3, while we do not unnecessarily depart from the usual sequent. In the general description of the last clause—R.]
of the earnest expectation of the **καιρος**. Perhaps this is from Origen and Rothe; see, on the contrary, 1 Cor. xv. Tholuck's quotation from Augustine is better (De doctr. christi): *Quod nonnulli dicunt, male se omnis esse sine corpore, omnis fallaciter, non enim constituent sed corruptiones et pondus decurrent*; Phil. ii. 21; 1 Cor. xx. The most untenable view is: Deliverance from the morally injurious influence of the body by death (Carpzov, and others). It is so natural to refer this phrase to the glorification of the body at the coming of Christ, that it is unnecessary to state arguments in favor of this reference (comp. Phil. iii. 21; 2 Cor. v. 2 ff.; 1 Cor. xv. 42 ff.). The redemption is not complete until the body is redeemed. Any other view is not accordant with the grand current of thought in this chapter. The fact that even here, where the longing of Christians is described, so much stress should be laid on the redemption of the body, the material part of our complex nature, confirms the view of **καιρος**, which takes it as including material existences. In fact, since "even we ourselves" are represented as waiting for an event, which shall redeem that part of our nature most akin to the creation (in the restricted sense of Meyer, and others), it would appear that a distinction of this sort is unnecessary to "creation," but rather a part of it; "subjected in hope," like the whole creation, but also as having the first-fruits of the Spirit, "saved in hope" (ver. 24).—R.

Ver. 24. For we were saved. (εσώθητι, μέν.) Delivered, and participating in salvation. The dative ἐκ, λόγος, in hope, does not express the means, but the motive of the deliverance. [So Bengel, and many others. Comp. Winer, p. 203. The phrase is emphatically placed. Luther is excellent: we are indeed saved, yet in hope.—R.] Even if we were to admit that the Apostle understood faith to be the hope here mentioned (Chrysostom, De Wette, and others)—which, as Meyer correctly observes, is controverted by Paul's definite distinction between faith and hope,* the admission of the dative of instrument would be too strong. But if, if we consider the double idea of faith and hope, as necessarily and inseparably connected, it does not denote "that to which the λογος is to be regarded as confined" (Meyer), but the condition: in hope of. Therefore the **λογοθυμια** must be here explained conformably to the conception of the **νοεσσια** in ver. 23, not as being the principal attainment of salvation in the Spirit—which is already complete there—but as being the perfect attainment of salvation in glory. This has become the portion of Christians, but in such a way that their faith is supplemented by their hope. They have the inward **νοεσσια** in the witness of the Spirit; but the **νοεσσια** of δοσις in the pledge of the Spirit.

Now hope that is seen is not hope [εις ιπτις δε βλεπομενον οιν εις ειπτις ιπτις]. Tholuck: the second ειπτις is concrete, the object of hope. [This usage is common in emphatic phrases in all languages (Philippi). Comp. Col. i. 5; 1 Tim. i. 1; Heb. vi. 18, where ειπτις is objective.—R.] Luther: "The word hope is used in two ways. In one case it means great courage, which remains firm in all temptations; in the other, the finite salvation which hope shall get; here it may mean both." Seeing means, here, the acquired presence of the object, which can be "grasped with the hands;" however, the beholder must momentaneously afford heavenly satisfaction; see 1 Cor. xii. 3; 2 Cor. v. 7.

For what a man seeth [ὅ γαρ βλεπομεν]. Thus the hope of believers proves that they are to expect a state of completion, but that they must wait for it perseveringly.

Why doth he still hope for? [τι και εις ειπτις; See Textual Note.] Adopting και as well established, it seems best to take it as εις ειπτις (Meyer). Why does he still hope, when there is no more ground for it? Comp. Bartung, Partikellehre, i. p. 127, on this use of και. Bengel: cum visione non est opus operis.—R.

Ver. 25. But if we hope for that, we. Hope is no vain dreaming; it is proved as religious confidence in the ethical labor of patience. The διακο-μονη denotes perseverance amid obstacles; therefore always, also passiveness, or patience and steadfastness. But the connection here authorizes the introduction rather of a meditatively fixed idea. And though complete salvation comes from the future and from above, patience in this life must cooperate with its future: therefore: to persevere.* Grotius: Speci. non infractuosa est in nobis, sed egregiam virtutem operatur, maiorum fortium taliemantam.

Ver. 26. Likewise the Spirit also [δαιμονιος δε και το πνευμα]. Likewise (δαιμο-νιος) introduces, as contemporaneous with the preceding verse, the divine assistance of the Holy Spirit (Tholuck).—R.] De Wette and Meyer explain: The Holy Spirit. The latter commentator appeals to verses 16, 23. But, in ver. 23, the new spiritual life is spoken of;† which certainly consists in the fellowship of the human spirit with the Holy Spirit, but is, nevertheless, not the Holy Spirit itself. To say of the Holy Spirit in himself that He groans—indeed, that He gives vent to groanings—were inadmissible. Neither can we, with Nessel, substitute the gospel; nor, with Mora, the Christian disposition; nor, with Köhler, the Christian element of life. According to the opposition of πνευμα and οργη in 1 Cor. xiv. 14, it is the new basis of life, which constitutes to the conscious daily life an opposition of the life which, though apparently unconscious, is really the higher consciousness itself, the heavenly sense of the awakened soul. As, in the unconquered state, the influences of the unconscious basis of the soul invade the conscious daily life with demoniacal temptation, so, vice vers, does the unconscious spiritual life of the converted man come as a guardian spirit to the help of the daily life. Therefore the groaning of the spirit itself (see ver. 16) corresponds with the groaning of the consciousness.

---

* [On δαιμονιος, see p. 162; also Col. i. 11; Lange's Comm. p. 19. Constancy seems to be always prominent in the word. The preposition εις with the genitive denotes that through which, as a medium, our waiting takes place (Alford). It is, therefore, an accompaniment—the state which characterizes the waiting throughout. On the connection of hope and patience, comp. 1 Thess. i. 3; Heb. p. 39.—R.]

† [Against this, see notes in loco, where Dr. Lange himself does not defend this view. It is opposed to the most natural grammatical construction of that passage, and objectable on other grounds. Comp. the additional notes on vers. 16, 23, and the excursus, chap. vii.—R.]
ir. its natural feeling. [This position of Dr. Lange is not in accordance with the view of the best modern commentators. Tholuck, De Wette, Ewald, Stuart, Hodge, Philippi, Meyer, Alford, Wordsworth, Johnson, and the other older commentators in general, all refer it to the objective, Holy Spirit. Ule-hausen, however, adopts the subjective sense. The proof must be very strong which will warrant us in referring to it to any thing other than the Holy Spirit itself; for the Apostle uses τον πνεύμα, as he has done in verses 23, 16, &c., where the Holy Spirit is meant. The only reason urged against such a meaning here is, that the "groaning," &c., cannot be predicated of Him. But we have no right to deny part from the obvious meaning, because, in the next clause, that is predicated which, we fancy, cannot be predicated of the Holy Spirit. The predicate in this clause cannot, with strict propriety, be referred to any spirit save the Holy Spirit. That Dr. Lange's view weakens the thought, is also evident. —R.] 

Helpeth our weakness [συναντιλαμβάνεται τῇ ἀθηνίτει ἡμῶν. See Textual Note 11.] On the one hand, Meyer asks that Mary be hidden to help her; i.e., take hold of in connection with it. It requires a weakening of its force to make this applicable to the new spiritual life. The subjective side has been brought out in verses 23–25. Hence a reference to the Holy Spirit accords with the progress of thought. —R. Meyer urges, with Beza, the σὺν in συναντεῖται, as an adverb of laborae referatur. At all events, it would refer to only the conscious side of our effort. But it is clear, from the further definition, that ἀθηνίτεια is the only correct reading. Tholuck understands this ἀθηνίτεια as referring to occasions of invading faintness. But the Apostle speaks of a permanent relation of our weakness in this life, which certainly becomes more prominent in special temptations. This is the incongruity between the new principle and the old psychical and carnal life. [The singular must be accepted as the true reading. It then refers to a state of weakness, already described (ver. 23). The dative, as in Luke x. 40, denotes not the burden which the Spirit helps us bear (so Hodge, and many others), but that which It helps. (Alford: "helps our weakness—us who are weak, to bear the burden of ver. 25."") Meyer: "Er legt mit Hand um mit unserer Schwachheit,") It should not be limited to weakness in prayer (Bengel), but is the general weakness in our waiting for final redemption. —R.] 

For we know not what we should pray for as we ought [τὸ γὰρ τοῖς προσευχομένοις καθὸ διὰ τῶν οἴνομάν. To belongs to the whole clause. Γὰρ introduces an illustration of our weakness, and how it is helped. The aorist προσευχομένοις, which we accept as the correct reading, is more usual than the future, but either is grammatically admissible. See Winer, p. 230.—R.] Tholuck holds that this not knowing refers to special states of obscure faith, and has a twofold meaning: ignorance of the object toward which prayer should be directed, and the language in which we should pray. But the supposition of special states is incorrect; otherwise the expression would be: we often do not know. But the language can by no means be under consideration, neither can a more vague term be meant. Therefore: De Wette and Meyer explain thus: we do not know what, under existing circumstances, it is necessary to pray for. We refer the καθὼ διὰ as well as the heavenly clearness of the object of redemption as to the subjective purity, definiteness, and energy of desire corresponding to it. * The conscious verbal prayer is related to the spirit of prayer, as the fallible dictate of conscience is to the infallible burden. 

But the Spirit itself intercedeth [ἀλλ' αὐτὸ τὸ πνεύμα ὑπερενεχθέναι. On the omission of ἦν ἄνω (Rec.), which Meyer finds in the verb itself, see Textual Note 11. The verb occurs only here. The simple verb means, to meet; then, compounded with ἐν, to approach in order to make supplication (Acts xxxii. 9, τρεπόμενοι;) the τρεπόμενοι seems to show that the supplication is in favor of the persons in question. Dr. Lange rejects this, in order to avoid a reference to the Holy Spirit.—Αὐτὸ τὸ πνεύμα brings into prominence the Intercessor, who knows our wants (Tholuck, Alford), —R. Since the ὑπερενεχθέναι must be read without the addition of the Eppost, we refer the ὑπερενεχθέναι to our want in not knowing what to pray for, as it is proper for us, and in harmony with our desire. Tholuck remarks, "It requires a higher degree, as in ἀνερπηθών; Meyer [so Philippi] sees here a ἦν οἴνομα, according to the analogy of ἀναποκαθάρισμα, &c.

With groanings which cannot be uttered [στεναγμοὶ αἰαλοτοιχοί.] Analogous to 1 Cor. xiv. 14; against which Tholuck remarks, that there the subject in question is the human πνεύμα. Meyer even declares that those explanations are rationalistic which do not interpret the πνεύμα to be the Holy Spirit (Reiche: the Christian sense; Köllner: the Spirit obtained in Christ); Chrysostom's calling it the χάραμα ἢνως, and Theodoret's not understanding by the expression the ῥύποταις τοῦ Σπυρίτος, are declared to be an arbitrary alteration. Meyer does not accede to the opinion of Augustine, and most commentators, that the sense is, that man himself, stirred up by the Holy Ghost, utters groanings. It is rather the Holy Spirit himself; but certainly He needs the human organ for His groanings. He claims that the analogy, "that demons speak and cry out of men," is adapted to this view. The analogy of demoniacal possession! Besides, Meyer, in his exposition of the αἰαλοτοίχοι, prefers the interpretation of most expositors, unutterable, to the opposite rendering, unuttered, dumb (Grotius, Fritzsche, and others), because it denotes greater intensity. But we get from this the result, that the Holy Spirit, the Spirit of God in His glory, not only groans, but also cannot utter His groanings. [Now notwithstanding this attempt at a reductio ad absurdum, the view must still be held, that the Holy Spirit is here represented as interceding. To avoid this conclusion, Dr. Lange must first weaken the subject into the human spirit, and then the force of ἐνέχθη in the verb. It is far better to accept the obvious sense, and then explain it in a way which escapes the extreme conclusions of Meyer. The Holy Spirit is here spoken of as dwelling in us; in this indwelling He makes the intercession. This view presents no absurdity; it rather accepts the
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prominent thought of the previous part of the chapter (vers. 9, 11, 14, 16), and implies not only that, by this indwelling, we are taught to pray what would otherwise be unutterable (Calvin, Beza), but that the Holy Ghost "himself pleads in our prayers, raising us to higher and holier desires than we can express in words, which can only find utterance in sighings and aspirations" (Alford). So Hodge, Stuart, De Wette, and most commentators.—R.

On the threefold view of διαστάσεως (not utterable, not spoken, not speaking), see Tholuck.*

Ver. 27. But he who searcheth the hearts [ὁ δὲ ἐρευνῶν τὰς καρδίας. ἄλιθ is slightly adverative: These groanings are unutterable, but He, &c. The ἐρευνῶν describes God according to the Old Testament phraseology (1 Sam. xvi. 7; Ps. vii. 10; Prov. xv. 11), as omnipresent.—R.] In 1 Cor. ii. 10 it is said of the Holy Spirit that He searcheth all things; here, according to the just cited reference; for the meaning of the groaning of the Spirit to the Holy Spirit, this very Holy Spirit would be an object of the searching God. [This object is of little weight, since the object of the all-searching God is the mind of the Spirit, hidden (even to us) in the unutterable sighings, &c.—R.]

The mind of the Spirit. His φρονήματα; see chap. viii. 6. His purely divine and ideal striving, but here, especially, thought, denoting the exalted sense of that language of groans. [If the reference to the Holy Spirit he accepted, then the sense not even exegogated by us is included.—R.]

Because he pleads for the saints [ὅτε ... ἐντυγχάνω ὑπὲρ ἄγιον. How can the human spirit, even when possessed by the Holy Spirit, be said to plead for the saints?—R.] The explanation of ὅτε by for [because], according to most expositors (De Wette, Philippi, &c.), is opposed by Meyer (in accordance with Grotius, Fritzsche, Tholuck, and others), who urges instead of it, that.

A very idle thought; God knows the mind of the Holy Spirit, that He intercedes for the saints in a way well-pleasing to God. The οἱδά is perfectly plain in itself, even if not taken in the pregnant sense (with Calvin and Ruckert).† He knows well that He, as the searcher of hearts (Ps. cxxxix. 1) and as hearer, is conscious of the thought and pure purpose of these holy groans. Wherefore? Because it is well-pleasing to God.

According to the will of God (χαρὰ τῇ ὑπὸ) is the correct paraphrase of the E. V.—R. Not, according to Deity (Oriigen); nor before God, nor with God (Reiche, Fritzsche); not by God, by virtue of God (Tholuck).—How can we hold that the Holy Ghost should intercede because of God's impulse?], but according to God, in harmony with the Divine will (Meyer).† The Divine impulse is, in

deed, indirectly implied here; but then it follows again, that the groaning Spirit cannot be identified with the Holy Spirit. [Not with the Holy Spirit as without us, but as within us.—R.]

SECOND PARAGRAPHS, vers. 28-37.

Ver. 28. And we know [οἶδα μετὰ δέ Meyer, Philippi, and others, take δέ as introducing a general clause after the more special ones in vers. 26, 27. Alford finds it slightly adverative, the antithesis being found in ver. 22. The former is preferable. Ôi'da μετα, Christian consciousness.—R.]

The subjective assurance of the future consummation reaches its climax in the fact that believers are lovers of God. But in this form it indicates the objective certainty, which is its lowest foundation. However, instead of the most direct inference, that those who love God are previously beloved by Him, and are established on God's love (an inference controlling this whole section; see vers. 29, 31, 32, 35, 39), the Apostle applies this inference to the condition of Christians in this world. The whole world seems to contradict their hope of future glory. All things visible, especially the hatred of the hostile world, seem to oppose and gainsay their faith. And yet this fearful appearance can have no force, since all things are subject to the omnipotent and wise administration of God, on whose loving counsel their confidence is established. Still more, if all things are subject to God's supreme authority, and this authority is exercised in the development of His loving counsel, they know, with the full certainty of faith, that all things work together for their good. This follows, first, from the decrees, plan, and order of salvation (vers. 28-30). It follows, second, from God's arrangement, act, and facts of salvation (vers. 31-34). It follows, third, from the experience proved in the Old Testament, that the Lord's companions in salvation and the covenant are His companions in suffering, as His companions in conflict; but as His companions in suffering, they are also His companions in victory, for whose glorification all surmounted obstacles are transformed into means of advancement (vers. 35-39). The expression of vers. 29, 30 expresses so strongly the subjective, and also the objective certainty of the future completion, that we believe it necessary to make it prominent as a special paragraph.

That all things, πάντα; not merely all events (Meyer), or all afflictions (Tholuck) [Calvin, Hodge, Stuart]; for, besides events (ver. 28), all the powers of the world are mentioned (vers. 38, 39).—Work together, συνεργάζεται. The beautiful and correct term, serve for the good of, must nevertheless follow the more specific definition. For the principal factor of the completion of Christians is the central one: Christ over them and in them, the love of Christ or the Spirit of glory, the free and dominant impulse of their new life. With this first and central factor there now cooperates the second

* [The meaning unutterable, which cannot be expressed in words, is favored by the analogy of verbs in -ορο, and is adopted by Luther, Calvin, Beza, Meyer, Tholuck, De Wette, Hodge, Stuart, Alford, and many others. Philippi modifies this sense, but includes with it the sense unspoken, which are not expressed in words. Comp. 2 Cor. xii. 4; 1 Peter i. 8.—R.]

† [It is held by many commentators (among them Stuart, Hodge, Meyer), that if ἀλίθ is taken as causal, ἀλίθ must be rendered approbation; i.e., He approves what is the work of the Spirit, because of it. Dr. Meyer's estimate of the Spirit's interpretation is very just, and he seems to be equally correct in denying the necessity for the pregnant sense; for the word should be taken only in it's explanatory sense, as εἰ ἂν is evidently happy in its rendering of this verse.—R.]

‡ [Alford: "All these pleadings of the Spirit are heard and answered. If the Spirit speaks, it is spoken to the voice of the Spirit, which speaks through them, which we would express, but cannot."—R.]

* [See Tholuck, Note 14. Tholuck would refer the οἶδα to the being God, but the simplest sense is that of cooperating (Bengel, Alford, and others). Meyer, however, finds in it the idea of the bondage, on which the necessary co-operation depends on him who is supported. So Philippi and others, all taking οἶδα μετα as = οἶδα μετα.—R.]
and peripheral one—that course of all things and all destinies about them which is placed under God's authority and Christ's power, and constitutes their guidance to glorification.

For good, εἰς ἀγάθωσι. Strictly, for good. The article is wanting, for the Apostle has in mind the uniformity of the divine purpose, and that it is to be effective, working; and because every thing shall be useful to them, and promotive, in a special way, of their good. For the good, is the promotion of life. Every good thing of this kind relates, indeed, to the realization of their eternal salvation, but it is not directly this itself (Reiche). [Bengel: In bonum ad glorificationem sacrum.]

Vers 29, 30. In the following grand and glorious exposition, the Apostle represents God's purpose as being unfolded and realized in its single elements. It is developed as the antecedent and eternal foundation of the historical and eternal salvation in the two parts, foreknowing and predestinating, with respect to the eternal limit, the glory. It is then historically realized in the saving acts of the calling and the justifying. It is finally completed in the glorifying of believers. The foreknowing proceeds, in truth, from eternity to eternity; the predestinating passes from eternity over into time; and finally, the glorifying passes from eternity back into post-temporal eternity, while in the calling and justifying the two eternities are linked together, and reveal eternity in time.

For whom he foreknew, he also predestinated [ὅτι εἰς προφοβίαν, καὶ προορίσθη]. The twice-repeated πρό comes under the treatment before the examination of the single elements. Tholuck: "According to a later view of Meyer, the πρό expresses only precedence before the call; but it is against the analogy of προφοβίαν in chap. xi. 2; 1 Pet. ii. 20; and of προορίσθη in 1 Cor. ii. 7; Eph. i. 5, 11." It is certainly clear that the Apostle will here establish the eternal end, the ἀγάθωσι, upon an eternal beginning (ἀγάθη).

First element: Whom he foreknew. Tholuck says, that "προφοβίαν has been explained in four different ways, and in such a manner that each of the accepted meanings has its predestinarian as well as its anti-predestinarian advocates." These four definitions are: 1. To know beforehand; 2. To acknowledge beforehand, approbate; 3. To select, or choose beforehand; 4. To determine beforehand, decremere, predestinare.

The knowing beforehand was understood by the Greek and Arminian expositors in an anti-predestinarian sense as the foresight of faith; and by the Lutheran exegetical writers as the foresight of perseverance in the bestowed faith. Meyer: Foreknowledge of those destined for salvation. A knowing of the predestinated beforehand, as, according to Tholuck, was accepted by Augustine in later life, and by Zwingli, is very tautological.* But this view passes over, in reality, into a second: approbative; and we then have Tholuck's arrangement, by which eight antitheses—four predestinarian and four anti-predestinarian—must be limited, yet not carried out. The approbative is, indeed, defended in both an Augustinian and an Arminian sense. But, in the former, it coincides with the third view, elegit (Calvin, and others). But if the decremere is also understood in a predestinarian sense, to determine concerning a person, it is only a stronger expression for the elegit in the predestinarian sense. With respect to further treatment of this point, we must refer to the well-known commentators.

If we turn away from the verbal explanation, then there are really but two constructions of this passage, the predestinarian and the anti-predestinarian; in addition to these, there comes at most only the present imperfect condition of man." See chap. ix. throughout. He who would understand the Epistle to the Romans, must assume this position, and remember that the difficulty between God and man is the same, whether the latter, on the one hand, is so sovereign, and, on the other, man's free will, is plainly declared to us. To receive, believe, and act on both these, is impossible of man's nature; no more natural than revealed religion; and every one who believes in a God, must acknowledge both. But all attempts to bridge over the gap between the two are futile, in the nature of things.
germ, or intimation of the possibility of a third.

The predestination explanation of the word φοροῖντος by "to acknowledge," ἀποφαίνεσθαι (Beza, and others), or by δεσμοὶναι, "to determine" (Luther: "ordained," not foreseen), is linguistically untenable; but it is linguistically tenable when explained by to εἴλσε ἐβεβήλω, to choose (Calvin, Rücker, De Wette); * and now means predestination as a doctrinal truth, now as a temporary Pauline view, and now as a permanent sense possible, the general election for salvation (De Wette, and others).

The anti-predestination interpretation of the expression is also varied: the seeing or knowing beforehand of those who are worthy through faith, of those endowed with faith, &c.; and again, in the sense of loving or ἀναρρέουν beforehand (Grotius, and others).

As far as a third exposition is concerned, the observation has been made that God's foreknowledge is a loving knowledge (see Tholuck, p. 449), or a creative knowledge, a being placed in the idea of Christ (Neander, Apost. Zeitreiter, p. 829). Yet Neander's explanation does not go to the bottom of the matter. It is this: "Those whom God, in His eternal view, has known as belonging to Him, through Christ, have been predestinated thereto by Him." We are, indeed, in want of a term which definitely expresses the truth that the loving or fixing of knowledge is an absolutely original one, which determines the idea of the one to be perceived, but does not predestinate it. * Meyer's reminder, that the φοροῖντος, in the classical sense, never means anything but foreknowledge, has no weight here, where we have to do with an ἀπεικόνισθαι in the centre of the Christian doctrine of salvation.

[See Meyer's note.] The one collective Hebrew term for knowing, loving, being present at, and belonging (Gen. iv. 1), is only a modification of the theocratic thought that God calls by name those who do not yet exist, as if He would be, and in order that He may be, their God (Jer. xxxii. 3; Ps. cxxxii. 9; cxlvii. 6). "To call by name" (Is. xlili. 1) to graven upon the hands" (Isa. xlix. 16), and similar expressions, denote figuratively the unity of that knowing and loving which fix in idea the subject in its peculiarity (certainly in Christ), in order that, in consequence of the idea, they may be called into existence. The distinction of preiscence and predestination is in the first foundation of the world, is connected with a defective comprehension of the peculiar character of personal life. (See the Doctr. Notes.)

Second element: He also predestinated. The φοροῖντος presupposes God's first determination of man, * which establishes his individuality in relation to other individualities, and to Christ, the centre. Here the question is the predestination of the historical destiny of the individual, the establishment of the historical gr converse to salvation, just as all kindred definitions, together with φοροῖντος in Acts iv. 28; 1 Cor. ii. 7; Eph. i. 5–11; ἀποφαίνεν in Rom. i. 1; Gal. i. 15; and ἀναρρέουν in Acts x. 28, vii. 26 (where we have ἀναρρέων also), are determined by the fundamental thought of the ἀναρρέω, which is the limitation and condition in time and space, that are identical with the destiny in its relation to salvation, the object of man—a relation which reaches its climax in the τάσσων (Acts xiii. 48). Therefore the Apostle also adds here the destination to conformity to the image of God's Son, undoubtedly with reference to the definite conformity of the historical way of life—through sufferings to glory (chap. vi. 4 ff.; 2 Tim. ii. 11; Heb. ii. 9–11), and to historical confirmation and completion (Phil. ii. 5–11, and elsewhere).

[To be conformed to the image of his Son, αὐθεντός τῆς εἰκόνος τοῦ νιου αὐτοῦ. The word συμμορφοῖν is followed by the genitive here; by the dative, Phil. iii. 21. Hence Sturt thinks it is to be taken as a substantive in this case; but Alford, Tract. ii. 4, says (Acts vi. 8), in being followed by either. Comp. Kümm., ii. p. 172. It is the accusative of the predicate; see Winer, p. 214.—R.] Evidently, we have to deal here with a specifically new ordination on God's part, though it is in harmony with the previous one. The meaning of μορφή comes into consideration in order to explain more definitely the συμμορφοῖν (to which we need not supply an εἰκόνα, because the predensation involves a predescription). Tholuck: "The term μορφή means frequently, but not invariably, the phase of the human form, as well as the form in general, and even the μορφή ἐκείνου (see Plato,

* [So Jowett, Stuart (substantially), and Calvinistic interpreters generally. Dr. Hodge thus presents this Calvinistic view: "It is evident, on the one hand, that φοροῖντος expresses something more than the presence of which all men and all events are the objects; and, on the other, something different from the φοροῖντος (predestination) expressed by the following word: 'whom he foreknew, them he also predestined.' The predestination follows, and is grounded on the foreknowledge. Their foreknowledge, moreover, expresses the act of cognition or recollection—the fixing, so to speak, the mind upon, which involves the idea of selection. If there is a second object of foreknowledge, selecting some of them for a definite purpose, the first act is to fix the mind on some, to the neglect of the others; and the second is to fix the mind on some, to the neglect of others. So God is represented as looking on the fallen mass of men, and fixing on some whom He predestines to salvation. This is the φοροῖντος, the foreknowledge, which is the Apollo. It is the keeping, fixing upon, or selecting those who are to be predestinated to be conformed to the image of the Son of God. * As little can be gained by a philological discussion of the word, and as the theological bias will affect the views of many, it need only be added, that the φοροῖντος of ver. 28 gives the best clue to the meaning of συμμορφοῖν, in the compounds of this verse: that the words should be as little as possible confused by the introduction of the ideas of approving, loving, &c.; that chap. xi. 2, where φοροῖντος is used of Jesus, mode of whom were not saved, does not affect the specific sense here; for there, the matter under discussion is a whole people as a chosen people; here individuals, who are first of all brought into prominence as personal lovers of God, then as "called according to His purpose:" that the idea of the certainty of salvation is the main thought of the passage, as to warrant us, where two meanings are presented, in leaning to that which offers the best ground for each sense. The context is to be read in a way very different from the way in which it is read in the commentary, and in which it is read above.—R.]

† [This seems to be the view of Wordsworth, and many Anglican divines, who would avoid both Calvinism and Arminianism, and at the same time wish it to be in his predestination, and not in his foreknowledge, that we see the ultimate cause and source of this, the passage of sins, and notes upon this subject, but lacks clearness. —R.]

* [Alford: "His foreknowledge was not a mere being previously aware how a series of events would happen, but was correlative with, and inseparable from, His having predestinated all events, foreordained, predestinated, is certain; that it is here applied to individuals, is obvious; that it implies an eternal destination of the Divine purpose with the current of thought in the chapter, the scriptural conception of God's purpose, and the use of the word in other passages. It is the only one used in the truth, indeed, but the other side is not more firmly established by ignoring this. The only reconciliation of the difficulty is in practical Christian experience, and Paul is addressing himself to this throughout And we know (ver. 28).—R.]
THE EPISTLE OF PAUL TO THE ROMANS.

That he might be the first-born among many brethren. The εἰς τὸ εἶναί αὐτὸν πρωτότοκον ἐν πολλοῖς διδαχαί εἰσελθεῖν ὅλης ἔκειν ἀπὸ τῶν ἐπιστολῶν—ἐξ διαφόρων οὖσαν εἰς διαφόρα κατά τὰ ἐν πολλοῖς διδαχαί, τῶν μὲν καθ’ ἑαυτὸ ἀκμαίαν ἐκεῖνον, τῶν δὲ τὴν πρωτότοκον προσώπων ἀκμαίαν τοῦ Χριστοῦ, τοῦ δὲ τοῦ πρωτοτόκου μετὰ τὸν εἰσελθεῖν ἐκεῖνον τῆς μὲν ἀκμαίας πρωτότοκου, τοῦ δὲ τοῦ πρωτοτόκου μετὰ τῆς ἀκμαίας πρωτότοκου τοῦ Χριστοῦ. [The reference in the aorists to the past do of redemption requires us to take this clause as telic.—R.] According to De Wette, the principal thought is, that He, the first-born, might be among many brethren; according to Meyer, that He might be the first-born among many brethren. Tholuck: The chief thought is, the share of the δόλοιος in the possession of the First-born. The πρωτότοκος (Col. 1. 15) involves not merely the element of first-born (Tholuck), but also that of causal priority; and this element cannot be wanting in the present passage. The expression therefore denotes, according to the prominence given to His conformity with believers, also his elevation above them; but it is an elevation which is in harmony with inward uniformity, a true fraternization.

We do not think it advisable to lay stress on either the many brethren or on the first-born. The real aim, after all, is Christ. (For Col. 1. 15) implies not merely the element of Christ as the first-born (not merely the μονογένης of God) among many brethren; therefore the people of His kingdom, a choir of brethren, are to be with Christ, and all around Him. [The end of the foregoing and predefining is the glorification of Christ in us, His people. The ideas become as inseparable as the glorified brethren themselves are.—R.]

Ver. 30. Thon he also called [τό τῶν καὶ ἡκάλασαν]. The καλεῖ, like the κληρ, is without suffix, since the idea, prepared by the Old Testament βητ, is generally known and elucidated; in addition to this, there is a still greater New Testament fundamental conception. The sense is this: called to the community of Christ as to the communion of salvation, to the Supper of the Lord, to life, &c. But as election comprises a twofold idea, a historical (John vi. 70) and a mystical or transcendental one, so does κληρονομεῖ also comprise a twofold conception (Matt. xxii. 14). Evidently, we have here no idea of any fixed idea of an eternal κληρονομεῖ that is, a κληρονομεῖ becomes inward from a merely external one. Meyer denies that this κληρονομεῖ relates to the inward operations of grace, but holds that the effects of the call result from the relation of preaching to the existing qualification of men. But such an effect is hardly conceivable without the operation of grace. Tholuck opposes any distinction between a vocatio externa and interna, between a vocatio intellectiva and spiritual. The idea may have been represented one-sidedly by predestinarian theologians; but the fact of the distinction is continually corroborated in every village church where the gospel is preached. We gain no clearer view by the remark, that the spirit of Plato is contained in the Platonic writings, for thousands have not found the Platonic spirit in them. This remark applies only to such spiritualists as, on the one hand, place the "dead" word without the spirit, or, on the other, the spirit without the word. We may enlarge by saying, that if the κληρονομεῖ stands midway between πρωτότοκος and the δικαιοσύνη, the specific idea necessarily becomes apparent. The καλεῖ is that effect of God's word completed in the gospel, which is divided into illu-
mination and awakening. It is prepared by the effect of the προοίμιον: Laboriousness and burden-someness (Matt. xi. 28); it unites these with, and, by conversion through penitence and by believing confidence, prepares the δόξασις for saving faith. But, of course, if the question is concerning the κηρύσσει, the κῆρυς also comprises the δικαιοσύνη, and then the beginnings of the δοείσεως.—In that case, also, the idea of the δοείσεως also becomes κηρύσσεος and δοείσεως results in the most definite way (see chap. iii.).

[Them he also justified, τούτων καὶ δικαιοσύνης. See the exhaustive notes of Dr. Schaff, pp. 130 ff., 138 ff.—R.]

And whom he justified, them he also glorified [οίς δὲ δικαιοσύνης, τούτων καὶ δοείσεως]. The exegetical writers begin here to wonder at the aorist, while their surprise ought to have begun at least with the δοείσεως. For, at the time when the Apostle wrote these words, only a very few of the whole future body of believers were really called. Therefore the aorist δοείσασθαι cannot stand here for the future (according to Vorstius and Glass), nor for the present (according to Kollner), nor in the sense of taking care of (according to Frits). Meyer holds that the Apostle here describes the process of future glorification as necessary and certain, that it is the same as if it had already taken place. Tholuck regards the aorist here as the prophetic preterite. [So Stuart,]

We will now consider more particularly the anathesis which Meyer calls special attention to—that Grothus, and others, have regarded the act of δοείσεως as having only happened in the purpose of God,† but that Chrysostom, and others, on the contrary, hold it far beyond the God of this world. The Apostle's starting-point is evidently his present time, the fellowship of the κηρύσσει and the δικαιοσύνην in which he stands. This is even literally established, in a certain rotation, by the expression, καὶ δοείσεως. For δοείσεως means not merely to invest one with δοείς at the end of time, but to lead gradually by the πνεύμα τῆς δοείς (1 Peter iv. 14) to the glory of all guidance of believers is δοείσασθαι in the biblical sense. This δοείσασθαι had therefore already begun for the companions of the Apostle, and, in his believing confidence, it was just as good as completed (see vers. 38, 39).* But if the Apostle had merely wished to describe this standpoint of the Christians of that day—that is, merely the standpoint of experience—he would have had to commence with the αὐτὸς κηρύσσει, and return from the αὐτὸς δοείσασθαι to προφανείας, and finally to προοίμιον. But he has changed the statement of his experience of that period into a doctrinal statement for all time, in order to exhibit the προσώπον of God in its full splendor. His orates has then chiefly a historical meaning. Many had already completely passed over this stationed way; for example, Stephen, and James the Elder. In the same manner this way had, and will always have, so many, a distinguishing meaning; that is, it applies to the secure developing progress of the elect in a special sense. It has, finally, for all: a. a methodological meaning; that is, they experience here the final consequence of God's saving acts in the etera salutis; b. the meaning of evangelical promise. If they stand in the circle of the κηρύσσει and δικαιοσύνης, they can be certain, retrospectively, of their election and forordination (historical determination), and prospectively certain of their guidance to glory. Paul argues, throughout, on the ethical facts and conditions that correspond to these acts of God; but he does not name them here, because the connection requires that the superiority of the Divine ground of salvation to human weakness should alone be glorified (see Doctr. Notes.)

Ver. 31. What then shall we say to these things? [Τί εἶπον ἐρωτευμένος πρὸς τὰ τάσσεια; Τί εἶπον τοῖς ἰησοῦς, οἱ ἐρωτούντες τὸν Ιησοῦν;] vi. 1; vii. 7; ix. 14, where it introduces a false conclusion; here, and chap. ix. 30, a correct one; De Wette.—R. Tholuck: "Τί ἐρωτεύμενος is used here, contrary to the Apostle's custom, in a conclusion which has not a doubtful character." But the apparently doubtful element lies in the conclusion which might be drawn, that the Christian can have no opposition. He has, indeed, says Paul, no veritable opposition to the whole opposition has, only helps him. What follows from the fact that God has so securely established our salvation through all its stages?† The conclusion is this:

If God is for us, who is against us? [Εἰ δὲ θεὸς μετ' ἡμῶν, τίς καὶ θεὸς ἡμῶν;] (Ps. xci. 1—7). Everything thing which is against us, in

* [As the Apostle is speaking of God's acts, not ours, there is no mention of faith, or any other human exercise and there need be none; for who can misunderstand him, when this side of the matter is in question? The justice of the sentence in the English version is, "called," rather than "called and glorified," and to understand by the term only the general invitation to believe and accept the gospel, weakens the force of the passage. Besides, it is not true that those whom God invites to believe through the gospel, he justifies also, and glorifies. To admit this is, to obliterate the distinction between the wayside and fruitful hearers (Matt. xiii. 18-39) to fly in the face of, as well as the plain teaching of, the Word of God. Dr. Hodge, and Calvinistic interpreters generally, make called = effectually called. Without calling, faith is effectually called, including faith, antecedently, with predestination and justification; but since the technical meaning of effectual calling is really regeneration, we may hesitate in giving to the word its full extent. The subjective aspect of effectual calling is not introduced, at all events, we have only the order of the Divine acts respecting the salvation of individuals, as presenting the Apostle's standpoint of salvation.]

† [So Philipps, De Wette. Accord combines with it that of Grothus, much as Dr. Lange does: "The aorist ἐρωτεύμενος is used, as the other aorists, to imply the communion in the Divine counsel of all these, which are to us, in the state of time, so many successive steps—simultaneously not, however, a continuous one, which would have been necessary."

‡ [Dr. Hodge adopts a modification of this view, though he suggests that the aorist may imply frequency, almost = the present. Luther's view of the aorist = "sufficiently so that Meyer, or that of Lange himself."—R.]

[The omission of "them he also sanctified," which we would expect to find in the context, "have glorified," limited to the future, is a sufficient ground for this position of Dr. Lange, and favors also the view, that the certainty is prominent, rather than the completion of all these in the purpose of God. Of course, the objective certainty rests on this completion in God's purpose, but the latter is included only by implication.—R.]

§ [As the whole passage can only be of encouragement when viewed in this light, Wordsworth deprecates it of its use in sermons of that character, and he says that the Church of England teaches: "She considers these things as done; for in God's will, and, on His side, they are done, for all members of the visible Church. But this is not to say that they are accomplished, and this is not to say that we are dependent on us, that, unless we perform our part, all God's gracious purposes toward us will fail of their effect." See his lengthy note on which touches (eagerly graspful) this difficult subject.—R.]

¶ [Meyer takes vers. 31-33 as a conclusion from vers. 29, 30: "The Christian answers then, that in the determination of God he is saved, but he is, with the love of God in Christ, certain of this salvation." This whole passage (notice the logical relation of οὐκ, vers. 29, and αἱ, vers. 31) is a commentary on vers. 29—and what a commentary—R.]
an earthly sense, must, in a heavenly sense, promote our welfare through God's sovereignty. [How God is for us, has been set forth; the question therefore implies, not doubt, but joyous certainty. Hence the E. V. is not strong enough.—R.] This confidence of the Apostle, in opposition to the hostile forces of the world, assumes a bold and almost challenging tone. Tholuck: "There begins with this expression a series of victorious questions and triumphant assertions, in reference to which Erasmus exclaims: 'Quid usquam Cicero dixit grandiloquentius?" Just such a triumphant acclamation is found in 1 Cor. xv. 54."

Philippi: "In fact, as vers. 19–23 may be called a sacred elegy, so we may term vers. 31–39 a sacred ode; that is as tender and fervent as this is bold and exalted in matter and in manner; that, an amplification of 'we do groan, being burdened' (2 Cor. iv. 3); this, a commentary on 'this is the victory that overcometh the world' (1 John v. 4). Augustine, De doctr. christi, iv. 20, cites vers. 31 as an example of the grande dieendi genus, quod non tam verborum ornatus ceritum est, quam violentum animi affectus—Satis enim est ei propter quod agit, ut verba congruent, non oris eligantur industria, sed poetae sequantur ardorem. Nam eum auro magno, fidele, inquit, Mons sit 2. Paulini, ii. 7. observation. It is true, in our own time, illus, quod agit, non quia pretioso, sed quia arma sunt." —R.

Ver. 32. He who spared not his own Son [ὁ γὰρ εἷς τὸυ ἵδου καὶ κάθι σα ἐπὶ σκότος], Meyer, and others, take this as an interrogative answer to the preceding question. It does indeed answer it, but is, at the same time, an advance (see below). Then, the enclitic γις has the force of even, quique qui, but Alford is not justified in saying that this takes "one act as a notable example out of all;" for this is the crowning proof of love, including all the others, and hence establishing the main clause: how shall he not, &c.—R.] After the Apostle has described negatively, in vers. 31, the elevation of God's children above the hostile world, he portrays it positively in vers. 32. The logical construction of the sentence is a double one. God had already established our δόξα, is for us, with the whole energy of His purpose. a. He is for us in person as our protector, and therefore no person and no thing can be against us; b. He is for us to such a degree that He gave His Son for us. "Οὗτος ἐπιστάτη, as involves here two ideas: He did not save Him (Bengel: paterno suo amor quasi viam aedificavit), and, He did not spare Him.

但却 delivered him up for us all [γαλλὰ ἡπιά τὴν πάντων παρεῖδομεν αἰτῶν]. On the verbo, comp. chap. iv. 25. On the preposition ἐπίκα, in behalf of, comp. chap. v. 6.—R.] Deliverance to death for us, for our redemption. The notion which would explain John iii. 16 as a "deliverance to finiteness" (mentioned by Tholuck on p. 455), belongs rather to the philosophy of Schelling in his early period, than to the christological standpoint.

[Freely give us all things? τὰ πάντα Ἡμῶν 6. οὖν γανοκτίσται? A question a majori ad min. (Meyer).] Philippus and Meyer join καὶ, with πᾶς ὁσοῦ ἤδι, not with σιὰν αὐτός. It is perhaps more grammatical, but the thought is still the same: that with Christ, and because of Christ, all else shall come.—R.] Τὰ πάντα. Tholuck: "Every thing which we need." This is against Brenz, who explains thus: "All the blessings comprised in Christ." But why not simply, every thing, in harmony with vers. 17 and 1 Cor. iii. 22? For, after all, we "need" every thing, and the "blessings comprised in Christ" are the whole universe. Therefore the σιὰν is not merely based on the idea of the πληθύς.

Vers. 33–35. Two lines of the certainty of salvation have been drawn from the one fundamental idea of the μισθός κατὰ πρώτον; that is, the assurance of salvation. There is, first, the line of the certainty of individual, inward, and personal salvation (vers. 28, 30); the causa principialis: grace. Then we have, second, the line of historical salvation, and, finally, the hypothesis, which corresponds with the first line as the causa mediatriz. This latter appears as the almighty gift of salvation, in opposition to the contradiction of the world. As the Apostle looks at the fearful appearance of this contradiction, he now presents throughout the negative character of the historical salvation. That is, he develops the thought placed at the outset—that nothing can be against us, because God is for us; so very much for us, that He delivered even His Son for us. But this Apostle then brings out the fact, though more indirectly, that God will, with Him, also freely give us all things. Thus there is, first of all, the exalted mediation of salvation. "Who shall lay any thing to the charge of God's elect?"

Different constructions of the following three verses (vers. 33–35):

a. Vers. 33 and 34 are antitheses which must be read as questions and an answer, according to our translation. [See Loth. Castello, Beza, Calvin, Fränzle, Philippus [Stuart, Hodgce], and others.]

b. The three answers also stand in the form of questions, thus: Who shall lay any thing to the charge of God's elect? Will God, who justifieth, do it? Who is He that condemneth? Will Christ, who died for us, do it? (This is the view of Augustines, Ambrose, Koppek, Reiche, Olshausen, De Wette [Alford, Webster and Wilkinson, Jowett], and others.)

c. An altered form of presenting the antitheses: 1. Who shall lay any thing to the charge? Answer: It is God that justifieth; who, therefore, is He that condemneth? 2. Answer: It is Christ that died, &c, who also makest intercession for us; who, therefore, shall separate us from the love of Christ? This construction of the antithesis, which was laid down by Origen, Chrysostom, and Theodoret, has been neglected by nearly all recent commentators. But this construction is urgently recommended by Meyer. [Wordsworth follows it in his text, but is impressively silent on the subject in his notes. See Meyer, not only in defence of his own view, but for a remém of other opinions.—R.]

Tholuck very properly remarks, in opposition to
CHAPTER VIII. 18–39.

this third combination of sentences, as follows: "It can be least satisfactory of all; for, if we adopt it, that rhetorical conformity of the sentences is lost which is apparent in the other constructions," &c. But construction not merely obliterates the grand simplicity of the antithesis, but also obscures their real order. The question, Who shall lay any thing to the charge? remains totally unanswered. But, on the contrary, the question, Who is He that condemneth? would receive two answers: first, the expression, "it is God that justifieth," and afterward, "it is Christ that died," &c. In addition to this, the clear thoughts, justification, in ver. 38, the atonement, in ver. 34, and holiness or glorification, in vers. 28–37, would be totally confused.

The second construction appears to be favored by the fact, that the third question, "Who shall separate us from the love of Christ?" seems, in turn, to be answered by a rhetorical question (tribulation, or distress, &c.). But the third question is continued through vers. 35 and 36, and the answer to it follows in a positive declaration in ver. 37.

Thus elegance of both form and matter pronounces in favor of the antithesis of three questions and three answers. If it be objected, that the answers would be still strengthened by the form of rhetorical questions, we might reply, that they would indeed be strengthened even to overstraining and obscurity. For there are, indeed, accusers and condemners enough against believers, which is plain from what follows: tribulation, distress, persecution, &c. But the principal thing is, that they stand as accusers against the justifying God himself, and as condemners of the future Judge of the world, Christ the Messiah, who is the Saviour of believers; and therefore, that their charge and condemnation are not only impotent, but must even advance the glory of believers, just as tribulation, distress, persecution, &c., are not only unable to separate them from the love of Christ, but must establish them in His love as decided victors. But Paul could hardly have expressed, as he does in the form of a rhetorical question, the thought that God could be the accuser of believers, and Christ could be their condemnner, even if we consider the question apart from the fact that he would thereby have destroyed the antithesis: if God be for us, who can be against us? Meyer remarks, against the former construction, that θεὸς ὁ δικαιων and θεὸς κατακρίνων would be essentially correlative. This is altogether incorrect. The δικαιων removes the charge of condemnation; the atonement made by Christ aboliishes the condemnation itself. That Paul did not write τῆς κατακρίνης to correspond with the τῆς ἡγεσίας, is not only unjustifiable, but is based upon the supposition that there could be many accusers, but that there could be only one condemnner at the tribunal. Meyer holds that, by the first construction, Christ must have been represented as Judge, in harmony with the δ κατακρίνων in ver. 34. But apart from the consideration that Christ opposes all the worldly condemnation, the word κατακρίνω (see chap. iv. 25) and in His sitting at the right hand of God, and in His intercession, there is comprised

"Ἰησοῦς is given with the adjective designations." Tholuck has declined to decide concerning the punctuation.

[The pointing adopted in the E. V. has been fully defended by Dr. Lange, that the following remarks will confute its objection. (1.) Even the most rhetorical style would scarcely indulge in seventeen successive questions, without an answer, as view b would maintain. (2.) View a. disturbs the flow of the passage, without adding to this force. (3.) The grand thought of the certainty of salvation seems to be even more fully established by accepting three questions and three answers following each in turn, while there is no reasonable objection to the cor correspondence thus claimed between each question and its answer.—R.]

Ver. 33. Who shall lay any thing to the charge of God's elect? [τῆς ἡγεσίας κατὰ ἐκλεκτὸν θείον:] The word is usually followed by the dative, only here with κατὰ. The article is omitted with ἐκλεκτὸν, giving prominence to the attribute of the persons (Meyer). That it refers to the persons under discussion throughout, is obvious.—R. The idea of the ἑλεγχων theoretically resting on the Old Testament "γῆς, corresponds with that of the προφυλακτοὶ; but in the concrete sense, the ἑλεγχων, the interceders, was the deepest establishment of the whole character of believers in the ἱδεῖα of God (see Druc. Nota.)

It is God that justifieth! [θεὸς ὁ δικαιων τῇ ἡγεσίᾳ:] The expression is more energetic than θεὸς δικαιων; comp. Matt. x. 20 (Philippi). The δικαιων, occurring immediately after διον, has a rhetorical emphasis (Meyer).—R. According to Tholuck, the question really is the interestor in opposition to the charge, and, on the other hand, the δικαστὴν in opposition to the κατακρίνων. But this would not correspond with the connection. As the authorized accusers, the law and the conscience, are silenced in the δικαστὴς, which God himself executes, we must here have in mind principally the weakness of the unauthorized accusers, at whose head stands Satan, κατάγησις (Origen), who opposes Christians not only in heathen adversaries (Phocis, Theophylact, Grotius), but also in Jewish adversaries. The δικαστής has evidently here also a forensic meaning. Tholuck: ["Luther excellently says, in harmony with the sense, 'God is here.'"]

Ver. 34. Who is he that condemneth? The δ κατακρίνων declares, that in an authorized form there can only be one, the Messiah, but it is just He who is their propitator and intercessor.

It is Christ, &c. [Χριστός ὁ προσευχητὴς, x. 31.] The οὐδεὶς expresses complete deliverance from condemnation in four essential elements of Christ's redeeming work. In the two elements of His death and resurrection there is comprised full deliverance from the real guilt of condemnation (see chap. iv. 25); and in His sitting at the right hand of God, and in His intercession, there is comprised

* [As remarked in Textual Notes 14, this view is doubly doubtful. The reading is quite uncertain, and to render Χριστὸς Ἰησοῦς, Christ is Jesus, is almost fanciful. Dr. Lange remarks that the article (which might have been expected before Ἰησοῦς, were this the meaning) is found in the attributive clause (ὁ κατακρίνων), will not meet the grammatical objection. So forced a construction would be admissible only in the absence of any other satisfactory explanation. Certainly the thought that the slain yet risen Christ shall intercede for us in the world, that he is really the only Condemner, is not so unscriptural or unphilosophical as to create a difficulty from which we must escape by this singular exegesis.—R.]
His protection against the unauthorized accusers from without, and the condemnatory results of the injury of the new life from within.—Meyer: *μᾶλ·
λον δὲ καὶ·* a higher degree of importance; *ίππον ἀιώνιον.* The δὲ καὶ has a somewhat festive

Ver. 35. Who shall separate us from the
love of Christ? [τις ἡμᾶς χωρεῖν ἀπὸ τῆς ἀγάπης τοῦ Χριστοῦ;] The reading τοῦ θεοῦ is but weakly supported. Meyer, with Tholuck, De Wette, Philippi, and others, properly
say in favor of the construction Χριστοῦ, that it is the genitive subjective; and, therefore, that it denotes Christ's love toward His followers (see vers. 27, 39). But when he says that this forholds the interpretation of others who understand it to be
love for Christ (Origen, Kölner [see Forbes, p. 332, on this view], and others), his remark is only cor-
rect in form; for, in reality, confidence in love on Christ's part for His children cannot be separated from love for Him (see ver. 28).† The affections which now follow are personified by τις [instead of τοῦ θεοῦ].

But how is the possibility of this separation to be regarded? Meyer: A possible surrendering of men from the influx of Christ's love by intervening hindrances. De Wette: The joyous sense of being beloved by Christ. Philippi: Affections can seem to us to be an indication of Divine wrath, and thus mislead us into unbelief in Divine love. Tholuck: The firmness of the consciousness of this Divine relation of love. The sense of the question is this: Can an affection lead us to fall from the operation and experience of Christ's love? By answering in the negative, there is assumed not merely the Divine purpose of grace according to the predestinarian view, and also not merely the purity and perseverance of faith according to the Arminian view, but the connection between the two, the new bond which is secured by the recognition of tribulation, distress, &c., as powers overcome by Christ, and made serviceable to His love itself.

Shall tribulation, &c. [Ωδίνες, &c.] The forms of affliction are in harmony with the relations of Christians at that time, and especially of the Apostle; there is the apparent fearful number seven, but the seventh leads to the triumphant conclusion in martyrdom. First of all, believers are pressed into anxiety by the world. [On Δινίας and στερεομορία, see II. 9, p. 99, the former external, the latter internal.—R.] Then there comes persecution itself, which drives them out to famine and nakedness; the end is peril, the danger of death, and sword, death itself.

Ver. 36. As it is written [καὶ χρῖνς ἐγκατα-
τει ὁτι. *Ωτι is the usual quotation-mark.*

* [See Textual Note 17. The καὶ before τις is also omitted in N. A. C., but inserted in the majority of MS.]

† [Orvin adds a third meaning: *our sense of Christ's love to us.* This is implied in the excellent remarks of Dr. Hodge: "The great difficulty with many Christians is, that they cannot persuade themselves that Christ (or God) loves them; and the reason why they can not feel confident of the love of Christ, is, that they know they do not deserve His love; on the contrary, that they are in the highest degree wretched. But it is the very thing we are required to believe, on the one hand, of peace and hope, but as the condition of salvation. If our hope of God's mercy and love is founded on our own goodness or attractiveness, it is a most barefaced, unmeaning, foolish, mysterious, without any known or conceivable cause, certainly without the cause of loveliness in its object."—G.]

Psalm xlv. 22, according to the Septuagint. *This Psalm contains a description of the sufferings which God's people had to suffer for the Lord's sake, and is therefore correctly regarded by Paul as a typical, and prophetic pledge for the sufferings of the New Testament martyr. *It is the love of God for God's sake. De Wette does not regard the passage as a prophecy (Tholuck), but thinks that Paul probably cites it as prophecy. But even Tholuck's expression, "a real parallel to the conflicts of God's ancient people," is by no means sufficient for the idea of typical prophecy, for the type is much more than a parallel.

Ver. 37. Nay, in all these things we are
more than conquerors [ἀνάλλην ἐν τούτοις πανίς, τ.τ.ι. Some connect this with ver. 35, and hence ver. 36 has been made parenthetical; but there is no necessity for this, since the course of thought is unbroken, and this verse is antithetical to both vers. 35 and 36.—R.] That is, far beyond the necessary measure (πεποιημένος). Recollection of prayers for persecutors (Stephen), hymns of praise in prison (Paul and Silas), and the joyous spirit of the martyrs.

Through him who loved us [διὰ τοῦ ἀγαπησάντος ἡμᾶς. See Textual Note 17.] Meyer refers the aorist to "the distinguished act of love which Christ has performed by the offering of His own life." Though this reference is undoubtedly correct, there is something inadequate in the translation, loved. The aorist ἐποίημεν does not merely affirm that they believed, but that they became believers (see John x. 29); and thus the act of our Lord's only revelation of love also involves here the continuation of that relation: who has proved and bestowed His love.—Through him. The reading διὰ τοῦ (Semler, Koppe: proper) is a smoother exegetical interpretation.‡ Chrysostom, Theodoret, Bengel, and Fritzschel, refer the expression ἐποίημεν to God: but on account of ver. 39, Rückert, De Wette, Tholuck, Meyer, and Philippi, on the contrary, refer it to Christ. This latter view is favored by the relation of the present passage to τοῦ Χριστοῦ in ver. 35, as the aorist serves as an intensification of the historical fact of redemption. The expression, "through Him that loved us," denotes not only Christ's assistance in general, but the power of His victory. His death is principally our death, and His resurrection is our resurrection, so is His victory also our victory through faith (1 John v. 4). But the power of His victory is divided into the subjective principle of victory in the heart of believers, and the objective victorious principle of Christ's rule at the right hand of God. Nevertheless, the Apostle does not say, "through Him who hath conquered for us," because Christ's love shall be manifested as the permanent motive of the free and ethical loving life of Christians in their faith.

* [In the LXX, Ps. xxxiii. 33. The only variation is ἐγένετο here, on the authority of N. A. B. D. E., while (Rec.) C. K. have ἐστε. It must be remarked, however, that the reading of the LXX. itself varies in the same manner.—R.]

† [So Alford: "It is no news to trial to which we are subjected: what if we verify the ancient description!""]—R.]

‡ [This would refer to Him as the efficient cause; but since the context clearly uphold the reference to Christ, it is the more surely correct that it is given a more exegetical interpretation than that which presents Him as the instrumental cause. It represents the union in victory as more intimate to follow the better supported reading, διὰ τοῦ ἐγένοτα.]
Tholuck: "seductive, Melanchthon removed and 2, would superior to plain w vers. Thess.) of all the and, come of things (angels, powers" Lord above mortis, darkness is not consciousness referred yf/loi, "EvS-fo? ayyiXoi, (death of death of one, angelic vivat, aqx'="的现象, angels, principalities, category according to Tholuck's argument, that the "dévainé" is a more significant classification of angels, that it is used in the New Testament, and that it is a natural classification of angels, rather than a more difficult one. He also notes that the "dévainé" is more appropriate as referring to the former, and "principalities" to the latter, giving an abrupt antithesis; to refer both to good angels, leaves evil spirits out of view in this extended catalogue, unless we find them named in "dévainé"; to refer both words to both classes (Bengel, Hodge), is perhaps least objectionable, yet with this view the absence of any attribute is remarkable. Still, we infer from other passages that both good and bad angels were classified somewhat in this manner, "dévai" denoting a superior order. Comp. Lange's Comm., Colossians, i. 16, p. 22.—R.

The "dévainé", which Melanchthon interprets as the warlike hosts of tyrants, do not belong here, and therefore still less in the category of angels. They belong in the third category: Nor things present, nor things to come, nor powers [o vte eπιστοτα, o vte μελλοντα, o vte δεναινει̑]. (See 1 Cor. iii. 17.) It was no grievance, Paul, to the believers of his period, that they earnestly looked for the second coming of our Lord (1 Thess.); but even the future had a gloomy aspect, for our Lord's coming was to be preceded by the apostasy, and by the appearance of Antichrist (2 Thess. ii). But with this appearance there were to come just these gloomy, seductive, and Satanic forces (for πεινα δεναινει̑ και σαπιον και είρανα αγιον). We thereby hold that Tholuck's objection, that the "dévainé" would here "disturb the sense in a threefold way," is removed (p. 462). One objection, that it would disturb the bipartite rhythm, is removed by Meyer's observation, that the Apostle first arranges by couples, and then combines the three parts twice more. According to Tholuck, the "dévainé" would be first called "dévai" without some qualifying expression." Meyer opposes the objection of Reiche, and others, that good angels could not make such an attempt to separate Christians from God, by saying that Paul, in Gal. i. 8, did not believe this possibility, but only presented it hypothetically. According to Clement of Alexandria, Grotius [Seriri], and others, the "dévai" denote evil angels; but according to Beier, Bengel [Hodge], and others, good and evil angels. Melanchthon has interpreted the "dévai" as human tyrants, because he correctly saw that they, being placed beside "dévai", could not themselves be angels.

The difficulty in deciding the meaning of the word "dévai" arises from the fact that it is used in the New Testament in all the senses given above. The prevailing reference is undoubtedly to super human creatures (Eph. iii. 10; vi. 12; Col. i. 16; ii. 10, 15). It seems more natural to take "dévainé" (in its separate position) as "earthly powers," especially as that meaning here gives an anti-climax. The disposition to insert "dévainé" immediately after, shows that a classification of angels was assumed here (comp. Eph. ii. 21; Col. i. 16). Whether we should understand good angels, or bad, or both, is not decided.

Neither death, nor life, [o vte ιεναιόμαι, o vte άρωσι], if we look closely at the possibilities above referred to, we shall see that, first of all, with death there is connected the fear of death and the darkness of the kingdom of death; and, with life, that there is connected the charm of life and the love of life, or even the apparent distance from the Lord (Heb. ii. 14; John xvi. 33; 2 Cor. v. 5, 6). On death and life, see chap. xiv. 8. Grotius: meta mortis, spec visibi by which Meyer objects to; but his objection to Kopp's interpretation, which is as follows, is more appropriate: quipudet est in rerum natura: aut vital, aut vital carert.

Nor angels, nor principalities, [o vte ιεναιόμαι, o vte άρωσι]. See Textual Note a, and below. As far as the second category is concerned, the Apostle could not think that God's angels should desire to separate him from the love of Christ, but, according to Col. ii., the Gnostic Jews soon opposed a morbid adoration of angels to a pure and full resignation to Christ as their head; and even Phari saic Jewish Christians would have been quite capable of adulterating the pure gospel, according to Gal. i. 8, by an appeal to nagiciel revelation. But it is well known how the subsequent worship of angels really led to an obscuring of the sun of Christ's love.

The threat of the powers of the Gentile world then takes its place beside the Jewish angelic visions. It is plain enough that the "dévai" named with the "dévai" cannot again mean "angelic powers" (Meyer). The Apostle had to deal more and more with the powers of the Gentile world (2 Tim. iv. 17). The "dévai" are interpreted by Chrysostom, Theophylact, Beza, Meyer, and others, as good angels, "because the evil angels are never
introduced, and then removed. Meyer urges that έστιν does not mean things present, but things standing before—those which are about to come. Thus things present are distinguished from things to come. De Wette opposes to Glockler's interpretation of δι' αυτών as miracles, that of powers.

Fourth category: [Nor height, nor depth, οὐτε ψυχή, οὐτε βαθύς.] The Apostle looks down from the height of an inspired sense of life, many times elevated to heaven (2 Cor. xii. 2), which could well have become to him a temptation (2 Cor. xii. 7), into the depth of the demoniacal kingdom, with which he had to fight a spiritual conflict with his contemporaries (Eph. vi. 12), as well as into the depth of the realm of the dead in which he had, at all events, to pass through a painful unclouding (2 Cor. v. 4); but he saw in the future altogether new forms of the world arise, whose strangeness and splendor, by their attractive value, could be regarded as dissipating his view from Christ, the centre.

Tholuck: "ψυχή, βαθύς. Explanations: Heaven and hell (Theodoret, and others; Bengel, Baumgarten-Crusius); heaven and earth (Theophylact, Fritzsche); happiness and unhappiness (Koppe); honor and shame (Grotius); lofty and lowly (Ulrichus); higher and lower evil spirits (Origen). Sapientia hehreorum et communes vulgi furores (Moortghein)." [The generic idea here is that of space. If a more specific definition is required, heaven and hell is the simplest explanation, though this cannot be insisted on as the precise meaning.

—R.]

Nor any other created thing. In connection with the great antithesis of height and depth, the πνεύμα τέλων can hardly mean merely "any thing else created" (Meyer), or a creature in general (Luther, Tholuck).

Shall be able ... love of God which is in Christ Jesus our Lord. The love of God in Christ, or Christ himself, is now perceived by believers as the all-prevailing principle, and is therefore spiritually appropriated by them (Eph. i.).—The absolute διά ήλιου is for them also in the ethical sense. It is the completed revelation of the love of God in Christ, overcoming the world and bringing it into its service, by which believers are embraced, and which they in turn have embraced (Eph. v. 9).

[Alford: "God's love to us in Christ; to us, as we are in Christ; to us, manifested in and by Christ." Stuart thus sums up: "This is indeed 'an anchor sure and steadfast, entering into that within the vail';—a blessed, cheering, glorious hope, which only the gospel and atoning blood can inspire."—On the parallelism between chaps. v. and viii., see Forbes, pp. 333 ff. —R.]

DOCTRINAL AND ETHICAL.

FIRST PARAGRAPHS, VERS. 18-27.

A. The growing of the creature* (vers. 18-22).

1. The Scriptures ascribe to the whole universe, even to the heavenly regions, the necessity of the renewal of created being by transformation (Ps. civ. 26-28; Isa. li. 6; Rev. xxi. 5); but they distin-

* [This subject has been a special study with Dr. Lance. His works, which are as profound as they are exhaustive, are left without additions, since to add would be to mar the unity.]
which becomes a pray to the stronger, cannot and should not voluntarily offer itself upon the altar of life, even though it be only a beast; but when the beast in a torpid state pays to the stronger, as though in a dream, its tribute for the joy of its existence, there is reflected the voluntary deliverance to death in a higher region. The most apparent phenomena of the sufferings of the creature, next to the innumerable sufferings of human nature in subjection to diseases, wars, battles, pestilences, are the sufferings of the brute world as they appear to be immersed in the fate of the human world, and are represented in the noblest form in the sacrifice of the brute, and in the grossest form in the pangs of the brute. Yet not only over the brute world, but also over the whole realm of vegetable life, there has extended, with the morbid tendency of the human centre of the world, a morbid development of the most subordinate forms, such as we find in parasites and dwarfs, together with the rapid increase of the common herd of this form of all kind, and, in fact, an increase of degenerations of all kinds. But the apostolical, as well as the modern Christian and humane apprehension of nature, extends still beyond the perception of the real groaning of brutes and the degeneration of vegetable life, the sense of the most profound life perceives a groaning of the creature in the most general sense, first, as a longing, developing impulse of the creature-world toward perfection and to the second higher form of existence, and secondly, as a painful suffering under the law of an abnormal and more intense corpuluteness, and thirdly, as a mournful concert, a harmony of all the keynotes of the orchesis in its homesickness for a new paradise. These keynotes were heard by the prophet (see No. 2, above); Christ has definitely characterized them in His eschatological discourse (Matt. xxv. 29, and the parallels in Mark and Luke); and Paul sketches them here in brief outline, while the Book of Revelation speaks of them in great figures. Through all the periods of the Church there extends a profound sense of this earnest connection between the moral and physical decline of the human world, and we notice its echo in the voices of the poets (Shakespeare, for example), down to the Romanticists of recent date (Fr. von Schlegel, Bettina); but in the department of the most recent literature, in which the sense of this anxious expectation and sadness is blunted, there has arisen on the side of the degenerating extreme a fantastic and gloomy view of the "battle for existence," and it would not be surprising if even this materialism should, in turn, degenerate into dualism. Moreover, the expectation of the last catastrophe refers back to the catastrophes underlying the creation of the world, and whose reflection in the Deluge is still proved by our recollection of the most remote antiquity.

4. The Apostle has described the orchesis in 1 Cor. xv. 54 as deströsis. Peter speaks of an inheritance incorruptible, undefiled, and that fadeth not away (chap. i. 4). Here the orchesis means, on the one hand, the deliverance of the body, and, on the other, the freedom of God's children. The body, therefore, in its new form, shall be exempted from the natural necessity of physical life; for, as the real body, it has put off, at death, the old bodily form with its sinful propensities. In this life it has become in many ways, a source of corruption and hindrance to the inward life; but in its higher form it shall become the perfect outward expression of the inward life. To be wholly adapted to the spirit, and therefore not only exempt from the corruption, but also the constraint of nature, and to be wholly an organ, an expression, and an image of the spirit —these are the individual characteristics of the glorification in which nature also shall participate, since it is rendered free to share in the freedom of the glory of God's children. In general, the conception of real ideality is the object to which they shall be raised; that is, an ideality in which its idea shall not only be delivered from all deformity, but shall even be elevated to a symbol of the beautiful splendor in which poetry involuntarily becomes prophecy, into the real nature of the beautiful appearance. We shall find an analogue to the representation of the new form of things, if we compare the present form of the earth and of the creature-world with the rough forms of the earth and the gross forms of the creature, which, according to the testimony of paleontology, have preceded the present form of our cosmos (see my Land der Herrlichkeit; Vermischte Schriften, vol. II.).

5. The different eschatologies of antiquity here come in for consideration. As for the relation of the Persian to the Jewish eschatology, it seems, after all, demonstrable that the originality of the theocratic eschatology is reflected in Persism (Vendidad, Bundeshesh), just as the Christian eschatology is reflected in the old German Edda. On the development of the Old Testament eschatology, see Tholuck, note on p. 429; Ps. lxxii.; Is. xi. 9; xxx. 8; lxv. 66; Hosea ii. 21 ff.; Amos ix. 13; Zephaniah, &c.; and on the Jewish-Rabbinical eschatology, see Tholuck again, p. 428. It is noteworthy that Rabbinical Judaism has even assimilated itself to hexa gimmata, in that its expectation has become chiefly retrospective, like the longing of the heathen for the golden age (that is, an expectation of the grotesque restoration of sonorous glory), while the Old Testament anticipation of Israel, the "people of the future," has been consummated in the eschatology of the New Testament. On the eschatology of the New Testament, we must refer to biblical and dogmatic theology (see Commentary on Matthew, pp. 418-434; 1 Cor. xv.; 2 Peter, pp. 46 ff.). For remarks on ecclesiastical eschatology, especially on Luther's discourses concerning the future form of the world; on the question of the notion of the end of the world into the gross representation of an utter destruction of the world by the Lutheran doctrinal writers of the seventeenth century; and on the restriction of the Apostle's entire description to mere human relations, &c., see Tholuck, pp. 429-439.—It is a beautiful idea of Theodore of Mopsuestia, that "things visible and invisible" constitute a orchesis, for the comprehension of which (consisting, as it does, of all created things together), in one pledge of love, man (consisting, as he does, of both worlds) was created; that, after his fall, the higher spirits alienated themselves from him; but at the prospect of his restoration, they dedicated themselves to his service, and now rejoice in his restoration, &c. This idea is more in place in the passage relating to the original founding of the new world in the absolute atomism (Col. ii. 20), than in the present passage, relating to the glorification of the redemption. We have no faithful ideas in regard to the question de futurite brutum, and apply Christian principles only, by treating it in brief allusions: (1.) The morbid sundering of types analogous to
the formation of human heathendom. The opposite must therefore be a return of nature to collective fundamental types.

(2) The multiplying increase of individuals, analogous to the extravagant generation of the human proletarian. The opposite is the preponderance of constant existence over an excited growth.

(3) The rise of a preponderance, of the most subordinate forms, of parasites, of forms doomed to decay. The opposite is the dynamical dominion of pure forms, the negation of parasites.

(4) The reflexive formation of the morbid form of death in original, ideal forms.

The absolute connection of the creature thus idealized with man, and its appropriation by man.

Here, as well as to the following paragraph, belong Ps. lxii.; Isa. lxv. 66; John Walther's hymn, "It makes one heartily rejoice;" G. Arnold's hymn, "O Breaker of all bonds;" Schiller's poem, "Oh, from this valley's depths;" and expressions of Fr. von Schlegel, Bertina, and others, on the anxious expectation of nature.

The most prominent views on eschatology may be distinguished thus: (1) The Gnostic-dualistic view, with which we must also unite the recent theosophic views in general; (2) The Positivist, which holds to an absolute catastrophe without intervention; (3) The Rationalistic, which does not get beyond the notion of a gradual idyllic improvement of nature and humanity; (4) The christiologo-dynamical, which defines eschatology from the centre (which operates as a principle), of the death, the resurrection, and the glorification of Christ. This is also essentially the patristic view. To modern philosophical unbelief the beginning of the world, as well as its end, is sunk in mist and night, because to it the centre of the world—the historical Christ—is sunk in mist and night.

The christiologo- and dynamical view stands in particular need, at the present time, of a vigorous development. It appears everywhere throughout the Scriptures, and is strongly expressed in Eph. i. 19, and also in Phil. iii. 21. Tholuck: "It is noteworthy that in Phil. iii. 21 the same ἀντιστασία, which here expresses subjection to matter, denotes the operation of Divine power through which matter shall be glorified."

B. The groaning of believers themselves (vers. 22-23).

1. The Apostle speaks of a twofold testimony of the language of groans, which is further divided into a threefold one. The creature groans in its painful struggle for perfection; the life of believers groans. But as believers groan in their consciousness and conscious sense of life, so also does the spirit, in its ethical struggle, groan in the ground of its life.

2. The groaning is related to tears, as labor is to rest. Tears relieve the passive resignation of the soul to God's counsel amid its conflict with the hindrances of life; the groaner labors in his recourse to God's act in heaven against the power of hindrances. Tears flow from this opposition, since they come from God; the groaner protests against the opposition by appealing to God. Both are twin children of the ἀντιστασία, which now proves itself as patience and now as steadfastness. Compare the history of death and tears of Christ. On the great power and importance which tears and groans have as signals of the most extreme distress of the invisible world in conflict with the visible, and of the higher in conflict with the lower, compare the evidences of the Holy Scriptures by the aid of concordance. Herder: "The groaning forest does not rise so high heavenward as does the burdened man's groan" (see James v. 9).

3. The idea of the ἀντιστασία denotes not merely the first beginning—harvest, for example—and not only the most excellent, but also the pledge and representation of the future totality which is assured in the successful beginning. But so is God's Spirit the pledge of glory. See the Enzy. Note.

4. Without a comprehension (which is often very defective) of the relation between the principal Christian life and the same life in its broadest completion—which is suggested even by the development of every grain of wheat—it must appear a wonderful thing that the believer already possesses adoption, according to ver. 16, and that, according to ver. 23, he first expects the adoption with groaning; that he has righteousness, and yet must strive after righteousness (2 Tim. iv. 8); that he is truly delivered and saved, and yet is only delivered and saved in hope. The most intimate and mysterious elaboration of this development renders its comprehension more difficult, and therefore many speak of an ideal possession, and the like. The principal possession is, indeed, also an ideal one, in so far as the idea of perfection is contained in the principle, and always appears more grand from it, but the realization of the idea is only begun in it; it perfectly exists as a foundation in the germ. On the variety of such antitheses as σαρκικός, σωφρονίς, and ἀναλογικός, see Tholuck, p. 436. Theodoret has even perverted the antithesis into that of θρόνος and πάρθενον; the Socinians distinguished tenere fide et frui; Tholuck speaks, with De Wette, of a "partial definition of the idea of υἱόθεσις;" and Luther translated thus: "We patiently wait for the adoption, and expect," etc. The Godd. D. F. G., in surprise at the expectation of the adoption, leave out the υἱόθεσις.

5. No grander and more glorious thing can be said of the original state of the human body, than that its full deliverance (from sinfulness, misery, death, decay, and perishableness) shall be its transformation to the glorious freedom of the children of God. That the resurrection of the flesh is also declared with the glorification of the body, comp. my Vermischte Schriften, vol. ii. pp. 282 ff.

C. The groaning of the Spirit imparted to be believers (vers. 26, 27).

1. On the contradictions arising from the identification of the groaning spirit with the Holy Spirit itself, comp. the Enzy. Notes. We are led here to the antithesis which the Apostle brings out in 1 Cor. xiv. 15. It is the Christian, religious-ethical formation of an antithesis, whose physical foundation is the twofold form of sonoriosity originally peculiar to the present human life.* Compare, on this point, Deutsche Zeitschrift für christliche Wissenschaft, etc., 1851, p. 242.

2. According to Tholuck's view (p. 438), when the believer is in the greatest distress, he knows least of all how to find a verbal expression of his prayer. But, according to the Paulus, necessity teaches how to pray; the greatest distress becomes

* [This view of Dr. Lange is one to which exception has been taken throughout the Enzy. Notes, from chap. viii. to the close of chap. viii.; it is not necessarily, then, to enter upon a new discussion of it here.—E.]
prophetic when recourse is had to God. But it is just in the calmest states that the believer needs most of all the intervening Spirit. Indeed, distress gives to prayer a strong expression of human feeling, and in so far Tholuck's view is applicable to the prayer of distress in a more special sense. The intercession of the Spirit denotes the more direct access which God's children, in their inmost hearts, have gained to the Father through Christ, according to John xvi. 26. For the real Advocate with the Father is Christ (1 John ii. 1); the Holy Spirit, as such, is the present Comforter of believers, in opposition to the world (John xiv. 16) 1.

5. The real nature of true prayer is the union of the human and divine Spirit, prompted by God's Spirit. Hence the prophetic confidence of the Amen. This union, according to which God is not only the author and finisher, but also the disposer, of prayer, is represented most of all in the mystical adoration of a spirit absorbed in communion with God. On this point, see the expression of Jelaledin, in Tholuck.

4. On the groaning of the creature, see Bucer's beautiful expression, in Tholuck, p. 440.

SECOND PARAGRAPH, VERS. 28-37.

A. The certainty of salvation in the saving purpose of Divine grace, as the causa primaria (efficients) of salvation (vers. 28-30).

1. The certainty of salvation is divided into two lines, one of inward and individual life, and the other of external relations. Both have three starting-points in common: a. The causa primaria, the purpose of God (ver. 29); b. the causa meritoria, the gift of His Son (ver. 32); c. The causa apprehendens, or organica, faith in its development into the life of love (ver. 28). Believers are here called those who love God, because, in their love for God, the reflection of God's love has become manifested in them. The progress of the expectation and joyfulness of personal life toward the dark and concealed ground of life, as to the absolute and spiritually clear personality, which is one with love itself, is not the ground, but the sign and evidence that our personal life has been appointed and called into being by God's eternal counsel of love and grace. In our love for God there is revealed His love for us, and in our personality there shines the reflection of His personality. But with this there appears the dynamical central line of life—that of the Divine determinations of the persons allied to God— to which the whole succession and course of things is made subservient.

2. The divine πρὸδεσια denotes the eternal relation of God to the world called into being by Him, but also called to free self-development under His authority; just as is the case with the two terms διὰνη and θνοα. All these definitions denote God's eternal thought and plan of the world; but they denote it in different relations. The θνοα designates the central point of the Divine purpose, its anticipating love, the ideal perception and contemplation of the personal kingdom. Beside it there stands, on the one hand, the διὰνη, God's going to himself for counsel, the look of His intelligence at the necessities of the free development of the world; and, on the other hand, there stands the πρὸδεσια as the establishment of His government over the beginning, the middle, and the ultimate object of His jurisdictic of love. The θνοα settles the children of salvation; the διὰνη perceives the conditions of salvation; and the πρὸδεσια determines the stages of salvation. But this is not the decree of fate, but rather qualified and communicated according to the stages of the free spiritual kingdom, is plain from the very term used to describe Christians: that they are called according to the purpose—called, not compelled. Tholuck: "πρὸδοσία. The πρὸ is not the temporal before, as in πρὸς θην, which Bera and Paraeus hold, but as the prefix in προστίθεσιν. Yet they are not merely nāde, called according to a Divine decree, but according to one whose stages to the ultimate object of the θνοα are laid down." But the idea of the κληρον appears here in a narrower sense as a definition of God's children, characterized by patience and faith, baptism and confession; the more general idea, on the contrary, appears in ver. 28.

3. All things and events must be subordinate and subservient to, and promotive of, the highest purposes of God—the realization of His kingdom of love, and therefore the salvation of His elect. Augustine: Deus est adae bonus, quod nihil maius esse permittere, nisi adae esse potius, ut quaelibet malo possit aliqque aliquid bonum (Tholuck, p. 444). 4. And we know (ver. 28). We know not what we should pray for as we ought; but God knows the meaning of the groaning of our spirit, and we know, too, that all things work together for good to them that love God. This knowledge is not merely a direct confidence of the spirit, but is based upon the most certain argument: a. In our love for God, His love for us appears; b. But God reigns omnipotently, and disposes all things according to the counsel of His love; c. Consequently, all things must become evidences of the loving God.

5. We hold that the passage in vers. 29 and 30 contains the whole Divine plan of salvation, from the first foundation to the ultimate object, and we have repeatedly treated it from this point of view (see my Positive Dogmatik, p. 186). We remark first of all, exegetically, that the passage in Eph. i. 4-14 is an explanatory parallel to the present passage. As the foreknowing love precedes the predestinating, so there the choosing (ver. 4) precedes the predestinating (ver. 5); from which it follows that both the foreknowing and the electing mean essentially the same thing—an act preceding the predestinating. To καλεῖν or κληρον in the present passage there corresponds in that passage εγκαίρων, accepting, &c., in ver. 6, which the Apostle resumes in ver. 11, and specially elaborates. To the justifying here, there then corresponds there the following: "in whom we have redemption," &c., in ver. 7. But finally, the glorifying here is reflected in the "wherein he hath abounded toward us in all wisdom," &c. But Paul also there refers all these individual parts to the "good pleasure which he hath purposed in himself" (in ver. 9). So that it plainly follows there that the "predestinating" relates specifically to the "purpose", while the "purpose" appears to be qualified by the διὰνη, "concelled," as this latter is qualified by the "good pleasure." But we learn, in reference to the first act, the "choosing" in the Epistle to the Ephesians, that election took place in Christ before the foundation
of the world (see John xvii.), just as we learn that the glorifying or guidance of believers to "glory" will be identical with being led "to the praise of his glory," according to the idea that the beholding of the glory of God will constitute the glory of believers. There is thus a sense in which the former will be identical with the latter (1 John iii. 2).—We may further observe, that a real difference exists between election and foreordination, or predetermination, and that the συμφωνία cannot possibly mean foreknowledge, in God's idea, of subjects already present (for whence would they have come into God's idea?), but that it can only mean the loving and creative sight, in God's intuitive vision, of human personalities for a preliminary ideal existence. The doctrine of predetermination of Augustine, of the Middle Ages, and of the Reformers, could not reach this idea of election intellectually (Christian faith has always reached it in spirit), because the distinction between the idea of the individual personality of man and the idea of the "specimen of every kind" had not yet been definitely attained. It is now clear that such a "foreknowing" of God in relation to all human individuals must be accepted, because man is an individual thought of God; and that the same must hold good of "electing," in so far as each individual is distinct in his solitary separation from all other individuals, and has a solitary call (see Rev. ii. 17). But it follows from this that the foreknowing of the "elect," when it has become manifest, must be accepted in the most emphatic sense, analogous to the fact that Abraham is, in God's typical kingdom, the elect αὐτός ἦν ὁ Εβραίος, and that Christ is the elect in God's real kingdom in the absolute sense, so that all His followers are chosen together with Him as organic members, according to their organic relations (Eph. i.). From both propositions it follows, further, that election does not constitute an infinite opposition between such as are ordained to salvation and such as are ordained to condemnation, but an infinite difference of destinations for glory; which difference, however, can be the basis of an actual opposition (see Matt. xcvii. 24), and therefore is also combined with this. As the foreknowing expresses the collective foundation, the godlike spiritual nature of the elect as the product and object of Divine love, there is comprised in the electing not only their election from the mass of the world, but also the distinguishing feature of their χριστιανστά οὐσία and characters. In addition to the earlier perversions of this doctrine of the eternal foundation of personal essence—a doctrine of the highest importance to our times—we may add the recent assertion of Hofmann (Schriftenbesinn, vol. i. p. 227.), that the οὐκ οὖσα relates not merely to individuals, but to the entire body, and, accordingly, to individuals as members of the body. The Apostle says ἡρὰ four times, and τοιούτος three times. After the ideal determinations of personalities themselves, there can now follow the predetermination of their άγία in time and space, their "elect lot" (to which previously determined permission and control of the fall). For the foundation of the world corresponds to the history of the world. But the fate of each individual is designed to mature him, under gratia proventis, for conversion, and when this object is reached, it is his turn; he is παρακληθεσίν (Acts xii. 48). From this it now follows that the "calling," in a special sense, first makes its appearance with the theocritical and evangelical revelation, and its teaching of salvation. Those in whom the heavenly call of God has become an inward one, are "called" in the specific sense; yet the typical "call" first becomes perfectly real in the New Testament. As the life-sphere of election is the spiritual kingdom, and the life-sphere of foreordination is the history of the world, so is the Church the life-sphere of the call. But if godly sorrow leadeth to salvation, and germinating faith to saving faith, the justifying will be realized. This becomes decided by the Spirit of "adoption," which spirit, however, now begins to operate also as αἰτία τῆς δόξης, and in reciprocal action with it even the whole historical experience of God's children becomes a δόξα παρακληθεσίν, a guidance to glory. On the modes of this guidance, which have been but little developed doctrinally, see my Positive Dogmatik, p. 1094.

As far as the five divine saving acts are concerned, five human elements must correspond with them, according to the sphere of salvation. According to the christological idea, the Divine acts and human elements should come together in five points of union, somewhat as follows:

**Election.**


**Call (as awakening and illumination).**

**Justification.**

**Gratification.**

**Faith.**

**Holiness.**

**Peace, Adoption.**

**Godly life of Love.**

If we reduce the five elements to three: foundation, execution, end (ἀριστερά, τέρματα, τέλος), the two elements of execution—call and justification—denote the incipient and decided new birth (from water and the Spirit). The δοκίμα denotes regeneration in the sense of completion (Matt. xix. 28). The sum of all the divine operations taken together is grace; the sum of all the human elements is the growing freedom of God's children; and the sum of all points of union is eternal life.

It is only from the standpoint of the call and of justification that man can look retrospectively at his ordination and election in the light of God's love, and prospectively at his object, the δοκίμα. But if, on the other hand, he would infer his own justification out of the fragmentary work of holiness, and this would become self-storming or self-righteousness. The believing sinking into the image and righteousness of Christ, is a sinking into the fountain of eternal life, which then sinks thereby, as though unoberved, into the heart.*

* These Notes of Dr. Lange are very just, in their opposition to such a sandering of the acts of God in our salvation (here represented, as they necessarily must be to them, according to the sphere of salvation), that would make election and predetermination something arbitrary on the part of God. The guard he sets about the doctrine of human personality as very necessary, especially for minds trained in the school of hyper-Determinism. Still he has not solved the problem. The Apostle himself does not do it. He but presents, for the security of believers, the objective ground of their confidence. These nicely read, with comfort what God has done for them in eternity. How He, to whom all time is present, whose eternity endures into
Chapter VIII. 18-39.

B. The certainty of salvation in its historical gift and establishment in Christ, in opposition to historical contradiction in perfections (vers. 31-37).

1. The thesis of the perfect historical securities of the salvation of Christians. Ver. 31 says: If God be for us, all the hindrances and restrictions to our salvation are nullified as such. Nothing can harm us. Ver. 32: Since God did not spare His own Son for us, He has given us already every thing in principle, in order to give it to us in His own time. And all the hindrances for our salvation are given to us; every thing contributes to our good.

2. The Apostle represents, in four distinct elements, the complete security of our perfect salvation in Christ. His death removes our deserved condemnation. His resurrection raises us above the sense of condemnation into the confidence and spiritual life of adoption. His sitting at the right hand of God protects us against all compelling powers, and is the pledge of our acquittal at the judgment. His intercession abolishes the last remains of condemnation in our life, and secures us against relapse. On the disensus between the Reformed and Lutheran theology in reference to Christ's sitting at the right hand of God, see Tholuck, p. 458. Tholuck decides in favor of the view that the right hand of God is ubique, and the sitting at the right hand of God indicates the Saviour's entrance into absolute freedom from all restraint. But if we will not regard the "absolute freedom from all restraint" in a purely negative sense, we are driven with this freedom itself to the possibility of an absolute situation and standpoint in glory. On the views relating to the intercessio, see Tholuck, p. 469. According to Tholuck, the intercessio must be strictly regarded only with reference to Heb. vii. 25; ix. 24; 1 John ii. 1; according to Meyer, it is vocati et ordinis. But it may be asked, Is it analytical, or synthetic? The glorified Christ, in His eternal purpose of love, is himself, as the personal and complete Word, the personified intercession. He appears in the presence of the Father for us (Heb. ix. 24). For statements relating to this subject, see Tholuck, p. 461.

C. Conclusion.

1. The Apostle has enumerated seven oppositions that can operate against us as temptations to relapse. There are seven, from the beginning of labor to rest. He here enumerates the forces which can oppose us in our fellowship of love with the Lord; these are ten in number. But this is the number of the finished course of the world. By height we might have in mind the νυστατω, in the sense of 2 Cor. x. 5; and by depth, Rev. ii. 24. Yet both terms are essentially the same, and we prefer the explanation given in the Exeg. Notes.

2. The assumption that different classes of angels are spoken of in this passage, has resulted in various changes of the text. Also in Eph. i. 21, the Apostle has chosen expressions which comprise as well present powers of the world as future spiritual powers. The same holds good in reference to Col. i. 16.

Paul has given no ground for a definite hierarchy of angels; neither has Peter done so in 1 Peter iii. 22. On Tholuck's discussion concerning angelic classes, see pp. 461 ff.

3. There is a special need, in our day, of bringing forward the absolutely dynamical view of the world in opposition to a groundless and illimitable atomistic one. But the vital way to bring about this view, is the experience and developed perception of the absolute operation of the love of God in Christ Jesus our Lord.

4. Thus chap. viii. advances from the certainty of freedom from condemnation, in ver. 1, to the certainty of eternal salvation, in ver. 39.

Homiletical and Practical.

Vers. 18-23. The glooming of the crea tu re.

1. What are we to understand by "creature" here? 2. Why does it grieve? 3. For what does it grieve? (vers. 18-23)—The magnitude of the future glory of God's children. 1. It makes us forget all the sufferings of this present time; 2. It satisfies not only our expectation, but also the anxious expectation of the whole creation (vers. 18-23)—Why are the sufferings of this present time not worthy to be compared to the future glory? 1. Because our sufferings, however great, come to an end with this present time; 2. The glory, on the contrary, will continue forever (ver. 18).—Comparison of the sufferings of this present time with the glory which shall be revealed in us: 1. The former bring pain, care, and tears; 2. The latter brings eternal health, peace, and joy (ver. 18).—The revelation of God's children is a revelation of their life (concealed with Christ in God) of courageous faith, fervent love, and calm hope; Col. iii. 3 (ver. 19).—The creature in the service of corruption (ver. 21).—The creature transformed into glory (ver. 21).—Believers in the possession of not only the first-fruits of the Spirit (faith, knowledge, love, patience, chastity, &c.), but also in the possession of God's full adoption, since the body also will be delivered from the bondage of corruption (ver. 23).

Luther: God will not only make the earth, but also heaven, more beautiful. This present time is His working garth; afterward He will put on an Easter coat and a Pentecostal robe (vers. 18-23).

Starke: Wonder and rejoice, ye cross-bearers, for your heavy and wearisome sufferings are only a drop compared with the boundless sea of joys, and as a grain of sand in the balance against hundreds of thousands of pounds (2 Cor. iv. 17). "Non sunt condignae passiones hujus seculi ad presentiam cul pam, qua remittitur; ad praescientiam consolationis gratiam, qua imminuitur; ad futuram gloriam qua promittitur," Bucer: De Conuers, ad elope, c. 50 (ver. 18). The creature will not be utterly annihilated, but renewed, and placed in a more glorious state (ver. 21).—Heninger: Woe to those who revile, torment, and abuse God's creatures! (ver. 19.)

Spener: What would not a soldier suffer, if he knew that he should become a General? But here is a glory succeeding suffering, beside which all the glory of the greatest emperors and kings is only a shadow (ver. 18).—Roos: The glory of this present time is infinitely small compared with this present time and of glory (ver. 18).—The glory is contrasted with the corruption, and freedom with bondage. That which is glorious will last eternally; and
that which is free may indeed be used and enjoyed by others, but is not in a state of bondage or slavery (vers. 20, 21).—What is spiritual, will become completely spiritual, and, consequently, will be revealed in great glory. Paul calls this state of glory the state of adoption, because God's children will then completely show their honor in themselves, fully enjoy their Father's love—in a word, will be heirs of God and joint-heirs with Christ (vers. 22, 23).

Gal 4:25.—As the mother in travail delivers the living child, as it were, from death, so does nature, groaning under the power of death, struggle to bring forth itself a new and incorruptible creation. "Not you alone, but what is much lower than you are, and without reason and conscience, shall share with you your blessings. The creation will be free from the bondage of corruption; that is, it will no more be corruptible, but will keep pace with the glorification of your body. For as it became corruptible when you did, so will it again follow you when you become immortal. As a nurse who fostered a king's son will herself enjoy his possessions as soon as he attains his father's throne, so will it be with creation. Do you see how man everywhere goes ahead, and everything happens for his sake? Do you see how the Apostle comforts the struggling one, and points him to the unutterable love of God? But the one, exceedingly good, he also shows the certainty of what he says. For if the creature which was created for your sake has hope, how much more do you have hope for whose sake the creature shall enjoy all these blessings! Thus, when the son appears in his glory, shall men clothe their servants in more glorious robes to the honor of the son;" Christoetom (vers. 18-25).

Lisco: The magnitude and universality of the future perfection (vers. 18-23).—All the sufferings of this present time, both physical and spiritual, which we must endure on the way to our future glorification, bear no comparison to this perfection. The proof of this is, that the creature, the whole creation, both irrational creation and every thing which is still outside of fellowship with Christ, is anxiously waiting for the revelation of the still concealed glory of God's children, the truly new-born; in which glorification the whole creation will particip-ate for it is great and glorious. The ground of this anxious expectation of what will come is the partiality of the creature, partially owing to the subjection of the latter to vanity, and in part to the hope that it shall be delivered from that state which is subject to vanity, and shall participate in the glorious freedom of God's children (vers. 18-21).

Herkner: "Temporal sufferings are a differential of the future glory which shall be revealed; that they are so infinitely small that they have no value compared with the future glory" (Silb. Schlag, Dreiheinigkeit, vol. iv. p. 138).—The sufferings of this present time are not worthy to be compared with the glory which shall be revealed in us: 1. In respect to duration; 2. Quantity; and 3. Quality. —The sufferings are a mote, the glory is a hundred-weight; the former are but a drop, the latter a sea (ver. 18).—Paul design to show: 1. The certainty of our redemption in Christ, as In 2 Peter iii. 4, who say that all things continue as they were; be answer, by saying: No; nature does not remain unchangeable; nature itself has a tendency to transformation and completion; 2. The magnitude of salvation, for it is the object and limit of the whole creation; it must therefore be exceed-ingly abundant.—Revelation of the children of God. What will then be revealed? 1. The honest and deepest nature of their hearts; 2. The distinct-ly distinguished grace of God toward them, which is the glo-rious destination to which God elevates them. To whom will the revelation be made? To themselves, to the angels, to the believing children of God, to the world, and to all devils (ver. 19).—The salary to which the nature is subject is manifested spec-ifically as follows: 1. The creation has lost its original charm, its beauty, its durability, and its uniformity; 2. It has become corrupted by much that is injurious or useless; 3. It is now given over to abuse (vers. 20, 21).—How is the self-answering nature to be regarded? We must suppose nature to have a consciousness, a feeling, and that it would say: 'What must I suffer! how must I be abused!' Supposing particular objects to speak, the sun would say: 'How must I shine upon the wicked works of men! how am I compelled to see everything!' The earth: 'What must I bear! what blood must I absorb!' The gardens and fields: 'How are we wasted in excess!' Gold and silver: 'How are we perverted into idols!' Beasts: 'How are we tor-tured and abused!' If the Almighty were to open the mouths of many beasts of burden, how would the irrational brutes complain against rational man (ver. 22).—The Christian is l'homme de devoir (St. Martin), a man of longings.

Besser: The martyrdom of the creature is twofold, and its communication will also be twofold: 1. It suffers death, under whose pains the elephant groans and the worm writhes; 2. It suffers violence and injustice from the ungrateful and malicious; and it suffers involuntarily, for it is subject to these through God's authority (ver. 19). The glory of God's children is freedom—freedom from sin and death—freedom from the tyranny of the devil and the world (ver. 21).—The Apostle says: We are waiting for the adoption. It is the mystery of Christianity, that we wait for what we already have, or that we are and at the same time are not what we shall be. We are righteous and sinful; we are holy and impure; we are kings and slaves; we are free and bond; we are living and dead; we are saved and condemned;—we are all the former, apart from ourselves, in Christ; we are all of the latter in ourselves, apart from Christ. Vers. 24-25. The salvation of Christians in the present life is a salvation: 1. In hope; 2. In patience; 3. In prayer (vers. 24-28).—The one Christian hope in distinction from the many worldly hopes. 1. It has a good ground—Christ, on whom we can build; 2. A certain object—eternal salvation (ver. 24).—What a man seeth he cannot hope for; if we therefore hope, the object of our hope must be invisible (vers. 25, 26).—Christian patience: 1. In what does it consist? 2. To whom is it found? (ver. 25).—Intercession for us by the Spirit of God. 1. How does it take place? 2. With what result? (vers. 26, 27).—It is only when we perceive our infirmities that God's Spirit intercedes for us with unutterable groans (ver. 26).—A glance at the inmost life of prayer of God's saints. We here perceive. 1. Our great weakness; 2. The comforting intercession of the Spirit of God; 3. God's friendly heartening to our prayer (vers. 25, 26).—Praise God for His compassion shown in the Spirit's helping us in our infirmities (ver. 26).—The unutterable groanings of the Spirit (ver. 26).—God knoweth the heart (ver. 27).—Are we also saints? Does God's Spirit
also intercede for us? Can we also hope that our prayer will be answered? (vers. 26, 27).—Under what circumstances do we, too, know that all things work together for our good? 1. When we love God; 2. When we are conscious of our call (ver. 28).—The Christian view of human destiny (ver. 29).—How many men are still very far from knowing that all things must work together for good to them that love God! 1. Proof that such is the case; 2. Statement of the grounds of this phenomenon.

Scharer: Impatience in distress arises from want of hope; 2 Kings vi. 29, 31 (ver. 28).—Spener: We do not know what would always be useful to us, and, if left completely to our own choice, would often pray for things which might be injurious, rather than useful. We also do not understand how prayer should be best formed, and in such a way as most likely to be heard, especially in seasons when necessity is great, and the heart is perplexed; but the Spirit intercedes for us in the best way, with utterable groanings (ver. 26).—We, in whose there are such groans, often do not ourselves understand what we pray for, for the anxiety of the heart is so great that it can express nothing more than a sorrowful but confident desire for the grace of God; but the remaining prayer is shaped by the Holy Spirit, and brought before God’s throne (ver. 27).—Boos: Here (ver. 27) the Holy Spirit intercedes for us as a wise father intercedes for his child, who does not know how to address a great nobleman as he should, when he puts into his mouth refined language and a fitting compliment.

Bengel: In this purpose of God lie concealed the very first roots of the justification and glorification of believers (ver. 28).—Gerlach: The personality of man is no passing show, and does not pass away into universal life; but it only lives truly a life of the spirit when the personal Spirit of God is the soul of its life—when God is in it—when the Spirit of the eternal fellowship of the Father and of the Son, of God and of His creation, is in it (ver. 26).—By this means the prayer of the believing Christian first receives a strong and sure ground that the Spirit prays out of him; and by this means it becomes clear how such great petitions as the first three of the Lord’s Prayer are placed by the Lord in the mouth of the weaker believer (ver. 27).—It is God who worketh all in all on our behalf (Phil. ii. 13); therefore all things, His creatures who live, move, and have their being in Him, cooperate for the same end; not with Him, or beyond Him, but in Him and through Him. Even all the evil that takes place on the earth cooperates for good; for the will of the creature, which tears itself asunder from its Creator, is evil, and the evil continues to exist in this will; but the evil that results as the work of this will is, in so far as it intertwines with God’s order of the world, God’s own work, is overruled by Him for good. If a child or friend of ours is struck by lightning, or killed by a murderer, it is God’s work in both cases, so far as the matter concerns us; even God’s own retributive judgments, which require the evil deed with evil, becomes a blessing to him who learns to love Him under the blows of His rod, so that then His penal justice is no more revealed therein, but purifying love and grace (ver. 29).

Lange: Patience; it is established on hope, which is the direction of the spirit toward a future good. Hope is established on faith, which is the grasping of the promise that holds out the blessing; this promise, which is contained in God’s word, is the ground of faith; God’s word is therefore the ground of all (ver. 28).—Heubner: Hope is advanced faith (ver. 24).—To hope, and to act in hope, are the strength of the soul (ver. 26).—The heart of the Christian is a sanctuary, a dwelling-place of the Holy Spirit (ver. 26).—Divine omniscience has a very comforting side: God knows the inmost faithfulness of the Christian’s heart. The true Christian desires to be searched, and to have his heart seen; the false Christian fears this (ver. 27).—”Deus nihil mali sinit accidere, ex quo non aliquid boni possit et velit inventur”, Augustinus (ver. 28).—Vers. 29—39. Summary of the Christian order of salvation. 1. Election; 2. Ordination; 3. Call; 4. Justification; 5. Glorification (vers. 29, 30).—The Only-begotten of the Father is at the same time the first-born among many brethren (ver. 29).—Let us never forget that we should be brethren of our Lord Jesus Christ (ver. 29).—The call, justification, and glorification correspond to the threefold office of Christ (vers. 29, 30).—Why do we, as Christians, not need to fear? 1. Because God, who delivered His only Son for us, and with Him will also freely give us all things, is for us; 2. Because Christ is here, who has finished His work for us; 3. Because He loves us, for the sake of Him who hath loved us, are able to endure every danger, and to allow nothing to separate us from the love of God which is in Christ Jesus our Lord (ver. 31—39).—If God be for us, who can be against us? Or, God’s protection bids defiance to our enemies (in times of war) (ver. 31).—If God be for us, who can be against us? 1. Ask whether God is for us; 2. Look at the enemies (ver. 31).—The gracious gift of God’s Son (ver. 32).—Four believing and joyous questions of the Apostle, with the same number of answers evincing certainty of triumph (vers. 31—39).—Scharer: The precious chain of the blessings of salvation, which far exceed all golden chains and jewels (1 John iii. 1, 2) (ver. 30).—Even the smallest child of God can defy the whole world; therefore, what a great privilege all the children of God have! O man, be converted, and this day become a child of God! (ver. 31).—Though the whole world condemns you, and in the mouth of the crafty, the unrighteous man, condemn you; but one, the Truth, the Spirit, the Holy One of God, avails to you; you must call Him! crucify Him! away with Him!” smile at it; for if God justifies you, nothing can condemn you (ver. 33).—”Hoc habet proprium scelera: dum persecutionem patitur, floret; dum opprimitur, crescit; dum contuminitur, profait; dum ludentur, vincit; dum arguitur, intelligit; tune stat, cum superari videtur;” Hilarius, i. 8, De Trinit. (ver. 37).—Strong heroic faith, which will allow nothing to separate from the love of God in Christ. Oh, Almighty God, armed with the same sense, in order that we may remain true to death! 2 Tim. iv. 8 (ver. 39).—Lange: What will it help you, poor man, if you have many great, rich, and mighty men in the world, and even a partial judge at the judgment? If God and your own conscience be against you, how soon will the table be turned against you? Job ix. 4 (ver. 31).—Osander: Even though Satan should make a row against our sins before God’s judgment-seat, he will not be able to accomplish anything, but will be compelled to pack off to hellish fire with his charges (ver. 39).—Spener: It is the order of Divine beneficence that foreknowledge and foreordination take place in eternity, but the call, justification, and glorification
occur in time (ver. 30).—He who has not hesitated to give the greatest blessing, will also not be sparing of smaller ones (ver. 32).

**Roos**—Many would be against us, but they are nothing against God (ver. 32).—Paul had previously spoken (vers. 32-34) of judicial charges, but now he speaks of hostile powers that would violently snatch us away, and separate us from the love of Christ, which underlies calls the love of God in Christ **Jesus our Lord** (vers. 35-39).

**Gerlach**—The Apostle has now, in spirit, reached the top of the mount of glorification, and looks back once more at the transitory hindrances, and the victory of believers, in the midst of their unfinished conflicts. That which here disturbs the peace of believers, and threatens to deprive them of their comfort, is of a twofold character: it is inward and outward. **Inwardly it is sin, outwardly it is tribulation**; in part it is the necessity of life in general, and in part it is the temptations especially appointed for the Christian (vers. 31-39).

**Lisco**—The blessed certainty of the grace of their God strengthens believers to conquer all temptations and embarrassments (vers. 31-34).—As Abraham's love of God strengthened him for the greatest and sorest sacrifice, so is the greatest expression of our love for God, that we count it an act of love which infinitely exceeds all else that God has done for us as Creator, Preserver, and Ruler (ver. 32).—With the strongly established conviction of God's grace toward us Christians, temporal sufferings, still less than those temptations (vers. 33, 34), cannot lead us astray in our certainty of salvation and glorification (vers. 35-39).

**Huxm**—Christ is the true and real Ideal of human virtue, to whom we should be conformed, and to whom we are appointed as Christians to be conformed. The higher we think of Christ, the higher must we think of ourselves (ver. 29).—The Christian is a brother of Jesus Christ (ver. 29).—"Faith," says Luther, "puts such courage into a man, that he can say, 'Though all devils should pounce upon me, and all kings, emperors, heaven, and earth, stand against me, I nevertheless know that I shall be sustained.' He who has faith is in the Lord, and although he dies immediately, he must live again" (ver. 31).—Compare also PAUL GEHARD's excellent hymn, "If God be for me, I need on all against me" (vcc. 31).—The power of the Christian reaches further than his trials; his strength will never be wholly exhausted. And this strength is called love through Him who hath loved us; He, whose love raiseth above all, suffereth us (1 Cor. xv. 57; 2 Cor. ii. 14; 1 John iv. 4; v. 5).

**Busser**—The triumph of faith (vers. 31-39), The Perioope for the 4th Sunday after Trinity, vers. 18-23.

**Hewi**—How the Christian regards the evils and imperfections of this world—the future rejuvenation of the earth.—The history of the earth, 1. What was the earth? A scene of God's glory. 2. What has it become? A scene of sin and death. 3. What shall it become? Renewed, glorified, and a part of heaven. 4. Who will live on it? Matt. v. 5.—The comfort which the gospel gives the suffering Christian.—**Apjohn**—The connection of the creation with man: 1. The creature has fallen with man; 2. It serves him against its will; 3. It bears his image in itself; as men contend and fight together, so is it among the lower orders of creation;

4. It anxiously expects deliverance with man.—**Genzken**—The token of future glory: 1. The anxious expectation of the creature; 2. The expectation of believers.—**Kapf**—The deliverance of the groaning creature: 1. In nature; 2. In humanity in general; 3. In believers.—**Ranke**—The hope which Christians have of their future glory: 1. What is implied in this hope; 2. Its connection with the life of the Christian; 3. Its blessings.

The New Revish Perioopes: 1. Vers. 24-29, for New-Year's Day. **Deichert**—The great privilege of God's children, to be able constantly to hope for the best. 1. It is only God's children who know what is best; 2. It is only they who hope for it in a proper way; 3. Their hope rests upon the strongest grounds.

2. Vers. 31-39, for the 13th Sunday after Trinity. **Deichert**—The blessedness of God's child, who lies in His bosom in full faith of eternal love. 1. Such a child of God has every thing which can truly benefit him; 2. He is no more afraid that anything can harm him; 3. He continues unseparated from eternal love.

On chap. viii. 28. **Schleiermacher**—On improving occasions of public calamity. 1. They appeal to us to know ourselves; 2. They greatly benefit us by making us better acquainted with God himself. (Delivered in Halle soon after the French occupation.)

**Lange**—Christians, as God's children, are heirs of future glory. 1. The right of inheritance established on the New Testament; 2. Anxious waiting for the decision; 3. Its eternal institution; 4. The opponents of the right of inheritance; 5. Its assurance; 6. The infinite value of the inheritance.—The anxious expectation of the create, as contrasted with man without this expectation in our day, is the same picture on a large scale which Balsam'sass presents on a small one. The Spirit in nature in opposition to the worldly-mindedness of speculative natural philosophy.—Unspirituality in the garb of pretended natural philosophy, judged by its declarations: 1. Nature was not called into being by the Spirit of the Lord; 2. It does not testify to the dominion of the Spirit; 3. It does not bear for the revelation of the glory of the Spirit. The true meaning of the groans: 1. Of the creature; 2. Of believers; 3. Of the Divine Spirit in their new life. —How does the case stand in reference to the battle of your life? 1. If God is not for you, everything is against you, though every thing seems to be for you. 2. If God be for you, nothing is against you, nothing can harm us, for nothing can separate us.—Our fortress of rock: God's love in Jesus Christ our Lord.

**Buxht**—How will God's adopted children be made manifest? 1. In their persons; 2. In their actions; 3. In their condition.—The Holy Spirit intercedes for us: 1. By assisting us in duty; 2. By quickening our affections; 3. By enlarging our desires; 4. By setting us to groaning after the Lord. —Groaning denotes the strength and ardency of desire, which, through its fervency, puts the soul to pain and to a holy impatience till it is heard. If we want words, let us not want groans; Lord, let Thy Spirit help us to groan out a prayer when we want ability to utter it; for silent groans, proceeding from Thy Spirit, shall be heard in Thine ears when the loudest cries shall not be heard without it.

**Henry**—Though the soul be the principal part
of man, yet the Lord has declared himself for the body also, and has provided for it a great deal of honor and happiness. The future adoption of God's children is: 1. The adoption manifested before the world, angels, and men. Their honor is now clouded, but God will then publicly own all His children. The deed of adoption is now written, signed, and sealed; then it will be recognized, proclaimed, and published. 2. It is the adoption perfected and completed. The children of God have bodies as well as souls, and the adoption is not perfect until those bodies are brought into the glorious liberty promised the children of God. —Difference between faith and hope: 1. Faith has regard to the promise; hope, the thing promised. 2. Faith is the evidence of things not seen; hope is the expectation of them. 3. Faith is the mother; hope is the daughter. —Scott: All that we owe to the flesh is a holy re- venge for the injuries already done, and the hindrances continually given us; and instead of ren- dering our state delightful, by living after it in any degree, we should, by the Spirit, continually endeavor more and more to mortify it, and repress all its actions. —Sis has filled the world with suffering, yea, with unspeakable disorder and misery; all creatures seem to proclaim man's fatal apostasy, and to recom- mend the inestimably precious salvation of Christ. But the gospel opens a brighter prospect; a glorious crisis approaches, of which all things seem in anxi- ous expectation. —Clarke: Fluency in prayer is not essential to praying; a man may pray most power- fully in the estimation of God, who is not able to utter even one word. The unutterable groan is great with meaning, and God understands it, because it contains the language of His own Spirit. Some de- sires are too mighty to be expressed; there is no language expressive enough to give them proper form and distinct vocal sound. Such desires show that they came from God; and as they came from Him, so they express what God is disposed to do, and what He has purposed to do (ver. 27).

[Hone:] Observe. 1. As there is a dreadful pressure of sin and misery on the whole creation, we should not regard the world as our home; 2. It is a characteristic of genuine piety to have exalted conceptions of future blessedness, and earnest longings after it; 3. Adoption is not perfect until those bodies to- gether for the good of God's children is, that all things are under His control; 4. The plan of re- demption, while it leaves no room for despondency, affords no pretence for assumption; 5. As there is a beautiful harmony and necessary connection be- tween the several doctrines of grace, so must there be a like harmony in the character of the Christian.

—The gospel is: 1. Wonderful; 2. Glorious; 3. Sericate. "Blessings which we are continually to receive in this state of vanity: 1. Christians are subject to this state to do good to others; 2. Their remaining here shows the power of the gospel in overcoming sin, and in thus furnishing living evi- dence to the world of the power and excellence of that gospel; 3. It furnishes occasion for interesting exhibitions of character, and for increasing and pro- gressive excellence; 4. It is a proper training for happy effects. Observe the Christian's duty in his own state of vanity. The Christian should be prepared: 1. To pray for: 1. They do not know what would be really best for them; 2. They do not know what God might be willing to grant them; 3. They are, to a great extent, ignorant of the character of God, the reason of His dealings, the principles of His government, and their own actual wants; 4. They are often in real and deep perplexity; and if left alone, would neither be able to bear their own trials, nor know what to ask at the hand of God. —J. F. H.

[HOMILETICAL LITERATURE ON THE WHOLE CLA- TTER.—The homiletical literature on this chapter is very voluminous; we select the following, as being most important:—Bishop Cowper, Heaven Opened, &c., Works, 11 (1619); E. Philips, Certain Godly Sermons, 245; Edw. Elton, Triumph of a True Christian Described (Three Excellent and Pious Treatises, 1623); H. Riving, The Singer's Sanctuary, &c.; being Forty-eight Sermons on the 8th Chapter of Romans, Works, 1, 237; T. JACOB, Sermons Preached on the Whole 8th Chapter of the Epistle to the Romans (only the sermons on the first four verses have been published, 1675); T. Horton, Forty-six Sermons upon the Whole 8th Chapter of the Epistle of the Apostle Paul to the Romans (1714); T. Manton, Forty-seven Sermons, Works, 2; J. Merebe, Sermons on the Chap. de l'Eglise aux Romains (1709); T. Bryant, A Comprehensive View of the Real Christian's Character, Privileges, and Obligations (1794); A. Short, The Witness of the Spirit with our Spirit, Illustrated from the 8th Chapter of St. Paul's Epistle to the Romans (Bampton Lectures, 1840); O. Winslow, No Con- demnation in Christ Jesus, as unfolded in the 8th Chapter of the Epistle to the Romans (new ed., 1867). —HOMILITICAL LITERATURE ON THE CARNAL MIND AND MAN'S ENEMY TO GOD.—C. Simeon, Works, 15, 195; Bishop Stillingfleet, Serm., 3, 299; B. IBOT, Disc., 1, 365; J. Evans, Disc., 1, 98; J. Drysdale, Serm., 1, 218; R. Graves, Works, 4, 169; The Carnal and the Spiritual, Village Preach- er, 1, 181; C. Simeon, Works, 16, 199; G. T. Noel, Serm., 2, 432; S. Charnock, Works, 9, 176; Arch- bishop Leighton, Serm., Works, 3, 126; J. Jamies- son, Serm. (4) on the Heart, 2, 263, 281, 439, 455; G. Bidder, Village Serm., 5, 56; T. Dwight, Theology, 4, 443; C. Sco Ich, Serm., 168; E. Cooper, Pract. Serm., 6, 17; T. Cham- bers, Works, 9, 66; H. Caulfield, Irish Pulpit, 2, 263; J. Cooper, Serm., 29; C. Simeon, Works, 16, 208; E. Blewlow, Plain Sermons, 2, 362; J. Finn, Serm., 52.

THIRD DIVISION.


Chapters IX.—XI.

First Section.—The dark problem of God's judgment on Israel, and its solution.

Chap. IX. 1-33.

A.

1. I say the truth in Christ, I lie not, my conscience also bearing me witness in the Holy Ghost, That I have great heaviness [grief] and continual sorrow in my heart. For I could wish [that I] myself were accursed from Christ for my brethren, my kinsmen according to the flesh: Who are Israelites; to whom pertaineth [whose is] the adoption, and the glory, and the covenants, and the giving of the law, and the service of God [of the sanctuary], and the promises;

2. Whose are the fathers, and of whom as concerning [as to] the flesh Christ came [is Christ], who is over all, God blessed for ever. Amen.

B.

6. Not as though [It is not however so, that] the word of God hath taken none effect [come to nought]. For they are not all Israel, which are of Israel. [For not all who are of Israel, are Israel]; Neither, because they are the seed of Abraham, are they all children: but, In Isaac shall thy seed be called. That is, They which are the children of the flesh, these are not the children of God [Not those who are the children of the flesh, are children of God]: but the
9 children of the promise are counted for the seed [reckoned as seed]. For this is the word of promise [this word was of promise]. At this time [season] 2 will I come, and Sarah shall have a son. And not only this; 4 but when Rebecca also had conceived by one, even by [omit even by] our father Isaac, (For the children being not yet born, neither having [Without their" having as yet been born, or] done any [any thing] good or evil," that the purpose of God according to election might stand, not of works, but of him that [who] calleth;) It was said unto her, The elder shall serve the younger. 13 As it is written, Jacob have [omit have] I loved, But Esau have [omit have] I hated. 14 What shall we say then? Is there unrighteousness with God? God forbid. 15 For he saith to Moses, I will have mercy on whom I will [omit will] have mercy, and I will have compassion on whom I will [omit will] have compassion. 16 So then it is not of him that [who] willleth, nor of him that [who] runneth, but of God that [who] sheweth mercy. 17 For the Scripture saith unto Pharaoh, Even for this same [very] purpose have I raised [did I raise] thee up, that I might shew my power in thee [in thee my power], 18 and that my name might be declared throughout all the earth. Therefore hath he mercy on whom he will have mercy [Therefore on whom he will he hath mercy], and whom he will he hardeneth. 19 Thou wilt say then unto me, Why [then] doth he yet find fault? For who hath resisted [resisteth] his will? Nay but, O man, who art thou that repliest against God? Shall the thing formed [or, moulded, πλακυμ] say to him that formed it, Why hast thou made [didst thou make] me thus? Hath not the potter power over the clay, of the same lump to make one vessel unto honour and another unto dishonour? What [But what] if God, [although] willing to shew his wrath, and to make his power known [make known his power], endured with much long-suffering the [omit the] vessels of wrath fitted to [for] destruction: And [Also, i.e., he endured for this purpose also] 22 that he might make known the riches of his glory on the [omit] the vessels of mercy, which he had afore prepared unto [before prepared for] glory, Even us, whom he hath called [As such, i.e., vessels of mercy, he also, besides preparing, called us] not of [from among] the Jews only, but also of [from among] the Gentiles? 23 As he saith also in Osee [Hosea], 24 I will call them my people, which [who] were not my people; And her beloved, which [who] was not beloved. [i] 26 And it shall come to pass, 27 that in the place where it was said unto them, Ye are not my people; there shall they be called the children [called sons] of the living God. Essais also [And Isaiah] also cried concerning Israel, Though the number of the children of Israel be as the sand of the sea, A [The] remnant 27 shall be saved: 28 For 4 he will finish the work [is finishing the word], 29 and cut [cutting] 4 it short in righteousness: Because a short work [word] 30 will the Lord make upon the earth. 29 And as Essais said before [And, as Isaiah said], Except 7 the Lord of Sabaoth had left us a seed, We had been [become] as Sodom [Sodom], And been made like unto Gomorrah. What shall we say then? That the Gentiles, which followed not [who were not following] after righteousness, have [omit have] attained to righteousness, 31 even the righteousness which is of faith. But Israel, which followed [following] after the law of righteousness, hath not attained [attained not] to the law of righteousness [omit of righteousness]. 32 Wherefore? Because they sought it not by faith, but as it were by the works of the law [or, as by works]. 33 For they stumbled at that stumbling-stone [stone of stumbling]; As it is written, Behold, I lay in Sion a stumbling-stone [Zion a stone of stumbling] and [a] rock of offence; and whosoever believeth [he who believeth] 34 on him shall not be ashamed [put to shame].
TEXTUAL.

1. Ver. 5.—Lange renders: Denn ich dass dessen Geltende, for I once indeed made the vow to be, xci. For the full discussion of this interpretation, see E. N. Notes. The English text has not been altered to correspond, since the common view of χάρις is upheld in the additions.—D. K. read εὖδαιμον, which is generally rejected.

2. Ver. 5.—(The Rec. has this order: αὐτῷ οὖν διὰ δόξας τίμησε τινί (C. K. L.); but the preponderant authority N. A. B. D. E. G. favors: αὐτῶν διὰ δόξας τίμησε τινί (N. B., however, puts τινί after). So Griesbach, Lach- mann, Tiischendorf, Meyer, Alfred, Tregelles, Lange. This order, if it has any special force, probably emphasizes the fact, that he could wish himself accursed, rather than that he himself could wish it. Hence the Amer. Bible Union is unfortunate in placing myself after the first L. Note: I would wish to be accursed. The latter is the most faithful read: διὰ δόξας N. A. C. K.: αὐτῶν διὰ δόξας, now adopted by most editors. The alteration to the singular probably arose from a misunderstanding of the meaning. The plural was referred to the Old and New Testaments; and as the latter was no advantage of the Jews, the singular was substituted (so Meyer).—(For discussion, see E. N. Notes.)

3. Ver. 5.—Lange considers God blessed forever, Amen, a synagogal form, to be put in quotation marks. His exegesis accords better with the E. V. than with Luther’s hic die ist God über Alles, gebet in Elisabeth, Amen. On the disputed punctuation, see E. N. Notes. Note, naturally, puts a period after Christ.

4. Ver. 6.—See E. N. Notes.

5. Ver. 6.—The ambivalence in vers. 6-8 cannot be preserved in the exact form of the Greek, except at the sacrifice of elegance and awkwardness, to be explained, on the one hand, by the Hebrew הַנָּשָׁה, when the time (which is written) has been made to appear in both verses clearly implies what the LXX. expresses: at this season of the year. Comp. Genesis, Thesaurus, l. p. 470. Knebel on Gen. xviii. 10.

6. Ver. 10.—Οὐ μὴν δὲ ταῦτα. The passage is elliptical. On what should be supplied, see E. N. Notes. As the case to be introduced is not strictly of the same kind as that of Sarah, but stronger, this is preferable to so (Alford, Amer. Bible Union); the former seems to imply the difference more clearly than the latter.

7. Ver. 11.—The subject of the participles γεννηθέντων παρακατάστατον is not expressed, “according to the word” (Eugen.); it is readily supplied (κεκεραθέντας) (Lange). It is really supplied with the aorist εἰσερχόμενος, occurring in both texts and the history was well known. The rendering given above seems more satisfactory than that of the E. V. It is, in the main, that of Alford.

8. Ver. 12.—The meaning of καὶ εἰς (Rec., D. E. K. L., Wordsworth), φάσάνθεν is found in N. A. B. and cursives; adopted by Lachmann, Tiischendorf, Meyer, Alfred, Tregelles, Lange. The former is the more usual word, in contrast with ἀμαρτάω; hence, likely to be inserted. But it best express the slight difference, since φασάνθεν, like illī, does not express the purpose of the action, but it has yet the same wide range of meaning. It must have a moral signification here, however. (See Alford in loco.)

9. Ver. 12.—Quoted literally from the LXX., Gen. xxvii. 3, except that δῆτε (repetitive, sign of quotation) takes the place of οὕτως (of οὐδ’).—(For discussion, see E. N. Notes.)

10. Ver. 13.—(From the LXX., Mal. i. 2, 3; the only variation is, the inversion of the first clause. It reads in the LXX.: γεννήτω τὸν Ἰςαὰ. The Hebrew text is:

   לֶאֶלֶעַ יִשְׂרָאֵל

11. Ver. 13.—An exact quotation from the LXX., Exod. xxiii. 19. The Hebrew of the original passage is a, importance in the exegesis. It reads: לַעֲקֹבּ הָאָבִי לֶאֶלֶעַ יִשְׂרָאֵל. Alford thinks דא, inserted in LXX., refer to pure mercy; Meyer, and many others, join it with δα: “whomsoever, in whatever state;” thinking that he chose the object of his blessing, and reckons the whole race of God; for the emphasis in the relative clause rests on the repeated δα, since δα generally has its position after the emphatic word (Kühner, ii. § 437). We are certainly justified in making the relative clause present instead of future; for the future force of the Hebrew verbs is doubtful, while the Greek verbs (both in LXX. and the text) are present. See E. N. Notes.

12. Ver. 14.—(The Rec., D. K., read ἀκέραιος from ἀκέραιος; N. A. B. D. E. K. ἀκάραιος from ἀκάραιος). The latter is adopted by Lachmann, Tiischendorf, Alfred, Tregelles; the former by Meyer and Wordsworth. Meyer urges that Paul would not use two forms, one here, and the other in ver. 15 (where the reading ἀκέραιος is well established, only D. F. G. having ἀκάραιος), and concludes that ἀκέραιος was substituted for ἀκάραιος on the supposition of the transcriber, and thus readily preserved, since it corresponded with a form in actual use.

13. Ver. 14.—Very freely quoted, especially this clause, from LXX., Exod. ix. 14: ἐναραξοῦντο γεννηθέντο, on this account that were preserved. ἐναραξοῦντο ἀκέραιος is merely a strengthening of the LXX.; but ἀκέραιος seems to be a purposeful deviation. The form of the Hebrew הַנָּשָׁה (Hiphil of נָשָׁה, to stand), I have caused thee to stand, is better preserved. The form of Paul’s expression. See E. N. Notes, for discussion of the meaning of all three passages.

14. Ver. 17.—Here Paul deviates from LXX., writing διὰ μίαν (instead of διὰ μόνην).—Ver. 18.—There is some confusion about. R. D. B. insert it in both clauses; Rec., n. A. K. L omit it the second time. All have it in the first clause, but the position varies. Rec., D. E. K. L. put it before μόνη; N. A. B. Tregelles after. The above rendering adopts it in both clauses.

15. Ver. 23.—The participles διακριθέντα is: (a) because he was willing (i. e., purposed); or: although he was willing (not yet purposed). The latter is adopted by Lange: χορηγεῖν (heretike) δείλεως; Meyer, and others. After what supply: until thus reply? something to that effect. See E. N. Notes, on both points.

16. Ver. 23.—It was necessary to supply this remark in the text, in order to indicate the view taken of this difficult passage. See E. N. Notes.

17. Ver. 25.—This is a free quotation from Hoses ii. 20 (26, LXX. E. V.). The Hebrew text is followed more closely than the LXX. than is necessary for the sake of the translation. It is not necessary to insert the LXX. texts here, as it differs in almost every word, though containing the same general thought: ἀκέραιος ἀκάραιοι and ἀκάραιος ἀκέραιοι. In rendering Lo-ruhamah, Paul follows the LXX.

18. Ver. 26.—From the LXX., Hoses i. 10 (ii. 1, Hebrew), closely connected with the preceding, as if from the same place, according to the usage of the Rabbins, who thus joined clauses from different authors. The only variation from the LXX. is the strengthening of καθὼς κατ’ εἰς καθὼς κατ’ εἰς. The E. V., Hoses i. 10, supplies there.
CHAPTER IX. - 38.

25. [Phile.] 16-20. Paul follows the LXX., which reads: καί εἶπεν δόξα ὁ λαὸς Ἰσραήλ ὡς ὁ λόγος τῆς δεκαογύνος, τῷ κατεύθυναν αὐτῶν συνθέτεσσα. The variation from the Hebrew is slight; but, shall return, is strengthened by the LXX., into συνθέτεσσα, which of course means still more as Paul uses it. 

26. A. B., Lachmann, Thieschendorf, Meyer, Alford, Tregelles, Lange, {read νοθείων} the more probable reading, as the LXX. differs. It is a stronger word, apparently.

27. [Phile.] 21-28. - The variations from the Hebrew are so extensive, that it will be best to give the text entire:

| Εἴρηται μετὰ τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ ἐν θυσίᾳ κατασκευασμένον | Πολυγώνιος, ἐφάνετο πρωτοφανές καὶ λαμπρόν. |

"The consummation is decided, overflowing with righteousness; For a consumption and a decrees shall the Lord of Hosts make, In the midst of all the land."
which rests upon the Jews themselves (chap. ix. 30–33, and chap. x. 1–21). d. The consolation arising from it (chap. xi. 1–32), with praise offered to God (chap. ix. 33–35). While De Wette regards the section of chaps. ix.–xi. as only a supplement, Baur considers it the real centre and kernel of the Epistle. If this be so, the kernel would indeed have a very massive stool.

[Forbes following Giesebrecht] finds a parallel between chap. i. 18–iii. 20, and these three chapters. "We have here an instance of the Epanodos, the object of which is to bring the main subject into prominence by placing it first and last. In both sections the subject is the relation of Israel, and of the Gentiles, to the new way of salvation. But in chap. i. 18–iii. 20 it is regarded more on the side of the Law—as condemning Israel equally with the Gentiles, and necessitating them equally to have recourse to the gospel. In chaps. ix.–xi. it is regarded more on the side of Grace (on the part of God, as possessing a right to prescribe His own terms of acceptance), and of Faith (on the part of man, as the one only condition for attaining salvation, and which is demanded equally of Israel as of the Gentiles). Another point of resemblance between the two sections consists in the striking parallelism between the three objections of the Jew in chaps. i. 18–25, and those of the Gentile in chap. ix. 20–29; thus: 'The Apostle himself seems for a time in doubt between contending feelings, in which he first prays for the restoration of Israel, and then reasons for their rejection, and then finally shows that, in a more extended view of the purposes of God, their salvation is included. He hears the echo of many voices in the Old Testament, by which the Spirit spoke to the Fathers, and in all of them there is a kind of unity, though half expressed, which is not less the unity of his own inmost feelings toward his kinsmen according to the flesh. As himself an Israelite and a believer in Christ, he is full of sorrow first, afterwards of hope, both finally giving way to a clearer insight into the purposes of God toward His people.' As respects the relation of these chapters to the preceding part of the Epistle, in an experimental view, Luther well says: 'Who hath not known passion, cross, and travail of soul, cannot treat of this moment of knowledge (election of grace), without injury and inward enmity toward God. Wherefore take heed that thou drink not wine, while thou art yet a suckling babe. Each several doctrine hath its own season, and measure, and age.'—R.

Tholuck gives, on pp. 466, 467, a copious catalogue of the literature on Romans ix. See also Meyer, p. 347. We may here call attention to a more recent monograph: Beck, Versuch einer pneumatisch-historischen Erklärung der 9. Kap., &c., 1833. To this we add the following: C. W. Krummacher, Das Doxoma von der Gnadenwahlt, nebst Auslegung der 9te, 10te, und 11te Kap. im Briefe an die Römer, Duisburg, 1856; Lamping, Pauli Apostolise de prodestinatione decretae, Leiden, 1858; Delitzsch, Zur Einl. in den Brief an die Römer, Zeitschrift für die luth. Theologie und Kirche, 1870, p. 16; Th. van der Wyssua, Leerredenen over Romeinen, ix., x., xi. tom. i. [Philip Schaff, Das neue Kapitel des Römerbriefs übersetzt und erklärt, in the author's Kirchenfreund, Mereesburgh, Pa., 1852, pp. 378–389, 414–422, largely used in the exposition of this chapter in the present volume.—R.]

**Summary.—A. The painful contrast between the misery of the Jews and the described salvation of the Christians, most of whom had been Gentiles. The Apostle's sorrow over the apparently frustrated destiny of his people (vers. 1–5).**

**B. The exultation of the Apostle in the thought that God's promise to Israel would nevertheless remain in force (vers. 6–35).** Proof: 1. Differences in the election they are not all Israel which are of Israel (vers. 6–13). 2. Antithesis in the ordination (predestination): God is not unrighteous in showing mercy and in hardening, and in his manner of connecting judgment and compassion (vers. 14–18). 3. God's freedom in the actual call of salvation (vers. 19–29): a. Proof from the existing fact (vers. 19–24); b. Proof from the witnesses of the Old Testament (vers. 25–29). 4. The correspondence of God's freedom in His administration, and the freedom of men in their faith or unbelief. The firmness of the fact that the Gentiles believe, and the greater part of Israel do not believe (vers. 30–33).

**EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.**

**A. The Apostle's sorrow over the apparently frustrated destiny of his people (vers. 1–3).** Winer, Programm in Rom. ix. 1–3, Lips., 1832.

After the Apostle has portrayed the glory of believers in the New Testament, he must return to the surprising phenomenon, that it is just the majority of the people of the Old Testament who are absent from this feast of salvation—from the Supper of the Lord in the New Testament. The Jews, however, have already come into view (chap. viii. 33) as among the accusers and persecutors, and thus the way has been prepared for this transition. In a systematic reference, the Apostle turns from the consideration of the consummated salvation, to the most extreme contrast—sin in its third potency, the judgment of hardening.

**Ver. 1. I say the truth in Christ [ἄλογος θείου λόγον εἰς Χριστόν]. Dr. Lange retains the article, as is done in the E. V., and in most revisions (exceptNovys). It seems required by the genius of both the German and English languages.**—R. The Apostle strengthens his subsequent declaration in a threefold way: I say the truth in Christ; I lie not; my conscience bears me witness. The execrable battle which the Apostle waged against the Jews' righteousness of their works, and their claim to privileges in God's kingdom, made him odious to the Jews and an object of opposition and suspicion to many prejudiced ones among the Jewish Christians; while biased Gentile Christians might be tempted to regard him as one of their partisans. He meets all this by the solemn asseveration of his pain.

[Alford: "The subject on which re is about to enter, so unwelcome to Jews in general, coupled with their hostility to himself, causes him to begin with a depreciation, bespeaking credit for simplicity and earnestness in the assertion which is to follow. This depreciation and assertion of sympathy he puts in the forefront of this section, to take at once the ground from those who might charge him, in the conduct of his argument, with hostility to his own alienated people."—R.]

But the Apostle treats also of a further great progress in the glorification of Divine grace, which, in its third potency, glorifies as compassion that gloomy judgment of hardening which the Apostle
can only disclose by an expression of the greatest pain. The Apostle is doubly assured of the sincerity of his declaration. First, he expresses his feeling in the consciousness of the fellowship of Christ: * (Eph. iv. 17; 1 Thess. iv. 1), while he, so to speak, transferred himself into the feeling of Christ (Phil. ii. 4). Second, he proves and tests the truth of his feeling by his conscience, and by the strong and clear light of the Holy Spirit. Now, is this declaration an oath, according to most of the earlier and many of the later expositors (Reiche, Köllner, and others); or is it not, according to the exposition of Tholuck, De Wette, and Meyer? This much is clear, that the Apostle's asseveration is not a formal taking of an oath, and not in the form of an oath. * [The form of an oath would be πρό, with the accusative.—R.] It will so remembered, in favor of this view, that the ἀματω (Matt. v. 34) is here wanting; and that the Apostle does not swear by Christ, nor by the Holy Ghost. Neither does he swear in a legal sense in general; we may only ask, whether he does not here give a solemn assurance in God's presence, and whether such an assurance is not an ideal oath?

* I lie not [οὐ ψευδομαί]. (1 Tim. ii. 7.) White lies being very much in vogue at the time, this addition surely meant that he was perfectly conscious of his responsibility for his declarations, since he called on Christ as a witness.

My conscience also bearing me witness [συνεισήχθη μοι τῆς συνείδησις μου]. Meyer: *Since my conscience bears me witness. But Paul's conscience could not bear witness to the Romans apart from Paul himself. The distinction between his own declaration and that of his conscience, means that he has proved his feelings in regard to his people by the light of conscience and of the Spirit of God. [Alford: The σωμ in composition, denoting accordance with the fact, not joint testimony.—R.]

In the Holy Ghost [ἐν πνεύματι ἁγίῳ]. This is not an addition to συνείδησις itself (a conscience governed by the Holy Ghost; Grotius), and still less to συνείδησις μοι (καθάποτα, through this and other similar phrases favored by many: ὡς ἐν πνεύματι ἁγίῳ δόγμα, but to συνεισήκυς μοι (Tholuck, Meyer, and others). * Meyer: “Paul knows that the witness of his conscience is not outside the Spirit which fills him, but spirto sancto diente et moderatore (Beza) in it.”—R.

Ver. 2. That I have great grief and continual sorrow in my heart [ὅτι λίπη μοι ἐστίν μεγάλη καὶ ἀδύνατος δόγμα τῇ καρδίᾳ μοί]. The position of the words is solemnly emphatic.—R. The Apostle does not immediately and directly mention the subject or occasion of his grief. Why not? Meyer: “From tender compassion.” Tholuck: “In lively emotion.” But the object is indicated by the ἐπί τοῦ σ. ἀδ. μοῦ (ver. 3), and it is the ἀπλώμα them threatened them (ver. 29). But this great pain relates not only to the great fall of his glorious people, which had already occurred, but to the Apostle's tragic position toward his brethren according to the flesh. This verse indicates that Paul is putting distinctly and fully the whole judgment of hardening pronounced on Israel, with its immeasurably sad consequences. Christ also wept as He prophesied Jerusalem's fate. * (Comp. Isa. vi. [How noble the Apostle appears here, with this holy patriotism and hearty love to those who, from the day of his conversion, had persecuted him with relentless hatred; who, soon after the composition of this Epistle, occasioned him a long imprisonment, and who was the immediate cause of his martyrdom!—P. S.]

Ver. 3. For I could wish. [Lange: Dein ist, dass Geltüde, for I made the vow]. See the discussions on this difficult passage, quoted by Tholuck. For an elaborate account of the earlier expositions, see Wolf's *Curs. ill. p. 164. Explanations of the ηγεμόνια:

1. I have wished, namely, formerly (Vulgata: optabam; Luther: I have wished). This explanation divides, again into two:

a. When I was a Jew, I wished to keep the Jews far from Christ; yes, to be myself the personal medium of the alienation; αὐτὸς ἐμῶς = χωμομαίρω (Pelagius, Abelard, and others). In this case he appeals to his former blind zeal for Israel against Christ, in order to prove that he loves his people, and, in his love, that he now sorrows for their fate.

b. In my pain I have gone so far, as a Christian, that I wished, etc. (Significat, se aliquando hos orares, nimium cum dolor late singulariter inveni). Bucer. Meyer, and others, suggest, to the contrary, that there is here no ποτέ, or any other word of similar import. Philippi adds: it must then mean ἐνευμαν ποτέ.*

2. I wished, namely, even now.

a. Tholuck: Dumn modo fieri posset, si icert. b. Meyer: I would wish, if the import of my wish could contribute to the good of the Israelites.

c. Philippi: But ηγεμόνια is also not identical with ηγεμόνια ἄν; that is, I would wish, if the wish were possible; but since it is not possible, I do not wish. But it is = I wished, namely, if the wish could be realized, and therefore really wish on this supposition.

The difference between the explanations is this: a. If the wish were possible (Tholuck); b. If the thing wished for were possible (Philippi); c. If the thing wished for, and also the wish itself, were possible (Meyer). There has, perhaps, not been enough regard to analogies in Paul's method of expression. Paul says ἐνευμαν ἄν (Acts xxvi. 29), for I wished, in the sense of I would wish, and why not here, too? Luke relates, on the contrary, Acts xxvii. 29, in the imperfect: ηγεμόνια, they wished (at that time); and why should not the imperfect he used here in the same sense? If, indeed, the word should mean here, I have wished, or even, I have prayed (Theodoret, and others), the presence of ποτέ might be insisted upon. But if the Apostle wishes to say, I made a vow—i. e., if he speaks of a definite fact—the ποτέ lies already in the emphasis of the ηγεμόνια itself, especially as joined with the added

* (Under 1) belongs an interpretation, suggested by the venerable S. H. Cox, D. D., taking the verse as a parochial explanation of Paul's sorrow, in this sense: "for I myself am glorified as a persecutor to be banished from Christ." Besides the objections against the past sense as given above, it may be added, that this puts myself in the wrong place (see Tholuck, Note 7); that, while εὐμας has this meaning: to boast, to glory, in Homer, yet even there it is often little more than to profect, meanan, while the New Testament it does not occur in this sense. The probabilities, both lexical and grammatical, are very strong therefore, against such a meaning here.—R.]
It is very probable that he made some pledges, when he (according to Acts ix. 2) received from the high priest authority to persecute the Christians; but when an act of exalted station does not confide in a young man without some such pledges. His present perception of the fearful import of that engagement is immediately expressed in ἀνάθεμα, x. l.

If we disregard such an acceptance, the exegetical difficulty will really begin with ἀνάθεμα. [Dr. Lange prefers, yet does not commit himself to, this view of the imperfect. It is far-fetched; and when there are no grounds to influence the interpretation than those of grammar, as Alfred Hintz, any school-boy could tell that the imperfect does not refer to a definite past act, but represents "the act unfinished, an obstacle intervening." In support of the grammatical correctness of this view, see Buttman, N. T. Gramm., p. 187; Kühner, ii., § 488, 3; Bernhardy, Syntax, p. 376; Krueger, § 54, 10; Winer, p. 296. It seems perilous to go upon the obvious meaning, I could wish, for one barely allowable. The present was at home, Paul wishing to refer to a past vow. If there be a difficulty in the passage, it is met most fairly by Meyer's view, that the verb implies an impossibility, or at least an insurmountable obstacle, both as to the wish and the thing wished for. We can then take ἀνάθεμα in its obvious sense, without putting it also on the rack to ept the other meaning. See the final Exeg. Note on this verse.—R.

That I myself were accdemated from Christ [ἀνάθεμα εἰναι αὐτός εἰρ. ἀπὸ τοῦ Χριστοῦ]. Ἀνάθεμα, Attic ἀνάθεμα, dedicated to God; hence, also, dedicated to the Divine judgment, and consequently to ruin; in the latter sense ἀνάθεμα (Gal. i. 8, 9; 1 Cor. xii. 3; xvi. 22).

Though the latter sense of ἀνάθεμα "must not be construed as the Jewish curse of excommunication" (Meyer), yet the theocratic idea: to excommunicate from the Church of God, and to dedicate to ruin, cannot be separated. In the Christian sphere the ἀνάθεμα is, indeed, in the ecclesiastical form, a temporarily qualified excommunication: "for the destruction of the flesh, that the spirit may be saved" (1 Cor. v. 5).

[EXCURSUS OF ANALYSIS.—The proper understanding of this passage may be furthered by discussing at this point the precise meaning of the word ἀνάθεμα. The following dissertation is from Wieseler, Commentary on Galatians (i. 8, pp. 39 ff.). The fact that it is founded upon another passage, adds to its weight in determining the meaning here, since the discussion of Gal. i. 8 is not beset with the prejudices which arise here.

"Ἀνάθεμα* is the Hellenistic form for the Attic ἀνάθημα (comp. εὐθύρμησις and εὐθύρμησις, προσήθημα, ἄρωμα, Lobeck, Ad Phrynich., p. 249, and Parali, pp. 391 ff.), and, like the latter form, denotes in general 'something dedicated to God, a votive offering;' but in the Bible it is usually the translation of the Hebrew אָ֫נָ֩תָה, as ἀνάθημα.

* "Respecting excommunication among the Jews, comp. specially Selden, De juris gent. et jud., 4, 8, De Synod., i. 8 and 11; Gildemeister, Blendedhofs des vulgatisen Rationalismus zur Belehrung des paulinischen Anathema, 1841, and Beiträge zur Kritik des Pau1s, 1843; Zwick, Alten- lichner von dem Volta Israel, S. 81 ff; regarding the Greek ἀνάθεμα, Fritzsche on Rom. ix. 3; also Tholuck on Rom. ix. 31; and on the general subject, Winer, Rabinwellstorch under Bora."—R.]

The Epistle of Paul to the Romans.
become obnoxious to the wrath or curse of God." Winer, Schott, Rückert, Do Wette, Usteri, Meyer, Gildemeister; so that, therefore, Luther, with his: 'der sei verflucht,' according to Krummacher's interpretation, is justified. Luther would be right also in the main matter, according to Olshausen's assertion, which he presents without proof, and which stands midway between Nos. 1 and 2, that in this formula (2), we are not merely to understand ecclesiastical excommunication, but that this is only so far included in the signification as it presupposes Divine reprobation.

All these explanations, notwithstanding their divergences, proceed from the correct assumption that this ávádyµµa is the translation of the Hebrew דָּאָדָם. The question is therefore this, what this דָּאָדָם among the Jews was, and whether it denoted—i. e., in the time of Paul—the Jewish excommunication. If the latter were disproved, Nos. 1 and 3 would fail; but if this should really be the case, the question would be whether ávádyµµa here is used of excommunication, or of what it is used. But, in the first place, it is clear that, in the whole Old Testament, דָּאָדָם and דָּאָדָם are never used of excommunication. Indeed, they are used with at least as frequent reference to the idolatrous apostasy of the heathen nations, especially of Canaanitish ones, as with reference to idolatry and impiety within Israel. דָּאָדָם is used of every thing, person or thing, which, on account of its worthiness of death, founded in God's Word—the thing usually in connection with, and on account of, its impious possessor—was, whether of free resolve, or at the express command of God, consecrated to Jehovah, without capability of being ransomed; Levit. xxvii. 21, 28. The person who had become a דָּאָדָם might not continue to live; Levit. xxvii. 29; and only the thing—to which class, according to ancient view, the slave also belonged—could, if a living creature, remain alive, falling then forever to Jehovah—that is, to the priests; Levit. xxvii. 29; Num. xviii. 14; Ezek. xiv. 28. From this it arises, that דָּאָדָם, as to its sense, signifies simply 'to destroy,' and is not seldom connected with דָּאָדָם שֶׁפֶם (comp. the Hebrew שֶׁפֶם, which also originally signifies 'to be holy'; Exod. xxx. 37; xxxi. 29; and דָּאָדָם שֶׁפֶם is rendered in the LXX. not simply by αὐτέχθης, or αὐτόχθης, Ezek. xiv. 28; but also by αὐτοκτόνος, Deut. vii. 2; ἄξονες, 1 Sam. xxvi. 21; and αὐτοκτόνος, Isa. xxxiv. 5. From this it appears that, according to the Old Testament, דָּאָדָם neither literally nor by derived use can signify excommunication, as exclusion from the fellowship of the chosen people. Nay, the latter is expressly mentioned, Ezek. x. 28; but the verb דָּאָדָם is not used of the excommunicated persons; but, in contrast with it, the verb דָּאָדָם; the former verb, on the other hand, is used in its true sense (see above) of their property, because this excheated forever to the sanctuary. Had the דָּאָדָם been decreed against the persons in question on the part of the Jewish assembly, they would thereby not have been excommunicated, but destroyed in honor of the God whom they had outraged. On the other hand, in the Talmud, דָּאָדָם is unquestionably used formally of excommunication. According to Eiss Levi, the three grades of excommunication among the Jews have not seldom been assumed as (1.) the דָּאָדָם, (2.) the דָּאָדָם, and (3.) the דָּאָדָם. Paul and Weber also assumed them, assuring that only the highest grade, as the Shammatha, was conjoined with these fearful curses which we read in the Talmudists, but that Paul, with his דָּאָדָם, meant no other than the דָּאָדָם. On the other hand, Gildemeister, passim, preceded by Selden, and others, has lately thoroughly demonstrated anew that the Talmud and the Jews, by those three names, do not designate three different grades of excommunication, but that the Shammatha is only another word (the Chaldaic translation for Niddath; that, therefore, if the Apostle, by his דָּאָדָם, meant the Cherehm as excommunication, the highest grade of excommunication—that accompanied with these curses—must have been meant.

"The next question is, therefore, whether the Cherehm, as excommunication, already existed among the Jews at the time when the Epistle to the Galatians was written. Although the primitive history of Jewish excommunication is veiled in great obscurity, we certainly shall not err if we ascribe to it, from its first documentarily attested appearance under Ezra (Ezra x. 8), up to the time of Paul, a certain extent of development, and that a more extensive one than Gildemeister appears to do."

According to New Testament testimony there were, then, the two grades of excommunication: (1.) The exclusion from the worship in the Temple and synagogue, John ix. 22; xii. 42; xvi. 2; and (2.) what, as it was already practised under Ezra, can least surprise us, the expulsion] from the congregation of the people, Luke vi. 29 (ἀφολόκτητος), which concluded with obliteration of the name in the ší'ála (Sifrise: בְּמִלְכָּה הָאָדָם לְהוֹא מַרְשָׁא, l. c.); which latter circumstance is here expressly added, that the hearers may not understand the excommunicatio minor. Quite as certainly, however, is the Jewish excommunication at Paul's time not yet designated as Cherehm, which even antecedently is improbable, on account of the above developed Old Testament use of דָּאָדָם, which could only gradually, and after a longer time, be so considerably modified. For in the Mishna, where excommunication is largely handled, Cherehm is as yet never used of excommunication, but this is denoted by Niddah; it is in the Gemara that Cherehm appears as excommunication, and that the sharpest form of the same—that joined with fearful 'curses' having reference to everlasting destruction, from whence also its name—is explained. With this alone agrees, moreover, the New Testament use of αὐτεχθῆς and αὐτοκτόνος, Rom. ix. 3; I Cor. xii. 3; xvi. 22; Gal. i. 8, 9; Acts xxiii. 12; xiv. 21; Mark xiv. 71, which in none of these passages signify excommunication, or to excommunicate. On the other hand, αὐτοκτόνος, in entire congruity with the Old Testament Cherehm, is used of a person who is dedicated to God, subjected to the Divine curse for his death,

---

* [The Epistle to the Romans was written but a year or two afterwards. See Introd. pp. 14, 40.*---E.]

[1] "If Person by the άναφηκτός, or ἀπώθηκτος, 1 Cor. v. 11, which is to conjure the excommunication of the iniquitous person—comp. 1 Cor. v. 2—alludes, as is commonly assumed, to the technical expression of Deuteronomy: קָרָא יָמַעְתָּנוּ, and the translation of it in the LXX.;] Deut. xvii. 7; xlii. 22 et. al., this term must, at the time of Paul, have been already understood among the Jews not of the death penalty, but of excommunication; comp. Winer, Bih. Rechüibuch, under Lebenstraf, ii. p. 128, R.]
not, however, to bodily, as in the more ancient formula—which reference, however, was not necessarily contained in the root, but resulted only from the historical relations of the Jews in ancient time—but to spiritual and eternal death. The ἀναθήματι, 1 Cor. xvi. 22, cannot signify excommunication, since otherwise it would be denounced against a temper of mind, the ob phylin; nor yet 1 Cor. xii. 3, since no one could have wished to excommunicate Jesus, no longer dwelling on earth; nor Rom. ix. 3, as appears sufficiently from the defining ἄνω τοις Χριστοῖς. In the case of the verb ἀναθήματιν, indeed, it has not yet come into any one's head, in respect to the New Testament passages, that it signifies, to excommunicate; but ἀναθήματι, Mark, l. c., signifies 'under self-impressions (by his soul's salvation) to attest, that,' ἀναθήματιν ταρτώμενον, Acts, l. c., 'under self-impressions to oblige himself.' Quite as little can ἀναθήματι, Gal. i. 8, 9, be used of excommunication, on this account, if no other, because one cannot excommunicate an angel from heaven (ver. 8), but can very well call down God's curse of damnation upon him, in the ἀναθήματι. Ver. 9 must have been used in the same sense as in 1 Cor. xii. 16, the subjective participation expressed by the imperative, ἀναθήματι ἄνωτε expresses neither more nor less than Gal. v. 10, where Paul denounces against the same false teachers the judgment of God at the end of days; comp. 2 Thess. i. 9. In form, as in meaning, the Pauline ἀναθήματι ἄνωτε (or ἄνωτα, 1 Cor. xvi. 22) reminds us strongly of the ἐκκλησια, LXX.: ἐπικατάρατος, Deut. xxvii. 15 ff.; only that not every ἐκκλησια in the Old Testament needs, like our ἀναθήματι, to be taken as involving the highest and most intensive evil—eternal damnation—but may very well, according to the connection, be used of that; comp. Gal. iii. 13; Matt. xxv. 41; it being, of course, understood that, by the ἀναθήματι, the loss of eternal life and the blessed fellowship of God is meant to be invoked against the sinner, only so far and so long as he persists in his wickedness, or this in its nature is irremissible. As to the rest, when Rückert and Schott, in the case of the ἀναθήματι in this passage, will have that it does not mean excommunication, for the additional reason that that age was not yet acquainted with this among the Christians, this assertion is unquestionably erroneous; 1 Cor. v. 2 ff.: 1 Tim. i. 20; 3 John 10; Jude 22; comp. Matt. xviii. 17, 18; 2 Thess. iii. 14; 2 John x. 11. The Church fathers afterwards used the ἀναθήματι, doubtless deriving the use through the Pauline passages, of Christian excommunication, similarly as the Jews their קַרְכּת, but these commonly misunderstood the proper sense of this expression. Comp. the criticism of them in Frischele, l. c., tom. ii., p. 219, Note."

With this well-established view of the meaning of our word, we can pass to the exegesis of this passage, remembering that the burden of proof now rests with those who, to avoid difficulties, assign any other meaning than that so ably defended by Wieseler.—R.]

Meyer: "The destruction to which Paul would commit himself for his brethren must not be understood as a violent death (Jerome, Limborch, Platt, and others), but as the eternal ἀναθήματα, as is required by the ἄνω τα ἐπιφανεία. It has often been objected that the wish of this ἀναθήματε is unreasonable, and Michaelis even says that it would be a rising prayer. But the standard of selfish (!) reflection does not harmonize with the emotion of boundless self-denial and love in which Paul here speaks." (Comp. Chrysostom and Bengel in loc.) Tholuck quotes Chrysostom's expression: "This point Paul adds: 'Thus interpret the vast majority of expressions of the same kind.' It has been interpreted:

1. As temporal death, as already mentioned. Analogies in 2 Cor. xii. 15: the death of Christ is σαρκάναι (Jerome, Nosselt, and others). Tholuck, on the other hand: With temporal death as Christ, there is connected the accruing, which is additionally comprised here in ἄνω τα ἐπιφανεία.

2. Banishment from church fellowship (ထ胱issa, and others; apparently, Luther also.) On the contrary, Tischendorf, derived from a word by Fr. Krummacher on Gal. i. 8, in regard to this explanation, comp. Tholuck, p. 471 ff. There is, now, no question that the supposition of an exclusion to injury is always connected with a true exclusion from church fellowship. But if we explain the Old Testament Cherem and the ecclesiastical ban according to the New Testament—that is, specifically according to the words quoted from 1 Cor. v. 9—then it becomes evident that the Old Testament Cherem did not declare eternal condemnation when it declared extermination from the congregation of the people, and that devotion to eternal condemnation could never have been the meaning of an authorized ecclesiastical Christian ban. If the explanation, I wished to be accused from Christ, were therefore correct, it would nevertheless not be the same as: I wished to be eternally damned; but: I would be willing to be cast into boundless misery for the brethren.* From the overstrained interpretation of the accused, it would follow, that the Apostle regarded the brethren in question as eternally damned. See, on the contrary, Rom. xi.—Tholuck refers to the Jewish and Arabic manner of speaking: May we be thy ransom; may my soul be the redemption of thine! Evidently, hyperbolcs of Oriental polite-ness. He cites the reference of Origen to the example of Moses (Exod. xxxii. 22): Paul has spoken like Moses, says Origen: devotion, non procrastination. But Moses spoke thus at a moment of the deepest emotion, and just as Moses, in the Old Testament sense of the theocratic judgment of rejection. Jerome takes the value of many souls against one into account; Cyril accepts a hyperbole; and Thomas Aquinas distinguishes between a separatio a damnationis per culpam and a separatio a frutitum gloriae.† Tholuck remarks, that Fenelen

* (So Hodre, who, while advocating the common interpretation, mentions the meaning in very general, and the words express not "definite ideas," but "strong and distinct emotions."—R.)

† (There contrives to be some abstract ground for this distinction. The first, separation from God's holy will, is opposed to love to Christ and striving after sanctification; it is godless, and, of course, excluded here. The second, separation from the enjoyment of God's life, is immoral, yet can, indeed, be distinguished from the first only abstrusely and in thought, being also impossible, at
has referred to this passage in order to defend the mystical idea of amour disinterested, and that Bos- 
suet replies, by saying, that fellowship with God cannot be held to form part of participation in saving blessings (salvation). Yet Tholuck returns at last to Fenelon's distinction, after quoting many other theological explanations (Calvin: ervaio animi confuso; later moralists, especially Dannhauser, Spener, and Bengel: vertex heroicus). Most expositors, by their reference to the hypothetical si fieri posse, return to the acceptance of a hyperbolical expression.

The αἱρέσις εὑρήσει leads us back to the simplest reductio ad absurdum.

The current explanation is incorrect at the very outset. Meyer is nearest right: The antithesis is the brethren, the majority of whom are seen by Paul as ἀνεξίωμα αὐτῷ Χριστῷ going to the ἀπολία. In this case the ἀγέω would still be superfluous. Our present expression refers to the αἱρέσις εὑρήσει (chap. vii. 29). We have seen how the expression there designated the opposition of spiritual and carnal life in the identity of the same individual, as it designated the antithesis of his earlier and of his present standpoint, in the identity of an individuality which, at that time, acted from a love for Israel. For I even pleaded myself, I, the same Paul who must now pronounce the following judgment on Israel, &c.—His former wish to destroy the Christians by means of the Cheren, he now denominates in its true meaning:

least in perniciousness. For holiness and blessedness are inseparable, and it is the will of Christ that we become saved through fellowship with Him.—F. S."

[Compare Madame Guian (died 1717): "I consent that thou depart, Though thine absence breaks my heart, Go, thou, and forever, too; All is right that thou wilt do."

"My last, last offering, I present thee now— Renounce me, leave me, and be still adored! Stay me, my God, and I applaud the blow."

On transliteration.

The doctrine of disinterested affection has been supported in America by Samuel Hopkins, D.D., and his system is commonly called Hopkinsianism. He holds that self-love, which is distinguished from selfishness in his view, "is the root and essence of all evil;" that holiness consists in disinterested benevolence. He makes the possession of this "an inestimable gift, a test of God's love and religious exercises, and says, that though a benevolent person "could know that God designed, for His own glory and the general good, to cast him into endless destruction, this would not make him cease to approve of His character; he would continue to be a friend of God, and to be pleased with His moral perfections." (System of Doctrines, 2d ed., Boston, 1811, p. 470.) But he puts certain limitations respecting proper personal interest, and nowhere implies that one must reach this point of experience in order to be converted. The current opinion of his view is, that he teaches: "a man must be willing to be damned, in order to be saved"—a logical sequence which he does not affirm. Nor does he maintain, in this passage, which would seem to favor his position. It is probable that he, too, would admit the impossibility of such a wish being granted, and claim no other meaning for this passage than that which many of the most judicious commentators adopt, and which is the most literal and obvious one. It may well be held that Paul desired to give a pitch of feeling as this, without nothing that this is the constant and conscious state of the Christian heart.—B.

[This obvious difficulty, urged by Dr. Hodge, against the sense I wished: "No Jew would express his hatred of Christ and his indifference to the favours which He otherwiscs desired by every means to obtain from Christ." But it makes the grammatical difficulty still greater. An imperfect is made to do service not only as an aorist, but in such a way as universal, while what is closely joined with it—viz., the purport of the wish or view—derives its significance from the present standpoint. Extremely doubtful, to say the least.—B.]

to be assured, ἀπὸ τοῦ Χ., away from Christ; as he is not aware of any other ban from the Church of God than banishment from Christ. Nisstit, and others, have understood by the expression that Christ would be the author of the ban; which would increase the harshness of the expression. With our view, the ἐπὶ τῶν ἀδελφῶν μου can only mean this: for my brethren, as one zealous for their interests. Even with the opposite view, Meyer explains ἐνακτίας as for the good of; but Tholuck, on the contrary, says that the idea of substitution underlies the ἐνακτίας, at least indirectly. [Olshausen makes ἐνακτίας = ἄριστη.—B.] This would render the idea still more intolerable, Paul would not venture to utter the thought, that his ruin might still bring salvation to the people for whom even the death of Christ brought no salvation.

The interpretations of this difficult passage may be classified as follows: (1.) Those which take γίνεσθαι me, in the past sense. The grammatical objection to this is is so decided, that, unless the gravest difficulties attend it, it cannot be retained. The view of Dr. Lange, which makes it equivalent to a definite aorist, is grammatically less admissible than that which takes it as ὀπτάσαμ,, I was wont to wish. (2.) Those which give to ἀνεξίωμα some less strong sense than aoriste, devoted to destruction. Dr. Lange has cited most of these. The least objectionable among these is that which interprets the word as meaning: untold misery, not necessarily eternal. The lexical objection here is very strong; see Excursus above. If Wieseler's statements are reliable, all of these are necessarily excluded. There remains, then,

(3.) The obvious meaning, I could wish myself devoted to destruction from Christ for my brethren's sake; implying either that the wish was not formed, because it was impossible to wish, or of impossible fulfilment; ἐνακτίας, involving, not necessarily substitution, yet such a suffering for the benefit of others as would turn to their corresponding advantage; for Paul often speaks of what he does for ἐνακτίας his readers. The question then arises, Are the difficulties attending this view so great, that it must be abandoned for such doubtful exceptions as (1.) and (2.) present? Dr. Lange objects: (a.) That it implies a senseless overstraining of the idea of self-denial. But who shall put the limit? "It is the expression of an affectionate and self-denying heart, willing to surrender all things—even, if it might be so, eternal glory itself—if thereby he could obtain for his beloved people those blessings of the gospel which he now enjoys, but from which they were excluded. Others express their love by professing themselves ready to give their life for their friends: he declares the intensity of his affection by reckoning even his spiritual life not too great a price, if it might purchase their salvation" (Alford). Surely we dare not let our assumption of how far his self-denial would go, limit words, which, if they do not mean this, have always borne this as their obvious meaning.

(b.) It is further objected, that then the Apostle would regard the brethren in question as eternally damned. But it is Paul who says that those out of Christ are already perishing (1 Cor. i. 18) and Christ himself speaks of the wrath of God abiding on men: those out of Christ (Rom. i. 18, 32). This objection sunders too widely the present and the future state of unbelievers. Paul would, at all events, feel the power
of the future state of retribution in the case of these brethren, just to the extent that he attached a definite meaning to αὐθεντήμα; so that this objection is of no weight.

(c,) The implication suggested above, that Paul then would deem his ruin more powerful than the death of Christ, involves the strongest meaning of ιπτ. If the idea of substitution be excluded, this objection fails to the ground. But if Paul could not use ιπτ here, in the sense that his sufferings might produce certain beneficial results to others, he could not use it elsewhere in the same sense (Eph. iii. 13; Col. i. 24 twice). The objection, in any case, lies against the degree, but the quality of the suffering.

(d,) Lange characterizes the current interpretation as hyperbole. If it be, then objection (a,) has no weight, for a hyperbole would not overstrain the idea of self-denial. But this interpretation is not strictly a hyperbole. For Paul wished by this to express a degree of feeling which could be measured in no comparable terms by anything less strong than this. The objective impossibility did not destroy the subjective intensity of feeling. And although he may not have actually formed the wish, still any student of human nature knows that feelings often exist, never taking shape in definite wish, which are contrary both to what is possible and what is actually wished. The expression is, however, truthful in Paul’s consciousness, hence not a hyperbole.

On the whole, the objections to this view (3,) seem of so much less weight, that the majority of commentators adopt it. Besides the grammatical and lexical grounds in its favor, it presents the great Apostle to the Gentiles under the influence of feelings most akin to the self-sacrficing love of the Lord he preached. And it detracts nothing from our estimate of his affection to know, as he did also, that such love flowed only from his love to Christ, his fellowship with Christ, which would itself change hell to heaven.—R.]

My kinsmen according to the flesh [τῶν παγγενέων μοι κατὰ σάμακα.] This addition expresses both his former motive and his continued patriotic feeling (see chap. xi. 14.) [There is, however, here an implied antithesis to “brethren in the Lord” could not be patriots here justified, but Paul in the next verse shows, it has a deeper ground in the gracious gifts and religious advantages which the Jews had hitherto enjoyed.—R.]

Ver. 4. Who are Israelites. ὤν τὰς νωγελις.—Quiippe qui. Thus he announces the characteristics of his kinsdred “according to the flesh,” who lay so near his heart, and the decline of whose glory excited his profound compassion. The collective glory of the Jews was in proportion as he was justified, but when the very nation, it has a deeper ground in the gracious gifts and religious advantages which the Jews had hitherto enjoyed.—R.]

Whose is the adoption [ὅν ἐν νωγελία; God’s acceptance in the place of a child, adoption; yet not in the sense of the New Testament realization, but in that of the Old Testament typification (see Exod. iv. 22 f.; Deut. xiv. 1; xxxii. 6; Hosea xi. 1; Rom. viii. 1, 2.) The foundation of this adoption was the election, calling, and sealing of Abraham. But in this right of the child there was not merely comprised the real enjoyment of “theocratic protection,” but also the foundation and guidance to real adoption (Gal. iv. 1, 2); and, in relation to the promise for the remaining nations, the determination that Israel should be the first-born son of God (Exod. iv. 22). [It therefore comprises, though only generically and typically, the close union which Christ, the Only-begotten, who was in the bosom of the Father from eternity, forms between God and men through the regeneration of the Holy Ghost.—P. S.]

And the glory. The δόας, γην ὑπερ. This is that revealed form of Jehovah underlying the call to adoption throughout the Old Testament, which often stands out more definitely in the appearance of the Angel of the Lord (see Lange’s Comm. Genesis) [p. 386 ff., Amer. ed.]. Comp. Exod. xxiv. 10; xl. 34; Jdg. viii. 10 f.; Ezek. i. 28, and other passages). Untenable conceptions: 1. The ark of the covenant (Beza, Grotius, and others, with reference to 1 Sam. iv. 22). 2. The glory of Israel itself (Calovius, Köllner, Fritzsche, Beck, and oth-

* In the discussion on this subject, a second meaning of ἀδαινο is not been taken into consideration: ἀδαινόν, on the paternal side, &c.
the giving of the law, as αἱ ἐπαγγελίαι (the Messianic prophecies) correspond to αἱ διαθήκαι. This is a chiasm: according to Meyer, occasioned by the necessity of the promises standing at the conclusion, immediately before the Promised One. But a chiasm is altogether out of the question, as the promises in the stricter sense—the prophetic promises—followed the giving of the law, and as the λατρεία also was already, in the main, a typical promise, from which the ἐπαγγελίαι are only to be distinguished as verbal prophecies. Tholuck concludes, without good ground, from the reasoning of ver. 6, that the predictions of the prophets are meant here, but "chiefly" those communicated to the patriarchs. But how could Paul have enumerated the principal elements of Israel’s glory, without thinking of the prophets? We must adhere to the position that, apart from the connections of historical sequence, the νοµοθεσία, the διαθήκαι, &c., and, indeed, all the particular elements, pervaded all the periods of Israel’s existence. Even the νοµοθεσία, for example, is repeated in the germ in Abraham.

Ver. 5. Whose are the fathers? [ὅιοι αἰτήτες.] The fathers, the elect, the men of God, as preludes to the chief Chosen One, the Son of God; the glorious root of the Israelish parent-tree, as well as the fatness of the tree (see chap. xi. 17), referring to the only glorious crown (Exod. xlii. 18; iv. 5). These are chiefly, but not exclusively, the patriarchs, but, in addition to them, the long line of the true fathers of Israel.

And of whom as to the flesh is Christ [καὶ ἐς ὑν ὁ Χριστὸς τὸ κατὰ σάρκα]. It is the highest characteristic of Israel’s glory, that Christ descends from it, or comes of it according to the flesh (Rom. i. 3; iv. 1 ff.). [Christ, the promised Messiah, is the greatest of all the blessings imparted to the people of Israel, to whom all the others pointed typically and prophetically, and in whom they first obtained their full truth and reality.—P. S.] The τὸ κατὰ σάρκα is evidently a qualifying addition, and refers to an antithesis; Tholuck: "ὁ δὲ κατὰ τὸν θνητόν" (chap. i. 8, 4). [Alford marks the antithesis by rendering: “as for α as regards the flesh:” finding in το, accusative, the implication “that He was not entirely sprung from them, but had another nature.”—R.]

Who is over all [Ὁ ὁ ὃν ἐπὶ πάντων. There are two renderings which are nearly allied: Who is God over all, blessed forever, and Who is over all, God blessed forever. The doctrinal results are the same, whatever he be adopted; but Lange prefers the latter, for reasons which will appear, and seems warranted in his preference. The E. V. gives the latter; Luther, and most interpreters, the former.—R.] We explain the passage thus: He who is over all Israelites, believers and unbelievers, is that glorified One of our universally known supernatural formula: God, blessed forever, Amen. We must first of all accept a strong Pauline brevity. Then we must call to mind Paul’s expression concerning the unknown God (Acts xvii. 28). As Paul could say to the Greeks: “You seek and worship by your altar the one true God, without knowing Him,” so can he say of the Jews: “Even those who reject Christ must render homage to Him, though unconsciously, as by faith in the ancient theology; they cannot but praise Jehovah, the God of rere- cognition, who has appeared in Christ, and thus rules supremely over all, believers as well as unbelievers.” The ὁ ὃν therefore stands for ὃς ἐστι.
though with the additional strength peculiar to the parapet. That the ἐπὶ παῖνον here refers to the Jews, according to their antithesis of believing and unbelieving Jews, is evident from the strong prominence previously given to them (οἰκειωσθ., ὄν, ἐξ ὧν). [The form of the E. V. favors this view of ἐπὶ παῖνον. By taking it as masculine, the whole clause is brought into closer connection with the context, an increased difficulty in the interpretation of the doxology is avoided, while this closer connection gives strength to the view that the doxology refers to Christ. It seems preferable to the view which connects it with θῶς, in the sense of the supreme God (Hodge, and many others). Whether all that Lange suggests is included, is perhaps doubtful; but comp. his remarks below on Ps. lviii. 19.—R.]

God blessed for ever. Amen [θῶς ἐπὶ λουπτός εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας, α.μ.γ.]. We must regard this clause as a quotation from the symmetrical liturgy, sufficiently well-known to all the Jews, and to Jewish Christians and believers in general. According to modern usage, it should, therefore, be written with quotation-marks. But the sense is this: Christ is the object of the Jewish liturgy; the doxology to the revealed God, Jehovah, for He is the θῶς itself; is consequentially praised by some, and undoubtedly by all; for this latter class, notwithstanding their rejection of Jesus of Nazareth, cannot get away from the adoration of the Shekinah, and thus Christ also, the personally revealed God, rules over all (as they praise Him), even over unbelievers, for their future salvation. This is therefore the last advantage of Israel (see chap. xi.). For the details of all the explanations, we must refer to the Commentaries extant.*

Every exposition is attended with great difficulties. The strongest reasons are still in favor of the old one, transmitted to us by the early writers, all of whom favored it, with the single exception of Theodore of Mopsuestia (see Tholuck, p. 479). We may say, perhaps, that Julian maintained, with Cyril, that Paul never called Jesus "God," and that the Codd. 11 [5], 47 place a period after σάρκα, and Cod. 71 places one after ἐπὶ παῖνον. Here belongs also Irenaeus, Tertullian, Origen, &c., and the most of the later expositors (see Meyer). The passage is, therefore, a doxology to the divinity of Christ. This is most strongly favored by the requirement of the antithesis comprised in the τὸ κατὰ σάρκα (see chap. i. 3, 4; 1 Tim. iii. 16). This explanation has been rendered unnecessarily difficult by regarding ἐπὶ παῖνον as neuter: "over every thing." (Beza referred it as masculine to the patriarchs, to the antithesis of Jews and Gentiles), thus giving up its proximate reference to the Jews.

Since the time of Erasmus, this exposition has been directly opposed by another, the reference of the clause to God. "The Codd. 11 [5], 47, of the 11th and 12th centuries, like Diodorus of Tar- sus, place a period after σάρκα; this punctuation has been preferred by Erasmus, so that what follows is a doxology to the Almighty God. This proposition has found favor with the majority of recent exegetical writers, with the Socinians, &c., with Reiche, Rückert, Meyer, and Fritzschene. Tholuck, a middle ground is occupied by the interpretation which unites with a second punctuation proposed by Erasmus, according to Cod. 71, at it places a period after ἐπὶ παῖνον; this has been adopted by Lokee and Baumgarten-Crusius, a construction to which Tholuck also inclines to a certain degree. In addition to these three explanations are, the construction of Erasmus, that θῶς is not authentic, and the reading ὁ ὁ θῶς proposed by Croll, and others. But, according to Tholuck, the detached character of the doxology is against the third exposition.

The following may be said against the second exposition:

1. In simple doxologies, without a relative form, the ἐπὶ λουπτός generally precedes the θῶς. See examples in Tholuck, 489; Philippff, 369 ff. Tholuck regards it as a beautiful fact connected with Faustus Socinius, that his attention was first directed to this circumstance, and that, owing to it, he changed his exposition of this passage. Tholuck, indeed, cites a passage in which the ἐπὶ λουπτός comes after the θῶς (Ps. lviii. 10)—a passage which, in view of its connection, we regard as very important, and must hereafter return to it.

2. A doxology to the omnipotent God cannot interrupt the train of thought under consideration at its very outset; least of all, can an elegy or funeral discourse be changed abruptly into a hymn. The doxology for the whole discussion in Rom. ix.—xi., is at the conclusion of chap. xi.

3. The expression, τὸ κατὰ σάρκα, which limits Christ's descent from the Jews to His human nature, requires, as an antithesis, a reference to His divine nature. We have here had special reference to Calvin, Tholuck, Neander, and Phillipff. In the attack on the old exposition, it is remarkable that the same critical exegesis which elsewhere urges the immediate and separate context, urges the analogy of Scripture altogether in the background, here reverses its method. Meyer, indeed, only says, that both expositions might be equally right, according to the words. But he imagines that he can overcome the requirement of the antithesis in this passage merely by the assurance that divinity does not necessarily belong to the object represented. The doxologies to God which Meyer cites (Rom. i. 25; 2 Cor. xi. 31; Gal. i. 5; 1 Tim. i. 17), are fully occasioned by the connection which would not hold good of the present doxology. Meyer contradicts himself when he first urges that the present passage does not read ὁ θῶς, but only the predative θῶς, without the article; and when he concedes that Paul, by virtue of his appropriate and real harmony with John's christology, could, just as properly as John (chap. i. 1), have used the predicative θῶς (divine nature) of Christ (with reference to Phil. ii. 6; Col. i. 15 ff.; ii. 9; 1 Thess. iii. 4), and yet urges that Paul never used the expression θῶς of Christ, since he never accepted the Alexandrian form of John, but adhered to the strictly monotheistic form. He seems, therefore, to regard that "Alexandrian form" as prejudicial to strict monotheism. It should be remarked that Meyer, who is usually so clear and
decided in his statements of the reasons for his views, halts here, as if the grounds against the reference to Christ were not sufficient to satisfy himself. This fact is suggestive.—R.] As far as those passages are concerned in which Paul brings out the divinity of Christ, we refer to the Doctr. Notes. We must here, however, oppose the hermeneutical supposition that there are no doctrinal \\[aside from or translated as\] PaulYYer as outlining points of the view corresponding with them. Meyer even holds that John calls Christ Θεός but once. It is a perfectly gratuitous increase of the difficulty before us, to say that Christ is here called God over all. It is certainly a fact that Paul speaks preeminently of the historical Christ, and that, when he expresses also the ontological idea of Christ, he immediately places it in relation with the historical perfection of Christ; but when this historical subordination of Christ, Paul expresses (1 Cor. vii. 6; Eph. iv. 5 f.; 1 Cor. xv. 28) is allowed to be identical with His ontological subordination, the error is owing to a defective ecclesiastical education and speculative penetration.

We now come to Ps. lxviii. 19, according to the Septuagint: Κύριός ὁ Θεός ἡ δυναμιν, ἡ σιωπή τοῦ κυρίου καθός ημῶν. It must be borne in mind that Paul was particularly familiar with that passage. In Eph. iv. 8 he quotes a good part of ver. 18, and versa it to Christ. But this verse reads, according to De Wette's translation, thus: Thou ascendedst to the high seat, thou leadest captive, thou receivest gifts for men, and the rebellious shall also dwell with Jah. Tholuck: Even the apostates shall still dwell with God the Lord. Do we not plainly hear the reécho of this passage in the ὅ ὁπον ἐγιναντος; And since we know that Paul applies this passage to the glorification of Christ, is it not clear that he immediately adds that ascription of praise in Ps. lxviii. 19? His expression occupies the middle ground between the LXX. and the Hebrew text. Hence we return to the acceptance of a synagogal form.

[The main point being not the synagogal form—to which, however, there is little to object—but the reference to Christ, the following summary in favor of that view is added:

(1.) This view is the most simple and natural one. It becomes justifiable in remarking: It is the only one admissible by the rules of grammar and arrangement.

(2.) It accords best with the context, presenting an antithesis to θα ἐστί σάρξ, and forming a suitable culminating point after the enumeration of the advantages of the Jews.

(3.) It is sufficiently Pauline, for Paul wrote Col. i. 16 ff., and in view of that and many similar passages, any other reference would be derogatory to the divinity of Christ.

(4.) On no exegetical point, where there is room for discussion, has the unanimity of commentators, of all ages and confessions, been so entire, as in referring this to Christ.—R.]
ence could also be made here to the preference of Sarah to Hagar; and, therefore, the second and more convincing proof follows: Rebecca. It is important that Rebecca, and not Isaac, appears in the foreground, but then, also, that she conceived twins by Isaac in one pregnancy; and, third, that a determination is made respecting children as yet unborn, which gave the preference to Jacob.

But (thus the promise reads) in Isaac [καὶ Ἰακὼβ] (Gen. xxvi. 24; Med. Not. 24 for the Hebrew.) Though the decision of the promise is quoted directly and authentically, without a γέγονεν, or any thing of similar import, as in Gal. iii. 11, 12, it is nevertheless a simple logical requirement to supply something of the kind mentally; this, however, is contested by Meyer. The promise is quoted from the Septuagint. Meyer maintains, in accordance with Gezer anxious, that the original text βρέθη would say: Through Isaac will the posterity be called; but that the Apostle has conceived the sense of the passage according to its typical meaning, and transferred it to Isaac's person. [So Philippi, Ewald.] The entire digression on this supposed antithesis rests upon a mistake of the significance of the typical collective name. The name of Isaac here can just as little exclude his posterity, as the included posterity can exclude Isaac himself. Meyer says: all Jews belonged to the offspring of Isaac, and therefore the expression would be inappropriate, if those whose claims are to be disputed, are also described by it. But yet, in verses 11 and 12, the election of Jacob is evidently meant at the same time with that of his posterity, but without the Apostle having designed thus to favor again the claim of individual Jews. The examples cited serve to prove that the distinguishing process of election, in reference to the descendants of Jacob also, was not hindered by the election of their ancestor with his πρότερον, but rather that it took place with perfect freedom in reference to the posterity.

Shall thy seed be called [καὶ θεοτόκοι σοι πρότερον]. Different explanations of the καὶ θεοτόκοι (εἰρήνη, shall be; shall be awakened, shall be called from nothing): [Tholuck, Stuart; Reiche. Meyer objects to this, on the ground, that this promise was made after Isaac was born. As we are less warranted in referring the citation exclusively to Isaac's descendants, than to Isaac alone, this objection seems to be valid and conclusive. — R.] The καὶ θεοτόκοι brings out the freedom of Divine choice; not in the sense that he merely became the ancestor of the promised seed, but in and with Isaac the seed of promise belonging to Abraham was called, according to the election. [Hodge, Alford, and most.] Freedom of election in thus distinguished by two characteristics: only in Isaac, and, only by virtue of free appointment.

Ver. 8. That is, They who are the children of the flesh [Τοίνυν ἐστιν, οὐ τὰ τίκτην τῆς σιδήνας. Comp. Gal. iv. 28]. The children who are to be regarded merely as the fruit of physical generation. The antithesis is: [καὶ τὰ τίκτην τῆς ἐπαγγελίας], makes these appear as born under the predetermination and cooperation of the Divine promise. The expression, "promised children," would be too little; while the expression, "begotten by the power of the Divine promise" (Meyer), would be too strong. [The facts respecting the birth of Isaac, and Paul's language in Galatians, seem to justify Meyer's view; the conception of Isaac was so extraordinary, and so connected with the promise, that he is called "after the Spirit," in distinction from one "born after the flesh," as well as "by promise;" still in neither case is Isaac said to be born by promise or after the Spirit, as if to guard against any thought of miraculous conception. Lange himself says below, that "the promise acted as a producing and cooperative cause." — R.]

But not "those children of the flesh are children of God [τὰ αἱτία τίκτην τοῦ θεοῦ], but the children designated by the promise are reckoned as seed [λογίζεται ἐς σπέρμα]. The antithesis must be carefully observed. Even the children of promise are not, in themselves, children of God in the New Testament sense. They are counted such according to their faith, and therefore typically so called in the sense that they are the seed of God's children as the seed of promise. Also in this line there are not yet children born of God (see John i. 13).]

Ver. 9. For this word was of promise [ἐπαγγελίας γὰρ ὁ λόγος οὗτος]. Notice the emphatic position of ἐπαγγελίας. "The children of promise are reckoned for seed; for this word, fulfilment of which Isaac was born, was a word of promise" (Alford). — R. Free quotation from Gen. xviii. 10, 14, according to the Septuagint.

At this season [Καὶ τὸν καὶ ἐγένετο τοῦ; i.e. next year at this time. See Textual Note 8. — R.] The accessory proof in this verse will show, first, that Isaac was now already an object of promise; second, that the promise ("according to the time") acted as a producing and cooperative cause; and third, that the becalmed of the right of childhood was attributed for Abraham's faith.†

Ver. 10. And not only this; but when Rebecca also [οὐ μόνον δὲ, ἀλλὰ καὶ ἡ Ρεβεκκα]. Winer's supplementary explanation, οὐ μόνον δὲ Σάλλα ἐπαγγελίμην τῷ Μεγάλῳ (Meyer: Not only Sarah, but Rebecca also, had a Divine promise), is repelled by Tholuck, with the reminder that it was not Sarah, but Abraham, who had received that ἐπαγγελία. Tholuck, with Erasmus and Rückert, prefers to supply a τοῦτο to μόνον δὲ, and μόνον τοῦτο, or something similar, to Rebecca. Grotius, and others, in accordance with the sense, interpret similarly the non solo (sane) of Gen. xvii. 4, documentum et eis, quod informe velut. [The view of Tholuck seems least objectionable. Ρεβεκκα is then either the nominative absolute, or we must accept an anacoluthon. The sense is the same in either case. Philippi prefers the former, decidedly, on grammatical grounds, and takes this as almost = behold, Rebecca too. The progress of thought is against Meyer's view. — R.]

* [Stuart, and others, deny the highest spiritual sense to the phrase "children of God," limiting it to "children of promise in respect to the external privileges and blessings of the annual covenant or dispensation." In itself there would be no objection to this view, as Lange has already written Gal. iv. 22-31, where those phrases receive that expression (see Lange's Comm. Gen., pg. 115 sq., 120 sq.). Besides, if this were all, it would hold coined. It was the idea already suggested in ver. 6, 7 (Hodge). We must hold them to a typical sense at least, and, in "reckoned," the idea well comes in the assumption of spiritual privilege from natural descent. — R.]

† [Stuart suggests the interpretation: "as at life-giving time;" in which case the meaning might be, that God would again address her as a mother, who gave to &c., 6, 7, sons, children." But there seems to be no reason for departing from the simple rendering of the LXX. quoted by Paul. — R.]
In consequence of the ambiguity of the brief form of expression, we must consult the contents themselves. But, according to these, Rebecca is not merely a second example, but even a new one for the same fundamental thoughts. She is a new example, in whom there appear three new characteristics. First, Rebecca appears in the foreground as a principal person, and becomes the parallel to Abraham. The Apostle says to the Jews, as carefully as he can, that the weight of the promise does not rest upon Isaac, the promise of natural seed of Abraham, but on the daughter-in-law, Bethuel's daughter, who 'had become Isaac's wife. Then comes the principial characteristic which constitutes the real antithesis:

[Had conceived by one, our father Isaac, εἷς Ιακωβ κοίτην ἔγοςα, Ἰσαακ τοῦ πατρός ημῶν.—R.] Between the twin children of one marriage, by one husband, and from one conception or pregnancy (οὐδεὶς πατρίς, see chap. xili. 15; not emphasized as unity, but really so understood), the election already made the greatest difference before birth. This leads to the third characteristic:

Ver. 11. [Without their having as yet been born, or done any thing good or evil, μην οὖν γάρ γεννηθ' εν τῷ σταυρῷ μηδέ πράσαντων τι ἀγάθων ἤ πρωτίνοι. See Textual Notes 29 and 31.—R.] Before the children had done any thing either good or bad. This example denies once more, as though superfluously, the exclusive privilege of birthright. In view of all this, we think that the real explanation of the οὐδὲν δὲ is contained in the second characteristic—not merely that Sarah, the unfitted one, is a proof, but also Rebecca, in her pregnancy with twins. It is Sarah, in so far as the promise determines a year beforehand that the unfitted Sarah, instead of the mother of Ishmael, should be the mother of the promised one; and Rebecca, in so far as the promise made even the greatest difference between the twin-fruits of her womb.

The expression, τοῦ πατρός ημῶν, indicates that also the paternity of Isaac did not guarantee any choice concerning the Jews. The μην οὖν expresses the fact that God's revelation concerning the preference of the younger before the birth of the twins (Acts must be supplied) was intentional, in order:

That the purpose of God according to election might stand [εἰς ἣν κατ’ ἐκλογήν πρόθεσις τοῦ Θεοῦ μην.]. Meyer holds, that the εἰς therefore determines, at all events, a purpose. But he incorrectly denies that the ἐκλογή here precedes the πρόθεσις. [Meyer opposes this precedence, on the ground that the election is essentially pre-temporal (Eph. iii. 11; 2 Tim. i. 9), objecting also to the view of Grothus, and others, that the phrase means a decree considered with respect to an election. He holds that, as an essential inherent of the purpose, κατ’ ἐκλογήν εκ pressing the modality of πρόθεσις. Perhaps it is not safe to affirm positively more than this respecting what belongs to the order in the mind of God. Meyer also repels the strong view of Bengel: proposition Dei electum; but after all has been admitted, that must be respecting the primary reference to theocratic privilege (Meyer limits thus), the Apostle's language fairly implies a choice of individuals, and a free choice, whether we can reconcile this with our systems, or our consciousness of our own freedom or not. The emphasis throughout, it may well be admitted, rests on the unmerited choice of Jacob, rather than on the rejection of Esau.—R.] The ἐκλογή is founded in the θεοτοκία, and the πρόθεσις joins with the latter. Meyer's opposition to the explanation of the expression (of Rosenmüller, and others) proposition Dei liberum, is correct only so far as the election of love and arbitrary freedom are different; but the election of love is certainly free in relation to human claims. The following clause expresses a principal maxim of the πρόθεσις:

Not of works, but of him that calleth [οἷς ἐκ ἐργον ἀλλ' ἐκ τοῦ καλέσαντος]. Such a view is favored by the peculiarly broken construction of the whole verse. In any case, it establishes the position of Augustine: "God does not choose us because we believe, but that we may believe." Hence, too, we are justified not on account of faith (proper legalism), but through faith (proper fidem), which God himself works in us through the Holy Ghost (Schaff). Any other view would contradict the obvious meaning of this verse. Comp. Hodge and Philippi on each side of this verse of the predestinarian question as involved here.—R.]

Ver. 12. (The elder (that is, the first-born) shall serve the younger [ὁ μείζων δολλυσσει τοῦ ἐλάσσοντος]. Gen. xxv. 22, according to the Septuagint).—Here, again, Meyer finds a difference between the original sense of the passage and the Apostle's explanation. According to the connection of the original, the expression extends to the nations concerned (Jews and Edomites), and was fulfilled in David's conquest of the Edomites (2 Sam. xviii. 14, &c.); and the Lord Paul rephrases it in his commentary. The adjustment of the difference by regarding the two brothers as representatives of two nations, is insufficient; rather, the inodol of Jacob was really continued in the Jewish people, and the inodol of Esau in the Edomites. [The reference of the original Hebrew, as shown by the context, is to the nations springing from the twin children ("two nations are in thy womb"); Gen. xxi. 29]. Lange and Meyer agree that there is an external reference, though differing in their mode of stating the relation of the two.

* [It must be noticed that this expression contains an incident, in that the Platonic and Origenistic doctrine of the preexistence of souls, and their exile into this world in consequence of a previous fall. This theory, revived again and again, is as unsatisfactory as it is objectionable, and must be considered one of the many attempts to solve the enigma which this chapter confronts. Gledhill, then, Paul rejects this solution. But there is another reason, because the negative relation is to be expressed subjectively—εἰς, as presented and considered by God in the giving of His sentence." See Winer, p. 441.—R.]
Neither should be excluded, though the whole passage seems to indicate that the personal reference was the more prominent one in Paul's mind. On the national reference, Schaff remarks: "At all events, in the passages quoted here and ver. 13, Jacob and Esau appear as the heads of two nations. If the promised lordship of Jacob be not limited to the transfer of the divine favor, and the theocratic blessing to Jacob, but taken in its full, physical, and spiritual sense, the fulfilment did not take place until long after their death, in their descendants, when David conquered the Edomites (2 Sam. viii. 14). Since then the Ishmaelites and the Edomites, together with the other heathen, were at all events called to the gospel, though later than the Jews (comp. Gen. xxvii. 40, where Isaac predicts the future cessation of the bondage of Esau; and Amos ix. 12; Acts xv. 16, 17; Rom. xi. 11 ff.) it follows that Paul speaks here, not so much as Calvinistic expositors misunderstood him, of an eternal reprobation, but of such a preference of one nation as shall prepare for the final salvation of all nations (we do not say, all individuals)." The individual reference is also undeniable, though it be no means certain that it here implies eternal results. The point here is not what or how much God did in His election, but that He had a προθεσις κατ' ελεγχ. — R.

Ver. 13. As it is written, Jacob I loved, but Esau I hated [Τὸν Ἰακώβ ἠγάπησα, τὸν δὲ Ησαυ ἐμισήσα]. Mal. i. 2 ff.: "I have loved you, saith the Lord. Yet ye say, Wherein hast thou loved us? Was it not Jacob's brother? said the Lord; yet I loved Jacob, and I hated Esau, and laid his mountains and his herbage waste for the dragons of the wilderness." Here the statement that Jehovah hates! Esau is proved by the fact that He gave a desolate land to the Edomites for an inheritance, and that He called it a wicked land, on which His indignation rested. Thus the people are placed first here, but with them also their ancestor, as in Gen. xxv. 23 the ancestor is placed first, but with him his people also.

The statement is therefore assumed throughout:
1. The continuity of the indoles in the ancestor and in the real substance of his posterity; 2. The universal connection between the indoles and its religious and moral conduct; 3. The universal connection between the religious and moral conduct and the historical decrees. The sum of these characteristics is now referred to the Divine purpose, and is applied to Esau in the sentence, "I hated him." Yet this sentence has, at most, only a relative meaning; God has hated Esau in the relation of Esau to Jacob, and in antithesis to the fact that He loved Jacob. God's whole arrangement, therefore, proceeds from the primary πρόθεσις, which came from Jacob's glorious history, the determination of his theocratic inheritance. But the whole sentence depends upon πραξεις conditions on both sides.

1. An economical condition. The question is not at all concerning decrees of eternal salvation and damnation, but concerning the economical relations of the ordination and call to the possession of salvation and to the economy of salvation in time. On the prospects of salvation for Edom, comp. Isa. xi. 14 (Dan. xi. 41); Amos ix. 12; Mark iii. 8. On the other hand, Edom has become, on its dark side, a type of anti-christianity. See the article Edomiten, in the Bibl. Wörterbuch für das christliche Volk.

Likewise the passage in Heb. xii. 17 relates to Esau's incapacity to inherit the theocratic blessing even with tears and repentance.

2. An individual condition. There could be also in Edom individuals having the character of Israel, and in Israel there could be individual Edomites. In the LXX., regarding Job as an Edomite prince, Allowing this to be uncertain, the Edomite nature of the Jewish Judas is beyond a doubt.

3. A religious-ethical condition. Salvation was as little secured unconditionally to the individual Jew by Israel's election, as the individual Edomites was personally subjected to condemnation by that theocratic rejection of Edom (Gen. xvi. 15). Meyer: "We must not attach such a merely private meaning to the ἐμισήσα * as not to love, or to love less (Grotius, Erasi [Hodge, Stuart], and others), yet it is also not confirmed by Matt. vi. 24; Luke xiv. 26; xvi. 18; John xii. 25; but it expresses just the opposite of the positive ἡγάπη, —positive abhorrence." This would be still more than hatred? Meyer also speaks of a becoming fond of and abhorrence even before the birth of the brother, which might perhaps have loved the letter, but the spirit of the letter I have loved less! This, indeed, might be said of many of the results of modern criticism and exegesis. Philippus leastens at least the antithesis in relation to Jacob and Esau themselves, but yet without thereby becoming rid of the traditional prejudices respecting the sense of this passage. "Jacob's reception of the theocratic birthright, and Esau's exclusion from it, constitute, in Paul's mind, only the type for the law of the reception of eternal salvation, and of abandonment to eternal perdition." But the law of this reception and abandonment is not given here, but in Mark xvi. 16. The following interpretation is better, if we understand thereby not absolute, but relative antitheses. Calvin well explains ἡγάπην and μισήσαν by avmavta and λιπαλα and by avma and velipela. The use of μισήσα is similar (Gen. xxix. 30, 51; Deut. xxi. 15 ff.; Prov. xiii. 24; Matt. vi. 24; Luke xvi. 13; Mark x. 17; comp. with Luke xiv. 26; John xii. 25). The idea of a father and mother, and his own soul, does not mean to love them less than the Lord, but to reject them altogether in a case of collision, or to so act toward them as if one positively hated them?; in which case there might still exist a great deal of love for them, though certainly less than for the Lord. — If, indeed, absolute love and a conditional love = loving less, are at variance with each other, then the disregard, which is similar to hatred, though not partaking of the nature of hatred, follows of itself; it is

* It cannot be denied that ἄγαπη, in the Scripture, does not always describe positive abhorrence, but occasionally a less degree, or more accurately, the absence of love; e. g. Gen. xxix. 30 (where the original text says "Leah was hated" by Jacob—c. e. less loved than Rachel); comp. ver. 30; Matt. vi. 24, and especially Luke xiv. 24; compared with Matt. x. 37, where one evangelist says ἄγαπην, and the other, λιπαλα. The word undoubtedly, even in these passages, taken exactly, describes not merely an absence of love, but a formal putting into the background.

—T. S.

† This is an allusion to the strictly literal and grammatical meaning of the passages adopted by Meyer. But if we depart from the letter, who is left to discern the spirit? There are but two answers: that of Rome (eccle- nastic authority) and that of Nationalism (individual human consciousness). The strict interpretation of Matthew x. 37 is adopted by Fritzsche, De Wette, and others. Unquestion-   unanswerable; only the direct word of God with respect to Esau indicates something positive, though, were it not the antithesis of love, the results of evil-doing would still account for the historical fate. —R.
the negation of the defect or of the sin to which
the hated individual cleaves, but it is not the indi-
vidual to which the defect or the sin cleaves. See
also Tholuck, p. 498, against Fritzsch, Meyer, De
Wette, &c.

It must be observed, further, that, in ver. 18, the
description of pre-ordination or predetermination
according to election, is introduced by ἐκ τῆς ἐλαύνης
προθεσίας. The idea of election refutes the following
in a right to God’s kingdom:

1. The claim by virtue of natural descent from
Abraham, the father of the faithful, especially by
virtue of birthright; 2. The claim by virtue of
descent from the legitimate marriage concluded under
the promise; 3. The claim by virtue of the merit
of works.

Election takes place freely:
1. Without regard to the advantage of birthright;
2. to descent from a family that is blessed; 3. to
community even in a twin-birth; 4. and to the fore-
seeing of works. And all this is on the simple
ground that election, a voluntarily determines the
indoles beforehand, thereby avoiding all appearance
of natural necessity, the requirement of birthright, &c.; and, according to the indoles or economic
endowment, it also makes a προθεσία in regard to
the economical call. [The sum of the whole matter,
detaching from it all reference to the extent of the
preference or the result of the choice of God in this
instance, is, that God does exercise a prerogative of
choice or election, independently of all these human
considerations. That this is the point to which Paul
would bring his readers, is evident from what im-
m ediately follows. A further proof that a general
truth is also to be drawn from it, is afforded by the
constant use made of special points in Old Testa-
ment history and of Old Testament passages to es-
tablish general propositions (see the case of Pharaoh,
below, ver. 17, which, as far as the individual in
question is concerned, has no connection with the
discussion, and New Testament passim). This
method of citation is based on the stability of the
Divine character; to deny his pre-ordination is to pre-
sume an arbitrariness on the part of God, in far
greater opposition to His character than is implied
in the most fearfully fatalistic view of this chap-
ter.—R.]

Second Proof: The antithesis in fore-ordination
(predis tination). God is not unrighteous in showing
mercy and in hardening; and in His manner of
denying judgment and compassion (vers. 14–18).*
Meyer: The second part of the theodicy.

Vers. 14. What shall we say then? Is there
unrighteousness with God? [ἐὰν οὖν ἐρώτη-
μεν, μη ἀδικεῖ παρὰ τῷ θεῷ; Comp.
chap. iii. 5.] The Jew cannot refute the facts that
shmael was rejected in spite of his birthright, and
that Esau was rejected in spite of his legitimacy and
birthright. Just here was a special point of pride
with the Jew. But the consistency of this fact had
now appeared—the absolute freedom of Divine
choice. Israel’s call was itself the strongest witness
against the claims of the Israelites, because by it the
most weighty prejudices concerning their privileges
were overcome. But, finally, God’s promise to Re-
becca stood firm, and by this was decided, that the
works of the Israelites could no more impose con-
ditions on the free exercise of His authority, than
could be done formerly by the other brother—the
God assigned to him beforehand the domination over
his brother—that is, the theocratic honor. It was
especially this declaration against the claims estab-
lished on works which was calculated to excuse the
Judaizing spirit, and lead it to the conclusion that,
by so doing, God would be unrighteous. This is the
interpretation of Augustine, Herverus, the majority
of Lutheran writers, and Bullinger and Tholuck.
But even this conclusion he rejects with abhorrence
(comp. chap. iii. 5). He adds his proof immedi-
ately afterwards.

Meyer remarks: “This reason is demonstrative,
in so far as by it the absolute divine worthiness of
what God predicates of himself must be assumed.”
Yet this would be only an absolute proof of author-
ity. Also, according to Calvin, the proof lies in
the refuting effect of the biblical declaration: satis
et simul corrigit, scripturae testimonia imposueri.
* In this choice and preference of the one before the other there is no unrighteousness. For
he only is unrighteous who is under obligations which he
does not fulfill; but God is under no obligations to
His creature, hence can do with him what He
will (vers. 14–29). God’s will is the absolute and
eternal norm of righteousness, and all that He does
is necessarily right (Deut. xxiii. 4). There is no
norm of righteousness above Him to which He is
subject; else were God not God.—P. S.] For other
explanations, see Tholuck, pp. 607, 608.

Tholuck: “Origen regards this as the ob-
jection of an opponent, and vers. 15 as the Apostle’s
answer, and vers. 16–18 as another objection of
the opponent, is a result of doctrinal perplexity.”
Theodore of Mopsuestia, Storr [Jerome], and Flatt,
regarded vers. 15–18, and Heumann, vers. 15–21, as
the objection of an opponent. [Vers. 15 and 17 are
quotations from the Scripture, and hence cannot
be objections; while vers. 16 and 18 are not the
incorrect deductions of an opponent from these
passages, as Chrysostom and Pelagius suppose, but
the correct conclusions of the Apostle himself.—P. S.]

Vers. 15. For he saith to Moses, I will have
mercy on whom I have mercy, and I will
have compassion on whom I have compassion
[Ἐλεηοῦν ὑμῖν δὲ θυμὸν, καὶ οἰκτηροῦν
δὲ οἰκτηρίαν.] See Textual Note 14, for the
Hebrew. An answer to the self-proposed objection
in vers. 14, taken from Exod, xxxiii. 19, according
to the LXX. The form of the original text is evi-
dently this: I have (already) had mercy on whom I
will have mercy, and I have had compassion on
whom I will have compassion. The sense is there-
fore not: To whom I am gracious, to him I am
gracious; that is, I act in the matter according to

* [Hodge: “It will be remarked that these arguments
of the Apostle are founded on two assumptions. The first
is, that the Scriptures are the Word of God; and the
second, that what God actually does cannot be unrighteous.”
R.]

† [On the distinction between ἐλεηοῦν and οἰκτηροῦν, Meyer
remarks: “The distinction between these two words is not
always as defined, with Fitzmyer, Synopsis, p. 60 f., that ἐλε-
ηοῦν to be thus defined, with Fitzmyer, Synopsis, p. 60 f., that ἐλε-
ηοῦν describes the active mercy, and οἰκτηροῦν the sympathetic
compassion; but rather, that the same word may be expressed
in the two ways. The latter is originally the bewailing sympathy,
contrasted with μακρυγέον (Xen. Anab, 3, 19).”—R.]
my own authority or freedom, unrestrainedness (the view of most commentators, also of Tholuck, p. 311). Yet this is not mere freedom, as is the case with Jehovah: The question is not concerning God's right, but God's grace; p. 114), but: I remain just, as Jehovah, and continue the work of my grace where I have once revealed it, &c.—That is, Jehovah is the God of revelation in His consistency, and so are also His grace and His compassion consistent. His freedom binds or unbinds itself. His freedom is rather to be regarded as decision also. According to the connection, indeed, the τῆς ὁμοονομασίας could be regarded as a future form; but this is hardly admissible in connection with the simple future form ἡ σύνεσις; and with the name Jehovah; therefore the Hebrew translations—for example, that of Philippius—are to no purpose; "And as I have mercy on whom I have mercy," &c.

In sense, the inverted form of the LXX, from which Paul quotes, is therefore correct: καὶ ἡ σύνεσις τοῦ ὀνόματος τοῦ Θεοῦ καὶ τῆς ἱλαρότητος. [Alford objects, without sufficient reason, to laying the stress on τοῦ ὀνόματος τοῦ Θεοῦ, whomsoever; but Paul, following the LXX., makes the scriptural expression of general proposition. It is in the form of a Divine axiom (Meyer).—R.] The meaning of the name Jehovah is: Divine consistency. But Jehovah's speaking to Moses has a special significance. The Jews regarded Moses as the founder of righteousness by works. Paul, on the contrary, brings out the fact that God said to this very Moses, that the consistency of the work of grace is grounded on the beginning of the work of grace in free grace. [This view is ingenious, and gives at least some warrant for a reference to works, which too often is "all supplied by the commentator" (Hodge). But it can scarcely be accepted, as it seems to be rather an effort to avoid than to discover the meaning of the passage. —As regards the thought of Divine consistency, which seems to rest on the present tense in the relative clauses, it is scarcely proper to limit the meaning thus. Certainly Meyer does not often let a grammatical point escape him; yet he paraphrases: "I will have mercy upon him who (in whatever given case) is the object of my mercy. . . . I am the absolutely independent on nothing without myself. That is the consistency of God's method, is, in fact, to extend it, since Esau was not of the chosen people; and what God said to Moses, the head of the chosen people, could not be applicable to him, unless it was of general validity. To limit it to the Jewish people, because they are under discussion in this part of the Epistle, is forbidden by the fact that the instances or illustrations are outside that people (Esau, Pharaoh). The only safe view is, that the word to Moses is a Divine axiom, and this an inference of universal application and validity. It will not interfere with human means in salvation; for, if true, it applies to willing and running in general, and yet it stops no volition and its accompanying muscular exertion. That side of the matter is not under consideration. Aldor: "At present the Apostle is employed wholly in asserting the divine Sovereignty, the glorious vision of which it ill becomes us to distract by continual downward looks on this earth. It is most true that the immediate subject is the national rejection of the Jews; but we must consent to hold our reason in abeyance, if we do not recognize the inference, that the sovereign power and free election, here proved to belong to God, extend to every exercise of His mercy—whether temporal or spiritual, whether in Providence or in grace, whether national or individual. It is in parts of Scripture like this that we must be especially careful not to fall short of what is written—not to allow of any compromise of the plain and awful words of God's Spirit, for the sake of a caution which He himself does not teach us."—R.]

Ver. 15. So then it is not of him who will-eth, &c. [ἀρν ὁ δεικνύω, τοῦ ἱλάροτος, κα.ἐ. On the construction, see Winer, p. 535.—Meyer: "From the saying of God, Paul deduces the inference lying therein, respecting the causality of the Divine saving deliverance."—R.] That the entrance of human good conduct in faith is presupposed, follows not only from the analogy of Scripture, but also from the antithesis (ver. 17); though the Apostle here precludes the conclusion that men, by his willing and running, can acquire that foundation of salvation which proceeds only from the freedom of the compassionate God. Meyer: "Incorrect, according to Locke, and most commentators; Reiche: ἱλαρότης is probably chosen with regard to Abraham's wish to constitute Ishmael, and Isaac's wish to constitute Esau, the heir; but ἱλαρότης is chosen with regard to Esau's fruitless running home from hunting (Theophylact thought that it refers to his running to the hunt)." For Paul, by his ἱλαρότης, draws his conclusion only from God's declaration promulgated to Moses." But, by this declaration to Moses, Paul proves that God was not unjust to Esau; that is, that God, acting in harmony with the application of that declaration to Judaism, does not now do any in justice to one who relies on righteousness by works. The willing and running are not rejected in themselves, but are elsewhere required according to the Divine will (1 Cor. ix. 24. Meyer even denies the running in this passage from the races, which ill suits the connection); it is only not recognized as the causality of the line of development. The causality is God's grace (the ἱλαρότης must here be defined correspondingly to the preceding distinction of ἱλαρότης and ἱλιαρότης).

[Paul obviously draws an inference from ver. 15, with ἱλαρότης. The question is, How general is that inference? The verse is certainly general in form; any limitation must be found in the proceeding context, or in the scope of the Apostle's argument. To limit it to Esau, as an instance of God's method, is, in fact, to extend it, since Esau was not of the chosen people; and what God said to Moses, the head of the chosen people, could not be applicable to him, unless it was of general validity. To limit it to the Jewish people, because they are under discussion in this part of the Epistle, is forbidden by the fact that the instances or illustrations are outside that people (Esau, Pharaoh). The only safe view is, that the word to Moses is a Divine axiom, and this an inference of universal application and validity. It will not interfere with human means in salvation; for, if true, it applies to willing and running in general, and yet it stops no volition and its accompanying muscular exertion. That side of the matter is not under consideration. Aldor: "At present the Apostle is employed wholly in asserting the divine Sovereignty, the glorious vision of which it ill becomes us to distract by continual downward looks on this earth. It is most true that the immediate subject is the national rejection of the Jews; but we must consent to hold our reason in abeyance, if we do not recognize the inference, that the sovereign power and free election, here proved to belong to God, extend to every exercise of His mercy—whether temporal or spiritual, whether in Providence or in grace, whether national or individual. It is in parts of Scripture like this that we must be especially careful not to fall short of what is written—not to allow of any compromise of the plain and awful words of God's Spirit, for the sake of a caution which He himself does not teach us."—R.]

The antithesis of the consistency of free Divine grace, as experienced by Moses, is the consistency of Divine judgment as revealed in the case of Pharaoh.

Ver. 17. For the Scripture saith unto Phara-oh. The γάρ announces the proof which arises from the uniformity of the same Divine dealing in its rejection. The Scripture saith, is a metonymy for God saith according to the testimony of Scrip-true. But the metonymy brings out prominently the fact that this declaration of God is not merely temporary and isolated, but has the force of a per manent scriptural declaration, which is applicable to...
all analogous cases. The scriptural statement itself is in Exod. ix. 16.

[Even for this very purpose have I raised thee up, *ei c^v t^v t^v ^v^n^v^v^v^v S^v*]. For the original Hebrew and LXX., here altered, see Textual Note *—R.*] If we look at the connection, Paul's translation, *v^v^n^v^v^v^v S^v,* corresponds in sense to the original text, *^v^n^v^v^v^v S^v,* just as well as the *d^r^v^r^v^r^r^p^r [LXX.]* does, only it is more specific; from which consideration Meyer again educates a difference between the original sense of the Hebrew text and Paul's meaning. After the judgment of ruin and boils and blains (the fifth and sixth plagues) on Egypt, we read, as before: "The Lord hardened the heart of Pharaoh," after it had already been said (Exod. viii. 15, 32): "Pharaoh hardened his heart;" and Moses must solemnly declare God's message to Pharaoh, which, according to the translation of Zunz, is as follows: "For I would already have stretched out my hand, and would have smitten thee and thy people with pestilence, so that thou wouldst be cut off from the earth. Yet I have allowed thee to exist on purpose to show thee my strength, and that my name may be extolled throughout all the earth." Evidently the translation allow to exist (also in Sider), is as much an evocation of the eanul *^v^n^v^v^v^v* as that of the LXX. is, and probably the cause in this case is also the same hesitation in accepting the full strength of the thought.

The expression is chiefly used of positive setting up (for example, of statues), and then also of arousing, awaking; and even the weaker meaning of allowing to exist has still the sense of a positive support. According to Meyer, Paul makes the Scripture say: "I have awakened thee;" that is, allowed thee to appear, to stand forth; why whole historical appearance has therefore been effected by me," &c. This interpretation introduces a hard, fatalistic sense into the text; and though Meyer presents a series of expositors as saying the same thing, this proves incorrect in the case of the very first one, Theophylact, who says: *t^v ko^v h^v^v^v^v^v S^v^v.* Bengel: *^v^n^v^v^v*; *omnia locis omnino praeposuit subjectum iam ante productum.* Philippi's explanation is: "I have awakened thee to being, let thee exist." Calvin's interpretation is strongest: *Deus Pharaonem a se profectum dixit, aequale hanc imperatissimae aeternitatis*.

The explanation: *vivum te servavi* (Grotius, Wolf, and others), at all events weakens the force; but it is not incorrect, since it follows from the connection: "I might have already destroyed thee, but, on the contrary, I have once more fully raised thee up." The interpretation, "I have raised thee up to opposition," (Augustine, De Wette [Haldane, Hodge: have placed and continued thee as my adversary, Alford: pro dire fect, excitavit, Stuart: have roused thee.—R.], and others), has one feature of the context in its favor, namely, the circumstance that the word, according to the following expression, ought to be used synonymously with this *v^v^n^v^v^v^v S^v.* For, according to the sense, this idea is also comprised in the Apostle's translation, *v^v^n^v^v^v^v S^v,* although this sense does not follow directly. He also presents no antithesis to the declaration: I could have cut thee off; the sense is rather: I have, so to speak, once more erected and raised thee up in thy hardened conduct from the judgment of death to which thou wast already subject, that I might show my power, &c.—To the more forcible construction of the Apostle there also corresponds the *v^v^n^v^v^v^v^v T^v^v* to *v^v^v T^v^v^v^v^v^v* of the LXX. [It is perhaps to be expected, that in the somewhat wide scope afforded to interpreters by the text of the Hebrew, and LXX., both Paul and his opponents will largely determine the view of each. But Paul has chosen the stronger term, and uses it to establish a strong position (ver. 18., introduced by the inferential *^v^v^v^v^v^v*). Hence, while we must utterly reject, both on lexical and theological grounds, the extreme supralaparian view: *God created thee—I., e., as a hardened sinner; the view of Lange, and many modern interpreters, is too weak—is out of keeping both with the original translation and the use he has made of it. The view of Meyer (and also substantially of Theophylact, Boza, Calvin, Bengel, Reiche, Olshausen, Tholuck, Philippi, De Wette, Hofmann, Schaff, and many others) is perhaps most tenable, and is certainly accordant with the original passage. The objection that it is fatalistic, is an objection of too wide scope. Olshausen: "it by no means follows from this high view of the subject, that St. Paul intends to say that God has made Pharaoh evil by any positive operation; but he only means that God permitted that evil person, who of his own free will resisted all those rich workings of grace which were communicated in rich measure even to him, to come into manifestation at that time, and under these circumstances, in such a form that the very evil which was in him should serve for the furtherance of the kingdom of The Good and the glory of God."

So Schaff: "All events of history, even all wicked deeds, stand under the guidance of God, without whose will not a hair falls from our heads, much less is a world-historical fact accomplished. God does not cause the evil, but He bends and guides it to His glory."—A too definite, and too weak view, though a modification of the correct one, is that of Flatt, Benecke, Glöckler, and Wordsworth: *placed thee as king.—R.]* That I might show in thee my power, and that my name might be declared throughout all the earth. This is a strengthening generalization of the purpose, namely, that God will make Pharaoh, precisely in his opposition, a monument of His power (His majestic power), by allowing him to perish. Pharaoh, the hardened one, will only experience His crushing power and become a monument of it; but in the world, the glory of His name revealing itself in Pharaoh's case will be declared to Israel (see the Song of Moses, Exod. xiv.).

Ver. 18. Therefore on whom he will he hath mercy, and whom he will he hardeneth [^v^v^v^v^v^v ^v^v^v^v^v^v ^v^v^v^v^v^v ^v^v^v^v^v^v ^v^v^v^v^v^v ^v^v^v^v^v^v. This passage, if taken out of its connection, seems to declare an absolute predetermination in the supralaparian sense. Meyer, with others, protests against any mitigation of the sense: "Paul's simple and clear meaning is, that it depends upon God's free authority either to bless by His saving mercy, or to remove to that spiritual state in which one cannot be a subject of His saving grace, but only of His *T^v^v.*"

Of the two modes of view each of which, according to him, forbid the other—"that Pharaoh in part produces his own hardness himself (Exod. viii. 15, 32; ix. 34), and that in part seems to be wrought by God (Exod. iv. 21; vii. 8, &c.)—he makes the Apostle expressly follow the latter. [Meyer is perhaps unnecessarily harsh in his view, but he intimates that it suits the purpose of
the Apostle better to choose this aspect of the hardening, as this Pharaoh, hardened by God, is to him a type of the Jew resisting the gospel. — R.

3. The whole of the Immediate result of this fearfully significant expression is, that God, in His freedom, has mercy on Moses to the utmost, and has, to the utmost, led Pharaoh to judgment; that Moses can thereby make no fust claim on the ground of the righteousness of works, and that Pharaoh can protest against nothing that he might regard as injudicial done to him. In this way the justifiable use of the passage quoted by Paul is determined. [The freedom of God seems to be the main thought. The reference to the righteousness of works seems needless. Meyer concludes his exegesis of the passage thus: "Undoubtedly the will of God is just and holy, but it is not conceived and presented here from this point of view, but in its independence of all human will and purpose, consequently in its simple self-origination (Aseitath); which means is to be preserved in the clear sharpness of δὴ δίκαιον ἀσείτητον." The words certainly favor this view; we need but guard against inferences, which are drawn, not by the Apostle, but by imperfect human logic, — R.]

**Third Proof: God's freedom in the actual call to salvation (vers. 19–29).**

A. The proof from the real relation (vers. 19–24).

Tholuck regards this section as the collective carrying out of the thought, that the excluded one can bring no complaint against God, because he is left free in his conduct, &c.; but Meyer, on the contrary, regards vers. 19–21 as the third part of the theology: "Man is not entitled to reply against God by saying, 'Why doth He yet find fault?' His relation to God is as that of the thing formed to him that formed it, or of the vessel to the potter, who has power over the clay, of the same lump to make one vessel unto honor and another unto dishonor." Then he regards vers. 22–29 as the fourth part of the theology: "God has endured with much long-suffering the vessels of wrath fitted to destruction, in order to make known His glory on the vessels of mercy, even us Christians, whom He hath called, not of the Jews only, but also of the Gentiles." We make the following distinction: In the first case, in vers. 6–13, the question was the freedom of God's election in antithesis to the human, and especially to the theocratic, right of inheritance. Then, in vers. 14–19, the question was, the freedom of God's ordinance in antithesis to the claims of human righteousness by works (since even Moses himself, the lawyer, did not merit mercy by the works of the law, and Pharaoh was visited by the judgment of hardening, instead of by the judgment of destruction which he had merited). The Apostle now passes over to God's freedom in His call.

Whatever be the division adopted, or distinction...
dons made, there can be no doubt, that the objection the Apostle here raises and answers is one which arises at once against the freedom of God's will, viz., that it destroys our responsibility. As this was more likely to have been an inference (οὐ, ver. 19, which seems to have troubled the translators, however) from what precedes, there is the greater ground for holding that the preceding verses refer to God's sovereignty, considered in the light of an objection (ver 14), and that this paragraph presents it in opposition to another (ver. 19). At all events, whatever limitations and special applications he made, the reader now deals with the passage (and subject) in this more general reference, and most commentators have felt obliged to treat it thus.—R."

Ver. 19. Thou wilt say then unto me [ἐγοίτοις μοι οὖν]. The conclusion which the Apostle allows the Jew to draw from the assumption that he has derived mercy and hardness from God's will, has been urged by thousands against Calvin's predestinarian system; and, indeed, they have done it with much better ground than the Jew could object to Paul's doctrine; yet they have also in many ways mistaken the infinite importance of the exercise of Divine authority in human guidance, if the whole development of man is only an absolute Divine decree, the objection in ver. 19 says: Why then doth he yet find fault? [ἐγείρης ἐτι μισθεὶς; See Textual Note ]. How, then, can God find fault with man, or rebuke him for being a sinner? By doing so, He would even contradict himself. The expression μισθεὶς seems to be purposely chosen to bring out the authoritative character in the finding fault, of which the question cannot be a really objective relation to guilt. Tholuck: "Neither the charge against Pharaoh (Justin Martyr), nor that of the ungodly in the prophets (Zwingli, and others), is meant, but the rebuke of hardening brought against the Jews. Every penal declaration of revelation in general is meant, in so far as it would not be authorized by the doctrine of fate. The Jew does not here have in mind God himself, but that presupposition of the idea of God which Paul seems to present. But he nevertheless betrays the inclination of the one who relies upon the righteousness of works to find fault with God. [In so far as one holds that notion of God, however derived, which in any way allows the possibility of His being the author of evil in man, this objection will arise. It cannot be confined to the Jew and his legal righteousness. (Meyer, De Wette, make the objection general, while Philippi finds in the sharp answer of ver. 20 a proof that the objector is a Jew.—R.)]

"[For who resistent his will? Τῷ γὰρ βοηλησάται αἰτοῦ τις ἀνθρώπης; Meyer renders βοηλησάω, which Paul uses only here, das Gewollte—i. e., captum consiliwm. It obviously implies deliberation, as βοηλησάω does, when properly distinguished from ὑλο. —R.] The obvious implication, as βοηλησάω does, when properly distinguished from ὑλο. —R.]. Tholuck: "The act of deliberation has the present meaning, yet the form seems to indicate also the thought that God has adversely anticipated every attempt of human opposition. The Apostle does not hasten to refute the charge directly, by urging the truth of the relations of guilt, because this charge is based upon such a one-sided standpoint from the overrating of human action, that this human boasting must first of all be prostrated. Chap. iii. 5 ff. proves that he can also reply to a similar charge by an answer which brings out the ethical relations in harmony with the connection. But the first task presented to him here is, to go back with the quarrelsome Jew resting upon the righteousness of his works, to the absolute dependence of man on God."

Ver. 20. Nay but O man [οὐκ ἀνθρωπίνοις, μετατομήν ]. We translate the μετατομή with Tholuck: Much more; Meyer construes it as irony: "Yes, indeed, O man." Its most probable use is to strengthen the thought: "Just the opposite, O man, &c. Thou sayest that God disputes with thee, and thou rather, in thy erroneous claims of right, darest to dispute with God." [Still better, Alford: "Yes, rather, taking the ground from under the previous assertion, and superseding it by another; implying that it has a certain show of truth, but that the proper view of the matter is yet to be stated. It thus conveys an intimation of rebuke; here with severity." Comp. chap. x. 18. Hodge: "Gross as is this perversion of the Apostle's doctrine on the part of the objector, Paul at first rebukes the spirit in which it is made, before he shows it to be unfounded."—R.] The αὐθομίνοι expresses already man's complete dependence on God; and this is increased by the τι, τί, who art thou [quantumus, Meyer].

[That repliest against God, ὁ αὐτόπορος· τι σχοτῆμα τῷ Θεῷ.]. According to Theodore of Mopsuestia, Jerome, and others, Paul, in using the αὐτόπορος, refutes his opponent by referring him to his own words. His opponent replies against God, and therefore opposes God, in the very moment in which he maintains that He cannot be opposed. In that case, indeed, μισθεῖς. This interpretation is ingenious, but too refined, and is opposed by the following words.

"Shall the thing formed say to him that formed it, Why didst thou make me thus? [Μὴ ἐγείρης τὸ πλασμα τῷ πλασματι, Τί μὴ ἐπιθυμήσης οὗτος; An echo of, but scarcely a quotation from, Isa. xxix. 16, though the first clause is found word for word in the LXX. —R.] The expression τριτον τὸν τριτον (Grotes, and others) is evasive. The tertium comparationis is the causality of him that forms, but here as the causality of the form. [It must be observed that even a pressing of the figure cannot make πλασμα mean the thing created; the reference is not to original creation, but to the subsequent ethical moulding, from which, of course, must be excluded the mystery of universal sin referred to in chap. v. 12. That enters into the nature of the "clay" and the "lump" alike. Against Gläckler's argumentatio minores adajus: "If a thing moulded cannot thus speak, much less a man," &c., see Meyer in loco.—R."

Ver. 21. Hath not the potter power over the clay [ὁ θεὸς γὰρ ἀνθρωπον ὡς νυμφαῖον αὐτοῦ, ἐπιδιδόμενο τῷ πηλῷ.]. The order indicates the two emphatic thoughts: 1. That the human subjects under discussion are "clay"; "his clay," would be a proper rendering. 2. That God has power; the definition of that power is given in the next clause —R.]. Tholuck: "The potter's clay regarded by infralapsarianism as the massa jam perdita. The vessels are not considered, as is observed by the L. ord. and Brenz, as naturally part silver and gold, and part dirt, but altogether dirt. Consequently, these expositors prefer the allusion to the Old Testament, Jer. xvii., where a potter had already formed, which God forms into vessels of honour or dis honour according to its own conduct, is spoken of; the su
pralapsarianism, on the contrary, as Thomasius, Estius, Calvin, and Gomarus, decide in favor of an allusion to Isa. xxix. or xliv. Supralapsarianism, to wit, regards the πηλίς as the massa absolute, qualia erat massa angelica, and the πίσιγμα—which means the word of the king as alleged to favor—as the product of the first creation. Tholuck finds in the simile only the sense expressed by Calvin: Nullam dei arbitrio causa superiorem posse adduci, &c. For the harsh expressions of Calvin, the still harsher ones of Zwinglei, and the equally mild ones of Bullinger, see Tholuck, p. 269.

According to Arminians, and others, together with Lutherans, ver. 21 contains only a preliminary rejoinder; the real answer follows in vers. 22, 23. It is indeed a preliminary, but one that "aims rather at striking dumb the objector by a statement of God's undoubted right, against which it does not become us men to murmur," than at unfolding to us the actual state of the case (Alford). Comp. the emphatic order of the words.—R. Besides, Arminians and Socinians have discovered that here Paul does not speak of "an election of individuals, but of classes—of believing Gentiles" (Tholuck).

According to Tholuck, further, the principal question here is, What must we understand by the πηλίς? If we regard the earthly clog as the real clay from which man was made, then the work of Him that formed may be transferred to the creation itself. According to this idea, indeed, the individual man is only "a specimen of the species." But if we regard God's breath as the real substance of man's formation, according to the biblical idea of personality, Calvinistic supralapsarianism is obviated.

[One vessel unto honor, and another unto dishonor, προκειμενον κατ' εσχατον γενεσιν, δια της επομενης. Meyer calls attention to the position of επομενη. Even here, in this strong assertion of "power," the preparation of the vessel for honorable use is emphasized.—R.] But as he that forms does not wantonly destroy his φιγομα, but, according to his own pleasure, makes of it vessels unto honor and unto dishonor—that is, vessels for honorable and vessels for dishonorable use—so also does God's exercise of authority as Maker go no further than to appoint a great difference between honorable and dishonorable vessels of His call, according to the personal conditions which have been established by the call corresponding to the necessity of salvation (2 Tim. ii. 20; 1 Cor. xii. 23). But the Apostle does not carry out his figure in this direction. He rather urges, only for a moment, the figure that God has the ἔσωσι, the free and full power, which is at the same time essentially the right, to make of the φιγομα, of His people [or, rather, of all people, as the next verse unto in ver. 20] vessels unto honor; but then, in ver. 22, he turns to say that God has never made full use of this right; but that He has even endured with much long-suffering the vessels of wrath which He found before Him, His object being to make known the riches of His glory on the vessels of mercy. In ver. 23 there is thus repeated the thought of the sentence awarded Pharaoh.

Preliminary note on the connection of vers. 22, 23. But how now? If God—notwithstanding His perfect power and His ready will to show forth His wrath and demonstrate His power—has just as much adhered to himself as formerly, when He suspended the judgment of destruction on Pharaoh, by enduring with much long-suffering the vessels of wrath fitted to destruction, that He might make known the riches of His glory on the vessels of mercy, which He had afore prepared unto δεσμα—how does the case stand with the complaint that He makes an unrighteous use of His power? It is evident that the thought is presented here which is elaborated in chap. xi. In God's exercise of authority, judgment, and long-suffering are united. His judgments are interpositions of long-suffering. In this sense God rules freely in His call, just as He has ruled freely in His election and ordination. With the explanation of the divine economy of the call, in vers. 21-24, the Apostle has also now pointed (in ver. 20) the charge that God is represented as an unrighteous God. He has therefore now proved the righteousness of divine ordination, vers. 15-18, from the righteousness of the divine call in ver. 20; just as he had already proved the righteousness of divine election (vers. 9-13) from the righteousness of divine ordination. The proof of the freedom of election lies in the fact that God is still free also in His ordination, and the proof of the freedom of His ordination lies in the fact that He is still free in His call.

But God's manner of using His freedom in these three stages testifies to the righteousness of His dealings.
1. His exclusion of Ishmael, gives an ethical character to the whole series of God's acts of freedom.
2. His hatred of Esau is only relative; it denotes the infinite difference between the two, by making the first-born theologically subject to the younger.
3. It is plain, to one acquainted with the Scriptures, that God's hardening of Pharaoh resulted from Pharaoh's having hardened himself; and besides this, there is connected with this the additional fact that, even though Pharaoh was ripe for the judgment of destruction, God makes the useless man still useful by allowing him to exist longer, and by raising him up, in order, through him, to declare His power and His mercy. With the same consistency, He goes so far on the side of His exercise of mercy toward Moses, whose fidelity is well known to Israel, that He can reveal to him His glory, though it is in only a qualified manner.

4. He finally stood with the formative power of His call to salvation over the φίλαρμα of Israel prepared in the Old Testament, and could exercise His freedom by immediately allowing a Christianity to come from it, by virtue of which the whole φίλαρμα crumbled into vessels of honor and dishonor, if peradventure He allowed new wine to be poured into the old bottles, or the new clot to be sewed into the old garment. But then it came to pass that another antithesis was prepared in the Israel of the apostolic age. The representatives of the φίλαρμα (not this merely) living at that time, had already transformed themselves in part into vessels of wrath, fitted to destruction; that is, to be broken to pieces (see Ps. ii.), but not to be worn out as vessels of dishonor; and the blessing of the Old Testament in part exhibited itself in them by their allowing themselves to be prepared by God as vessels of glory. And He was already about to break those vessels of wrath; but as He had once patiently made use of Pharaoh as a means of revealing His majesty and of declaring the glory of His name, so did He now endure in great long-suffering the vessels of wrath; and for this purpose, that their contradiction might be the means for the transference of salvation to the Gentiles, and for making known the riches of His glory on the vessels of His mercy. In brief, the turning-point was this: Instead of a φίλαρμα, which could have been simply used in the antithesis of vessels of honor and dishonor, He found that the developing process of the covenant people of the Old Testament had gone to such an extreme, that the people were divided into vessels of wrath and vessels of mercy, and instead of now making a standing judgment everywhere from the whole substance of the people, He established that economy of saving interposition explained by the Apostle in chaps. x. and xv.

Though Paul has principally allowed only the factors of the divine exercise of authority to appear, the ground for this was, that he had to establish the freedom of God's grace in relation to Judaism. But afterward he shows the righteousness of God in relation to the disbelieve of most Israelites and the faith of the Gentiles.

Meyer remarks, in reference to the idea αὐτοί εἰς τιμίαν: "It shall be either honored, so that it has τιμία (as, for example, a sacred vase); or else it shall experience the opposite, so that αὐτοί adheres to it (as, for example, a vessel designed for a low and filthy use)." According to 2 Tim. ii. 20, the difference in matter comes most prominently into consideration; but as far as the use is concerned, the antithesis of sacred and secular will suffice. Tholuck emphasizes principally the antithesis: hold in honor and in dishonor, but maintains that the simile is not adequate in the very chief point of comparison; the potter woulds the clay, but God is the Creator of the creature, therefore Paresus also speaks of a comparatio a mineri ad morbus. Yet it is incorrectly assumed here that the creation is spoken of.

The passage undoubtedly cited by Paul, Isa. xxxix. 16, refers to a people relying upon the righteousness of their works (ver. 13), on whom judgment is about to be visited (ver. 14), because they claim a false independence toward God in return for their service, as if God was related to them as an equal—as if the potter were equal with the clay, and the clay could say: "He has not made me," or, "He does not understand the matter." Besides, the vessels unto honor and unto dishonor must by no means be identified with the vessels of wrath and of mercy, which error has been committed by De Wette, Tholuck, Meyer, and others.

Ver 22. But what if God, although willing to show, &c. Εἰ δὲ Θεὸν ὄρθις, κ.λ. [See Textual Note] The question as to what should be supplied with εἰ δέ, is discussed below. Meyer suggests: "Wilt thou still venture this replying against God?" (ver. 20).—R.] Two opposite explanations here present themselves: because God would, and although God would. The sense in the former case would be this: the μακροθυμία was also designed to enhance the penal judgment (De Wette, Rückert, [Calvin], and most commentators). But this cannot be the purpose of the μακροθυμία. Though the result is, that the judgment is enhanced (chap. ii. 4) by the abuse of the μακροθυμία, yet this abuse must by no means be referred to the μακροθυμία. The translation although God would, adopted by Fritzsche, Philipp, and Meyer, is therefore preferable. [It may be added in favor of this view, that it gives to Θεὸν the meaning of willing—i.e., spontaneous will. It was the will of God, growing out of His character, to show His wrath, &c., but He endured notwithstanding, &c. The other view takes the particle in the sense of purposing, which is too strong. The passage then presents another answer to the objection of injustice, by showing how the sovereign God had withheld the exercise of a power in accordance with His holy will. The position of Θεὸν, as Meyer remarks, prepares the way for the strong contrast with long-suffering. And if we look for in the glory of God, parallels in Pharaoh's history, the meaning becomes more definite: although, and since already; as God was already about to do. In Exod. ix. 16, God said to Pharaoh: "For now I will stretch out my hand." Likewise the oristos ἐνδικασθαι, γνωρίσαι, indicate this readiness of judgment, not less than the expression αὐτοῖς ζωήν, and especially αὐτοῖς προσελθεῖν. The expression: ἐνδικασθαι τὸν ἐργασίαν τοῦ ἔργου τῆς ἐργασίας of the passage in conjunction with the foregoing, forcibly calls to mind the declaration to Pharaoh.

Endured [ὑπομενών]. Chrysostom, De Wette, and others, have referred this to the long-forgiving with Pharaoh; but Meyer, on the other hand, is of the opinion that Paul means the previous time in general (which shall thus continue under this divine

* [It is more of an echo than a citation; hence there cannot be much stress laid upon the words of Isa. xxxix. Certainly Paul, who is one of the freest generalizers from the Scripture texts he refers to, must not be limited here, where he has introduced such a variety of passims into his discussion.—R.]

† [Πάντα δέ σωματίκα, what was possible for Ημῶν, what He was in a condition to do. Comp. comp. viii. 3 Meyer.—B.]
forbearance until the second coming of Christ). But it is evident from the connection, that the Apostle means the hardened portion of the Israelitish people. This is the view of Tholuck, with others: "The unbelieving Jews at Christ's time; there can only be a mere allusion to Pharao." For other views, see Tholuck.

The whole passage in vers. 22, 23 has occasioned very great difficulty. The principal difficulty lies in the fact that it is not fully carried out; that is, that it is an apophasis. Augustine [so Stuart] observed this, and supplied a "alii in" from ver. 20; but the better supplement would be: "nul aliius papa toto Statu; me ignoro in ver. 14; but the best of all would be chap. xi. 35.

The second difficulty lies in the brief expression καὶ ἐνα, which, as once comes clear by bringing over once more the ἀντίκειται; has also endured in order. For the different attempts at construction, see Tholuck (p. 536).

1. Καὶ γνωρίσαι, καὶ ἐνα γνωρίας: the καὶ—καὶ just as well—as also (Nosselt, Baumgarten-Crusius). Tholuck says, on the contrary, that in that case it must read ἀναφερώ ὑπ'.

2. Our own construction. The καὶ ἐνα is connected with ἀναφερώ, so that the latter expresses a double purpose (cf. Tholuck, Calvin, Grotius, Windy, Meyer, and others). Tholuck does not regard the connection by the mere καὶ as sufficient, and thinks, with Baumgarten-Crusius, that this construction does not present any clear thought. But the previous formation of this clear thought is already contained in Exod. ix. 15, 16.

3. Beza, Rückert, and Fritzsche, have connected καὶ ἐνα to the participial κατηρτισμένα: "those who are originally (?) appointed to destruction, for the purpose," &c. The καὶ would thus be epektevtical, which is Calvin's view of the thought; but the κατηρτισμένα is totally misconstrued. Tholuck proceeds, with Philippi, from the unwarranted supposition, that the Apostle is expected to uniformly God's dealings in relation to the σοιγει ἐς ἀπόλιων and to the ἐς τάρην; he requires to the accordingly, the consecration of a double ana-salvation. "Neither for the Apostle must have written," &c. Philippi interprets similarly. (See Meyer, etc. 380, 4th ed., on the contrary. On the constructions of Hofmann, Bengel, Schöttgen, and Beck, see Tholuck, p. 532 &c.

With much long-suffering [ἐν πολλῇ μεγαθραφίᾳ] On the obscurity of the idea of μεγαθραφία in Calvin, Hofmann, and others (as only meaning waiting for), see Tholuck, p. 536.

*The more general reference is to be preferred, and, in any case, it is implied; for all ante-Christian history must be viewed as long-suffering forebearance in preparation for the great revelation of God. Comp. all the more modern conceptions of ancient history.—R."

[Stuart agrees substantially with this view, but prefers to supply "was this my part", this ἀναφερώ, ἀναφερώ of, or rather supplies ἀναφερώ, which is not only objectionable on the ground he states himself, but unsuitable, if the sense be: although willing. Stuart takes a somewhat different view of the syntax of the passage, and paraphrases the whole: "If God, in order that He might exhibit His primitive justice and sovereign power, endures with much long-suffering the wickedness of the impotent and rebellious whole; if God, in order that He might exhibit His rich grace toward the subjects of His mercy whom He has prepared for glory, and make them all Gentiles as well as Jews; who act thus," &c. This gives a stronger meaning to ἀναφερώ, and is not so justifiable grammatically as the view of Meyer and Lange.—R.]
that are related to each other as chain and clasp.*

The poet knew something more of the matter than many theologians, when he wrote: "This is the very curse of evil deed," &c.; if provided the curse is not taken as a mere phrase.

Ver. 23. And that he might make known the riches, &c. [kai ἵνα γνωσίσῃ τὸν παλαιότατον, &c.] As intimated above, this clause should be compared with (Winer; p. 630) with endured. Kail, also. This was a second purpose of God's endurance, undoubtedly the more important one. ἵνα is of course telic.—Τῇ δόξῃ αὐτοῦ.

The divine majesty in its beneficent glory. Bengel: Bonitatis, gratiae, misericordiae, sapientiae, omnipotentiae.—[R.] The riches of glory form the antithesis to another miserable train of development which Christianity could conceivably have taken within the Jewish nationality. The riches of glory are the train of development which God has actually taken, the course of the unlimited universality of evangelization, to the wonderful blessing of which, in the connection version of the Gentiles, the Apostle ever reveres with rapt adoration (chap. x. 11; Eph. iii. 5-10; Col. i. 6, 20 ff.).

According to Calvin, the παλαιότατος τῆς δόξης should be so regarded that by the interitus improborum as localisit in divina bonitatis, erga electos ampliude should be strengthened. According to the explanation of the Remonstrants, the liberalitas of God should be made known on the vessels of mercy, by the comparison of this mercy with the patient endurance with the vessels of wrath. According to Fritzsche, the purpose of sparing the Jews was, that many of them might be converted before the second coming of Christ. But this overlooks ver. 24, according to which the vessels of mercy are only partly among the Jews.† Meyer must also here mix up the second coming of Christ, which he everywhere brings in, just as Dr. Baur does Clemens Romans. "If, namely, God had not so patiently endured the σωτηρία ὑπόλοιπος, but had already permitted his judgment to be inflicted upon them (which must be regarded together with the second coming), he would have had no period to declare His glory to σωτηρία ἔλοις." That is, the final judgment, as the end of the period of mercy, would have been preceded by the personal judgment of Israel. The destruction of Jerusalem has certainly become a type of the end of the world, but not the end of the world itself. The Apostle presents us with an excellent exegesis of his own language, in chap. xi. 11, 26; Acts xiii. 46; and also in other passages.

[On vessels of mercy, ἐπὶ σωτηρία ἔλοις. Not to (De Wette), but toward, with regard to, depending on παλαιότατον (Allford). The making known is represented as by the proposition as stretching itself over the men who are its objects (Meyer). The latter is preferable. We have no right to limit the "vessels of mercy" to any period. The preceding context would extend the reference to the times of Pharaoh; ver. 24 extends it indefinitely into the Christian dispensation.—[R.]

Which he before prepared for glory [ἐν προόρισται εἰς δόξαν. The verb is aorist, and refers to a definite past act. The two meanings suggested by Hodge: (1) predestined; (2) prepared by providence and grace (also that of Olshausen), are both objectionable, (1) Because it is not the proper meaning of the word; (2) because this is a continued work, and would be indicated by the perfect, as was the "fitted" of ver. 22. It probably refers to the actual constitution of the individual, as clay in the hands of the potter, the result of election, yet distinct from it. —There is no necessity for limiting δόξα to "the glory of the new covenant." Its antithesis, "destruction," shows that it means the full and eternal glory of the kingdom of heaven.—[R.] Tholuck translates, "which he had prepared unto glory from eternity," and remarks thereon, that from the circumstance that the καταρτισμὸν does not have the πρὸ before it, it follows that Paul could have thought only of a decretum electionis, but not probationis. [So Schaff.] Tholuck cites, in favor of this explanation, Eph. ii. 10; Matt. xxiv. 24; Book of Wisdom viii. 8.

We must remark, in relation to the middle passage, that the expression: Βασιλία προορισματικὴ ἀπὸ καταρτισμὸς κόσμων must not be confounded with πρὸ καταρτισμοῦ κόσμου. From the foundation of the world, through all time, God has labored for the preparation of the βασιλια. The thought, God has chosen us before the foundation of the world, is also totally different from the inflexible thought, that He prepared us for glory before the foundation of the world. The two other passages are equally unconvincing. Meyer explains, more correctly, thus: God formed the σωτηρία ἔλοις therefor beforehand, before He declared His glory on them. But the general statement has also its historical relation on this side. As the true children of faith among the Jews came out from the pedagogical exclusion under the law (Gal. iii. 29), they could find themselves as prepared for the glory of the new covenant, and the preparatory mercy had operated in this direction on even many of the Gentiles (chap. xii. 14, 15). The παλαιότατος τῆς δόξης came over them like the rising of a spiritual sun—ἐπὶ σωτηρία ἔλοις, the vessels which were subjects of mercy—and went far beyond them in the evangelization of the Gentile world (see Isa. ix. 2). The paraphrase of Meyer (ver. 22, 23) is appended, as it seems to us, as a conclusion, for the most part supported in the notes above. "But if God, notwithstanding His holy will leads Him, not to allow His anger and His power to remain unproven, but to make it known in act, has yet, with great long-suffering, endured such as were objects of His wrath, and spared them the destruction, into which they are, however, fitted and prepared to fall, as a vessel from the potter—endured and spared not merely as a proof of such great love, but as bearing toward them, during the continuance of this forbearance, the fullness of His glorious perfection upon such as are objects of His mercy, whom He had before prepared, as a potter a vessel, and enabled for eternal glory."—[R.]
Ver. 24. As such he also called us, &c. [οὖν καὶ κατάληψις ᾨρακ, κ.κ. Οὐς, of which kind, quales (Alford).] As such vessels of mercy, he also, besides preparing, called us. He prepared us among these vessels of mercy, and, as such, has also called us, Jews and Gentiles. Stuart would supply here ἀπέδοσα, He showed mercy to us; but this is unnecessary in our view of the passage.

—R.] We have already brought out the meaning of the κατάληψις in this passage. It denotes the fundamental thought of vers. 21-23, God's freedom in the economy of His call. Even us whom, namely, even such vessels of mercy; or they, even whom. That is, in this characteristic He has also called us (not us also) as vessels of mercy. Because He had in mind only objects of mercy, but not the probable legitimate heirs, He could, consistently with His mercy, conformably to His preparatory mercy, really call us.

Not from among the Jews only, but also from among the Gentiles. [Εἰς, from among. Bengel notes the reference to the call of the Jew as: "Non e ipso vocatus, quod Judaicus est, sed ex Judaeis." Hodge: "How naturally does the Apostle here turn to the main subject of discussion! How skillfully is the conclusion brought out at which he has continually aimed!"—R.]

3. The third proof; [προφετον, ἀναφορῆς των Ἐκκλησιων των Παλαιων (vers. 25-29).]

Ver. 25. As he saith also in Hosea 11:1 [καὶ εἶναι, κ.κ. See Textual Note 2], for the Hebrew text. Alford suggests, very properly, that καὶ εἶναι implies "that the matter in hand was not that directly professed in the citation, but one analogous to it." See below.—R.] The call of believing Gentiles is not only a New Testament fact, but is also attested previously in the Old Testament.—In Hosea; that is, in the Book of Hosea. The first quotation is Hosea ii. 23: "And I will say to them which were not my people (see Hosea i. 9), Thou art my people; and they shall say, Thou art my God." Paul has changed the ἐγὼ of the original text and the LXX. into καλισσω, which, according to Fritzsche and Meyer, should mean, I will call. Tholuck, on the contrary, properly observes that the ancient manner of measuring God's call has also left out the addition, irrelevant in this connection: "And they shall say, Thou art my God!" while, on the other hand, he has, in conformity with the sense, correctly supplied the clause καὶ του ὅν ἐν γιατρὶ ἡγήσατο, κ.κ., in harmony with Hosea i. 6, referred to Hosea ii. 23.*

Ver. 26. And it shall come to pass, that in the place. [See Textual Note 2.] In order to understand the whole argumentative force of this citation, we must, like the Apostle, connect the second citation, Hosea ii. 1 (LXX. i. 10), with the first (and this is simply an exegeis according to the analogy of Scripture, as we frequently find in Paul). The Apostle, designating to emphasize the word ὅραζε, brings it out once more in his conclusion: ἔνα ηλιομέτρεως, κ.κ. Hitzig explains the expression: ἐν τῇ πλευρᾷ, by instead of. According to Meyer, the prophet meant by this expression the locality of the Gentiles, the Gentile lands; but Paul understood by it, Palestine. That the expression denotes the stay of the Jews in the Gentile world, is proved by Hosea i. 11: "Then shall the children of Judah and the children of Israel be gathered together, and appoint themselves one head, and they shall come up out of the land." It is just on this point that the weight of the proof rests. The call will be published to them among the Gentiles, therefore among the "no-people," among whom they themselves are scattered as "no-people."* According to Meyer, Paul finds the demonstrative force of the two passages in the fact, that he perceives the mercy shown to the ten tribes as a type of the reception of the Gentiles to salvation. According to Tholuck, his proof rests upon the hermeneutics of the Jewish exposition. This "was accustomed to refer biblical declarations, according to the law of ideal analogy, to such subjects also as were comprehended in the same category" (see p. 541).* It must be assumed that the decision: "not my people," has placed the Jews among the Gentiles, and that the decision: Lo-Ruhamah, has adjudged them to be a very intractable people even among the Gentiles themselves. If, now, the call to salvation is published to this not my people, in the midst of the Jews, then it has a creative, original meaning; it is not published to Israel as God's people, but it creates for itself a people of God from the mixed "no-people" of the Jews and of the Gentiles. According to the typical construction, De Wette has referred the τόπος to the ideal state or divine kingdom, and Fritzsche to theŭs Κτιστήματος. Yet, according to the connection, this locality means the equalization of Jews and Gentiles in one common need of mercy.

Ver. 27. and Isaiah cries also concerning Israel, though the number of the children of Israel be as the sand of the sea, a remnant shall be saved. [Vers. 27 and 28 contain a quotation from Isa. x. 22, 23; the verses being varied differently, however. The original reference was undoubtedly to the return from Babylon. Here, however, the emphasis is laid on remnant, mainly with reference to the call of the Gentiles, though perhaps not without a secondary reference to the future salvation of Israel.—See note on chap. xi.—R.] That the question in the foregoing was the call of the Gentiles (the Jews, of course, included, in so far as they have sunk into heathenism), and not the call of the Jewish people, as Hofmann holds, is proved by the verse which now follows—a quotation from Isa. x. 22, nearly according to the LXX. The Apostle here emphasizes the remnant, as he has emphasized the Gentile land in the foregoing passage. Only a remnant of Israel, * The reference is undoubtedly to the symbolic name given by the prophet to a son and daughter (chap. i. 6, 9): Lo-Ruhamah (not having obtained mercy). In order of birth; the latter stands first, as well as in the passage cited. This is natural, as visible deprivation of mercy precedes visible rejection as a people. The Apostle inverts the order, however, perhaps because the prominent thought for his purpose was: not my people.—R.]

* [So Hodge, Stuart, substantially. For a discussion of Paul's use of Old Testament events and citations, the reader is referred to Lange's Com. Gal. pp. 113 ff., 120 ff.—R.]
the original ἀνάκτωσις: will return, be converted, by σάρκινας, in the sense of will be saved, though in a more restricted sense than Paul intends. The term remnant is of all the more weight, as it stands in contrast with the declaration, "though thy people Israel be as the sand of the sea." Similar passages: Isa. lxxv. 8, 9; Mal. iii. 2; iv. 1. The saying, καθεύδεις, describes the hold declaration of a truth very offensive to the people.

Ver. 28. "For he is finishing the word, and cutting it short in righteousness; because a short word will the Lord make upon the earth. Λόγον γὰρ συντίμων καὶ συντίμων ἐν δικαιοσύνῃ, ὅτι λόγῳ συντίμωμον ποιήσει κύριος ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς. See Textual Notes 24, 29, 54. Lange renders: For He who consummates the reckoning, is also he who limits it in righteousness. Yes, a restrained word will the Lord carry out on the earth. Against this view, see below."

Zunz translates the following words of the same quotation, γράφεις γάρ καὶ συντίμων ἐν δικαιοσύνῃ, ὅτι λόγῳ συντίμωμον κύριος ποιήσει ἐν τῇ ιδιόκτησιν δελ. Paul follows this in the main, with the exception of the last words. It may now be asked, Has the LXX. translated incorrectly, and has Paul incorrectly quoted from it, under the supposition that this translation corresponds better to his purpose? (see Tholuck, pp. 642 ff.) έξερχεται means, first of all, completion, consummation, and conveys the idea of settlement (see the LXX., 1 Mac. x. 40, 42, 44). Accordingly, γράφεις also means the judgment of destruction in the sense of settlement. Now the LXX. translates the first clause thus: "He who has completed the settlement (the same as the final judgement) is the same who limits it, cuts it short in righteousness; so that a remnant can be left from the destruction." We read the καὶ συντίμων as a conclusion with ἐν τῇ, and understand by righteousness, not penal righteousness, but righteous restraint in punishing; according to the saving purpose of righteousness, in the highest glory does not consist in irrationally rigorous. This translation is undoubtedly exegetical. First, it takes over Adonai, the subject of the following clause, in order to bring back the definition of the first clause to the defining clause. Then it does not explain the περιλήπτωμα as a higher degree of the first term γράφεις, but, antithetically, as a mitigation, which is even already indicated in the γένος. This exegesis will be perceived from the sense, also, to be altogether correct. Destruction is defined as settlement, but therewith also cut short; overruling (restraining itself) with righteous mildness, deliverance. The word περιλήπτωμα frequently has the sense of mildness, of righteousness, as fitness in its saving effect. The verb περιλήπτωμα is here transitive. See Gesenius, Lexicon, On συντίμων, see the Lexicon. This translation is further in harmony with the connection which gives prominence to precisely this thought, that a remnant shall be saved from the decreed judgment. The shortened days," in Matt. xxiv. 22, denote the same thing. See the Commentary on Matthew [Amer. ed. pp. 425, 426].

The second clause changes the maxim of divine government declared in the first clause, according to which, judgment always brings a deliverance, into a declaration; here the word of the LXX. is explained of itself by the foregoing: for the Lord will effect a shortened, that is, a moderated settlement in the whole world, or, as Paul says in a more general way, the earth, there seems to be no support for the συντίμωμον is the original text. But the nippal participle γράφεις, like the substantive γενος, does not by any means denote in turn, like περιλήπτωμα, the penal judgment in itself, but the definiteness and fixed limitation of the penal judgment. Thus the word γενος after ἐξερχεται, in Isa. xxvii. 26, evidently serves to express the limitation of the present passage; for example, from the translation in Ps. 79: 23-29. (Ver. 28: He will not ever be thrashing it.) Therefore the Vulgate properly translates consummationem et abbreviacionem aedificii; according to the Septuagint, συντίμωμα καὶ συντίμωμα ποιήσεις ἐν χίουμα. Camp, also Dan. ix. 27; xl. 36. From this it follows that in the γενος, in the first member of Paul's citation, there is comprised not merely the close, but also the limiting conclusion of the judgment of destruction.

According to Meyer (and Fritzsche), the LXX. exhibits an ignorance of the passage, yet Paul found the sense of the translation suited to his purpose. In consequence of a defective construction, the word λόγος has been differently explained: purpose; fact; dictum. According to Meyer, the λόγον συντίμωμα signifies the shortest possible consumption of the λόγος. Tholuck: "The Lord will execute an exactly defined declaration." (On the usual opinions on Paul's quotations, see Tholuck's Note on p. 544.) See also the account of the different explications of the passage, for example, the pathetic one of Chrysostom, Augustine, and others, that λόγος συντίμωμα is the gospel as an abridged doctrine of salvation, in antithesis to the elaborateness of the Old Testament. Luther's translation of the present passage is very inexact; but it is ver. 27, is not upon the salvation of the remnant, but upon the fact that only a remnant will be saved. Nor does the remoter context favor such a mitigated view. It is not in accordance with the passage cited from Hosea, see with ver. 24, still less with ver. 20-23, 25.

* I add to this the words of Scripture, which says: (see ver. 28) "He will not ever be thrashing it." Therefore the Vulgate properly translates consummationem et abbreviationem aedificii; according to the Septuagint, συντίμωμα καὶ συντίμωμα ποιήσεις ἐν χίουμα. Camp, also Dan. ix. 27; xl. 36. From this it follows that in the γενος, in the first member of Paul's citation, there is comprised not merely the close, but also the limiting conclusion of the judgment of destruction.
more in harmony with the sense than the more recent explanations.  

(1.) Critically, the text is in doubt. See Textual Note \(^9\), where the longer reading of the Rec. is accepted (against such careful critics as Lachmann, Alford, Tregelles).  

(2.) The LXX. seems to have departed from the sense of the Hebrew original. Paul varies from the former, but not materially; thus endorsing what is deemed by many an incorrect rendering of the Word of God. Out of this grows the difficult exegetical problem of getting the sense of the Hebrew out of the Greek words (which seems to be Dr. Lange’s endeavor), or the equally difficult solution of the strange fact, that an apostle would choose such an altered version of the Hebrew.  

(3.) This state of things has encouraged expositors in departing almost at pleasure from the obvious meaning of Paul’s words, while it has not led them to adopt the obvious meaning of the words of the prophet. Dr. Lange has chosen an ingenious interpretation, with a view of discovering in the passage a declaration of forbearance on the part of God. It is open to lexical objections (see below), and is not in accordance with the context; since the only verse which intimates a kindred thought is ver. 22, while the immediate connection is rendering the opposite thought of very prominent.  

The only method which seems fair in dealing with any author when he quotes, is to take it for granted that he quotes wittingly, and then to interpret his citation, making the original passage, especially when used through the medium of a translation, entirely subordinate. The interpretation then becomes a simple exegetical question. What, then, does Paul say here, as his view of the meaning of the prophet’s words?  

(a.) Αὐτός, word, saying. It does not mean work (E. V.). Many render: decree. Doubtless this idea underlies the passage, and is found in the Hebrew, but the Greek word never means this. It is better, then, to render word (i.e., of promise or threatening, probably both—threatening to the mass of the people, promise to the remnant). This is the view of many of the best modern commentators, although they differ regarding the verb. The verb (only here in the New Testament) means to cut short, to finish rapidly. It obviously refers to the rapid accomplishment of what God has said. It seems, then, altogether unnecessary to find in the rapid accomplishment of what God says, an indication of something different from what He says,—i.e., that this quick fulfillment of wrath is an exhibition of mercy to those who are its objects. This is Lange’s position. Admitting that “righteousness” includes God’s mercy to the chosen remnant, that does not imply “mitigation of judgment” to the apostate mass. Nor is it necessary to find a different meaning for the word in the second clause, though such a variation can be justified. We render, therefore: is cutting short, and cut short, supplying ως (with the present participles; Meyer, and others).  

(b.) Συνεκαθημένος, συνεκαθημένων. The verb (only here in the New Testament) means to cut short, to finish rapidly. It obviously refers to the rapid accomplishment of what God has said. It seems, then, altogether unnecessary to find in the rapid accomplishment of what God says, an indication of something different from what He says,—i.e., that this quick fulfillment of wrath is an exhibition of mercy to those who are its objects. This is Lange’s position. Admitting that “righteousness” includes God’s mercy to the chosen remnant, that does not imply “mitigation of judgment” to the apostate mass. Nor is it necessary to find a different meaning for the word in the second clause, though such a variation can be justified. We render, therefore: is cutting short, and cut short, supplying ως (with the present participles; Meyer, and others).  

(c.) Εἰς διακοσμήσιν is referred most naturally to the judicial justice of God, which punishes, in order to save the remnant. The former thought is the prominent one, as we infer both from the context here, and from the original. The sense of the whole verse then is: He (i.e., the Lord) is finishing and cutting short the word (making it a fact by rapid accomplishment) in righteousness, for a cut short word (one rapidly accomplished) will the Lord make (execute, render actual) upon the earth. This is, in the main, Meyer’s rendering. While the original reference was to the Jews in the times of Isaiah, the Apostle makes the prophecy of more general validity, referring it to the sad fact that most of the Jews were cut off (so Hodge), though including the other fact, that the remnant should be saved, both sides supporting the general thought of the chapter. Dr. Lange at last comes to nearly the same view. The question then arises, Is this at all in keeping with the words of the prophet himself? A comparison will show that it preserves the spirit of Isaiah’s language most fully, and actually conveys to the reader’s mind a clearer sense than a literal rendering of the Hebrew would do. Hence he used the LXX., and (as all authors do) inserted such important words as would make its language conform to the use for which he designed it.—R.]  

The prophet has uttered a twofold truth in the quotation; first, that only a remnant will be left from the great judgment of destruction, but then that this remnant shall be preserved in security. The Apostle, in vers. 27 and 28, has brought into prominence this first feature, but without altogether excluding the second. This latter is proved by the remaining part of his citation.  

Ver. 29. And, as Isaiah hath said, or prophesied (Isa. i. 9), etc. [καὶ, καθὼς προφητεύειν ἑαυτεῖς, κ. τ. λ. We give the pointing of Meyer (a comma after καὶ). The meaning then is: And, as Isaiah has already said (so I appropriate his words), Except, etc. See below, however. If it be objected, that this gives to the verb the unusual sense of prophesy, it will be seen that this is not the necessary meaning of has already said. The introduction of καθὼς calls for some such paraphrase, and the προφητεύειν seems to refer to the time of the Apostle, rather than to the place of the last citation. Besides, the propriety of a direct adoption by the Apostle appears both from the use of the first person, and the quasi-prophetic character of the application Paul makes of the passage here.—R.]  

The explanation: he has already said, namely, in an earlier chapter (Erasmus, Calvin, Grotius, and others), is opposed by Tielck, and others, with the remark, that such a reference to earlier passages is without an analogy in the Apostle’s constant quotation memoriter. Against this explanation, at all events, is the Apostle’s design of returning to the subject of the destruction of Israel, and to the consideration of believing Israel; so that he seems to consume his prophecies in this declaration chiefly as a typical prophecy. But that passage is immediately more than a description of an existing condition; it is a vision of an immeasurable ruin extending to the future, as the passage, Isa. vi. 9;
comp. Matt. xiii. 15; John xii. 39 ff.; Acts xxviii. 26, 27; 2 Cor. iii. 11, xiv. 11. It may be asked, whether we would read γινόμενον καθά τόν Ισαάκ. Ἡσ. &c.: It stands thus, as Isaiah has prophesied; or: And—as Isaiah has prophesied—Except, &c. Meyer defends the latter construction; but we prefer the former, because the Apostle designates to adduce this quoted expression, like the former and the following one, as an expressive prophetic declaration. The term σιγήμα means the xerox of the word, as well as its external smallness as in its inward importance for the future. The Septuagint has translated the γινόμενον of the original text by σιγήμα.* Compare Isa. lxv. 8.

Fourth Proof: The correspondence between God's freedom in His government with the freedom of men in their faith or unbelief. The stability of the fact that the Gentiles believe, and Israel, in its popular totality, does not believe (vers. 30-35). Meyer says, on this section: "The Jews themselves bear the guilt of their own exclusion, because they esteemed it not by faith, but by works of righteousness, for they were offended at Christ." [A new chapter should begin here. For, having already stated the objective, Divine ground of the rejection of the Jews, Paul now passes to the subjective or human cause, hinted at frequently before, viz., their unbelief. They were rejected by God, because, in spite of the many warnings of their prophets, they sought their own righteousness, springing from an external view of the law, and were offended at the promised Messiah, when He actually appeared, instead of seeking salvation through vital faith in the grace of God in Christ. This mode of view, which is carried out further in chap. x., solves in part the enigma of the preceding discussion; yet it cannot be denied that, in the Divine predetermination, there ever remains an obscure background, which reason is not in a condition to fully comprehend, and should humbly adore.—P. S.]

Ver. 30. What shall we say then? [Τι ὁ λόγος; Precisely as in ver. 14, where it introduces an objection.—R.] We may ask, whether the Apostle again uses this expression here in order to avoid a false conclusion, or whether he merely "deduces the historical result from the foregoing prophecies" (Meyer). Evidently, this passage is a turning-point of the greatest importance. The Apostle has heretofore described God's freedom, and finally His freedom even in rejecting the greater part of Israel in contrast to His call of the Gentiles, and has strengthened his declaration by appealing to the prophecy of the Old Testament. This is now the place where the question arises: From all this, does there not follow fascism, or a simple absolute authority of Divine freedom? He does not absolutely express this false conclusion, in order to make short work of it by a γεγονός, because he has really anticipated it already. But he actually removes it. The Gentiles have not first attained to salvation from an exercise of absolute authority; they have attained to righteousness, the righteousness of faith, which can only be obtained from the source of righteousness.

Some expositors (Pelagius, Cyril, Theodore of Mopoeostia, Flatt, Osihausen) have not understood the expression from Ων to τροπαίαν as an answer, but as the real import and continuation of the pending question, under different modifications (for as because, that, somehow that). This is opposed to the following: 1. The statement in vers. 30 and 31 can by no means be regarded as a summary of the foregoing; 2. It has not been at all present as yet in this definite deduction of the antithesis. It contains something new, which only arises as a conclusion from what has preceded. Chrysostom says that this passage is the σύγκροτημά τούτων of the chapter. Baur, and others: The Apostle here first becomes conscious of the subjective point of view. Tholuck, correcting this view, says, that the Apostle here first brings it out to prominence. On the discussions of the Predestinarians and the Remonstrants concerning the Προσακοσμησθείσα, see Tholuck, p. 546.

That the Gentiles. Ἐφέσοντες, not merely Gentiles. [Against Meyer, who says: "Not the Gentiles as a whole. On the Gentile side was righteousness," &c.—R.]

Who were not following after righteousness, attained. Τα μὴ δικαιοσύναι. The Apostle uses the δικαιοσύναι with special reference to the races (see Meyer on Phil. iii. 12, 14), and κατά λαμβάνεις. means not merely the reaching, but also grasping; in this case it is especially the grasping of the prize (see 1 Cor. ix. 34). This constitutes a doubtful antithetical oxymoron. The Gentiles did not run after righteousness, and yet even they grasped righteousness at the goal of the race-course. But the Jews, who ran, or so far as they were runners after the law of righteousness, never reached the proper terminal point of the race—the well-understood law. The Apostle does not design to say that the Gentiles in general had known no higher pursuit; for he has already referred to the Gentiles in his discussion concerning the old dispensation; ἤκοψατο δὲ συνεδρίαι τῶν Ἰουδαίων. But the Gentiles were not only not companions with the Jews in the course in which the latter ran after the law of righteousness; righteousness, as an explicit moral law, was not the fundamental idea of their pursuit (although it constituted the unity of the platonic virtues). The Greek struggled for ideality, or wisdom, while the Roman struggled for an innocent legal order, or for power; and it came that they did not run astray by looking at an analytical phantom of righteousness, like the majority of the Jews; and hence that they could be subjected (that is, for a preliminary condition of faith) to the curse of their ideals, to a profound despair in themselves and in the glory of...
of the world (see chap. iv.; Acts xvi. 9; Rom. ix. 27-30).*

Even the righteousness which is of faith [δικαιοσύνης δί, κτλ.] That is, precisely the true righteousness. On the delicate meaning of δί, see Alford in loco; Winer, p. 412.—[R.]

Ver. 31. But Israel, following after the law of righteousness, attained not to the law ['Ισραήλ δὲ δικαιοσύνην δικαιοσύνης, κτλ.] It is not: the righteousness of the law, but, more strongly: the law of righteousness. This would mean, in the figure of the race, that Israel has by no means advanced so far as to run after righteousness itself; the programme of the race became its goal; in striving after an endless analysis of the law, it has run astray in statutes of external legality. Therefore it has come to pass that it has not reached νομος in its truth—that is, in its literal inward character—and that, after all its running, it has never attained to the true beginning, the principle of the running. This antithesis is in harmony with the subject-matter (see Rom. vii. 7 ff.), and is much stronger than if the Apostle had said: It has not attained to the law of the righteousness of faith, which would be self-evident; or even if he had said: It has not attained to the righteousness of the law according to the letter—which charge he could have brought against them. Therefore we prefer the reading of Cod. B. B. D., given in the text. [The briefer reading is quite well supported, and certainly, when rightly understood, adds to the force of the passage. They did not even attain to the law. Comp. Alford in loco.—R.]

It hardly needs to be called to mind, that the question here is essentially concerning the Gentiles and Israel; that is, concerning the antithesis between the believing Gentile world and unbelieving Israel. This limitation in reference to Israel lies in the δικαιοσύνην νομος.

The law of righteousness. The expression has been regarded by many as an exchange for δικαιοσύνην νομος (Chrysostom, Calvin, Bengel, and others). Undoubtedly this was the basis of the effort of the Jews, but their real following extended, in Pharisaism, far beyond, to the amplification of the law into an endless series of ordinances. The view: The justifying law (Meyer), obscures the strong emphasis of the νομος itself, when this νομος is subsequently explained thus: "The law was an ideal, whose realization the Israelites strove to experience by their legalism." Comp. ch. ii. 17-24.

The theoretical, legal orthodoxy of the Jews was the perfect development of their righteousness of works, according, also, to the Epistle of James.*

No one, except the Chalcedonian (Chrysostom, Theodoret, and others) hold that Paul meant the Mosaic law in both cases in ver. 31. Others, on the contrary (Theodore of Mopsuestia, Bengel, and De Wette [Hodge]), have understood, by the second

law, the Christian δικαιοσύνην. These two constructions are opposed not only by the δικαιοσύνην (Meyer: it does not express the effort to fulfill the law, but to possess the law), but also by the consideration that a true following after the Mosaic law—that is, after its fulfillment—must not only lead to it, but even to Christianity (see chap. vii.). Tholuck (with Calovius, Philippi, and others) takes νομος in the wider sense, as vita, disciplina of righteousness: "They strove for the means which furnished justification." But this striving, construed in a general sense, cannot be regarded as fruitless. The law, in the former case, can only mean their illusive image of the law, according to which the law, in its external shape, should become to them a real means of justification, and would in reality be made this means; * but in the second place, it is the Mosaic law in its truth, and in that inward tendency by which it became the schoolmaster which led them to Christ.

Ver. 32. Wherefore? [διὰ τί] The failure to attain to the law.

Because they sought it not by faith [οὐτί, οὖν ἐκ πίστεως. The E. V. properly supplies sought ὑπό.] As the proper observance of the law leads to saving faith, so does it proceed from a germ of faith, which is shown by Abraham's historical precedence of Moses. Faith is the inward relation of confidence and obedience to God's Word; only the Spirit in the law gives to the legal striving, which is a preparatory school to the gospel, its proper direction.

But as by works [ἀλλ' ὡς ἐκ ἐργα. On ὡς, comp. Winer, p. 573. Alford: "as if about to obtain their object by." See Textual Note 29.—R.] Meyer correctly maintains that the ὡς is not redundant—as Koppe holds—and that it does not indicate hypocrisy, according to Theophylact; but Meyer is incorrect in opposing Fritzsche's construction, presumed works, with this explanation: As a δικαιοσύνη proceeding from works is constituted. His ground is, that the Jews really set out from the works of the law, but not simply from true works (see chap. x. 3). A pointed ἐκ πίστεως must correspond to the pointed ἐκ πίστεως, which former can then be only an ὡς ἐκ ἐργα. In their seeking, they proceeded on the supposition of invading one true Messiah, good works, and they continually piled law upon law, in order to become richer in such works. In short, the starting-point, but not the δικαιοσύνη, should be emphasized as fundamentally false.

For they stumbled [προσκόμισαν γὰρ. On the rendering, should γὰρ be rejected, see Textual Note 30. Meyer, however, opposes this connection, though rejecting γ阿根廷. The figure of a case, if not inconvenient here, seems at least to have suggested the "stumbling."—R.] To what does refer? First of all, it presents the proof that the Jews did not stand in the direction of faith, but in the illusion of the righteousness of works. Then this proves indirectly, also, the principal statement

* [On this thought, see especially Gribechthonth und Christenthum, by D. G. G. Seb. 1867: referred to in the General Introduction. Matthew 2. 6. The author is now pastor in Newark, N. J.—R.]

† [Dr. Hodge seems to prefer the following view: "The word righteousness may be redundant, and Paul may mean to say nothing more than that the Jews sought righteousness, or justification, but did not attain it." This, no doubt, is the substance, though it may not be the precise form of the thought." This is but avoiding an interpretation, and in a way which the learned commentator would deem unjustifiable if applied to less sacred forms than those written by an Apostle.—R.]
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in vers. 30 and 31. But the full strength of the proof lies in the fact that they have come to shame at the touchstone of the true Israelites, which made a distinction between those who trusted (that is, believe) upon the stone laid by Jehovah, and those who stumbled—that is, who were defective in faith because of their presumed righteousness of works.

At that stone of stumbling [τῷ λίθῳ σου προσκόμπατος]. (Isa. viii. 14; xxviii. 16; Luke ii. 34; 1 Cor. i. 28; 1 Peter ii. 6-8.) The Jews, in their hypocrisy, have been offended first of all at the unwieldy spirituality, the penal office, the independence, and the spiritual freedom of Christ (see Matt. iv. 1 ff; John ii. 18; iv. 1; v. 9 ff), and then, in their claim to the reward of universal Messianic glory, at His poor appearance, His renunciation, His love of sinners, and His suffering and death on the cross. In their running, they ran all the more violently against the stone, because they were just then engaged in their strongest running. The Apostle proves that this fact also is represented beforehand in the Old Testament. He here freely connects the passages in Isa. viii. 14; xxviii. 16, into one prophecy, in which he follows the original text in preference to the LXX. According to Isa. viii. 14, Jehovah himself assuredly becomes a stone of stumbling to both houses of Israel; but it is Jehovah who has now concealed His face, in order to declare himself in future to those who patiently wait for Him (see Isa. viii. 17; ix. 7). But that, in chap. xxviii. 16, only the ideal theocracy of the Old Testament sphere is meant, seems very doubtful. The ideal theocracy of the Old Testament is properly defined as the growth of the New Testament kingdom of God. Now, if a corner-stone for this is laid in Zion, it must nevertheless be the foundation of the "ideal theocracy," and not the whole ideal theocracy itself, or even this ideal theocracy apart from its foundation. Likewise, the collective corner-stone in Zion (ver. 16) constitutes a grand antithesis to the Jewish dissolution of God's Word into a ruined diversity (ver. 18), and it stands in connection with the judgment, from which the ἐκκόλοθος appears. Therefore Paul and Peter had a perfect right to regard this passage as more than a typical prophecy. 

Ver. 33. As it is written, Behold, I lay in Zion a stone of stumbling, &c. The "stone of stumbling and rock of offense" (παράδειγμα ἐκ τοῦ οἰκουμένου τοῦ θεοῦ) is taken from Isa. viii. 14, and substituted for the "corner-stone," &c., of chap. xix. 16. Both passages were interpreted by the Jews as referring to the Messiah. Comp. Luke ii. 34; 1 Peter ii. 6-8. The combination is therefore both justifiable and natural.—He who believest on him, καὶ ὁ πιστεῦων ἐπ' αὐτῷ. Πᾶς, which is found in chap. x. 11, is omitted here (see Textual Note 3). The emphasis there is on πᾶς; here, on πιστεύων, in antithesis to ver. 22.—R.

Shall not be put to shame, κατατυπάων ὑπὲρτις. The original word ςς; [make haste; Gesenius: flee hastily.—R.] is here given as an explanation, after the precedence of the Septuagint κατατυπάων, from which Paul varies, as above.

DOCTRINAL AND ETHICAL.

(The Literature on the Doctrinal questions involved in this chapter really includes all works on systematic theology, all confessions since the times of the Reformers, together with a large proportion of modern psycl logical and ethical treatises. The larger commentators, especially those of Hodge, Stuart, Tholuck, Philippi, Meyer, Haldane, Wordsworth, Wordsworth, Hackett, and Forbes, have discussed the thomistic question. The literature of the Armenian conscience (much of which is enumerated in the Homiletical Notes on chap. viii. herein on this subject. (Comp. Introd. p. 51, y. 12-21, p. 191.) We may mention further: 

ACQUETUS, DE LIBERO ARBITRII; ANSELM, DE LIBERO ARBITRII; also, W. D. WEBSTER. The works of Calvin, especially those of the first two and America. The latest monographs, published in America, is by G. S. Bishop (Newburgh, N. Y.), Reproductions (a sermon on ver. 23), New York, 1869.—R.)

1. In regard to the copious and, in many respects, mysterious contents of this chapter, we must refer principally to the Exeg. Notes, where we have anticipated many points. We would also refer to the history of the exposition of this chapter, and especially to the monographs bearing on the subject, mentioned above. The real difficulties which the chapter presents have been greatly increased by attempts at its exegesis. This has occurred, first, in consequence of the little account that has been taken of the connection, the immediate relation of this chapter to Israel, and the judgment of hardening on Israel; and because there has not been an effort made to explain with sufficient clearness, according to the analogy of Scripture, the nature of the judgment of hardening, or sin in its third potency. A second cause of difficulty has been the confusion of the antitheses of the Apostle with the antitheses of the history of doc trines—of Augustine and Pelagius, or Calvin and the Catholic righteousness of works, or even the doctrine of the Remonstrants. A third source of difficulty has been a failure to use aright the key to this chapter in the passage, chap. viii. 29, 30, and a disposition rather to accept a contradiction between Rom. ix. 7-29 and chap. ix. 30-xxi. 38, than to accommodate the former part of the whole section to the latter.

2. In the translation and headings we have already given a connection between the whole of this section and the former chapters. The fundamental thought is, the antithesis of sin and grace in its three potencies.

First antithesis: The actual corruption of the whole world, and therefore no conceivable righteousness of works; in contrast with this is the saving and preponderating righteousness of faith, which is prepared by the heartiness of conduct toward the law, in antithesis to external legality (chap. i. 18-11).

Second antithesis: The corruption of human nature, the hereditary character of liability to sin and of the judgment of death, in which the whole creature-sphere of humanity is subject to vanity and corruption; but Christ as the preponderating principle of the new birth and of the glorification of man, of humanity and its soul, according with the Augustinian antithesis. This principle is operative from the standpoint of a watchful spiritual life, which agitates the old carnal propensity, in order to lead to resurrection a new embryonic life of consecrated corporality, in antithesis to the life in the
liability of the flesh to death, to which the external legality also belongs (chap. v. 12–viii. 39).

Third antithesis: The corruption of the religious people, the noble people of humanity, and of the manifested form of their theocracy, in the judgment of historical hardening, in consequence of their false reliance on natural descent, historical privileges and the righteousness of a practice of legalism. In contrast with this, on the other hand, is the freedom of Divine grace in its election, ordination, and call, which, as election distinguishes persons, as ordination shows mercy and hardens, and as a call makes the judgment of hardening first of all a means for the advancement of the call to salvation, and finally cuts itself short and is turned in another direction by the historical exercise of compassion. On both sides it is conditional, in consequence of the antithesis of pride and humility (chaps. ix–x.)

3. The construction of the chapter. The Apostle's first prologue (vers. 1–5). An apology for his painful duty to pronounce clearly the decisive declaration on the rejection of the majority of Israel; or, if we may so speak, to sum up all the individual experiences and Divine judgments relating to this fall. At the same time, he pronounces an elegy on the fall of his glorious people of God, on the retributive relations, which in him are the outwork of God's antithesis to the realization of the glorious inheritance of God's children (chap. viii.), with the declaration of his patriotic and tragical feeling (increased and become to him a "thorn in the flesh") by its ruin with the direction which the Jews had taken, and by the hatred with which they opposed his love—an analogue to David's elegy on the fall of Jonathan, Jeremiah's Lamentations, and similar laments in the Old Testament. But he finally gives expression also to a doxology in regard to the victorious exercise of the authority of the God of revelation on Israel, as well as in its ancient history as in its New Testament fulfillment in Christ, whose glorification predominates over the division between believing and unbelieving Israel. The theme: The rejection of the majority of the members of the Israelish people is not an abrogation of the promise to the theocratic Israel itself (ver. 6).

First proof (from the time of the patriarchs): The fact of election. The election is not made conditional by descent, nor by heirship, nor by birthright, nor by works; it is God's free exercise of love in the predetermination of an individual and personal nature, which is only self-conditioned by the organic relation to Christ and to each other into which the elect individuals shall enter, and by the possession made to them, in which the thought of love, which shall appear in future conceptions and births, is already reflected. It unites in the relative antithesis (Jacob and Esau) the infinitely great difference in the qualifications of persons for God's kingdom, but not the absolute antithesis of salvation and condemnation (verses 6–13).—The doctrine of the predestination of a part of the human race to eternal perdition by no means follows from the statements of these verses. Even Calvin himself calls the decree of reprobation "horrible" (decretum horribile, atrocimum verum), and it is opposed to those passages of the Scriptures according to which God wills not the death of the sinner, but that he might turn unto Him and live. (1.) The Apostle is not treating here at all of eternal perdition and eternal blessedness, but of a temporal preference and disregard of nations in the gradual historical development of the plan of redemption, which will finally include all (chap. xi. 28, 32), and hence the descend-ants of Esau, who stand figuratively for all the Gentiles (Amos ix. 11, 12; Obad. 18–21). On this account we may well say, with Bengel: "not all Israelites are saved, nor all Edomites lost". (2.) The hate of God toward Esau and his race cannot be misunderstood from their evil life, their obstinacy against God and enmity to His people: It is true, ver. 11 (with, however, ver. 13, does not stand so closely connected as ver. 12) seems to represent not only the love of God, but His hatred as transferred even into the mother's womb. But it must not be forgotten that, to the omniscient One, there is no distinction of time, and all the future is in Him present. Besides, an essential distinction must be made between the relation of God to good and evil, to avoid unscriptural error. God loves the good, because He produces the very good that is in them; and He elects them, not on account of their faith and their holiness, but to faith and holiness. But it cannot be said, on the other hand, that He hates the evil men because He produces the very evil that is in them; for that would be absurd, and destroy His holiness; but He hates them on account of the evil that they do or will do in opposition to His will. While human goodness is the effect of Divine mercy and grace, on the contrary, human wickedness is the cause of Divine hatred and abhorrence; and on that account alone can it be the object of the punitive wrath and condemnatory decree of God. Were evil the effect of His own agency, He would be obliged to condemn himself—which is irrational and blasphemous.—P. S.

Second proof (from the time of the giving of the law): The fact of ordination. The predetermination of the historical train of development of persons is the free exercise of God's (Jehovah's) righteousness on persons. It is not made conditional on a self-willed human willing and running; but it conditions itself by its consequence in relation to a definite human course of conduct, by further showing mercy on him to whom mercy has once been shown, and allowing all his experiences to contribute to his salvation, and, by its influence and long-suffering, leading him to be hardened up to the judgment of hardening. In the infinitely vast antithesis between the one to whom mercy has been shown and the hardened one (Moses and Pharaoh), it constitutes the perspective of the antithesis of a final glorification and rejection, but not yet this antithesis—i. e., the final judgment itself (vers. 14–18).

Third proof (from the time of the development of Israel in the Old Testament): a. The fact of the call. The free exercise of Divine wisdom on the qigasia, or the spiritual, plastic material of the ancient world, and especially on Israel. This exercise is not made conditional on the historical Israel's claims to inheritance, and had the right to make of Israel, as it had become, vessels unto honor and unto dishonor, by a universal Christianization. But the call makes itself conditional by the actual state, in which it still endures with much long-suffering the existing vessels of wrath, which are already fitted to destruction, that, by their existence and opposition, the full display of God's glory, of His spiritual revelation in Christ, may be made known on the vessels of mercy. It thereby constitutes the economic antithesis of hardening in the New Testament, and of the historical judicial curse on the great mass of Israel, and of an opposing im
measurable display of the glory of its exercise of mercy in the Gentile world. But this antithesis, as we shall further perceive, does not preclude the possibility of mercy on individual Jews, and of the rejection of individual Gentiles (verses 19-24).

b. The proof of this freedom of the Divine call from the Old Testament. First, the equalization of Jews and Gentiles in their rejection is prophesied by Hosea (verse 25). Second, the equalization of Gentiles and Jews in the mercy shown to the latter (verse 26). Likewise, Isaiah has prophesied, first, the reduction of the great mass of Israel to a small remnant, who shall be saved from the judgment (verse 27); but second, the certainty that such a remnant shall arise from a judgment cut short by righteous mildness (verses 28, 29).

Fourth proof: The correspondence of the exercise of Divine authority on Jews and Gentiles, with their ethical conduct, or with the antithesis of faith and unbelief. The conclusion from the whole chapter, as drawn by the spirit of the Apostle (verses 30-32), is:

[4. This chapter cannot be fairly explained or properly honored without a recognition of the profound truth which lies at the foundation of the doctrine of election, viz., the free, unconditional grace of God. Those expositors who would limit the sovereignty of the Divine will by human freedom, and decline salvation more or less from the creature, must do great violence to the text if they make it accord with their systems. Yet we must guard against the opposite extreme of supralapsarianism, which, with fearful logical consistency, makes God the author of the fall of Adam, hence of sin; thus really denying both God's holiness and love and man's accountability, to the ultimate extinguishment of all morality. Many, indeed, have held this view, whose lives, by a happy inconsistency, were far better than their theories. They arrived at this extreme position through a one-sided explanation of this passage, and through the logical consequence of their conception of the sovereignty of God's all-determining will. But if we would not have the Bible prove any thing man wishes, we must interpret single passages in their connection with the whole, and according to the analogy of faith. In the early part of this Epistle (chap. i. 18; iii. 80), Paul unequivocally declares that God is not the author, but the enemy and judge of evil; how, then, can he here affirm a specific Divine foreordination of sin and retribution? In chap. v. 12 ff, he shows that redemption through Christ, as to its indwelling power and purpose, is fully as comprehensive as the fall of Adam. With this agree many passages, which speak of God's sincere will to save all men, and of a general call, extended not at once, but gradually, to all (Ezek. xxxii. 11; 1 Tim. ii. 4; Titus ii. 11; 2 Peter iii. 9). Accordingly, Paul must have in mind here such a general repentation, as is either a self-induced result of unbelief, or only a negative preparation for the extension of the plan of salvation, which it therefore ultimately furthers. Besides, in chap. x. the casting away of the Jews is attributed to their own unbelief, hence to the personal guilt of the creature; and in chap. xi. the rejection is represented as temporary. In God's gracious decree, the fall of the Jews redounds to the blessing of the Gentiles, and the conversion of the Gentiles, and to the exaltation of the Jews. So He has permitted the fall of Adam, in order to redeem humanity in Christ, the second Adam (ver. 12 ff); He has included all under disobedience, that He might have mercy upon all (chap. xii. 32; Gal. v. 22). But the salvation can become actual only gradually; and the redemptive accomplishment of all (not all as individuals, but the most in an organic, not a numerical sense) presupposes the temporary rejection of some.

The Scriptures teach, on the one hand, the absolute causality and unconditional grace of God; and, on the other, the moral nature of man, including also his relative freedom and his responsibility (i.e., human personality). They ascribe redemption and salvation, as well as the creation and maintenance of all things, to God alone. He works both to will and to do of His good pleasure (Phil. ii. 13); no man cometh to the Son, except the Father draw him (John vi. 37, 44); without the Son, believers can do nothing (John xv. 5). Not only the beginning, but also the progress and completion of conversion, are attributed to God (Jer. xxxi. 18; Heb. xii. 2; Luke xxii. 28; Eph. iii. 10; 1 Cor. iv. 7; 1 Thess. iii. 5). Hence all believers confess, with Paul: "By the grace of God I am what I am" (1 Cor. x. 13), and ascribe all the honor and glory to the Lord alone (2 Cor. x. 17). Indeed, even evil, as a phenomenon, and according to its material forces, cannot be excluded from the absolute activity of God. He hardens Pharaoh and raises up Nebuchadnezzar; He creates the light and the darkness; He gives peace and effects evil (Isa. xlv. 7); and there is no evil (misfortune) in the city, that the Lord has not done (Amos iii. 9).—On the other hand, however, the Scriptures never treat of man as a mere machine, but as a moral being. They hold up before him, in the Old Testament, laws, with the promise of blessing if he obeys, and the threatening of a curse if he transgresses; they offer him, in the New Testament, the gospel, baptism, faith; bid him, with fear and trembling, work out his own salvation (Phil. ii. 12); present to him the highest moral duties as commands: He ye holy, be ye perfect; and account sin and the rejection of salvation as his own personal fault. "How often would I have gathered you, as a hen gathereth her chickens under her wings, and ye would not" (Matt. xxiii. 27; Luke xviii. 34).]

* [Forbes thus lays down the fundamental truths on this difficult subject:

"All good originates from God.
All evil originates from the creature.
Election originates in the free grace of God.
Reprobation originates in the free-will of man.

To God belongs the whole glory of the salvation of the Elect.
To man belongs the whole responsibility of the ruin of the Reprobate.

See his Dissertation, pp. 380-475.

That these positions are not reconcilable by human logic, is evident from the discussions on the subject; but this cannot, of itself, disprove their truth. It is the old and ever-recurring mystery of the origin of evil. Forbes seeks to prove that these positions are compatible with the doctrinal statements of the Westminster Assembly. Those who wish the sharpest professedly Calvinist views, may find them in Ballyman's "The Westminster Confession." This text is, to a certain extent, of little service to the modern unbeliever, who is inclined to hold, that the position of these books must be considered as the representaives of hyper-Calanvinism, only goes thus far in speaking of the reprobate. Whom God, out of His sovereign, moral, irrevocable and unchangeable good pleasure, hath decreed to leave in the common misery into which they have wilfully plunged themselves, and not to bestow upon them saving faith and the grace of conversion; but permitting them, in His just judgment, to follow their own way, at last for the declaration of His justice, to condemn and punish them forever, not only on account of their unbelief, but also for their
If the first truth respecting the absolute, creative causality of God in the works of creation, redemption, and sanctification be denied, we fall into the Pelagian error, which destroys the very marrow of Christianity, and attributes salvation to the creature; but if the second class of Scripture texts be denied or wrested, we are brought to the brink of the abyss of fatalism or Pantheism; man is degraded into a mere instrument without a will, and his responsibility, guilt, and punishment are abrogated. The task of theology consists, not in the establishment of one of these postulates at the expense of the other, but in reconciling both, and bringing into right relations with each other the infinite and finite causality; in loosing, not in cutting the Gordian knot. This is, indeed, one of the greatest and most difficult problems, which can never be fully solved from the standpoint of earthly knowledge. Only after the accomplished victory over evil can the deep, dark enigma of evil, which forms the main difficulty in the problem, be fully solved.*

For practical and popular use, the following remarks will suffice:

(1.) There is an eternal *predetermination of believ- ers unto holiness and blessedness, and hence they must ascribe all the glory of their redemption, from beginning to end, to the unmerited grace of God alone.

(2.) They do not, however, on this account cease to be free agents, responsible for all their doings; but, as God works in nature not magically and immediately, but through natural laws, so He works in men, through their wills, hence through the mediation of finite causes; and the more that grace is developed within them, so much the more is their free freedom developed; so that perfect holiness and perfect freedom coincide with each other. Accordingly, the highest freedom is the complete triumph over the evil, and is consequently identical with the moral necessity of the good. In this sense, God is free just because He is absolutely holy.

(3.) There is no divine foreordination of sin as *sin, although He has foreseen it from all eternity, and, with respect to redemption, permitted it, while constantly overruling it to His purposes. Hence, those who are lost are lost through their own fault, and must blame their own unbelief, which rejects the means of salvation proffered them by God.

(4.) In the time of the calling of nations and individuals to salvation, God proceedeth according to a plan of eternal wisdom and love, which we cannot fathom here, but should adore in silent reverence.

(5.) The right use of the doctrine of election is the humbling of sinners and the comforting of believers, as well as the increase of their gratitude and happiness. Only a culpable misunderstanding and misuse of it can lead to carnal security and to despair.

(6.) Instead of meditating much upon the profound depths of the Divine decrees, it is better for each to make his own calling and election sure, and, with fear and trembling, to work out his own salvation.—P.S.]

5. The forbearance and confidence with which the Apostle pronounces his opinion on the fall of Israel, his patriotic and truly human pain (2 Cor. xi. 7-9), and his prophetic elevation above it, reaching to sublimity, are characteristics of this wonderful man of God.

6. Israel's glory is revealed in the correspondence of its great actual blessings with its chosen individuals. The line of actual saving blessings enters into reciprocal operation with the personal love of the fathers down to Christ according to the flesh, the climax in which divinity and humanity unite. Its foundation is Israel's adoption, in Abraham, to sonship. On this there is founded, first, the patriarchal antithesis of the δῖα of or of the revealing angel of Jehovah, and of the covenants, in which the evangelical element is properly placed in advance of the legal element, conformably to the character of the patriarchal revealed religion; then comes the antithesis of the Mosaic period, of the gift of the law, and of the services; and here, in conformity with the character of the legal economy, the legal element precedes the evangelical. Both the patriarchal and Mosaic economies then comprise each other, just as the evangelical and legal elements are compared in the promises of the prophetic period. It has already been remarked that, notwithstanding this articulation, each particular of the attributes mentioned is peculiar in a more general sense to the entire theocracy.

7. Careful attention must be paid to the fact that, in the election in vers. 6-13, the communication of the Divine decrees proceeds the birth of the children. But, on the other hand, in the ordinance in vers. 14-18, it applies to characters already existing—Moses and Pharaoh—in accordance with the direction which they have taken themselves. In the call in vers. 19-24, this communication finally follows the state of the case already existing: Vessels of wrath, vessels of mercy. From the whole of this section, chaps. ix-xi., it follows that the decrees underlying these communications belong also to eternity. But they belong to eternity as decrees which are pronounced upon individuals of fact, as God universally conditions himself in the measures which He adopts in reference to persons to be determined or already determined, and their personal relations. The decree of election (or of love) takes cognizance of no other condition than that the single individual must be defined according to the organism of the members of God's kingdom in Christ.
The decree of ordination (or of righteousness) is conditioned by the fact that individuals, in their free self-determination, need, both for themselves and for their relation to the whole body, their historical destination and special guidance. The decree of the call (or of wisdom) is conditioned by the fact that it makes the judgments pronounced on unbelief itself means for subserving the promotion of faith. The distinction of the elder theology, decretum praedestinationis, decretum gratiae, decretum justifications, has confused election and ordination—which has generally been the case from Augustine's time down to the present. This distinction has likewise overlooked the fact that the decretum gratiae constitutes the very centre of the decretum praedestinationis (Christ ὑποτελεύτας, Acts x. 42; Rom. i. 4). The decretum justifications is most intimately connected with the decree respecting the vocation.

8. We have elsewhere brought out the truth, that the wonderful flower of the biblical doctrine of election, like the aloe, has been long concealed, yet with its character determined, in the sharp thistle of the ecclesiastical doctrine of predestina tion; and that it is a duty of our day to acquire, with its full idea, the whole depth and glory of the biblical doctrine of personality; but not to seek to weaken and render indifferent, by the old Lutheran or Arminian Reformed definitions, the solution of an enigma to whose real solution every living distinct of individuals contributes, more than a scholastic hatching of confessional antitheses can do. In this respect, Lavater's Physiognomy may be regarded as an explanatory enlargement upon Calvin and Zwinglei. The mystery of predestina tion, like that of the atomism, is one of the other Christian mysteries, rejected in the midst of life.

9. Ver. 1. The intimate proximity of salvation and sorrow (chap. vii. 39; ix. 1) in the Apostle's state of mind, as in our Lord's state of mind.

10. Ver. 3. For more particular information on the ban, see Tholuck, p. 472. [See also Exegeta on Anathema, p. 302.—R.]

11. Ver. 3. Pentecost is a tragic feeling, subject to the dominion and kingdom of Christ, and thereby glorified to the intercessory feeling.—On the Shekinah (doza), see the note in Tholuck, p. 477.

12. On the divinity of Christ, and the relevant passages of the New Testament in which He is in part called really God, and in part appears to be so called (John i. 16; xvi. 28; 1 John v. 20; Acts xx. 28; the present passage, ver. 5; Rom. xvi. 27; Eph. v. 8; 1 Tim. iii. 16; 2 Tim. iv. 18; Titus ii. 13; 1 Peter iv. 11; 2 Peter iii. 18; Rev. v. 13), comp. Tholuck, p. 482. My Positio Dogm., p. 160 fl.

13. Biblical doxologies: Rom. i. 25; ix. 5; xlii. 36; xvi. 27, &c.; 2 Tim. iv. 18: 1 Peter iv. 11; 2 Peter iii. 19, and others.

14. Ver. 6. Not all are Israel which are of Israel. This applies also to every nation, to every confession, to every Christian community, just as it applies in general to the branches of the mystical vine, Christ (John xv. 2).

15. The children of the flesh and the children of promise. See the Commentary on John, i. 13. [Comp. Galatians, pp. 119, 133.—R.]

16. On the theological discussions with reference to the doctrine of predestination in the present section, see Tholuck, pp. 490—506, and below.

17. Ver. 15. On the idea of consistency in the name of Jehovah, as well in His having composition as in judging, see the Exeg. Notes. It is in harmony with the righteousness of Jehovah's exercise of authority, that even the judgment of death redounds to the life of the sincere and compassionate Pharaoh; while the gospel, on the other hand, is a sorer of death unto death to the perverse and unbelieving. But the consistency of Jehovah does not lie in His carrying out the abstract decrees of His own will, inflexibly and in an exact direction, but in His remaining like himself, and therefore in His even assuming a different position in relation to the changed positions of man; yet this is, of course, in harmony with the consistency of the principles established and realized by Him. Therefore, there is propriety in speaking of a Divine repentance—for example, in the history of the Flood. The position of mankind toward God has become so thoroughly perverted, that the Creator must become the Destroyer. Comp. Ps. xviii. 24—27.

18. On the Egyptians' remembrance of the Pharaoh under whom Israel went forth, see the article Egypt, by Lepsius, in Herzog's Theol. Enzyk., and Tholuck, p. 516. On the hardenings of Pharaoh which are especially pronounced, see chap. vii. 16. Since the judgment of hardness is here declared collectively, the passage does not decide on the succession of the particular ones. The same applies to chap. vii. 3. Then the particular historical ones follow. First, Pharaoh is hardened by the counteraction of the magicians (chap. vii. 13, 22). A significant illustration of the free volition of Pharaoh in the latter case; see chap. vii. 23. In chap. viii. 16 we read: "Pharaoh hardened his heart, and hearkened not unto them." And now his heart becomes hardened, even in spite of the warning of the terrific magicians; chap. viii. 19. Again, in chap. viii. 32: "And Pharaoh hardened his heart." We read the same thing in chap. ix. 7. But in chap. ix. 12 we read: "And the Lord hardened the heart of Pharaoh." In chap. ix. 24, on the other hand, we again meet with self-hardening, which is then designated as a judgment; ver. 35. Ver. 37: "And the Lord hardened Pharaoh's heart." The same occurs in chap. xi. 10; xiv. 8. As regards this whole series of particulars, the atomistic exegesis of earlier times led to its being regarded as fatalistic. But we must, in the first place, distinguish the prophetic declarations of the judgment of hardening as general views of the whole course of events, from the historical particulars. As for the historical particulars, we must always be very careful to notice that the hardening is not a single act, but a long succession of acts, which succeed momentary shocks and apparent awakenings. But the periods of hardening themselves are divided into three particular acts: 1. Pharaoh is hardened by the magicians; 2. He hardens himself; 3. The Lord hardens him. We must further consider, that he always hardens himself just as soon as he has recovered a little from the penal judgments, but the series of his expressions of penitence must be regarded as arising particularly from fear (advertisio, non contrito). Pharaoh's starting-point is the defiant question: Who is the Lord? chap. v. 2. Then he requires a miraculous proof; chap. vii. 7—10. He does not take the first plague to heart, because the magicians do likewise; chap. vii. 22, 23. The first shock and its characteristic expression; chap. viii. 8. Similar emotion; ver. 28. The first confession of man; chap. ix. 27, 28. The second confession; chap. x. 16. It is characteristic that Pharaoh pays least attention to
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The plagues that least affect him and his house. This may be seen in the first and third plagues; but he observes with more attention, on the other hand, the second and fourth, which rest heavily upon himself. He does not trouble himself about the mur- rain; the boils and blains seem to spare him personally. The thunder and hail, on the contrary, terrify him; the locusts also, but the darkness less. Finally, the death of the first-born at the decisive moment breaks the tyrant's defiance, yet without being able to convert him. And it is out of this wonderful net- work of human offences and Divine judgments that a ponderous fatalistic decree has been contrived. Meyer quite gratuitously opposes Olshausen's explanation, that the hardening assumes at the outset the already existing beginnings of evil. The ἤ δὲ δὲις does not oppose it, for God can let man die before his hardening. Meyer, also, does not favor Calovius' definition of hardening, that God does not harden man η μὴραγίας, but 1. συγχωρητικός, proper per- mission; 2. ἀναπτυσσόμενοι, occasional; 3. ἱερατικός, 4. παραδοτικός.

19. Just as Pharaoh hardened himself more and more at Moses' deeds of faith, so was Moses always advanced and strengthened in faith by the trials of faith which were prepared for him by Pharaoh's hardenings—that is, by the apparent failure of his miraculous deeds. This is a fundamental law of God's kingdom. The kingdom of darkness displays itself in its reciprocal action with the kingdom of light, but the latter is also displayed in its reciprocal action with the former.

20. Tholuck's explanation on having compassion and hardening, p. 533, harmonizes with the old Lutheran dogmatism. Meyer's resumé, p. 510. [Pages 390 ff., 4th edition. Justice to this author, whose clear and acute exegetical notes have been so freely used by Dr. Lange, as well as in the additions, requires the insertion of a larger portion of his theological resumé than is given in the original.

The contents of chap. ix. 9-23, as they have presented themselves purely exegetically, and taken in and of themselves, of course exclude the idea of a decree of God conditioned by human, moral spontaneity; for indeed God's absolute activity, considered in itself as such, cannot depend on that of the individual; but a fatalistic determinism, which robs man of his self-determination and free self-positing for salvation, making him the passive object of Divine arbitrariness, must not be deduced from our passage as a Pauline doctrine. For this reason, that this passage is not to be considered separately from what follows (vers. 30 ff.; x. 11), and also because the valueless exportation of the Apostle to believing obedience, to steadfastness and Christian virtue, as well as all his warnings against falling from grace, are so many witnesses against that dreary view which annuls the nature of human morality and responsi- bility. Should we, with Reiche, Köllner, Fritzsch, and Krehl, suppose that Paul, in his dialectic zeal, had permitted himself to be hurried into self-contra- diction, we would have a self-contradiction so manifest, yet so extremely important and dangerous in a religious and ethical respect, so opposed to the Christian moral ideas of Divine holiness and hu- man freedom, that it were least of all to be expected of this Apostle, whose acuteness and dialectic skill could guard him against it on the one hand, while especially, on the other, his apostolic illumina- tion and the depth and clearness of his moral expe- rience must guard him against it. "But this by no means justifies the interlining of the clear and definite expressions of the Apostle in our passage, on the part of anti-predeterminism from Origen and Chrysostom until now, to the effect that the moral self-determination and spontaneity of man is the correlative factor to the Divins decree. The correct judgment of the deterministic propositions (vers. 15-23) lies rather between the psychologically and morally impossible admission of a self-contradiction, and the exegetically impossible interpolation in this way, of thoughts the direct opposite of the Apostle's expression. How there can be the concurrence, so necessary in the moral world, of the individual freedom and spontaneity of man and the absolute self-determination and all-efficiency of God, is incomprehensible to human reflection, at least so long as it does not desert the sphere of Christian view, and pass into the unscriptural, pantheistic sphere of Identity, in which, indeed, there is no place for free- dom in general." Whenever, of the two truths: 'God is absolutely free and all-efficient,' and 'man has individual freedom, and is also on his side, in his own self-determination as free agent, the cause of his salvation or misery,' we handle the truth, and that one consistently, and hence, one-sidedly, we are com- piled to speak as if the other seems to be invalidated by our reasoning. But only seems; for, in fact, there is in this case only a temporary and conscious abstraction with respect to the other." Paul, then, found himself in this case. For he wished to pre- sent, in opposition to the fancy of the Jews respecting descent and works, the free and absolute al- mightiness of the Divine will and work, and all the more decidedly and exclusively the less he would leave any ground for the presumptuous error of the Jews, that God must be gracious to them. The Apostle has here placed himself entirely on the abso- lute standpoint of the theory of God's pure independ- ence, and that, too, with all the boldness of clear consistency; but only until he has done justice to that polemic purpose. Then he returns (vers. 30 ff.) from that abstraction to the humane-moral stand- point of practice, so that he has, in effect, a view, side by side, that right which they have within the limits of human thought. The view which lies beyond these limits, the metaphysical rela- tion of the essential connection of the two points, viz., objectively Divine and subjectively human free- dom and voluntary activity, was necessarily without and beyond his present circuit of view. He would have had no occasion either to enter upon this prob- lem, since it was incumbent upon him to defeat the Jewish presumption with but one side of this— the absoluteness of God. That, or how far the Di-vine election is no delectus militaris, but finds its norm immanently in God himself through His holl- ness, and thus may be conditioned by moral condi- tions on the human side, remains for the present entirely out of the account. It enters, however, with vers. 30, in which the one-sided method of con- sideration, followed for a time, is again compensated for, and the ground afforded for a time for apolo-
getic purposes, to the doctrine of absolute decrees, is again withdrawn."—R.

He opposes those who have charged the Apostle with a self-contradiction—determination and freedom (Reliche, Köllner, Fritzsche, &c.); but he himself thinks that the metaphysical relation of unity between the all-prevailing efficiency of God and man's freedom is incomprehensible by Christian reflection, and that, therefore, we can only speak of the oneness considered in itself alone, in such a way that the other seems to be removed by our reasoning. But this is not the case if we speak either of human freedom or of God's free grace in a proper way. The former assumes dependence on God; the latter requires faith. Though God's all-efficiency is not conditional on man, yet it conditions itself as the personal exercise of authority in relation to man, so soon as he is determined by election, according to the stage of development in which man is. It may also be said that the one decree of God is explained, according to chap. vii. 29, 30, in five decrees, and these are reciprocally conditional.

If the decree of election were an absolute determination of salvation and condemnation, there would be no peculiar decree of ordination or historical predetermination; God would no more be free to say to Moses, "I will have mercy on whom I will have mercy," but if the decree of ordination were absolute, then we could no more speak seriously of a new decree of the call, and still less of a free idea of justification, as well as of glorification. The Divine decree in relation to the final judgment has conditioned itself by the nature of all the preceding decrees. And only in this way does God remain a free God, while, on the other hand, we would make of an unconditional decree of predestination itself a real divinity, which would have bound the personal God. But it is quite in harmony with the nature of religion, the real relation between God and man, that the truth asserts the majesty of the Divine right against every human arrogation, every irreverent claim against God. The free power of election stands in opposition to the claim of a natural heirship in God's kingdom; the free power of grace, in its historical exercise of authority, opposes the claim to the merit of works; and the free power of the Divine call in the economic relation of God's Kingdom to the world, opposes the claim of man to both. If the point is reached where man will make God conformable to himself, before whom he would present himself independently, yes, one whom he thinks that he can bind by "replying against him, then God himself opposes him in His truth as the God who stands in absolute free power above him, and before whom he is as nothing; or as the saying goes, in the potter's hand. Up to this point the Apostle must have conceded to the Jewish assumptions against God's majesty. The pioneers of the Reformation, but particularly the Reformers themselves, were in a similar situation; ecclesiastical tradition had, in the latter case, taken the place of descent from Abraham; ecclesiastical righteousness of works had taken the place of Levitical righteousness of works; the self-righteous creature began to prescribe laws for his Creator. The Reformers, adhering to the truth, thus reversed the relation: God's sovereignty and grace are overpowering, while the arrogated right and merit of man are nothing. But their arriving in theory—which was really only one chapter in their system—to the negation of human freedom of election (Melanchthon, in his later life, excepted), and their being led into contradiction with their ethical principles, were a tributary of weakness which they had to pay to their indepen-

dence from the Catholic Augustine (strong expressions of Calvin and Zwingle, see Tholuck, p. 525), and in part the false conclusion from a profoundly justified religious feeling. They taught, with good ground, that God's government of the world is a government controlling and pervading all moral events, and that even sin is not merely permitted, but accepted and determined as a fact in God's plan; only they had not yet found—or Sebastian Franck, at their time, and, subsequently, such orthodox teachers in the Church as Breidinger, Vesins, and others—the distinction between sin as a wicked counsel of the heart, that merely appertains to man, and sin as a fact in which inward sin itself is already treated with irony, captured, and judged (see Prov. xvi. 1 ff.). The Apostle himself, on the contrary, has united the doctrine of the absolute judicial power of God with the doctrine of the importance of faith, yet particularly with the declaration that God has delayed His historical judgment in long-suffering, and has made the already existing judgment of hardness a medium of compassion. "—The people, clay in the potter's hand," is a frequently recurring biblical expression. See Tholuck, p. 530; also the Note on p. 533; likewise p. 536.

21. The concatenation of judgment and compassion which appears throughout in the facts of Holy Scripture, as well as in its doctrines, has not been sufficiently comprehended and made use of by the popular ecclesiastical conception; and this is a principal source of its hindrances and imperfections. Righteousness and mercy are regarded as collateral modes of God's revelation. Judgment and compassion absolutely preclude each other. But the Scriptures unite both facts in various ways. First, the reconciliation of men themselves, both collectively and individually, inwardly as well as outwardly, is made conditional on a judgment which separates the old from the new life. Second, the display of redemption and its institutions, the theocracy and of the Church, is conditioned by judicial acts that separate the old from the new states. Third, Judgment, even from the flood downward, separates an old from a new race, and brings to pass the redemption and opposition of the claim and rejection of the former. Even in the final judgment, the consummation of heaven is made conditional on the separation of the wicked; Matt. xiii. 48.

22. With the confusion mentioned above, there is also connected the fact that righteousness has ever been too much regarded as the extreme consequence of rigor, but not also in the light of forbearance and mildness. The former idea of righteousness is frequently found to be the Sermon on the Mount (see Matt. v. 1; I John i. 9), and so also in the present chapter, ver. 28. Comp. also chap. iii. 26, p. 138.

23. The full and direct force of the passage in ver. 31 is only reached by accepting the reading preferred by us. The Jew's righteousness of works, as such, was never faithful righteousness of works, but a righteousness of boasting of the practice of statutes, and therefore it was a failure to obey the true

* * *
The Apostle's sorrow for his brethren: 1. A great sorrow, so that he wished to be accursed from Christ for them; 2. A natural sorrow, because they (a.) are his kinsmen according to the flesh; (b.) are Israelites to whom pertaineth the adoption, &c. (vers. 1-5).

An apostolical assurance (vers. 1).—Words only have strength when our conscience bears us witness in the Holy Ghost that we say the truth in Christ (ver. 1).—The witness of our conscience in the Holy Ghost is a witness for us that we say the truth in Christ (ver. 1).—Magnanimous heaviness and magnanimous pain (ver. 2).—The Apostle's readiness to stake the dearest possession for his brethren (ver. 3).—The difference between Israelites and Jews (ver. 4).—What do Israelites possess? 1. The whole of the Old Testament, with all its covenant blessings; 2. The fathers; 3. Through the fathers, Christ, so far as His human descent is concerned, belongs chiefly to them (John iv. 22) (vers. 3-5).

Stark: Cramer: In important matters for God's honor and the advancement of our neighbors' salvation, we may swor (Isa. xix. 18; Jer. xii. 6); but to wantonly affirm a thing before God, is an abuse of God's name (Exod. xx. 7) (vers. 1).—The saints are not stoical blocks of wood (1); therefore we should also weep with those that weep, and rejoice with those that rejoice (ver. 2).—Love has certain degrees, and one may with a good conscience prefer in love his natural friends and blood relations to others (vers. 3).—Novum Bibl. Thib.: Nothing grieves pious men more than the ruin of the ungodly. Particularly a true shepherd can do nothing else than speak of them with sorrow and tears (ver. 2).—Hedinger: This is love! Oh, that we had even a less degree of it! Exod. xxxii. 32.

Gerlach: Calvin beautifully says: "It is not contradictory to this wish of the Apostle, that he knew of a surety that his salvation by God's election could not prove a delusion. For as such a glowing love always burns out more violently, so does it see nothing and care for nothing except its object" (vers. 1-6).

Lisco: The Apostle's sorrow at Israel's unbelief (vers. 1-5).—In Christ every thing was glorified and fulfilled which Israel already had; how important, therefore, it was to believe in Him whom the antitypes had announced, and who brought grace and truth! John i. 16, 17.

Heiwer: Assurance of the Apostle's love for his people (vers. 1-5).—It is only a spirit sanctified by God's grace that can be grieved at the spiritual fall of others. The unconverted man is indifferent to the moral misery of his neighbor. The holiest sorrow is for others (vers. 2).

Bessen: Throughout the Holy Scriptures there is no other passage where, as in the present instance, the most profound darkness of sorrow is in juxtaposition with the brightest sun of joy. Paul has ascended on the wings of faith to the height where he sees the whole kingdom of the world and the devil himself, and, sheltered in the rock-solid love of God in Jesus Christ, he has sung a triumphal song in the upper choir. There he pauses, and as one who is still dwelling in the land of pains and tears, just at this point he discloses to his brethren, first, the profound and concealed sorrow of his life by a solemn assurance of that of which he would have God also condescend (vers. 1).—The sainted Brossel says: "Souls which have made no progress do not comprehend Paul's wish. We should not lightly pronounce judgment upon the measure of love in Moses and Paul. The modicum of our thoughts of love is too small for us to do so; just as a boy does not appreciate the heroic spirit of a general" (vers. 3).—Not Jacobites, but Israelites, wrestlers with God, are called the descendants of the patriarch, who obtained of the Lord a blessing upon his seed, that they might be called after his name, and the names of his fathers Abraham and Isaac (ver. 4).—Eight blessings of God's house united in four pairs (vers. 4, 5).

Birkett: God has placed a conscience in every man, whose office it is to bear witness of all his words and actions; yes, of all his thoughts and inward affections. Conscience is God's register, to record whatever we think, speak, or act; and happy is he whose conscience bears witness for him, and doth not testify against him. Ver. 2. Note: 1. What are the dismal effects and dreadful consequences of obstinate unbelief, under the offers of Christ tendered to persons in and by the dispensation of the gospel, without timely repentance? 2. The true spirit of Christianity is to make men mourn for the sins and calamities of others in a very sensible and affectionate manner. Good men ever have been and are men of tender and compassionate disposition; a stoical apathy, an indifference of heart, a want of natural affection, is so far from being a virtue, or matter of just commendation unto any man, that the deepest sorrow and heaviness of soul in some cases well becomes persons of the greatest piety and wisdom; 3. Great sorrow and continual heaviness of heart for the miseries of others, whether imminent or incumbent, but especially for the sins of others, is an unbroken argument, sign, and evidence of a strong and vehement love toward them.
HENRY: We ought to be in a special manner concerned for the spiritual good of our relations, our brethren and kinsmen. To them we lie under special obligations; and we have more opportunity of doing good to them; and we must, in a special manner, give account concerning them, and our usefulness to them.—Hodge: Fidelity does not require that we should make the truth as offensive as possible. On the contrary, we are bound to endeavor, as Paul did, to alloy all opposing or ministerial feelings in the minds of those whom we address, and to allow the truth, unimpeded by the exhibition of any thing offensive on our part, to do its work upon the heart and conscience.—J. F. H.

Schaaff: Vers. 4, 5. These advantages of Israel, sketched by the Apostle, are at once types and prophecies of the higher blessings, which continue uninterruptedly in the Christian Church, and are enjoyed daily and hourly by all believers. In their lap is the adoption and heirship of eternal life, the continued presence of the Lord in the means of grace, the eternal covenant of grace instead of the successive covenants, the free, life-giving spirit, instead of the killing letter of the law, the worship in spirit and in truth in all places instead of the service confined to Jerusalem, the far more plain and precious promises of the heavenly Canaan and abundant inheritance, the incomputable cloud of witnesses, patriarchs, prophets, apostles, martyrs, and confessors, from all climes and tongues, and, as the sum of all blessings, Jesus Christ, the God-man and Saviour, who is flesh of our flesh, eye, our Brother and Friend, and yet exalted above all, the eternally adored Head of the Church, which He calls “His body, the fulness of Him which filleth all in all.”—R.

Vers. 6-33.

a. Vers. 6-18. Who are the true Israelites? 1. By no means all who are of Israel, or are the seed of Abraham, are children according to the flesh; but rather, 2. The children of promise, whom He has freely chosen according to His purpose (vers. 6-18).—The question of Divine adoption does not depend upon natural descent, but upon the mercy of the call, without the merit of works (vers. 6-18).—God's word (promise) has not failed because many are not Israelites—that is, are not participators in the promise (vers. 6-8).—Neither has God's word failed to us because many who are called evangelical are not evangelical (vers. 6-8).—How Paul, the Apostle of the righteousness of faith, reminds us of John the Baptist, the preacher of repentance! Comp. vers. 6-8 with Matt. iii. 9.—The children of the promise: 1. Isaac, the son of Abraham; 2. Jacob-Israel, the son of Rebecca (vers. 9, 10).—The mystery of election and reprobation (vers. 10-14).—Not by the merit of works, but by the mercy of Him who calleth! A passage: 1. For our humiliation; but also, 2. For our consolation (ver. 12).

Stokes: God does not look at carnal service and external advantages and privileges in the distribution of His mercy and spiritual blessings; 1 Cor. xv. 10 (ver. 12).—Hengstenberg: God's word always has its fulfillment in either one way or the other; Jer. xxxii. 42 (ver. 6).—Beware of founding your hope of salvation on birth, or the visible Church, or merely seeming work. One must inwardly be a Christian and Abraham's heir (ver. 7).

Spence: By this instance (vers. 8, 9) Paul has sufficiently shown that salvation does not depend on natural birth, and that, therefore, not all the descendants of Israel were necessarily the people of the covenant. But because it might have been said that Ishmael was born of the bondwoman, and lost such an honor in consequence of his wicked life, for he was a scoffer, Paul proceeds to show, by the example of Esau and Jacob, that it depended upon God's free choice as to whom He would show certain spiritual or temporal advantages and benefits, in which case He does not look at works (vers. 10-13).

Roos: The children of the promise are such as have become the children and true seed of Abraham by belief in God's promise (vers. 8-11).—An election does not preclude the foreknowledge of faith and works; but, on the contrary, it always goes in advance, while faith and good works follow afterward. Thus, a soldier is chosen before he has furnished a proof of his bravery; a child is chosen for adoption before he has given evidence of filial gratitude. The exhibition of bravery and gratitude is hoped for. But what is man's hope, is God's foreknowledge. Yet it must not be said that, in making an election, the one who chooses has been influenced by works that have already occurred. It was not from works already performed by Jacob that God's promises resulted, but from the loving will of God, who does regard not the creature can place under obligation, and who does not inwardly pass from hatred to love (vers. 11-13).

Gereck: As the preference of Jacob to Esau, and of the Israelites to the Edomites, was declared by God before the birth of the two ancestors, and thus what Jacob had in advance could by no means depend upon any privilege or merit of birth, so is free grace the bestowal of justification through Christ; it does not depend upon anticipated virtues or services of him who receives them; it admits valid claims of any kind (vers. 11-13).

Lisco: The Apostle's purpose is to prove that God, far from all arbitrary authority, and with the most exalted love, holiness, and wisdom, though without binding himself to natural laws (primogeniture, posterity of Abraham), or to the narrow limits of a certain descent, proceeds in His guidance of nations, and natural selection, and has no regard to the Edomites, but, as He formerly called to a share in the privileges of the old covenant people, the Israelite, as such, had legal claims to salvation in Christ, yet not on account of his natural descent, as is shown from both the examples adduced. Even Esau's descendants, and, indeed, all heathen, have been called to salvation in Christ; therefore evidently Esau's rejection is by no means regarded as eternal, and the object of Jacob's preference is the temporary salvation of the nations descended from both Esau and Jacob (vers. 11-13).

Heubner: We must maintain: 1. Paul's speech is altogether individual or national, and applies solely to Israel, in order to prostrate Israel's perverse pride; 2. The question is not concerning an eternal election and reprobation, but the calling of a people by the external call, by justification, and consequent, the submission of such callings; of such a call (vers. 6-19).

tion (vers. 14-18).—On what does our salvation depend? 1. Not upon our willing or running; 2. But upon God's mercy (ver. 16).

Stearne: God is and ever remains righteous, however He disposes things according to His sovereign will and good pleasure (ver. 14).—Oh, the great and exceeding riches of divine mercy and compassion, by which God performs all the good which He bestows on man, without regard to any service, greatness, honor, or appearance! (ver. 15).—Henderson: One's own running, working, exerting himself, devising services, doing penitence, and inflicting scourging, crawling into caves and putting on sackcloth, accomplish nothing; God must open the heart, and, when He knocks, open to Him! He has the key himself, and you have from Him the hands and the power to throw wide open for His entrance (ver. 16).—Hardening is a great judgment. Many are involved in it, and yet they do not know it (ver. 17).—Spener: Thus God's will is perfectly free and unconfined in its own work, and He has the power to show mercy or not, just as He will, without our ability to find sufficient cause for the difference, although He himself, as the wise and holy God, does nothing without a holy cause, so that even His freest power wills and does in such a way as His wisdom perceives conducive to His glory. For as men of understanding do not foolishly and thoughtlessly use their freedom, but do every thing considerately and with a rational choice, even when they are in the enjoyment of the most unfettered freedom, how should we suppose that the all-wise God can have mercy and harden without holy causes, or in any other way than in harmony with His goodness, righteousness, and majesty, though above our understanding? This should be enough for us: The holy and righteous God, who never can wish to do any thing evil, will it to be thus.

Roos: Ver. 16: Moses desired to see God's glory; but his desire would not have obtained this view by force. More than once Moses ascended to the top of Sinai, and came down again; but his running did not earn as a reward that which he prayed for, as showing by his compassion: out of compassion He crowned Moses' ascent of Mount Sinai by an extraordinary blessing. —Gerlagh: Ver. 16: Paul elsewhere exhorts (1 Cor. ix. 24-27; Phil. iii. 12-14) in the most decided way to will and to run; but it is a willing whose soul is God's mercy toward sinners, and it is a running whose power is God's renewing grace.

Law: The last and only ground of participation in God's kingdom is and ever remains God's mercy (ver. 16).—All of Pharaoh's efforts did not prevent the execution of the Divine purposes, but he himself became, contrary to his will, an instrument for their execution; accordingly, God was glorified in the perverse king, who did not escape His righteous punishment (ver. 17).—Thus, then, God shows His mercy on whomsoever He will with unlimited freedom; and He hardens whomsoever He will—that is, He allows His mercy to rebound to the ruin of those who, like Pharaoh, are impervious to all of His instructions and guidance; and thus it can also come to pass to the unbelieving Jews, that God will withdraw His mercy from them if they scorn His gospel, just as Pharaoh once despised God's will (ver. 18).

Henderson: No people can prove that it will be God's people (ver. 16).—The humiliation of presumptuous tyrants is a glorification of God (ver. 17).—Hardening is therefore never a blindly absolute, but always a righteous decree of God on those who have long withstood all of His calls. Pharaoh would not have been hardened, if his many cruelties had not already hardened his heart (ver. 18).

Beza: To sum up, says Beza (Works, vol. xxii. p. 799), the whole thing is spoken against the Lord—and His power and wisdom—by those who supposed, 'He to whom I give shall have it, and you shall not take it from me by your holiness.' What more shall he do? He nevertheless says, 'You shall have it, but if you seek and wish to have it for the sake of your righteousness and your piety, I cannot and will not allow you to have it; I will sooner tear to pieces and destroy every thing, both priesthood and kingdom, and even my own law.' But shows no mercy, and you shall have it' (ver. 19).—He who can still take upon himself to say, "God has had compassion on me because I am not as Pharaoh was", has not yet read the Epistle to the Romans aright.

The reverse is the case: Because God has had compassion on me, I am not as Pharaoh, but as Moses (ver. 18).

c. Vers. 19-25. Nay, but, 0 man, who art thou that repliest against God? 1. Remember that thou art only the work, but He is the Maker; 2. Therefore submit unconditionally to His sovereign will (vers. 19-21).—What does God design by His unconditional and free election? 1. On one hand, to show His wrath and make known His power; 2. But, on the other, to make known all the more, by this means, the riches of His glory (vers. 22-29).—The vessels of wrath and the vessels of mercy (vers. 22-24).—Who are the vessels of mercy? All who are called; not alone, 1. of the Jews, but, 2. also of the Gentiles (ver. 24).—Moses and Isaiah as ministers of God's grace, showing mercy on and calling Jews and Gentiles: 1. Hosea; 2. Isaiah (vers. 25-29).

Luther: Although the greater part fall away and remain unbelieving, He will nevertheless not let all fall, but will support the rest, and by them all the more abundantly disseminate His word and grace, in order that they may be righteous and glorious (ver. 26).

Stearne: God, in leading man to salvation, does not deal with him according to the unconditional purpose of His will and with unlimited power, but in a certain order, in which they who are ennobled by the rational soul have obtained the freedom to obey or to oppose (ver. 29).—Also teachers and preachers must exhibit an appropriate gentleness when censoring the ungodly, and must not always select the rancorous words of abuse and reproach, to pour them out upon them like a heavy shower (ver. 26).—Do not despair, though you be miserable; the merciful and gracious Lord can cause a light to arise within you; Ps. cxxii. 4 (ver. 26).—Hedinger: God be praised for His long-suffering! How many thousand brands of hell dost thou bear with! Thou art, and ever remainest, my righteous God! Ps. cii. 8 (ver. 22).—Lange: If you would be a true vessel of mercy, you must draw grace for grace from the fulness of Jesus (John i. 16).—Let the love of God be poured out in your heart by the Holy Spirit (chap. v. 5); and in order that you may be useful in the Lord's house, and a vessel sanctified to His honor, seek to be purified from contact with all impure vessels (ver. 23).

Spener: The Apostle says of the vessels of mercy, that God has prepared them for glory. He is not only their Creator, but their being the vessels of
His mercy is His own preparation. But he does not say of the vessels of wrath, that God prepared them for destruction, but that they are fitted to destruction who have fitted and corrupted themselves to it, so that their condemnation does not come from God, but only that He has long borne with them patiently, just as He did to Pharaoh, and that He finally destroys them with all the more violence. By this He declares His glory, power, compassion, and righteousness, without one coming in conflict with the other (vers. 22, 23).—Roos: The great long-suffering of which Paul speaks, proves that God takes no pleasure in the destruction of the vessels of wrath; for if He had wished, He could at any time have given them up to destruction sooner than He really did; but the efficacious call, which applies to the vessels of mercy both of the Jews and Gentiles, proves that God does not indulge a preconceived hatred either of the Jewish people or of the Gentile nations, and it is only His call that makes a difference between the vessels of wrath and of mercy (vers. 22-24).—GkrLACH: We must always bear in mind, that when God has compassion, and when He hardens, He acts in different ways; in the former case, He produces good in the human heart by His compassion; and in the second, He withdraws from man His divine light and life, yet does not awaken evil in him, but only allows the evil already existing to assume the form and take the course which, to Him, is evidently necessary for the salvation of the world. Man’s seeing, in mercy as well as in hardening, a perfectly similar operation of God—namely, His own arbitrary authority—is his own fault, since he closes himself against God’s compassionate love by his own claims (ver. 21).

Lisco: All humanity, and not merely Israel (which fenced itself thus), is like the clay from which God, of His own free choice, chooses unto participation in the kingdom of heaven; and He is not bound to Israel in such a way that He cannot also appoint the Gentiles to the same privilege (vers. 20, 21).

Heubner: Before God rejects a people, He patiently gives it time for repentance (vers. 19-23).—Especially on ver. 19: The universal objection of all determinists, fatalists, and absolutists, is: “How can man claim God’s unlimited foreknowledge and change of his mind, he is totally dependent on God?” This is here represented in a special direction, thus: “How can sin be imputed to man? Why does God’s punishment of him enrage him? He is only what God makes him! Who can oppose God?” This objection is still frequently heard in such modifications as these: “Man becomes every thing, just according as he is trained, educated, and placed in a favorable or unfavorable state?” We may answer this objection somewhat as follows: Although man does not himself control his destiny, and although this destiny has an influence upon his development, yet it is by no means compulsory; the external world does not operate irresistibly upon him. Yet Paul does not exactly answer thus, but says, ver. 26: “Yea, dear man,” &c.—Ver. 21: This comparison would be inapropiately applied if it were regarded as the sole cause of the man’s ruin. Paul means: “Can God not make out of this man a bad one, and out of that a good one?” The question is only the determination of the external state which operates on man. “Cannot God, according to His own will, direct to every one his condition and all the circumstances that operate upon him?” It still depends on man whether he will make use of his condition in this or that way, and in what shape he will allow himself to be formed. Comp. 2 Tim. ii. 20, 21. In Jer. xviii. 6, the type of the potter applies to the events that God allows a people to experience, but not to the determination of their salvation or destruction.

d. Vers. 20-22. The faith of the Gentiles, and the unbelief of the Jews: 1: The establishment of this fact; 2: The explanation of its origin (vers. 20-22).—In the righteousness of faith, the law of righteousness is really fulfilled (vers. 20, 31).—Who attains to the law of righteousness? All who seek its fulfilment, not: 1. By the works of the law, but, 2. By faith (vers. 31, 32).—The stumbling-stone: 1: For some a rock of offence; 2: For others a rock of salvation (ver. 23). Comp. 1 Peter ii. 4-10.

Luther: Christ justifies without works; they who do not believe Him, run against Him and stumble (ver. 32).

Starkie: O thou tempted soul, who art ever indulging in fearful thoughts, thou shalt certainly not be ashamed! (ver. 33.)—Cramer: If one should seek fire in snow, or ice in fire, he would not find it; so he who seeks life, righteousness, and salvation in the law, and not in Christ, will never receive them (ver. 32).

Suren: God laid such a stone in Zion as would of itself be a stone of help, a tried and precious corner-stone, on which the fallen could and should rise. But man’s wickedness, &c., causes many to stumble against it, and their fall is more dangerous than if such a stone had not been placed there. Yet God’s saving counsel must not be in vain for all, for there are others, on the other hand, who hold to this rock, and believe on it. These will not be deceived in their hope, nor come to shame, as they will take from it that which they have hoped for—salvation (ver. 33).

Roos: As Paul had previously made every thing dependent on simple grace and mercy, and on God’s free will, so he now makes every thing dependent on faith. Grace and faith, the will of God and faith, correspond to or meet each other. Grace is in God, faith is in man (vers. 30-38).—GkrLACH: God did not enforce His rights against the unbelieving Israelites, nor harden their hearts, nor fit them for destruction, because He predestinated them for destruction before their existence, but because they “rejected against God” (vers. 18-22).

Lisco: The reason why Israel refuses to accept the gospel, and is rejected, is because they seek it—righteousness—before God, not of faith, but by doing the works prescribed in the law; and therefore they experience the judgment of falling against the stumbling-stone (ver. 32).

Heubner: No people or no man is so corrupt that God cannot call and save if they will only believe in the gospel, and become sensible of their guilt (ver. 30).—All the works on which man relies cannot save him, but rather hinder him (Luke xii. 24). Therefore the paradox: It would be better for many if they were worse (ver. 32).—Offence at Christ is culpable; it is one that is taken, and not given (ver. 23).

Benser: Luther (Works, vol. vii. p. 581) strikingly compares the law to the field in which Christ, the Treasure, is buried. The Jews had the field, and even tilled it with great pains, but they did not see the buried treasure; but the Gentiles, on the contrary, since they found Christ in the law, went
for joy beyond the law, and sold every thing which they had, and bought the field with its treasure—
that is, the law with Christ (vers. 30, 31).

Lang. : The forbearance and decision with which the Apostle expresses the strict judgment on Israel, is an example for us, when occasion occurs, to speak unpleasant truths.—The Apostle's fidelity to the Israelites is conditioned by his fidelity to the Lord; or the duty and limits of patriotism.—Israel's fall is an eternal admonition for churches, states and nations. — The greater the glory of a community, the deeper is its fall.—Israel, which was once saved, is now judged in Christ its Head.—God's freedom with respect to humanity: 1. How it is bound by institutions and promises; 2. Yet how it also remains free.
—His freedom in His determinations: 1. In the determination of the personalities themselves; 2. Of their fate, and its effect; 3. Of their call to the kingdom. —The freedom and consistency of Divine sovereignty in the name Jehovah. — The antithesis: Israel and Isaac, Jacob and Esau, Moses and Pharaoh. — The judgment of hardening elucidated by Pharaoh's history. — Judgments changed by the sovereignty of God himself to the glorification of His mercy. — God's judgments are cut short by His wisdom and grace. —The importance of faith in antithesis to ordinances. —The twofold operation of the cornerstone.

Lightfoot: Ver. 3. We owe charity to every one because of his soul. If a soul, in its essential constitution, be not beautiful and lovely, what thing upon earth can be accounted beautiful and lovely? A soul that carries the image of God in its very constitution—that is like to the nature of angels in its essence and being—that is capable of divine nature and of eternal life and glory—if it be not lovely, what is? It is a great piece of wisdom to study souls, and to observe the nature, worth, price, and excellency, both of our own and other men's; and there is not a more general and comprehensive cause of the ruin of souls, than men's ignorance of and unacquaintance with their own souls. Shall I hate any man's soul? It may be united to God. Hate any man's soul? It may be the temple of the Holy Ghost. Any man's person? He may be an inheritor of eternal glory. Scorn not poor Joseph; for all his rags and imprisonment, he may come to sit upon a throne. Despise not poor Lazarus; for all his sores and tatters, he may be carried by angels into Abraham's bosom. — Burnitt: Learn: 1. What the sincere believer shall not be ashamed of: a. He shall never be ashamed of his choice; b. Nor of his profession; c. Nor of the cause and interest of Christ, which He has owned and vindicated in the world; d. Nor of any time sincerely spent in the work and service of Christ; e. Nor of reproaches and sufferings, tribulations and persecutions, for the sake of Christ; f. Nor in eternity, that he never was ashamed here of Christ and His gospel, His work and service, His cause and interest. 2. When the believer shall not be ashamed: a. When he is called to bear testimony of Christ before the world, at the hour of death, or at the day of judgment; b. Nor the dreadfulness of the day, nor the majesty of the Judge, nor the number of the accusers, nor the impurity of the sentence, nor the separation which shall then be made. 3. Why the believer shall never be ashamed: a. Sin, the cause of shame, is removed; b. Those only from whom he can reasonably fear shame, will never be ashamed of Him; c. He can look to God and Christ, his own conscience and the whole world, in the face, without shame and suffering. — Henry: What does God do for the salvation of His children? He prepares them beforehand for glory. Sanctification is the preparation of the soul for glory, making it meet to partake of the inheritance of the saints in light. This is God's work; we can destroy ourselves fast enough, but we cannot save ourselves; sinners fit themselves for hell, but it is God that prepares saints for heaven. — Waterland: There is a degree of pity and regard due even to very ill men, to ungodly, and sinners; not to be shown by caressing them and smiling upon them, but by earnest and ardent endeavors to reclaim them. There is not a more forlorn or miserable wretch under heaven than an overgrown sinner, become mad, desperate, and incurable in his sins. For though such persons regard neither God nor man, nor have any mercy or tenderness for friend or brother, but would go any lengths in mischief, and set the world on fire, if it lay in their power, yet we very well know, all the while, that they are weak and impotent, and are under bridge and restraint. The utmost they can do is only to afflict and torment good men for a time here, while they themselves lie exposed to eternal vengeance, to torments everlasting hereafter.

Dozannos: We know a descending, a risen Redeemer. He still visits us in His gospel, still preacheth in our assemblies, and stretches out a gentle and compassionate hand to lead us in the way of happiness.—Where we see a zeal for God, let us pay all due regard to it, and compassionate that ignorance which may sometimes be mingled with it. — Sorley: Modesty, caution, humility, and profound awe of the holy majesty of God, should restrain and guide the tongues and pens of all who speak or write on the great subjects connected with salvation, however satisfied such men may be with their own views of them; and every sentence which is written or spoken with impetuous injustice to God, is a proof of the pride and irreverence of the writer or speaker. — Honor: Vers. 15–19. It should be assumed as a first principle, that God cannot do wrong. If He does a thing, it must be right. And it is very much safer for us, corrupt and blinded mortals, thus to argue, than to pursue the opposite course, and maintain that God does not and cannot do so and so, because, in our judgment, it would be wrong. — J. F. H.}
SECTION.—More decided explanation of the mysterious fact. The faith of the Gentiles and the unbelief of Israel.

CHAP. X. 1-21.

A. Self-righteousness, and the righteousness of faith (vers. 1-11).

1 Brethren, my heart's desire [σάρξ, good-will, εὐδοκία] and prayer 1 to God for Israel [on their behalf] 2 is, that they might be saved [for their salvation].

2 For I bear them record [witness] that they have a zeal of God, but not according to knowledge. For they, being ignorant of God's righteousness [not knowing (i. e., mistaking) the righteousness of God], and going about [striving] to establish their own righteousness, 3 have not submitted themselves unto the righteousness of God.

3 For Christ is the end of the law for [unto] righteousness to every one that believeth. 4 For Moses describeth [writeth concerning] the righteousness which is of the law, That the [saying, The] 5 man which doeth those things 6 who hath done them] shall live by them [σάρξ, in it]. 7 But the righteousness which is of faith speaketh on this wise [thus], 8 Say not in thine heart, Who shall ascend into heaven? (that is, to bring Christ down from above [omit from above:] ) Or, Who shall descend into the deep? (that is, to bring up Christ again [omit again] from the dead.) But what saith it? The word is nigh thee, even [omit even] in thy mouth, and in thine heart: that is, the word of faith, which we preach; 9 That [Because] if thou shalt confess with thy mouth the Lord Jesus [σάρξ, Jesus as Lord], 8 and shalt believe in thine heart that God hath [omit hath] raised him from the dead, thou shalt be saved. For with the heart man believeth [faith is exercised] 10 unto righteousness; and with the mouth confession is made unto salvation. For the Scripture saith, Whosoever believeth on him shall not be ashamed [put to shame].

B. The equal claim of Jews and Gentiles to faith. Hence the necessity of universal preaching. The unequal results of preaching (vers. 12-18).

12 For there is no difference between the Jew and the Greek [distinction between Jew and Greek]; 11 for the same Lord over all is [is Lord of all,] 12 rich unto all that [who] call upon him. For whosoever [every one who] 13 shall call upon the name of the Lord shall be saved. How then shall [can] they call 14 him in whom they have not believed? and how shall [can] they believe 15 in him of whom they have not heard? and how shall [can] they hear 16 without a preacher? And how shall [can] they preach, 17 except they be sent? as it is written, 18 How beautiful are the feet of them that preach the gospel [those who bring glad tidings] of peace, 19 and bring glad tidings of good things! But they have not all obeyed the gospel [did not all hearken to the glad tidings]. 20 For Esaias [Isaiah] saith, Lord, who hath [omit hath] believed our report? 21 So then faith cometh by [of] hearing, and hearing by [through] the word of God. 22 But I say, Have they not heard [Did they not hear]? Yes [Nay] verily, their sound went [out] into all the earth, and their words unto the ends of the world.

C. The unbelief of Israel and the faith of the Gentiles already prophesied in the Old Testament (vers. 19-21).

19 But I say, Did not Israel [Israel not] 23 know? First Moses saith, I will provoke you to jealousy by them that [with those who] are no people, and by 20 [with] a foolish nation I will anger you. But Esaias [Isaiah] is very bold, and saith, 24 I was found of them that [by those who] sought me not; I was made manifest unto them that [those who] asked not after me. But to [of] Israel he saith, 25 All day long I have [omit have] stretched forth my hands unto a disobedient and gainsaying people.
TEXTUAL.

1. Ver. 1.—After διήγεσθαι, K. L. Rec. insert ἡ, defended by Philippus; omitted in Κ. A. B. D. F. G., by Lachmann, Tischendorf, Meyer, Tholuck, Alford, Tregelles. Probably inserted to limit πρὸς τὸν θεόν κατὰ τὸν ἀνθρώπον, since a closer connexion with ἀπόθεως does not seem to be required with εἰς ἔρρομαι. On the meaning of the last-named word, as involved in the enigmatic phrase, see Ew. 122, 6.

2. Ver. 1.—(In A. B. D. F. G., all modern editors, read ἀντίθεμα, instead of τῶν ἀνθρώπων (K. L. Rec.). The latter was substituted as an explicatory gloss, which was the more necessary connexion, since this verse began a chart of the entire Epistle. For the authority of τῶν ἀνθρώπων, see Rec. on the authority of Κ. K. L. rejected by modern editors generally.

3. Ver. 1.—Rec. (O, K, L) insert εἰς τὸν θεόν before τὸν ἀνθρώπον. This probably led to the paraphrase of the E. V. in the New Testament. A number of editors, and fathers, omit διήγεσθαι after ἁμάρτω τοῖς ἀνθρώποις. (So Lachmann, Tischendorf, Wordsworth, Tregelles.) It is found in Κ. N. L. K., Syriac, &c., also after ἠμαρτήσατε in one cursive. It is retained by Meyer, Lange; bracketed by Alford, who, in his notes, agrees with the LXX. The omission of this manuscript, and of the last-named note, as given in the reading of the LXX., is very interesting. As Meyer, and others, have pointed out, it is the most natural reading of the manuscripts, and is supported by such ancient authors just named, in thinking the repetition of the same word, so often and emphatically, but easily done, unnecessary: hence the omission.

4. Ver. 4.—Dr. Lange’s rendering is striking: ἐν τῷ ἐνδεικτικῷ τοῦ ἔργου; ἡ χάρις γενέσθαι για τοὺς ἀνθρώπους (For the end of the law is: Christ is righteous for every one who believes). Luther’s version is really a paraphrase: Deum Christum est generis Humani. (I do not much like J. A. D., as an alteration, on account of the accent of υπο γενεσθαι).—The quotation is from Lev. xvi. 30. If the reading of the Rec. be adopted, the only variation is δ, instead of δ; a change necessary to adapt the citation to its position here. See next Note.

5. Ver. 5.—The correct reading is difficult to determine. Most editors now retain ἀντίθεμα (Rec., Β. Β. F. G., most versions and fathers). Instead of ἐν ἀνθρώποις (Rec., Κ. D. F. L. some versions and fathers, Meyer, Wordsworth, Lange), the reading ἐν ἀνθρώποις is found in Κ. A. B. many versions, and is accepted by Lachmann, De Wette, Alford, Tregelles. The singular would be a variation from both the LXX. and the Hebrew: yet this has readers at alteration to the plural (for the sake of conformity) the more probable. On the other hand, Meyer urges strongly that the plural stands or falls with aor., which is now generally accepted. The change to the singular may have been made to guard against the rendering of the righteousness of works, as indeed A. substitutes τὸν ἀνθρώπον for υπὸν ἀνθρώπον, I hold to the reading of the Rec.

6. Ver. 6.—From this point to the middle of ver. 8, we have a free citation from the LXX., Paul. xxx. 13-14. Parts of the E. V. diverge from the free rendering of the LXX., but not from the literal (var. 2-7). As the LXX. does not differ materially from the Hebrew, we give only the text of the former: (ver. 11, ὑπὸν ἐνδεικτικόν, ὕπατε ἐντολήν σαμερήν, οὐκ ἐνδεικτικόν ἄνθρωπον, οὐκ ἐνδεικτικόν οὐκ ἒντολην κατὰ τὸν ἀνθρώπον.) 12. εἰς τὸν ὀφθαλμόν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου, λέγει: τῷ ἀνθρώπῳ ἐν τῷ ἀνθρώπῳ, καὶ ἀνθρώπῳ ἐν τῷ ἀνθρώπῳ: 13. τὸν ἄνθρωπον τὸν ἄνθρωπον ἐπετέλεσεν, λέγει: τῷ ἡμερνάρα καὶ τῷ ἂθανατῳ καὶ τῷ ἀνθρώπῳ. As Meyer says, not υπερτελεσεν, but τον ἄνθρωπον τὸν ἄνθρωπον ἐπετέλεσεν, I would follow the LXX. The New Testament exclamation is remarkably well established throughout. The variations from the LXX. are noted in the Elina. Notes.

7. Ver. 7.—(In the LXX. [Joh. ii. 29, οἱ γονεῖς τίς εἰσίν; some fathers; others οἱ γονεῖς τίς εἰσίν; these readings are doubtful explanatory glosses, and, as such, tend to confirm the interpretations given in the brackets above: Jesus is Lord. See Also. Notes, also on the rendering because. The E. V. improperly translates ἀντίθεμα, hath revised. It is the historical sortist.

8. Ver. 10.—The E. V. has made this verb active, and the second one passive. Both are passive. It would seem as if the Hebrew gave two clauses, from which, by aor. with the preposition, aor. from which, by aor. with the preposition, aor. was given: but their positions is uncertain. A. renders: καὶ καὶ μιας καὶ μιας. See also Ver. 11. Lightman: there is no distinction of αὐτοὶ and Greek; but this sounds too abstract, as if the distinctions were obliterated, as in Gal. iii. 26. Here it is better, then, to preserve the concrete idea, by using between. So Rev. Five Ang. Clergymen.

9. Ver. 12.—Lange renders: Dem Einen und derselben ist Herr von Allen. So Noyes: For one and the same is Lord over all. Five Ang. Clergymen: The same is Lord over all. The Amer. Bible Union as above. This is most literal. Alford, indeed, objects, so account of the strangeness of ἄν κατὰ τὸν ἄνθρωπον, such standing alone; but this is not met by Dr. Lange in the Elina. Notes, where he expands the phrase into: One and the same Lord is Lord over all. Statur: There is the same Lord in each. Which, on the whole, is best to find the predicate here, and not supply is with rich, as is done in the E. V.

10. Ver. 12.—This is almost word for word from the LXX., Joel iii. 5 (Heb. iii. 5): καὶ γονεῖς πάντες, καὶ καὶ καὶ καὶ καὶ καὶ καὶ καὶ καὶ καὶ. The γονεῖς is inserted to introduce the phrase. In Acts ii. 21, the citation is made even more exactly. The strong form of the last clause is retained by rendering, every one whatsoever (Alford, Five Ang. Clergymen); Ams. Bible Union, Noyes: every one who.

11. Ver. 14.—In each of the four interrogative sentences of vers. 14, 15, the exact form of the leading verb is doubtless. This is not improved by the modern omission of the particle τί. The uncial cursives give τί, and several Byzantine cursives. The text of the MS. authority is given in the separate notes. Here the Rec., with K. L., and some fathers, reads: εὐρετήσων; N. A. B. D. F. G.: εὑρεσίωσαν. The future is supported by Meyer, and appears to be the correct reading. Where throughout by Dr. Lange, for the second of the Greek, as the variation here involves only the change of the τί into a ν, it is readily accounted for. The E. V. gives a correct rendering of the future, which, indeed, in these cases differs little in meaning from the conjunctive. Can is substituted to express the force of the correct reading, although it is perhaps a shade too strong. The Amer. Bible Union omits here the relative clauses throughout; but, although this is a literal rendering of the sortist, it here obscures the meaning by destroying the titles. All other later versions properly retain the English perfect.

12. Ver. 15.—(Revised, N. B. D. F. K. L. kapáto.) The last two prefix the argument. See also Ver. 13. No MSS.: εὐρετήσων; N. A. B. D. K. L.: εὑρεσίωσαν. This well-supported sortist seems to decide the other cases.

13. Ver. 16.—The quotation is not exact, though giving the sense of the Hebrew. The LXX. is closely followed at all. See Elina. Notes.

14. Ver. 16.—The words: εὐρετήσωμαι εἰρήνην, τίμων, are omitted in Κ. A. B. C., by some versions and fathers; rejected by Lachmann, Tischendorf, Tregelles; bracketed by Alford. They are found in Κ. N. D. F. L. K., and by Wordsworth, Lange, on the ground that the repetition might easily lead to the omission. This view will readily be adoptable by any one who examines the context, since, on the contrary, the first occurrence of so long a word for the second. The original passage, of course, favors the retention. The uncial and the uncialist (K. L.) before εὐρετήσωμαι is defective. The E. V. takes away the exact parallelism by rendering εὐρετήσωμαι by a different phrase in each clause. A paraphrase of the context is in every case, from the poverty of our language.

15. Ver. 16.—Here also gospel is too restricted. The above emendation is adopted by Amer. Bible Union, Noyes, Five Ang. Clergymen.

16. Ver. 18.—(As none of the modern versions have altered this citation, it is allowed to remain, but the reader will find in the Elina. Notes the view of Forbes, which would be thus expressed: Who (of us) hath believed what we heard?).
The LXX: ἐκ πάντων ἔσοδόν τοῖς ἐκ μὴ ἐπηρεασμόν, εἰρέθην τοῖς ἐκ μὴ δοξολογίαν. The variations are a transposition of the clauses, and ἔσοδόν, instead of ἔσοδόν. The Hebrew is followed with exactness.—Ver. is inserted after ἔσοδόν, in B. D. C. bracketed by Alford and Tregelles.

Exegetical and Critical.

Summary.—The fact of the partial rejection of Israel, &c. The fact is not a fatalistic decree, for the Apostle prays for Israel, and bears record to their zeal; vers. 1, 2. It rests rather on the antithesis between self-righteousness as the presumed righteousness which is of the law, and the righteousness which is of faith; vers. 3, 4. The righteousness of faith, although arising from Israel, is proved by the prophecy of the Old Testament to be, according to its nature, accessible to all men, and not confined to the Jewish nation. It is universal; that is, accessible to all in its internal character, because it is allied to the inward nature of man; vers. 5, 9. Its universality is confirmed by experience; vers. 10, 11. It is proclaimed by the Old Testament Scriptures, which promise, in Christ, salvation to every man. There arises therefrom the universality of faith—the freedom of faith to Jews and Gentiles; vers. 12, 13. This freedom of faith is made actual by the universality of the preaching of the gospel and of the apostolic mission; vers. 14, 15. Unbelief is voluntary, like faith. The gospel is conditioned by faith; vers. 16–18. But the faith of the Gentiles is prophesied in the Old Testament, as well as the unbelief of the Jews; vers. 19–21.

There is little difference of opinion among commentators respecting the meaning of this chapter as a whole. Dr. Hodge coincides most nearly with Dr. Lange in his divisions. Tholuck, Philippi, Meyer, Alford, make two sections. (1.) The further exposition of the fact that the exclusion of Israel is founded on their own unbelief; vers. 1–15. Alford: "The Jews, though zealous for God, are yet ignorant of God's righteousness (verses 1–5), as revealed to them in their own Scriptures (verses 4–15.)." (2.) Proof from Scripture of the same fact; vers. 14–21. Tholuck: "They could not excuse themselves by this, that God had not done His part to make humanity know the gospel, or that it had not reached them, or that they could not have seen what their conduct with regard to it and God's dealings with the Gentiles would be." The connection with chap. ix. 23 is very close; and as the Apostle is accustomed to repeat, at the close of an argument, the proposition from which he started, the repetition of the quotation of chap. ix. 23, in vers. 11, favors the division of Dr. Lange.—R.

A. Faith, vers. 1, 2. The fact described is no fatalistic decree.

1. Brethren [Ἰδιάιοι]. Bengel: "Fruit quasi superba praecedentis tractationis scelerate comiter appellat fratres." Comp. 1 Cor. xiv. 20; Gal. iii. 15.—R. Though this is an address to all readers, yet it is directed with special feeling to the Jewish Christians. Repetition and carrying out of the personal reference in chap. ix. 1 foll.

My heart's desire, or, good-will [ἐὰν μὲν εἰδοξιὰ τῆς ἱππος καρδιάς]. A real antithesis to the μὲν is contained in the judgment passed in vers. 3. [See Winer, p. 530; who thinks the antithesis was too painful to be expressed. All admit that the thought is found in vers. 6—R.] Meyer, contrary to Chrysostom, Theodoret, and most of the early writers, as well as Dr Wette and Olschen, holds that εἰδοξιὰ cannot mean wish, desire, but to God's will; only benevolence (Vulgata, voluntas; Augustine, bona voluntas; Calvin, benevolentia). Tholuck: "There is, indeed, no example as yet in which εἰδοξιὰ is exactly equal to 'wish.' But how could the Apostle have said, 'My good pleasure and my prayer for them to God are directed to their salvation.' Yet he regards it advisable to adhere to the translation: My good-will for them. [The lexica obstruction to rendering εἰδοξιὰ, desire, is weighty. On the other hand, the rendering good-will serves it from the context. The insertion of ἥ after δέχομαι was probably an attempt to avoid this difficulty. Alford suggests a 'mixture of constructions: the Apostle's εἰδοξιὰ would be their salvation itself—his δέχομαι κεϊλ. ἦν ἐλ. σωτ. We hold to the more usual meaning of the word. Wordsworth pushes it as far as this: "Probably he uses this word because he wishes to represent the salvation of the Jews as a thing so consonant to God's wishes and counsel, that, as far as He is concerned, it is as good as done; and the Apostle delights in looking back, in imagination, upon that blessed result as already accomplished." There is little warrant in the word or context for such an interpretation.—R.]

And prayer to God [καὶ ἡ δέχομαι πρὸς τὸν Θεόν]. The latter phrase can be limited to δέχομαι without adopting the poorly supported ἥ. The "prayer" was undoubtedly "of his heart," but there are no grammatical reasons for connecting that phrase with these words. δέχομαι is strictly, petition, request.—R.] We refer καὶ ἡ δέχομαι back to verse 11, and then exclusively to Meyer, τὸν Θεόν. My heart is not only full of good-will toward the Jews, but it can also venture to intercede for them before God—a proof that they falsely regard me as their adversary—and I have not yet given up the hope of their salvation. This also comprises a pledge of Divine compassion. [So Bengel: "Non orassed Paulus, si absolute reprehendi esset."—R.]

[On their behalf is for their salvation, ὑπὲρ αὐτῶν τὸς σωτηρίαν. The correct reading shows how close the connection with chap. ix. is. Meyer: "Σωτηρία is the end which my εἰδοξιὰ would have for them, and my prayer aspir for them." The E. V. gives the correct sense though in a paraphrase.—R.]
Ver. 2. For I bear them witness [μαρτυρία γὰρ αἴτιος]. Ἡ τοῦτο introduces the reason for the preceding declaration.—R.] He still sees, even in their error, something good: they have a zeal of God [ζῆλον θεοῦ ἐγγύσισσιν. Zeal for God, not great zeal, or godly zeal. (Acts xxi. 20; xxii. 3; Gal. i. 14; John ii. 17.) This will, indeed, not be the only ground of his εὐδοκία, but is the ground of the cheerfulness of his intercession for them.

But not according to knowledge [αλλ' αὖθις ἐπίγνησιν. Compare chap. iii. 20, p. 123; Col. i. 9 (Lange's Comm., p. 17)—R.] The ἐπίγνησις is the knowledge which, being the living principle of discernment, impels far beyond the mere historical γνώσις. Meyer's definition: in consequence of the ἐπίγνησις, is incorrect. The antithesis: κατὰ ἄγνωσιν, Acts iii. 17. The Apostle's statement may, at all events, be designed to alleviate his charge. The bright as well as the dark side of the religious zeal of the Jews was and is a peculiar phenomenon in the history of the world. [The objective advantages of the Jews were given in chap. ix. 1-5; here we have the subjective religiousness, which corresponds, although degenerating into blind fanaticism. Yet religious fanaticism, we infer from this passage, is preferable to religious indiffenrentism. There is something to hope for, a ground for good-will, where there is carneness.—R.]

Vor. 3. For they, not knowing (mistaking) the righteousness of God [ἀγνώστες γὰρ τὴν τοῦ θεοῦ δικαιοσύνην. We take ground, with De Wette, and others, against Meyer, who does not see in the idea of ἀγνώστες, the element of mistake, but merely the declaration of ignorance. [Meyer justifies his position, by saying that Paul was only proving the "not according to knowledge."—R.] But simple ignorance, without guilt, could have no meaning whatever in the present instance; and still less could it be the cause of wicked results. The same holds good of chap. ii. 4; i Cor. xiv. 38; see also Tholuck, in loco. Their ἀγνώσις is the cause of their seeking to establish their own righteousness, and consequently they did not submit themselves to the Divine righteousness revealed in the gospel for faith.*

And striving to establish their own righteousness [καὶ τὴν ἱδίαν δικαιοσύνην κινεῖς στίγμασιν. See Textual Note*]. Essentially, it is the same as the righteousness of the law, according to Phil. iii. 9. Formally, this expression is stronger, because it not only signifies acquired righteousness in distinction from that which is bestowed, but as the real principle of this acquired righteousness, it denotes one's own choice, power, and will, as well as man's own will in opposition to God's choice, grace, and order. [The point of this distinction is lost, if the phrase be construed as = their own justification.—R.] Therefore this effort remains a nugatory ἵπτισιν στίγμασι (chap. iii. 31; Heb. x. 9). The στίγμα expresses the element of pride in their effort.

* [Stuart, and others, take the phrase righteousness of God here as God's method of justification. How incorrect this is, will appear from a reference to p. 74 ff. Dr. Hodge says, very properly: "It is that on which the sentence of justification is founded." Alford: "that righteousness, which abides after God, which becomes sure in judgment.—R.]

[Have not submitted themselves, &c., τὰ δικαιοσύνης τοῦ θεοῦ υπέτασσαν.] Meyer regards the υπέτασσαν as passive, as in chap. viii. 20; 1 Cor. xiv. 28. Tholuck, on the other hand, correctly regards it as reflexive.*

4. For Christ is the end of the law [τέλος γὰρ νόμου Χριστός]. First, τέλος must be left in its full signification, and not be considered merely as the negative end by which the νόμος is made void; second, Χριστός is = Christ himself, not simply the foundation of the law (Meyer), or the doctrine Christi (Socinians, and others). In both cases, Meyer's explanation would destroy the full meaning of the text. The same thing is declared in reality by the passages, Matt. v. 17; Rom. xiii. 10; Gal. iii. 24; Eph. ii. 16; Col. i. 14. The end of the law was not Christ, because Christ was, in a positive form, the fulfilment of the spiritual, essential import of the law, and therefore He was, at the same time, the making void of the law in it, in another form of the law. Comp. 1 Tim. i. 5; 1 Peter i. 9; Rev. xxi. 6; xxii. 13. The centre of the idea is therefore final aim, purpose, and end (Chrysostom, Melanchthon, Calvin, and others). There is no good ground for dividing this explanation into two different ones. On one hand, Erasmus, Wolf, and others, have brought out the positive view: Fulfilment of the law. The alternative here: obedientia, or obedient action and passiva (see Meyer), must be removed. As for the negative view of the idea, Meyer cites a large number of authorities who harmonize with him in limiting it to this; yet he can hardly prove this by Augustine, Oehlerhausen, and many others.† Even ver. 4 plainly says that Christ is in so far τέλος νόμου as He is unto righteousness to

* [Alford defends the passive sense, as expressing the result only, it might be themselves, or some other that subjected them—the historical fact was, they were not subjected. But as this verse presents an antithesis to τὸ νόμον (ver. 1), and as the whole current of thought implies their personal guilt, the meaning of righteousness is preferable, and is adopted by the majority of commentators.—R.]

† [Meyer thus paraphrases: "For in Christ the validity of the law as such is an end, that righteousness should become the portion of every believing soul."—R.]

† [Dr. Lange's view is, on the whole, to be preferred; but he does not entirely steer those of other commentators. We append, for the sake of the three common names of a text: (1.) Christ is the αἴματος (Ende) of the law. (Sc Chrysostom, Calvin, Beza, Bengel, Alford, Webster and Wilkinson, and others.) This view seems either (a) the end of the law was to make men righteous, and this end is accomplished in Christ (Chrysostom, Stuart, and others); or, (b) the law led to His, as schoolmaster (Calvin, and others, Tholuck reaches this from another point of view). (2.) Christ is the fulfillment of the law (τὸ νόμον ἐπάλημμα). This is, indeed, true, but scarcely meets the requirements of this passage, especially if it be limited to the ceremonial law. (3.) Christ is the termination of the law (Augustine, Luther, Tholuck, Nössing, Alsted, and others). This view, which Dr. Lange calls the negative one. In what sense he is the termination of the law, is also a matter of dispute (ceremonial, or moral). Some confusion exists in most commentaries in the citing of authorities. In fact, these meanings largely run into each other. In favor of the last, it may be urged that the Apostle speaks of a new era here between the righteousness of the law and the righteousness of faith (vers. 5, 6), as requires a strong antithesis between the Old and New; and Christ; but we must interpret: "When Christ came, the old legal system was abolished, and a new era commenced" (Hodge), this antithesis will not be correct. The fact that we quote from the law itself to support the claims of the righteousness of faith, seems inconsistent with this view. (See below.) Nor will it be evident that this introduces a proof of the non-submission of the Jews to the righteousness of faith (vers. 5, 6). Unless it asserts that the law led to Christ, rather than that Christ abolished the law. All three views may be included, but the first is the more prominent one.—R.]
CHAPTER X. 1-21.

every one that believeth, εἰς δικαιοσύνην παντὶ τῷ ποιήτῳ, and the γὰρ introduces just the proof that the Jews did not submit themselves to the righteousness of God, which, however, was manifested in Christ's fulfilment of the law (comp. chap. ix. 31). The question of the extent of prominence here given to the negative side of the τῆς, is connected with the explanation of vers. 5 and 6. [Stuart, following Flatt, renders εἰς, with respect to. It is better to take it as indicating result or purpose. The former will be preserved, if τῆς be rendered aim; the latter, if it be rendered termination. The sense will then be, either: Christ is the aim of the law, so that righteousness may come to every one, &c.; or: Christ abolished (or fulfilled) the law, in order that, &c. The word righteousness has here the full sense, "righteousness of God;" but the emphasis rests on believeth.—R.]

Vers. 5-9. The universality of the righteousness of faith is proved by the Old Testament also.

On the citations. It is evident that vers. 5 and 6 present an antithesis between the idea of the righteousness which is of works and the inward essence of righteousness. But it is clear from the place of the citations, that this antithesis means no contradiction between the Old and New Testament. The quotation in ver. 5 is taken from Lev. xvii. 5; the quotation in ver. 6 from Deut. xxx. 11-14. It is evident, therefore, that the Apostle places the two sides of the law in contrast, one of which is an external Jewish law of works, and the other an inward law of the righteousness which is of faith, or a law designed for the inward life; the one is transient, the other permanent. Therefore, he takes his first statement from Leviticus, and from that part of it where the laying down of the Mosaic obstacles to marriage is introduced; the second, on the other hand, is taken from Deuteronomy, which early imparts a profoundly prophetic meaning to the law. Therefore we read, first: Moses describeth, or writeth (and what he writes is a command); but then, the righteousness which is of faith speaketh (and what it says is a proclamation). Though the Apostle holds Deuteronomy to be as fully Mosaic as Leviticus, yet, in the former, Moses administers his office as the Old Testament lawgiver of the Jews; while, in the latter, the prophetic spirit of the righteousness of faith speaks as decidedly through him as if it altogether took his place.

Ver. 5. For Moses writeth respecting the righteousness, &c. [Μωυσῆς γάρ γράφει τῇ δικαιοσύνῃ, κ.λ. The accusative after γράφει is either written by the verb in the transitive sense: to write of, to describe, or is the remote object, that concerning which it is written. The rendering of the sense is perhaps strong, though not lexically admissible.—R.] Γράφει, John i. 46. The citation is from Leviticus, according to the LXX., but of the same purport as the original text.

We further read: Moses writeth down, or commands: The man who hath done them [ὁ δὲ ποιήσας αὐτὰν ἀνθρωπος]. The ποιήσας is emphatic, yet it is significantly connected with ἀνθρωπος. After, the which is written, the commandments; the law, in the analytical form of commandments. The emphasis here rests on the doing. "But the righteousness which is of faith says: 'The word is high thee, even in thy mouth, and in thy heart; only confess with thy mouth, and believe in thy heart.'"

Shall live by them [ζησείς ἐν αὐτοῖς. See Textual Note. If αὐτοῖς be adopted as the correct reading, it refers to the righteousness accruing from the doing of the commandments (Alford). Dr. Lange renders αὐτῷ, durch, but this is too strong; in the strength of, is better.—R.] The different readings appear to have arisen from an apprehension that the Apostle's expression might cause a misunderstanding, perhaps an acceptance of the possibility of righteousness by works. Hence the omission of αὐτῶν, and the reading by αὐτοῖς ("He shall live by righteousness itself") Cod. A. even reads: γενεια. A proof how decidedly the early Church rejected the righteousness of works.

The assurance of life has been referred to the life in Palestine. But the historical standpoint of the Mosaic economy indicates something further than the vita prospera. Proof: 1. The vita prospera in the real sense, or as the welfare of the people, is a special promise for obedience to parents; Exod. xx. 12. 2. The most direct meaning of the passage in Leviticus is, that the transgression of the following statutes is connected with the punishment of death; chap. xviii. 29. 3. The passage in Deut. xxx. 16, not to mention Ezek. xx. 11, indicates something further than the mere vita prospera.*

There are here two antitheses: first, that of the externality of the law and the inwardness of the gospel; second, that of doing and experiencing. In the first case the promise reads: shall live by them; and in the second case there is the assurance: he shall be delivered, shall be saved. We have already observed that the Apostle did not wish to say that there is a contradiction between the Moses of Leviticus and of Deuteronomy; we may now ask, whether he has instituted an irreconcilable contrast between the two passages. This is very supposable, if ver. 5 be regarded as a purely hypothetical and almost ironical promise: If one fulfill all the commandments, and the law of the people as well, and yet be not capable of this, no one can find life by the commandments. Therefore, after ver. 6, the gospel now takes the place of the law. [So Hodge, and others.] But this cannot be the Apostle's meaning. For, first, in that case the law would have been useless from the beginning. Second, an analytical fulfilment of the law would be designated as analytical, or at least as a theoretical way of life, by the side of the practical, and thus two kinds of righteousness would be conceivable, as well as two kinds of life. But, in our opinion, ver. 5 is not merely designed to prove that the law is at an end, but that its end has come because Christ has come. Therefore the expression in ver. 5 has an enigmatical form, as that in 1 Tim. iii. 16. Moses inscribes his precepts thus: The man which doeth these things—

* [To this may be added the exalted term which God has in the New Testament. Comp. Tholuck, Trench (referring to Christ's calling himself θεός): "No wonder, then, that Scripture should know of no higher word than θεός to set forth either the blessedness of God, or the blessedness of the creature in communion with God." Syn. N. T. Testament, § xvii. — R.]
that which was once neglected and lost— from above, that means, in the language of the present, "Who shall bring Christ down from above?" although He has come upon the earth, and has here finished His life, and incorporated himself with humanity.

4. If, at that time, the unbelieving Jew said; "Who shall go over the sea for us, and bring the law, that it may be as much as to say from the future world, the lower regions—that question is now; "Who shall bring Christ to us from the dead?" although Christ has risen from the dead, and has sealed His resurrection by the outpouring of His Spirit.

5. But just as, at that time, the essence or word of the law was infinitely near to Israel as an outline of its most personal and inward nature, so is now Christ, or the gospel by Him, still more than the fulfilment and completion of the most inward nature of man to rightousness and salvation. For if the law was already glorious, how shall not the gospel exceed in glory? 2 Cor. iii. 7—11.

Speaketh thus [οὐτος λέγειν, The Apostle's decided intention of finding in the passage in Deuteronomy itself the real sense which he further expounds, is evident from the fact that he allows the righteousness which is of faith, personified in that passage itself to speak. The multifarious expression expressed by expositors on the Apostle's citation is chiefly traceable to a defective construction of the passage in Deuteronomy. According to Meyer, the meaning of the Mosaic passage is: The commandment is neither too hard nor too far; the people speak of it, and it is impressed in their hearts, in order that it may be performed. De Wette adopts the same view. According to Tholuck, the words would say: The faithful observance of the law is made so easy to man after the revelation that has taken place. But how can Moses say to the people, whose apostasy he hypothetically assumes, in their apostasy: Thy God will again accept thee if thou turn to Him, for thou hast the law in thy mouth and in thy heart—in the sense that the people are still living in the knowledge of the law, that the law is still in their hearts, and that they only need to perform it. The explanation of ver. 14 lies rather in ver. 15, that the law is not the true life of man himself; it is his real good. The transgression of the law is death and evil. God can therefore deliver man from the transgression of the law, because the law is as an inalienable appointment in his heart, and because he returns to his God when he comes to himself (Luke xvi. 17). Because of this inwardness of the law in itself, it can be written upon man's heart (see Deut. xxx. 6); it can always revive afresh in him. The law is therefore not merely concealed from, or foreign to, man; it is not simply something positive from heaven, which must be gained altogether vanish to heaven; and it is no simple promise or threat from the future world, or from the realm of the dead, "from over the sea," which may be forgotten until death. Rather, it is still with Christ. For undoubtedly the Apostle will not merely say, in ver. 8, Faith is so nigh to men, because Christ is preached to them as the One who has become man, and is risen from the dead; but because the truth of Christ's incarnation and resurrection can unite, in the faith of their heart, and in the confession of their mouth, for the completion and salvation of their immortal nature. The typical prophecy of the Mosaic passage, which Paul, the great master, has strikingly brought out, lies in the
The fact that conversion to the law is the beginning of its hearty reception, but that faith in the gospel is its completion, is objectively defined, that the law is the shadow of the inward life, and that Christ is the life of this life itself.

On the different misunderstandings of this typical prophecy, see Tholuck, who speaks of a profound parody, p. 557 ff. Explanations: Only an application of the words of the law in the Old Testament (Chrysostom, Theodoret, &c., down to Neander); 
accommodation (Thomasius, Semler); 
interpretation (Grotius); 
alloesis (Calixtus); 
universalis paradoxa (Bengel, and others). 

The explanations divide themselves into two principal classes. According to one, Paul has made use of the words of Moses for clothing his thoughts, with the knowledge that they, considered in themselves, expressed something altogether different. Philippi calls it "a holy and lovely play of God's Spirit upon the word of the Lord." But would not that be a very lovely play of the Apostle upon the word of the Lord? Likewise Tholuck is of the opinion, that the passage is to provide an application corresponding to the meaning of the text, and, still less, the identity of the historical meaning with the Pauline interpretation. Naturally, the constructions of this class are partly of a critical (Semler) and partly of an apologetical nature (Bengel).

The other class accept, that in the declaration of Moses the Apostle has really found the prophecy declared by him. But this again divides into two subdivisions: 1. He was the exponent of that passage in his spiritual illumination as an Apostle; 2. Rather, one intimately acquainted with the rabbinical hermeneutics. Calvin, and others, who belong to the first subdivision, hold that univer sa doctrina verbi divini is meant; Knapp, the commandment of love toward God; Hackspan, and others, the messianic promise; Luther, who is frequently hesitating, belonging to both of the principal classes (Tholuck, p. 558).

The expositors of the other subdivision regard Paul's interpretation as an allegorical exegesis—that Paul, using the Jewish expository art, has allegorized the passage, and has found in it a Midrash, or secret meaning. Meyer regards the sum of the oracular meaning to be this: "Be not unbelieving, but believing!" A Midrash, indeed, which might well be drawn from every verse of the Bible.

[The majority of commentators adopt the view, that Paul does not cite the words of Moses as such, but merely adapts them to his purpose. But the position of Dr. Large seems preferable, not only because this "adaptation" or "accommodation" is not what we would expect from such a writer as Paul, but because the other view is more in accordance with the context. As Forbes well says: "St. Paul's great object in reasoning with his countrymen is to prove to them, out of their own Scriptures, that God's mode of salvation, from the first, had been always the same (simple faith in Him), and that their Law was but a

provisional dispensation, designed to prepare for the universal Gospel, which was to embrace all equally Gentiles as well as Jews. Is it likely that the arguments adduced to persuade the Jews of this from their own Scriptures would, even in part, be words turned from their true meaning in the Jewish Scriptures?" Vers. 2 and 3 show how necessary this proof is. This view accords, too, with ver. 4, and the real position of the law. Alford: "The Apostle, regarding Christ as the end of the law, its great central aim and object, quotes these words not merely as suitting his purpose, but as bearing, where originally useful, as Midrashic applications, to advance the idea who is the end of the law, and to the commandment to believe in Him, which is now God's commandment." If spoken of the law as a manifestation of God in man's heart and mouth, much more were they spoken of Him, who is God manifest in the flesh, the end of the law and the prophet." "In this passage it is Paul's object not merely to describe the righteousness which is of faith in Christ, but to show its antithesis (already in Moses), and thus to prove its necessity. Thus the connection as well as the contrast of law and gospel are preserved. This view suits the precise circumstances of the original utterance (see Forbes, pp. 356 ff.). That the variation (in ver. 7) and the omission of parts of the original, do not interfere with it, is obvious.—R.]

Say not in thine heart [μη ἰσχύῃς ἐν τῇ αὐδὴ σου. LXX.: ἴσχων; Hebrew, יָאָקֹב]. The passage is taken out of its grammatical connection, and in thine heart," added, as might well be done. The phrase is = think not (Alford).—R.

This is the ever-recurring secret or expressed language of the unbeliever: Revelation is something thoroughly heterogeneous and strange to, and in disagreement with, my nature. To the words say not, Paul has added in thine heart, perhaps to bring out the contradiction, that a witness of faith can assert itself in the same heart in which unbelief speaks negatively.

Who shall ascend into heaven? [Τίς ἀναβησθήσεται εἰς τὸν οὐρανόν: The αὐθην as of the LXX. is omitted.]. This formerly meant: It is impossible to bring down from heaven the law (that which has been lost, because it was foreign to us); but it now means: Who shall bring Christ down from heaven, that He may become man? the incarnation of the Son of God is inconceivable. Thus the actual incarnation of Christ is, to Paul, the full consequence of the moral truth of the Mosaic law.

That is, to bring Christ down, τοῦτο ἔστιν ἕκκλημα τὸν Χριστὸν καταγείρειν]. The γένος ἔστιν lays down the meaning of the Old Testament language in the New Testament sense. On the different explanations of it, see Tholuck, p. 565. [The two leading interpretations are (1.) That is to say,—i.e., whoever asks this question, says, in effect, Who will bring Christ down? thus he denies that He has come already—makes of the Incarnation an impossibility. (So Erasmus, Calvin, Philippi, and others.) (2.) That is, in order to bring Christ down. This gives the purpose of the ascension. In this view, τοῦτο ἔστιν is = the rabbinical μήτι. This implies also a denial of the Incarnation. See Meyer. In its favor is the fact, that a final clause follows in Deutero-Prophecy. The reference to the present position of Christ at the right hand of God (Calvin, Reiche, and others) is out of keeping with the con
text, especially the order in ver. 9. The passage has been tortured into a variety of special applications, but the majority of commentators now support the reference to the Incarnation, though differing as to the precise character of the questions (see below). It should be noticed, that this view assumes the certainty of the preexistence of Christ.—R.

Who shall descend into the deep? [ἡ Τις σάρκος αορείας εἰς τὴν ἀβύσσονα; LXX: τις βασπισθῆται ἡμῖν εἰς τὸ πέλαγος τῆς θαλάσσης]. The explanation of the Mosaic sea/1 According to Schultz, (Denticonomium), Beor the sea refers only to the vast exent of the sea. This would be tantative in relation to the foregoing. To bring from beyond the sea, can also not mean (according to Viringa), to bring over from the Greeks. That the sea may be considered as ἀβύσσονα, is proved by the harmony of the Septuagint. But ἀβύσσον is not ὕπα, and over the sea is also altogether a different idea from into the deep. The probable solution of the difference is, that the ideas over the ocean and beneath the earth coincide as designations of the realm of the dead. The Greek Tartarus is, indeed, under the earth, but not a real cavern under the earth. The Greek Elysium lies far out in the ocean, on the Isles of the Blessed. Also, in the present passage, Paul has evidently found the realm of the dead to be indicated by the words beyond the sea. Similar notions existed among the Celts and Germans. Meyer dismisses the question in a very untenable manner, when he says: The view of Keil, Bolken, and Ammon—that the place of the blessed (over the sea) is also meant in the Hebrew—confounds a heathen representation with the Jewish one of Sheol (see Job xxvi. 5, 6).

[Dr. Lange (following Chrysostom, De Wette, Meyer, and others) assumes throughout that these three questions are questions of unbelief, although finding in the passage something more than Meyer's brief statement: "Be not unbelieving, but believing." Alford gives a full discussion of the three views: questions of unbelief, of embarrassment, of anxiety. He combines all three: The anxious follower after righteousness is not disappointed by an impracticable code, nor mocked by an unhittible revelation; the word is near him, therefore accessible; plain and simple, and therefore apprehensible—deals with definite historical fact, and therefore certain; so that his salvation is not contingent on an amount of performance which is beyond him, and therefore inaccessible; irrational, and therefore incomprehensible; undefined, and therefore involved in uncertainty. Thus, it seems to me, we satisfy all the conditions of the argument; and thus, also, it is clearly brought out that the words themselves could never have been spoken by Moses of the righteousness which is of the true, but of that which is of faith." Dr. Hodge does not clearly define which view he adopts, although objecting to the thought, that the object is to encourage an anxious inquirer.—R.]. The reference of unbelief to an unbelief in the sitting of Christ at the right hand of God (by Melanchthon, Calvin, and others), removes the centre of the object of faith; this centre is the resurrection.

Ver. 8. But what saith it? [ἄλλα τι λέγεται] After the Apostle has shown what the righteousness which is of faith forbids saying, he brings out what it says itself to unbeliefs. Rückert and Philippi [Hodge and Stuart] have intensified this so much the antithesis between Moses and the rightousness of faith; Meyer obliterates it by formally referring even the expression concerning the righteousness of faith to "For Moses wrote." [The former position is almost inseparable from the view of ver. 4, and of the use of Old Testament language, which these commentators hold.—R.]

The word is nigh thee [ἡ γίνεσθαι τι ἐκ τοῦ Μωϋσέου]. The γίνεσθαι is stronger than if it were γένεσθαι. It is one next to thee, a neighbor, a relative of thine. The opinion of Chrysostom, Grotius, and others [held to some extent by Stuart, Hodge, and others], that this verse is an assurance how easy it is to become righteous, is foreign to the context. We must not suppose that this is an expression of merely the historical acquaintance with Christianity. If this were the case, how could it be said to the doubter and unbeliever? It is in thy mouth and in thy heart? [The Apostle evidently here says, not what is, but what may be, just as Moses had done (Tholuck).—R. But as the word of life, which should be peculiarly in the mouth and in the heart, it is attested in a twofold way. First, it is the word of faith,* which we, the apostles, as God's heralds and Christ's witnesses, preach. Second, its effect is, that he who confesses Jesus with the mouth as his Lord, and believes in his heart, that He is risen from the dead to a blessed life, shall be saved.

Ver. 9. Because [ὁ πηρός]. The E. V. follows Beza, the Vulgate, &c., in rendering ὁ πηρός, that, indicating the purport of the word preached. Dr. Hodge gives, besides, a view which connects this verse directly with the former part of ver. 8: it says that, &c.; but this is opposed by any proper view of the citation from Deuteronomy. The sense, as now generally agreed (Tholuck, Stuart, De Wette, Meyer, Alford), is that of because, or for, giving a proof of what precedes. To mouth and heart correspond confession and belief. This purport of the preaching would scarcely be stated in this form.—R.]

[If thou shalt confess with thy mouth, ἕνων ὑπολογίσης ἐν τῷ σώματι σου. Confession is put first here, on account of the connection with the words quoted in ver. 8. This is a further proof of the meaning because. In ver. 10, belief comes first (Tholuck).]

Jesus and Lord [Χριστός ὁ Κυρίος]. The mass of commentators are disposed to take χριστός as a predicate placed first for emphasis, and render as above. So Tholuck, Stuart, Hodge, De Wette, Meyer, Schaff, Webster and Wilkinson, Noyes, Lange, Alford doubts this interpretation; comp. his note in loco. See Textual Note 9: Hodge: "To confess Christ as Lord, is to acknowledge Him as the Messiah; recognized as such of God, and invested with all the power and prerogatives of the meditorial throne." Used in such close connection with a citation from the LXX., which translates Jehovah by the same word χριστός, it certainly means more than an acknowledgment of power and moral excellence; especially as this part of our verse corresponds with the coming down from heaven alluded to in ver. 6.—R. Just as the words "Lord Jesus" correspond with to bring down from heaven, so raised him.
from the dead corresponds with to bring up from the dead.—Thou shalt be saved, σωθήσῃς, belief, with the heart, in the central fact of redemption, not as an isolated historical event, but as linked indissolubly with the coming of the Son of God, now the ascended Lord—and hence confession of Him as such—these are the requisites for salvation. "A dumb faith is no faith!" (Olschhausen).—R.

Ver. 10. The experimental proof of the right-eousness which is of faith.

For with the heart faith is exercised unceasingly, and with the mouth confession is made unto salvation. The Apostle presents, in this verse, the parallelism with reference to ver. 9, and the underlying passage of Dout. xxx. 14. Yet he now reverses the order of heart and mouth, in harmony with the genesis of the life of faith, especially in the New Testament. As a matter of course, faith and confession are connected with each other, just as the heart and the mouth, or as the heart and speech; that faith without confession, would return to unbelief, but confession without faith would be hypocrisy. However, the distinction is correct: first, faith in the heart, then, confession with the mouth. There is the same distinction of effects. Faith in the heart results in justification; confession with the mouth—that is, the decided standing up for faith with word and deed—results in ἀδικία in its final significance, deliverance from evil to salvation, with the joy and freshness of faith. It is natural to man that only that first becomes his complex possession and his perfect joy which he confesses socially with his mouth, and which he maintains by his life. See Tholuck, p. 571, on the apprehension of the early Protestant orthodoxy, that by a distinction of the two parts εἰς δικαιοσύνην and εἰς σωτηρίαν prejudice would be done to the doctrine of justification. The doctrine of the righteousness which is of faith has, indeed, been carried to such excess, that it has been regarded as prejudiced by the requirement of the fruit of faith in the final judgment. This reduces it to a dead-letter affair, and is a failure to appreciate the necessary elements in the development of life. The Apostle's testimony is so decidedly one of experience, that it expresses the permanent force of the law of faith by the passive forms: ματαιωθήσατε, ὕπολογίσηται. This is its custom; thus is the kingdom of heaven taken by force.

Ver. 11. The testimony of Scripture for the righteousness of faith.

For the Scripture saith (Isa. xxviii. 16). "Πᾶς," says Meyer, "is neither in the LXX. nor in the Hebrew, but Paul has added it in order to mark the (to him) important feature of universal-ity, which he found in the unlimited δι' ἀνωτέρων.

* [Alford thus paraphrases: "With the heart, faith is exercised (προστεθεσθαι, men believe) unto (so as to be available to the acquisition of) righteousness, but (q. d., not only so; but there must be an act of confession, in order for justification to be carried forward to salvation) with the mouth confession is made unto salvation."—R.]

† [Dr. Hodge is very guarded here. "By confessing Him before men, we secure the performance of His promise that before His angels of God He will hear our prayers. . . . We surely may not fear to interpret salvation as an actual salvation, begun here in us, and to culminate at that time, when we shall be thus confessed."—R.]

οὐ." This is, in meaning, certainly contained in the γίνεσθαι. The weight of the clause lies in the fact that only faith is here desired. The Apostle has very justifiably referred the ἐν' αὐτῷ to Christ.

Shall not be put to shame. That is, shall attain to salvation (see chap. v. 5; ix. 23).

B. The universality of faith. Vers. 12, 16; The testimony of Scripture for the universality of faith.

Ver. 12. For there is no distinction between Jew and Greek ὑπὸ γὰρ ἐστιν διαθήκη Ἰουδαίων τε καὶ Ἑλλήνων. This rendering is more literal than that of the R.V. See Textual Note 11. Greek stands here for Gentiles. Comp. chap. i. 18; also in chap. iii. 22.—R. No difference in reference to the freedom of faith; in reference to the possibility and necessity of attaining to salvation by faith. The right of faith is the same to Jews and Gentiles. Proof:

For the same is Lord of all [ὁ γὰρ ἀνώτατος κύριος πάντων. See Textual Note 11]. Strictly speaking, I must suppose a breviloquium also here: One and the same Lord is Lord over all. The one Lord is Christ, according to Origen, Chrysostom, Bengel, Tholuck, and most other expositors (see ver. 9). Others refer the expression to God (Grotius, Ammon, Köllner, &c.); Meyer, on the other hand, has good ground for observing that it was first necessary to introduce the Christian character, as Olschhausen has done ("God in Christ"); see Acts x. 36; Phil. ii. 11.

Rich. [Langae: ereisend sich rich.] Πιστις (see chap. viii. 32; xi. 33; Eph. i. 7; ii. 7; iii. 8).

Unto all [εἰς πάντας. Alford: toward all; Lange: über alle; Meyer: für alle, zum Besten Aller; Olschhausen: "By εἰς is signified the direction in which the stream of grace rushes forth."—R.] This is both the enlargement and restriction of Christ's rich proofs of salvation. Only those who call upon him [τοιούτοις ἐπικαλομένοις αὐτοῦ], but also all who call upon him, share in His salvation. The calling upon Him is the specific proof of faith, by which they accept Him a their Lord and Saviour.

Ver. 13. [For every one whosoever, &c., πᾶς γὰρ ὅς εἰς τὸν Θεόν. See Textual Note 11.] Scipharal proof: Joel iii. 5. [LXX. and E. V., ii. 32.] Tholuck: "The omission of the exact form of the quotation occurs either in universally known declarations, as in Eph. v. 31, or where the Apostle makes an Old Testament statement the substratum of his own thought, as in chap. xli. 34, 35." Paul has specified the name κύριος in Joel as the name of the God of revelation, in harmony with the messianic passage. "If we accept a reference to Christ in ver. 12, we must do the same here, as, indeed, the next verse also requires. Alford well says: "There is hardly a stronger proof, or one more irrefragable by those who deny the Godhead of our Blessed Lord, of the unhesitating application to Him

* [Alford thus paraphrases: "The Apostle seems to use it here as taking up upon Himself the expressions, ver. 4. At all events, there is a correspondence to the starting-point, chap. ix. 23 where the same passage was cited, and this enlargement of it is at once established in the verses which follow. A weighty monograph (Wordsworth, "The Godhead") sustains this view."—R.]

† [Meyer means that, if God is referred to, we must add this dedication, εἰς θεόν; as in the Hebrew, where the auxiliary is, we be well remarks.—R.]
by the Apostle of the name and attributes of Jehova...—R."

Vers. 14, 15: The realization of the universal righteousness of faith through the universality of preaching and the apostolic mission.

Verse 14: How then can they call on him? [πως δεν επικαλέστων εἰς ἡμᾶς ἀποστόλοις.] The definite preachers spring first from the divine mission. But the Apostle proves, as in Isa. lii. 7, that there must be such sent (apostolic) preachers.

As it is written, How beautiful, &c. The Apostle here repeats the prophet's announcement in an abridged and free manner, but yet in strict conformity with the sense; following the original text more closely than the LXX. According to Meyer, the prophetic passage in question speaks of the happy deliverance from exile, while the Apostle has very properly interpreted it in its messianic character as a prophecy of the gospel preachers of the messianic kingdom. But the full, mysterious messianic import of the prophetic passage extends beyond the meaning of a typical prophecy as verbal prophecy. The beauty of the feet of the messengers of peace is hardly spoken of, because the feet of the one who approach becomes visible (Tholuck), but because they, in their running and hastening, in their scaling and climbing mountains, and in their appearance and descent from mountains, are the symbolical phenomena of the earnestly desired winged movement and appearance of the gospel itself. Paul has left out the mountains, and has given the collective singular a plural form, according to the sense; peace has to him the full idea of the gospel salvation; the good things are rich, displayed, saving blessings which proceed from the one salvation.

Vers. 16-18: But as the gospel is, on the one hand, naturally free and universal in relation to the antithesis of Jews and Gentiles, so, on the other, it is, according to its inward nature, conditioned by the antithesis of faith and unbelief.

Verse 16. But they did not all hearken to the glad tidings [εὖ αὐτοῖς ἀκούσαν tῷ εὐαγγελίῳ.] The aorist is historic; during the preaching (Alford). Hence the general reference is to be admitted, especially as the αὐτός contrasts with the preaching to "all," the limited result.—R.  

Theodore of Mopsuestia and Reichel do violence to the connection in reading these words as a question. Fritzsche holds that they refer to the Gentiles; and Meyer, to the Jews. But they refer chiefly to the difference between believers and unbelievers in general, for there were also unbelievers among the Gentiles; and, above all, the question was the general establishment of the antithesis: believers and unbelievers, and then its application to Jews and Gentiles.

Lord, who believed our report? [Κύριε, τις ἐπίστευσεν τῇ αὐτοῦ ἡμῶν; An exact quotation from the LXX.] This citation from the prophet Isaiah, chap. iii. 1, is mainly a strong proof of this: that the preaching of salvation does not meet with faith on the part of all to whom it is preached, although in this citation the reference to the Jews comes out more definitely. The hyperbolical expression of the prophet means: "Only a few believe." The entire contents of Isa. iii. prove that here we have not only to deal with a typical prophecy, but also with a verbal one.

On the different interpretations of αὐτός, see Tholuck, p. 577: "That which is preached, to preach which is apprehended," or, in which the Apostle upon the right apprehension (the words of obedience).—Not all. That is not all within the reach of
This is the sense, if we adopt the usual meaning of ἀκοή; and, indeed, it gives ἠκοη a simpler sense. De Wette suggests that ἠκοη prepares for τὸ ἔρωτα ἐν τῷ νόσῳ in the next verse.—R.

Ver. 18. But I say, Did they not hear? [ἐλλὰ δὲ λέγω, οὐκ ἠκοῆσαν;] The indefinite ὅ [which Dr. Lange supplies] is regarded by Meyer as denoting the ἀκοη; and, according to Tholuck, as that which has herefore been the subject under consideration; which is sufficient. [All the difficulty about the verb here disappears, if Forbes’ view be accepted. There is no necessity for going back to ver. 14, or making the matter indefinite. The Apostle has been speaking of the necessity of hearing, of the thing heard; now he says: did they not hear? The universality of the privilege is affirmed.—R.] Although reference is constantly made to the Jews, the question is nevertheless, principally and formally, concerning unbelievers in general. If unbelievers, as unbelieving people, can excuse themselves by saying that they have not heard God’s message, the most direct answer would be: “Then they should not be unwearying in the necessity of hearing.” But the Apostle rather brings out the fact of the incipient universal propagation of the gospel, by clothing it in the language of Ps. xiii. 4, from the LXX.

Nor is this the sense, if we render ἀκοη, [ἀκοη ἐν τῷ νόσῳ] the word. [The word ἀκοη has occasioned much difficulty. For, if rendered report, preaching, here, then it would seem natural to give it the same sense in ver. 17. But if this be done, then a second term must receive an unmeaning meaning (see below). General commentators have admitted that its meaning here without question, and then in various ways met the subsequent difficulty. Forbes, however, strikes at the root of the matter, and claims that there is no ground for rendering ἀκοη, report, or, what we cause others to hear. His view has been adopted by Hengstenberg, and is the most satisfactory solution yet offered. ἀκοη, like the Hebrew equivalent, he claims with reason,* refers to the message viewed from the side of the hearer, not from that of the preacher. The prophet is speaking in the name of his countrymen, as he does throughout the chapter: Who (of us) hath believed that which we heard? (See Forbes, pp. 362 ff.) This view is more literal; it does not disturb in the least the general drift of the argument, while it relieves ver. 17 of a great difficulty. In fact, Meyer, Alford, and others, approach this sense, but too indirectly; this is as simple as it is satisfactory.—R.]

Ver. 17: So then faith cometh of hearing [ἀκοη ἐν τῷ νόσῳ] from the ἀκοη. [The word, explains Hengstenberg (Tholuck, Meyer [Hodge, and most]); the act of hearing (Calixtus, Philiippi, and others); hearing with faith (Weller, and other Lutherans expositors). As this preaching does not meet with universal faith, only the announcement itself can be meant. [Accepting Forbes’ explanation of ἀκοη in ver. 16, we apply it here: Faith comes from what is heard, not the act of hearing—which gives a different sense from ver. 16: nor what is preached—which confuses this word and ἠκοη.—R.]

And hearing through the word of God [ἡ ἀκοη διὰ τοῦ ἐρωτου. See Textual Note 22 on the reading Χωροντ.] Different explanations of the ἐρωτα προτετελεθη: 1. God’s revealed word (Tholuck, and others): 2. God’s order, commission (Beza, Meyer [Hodge], and others). The ground: Because otherwise ἐρωτα προτετελεθη would not be different from ἀκοη. But strictly speaking, both words have an inseparable union to ver. 14’s revealed word with which prophets and apostles were entrusted. The Divine message, as such, is a formal sending, a commission and a material sending; or, with these, also a preaching. Therefore Tholuck does not appear to be correct, when he says that τὸ ἐρωτα προτετελεθη παντις denotes not God’s order, but His oracles; Jer. i. 1, κε. Nevertheless, there does exist a difference between this ἠκοη and the ἀκοη: ἀκοη is every message of salvation to the end of the world; but the ἐρωτα προτετελεθη denotes the Divine sources of revelation, on whose efficacy the authority and effect of every message depend: The word, and the fact, and the effect in life taken together. Therefore διὰ τοῦ ἐρωτου. [The thing heard is through or by means of the revelation of God.]

* This is the classical usage, and all the New Testament passages can be quite as readily explained thus. The Hebrew word is not Hiphil, yet the common interpretation forces a Hiphil sense upon it. [H.-R.]

† [Stuart has a singular view respecting this verse. He finds in it the suggestion of the Jewish objector, whom he has already discovered in verse 14. To the effect that the Jews are culpable for unbelief, inasmuch as they have not heard the gospel, and hearing it is necessary to the believing of it. —R.]

* [The LXX. thus renders ἔτ(public noise), which means, first their time; then, from the string of an instrument, their sound.—R.]
the hyperbolical form of the Apostle's statement of the universal propagation of the gospel, disappears just in proportion as that propagation is regarded not quantitatively, but qualitatively. Jerusalem and Rome were the centres of the ancient world. But, in addition to them, there were many other general centres. The error of expounding the passage in the sense of a quantitative universality could not hold good, even if we admit that the gospel had at that time reached America; the whole of the fifth grand division of the world, as well as all Africa, would also have to come into consideration.


Ver. 19. But I say, Did Israel not know? [v. 15, σαφῆς οὖς ἐγγύς:] The Apostle now passes over to the long-prepared antithesis of unbelieving Israel and of the believing Gentiles. But yet, in his representation of this fearful inversion (which stirred up unbelieving Judaism) of the old theocratic relation—according to which the Jews were God's people, and the Gentiles were given up to themselves—he has recourse to the witnesses of the Old Testament respecting the beginning and prospect of this inversion. After the first question: "Have unbelievers not heard the gospel?" there follows the second: "Did not Israel know it?" We may now ask: What is referred to? Explanations:

1. That the gospel should pass from the Gentiles to the Jews (Thomas Aquinas, Calovius, Tholuck [Stuart, Hodge, Jowett], and others). But that there was only conditionally uttered, and is not contained in the foregoing.

2. The gospel (Chrysostom, and others). [Here must be classed Calvin and Beza, who supply: the truth of God; Philippi and Forbes: the word or message of God (from ver. 17). The last named defend their view, from the emphasis which seems to rest on Israel (in the correct reading), and from the parallelism with ver. 18. Meyer opposes, with reason, the μη-οὖς, which anticipates an affirmative answer; nor is this objection met, by saying that an affirmative might be expected, that Israel ought to have known the gospel. Paul knew too sadly that the reverse was the fact.—R.]

3. That the gospel should become universal, according to the preceding language of the Psalm (Fritzsche, De Wette [Alford], Meyer). Meyer places Tholuck also in this category. Tholuck, however, now declares for (1.), as follows: "But yet the following prophetic declarations do not contain so much the universality of preaching, as explanations of the inverted relation which God will assume toward Gentiles and Jews."

At all events, the citation immediately following is not simply a proof of the universality of the gospel. But it only follows therefrom, that a new statement is made with: the proof. This also holds good of the last quotation. The progress is as follows: a. Universality; Ps. xix. b. The faith of the Gentiles for the awakening of the faith of the Jews; Deut. xxxii. 21. c. The faith of the Gentiles; Isa. lxv. 1. d. The unbelief of the Jews; Isa. lxv. 2. Therefore we regard the explanation of Fritzsche, [Ac, as correct, and all the more striking, as the fulfilment of this very ancient prospect just now became an offence to Israel.—Proof:

First Moses saith [πρῶτος Μωσῆς λέγει. First, in the order; of the prophetic roll] (Alford), with reference to Isaiah, as one among the many others, more or lessforward to the same effect. Wetstin, Storr, E. J., join πρῶτος with οία ἐγγύς, but on insufficient grounds.—R.] The future universality of the Abrahamic blessing had been declared earlier, but it was Moses who first declared that there should be no difference between Jews and Gentiles before God's righteousness; indeed, that possibly the Gentiles, in their good conduct, might be preferred to the Jews in their bad conduct. Thus the same Moses who communicated to Israel its economic advantages over the Gentiles, was he who had set up the rule of faith by which this relation could possibly be inverted in the future.

I will provoke you to jealousy [Ἐγὼ παραγίνωσον ἡνακόσια. The only variation from the LXX. (which closely follows the Hebrew) is the substitution of ἡνακόσια, in each clause, for αἰνεῖον. —R.] Thus Moses speaks to Israel in the name of the Lord; Deut. xxxii. 21.

With those who are no people [ἐξερχόμενος ἐκ θεών]. The precise force of the preposition is with difficulty conveyed by any English word. It is not = against, although that is implied; nor = by means of, but rather, on account of. With expresses the weaker shade of instrumental force sufficiently well, but the real sense is: aroused on account of and directed toward a no-people.—R.] ὑμεῖς ἐκ θεών. The Gentile nations were not recognized as true nations in the idea of the people, because they were devoid of that religious and moral principle which transforms nature into a moral nationality; see chap. ix. 29; 1 Peter ii. 10. "ἐκ θεών," denotes, strictly speaking, the increasing mass of natural human beings; ὑμεῖς, from ἐκ θεών, a connection, assembly, community. [The words people, nation, are used in the E. V. to preserve the distinction between the Hebrew words. Despite the fact that the LXX. has used the same word to render both, it has not been overlooked in the E. V. in this passage.—R.] The explanation of the "no-people" (the ὑμεῖς denies the idea contained in a ἀσωματικόν connected with it), is found in the following parallel:

By a foolish nation [ἐπί θεών ἐκ θεών ἐκ θεών]. The religious and moral folly of the Gentile consisted in his not seeking God's signs with resignation; for which reason they also could not seek Him. Paul, with good ground, sees in the thoroughly prophetic song of Moses, which looked far beyond Israel's history in the wilderness and its relation to the Canaanites (Deut. xxvii. 48), a typical, and still more than a typical prophecy, which should be fulfilled in many ways in preludes, and which has finally been fulfilled in the almost complete changes of the relation between Israel and the Gentiles in relation to the gospel. In ver. 21, neither Israel's iniquity in the wilderness, nor the Canaanite people, is meant alone. On the different untenable explanations, including those of Philippi, see Tholuck, p. 583 [given above].

* [Noyes, in his version, preserves the parallelism of the verbs: παραγίνωσκω, παραγίνωσκω, παραγίνωσκω, by the paraphrase: I will move you to jealousy, I will exclaim you to indignation.—R.]
antithesis there then arises the description of the new Israel, which was to be called by another name (ver. 16.). By the Jews, see chap. lxi. 12, 18, 19, 21. But the antitheses in verses 1 and 2, come still more into consideration. In verse 1 we read, "πᾶς ἡμῖν;" in verse 2, "διὰ φόβου." The "πᾶς," in verse 1, is "πᾶσιν ὑπὲρ," which could not very well denote the Israelites, whether the people be considered passive or active (see Tholuck, p. 554), as the question in both cases is the official form of their religion; ἡμῖν, on the other hand, in verse 2, is designated as ὑπὲρ; it is a people pledged to the Lord, but is now an apostate people. The antithesis is still stronger, that the Lord is now a subject of search on the part of a people (God) which had never inquired after Him; that He is found by those who did not seek Him, and must merely be found with the words ισχύς ἐκ της, while He had to spread out His hands in vain the whole day to a rebellious people. In verse 1, a people is spoken of which now not only inquires after the Lord, but even searches after Him; but, in verse 2, it is a people which has so fully turned away from Him, that He seeks it the whole day in vain. Thus the ἡμῖν, in verse 2, rather than ἐκ της at the beginning, must be read as a strengthened preterite. The Lord answers the question, whether He would afflict very sorely, by referring to His compassion to the Gentiles (Jerome). Then He explains, in verse 2, how this turning from Him has occurred. "I have spread out my hands" (in vain), &c. The exegetical abridgment of this last chapter is connected with an abridgment of the whole of the second part of Isaiah. Tholuck, not satisfied with the defence of the older interpretation of this passage by H.ogstenberg, Hofmann, and Stier, takes a middle position between Paul and the expositors cited, by remarking "that the prophet did not speak, in verse 1, of the Gentiles, and yet that Paul did speak, in verse 2, of the Jews." But what would the ἀποτολαθά then mean? Paul could, indeed, have good ground for not naming the Gentiles, because a consequent exclusion of the chosen substance of Israel could have been inferred. Stier's explanation is therefore so far correct as it holds that, in verse 1, Israel is added, yet not after its first call, but after its dissolution into the "no-people" of the Gentile world. [There is no other view of the passage, except that which refutes it, as originally used, to the Gentiles, that conscribes with Paul's prudence as a reasoner, much less with his apostolic authority and inspiration. To the argument of Dr. Lange nothing need be added.—R.]

Ver. 21. But of Israel [πρὸς δὲ τὸν Ἰσραὴλ]. Erasmus, odoerus; De Wette, [Philipp], Alford (Meyer, &c.), and others, with respect to Israel; Vulgate and Rüdbeck, to Israel. We adopt with respect to, since the prophet had already made the foregoing declaration to Israel.

He saith [ἐλέγει]. Namely, Isaiah, in the name of God.—All day long I stretched forth my hands, Ὅλην τὴν ἡμέραν ἐκπίπταμα τὰς χείρας μου. The spreading out of the hands, says Tholuck, is not (as Fritzsche would have it) the gestus of the one inviting to his embrace, but, according to Chrysostom, the gestus of the super-

* [Stier, Jesuas, nicht Pseudo-Jesuas, pp. 597 ff.—E.]
† [See Conybeare: "The metaphor is that of a mother opening her arms to call back her child to her embrace.—E.]

Ver. 20. But Isaiah is very bold, and saith [Ἡσαίας δὲ ἀποτολαθάν ἡμῖν]. Lange: Dr. Lange, as usual, has regarded a reference to the words of the Prophet, as they may be understood, and the expression of the Greek, Bengel: Quod Moses insinuaret, Ecclesiasticus adulator et plane eloquentem.—R.]. The Apostle regarded it as great boldness in Isaiah to say the words of chaps. lxv. 1 and 2 in the hearing of the Jews, as the first verse, according to his explanation, expressed mercy to the Gentiles, and the second the hardness and apostasy of the Jews.

[I was found by those who sought me not, Ἐγὼ δὲ τοὺς ἐπιθυμοῦντας ἐμαυτόν, &c. See Textual Note 44, for the text of the Hebrew original and the LXX., to the former of which Dr. Lange refers so frequently. The Apostle has transposed the clauses.—R.] The question is now raised first of all by the later exegesis, whether Paul's explanation of Isaiah's passage is correct? Meyer says: "In its strict sense, Isa. lxv. 1 (freely from the Septuagint, and with an inversion of both the parallel members) treat of the Jews; but in a typical sense, which Paul clearly perceives in it, they are types of the Gentiles," &c. But in this case, Paul would have made an exegetical without any evidence, and would have exposed himself to the legitimate contradiction and censure of the Jews. Tholuck also remarks, that if the Apostle, in verse 1, referred directly to the Gentiles, his application would have to be regarded as having missed its object. In the first place, namely, Tholuck says that rabbinical expositors (Jarchi, &c.) have "simply and satisfactorily" explained verses 1 and 2 as relating to the same subjects. He further says: "Independently of these rabbinical predecessors, the same explanation has been adopted by Geccenuus, Ewald, Hitzig, and Umbrecht, which last writer translates: 'I was to be inquired of!' There is just ground for disapproving of Luther's confidence in inserting in verse 20: to the Gentiles, and in beginning verse 21 with a for— for I speak, &c. Yet the exegetical authorities cited are utterly refuted, not only by Paul's authority,—although we cannot even admit that in one of his last sword-thrusts he has made not merely a random stroke, but even wounded himself— but also by the connection of the whole of Isaiah's passage, chap. lixii. 7—lxvi. The antitheses in general between the strongly Old Testament Jewish prayer in chap. lixii. 7 ff., and the prophetic New Testament interpretation of the passage, chap. lixvi. 7—lxvi., here first to be considered. It is said that the prayer is undoubtedly designed to express Israel's state of mind; that it contains angry and passionate elements; and that the Lord must so reveal himself that the Gentiles will tremble at His name (verse 17); chap. lxi. 1. The prayer is a conflict between the profoundest contrition and the most painful dejection, and it dies away in a question which sounds like a reproach. The Lord now answers, it is said, in the cold reproach: "I was to be sought." And this is claimed to be the simplest rendering of ἐπιθυμοῦντας. But what does the Lord answer in relation to the people of Israel, and in relation to the Gentiles? In chap. lixiv. 8 ff. we read: "Thou art our Father; we are the clay, and thou our potter," &c. Finally: "O Lord, wilt thou hold thy peace, and afflict us very sore?" Compare here the answer in chap. lxv. 2, and further. In verse 8 the familiar thought again recurs to the prophet: A remnant of the people will be saved; from verse 18 onward he explains by a grand antithesis. From this
DOCTRINAL AND ETHICAL.

1. The intercession of the believer a sign of hope and salvation to those for whom it is made.

2. The bright and dark sides of religious zeal. If it be not purified by progressive, living knowledge, it becomes inverted into the carul zeal of fanaticism. On the first appearance of Jewish fanaticism, see the Commentary on Genesis [p. 564, Amer. ed.].

3. Self-righteousness has many forms. The starting-point is the effort for the righteousness of the law, not as it is attained inwardly by simplicity and humility, but as it, by self-complacency and impurity, falls into externality. In this direction the righteousness of the law becomes the righteousness of works; and from this there results self-righteousness, which branches out into many forms—into the ecclesiastical and political form of confessional and partisan righteousness; into the ecclesiastical and scholastic form of doctrinal righteousness (orthodoxism); into the worldly form of moral righteousness; into the pietistic form of righteousness of feeling; and into the philosophical and brutal forms of the denial of all personal guilt. In all forms it inverts the relation between God and man—between the Creator and the creature—between God's sovereignty and man's own will—between God's law and the self-made service and law—between grace and works—and between the good of life and the bad of life. Inward false show. Its real want is the want of the heart's upward look at the throne of God's eternal majesty; and this want is also the first guilt; the positive ruin connected therewith is the baseness of the mind's look at things below; the lost state of the mind's look in the abject beholding of self. But as this self-righteousness is so thoroughly selfish that it misunderstands and scorns the proffer of God's freely-given righteousness, the gospel of grace, so is it likewise selfish in connecting itself inseparably with fanaticism.

4. Christ is the end of the law, because He is the fulfillment of the law; therefore He is, on one side, the end where the law is changed into the collective principle of the new birth; and, on the other, He is the end in which it lays off its eternal Old Testament form and meaning; just as ripe fruit becomes freed from its bondage in the husk. See Ezek. Notes.

5. Ver. 5. The doctrine of eternal life has developed itself embryonically by stages: In this life, God's blessing, God's glorious deliverance from the manifold danger of death, and, in the future, the peaceful slumber of those delivered from beds of earthly suffering, their celebration of the marriage supper of the Lamb, and their safety in Abraham's bosom, &c. The development, just as every biblical doctrine, has taken place in organic conformity to the law. According to Tischl, p. 557, the eschatology of the Jews of Palestine at the time of Christ had already attained to the idea of eternal life. Yet they hardly attained to the idea of eternal life in the Christian sense. [It must ever be remembered that the ideals, immortality and eternal life, are not identical. Zor] has a new meaning in the New Testament. Comp. the thoughtful remarks of Trench, Syn. X. T., § xxvii.—R.]

6. The righteousness of faith speaks even in Moses, if Moses be properly understood and explained. [Comp. Ezey. Notes on vers. 7—9.—R.]

7. The truth of the inward essence of the law, like that of the gospel, and therefore the truth of the whole saving revelation of God, is based on its inward character—on its inward union with the most profound and comprehending aspect of Christianity. [Doubtless the immortality and incorruptibility also rest upon the same basis. Just as man must return from all by-ways (for his salvation or for his judgment) to the idea of God, so must he return to the idea of the God-man, of guilt, the atonement, deliverance, the new birth, and the new and eternal life. The objection urged against revelation, and especially against Christianity, that this religion beclouds the earthly life by an exclusive representation of heaven, and the present by an exclusive assertion of the future, the realm of the dead, and duration after death, is removed by a passage which the Apostle cites and elaborates from Deuteronomy. Christ is on the earth in so far as He has become inseparably incorporated with it by His historical presence and union with humanity; and He is just as much in this life, and present in His judgments and bestowals of salvation, as He is in the eternal world, as the future Finisher of all things.

8. Faith and confession; see Ezey. Notes. The delivering power of confession. Because it: 1. makes inward faith irreproachable; 2. Breaks loose from unbelief; 3. Unites with believers, becomes flesh and blood, and, in a good sense, acquires worldly form, worldly power, and the power of manifestation; 4. Pledges itself to full consistency in word and deed, life and death. Christians have had good ground for holding martyrdom in such high honor. But if martyrdom can be exaggerated and overvalued, how much more can a confessional righteousness be overvalued, which seeks its protection and peace under the shadow of formulas! 9. The centre of faith and the centre of confession; see ver. 9. The centre of faith is Christ's resurrection, with all that it comprises; the centre of confession is Jesus as the Lord, and therefore not the Christianity of Christ, but the Christ of Christianity. [Hence the Apostle does not say: If thou shalt confess with thy mouth thy doctrine, and believe in thine heart in justification by faith, thou shalt be saved; yet often he is represented as saying this, and no more. The living Christ is not in such a gospel.—R.]

10. With the complete freedom of revelation and of God to people there has also come the full protection of faith against unbelief.

11. The riches of the Lord to a praying human world.
19. The order of the gospel message. Its necessity, its promise, its authority, its condition (the Divine mission; direct or indirect). See the interesting statements which Tholuck makes, p. 380 ff., on the assertion of the Lutheran theologians of the seventeenth century, as well as of their latest companions in adherence to the letter, that this text (and the article of the general call) forces us to accept the position that the gospel had been preached in all the world at Paul's time.

21. We must be careful to distinguish, that the question here is not the necessity of the official bearers or messengers of God's word, but not of them exclusively. Or, more strictly speaking, the sending has two sides, and does not consist simply in official arrangements and forms. [This is even more apparent, if we understand ver. 17 to refer to what is heard, rather than what is preached; and then consider how the Apostle proves from an Old Testament description of the voice of God in nature (ver. 19), the universality of this privilege. —R.]

14. The fact of the messengers on the mountains, or the beauty of the progressive course of the gospel.

15. Unbelief in the gospel is disobedience, specific disobedience and rage; Ps. ii. The more grossly and roughly human nature is apprehended, the more external become the ideas of obedience and disobedience; the more profoundly, purely, and inwardly they are viewed, the more profoundly, purely, and inwardly is this antithesis defined; and, finally, and fundamentally, faith in God's word is specific obedience, while unbelief is specific disobedience, specific rebellion. [The LXX. form of Isa. lxxx. 2 (ver. 21), by dividing the idea of rebellion into disobedience and gainsaying, only recognizes the connection between refraining God's commands and contradicting His words: disobedience and unbelief, acting and reading upon each other continually. —R.]

16. The prudent advance of the Apostle in his judgment, that Israel has changed its part with the Gentiles by its unbelief, and has become an apostate people, is here a characteristic of his masterly apostolic wisdom of instruction, as well as of his apostolic heart, as, with a shudder of imminent sorrow, he gradually draws aside the curtain from the ghastly picture of Israel. The argument from the Old Testament is in conformity with the law that every apostle must be discussed from the acknowledged sources, statements, or principles of the opponent, and that its possibility ceases where there cease to be positions in common.

HOMILETICAL AND PRACTICAL.

a. Vers. 1, 2. The benevolent disposition of the Apostle toward Israel. It is clear: 1. From his wish and prayer that they might be saved; 2. From his record that they have a zeal of God, but not according to knowledge. —A zeal for God is good, but it should not exist without knowledge (ver. 2).

—How often ignorant zeal occurs: 1. In domestic; 2. In civil; and 3. In ecclesiastical affairs; and, unfortunately, it occurs most frequently in the last (ver. 2). —The folly of ignorant zeal. It is foolish: 1. In regard to its starting-point; 2. Its end; 3. The choice of means (ver. 2). —Wise and Ignorant zeal.

Bessen: When Paul cherishes, and expresses in praying to God, the hearty wish that they who have stumbled against the stone of offence may yet be saved, he certainly has no knowledge of any absolute decree of condemnation on any man, not even on the most stiff-necked Jews (ver. 1). —One of our elder teachers lamented: "The Jews had, and still have, a zeal without knowledge; but we, alas, have an understanding without zeal" (ver. 2).

b. Ver. 3. Our own righteousness, and righteousness which is of God (Luke xvii. 9–14). 1. The former is proud, and leads to humiliation; 2. The latter, on the contrary, is humble, and leads to exaltation.

Stark, Landor: No persons are farther from God's kingdom, and more difficult to be converted, than those who, when they hear of the method of salvation, have so much of their own righteousness as to think that they have long conformed to it.
of confession, and so little is inwardly believed (vers. 9-11).—The great confession of the Christian Church, as expressed: 1. In the apostolic confession of faith; 2. In the hymns of the church; 3. In its prayers; 4. In its celebration of the Lord’s Supper (ver. 10).—It is the confession of the Christian Church: 1. In the beginning (the time of the first persecutions); 2. In the period of the Reformation; 3. At the present time (the martyrs in Madagascar, on the South Sea Islands, in Borneo, Syria, &c.; ver. 10).

LUTHER: He who does not believe that Christ has died, and risen, in order to make us righteous from our sins, says: Who shall ascend into heaven, and who shall descend into the deep? But this is done by those who would be justified by works, and not by faith, when they speak thus with the mouth, but not in the heart. *Emphasis est in verbo:* in the heart.

STARK: Christ is the essence of the Old Testament Scriptures also; he little understands them who does not find Christ in them. The entire life of the saints of the Old Testament is a prophecy of Christ (ver. 6).—Say not, "Who has been among the dead, and has returned again, and has told us the condition of the dead?" Stand by the gospel truth, and you will be righteous and saved; Luke vi. 81 (ver. 7).—Be comforted, troubled soul; though you do not have the joy of faith just in the hour of temptation, you will nevertheless be saved, so long as you depend on Christ; for God, who does not lie, has often given you the assurance that you shall be saved (ver. 11).—Cramer: The mouth and the heart cannot be separated; Ps. cxvi. 10 (ver. 9).—Faith must not grow on the tongue, but in the heart; Acts xv. 9 (ver. 10).—Hedinger: The heart without the mouth is timidity; the mouth without the heart is hypocrisy (ver. 10).

Spenker: We read that the word is nigh us, namely, that it is declared to us; that we have it in the heart—where the Holy Spirit has impressed it; and in the mouth, by which we declare it. Therefore, it is not something concealed in heaven, or in the deep, but we have it with us, and in us. Verily, we may say that the word means not only the word itself, but also the blessings which that word presents—Christ, with all His gospel treasures. Christ’s merit, grace, Spirit, and Life are not far from us, and cannot first be brought down from heaven, or brought up from the deep; they are not first to be acquired, but are nigh us, and, if we will accept them, in the mouth and in the heart. Thus, though the language of the Old Testament was not *on this wise*, since the knowledge of grace was of a less degree, more obscure, and more difficult to be obtained, yet it is now very near to us, for it is imparted by the greater and stronger measure of grace which is now declared to us (ver. 8).

Scharlach: Christ is in so far the end of the law as He, 1. Is its final object, the one to whom it leads (Gal. iii. 24); 2. Is its fulfillment (Matt. v. 17); 3. Puts an end to the demand of the law (Luke xvi. 16) (ver. 4).—To become acquainted with God’s gracious counsel, to deprive death of its power by the manifestation of a divine and holy life in the flesh—which the carnal man was incapable of, since he knew nothing except the righteousness which is of the law—can be effected by the righteousness which is of faith, which establishes him in Christ’s right, and freely gives him habitually that the Son of God is and has. The heart need only believe, and the mouth only confess, in order to be righteous and saved (vers. 8-11).

Lisco: The Divine order of salvation is, therefore: Justification through faith; God’s assistance is obtained, and he who courageously and perseveringly confesses his faith, obtains salvation (ver. 10).—Hedinger: Righteousness is introduced as speaking, and is regarded as proffering itself. No superhuman knowledge, or profound learning, or ascending to heaven to see Christ, is necessary to convince us of Christ’s resurrection and His sitting at God’s right hand; neither is it necessary to descend into the kingdom of the dead, to ask whether Christ is with the dead, or risen? In short, no view of the history of Jesus Christ himself, and no laborious and learned research, are necessary for us to believe. Faith is an affair of the heart. No one can, therefore, excuse his unbelief on the ground of the difficulty or impossibility of faith (vers. 6, 7).—Paul brings out prominently the faith of the heart against hypocrites and lip-Christians; and against the faint-hearted and despoothing confession—that is, the expression, John’s demonstration of Christianity by word and deed (vers. 8-11).

Besser: Faith and confession are related to each other as essence and manifestation, as light and ray, as fire and flame. Salvation is the manifestation, the present and finite revelation of righteousness; and righteousness is salvation under cover, though the covering is transparent and fragrant, just as Christ is concealed in prophecy, and the enduring tabernacle of God in the Church on earth (ver. 10).

d. Vers. 12-17. The gospel as a saving message for all, Jews as well as Greeks: 1. It is preached to all; but, 2. It is not believed by all (vers. 12-17).—There is no difference in nations before the one Lord, who is rich unto all that call upon Him; but whosoever calleth upon Him shall be saved (vers. 12, 13).—How the calling upon the true God—who is perfectly revealed in Christ—and faith and preaching, are connected (vers. 13-18).—"Lord, who hath believed our report?" Thus Isaiah once lamented, and thus we, too, lament frequently; but we can only do it when we are conscious that we have performed our ministerial duty to the best of our knowledge and conscience; that is, if our sermons have proceeded: 1. From thoroughly searching into the Holy Scriptures; 2. From hearty prayer; 3. From a full acquaintance with the necessities of our congregations (ver. 16).—Christian preaching: 1. What does it effect? Faith. 2. By what means does it come? By the word of God (ver. 17).—Preaching stands midway between faith and God’s word. 1. It produces the former; 2. It draws its supplies from the latter (ver. 17).—The appealing power of preaching (ver. 17).

Stark: All kinds of people can have free access to God, and so pray that their petitions may be answered (ver. 12).—Hedinger: Oh, if a man would be saved, how much depends on hearing, teaching, and calling! A beautiful chain; but what is wanting in it? Hearing is defective; proper and thorough preaching is wanting; and many thousands are needed for preaching. Dreadful harm thereby ensues, &c. (ver. 14).—Cramer: The world ever remains the same—as in Isaiah’s day, so at the time of Christ and the Apostles, and even at this very hour. What a pity that the old lamentation must still be repeated! (ver. 16).—Lang: Preacher, see that your discourse be delivered in simplicity and Divine power.
and hearer, see that your attention is of the right kind (ver. 17).

SPIRIT: 1. They must call upon Christ if they would be saved; 2. But if they would call upon Him, they must believe in Him; 3. If they would believe in Him, they must hear His word; 4. But if they would hear His word, it must be preached to them; 5. But if they would have preachers, people must be sent to them for that purpose. These are the successive links in the chain of Divine beneficence (ver. 14).—ROOS: Here, as was always the case with the Apostle in his charges against the Jews, he cites passages from the Old Testament Scriptures; the first of which is Isa. xxviii. 18, where the "making waste" has the same force as "being ashamed." ... The second passage is in Joel ii. 23, and comes down lowest to the weakness of men. Our advice to the greatest sinner who stands on the brink of hell is: "Call upon the name of the Lord, and thou shalt be saved." ... The third passage is in Isa. iii. 7, and is a prophecy of the friendly and beautiful heralds whom the Lord, having previously spoken himself, would send out at the time of the New Testament, in order to preach peace and good-will to men. But why? Undoubtedly in order that men might lay hold of the peace declared to them, and appropriate and enjoy God's good-will toward them. But because this should take place by faith, these heralds lament, in the fourth passage, Isa. liii. 1: "Lord, who hath believed our report?" (vers. 11-16.)—BENGEL: Any man is worth more than the whole world.

GERLACH: God willeth the salvation of all, but all do not wish the salvation of God; unbelief is the cause of the ruin of all (ver. 18).—It is God's will that all will believe; and for this reason He has sent preaching, whose import is His own word (ver. 17).

Lisco: It is Christian duty to send teachers to the heathen world; missions are necessary, and according to the Lord's will (Mark xvi. 15); and it is a glorious calling, to declare the message of Jesus, deliverance of the captives, and the new kingdom of God.—Preaching takes place by God's word; that is, by virtue of the Divine call and a doctrine revealed by God (ver. 17).

HEUBNER: Living preaching is God's chosen means of instruction (ver. 14).—God must send preachers; they cannot go of themselves (ver. 15).—All the effects of grace are connected with the word; this applies to fanatics, enthusiasts, and those who despise the word and preaching (ver. 17).

BESSEN: The Divine order of salvation admits of no personal or national distinction (ver. 12).—The help of the rich Lord, as He passes by, is invited by calling upon Him, though it be not with strong faith, yet with a hearty desire to believe; by calling upon Him, though we do not pray as we ought, yet are supported by the unutterable groans of the Spirit (chap. viii. 26); by calling upon Him, if not with advanced knowledge, yet with the loud confession of Bardineous: "Jesus, thou Son of David, have mercy on me!" (Mark x. 47) (ver. 12).—BARNUM: He who also gratefully and gratefully contributes to the means, God desires that all men call upon Him for salvation; therefore He wishes them to believe; therefore, to hear; and, therefore, to have preachers. Hence He has sent preachers. He has done every thing necessary for our salvation. His antecedent gracious will is universal, and is clothed with energetic power " (ver. 14).—It is not only necessary for the real preacher in God's name that the word preached be real, but also that the preacher say: "Here is the staff in my hand; the Lord has sent me" (ver. 15).

V. 15-21. The relation of the Jews and Gentiles to the great preaching of the gospel: 1. The former did not wish to understand the gospel, although they could understand it; 2. But the latter although they were ignorant, have understood it because they wished to do so.—THE CONCLUSION of the whole chapter: The Jews are themselves guilty of their wretched fate, which took such a lively hold upon the Apostle's sympathy. For, A. The gospel was: 1. Not far from them; 2. It was preached to them; 3. They could lay hold of it; but, B. They —the Jews—sought it; 1. Far off; 2. Did not like to hear it; 3. Would not understand it.

STARKER: Who will blame God that so many people remain children of Satan, and are condemned? Behold, they are themselves the cause (ver. 21).—Roos, with reference to chaps. ix. and x.: From all this it is plain that the word grace is the most comforting and most severe, the clearest and the darkest word in the Bible. It is the most comforting word, because it assures salvation to the creature (to whom His Creator is in nowise indebted), the sinner who deserves punishment. It is also the most severe word, because it utterly prostrates pride, slays defiance, and completely destroys the notion of self-righteousness, which is so natural to man. It is the clearest word, because it needs no description; but it is also the darkest word, because its simple meaning is understood by only a few humble souls. Many men, who think that they understand this word, conceive God's grace very much as a prince's favor, which always has regard to service, and is never disconnected from utility. But God needs no service. His will alone is free. No one can compensate Him. And yet He is righteous, and acts according to knowledge. Whose is wise, and he shall understand these things? Prudent, and he shall know them?—HEUBNER, on Ps. xix.: The gospel and creation are God's two voices that reecho about us.

BESSEN: On the occasion of a passage from Luther, who compares preaching to a stone thrown into the water. The circles ever enlarge, but the water in the middle is still.

LANGER: The intercession of Paul, who was per secutus by the Jews, for Israel.—His witness for Israel: 1. High praise; 2. Great censure.—The different forms of self-righteousness. —Self-righteousness is always opposed to God's righteousness, which is: 1. Legislative; 2. Penal; 3. Merciful, justifying; 4. Awakening to new life.—The self-testimony of the law and the gospel to the inward nature of man: 1. The law, the ideal of his life; 2. The gospel, the life of his ideal.—The twin form, faith, and confession: 1. Is positively different; yet, 2. Inseparable. —The riches of the Lord to praying hearts—to the praying, sinful world. —The univer sality of the gospel.—The freedom and limitation of the message of salvation: 1. It is free to all in the world who call upon the Lord; 2. It is confined to faith, beyond belief contradicts it.

BURRITT (condensed): Christ is the end of the law: 1. As He is the scope of it; 2. As He is the accomplishment of it; 3. As He is to the believer what the law would have been to him if he could have perfectly kept it—namely, righteousness and life, justification and salvation.—The natural man is a proud man; he likes to live upon his own stock
he cannot stoop to a sincere and universal renunciation of his own righteousness, and to depend wholly upon the righteousness of another. It is natural to a man to choose rather to cut a brown crust, or wear a coarse garment, which he can call his own, than to feed upon the richest dainties, or wear the costliest robes, which he must receive as an alms from another. — Doobalger: Let us rejoice in the spread which the gospel has already had, and let us earnestly and daily pray that the voices of those Divine messengers that proclaim it may go forth unto all the earth, and their words reach, in a literal sense, to the remotest ends of the globe. — Lord, give us any plague rather than the plague of the heart. — Scott: Ministers who are faithful bear the most affectionate good-will to those from whom they receive the greatest injuries; and they offer fervent and persevering prayers for the salvation of the very persons against whom they denounce the wrath of God if they persist in unbelief. — Clarke: Salvation only by righteousness: 1. The righteousness, or justification which is by faith, receives Christ as an atoning sacrifice, by which all sin is pardoned; 2. It receives continual supplies of grace from Christ by the eternal Spirit, through which man is enabled to love God with all his heart, soul, mind, and strength, and his neighbor as himself; 3. This grace is afforded in sufficient degrees, suited to all places, times, and circumstances, so that no trial can happen too great to be borne, as the grace of Christ is ever at hand to support and save to the uttermost. — Horsley: It is the first and most pressing duty of the Church to cause all men to hear the gospel. The solemn question, “How can they believe without a preacher?” should sound day and night in the ears of the churches. The gospel’s want of success, or the fact that few believe our report, is only a reason for its wider extension. The more who hear, the more will be saved, even should it be but a small proportion of the whole. — J. F. H.

Third Section.—The final gracious solution of the enigma, or the overruling of judgment for the salvation of Israel. God’s judgment on Israel is not one of reprobation. God’s saving economy in His Providence over Jews and Gentiles, over the election and the great majority of Israel, and over the concatenation of judgment and salvation, by virtue of which all Israel shall finally attain to faith and salvation through the fullness of the Gentiles. The universality of judgment and mercy.

CHAP. XI. 1-26.

A.

1 I say then, Hath [Did] God cast away his people? God forbid, [Let it not be!] For I also am an Israelite, of the seed of Abraham, of the tribe of
2 Benjamin. God hath [did] not cast away his people which he foreknew. Wot [Or know] ye not what the Scripture saith of Elias [Ev Hllye, in the story of Elijah]? how he made intercession to [pleadeth with] God against Israel,
3 saying [omit saying]. Lord, they have killed thy prophets, and [omit and, insert they have] digged down thine altars; and I am left alone [the only one],
4 and they seek my life. But what saith the answer of God [the divine response] unto him? I have reserved [for myself seven thousand men, who have not [who never] bowed the knee to the image of [omit the image of] Baal.
5 Even so then at [Ev, in] this present time also there is a remnant according to
6 the election of grace. And [Now] if by grace, then is it no more [no longer] of works: otherwise [else] grace is no more [no longer becomes] grace. But [if] it be of works, then is it no more [longer] grace: otherwise work is no more [longer] work.

B.

7 What then? Israel hath not obtained that which he seeketh for [That which Israel seeketh for, he obtained not]; but the election hath [omit hath] obtained
8 it, and the rest were blinded [hardened], [omit parenthetically] According as it is written, God hath [gave] them the [a] spirit of slumber [or, stupor], eyes that they should not see, and ears that they should not hear;) unto
9 [not hear, unto] this day. And David saith,

Let their table be made [become] a snare, and a trap,
And a stumbling-block, and a recompense unto them:
Let their eyes be darkened, that they may not see,
And bow down their back alway.
I say then, Have they stumbled that [Did they stumble in order that] they should fall? God forbid: [Let it not be!] but rather through [but by] their fall salvation is come unto the Gentiles, for to provoke [in order to excite]
them to jealousy [or, emulation]. Now if the fall of them [their fall] be the riches of the Gentiles; how much more their fulness? For I speak [I am speaking] to you Gentiles [;], inasmuch [then] as I am the apostle of the Gentiles,
I magnify [glory] mine office: If by any means I may provoke [excite] tc emulation them which are [with them which are] my [own] flesh, and might save some of them. For if the casting away of them be the reconciling [reconciliation] of the world, what shall the receiving [reception] of them be, but life from the dead. For [Moreover] if the first-fruit be holy, the lump is also holy [so also is the lump]: and if the root be holy, so are the branches [also].

And [But] if some of the branches be [were] broken off, and thou, being a wild olive tree, wert grafted [grafted] in among them, and with them partaked [and made fellow-partaker] of the root and its fatness of the olive tree;
Boast not against the branches. But if thou boast, thou bearest not the root, but the root thee. Thou wilt say then, The branches were broken off, that I might be grafted [grafted] in. Well; because of unbelief they were broken off, and thou standest by faith. Be not high-minded, but fear: For if God spared not the natural branches, take heed [fear] lest he also spare not thee.
Behold therefore the goodness and severity of God: on them which [those who] fell, severity; but toward thee, goodness [God's goodness], if thou continue in his goodness: otherwise thou also shalt be cut off. And they also [moreover], if they abide not still in unbelief, shall be grafted [grafted] in: for God is able to graft [graft] them in again. For if thou wert cut out of the olive tree which is wild by nature, and wert grafted [grafted] contrary to nature into a good olive tree; how much more shall these, which be the natural branches, be grafted [grafted] into their own olive tree?

For I would not, brethren, that ye should be ignorant of this mystery, lest ye should be wise in your own conceits, but blindness [hardening] in part is happened to Israel, until the fulness of the Gentiles be [come] be come in. And so all Israel shall be saved: as it is written, There shall come out of Sion the Deliverer, and shall turn away ungodliness from Jacob: For this is my covenant [the covenant from me, παρ' ἐμοῦ] unto them, when I shall take away their sins. As concerning [touching] the gospel, they are enemies for your sakes: but as touching the election, they are beloved for the fathers' sakes. For the gifts and calling of God are without repentance. For as ye in times past have not believed [were disobedient to] God, yet have now obtained mercy through their unbelief [the disobedience of these]: Even so have these also now not believed, that through your mercy [i. e., mercy shown to you] they also may obtain mercy. For God hath concluded them all [shut up] all in unbelief [disobedience], that [in order that] he might [may] have mercy upon all.
The depth of the riches both of the wisdom [riches and wisdom] and knowledge of God! how unsearchable are his judgments, and his ways past finding out! For who hath known the mind of the Lord? or who hath been his counsellor? Or who hath first given to him, and it shall be recompensed unto him again? For of him, and through him, and to [unto] him, are all things to whom [him] be glory for ever. Amen.
The Epistle of Paul to the Romans.

TEXTUAL

1 Ver. 2.—(The Rec. inserts λόγος; supported by Μ. L. It is omitted in Μ. A. B. C. D. E., various and fathers. The probability of an interpolation is so great, that modern editors unhesitatingly reject it.—Some MSS. insert δομάτιον δόξας at the same place of rec. ver. 1. The similarity of the clauses readily explains this.)

2 Ver. 3.—[A free citation from the LXX. 3. (1) Kings xix. 18 (ver. 14 is almost a repetition of ver. 16).—8. ὡς ἡμών εἰσίν, εἰς τῆς ἡμερᾶς της μεταμόρφωσεως. The latter part of the clause has omitted, for unorthodox words, transposed, the Hebrew closely.

3 Ver. 8.—[Rec. ὡς (Rec. οὐ D. L.) is omitted in Μ. A. B. C. E., by recent editors. The vivacious form of the Greek is retained by the above emendation. So Ν. H., in his German text: “Lord, they have killed thy prophets, they have digged down thine altar”.

4 Ver. 9.—[Free from the LXX. 3. (1) Kings xix. 18, but varying from both the Hebrew and the LXX.; not materially, however. The LXX. reads: καὶ καταλαθείσας (complut. ed. καταλαθείσας) ἐν ἔρευνα ἐναντίον δικαιοσύνης, δύναται μόνον καὶ εἰς θλίψεις γίνεται τοῖς Βάσιν. Alford: “The Apostle here corrects a mistake of the LXX., which have, for καταλαθείσας, καταλαθείσαι. He has added to the Hebrew, ἔρευνα, I have left; kept as a remainder,—ιμαθήτης, a simple and obvious filling up of the sense.” On ὡς ὁ θάνατος, instead of ὡς, see Exeg. Notes. The italicised words of the E. V. are omitted, allowed defending himself to extenuate Dr. Lange, who supplies, in his German text: “(der) θάνατος ἐν ἐρείπιοι τεσσεράνων;” it seems unnecessary to insert a comment of such doubtful correctness.

5 Ver. 10.—[Otherwise is sufficiently correct, although ἀλλακτικός, literally, means: since in that case.—Tr., it seems, has been omitted, and in the main versions, is to be rendered exactly. On the meaning, see Exeg. Notes. The simplest view is: ceases to be; but Dr. Lange finds more in the expression.

6 Ver. 12.—(The whole clause: εἰ δὲ ἐγώ ἐγώ, is omitted in Μ. A. C. D. E., versions and fathers.)

7 Ver. 16.—[The Text for this article and take ἐκκλησία, is omitted in Ν. A. C. D. L.; rejected by Schwab, Lachmann, Meyer, Wordsworth (who incorrectly cites X as omitting it), Tregelles, bracketed by Alford. It is found in B. D. L.]

8 Ver. 18.—[The LXX. version of Ex. lxxiv. 24 (23) is followed with great exactness. But it varies from the Hebrew text τίνος τῶν ἐκκλησίων, make their loin to water, or tremble in the last clause. The meaning is preserved, however. See Exeg. Notes.

9 Ver. 19.—(The Rec. D. F. L. fathers, read γάρ; Ν. A. B. versions, δέ. Lange adopts the former, mainly on exegetical grounds. Lechmann and the latter, C. has ὡς; hence Meyer thinks it impossible to decide which is the genuine particle; nor is it of importance.

10 Ver. 20.—[In Rec. L. some versions and fathers, oμέν is omitted in D. F., μεν ὡς; both are found in Ν. A. B. C. D. E. West and Tholuck reject both, on exegetical grounds; most critical editors retain μεν, and Meyer accedes for ὡς as inserted because the corresponding δέ was wanting. On the whole, it is safest to retain both, with Lechmann and Alford, Tregelles brackets oμέν.

11 Ver. 21.—(The κατ' εἰκόνα (Rec. is omitted in Ν. B. C. but found in Ν. A. L. Still another reading in D. L. E. Alford rejects, Tregelles brackets, but most editors retain it. If retained, the note of Dr. Lange in loco is correct.—The E. V. has paraphrased περιπατέτων; with them partaken. The above emendation is more literal.

12 Ver. 22.—(Instead of ψυχωμένως (Rec., C. D. F. G.), Lachmann and Tregelles adopt ψυχάλημα φέρεται, on the authority of Μ. A. B. The first word is so unusual that it was likely to be changed. Most editors follow the Rec.

13 Ver. 23.—[The uncial authority is against μεν. It is omitted in Ν. A. B. C., but found to D. F. L. It is rejected by Lechmann and Tregelles, bracketed by Alford. But the probability of an omission, because of the future (ἐν) signifies, is so great, that most critical editors retain it. To obviate the same difficulty, the ὑπομονή is substituted in Rec., but with no uncial support.

14 Ver. 24.—[Instead of the accusative ἀνθρώπων (Rec., D. F. L.) most editors adopt the nominative, on the authority of Μ. A. B. C. D. E. As the locative is the form which is governed by εἰς, which is separated from it by a colon. The absence of a predicate for the nominative leads to the change. So Lachmann, Tischendorf, Meyer, Alford, De Wette, Tregelles, Lange. The same remarks apply to the χρηστοτάτος.

15 Ver. 25.—[D. F. L. omit: εἰς, which is found in Ν. A. B. C. D. N. L. χρηστότατος.—Rec. D. F. L. omit: θεοῦ, which is found in Ν. A. B. C. D. N. L. The critical editors generally adopt it, on the ground that it was likely to have been omitted as unnecessary. The later revisions retain and render as above, except by Lange, who follows the original, adopted in the varied form of the text.

16 Ver. 26.—[Rec. with Ν. A. C. D. L. reads χαρὰ τοῦ; A. B. have ἔκ. The preposition is omitted in E. and some cursives. Lachmann, Tischendorf, Alford, Hodge, Tregelles, adopt ἔκ; but the sense is much the same, whichever
prophecy be adopted. The phrase was διεστραφή is found in chap. xii. 16, and Prov. iii. 7 (LXX.); hence the probability of a similar interpretation of the last clause of ver. 21 is from Isa. lvii. 9. The text of the LXX., and the more important variations from the Hebrew, will be found in the Exeg. Notes.

25 Ver. 36. (According to the view of most of the best expositors, the citation is from Isa. lvii. 21. (from "He to 
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EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL

Summary.—A. Israel is not rejected; the kernel of it—the election—is saved; vers. 1.—6. B. The great proportion of Israel, all except the essentially important remnant, the "rest," are hardened, as was described in the Spirit of God's Testament beforehand; but its hardness has become a condition for the conversion of the Gentiles; vers. 7.—11. C. Yet, on the other hand, the conversion of the Gentiles is in turn a means for the conversion of Israel, and thereby for the refivirification of the world. The saving effect of their rejection gives ground for expecting a still more saving effect of their reception. The significance of the first-fruits and of the root; vers. 12.—16. D. The very fact that the Gentiles believe, and the Jews do not believe, is largely conditional. Gentiles, as individuals, can become unbelievers; and Jews, as individuals, can become believers. For: a. The Gentiles are grafted on the stem of the Jewish theocracy among believing Jews. b. They can just as readily be cut off by unbelief, as the Jews can be grafted in by faith, because the latter have a greater historical relationship with the kingdom of God; vers. 17.—24. E. The last word, and the mystery of Divine Providence in the economy of salvation. Every thing will redound to the glory of God. God's saving economy for the world: The unbelieving Gentiles have been converted by believing Israel; unbelieving Israel shall be converted by believing Gentiles. The judgment on all, that mercy might be shown to all. Praise offered to God for His plan of salvation, for its execution, for its end, and for its goal; vers. 25.—28. [Dr. Hodge divides the chapter in two parts: vers. 1.—10 and 11.—36. (1) The rejection of the Jews was not total. A remnant (and a larger one than many might suppose) remained, though the mass was rejected. (2) This rejection is not final. The restoration of the Jews is a desirable and probable event; vers. 11.—24. It is one which God has determined to bring about; vers. 25.—28. A sublime declaration of the unsearchable wisdom of God, manifested in all His dealings with men; vers. 29.—36. So Forbes.—R.]

VERS. 1—6: Israel is not rejected. The real kernel of it is already saved.

Vers. 1. I say then [Διδος ὁ αὐτός] The αὐτός may appear to be merely an inference from what was said last: All day long God stretched forth His hand. But as, in ver. 11, he makes a further assertion, designed to forestall a false conclusion, it has here the same meaning, in antithesis to the strong judgment pronounced on Israel at the conclusion of the previous chapter. Meyer maintains a more definite reference to the λόγοι in vers. 10, 18, 19.

[Did God cast away his people? κινεῖ ἀπόστασιν ὅ τι οὖν τὸν λαὸν αὐτοῦ; When Reiche remarks the absence of an ἀπόστασα from λαόν, and Semler an omison from ἀπόστασα, they both fail to appreciate the emphasis of the expressions. The people and his people are different; just as an economic giving over to judgment and an economic casting away (Ps. xciv. 14; xcv. 7). Bengel: ἡ ἐποίησις ἐναποτάσια ἐναλλαγήν ἐγκαθίσταται. The Apostle repels such a thought with religious horror: μὴ γένοιτο.

For I also [καί γὰρ ἐγώ]. According to the usual accentuation, he adds his own seal as an example; but Meyer, with De Wette and Baumgarten-Crusius, on the contrary, hold that Paul, on reading the καί, refers to the other examples which were numerous represented by the Jewish Christians among his readers.

I am an Israelite, of the seed of Abraham, of the tribe of Benjamin [Ἱερουσαλήμ τις ἐγώ, Ἰς σποτα ματος Ἀβρααμ, γινώς Βιβαλιό 
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of the people which returned from the captivity—
he is conscious that he does not belong to the elec-
tion as a mere proselyte; if he would speak of a
casting away of God’s people, he must therefore
deny himself and his faith (Vill., ii. 6). [Alford
distinguishes between the popular view, and another
which implies, “that if such a hypothesis were to
be conceded, it would exclude from God’s kingdom
the writer himself, as an Israelite.” This agrees,
apparently, with Lange’s view, but implies also
that “his people” is used in the national sense, not of
the spiritual Israel. See below.—R.]

Ver. 2. God did not cast away [ον προηγηθη και προηγηθή]. He follows with a solemn
declaration founded upon the testimony of his own
consciousness, and of examples.

His people [τον λαον αυτου]. He is as
definite in characterizing His people, δι προηγηθην,
as he is grand in his declaration of the not casting
away. On the idea of προηγηθην, see chap. viii.
29.

Two explanations here come in conflict with
each other;
The spiritual people of God are spoken of,
the ιερου υιου; Rom. ix. 6; Gal. vi. 16 (Origen,
Augustine, Luther, Calvin [Hodge], &c.).

2. Meyer says, on the contrary: The subject of
the whole chapter is not the spiritual Israel, but the
fate of the nation in regard to the salvation effected
by the Messiah. Tholuck and Philipp [De Wette,
Stuart, Alford], are of the same view. But the idea of
“people” which the Apostle presents is so very
dynamical, that it might be said: to him the elec-
tion is the people, and God’s true people is an elec-
tion. This is evidently the thought in chap. ix.,
and also in vers. 4 and 5 of the present chapter.
But if we emphasize properly the idea of casting
away, the idea of election does not any more stand
in antithesis to it; that is, it is not thereby settled
that there is an election. But as the defenders of
view (1.) mistake the full import of the further elaboration,
especially vers. 28, so do the defenders of (2.) pass too lightly over the gradations made
by the Apostle. [Against the interpretation: spiritual
people, it may well be urged, that all along the Apostles has been speaking of the nation; that this
very chapter treats of the final salvation of Israel
as a nation, and Paul says he is an Israelite, &c.,
of this historical (not spiritual) people. Besides, the Scriptures have suffered very much from assumptions regarding spiritual references. The only argument
in favor of this meaning is the phrase: “Whom he
foreknew.” It is held that this defines the people
as those referred to in chap. viii. 29 ff; but may
there not be a foreknowledge of a nation resulting
in national privileges, such as the Jews enjoyed, as
easily as foreknowledge of an individual and conse-
quently blessing? The whole current of thought in
the chapter—fact, in chap. ix.—xii. is against any such interpretation as shall make: “His people”
= His spiritual Israel, over against Israel as a na-
ton. If any limitation be made, it should be thus
expressed: the real people of God among the Jewish
people, recognizing them as the pith and kernel of
the nation, not as isolated individuals from out the
class. This seems to be Dr. Lange’s view, and is
probably that of many who are quoted in favor of
(1.). We then retain the weight of the Apostle’s
proof; For I also am an Israelite and avoid weari-
ing the main thought of the chapter, which un-
doubtedly is: the ultimate national restoration
of the Jews. Were it not this, the whole argument
of

chaps. ix.—xi. ends with a non sequitur. Comp. Al-
ford, in loco.—R.

What is meant by God casting away His people? 1.
There is an election of believers, and it is far
greater than one of little faith may think. How
many Jews would have been true friends of Jesus?
2. The call of the Gentiles is even designed indirectly for the con-
version of Israel, and individuals can always be gained.
3. The whole Divine disposition is designed for the
final salvation of all Israel. Here, therefore, the
thought of the mercy controlling this whole econ-
omy, comes in contrast with the thought of the
great economical judgment of hardening: If, how-
ever, the expression all Israel be urged, and were
found in individuals of it an assurance of the
salvation of the empirical totality, we would have to
be indifferent to the idea of election with refer-
ence to Israel as a people, and let it consist in the
idea of an absolute restoration.

Which he foreknew [δι προηγηθην]. This
limits the meaning, in so far as the empirical mass
of the people is not meant; but, on the other hand,
the small empirical number of believing Jews is also
not meant, but the people in their whole regal idea
and nature. In this eternal destination of Israel,
God cannot contradict himself. [Alford (so Tholuck,
De Wette, Meyer) thus paraphrases: “which, in
his own eternal decree before the world, He selected
as the chosen nation, to be His own, the depository
of His law, the vehicle of the theocracy, from its
first revelation to Moses, to its completion in Christ’s
future kingdom.” Toward this national reference
later commentators generally incline. See Hodge,
on the other side.—R.]

Or know ye not, &c. [Η ων οιδατε ειν Ηλια, πε.]. "H introduces a new objection to the
matter impugned (Alford). Comp. chap. ix.
21; vi. 3.—R.] Tholuck: “Εν Ηλια, quotation of
the section treating of Elijah, as Mark xli. 26:
ιτι της βατον. Examples from the classics in
Fritzsche, to which may be added Thucydides i. 9,
and proofs from Philo, in Grossmann, &c. (see 1
Kings xix. 10, 14). Incorrect view: en Helia, of
Elijah (Erasmus, Luther [B. V.], and others). [Upon
this point all modern commentators and translators agree, though they differ about the proper
word to be supplied, whether section, history, or
story; the last is simplest.—R.] Ver. 3. I have
killed thy prophets, &c. [Κυριε, των προφητων σου
απεκτιγμεν, πε.]. See Textual Note 2.] The
Apostle has quoted freely the real meaning of the
words of the text. It makes no difference in the
thing itself that, in the complaint which Elijah makes,
he understands by the μονος the only remaining
prophet, while the present passage understands
the only worshipper of God. For the prophet, in
his denunciation of men, was not inclined to acknowledge dumb
or ascending worshippers of God as God’s true
worshipers. But Paul, in conformity with his view,
has transposed the words meaning altars and proph-
et. Paul pays attention to the plural, the altars,
“as the temple at Jerusalem was the only place ex-
clusively designed for service.” But even in
the temple at Jerusalem there were two altars. Yet
the question here is concerning the kingdom of
Israel, and therefore the remark of Ezech is almost super-

* [See Textual Note 4: “I am left the only one.”—R.]
fluous, that it was even blasphemy to throw down God's altars on the high places.*

But what with the Divine response unto him? *άλλα τι λέγειν ὡς ἁγιασμός; οὐχ ἁγιασμός; On ἁγιασμός, see the Lexicons. * 

[The substantive occurs only here in the New Testament. The cognate verb is used in Matt. ii. 12, 22; Acts x. 22; Heb. vii. 5; xi. 7, in the sense: to be warned of God, as the E. V. expresses it.

The obvious meaning here: Divine response, seems to have been times devised: the word first meant business, then formal audience given to an ambassador, and then an oracular response, though this was not the classical sense. See 2 Mace. ii. 4; xi. 17.—R.]

I have reserved to myself [Κατέλιπον ἐμονε.] See Textual Note b. To myself, as my possession and for my service, over against the apostasy into idolatrous service (Meyer).—R.]

The original expression: "I will leave me," has been changed by the Apostle into the past tense, without thereby altering the sense, as has been done by the LXX.

Seven thousand men [ἐπικαινοῦσιν ἁγίασμεν.] It is sufficient to regard the number seven as the sacred number in relation to the services, and the number thousand as a designation of a popular assembly. Tholuck, after Körtz (p. 591), considers the number seven as the perfect and covenant number. There are different ideas of perfection, according to which the numbers 3, 4, 7, 10, and 12, may be together regarded as numbers denoting perfection. The Mohammedan saying, quoted by Tholuck, is interesting: that "God never allows the world to be without a remainder of seventy righteous people, for whose sake He preserves it."

[Who never bowed, οἵτινες οὐκ ἔκαψαν. Allford remarks on οἵτινες, which is a variation from the original, that it gives "the sense of the saying, as far as regards the present purpose, viz., to show that all these were faithful men; in the original text and in the LXX., it is implied that these were all the faithful men."

To Baal. The feminine τῇ Βααλ has given occasion for much discussion. In the LXX., the name has sometimes the masculine and sometimes the feminine article. Why does it have the latter? As the LXX. of this passage has τῇ Βααλ, Meyer has admitted a mistake of Paul's memory; Fritzsche holds that the codex which Paul read, contains a different reading. According to Olsaussen, Philippi, Meyer (Stuart, Hodge), and others, the feminine form may be explained by the fact that Baal was regarded as an androgynous deity; but this is not sufficiently proved. According to Gesenius, the feminine form was understood as a contemptuous expression of idols; which view is also favored by Tholuck. The elder critics (Erasmus, Beza, Grotius) understood the word as applying to the statue of Baal. [So E. V.] Tholuck replies to this, by saying: without analogy. But the idol is

the contemptible image or statue of the false god.

Yet, if we hold that Baal had no reality as god to the Jews, but merely as an idol, the whole series of feminine forms used in designating Baal becomes clear at the outset. (I Sam. vii. 4; Zeph. i. 4; Hosea ii. 8.) Meyer is of the opinion that, in that case, it would have to read τῇ τοῦ Βααλ; but this would fully destroy the probably designed effect of the feminine form. Tholuck observes: "In the Gothic language, Gath, as masculine, means God; but gud, as neuter, means idol;" and by this means he again approaches the explanation which, in passing, he has rejected. He does this in a short thing in his preceeding remark: "In the n. hintitel, "Gods, idolaters, are contemptuously called ἔθνος." On Baal," comp. Winer, das Wörterbuch für die christliche Volk, and the Hebrew Antiquities, by De Wette, Ewald, and Keil.

Ver. 5. Even so then in this present time [οἶτος οὖν καὶ εἰς τοῦ νῦν καὶρος. Allford suggests: "even in the present time, etc., of Israel's national rejection.—R."] God, according to that example, secures for himself a certain remnant [λείψανα] of the elect, according to His constant law of election—that is, according to the election of grace, ἀποκλογὴν χάριτος. Comp. chap. ix. i. 5. See above, "This is, not on the ground of merit, but of mercy.—R."

Ver. 6. Now if by grace [εἰ δὲ χάριν. Απελογικὸν, now.—R.] Namely, that a λείψανα existed, and always continues to exist. Grace, or the gift of grace, cannot be divided and supplemented by, or confounded with, a merit of works. Augustine: Gratia, nihil gratia sit, gratia non est. [Then it is no longer of works: otherwise grace no longer becomes grace, οὐ τοῦτο ἐξ ἐργάτων, ἀπέρσε ἢ χάρις ἐξ ἐπιστας χάρις. But if it be of works, then it is no longer grace: otherwise work is no longer work, εἰ δὲ ἐξ ἐργάτων, οὐ τοῦτο ἐξ ἐπιστας ἢ χάρις, ἀπέρετο τὸ ἐργάτων οὐκ ἦν κατὰ κατά ἐργάτων. The critical questions respecting the second clause are discussed in Textual Notes c, d, and at some length below. The discussion requires us to insert the verse in full.—R.] We may now ask: How we must understand the usual explanation, which places the following in antithesis to each other: Now if it is by grace (that remnant, or its causality, the election), then it is simply not by the merit of works, otherwise grace is no more grace. But if it be by works, then it is no more grace, otherwise work would be no true work, but mercenary work. In connection with this antithesis, clear and significant in itself, there arise, however, three questions: 1. Why does the Apostle enlarge the first proposition by the second, since the latter seems to be quite self-evident from the former? 2. What should the χάρια (χάρις) mean, where ἐπιστας should be so positively expected that the Vulgate [E. V.], and other versions, have even substituted est? 3. Why is χάρις used instead of εἰσ.
The great body of unbelievers who have not been able to obtain grace by works, are not the real substance of the people. They were generally an apostate remnant of hardened ones. Yet their trembling was not designed for their ruin, but for the salvation of the Gentiles.

Ver. 7. What then? Ti oýw. This inference, as well as the ἐπίζητει, becomes quite definite, if we refer to the conclusion of the previous verse.—That which Israel seeketh for he obtained not [ὁ ἐπίζητει Ἰσραήλ, τῶν ἐπίζητει] The latter verb is usually followed by the genitive, after the accusative, as here. Hence we find, in Rec. (no MSS.), τῶν Μω. See Meyer for the authorities for this use of the accusative. The meaning is not: to find, but to attain to, to obtain.—R.] Israel did not obtain that which it sought to obtain by works—grace, as the end of the finished work. Like a phantom beyond the ever unfinished work, grace had to recede ever further in the distance. The ἐπίζητει can, all or none, also mean jealous acquisition [Fritzsche, Philippi, Hodge]; but it is clear that this idea would not be in place here. [Meyer says it indicates the direction.—R.] The present properly denotes "the permanence of the effort"—the permanence of the effort to find the city of grace at the end of the long road of self-righteousness.

But the election obtained it [ἡ δὲ ἐπίζητει ἐπίζητειν. The election for the elect, as the circumcision for those circumcised. Vivacious expression.—R.] Meyer says: "For they were subjects of Divine grace." Paul has already said, in other words: For the elect are distinguished by having received God's grace in faith.

And the rest were hardened [οἱ δὲ λοιποὶ ἐμποδίσασαν. The verb is rendered blinded in the E. V., here, and 2 Cor. iii. 14; in other places, hardened, which is decidedly preferable.—R.] Israel is divided into two parts. One part is the ἐξολοθρεύθη, although it is the minority; the other is the λοιποί, the τῶν, although they are the majority. Meyer says, they were hardened by God. [So Hodge, Stuart, Philippi (with a reservation), and Tholuck, in later editions; comp. chap. ix. 18. The passive certainly includes this thought.—R.] Paul says, they have been hardened by a reciprocal process between their unbelief and God's judgments. The sense undoubtedly is, that those who remain for the inexcusable periods of judgment have become, "in understanding and will, insusceptible of the appropration of salvation in Christ" (Meyer), and insusceptible above all, in their heart and spirit; because the last sparks of the spiritual life in them, which alone can understand the gospel of the Spirit, have expired; just as sapless plant is no more supported by the sunshine, but is reduced to a dried-up stalk.

Vers. 7-11. The great body of unbelievers who have not been able to obtain grace by works, are not the real substance of the people. They were, generally, an apostate remnant of hardened ones. Yet their trembling was not designed for their ruin, but for the salvation of the Gentiles.
rather than a citation of prophecy. So Tholuck; but Fritzsche, Meyer, and others, hold the latter view. The perspective of prophecy, in stating such cases, embraces all the analogous ones, especially that great one, in which the words are most profoundly fulfilled" (Alford). See below, note on ver. 10. On the free citation, see Textual Notes and.—R. The citation is freely collated from Isa. xxix. 10; Isa. vi. 9; Deut. xxix. 4. Meyer denies that Isa. vi. 9 is taken into consideration; but if we compare the two other passages, they do not suffice for Paul's citation, since the assertion in Deut. xxix. 4 contains merely negations.

God gave them" By this means a mere permissive holiness is meant, but likewise not simply activity, without something further. The ground of the judgment of a spirit of slumber [πνεῦμα κατανευριζόμενον], or of deep sleep (הענרנ יפר), on Israel, is definitely declared, in Isa. xxix. 10, to be the guilt of the people; ver. 13 ff.—But the passage in Isa. vi. 9 ff., which constitutes the principal part of the present quotation, is explained immediately afterward in the conduct of Ahaz, in chap. vii. The third passage from Deuteronomy brings out more definitely the negative element in this hardening process: "Yet the Lord hath not given you a heart to perceive," &c. On the meaning and interpretation see Meyer, p. 420; Tholuck, p. 596,—[Unto this day; to be joined with what immediately precedes, since they are substantially from Deut. xxix. 4. So modern editors and commentators generally.—R.]

Ver. 9. And David saith. The second passage is taken freely from Ps. lxx. 22 (LXX.). Meyer says: "David is not the author of this Psalm (against Hengstenberg), which must be judged analogously to the expression in Matt. xxii. 43," Comp. on that passage the Commentary on Matt. hex, p. 404. First of all, it is quite easy to prove that the sufferings of the people in exile could not have been in mind in writing either the lamentations of Psalm lxxix., or the "imprecations" on enemies. First, the theocratic exiles did not say that they had to suffer for the Lord's sake (ver. 7), and for zeal for His house (ver. 9). But they said just the contrary (see Ps. cvt.; Isa. lxv.; Dan. ix.). And though the exile could also invoke God's wrath on the heathen, and with them (Ps. lxxix. 4, 9), the prophetic imprecations are very different, for they portray the judgments of blindness that are invoked on the spiritual adversaries of the theocratic faith, and of the house and name of the Lord, who proved their enmity by persecuting God's servant. Comp., in this respect, Ps. ix.; lxxiv.; lxxv. 22–28; clx. In such Psalms, either the personal, collective, or ideal † David chiefly speaks, because David has become the type of God's suffering servant. We therefore hold, with Luther, Rosenmüller, and others, that the concluding words (from ver. 92) are a later addition.†

* Fritzsche has an Excursus on this word, pp. 588 ff. He makes it = stumps, stubbines, as from stubbing wino. Only here, and not in the classics. Incorrect, according to this view; Calvin: spiritus componuntur; Luther: einen widerlerten Gnot.—R.

† Philippi (following Keil) says that the subject in this Psalm is not the ideal, but the concrete person of the righteous." Hengstenberg (and J. A. Alexander) adopts the other view.—R.]

† [The Psalm purports to be written by David. Dr. Lange's remarks are in support of this view of the authorship, though he finds it necessary, in order to sustain it by the imprecations themselves, to adopt the later addition of the concluding verses. The question of authorship does not, indeed, affect the question of the propriety of the phrase: David saith; but when it is so, it cannot be denied that David did write the Psalm, inventing theories to prove that he did not seem to be useless ingenuity.—R.]
And bow down their back always [καὶ τὸν ἄντων αὐτῶν διὰ παντὸς σύγκας.\footnote{[Although Isa is told, as is now held by most commentators, the emphasis does not rest upon it, as though only the purpose were denied, and the fact admitted. Taking ἀλλὰ τῷ αὐτῶν πα-\[See Textual Note\].—R.]}. Spiritual blindness is one form of the inward judgment, and total despondency of spirit is the other.

But therefore Israel, the which indulge their hardness, did not understand spiritual slavery, while the early expositors understood Roman slavery. Yet this would be an important deviation from the original text. But, in reality, the bowed-down backs should mean the same thing as shaking or tottering loins.

Tholuck and Philippi have correctly observed, against Fritzschne, and others, that in ver. 8 (and the same thing applies also to ver. 9) the question is not the judgment of a prophecy, according to which the unbelief of the Jews at the time of Christ must be a necessary result. Yet this remark does not suffice to show that the quotation takes place as in the citations in Matt. xiii. 14; John xii. 40; Acts xxviii. 26; which refer, \textit{vi analogia}, to the classical passage for the unbelieving conduct of Israel toward God, in Isa. vii. The most direct practical purpose of these citations in the New Testament is to prove to the Jews, from their own Holy Scriptures and history, that there was always in Israel an inclination to apostasy; and that it is therefore not contrary to faith in prophecy to charge the present Israel with apostasy (see the defence of Stephen). But then a really typical prophecy also underlies this purpose; yet it is not a fatalistic prophecy, but the idea of the consequence of ruin even to its historical consummation (see Matt. xxiii. 32 ff.).

Ver. 11. I say then, Did they stumble in order that they should fall? [ἀλλὰ τῷ αὐτῶν πα-\[See Textual Note\].] A qualification to guard against a false conclusion. They have certainly stumbled and fallen; but the purpose of their guilty stumbling and falling under the previously described judgment of hardness was not that they should fall, in the absolute sense, into the ruin of the day; but rather, that they might be restored, and economically turned, and applied, to the salvation of the Gentiles (see chap. ix. 17, 23). The stumbling of the Israel took place against the stone of offence (chap. ix. 32, 33; x. 11). The ἵνα denotes the final purpose of the Divine judicial government, and is not merely ἐξάρχεσθαι, as Chrysostom, Augustine, and others, would have it.\footnote{[The full here must be taken as a less strong expression than the verb ἦσθαι, if the former be adopted, this denies the fact of a final fall. We must, then, hold that the national fall into utter ruin is denied throughout, while the stumbling and the moral fall of the individuals are admitted. So Alford.—R.]} Tholuck makes the noteworthy remark, that πα-\[See Textual Note\], to stumble (which must not be referred, with De Wette, and others, to the αἰσχρόν mentioned in ver. 9, but rather to the λίθος προκαταπελπίδας in chap. ix. 33), has the sense of moral stumbling; James ii. 10; iii. 2; and that πιστεύω, on the contrary, has this ethically figurative sense neither in the Hebrew, nor Greek, nor Latin, but only the sense of yielding to, sinking under.

But by their fall [ἀλλὰ τῷ αὐτῶν πα-\[See Textual Note\]. On παράττομαι, see p. 184, Dr. Schaff’s note.—R.] Meyer has no ground for not finding in παράττει, the meaning of falling, but only the \textit{deicitium} (Vulgate) [so Alford], for they have really fallen, yet that was not the object (see also Tholuck, p. 600). Tholuck properly opposes, also, the view that here the principal thought is, that Israel should be restored, although an intimation of the resurrection of Israel is included in the words. It is evident that the conversion of the Gentiles is primarily designated as the final object of Israel’s fall; with this final object there is, indeed, again associated the final object of the preliminarily isolated and of the finally total conversion of Israel. The παράττει here can as little mean a mere “passing away,” as a mere \textit{infortunium}, which Reiche and Rückert, with others, would render it.*

Salvation is come. \textit{Ἡ σωτηρία.} \textit{Πιστεύσα}, must be supplied, according to the connection. The Apostle cannot have regarded this tragic condition of the Jews as an absolute necessity; but he may very well have considered it an historical one. Israel, having been placed in its existing condition by its own guilt, did not desire the Gentiles, under the most favorable circumstances, to participate in the messianic salvation, except as proselytes of the Jews; and still more did it indulge the thought of vengeance on, and dominion over, the Gentiles, but it was impossible for Christianity, as Jewish Christianity, to become universal in the Gentile world. In addition to this came the experience of the Apostle, that he was always driven more decidedly to missionary labors among the Gentiles by the unbelief of the Jews; Matt. xxi. 43; Acts xii. 46; xxviii. 28. The negative condition of this transition was apostolic preaching, and especially that of Paul.

In order to excite them to jealousy [τῇ \textit{παράττει} ἀυτῶν. Instead of \textit{jealousy}, we may substitute \textit{emulation}, as the word is not used in a bad sense (Hodge). The clause is tele; the purpose was not the total fall, but that their moral fall might be used to further the salvation of the Gentiles, and this, in turn, bring about their own salvation as a nation.—R.] This purpose was associated from the outset, and the mention of it is here in place for the removal of the fatalistic thought, that their fall was decreed for their ruin.

Vers. 12-16. As the unbelief of the Jews has been the means of effecting the conversion of the Gentiles, so shall the conversion of the Gentiles be still more not only the means of effecting the belief of the Jews, but, with this return of Israel, still greater things shall occur.

Now if their fall  ... and their diminishing the riches of the Gentiles \[See Textual Note\] to παράττει ἀυτῶν. To \textit{ηττήμα} αὐτῶν πλαύτως ἔδωκεν. In order to explain this difficult verse, we must start with the \textit{ηττήμα} in Isa. xxxii. 8, which does not occur in classical language, but is there represented by \textit{ηττήσα}, [Attic for \textit{ηττήσα}, a defeat], the contrary of \textit{νικά}. In the passage cited, \textit{ηττήμα} means not merely the being overcome, but the military diminution which is the result of defeat. At all events, it is to be taken
here as diminution in captivity, according to the original text, for mental servitude. Likewise, in 1 Cor. vi. 7, the word means a moral loss, a diminution of the power of believers in opposition to the world. We therefore hold that the expression ηπτημα places the two other ideas in a more definite light, and that the whole expression alludes to the scene of a round array. Even in military affairs, the dynamical antithesis of broken power and of the full sense of power is connected with the ideas of numerical diminution and numerical fullness; as, in the present instance, the weakening is connected with the loss of men, and full power with the complete number. Tholuck bases his explanation on the meaning of πληρωμα in ver. 25.

Explanations of the ηπτημα: diminish't (Vulgate); minority, defectus (Chrysostom, and most commentators); injury, loss, fail (De Wette, and others). De Wette brings this explanation in exclusive antithesis to the first, with reference to 2 Cor. xii. 13. Fritzscbe: Diminution of mystical salvation. Philippi: The damage to God's kingdom by their falling away. But Meyer remarks, with good reason, that the thrice-repeated αινως is in the same relation, the subjective genitive. Tholuck: Reduced state. According to Tholuck, Meyer's explanation is: the minority; but Meyer himself pronounces against this explanation, and understands the word to mean, sinking and ruin. Utilas has interpreted the word, which means at the same time the loss of men and the weakening, by the deficiency. There is a real difference made by the reference to the believing Jews as the minority of believers (pauellus Judaeorum creditum; Grousins), and the antithetical body of unbelievers, the moral field of the dead, or the captured, those subjected to slavery. But here, too, both parts cannot be separated. The αινως are the whole people; the believers are the sound remainder of the army; while the unbelievers, as the same as the fallen, or captives, are its ηπτημα.

How much more their fulness [πορφο μαλλον το πληρωμα αινων]. The πληρωμα. Explanations: The whole body (Tholuck); the full number (Meyer); the restoration of Israel to its proper position (Röckert, Kölner); [Hodge: their full restoration or blessedness; Alford: their replenishment.—R.] Philippi: the filling up of the gap caused in God's kingdom by their unbelief. The latter view, which was first set forth by Origen, is discussed at length by Tholuck, p. 606 ff. But this view confounds in a twofold way: 1. The idea of the full number of God's eternal community in general, and the idea of material fulness (πληρωμα), the whole number of the Jewish people; 2. The idea of the economic completeness in the present passage, and that of some completeness.

Tholuck very properly calls attention to the apparent tautology in πληρωμα κοσμον, πληρωμα ιδων, which has been very much neglected by expositors. In κοσμον, he says, there seems to be comprised the idea of the whole extent of humanity and in πληρωμα ιδων, there appears the more concrete designation: "The reduction of the chosen people turned to an enrichment of the profane nations." The former definition regards the qualitative, intensive, and teleological relation in an altogether universal sense: The fall of the historical Israel redounded to the advantage of the world, even including the idea of Israel. The latter definition describes the quantitative and extensive character of the historical course. Jewish tribes, or Jewish communities, drop out of the people, while, on the other hand, whole heathen nations are gained. But if their fall has thus been a gain to the world, how much more their fulness—that is, a believing Israel!

Ver. 13. For I am speaking to you Gentiles [ἐπι τοις ὑποκριταις τοις θεοις]. The sense is the same whether we read γαρ or δι. A colon should follow this clause; the pointing of the Ε. V. obscures the proper connection.—R. The declared prospect of the full conversion of Israel leads him to the further explanation, that he regards even the conversion of the Gentiles, though an object in itself, as a means for accomplishing the object of Israel's conversion. [According to Alford, this verse answers the question: Why make it appear as if the treatment of God's chosen people were regulated not by a consideration of them, but of the less favored Gentiles?—R.]—You Gentiles; that is, Gentile Christians.—[Inasmuch then ἐσεται ὁ οὐν ὑποκριταις. See Textual Note 1]. The corresponding ἐσεται is wanting, as often in the Apostle's writings.—R.] 'Ew ὑποκριταις, not quamdis (Origen, Vulgate, Luther).

1 glorify mine office [τὴν διακονιαν μου δεσδαμων]. Not: I praise my office (Luther, Grotius, and Beilze); but: I strive to glorify my office by its faithful discharge (De Wette, Meyer, and others); in which, indeed, he also says, that he esteems his office as a glorious one.

Ver. 14. My own flesh [μου τα τομα]. On μου in this peculiar position, see Meyer. D. F. put it after the noun. It is sufficiently emphatic to justify the emendation, my own flesh.—R. An expression of inward participation with Israel in natural and spiritual descent. Theorofeth: The word leads us to understand the denial of spiritual participation. Ver. 28 proves that this antithesis is not very remote; yet the inward attachment to his people here appears in the foreground.

Ver. 15. For if the casting away of them [εἰ γαρ ἀποβολη αινων] Αποβολη, throwing away, an antithesis to προδοσιας; see ver. 17. Therefore not their diminution (Vulgate, Luther). [See Bengel, Philippi, who finds here also an allusion to the loss in numbers sustained by the kingdom of God.—R.] Tholuck alludes to the use of language in the LXX., and the Church ἀποβολη, expulsion.

Be the recompilation of the world [καταλογη κοσμου]. Not as causality, but as condition, without which the word of recompilation did not reach the Gentiles without obstruction. [It

* [So Hodge, Alford]: their impoverishment. The numerical idea is quite objectionable, although Dr. Lange seems to think it is included also. The whole verse, according to this view, means: "If their unbelief (i. e., in one part of them) is the world's wealth, and their small number (i. e., of believers, the other part of them) the wealth of much more of their full (restored) number?" This arbitrarily changes the reference of αινως, puts a forced meaning on ηπτημα, and really weakens the force of the argument, which is: if their sin has done so much, how much more their conversion?—R.

† [The numerical idea is technically allowable in πληρωμα. When a number falls, it is the same as if one of the same number had fallen, but even here it is not the prominent one. It is, however, to be understood, that the spiritual fulness will necessarily include the conversion of the nation as a whole.—E.]
is perhaps to express this shade of thought that the A. V. renders: reconciling; but reconciliation is more literal, and shows how important Paul deemed the fact in question, which could thus be characterized.—R.] In this free use of language Paul also says σωτήρ, in ver. 14, because he is the herald of σωτηρία.

What shall be the reception of them be [τίς ἐν τῷ ἄνω κόσμῳ]; Reception to salvation, and to participation in salvation by their conversion.

But life from the dead? [τίς ἐν τῷ ἐν θανάτῳ] It is clear that the Apostle avails a boundless effect of blessing on the world from the future conversion of the Jews. We ask, What is it? We must first look at the antithesis: Their existing away became the reconciling of the world; that is, only conditionally, therefore as if, and indirectly. Thus, we continue, the conversion of the whole people of Israel will also be conditionally, as if, and indirectly, a life from the dead. With the appropriate καταλλαγή; there now begins, first, the spiritual resurrection, which is succeeded, second, by the future bodily resurrection. Hence different explanations:

1. Figure for expression of the new spiritual life (Olshausen, Calvin, and others) of the Gentile world, or of the world in general, but not of the Jews (as Coccasus, Bengel, and others, explain), since the new life of the latter is regarded as an antecedent means. But this new life is also regarded in different senses: The further extension of God's kingdom, and the new subjective vivification (Philippi, and others), increase, and advance of piety (Bucer, Bengel). A new life in the higher charismatic fullness, in which the Spirit shall extend God's people to the nations of the world, compared with which the previous life of the nations must be considered dead;—Abercius (calculated to mislead, and overdrawn, so far as the Christian life of the previous world is meant). Other modifications: Highest joy (Grotius, Hodge apparently), highest blessedness. [Stuart: something great, wonderful, surprising, like to what a general resurrection of the dead would be. He thinks it probable Paul had in mind Ezekiel's vision of the dry bones.—R.]

2. The literal view: The resurrection of the dead is meant—the oldest ecclesiastical explanation (Orietus, Chrysostom, Rückert, Tholuck, Meyer, De Wette, &c.). Tholuck says that the meaning of this is, that the conversion of Israel is regarded as the final act in the world's drama; but then he makes the objection, that ζωή ἐν θανάτῳ nowhere stands in the New Testament for the αἰώνια, and thus the expositor finds himself compelled to prefer the metaphorical expression.

But it has not been sufficiently considered how very conditional the first proposition in the comparison is: for if the existing away of them be the reconciliation of the world. As this is a fact which is realized first up to and in the conversion of the Pleroma of the Gentiles, and then of the Jews, so is the consequence of their reconciliation a fact which is continued from the higher spiritual new life of the world to its consummation, particularly in the first resurrection. To the Apostle, the idea of spiritual resurrection and bodily resurrection do not lie so far apart (see chap. vii. 11) as to our exposition; therefore Olshausen is right in applying the word to a spiritual resurrection, which takes place in the bodily resurrection. [Alford also combines the two views—Standing as it does, it must be quali-
that the Apostle elaborates the second figure only, is of just as little force; for, with the further resumption of the second figure, there is presented a perfectly new thought. The most untenable explanation, is, that ὑπερπάτη means the original Christian Church, and κλάδων are the individual believing Jews.

We hold that the antithesis is very decided. From what follows, it is clear that the ideal theocracy, though represented by the patriarch, is not identical with them (see Is. xi. 1; 10; Rev. v. 5; xxii. 16), must be regarded as the root of Israel. In fact, from the foregoing citations, the same Christ is certainly the root of the old theocracy, as He is the ἀρχη in the ἀρχαγγελο καὶ ἐκκλησια of the new Jewish believing Church, and the causa effectio of the sanctification of both. But according to the antithesis here presented, ἀπεκτείνεται is the patriarchal foundation of the theocracy as the natural disposition consecrated to God; while the ἀρχαγγελο, on the contrary, is the first Jewish body of believers prepared by God as the bread of the first-fruits for the first harvest festival of the time of fulfilment, the Christian Pentecost. The present passage is related to Rom. ix. 5, the fathers being regarded as the root, and Christ as the miraculous fruit of the branches.

It is evident, from Dr. Lange's note, how difficult it is to support the twofold sense of the verse. As Tholuck remarks, the ἀρχαγγελος is the point of comparison. Holy here means not only as consecrated to God, but as actually pure. If a distinction must be made between the two figures, it seems natural to find these two ideas of holiness given prominence in each respectively. Those certainly miss the point of both figures, and the argument of the Apostle as well, who do not find here, in "lump" and "branches," a reference to Israel, considered as the people of God. Alford: "As Abraham himself had an outer and an inner life, so have the branches. They have an outer life, derived from Abraham by physical descent. Of this no cutting off can deprive them. But they have, while they remain in the tree, an inner life, nourished by the circulating sap, by virtue of which they are constituted living parts of the tree. It is of this life that their severance from the tree deprives them; it is this life which they will reacquire if grafted in again." This obviates some difficulties, and is, on the whole, the simplest explanation.—R.]

V. 17-24. The conditionality of the new antithesis of believing Gentiles and unbelieving Jews. The figure of the wild and the good olive tree. Warning for the Gentiles, and hope for the Jews.

Ver. 17. But if some of the branches were broken off [ἐὰν δὲ τινες τῶν κλάδων ἔτεκασθήσανται]. The E. V. is too conditional in its form,—R. Although there were many of them, they were nevertheless a small minority, compared with the incorruptible tree of God's kingdom. With this fact, the heathen should also prize the value of the theocratic institution itself.

And thou being a wild olive tree [σὺ δὲ ἀργυλίας ὄν]. As the expression ἀργυλίας ὄν can mean, as a substantive, the wild olive tree itself, but, as an adjective, the belonging to the wild olive tree, we prefer, with Fritzsche and Meyer, this latter view to the former, which is defended by Luther, Filthiapi, and Tholuck, with this explanation. The address, "thou being a wild olive tree," views the individual Gentiles as a collective person.* Meyer objects to this, by saying, that "not whole trees, and also not young ones (against De Wette), are grafted in." Against him, we may remark: 1. That the wild olive tree of the Gentile world is destined to be transferred, in all its branches, to the good olive tree; 2. That this has already taken place incipiently by Paul's mission to the Gentiles. Meanwhile, the Apostle was as far from supposing a total apostasy of the Gentile Church, as from admitting the possibility of a total apostasy of the Jews. Likewise, he speaks of "being grafted in" as having already occurred, with reference to the probable boasting of Gentile Christians over Jewish Christians. Besides, the Apostle considers the wild olive tree to be converted in all its branches just as little as in the case of the good olive tree. Likewise, ver. 24 must be kept in mind, where the same subject is not the wild olive tree itself, but only one branch of it. On the wild olive tree, or oleaster, comp. Natural History of the Bible, and the Dictionaries. Pareus: olearia habet guidem naturaliter erat formosa olea, sed caret succo olei decurrenti.

On the Oriental custom of strengthening olive trees that had become weak by grafting them with the wild olive, comp. the citations in Tholuck, p. 617; in Meyer, p. 345. Now, if this custom were frequent, and occurred in various ways, there would be apparently an incongruity in the figure, in so far as the cuttings of the wild olive are designed to strengthen the olive tree; but the question here is a communication of the sap of the good olive tree to the branch of the wild olive. Therefore Tholuck remarks: "Paul was either not acquainted with the arboricultural relation of the matter, or—which is more probable, when we look at the triviality of this notice—he designed to say, that has here taken place by grace, which otherwise is contrary to nature."† But, in our opinion, this does not settle the question. First, the tertium comparationis does not lie in the breaking off and grafting on of the branches. In relation to this point, the figure is of perfect application. Secondly, though the branches of the wild olive tree communicate to the good olive tree a new and fresher life, and a vegetable vital nourishment (such as, for example, the Germans, at the time of the Reformation, gave to the Christian Church), this does not preclude the necessity of their receiving from the root and stem of the olive tree the good sap and productive power which produce the olive fruit.

* Wört grafted in among them [ἐν γεγραφην στοιχείων ἐν αὐτοῖς]. The ἐν αὐτοῖς is differently rendered. The most simple rendering is: among them. [So Meyer, Alford, and most. Stuart, De Wette, Olshausen: in place of them. The
former is preferable on account of σημειώσεως.—R.

And made fellow-partaker of the root and fatues [καὶ συγγενισίας τῆς δίδυμα καὶ τῆς πιστικώστας]. See Textual Note "—R.

Not ἐν δίδυμον (Grotius, and others). The communication with the root secures participation in the good sap.

Ver. 18. Boast not against the branches [ινὶ καταζωῷ τῶν κλάδων]. The Jews in general were the branches of the olive tree; thus Jewish Christians are as much meant as the unbelieving Jews; not the latter alone (according to Chrysostom [Alford, Stuart, De Wette, and others]), but rather the former principally, as is indicated by the ἐν αὐτῶν. [Meyer: the Jews in general. He rightly adds, that not all Jews, who were not converts as yet, were to be regarded as broken off; only those who had rejected Christ.—R.]

But if thou boast [ἐὰν δὲ καταλυχαῖσαι]. The verb, occurring twice in this verse, is unusual.—R.

Meyer: Triumph over against them. According to the assumed figure of the wild olive tree, they could be tempted to boast that the members of the Jewish believing Church had received new life through heathenism, just as the boast has been made that Germanism, and especially Lutheranism, has reformed Christianity itself; while Christianity, operating from its very foundation, has reformed, and still reforms, its phenomenal forms. [Nota ist mutandis, of special application everywhere.—R.]

Thou bearest not the root [οὐδὲ τὴν δίδυμα βραστικήν. Supply: know that, or, let this humble thee, that. See Winer, p. 475.—R.]

Thou, as a grafted branch, standest in no more favorable relation to the root than those which are broken off and remain standing. Thou remanest thoroughly conditioned by an inward fellowship with the root, which must be confirmed in the humble knowledge of this dependence, and in inward union with the natural branches. The brief explanation is strengthened by the fact that it forms an immediate conclusion. Tholuck remarks: Such a presumption toward the branches could not be possible without a separation from the root.

Ver. 19. Thou wilt say then, The branches were broken off, &c. [ἐὰν δὲ καταλυχαῖσαι τῶν κλάδων, κ.λ. See Textual Note 19.] The genuineness of the article ὦ is rendered very probable by the intention of the Gentile speaking. After this religious warning, he will appeal to a religious decree, to a fait accompli of predestination. He accordingly abuses the truth which the Apostle himself has taught, by saying, negatively: the fate of the branches is irrevocably settled—there is no more salvation for the Jewish people; but he also abuses it, positively, by believing that he himself stands firm through the privilege which he presumes he has acquired. Here, then, we clearly see how the Apostle dismisses such a predestinarian presumption.

Ver. 20. Well [καλῶ]. Ironical, as it ne would say; a fine application of the doctrine of Divine predestination by overturning the other elements brought into the account by it! [With Stuart, Hodge, Meyer, Alford, and others, it must be held that the Apostle here admits the purpose in the breaking off, as stated in ver. 19; but he admits it only to protest against the wrong use made of it,—R.]

Because of unbelief they were broken off [ὅτι ἄφωντο καταλυχαίσαι]. On the dative, see Tholuck and Alford in loco. The latter suggests their unbelief, thy faith (so Amer. Bible Union), but it seems better to take the nouns as abstract.—R. The earnest declaration. That is, because of unbelief, expressed in strengthened form by the dative. That, therefore, is the decisive cause of their καταλογοκρον, the real hindrance to their salvation.

And thou standest by faith, &c. [ὅτι καὶ λειτοῦσας ἡμεῖς.] And thus thou also standest and endurest only by faith. The standing means here the being grafted in, and not, standing in the absolute sense, as Meyer correctly observes, against Tholuck, and others. For the opposite of it is not falling, but the being cut off. Essentially, the idea certainly coincides with standing and falling.

[Be not high-minded, μὴ ἐσθήσεσθε. See Textual Note 15.—R. Be not therefore proud of an imaginary privilege, but fear [διὰ λατρείας]. that is, be all the more afraid of failing, because thou art inclined to boast. Bengel: τιμωρ ὄφει σιζάτων, sed supercetio et securitati.

Ver. 21. For if God spared not the natural branches [ἐὰν ὁ Θεός τῶν κατά χαίδους αὐτῶν ἔγενεσθαι]. Nature here evidently denotes the elevated, consecrated, and unenobled nature of the Abrahamic race. Least he also spare not these [ἴδιος σοι σῶτος φιλιτάται]. See Textual Note 21. Supply fear, or, it is to be feared. See Winer, p. 442, 470, 556.

On the future, Buttmann, N. T. Gram., p. 303.—R. Thou hast no claim to this genealogical nobility of Israel. Meyer: "The future is more definite and certain than the conjunctive."

Ver. 22. Behold therefore the goodness and severity of God [ἐὰν δὲ ἐγενήθη τοῖς ἐνοπτηστικοῖς καὶ ἀποτομημένοις θείοις]. The usual predestinarian system would say: The grace and justice of God. Paul says something quite different. The period [E. V., colon] gives grammatical support to the reading ἀποτομημένοι, &c., accepted by Lachmann.

On those. Ἐπί μὲν τούτοις. The goodness, as well as the severity or sharpness of God in continual movement, corresponds to human conduct.—[Severity, ἀποτομημένοι. See Textual Note 21.—R.]

But toward thee, God's goodness, &c. [ἴδιος δὲ εἰς χρηστότερας σινίοις. See Textual Note 29.] The nominatives give an elliptical construction: there is severity, there is the goodness of God.—R.

If thou continue in his goodness [ἴδιος εἰς καταλυχαίσαις τῇ χρηστότητῃ. That goodness, Alford: If thou abide by, &c.—R.] On the living ground of God's free grace and mercy. Meyer: Will have been maintained. Should the goodness have first begun then—Otherwise thou shalt also be εἰς τὴν ἐκκλησίαν. Comp. ver. 6. The E. V. conveys the correct meaning of εἰς τὴν. —R. Meyer very appropriately calls attention to the stronger expression: ἐκκοπήσῃ.

Ver. 23. And they moreover, καὶ τῆς διὰ. This is the reading adopted by Griesbach,
Scholz, Lachmann, Tischendorf, and critical editors generally, on the authority of A. B. C. D. F. The rendering is that of Alford, who is unusually happy in expressing the exact force of δια.—R.

—For God is able to graft them in again [ἐπειδὴ ἐγὼ ἐστίν, κ.τ.λ.]. He will not apply his power to compel unbelievers to believe; but if they only do not continue in unbelief, He will graft them in again. He is not wanting in power, and certainly He will not be wanting in the application of it. The becoming strong for faith, and in faith, as well as the being planted in again, is exercised by the power of Divine grace.


—Of the olive tree which is wild by nature.

This is the idea of the oleaster, or wild olive.

And were grafted contrary to nature [καὶ παρὰ φύσιν ἐνεκκαταρτίον ἐστίν]. We doubt the propriety of translating παρὰ φύσιν exactly by against nature (contra naturam; Vulgate). Comp. chap. i. 26, p. 87. There exists no absolute opposition between the oleaster and the good olive tree; otherwise the grafting in would have no result.

This application is clear.

How much more. Nevertheless, a greater natural relation exists between the branches which are cut out of the good olive tree, and this olive tree as peculiar to them; so that they, after all, can be grafted more easily into them than the branches of the wild olive are grafted into it. The difficulty which arises from the consideration that the (Jewish) ἐκκαταρτίον is more difficult to be overcome than the (Gentile) ἐγνωστα, is removed by Tholuck, who says that he renders the γάρ of the present verse as coordinate with the δινώστε γὰρ, so that it would relate to the ἐνεκκαταρτίον ἐστίν (ver. 23). But this changes the matter very little; the Apostle's supposition is, that the economy of God's government will accomplish the dissolution of the Jewish ἐκκαταρτίον.

Albert clearly defines the meaning: In the case of the Gentile, the Apostle sets the fact of natural growth over against that of engrafted growth; here, the fact of congruity of nature (ἐν ἑιδίᾳ ἑδίᾳ), is set against incongruity, as making the regrafting more probable. Hodge: "The simple meaning of this verse is, that the future restoration of the Jews is, in itself, a more probable event than the introduction of the Gentiles into the Church of God."

—R.

Ver. 25-26. The last word, or the mystery of the Divine government.

Ver. 26. For I would not, brethren. The ὅταν confirms the previous παρὰ μάλιστα; according to Tholuck, the address, "brethren," is directed this time to the Gentile Christians. But why not to

*As Stuart well remarks, this verse speaks of what can be done; the next, of what will be done. It is prytly to be doubted whether the verse has any bearing on the question of perseverance, converti resistentia, &c., which question, over and above these involved here, is also raised elsewhere.

†There seems good ground for departing from the common rendering. Dr. Lange's idea about real fresh life in the branches is not admissible. For, although fresh physical and intellectual life has again and again come into the Church from new races, it has always been, for a time, at the expense of spiritual vigor. Not until the not spiritual life, owing to nature, had been lost, was there any gain by such grafting.—R.]

Of this mystery. Τὸ τὸ καταρτίον τούτο [See Tholuck and Alford in loco on the word μυστήριον. —R.]. On the basis of the general mystery of the Christian ἰσχύς, 1 Tim. iii. 16, revealed to the Christians of the first two centuries, and to the Gentiles becoming believers, there are displayed the individual mysteries which concern the development of Christian life in the world, particularly the universal development of Christianity. In regard to these, the Apostles are illuminated in advance by revelation, in order to communicate them to the Church. Thus Paul communicates, in many ways, to believers, the mystery that the Gentiles shall be joint-heirs of life, without legal conditions, Eph. iii. 6; also the mystery that, in the last times, the transformation of persons still living will take place, 1 Cor. xv. 51; and so here he communicates the mystery of the Divine economy in relation to the results of the conversion of Jews and Gentiles, and especially of the final, universal conversion of Israel.

Last ye should be wise in your own conceits [ἰνα μή ἢτε ἐν ἑαυτοῖς φρονέμενοι. See Textual Note. —R.]. Meyer: According to your own judgment. The Apostle foresees that, in the Gentile Christian Church, there will arise respecting Israel's future contemptuous decisions of the unintroduced and self-sufficient judgment. [Calvin, Beza, Stuart, refer it to pride in their own position, but Meyer, De Wette, Hodge, and most, agree, with Dr. Lange, in applying it to a wrong view of the exclusion of the Jews.—R.]

That hardening in part is happened to Israel. [ἐναπορέως ἐπὶ πῦρς ἐντούς τῶν Ἰσραήλ. Οὐ συνέχοντας, see ver. 11. —R.]. ἐπὶ πῦρς: according to Calvin, qualitative, quodammodo, and not total hardening; yet it evidently refers to the unbelieving portion of Israel. [De Wette, Meyer, Hodge, join it with γίνοντα, not with πῦρως ὡς το το Ἰσραήλ (Eutius, Fritzsche): Hardening has happened in part. Most commentators now adopt the extensive, rather than the intensive significance.—R.]. This hardening of a part has been reserved all Israel. Calvin's opinio ut is alleged, in spite of the language, to remove the thought of a final object; on which account Calvisius, and most, elaborate here a good deal, in order to bring out the sense that partial blindness, and therefore partial conversion, will last until the end of the world. [With Tholuck, Hodge, Alford, and others, we must insist that a terminus ad quem is here affirmed.—R.]

The fulness of the Gentiles, [ἐρχομένως ὑμῶν ἐν τῷ πληρώμα τῶν ἀνθρώπων. For then the hardening shall cease. Meyer: "Calvin's ista ut is alleged, in spite of the language, to remove the thought of a final object; on which account Calvisius, and most, elaborate here a good deal, in order to bring out the sense that partial blindness, and therefore partial conversion, will last until the end of the world." [With Tholuck, Hodge, Alford, and others, we must insist that a terminus ad quem is here affirmed.—R.]

The fulness of the Gentiles. Interpretations:

1. The completion of the Israelitish people of God by believing Gentiles (Michaelis, Olshausen, and others); 2. The great majority of the Gentiles (Fritzsche) [Stuart, Hodge: the multitude of the Gentiles.—R.]; 3. Meyer, strikingly: "The filling up of the Gentiles—that is, that by which the body of the Gentiles (that is, a part of whom have as yet not been converted) is full—the fulness of the Gentiles." [So De Wette. This makes it πληρώματος.—R.]. As the Apostle could not have meant an indefinite mass of Gentiles, nor yet all the Gentiles down to the last man, he evidently had in view an organically dynamic totality of the heathen world, in which he unquestionably bethought himself of the conversion...
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of the Gentile world. [Alford: The totality of the Gentiles, as nations, not as individuals. This is substantially the view of Lange, and differs but little from that of Meyer:] the kingdom of the Messiah, the establishment of which is, later, not yet in question." [Meyer refers to the personal reign of the Messiah, beginning with the Second Advent.]

This period, on which he lays great stress in his commentary, will come in, he thinks, after the event here predicted.—R.

Ver. 26. And so. O ὑπὸ τούτου, In this order and succession, and in this mode of accomplishment; after the conversion of the Gentiles, and by means of:

All Israel [πᾶς Ἰσραήλ]. This is not spoken of all Israel in isolated examples, nor of the "totality" without exception. The former supposition, for example, that only the elect part, the true λείψανα, is meant (Bengel, Olshausen, and others), or only the greater number and mass ( Rückert and Fritzsche), does not arrive at the idea of the nation, which here, in its totality, as all Israel, comes just in antithesis to the mere λείψανα. The latter supposition (Gennadius, Meyer, and others) transends the idea of the Πνεῦμα, which will suffice here in the case of the Jews as in that of the Gentiles.

This simple apostolic prophecy, pronounced directly in the future, has been much criticized, and much fanaticism has played about it.

Definitions narrowing the meaning: (1.) The spiritual Israel of the elect, from Jews and Gentiles [Augustine, Theodoret, Calvin, Bengel, Olshausen [Wordsworth], &c.]; (2.) An election from Israel will be saved in the millenial kingdom (Baldwin, Bengel). "The one hundred and forty-four thousand of Rev. vii. 4, in which the number is literally interpreted as the principal citizens of the city of Jerusalem;" (3.) Israel will be able to be saved (Episcopius, Selder, and others); (4.) The prophecy has already been fulfilled by the myriads of Jews of whom Eusebius speaks, chap. iii. 38 (Wetstein, and others); (5.) Luther, as Jerome before him, has fallen into glaring contradictions in relation to this question (see Tholuck, pp. 629, 630, and the quotation in Meyer, note, on p. 489); and on this point Melancthon has proved, by his calculations, his fear of Luther's decisive declarations on the hopelessness of the Jews (Tholuck, p. 530). On the further shape which Lutheran exegesis has taken on this point, see the same. With Spener there came a change.

In opposition to all these, there are definitions exaggerating the meaning: (1.) The πᾶς must be so much emphasized, as to lead us to suppose that Israel, dying in unbelief, will be raised from the dead for the realization of this hope (Petersen, Mystiaca Poesae: see Tholuck, p. 628). (2.) We do not include here the idea of a return of the main part of the Israelites, as a nation, to Palestine, but the idea that a spiritual Jewish Church of the Dispersion will come into existence, that a temple will be built in Jerusalem, in which a sort of restitution of the Israelitish worship will take place, and that then the Jewish people will stand as the preferred priestly and noble people ζ. the midst of the believing Gentile world (comp. Tholuck's quotations, p. 625, in addition to which many others might be easily collected).

These fanatical apologists for Judaism should not forget that Israel has fallen so deeply, just because of such aristocratic and priestly claims to the messianic sphere of salvation, and that the only help for it is to acquiesce modestly in the glory of the New Testament spirit of Christ, and to take its place among the Gentile Christian Christians, without special and peculiar privileges, but fully of the humble sense of its long apostasy, yet in the power and demonstration of the Spirit, which will then be imparted to it according to its—that is, according to its great natural state transformed by grace. The scholastics Abelard, Thomas Aquinas, and others, had in view the proper mean, a conversion of the collective tribes, or tribal fragment, of the nation, but not the conversion of each individual, which is qualified as such by free self-determination. The hope of Israel's conversion has been warmly defended in the Reformed Church; first by Beza. See Tholuck, p. 699 f.

The question of the source from which Paul drew this μνημεία has engaged much attention. Tholuck, following in the wake of others, properly calls attention to the fact that the Apostle's quotations from the prophets were given by him as a warrant of his hope, but not as its ground; p. 625 ff. Paul, as an Apostle, was also a prophet, apart from the consideration that he could already find the germs of this prophecy in the gospel tradition (see Matt. xxiii. 39; John xii. 32). However, we take for granted that he could have drawn his warrants from the Old Testament as freely as he desired, though Tholuck raises the question why he did not do this, but contented himself with citing two passages not belonging to that class, and of doubtful relevancy (the declarations cited by Auberlen, p. 628). We must here refer to biblical theology, as well as to the writings which have treated especially on this eschatological part of the theology of the Old Testament.†

There shall come out of Zion, &c. [‘Ἠλέα εἰς Ζιών, κ.τ.λ. See Textual Note* and below. Forbes makes the four lines of the quotations correspond alternately: covenant-promise—removal of sin.—R.]. The two connected quotations are from Isa. lx. 9 and xxii. 9; not (according to Calvin [Stuart], and others) from Jer. xxxi. 35, although there is a kindred sense.† They are freely

* [The view now generally adopted, and supported by Beza, Estius, Koppe, Reiche, Kilner, Meyer, Tholuck, De Wette, Hodges, Stuart, Alford, and a host of others, is that the whole people of God (so marvellously preserved in their distinctive life, as if in earnest of this) shall be restored, as a nation, to God's favor. With all the modifications of this view from other passages, we have not to do. Thus much ought to be admitted by all fair readers of exegesis.—R.]

† [The literature on this subject is very extensive. The passages bearing on this particular question are discussed by Demarest and Gordon, Christocentric, pp. 234 ff. Comp. Meyer, pp. 443 f.—R.]

‡ [See Tholuck, De Wette, Meyer, Alford. Dr. Hodges thinks it probable 'that here, as elsewhere, he does not intend to refer exclusively to any one prediction, but to express the general truth of many special declarations of the ancient prophets.' The objections urged against such a view of the Apostle's citations are applicable here.—Tholuck. To support the affirmation 'so all Israel shall be saved,' note the continuance of the hardening 'until the fulness of the Gentiles come in.—R.]

** [The view now generally adopted, and supported by Beza, Estius, Koppe, Reiche, Kilner, Meyer, Tholuck, De Wette, Hodges, Stuart, Alford, and a host of others, is that the whole people of God (so marvellously preserved in their distinctive life, as if in earnest of this) shall be restored, as a nation, to God's favor. With all the modifications of this view from other passages, we have not to do. Thus much ought to be admitted by all fair readers of exegesis.—R.]

†† [The literature on this subject is very extensive. The passages bearing on this particular question are discussed by Demarest and Gordon, Christocentric, pp. 234 ff. Comp. Meyer, pp. 443 f.—R.]
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[105]. Other explanations: regarded by Paul as enemies (Grotius, Luther); enemies of God (Thomas Aquinas, Bengel). According to the gospel—that is, according to the relation of the gospel to believers and unbelievers—they are enemies; this means not merely that they are adversaries of the gospel (Christians, and others), but that, as adversaries of the gospel, they are regarded by God as adversaries, and they arc By his messengers also— for your sakes [δὲ ὑμᾶς]: from the ground of the saving economy already set forth.

But as touching the election, they are beloved [κατὰ δὲ τὴν ἐκλογὴν ἀγαπᾶτο ὑμᾶς]. We would here also protest against the favorite division: beloved of God, or of the Apostle, or of Christians. They are enemies in their falling out with the gospel, yet they are favorites according to the election, but simply for the sake of their connection with the fathers.—For the fathers’ sakes [διὰ τοῦτο πατέρας]. Meyer says: in favor of the patriarchs; the sense is, because they are included in general in the election of the fathers; according to ver. 28, are made partakers in the gifts of the fathers, in the call of Israel.*

Ver. 29. Without repentance [ἀμετανόητα]. The reference here is evidently national, and not individual. Thus the passage is general in its form and force.—R.]

Unreprobated. Irrevocable in the sense of a Divine, ethical, and self-conditioned result (see 2 Cor. vii. 10).

Ver. 30. For as ye [εἰς ὑμᾶς, See Textual Notes, &c.] The Gentiles.—Formerly disobedient. The ἀπίστευσιν toward God’s word, which was promulgated to the Gentiles by the creation (Rom. i. 21). (Forbes finds, in verse 30, a six-lined stanza, two lines in each verse, with the alternating thought: Disobedience—mercy, recurring three times.—R.)

Ver. 31. That through the mercy shown to you they also may obtain mercy [τῷ ὑμετέρῳ ἔλλει ἡνα καὶ αὐτὸ ἐλεημοσύνα. We accept (with E. V., Hodge, Meyer, De Wette, Alford, and most) a projection of the ἡνα, and not the projection of the ἐλεημοσύνα, which we would join to the following ἔλλει, that, by the mercy manifested to you (which mercy provokes them to jealousy of your faith; ver. 11), mercy might be shown to them.” This construction must be rejected outright, because by it the Apostle would say to the Gentiles what is both ill-bred and untruthful, namely, that their conversion was merely a means for the purpose of the further conversion of the Jews, &c. The opposite construction: non credidunt in estram misericordiam (Vulgate), emphasizes the conversion of the Gentiles as an end in itself, and then makes the further purpose of the conversion of the Jews, thereby brought about, to follow.

* [The obvious meaning is, that the election of Israel as the people of God involves such a hope of blessing to the children of Abraham, that the mercy will at last come, even after “thousands of generations.” If the Abrahamic covenant is abrogated, the Apostle’s words have little force.—R.]

[Notwithstanding this very strong assertion of Dr. Lange, on the ground of the parallelism, as well as on account of the general thought of the whole passage, the construction of Meyer is to be preferred. The construction gives emphasis to τῷ ὑμῖν, &c. The other views are: They are disobedient through the mercy, &c. (Calvin. Alford. Meyer); they have mercy shown to you, &c. (Luther, Estius, Lange). But to these there is the same grammatical objection. Tholuck says: with the same mercy which obtiins Dr. Lange’s difficulty, but is against the parallelism.—R.]

10. And joined together (from the LXX.). Yet, in reality, they perfectly answer to their application. We must not forget that the armor of deliverance which the Lord puts on, according to chap. ix. 17 ff., is a further enlargement of the armor of the Messiah in Isa. xi. 5 ff. Now, if we adhere to the position that prophecy makes no movement independent of itself, that therefore Jehovah, instead of the Messiah, must denote a progress—the passage cannot be understood merely to denote the first appearance of the Messiah, as Isa. xi., but, in any case, the eschatological appearance of Jehovah is also conjoined in the Messiah. This is favored by the grand expression in vers. 19. The Apostle, with his usual masterly skill, therefore makes use of the proper passage here, similarly to the exegesis of Christ, which has also been a subject of surprise to many expositors.

The original text (Isa. lix. 20, 21) reads: “And the God (Redeemer) shall come to Zion, and unto them that turn from transgression (ὑπὲρ) in Jacob, saith the Lord. As for me (on my side), this is my covenant with them, saith the Lord: My Spirit, &c.” etc. The Septuagint: καὶ ἦτε ἵνα τίνι τίνι τίνι δένα τῶν Ζωίων ο λογισμός, καὶ ἀποτρέψας σάρκιας ἀπὸ Ἰακώβ, εἰς οὖν εἰς Κύριον, καὶ ἀποτρέψας τῶν Ζωίων ἀπὸ Ἰακώβ, εἰς οὖν εἰς Κύριον, εἰς οὖν εἰς Κύριον. The solution of this passage is difficult, and is joined with six-lined verses (chaps. xxvii. and xxviii.) to the restoration of Israel. Vers. 6 gives the necessary starting-point. The sense of vers. 8 is: God punishes Israel with moderation. The form of this punishment is hardening, and being carried off as by an east-wind storm. Then we read: “Therefore (by this means) shall the iniquity of Jacob be purged; and this is all the fruit (the use) to take away his sin.” The LXX.: Ἀδ τούτῳ ἀποτρέψατα ἡ ἁμαρτία Ἰακώβ, καὶ τούτῳ ἐπίτηδε ἡ εἰρήνη ἡ ἐαυτοῦ, ὧν ἦτε δικαίωμα αὐτοῦ τὴν ἡμερανίαν. Paul took into consideration three modifications: (1). From Zion, instead of for Zion, in which we must not forget that also in Isaiah Jehovah must come from Zion for Zion; (2). The original text assumes conversion at the announced redemption; with the Apostle it was self-evident that the redemption precedes the conversion; (3). The Apostle describes the new covenant with Israel, by inserting the passage from Isa. xxix.; that is, he here describes the purging and taking away of Jacob’s sin as the essential part of the covenant, instead of the purging of the sin of the Spirit, in Isa. lix., because he knows that both are indisputably connected. Yet these modifications of form do not prevent the citation from being a proof, as Tholuck supposes. See, on the further exposition of this passage, Tholuck, p. 631.

[Tholuck: “How came the Apostle, if he wished only to express the general thought that the Messiah was come for Israel, to choose just this citation, consisting of two combined passages, when the same is expressed more directly in other passages of the Old Testament? I believe that the ἐπὶ gave occasion for the quotation: if he did not refer this directly to the second coming of the Messiah, yet it admitted of being indirectly applied to it.”—R.]

Ver. 28. As touching the gospel, they are enemies [κατὰ μὲν τὸ εἰσεργασθέν ἐν γενεσίν]. As enemies, they are said, by Meyer and Tholuck, to be hostilely treated by God (Alford, Hodge) (Tholuck: εἰσιν δεός). But it is difficult to establish this epithet, as they can be simultaneously odious to, and beloved by, God, except in different relations. See the Exeg. Notes on chap. v. 10
mercy is shown, is, that by all men this mercy is not accepted, and so men become self-excluded from the salvation of God. God's act remains the same, but equally great, equally universal, whether men accept His mercy or not. This contingency is here not in view, but simply God's act itself. We can hardly understand the oi πάντες nationally. The marked universality of the expression recalls the beginning of the Epistle, and makes it a solemn conclusion to the argumentative portion, after which the Apostle, overpowered with the view of the Divine mercy and wisdom, breaks forth into the sublime apostrophes existing in the pages of Inspiration itself." Comp. Doct. Note 21.—R."

Ver. 33. On the depth of the riches, and wisdom, &c. [ω δόξας πλοίων καὶ σοφίας, κ.τ.λ. In the English, that interpretation has been followed which regards the three genitives, πλοίων, σοφίας, γνώσεως, as coordinate. θεός is joined with all three.—R.] Construction:

A. What a depth: 1. Of riches; 2. Of wisdom; 3. Of knowledge (Chrysostom, Grotius, Olshausen, Philippi [Hodge, Alford, De Wette], &c.

B. What a depth of riches: 1. Of wisdom; 2. Of knowledge (Luther, Calvin, Reiche). Meyer says, in favor of the first construction: "As vers. 33 and 34 portray the σοφία and γνώσις, but vers. 35 and 36 the πλοίων θεός, the former construction is preferable." Besides, the depth of the riches would be, in a certain measure, tautological. But δόξας can also not (according to the same writer) mean "the great fulness and superabundance," because there would merely result such a tautology. The depth, whose outward figure is the ocean, is also a spiritual depth (see the quotations in Meyer). There is also another sort of fulness, as a rich and fruitful plain. Here God's miracles are obscured by a holy darkness. But the riches of God are not merely God's riches of grace in the special sense, for the fulness of creation and the treasures of redemption constitute a more general unity in the all-sufficiency of God. This is the entire ontological and soteriological foundation of God's kingdom. If, now, σοφία be defined as the exercise of God's designing attribute, the idea also usually includes the knowledge and choice of means; here, however (according to Meyer, for example), γνώσις denotes the knowledge of means. Proof: ας οδιοι αιτων. His measures, must be referred to the latter. But the ways have just as decided a relation to the starting-points as to the final points, and we would here also hold to the distinction: γνώσις relates chiefly to the θεός and its consequences, and σοφία chiefly to the τίλι and their premises.

How unsearchable, &c. [ως άνεξερευνητα, κ.τ.λ. See Textual Note 21. Meyer refers am odoi ai'tos to γνώσις, to prwita ai'tos to sofis; the former in the sense of His modes of dealing, His economies, the latter, His judicial decisions (as ver. 32). So Tholuck, but the distinctions are very subtle. See below.—R.] The most unsearchable character of God's judgments consists in His causing redeeming acts to arise from them (Gen. iii.: the flood; the Egyptian plagues; the Babylonian captivity; the cross of Christ); and

Ver. 32. For God hath shut up all under disobedience [συνελεκτήρισε γάρ ὁ θεός τοὺς πάντας εἰς απίθεαν. On the verb, comp. Gal. iii. 22, 25. Παραβλητίζω below. Meyer, Alford, and others, regard this as as well as the Gentiles. According to Meyer, all and every Gentile and Jew are meant, and not merely the masses of both (according to Tholuck, and others). Trite, the masses are, in a certain sense, the all-concluding; yet, strictly emphasized, all and every one cannot be spoken of, because the question is not simply the fall of man, but the generic consequences of the fall (Vulgate and Luther have the neuter). The neuter is probably borrowed from Gal. iii. 22. The sense is the same, whether we accept the view of Meyer or that of Tholuck; but by pressing the former in the second clause, a conclusion might be inserted, which Meyer himself does not accept, viz., the actual exercise of saving mercy in the case of every individual. —R.]

But what does shut up mean? Meyer would explain it, according to the peculiarities of the later Greek, as to or under, the effective power, but not merely a declarative (Chrysostom, and others), or permissive power (Origen, and others). [Meyer, Alford, and others, remark that the συνελεκτήρισε in composition strengthens the simple verb, without, however, introducing the idea of shutting up together.—R.] The real explanation of the expression is contained in Rom. v. 12 and Gal. iii. 23. The state of the totality of men (their being shut up under disobedience) is based on the organic (generic, social, political, and sympathetic) connection. By the organic connection, all men are shut up in the consequences of the fall. Then, by the organic connection, the Gentiles are first shut up in the process of unbelief (see chap. i.); and in the same way the Jews also are shut up by means of this organic connection (chap. ii.). In the collective character of the history of the world, this makes a collective conclusion [Zusammengeschlossenheit]. Thus the Jews, by their organic connection (according to Gal. iii. 22), were shut up under the law, as it were, in a prison or place of custody * [ἐφρυνόμενοι μεθα ανακαλειμσίνοι]; although, after the confinement was abolished, it turned out that they consisted of two parts, the children of the bondwoman and the children of the freewoman. Thus it could only come to pass, by the fearful power of the connection of the universal currents, that all should be consummated in unbelief under God's judgment, in order that sinners might become receptive of Divine mercy (Rom. v. 20; vii. 13).

In order that he may have mercy upon all [γινομαι πιστίς τοῖς εἰλησία]. The purpose of this authoritative judgment of God (that is, of this Divine hardening, which was carried constantly further by the reciprocal action with human guilt) was, first, that fulfillment in the ancient time, when the heathen world was ripe for mercy, and will be hereafter the fulfilment of the New Testament time, when Israel shall be ripe for mercy.

Alford remarks on τοῖς πάντας in the two clauses: "Are they the same? And, if so, is any support given to the notion of an ἀποκατάστασις of all men? Certainly they are identical, and signify all men, without limitation. But the ultimate result has been that all men are shut up under disobedience, and the all men upon whom the

* [Comp. Lange's Comm. Galatians, p. 85 E.—R.]
the peculiarity of His ways as past finding out, consists in His leading the minds which He has created through byways, circuitous paths, apparently contrary roads, and even impassable roads, safely to their object (see Job v. 9; ix. 10; xxxiv. 24).

Ver. 34. For who hath known the mind of the Lord? &c. [τις γὰρ ἐγνώσει καὶ ἀνακοσμήσει τοὺς ἑαυτοῦ; π.λ.] Isa. xl. 13, "almost exactly" from the LXX. This mind took knowledge of the objects; the counsel took knowledge of the ways. Or, the former word applies to the γνώσεις, the latter to the σοφία (Theodoret, and others). In wisdom He is exalted even above the understanding of man ("My thoughts are not your thoughts"); with respect to His counsel, above the necessity of man's being a counsellor with Him; finally, with respect to His riches, no one has enriched Him or given to Him so that He had to recompense unto him again; He is the absolute source of all good things.

Ver. 35. Or who hath first given to him, and it shall be recompensated unto him again? [ἐγὼ δὲ τοὺς πρεσβύτερους οὕτω καὶ ἀνακοσμήσει τοὺς αὐτοῦ; See Textual Note 2* for the text of the Hebrew and LXX.—R.] From the original text of Job xii. 11. No gift must be regarded as a recompensing of God.

Ver. 36. For of him and through him [ἵνα καὶ ἀνακοσμήσει τοὺς αὐτοῦ;]. The negation of the previous proposition is carried out positively in the completion of the doxology. All things are of Him. He is the original fountain, original ground and author.—Through Him. Preservation, government, redemption. And unto him [καὶ τις αὐτῶν;]. Toward Him as end. That He may become all in all (1 Cor. xv. 28); He is glorified in all, and all is glorified in Him. Meyer says: "In so far as every thing serves God's purposes (not merely God's honor, as many would have it);" But every thing always serves God's purpose. Yet the final, absolute glorification of God cannot be separated from the purpose of the revelation of His άποκαλύψεως in Christ, and by Him in His children, His inheritance.

Ambrose, Hilary, Olshausen, Philippi, and others, have regarded this passage as an expression of the relation of Father, Son, and Spirit. Meyer opposes this, by urging that neither Chrysostom, Uczerinus, Theophylact, Calvin, nor Beza, have referred to the Trinity in their expositions. The context speaks simply of God the Father. Yet it cannot be doubted, if we take into consideration other passages of the Apostle (for example, 1 Cor. xiv.; Col. i.), that Paul here had in mind at least the difference of the revelations of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit. It is certain that the view of God's absolute unity predominates here, but not therefore in the exclusive, doctrinal definiteness of God the Father. The Trinitarian relation lies beyond subordinationism.

* [Alford, who is unusually happy in his comments on this chapter, remarks: "If this be rightly understood—not of a formal allusion to the three Persons in the Holy Trinity, but of an implicit reference (as Tholuck) to the three attributes of God, and respectively manifested in the three coequal and coeternal Persons—there can hardly be a doubt of its correctness." Only those who are dogmatically prejudiced can miss seeing that, though St. Paul has never definitely expressed the doctrine of the Holy Trinity in a definite formula, yet he was conscious of it as a living reality.—R.]

**DOCTINAL AND ETHICAL.**

1. While the whole of Paul's Epistle to the Romans has been called a "christological philosophy of the history of the world and of salvation," the term applies more specially to the section chap. ix.-xi., and preliminarily to chap. xi.

2. God has not cast away His people: Proofs (1.) The public history of Israel; Paul and his Jewish companions in faith; (2.) Israel's concealed history, disclosed by God's declaration to Elijah; (3.) The teleology of the partial blindness of Israel: a. a condition for the conversion of the Gentiles, b. then this a condition for the conversion of the Jews; c. then this, finally, a condition for the completion of God's saving work on earth; (4.) God's exercise of judgment on all humanity has always a merciful purpose—that is, deliverance and restoration. The history of prosylytes proves that the attraction of the Jews to faith is constantly fulfilled in the individual.

3. The history of the seven thousand hidden worshippers of God at the time of Elijah, a type of similar cases in all ages. Not merely the heroic witnesses for God's honor are His people, but all who do not bow the knee to idols. The kingdom of God has not merely its present but its future doves.

4. God preserves at all periods, even at the worst, a λείμμα κατ' ἐκλογὴν χάριτος. When the enemies of the gospel think that Christianity will soon decline, they miscalculate, especially on two or three points: (1.) They do not observe that the blight of division is unavoidable in their own camp; (2.) That a new Divine seed of Divinely chosen children, of sincere adversaries converted and led by God, and of courageous witnesses for God, are in His plan; (3.) That every direction which apostasy takes, leads to a dispersion and taint like that of the Jews, while the deep current of the world's history takes its course with God's kingdom. This confidence is resplendent even throughout the Old Testament, through the prophets.

5. Vers. 6, 7. The unanswerable sylogism of the evangelical Church against the decree of the Council of Trent (see Ezeg. Notes). To seek grace beyond works is an ἀπόστασις, comprising in itself a self-contradiction.

6. Vers. 8-11. The twofold judgment of blindness: a. By external, seeming happiness (see chap. ii. 4); b. By inward disobedience, whose fundamental characteristics are presumptuous blindness and insensible, cowardly despondency in relation to the highest good.—On the process of hardening as a continual reciprocity between human offence and God's sovereign judgment, see Ezeg. Notes on chap. ix. On Jelaledin Rumi's doctrine of predestination, see Tholuck, p. 695.

7. From the fact that judgments on unbelievers are remedial judgments, which are the means of producing faith in the elect, there follows the proposition that all judgments are not of an eccentric, but of an economic nature. God always seeks, through the unbelievers, indirectly to reach again the unbelievers. Therefore the messengers of salvation must shake the dust from their feet when they are not received. That is, they must go farther and farther! The
prophecy of the Apostle about the restoration of Israel, see Tholuck, p. 625.

17. In spite of the Apostle's warning, the grafted branches have in many ways boasted against the natural branches. Under this head belong the conduct of Christians toward the Jews, the judgments passed upon the capability of the Jews for conversion, and, finally, the opinion pronounced on converted Jews. Here belong also the predestinarian appeals to God's decree, under a disregard of the ethical conditions.

18. The mystery. Tholuck: "According to the ecclesiastical definition, res captum humanae rationis tum reginam quam irreginatam transcedens (Quenstedt, i. 44). According to the later expositors, on the contrary, it means, at least in Paul, unknown truths, hitherto concealed from humanity, and only known by revelation (Rückerl, Fritzschc, Meyer, and Philipp)." The latter, or formal idea of the mystery, underlies the former, the material one. This is proved by 1 Tim. iii. 16. But it is clear, from ver. 28, that a mystery, in the material sense, is so called because it is of unfathomable depth; not because it merely extends beyond the human understanding in the abstract sense—or, in other words, because it is not attainable by the understanding— but only by the believing intellectual perception, because it even reveals itself in its Divine depth, in infinitum, but not because it should remain in infinitum an unsolved enigma.

19. Meyer acknowledges that the conversion of all Israel has not yet taken place; but he adds, that it lies in a very distant time, although the Apostle has regarded the matter as already near at hand; p. 442. This is the usual misconception arising from the failure to distinguish between the religious and chronological ideas of the nearness and remoteness of time.

20. On the different renderings of χάριμα and κόσμος, see Tholuck, p. 633. A series of insufficient explanations of the συνιστάων in ver. 32, is on p. 635; and discussions on the meaning of τοῖς πάντεσιν, on p. 637.

31. It is worthy of note, that the usual doctrine of predestination, as well as the doctrine of restoration, has been connected with the present chapter, particularly with 33. This contradiction is adjusted, if, with Schlieper, we regard predestination as economical, and restoration as cosmic. True, even in that case, the consequence of the former idea is strongly affected by the reference to faith and unbelief as ethical motives for the Divine sovereignty. Against the latter idea, viz., the usual doctrine of the ἀποκατάστασιν, Meyer observes, that the universality of the Divine intention does not preclude the partially finite non-realization of it through the guilt of human individuals. But this observation applies also to yesterday and to-day. Important weight rests upon the fact that the συνιστάων, which is similar to faith in the organic connection of men (for example, a Jewish child, born in a Jewish alley, &c.), should be removed by God's sovereign grace; yea, that the currents of unbelief should give place to a current of faith. Judas has approved that a false individual can, at all events, swim against the stream of salvation. The sons of God and the freedom of man turn above the used ideas of the apokatastais, as well as above the usual ideas of eternal = endless condemnation.*

* [A comparison c ver. 32 with Gal ii. 22 will assist us]
Theology of distinctions between σοφία and γνώση, see Tholuck, p. 641. The former (Abe
dard) constitutes just the reverse of ours: sapiéntia quantum ad praecistentiam ipse scientia quantum ad ipso oripia effictum, &c. Tholuck defines the
σοφία, according to Proverbs, as the economic and architectural wisdom of God, and the γνώση as the knowledge of the nature of the universe. He, in
opposition to Meyer, refers the κριτήρια to the γνώση, and δολοί to the σοφία. On the latter point, we
must coincide with Meyer. The ideas: κριτήρια and the essence of things, and δολοί and architectural
dispositions, do not fit very well together. The κριτήρια refer to final points; the δολοί are at least
connected with starting-points. See Eeck. Notes. We must also refer, in reference to ver. 36, to Tho-
luck's instructive statements.
23. Rom. xi. 36; comp. 1 Cor. vili. 6; Col. i. 
16; Heb. ii. 19; also the doxologies in the New
Testament, and especially those in Revelation. [Sta-
nes, p. 323.] I think that the arch anticipation of the
future of our Epistle: a powerful expression of profound
wonder, reverence, and adoration, in regard to the
unsearchable ways of God in His dealings with men;
and an assertion of the highest intensity respecting
His sovereign right to control all things so as to ac-
complish His own designs. A doctrine truly hum-
brighting to the proud and towering hopes and claims
of self-righteous men; a stumbling-block to haughty
Jews, and foolishness to unlearned Greeks. I
scarcely know of any thing in the whole Bible which
strikes deeper at the root of human pride than vers.
33–36. — But sovereignty in God does not imply what
is arbitrary, nor that He does any thing without the
best of reasons. It only implies that those reasons are
unknown to us. — And if our hearts are ever
tempted to rise up against the distinctions which
God has made, either in a temporal or spiritual re-
spect, in the bestowment of His favors, let us bow
them down to the dust, as well as silence and satisfy
them, with the humbling, consoling, animating, glo-
rious truth, that 'of God, and through Him, and for
Him, are all things.' To Him, then, be the glory for
ever and ever! Amen. — B.]

HOMILETICAL AND PRACTICAL.

A. Vers. 1–6. Has God cast away His people? God forbid! 1. The thought is intolerable to the

Apostle as a true Israelite. 2. He repudiates the
fact in the most positive manner; because, a. God has
provided for His people beforehand; b. In times of
great apostasy He has preserved His remnant of
seven thousand who did not bow the knee to Baal.
He will deal likewise with those who have been
reserved through grace.—Paul, as a model of truly
national feeling. 1. He was a Christian with all his
heart; 2. But he was also an Israelite with all his
heart (vers. 1, 2).—The example of the Apostle Paul
does not show how Christianity and national feeling not only
do not part! Not at all, but people very well to-
together.—I also am an Israelite! An expression: 1. Full
of manly power; 2. Full of Christian love (vers. 1, 2).—The example of Elijah. 1. His com-
plaint against Israel; 2. God's answer for Israel (vers. 2–4).—God still has His seven thousand who
have not bowed their knee to Baal (vers. 4–6).

Let the apostasy be never so great, God never
wholly casts away His people (vers. 4–6).

Lurzeu: Not all are God's people who are called
God's people; therefore not all will be cast away,

though the greater portion be cast away.

Sarae: God's children often make unnecessary
complaints, and if the Lord should answer them, He
would not reply in any other way than: "Ye know
not what ye should pray for as ye ought" (ver. 2).

God can permit no such confusion of ideas, as
that we are to be saved partly through grace and
partly through merit; chap. ii. 28 (ver. 6).—Har-
ness: God has more saints in the world than we
often imagine. Much of the good seed lies under the
ground; in the Spring, when the right time
comes, it germinates. Be comforted by this truth,
ye faithful teachers! Isa. xlix. 1; Kings xix. 48
(vers 1–3).—Novæ Bibl. Tüb.: God does not cast
us away, if we have not previously cast Him away
(vers. 1).—You regard that church and congregation
as the best one to which the most belong, which the
great men in the world honor, and which, therefore,
has the most splendor, show, and consideration. Oh,
no; it is the small and insignificant number which God
has preserved for salvation according to the election.
"Fear not, little flock; for it is your
Father's good pleasure to give you the kingdom"
(vers. 5).—Spเน: God looks with other eyes than
men's, and perceives those who were imperceptible
to others. Yet such persons did not exist by their
own strength, but the Lord has reserved them
(vers. 4).

Lisco: The fall of Israel is neither altogether
universal nor perpetual. The Gentiles' becoming
God's people, and participants in His kingdom, is a
fulfillment of Gen. ix. 27, that Japheth shall dwell in
the tents of Shem.—As surely as unbelief, according
to chap. x., is an offence, so sure is the better dispo-
sition of these better ones among the people not
any work of theirs, but a work of Divine grace (vers
4, 6).

Heuris: There is a divine casting away, the
most terrible penal judgment of God, in which He
takes His Holy Spirit from man, and quenches the
spark of good within him, so that he morally dies
out, is without the feeling and power for good, and,
shut out from heaven, must bear misery and tor-
ment. —This is what pious people since the fall
have been anxious about praying God, as shown in
vers. 1.—Elias believes that he was the only one
left. How often does many a pious person believe
himself alone! This is a divine trial; but in such
hours there also comes equal consolation (vers. 3).
There is a seed of good people which never dies out. (Indevoctabilitas ecclesiae.)

B. Vers. 7–10. The judgment of hardening on the Israelites not belonging to the election. 1. Why is this judgment inflicted upon them? a. Not because it was determined from eternity against them; but because they, according to chap. ix. 30, sought righteousness by works and not by faith, and, accordingly, became guilty themselves. 2. In what does this judgment consist? God fulfills in them what He, a. Has said by Isaiah; b. By David.

Nova Bibl. Tib.: The terrible judgment ofhardening! They have hell, who are smitten and do not feel it; who have eyes, and do not see; who have ears, and do not hear; who have poison and death instead of the bread of life; who have ruin, punishment, and condemnation, instead of strength, joy, and comfort; who have darkness instead of light, and earth instead of heaven.—Cramer: O God, Thou beautiful and clear light, Thou wouldst blind no one; and Thou only dost it as a righteous Judge after one has blinded himself in the power of the devil; 2 Cor. iv. 4 (ver. 10).—Roos: When the bible (where they concommit mischievous devices), with whom they usually sit uncontrolledly and eat good things, becomes a rope, a trap, ruin, and a recompense for the unfaithfulness and violence which they have exercised against others, it is a symbol of all the means by which men unexpectedly become involved in dangers by their words, or, by their deception or power, are led into the hands of their enemies, and sustain real injury (ver. 9).

Lisco: The burdens of age—dim-sightedness and crookedness—are likewise a symbol of ruin (ver. 10).

Heinzer: God has given them such a spirit; that is, He has permitted it to visit them as a necessary consequence, as a righteous punishment, because they made such resistance to the strivings of the Divine Spirit (ver. 8). Comp. Acts ii. 37; vii. 51. —Man, both the individual and the people, declines into wretched slavery by apostasy from God (ver. 10).

C. Vers. 11, 13. The fall of the Jews is the salvation of the Gentiles. 1. No dark fatality rules here; but 2. The loving providence of God, which continually turns every thing evil to a good purpose.

—Nothing is so bad that God cannot make it serve a good purpose. —Provisional sovereignty: 1. It is mysterious, in so far as we often cannot understand why it permits evil; 2. It is clear and plain, in so far as it always causes good to come from evil, Comp. Gen. l. 20.

Staikes, Hedingen: What a great Artificer is God! He makes good out of evil, medicine out of poison, and something out of nothing.—Roos: Has God brought nothing good out of this evil? God forbid! From their fall there has taken place the salvation of the nations, to which the gospel was directed after it had been scorned by the Jews (Matt. xxi. 46; Acts xiii. 48–49; xxi. 18–21; xxvii. 21, 28) that the latter might be provoked to jealousy by the former.

Gerlagh, Calvin: ”As a wife who has been cast away from her husband because of her guilt is so inflamed by jealousy that she feels herself impelled by it to become reconciled again to her husband, so shall it now come to pass that the Jews, having seen the Gentiles taking their place, and being pained by their being cast away, shall strive after reconciliation with God;” comp. Eph. v. 26–33.

Lisco: God’s wisdom brings good out of Israel’s perversity. Paul does not say that the individuals, unbelieving Israelite cannot be lost; but there is quite a difference between the individual and the people (ver. 11).

D. Vers. 13–18. How does Paul wish to be regarded by the Gentiles? 1. By all means as their Apostle, who magnifies this his office; 2. But yet, at the same time, as a true friend of his linear kindred, who wishes to be the means of saving some of them, because they are destined for life (vers. 12–16).—The rich mercy shown to Israel; perceptible, 1. From its rejection, which is the reconciling of the world; 2. From its reception, which is life from the dead (vers. 19–20).—The figure of the first-fruits as related to the justification of infant baptism; comp. 1 Cor. vii. 14 (ver. 16).—Likewise the figure of the root and the branches. (Comp. also the Zurich Catechism, Question 73, b.) The figure of the olive tree. 1. The Apostle warns the Gentile Christians against pernicious presumption (vers. 17, 18); 2. He takes away the strength from such a possible and proud objection on their part (vers. 19–21); 3. He exhorts them to behold God’s goodness and severity (ver. 22); 4. He also declares to them his joyous hope of the future conversion of Israel (vers. 23, 24).—The branches do not bear the root, but the root bears the branches. Application: 1. To the relation of children and parents; 2. To the unconfirmed and the Church (ver. 18).—Do you stand by faith? Then do not be proud, but fear (ver. 20).—God’s goodness and severity (ver. 22).—God can graft them in again; as this was the Apostle’s hope for the children of Israel, so is it ours (ver. 24).—The future conversion of all Israel. 1. When will it take place? Where does the fullness of the Gentiles come into the kingdom of God, and the time of the blindness in part of Israel is past. 2. Why will it take place? a. Because God has promised it by the prophets; b. Because God has once chosen His people; c. Because He does not repent His gifts and call (vers. 26–28).—The future conversion of Israel is a mystery, in the sense of Matt. xxi. 39; 1 Cor. xv. 21–34, The entrance of the fulness of the Gentiles into God’s kingdom. (Ver. 17) It will be effected by the preaching of the gospel among them; 2. It will take place amid praise and thanksgiving (ver. 25).

Starkz: It is part of a teacher’s wisdom to address himself especially to every class of men in an assembly (ver. 13).—One of them lags, and yet by his fall another rises; oh, wonderful and yet holy government of God (ver. 16)!—A whole church, a whole ministry, a whole community, and a whole generation, must not be rejected on account of a few fools (ver. 16).—The living of the Jews among us in a dispersed way can be of use to us, for the frequent sight of a Jew, and his intercourse with us, remind us frequently of this Pauline admonition (ver. 21).—Why should you trouble yourself if you are not remembered in any earthly will as an inheritor of corruptible goods? If you stand in God’s covenant of grace, you are more than rich (ver. 27).—Cramer: Let no one forget his origin, for that will teach him to be humble. (ver. 17).—Humility is the gift of God; the human heart is guilty of two sins; it is deceitful, and desperately wicked; Jer. xvii. 9. Therefore God must oppose it by goodness and righteousness (ver. 22).—Hedingen: Do not cast away so soon what does not please you. Many sin by doing this. God has many ways to souls. Your neighbor is
guilty, and so are you. Shall the Lord cast both away? Bear and forbear. Time produces roses even from thorn-bushes (ver. 17).—Oh, how I wish that no one would sin against the poor Jews! Are they not Abraham's seed, and the lineal kindred of the Church? O God, take compassion on these hardened ones, and remember thy covenant!—The Jews, you say, only steal and cheat; they are a foolish people! Are you better than they? Cannot God convert them? They hear the word, and so do you; neither you nor they are pious. Which has the greater condemnation—you, or those who are under a judgment? The same blindness will come over you, if you do not turn to Christ (ver. 23).—If it is a mystery, who would be so daring as to desire to fathom it? If it is a revealed mystery, who will deny the conversion of the Jews? Though you cannot imagine how it will come to pass, neither can I imagine how those who were formerly Gentiles and servants of the devil, shall now be God's children and the temple of His Spirit (ver. 25).—*Nova Bibl. Tub.*: Everything which God does must be regarded as for our improvement; His judgments to lead us to it, and His mercy and grace to keep us to it, even to the end. Because thy loving-kindness is better than life, my lips shall praise thee; Ps. lxiii. 3 (ver. 23).—Quernus: Let no sinner despair! There is no abyss of sin from which God cannot rescue him. He who returns to Him with faith and confidence, will find His bosom open to him (ver. 28).

*Spener, on ver. 23:* We have here the clear testimony that the poor castaway people shall hereafter be received to grace, and be converted to their Saviour; and the promises once given them repeatedly in the prophets, shall be fulfilled in them. From the beginning of the Christian Church down to the present time, this has been taught and believed by its dearest teachers, from many passages of the Old and New Testament Scriptures; and we, too, have no ground of departing from it, or looking more at the hardness of those hearts which appear impossible to be converted, than at God's promise. Yet the time and manner of God's effecting the work we should as well commit to Divine wisdom, as rejoice with thanksgiving for Divine grace. Because of this thing itself, and when such a result is effected, we hope for all the more blessed condition of the Church, but meanwhile heartily pray for the fulfilment of such hope.

*Gerlach, on ver. 16:* The first figure says, the part has the nature of the whole; the second, the derived has the nature of its origin. The Apostle lays greatest stress upon the latter figure, for he dwells upon it afterward, and portrays it in clearer colors. The Apostle purposely uses here a very striking figure, from a transaction which did not in reality occur—the grafting of the branch of a wild olive tree on a good stock—in order to show that the Gentiles, in a higher sense than the Jews, are called to salvation contrary to nature (ver. 24)—that is, by supernatural grace overcoming their nature; comp. Luke xii. 37 (ver. 18).—Paul calls every thing mystery which man cannot know of himself, and can only perceive by Divine revelation. Previously it was the case of the Gentiles (chap. xvi. 25; Eph. iii. 8), but now it is that of the Jews. Comp. Col. ii. 2; I Cor. xv. 51 (ver. 25).—The continued existence of the Jezireites among all the remaining nations—this perfectly isolated phenomenon of history—is therefore designed by God to glorify hereafter His covenant faithfulness by a future total conversion of the people (ver. 26).

*Lisco:* Under what conditions we become and remain participants of God's grace (ver. 22-24).

*Heubner,* on ver. 16: Honorable forefathers of an earnest admonition to their posterity (ver. 16).—Nothing more clearly proves the strict righteousness of God, than His judgment on the fallen angels and the unbelieving people of Israel. This should inspire every one with awe, and with solicitude for himself (ver. 21).—It is very necessary to bear in mind both God's severity and goodness; His severity, in order to be preserved from indulgence, false security, and backsliding; and His goodness, in order to be encouraged, and to hope for forgiveness and improvement. God has revealed both. With out the two together there would be no training of men (ver. 29).—Israel is without God, because it is without Christ; God has disappeared from the synagogue. He who would find God, must be converted to Christ (ver. 26).—The true deliverance of Israel does not take place by civil, but by spiritual, emancipation—the mercy of God. Mercy is the object of the reception of the Jews into the Christian Church (ver. 27).—God's friendship with the patriarchs endures eternally (ver. 29).

*Baeyer:* It is with Mary, with the shepherds, with Simon, with the first-called disciples, with the Galilean women, with the Apostles, and with the pentecostal Church of Jerusalem, and not without or separated from them, that thou, Gentile, hast a share in the root and sap of the olive tree. "Paul loves the little word 'with,'" says Bengel, in speaking of the Gentiles; chap. xv. 10; Eph. ii. 19, 22; iii. 6 (ver. 17, 18).—See that you are not led into the folly of planting the top of the tree in the earth, and imagining that you bear the root, and that first from you, German blood, the good sap of the olive tree has really received strength and impulse (ver. 18).

*Disceery,* (ver. 11-21): What serves for the fall of some, must serve for the support of others. 1. Corroboration of this experience generally and particularly; 2. For what should it serve both the fallen and the raised? E. *Ver. 26:* God's general compassion on all. 1. On the Gentiles, who formerly did not believe, but now believe; 2. On the Jews, who do not believe, but shall hereafter believe (ver. 29-32)—All concluded in unbelief. 1. How far? 2. To what end? (ver. 32).—The universality of Divine grace (ver. 32).—An apostolical song of praise: 1. For God's fulness of grace; 2. For His wisdom; 3. For His knowledge (ver. 33-36).—Everything is of, through, and in (to) God (ver. 36).—To God alone be the honor (ver. 36).

*Luther,* on ver. 32: Observe this principal declaration, which condemns all righteousness of man and of works, and praises only God's compassion in our obtaining it by faith.—*Starke:* God must be the beginning, the middle, and the end of all things (ver. 36).—*Hengstenberg:* How audacious not only to look upon God's council-chamber, but to become master of it! Men do not allow their political follies to be known, they should we blind ones, then—we who are of yesterday and know nothing—invalidate God's wisdom? Job viii. 9. O man, be acute with the Scriptures, but not on and beside the Scriptures. Hypercritics mount high, and fall low; and it all amounts to nothing with the Divine Being (ver. 33).

*Spener:* The loftiness of the divine Majesty...
1. How unfortunately redemption must repeat itself. God has chosen Israel, and remains true to it. He has from the beginning shown great mercy to this people; and He does not repeat of the Gentiles what can, indeed, be cut off, and individual Jews can be lost in great numbers; but the whole tree will not be cut off, the whole people cannot be cast away (ver. 29).

GERLACH: God’s purposes for Israel will continue uninterrupted until the end of the present course of the world; as the fulfilment of all the promises, there is yet to take place a great popular conversion, and a mighty activity within the Church itself. But from all this we cannot conclude that there will be an external restoration of the Jews to a people in the political sense, and their return to the land of Canaan (ver. 29). The survey of the wonderfully glorious saving purpose of God, as He gradually unfolded it in the foregoing verses to the eyes of the Apostle, leads the latter to make, from the bottom of his heart, this exclamation of amazed and adoring wonder. The wisdom of God comprehended the whole. He loved and prompved; and God’s knowledge marked out the way, defined the measure, and ordered the course for its execution. His judgments even on His own children, when they wish to set up their own righteousness, and the ways in which He draws the most remote Gentiles and most hardened Pharisees to himself, are unsearchable; but they are not absolutely and eternally concealed, but the light of revelation is disclosed to man by the Spirit, which searcheth after the deep things of God, and reveals them to those who love God (vers. 32-36).

SCHILLERMACHER: The contemplation of the order of salvation, that God has concluded all in unbelief, is also necessary to us for wonder at Divine wisdom. 1. God’s concluding all in unbelief, constitutes the nature of this Divine order of salvation and of redemption through Christ. 2. In this, Divine wisdom is necessarily revealed, and something (vers. 32, 33). — SCHWEIZER: The unfathomable depth of God’s wisdom. 1. We represent this unfathomable depth to ourselves in humility; 2. We lift ourselves up in faith, since therein the ways of Divine wisdom are concealed (ver. 33).

PERCIVAL FOR THE SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY (vers. 33-36).—WOLFF: How our reflection should be directed to the unsearchable purposes of God. We see, 1. From whence it should proceed; and, 2. To what it must lead. — RANKE: How one can learn to submit to God’s incomprehensible ways: 1. By being humble; 2. By being confident. — PETRI: How should we act in regard to the incomprehensibility of God? 1. We should be discreet in our opinions; 2. We should be humble in our disposition; 3. We should be faithful in our work. — KAPPE: The Holy Trinity: 1. An unfathomable depth; 2. But an inexhaustible fountain of life. — FLOREY: Our inability to comprehend God is a reminder that should lead us to a careful reflection. It is: 1. A reminder of the narrowness of our mind, that we should be warned by it against useless subtleties; 2. A reminder respecting the Scriptures, that we should be moved thereby to hold fast to God’s revealed word; 3. A reminder of eternity, that we should thereby think of the perfect knowledge which awaits us in the future world. — SCHULZE: The Lord’s ways: 1. How God glorifies them before our eyes; 2. To what end God’s glory, which is declared in His ways, summons us.

BISHOP HALL: On Divine severity. With how envious eyes did the Jews look upon those first heralds of the gospel who carried the tidings of the despised Gentiles! What cruel storms of persecution did they raise against those blessed messengers, whose feet deserved to be beautiful! wherein their obstinate unbelief turned to our advantage; for, after they had made themselves un worthy of that gospel of peace, that blessing was instantly derived upon us Gentiles, and we happily changed conditions with them. — The Jews were once the children, and we the dogs under the table: the crumbs were our lot, the bread was theirs. Now it is the case, through their wilful incredulity, altered: they are the dogs, and we the children; we sit at a full table, while their hunger is not satisfied with scraps. — On the necessity of a living faith in Christ. If ever, therefore, we look for any consolation in Christ, or to have any part in this beautiful union, it must be the main care of our hearts to make sure of a lively faith in the Lord Jesus; to lay fast hold upon Him; to clasp Him close to us; yes, to receive Him inwardly into our bosoms, and so to make Him ours, and ourselves His, that we may be joined to Him as our Head, espoused to Him as our Husband, incorporated into Him as our Nourishment, engraven in Him as our Stock, and laid upon Him as a sure Foundation. — On the incomprehensibility of Divine wisdom. It is unfitting for the vulgar mind to attempt with profane foot to ascend the highest pinnacles of heaven, and there to scrutinize with presumptuous eyes the holy innermost places of God, and to pronounce an opinion on the most profound secrets of the Divine wisdom! — Shall we dare to measure the depths of the Divine law with the diminutive standard of our intellect? Shall we trample on things which even the angels gaze on with awe? But in this respect I do not so much blame the people as the teachers themselves, who have so inopportune supplied the ears and minds of the multitude with confused and shallow opinions.

FARINTON: What better spectacle for the Church than the synagogue, in whose ruins and desolation she may read the dangerous effects of spiritual pride and haughtiness of mind, and thence learn not to insult, but tremble? — Take virtue in its own shape, and it seems to call for fear and trembling, and to bespeak us to be careful and watchful that we forfeit not so fair an estate for false riches; but take it, as from the devil’s forge, and then, contrary to its own nature, it helps to blind and hoodwink us, that we see not the danger we are in, how that not only the way, but our feet, are slippery. It unfortunately occasions its own ruin, whilst we, with Nero in Tactus, spend riotously upon presumption of treasure. — LEECHTON: Our only way to know that our names are not in that black line, and to be persuaded that He hath chosen us to be saved by His Son, is this, to find that we have chosen Him, and are built on Him by faith, which is the fruit of His love who first chooseth us, and which we may read in our esteem of Him.

CHARNOCK: On regeneration. The increasing the perfection of one species, can never mount the thing so increased, to the perfection of another species. If you could vastly increase the heat of fire, you could never make it ascend to the perfection of a star. If you could increase mere morals works to the highest pitch they are capable of, they can never
make you gracious, because grace is another species, and the nature of them must be changed to make them of another kind. All the moral actions in the world will never make our hearts of themselves of another kind than moral. Works make not the heart good, but a good heart makes the works good. It is not our walking in God's statutes materially, which procures us a new heart, but a new heart is necessary before walking in God's statutes. On the misery of unbelief. Some humbled souls think God is not so merciful as He declares; He swears to expel their doubts. Presumptuous persons think God is not so just; He swears to expel their vain conceits. This sin lies up, as it were, the hands of an omnipotent mercy from saving such a one.

[ Tillotson: We are apt to attribute all things to the next and immediate agent, and to look no higher than second causes; not considering that all the motions of natural causes are directly subordinate to the first cause, and all the actions of free creatures are under the government of God's wise providence, so that nothing happens to us besides the design and intention of God. If God be the last end of all, let us make Him our last end, and refer all our actions to His glory. This is that which is due to Him, as He is the first cause, and therefore He does most reasonably require it of us.

[Hopkins: Fear God, lest at any time, through any neglect or miscarriage of yours, He should be provoked to suspend His influence, and withdraw His grace from you, and to leave you to your own weakness and impotency, upon whose influence all your obedience doth depend.

[Henry: The best evidence of integrity is a freedom from the present prevailing corruptions of the times and places that we live in; to swim against the stream when it is strong. Those God will own for His faithful witnesses that are bold in bearing their testimony to the present truth. This is thankworthy; not to bow to Baal when every body bows. Sober singularity is commonly the badge of true sincerity.

[J. Wesley: God always reserved a seed for himself; a few that worshipped Him in spirit and in truth. I have often doubted whether these were not the very persons whom the rich and honorable Christians, who will always have number as well as power on their side, did not stigmatize, from time to time, with the title of heretics. Perhaps it was chiefly by this actifice of the devil and his children, that the good which was in them being evil spoken of, they were prevented from being so extensively useful as otherwise they might have been. Nay, I have doubted whether that arch-heretic, Montanus, was not one of the holiest men in the second century.

[Clarke: The designs are the offspring of infinite wisdom, and therefore they are all right; the means are the most proper, as being the choice of an infinite knowledge that cannot err; we may safely credit the goodness of the design, founded in infinite wisdom; we may rely on the due accomplishment of the end, because the means are chosen and applied by infinite knowledge and skill.

[Barnes, on ver. 14: We may see here, 1. That it is the earnest wish of the ministry to save the souls of men; 2. That they should urge every argument and appeal with reference to this; 3. That even the most awful and humbling truths may have this tendency; 4. It is right to use all the means in our power, not absolutely wicked, to save men. Paul was full of devices; and much of the success of the ministry will depend on a wise use of plans, that may, by the Divine blessing, arrest and save the souls of men.—J. F. H.]
PART SECOND.

The Practical Theme: The calling of the Roman Christians, on the ground of their accomplished redemption, or the Universal Mercy of God (which will be extended to all), to represent the living worship of God in the completion of the real burnt-offering, and to form a universal Christian church-life for the realization of the call of all nations to Praise and Glorify God, so that they too may recognize and sustain the universal call of the Apostle. In correspondence with this is the recommendation of his companions, assistants, and friends, in sending his greetings to them; in contrast with which is his warning against Judaizing and paganizing false teachers; chap. xii. 1-xvi. 20.—Conclusion. Salutations of friends. Amen (vers. 21-27).


FIRST DIVISION.

THE CALLING OF THE ROMAN CHURCH TO A UNIVERSAL CHRISTIAN DEPORTMENT

CHAP. XII. 1-XV. 13.

FIRST SECTION.—The practical theme (chap. xii. 1, 2). The proper conduct of Christians toward the fellowship of the brethren for the establishment of a harmonious church-life (vers. 8-18).

CHAP. XII. 1-8.

1 I beseech you therefore, brethren, by the mercies of God, that ye [to] present your bodies a living sacrifice, holy, acceptable [well-pleasing] unto God,
2 which is your reasonable [rational] service. [.] And be not [And not to be] conformed to this world: but be ye transformed [but to be transfigured] by the renewing of your mind, that ye may prove what is that good, and acceptable, and perfect will of God [or, what is the will of God, what is good, and well-pleasing, and perfect].

3 For I say, through the grace given unto me, to every man that is among you, not to think of himself more highly than he ought to think; but to think soberly [or, not to be high-minded above what he ought to be minded, but to be so minded as to be sober-minded], according as God hath dealt to every man the measure of faith. For as we have many members in one body, and all members have not the same office: So we, being many, are one body in Christ, and every one of members one of another. Having then gifts differing according to the grace that is given to us, whether prophecy, let us prophesy according to the proportion of faith; Or ministry, let us wait on our ministering; or he that teacheth, on teaching; Or he that exhorteth, on exhortation: he that giveth, let him do it with simplicity; he that ruleth, with diligence; he that sheweth mercy, with cheerfulness.

TEXTUAL.

1 Ver. 1.—(The infinitive should be retained in the English rendering, for the sake of convenience in connecting the infinitives, which are to be accepted as the correct readings in ver. 2.
2 Ver. 2.—(The Rec. (with K. B. L. many versions and fathers) reads: every man, which is adopted by Wordsworth and Tregelles. The majority of modern editors and commentators (Lachmann, Tischendorf, Tholuck,
EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

Summary.—The practical theme controlling the whole of the second part. The proper conduct of Christians, or the calling of (Roman) Christians to the living worship (service) of God,1–3.2. The proper conduct toward the fellowship of believing brethren, the Church (ecclesiastical duties), vers. 3–8; 8. The proper conduct of Christians in all personal relations, vers. 9–21; c. Toward civil authorities and the government, chap. xii. 1–6; d. Toward the world in general. Recognition of the rights of the world, and of legal fellowship with it. Separation, on the contrary, from the ungodliness of the world, vers. 7–14; e. The proper practice of the living worship of God, and its universality in the removing of the differences between the "weak" and the "strong," chap. xiv. 1–xx. 4; 8. Exhortation to unanimity of all the members of the Church to the praise of God, on the ground of God's grace, for realizing the destination of all nations to glorify God, chap. xvi. 5–13.

See also the headings of the sections. Meyer: "General exhortation to holiness." But this "general" exhortation is very characteristically defined according to the characteristic, fundamental thought of the whole Epistle, in its essential as well as in its personal reference. According to the essential reference, the Apostle has shown, in the first part, that the Church is the center of the world, that in its being fallen from the living worship of God, and that therefore redemption is a restoration of the fundamental principles of this living worship. The entire holiness of Christians is, accordingly, portrayed as the development of a living spiritual worship. But in the personal reference, the Apostle shows how the Roman Christian congregation should be developed into a congregation of living worship, in order to be the instrument of its extension to all the world, to serve as an organ for the Apostle, who has perceived his calling in the extension of this worship into all the world.

1. The practical theme (vers. 1, 2). A summons to develop the service restored by redemption. [Comp. here the third part of the Heidelberg Catechism, On Thankfulness to God for Redemption.—F. N.]

2. The bodies (τὰ σώματα ἕκας, δόξα). According to Meyer and Tholuck, the ὑδή does not introduce an inference from the whole of the previous didactic part (as Calvin, Bengel, De Wette, and others, would have it), but from chap. xii. 30, 31. But it must be observed, that the conclusion of chap. xi. constitutes the organic apex of the entire doctrinal division; this is especially true of ver. 32, with which Rückert, and others, would securely connect this verse. Tholuck fails to perceive the Apostle's practical theme, in saying: "The Apostle was accustomed to make some exhortations follow the chief, and therefore the didactic contents."

By the mercies of God [διὰ τῶν εἰκινητικοῦ τοῦ Θεοῦ] (chap. xviii. 8; 1 Cor. i. 10; 2 Cor. x. 1). The objective ground of Divine mercy in their experience of salvation, is made the subjective ground of his admonition. He refers to the experience of Divine mercy, its consequence, and its light and right, as if he said, by the name of Divine mercy. The only difference is, that, in the asseveration διὰ, by, the speaker allows the subject of his asseveration itself to speak as motive and motor. The plural εἰκινητικοῦ corresponds to the Hebrew שֵׁם; but the Apostle has also instituted, in the foregoing, a threefold gradation of the Divine demonstration of grace.

To present, παραστασισ. The expression, which was used of placing the sacrificial beast before the altar, conveys the thought of the complete resignation and readiness which, on the one hand, does not in the least hesitate, but, on the other, makes no intrusion by an arbitrary slaying of the offering.

Your bodies (τὰ σώματα ἕκας). The holding of the body in readiness for an offering well-pleasing to God, is the expression for the highest measure of the renunciation of every thing earthly and temporal. Explanations:

1. Figurative designation of personality itself, according to the figure of the offering (Rezz, De Wette, and Philippi [Stuart, Hodges]).

2. The bodies in the real sense, as the holiness of the νοστα is added in the second verse (Frisseze, Meyer).

3. The renewed nature of man, which leads him to sin (Killner, and others).

Against (1.): The Apostle speaks, according to the apostolic standard, to believers, who, according to chap. vi., have already given their personal life to God, but the body is the organ and symbol of all the individual parts, which must be offered in consequence of this principal offering. Against
rational, in antithesis to merely external symbolic service (Melanchoth, cultus mentis),* but not in antithesis to the θεός ἁλογα (Theodore, Grotius, and others); for, as Meyer observes, the question here is λατρεία, but not θεολογία. Indirectly, indeed, the λογική λατρεία is also an antithesis to the cultus commentitii; for if the symbolic service would establish itself beyond its time, against the real service, it would then become cultus commentitii.

Ver. 2. And not to be conformed. On the difference in the readings, see Natural Note. The infinitives must be referred to the παρακαλέω. The συναγηματισθάναι is passive, with a reflexive meaning, in σαν δομον formam redigis, se conformare. Philippi: "The original difference between σήμα and μορφή may be, that the latter denotes rather the organic form, while the former denotes more the mechanical form, the external and adventitious habitus (σήμα from ἴσος, σίμα); comp. 1 Cor. vii. 31. Hence σήμα is also the external semblance, the pompos, and συμματισθάναι, synonymous with προσποιοίσθαι, to assume a form, a seeming shape, to appear, to take the shape of; comp. the passages cited by Wetstein; μορφή also the beautiful form, forma; comp. formosum. Thus μορφή more fitly designates the real inward form, while σήμα denotes rather the external and accidental appearance." Comp. Phil. ii. 19. 20. See also Tholuck, p. 652. Meyer holds [as the E. V. assumes], that the antithesis of both verbs is comprised only in the prepositions; these, indeed, increase it. The σῶν denotes the torpidity of the external form of the Church by uniformity with the world, worldliness; the μετά denotes the organic change and transformation of the organic shape, according to the new inward form. Meyer: "The present infinitives denote a continued action, while παραστήσασθαι represents the presenting of the offering as a completed act."

To this world [τῷ αἵλον τοίτερον]. γὰρ ψόν. The pre-messianic and relatively anti-messianic form of the world in its perfected course. [Comp. Lange's Comm. Gal. i. 4, p. 13.—R.]

But to be transfigured (αὐλία μεταμορφοφόροις). The difference in proposition and verb is better preserved by transfigured, which also conveys the distinctions suggested above. See Five Anglican Clergymen.—[R.] The μεταφορά is reflexive, as σινογρ.

By the renewing of your mind; chap. vii. 24; Eph. iv. 23. The καινοτομία πνευματος (Rom. vii. 6; comp. chap. vi. 4), as an impelling principle, results in the ανακαινίωσις of the νοῦς; for the νοῦς, the conscious, thoughtful, or reflective moral and religious spiritual life (disposition) is constantly renewed, in part restored, and in part developed, in its mastery over the natural part of life. The transformation and shaping of the life of the Christian are determined not by external worldly forms, but by this inward renewing, or renewing ascending to the whole of the Christian life (ανακαινίωσις) through the productive power of the Spirit. The νοῦς, as such, does not then receive the new φορή (Tholuck), but rather the whole Christian life from the νοῦς outward."
That ye may prove. Literally: ἐς τὸ διακαθέναι. [Infinitive clause of design (Meyer).—R.] The Christian life should not receive its development by means of an external legislation, but by the inward one, which is directed by spiritual passion and self-determination (see Gal. vi. 4; Eph. v. 10; Phil. i. 10, and other passages). Meyer appropriately says: "In the uncovered man this proving is altogether foreign to the activity of his coe science. Comp. Eph. v. 10." But with this there is also connected the being able to prove (Rückert, Köllner [Hodge, apparently]), although the actual proving is conjunctive with it. Meyer: "The regenerate one proves by the verdict of his conscience, aroused and illuminated by the Spirit." The σωματεύω of the Spirit, the Christian principle of life, is an infinitive, whose explanation and concrete application to life is committed to the proving of Christian illumination and wisdom.*

The will of God [τὸ ἦλπημα τοῦ Θεοῦ]. That which is willed by God in every relation of life. The reference of the definitions τὸ ἀγάθιν, καὶ ἐναρκτήν καὶ τέλεον, as adjectives, to God's will (Vulgata, Chrysostom, the most of the early expositors, Luther, Rückert, &c.), is opposed, first of all, by the ἐναρκτήν, but, in general, by the tautology that would be contained in the expression. Therefore Erasmus, Castalio, Tholuck, Meyer, and the most of the early commentators, have regarded the additions as a substantive apposition.

What is good, &c. We may ask whether a climax of three members is designed [Meyer], or whether we should render explicit that double relation of the good, by which, on the one hand, it is that which is well-pleasing to God, and, on the other, that which is perfect in itself, because it arises from the righteousness of faith, the principle of perfection. We prefer the latter rendering. The repetition of the article would, of course, not be necessary with the first interpretation.†

2. The proper conduct of Christians toward the community of brethren for the establishment of a harmonious church-life (vers. 3–8). Tholuck is correct in finding, in what follows, a reference to the different spheres of activity in the Church. Meyer speaks only of an exhortation to individual duties.‡

Ver. 3. For I say (say definitely). The γὰρ is rendered namely, by Tholuck and Meyer. [Alford also takes it as resumptive.] First of all, namely appears as inappropriate as for. If it is the manner of the self-proving and self-determination of believers, how they should act toward each other, how can the Apostle lay down his precepts immediately afterward? The answer lies in the fact, that their subjective judgment should be subordinated to the known objective will of God. This requirement, that they should be certain as to whether their conduct corresponds to God's perfect will, is so great, that it causes the Apostle to lay down regulations for it. Therefore we may also translate the γὰρ by for. The ἔκαστος is used in the sense of injunction.

Through the grace, &c. [διὰ τῆς χάρι- τος, &c.] Even here, διὰ. He will now prescribe for them by virtue of his subjective opinion or authority, but by virtue of the grace which is given to him (see chap. i. 5), which establishes his office, and is at the same time the element of life common to his office and their church-life (see chap. xv. 16; 1 Cor. iii. 10; Eph. iii. 7, 8).

To every man that is among you [παντὶ τῷ ὄντι ἐν νυείς]. Alford: "A strong bringing out of the individual application of the precept."—R.] This would therefore have applied to Peter also, if he had been in Rome, or Paul would not have spoken thus, or, indeed, would not have written to them at all.

Not to think of himself [ἡ υποποιο- νισίς. See the text, and Textual Note.—R.] Tholuck: ηποποιίνις is here not "to strive after," and also not "to be disposed, to think," but "to think of himself" (see p. 656).

Soberly and wisely. It is wise conduct or good behavior, especially as moderation.—Proper self-knowledge and esteem, apart from over-estimation, should, by modesty, come to proper and wise moderation in the reciprocity of the personal life with the society. Meyer understands ηποποιίνις as to be disposed, and explains the details accordingly; the Vulgate, Calvin, and others, interpret in the same way. The mode of thinking and feeling is undoubtedly connected here with the holding and demeaning, which is proved by the συνεργία

According as God hath dealt to every man [ἐὰς ἐκαστὸς ὁ δὲ θεὸς εὐμμορισάτο]. The ἐκάστος is dependent on ἐυμμορισάτο: According as God hath dealt to every man, &c., is therefore made antecedent by inversion (see 1 Cor. iii. 6).—The idea of a different distribution of the measure of faith leads to the idea of the gift (ver. 6). No one should appear more than the other, for what lies beyond this is presumption; but the whole of the gift of grace should be applied, for if this be not done, something would be withheld from the society which is designed for it. Comp. 1 Cor. xii. 4–6, 11; Heb. ii. 4.

The measure of faith [μέτρον πίστεως]. When Meyer maintains that faith here means only faith in the ordinary sense, he overlooks the fact that the measure of faith is spoken of in concrete unity; or rather, he interprets this measure erroneously, by understanding only different degrees of the strength of faith, and, accordingly, he not only rejects the reference of the expression to Christian knowledge (Beza, and others), or to the power of working miracles (Theophylact), but also to the gift of grace (Chrysostom, and most other commentators). The purely Divine element in the gift is undoubtedly emphasized here, for what is not of faith is sin. [Alford explains the phrase: "The receptivity of χάριμαστα, itself no inherent con- gruity. It is, in fact, the subjective designation of the grace that is given unto us," ver. 6.] He rightly distinguishes it from the gifts and graces themselves. So Phileippi in substance. The objective sense of "faith," which is implied in the view of Beza, is open to decided objection.—R.

Ver. 4. For we have by their members in one body [καθιστεῖ γὰρ ἐν ἑνὶ σώματι]
πολλά μίλη ἔγωμεν]. Establishment of the foregoing. The individual Christian is only a member of Christ's body, and should conduct himself as a member, avow himself as a member, and should permit himself to be strengthened as a member; Christ alone is the Head."—On the commonness of the assumption of a human body and a corpus sociale (1 Cor. xii.), even among the ancients, see Grotrius and Wetstein in loco;—Meyer.

Ver. 5. So we, being many. In antithesis to the unity of the body.

In Christ. The head is the organic vital centre of the whole, in which (not to which) every thing in respect to dominion and glory is comprised (Eph. i. 22, and other passages).

And every one. Τὰ δὲ πάντα ἡμῶν ἦν is a solemnity of the later Greek, instead of τὰ δὲ καθό ἡμῶν: Mark xiv. 19; John viii. 9, and other passages.

Ver. 6. Having then gifts differing according to the grace [ἐνοίατε δὲ χρησιματικά κατὰ τὴν καρπὸν τῆς δοξίας ἡμῶν διάφορα]. Different constructions here enter into consideration.

With ἐνοίατε a new sentence begins, which continues in a succession of elliptical exhortations (Beza, Olshausen, Philippi, and others). Meyer: "The elliptical expression κατὰ τὴν κάρπὸν τῆς δοξίας, may be supplied by προφητεύων, by ὑμῖν after εἰς τὴν δοξίαν, by ἐτέρων after εἰς τὴν δικαιαλίαν; by the same after εἰς τὴν παρακλήσιαν; and, finally, by the imperative of the corresponding verbs (μετανοεῖν, &c.) after the following parts, εἰς ἄνοιαν, &c. [So E. V., Hodge, &c.] Comp. the analogous mode of expression in 1 Peter iv. 10 f.

The ἐνοίατε is connected with the foregoing, but in such a way that the following clauses are, according to Meyer, all ellipses (Erasmus, and others). Meyer also places Tholuck here, but Tholuck declares now for (1.).

3. The ἐνοίατε δὲ is joined with ἑπονοεῖν (ver. 5), in appositional meaning and the following clauses are, at the outset, not hortatory, but descriptive, yet pass over into the hortatory (Reiche, Rückert, De Wette, Lachmann). We accept this construction with the modification, that we construe the ἐνοίατε emphatically in the meaning of to have and to hold fast, to put into practice, to eschew. Comp. Rom. i. 29. With the gifts, as with every thing spiritual, we must bear especially in mind that they cannot be possessed aright without exercising them. Thus the hortatory character under the descriptive form lies in the force of the ἔγωμεν, and in the added δὲ. [This δὲ is rendered by Alford: "and not only so, but."—R.]

As for the apparent fluctuations in the construction, they resolve themselves into regular forms, if we consider the subdivisions.† The Apostle distinguishes, first of all, two principal categories: a.

prophētia; b. δοξία. The δοξία is then divided into the ἐπονοεῖν and the παρακλῆσιν; this latter is again divided into the μετανοεῖν, the προφητεύων, and the ἡμερίαν. This is proved by the forms:

1. The antithesis of the abstract nouns, προφητεύω and παρακλῆσις. The latter, in its broader meaning, was evidently a church office; while, on the other hand, the προφητεύω was, in the fullest sense, also an office.

2. ἐπονοεῖν δὲ διάφορα, ἐπονοεῖν παρακλῆσιν. This παρακλῆσις must, at all events, be regarded as a superintendent of the society, presbyter, or man having the gifts of the presbyter, whether, as ὁ μετανοεῖν, he devoted himself to the care of the poor; ὁ προφητεύων, to the μετανοεῖν in the narrower sense; or, as ἡμερίαν, to the healing of the sick and casting out of devils.†Gifts differing according to the grace. Gifts; that is, modifications of the one Divine grace in the differences of the human individual talent (see 1 Cor. xii. 4 ff.).

Whether prophecy. Prophecy, in the Old Testament as well as in the New, is the gift and calling to declare, by the prompting and communication of God's Spirit, what is new and not that is necessary to the future, and the development of God's kingdom; in order, like the compass, to direct aright, in the present, the ship of the kingdom. The reason why it appears more in the foreground in the Old Testament than in the New, is, that the former was the time of expectation and longing, and the latter the time of fulfilment and satisfaction.

† According to the proportion (harmony) of faith [ἐνοίατε δὲ χρησιματικά κατὰ τὴν καρπὸν τῆς δοξίας διάφορα]. The expression defines exactly: according to the relation, the proportion, or harmony of faith; that is, according to the proportion defined by faith.

Explanations:

1. Subjective faith, including the measure of faith, is meant (the early commentators; Origen, Chrysostom, Ambrose, and others; Bengel and Meyer). [Alford, De Wette]. Tholuck: "The prophet keeps with the limits of his prophetic gift, assigned him by his individuality.

2. The objective rule of faith (Abelard, Aquinas, Herrzeus, &c.; Platt, Klee, Philippi, and others). Tholuck, on the contrary, observes, that we may ask whether Paul could have appealed already to such a regulæ fidei. But, in reality, Moses has already established the features of the analogia fidei, Deut. xviii. 18 ff. It is well known that the

* [Alford: "γάρ, elucidating the fact that God appoints variously to various perecs; because the Christian community is like a body, with many members, having various duties."—R.]

† [Tholuck: "The first two accusatives are grammatically dependent on ἔγωμεν, by degrees the Apostle once sight of this construction, and continues with the concrete ἐπονοεῖν, which he still binds on to the foregoing with; but, τὸ μετανοεῖν, on this also, and, at ver. 9, introduces the abstract ἔγωμεν. This δὲ, or that of Dr. Lange will be preferred, as one does or does not seek definitions of arrangement in the verses.—R.]

†† "Prophecy" undoubtedly includes more than the prediction of future events, yet the tendency has been to identify the O.T. Testament prophet with the preacher. Dr. Hodge remarks: "The gift of which Paul here speaks, is...that of immediate occasional inspiration, leading the recipient to deliver, as the mouth of God, the particular communication which he had received." This view, which is undoubtedly correct, removes this office out of the dis-
Jews crucified Christ by a false application of this rule; but it is equally well known that the New Testament proofs of faith from the Old Testament, which first introduced Christianity into the Jewish world, have only been a living application of this rule. At all events, Paul could not yet appeal to ecclesiastical confessions, but he could appeal to a fundamental canon of truth; see Gal. 1:8; vi. 18; Phil. iii. 16; 2 Tim. iii. 16, 16, &c. However, Tholuck has other grounds for preferring the explanation, that the prophet keeps within the sphere of his calling; namely, because the deacon should remain within the sphere of his diaconate, &c. But is the sphere of the prophet described by the measure of his subjective faith, or would not this be here rather a nugatory generality?* The sphere of the prophet, who reveals what is new for the enlargement of the old revelation, is just the real character of the revelation itself, harmonizing with itself through all the stages of development. Yet the Apostle does not see Deaconship, but the episcopate as the order of the Church is also called to the office of watchman, in order that the development of the truth be not corrupted by false prophets. The application of this rule to the exposition of the Scriptures in the early period (see Tholuck, p. 664) is not explicatio, but application; it cannot be denied that this application itself is made κατὰ τὴν ἁναλογίαν τῆς πιστεύς.

Ver. 7. Or ministry [τίττε διακονίαν, das Dienstman (Lange). Governed by ἐξουσία, like the preceding accusative]. A threefold idea of the διακονία can be distinguished in the New Testament. 1. The most comprehensive idea understands διακονία the ecclesiastical office in general; see 1 Cor. xii. 5. There, prophecy is designated as a diaconate; here, it is distinguished from it. 2. Therefore, the special office for a definite congregation. So here. [Dr. Lange apparently includes here all the permanent offices in a single church, as he makes διακονία a category, under which the five following terms fall. If, however, it be considered as coordinate with what follows, then the still more restricted view must be adopted.—R.] 3. The diaconate, in distinction from the presbytery and episcopacy, 1 Tim. iii. 8. At the time when this Epistle was written, the ecclesiastical distinctions were less developed than when the First Epistle to Timothy was written, yet far more so than in the First Epistle to the Corinthians.

Let us wait on our ministering [ἐν τῷ διακονίῳ]. The διακονία is not the diakonia, but the whole diaconate. The sense is the same.—R.] Meyer thus explains the ἔν: The one who was "diagonally endowed" shall not wish to be of authority beyond the sphere assigned him by this endowment, but to be active within it. But it is not necessary to understand the ἔν τῷ quantitatively; it can also be understood qualitatively. And since all the other functions of the Church were diaconal, qualitative ministration is undoubtedly the meaning. The proof of the true office is, that it consists simply in service; just as, inversely, pure divine service becomes the true office, even if it had no human official seal. With the positive filling of his sphere, it is always supposed that he does not commit improprieties beyond his sphere, even if he had no human official seal.

Or he that teacheth, on teaching [τίττε ὁ διδάσκαλος, ἐν τῷ διδασκαλίῳ]. According to Meyer, Paul should have continued uniformly; τίττε διδασκαλίαν (sc. ἐξουσία), "as [Cod.] A. actually has." We have seen, in the arrangement of the gifts (see above), what grounds he had for not thus continuing.* Thus he has his gift in his labors as teacher. This appears self-evident; but how many, who would be deemed teachers, are mere babblers!

Ver. 8. Or he that exhorteth, on exhortation [ὁ παρακαλῶν, ἐν τῷ παρακάλεσθε]. As the παρακαλέω here is definitely distinguished from the διδάσκαλον, nothing else can be understood by it than a fraction within the more general presbyterate. Evidently the more definite distinction, in 1 Tim. v. 17, between presbyters who devote themselves to teaching, and ruling presbyters, thus begins to take shape; while, on the other hand, the diaconate is developed in a presbyterate from the date of Acts xi. 30, and has not yet positively been separated from it. The exhorter, according to what follows, comprises the different sides of the subsequently developed presbytery office; he is undoubtedly synonymous with the pastors, Eph. iv. 11. The division of his office appears in the following statements.†

He that giveth [ὁ μεταταξός]. According to Meyer, the official functions to the Church cease with the ἐξουσία. We have, on the contrary, laid down further subdivisions here. Every Christian is indeed a μεταταξός, but not less an ἀποστόλος; but here there stands midway between the two a προϊστάς, which not every one can, special functions recognized by the Church are evidently meant. Meyer argues against such functions, by observing: a. The diaconal gift could not be thus analyzed; b. The position of the προϊστάς, that the presbyter between two deaconal employments, would be inappropriate. Instead, therefore, of bearing in mind the growing relations, he does violence to them by preconceived opinions; a presbyter is a presbyter, a deacon is a deacon, &c.; and then, ac-

* [Alford (with most modern commentators) defends the subjective view of "faith," from the context, "which aims at showing that the measure of faith, itself the gift of God, is the receptive faculty for all spiritual gifts, which are therefore not to be boasted of, nor pushed beyond their provinces, but humbly exercised within their own limits." Besides, there is very little warrant for the objective sense of νοστία; it was unknown to the early Greek fathers (Meyer), and cannot be established as a New Testament word; comp. Lange's Commentary, p. 253, n. Lightfoot's Galatians, pp. 132 ff. It would seem, then, that the techni- cal. Incoherent phrase: analogy of faith, has a meaning not specified by the present context. Paul's text, therefore, distinctly indicates that the appellation is quite different,—here, to the extraordinary gift of prophecy; theologically, to a regula fidei. Dr. Lange seems to take middle ground.—R.]

† [Meyer confines the charisms of exclusively official signification to the four terms already discussed, though he thinks these four are examples chosen out of a larger number: (1.) The gift of the prophetic discourse, prophecy. (2.) The gift of the miraculous interpretation of deep or hidden things, Lam. vii. 12. Lightfoot's Galatians, pp. 152 ff. It would seem, then, that the techni- cal. Incoherent phrase: analogy of faith, has a meaning not specified by the present context. Paul's text, therefore, distinctly indicates that the appellation is quite different,—here, to the extraordinary gift of prophecy; theologically, to a regula fidei. Dr. Lange seems to take middle ground.—R.]

* (The change to the nominative is deemed by Dr. Lange a sufficient warrant for taking this, and the corresponding participle which follows, as directly subordinate to the idea expressed in διακονίαν. If a notion must be found for the irregularities of the Apostle's syntax, this is the simplest and most satisfactory explanation.—R.)
According to him, Paul cast the presbyter right in the midst of the membership. *

With simplicity. This term is characteristic of the penetration of the Apostle, since accessory ideas might be easily connected with all exercise of beneficence.†

He that ruleth, προϊσταμένος. According to Meyer, the presbyter, but not the presbyter exclusively. See 1 Cor. xii. 25, 26. In the passage there laid down by the apostles is as follows: 1. Prophets; 2. Teachers; 3. Miraculous powers; then healing of the sick, then bestowals of help, then κυβερνήταις, and finally μίνι γίνονται. Therefore the bestowals of help would thus fall under the rubric of the present παρακάτων, and especially of the μεταδότος. Undoubtedly the κυβερνήταις there stands in the same line with the προϊσταμένος here. The ones concerned as having care of the external affairs of the Church, had, at the beginning, no great things to manage. We then find the parallel of the εἰσών in the gift of specific miracles: the healing of those possessed with devils, and the restoration of the sick.‡

With diligence. Σπουδή may mean haste, zeal, or diligence. But the latter idea is most definite; zeal was a common duty of all.† With cheerfulness [ἐν ἀγαθῷ: ἢ ἀγαθῶς. i. e., hilarity]. "With gladness and friendliness," says Meyer, "the opposite of unwilling and ill-tempered behavior." But the question here is not a conventional good conduct, but that cheerfulness from heaven which, in a despondent world, among other duties, must conquer and banish the demons of sadness.

DOCTRINAL AND ETHICAL.

1. On chap. xii. 1 ff. As man's ideal destination was to perceive God aright in His works, and to praise and glorify Him, and, accordingly, the fall consisted in the omission of this living worship, according to Rom. i. 20, 21; then, as human corruption consisted fundamentally in the false worship of heathen idolatry and of Jewish zeal for the letter, according to chaps. i. and ii.; as, further, redemption was instituted that God might effect and manifest the real atonement in Christ as the mercy-seat of the Holy of Holies sprinkled with His own blood, according to chap. iii. 25; as then, consequently, also Christian saving faith consisted (according to chap. v. 1, 2) of free access to God into the Holy of Holies, and is developed in the most varied features of a New Testament call to worship; so, according to the practical part of this Epistle, should all believers begin the development of their worship (chap. xii. 1), by finishing the real burnt-offering by the pure presentation of their own bodily life to God's service. On the passages of heathen and Jewish wise men relating to the moral consecration to God as a self-offering, quoted in Wetzstein and Koppe, see Meyer, p. 453. See the same author on the "rational service," p. 463; Tholuck, p. 581 ff.; Philippi, p. 500. It is noteworthy that the "rational service" is recommended to the Roman Church. On the σωρευτικόν and μεταφοροφόρωσις, see the Exeg. Notes. On αἰών οἰκον, see Philippi, p. 202.

2. Just as the First Epistle of Peter appears as an evangelical prophecy, in opposition to the later false image of Peter, so it is with the Epistle to the Romans; and especially does the expression of the living offering and the reasonable service stand in opposition to the latter picture of the Roman Church. The same assertion holds good of the expression with which Paul prescribes for all Christians in Rome, that every one should not think too highly of himself, that we are all members one of another, &c.

3. The first application which the Christian has to make of the principle of his new life is, that he should not arrogantly abuse his chrism [gift] in a hierarchical or sectarian way, but should exercise it purely for the service of the Church, by adapting himself to the requirements of the community, and yet preserve his evangelical freedom. The rule is: (1.) Tho whole gift for the Church; (2.) Nothing but the gift; see 1 Cor. xii. On the idea of the chrism, see the Exeg. Notes; also Tholuck, p. 685 ff.; p. 661.—The difference between the ἐγκατάβασις and him that giveth, applies to an early period in the Church. The support of the poor brethren in the first period was not the aim of charity. On the disposition and character of the increasing offices in the Church, see the Exeg. Notes. For fuller information on the gifts, see my Gesch. des apostol. Zeitalters, p. 555 ff.; and on the offices, p. 555 ff.

4. The defective understanding, which is still apparent in many ways, in reference to the rule that prophecy is according to the measure of faith, arises from the want of perception of the lawfulness of organic development in the department of spiritual as well as of natural life. With the lawfulness of development there is combined the development of lawfulness in all the spheres of life. But in the ecclesiastical department of faith, many will know nothing of the development expressed in prophecy, and, in contrast to them, many will know nothing of the lawfulness expressed by the measure of faith. Hence arise such foolish, noisy decisions of the day and night—may God have mercy on this! The confusions of the Church are no longer obligatory! Everyone must now know what is obligatory for him, according to his own conscience and calling. But no one has any right to deny the validity of what the Church of God, in its real development of life, regards as its duty. At all events, it follows most from the Apostle's rule, that the mean.
ing of confessions is thoroughly dependent on the meaning of the Holy Scriptures. But then it may be asked, whether a legal development has been committed to the Church in its essential and substantial life, or whether the custom of declaring against the boundless culpability of the Church, now in doctrine and now in life, has arisen because the tradition of 'bishops' caps and doctors' hats' is regarded as the most exact history of the Church.

[5. On church polity, as taught in this section. The most remarkable fact is, that so little is said. The doctrines of grace are fully treated; the practical theme is distinctly announced. Then, after an exhortation to humility, comes an exhortation apparently to church officers, yet so indistinct in its distinctions that nothing definite as to the usages of the Roman Church can be based upon it. A warning against the hierarchy of Rome can readily be found in it; but is it not also suggestive of a certain "freedom of adaptation" in the external polity of Christ's Church? To one who has puzzled over this and parallel passages with the honest purpose of finding out what is the form of church government given "jure divino," and failed to discover, in any present form, the counterpart of the apostolic Church, it gives a happy relief from perplexity to conclude that church polity was purposely sketched by the apostles only in "sibousete," that the details are to be of ecclesiastical rather than of Divine enactment; that, while despotism and anarchy are excluded, both by the nature of the case and the hints given in the New Testament, the external form of the Church of the future may be as different from any organization at present existing, as its spirit will transcend that of mere ecclesiasticism. Mayhap, when the Church shall return to the apostolic spirit, it will find in its outward form the true essence of these disputed passages. He who reads prevails here, reads through colored glasses; and he who finds ruling elders alluded to, must first derive his knowledge of their existence from other sources, and then make his exegesis correspond. If, however, any will not be satisfied until a "jure divino" form is found, a search into later Epistles will be more profitable; yet that fact of itself admits development in the apostolic age, and who shall say when that development shall cease? Comp. Schaff, History of the Christian Church, i. pp. 180 ff., and the list of authors there referred to; also a discussion on Law and Primitive Eldership, in the Amer. Presbyterian Review, Dra. R. D. Hitchcock and E. F. Hatfield, vol. vi. pp. 253-268, 606-531.-R.]

HOMILETICAL AND PRACTICAL.

[In the original, the Homiletical Notes are inserted at the close of the chapter.-R.]

Vers. 1, 2. Our thank-offering for God's mercy. 1. What sort of a sacrifice should it be? a. Living; b. Holy; c. Well-pleasing to God. 2. With what disposition should it be presented? a. Not so that we should conform to the world, and therefore not with unconverted hearts; but, b. That our minds should be renewed, that we may continually perceive God's will aright. —Our rational service. 1. The sacrifice which is presented, is not the sacrifice of some parts of the body, but the living sacrifices of our bodies. 2. The sanctuary is not the tabernacle or temple, but the Church of our Lord Jesus Christ. 3. The priests are not Levites, but all believing Christians whose mind is renewed. —The restoration of rational service was a prime advantage conferred by our Reformers. —How rational service, in conformity with its nature, should not be limited to the celebration of Sundays and holy days, but should embrace the whole life. —The exhortation to rational service is still necessary. 1. In opposition to the Catholic Church; 2. In opposition to certain sects. —Paul exhorts to reasonable worship, but not to the worship of reason. —Reasonable service is not subtilizing service. —Christ's exhorter is living and inspiring; 2. The latter, dead and cold.

LUTHER: St. Paul here calls all offerings, works, and worship, unreasonable, when performed without faith and the knowledge of God. —The law has a sacrifice of many kinds of irrational beasts, all of which are combined in one sacrifice, in order that we ourselves may become reasonable men.

BRANX: Nothing so urges us to what is good as the sense of God's sweet grace and mercy. —The death of the old man is the life of the new man; where Adam's wrath ceases, Christ's meekness begins; and where Adam's pride goes down, Christ's humility rises. —Cramer: The Christians of the New Testament are spiritual priests, and bound to sacrifices, but they should sacrifice themselves; laying their obedience (1 Sam. xv. 22), their lips (Hosea xiv. 8), faith (Phil. ii. 17), alms (Phil. iv. 18), mercy (Hosea vi. 6), and all such things, on Jesus Christ, the golden altar, God will accept them.

SPENCE: It is not enough to do good and leave evil undone, but the Christian must present himself a complete sacrifice to God. —If, in short, we would know at what we should aim in Christianity, it is the Divine will, and therefore the Divine word. Whatever this fortieth must be evil, though even the whole world should permit and praise it; and whatever it enjoins is good, though it should be displeasing to every one. —Bancroft: They very improperly shrink from this perfect will who are always in search of what they, as they think, are at liberty to do, without sin. But their course is just like that of a voyager, who, having lost his reckoning, is constantly in search of the most distant shore (ver. 2).

ROSE: God wills every thing that is good, every thing that is well-pleasing to Him, and every thing that is perfect. That is good which harmonizes with God's commandments; and it is good (sacred) as far as it is well-pleasing to Him; and it is perfect if presented to the extent of our capacity (ver. 2).

GERLACH: The Apostle compares the worship of Christians in spirit and in truth (John iv. 24), which be accordingly calls reasonable (comp. 1 Peter ii. 5), with the typical and figurative sacrificial worship of the Old Testament (vers. 1, 2).

HEWENS: The love and mercy of God should be the incentive and source of the Christian sense. This constitutes the characteristic difference between Christian piety and every other kind: it flows from faith and the experience of Divine love in Christ. —The mutual devotedness of God and pious people. —The holiness of the first commandment. —Christian faith is the foundation of Christian piety (ver. 1). —Mastery over the fashion of the world: love for God, and the wish to have only His grace, conquer. —Proper and improper accommodation to circumstances. —This world must be something in motion, otherwise it will sink. Accipiens vitium, ni mouentur, aqua.

BUSER: A Christian man presents his body as
THE EPISTLE OF PAUL TO THE ROMANS.

s a daily offering, when he, 1. Crucifies that which impedes the spirit willing for God's service; 2. When he offers all the powers of his body and soul for God's honor and his neighbor's good (ver. 1).—Our service is reasonable ("logical") when it consists in Christian self-sacrifice, because this service is worthy of God, and well-pleasing to Him; just as the pure milk of the gospel (1 Peter ii. 2) is called reasonable (sincere) because it is the proper nourishment for God's children.—Paul Spieratus preached at Vienna, from this apostolical text, his powerful Reformation sermon on "The Glory of the reasonable Gospel Worship, and the Punishment of the unreasonable Popish Worship" (ver. 1).—We should flee from conformity to the world (ver. 2).

Vers. 3-6. Humility as the fundamental law of reasonable service in the Church. 1. It should show itself in no one's thinking too highly of himself, but in every one's thinking soberly of himself. 2. It should be manifested by patient consecration of gifts to the service of the Church (vers. 3-8).—True Christian humility: 1. Its nature; 2. Its source (ver. 3).—The figure of the body and the members; comp. 1 Cor. xii. (vers. 4, 5).—Healthy church-life, To this belong two things: 1. Unity in Christ; 2. Diversity of gifts (vers. 4-8).—Proof of the necessary connection of unity and diversity in the Church. 1. Unity with a foundation. Diversity without unity is disorder (vers. 4-8).—The gift of prophecy, 1. In what does it consist? 2. What purpose should it serve? Comp. 1 Cor. xiv. 3 (ver. 7).—Has any one an office, let him wait on his office. This is said, first of all, of the special care of the poor (hœxovia); but then it applies to every office (ver. 7).—What belongs to waiting on our teaching? 1. The appropriation of the material for teaching. 2. Observation of the proper mode of teaching (method). 3. The consecration of our own persons (ver. 7).—We should give with simplicity—that is: 1. From an unselsh heart; 2. With a single eye (Matt. vi. 22); 3. With a pure hand (ver. 8).—Proper care in government; 1. It protects order; 2. It regards freedom (ver. 8).—Christian mercy. 1. Its nature; 2. Its exercise (ver. 8).

Let us give to our precious be all prophecy which leads to works and not to Christ, as our comfort, it is nevertheless not like faith; since those who practise it seek the revelation of hol- gobles, and masses, pilgrimages, fasts, and the worship of saints (ver. 7).—Let those be taught who do not know it, and those be admonished who know it already (vers 7, 8).

Starke: Man—a little world; such a glorious, articulate masterpiece of the Almighty Creator, that it cannot be too much contemplated and wondered at (ver. 4).—If you are appointed to the office of preacher, take your hand from the oxen, from the plough, and from your worldly business! Every one to the work to which God has assigned him! Sirach xxxvii. 25 (ver. 8).—Cræmer: Let no one think that he knows, and can do, every thing alone. If that had been designed, God would only have created one member to the body; Prov. xxii. 2 (ver. 4).—The proper touchstone for all exposition of the Holy Scriptures, is the constant and impres- sible harmony of the writings of the prophets and apostles; Acts xxvi. 22 (ver. 7).—Heininger: Not out of the nest! How will you fly without feathers, judge without understanding, boast without a reason, be called pious without proof, be skillful without God? God does every thing, and you nothing. Therefore glorify Him, but not yourself. Be still and humble (ver. 8).—Listen! You are your neighbor's servant. Happy he, who, as the servant of his neighbor, lives in love (ver. 4).—Many rules, little work. What may it be? Great cry, little wool, Perform your office well, and regard yourself as unworthy of praise and reward (ver. 7).—Müller, Teaching instructs and lays the foundation, exhortation builds upon the foundation (ver. 8).—Spener: God has given one and the same faith to all—that is, as far as the matter itself is concerned, for God's sake, to those who have obtained like (ἀποίκισις) precious faith with us (2 Peter i. 1). Therefore we must regard ourselves, mutually, as members of one body (ver. 3).—On ver. 7: Here belong preaching and catechetical instruction (characteristic of Spener).

Roos: Every one should act according to the proportion of his faith, and especially deliver divine truths—that is, prophesies. That which is beyond them is the work of nature, and is worth nothing (ver. 4).—To the words, "he that teacheth," and "he that exhorteth," &c., we must mentally add, "because he has received his gift to do it from the Lord." Now he should exercise himself in this employment (vers. 7-9).

Gurkach: True humility is, to be conscious of what God has given to it; and it is not a self-acquired possession, but a free gift, and therefore must intimately one with sobriety and clearness of spirit, while false patience, with an apparently deep self-humiliation, gives man a sullen look at his own heart, and in his gloom it increases the dark spirit of selfishness and pride (ver. 8).—The gift of prophecy should not draw the Christian into the sphere of obscure feelings, where he can no longer distinguish the truth revealed by God from the imaginations of his own mind, but should have a guiding star and rule of conduct for common Christian faith (ver. 7).

Hecenner: God has given us, in the human body, an eloquent picture of human society, and of the inward union of all men. [Comp. the address of Menenius Agrippa to the people in monte sacro, Livy ii. 32] (vers. 4-6).—The sense of ver. 7 is: Let no one manifest or affect more fervency or enthusiasm than he has, according to the measure of his faith, according to the degree of his strength and religious character. How common it is for one to wish to appear more than he is, or more than he can! Even religion is brought out for a show, and perverted to a desire to please (ver. 7).—Nothing beyond the Christian's office is required of him; that is the first thing for him.—Christian fidelity to office as the fruit of faith (ver. 7).

Besser: It is very important to distinguish the measure of faith, and yet not to separate from the measure of faith, the measure of prophesying; the prophecy, means to declare God's mysteries, impelled by the Holy Spirit (ver. 7).—The prophecy of an unbelieving preacher and expositer can, indeed, resemble faith; but we pray the Lord for prophets whose measure of faith holds the rule of faith alive within them, who preach, with hearts believing according to the received measure of faith, the faith which the Church confesses (ver. 7).

They are shown: 1. In true service, or proper conduct toward God; 2. In proper conduct toward the world; and, 3. In proper conduct toward ourselves.

—KAFF: What is necessary for the offering of a sacrifice well-pleasing to God? 1. That we should no longer seek salvation in ourselves or in the world; 2. That we should fully appropriate Christ as the perfect sacrifice; 3. That we should wholly surrender ourselves to the perfect will of God.

—SPATON: How far a true Christian must alienate himself from the world. 1. As a sacrifice on the Lord's altar; 2. As a work of the Lord's hand; 3. As a member of the Lord's body. —BURK: The Christian's life a daily priestly service. 1. In the feeling which pervades him; 2. In the denial which he exercises; 3. In the service which he renders.

[BISHOP HALL, on ver. 2: Sermon on the fashions of the world. Outline: I. The world. II. The forbidden fashions. 1. The head. 2. The eyes: (1.) The adulterous eye; (2.) The covetous eye; (3.) The proud eye; (4.) The envious eye. 3. The forehead—the seat of impudence. 4. The ear: (1.) The deaf ear; (2.) The itching ear. 5. The tongue: (1.) The false tongue; (2.) The malicious tongue; (3.) The ribald tongue. 6. The palate, or belly. 7. The back. 8. The neck and shoulders. 9. The heart. 10. The hands and feet. III. The ugliness and disgustiveness of worldly fashions in God's sight.

[ARABINSON, on ver. 6: On the proportion of faith. Plato, when asked what God does in heaven, how He bestows and employs himself, how He passes away eternity, answered: "He works geometrically." So is the "proportion of faith," as St. Paul calls it, also geometrical; where we must not compare sum with sum, as they do in a market, or value the gift more or less by telling it; but argue thus: "As what He bestows is in proportion to his estate, so is what I bestow unto mine." And in this sense, the widow's two mites were recorded as a more bountiful and a larger present than if Solomon had thrown the wealth of his kingdom into the treasury. It was the faith, therefore, from which their liberality proceeded, which cheered the Apostles in all his distresses; not the gift itself.

[LEIGHTON, on ver. 1: On the sacrifice of the godly. The children of God delight in offering sacrifices to Him; but if they might not know that they were well taken at their hands, it would discourage them much. How often do the godly find it their experience, that, when they come to pray, He welcomes them, and gives them such evidence of His love as they would not exchange for all worldly pleasures! And when this doth not appear as at other times, they ought to believe it. He accepts themselves and their ways when offered in sincerity, though never so mean; though they some times have no more than a sigh or a groan, it is most properly a spiritual sacrifice.

[GERIMY TAYLOR: Religion teaches us to present to God our bodies as well as our souls; for God is the Lord of both; and if the body serves the soul in actions natural, and civil, and intellectual, it must not be eased in the only offices of religion, unless the body shall expect no portion of the rewards of religion, such as are resurrection, reunion, and glorification.

[CHARKONCK, on ver. 1: God, who requires of us a reasonable service, would work upon us by a reasonable operation. God therefore works by way of a spiritual illumination of the understanding, in propounding the creature's happiness by arguments and reasons, and in a way of a spiritual impression upon the will, moving it sweetly to the embracing that happiness, and the means to it, which He proposes; and, indeed, without this work preceding, the motion of the will could never be regular.


[BISHOP HOPKINS, on ver. 2: On God's will. This is all contained in the Holy Scriptures, which are a perfect system of precepts given us for the government of our lives here, and for the attaining of eternal life hereafter; and therefore it is likewise called His revealed will; whereas the other, namely, the will of purpose, is God's secret will, until it be manifested unto us by the events and effects of it. —To be governed by our own or other men's wills, is usually to be led by passion, and blind, headlong affections; but to give up ourselves wholly to the will of God, is to be governed by the highest reason in the world; for His will cannot but be good, since it is the measure and rule of goodness itself; for things are said to be good because God wills them. And whatsoever He requires of us is pure and equitable, and most agreeable to the dictates of right and enlightened reason; so that we act most like men when we act most like Christians, and show ourselves most rational when we show ourselves most religious.—J. F. H.]
SECOND SECTION.—The proper conduct of Christians in all their personal relations: to the brethren in their own life; to the needy; to guests; to every body, even toward enemies.

CHAP. XII. 9–21.

9 Let love be without dissimilation [your love be unfeigned]. Abhor1 that which is evil; cleave to that which is good. Be kindly affectioned one to another with brotherly love [In brotherly love2 be affectionate one to another, literally, be as blood relatives]; in honour preferring one another; Not slothful in business [In diligence, not slothful]; fervent in spirit [in spirit, fervent]; serving the Lord [or, the time]3: Rejoicing in hope [in hope, rejoicing]; patient in tribulation [in tribulation, patient]; continuing instant in prayer [in prayer, persevering]; Distributing [Communicating] to the necessity [necessities]4 of saints; given to hospitality. Bless them which [those who] persecute you; bless, and curse not. Rejoice with them that do [those who] rejoice, and weep with them that [those who] weep. Be of the same mind one toward another. Mind not high things, but condescend to men of low estate [or, lowly things].3

21 Be not wise in your own conceits. Recompense to no man evil for evil. Provide [Have a care for] things honest [honorable] in the sight of all men.5 If it be possible, as much as lieth in [dependeth on] you, live peaceably [be at peace] with all men. Dearly beloved, avenge not yourselves [Avenge not yourselves, dearly beloved], but rather give place unto wrath [to the wrath, so of God]: for it is written, Vengeance is mine; I will repay, saith the Lord.

20 Therefore" If thine enemy hunger, feed him; If he thirst, give him drink: For in [by] so doing Thou shalt heap coals of fire on his head.

TEXTUAL.

1 Ver. 8.—The imperatives of the E. V. are retained, since we accept the hortatory view of the participles. It is true, the E. V. itself occasionally retains the participial form (vers. 10, 11, 12, 13), but only in such a way as not to disturb the hortatory meaning. See the Eng. Notes on the construction.

2 Ver. 10.—The E. V. has inverted the Greek order in these brief clauses. The datives stand first, and their equivalents should occupy the same position in English. So Five Ang. Clergymen, Amer. Bible Union, &c.

3 Ver. 11.—(The Rec. with N. AB. D3 2. Z. meet fathers, reads: καὶ εὐφημῆς; adopted by Beza, Lachmann, Scholiis, Tischendorf, De Wette, Philipps, Alford, Tregelles. Dr. Lange, however, follows Griesebach, Mill, Fritzsche, and Meyer, who adopt καυχάμενος, on the authority of D. F. G., Latin fathers (so Latiius). Yet Meyer himself acknowledges that the other reading is better supported; he rejects it on account of the critical difficulty of accounting for the variation, were καυχάμενος genuine, especially as the phrase: serve the Lord, is so common with Paul. Dr. Lange says: "Such a general summons to serve the Lord, looks like an interpolation in the midst of general directions. The reading, as Meyer observes, is readily explained by the fact that a prejudiced moral feeling would easily stumble at the principle: το καυχάμενος." It would seem that Dr. Lange is governed rather by a desire to preserve certain exegetical correspondences, than by the results of critical investigation. See Alford in favor of the received reading. He contends that, besides the weight of external authorities, the internal probabilities sustain it. "The present subject is, the character of our zeal for God." ‘The command, το καυχάμενος book, would surely come in very inopportunitly in the midst of exhortations to the zealous service of God.” De Wette, indeed, doubts the propriety of the expression, remarking that Christians may employ το καυχάμενος, but not serve it. On the whole, I feel constrained to differ from Dr. Lange, and to retain the reading of the Rec. See further in the Eng. Notes.

4 Ver. 13.—Rec. ξ. A. B. D3, ευκάριος; D. F.: ευμελος. The former is adopted by all modern editors. The latter was a corruption introduced, hardly accidentally, in favor of the honor of martyrs by commemoration (Alford). So M. and most. Dr. Lange admits that the reading μελος, which he rejects here, is supported by the same authorities as the reading καυχάμενος (ver. 11), which he accepts. "But the connection here pronounces in favor of the Rec." He intimates that he finds another meaning than “the worship of martyrs” in the rejected reading, but does not state what it is.

5 Ver. 16.—See Eng. Notes.

6 Ver. 17.—After κατά, Δ3. Polycarp, &c, insert ἐξετάζων το θεόν καθεκοθες; F. G., Vulgate, Gothic, many fathers, insert εἰς μονον το θεόν το δικαίον καθεκοθες. These additions are rejected by all modern editors, as taken from Prov. iii. 1, where the LXX. reads: κατακαίων θεον ενεργειαν αποθανονων.—Instead of προσκύνησιν (Rec. N. A. B. D3, versions and fathers), Δ3. F. &c., have τῶν, which probably arose from the previous inserter.

7 Ver. 19.—From Deut. xxxii. 35, where the LXX. reads: εν υις αναπαραπανωσον. Heb.: וַיִּשָּׁצְוּ אֱלֹהִים, where the LXX. reads: שָׁמַע אֱלֹהִים אֱלֹהִים. "mine is revenge and requital." The same thought is found, Jer. xxviii. 6. Heb. x. 30 quote precisely as here.

8 Ver. 20.—(An exact quotation from the LXX., Prov. xxv. 21, 22. There is, however, a variation in the opening words. The Rec. with D. L., some versions and fathers, reads: πέποιχας ἐπάνω; the απάνω alone is from the LXX.); adopted by F. have ἐπάνω alone; so Tischendorf, N. A. B., ἐπάνω κατὰ ὅσα (Lachmann, Meyer, Alford). Other variations occur in the fathers. It is difficult to decide. Probably απάνω was the original reading, then rejected because the inference was not understood, or to conform to the LXX.; then ἐπάνω substituted, as a connecting particle was deemed necessary. Certainly ἐπάνω ἐπάνω is licit difficult. Even Alford seems inclined to adopt it. R.}

9 Ver. 21.—"To be not wise in your own conceits. Recompense to no man evil for evil. Provide [Have a care for] things honest [honorable] in the sight of all men. If it be possible, as much as lieth in [dependeth on] you, live peaceably [be at peace] with all men. Dearly beloved, avenge not yourselves [Avenge not yourselves, dearly beloved], but rather give place unto wrath [to the wrath, so of God]: for it is written, Vengeance is mine; I will repay, saith the Lord. Therefore If thine enemy hunger, feed him; If he thirst, give him drink: For in [by] so doing Thou shalt heap coals of fire on his head. Be not overcome of [by] evil, but overcome evil with good.
CHAPTER XII. 9-21.

EXPERIMENTAL AND CRITICAL.

Summary.—The remark, that the expression ἡ ἀγάπη ἀνωτέρως serves as an inscription to all the following participles, has induced us, after the example of Meyer, and others, to begin the next section with ver. 9. It may be doubted whether the Apostle has mentally supplied ἐστιν or ἐστι. The latter view is favored by the idea of Christian love, not merely "toward others," but in a universal relation; see ver. 11. The first construction is favored by the hortatory form appearing more strongly toward the end. Our earlier division was based on the fact that vers. 9 and 10 treat of conduct toward companions in faith within the Church. The Apostle, however, makes use of a long series of participles, as if he would urge not so much a Christian course of conduct, as to set up a typical rule of conduct for believers, according to unfeigned love.

[De Wette, Olhausen, and others, supply ἐστιν, thus making these verses descriptive, not hortatory. They urge that the use of the participle for the imperative is very rare. That is true; but in ver. 14 we have the imperative, followed by an infinitive in ver. 15, and then by participles, vers. 16-19; all of these latter clauses being of a hortatory character. With most commentators (so E. V.), we prefer to supply ἐστο with the first clause of ver. 9, and ἐστι with the following participles, since ver. 8 is of a hortatory character. Meyer, Philip, Tischendorf, Lachmann, larger edition, declare for this; the editors by their punctuation, which is the same in the main as that of the E. V. Lachmann also favors (smaller edition) joining the participles with the imperative in ver. 14, and thus obtaining the hortatory force; this, however, is not only singular, but contrary to the thought, which will not permit these participles to modify the imperative, bless. Fritzsche takes the participles as corresponding to the personal subjects of "love unfeigned," as 2 Cor. i. 7; but this is unnecessary—R.]

Ver. 9. Let your love be unfeigned] ἡ ἀγάπη ἀνωτέρως. We are justified in strengthening ἡ ἀγάπη into your love, in English. But the Apostle means love absolutely, not merely love to the brethren (which is spoken of afterwards), nor love to God. The adjective need not be paraphrased, as in E. V.—R.] See 2 Cor. vi. 6; 1 Peter i. 22. Meyer well says: "As love, so also must faith, its root, be," 1 Tim. i. 5; 2 Tim. i. 8. Undivided love is therefore the inscription for the whole series of prescriptive which the Apostle lays down in parallelisms of two and of three members.

Abhor that which is evil. ἀποφυγήσινες. Strictly, repelling with repugnance. This first grand antithesis says, that believers should turn away with utter abhorrence from that which is evil, in order to cleave to the good with inseparable attachment, as with bridal affection. This antithesis constitutes the practice of heaven and heavenly life, and its realization is the life of our Lord. Its breaking off and turning away, as well as its connecting and uniting, constitute the fundamental moral law of God's kingdom. The second antithesis unites with this.

* [In the first edition, vers. 9 and 10 were added to the previous section. The present division has the support of the three commentators, and must be deemed a happy alteration.—R.]

Ver. 10. In brotherly love. φιλαδελφία. [The dative is that of reference: as respects brotherly love.—R.] Specific brotherly love for fellow Christians; 1 Thess. iv. 9; Heb. xiii. 1; 1 Peter i. 22, 2 Peter i. 7. [Be affectionate one to another, τὰ ἄλλα ἕναν ἕναν ἐλπίζοντες. Be lovers as toward those related in blood.

In honour. Τινὴν, esteem. The antithesis here is the equalization in confiding brotherly love, and the subordination of our own personality to our esteem for others.

Preferring one another. Προσποιούμενοι. The explanations: excelling (Chrysostom, and others), obilging (Theophrast, Luther, and others), and esteeming higher (Theodore, Grotius; see Tholuck), are intimately connected therewith. [Stuart: "In giving honor, anticipating one another." Meyer: "Going before as guides; i.e., with conduct inviting others to follow." These explanations, however, do not seem to suit τινὴ; hence Alford, and most, prefer the meaning given in the Vulgate: inviscio praebentes. Hodge: "Instead of waiting for others to honor us, we should be beforehand with them in the manifestation of respect."—R.]

Ver. 11. In humility, not slothful, τῇ ἀποστολῇ ἐννοιώντες. This clause, which has three members, defines proper activity in reference to temporal affairs, just as the following clause, which also has three members, defines proper passivity in these affairs. Both verses define the personal conduct of the Christian in relation to himself, according to his situation in time. The principal rule of the first clause is: not to shrink halfheartedly from the whole work of time, but to work with persevering enthusiasm. To this belongs the polar conduct of remaining warm in spirit (seething and boiling like a hot spring), and overcoming the time (see Acts xvii. 25), while in one's daily task adapting one's self to the moment, to the will of the κύριος in the καθός, so that He is served by observing its full meaning. Προσφέρειν. τῷ κυρίῳ, temporis servire (Cicero), and similar expressions; see Meyer, p. 465. The expression was usual in the Greek sense of the term, and it was the principle at the root of the good (to accommodate one's self to the time). But here it reads: controlling the time by serving the Lord; Eph. v. 16; see Tholuck, pp. 669 ff., who gives the preference to the reading κυρίοι.

[Serving the Lord, τῷ κυρίῳ δουλεύοντες. On the readings, see Textual Note 1. The adoption of the reading κυρίοι, which is not so well sustained as that of the Rec., has influenced the exegesis of Dr. Lange throughout the verse. Philip urges against καθός its equivocal meaning, and the fact that Paul always represents the Christian as free, a servant only to God, or Christ, or righteousness—never of the time. In fact, the injunction seems scarcely to differ from one of worldly wisdom, if that reading be accepted. Eph. v. 16; Col. iv. 5, will not justify the expression. Fritzsche in loco admits an interchange of κυρίος and κυρίοι in other places.—Dr. Hodge explains: "Influenced in our activity and zeal by a desire to serve Christ. This
member of the sentence, thus understood, describes the motive from which zeal and diligence should proceed.” The common interpretation, derived from the E. V., is: “not slothful in temporal affairs, yet of an earnest religious spirit,” because all is done in the service of the Lord. If the first clause be extended so as to include “whatever our hand finds to do,” this is sufficiently correct. The second member derives its appropriateness from the fact—never more noticeable then in those bustling days, when even religious duties partakes somewhat of the spirit of the age—that zeal and diligence may become a habit and passion, a more activity, lacking the genuine fervor of the spirit. The last term does not, indeed, refer to the Holy Spirit, but, in an exhortation to Christians, may well be taken as meaning the human spirit under the influence of the Holy Spirit.

—R.] This is followed by a trichotomy as the proper paucity in temporal relations.

Ver. 12. In hope, rejoicing, [τῇ εὐλαβείᾳ χαιρόντες. Stuart thinks the duties in this verse also are duties of reference: as respects hope, rejoicing, &c. But the regularity has been broken in upon by the τοῦ κυρίου of the preceding verse; we are therefore warranted in adopting a different view here, especially as the duties in this verse seem not to be parallel to each other. The verb χαιρέω may indeed govern the dat., but the homoeoteleuton point, more than the object of referring (so Meyer, Alford). De Wette, Philipp: vermöge der Hoffnung: Hodge: on account of hope. The hope is objective, and to be taken more generally than Dr. Lange suggests. His view results from reading καιρὸν above.—R.] The antithesis shows here the εὐλαβεία, as formerly the σπουδὴ, must be regarded as prevalently objective. In the time bestowing hope. It is in harmony with the childlike character of faith to rejoice gratefully over every good token; but it is also in harmony with manliness to be patient in tribulation.

In tribulation, patient; in prayer, persevering [τῇ θλίψει ὑπομένοντες; τῇ προσευχῇ προσκατηριστοῖτε. Alford: τῇ θλίψει, the state in which the ὑπομονή is found. Philipp, De Wette, Meyer, &c., think ἔννοϊα was omitted on account of the parallelism of construction, though the verb governing this (if even grammatically the accusative, however). On the second clause, comp. Col. iv. 2; Acts i. 14.—R.] The harmonization of the great contrasts of life lies in the persevering life of prayer. Similar harmonizations, see James i. 9, 10; chap. v. 13. Bengel: Gaudium non modo est affectus, sed etiam officium christiano-rum. Tholuck and Meyer would regard the hope here quite universally, as the foundation of Christian joy. This is not favored by the antithesis τῇ θλίψει. Meyer here reads the dative: standing out against tribulation. But Paul will not consider tribulation as an condemnation. We also prefer being patient to being steadfast, as continued steadfastness is placed here finely in the life of prayer.

Ver. 13. Communicating to the necessities of saints [ταῖς χρισίαις τῶν ἄγνω ἀνθρώ- 

pοντες. See Textual Note 4.—R.] The believer naturally comes from his own necessity to the necessities of his brethren. Ταῖς χρισίαις. The meaning of the verb κοινοῦν: distributing to, is opposed by Meyer and Tholuck. It is sufficient here that holding fellowship with is the fuller and stronger expression, yet not fellowship “in the necessities of fellow-Christians, but with them; or, in other words, to participate in their necessities (Chrysostom, Theodoret).—Given to hospitality [τῆς φιλο- 
vίαν δωματίου, literally, pursuing hospitality—R.] In ancient times, hospitality was also a highly important work of love, for the relief of necessity; Heb. xiii. 2; I Peter iv. 9.

Ver. 14. Bless those who persecute you, &c. [ἀλλογείτε τοῖς διωκόμες ὑμᾶς, &c.] Here the hortatory form becomes distinct; see Matt. v. 44. Probably the expression of Jesus has reached Paul by the tradition of the Church. Tholuck: “It is just from the Sermon on the Mount that we find the most reminiscences; 1 Cor. vii. 10; James iv. 9; v. 12; 1 Peter iii. 9; iv. 14.” Tholuck, very strangely, supposes here a so-called lexical connection—i. e., that ver. 14 is accidentally called for by the word δωμάτιον. But it is incorrect to suppose that the exhortation of ver. 14 interrupts such exhortations as vers. 13 and 15, which relate to the mutual conduct of Christians; ver. 14 has been too generally regarded as favoring this view.

Ver. 15. Rejoice with those who rejoice, &c. [χαιρέτεις μετά χαιρόντας, &c.] On the infinitive as imperative, see Winer, p. 296. Meyer fills out the sentence thus: χαιρέτεις μετά ἑαυτῶν.—R.] Χαιρεῖν, the imperative as an imperative, to be supplemented mentally by a corresponding verb; see Sirach vii. 33, 34. Ver. 14 defines the proper conduct in relation to personal antipathy; ver. 15, the proper conduct in relation to personal sympathy.

Ver. 16. Be of the same mind one toward another [τῷ αὐτῷ εἰς ἀλλοίων φρονομε- 

νεῖς. The partidevs in ver. 16 have been variously construed; now with the preceding imperative χαιρεῖν; now with the following see Phil. iv. 8; see Chrys. and others. The great difficulties of such connections, commentators prefer to supply τέτει (Philippi, Meyer). The idea of χαιρεῖν is patient continuance, or steadfastness; although, at times, the idea of patience may be the prominent one. It may be true that both meanings are present, and the other thought is not equally prominent here. So Philipp, in der Drangst bedrückt.—Accepting the wider reference of the verse, Dr. Hodge says: "This hope of salvation is the most effectual means of producing patience under present afflictions." "Intercourse with God, however, is necessary to this; and, besides, there are other virtues, and therefore the Apostle immediately adds: continuing instant in prayer." "In this expression the two attributes of acceptable prayer—perseverance and favor—both implying faith in God.—R."

* The idea of ὑπομονὴν is patient continuance, or steadfastness; although, at times, the idea of patience may be the prominent one. It may be true that both meanings are present, and the other thought is not equally prominent here. So Philipp, in der Drangst bedrückt.—Accepting the wider reference of the verse, Dr. Hodge says: "This hope of salvation is the most effectual means of producing patience under present afflictions." "Intercourse with God, however, is necessary to this; and, besides, there are other virtues, and therefore the Apostle immediately adds: continuing instant in prayer." "In this expression the two attributes of acceptable prayer—perseverance and favor—both implying faith in God.—R."

† [We retain the imperative form of the R. V. It might
through suffering to glory. Imprisoned and nailing with the lowly, but not with the bud!

The neuter construction is thus explained by Calvin, and others: *humilis verbis obsequiundus* (about: to be true in small things); while Grotius, and others, thus explain the masculine construction: *modestissimorum exemplo secundantes*.

[On the whole, the masculine is preferable: to in no other case in the New Testament is the subjective tautopos used of things. Nor does the Apostle's antithesis require the neuter meaning. Alford: *In τα ἴθιλα φησινοτες, the ίθιλα are necessarily subjective—the lofty thoughts of the man. But in τοις ταπεινοις, the adjective is necessarily objective—some outward objects, with which the persons exhorted are συναναγεθατα. And those outward objects are defined, if I mistake not, by the ις αλλιθα*. Dr. Hodge, and many others, do not decide between the two views.—R.]

**Be not wise, &c.** *Μη γινεσθη;* see chap. xi. 25. But there the concept of one's own wisdom constitutes an antithesis to God's revelation, while here it constitutes an antithesis to the fellowship of men (not merely of Christians in a good sense).

Ver. 17. **Recompense to no man evil for evil** [*μηδενι κακον αντι κακοι αποδιδοντες*. Alford: *The Apostle now proceeds to exhort respecting conduct to those without.*] This is, however, no warrant for this limitation in the language, and certainly the temptation to render evil for evil to Christians is frequent enough.—R.]

**Meyer: *The principle itself, and how it stood opposed to heathendom and phenarism!* ”

**[Have a care for things honourable, προ- νοιαν νοια καλα. Lange: Seid auf das Edle bedacht. Have careful regard to what is noble, &c. Dr. Hodge finds here a motive for the injunction which preceeds, and objects to the period after *evil* in the E. V., as well as to the translation *honest,* which undoubtedly conveys to the ordinary reader the thought that we are hidden to provide for ourselves and families in an honest way. The clause much resembles Prov. iii. 4 (LXX.), hence the variations.—R.]

In the sight of all men [*τους απαθους δια τους τοις θεους και ανθρωπους.* See Textual Note 4; Meyer: Before the eyes of all men. We regard the term as an expression of the relation to the most diverse men. However, the other construction also makes good sense; for Christians could often expose individuals to danger, by giving them cause for offence; Prov. iii. 4; 2 Cor. viii. 21.

Ver. 18. **If it be possible, &c.** *Ει δεικτον is referred by Erasmus, Bengel, and others, to what precedes [but this is objectionable]. The clause: *as much as dependeth on you,* explains the ι ει δεικτον. It may be outwardly impossible to us to live at peace with every body; but inwardly we should be peaceably disposed, prepared for peace, toward every body. [The ι ει δεικτον is objective (Tholuck, De Wette, Meyer, Alford), not, "if you can," but, if it be possible, if others will allow it. *All your part is to be peace:* whether you actually live peaceably or not, will be determined, solely on how others answer toward you (Alford). That this is often impossible, the Apostle's life plainly shows.—R.]

Ver. 19. **Avenge not yourselves, dearly beloved.** The additional *αγαπητηι, loving pressure.* [The address becomes more affectionate...}
as the duty becomes more difficult (so Tholuck).

—R.

Give place unto the wrath [ὁτε τοπν τῇ σέγγῃ]. Make way for Divine wrath; do not anticipate it; do not get in its way; let it rule. This is the explanation of most commentators, from Chrysostom of Antioch to Adler. Meyer, on the contrary: The Latin usage of non iva spatio dare harmonizes very well with this, but the Greek usage of τοπν δοδώνα does not. [Jowett says this explanation is equally indefensible on grounds of language and sense. It is only as a translation of a Latinism we can suppose the phrase to have any meaning at all; and the meaning thus obtained, 'defeer your wrath, is out of place.' See his remarks in defence of the next explanation.—R.]

Third explanation: To give place to the wrath of your enemy (Schöttgen, Morus, and others). Meyer: This would be only a prudential measure. The first explanation is raised above all doubt by the addition: V BLUE is mine.]

Ver. 20. Therefore if thine enemy, &c. [Εἰ ὃν ὑν ἐνειγαγόμεν ἐν εὐθύς.] See Textual Note 8.] The AME is, which is omitted by most Cod., probably on account of difficulty, follows from the antithesis. One cannot conform to the negative: not to hate an enemy, without obeying the affirmative. [Hodge: The expressions are obviously not to be confined to private or personal injuries; nor to the discharge of the common offices of humanity; they are figurative expressions for all the duties of benevolence. It is not enough, therefore, that we preserve an enemy from perishing; we must treat him with all affection and kindness.—R.] The words are from the LXX. of Prov. xxv. 21.

Thou shalt heap coals of fire, &c. [αὐτοῖς δειλότερα, σπερματίζειν.] The burning of fiery coals is an Oriental figure of constantly burning pain. Explanations:

1. Thou wilt draw down upon him severe Divine wrath (with reference to 4 Ezra xvi. 54: Chrysostom, Theodoret, &c., Zwingle, Beza, &c., Stolz, Hengstenberg, &c.).

2. Thou wilt prepare him for the pain of penitence (Augustine, Jerome [Tholuck, De Wette, Meyer], Luther, and many others). Origin has opposed to the former view, which was continually used to meet the necessity of being established in the Church, because of the propensity to wrath. On Hengstenberg's explanation of Prov. xxiv. 18, see Tholuck, p. 675 ff. Ver. 21, as well as the spirit of the passage, pronounced in favor of explanation (2). No one could gladly require evil with good, if he knew of a certainty that he would thereby be exposed to Divine wrath. Finally, this explanation is favored by the whole spirit of Christianity. Yet it must be observed, that penitence cannot be designated as an infallible effect of the love of enemies, and of its expressions. The most immediate effect of such expressions is burning shame, a religious and moral crisis. He will bend his head as if fiery coals lay on it. The rule, as well as the purpose, of this crisis, is penitence and conversion; but there are frequent instances of false adversaries, like Judas, becoming hardened by kindness. [3. Slightly different from (2.) is that adopted by Hodge: "You will take the most effectual means of subduing him." Kindness is as effectual as coals of fire. So Alford: "You will be taking the most effectual vengeance." Similarly Jowett. This view, which excludes even the pain of penitence, is favored by the connection with ver. 21.—R. For other unimportant explanations, see the Note in Meyer, p. 488. On the figure of fiery coals, see Tholuck, p. 676.

Ver. 21. [Be not overcome, &c. ἐνίκηθεν, κ.τ.λ. "A comprehensive summary of vers. 19, 20. Be not overcome (led to revenge) by evil (which is done to you), but overcome by the good (which you show to your enemy) evil (by causing your enemy, ashamed by your noble spirit, to cease doing evil to you, and to become your friend)?" Meyer. Seneca, De Benef. vi. 18, Fract in perturbatione Spiritu.]—R.] The purpose of all these manifestations of love is that of Christ on the cross: to overcome evil with good.

DOCTRINAL AND ETHICAL.

1. The proper conduct in personal intercourse, particularly with the brethren, is love without disimulation; as the proper conduct toward the Church, previously described, is love without self-seeking. The conduct toward civil authorities (which follows in chap. xiii.), is love without fear; and, finally, the proper conduct toward the world is love without despising the rights of the world, and without mingling with the immorality of the world.

2. The root of brotherly love is reverence for the appearing image of Christ; and its development and consummation are types of the most inward sanctity.

3. The proper conduct toward different individuals begins with proper conduct toward ourselves; portrayed in ver. 11. To this there belongs, first of all, fresh spiritual life; zealous and enthusiastic work, embracing eternity as the blessing of the
Spirit; calm ardor in communion with God, and in the consciousness of its being sent by God; but regarding the moment of time as the moment of eternity in time. In this place belongs Solomon's Ecclesiastes, this much-mistaken pearl of the Old Testament—a writing whose fundamental thought is, that every thing is regarded vain in consequence of despising eternity in time.

4. The Apostle's pen gives a festive expression even to Christian ethics; as is proved by the beautiful parallels, mostly in the form of trilogies, in this chapter, together with 1 Cor. xiii. [Comp. Erasmus on this chapter: "Comparvis membris et incisit, simulat cedentibus ac desinentibus sic totus sermo modulatus est ut nulla caustio possit esse fundator."—R.] Christian life should also be a worship. But the worship is festive, free from common weariness.

5. All Christianity is a conquest of evil by good, which Christ has established, and already decided in principle on His cross. All the single rules of conduct toward individuals concentrate in this last and highest one.

HOMILETICAL AND PRACTICAL.

Vers. 9-21. The sincerity of love. It is manifested in: 1. Our abhorring that which is evil; and, 2. In cleaving to that which is good (ver. 9). Let not love be false. 1. What is it to love in this way? 2. How is it possible? (ver. 9.)—What belongs to true brotherly love? 1. Sincere heartiness; 2. Obliging respect (ver. 10).—Universal love and brotherly love. 1. How far related? 2. How far different? Comp. 2 Peter I. 7 (vers. 9, 10).—Christian love in labor. 1. Its nature; 2. Its origin; 3. Its limit (ver. 11).—Be not indolent in doing what you should! (ver. 11).—Be fervent in spirit! A pentecostal sentiment (ver. 11).—Adapt yourselves to the time! A word of comfort in times of need and tribulation (ver. 11).—Rejoice in hope, be patient in tribulation, continue instant in prayer—an inexhaustible text, and one that can be always applied fresh on marriage occasions, in harvest sermons in years of failure, or in New Year's sermons in troublous times (ver. 12).—Distribute to the necessity of others; 1. Description of it (with special references similar to those in ver. 11); 2. A summons to energetic assistance (ver. 13).—The forgoing Christian spirit. 1. A beautiful virtue; but, 2. One very difficult to exercise; and therefore, 3. Proper to be implored from God (ver. 14).—Christian sympathy. 1. In joy; 2. In sorrow (ver. 15).—Christian unanimity (ver. 16).—Christian humility (ver. 16).—Christian honesty (ver. 17).—Christian peacefulness (ver. 18).—Christian love of enemies. 1. It desists from revenge; 2. It overcomes evil with good (vers. 19-21).—Fiery coals on the head of an enemy: 1. They cause pain; but, 2. Healing pain, because it is the pain of shame (vers. 19-21).

Luther: To heap coals of fire on the head is, that, by kindness, our enemy grows angry with himself for having acted so wickedly toward us.

Storr: True Christianity does not make lazy people and sluggards, but industrious ones; for the more pious the Christian, the more industrious laborer he is (ver. 11).—Dear Christian, you present a gift to strange beggars, though you do not know whether they are holy or not—indeed, the most are without bility; should you not rather do good to the poor who live among us, who prove by their deeds that they are holy and God's children? (ver. 13).—He who rises high, falls all the lower; such coocdt is always dangerous. High trees are shaken most violently by the winds; high towers are most frequently struck by the thunder-storm; what is high is easily moved, and likely to fall. Rather remain low, and then you will not fall, Sirach ii. 19 (ver. 16).—If you have wisdom, it is not your own, but God's; let it not be observed that you know your wisdom. There are others also who are not fools; and there are many superior to you (ver. 16).—Every one should be ruler of his own spirit, Prov. xvi. 32 (ver. 21).—It is most glorious to show good for evil, and to make a friend out of an enemy, Prov. xvi. 6 (ver. 21).—As fire is not quenched by fire, so is evil not quenched by evil, nor invective by invective. Hengstenberg: Christianity is not absurd selfishness and incivility. Love and patience teach quite different things toward our neighbor (ver. 10).—Müller: The richer and bigger in God, the poorer and more like nothing in our own eyes, 2 Sam. vii. 18 (ver. 10).—God sends His cross to us that it may press from our hearts many fervent sighs, from our mouth many a glorious little prayer, and from our eyes many hot tears (ver. 12).—Christian soul are one soul in Christ, and therefore one feels the sorrow and joy of another (ver. 15).—To do good is natural; to do evil is carnal; to do evil for good is devilish; to do good for evil is divine (ver. 17).

Spener: Love is the principal virtue required by Christ of His disciples (ver. 9).—Brotherly love should be as hearty as natural love between parents, children, and brethren (the συγγένες), and should not be lukewarm, but zealous (ver. 10).—The Spirit of God is a holy fire, which inflames hearts wherever it is. Where things go very sleepily, we may well apprehend that, because there is no fire, there is no zeal, and that there is also no work of the Spirit, but only of nature. Yet there should be a fervency and zeal of the spirit. For the flesh has also its blind zeal, which is the more dangerous the greater it is (ver. 11).—Accommodate yourselves to the time. But this must not be in such a way as to join in with the world, as every period brings with it that which the world requires. You are the other who are not wise to conformation to this world. But Christians should not lose the opportunity of doing good which God constantly presents to them; and they should always give due care to all circumstances—to what is best now to be done according to the Divine rule. Moreover, they should always give due attention to the condition in which they are situated, so that they may act just as God now requires of them (ver. 11).—In prosperity and adversity, prayer is the best means for our support (ver. 12).

Roos: Christians should be refined and polite people (ver. 17).

Gerlach: The most glowing love should not lose sobriety and discretion, by virtue of which it chooses and performs just what the circumstances require; comp. Matt. x. 16 (ver. 11).—"It is well," says one, that he has very properly commanded weeping with those who weep; but for what end for he command us to do the other part, that which is not great? And yet, rejoicing with them that rejoice is a far more self-denying state of mind than weeping with those who weep;" Chrysostom (ver. 15).—By fiery coals we must understand that we
lead the one who inflicts us to repentance of his deed, by doing good to him (ver. 20).

Lisco: How the love of the believer, arising from humility, is manifested toward other believers. 1. Its peculiarity (vers. 9-15); 2. Its manifestations with very different external circumstances (vers. 15-16).—Rejoicing of the believer to the unbelieving world. He is even animated with love toward it (vers. 17-21).

Besser: The works of Christians in love (vers. 9-21).—Paul calls upon us to oppose two special enemies of unity: 1. Pride; 2. Self-conceits of wisdom (ver. 16).—Saul felt most painfully the burning coals from David’s hand, 1 Sam. xxiv. 17 ff.

Heubner: Love should be tender and delicate; it should avoid everything that can offend another’s sense of modesty or honor. Indelicacy is always a want of respect (ver. 10).—Christianity teaches the real art of being always happy. The Christian must keep in a good humor. Hope is the source of the Christian’s cheerfulness; the condition of it is patience. Prayer strengthens both faith and hope (ver. 12).

Besser: The works of Christians in love (vers. 9-21).—Paul calls upon us to oppose two special enemies of unity: 1. Pride; 2. Self-conceits of wisdom (ver. 16).—Saul felt most painfully the burning coals from David’s hand, 1 Sam. xxiv. 17 ff.

Heubner: Love should be tender and delicate; it should avoid everything that can offend another’s sense of modesty or honor. Indelicacy is always a want of respect (ver. 10).—Christianity teaches the real art of being always happy. The Christian must keep in a good humor. Hope is the source of the Christian’s cheerfulness; the condition of it is patience. Prayer strengthens both faith and hope (ver. 12).

Vers. 7-16. The Pericope for the Second Sunday after Epiphany.—Heubner: The fruits of Christian faith in human life. The connection of the Christian virtues. The real life as a practical school of Christianity. Harless: True fidelity to calling. 1. Good Christian deportment is always likewise fidelity to calling; 2. The discharge of one’s calling is true when it is done with simplicity, with care, and with pleasure; 3. This fidelity to calling arises alone from true love; 4. But true love arises alone from the humility of Christian faith. Jaspar: True Christians are also the most faithful laborers. 1. They regard their lifetime as a very gracious gift; 2. They act continually from holy motives; 3. They feel inwardly united with their fellow-men; 4. They have too serious a reverence for their Eternal Judge to discharge their calling unconscientiously. Kuehn: Strengthening of patience in tribulation by: 1. Wise hope; 2. Pious reflection; 3. Steadfast prayer; 4. Joyous hope.

Vers. 17-21. The Pericope for the Third Sunday after Epiphany.—Heubner: The Christian amid the afflicting relations of the world. 1. He uses patience for opposing his own self-love; 2. He uses them for greater severity toward himself; 3. For the practice of a peaceful disposition; 4. For the exhibition of love toward enemies; 5. For increasing his stability and steadfastness. The dignity of Christian peacefulness: 1. Its source; 2. Its limits; 3. Its strength. Beck: Direction for the art of genuine Christian peacefulness. 1. Stop up the fountain of disquietude in your own heart; 2. Give place to the external occasion to disquietude by passions, and external circumstances (vers. every body); 3. Amid external temptations, direct your heart to the highest Requirer; 4. Strive to overcome the hatred of enemies by good deeds, and to turn away the punishment impending over them. —F. A. Wolf: Avenge not yourselves! 1. The meaning of this declaration of the Apostle; 2. How it should be observed. Kapff: What belongs to true culture: 1. Modesty and humility; 2. Universal philanthropy; 3. Truth and purity of heart. Brandt: Christianity is the way to a peaceful and blessed life; for it: 1. Opposes our own conceits; 2. Forbids all revenge; 3. Recommends honesty; 4. Loves peacefulness; 5. Enjoys magnanimity; 6. And always desires the conquest of all evil.

Hopkins: On revenge (ver. 15). Revenge is a wild, untamed passion, that knows no bounds nor measures. And if we were permitted to carve it out for ourselves, we should certainly exceed all limits and moderation; for self-love, which is an immediate affection, would be made the whole rule of our vengeance; and because we love ourselves abundantly too well, we should revenge every imaginary wrong done us with too much bitterness and severity; and, therefore, God would not trust the righting of our injuries to our own hands, knowing we would be too partial to our own interests and concerns, but hath assumed it to himself as the prerogative of His crown. On ver. 30: On kindness toward enemies. This is all the revenge which the gospel permits; this is that excellent doctrine which our Saviour came to preach, which He hath given us commission to declare and publish to the world, to guide our feet into the way of peace; that we might all be united, as by faith and obedience unto God, so in love and charity one to another.

Bishop Atterbury: Sermon on the duty of living peaceably (Rom. xii. 18). I. In what the duty consists, in relation to public and private men, opinions and practice. II. The extent of it—to all men. III. The difficulty of practising it. IV. The best helps to the practice of this duty: (1.) To regulate our passions; (2.) To moderate our desires, and shorten our designs, with regard to the good things of life; (3.) To have a watchful eye upon ourselves in our first entrance upon any contest; (4.) Always to guard against the intemperance of our tongue, especially in relation to that natural proneness it has toward publishing the faults of others; (5.) To keep ourselves from embarking in parties and factions; (6.) To study to be quiet, by doing our own business in our proper profession or calling; (7.) Add prayer to the Author of peace and Lover of concord, for the fruits of His Spirit.

Burritt: What it is to be overcome of evil. 1. When we dwell in our thoughts too much, too often, and too long, upon the injuries and unkindness we have met with; this is as if a man that was to take down a bitter pill, should be continually chewing of it, and rolling it under his tongue. 2. We are overcome of evil when we are brought over to commit the same evil, by studying to make spiteful returns in a way of revenge, for the injuries we have received. Wherein consists the duty and excellency of overcoming evil with good? 1. It renders us like God, who does good to us daily though we do evil against Him continually; 2. We imitate God in one of the choicest perfections of His divine nature; 3. We overcome ourselves; 4. We overcome our enemies, and make them become our friends.

Henry: Bless them who persecute you: 1. Speak well of them. If there be any thing in them
commendable and praiseworthy, take notice of it, and mention it to their honor; 2. Speak respect-fully to them, according as their place is; 3. Wish well to them, and desire their good, so far from seeking any revenge; 4. Offer up that desire to God in a pure prayer for them.

[Clarke, on ver. 16: There have not been wanting, in all ages of the Church, persons who, losing the savor of divine things from their own soils by drinking into a worldly spirit, have endeavored to shin the reproach of the cross, by renouncing the company of the godly, speaking evil of the way of life, and, perhaps, sitting down in the chair of the sorcerer with apostates like themselves. And yet, strange to tell, these men will keep up a form of godliness! for a decent outside is often necessary to enable them to secure the ends of their ambition.

[Hodge, on vers. 20, 21: Nothing is so power-ful as goodness; it is the most efficacious means to subdue enemies and put down opposition. Men whose minds can withstand argument, and whose hearts rebel against threats, are not proof against the persuasive influence of unfelted love; there is, therefore, no more important collateral reason for being good, than that it increases our power to do good.

[Barnes, on ver. 11: The tendency of the Chris-tian religion is to promote industry. 1. It teaches the value of time; 2. Presents numerous and impor-tant things to be done; 3. It inclines men to be conscientious in the improvement of each moment; 4. And it takes away the mind from those pleasures and pursuits which generate and promote indolence.

—J. F. H.]

### Third Section.—Christian Universalism (Roman Catholicism in Paul's sense) in proper conduct toward the civil Government (the heathen State), which has a diocesan and liturgical service in the household of God. The office of civil Government defined.

#### Chap. XIII. 1-6.

1. Let every soul be subject [submit himself] unto the higher powers [to the authorities which are over him]. For there is no power [authority] but of [except from] God: the powers that be are [those which exist] have been ordained of [by] God. Whosoever therefore resisteth the power [So that he who setteth himself against the authority], resisteth the ordinance of God: and they that [those who] resist shall receive to themselves damnation [condemnation]. For rulers are not a terror to good works [the good work], but to the evil. Wilt thou then not [Dost thou then wish not to] be afraid of the power [authority] do that which is good, and thou shalt have praise of [from] the same: For he is the minister of God [God's minister] to thee for good. But if thou do that which is evil, be afraid; for he beareth [weareth] not the sword in vain: for he is the minister of God [a minister, a revegetor to execute wrath upon [an avenger for wrath to] him that doeth evil. Wherefore ye must needs be subject [submit yourselves], not only for [because of the] wrath, but also for conscience' sake. For, for this cause pay ye [ye pay] tribute also: for they are God's ministers [the ministers of God], attending continually upon this very thing.

---

1. Ver. 1.—The word ἐξουσία, rendered power in the E. V., has, as its German equivalent: Obrigkeit. Dr. Lange explains ἐξουσίας ὑπερεχομένους into: den Obrigkeiten, den ihm überwiegenden Mächten. The rendering above is partly from Noyes, partly from the revision of Finz Ang. Clavigren. Both of these versions substitute throughout, authority for power (E. V., Amer. Bible Union). The change is a happy one, since authority has both an abstract and a personal force, corresponding to that of ἐξουσία. Civil authority is, of course, intended.

2. Ver. 1.—The Rec inserts ἐξουσίας after ὑπερεχομένους, with D, L, some versions and fathers. It is omitted in N. A. B. D. E. most versions and fathers. Later editors reject it. It would easily be written as an explanation. The Rec. also inserts ὑπερεχομένους before ὑπερεχομένους, on very insufficient authority.

3. Ver. 1.—Instead of τῶν ἐρωτάτων ἐρωτάτου, ἄλλω τῶν κακῶν (Rec., D, L, some versions, Schol.), the reading: τῶν ἐκ τῶν κακῶν is supported by: A. B. D. E. F. many versions and fathers, Lacmann, Tischendorf, De Wette, Meyer, Philippi, Alford, Tregelles. Stuart and Hodge do not notice the correct reading, which was doubtless altered into that of the Rec. for the sake of supposed grammatical accuracy.

4. Ver. 1.—The D. E., and a few minor authorities, ἐρωτάτου is omitted, and the indicative ἤτοι σαρκικά is inserted into the imperative ἐτοι σαρκικά. The Vulgate follows the reading ἐρωτάτου ἤτοι σαρκικά. So Luther.

5. Ver. 1.—The E. V. has here, God's ministers, and in ver. 4, the minister of God. The expressions are altered in both versions from Finz Ang. Clavigren, which I have followed, for this reason, that, in ver. 4, the idea of serving on behalf of God is implied in ἐκαστῶς; while here, that of serving or ministering to God, on behalf of the people (λειτουργός ἐκ τῆς) seems to be included also. It were perhaps still better to render διακονοῦσας, servants, and reserve the English word minister for this verse, as Noyes has done. "We could not vary the English rendering of διακονοῦσας and λειτουργός, except by introducing some word like 'officer,' which would have had an awkward sound" (Five Ang. Clavigren.—E.)
The Epistle of Paul to the Romans.

Exegetical and Critical.

General Remarks.—As, in chap. xii., ecclesiastical duties are supplemented by personal duties, so here, in chap. xiii., civil duties are supplemented by duties toward the world in general.—According to Tholuck, the passive conduct in relation to private injuries, in chap. xii. 19–21, has led to this exhortation. Yet this would be too accidental an occasion. The thought of the transition is, that, even in the internal State, the state of Christ be maintained by peace. But the possibility of this conquest lies in the necessity of the Christian’s recognizing something good even in the large State, as well as in the personal opponent. Chrysostom held that this section has the apologetical design of showing that Christianity does not lead to the dissolution of the State, and of the social legal relations (comp. 1 Tim. ii. 1; Titus iii. 1; 1 Peter ii. 13, 14). According to Calvin, and others, the exhortation lies in the fact that the Jews were inclined to resist heaven government, and that also the Jewish Christians often became subject, with them, to suspicions of the same disposition. As might be expected, Baur finds the key for the solution of this question also in the Clementines. On these and other hypotheses, particularly those of Neander and Baumgarten-Crusius, see further details in Tholuck, pp. 675 ff. The same author says: “If the Epistle was written in the year 68, then it follows, Nero’s five mild years terminated in the following year.” In view of the universal character of this Epistle, even on its practical side, the Apostle must have felt the necessity of defining, from his principle, the relation of duty in which Christians stood to the State, without his having been led to it by this or that circumstance.

Ver. 1. Let every soul, πᾶς ἡ καρδία, ἡ ἀνοιχτή.

Evenman; yet with reference to the life of the soul, whose emotions in relation to the government come into special consideration (Acts ii. 45; iii. 23; Exegetical, or).—[This exhortation was probably occasioned by the turbulent spirit of the Jews in Rome, who had been on this account banished from the city for a time by the Emperor Claudius. Their unquenchable expectations of a messiah assumed a carnal and political character, and were directed chiefly toward the external emancipation from the odious yoke of Rome. Meanwhile, for the future, the Germanists of the Epistle to the Romans, the spirit of revolt burst forth in open war, which ended in the destruction of Jerusalem (A. D. 70). The Jewish, and even the Gentile Christians, might readily be led away by this fanaticism, since the gospel proffered liberty, and they might not understand that it was mainly spiritual—moral freedom from the slavery of sin, out of which, by decrees, in the appointed way, a reformation and transformation of civil relations should proceed. Such mistakes have been common; e.g., the Peasant’s war, the Anabaptists tumults in the time of the Reformation, and many revolutions since the latter part of the last century. The leaders of the Apostles, and His Church down to the time of Constantine, toward the civil government, is truly sublime. They recognized in it an ordinance of God, despite its degeneracy, yielding to it, in all legitimate affairs, a ready obedience, despite the fact that they were persecuted by it with fire and sword. They should have been as those of this age. When the resurrection was first preached to the Romans, when the cruelties and crimes of a Tiberius, Caligula, and Claudius were in yet fresh remembrance, and when the moment Nero sat on the imperial throne—the same Nero who, a few years later, wantonly and mercilessly persecuted the Christians, condemning them to death as a sort of bandits, and was, no doubt, ever, by just such Christian conduct, in contrast such cruelty, that Christ’s Church won the moral victory over the world, far more than it ever could by the inducement of such precepts, the early Church was “great in deeds, greater in sufferings, greatest in death, for the honor of Christ and the benefit of generations to come;” thus sue was enabled to “overcome evil with good.”—P. 53.]

Rev. xvi. 8.—Submit himself, ἀποτελεσθήσεται ἑαυτῷ την ἀρετὴν. Voluntarily subjecting himself to authority. [The preceptive exhortation describes the obedience as of a rational, voluntary, principled character, in distinction from blind, servile subjection.—P. S.—To the authorities which are over him ἀποτελεσθήσεται ἑαυτῷ την ἀρετὴν. In ἐνοικία are comprised both the magistracy and their power (σωφροσύνης). Υπὸ ἐνοικίας ἰσχύσας, Vigilae; substantiores. Tholuck: The high, those high in authority, with a reference to 1 Tim. ii. 1. [Philippians and Meyer use the German Obrigkeit, but there seems to be no reference to the higher grade of rulers. The rendering given above is sufficiently explicit.—It must be noted how general the injunction is—every soul, and whatever powers are set over him. Wordsworth: He does not say obey, but submit. On the limitations, see below, and Deocr. Notes.—R.] Excerpt from God is a ἀποτελεσθήσεται ἑαυτῷ. See Textual Note. The proposition is universal, its application follows. Wordsworth remarks that [divinae, force, does not occur throughout. —R.] God’s sovereignty is, in the general sense (ἀποτελεσθήσεται ἑαυτῷ), the causality of magisterial power. Those which exist [ἀποτελεσθήσεται ἑαυτῷ, for which Dodd, A. B., and others, would read ἀποτελεσθήσεται ἑαυτῷ, is “more specifically defined by the ὑπὸ ἐνοικίας ὑποτασσόμενοι, have been ordained by God, which denotes Divine appointment.* The

* [Without anticipating the discussion in the Doctrinal Notes, it may be well to remark here, that while this phrase has been used very frequently in the interest of the divinity of kings, and even of the divine order of the government, it is a far less necessary inference from the Apostle’s proposition. The theologians of Germany are apt to turn this against the revolutionary tendencies of Europe, &c.; but should the government under which they live in any way become republican, or ultra-democratic, then consistency must lead them to concede to such authorities also the just designing. The simple, pellucid meaning of the Apostle is, that civil government is necessary, and of Divine appointment. We utter that anarchy is as godless as it is inhuman; that magistrates are not “the servants of the people,” but do they derive their authority from the people, but from God, or whatever the people; that republican officials, no less than the hereditary monarchs, can subscribe to themselves, “by the grace of God.” Unless the principle be of universal application, anarchy will be justly condemned somewhere. This principle, moreover, respects the office, not the character of the magistrate; not the abstract authority, indeed, but the concrete rulers, whatever their character. If it be deemed too strong, the self-imposed limits has been overcorrected. For as the obedience is demanded here of God’s appointment, then it is not demanded in matters contrary to God’s appointment. When the civil power contradicts God’s Word and His voice in matters of conscience, then is contradicts and subverts its own authority. Herein the superior right of the position is manifest. Human self-will leads to anarchy, human self-will to despotism; but obedience to de facto rulers as a Christian duty, and the duties of that character, are manifest. Human self-will makes the individual truly free, and, by asserting the higher law as the basis of the lower authority, ever elevates the lower authority nearer the Divine
Apostle, however, seems desirous of making a distinction, yet not between the rightful and illegal authorities, but between the actual appearance of the authorities and their ideal and essential ground of life, whose validity should also undoubtedly be recognized in the actual authorities, because of their permanent destination. In harmony with this distinction, Chrysostom, and others, have distinguished between the magisterial office itself and its accidental incumbents. Yet we must hold that the Apostle not only enjoins obedience toward the ideal institution of the authorities, but also toward their empirical appearance. But he will establish the requirement of this obedience by reference to the ideal institution and design of the authorities. This arises clearly from what follows.

Ver. 2. So that he who setteth himself against, &c. [ὁ θεῷ ἀντιτάσσομαι, κ.λ. Notice the recurrence of τάσσεσθαι in various forms and combinations.—R.] Whoevers becomes ἀντιτάσσομαι against the actual authorities, becomes also the renister of the ordinance of God. The ἀντιτάσσεσθαι designates, primarily, military opposition, the array of a hostile order of battle; but it has also a more general sense. Its meaning, over against the authorities, in every case must be that of resistance; and Tholuck makes an arbitrary limitation when he says: Neither the armed opposition of the individual, nor many, as in insurrection, is meant here; it rather appears, from ver. 7, what kind of opposition is meant, namely, that of refusal to pay taxes.” Besides, ver. 7 is the beginning of another section. [The more general sense is usually accepted, as in the above rendering: He who setteth himself against, which is adopted to bring out the reflexive force of the original.—R.] As related to the Divine appointment (διανοιγόμενον, here = δοκιμάζομεν), this resistance becomes a spiritual resistance. This is the rule; and, according to this rule, it is said of those who resist the Divine ordinance:

Those who resist shall receive to themselves condemnation [οἱ δὲ ἀνδικαστικῆς ἑαντοῦ εἰρμα λήμνωναι]. Meyer properly remarks, that “a condemnation by God is meant, as it is produced by its resistance of God’s ordinance, but that the ἀκοντίσια are regarded as executing this sentence; therefore Paul does not mean eternal (according to Reiche, and most commentators), but temporal punishment.” Yet these executioners are not always the ἀκοντίσια; for it is well known that revolution very often “devours its own children,” and that the sorest punishments come from anarchy.

The next verse seems to point to the rulers as the instruments in inflicting the Divine punishment (Tholuck, Alford), yet there is no necessity for this limitation. The frequency of doing or permitting injury is often caused by others. Though the punishment comes from God, condemnation is preferable to damnation, since the latter refers now to eternal punishment alone, which is not the case here. — On vers. 1, 2, Dr. Hodge remarks: “The extent of this obedience is to be determined from the nature of the case. They are to be obeyed as magistrates, in the exercise of their lawful authority. This passage, therefore, affords a very slight foundation for the doctrine of passive obedience.”—R.

Ver. 3. For rulers are not [οἱ γὰρ αὐτοῖς οὖν εἰσίν]. It may be asked here, what the γὰρ is designed to establish? According to Meyer, it explains the modality of the condemnation: they shall receive condemnation in so far as the civil authority is its executioner. But Tholuck and Philippi very properly suggest, that the κακὰ ἔργα in ver. 3 cannot mean merely resistance to civil authority. If the civil authority exists merely for the quelling of resistance, the whole State would be a mere circle, or the civil authority would be an absolute despotism. According to Calvin and Bucer, ver. 3 should connect with ver. 1, and prove the ἀποκαλύπτων of the Divine ordinance of civil authority.* But the γὰρ refers simply to the idea of absolute punishment in the condemnation in ver. 2. In Tholuck there is a similar, and perhaps somewhat more general, reference to ver. 2. God punishes insurrection, because it is designed to shake a legal ordinance, existing for the protection of the good and the punishment of the bad. All those are guilty of this misconception of all the moral powers of existing order, who, in their abstract worship of a pure fancy, oppose the best form of government, and therefore finish their labors by prevailing existing order to a moral chaos. Now, the limitation of the strict requirements of the Apostle lies in the definition of the civil authority, which he gives in this and the following verses.

A terror, φόβος. For terror, formidandi. Princes are not formidable to the good work, but to the evil.—[To the good work, but to the evil, τῷ ἀγαθῶ ρήγμα, ἀλλὰ τῷ κακῷ. See Textual Note.—R.]

Dost thou then wish not to be afraid of the authority? [ὅτι δὲ νόμος φοβήσεις τὴν ἐξουσίαν; Although it is not necessary to retain the interrogative form, yet it will express sufficiently the hypothetical force, which most commentators find here.—R.] These words are a hypothetical premise, and not a question, as Griesbach, and others, would construe them.— Thou shalt have praise [ἐστίς ἐπαινεῖτε]. Commentations by the magistrates, in opposition to punishments, and by those who were commanded to execute them; but the contrary, says, that it is not the custom of rulers to praise the non peccantes. To this, Pelagius says: Damnatio malorum laus est honorum. Meyer says: “Grotius, moreover, properly says: ‘Omne hoc scribere Paulus, non seculabatur Rome in Christianis?’ It was still the better period of Nero’s government.” Tholuck’s view is similar. Yet the written words of the Apostle have been of perfect application ever since. The Apostle sets up an ideal, by which the ruler also can and shall be judged. We must hold: 1. That he portrays obedience to authority as an obedience for the Lord’s sake (comp. Eph. vi. 5, 6). This secures the sphere: “Render to God the things that are God’s;” bondage under religious and conscientious despotism is excluded.

2. The definition of what is good works and what

---

*The view of Calvin, Philippi, Hodge, Alford, and others, that this verse gives an absolute ground for obedience, viz., that magistrates having the lodges being ordained of God, are appointed for a useful and beneficial purpose, has much to commend it. Dr. Lange seems to be led toward such exclusive references as bear against revelation.—R.
are evil works, abides by the decision of God's word, of Christian faith, and of conscience, but is not dependent on the ruler.

3. This also indicates that every power shall become weakness, when the poles of sword-bearing shall be so absolutely transposed that the sword becomes a terror to good works; but that it is a matter of the Divine government to prove that weakness, which lies in the fact that an actual government has absolutely dropped off from the idea of its design.*

Ver. 4. For he is God's minister [εἰς δὲ τὸν γὰρ ἀντίκειται ἐπίσημον]. The γὰρ of ver. 4 brings out the ground of the declaration in ver. 3. The rule of the magistracy as a terror to the evil, and for the praise and encouragement of those who do good, is explained by its character, its essential design, to be God's servant.—[To thee for good, so to to ἀδικῶν.] But he is God's minister for the good of man; see Book of Wisdom vi. 4. [While rulers are of God, it is for the benefit of the ruled. A repetition of what precedes, and suggesting the same limitations.—R.]

He wareth not the sword in vain [οὐ γὰρ εἰς τὴν μάχαιραν φορεῖ]. He wareth it (φορεῖ is stronger than φορεῖ) as the symbolical token, insignia, of his governing and judicial supremacy, being God's minister, he is merely used as a symbol, without reason, and for show. He makes use of it because he is God's minister, as the punitive executioner of His wrath. The addition: for wrath, εἰς δὲ τὴν ἐρωμένην, expresses the fact that even in the State and municipal court there is the authority of something higher than merely human justice, namely, the Divine retribution of wrath upon offenders.

We find different antiquarian interpretations of the μάχαιρα, particularly as the dagger which the Emperor carried at his side, see Tholuck, p. 690. Tholuck and Meyer decide for the sword, because μάχαιρα in the New Testament always means this, and because everywhere in the provinces it was borne by the highest officers of military and criminal affairs, as the sign of the ιω σαλίας. Nevertheless, the dagger was the Emperor's hand, his representative, the blade of his sword, his symbol, and the first responsibly of these is the sword itself, not the dagger. After all, in an abstract and real direction, we would otherwise have to think only of the executioner's sword. [It requires some ingenuity to escape the conviction that this passage implies a New Testament sanction of the right of capital punishment. At all events, the theory of civil penalties here set forth is in direct opposition to that so constantly upheld nowadays, that the end is simply the reformation of the offender. See Drv. Note 6.—R.]

* [In thus presenting an ideal of civil government (as most commentators suppose), the Apostle gives both the return for obedience to rightful authority, and makes room for resistance to rulers who utterly and entirely depart from this ideal. Wordsworth, however, takes decided ground to the contrary, and adds: "But even as a Nero, and a Nero persecuting the Church; yet even then you may have praise therefrom. You may overcome him yet by your good; you may be more than conquerors—you may derive glory from it. For though it is unjust and condemns you, yet God is just and will reward you. He will bring you from the path of evil; he does, nevertheless, always the greater service, and for a shorter term, than your prosperity. Therefore hold fast your justice, and whether the power acquits or condemns you, you will reap praise from it. If you are forgiven while he does this, it is his glory, your weakness its fury." Augustine (Serm. xiii. 302).] Yet even this author admits that the Apostle "charitably presumes rulers to be pious, that being God's ministers, they ought to be." This is virtually the presentation of an ideal, the non-realisation of which implies certain limitations to absolute submission.—R.]

Ver. 5. Wherefore ye must needs, &c. [διὰ τοῦτο δὲ ἁγγίζετε, καὶ πάντες τελεῖτε.] For the reason stated, it was not merely the duty of prudence, but also a religious and moral duty of conscience, to be subject. When the Apostle says, not only because of the wrath, but also for conscience's sake, he denotes thereby the antithesis of the external infliction of punishment, and of inward and free obedience, in the knowledge and reverence of the Divine order in the civil affairs of men.* Comp. 1 Peter ii. 13.

Ver. 6. For, for this cause ye pay tribute also [διὰ τοῦτο ὑμῖν καὶ λαόν τελεῖτε.] The question of connection has been much discussed. Calvin, De Wette, Alford, and many others, make διὰ τοῦτο parallel with διὰ (ver. 5), as another inference from verses 1-4. Meyer, however, connects immediately with ver. 5, finding here an inference from the necessity there described, as well as a confirmation of it. He thinks the other construction passes over ver. 5 arbitrarily. But if the verses are taken as parallel, this difficulty is not of much weight. See his notes for other views; Stuart takes διὰ τοῦτο γὰρ as a strengthened causal particle, and the verb as imperative.—R. The τελείει must not be read as imperative (Heunte), for the limitations. is, in the highest sense, a servant of the kingdom, and, in the widest sense, is a servant [Liturg.] of God, analogously to the servant of the temple. Olshausen, and others, erroneously construe προσκυνησιμότητα as subject.

[For they are the ministers of God, λειτουργεῖτται γὰρ ἐν θεοῖς.] See Textual Note. The subject is ὑποτευκτονεῖται (supplied in thought): λειτουργεῖτται is predicate (Meyer, Philippi, and most). Wordsworth places a distinction between λειτουργεῖτται and ἀνάξιον. He bases upon the former, which, he claims, applies to one engaged in a practical, external service, as well as on the concrete plural (instead of the abstract ἀνάξιον), the reference to the collection of tribute in εἰς αὐτὸ τοῦτο. But it is better, with Tholuck, Wordsworth, and others, to find here the idea of servants ministering to God in representation of the people.—R.]

Attending continually upon this very thing [εἰς αὐτὸ τοῦτο προσκυνησιμότητας.] Philippi explains εἰς αὐτὸ τοῦτο for this very purpose, viz., the payment of tribute. But then that would mean: they receive taxes in order that they may exact more taxes. The purpose is the fundamental thought of the whole section: The
State is the State of the police, of rectitude, and of civilization. Therefore the λογος του Θεου is undoubtedly meant (Tholuck, and others) in the very sense in which the section has described it.

DOCTRIAL AND ETHICAL.

1. As chap. xii. has defined the conduct of Christians toward the Church and the political departments of life, so does chap. xiii. define their conduct toward the State and the world. The Apostle has therefore very forcibly regarded the sphere of personal life as the atmosphere of the Church, and then the sphere of the world as the atmosphere of the State.

2. In reference to the civil authority, the Apostle evidently makes the following distinctions: (1) The actual existence of the civil powers, which are in every case an ordinance of God's providence [not of a social contract, nor simply by the will of the people.—R]; and the ideal and real existence of the civil power, which is not merely providentially ἀπὸ Θεοῦ, but also, by creation and institution, fundamentally an ordinance ἀπὸ τοῦ Θεοῦ πτωγμάτων.

(2) He distinguishes between social opposition to the civil power, and the spiritual opposition to God's institution which is comprised therein. (3) He also distinguishes between the power of the State itself and its incumbents, the rulers, by which designation he expresses the possibility of different political forms.† (4) He finally distinguishes between the actual appearance and its ideal destination, according to which the δοῦνα should be a δικαίωσις and administrator of Divine right, and the ἀδικωτοὶ should prove themselves as λογοφαί διοι.

3. The following distinctions with reference to duty toward the State clearly appear:

A. The submission is of necessity (ἀνάγκη), ver. 5; (1) Because of the wrath. Since Divine providence has its wise purposes even in raising up, and permitting to exist, severe and despotic powers, so long as they are really State powers, ἰστορίγωσα, so, in this relation, is the ἀνατάσιασθαι a sin against wisdom; the revoler draws upon himself the κρίσις for his want of judgment, his presumption, and his wicked encroachment and invasion. The same advantage which makes the State pass over from an institution of Divine mercy to a phenomenon of Divine wrath, and which makes use of the despotic tool as an axe to be cast aside in due season (Isa. x. 15), and which oppresses a people to its own chastisement, crushes, first of all, the individual anarchical despos of revoltion, who, in ex-

* [Powell omits all the difficulties of this section, by intimating that the Apostle's exhortation has a reference only to the Roman Christians in their then circumstances. He thinks many a scriptural precept is abused because not thus limited, and adds, respecting the Apostle: “It never occurred to him that the hidden life, which he thought of only as to be absorbed in the glory of the son of God, was one day to be the governing principle of the civilized world.” It is not likely to be so long, if all the professed possessors pass over under the benevolent precepts in this fashion.—R.]

† [From the expression, “God's minister to thee for evil,” the relative excellence of the different forms of government must be determined, since this is the only rule laid down, and an empirical one at best. So long as a popular government best fulfills this Divine purpose, so long will it be the best; and vice versa. The absolute government of the people, by the people, and for the people, shall perish from the earth.” (Greg. Lincoln at Gettyburg Cemetery.—B.)]
th the Rehoboam nor Jeroboam, neither Nebuchadnezzar nor the adversaries of Jeremiah, escaped the condemnation of the Spirit recorded on the pages of Holy Writ. But in the Jewish war, when the fanaticism of power and the fanaticism of an enthusiastic fancy for freedom contended together for the Holy City, the Christians emigrated to Pella. The light and right of the Christian consist in the incapacity of any earthly power to intervene between his heavenly King and his conscience. When it is therefore imputed to him that his conscience is stained by falsehood, injustice, cowardice, or partiality, and that he has become faithless to his heavenly King, he knows—for he must know—that his inward life stands or falls with his fidelity to his Lord, it matters not from what side the imputation may come. He must likewise refute the imputation that he employs his whole life in political law questions; for there are other things to be attended to in religious, ecclesiastical, moral, and social life, than contending for the most perfect political and social forms. The same fanatical externalization, which in the Middle Ages took place in absolute ecclesiasticism, can become absolute politicalism in modern society. But if conditions arise in the life of nations in which the Apostle's definition is not of absolute application, then the sword, when the sword is a terror to the good, then does the definition cease to be of application at its time to ἰνεργήσωσα. But even in such a case God could make a Russian winter do more for Germany, than man, alienated from God, could do for France by a series of revolutions. Of course, freedom never takes place without enthusiastic liberators, who know how to distinguish God's fiery sign from human incendiary. But every one must know for himself what his duty is in his particular calling. The positions of Dr. Lange are justly taken, but may require some modification for a region where the civil power is more directly formed and sustained by the individual members of the State. In that case, the personal responsibility in political affairs is, of course, largely augmented; to the duty of obedience and tribute, that of political knowledge and prudence is added. And every one must know for himself what his duty is in his particular calling. The conditions of Dr. Lange himself does not deny, will be the more an abstraction as lawful means are at hand to alter the organic law of the State. Thus popular government, when, and only when, the people are permeated by Christian principles, contains in itself the preventive of revolutionary excess. If insupportable it can become when this condition is wanting, history tells plainly enough.—R.]

4. From the experience through which the Apostle had previously passed, he had been often protected by the sword of the Roman authorities against the mutinies of Jewish fanaticism. Learned people have observed, that he has written these exhortations to Rome although Nero was Emperor there. Other scholars have remarked, on the other hand, that the five good years of Nero's reign had not yet come to an end. But it is certain, from the history of the State for posterity, as well as in the institution of the Church, the Apostle perceives the historical opposition to the germinating antichristianity in the world, according to 2 Thess. ii. But he did not regard his liberty of judgment thereby bound (see 2 Tim. iv. 17).

5. To what extent is the State a Divine institution? Elaborate discussions on this question are summed up and deliberated upon by Tholuck, pp. 681–689. According to the principles of Romanism, the State is merely a human ordinance (see Tholuck, p. 684; Gieseler, Kirchengesch., ii. 2, pp. 7, 108).—The germ of the Divine institution of the State lies in the Divine institution of the family, in the authority of the head of the family in particular, as well as in the substantial relations of humanity. But as the Old Testament gift of the law is the institution of a theocracy, which still embraces in common the twin-offspring of State and Church, so is there contained also in the Old Testament a Divine sanction of the State—a sanction which pledges the future sanctified State to reciprocity with the future Church. And this presages that it is just as destructive to make the State the servant of the Church, as to make the Church the bondwoman of the State.

[The Scylla and Charybdis of European Christianity, as related to the State, are: Romanism, which subordinates the State to the Church, and Erastianism, which subordinates the Church to the State. The American theory is: that both are coordinate, the State protecting the Church in civil rights, the Church sustaining the State by its moral influence. Yet on this here it is questioned whether this is the correct theory, or whether there is an exact and great blessings indeed, but, as yet, only an experiment. The dangers here are similar: (1.) Romanism, which would make its Church the State; in a popular government, as really as in a despotism, and even more fatally, since the genius of the Church must then become that of the State—what that is, is obvious. (2.) On the other hand, we find the theocratic tendency of Puritanism manifesting itself continually. This would identify Church and State, rather by making the State the Church, pressing upon it the duty of legislating men into morality, and even holiness. Here we must class the politicoreligionism, which has become so common during the last ten years.—Still, the constant tendency of Christendom to make a practical synthesis of Church and State, is an unconscious prophecy of an era when both shall be united in a christocracy.—R.]

6. On the right of the death-penalty with reference to the sword of authority, see Tholuck, p. 691. We must, of course, distinguish between the right of using the sword and the duty of its use. [Admitting that the Apostle is describing an ideal of civil government, we still find here the right of capital punishment. Of course, just in so far as the actual government has been below this ideal, has this right been abused. Still, the right remains justified by the theory of punishment here advanced, by the necessities of self-preservation on the part of society represented by the punishing power. This right to punish also implies the right to pardon; and the measure of the right (i. e., the conformity to...the ideal here presented) will be also the measure of the sense of responsibility, both as to the punishing and pardoning power. The usual objections to capital punishment misapprehend (a) the nature of punishment in general; (b) the Divine authority in civil government.—R.]

HOMILETICAL AND PRACTICAL.
Obedience toward the powers that be is every Christian's duty. 1. Without difference of posi-
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sions; 2. Of position; 3. Of culture; 4. And of confession (ver. 1).—In how far are there no powers that are not ordained by God? 1. So far as God himself is a God of order, who will therefore have order in civil affairs; 2. So far as God is also a God of love, who designs to do good for us by the powers which He has ordained (vers. 1-4).—Resistance to the powers that be, regarded as resistance to God's ordinance (ver. 2).—To do good is the best protection against all fear of civil authority (ver. 3).

—Praise from the civil magistrates. 1. Who shall obtain it? Every one who does good—that is, every one who, a. does not submit slavishly; but, b. obeys the laws of the country by voluntary obedience. 2. In what should it consist? a. Not so much in showy medals and ribbons, for which many are so eager, as, b. in the simple recognition of the faithfully discharged duty of the citizen (ver. 3).—The civil authorities should likewise serve: 1. God; 2. Men (ver. 4).—The holy judicial office of the magistracy. 1. From whom is it derived? From God, who is a righteous God, and to whom no wicked person is pleasing (Ps. v. 4). 2. What belongs to it? The exercise of penal judgment, and, above all, the right of life and death. 3. How should they exercise it? In the ennobling, but also humilitating, consciousness that they are God's ministers (ver. 4).

LUTHER: Worldly power is for the sake of temporal peace; therefore the conscience is bound, by dutiful love, to be subject to it (ver. 5).—See how good it is to pay taxes and be obedient; for you thereby help to protect the pious and punish the wicked. Therefore do not be provoked at it (ver. 6).

STARK: If persons in authority would attract their subjects to obedience, they should administer their office well, and, to that end, should remember: 1. That they are by nature no better than other men; 2. That they will therefore die, just as all others; 3. That they will have to give a far greater account than their subjects before God's judgment-seat, because of their official prerogatives and government (ver. 1).—Lange: When those in authority read and hear that their station is from God, they should examine themselves as to whether they are to their subjects what the head is to the body and its members (ver. 1).—Hendinger: The powers that be, God's minister! How much is expressed by this! Therefore there are no masters above God. He will hereafter hold to account, and throw aside, all titles of honor (ver. 4).—Ye subjects, give freely your possessions and blood, but not your conscience (ver. 6).

Gerlach: Though the office be divine, the incumbent may possess it illegally, and abuse it (ver. 1).—“Needs” here means not external compulsion, but the inward necessity of being obedient to God (ver. 5).

Lisco: The believer's holy love is the fulfillment of the law; first of all, in relation to the powers that be (vers. 1 ff.).—Obedience is a matter of conscience with the Christian; it is an inward and sincere obedience (ver. 5).

Hiibner: The Christian attitude toward the authorities (vers. 1 ff.).—The limits of obedience toward the powers that be are defined by conscience, faith, and God's commandment; Acts v. 29 (ver. 1).

Schleiermacher: On the proper relation of the Christian to his ruler. 1. How utterly improper it is for the Christian to be subject merely to avoid punishment; 2. How natural and necessary it is for him to be subject for conscience' sake (preached in January, 1809); vers. 1-5.

[Henry: Magistrates act as God's ministers: 1. In the administration of public justice; 2. The determining of quarrels; 3. The protecting of the innocent; 4. The righting of the wronged; 5. The punishing of offenders; 6. And the preserving of national peace and order, that every man may not do right in his own eyes. —Waterland: It is the duty of those in authority: 1. To correct those that needlessly and causelessly disturb the public tranquillity; 2. To remove those that libel the established religion, without offering any better, or an equivalent; 3. To curb the insolence and humble the pride of such as fly in the face of authority, and pretend, without commission or qualifications, to instruct, and, under that color, to insult their superiors. —Scott: As to the efforts which are anywhere made by those on whom trust constitutionally devolve, to preserve, increase, or assist the real liberty of mankind, personal, civil, or religious, or to check the career of despotism or oppression over men of any climate, complexion, or religion: let us zealously forward them with our prayers, and by every mean consistent with the peace and good order of the community; and, if we would enjoy the blessing of good government, we should pray earnestly and constantly for our rulers, and all in authority; else we have no just cause to complain of any real or supposed grievances to which we may be subjected by them. —Clarke: When a ruler governs according to the constitution of his country, and has his heart and life governed by the laws of God, he is a double blessing to his people; while he is ruling carefully according to the laws, his pious example is a great means of extending and confirming the reign of pure morality among those whom he governs. —J. F. H.]
FIFTH SECTION.—Proper conduct toward the world in general. Legal fellowship with the world. Recognition of the rights of the world in the justice and also in the strength of love for our neighbor. Separation from the ungodliness of the ancient world (the darkness of heathenism). Universalism and its sanctification through true separation.

CHAPTER XIII. 7-14.

7 Render therefore [omitt therefore] to all their dues: tribute to whom tribute is due; custom to whom custom; fear to whom fear; honor to whom honor.
8 Owe no man any thing, but [except] to love one another: for he that [who] loveth another hath fulfilled the law. For this, Thou shalt not commit adultery, Thou shalt not kill, Thou shalt not steal, Thou shalt not bear false witness [omitt Thou shalt not bear false witness], Thou shalt not covet; and if there be any other commandment, it is briefly comprehended in this saying, namely,
10 Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself. Love worketh no ill to his neighbour: therefore love is the fulfilling [love therefore is the fulfilment] of the law. And that [this the rather because] knowing the time, that now it is high time to awake out of sleep: for now is our salvation nearer than when we believed. The night is far spent, the day is at hand: let us therefore cast off the works of darkness, and let us put on the armour of light. Let us walk honestly, as in the day; not in rioting and drunkenness, not in chambering and wantonness, not in strife and envying: But put ye on the Lord Jesus Christ, and make not [do not make] provision for the flesh, to fulfill the lusts thereof.

TEXTUAL.

1 Ver. 7.—[Rec. §. D. F. L. Insert of ν (Philippi, De Wette); omitted in §. A. B. D.], by Lachmann, Tischendorf, Meyer, Alford, Tregelles, and many others. Dr. Lange thinks the omission favors his view, that a new section should begin here; while Philippi and De Wette think this view of the connection led to the early omission.
2 Ver. 9. —The Rec. inserts the in sufficient authority (X, versions and fathers). It is omitted in A. B. D. F. L. Many cursives, &c.; by Lachmann, and modern editors and commentators without exception. Even Dr. Hodge, who rarely deviates from the Rec., except under overwhelming authority, rejects it. The insertion is at once explained by the Decalogue itself.
3 Ver. 9.—[Rec. F. omit ἑν τῷ θεῷ. It is found in X. A. D. L.; adopted by many editors, bracketed by Lachmann, Alford, Tregelles. It might easily have been omitted as unnecessary, hence to be retained.—Rec., with A. L.: ἐν τῷ θεῷ ἕνώπιον οὐκ ἔχετε; X. B. D. F., Lachmann, Tischendorf, Tregelles, and most: ἐν τῷ θεῷ ἕνωσεν.]
4 Ver. 9.—[Rec. §. A. B. D. (Lachmann, Tischendorf, Alford, Tregelles): σεαυτόν, instead of ἐαυτόν (F. fathers, A., Meyer, Philippi, &c.). The latter is for the second person, however; and may have been changed, either as a grammatical correction, or from the repetition of the Σ, which precedes. On εαυτόν for the second person, see Winer, p. 146.]
5 Ver. 11.—[Dr. Lange's text reads: Und Söhne wissend, wiesen wir auch. See the Exeg. Notes on this interpretation, and that given above in brackets.]
6 Ver. 11.—[The subject of the infinitive is omitted in the E. V. The Rec. §. D. F. L. have ἡ μαρτυρία; §. A. B. C.: ἡ μαρτυρία. The former is adopted by most editors; Alford, however, having discovered that B. gives the latter, has adopted it. Lachmann, Tischendorf, and most, place δύο before ἡ μαρτυρία (so X. A. B. D. D.). Hence: if it is already time that we should awake, is the correct rendering.]
7 Ver. 12.—(The Rec. (with §. C. D. D. §. F. L., and fathers) reads καί before εἰσερχόμεθα. A. B. C. D. §. versions and fathers: εἰσερχόμεθα. §. omits the conjunction altogether. Lachmann, Tischendorf, De Wette, Alford, Wordsworth, Tregelles, accept δέ, since καί might be substituted on account of the failure to recognize the contrast. Philippi and Meyer accept καί, because δέ might have been inserted from the previous part of the verse, or to correspond with it. No change is required in the E. V., to express the slightly contrastive force of δέ.
8 Ver. 12.—[Amer. Bible Union, Noyes: becomingly: Five Ang. Clergymen: seasonally. The latter is more in keeping with the style of the E. V. 1 Cor. xiv. 40: decently (and in order). Seasonly is found in Chaucer in precisely the sense here intended by ἐσερχόμεθα.
9 Ver. 11.—[Dr. Lange's view would be thus expressed: Do not make such provision for the flesh as to satisfy its lusts. Noyes: Think not about satisfying the lusts of the flesh. Alford: Take not (any) forethought for the flesh, to fulfill its lusts. See the Exeg. Notes—11.]

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

Preliminary Remark.—This section is connected by ver. 7 with the preceding. While the previous section defines the relation of Christians to the State to which they belong as citizens, the present section, on the other hand, regulates their relation to the world in general, in its friendly and hostile side, in fellowship and repulsion; and ver. 7 treats of their relation to authorities in the world in general. We have not merely to do with our own civil authorities and our own State, but also with foreign States and dignitaries. The traveller does not have to pay tribute to a foreign State, but he has to pay duty; in all cases we should exhibit becoming honor and respect toward every one. According to Tholuck, ver. 7 contains "a summary of the various duties toward all kinds of authorities; first of all, toward the subordinate tax-officers, then to judges and magistrates."
CHAPTER XIII. 7-14.

[The view of Tholuck, which is that of Meyer, Philippi, Alford, and most, implies that ver. 7 belongs to the preceding sight the same division seems correct; but, really, ver. 7 is both a hortatory summing up of what precedes, and a transition to the more general admonitions which follow. If τῆς be read (see Textual Note), the latter becomes more prominent; if omitted, the latter.—R.]

Ver. 7. Render to all their dues [ἄποστε πάσι τὰς θεριὰς]. Πάσις. According to Estius, Klee, and others, this refers to all men; according to Meyer [Philippi, and many others], it refers only to magistrates, as if our respect were due to them alone! The antithesis is: Owe no man anything.

To Whom tribute is due (τῷ τὸν φόρον τὸν φόρον). Tholuck, Meyer, and others, would supplement ἀπόστεις by a ἀποτελεῖται. But the addition is already indicated in the τὰς θεριὰς, and δοῦλον follows immediately afterward. Fear and honor are asked from nobody, not even by magistrates, in the form of paying tribute and duty; and even with tribute and duty we should not wait until compelled to pay them. Grotius has supplied δοῦλον; Kelling, δοῦλον; against which Meyer observes, that it is philosophically incorrect, because τῶς does not stand for ὑπὲρ. But were they the reading, the idea of an organic distribution would easily arise; this was avoided by the Apostle's placing τῶς contractively for τοῦτο. According to Grotius, simply the Art. propositum is placed for the subjunctive, which is reversed in chap. xiv. 2. —R.

Custom (τῷ τῷ τίνι). Grotius: vectigalia pro mercedes dantur, tributa pro solo aut capitale. We must, at all events, understand here, by custom, the Roman internal tax on goods. As tributa was due to home authorities, while custom, duties, &c., are due to foreign authorities as well, there seems to be an extension of thought beyond the obligations referred to in verses 1-6. Bengel is quite incorrect in making φόρος the genus, and τίνι the species.

—R.]

[Fear, τὸν φόρον; honor, τὴν τιμήν. Those who receive the reference to magistrates, apply the former word to the proper sentiment and conduct toward the higher magistrates, especially the judges, the latter to magistrates in general (Meyer, Philippi). De Wette, however, refers the former to judges, the latter to magistrates in general, especially the higher ones; while Alford refers to φόρον to those set over us and having power; τιμή, to those, but likewise to all on whom the State has conferred distinction. If the wider view of the verse be accepted, then (with Hodge, Webster and Wilkinson, and others) the one means the reverence paid to superiors, the other, the courtesy due to equals.—R.]

Ver. 8. Owe no man anything [καθενὶ μὴ ἔχων δοῦλον. Dr. Lange renders: Blicht Niemand und Nichts schuldig, which he considers an improvement of the old version: Niemand nichts. —R.] The four preceding categories are here generalized to the idea of the universal duty to our neighbor. Tholuck is doubly inexact when he says: "The Apostle proceeds from the duties of subjects to universal Christian duties." [De Wette: "The Apostle proceeds at once from the residue of morality into her very domain."—R.]

[Except to love one another [τῷ ἕνωσις ἐλεήμονας ἱερὰς. Philippi: "A Pauline argute dictum or acumen,"—R.] In relation to the definite discharges of duty, the Christian should strive to perfect his love, and to keep discharged, his duty in every direction; in relation to love, as the source of duties, he should, on the other hand, be conscious, and constantly be more so, of that infinite and permanent indebtedness. The duties are externally a finitum, but the duty of loving our neighbor remains an infinitum. And the more clear the Christian becomes on one, the more clear he becomes on the other. [Bengel: "Amare, debitem immortaliter. Si amabatis, nil debetis, nam amor immplet legem. Amare, libertas est." So most commentators from the times of Chrysostom. Augustine: "Semper demum charitatem qua sola etiam reedita retinet debitoris" (Ep. 62).—R.]

Ophiiletes is not Indicative (Hebeche, and others), but Imperative, by which the sentence, "except to love one another," means: except that which you cannot pay as a debt. Meyer emphasizes the subjective rendering: Consider yourselves as debtors of love. Even in the "Owe no man anything" there is undoubtedly an appeal made to the consciousness and its method of action. "Hath fulfilled the law. Πλην ἡμεῖς ἐκεῖνος." [Perfect of completed action (Meyer).—R.] It is by love that the fulfillment of the law is fundamentally decided; chap, xiv. 18. Behfeche, and others: Id quod in lege summa est. Instead of this, we must place: Quod legis principium est. That no justification is here implied, is plain, first, from the fact that the Apostle regards this loving as possible only on the ground of justification; and second, from the fact that he lays down this loving, emphatically construed, as an ideal which has not been reached so long as we are still universal debtors in individual matters.

[Although ver. 9 shows that the Mosaic law is meant, yet it is to be doubted whether there is any "apologetic reference to the upholders of the law" (Alford). When De Wette says: "He who practises love, the higher duty, has, even before he does this, fulfilled the law, the lower," he seems to ignore the true position of the law in the Christian dispensation. The law, as a rule of gratitude, is completely fulfilled by love, seems a better view. For the former part of the verse implies that we never attain to this, but still "owe" this love increasingly. Hence the reference here is to the completed ideal. "The expression implies more than a simple performance of the precepts of the law; true love does more than this: it adds a completeness to the performance. It reaches those lesser courtesies and sympathies which cannot be digested into a code and reduced to rule. To the bare framework of law, which is as the bones and sinews, it adds the flesh which fills it, and the life which actuates it?" (Webster and Wilkinson).—R.]

* [This is required by the context with its frequent imperative, and also by the subjective negatives. The indicative would require the subjective, which is very wide, including all possible obligations, and not to be limited to a caution against pecuniary indebtedness. Friesche, and others take συμβεβληται in a different sense in the second clause (a kind of parenthesis): "Owe no man any thing, but ye ought to love one another." This is quite unnecessary, however.—R.]
Ver. 9. For this, Thou shalt not, &c. [τὰ γάρ τὸν και ἢγάπησέν; ] It is self-evident that the Apostle does not take the negative commandments of the Decalogue in a merely literal sense. This is clear also from the prominence which he gives to the last: Thou shalt not covet (Luther: Covet nothing; an emphasizing of the object; chap. vii. 7 is against this). It also follows, from the fact that this perfect negative conduct is not conceivable without a corresponding positive conduct. Tholuck: In the enumeration of the commandments in ver. 9, that respecting adultery precedes the one respecting murder. There is the same order in Codd. Alex. LXX., Exod. vi.; the same in Philo, and in the New Testament, James ii. 11; Mark x. 19; Luke xviii. 20. Philo establishes it, by saying: adultery is the most heinous crime." For further particulars, see Tholuck, p. 694.

Briefly comprehended. Ἀνατρέψατε ἀπαρτισθάνεσθαι. — In the expression there is comprised the idea, that all which is explained from the principle (for example, the Ten Commandments from the law of love) is again summed up in the fulfillment of the principle. Therefore not merely ἀνατρέψατε ἀπαρτισθάνεσθαι (Crysostom). [So Meyer, Tholuck, Philippi: recapitulated; De Wette, Alford: brought under one head. Dr. Lange includes both ideas. Briefly might be omitted from the E. V. with propriety.—B.]

Ver. 10. Love worketh no ill to his neighbor. [Philippi remarks that the Greeks usually write ἔργασαίον τινα, while Paul here has; τω πλησιόν κακόν οίκα ἔργασαι.—R.] The Apostle's maxim, in the form of an oxymoron, substantiates what has already been said, since love appears as the great positive fulfillment of the law, because it worketh no ill to the neighbor. (Defined, in the main, negatively) of the Decalogue becomes the measure of the perfection (defined, in the main, positively) of the gospel.

[Love therefore is the fulfillment of the law, πλήρωμα οίνον ἀγάπης. Fulfillment, rather than "fulfilling," which would be the proper rendering of πλήρωμα. Meyer: "In the love to one's neighbor, that takes place by means of which the law is fulfilled." He further adds, that in 1 Cor. xiii. 4-7; Paul gives a commentary on that respecting the commandments in ver. 8: εἰ δέ μη μηδέν ὁμολογόω. But not only is this acceptance of the remote, but there is also here a change from the second person to the first. If we look at the actual connection, the Apostle cannot simply say: Let us do that —love our neighbor as ourselves. The more direct thought is: Let us discharge all our obligations, for we know that the end is nigh. But the Apostle does not say: "the end is nigh," but, "the day of salvation is nigh." Therefore it is advisable to accept the εἰ δέ· προς τὸν καὶ τὸν ἐκάθεν ἐκαθάρισθαι, or, ἐκάθεν ἐκαθάρισθαι. Because we know that love, which fulfills the law, is present, we know the importance of the time, namely, that the time of perfect salvation is nigh. To what extent? Because, by love, the works of night must vanish—

adultery, murder, theft, covetousness; therefore the day of the complete righteousness of life must dawn. If this combination be deemed doubtful, Meyer's construction should then be preferred.

[Dr. Lange's view is indeed doubtful. On the whole, it seems unnecessary to supply any thing, but rather (with Hodge, Meyer, Philippi, and many others) to take καὶ as = et quidem, and indeed, the rather, and to refer τὸ εὖ to what precedes,—εἰ, to the injunction of verse 8, as afterwards expanded. In this, it is clear usage, though τοῖς is more common in such cases than τοῖς. The demonstrative pronoun is thus used "to mark the importance of the connection between two circumstances for the case in hand" (Hodge). Luther and Glöckler confute the construction, by joining τοῖς with ἔδοτες. The participle is not = considering (Grotius, Hodge, and others), but is causal, since ye know.—The time. This is explained by the next clause, that it is high time.—R.]

To awake out of sleep [ἐφευρεθή] Dr. Lange paraphrases thus in his text: "to fully arise, or, that we should immediately have arisen."—R. How very metaphorical a meaning the Apostle gives to the word, as a designation of the sleep of sin, and of the darkness and bondage of the judgment of conscience by the blindness of sin, is plain from his subsequently describing this excited, external watching, as works of darkness. According to Reiche, ἐφευρεθή is an image of the Christian's condition on earth; this is opposed by Meyer, p. 481. [This condition of sleep is that of Christians also, as the verse obviously implies, but only relatively so (Philippi, De Wette, and others).—R.]

For now is our salvation nearer [ἔφυσα καὶ ἀνανεόμενον ἡμῶν ἡ σωτηρία.] With Luther, and most commentators, we refer the ἡμῶν to ἡ σωτηρία, and not, with Meyer, to ἐγυμ- τέρον; because it would not be like Paul to say that salvation, absolutely considered, is already brought nearer to us believers. Ἀσωτηρία is here the completion of the redemptive salvation of the messianic kingdom. Therefore Meyer says: "This kingdom begins by means of the second coming of Christ, which Paul regarded near (Usteri, Lehrbegriff, p. 353). It was by not recognizing this—although Paul did so—incidentally in the calculation the short time from his conversion to the period of his writing—that men have been induced to accept very preposterous interpretations; for example, that salvation by death is meant (Photius, and others), or the destruction of Jerusalem, which was of good results for Christianity (according to the earlier commentators, and also Michaelis), or the inward σωτηρία, the spiritual salvation of Christianity (Mirus, and others)."

According to Tholuck, we can only grant that Paul indulged the hope of the speedy coming of Christ—perhaps even to live to see it—but yet that he had no fixed period of time for it. According to Meyer's rude view, we would have to imagine, with the Ebionites, a twofold σωτηρία; one of which, the spiritual salvation, has already happened; the other, the second coming of Christ, is near at hand, while between the two there is to be a gloomy period. But all this is not the view of the Apostle. Rather, the first or principal σωτηρία, which is already the saving possession of Christians, is in the course of permanent and full development toward the final, peripheral salvation. There is a daily
progress from σωτηρία to σωτηρία. And, particularly with Paul, a new era of the development of σωτηρία will come, after Christianity shall have spread from Rome throughout the whole West, which, according to the purpose of the Epistle, is near at hand; and, with this Christianization of the Roman world, the completed σωτηρία will be brought nearer. These great, vital, and dynamic views of the Apostle are very different from the modern assumptions of the Parousia imputed to him. Tholuck: "The period from the appearance of the regnum gratiae, when accompanied with its glory, is described as a nocturnal period. Spiritual truths will be shaken off when the regnum gratiae comes to men (Col. i. 15, 18); and how much more will this be the fact when the regnum gloriosum approaches!"

[Stuart, Hodge, Webster and Wilkinson, and a large class of commentators, understand by σωτηρία, the consummation of salvation in eternity—deliverance from the present evil world. Dr. Hodge objects at some length to the reference to the second coming of Christ. On the other hand, most modern German commentators defend this reference. Olshausen, De Wette, Philippi, Meyer, and others, think no other view in the least degree tenable; and Dr. Lange, while careful to guard against extreme theories on this point, denies the reference to eternal blessedness, and admits that the Parousia is intended. This opinion gains ground among Anglo-Saxon exegetes. The main objection to it is thus met by Dean Alford: "Without denying the legitimacy of an individual application of this truth, and the importance of its consideration for all Christians of all ages, a fair exegesis of this passage can hardly fail to recognize the fact that the Apostle, here as well as elsewhere (1 Thess. iv. 17; 1 Cor. xv. 51), speaks of the coming of the Lord as rapidly approaching." As to this being inconsistent with inspiration, he refers to Mark xiii. 32: "Of that day and hour knoweth no man," &c. "The fact that the nearness or distance of that day was unknown to the Apostles, in no way affects the prophetic announcements of God's Spirit by them, concerning its preceding and accompanying circumstances. The 'day and hour' formed no part of their inspiration; the details of the event did. And this distinction has singularly and providentially turned out to the edification of all subsequent ages. While the prophetic declarations of the events of that time remain to instruct us, the eager expectation of the time, which they express in their day, has also remained, a token of the true frame of mind in which each succeeding age (and each succeeding age à fortiori) should contemplate the ever-approaching coming of the Lord. On the certainty of the event, our faith is grounded; by the uncertainty of the time, our hope is stimulated and our watchfulness aroused." This ignorance of the time of the coming of Christ Dr. Hodge himself brings forward, yet not to account for the expectation so much as to deny it. It is difficult for an unlettered believer to read the New Testament and not find this expectation, while even the most learned commentators now find it.—R.]

Then when we believed. (Calvin, and others), Luther says incorrectly: Then when we believed it. [The aorist refers to the definite time, when we first believed. So 1 Cor. iii. 5; xv. 2, &c.—R.]

Ver. 12. The night is far spent, &c. [v. 13 περί ημηνίας, &c.] According to Meyer, the night would be the time before the second coming of Christ; and the near day, on the other hand, the second coming itself. Certainly we do not read that the night is gone, but the day is come." But I do not think from this Paul supposed that the day would not break until the second coming. The day will break a hundred times, in ever greater potencies, between the first and the second coming of Christ. Consequently, a chronological antithesis is not here in question. The night is the spiritual condition of heathen Rome; the breaking day is the future of Christian Rome. 'H νυξ προεξον. [The sense of the passage in itself considered is perfectly plain; but the precise reference is determined by the determination of ver. 11. Admitting such recurring daybreaks as Dr. Lange suggests, they are still only preludes to "that day" when there shall be "no night."—R.]

Let us therefore cast off the works of darkness [αποστάσεως ὑπάρχον τῶν τούτων σκοτεινῶν. The verb should be rendered: put off, if the figure of clothing be admitted; put away, if Dr. Lange's view be accepted.—R.] Meyer: "As soon lays off his clothing. This view (against Fritzsch) corresponds to the correlative ἀποστάσεως; comp. on Eph. iv. 22." [So De Wette, Philip, Harless, Hodge, Alford, Webster and Wilkinson, Jowett, and most.—R.] But the works of darkness are not the same as the clothing of night. There is a difference between nocturnal revels and nocturnal clothing. The moral side of the heathen, and especially the Roman, night-life, moves before the Apostle, and he makes it designate evil works in moral darkness in general. The Roman of that time, giving himself up to diabolical nocturnal feasts and works of debauchery, but, on the return of day, assuming the favorite Roman costume of arms—a very perceptible contrast to these Roman Christians—is presented to them by the Apostle as a picture of a moral and religious contrast.

And let us put on the armour of light [ἐν ἐνυφασίᾳ ἐνυφασίας τοῖς ἄκλατοι ὁμήρους. See Textual Note]. Not instruments (Morns, clothes (Reza, and others), shining arms (Grotius), but the armor which the Roman wears by day, as a figure of the spiritual means of conflict, and of the conflicts which belong to the light; they are presented by it, and wielded in its element (see Eph. vi. 18). The light is the master from whom, for whom, and with whom, this armor is,—"Ενυφασίας." Tholuck: "The figure of most intimate union of the garment with the body. Gal. iii. 27; Eph. iv. 24; Col. iii. 10. Also in the classics, see Wetstein."

Ver. 18. Let us walk seemly, as in the day [ὡς ἐν ἡμερίᾳ τοιοῦτῳ περιπατήσωμεν]. As if that day had already come, when it will be a characteristic of public respectability to live a moral Christian life, and therefore to live decorously. "Ενυφασίας [referring to the moral decorum of the conduct (Meyer).—R.] 1 Thess. iv. 12; 1 Cor. vii. 35; xiv. 40, because that day is already breaking.

Not in rioting, &c. [Webster and Wilkinson: "Three classes of sins are specified, to each of which two words are appropriated, viz., intemperance, impurity, discord: the first, public or social vice; the second, private and secret vice; the third, *[Dr. Hodge: "Those virtues and good deeds which men are not ashamed of, because they will be seen to be good.]

Too one-sided an conception of the figure. Alford: "The arms belonging to a soldier of light." The Christian's clothing as a child of the day is: armour.—R.]
eclesiasticopolitical vice, the vice infecting communities even Christian." To this must be added Meyer's remark, that the three members stand in the internal relation of cause and effect. Comp. Gal. v. 19-21 ( Lange's Comm., p. 158), where five of the six words are found.—R.-Kánoa, carouse.-Meyer translates, 'with nocturnal riotings,' by regarding the following datives as the darling of manner. This will not apply well to παραδείsein. [Philippi takes the dative as local, which seems the simplest view. Fritzsche, dat. commodi.—R.]

Rom. 1, 21-23. Envy, covetousness, chambers, and houses of debauchery, works of debauchery itself. [Wantonness, ἀσιλεύεις. On this word, see Tittmann, Syn., p. 161. The plural shows that the various manifestations of wantonness are referred to.-R.]

Envy, covetousness, jealousy. The reverse side of nocturnal lusts and pleasures is nocturnal quarrels, especially matters of jealousy, and the forms still prevailing among the works of darkness in our day, especially in Italy and Spain.

Ver. 14. But put ye on the Lord Jesus Christ. Ἐνδιδομένων, Gal. iii. 27; Eph. iv. 24; Col. iii. 10. [Hodge: 'To be intimately united to Him, so that He, and not we, may appear.'] So also Wettstein, Th. R.] Christ was already put on at baptism, Gal. iii. 27; but this ἐνδιδομένων, just as the being light, must also be continually renewed. Besides, we must take into consideration the aorist form: The putting on as a garment denotes the entrance of the most intimate communion. Meyer: 'Even in the classics, ἐνδιδομένων ὁ παράσκευα denotes assuming somebody's manner of thought and action.'

And make not provision for the flesh, &c. καὶ τὴν σαρκόν προνοεῖς μὴ ποιῆσαι τῇ ἐπιθυμίᾳ. Dr. Lange: Und die Pflege des Fleisches macht euch nicht zur Pflege der Lüste; and of the care of the flesh do not make for yourselves a care of its lusts. The order of the Greek seems to favor this, but this implies a proper care of the flesh; so that this can only be a tenable view provided σαρκόν does not have an ethical sense here. On this point, see below; Wettstein, Th. R. Luther's translation is doubly incorrect: Take care of the body, yet so that, &c. First, the sentence is not divided into a positive and negative precept; second, the question is concerning the σαρκί, and not concerning the σώμα. The sentence contains the expression of the moral limitation of the external perception of a self-evident duty. The duty is προνοεῖς τῆς σαρκὸς; the enjoined limitation is the μὴ τῆς ἐπιθυμίᾳ. According to Fritzsche, σαρκί can only be understood as caro libidinosa, and therefore the whole sentence is a prohibition. Tholuck and Meyer, on the other hand, observe that the σαρκί, understood in this sense as sensual lust, should even be crucified; Gal. v. 24. Meyer describes the σαρκί, as it is here understood, as the lower animal part of man, the fountain and seat of sensual and sinful desires, in antithesis to the σωματί. His calling σαρκί the material of the σωματί is better. [Philippi: 'σαρκί has here a purely physiological sense.']

DOCTRINAL AND ETHICAL.

1. The debt of love denotes the duty of love for our neighbor, as, according to the law, it is a requirement of infinite force; and, according to the believer's new principle of life, it is an infinitely impulsive power. The unity of this debt divides itself into the differently formed obligations of various duties to our neighbor.

2. Love is the fulfillment of the law: (1) So far as the whole law is only an outline of love to be filled up. (2) So far as it precludes every transgression of the law. (3) On the other hand, every commandment is realized as a vital principle in the new life. It is as love that God has given the law, as our call to our destination. It is as love that Christ has fulfilled the law for our reconciliation. It is as love that the law of the Spirit lives in our faith, and, by the fellowship of Christ, supplies the defects of our deeds, so that, in the imitation of Christ, that fellowship may ever be elevated higher and higher.

3. The new era of love, a dayspring of the new era of light, with which the completion of salvation approaches. 4. If we would define more specifically the relation of Paul, as well as of all the apostles, to the second coming of Christ, we must distinguish: (1) Between the religious measure (Zeitmaas, measure of time) of God's kingdom, and the chronological measure of the world; (2) Between the apostolic prospect of a future of glory which will be unfolded every day in new morning periods, and the measure...
ness of the Ebionitic idea, which has only a marvelous meteor of the Parousia, on the one hand, far behind it, and, on the other, far before it, while it finds itself placed in a troublous period and an ordinary course of the world. The present age in principle ceased at the death and resurrection of Christ, and the future age is already present in the heart of the Church and in the world's great crisis of development, though everywhere still externally surrounded by the nocturnal shades of the old age. And because it has been long present in principle, and in power breaks forth every day more gloriously, our full salvation is brought continually nearer, particularly in all the great epochs of the extensive and intensive enlargement of God's kingdom—all of which are presages of the Parousia, which is infinitely near to religious anticipation, and yet, chronologically, is indeterminably remote. All that must still precede that external Parousia, Paul indicates in Rom. xi. and 2 Thess. ii., and John elaborately describes in figures in the Book of Revelation.

5. The very fact that wickedness seeks the veil of night, is a witness for God's word; and as night is an image of spiritual darkness, and day is an image of spiritual and heavenly light, so are the works of night—sleep, on the one hand, and sinful nocturnal deeds on the other—images of different forms of spiritual corruption, the gross sins, which, indeed, are not only figures, but also phenomena, of spiritual corruptions. On the other hand, the putting on of the day, the armor of the day, have their spiritual meaning. The armor was a striking figure to the Romans in particular.

6. The two great antitheses of nocturnal life: Lust and strife, pleasure and murder.

7. With the salvation of Christianity to the believer there has also broken for humanity the morning of morality, of good manners, and of true decorum.

8. The 13th verse is an imperishable reminder of Augustine's conversion (see Conf. viii. 12, 28).

HOMILETICAL AND PRACTICAL.

Vers. 7. To every one his due! The Christian's royal motto: 1. In reference to his relation to the civil authority; 2. In his intercourse with every man.

HEUBNER: The respect which we, as Christians, owe to the civil authorities, is more than the external fulfilment of duty.

Vers. 8-10. Perseverance in love. It is: 1. In respect to our neighbor a debt, which never can be paid; 2. In respect to the law, it is its fulfilment (vers. 8-10).—The debt of love toward our neighbor: 1. It is a very great debt; a, because there are so many creditors; b, because their demands constitute a very important total; c, because it can never be completely cancelled. 2. But it is nevertheless a sweet debt; a, because it is not thoughtlessly paid; b, because it harmonizes with God's commandment; c, because even the attempt to discharge it makes the heart very happy (vers. 8-10).—The debt of love is the only debt of the Christian toward his neighbor which is not only permissible, but even commanded (vers. 9).—The commandment of love toward our neighbor is the substance of all the commandments of the second table (ver. 9).—Why does love work no ill to the neighbor? 1. Because it proceeds from the root of God's eternal love for men; 2. Because it will serve God in the neighborhood (ver. 10).—Love the fulfillment of the law. 1. The truth of this apostolic sentiment; 2. The importance of it (ver. 10).

STERKE: The heart is known by its behavior just as the sun is by its beams (ver. 9).—Christ's garden not only produces no injurious trees, but even no useless ones (ver. 10).—Hermann: The eternal debt of love! Do not weary, brethren! He who loves, will be loved in return; though it be not by the thankless world, it will be by God (ver. 8).—Let no one excuse himself on the ground of ignorance; let no one say, "Who would know the many commandments and prohibitions?" The whole law is contained in the one word love; Micah vi. 4 (ver. 9).

Spenk: There is one debt which we all owe—to love one another; that is such a debt, that, if we should daily count it up, it would always remain just as great as it had been (ver. 8).—Though a thing may sometimes appear to be forbidden, if love requires it, it is not forbidden, but rather commanded; on the other hand, sometimes something may appear to be commanded, but if it is in conflict with love, it is not commanded (ver. 10).

Gerlach: The debt of love is never wholly payable; its fulfilment increases the demands made upon it, for it makes love warmer (ver. 8).

Lecou: The believer's love fulfills its obligations even toward every body without exception (vers. 8-10).—The one requirement of love is divided into two chief commandments, in Matt. xxii. 37-40.—Heubner: The magnitude of the commandment of love (vers. 8-10).—The harmonizing of the Divine should and the human would can only take place by love; by it, compulsion is transformed into freedom (ver. 9).—Every wicked thing is invariably an unkindness (ver. 10).

Bessere: He who shows love to another in order to get clear of him, has not love (ver. 8).

Schweizer: Love, the fulfilment of the law, or, love performs what the law cannot obtain. The law does not deliver us: 1. Because it is a multiplicity of commandments and prohibitions, which perplex us; 2. Because it pronounces a curse on every one who transgresses a single point; 3. Because it is presented to us as an external power issuing its commands to us; 4. Because it takes refuge in threats and promises. Christian love is the contrary of all this.

Vers. 8-10. The Periodos for the Fourth Sunday after Epiphany.—Trym: The royal law of love toward our neighbor: 1. Its great necessity; 2. Its inward nature; 3. Its indescribable blessing.—Haus: Love is the fulfilment of the law. 1. The law, a, which makes love for us an indebtedness; b, and therefore the holy law loves to be pleased; and c, which knows no indebtedness except to love; b, and therefore does not come from the law, but from faith.—Heubner: The simplicity of Christian virtue: 1. It proceeds from one spirit of humility and love; 2. All its effects harmonize in one—the manifestation of love.

Vers. 1-14. The decided breach of believing Christians with darkness: 1. Wherefore should we break off from it? a, because it is time to do it; b, because it is high time. 2. In what should this breach consist? a, in laying off the works of darkness; a, gross, sensual sins; b, subtle, inward sins; b, in putting on the armor of light; c, in walking honestly as in the day; d, in putting on the Lord
JESUS CHRIST (or, a. civil righteousness; b. righteousness of faith).

LUTHER: Do not torture the body excessively by the intolerable holiness of watching, fasting, and freezing, as the hypocrites do (ver. 14).

STARKER: I must show outwardly what I am inwardly. Those who are inwardly good, must also have a good form and color (ver. 19).—QUINSEY: Time passes by, and eternity presses on (ver. 19).—MULLER: There is many a thing and idea comprised in putting on Christ; our Christianity is not a stagnant existence, but a growth; it is no leap, but a walk (ver. 12).—The armor of light well becomes a Christian. We must either clothe ourselves with darkness or with light (ver. 12).

SPENCER: Let us put on the Lord Jesus Christ. But we put Him on once by the belief that we receive, as our possession, His righteousness and merit, which He has imparted to us, and that we appear in them alone before God's throne. We afterward put Him on also by godly imitation, in walking as Christ has walked (ver. 14).

Lisco: The one care for the body, in bestowing upon it what is necessary, is natural; the other is sinful, when the lusts and desires of the body are preferred for every stroke of the bell—the Bible (ver. 11).—The Christian is not a night-walker, a nocturnal robber, but a walker by day (ver. 13).—Temperance, chastity, love—three great prime virtues (ver. 13).—Schweitzer: Blessful joy at the Reformation as a rising light (Serm. on the Anniversary Day of the Reformation).—Vers. 11-14. THE PERICOPAE FOR THE FIRST SUNDAY OF ADVENT.—HERRER: The call of Christianity is a call to awake from spiritual sleep. The appeal of Christian watchmen: 1. It is the day; the sun is risen! 2. Awake, arise! 3. Be purified to new life! 4. Put on Christ!—Nzoth: The awakening voice with which the Church appeals to us on its holy days, tells us: 1. What time it is; 2. What it is high time to do. —KAPP: The advent message: 1. As a message of salvation and joy; 2. As a message for penitence and renewal. —Florey: The advent season is a holy morning-time of the heart and life.—HALESS: The festal ornament well-pleasing to Christ: 1. A watchful eye, to see the night that covers the earth; 2. An enlightened eye, to behold the day which has come; 3. A willing heart, to do what the day requires.—Petri: What time is it for us? 1. To arise from sleep; 2. To put on the armor of light.—Ratemberg: What belongs to rising from sleep? 1. To open the eyes aright; 2. To put on the right garment; 3. To take up the right armor.—Thym: Paul's vigorous advent preaching: 1. On the advent time; 2. On the advent duties; 3. On the advent blessing.

FARMER, on ver. 14: Look into Christ's wardrobe, and you will find no torn or ragged apparel. Christ had the robe of righteousness, the garment of innocence, the spotless coat of temperance and chastity, and with these He went about doing good. Out of this wardrobe we must make up our wedding garment. We must be conformable to Christ. In the rule of our obedience, we must not wear a garment of our own fancying, an irregular, an unsuperscribed devotion; in the end of it, we must glorify God on the earth; and in the parts of it, we must not have a parcel garment. This garment must fit every part, and be universal.

[LEIGHTON: He that truly loves his neighbor as himself, will be as loth to wrong him as to wrong himself, either in that honor and respect that is due to him, or in his life, or chastity, or goods, or good name, or to lodge so much as an unjust desire or thought, because that is the beginning and conception of real injury. In a word, the great disorder and crookedness of the corrupt heart of man consists in self-love; it is the very root of all sin both against God and man; for no man commits any offence, but it is in some way to profit or please himself. It was a high enormity of self-love that brought forth the very first sin of mankind. That was the bait which took, more than either the color or the taste of the apple—that it was desirable for knowledge.

[JOHN HOWE, on ver. 10: Would it not make a happy world, if we all so loved our neighbor: 1. That we would no more hurt him than we would ourselves; 2. Would no more cheat him than we would ourselves; 3. No more oppress and crush him than we would ourselves. What a spring of mischief and misery in the world would be shut up, dried up, if righteousness were frequently unjust thoughts, were, by the workings of such a spirit of love, erased out of the minds and hearts of men!]

[BERRY, on ver. 14: This implies: 1. That the soul of man, since the fall, is in a naked state, destitute of those divine graces of the Holy Spirit which were its original clothing in the day of undeceived innocence; 2. That Jesus Christ is our spiritual clothing, a. In His righteousness, to pardon and justify us, He is our clothing, to cover the guilt of sin out of God's sight; b. In His grace, to sanctify us, by which He cleanses us from our sins, pollution, and filthiness; c. That Jesus Christ, in order to our spiritual clothing, must be put on by faith: an unapplied Christ justifies none, saves none. It was not sufficient, under the law, that the blood of the sacrifice was shed, but it was also to be sprinkled, in order to the expiation of guilt.]

[DODDRIDGE, on ver. 14: By putting on the Lord Jesus: 1. We make the gospel day yet brighter in the eyes of all around us; 2. We anticipate, while here in this world of comparative darkness, the lustre with which we hope, through Christ's influence and grace, to shine forth in the celestial kingdom of our Father.

[JOHN WEBSTER: The whole law under which we now are, is fulfilled by love. Faith, working or animated by love, is all that God now requires of man. He has substituted, not sincerity, but love, for angelic perfection.—Very excellent things are spoken of love—it is the essence, the spirit, the life of all virtue. It is not only the first and great command, but all the commands in one.

[RICHARD WATSON, Sermon on the Armor of Light (ver. 12): 1. What the armor of light is, with which the Apostle exhorts us to invest ourselves. II. Why has the appellation of "armor of light": (1) Because it is heavenly origin; (2) Because it is only found where Christianity exists and exerts its proper influence; (3) Because it corresponds to the character of our dispensation, which is a dispensation of light. III. The motives which should induce us, in compliance with the exhortation, to array ourselves with it: (1) From a.
consideration of the degraded state of man, who is not invested with this armor; (2.) The moral elevation which this armor gives to every one who is invested with it; (3.) We must either conquer or be conquered.

FIFTH SECTION.—The true practice of the living worship of God in the management and adjustment of differences between the stingy and weak (the captives under the law), and the strong (those inclined to laxity and freedom). The Christian universalism of social life (to take no offence, to give no offence).

CHAPTER XIV. 1-XV. 4.

C. Reciprocal indulgence by self-denial, after the example of Christ. Chap. xv. 2-4


1 Him that is weak in the faith receive ye, but not to doubtful disputations
2 [judgments of thoughts]. For one believeth that he may eat all things:
3 another, [but he] who is weak, eateth herbs. Let not him that eateth [or, the eater] despise him that eateth not [or, the abstainer]; and let not him which eateth not [or, the abstainer] judge him that eateth [or, the eater]: for God
4 hath received him. Who art thou that judgest another man's servant? to his own master he standeth or falleth; yea, he shall be holden up [made to stand]:
5 for God [the Lord] is able [to make him stand. One man esteemeth one day
above another; another esteemeth every day alike. Let every man be fully
6 persuaded in his own mind. He that [who] regardeth the day, regardeth it
unto the Lord; and he that regardeth not the day, to the Lord he doth not regard it [omit this clause]. He that [And he] who eateth, eateth to the Lord, for he giveth God thanks [thanks unto God]; and he that [who] eateth not, to
7 the Lord he eateth not, and giveth God thanks [thanks unto God]. For none
8 of us liveth to himself, and no man [none] dieth to himself. For whether we
live, we live unto the Lord; and whether we die, we die unto the Lord:
9 whether we live therefore, or die, we are the Lord's. For to this end Christ
both died, and rose, and revived [Christ died and lived again], that he might
10 be Lord both of the dead and [the] living. But why dost thou judge thy
brother? or why dost thou set at nought thy brother? for we shall all stand
11 before the judgment-seat of Christ [God]. For it is written, [As I live, saith
the Lord, every knee shall bow to me, and every tongue shall confess [give
12 praise] to God. So then every one of us shall give] an account of himself to
13 God. Let us not therefore judge one another any more:

B. Chap. xiv. 13-xv. 1.

13 But judge this rather, that no man [not to] put a stumbling-block or an
14 occasion to fall [of falling] in his [a] brother's way. I know, and am per
suaded by [in] the Lord Jesus, that [there is nothing [that nothing is] unclean
of itself: but to him that esteemeth any thing to be [accounteth any thing]
15 unclean, to him it is unclean. But [For] if thy brother be grieved with thy
meat [if because of thy meat thy brother is grieved], now walkest thou not
charitably [thou art no longer walking according to love]. Destroy not him
16 with thy meat, [Destroy not by thy meat him] for whom Christ died. Let not
17 then your [a] good be evil spoken of: For the kingdom of God is not meat and
drink [eating and drinking]; but righteousness, and peace, and joy in the Holy
18 Ghost. For he that [who] in these things [herein] serveth Christ is accept
able [well-pleasing] to God, and approved of men. Let us therefore follow after the things which make for peace [the things which pertain to mutual edification].
19 For meat destroy not the work of God. All things indeed are pure [clean];
20 but it is evil for that [the] man who eateth with [through] offence. It is good
neither [not] to eat flesh, nor to drink wine, nor [to do] any thing whereby
[wherein] thy brother stumbleth, or is offended," or is made [said] weak.
21 Hast thou faith? " have it to thyself before God. Happy [Blessed] is he that condemneth [who judgeth] not himself in that thing [said] which he
doth alloweth. And [But] he that [who] doubteth is damned [condemned] if he eat, because he eateth [it] is not of faith: for [and] whatsoever is not of faith is sin.

Chap. xv. 1 We then [Now we who] that are strong ought to bear the infirmities of the weak, and not to please ourselves.

G. Chap. xv. 2-4.

2 Let " every one of us please his neighbour for his good [with a view] to edification. For even Christ pleased not himself; but, as it is written," The four prepossessions of which reproached thee fell on me. For whatsoever were things written aforetime were written [for] our learning [instruction], that we through [the] patience and [the] comfort of the Scriptures might have [our] hope.

TEXTUAL.
CHAPTER XIV. I.-XV. 4

11 Ver. 13.—[B. D. F.: ἔκτριος; Lachmann, Tregelles. N. A. C. D. L.: άδεις; Philipp. Meyer, De Wette, Alford bracket ἀδείον, hence the reader is to be preferred. The sense is ambiguous which support διδασκαλιά, insert αὐτῷ. See Tischendorf.] This is curred by Alford in favor of διδασκαλία (Rec.). A. D. F. G. L. read: αὐτῷ (by which Tregelles adds B. Birch). The reading of the Rec. is adopted by Alford, but most modern editors follow the mass of ancient authorities. The only remaining dispute whether it should be αὐτὸν or αὐτῷ. The former is adopted by Griesbach, Knapp, Tholuck, De Wette, Meyer, Lange; the latter by Lachmann, Wermuth, Jowett, Tischendorf, Alford, Wordsworth. Only the former (in favor of διδασκαλία) has Bunsen's explanation: τὸ διδασκαλία will sustain the former. Tischendorf varies (comp. his 7th ed., p. 58). See Winer, p. 143.

12. [In A. B. C. D. F. G., Vulgate, and others: ές η διδασκαλία; adopted by Griesbach, Lachmann, Tischendorf, Tholuck, Alford, Wordsworth, Jowett, Tregelles, Lange (with no uncial authorities) some versions: ές η, adopted by Philippi, Hodge, De Wette, and the older editors. Dr. Hodge, in his new edition, states the exegetical variety of the latter reading, but is hardly justified in adding: 'the majority of commentators and editors retain the common text for the better supported reading is the more difficult one, hence doubly preferable on critical grounds. See the Exeg. Notes.' Stuart says the sense seems to require ές η, but takes no notice of the fact that it is read in the uncial MSS.

13. Ver. 16.—A. B. C. D. F. G., a number of versions (Vulgate, Peshito), some fathers, read: ἐνθέος. A gloss, which is useful in the interpretation of the verse. It shows that τὸ διδασκαλία was early referred to something which was a possession of the whole Church, not of a party in the Roman Church. Comp. the Exeg. Notes.

14. The Christians at Rome, in their various general, fundamental relations: (1.) As duties toward the Church; (2.) In all personal relations; (3.) Toward the State; and, (4.) Toward the world, he proceeds to lay down the universal deportment of the Roman Church, by establishing the proper reciprocal conduct between the strong (ἀντίπαθος) and the weak (ἀντίκειται, chap. xv. 1; αὐτοῦτον, chap. xiv. 1). In the first place, it is manifest that such a difference existed. This is especially evident from chap. xv. 7-9. Second, it is likewise evident that the one tendency springing from Judaism was a legally punctilious tendency; while the other, being connected with heathen culture and freedom, was more liberal. This is supported in a very general way by the connection of this opposition with freedom, as well as by the forms of opposition which the Apostle treats in his Epistles to the Corinthians, Galatians, Colossians, &c. There is the following characteristic of the antithesis: (1.) In regard to faith, the freedom of faith, while others are strong in this respect (chap. xiv. 21, 22). Some lay stress on their (under conditions which are not stated) eating no meat, drinking no wine (ver. 21), and keeping certain holy-days. The others know that they are free in this respect, and, proud of their freedom, and regarding of the consequence, seem inclined to use it at the expense of fellowship and unanimity. It is therefore the contrast of the punctilious and the large-hearted and liberal conscience (that is, decisions of conscience). Hence it is also characteristic of the former class, that they are inclined to judge, to take offence; and of the others, that they are inclined to despise, and thus to give offence. This contrast is so definite, that we do not hesitate to divide the section accordingly. Further, it follows from this that the more liberal party—we might even say the Pauline—was decidedly in the ascendency (particularly according to chap. xiv. 1 and xv. 1), since it was necessary to make the repeated admonition, not to break off fellowship with the others. Though the Jewish-Christian element in the Church was a numerous one, it does not follow that the element of punctilious believers was equally large.

15. Finally, it is absolutely necessary to distinguish the standpoint of these punctilious believers as well from the very marked (alike in degree, but in fact divided) standpoints of the Galatians and Colossians.
false teachers, as from the not less marked but yet already schematic standpoint of the Petrine party of
Corinth. The Apostle designates the Galatian false teachers, in chap. ii. 4, as false brethren; he
conditionally excludes the theory of circumcision, in the
false teachers therein in their dogmatically false gospel,
and would make circumcision (which is at the same
time the requirement of the legal standpoint) a
necessary condition of Christian salvation. By these
Ebionites there can only be meant Pharisaic, purely
Jewish, people.* The Colossian false teachers are,
indeed, not less false brethren, because they likewise
adulterate the ground of salvation by dogmatic
confusion, but their characteristic plainly leads to the
supposition of Essene Ebionites, for their worships
of angels and their asceticism indicate an infus-
on of heathen elements into Judaism.† There
were also such false brethren elsewhere (2 Cor. xi.
26); and the false apostles in 2 Cor. xi, 13 were,
undoubtedly, actually connected with the Galatian
false teachers. The Petrine party itself, however,
which does not seem to be the first, has to ex-
tend the same dogmatic basis, and also exercise
its factitious and indications to separation, must be
distinguished from those agitators, who furthered
the doctrinal adulteration of the law. Yet
the case stood still better with the weak
brethren in Rome. The Apostle treats them so
gently, that we can evidently not take them for decidedly
Ebionitic Christians, nor according to the degree
and manner of the Galatian and Colossian false
teachers, nor—according to the initiates of Ebionism
in the Corinthian church. He forbids them only
from pronouncing sentence, from their own con-
ciousness a standpoint, upon their more liberal
brethren; whereas, he even takes their right of con-
science against the more liberal brethren under his
protection; and there is nothing said of an anath-
ema, as in the Epistle to the Galatians, nor of a warn-
ing, as in the Epistle to the Colossians, nor of a con-
science, as in the Epistles to the Corinthians, to say
nothing of the severe criticisms in the Pastoral
Epistles. If the Apostle could have expressed such
different opinions on the same Ebionitic phantom of
Dr. Baur, his character itself would be to us a phan-
tom; that is, all theology would itself have to be gradually transformed into a phantom.
† Judging regarding the mild judgment expressed by
the Apostle on the weak brethren in the Church at
Rome, we are therefore aided in finding out the
character of their standpoint. Various suppositions:

* A comparison of the two Epistles will show how
much more sharply defined is the defence of the liberty of
the gospel in the Galatian epistle. There, the Apostle
appears as a champion of our freedom; here, as a judicious
guide to those whom the truth was making free. The
difference in tone is a striking proof of pedagogic wisdom.
—B.
† Comp. Lange's Comm. Odours, Introd., p. 7, where
the character of these false teachers is discussed. The
effort to define them by means of the nomenclature of
subsequent heresies has led to the greatest variety of opin-
of. The Ebionites do not date back of the
destruction of Jerusalem. They were Essene, undoubtedly;
their views might be called Ebionite; yet, when we recall
the Pythagorean character, and Jewish elements in that re-
must in that region, we see the seeds which were then only
springing up, to bear fruit in the heresies so prolific in that
region. Pythagorean Ebionism in the gem, is, perhaps, the
best definition.—B.
‡ [The rebuke was mild indeed then, but how pronounced its meaning as we regard to-day. Could one expect
from these words: "Who are thou that judgest another man's servant?"
He who is strongest in the Roman Church of to-day, is "weak," ac-
cording to the Apostle's judgment.—B.]
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luck cites Daniel (chap. i. 8, 12, 16), Esther (chap. iv. 16), Tobias (chap. i. 12), and the Maccapees (2 Macc. v. 27). The gradations (cited by Tholuck) of this scrupulousness on the part of the punctilious Jews, do not here come into consideration, as the weak brethren, according to Philippi's observation, did not withdraw from eating with the Gentiles (?) and the Gentile Christians. Likewise, the decree in Acts xv. is justifiably cited in favor of the view presented. Tholuck, with Philippi, is right in not admitting that, because of an adherence to special holidays, there were two parties among the weak brethren.

4. Various views. According to Erasmus, and others, both the tradition of laws respecting food and the fear of eating meat offered to idols, were motives. According to Chrysostom, and others, they would refrain from all meat, to escape blame, in consequence of the Jewish disfain of swine-meat. According to Eichhorn, these people were generally Gentile-Christian ascetics, who entertained philosophic and ascetic principles, especially the Neopythagorean. Meyer supposes the "influence of Essene principles," yet so that they are not led into conflict with justification by faith; however, he opposes Baur's view, that the people were Ebionitic Christians, because abstinance from wine by the Ebionites has been nowhere certified. He asserts, against view (3.), that the Apostle did not speak, as in 1 Cor. viii. 10, of the sacrificial character of meat and wine—as if this had been necessary in the presence of the well-known variance in the Church at Rome! After all, the object of the scrupulousness here was not the principal thing, but the laying down of the canon by which "the weak and the strong" in a church specially called to universality have to preserve their unanimity—the one class, by not taking offence in a Pharisaical, censorious spirit, and the other, by not giving offence in a reckless arrogance of freedom.

A. Chap. xiv. 1-13: Reciprocal regard, forbearance, and recognition between the weak and the strong. Especially of the taking offence and judging on the part of the weak. Meyer, on vers. 1-15: "Fraternal behavior toward the weak asked for (ver. 1). The first point of difference between the two classes, and the encouragement because of it (ver. 2). The second point of view for both in their differences (ver. 3), and its establishment (vers. 7-9); censure and impermissibility of the opposite course of conduct (vers. 10-12)."

Ver. 1. Him that is weak in the faith [τὸν δὲ ἰσόθρυστον τὴν πίστιν]. The δὲ connects with the foregoing; chap. xiii. 14. After the Apostle has expressed the recognition of physical necessities, and the necessity of abstaining from food that might be offensive, he finds himself, instead of all, to admonish those more freely disposed in this respect to be forbearing toward the weak (Meyer, Philippi). This applies to the formal connection; *but, according to the real connection, he must come, at any rate, to this difference between Jewish Christi-
sin against his faith by an uncharitable abuse of his freedom. Thus both parties have and exercise faith, being true to their conviction of faith; but the weak in faith show their weakness by not venturing, in the traditional scrupulosity of their legal conscience, to draw the full conclusion from their justifying faith, in order to break through their religious prejudices and traditions.

The Apostle proves that he does not recognize this weakness as a permanent rule for their life, by the candidly expressed conviction of his standpoint, as well as by his doctrine, in ver. 14; but he does not wish that the free development of their consistency of faith should be affected by the strong giving them offence, either to make them more scrupulous, or to mislead to a frivolous transgression of their conscientious limits. As, therefore, faith in 1 Cor. xii. 9 is a vigorous faith in reference to performing miracles, so here, in reference to the practical development of life; in both cases there is the full consequence of world-conquering confidence—there, in overcoming the force of the disturbed states of body and soul, and here, in conquering the power of legal misconceptions and prejudices. Tholuck is correct in observing, that the two explanations (of religious faith and fidelity to convictions) do not conflict with each other. The religious Christian faith, according to its practical form in the developing stage of the dictate of conscience, comprises both elements; as even the early expositors, who explained πίστις by saving faith, have generally placed the veritas conscientiae along with it (see Tholuck, p. 703); while, on the other hand, it is made eminently in many ways, that reference here is to the moral conviction of those who believe in Christ on the ground of this faith (Meyer) [Phillippi, Tholuck, Meyer, and most German commentators, together with Alford, and others, have carefully guarded against the purely subjective meaning: moral conviction, adopted by Stuart and Hodge. At the same time, they very properly reject the purely objective sense of πίστις, Christian doctrine—a sense which the word rarely, if ever, has in the New Testament. Hence the correct rendering is: weak in faith, or as to faith (Hodge), for thus the article is ignored, nor yet: weak in his faith, which is too subjective, but (as in E. V.): weak in the faith. Alford: "Holding the faith imperfectly—i.e., not being able to receive the faith in its strength, so as to be above such prejudices."—R.]

But not to judgments of thoughts [νυ τις διακρίνεις διάλογον]. Dr. Lange: doch nicht zur Abstehung von Leugenrüsten. See below.—R.] Διαλογίσμοι means, in 1 Cor. xii. 10 and Heb. v. 14, to pronounce judgment, sentence. Διαλογίσμοι generally denotes thoughts, but, regarded as moral (or often immoral) motives, imaginations (Rom. i. 21; 1 Cor. iii. 20), or even doubts (Phil. ii. 14; 1 Tim. ii. 8). Accordingly, the connection leads to the explanation: Not to the judicial decision of motives. Do not keep frequent company with them, for the object, or even to such an issue of the matter, that the mutual motives or differences shall be concluded by premature decision, that a fault-finding of the different tendencies can arise from it. It is evident that the expression cannot mean: "Not for criticizing scrupulous niceties," as an exhortation to the strong (Tholuck).* For the Apostle himself has

* [So Alford: "In order to settle the points on which he has scruples" Hodge: "Not presuming to sit in judgment on the opinions of your brethren."—R.]

criticized the scrupulous niceties of the weak sufficiently plainly, by characterizing them as weak, and not yielding their point theoretically. Philippi is right when he observes that, throughout the present chapter, the Apostle ascribes the κακίαν to the weak, but the ἀξιοῦσιν to the strong. Yet he arrives at the explanation: Receive them affectionately, so that no mental doubts arise in them. But this is something quite different from Luther's expression: Do not perplex their consciences. Mental doubts must needs arise in them, and even he awakened, if one would aid them to a more liberal standpoint. But, in their theoretical treatment, they must not be forced beyond the measure of their weakness, but such a premature decision should not also arise on their side. Paul could well exact of the strong, that they should not eat meat for the sake of the weak, &c.; but not, that they should hypocrisy deny their more liberal view in mental intercourse with them, or allow it to be overcome and judged. This submission of many a more discerning one to the harsh judgment of the narrow-minded has ever been a source of serious injury. But the measure of possibility should be, to treat the differences as non-essential peculiarities, on the common ground of being the measure of a truly hearty, but also very careful, intercourse (1 Cor. xii. 17, 18). This premature decision of what is spiritual life can harmonize only in time, is therefore forbidden to both parties. The strong are, however, chiefly recommended to deport themselves according to their difficult task, just because the others are chiefly inclined to judge. This view becomes still stronger, if ιης be taken in the sense of result.

If we distinguish candidly the two views: 1. Receive them, but not so that a reciprocal mental judgment is the result of it; 2. Receive them, but not to pronounce judgment on their scruples (Grotius, and others), we must urge against (2), that the stress lies on the modality, on the manner in which the strong should be accustomed to cultivate intercourse with the weak.* Therefore Reichs is right in referring the prohibition to both parties, and Chrysostom was not incorrect in attributing criticizing to the weak. That διαλογισμὸς may also mean doubt (Tholuck, and others), and not further into consideration. Erasmus, Beza, etc. Schnackenburg has explained the classical meaning of "doubt" for διαλογισμὸς, and "conflict" for διαφορὰ. [So E. V.] Therefore disputes. But these have ever been unavoidable, and even Paul has not avoided them.

Ver. 2. For one believes, &c. [οὐκ εν μίν πιστεύεις, κ.ε.] The explanation: He is confused, that he has eaten every thing (πιστεύεις ἔρχεσθαι; Tholuck, Reiche, and others), makes faith a subjective opinion. But it rather means: He has a confidence of faith, according to which he can eat every thing (οὐκ ἐπειδὴ πιστεύεις; Fritzsch, Meyer, Phippli).

But he who is weak [οὐ δὲ ἀσέβης].

* Fritzsch, Tholuck, Meyer, De Wette, Alford, and most, apply this adjective clause (κατὰ τὸν; Meyer) of the exhortation to the strong alone. Notwithstanding Dr. Lange's objection, it seems the preferable view; for certainly the same difficulty, when the verse is addressed to the strong exclusively, and the διάλογος is dropped, which means "power of distinguishing between" (Alford), is more applicable to them. Besides, the word διάλογος means objections, generally in maledictus partibus, in the New Testament. It is supported by a word more above named to the scrupulous thoughts cherished by the weak, and the doubt enters only in connection with this reference.—R.]
The E. V. assumes a strict antithesis here, but the τὸν ἀδιαθετοῦτα (ver. 1) is resumed; hence it is not necessary to find any other special reason for the anacolouthon, though another may be allowable.—R.] The Apostle does not continue with &c. &c. because he has, in the judgment into which he has entered, given his reasons for considering the Gentile Christians as theследующий и the ἀθέτουσα. The expression is pressed by Meyer, but somewhat symbolical or hyperbolical will nevertheless have to be allowed to his explanation; for example, the joint designation of bread, of vegetable food in general.* And it would follow from his view, that this eating of vegetables is an essential characteristic of the weak one, which can be urged with as little literalness as that the strong one is addicted to the eating of all kinds of food. His characteristic is the eating of meat, free from all ordinances. Therefore Fritzsche, Philippi, and others, would not regard the expression as an unconditional preclusion from all enjoyment of meat, as Meyer does. Philippi: "Some would only absolutely refrain from eating meat in order the more easily to overcome temptation in special cases, and others only in those special cases, particularly in the social meals, where their conduct was marked in the church as surprising; and, finally, others would only do so at the social meals, where they were certain that the meat placed before them was meant offered to idols, or, at any rate, were uncertain whether or not it was meat offered to idols. But all these could be very well designated as λαχανοφάγοι."

Ver. 3. Let not him who eateth despise, &c. The ἀθέτουσα is the specifically improper conduct of him who, occupying a more liberal point of view, in his own wisdom pleases himself (Tholuck): "The conduct of the weak one, who, whether he be an apostate Gentile Christian, as 1 Cor. viii. 1, or a weak member of the Gentile church, as 1 Cor. xii. 2 (for the ἀπόστατος, according to Stuart and Hodge, is a weak one also), is reprehensible; for the Judge, in this passage, speaks, not of the weak, but of the Gentile Christian as a whole, and of the weak one also, who is a Gentile Christian, and not a Gentile apostate."

Judge. On the other hand, the κηρᾶς is the specifically improper conduct of the legal believer, and it is not correct to suppose that (according to Tholuck) the ἀθέτουσα belongs as a species under this κηρᾶς. That the Apostle, in the present section, has, first of all, to do with the one judging, the one taking offence, is plain, as well from the construction of the foregoing verse as from the succeeding fourth verse. It is also clear from the additional: For God hath received him (καὶ Θεὸς ὁ γὰρ αὐτὸν προσλαβὼν) has been received into the communion of God and Christ, and thence will excommunicate him? This should always be perceived by believers relying on the letter, in relation to Christians who are established upon the real ground of faith. [Stuart and Hodge (following Calvin) apply this clause to both classes, but this is forbidden both by the context and by the fact that the strong are not disposed to reject but to despise the weak; while the weak are ever for excommunicating the strong, withdrawing from fellowship, &c. Hence the pertinence of the clause to this class. So Meyer, De Wette, Philippi, Alford, and most.—R.] The mark of this reception is rather the peace and light of fellowship with God, than reception into the Church. Yet this also comprises the fact, that God has received him into His service as a servant (Vatah.), but only indirectly.

Ver. 4. Who art thou? &c. [οὐ τις ἐστὶν x.r.l. Comp. chap. ix. 20.] Tholuck is here quite beyond the connection (in consequence of the sup position that ἀθέτουσα is only a species of κηρᾶς), when he questions whether the weak one here judged is addressed. The τις is claimed to belong to both classes (according to Reiche and Chrysostom) [Stuart, Hodge]; while Meyer and Philippi on the contrary, properly find it in this address to the weak one judging.

Another man's servant (ἀδιαθέτουσα κηρᾶς). Paul uses ἀθέτουσα only here, and it occurs in the New Testament but rarely (Luke xvi. 13: Acts x, 7; 1 Peter ii. 18). It means a house-serv ant, who is more closely connected with the family than the other slaves (Meyer).—R.] We must not pass lightly over the ἀδιαθέτουσα. It means not merely another, but a strange one. Meyer, and others: "He who is not in thy service, but in the service of another. But the one who judges is also in the service of this other one. That which causes him to judge, is not chiefly the notion that he is the master of this servant, but that the servant conducts himself in his service as an ἀδιαθέτουσα, who has in him much that is in itself surprising. The weak one fails to find in him the manner of the ἀθέτουσα."

To his own master (τῷ ὑπ' αὐτῷ κυρίῳ). The κηρᾶς is still chiefly figurative, the master of the strange servant. In order to understand the thought to its fullest extent, we must first consider the figure. It is the figure of a master who takes many kinds of servants in his service. Now, if he has one from a foreign country who makes himself a surprising exception, the matter belongs to the master alone, who has borne his "own master"—that is, the exclusive master.

Standeth or falleth (κηρᾶς ἐστιν ἀπὶ πίστεως). The standing and falling, as an expression of God's judgment (Ps. i. 5; Luke xxii. 36, &c.), has therefore also the further figurative meaning of standing or not standing in the household judgment. But this figure is from the beginning a clear designation of the relation in which Jewish and Gentile Chris tians stand to Christ. Christ is the Master, see verses 8, 9; comp. 1 Cor. xi. 20; 1 Peter ii. 9. The dative may be regarded as dativ. comm., even if the master himself is the judge, because it is his loss or gain if the servant falls or stands. Explanations: 1. The standing or falling is judicially understood as God's judgment (Calvin, Grotius, and many others).

2. The continuance or non-continuance in true Christian life is meant (Vatah., Semler, De Wette, Maier, Meyer).

The opposition of these two views has no well-justified meaning, since, in a religious sense, God's judgment is executed through the life. Meyer, indeed, says, in favor of (2): "To make stand in the judgment (to absolve), is not the work of Divine power, but of grace." But besides the fact that power and grace do not lie so far asunder, there comes into consideration the further fact, that the question here is (not concerning a making to stand chiefly in God's favor and God's judgment, but in the unbiased judgment of men (Ethicist, hierarchism, &c.).

He shall be made to stand (σταθήσεται). 

* [If, however, the judgment be confined to the final and future one, there is an opposition, and (1) must be rejected. Alford remains in the place and estimation of a Christian from which those would eject him. This is simplest and best.—R.]
Let every man be fully persuaded in his own mind [ο νοος του ζω θεος νοι πιθανος]. The Apostle does not decide in a dogmatical way, although he has sufficiently indicated his point of view. But he lays down a rule to reconciliation. We cannot here translate νοος; in his disposition (De Wette), for every one of both these parties would be thus assured in disposition. Rather, every one should seek to change his conviction of feeling—as it is connected with faith in authority, party influence, &c.—into his lowest, spiritually affected conviction. We could therefore here translate νοος: in his understanding, his self-reflection, his practical resolution, his meditated self-consciousness; the same thought is comprised in the expression: self-understanding, regarded as the conscious and reflecting spiritual life, by which the νοος constitutes an antithesis to the immediateness of the πνευμα (see 1 Cor. xiv. 15). In this tendency the rationalist must become free from the dogma of deistical or pantheistic illusiorism, and arrive at true rationality; in this tendency, the one who is bound to ordinances must learn to respect their Jewish basis in the Spirit and the law of the letter; in this tendency, both parties must become free from prejudice, fanaticism, and phraseology, so as to know how to be tolerant, and then to be in peace.*

Ver. 6. He who regarded the day [ο μεν χρονιοι την προειρατειαν]. This verse is a guiding-star, according to which every one, in his spiritual life, should become certain in his conviction. The one seeks to sanctify his opinion religiously, to bring it into the light of the Law and judicat diem inter diem; Bengal: the appointment of days for distributing alms. [It has also been referred to the usage in regard to abstinence from meat, &c.—R.] Tholuck: *As from the commandments on food, so also from the Jewish holy-days (Col. ii. 16), particularly the Sabbath, the Jewish Christian could not wear himself, for we find the observance of the Sabbath even in the fifth century of the Church, in the Curr. Ap. 15.3.* The sacred author correctly observes, that the holy-days, among the Jews, were not just the same as fast-days (see also Gal. iv. 10).†

* [Dr. Hedge, who applies ver. 3 to both weak and strong, although admitting that the admonition is chiefly addressed to the weak, in his comments on this verse, makes a special application treating the weak in faith with forbearance. This is altogether contrary to the context.]

† [Alford thinks this clause is inapplicable, if standing and falling at the great day are meant. He adds: *Notice, this argument is entirely directed to the weak, who uncharitably judges the strong; not vice-versa. The word imagines that the strong cannot be true servants of God, nor retain steadfast faith and abiding thanksgiving, if this the Apostle answers: (1) That such judgment belongs only to Christ, whose servant he is; (2) That the Lord's almighty power able to keep him up, and did so.* That this expression is not to be taken as absolutely true of individuals, is evident; yet it must not be made too general.]

† [Dean Alford argues from this verse against the recognition of the Divine obligation of one day in seven by the Apostle. The intercession for the weak in faith appears in the account of praying to have his mind altered, and that the inference does not concern the question of the observance of the Lord's Day as an institution of the Christian Church, analogous to the ancient Sabbath, binding on us from considerations of humanity and religious expediency, and by the rules of that branch of the Church in which Providence has placed us in a way inheriting the Divinely-appointed obligation of the other, or the strict prohibitions by which its sanctity was defended. But the presence of the fourth commandment in the Decalogue (and explanation of the obligation to keep the Sabbath by our Lord, as well as a true conception of the relation of the Law to the Christian Dispensation, would changes his view. To make of the Lord's Day a merely ecclesiastical institution, is to deprive it of all sanctity under a free government. Alford, too, assumes that there is a difference of opinion implied here, respecting the observance of the Lord's Day, and infers from, the language of ver. 6, that the Apostle could not have recognized the obligation, or he would not have commanded the man who did not regard the day. But there is no hint anywhere of a difference of opinion respecting the observance of the Lord's Day, though we may admit that the Lord's Day is not universal; besides, the text of ver. 6 is disputed. Comp. Lange's Comm. Matthew, viii. 6, p. 217; Guizotian, iv. 16, pp. 106, 109; Chrysostom, li. 16, pp. 33, 38; Haldane, Romans, pp. 688–721.—Also the literature of the Sabbath question, as published by the N. Y. Sabbath Committees.—R.]

† [The use of νοος, not νοος, shows that reflection, judgment, and all the proper exercises of the practical reason, are cast aside, and the doctrine of the duty. It is not the intuition of the νοος in any sense, but the full conviction of an educated conscience, which is here referred to.—Wordsworth, in using the term αποκρισις: *Let him sit quietly, as it were, with a fair wind of persuasion filling the sails of his own mind, and so proceed:* There may be a προαγωγια, a strong wind of persuasion, which will not waft a man to the harbor of Truth, but wrek him on the quicksands of Error.—R.]
The thanksgiving at the table (Matt. xv. 38; xxi. 26, &c.) is a proof that, with pious feeling and a good conscience, he consecrates his food and his enjoyment to God as a thank-offering. [Alford: “Adieued as a practice of both parties, this shows the universality among the early Christians of thanking God at meals.”—R.] —And he who eateth not. He who abstains from eating meat. Even he be is thankful for his scanty meal.

Ver. 7. For none of us liveth to himself [ο\'δεις γα\'ρ άμων έαυτ\' ε\'] The Apostle designates the universal basis of the thought, that the Christian eats or does not eat to the Lord. This rests upon the fact that we exist here, that we live and die, to the Lord. Meyer says, correctly: The dative must be taken in the chito-teile sense. This telle ε\' aitου is, indeed, always connected with a δε\' aitου and ε\' aitου; although the objective dependence on Christ (Rückert, Reiche) is not directly meant, and, in an absolute sense, all these terms apply, through Christ, to God.

Ver. 8. We die unto the Lord [τ\' εις κυ\'ριον ἀποθηκαρισθήσομεν. See Textual Note 1.] Even the Christian’s dying is an act of consecration to the glory of Christ (Bengel: σαμεν αμορθιαμεν, ημα ενεφανειαν). Whether we live, therefore, or die, &c. [κα\' τ\' εις εν ζωμ\' εν κα\' τ\' ἀποθηκαρισθήσομεν, κα\' κα\'.] This proposition does not merely serve to establish the foregoing (we eat or do not eat), but to explain and elucidate it. The stronger form, the stronger antithesis of living and dying, underlies the eating and not eating. But both coincide in our being the Lord’s (belonging to Him).

[Alford: “We are, under all circumstances, living or dying (and ά δορικ\' eating or abstaining, observing days or not observing them), Curzer’s: His property.”—Meyer: “In the thrice-repeated and emphatic τ\' κυ\'ριον (τοι κυ\'ριοι) notice the δε\'να Christi majestats et potestas (Bengel), to which the Christian knows himself to be entirely devoted.”—R.]

Ver. 9. For to this end Christ died and lived again [ε\' το\' των γα\'ρ Χριστο\'ς άπ\' θανατου και ε\' ζωου]. See Textual Note 2.] The following definition of Christ serves, on the other hand, to establish our living and dying to the Lord. The ε\' ζωου here, as in Rev. ii. 8, designates Christ’s return to eternal life, hence the άπ\' θανατου is passed over. Olshausen would understand the ε\' ζωου to be the earthly life of Jesus (therefore taken as a ημερον προτοτον. Thereby a uniformity would, at all events, be constituted by the statement: we live or we die, but a dissimilarly would be called forth in relation to what follows. Meyer properly brings out also the fact that the κυ\'ριου of the Lord is established on His death and resurrection. But it is in harmony with the τελει definition of Christ’s dominion that the antithesis in this life—the living and the dead—ecesses behind the antithesis in the future life, the dead (in the act of dying and in Sheol) and the living, by whom it is conditionally established.

Both of the dead and the living. According to Meyer’s suggestion, the purpose is not to refer merely to the death and return to life (as rendered) to the dead and to the living respectively (see his note on p. 497).

Ver. 10. But why dost thou judge. The θυ is here opposed to the dominion of Christ over the dead and the living, as above, to another man’s servant; but the latter is now denoted brother.

Or why dost thou set at nought thy brother? The Apostle, having spoken of the weaker one, now speaks these words to the stronger, in order to maintain his harmonizing position. Here, as well as in the supporting of him who stands, ver. 4, and in the thanking in ver. 6, the Apostle goes back to the highest casualty (see Textual Note 4.)

For we shall all stand before the judgment-seat of God [π\' αν\'τες γα\'ρ παρασηα σ\' ο\'μηδεν τ\' β\'ηματι τοι Θεοι\. We must appear before the judgment-seat of God himself, which Christ shall administer as Lord (chap. ii. 16; Acts xvii. 31; comp. Matt. xxv. 31; Acts xxvi. 6.) The judging of one’s brother, therefore, first, encroaches upon Christ’s office as ruler, and, second, anticipates the judgment-bar of God.

Ver. 11. For it is written. Isa. xlv. 23. On the free form of the citation from memory, and from the LXX., see Philipp, p. 571. [See also Textual Note 4.—R.] On εξωμολογισθησον, with the dative, meaning to praise (Rom. xv. 9; Matt. xi. 25, &c.), see Tholuck, p. 719; Meyer, p. 498. [Meyer says the verb with the dative always means: to praise; with the accusative of the object: to confess (Matt. iii. 6, &c.—R.) That special kind of praise, however, is meant, which occurs after a finished act of Divine Providence according to a Divine decision (see Phil. ii. 11). Tholuck says: “Isa. xlv. 23 does not speak of the appearance of Christians before the judgment-seat of God, but of mankind’s universal and humble confession of dependence upon God.” But this unwarrantably removes the element of future time, the eschatological element, which is, at all events, also comprised in the passage in Isaiah. Meyer says, somewhat better: “In Isaiah God makes the assurance by an oath, that all men (even the heathen) shall reverently swear allegiance to Him. Paul here regards this Divine declaration which promises messianic victory, because it promises the universal victory of the theocracy, according to the special and final fulfillment that it shall have in the general judgment.”—That even the prophetic passage itself comprises, with Christ’s saving advent, also the eschatological references, follows from the definite prospect that every knee shall bow before Jehovah, &c. (see Phil. ii. 10, 11.)

Ver. 12. So then every one, &c. [See Textual Note 11.] Meyer puts the emphasis on ά κα\' ο\'ς, Philipp on τ\' Θεοι, others on πα\' οι ενθαρ. The first is preferable.—R. In this lies the ground of the following exhortation (ver. 15): Let us not therefore judge one another any more [γ\' νετε ο\'νειν άλλ\' έκλειοι κρινο\'μεν]. The Apostle here comprises both parts, and thereby makes his transition to the following admonition to the strong.


Ver. 13. But judge this rather [α\'λ\'λα **[With the reading τοι Χριστοι (ver. 10), Theodore, Luther, Calvin, and many others, so Philipp, in the LXX. in the principal divinity of Christ. But the fundamental idea is rather, that it is God, whose judgment Christ holds; which thought is contained in the reading τοι Θεοι (ver. 10) also, see Matt. xii. 30.] It is quite unnecessary to found arguments on disputed readings, when so many other passages are at hand. Most of those who then do so, are naturally influenced in their critical judgment by their doctrinal positions.—R.]]
The Apostle uses the same word in a changed meaning, in order to emphasize more particularly, by this antanaclasis, the antagonism of judging. The consideration of the future judgment should move believers in particular to so conduct themselves as to give offense to none (Matt. xvii. 6 ff.). Meyer: "Let that be your judgment."

Not to put stumbling-block or an occasion of falling in a brother’s way [τῷ μὴ τιτίναι πρόσομα τῷ ἀδίκῳ τῷ σκάνδαλον]. It does not follow that, because the expressions πρόσομα and σκάνδαλον are, in general, used metaphorically as synonyms, we would here have to accept a "verbosity in the interest of the case" (Meyer). In ver. 21 we find even three special designations: προσόματα; κακοδαιμόνια; καθαρισμοῖς. There also, however, Meyer, with others, regards the threefold designation as only the expression of the urgency of the matter. But in a real reference, the twofold effect of the giving offence comes into consideration. The giving offence is either an occasion for the punctilious brother to become embittered and still more hardened in his prejudice, or to conduct himself frivolously; without an understanding of the liberty which is given and thus, according to the present passage, to eat meat with inward scruples of conscience. The Apostle indicates the first case in ver. 16, and the second in ver. 23. The use of different expressions, in themselves synonyms, to denote this antithesis, was quite natural, and, in ver. 21, the Apostle seems to distinguish even three cases: to take an offence forward, or backward, or to be strengthened in weakness. Even to this very day, the offence which the Jews take at Christianity is divided into the two fractions of extreme legality and of wild liberalism. The τιτίναι causes us to return to the original sense of the words (see the Lexicons).

Ver. 14. I know, and am persuaded in the Lord Jesus [οἶδα καὶ πιστεύω ἐν κυρίῳ Ιησοῦ]. He knows it already as an Old Testament monothist, who knows that God is the Creator of all things (Gen. i. 31). But he also has the fixed assurance of it in the fellowship of Christ, by virtue of justifying faith in his Spirit. Calvinius: libertate a Christo parta. [Alford]: "These words give to the persuasion the weight not merely of Paul’s own ἐπιγνώμονα, but of apostolic authority. He is persuaded, in his capacity as connected with Christ Jesus, as having the word of Christ."

So Hodge, substantially, but with less exactness, since he retains the incorrect by of the E. V. It is doubtful whether ἐν ever has this force. Jowett, however, calls these words; "the form in which St. Paul expresses his living and doing all things in Christ, as, in language colder and more appropriate to our time, we might say as a Christian." But this is a dilution of the force of the expression. [R.] A consciousness of Christ’s
declaration in Matt. xv. 11 is here more probable than questionable; but then that declaration is not in a legal sense the basis of his freedom (comp. also 1 Cor. viii. 8; Col. ii. 14-16).

Unclean: κακοδαιμόν, profane, unclean in the religious legal sense (see the Commentary on Matthew, p. 277); Levitically unclean was, indeed, even still a type of what was common or unclean in the real spiritual sense (Heb. x. 29).

Of itself, τὲ αὐτὸς, not according to Lachmann’s reading, τὲ αὐτῷ. [See Textual Note 15.] Of itself, according to its nature, in contrast with the economical order, the moral convenience, or the natural feeling or conscience of the one partaking. [Theodoret, reading αὐτῷ, refers it to Christ.—R.]

"The Apostle himself belongs to the strong (comp. ἐν ἑαυτῷ in chap. xvi. 20, and 1 Cor. xxii.);" Tholuck. But he also again distinguishes himself from the ordinarily strong one, in that he takes into the account, as a co-determining factor, conscience and regard to fraternal intercourse, or habitual practice.—[But to him, τὶ μὴ τῷ. This introduces an exception to unclean, not to unclean of itself. Hence not ἀκαθάρτος, but ἀκαθάρτος (Meyer).—R.].—To him therefore it is unclean, not uncleanliness is accordingly subjective (Meyer).—R.]

Ver. 15. For if [ἐν γὰρ]. See Textual Note 15.] The less authenticated reading τὶ δὲ seems at the first glance to be most suitable; but the reading [ἐν γὰρ seems to compel us to accept, that even the strong one, who knows that a certain kind of food seems unclean to his weak brother, makes himself unclean by eating it to his offence.

Because of the things that thy brother is griev ed [διὰ τὸ μὴ δεῖγμα ὁ ἄδειπνος σου λυπησέσθαι]. Ἡμάρα, that food which he holds to be unclean. Bengel calls this melios. Comp. Heb. ix. 10; xii. 16; xiii. 9.—R.]

The difficulty occasioned by the expression λυπησέσθαι, is due to a neglect to distinguish properly the two kinds of offence. First of all, the question here is concerning that offence which consisted in the weak one’s being made to stumble by the strong one’s eating of meat. Tholuck: "ἀπειροῦσα, according to the New Testament use of language: to afflict;" therefore λυπησέσθαι is taken by expositors (Origen) = σκανδαλισθῆσαι. But who is the one to afflict the eating be thereby induced to imitate the example?—According to the Apostle, it was, at all events, the one who ate, notwithstanding the offence he had taken, but not the other, who was irritated and felt himself aggrieved as much by the supposed pride as by the insensitiveness of the strong one. "But such an afflication," says Philippi, "would be the beginning of the judging forbidden by the Apostle, which he therefore would not recommend to special regard."

*Phillippi, Stuart, Hodge, Jowett, and most regard the two expressions as synonymous, the latter perhaps explanatory of the former. Alford distinguishes: "in occasion of stumbling, in defect; in occasion of offence, in thought." Webster and Wilkinson: "A larger obstacle against which we may strike the foot; a smaller one likely to catch the foot. The former denotes a certainty, the latter a probable, cause of falling." Wordsworth gives as a comment on this verse, some extracts from Hooker, in reference to his non-confessors. These remarks are eminently instructive, and they have a flavor of remote antiquity in their allusions to "obedience to rites and ceremonies constituted by lawful public authority."—R.]

[If ἐν be read, then this verse introduces a limitation to the practical application of the principle of ver. 14 (Hodge); but if ἐν be read, then we must take the passage as breviloquent or elliptical. Tholuck and Meyer join with ἐν ἀλλοτρίῳ, αὐτῷ, finding here the statement of the reason why he must add that exception. The root meaning which is involved in not regarding it. Alford makes it depend "on the suppressed restatement of the precept of ver. 13; or, "But this knowledge is not to be your rule in practice, but rather," &c., as to ver. 13; for &c., &c.]. Philippi objects to both views, and urges his ob jection against the reading of Meyer. He says Meyer’s interpretation is "manifestly too far-fetched," but his own lay so near, that the temptation to alter the text was great, as the desire to sustain the change against overwhelming evidence seems to be in the case of some commentators.—R.]
What a prejudiced man’s being afflicted itself the
beginning of judging? Philippus, in harmony with
Elsner, ignores the subjective justification of this
affliction, by interpreting the ἀγαθὸν according
absolute to the signification frequently occurring in the
classics; to prejudice, to injure. Meyer, on the other hand,
urges against this the New Testament use of lan-
guage, and understands the expression to mean
moral mortification, an insult to the conscience,
with reference to Eph. iv. 30.* Grotius, and oth-
ers, have referred the word to the affliction pro-
duced by the charge of narrowness. The charge
of narrowness comprised in reckless “eating” dose,
looking to the Church as a single element, but
it is not the principal thing.

Thou art no longer walking according to
love of φιλοτιμορίας, &c. Comp. 1 Cor. viii. 10, 11.
But it does not follow from this analogy (of 1 Cor.),
that the brother is, in all cases, led only by a nar-
row and frivolous eating with others, to indecency
in his conscience, and that it is only by means of
this that he incurs the danger of the ἀπόλλους, or
actually relapses into a state leading to this. The
exasperations of the one falling back upon ordinances
lead to fanaticism and the ἀπόλλους, just as surely
as laxities lead to antinomianism. Meyer says:
“The occasion to fall from Christianity (Theophyl-
lact, Grotius, &c.) is not at all taken into con-
terpration. But can there be, in the case of Christians,
the relapse into the ἀπόλλους without a real apostasy
from Christianity? Bengel: Ne pluris faceret tumo
eulum, quam Christus eiem sancet.†

Ver. 15. Let not then your good be evil
spoken of in such a way as to imply an.
itive sense. It must be distinguished from ἀνάλογον
whence it leads as a parallele､ism of Paul’s speaking especial regard to the
very judging he had forbidden, is altogether irrelev-
ance; since charity is not be searched through the property of the
demands made upon it by the weak brethren. We
reject the misunderstanding in (with) Meyer, leads to
the subjective sense. It must be distinguished from ἀνάλογον,
to which it leads as a possible result (Meyer, and others).
It does not necessarily imply that the weak brother is led to
imitate and thus offend against his own conscience,
al
though this is a probable result. Wordsworth suggests, as
part of the injury, that he is led to “to make a schism in the
Church by separating from them.”—R.
† [In his 4th edition, Meyer omits all reference to this
point. Philippus, however, calls this verse a διότι problem
for the possibility of apostasy. But as Dr. Hodge remarks:
“Saints are preserved, not in despite of apostacy, but from
apostacy. If they apostacy, they perish.”—R.]

Hodge defines ἄνωθεν to mean internal destruc-
tion, since Christ offered His life to redeem from this
(Meyer); yet, as this destruction (like the antithetical
notions in the present verse, according to the scholastic
representation), we must take it in its widest sense.
All thus paraphrase the verse, bringing out the contrast
between the ἄνωθεν (from above, from above) and the
brother, is an offence against love; how much greater
an offense, then, that this άνωθεν end in ἀνάλογον—in ratios
(above) in this internal change (still more external change
and be in danger of quenching God’s Spirit within him) by
[palath.]—R.

1. τὸ ἁγαθὸν is Christian freedom (“in re-
lation to eating meat”), Origen, Thomasius, Grotius,
and others; Tholuck, with reference to 1 Cor. x.
Then the reference to the eating of meat is evident,
nothing more than an accidental con-
sistency of Christian freedom, as a general principle of all
De Wette and Philippus, on the contrary, observe
that the matter in question here is the possession
not of a single party, but of the whole Church
But Tholuck aptly replies: “This freedom was ob-
jectively purchased for the whole Church.” There-
fore also the reading ἄνωθεν against this

3. The kingdom of God, in ver. 17. [So Ewald,
Umbreit, Meyer. With proper restrictions, this view
seems least objectionable. (2.) and (3.) imply that
the evil-speaking is from without the Church.—R.]

Unquestionably ver. 17 is an explanation of ver.
16, but the kingdom of God is here described as a
number of privileges and conceptions and, besides being
the first element: righteousness through Christ —
freedom from human ordinances; see Gal. v. 1. The
explanations harmonize, in maintaining that the ques-
tion is concerning the Christian good, καθ’ ἀγαθόν
And this good must be named objectively the
believer, and subjectively faith; or, if we comprise both
these elements, the kingdom of God. It obscures
the text to rend these things amunder by aut, aut.
But it is unmistakable that the Apostle speaks rela-
tively of this good, as it is represented in the free-
dom of faith enjoyed by renewed mankind. Now,
as the punitively Jewish Christians, and particularly
the Jews, saw many Christians abusing their free-
dom, they were exposed to the danger, from this
abuse of freedom, to abuse and finally to slander free-
dom itself, and even the gospel, according to a
confusion of fanaticism similar to what occurs in
our day, when men confound the Reformation with
revolution, with the Münster fanaticism, with sec-
tarism, and apostasy from Christianity. Paul
already had a sufficiently bitter experience in the
impossibility of avoiding such slanders, even when
the greatest care is observed; he all the more regarded it as an obligation of wisdom and love, to
admonish those who were free to make a proper use
of their freedom. We must not, however, consider
the slander of Christian freedom in itself alone, apart
from its principle, faith. Besides, this one slander
of Christians against Christians had, as its result,
another: that the Gentiles abused Christianity be-
cause of its division, and perhaps the proudest among
them made it a subject of derision, that Christians
contended about eating and drinking, as if these
things were the real blessings of the kingdom of
heaven. This latter feature is the explanation of
Cocceius.

Ver. 17. For the kingdom of God. [* if
the reference in ver. 16 be to freedom, then the
connection is: Preserve your liberty from such evil

[* [Alford: “Your strength of faith is a good thing; to
not pass into bad repute. This faith of Christ, and avoid
borrowing it from 1 Cor. x. Yet it is still
more open to the objection, that the matter here referred to
is a possession of the whole Church. The change of the
diagram would be to make the phrase τὸς ἁγαθὸν itself, sufficiently attest the correctness of the
view, which refers this “good” to the whole Church.—R.]
speaking, since nothing spiritual is involved. If, however, Meyer’s view is accepted, then a motive is presented here, with a reference to the tenor of the evil-speaking—i. e., the blasphemous expression of such a wrong spirit toward the kingdom of God in the minds of those without. The advantage of taking the wider view of ver. 16 becomes obvious here. For if it be restricted to the strong, then this verse must be so restricted also, when its most necessary application is to the weak brethren.—R.] The βεβαιωσις του Θεου, typified by the Old Testament theocracy, is God’s dominion over the heart, intuition, and administration by Christ; it is the heavenly sphere of life, in which God’s word and spirit govern, and whose organ on earth is the Church. Here, too, Meyer mixes up the second advent: there is “also here nothing else than the messianic kingdom, which shall be set up at the second coming of Christ.”

Is not eating and drinking [βρασις και ποσεις. Comp. Col. ii. 16. The act of eating and of drinking. The reference is obviously to the practice of both parties.—R.] in the Christian religion would consist in this. Not as the Greek fathers interpret: it is not won by this.—R.] Meyer: “The moral condition of its (future) nature does not depend upon it.”

But righteousness, and peace, and joy in the Holy Ghost [αλλα δυνασιν και ειρηνα και χαρα εις πνευματι αγιοι]. De Wette has full ground for contending against the shallow interpretations of these words, by a series of commentators from Chrysostom down to Meyer (Grotius and Fritzsche among the number), to the effect that the question here is not only one of moral virtues. With Meyer, the “recollect” naturally stands at the head. De Wette interprets these ideas in the full sense. Therefore he connects the doctrinal view (Calvin, Chrysostom, and others) with the ethical. (So Hodge, in last edition.) In the earlier, he adopted the “ethical” view. But as he now says: “Paul does not mean to say that Christianity consists in morality—that the man who is just, peaceful, and cheerful, is a true Christian. This would be to contradict the whole argument of this Epistle.”—R.] Accordingly, righteousness is, first of all, justification; peace is chiefly rest of spirit; and joy in the Holy Ghost is the joy of our spirit, which has its ground in the Holy Ghost. The reference is not only to the immediate question here, but to the whole question of the nature of grace and God’s kingdom as its blessings, the doctrinal view must be regarded as the principal thing. It might be said, as regards the concrete occasion [i. e., the circumstances of the Roman Church]: a. With righteousness in Christ there is joined freedom from legality; b. With peace and the spirit of peace there is joined hearty moderation and forbearance in the use of freedom; c. And with joy in the Holy Ghost there is joined the impulse to cultivate social joy through the proper tone of mind. Though, with good ground, has cited chap. xv. 13 in favor of the religious construction of the three definitions; also 1 Thess. 1. 6; Phil. iii. 1; 2 Cor. vi.

10. Grotius, and others, have interpreted the joy transitively, to establish joy; and this effect is, indeed, quite peculiar to the social impulse of Christian joy, which is thus from heaven (“The gold, I bring you good tidings of great joy”); but this element is not the principal and fundamental thought.

Ver. 18. For he who herein serveth Christ. "Ev τοιτων, according to Meyer, means: according to this; that is, according to the relation already given. Tholuck more fitly says: herein. The perception of the opposition between the inward and real and the unreal and outward in God’s kingdom, and the cultivation of the former, is meant. So far by τοιτων is much stronger than εις τοιτων. [The singular is so strongly supported, that we must adopt it; see Textual Note 14. But it has been referred by many commentators (from Origen to Jowett) to the Holy Ghost. Dr. Hodge assumes that this is the necessary view. But as Alford remarks: "It would be unnatural that a subordinate member of the former sentence, belonging only to χαρα, should be at once raised to be the emphatic one in this, and the three in a line, really mentioned, lost sight of.” This difficulty has led a number of commentators to retain the plural. But this is contrary to the received canons of criticism, and an unfair method of avoiding the difficulty.—R.]

Is well-pleasing to God, &c. [ιναρετος τω Θεω, &c.] He who, in the perception of this rule of the New Testament, serves Christ with pure motive, has the twofold blessing of being well-pleasing to God and approved of men. Among these men, the best among those who dissent are undoubtedly chiefly meant, for the really quarrelsome partisans are most embittered by the peaceful conduct of faith.

Ver. 19. Let us therefore follow after the things of peace [αρα ουν τα της ειρηνης διωκομεν]. The inference is from vers. 17, 18 (De Wette, Philippi, Meyer), not from the whole preceding context (Hodge). See Textual Note 10 on the form of the verb.—R.] The διωκων is here in contrast with the impulse of party excitements.

The things which pertain to mutual edification [και τα της οικουμενης της εις αλληλους]. Edification always comprises two elements, according to the figure which represents the Church as Christ’s temple: 1. Arrangement into the fellowship of Christ by the awakening, vivaification, and preparation of the stones; 2. Arrangement into the fellowship of the Church by the promotion of what is essential, and by moderation in the exercise of grace according to the spirit of humility and self-denial; see 2 Cor. x. 8; xiii. 10, and other passages. In this sense, each should build the other up.

Ver. 20. Do not for the sake of meat undo the work of God [μη δυνεσθε βρωματος κατανευρειαν (pull down) το ιερον του Θεου]. Instead of building up, the heaven and the corner stone. The κατανευρεια και κομματα are a specific expression of this fact. The work (building) of God has been understood as Christian faith, the σωτηρια, the extension of Christianity; Meyer, and others, have understood the Christian as such. ["His Christian personality." But the oikoumenephorei here evi—R.]
dently denotes the fellowship of faith. [This seems to combine the two favorite views, viz., that the fellow-Christian is here referred to—that the "kingdom of God" in its extension is meant, Alford, referring to 1 Cor. iii. 9, explains: "Thy fellow-Christian, as a plant of God's planting, a building of God's taking; the whole context.

But it is evil (ἀλλὰ κακὸν. Instead of δέ we have ἀλλά here. See Hartung, Paritikellehre, ii. p. 408.—R.) To κακὸν we must simply supply, from what precedes: Every thing which is clean in itself (Meyer)." Alford thinks nothing need be supplied, except, as in E. V., the neuter verb. "It is evil—i. e., there is criminality in the man." On the other proposed supplements, see Meyer, Alford, in loco.—R.] Kακῶν, injurious in this case, because it is not only a sin to him, but also leads him to ruinous frivolity; see ver. 15.

To the man who eateth through offence (κατὰ πιστίν ἐξείς; See Textual Note "a") The brief reading is adopted here.—R.] Meyer, with Calvin Grotius, and others, take these words as interrogative; Tholuck, with Luther, Fritzsche, and others as concessive, which corresponds better with the cor text.† [If ἐν be rejected, the interrogative form is to be preferred, as better suiting the lively character of the address (so Philippi, Alford, De Wette, Hodge, &c.). The question implies, on the part of the strong brother, that is, by thy inconsiderate and free enjoyment—the work of God, for, by the πρόσομα which thou givest thy brother, thou leadest him to eat against his conscience. For it is said, first, concessively: all things indeed are pure; second, the one eating with (taken, not given) offence to his conscience, is, as an injured one, contrasted with the one who destroys, who has given him offence; we have, besides, in the third place, the whole context.

[Those who find in offence a reference to the offence given by the strong one, rather than to the offence taken by the weak one, also urge the context in favor of their view. The context, however, only proves that the strong are addressed here. They incorrectly infer from this, that the κακῶν must be predicated of the action of the party addressed. But it is not like Paul to urge, as a motive, the evil effect upon the brother taking offence. Besides, as Meyer suggests, the other view has no special connection with the former part of the verse, but gives us only the vague remark, that it is wrong to eat so as to give offence to others. The objection, that offence cannot well be applied to offence against one's own conscience, loses its force, when it is remembered that the strong are cautioned with reference to the effect of their conduct on the weak.—R.]

Ver. 21. It is not good to eat flesh, &c. [καλὸν τὸ ἑαυτῷ καταπτινόν καταδίωκεται, κ.τ.λ.] Luther, and others, incorrectly take καλὸν as comparative in relation to ἐν φίλοις ["It is better that thou eatest no flesh and drinkest no wine, or (than) that thereon thy brother," &c.]. Probably to tone down the force of the expression, which seemed all too strong. But καλὸν itself contains the necessary modification, since it denotes a higher and freer measure of self-denying love. [Dr. Lange renders it: edel, noble. The case is not hypothetical; the scrupulous demanded the water comming from wine also, we infer from the whole message.—R.]

Not to do any thing wherein thy brother, &c. [ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν ἀδόλφους συν. See Text-Note "a"] Tholuck, and others, referring to 1 Cor. x. 31, would supply ποιεῖν with ἐν φίλοις, which is certainly more correct than to supply φαγεῖν ἐν φίλοις. [The E. V. seems to imply the latter view it is emended, therefore.] As De Wette proper remarks: Paul does not here lay down, as a definite precept, this principle of self-denying love according to which he had lived (see 1 Cor. viii. 13).* 0 the three expressions προσφέρειν, &c., see the explanation of ver. 13. [It is not necessary to fin (with Calvin) a climax of in former these three verbs yet they are not precisely synonymous. The figure of ver. 13 is retained, but the third verb express the mildest form of offence. De Wette, Philip, and E. V., render: it is made (or becomes) weak Meyer, Alford, and others, more correctly: it is weak. The full thought, then, is: It is noble not to do an thing wherein thy brother is weak; even to avoid his weak point.—R.]

Ver. 22. Hast thou faith? [σὺ πιστεύεις; See Textual Note "a"] The brief reading is adopted there.—R.] Meyer, with Calvin Grotius, and others, take these words as interrogative; Tholuck, with Luther, Fritzsche, and others as concessive, which corresponds better with the context.† [If Εγγεγραμμένος be rejected, the interrogative form is to be preferred, as better suiting the lively character of the address (so Philippi, Alford, De Wette, Hodge, &c.). The question implies, on the part of the strong brother, that is, by thy inconsiderate and free enjoyment—the work of God, for, by the πρόσομα which thou givest thy brother, thou leadest him to eat against his conscience. For it is said, first, concessively: all things indeed are pure; second, the one eating with (taken, not given) offence to his conscience, is, as an injured one, contrasted with the one who destroys, who has given him offence; we have, besides, in the third place, the whole context.

Have it to thyself (κατὰ πιστίν ἐξείς; Keep it, because well founded, but for the sake of thy brother, keep it to thyself.—R.] This comprises not only a restriction for the strong, but also a limitation of the principle previously established in ver 21. Or, in his private life, where he gives no offence to his brother, he may also live according to his will yet according to the rule that he should regard his brother as weak. Therefore, if any one can see it, need it not be paraded before man (Meyer, Hodge, &c.).—R.] Tholuck explains the ἐννοίαν θεοῦ by thanksgiving.

Blessed is he, &c. [μακαρίος, κ.τ.λ.] Li:

closer: Blessed is he whose conscience does not condemn him in that which he allows. So also Meyer Philip, with reference to ver. 5: "Let every one be fully persuaded in his own mind." But we can not expect here a simple declaration of the strong man's blessedness in opposition to the weak; an all the less so, because, immediately afterward, there is mention made of the weak one's sinful eating I doubt, which the strong man has occasioned by his offence.‡ Thus the proposition directs attention (Hence, while a Christian may strive to reach such principle in his practice, no brother, especially no "we brother, may demand it of him, or obtrude a stumbling, so as to exact self-denial from others.—R.

† [Fritzsche opposes the interrogative form, because would imply a negative answer, but there is little warrant for this. If the better correspondence with the context mentioned by Dr. Lange is based on this view of the use of the interrogative, then it disappears at once.—R.]

‡ (Philippi and Wordsworth make the clause supply: both classes; Meyer, to the strong alone (presenting the advantage to a more free translation: as a motive toward the weak, whose danger is set forth in the new clause); Alford, and most, find here a commendation of
grounded on and consonant with his life of faith. That ‘faith in the Son of God’ by which the Apostles described the Christian’s own life in the flesh as being lived, informing and penetrating the motives and the conscience, will not include, will not sanction, an act done against the testimony of the conscience.”

This is, perhaps, more in accordance with Dr. Lange’s view of πίστις (see below) than the ordinary interpretation, which confines it to mere persuasion, moral conviction (Hodge, De Wette, and most).—R.

And whatsoever is not of faith is sin [From ελάθειν in πίστις ἡμείς ἀναγινώσκων]. To be read as a concluding sentence, and not as an explanation of the foregoing: because every thing which is not of faith, &c. [The E. (V.) is incorrect; and should be substituted, δι’ introducing, as Alford suggests, an axiom.—R.]—Conflicting explanations:

1. Augustine, and many other commentators; Calovius, &c.: which is not of Christian saving faith. Then the consequence is the proposition: The whole morality and virtues of the heathen, &c. (Formula Conc. 700: where even the peccata sunt are moderated by the peccatis contaminatis).—R.

2. Moral faith, “the moral conviction of the rectitude of a mode of action” (De Wette, Reiche, and Meyer, after Chrysostom, and others). But undoubtedly Chrysostom’s explanation shows a better knowledge of the connection between the requirements of saving faith and subjective conviction than many modern explanations, with all their fidelity to conviction. Even Grotius does not speak of conviction, but of conscience: Peccatum est, quod ipse sit, conscientia non adscripta. There can be no perverted decision of conscience which conscience itself did not have to contradict, and consequently also no abstract and subjective certainty of conviction without an objective ground. But conscience itself harmonizes with God’s law, just as the law harmonizes with the gospel and its faith. Otherwise, the world would be irretrievably lost in egotistic separation. How would we ever get at the wayward, if the truth did not testify to its conscience?

We accordingly have to distinguish in explication—

* (It is greatly to be doubted whether this explanation necessarily involves this conclusion. It is easy to force upon this, or any other passage, some incorrect interpretation. For example, as Dr. Hodge well remarks: “It is wrong to do any thing which we think to be wrong. The converse of this proposition, however, is not true. It is not always right to do what we think to be right.” Alford says: “Here the Apostle has in view two Christians, both living by faith, and by faith doing acts pleasing to God: and he remarks on them what they do, to harmonize with this great principle of their spiritual lives, belongs to the category of sin. He is speaking of the ‘indeferrable’ which must be settled by another inquiry: Of whom we think some have faith—such a faith as may enable him to do acts which are not sinful—A question impossible for us to solve.” Certainly the Augustinian inference may be deduced far more directly from other passages: and it should not be prejudiced against the view which claims that Christian faith must underlie the “faith” here referred to. Bengel: “Inutile ergo tua fides, quae fideles consentat; etiamurque concinnorum formarum confirmens: partum fundamentum, partim norma recta actionem.” Still, Wordsworth, however, limits the meaning to something like subjective persuasion, which seems tame and unpalatable. The author last named shows the various effects of the other view, especially among the Puritans. But the tone and the spirit of that is not always right to do what we think to be right” (ver. 29): which the idea of some passages would be properly limited. Phillips: “The act of eating itself condemns him. of course according to the Divine ordinance, so that the justice of the verdict applies not only before God, but before men, and himself also.”—R.)

Who judged not himself. The Apostle says κατάργεσθαι, and not κατατάξεσθαι (as most commentators explain), because the Christian, with the unconscious and false application of a principle which is in itself righteous, and even holy, does not sin so ruinously as he who condemns himself by acting against his religious conviction. With the germinating principle of faith in the weak one, the law is no more of authority; but so long as it applies to him in connection with faith, he cannot do violence to it. It is not by presumption, but by mature conviction, that we become free.—[Alford, δοκομαί παίπτωμεν. Agenda eligit (Estius).—R.]

Ver. 23. But he that doubteth [οὐδὲ δέ ἀναγινώσκειν]. With the act of eating he is at the same time stricken and condemmed, κατατάξεσθαι; comp. John iii. 18. Meyer: “It was necessary to define more specifically the actual self-condemnation (Chrysostom, Theodoret, Grotius, and most commentaters). But there is a great difference between self-condemnation and actual self-condemnation. If the explanation, ‘to be subject to Divine condemnation,’ does not say: to be already subject to the final judgment, then must it be explained, that a Divine sentence on his condemned (not condemned) condition has occurred in his own act itself, which sentence he must himself best experience in his own conscience, because the fact of his doubting is better known to himself than to any one else.

Because it is not of faith [οὐδὲ ἐκ πίστεως]. Namely, that he ate. [Alford explains ἀναγινωσκειν of faith here: "from a persuasion of rectitude state in which the strong in faith are. His view (which is also that of Meyer and Hodge) is to be preferred to Dr. Lange’s ingenious and refined distinction.—R.]

[Meyer property rejoices the common view, which takes πίστις as κατατάξεσθαι, but explains it this: "who does not hold judgment over himself; i.e., who is so assured in his conviction, that his decision to do this or that incurs no self-condemnation." Dr. Lange’s explanation is occasioned by his view of the whole sentence.—R.]

[Meyer finds here an antithesis to “blazed” (ver. 22); for the idea of doubt is contrasted with the persuasion. The view which claims that Christian faith must underlie the “faith” here referred to. Bengel: “Inutile ergo tua fides, quae fideles consentat; etiamurque concinnorum formarum confirmens: partum fundamentum, partim norma recta actionem.” Still, Wordsworth, however, limits the meaning to something like subjective persuasion, which seems tame and unpalatable. The author last named shows the various effects of the other view, especially among the Puritans. But the tone and the spirit of that—is not always right to do what we think to be right” (ver. 29): which the idea of some passages would be properly limited. Phillips: “The act of eating itself condemns him. of course according to the Divine ordinance, so that the justice of the verdict applies not only before God, but before men, and himself also.”—R.)

THE EPISTLE OF PAUL TO THE ROMANS.
CHAPTER XIV. I.-XV. 4.

tion (2) between conscience and subjective conviction in the usual sense; see chap. ii. 14, 15. In explanation (1) we must distinguish: a. Between faith in a doctrinal system and saving faith itself; b. Between developed saving faith and its beginnings under grata promissio, the doing of the truth in the life of the upright; John iii. 21. It follows clearly enough from chap. ii., that the Apostle does not here mean to characterize such a conduct as sin. Yet, on the other hand, he will not designate such conduct as sinless; for, until the conscious reconciliation or perfection of conscience, even the better man is in an inward darkness and vacillation concerning his ways, and selfish motives are mixed even with his better actions. But the Apostle also does not speak here solely of the opposition in the life of Christians. Christians must be conscious of their opinion as well as of their action, in the light of truth itself. Philippus has brought out prominently the connection between (1.) and (2.). But he returns to a modified Augustinian view, by deducing from the claim that the confidence of the accountability to God of an action must be the result of saving faith, the conclusion that all conduct is sin which has not this saving faith as its ultimate source and origin (p. 584). It would be better to say: whose origin is not the shining of the Logos into the conscience. It is hazardous to regard believers as complete, but still more hazardous to distinguish only complete unbelievers from them. See the Eng. Notes on ver. 1. On Augustine's view, see Reiche, ii. p. 459.

On the doctrine following here in some respect of God, brought down from the conclusion, see the introduction, p. 35 [and Textual Notes to chap. xvi.]; also on the controversies occasioned by the two concluding chapters. For particulars, see Meyer, p. 607.†

† [Philippus view was not so under stated as more fully cited. He says: "more here is not immediately justified, saving faith, but the confidence springing therefrom, that all the action proceeding from it, and consistent with it, is acceptable to God and His Son, Christ sauved or saved conf. in the genuine, et eis in filium, vita praedestinata vita pacis est, finds here not, indeed, its direct, but its indirect proof. For, if every action which is produced from the confidence in the acceptability to God is sin, and this confidence is the result of evangelical, saving faith alone, then it follows, that all conduct which has not this saving faith as its ultimate source and origin."—R.]

† [On chaps. xv. and xvi. Barth of Thüngen has doubted the genuineness of these two chapters, but on such insufficient grounds that it is not necessary to enter upon the question. See Bischoff, p. 85. Various theories have been suggested (by Semler, Paulus, Eichhorn, Schulte, Ewald, and now by Renan), which admit that Paul wrote these two chapters, but deny them a place in this Epistle. For this, a plausible ground is found in the insertion of the doctrine at the close of chap. xiv., in the long list of acquisitions (chap. xvi.) at Rome, where Paul had never before—we or whom are mentioned in the Epistles written from Rome, especially in the salutation to Aquila and Priscilla, who were at Ephesus shortly before and shortly after the date of this Epistle. But Rome was the capital of the world, and many acquisitions might be readily depopulated. Were the salutations few, no doubt the critics would have urged this as an argument against its genuineness. Meyer, however, says: Among the reasons which are adduced in support of these different opinions, none hold good, not even those which seem least founded upon mere arbitrariness. The St. Paul of Renan has just appeared before us in that of Augustinus. The reasonings which are advanced in support of these different opinions, none hold good, not even those which seem least founded upon mere arbitrariness. The St. Paul of Renan has just appeared; he accepts the Epistle as genuine, and denies the correctness of its title, and also its Introd. The following is worthless; and to the reasons which are adduced in support of these different opinions, none hold good, not even those which seem least founded upon mere arbitrariness. The St. Paul of Renan has just appeared before us in that of Augustinus. The reasonings which are advanced in support of these different opinions, none hold good, not even those which seem least founded upon mere arbitrariness. The St. Paul of Renan has just appeared; he accepts the Epistle as genuine, and denies the correctness of its title, and also its Introd. The following is worthless; and to the reasons which are adduced in support of these different opinions, none hold good, not even those which seem least founded upon mere arbitrariness.

Chap. xv., ver. 1. Now we that are strong [σὺν δὲ Ἰησοῦς οἱ δύναμεν]. The δὲ does not stand for οὖν, as the E. V. indicates (so Hodge), although it connects with what has just been said. Meyer, Philippi, &c.—R. Tholuck finds in δὲ a correct proof that the division of the chapter has been improperly made at this verse, as far as conviction is concerned, the Apostle stands on the side of the strong; see chap. xiv. 14, 20; 1 Cor. viii. 4.

[to bear, θεωρεῖσθαι.] After the Apostle has shown what the strong have to avoid, he shows what is now their duty toward the weak. In natural life, weakness is often oppressed and made to suffer violence by power; in the kingdom of the Spirit, on the contrary, "strong" expresses both the appointment to, and the duty of bearing, the infirmities of the weaker.

Infirmities of the weak [τὰ ἀκόμημα τῶν ἄδιστων]. Meyer, Lange: Glaubensschwachheiten; but, with Philippus, Alford, &c., it seems best to regard the term as general, including, of course, the scruples above referred to.—R. These are undoubtedly a burden, and thus an impediment to the progress of the strong; but in order to take the weak ones along with them, their weaknesses must be taken up—which is the rule in a caravan. But the bearing does not consist merely in suffering, but rather in forbearance. [Comp. Gal. vi. 2, Lange's Comm., p. 149, where the same verb is used.—R.]

And not to please ourselves. Αριστεύοντα see Gal. i. 10 [1 Cor. x. 33].

C. Reciprocal edification, in self-denial, according to the example of Christ, chap. xv. 2-4.

Ver. 2. Let every one of us [ἐκ τοῦ ἀγάθου τοῦ κόσμου. See Textual Notes 17 and 26]. Thus the Apostle here comprehends both parties.—[For his good (with a view) to edification, εἰς τὸ ἀγαθὸν τοῦ κόσμου.] Bengel: Βοήσσαντα [αὖρα] genre, edificatio species. There is, first, εἰς, then, ποὺ, ἵνα. In order that one may add the other to the good which is in the world, in order that he may promote his edification, and thus improve his sense for the fellowship of what is good, the good chiefly meant here is self-denying love, the constant exercise of humility.

Ver. 3. For even Christ pleased not himself [καὶ γὰρ Οὐραίος ἐγεννημένος οὐ ἐπέλεγον ἁμαρτεῖν]. Dr. Lange renders: Denn (selbst) auch Christus lehre nicht sich selbst zum Gehen. The E. V. is more literal.—R. See Phil. ii. 6; 2 Cor. viii. 9. Pleading one's self denotes the insouciable and unfriendly pursuit of the ideals of our own subjectivity in the selfish isolation of our personal existence.

But, as it is written, &c. [ἄλλα παραστὰς οὐκ ἀναπτύσσεται, τ.τ.τ. See Textual Note 2]. Ps. lxxxi. 9. The sentence is literally cited. On the different supplements suggested with ἄλλα, see but also to the brethren of Rome and one or more other places. Local and individual items were added, according as the special destination of the general circulars. These specialities were selected, and arranged, so as to suit the circumstances of the Epistle to the Romans, otherwise inexact, or inadmissible in the text of so clean, straightforward, elegant, but logical writer as St. Paul. It would seem that his view is based upon an analogous phrase of the general theory advanced by the German authors named above.—R.
Meyer, who would not supply any thing.* Grotius suggests the most natural one: ἀεὶ. The citation is from the LXX. The reproaches for the Lord's sake, was a type of Christ; but Christ's subjecting himself to the reproaches of the world proceeded from His steadfast fellowship with humanity for God's sake. For himself, He might have had joy; Heb. xii. 2, 3. [Alford: "The words in the Messianic Psalm are addressed to the Father, not to those for whom Christ suffered; but they prove all that is here required, that He He did not please himself; His sufferings were undertaken on account of the Father's good purpose—mere work which He gave Him to do."—R.]

Ver. 4. For whatsoever things were written aforesight [ὁ σάρξ γὰρ προηγάγη]. Justification of the previous citation (Philippi), and a preparation for the subject to be introduced next, viz., the duty of unanimity (Alford). In προηγάγη, just before the emphatic ἀεὶ, Meyer correctly finds the thought: All before over time—i.e., the whole Old Testament. This does not apply merely to the messianic prophecies (Reiche). The immediate design of the entire Old Testament Scriptures for the Jews does not preclude their universal purpose for all ages.

That we through the patience and the comfort of the Scriptures [ινά διὰ τῆς ἐπομνήματος καὶ διὰ τῆς παρακλήσεως τῶν γραφῶν. See Textual Note 2] The repetition of διὰ seems to favor the view that γραφῶν depends on παρακλήσεως alone; yet many commentators, who adopt this reading, claim (and with reason) that such a construction would be ungrammatical. Still, Dr. Lange seems to favor it. We paraphrase: "the patience and comfort produced by a study of the Scriptures."—R.] Two things should support the believer, particularly in looking at the retarding, obstructing prejudice of the weak: First, the patience immanent in the Christian spirit (patience evidently suits better here than constancy, which Meyer prefers). [So Philip, De Wette, &c.] Second, the comfort of the Holy Scriptures, which, in the present connection, consisted in the fact that, in spite of all the impediments to spiritual life in the Old Testament, the development to the New Testament nevertheless proceeded uninterrupted.

Might have our hope [τὴν ἐλπίδα ἐγχώρησεν ἀπὸ τῆς Δόξης. Others say we might have more and more of the Christian hope. —R.] And then, this comfort was an encouragement to hold fast hope as the hope of better times; that is, of the ever newer and more glorious developments of God's kingdom, in Spener's sense, Beza, and others, properly explain: ἐν εὐαγγελίῳ, which is opposed by Meyer. We can, indeed, preserve hope by patience, but not acquire it. According to Meyer, indeed, patience should also be referred to τῶν γραφῶν (against Grotius, and others), and this should therefore imbue Christians. But yet the patience and comfort of the Scriptures could not mean, without something further: the patience and the comfort with which the Scriptures imbue us. [The genitive γραφῶν is joined with ἐπομνήματος also, by Chrysostom, and by most modern commentators. In fact, this is the only view which can be justified grammatically. "The patience and comfort produced by arising from, a study of the Scriptures," is the simplest and best sense. So Alford, and most.—R.] It is justifiably urged by Meyer, against Reiche, and others, that hope must here be taken subjectively. Of course, he who lets go his subjective hope, gives up thereby its object. [The hope is undoubtedly to be regarded as subjective, but the article (which we preserve in English by rendering: our hope) points to a definite Christian hope, viz., of future glory. It would then seem appropriate to "we might have hope" as referring to the obtaining of a higher degree of this hope through the patience, &c. (So Meyer, Philip, De Wette).—R.]

DOCTRINAL AND ETHICAL.

1. The present section contains a confessional Eirenicon of the Apostle. It requires: (1) Reciprocal recognition of the common ground of faith. (2) The balancing of the conviction of faith with the conduct of love. (3) Above all, watchfulness against particular ethical errors on both sides. [The profound insight into human nature manifested in this chapter, combines, with the unparalleled adaptation of its precepts to the social life of men in all ages, to prove "the God of peace" its author. In America, where society is newest, most experimental, and yet public opinion so tyrannical, where, perhaps, the extremes of the weak and the strong are found, it deserves especial study.—R.]

2. As the name, the weak, is not an unconditional reproach, so the strong is not unconditional praise. The weak one's prejudice is a certain protection so long as he keeps his weakness pure—that is, does not make it a rule for others; the strong one's justifiable sense of freedom leads to the danger of self-boasting, particularly against love, which can draw in its train the loss of faith. These propositions can be proved by the example of pious Catholics and of wicked Protestants. Yet the standpoint of the strong man is in itself higher, and though he becomes very guilty by the abuse of his freedom of faith, the Apostle yet portrays, with very strong expressions, the ruin of those who eat in doubt. The unbelievers, one, who would not be free in a positive, but in a negative, and therefore insufficient way, become the most unmitigated anathemas and antiheroes both in a religious and moral respect. If, in the time of the Reformation, all Protestants had become positively free by Christ, Protestantism would hardly have experienced in its history such great impediments of reaction as that of unbelief.

[Weak and strong, old and new, conservative and radical—these antitheses are not precisely synonymous, yet, in their leading features, the same. He does what Paul has not done, who throws himself entirely with one class or the other. The Church has ever contained, and has ever needed, both elements. Yet sometimes those are deemed radical who answer to the description here given of the weak brethren; and those who are truly strong are often classed with the old-fashioned. The caution about judging is prophetic of what is so manifest in the history of Christ's Church in her imperfection: that more divisions and discord have arisen from the question about which the Apostle himself gives no definite decision, than from the discussion of the weightier matters of the earlier chapters.—R.]
3. It is almost impossible to emphasize sufficiently the two distinctions to which the present section leads us. The Apostle shows, first, that we should not deny our free conviction, but should deny ourselves in reference to the inconsiderate conduct according to conviction in practical things, that do not belong to the testimony of faith. How often is this rule exactly reversed, by one's asserting a narrow view in order to please the weak (for example, in the condemning art, concerts, innocent relaxations, &c.), while he himself willingly enjoys occasionally the forbidden fruit.* The second distinction is brought just as closely home—namely, between doing and leaving undone. What one cannot do with the inward assurance of his conscience, must not be done at all.

4. The opposite tendencies that are presented to us as a germ in the Church at Rome, extend in continual gradations through the books of the New Testament, and confront each other in the second century. The two opposed tendencies of Eutychianism and of Gnostic autonomism.—On the relation between Gentile Christians and Jewish Christians at the time of Justin Martyr, see Tholuck, p. 704.

5. On the idea of weakness in faith, and conduct which is not of faith, see the Ezeg. Notes on vers. 1 and 23; comp. Tholuck, p. 706 ff.

6. "For God is able to make him stand;" ver. 4. How gloriously this has been fulfilled! see the Ezeg. Notes.

7. On the duty of striving after a certain conviction, and the means for attaining it (self-knowledge and gratitude), see the Ezeg. Notes on vers. 5.

8. On ver. 6. Thanksgiving makes every pure Christian enjoy a real peace-offering (2281).


10. Every thing is pure. According to Olshausen (in respect to the laws on food), creation has again become pure and holy through Christ and His sanctifying influence. The proposition cannot be opposed, but how far must it be more specifically defined? As the creature of God, it has again been recognized as pure and holy. As a means of enjoyment, it has again been freely given in a religious sense. But as a real enjoyment, it is only pure and holy to the one enjoying, when he has the full assurance of his conscience, and therefore eats with thanksgiving. But in this the natural repulsion, practice, law, and a regard to love, limiting the circle of the means of enjoyment, as well as of the enjoyment itself, come into consideration, because they also limit that assurance.

11. The understanding of the present section has been rendered much more difficult by not regarding the manner in which the offence is divided into the two fundamental forms of irritation and presumption. See the Ezeg. Notes on vers. 18 and 21.

12. Luther's expression, "the Christian is a master of all masters, a servant of all servants," comes into consideration here. Gregory the Great had expressed the same sentiment, but in a reverse order and application: "Free in faith, serving in love." The parable beginning with Matt. xviii. 23 tells us that the consistent and conscious offence against love weakens faith.

13. Bearing with the weak has: (1.) Its foundation in the fact that the Almighty God bears in love the world, which in itself is helpless; (2.) Its power and obligation consist in the fact that Christ has borne the guilt of the helpless world; (3.) And its dignity lies in the fact that the strength of the strong first finds in this function its whole truth, proof, and satisfaction.


15. The word of the Old Testament Scriptures is still of application; how much more, therefore, is this the case with that of the New Testament! Yet, in this relation, we dare not overlook the truth, that Christian life may have but one rule of faith, but yet two fountains: the Holy Scriptures, and the immediate fellowship of the heart with Christ, from which the patience of Christ flows.

HOMILETICAL AND PRACTICAL.

VERSES 1-12.

On the proper reciprocal conduct of the strong and weak in faith. 1. What form should it take? a. The strong should receive the weak, and not despise them; b. The weak should not judge the strong. 2. On what should it be established? a. On everybody's remembering that God has received the other as well as himself; b. Therefore he should consider that, in whatever the other one does or leaves undone, he does it or leaves it undone to the Lord; c. Do not forget that the decision on our course of action belongs to the Lord alone, whom we all belong, and before whose judgment-seat we must all appear (vers. 1-12). Who art thou that judgest another man's servant? Two things are implied in this question of the Apostle: 1. Directly, a warning to guard against any judgment of faith on our brethren; 2. Indirectly, an admonition rather to judge ourselves, and to perceive the weakness of our own faith (ver. 4).—In matters of conscience, each one standeth or falleth to his Lord (ver. 4).—The great value of a strong religious conviction. 1. To ourselves. a. We act according to fixed principles; 8. We do not vacillate; c. We preserve our inward peace. 2. To others. a. They know where they are with us; b. They therefore entertain confidence in us; c. Their own life is improved by our example (ver. 5).—The possibility of thanksgiving to God as a test of enjoying that which is allowed (ver. 6).—As Christians, we are the Lord's possession. 1. What is this? a. No one liveth to himself, and no one dieth to himself; that is, whether in life or in death no one belongs to himself; b. Whether we live, let us live to the Lord; or whether we die, let us die to the Lord; that is, we belong, in life and death, to Him; we are His. 2. By what means have we become the Lord's property? a. By Christ's death; b. By His resurrection
and glorification (vers. 7-9).—We shall all appear before the judgment-seat of Christ! This is said: 1. To the weak in faith, that he may not judge his brother; 2. To the strong, that he may despise his brother; 3. To both, that they may examine themselves (vers. 10-15).—The great account which every one shall have to give before God. 1. Of whom? Of himself, on all that he has done and left undone. 2. Before whom? Before God, who knciveth every heart, and seeth what is secret (ver. 12).

LUTHER: There are two kinds of Christians: the strong in faith, and the weak. The former arrogantly despise the weak, and the latter easily get offended at the strong. Both should conduct themselves in love, that neither offend or judge the other, but that each do and allow the other to do what is useful and necessary (ver. 1).

STARK: If one should be certain of his opinion in the use of things indifferent, how much more necessary is it in matters of faith! (ver. 6).—Herzinger: Stones in an arch support each other; so should you support your neighbor. You may know much, but your neighbor may be very useful; you should at least hear him witness that he has a tender conscience (ver. 1).—Bucer: Gratitude sanctifies all acts, however different, that are not inconsistent with gratitude (ver. 6).—The art of dying well is nothing else than the art of living well (ver. 7).

OLRACH: An article of food is only unclean when eaten without thanksgiving; but every thing is holy to him who thankfully acknowledges that the earth is the Lord's, and the fulness thereof (1 Cor. x. 33-31). Let him, on the other hand, who, through fear of breaking a Divine commandment, eats but one kind of meat, be thankful even for that which he does enjoy. Every thing depends on our acting in full obedience to the Lord, and in doing nothing wilfully and independently.

HEEBNER: The less scrupulous one must show tender forbearance; the more scrupulous one must guard against decrying the more liberal (ver. 2).—It is not becoming us to despise the outward worth of a man. We should not condemn even the fallen (ver. 4).—Christianity, as a free institution for the training of mankind, allows freedom in regard to services and in the choice of holy-days (ver. 5).—Every believer renounces his own will, lives to the Lord, who has purchased and redeemed him, and accordingly dies in harmony with the Lord.—This dependence on the Lord is something quite natural to the Christian. He, therefore, who will not be led by love to place a restraint upon himself on account of his weaker brother, but is obstinate, acts against that fundamental principle (vers. 7, 8).—He who judges, arrogates to himself Christ's office; he who bears in mind that Christ will judge us all, will no more condemn.

Besser: To despise and to judge—each is as bad as the other; for in both men encroach upon God's right, and arrogate to himself a judgment on another's state of faith and heart, which becomes an injury to his own life of faith (ver. 8).

SCHRIEMACHER: New-Year's Sermon on vers. 7 and 8. The language of the text is placed before us as a motto on entering this new year of life: 1. In relation to what shall happen to us; 2. In relation to what we shall be required to do.

Champion, Christ, by His death, acquired over us a right of lordship, and hath laid upon us the strongest obligation to serve Him. He made him self a sacrifice, that we might perform a service to Him. By His reviving to a new state and condition of life, His right to our obedience is strengthened. There is no creature exempt from the obedience to Him. Who would not be loyal to Him, who hath already received: 1. A power to protect; 2. A glory to reward?

John How: Receive the poor weaking, for God is able to make him stand. Every new-born child is weak, and we must remember that this is the case with every regenerate soul.

Bishop Hopkins: On ver. 12. All the wickedness that men have brooded on and hatched in the darkest vaults of their own hearts, or acted in the obscurest secrecy, shall be then made as manifest as if they were every one of them written on their foreheads with the point of a sunbeam. Here, on earth, none know so much of us, neither would we that they should, as our own consciences; and yet those great secretaries, our own consciences, through ignorance or carelessness, overlook many sins which we commit. But our own consciences shall not know more of us than all the world shall, for all that has been done shall be brought into public notice.

Henry: Though some Christians are weak and others strong, though of different sizes, capacities, apprehensions, and practices, in lesser things, yet they are all the Lord's. They serve Christ, and approve themselves to Him, and accordingly are owned and accepted of Him. Is it for us, then, to judge or despise them, as if we were their masters, and they were to make it their business to please us, and to stand or fall by our sentence?

Wesley, Sermon on the Great Assize, Rom. xiv. 10: Consider: 1. The chief circumstances which will precede our standing before the judgment-seat of Christ; 2. The judgment itself; 3. Circumstances which will follow it; 4. Application to the hearer.

Robbnt Hall: The proper remedy for a diversity of sentiment is not the exercise of compulsory power; much less a separation of communion, but the ardent pursuit of Christian piety, accompanied with a humble dependence on Divine teaching, which it may reasonably be expected, will in due time correct the errors and imperfections of sincere believers. The proper conduct to be maintained is a cordial cooperation in every branch of worship and of practice with respect to which we agree, without attempting to effect a unanimity by force.

Richard Watson, on vers. 7, 8: The extension of the work of Christ in every age goes upon the same principle. The principle of selfishness and that of usefulness are distinct and contrary. One is a point, but the centre is nothing; the other is a progressive radius, which runs out to the circumference. The one is a vortex, which swallows up all within its gorge; the other is the current-stream, which gushes with an incessant activity, and spreads into distant fields, refreshing the thirsty earth, and producing richness and verdure. The principle of one is contraction; of the other, expansion. Nor is this a sluggish or inactive principle. Lively desires for the acknowledgment of Christ by men, strong and restless jealousies for His honor, tender sympathies with the moral wretchedness of our kind, deep and solemn impressions of eternal realities, and of the hunger of souls; these are the elements which feed it; and they carry Christian love beyond even the philantrophy of the natural law.
[Horne: Owing to ignorance, early prejudice, weakness of faith, and other causes, there may and must exist a diversity of opinion and practice on minor points of duty. But this diversity is no sufficient reason for rejecting from Christian fellowship any member of the family of Christ. It is, however, one thing to recognize a man as a Christian, and another to recognize him as a suitable minister of a church, organized on a particular form of government and system of doctrines.

F. W. H. Knowlton: It is always dangerous to multiply restrictions and requirements beyond what is essential; because men, feeling themselves hemmed in, break the artificial barrier, but, breaking it with a sense of guilt, thereby become hardened in consequence, and prepared for transgressions against commandments which are divine and of eternal obligation. Hence it is that the criminal has so often, in his confessions, traced his deterioration in crime to the first step of breaking the Sabbath-day; and, no doubt, with accurate truth.—If God has judgments in store for England, it is because we are selfish men—because we prefer pleasure to duty, party to our church, and ourselves to every thing else.—J. F. H.]

VSS. 15-16.

On avoiding offence. 1. Offence cannot be avoided as the expense of personal freedom; 2. Just as little can it be avoided at the expense of love toward a brother (vers. 13-16).—If you would avoid stumbling or offence, then preserve: 1. Your personal freedom; 2. But do not injure love toward a brother, for whose sake Christ died (vers. 15-16).—Nothing is unclean in itself; much is unclean if one so regard it (ver. 14).—Take care that your treasure be not evil spoken of! 1. What is this treasure? Spiritual freedom. Comp. ver. 6; 1 Cor. x. 20; 1 Tim. iv. 4. 2. How can it be protected against slander? When the strong man in faith rejoices in his possession, but at the same time walks charitably (ver. 16).

Luther: The gospel is our treasure, and it is evil spoken of when Christian freedom is so boldly made use of as to give offence to the weak.

Stark: Heimgärtner: Take heed, soul, lest you give offence! No stumbling-stone, no sin, however small you think it may be, is really small if it can make a weak one fall. Use the right which you have, but use it aright; Matt. xvii. 24 (ver. 13).

Gerlach: It is not our office to judge our brother, and to decide on his relation to God; but it is every Christian's office to pronounce decisively against uncharitableness, which can condemn another to his fall.

Besser: The promise is Christian freedom, delivered from outward ordinances. It is evil spoken of either by the enemies of the Church, when they see the dissension of Christians, or by the weaker brethren, when they condemn the stronger, and use their freedom presumptuously, or by the stronger, when they give offence to the weaker, and injure their conscience (ver. 16).

Besser: It is a true proverb: "Though two do the same thing, it is not really the same thing," for not the form of the deed, but the sense of the doer, decides as to whether any thing is unclean or holy, or contrary to faith and love (ver. 14).

[Jeremy Taylor: In a ripe conscience, the practical judgment—that is, the last determination of an action—ought to be sure and evident. This is plain in all the great acts of duty, in actions determinable by the prime principles of natural reason, or Divine revelation; but it is true also in all actions conducted by a right and perfect conscience.

There is always a reflex act of judgment, which, upon consideration that it is certain that a public action may lawfully be done, or else that which is but probable in the nature of the thing (so far as we perceive it) may yet, by the superadding of some circumstances and confidential considerations, or by evidence or probability, become more probable in the particular. Although, I say, the conscience has not absolute certainty in the direct act, yet it may be certain, right, and determined, in the reflex and second act of judgment; and if it be, it is innocent and safe—it is that which we call the right and sure conscience (The Rule of Conscience, Works [Bishop Henn's edition], vol. xvi. pp. 389-422).

Clarke: It is dangerous to trifle with conscience, even when erroneous; it should be borne with and instructed; it must be won over, not taken by storm. Its feelings should be respected, because they ever refer to God, and have their foundation in His fear. He who sins against his conscience in things which every one else knows to be indifferent, will soon do it in those things in which his salvation is most intimately concerned. It is a great blessing to have a well-informed conscience; it is a blessing to have a tender conscience, and even a sore conscience is better than none.

Barnes: Christ laid down His precious life for the weak brother as well as for the strong. He loved them; and shall we, to gratify our appetites, pursue a course which will tend to defeat the work of Christ, and ruin the souls redeemed by His blood?

—Do not so use your Christian liberty as to give occasion for railing and unkind remarks from your brother, so as to produce contention and strife, and thus to give rise to evil reports among the wicked about the tendency of the Christian religion, as if it were adapted only to promote controversy.—J. F. H.]

VSS. 17-22.

The glory of God's kingdom as a kingdom: 1. Of righteousness; 2. Of peace; 3. And of joy in the Holy Ghost (ver. 17).—God's kingdom is not a kingdom of dead ordinances, by which the conscience is oppressed; but, 2. A kingdom of living, evangelical truth, by which righteousness, peace, and joy in the Holy Ghost are planted and promoted (ver. 17).—God's kingdom is a kingdom which: 1. Rests on righteousness; 2. In whose borders peace reigns; 3. To belong to which brings joy to the hearts of all its citizens (ver. 17).—The blissful service of Christ. 1. The service is in righteousness, &c.; 2. The blessing; a. That we are acceptable to God; b. That we are approved of men (vers. 17, 18).

For what should members of the Christian Church strive, if in most important matters they are one, but in unessential matters they have different views? 1. For what makes for peace; 2. For what contributes to edification (ver. 19).—Even the weaker brother's Christian life is God's work; therefore be indignant toward his conscience (ver. 20).—Rather deny self than offend a brother (ver. 21).—The happiness of Christian freedom (ver. 22).—The condemnation of the doubting conscience (ver.
serve: 1. That the love and practice of religious duties, such as righteousness and peace, is a clear and strong argument of a person's acceptance with God; 2. That such as are for those things accepted by God, ought by no means, for differing from us in lesser things, to be disowned of us, and cast out of communion by us.

**[Henry]:** Ways by which we may edify one another: 1 By good counsel; 2. Reproof; 3. Instruction; 4. Example; 5. Building up not only ourselves, but one another, in the knowledge of God. None are so strong but they may be edified; none so weak but they may edify; and while we edify others, we benefit ourselves.—**CLARKE:** If a man's passions or appetite allow or instigate him to a particular thing, let him take good heed that his conscience approve what his passions allow, and that he live not the subject of continual self-condemnation and reproach. Even the man who has a too scrupulous conscience had better, in such matters as are in question, obey its erroneous dictates, than violate this moral feeling, and live only to condemn the actions he is constantly performing.

**[Hodge]:** Conscience, or a sense of duty, is not the only, and perhaps not the most important, principle to be appealed to in support of benevolent enterprises. It comes in aid of and gives its sanction to all other right motives; but we find the sacred writers appealing most frequently to the benevolent and pious feelings—to the example of Christ—to a sense of our obligations to Him—to the mutual relations of Christians, and their common connection with the Redeemer, &c., as motives to self-denial and devotedness. As the religion of the gospel consists in the inward graces of the Holy Spirit, all who have these graces should be recognized as genuine Christians; being acceptable to God, they should be loved and cherished by His people, notwithstanding their weakness or errors. The peace and edification of the Church are to be sought at all sacrifices, except those of truth and duty; and the work of God is not to be destroyed or injured for the sake of any personal or party interests. An enlightened conscience is a great blessing; it secures the liberty of the soul from bondage to the opinions of men, and from the self-inflicted pains of a scrupulous and morbid state of moral feeling; it promotes the right exercise of all the virtuous affections, and the right discharge of all our duties.—**R. Richardson,** on vers. 29, 23: The reason that the Church is so held in her devotions, and so little comparative success attends her evangelizing efforts, is, that her confidence in God's promises and methods is paralyzed by a self-accusing consciousness of delinquency. There cannot be an overcoming faith in the people of God, except the Spirit of Him who fulfilleth all righteousness breathes and works in their hearts and lives.

CHAPTER XIV. I.-XV. 4.
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Chap. XV. 1-4.

Let us bear the infirmity of the weak without 
pleasing ourselves; for in this: 1. We seek to 
please our neighbor for his good, to edification; 2. 
We herein choose Christ as our pattern, who did 
not please himself (vers. 1-4).—For what purpose 
should the strong use the infirmity of the weak? 
1. To humble himself: 2. To please his neighbor; 
3. To imitate Christ (vers. 1-4).—On pleasing our- 
selves. 1. In what is its ground? a. In a man's 
regarding his views as the most correct; b. His 
efforts as the best; c. His words as the wisest; d. 
His deeds as the most godly; e. And, consequently, 
himself as insurpassable. 2. How is it shown? a. 
In the severe condemnation of the weak; b. In im-
moderate self-praise; c. In pretentious manners in 
society. 3. How is it to be overcome? a. By dis-

cipline in bearing the infirmities of the weak brethren; 
b. By an honest effort to please our neighbor 
for his good, to edification (comp. 1 Cor. x. 33); c. 
By a believing look at Christ, who did not please 
himself, but bore the reproaches of His enemies 
(vers. 1-4).—The blessing of the Holy Scriptures 
for our inward man (ver. 4).—The Holy Scriptures 
a fountain of hope (ver. 4).—Examples of patience 
and comfort, which the Scriptures present to us 
for awakening joyful hope: 1. From the Old Testa-
ment: 2. From the New Testament (ver. 4).

Roos: Bearing the infirmity of the weak is an 
exercise of meek love, which neither lightly esteems 
him who is weak, nor would seek to change him in 
a rough, vehement manner. To please ourselves, 
means to act according to our own views, whether 
another can be offended at them or not; or to so 
conduct ourselves as if we were in the world for 
our own sake alone, and not also for our weak 
brother's sake (vers. 2 and 3).

Gerlach: The Apostle here sets up Christ not 
merely as a pattern, but as a motive, and the living 
Author and Finisher of our life of faith (ver. 3).

Heubner: The reason why a man does not place 
himself under restraint, is pleasure with himself; 
and this binds all peace, destroys the germ of love 
in the heart, and is a proof of spiritual weakness, 
prejudice, and a corrupt heart. He is not strong 
who cannot bear with others near him, nor tolerate 
his opinions (ver. 21).—The Bible is the only real 
and inexhaustible book of comfort; Paul said this 
even when there was nothing more than the Old 
Testament.—The Bible is not merely a book to be 
read, but to be lived [nicht lesen, sondern Lebenbucht], 
Luther, vol. v., pp. 1707 (ver. 4).

Jeremy Taylor: There is comfort scattered up 
and down throughout the holy book, and not cast 
even in a lump together. By searching it diligently, 
we may draw our consolation out of: 1. Faith; 2. 
Hope; 3. The indwelling of the Spirit; 4. Prayer; 
5. The Sacraments.—Burkitt: The great end for 
which the Holy Scriptures were written, was the 
informing of our judgments, and the directing of 
our practice, that, by the examples which we find 
these of the patience of holy men under sufferings, 
and of God's relieving and comforting them in their 
distresses, we might have hope, confidence, and assur-
ance, that God will also comfort and relieve us under 
the like pressures and burdens.

Henry: Christ bore the guilt of sin, and the 
curse for it; we are only called to bear a little of 
the trouble of it. He bore the presumptuous sins of 
the wicked; we are called only to bear the infirmi-
ties of the weak. There are many things to be 
learned out of Scripture: the best learning is that 
which is drawn from that fountain. Those are most 
learned that are most mighty in the Scriptures. As 
ministers, we need help, not only to roll away the 
stone, but to draw out the water; for in many places 
the well is deep. Practical observations are more 
necessary than critical expositions.

Scot: Many venture into places and upon not-
tions against which there own conscience revolt;
because they are induced by inclination, or embold-
ened by the example of those who, on some account, 
have obtained the reputation of pious men. But 
they are condemned for indulging themselves in a 
doubtful case. In order to enjoy freedom from self-
condemnation, we must have: 1. A sound judg-
ment; 2. A simple heart; 3. A tender conscience; 

Robert Hald: Paul enjoins the practice of for-
bearance, on the ground of the conscientiousness 
of the parties concerned, on the assumption not only 
of their general sincerity, but of their being equally 
actuated, in the very particulars in which they dif-
f ered, by an unfeigned respect to the authority of 
Christ; and as he urges the same consideration on 
which the toleration of both parties rested, it must 
have included a something which was binding on the 
conscience, whatever was his private judgment on 
the points in debate. The Jew was as much bound 
to tolerate the Gentile, as the Gentile to tolerate the 
Jew.

Hodge: The desire to please others should be 
wisely directed, and spring from right motives. We 
should not please them to their own injury, nor 
from the wish to secure their favor; but for their 
good, that they may be edified.—Banks: Christ 

tollingly threw himself between the sinner and God, 
to intercept, as it were, our sins, and to bear the 
effects of them in His own person. He stood 
between us and God; and both the reproaches and the 
Divine displeasure due to them met on His sacred 
person, and produced the sorrows of the atonement. 
—His bitter agony in the garden and on the cross. 
Jesus thus showed His love of God in being willing 
to bear the reproaches aimed at Him, and His love 
of men in being willing to endure the sufferings 
necessary to atone for those very ones.

Homiletical Literature on ver. 4: Bishop 
Laymer, Sermons of the Plough, Works, vol. i. 59; 
Seven Sermons, Ibid., vol. i. 56; Bishop Patrick, 
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W. Wotton, Sermon, (1722); John Guts, Sermon, 
(1728); Dispositions for Reading the Scriptures; 
Pitman from Osterwald, 1st Course, vol. i., 16; J. 
Brailesford, Revelation of a Future State in the 
Scriptures, an Argument for Patience and Patience, 
Serm., 247; Thomas Adam, Works, vol. iii. 334;
H. Draper, The Authority, Excellence, and Use of

Sixth Section.—Exhortation to unanimity on the part of all the members of the Church, to the praise of God and on the ground of God's grace, in which Christ has accepted both Jews and Gentiles. Reference to the destination of all nations to glorify God, even according to the Old Testament, and encouragement of the Roman Christians to an immeasurable hope in regard to this, according to their calling.

Chap. XV. 5-13.

5 Now the God of patience and consolation [comfort] grant you to be like-minded [of the same mind] one toward another according to Christ Jesus; That ye may with one mind and one mouth [with one accord ye may with one mouth] glorify God, even the Father [or, the God and Father] of our Lord Jesus Christ. Wherefore receive ye one another, as Christ also received us [you], to the glory of God. Now [For] I say that Jesus [omits Jesus] Christ was [hath been made] a minister of the circumcision for the truth [for the sake of God's truth] of God, and [in order to] confirm the promises made unto the fathers: And that the Gentiles might glorify God for his mercy; as it is written,

For this cause I will confess [give thanks] to thee among the Gentiles And sing unto thy name.

10, 11 And again he saith, Rejoice, ye Gentiles, with his people. And again, Praise the Lord, all ye Gentiles; And laud him, all ye people.

12 And again, Esaias [Isaiah] saith, There shall be a root of Jesse, And he that shall rise [riseth] to reign over the Gentiles; In him shall the Gentiles trust [hope].

13 Now [And may] the God of hope fill you with all joy and peace [in believing], that ye may abound in hope, through [by, in] the power of the Holy Ghost.

Textual.

1 Ver. 5.—On the two renderings given above, see the Exeg. Notes.
2 Ver. 7.—The Rec., with B. D. * μέτα; N. A. C. D. F. L. most versions and many fathers: μετά. All modern editors adopt the latter. Besides the overwhelming MS. support, there is the additional reason, that μέτα might as readily enter as a correct gloss, since the reference is undoubtedly to both Jewish and Gentile Christians. See the Exeg. Notes.
3 Ver. 7.—The Rec. on very insufficient authority, omits τινος before θεοῦ; inserted in N. A. B. C. D. F. G.
4 Ver. 8.—Instead of γάρ, which is found in N. A. B. C. D. F. versions and fathers, the Rec. (with L. and Peshito) reads: ἢ. The latter reading probably arose from a misunderstanding of the connection (Alford), or because ἀνέθη is so common with Paul (Meyer). The former is now generally adopted (from Griesbach to Tregelles). Philippus thinks a decision impossible!
5 Ver. 8.—D. P., Syriac versions, Rec. insert [ὑπὲρ] before Χριστοῦ; some authorities (including Vulgate), after Χριστοῦ; omitted in N. A. B. C., fathers; rejected by Lachmann, Tischendorf, Dr. Wethe, Alford. The variation in position is decidedly against it, making an interpolation extremely probable. Dr. Lange thinks the connection favors the omission.
6 Ver. 8.—N. A. C. D. L. many fathers: γεγένηται; adopted by De Wette, Philippi, Meyer, Alford, Lange, B. G. D. F.; γεγένηται, adopted by Lachmann and Tregelles. The former is to be preferred, because the γε— was likely to be omitted and the latter might have been substituted as a correction.
[God, even the Father, &c. The E. V. thus renders, disconnecting "of our Lord Jesus Christ" from "God." So De Wette, Philippi, Meyer, Stuart, Webster and Wilkinson. Hodge, Tholuck, and Alford, leave the question undecided. It would seem that either view is admissible grammatically; Καὶ is often used exegetically, even, and the article (standing before Θεόν only) may merely bind the two terms, "God" and "Father of Christ" (Meyer). At the same time, the article might be looked for before παρέχω, were not καὶ explicative. Is there any doctrinal difficulty occasioned by either view. The only reason in my own mind for preferring the interpretation of the E. V. is, that those expositors, who are most delicate in their perceptions of grammatical questions, adopt it. See Meyer in loco.—R.]

Ver. 7. Wherefore received ye one another [διὰ προσλαμβάνοντο δὲ ἀλλήλους.] In the intensive sense. An exhortation to both parties.

As Christ also received you [καὶ Χριστὸς προσέλαβε ὑμᾶς.] See Textual Note.* This is more definitely explained in vers. 8 and 9.

To the glory of God [τις δοῦν τοῦ Θεοῦ. See Textual Note.*] This must be referred to Christ's reception of them, and not to the exhortation: receive ye one another, according to Chrysostom, and others. *This God might be referred Not immediately, in order that we may share the Divine glory with Christ (Grotius, Beza, and others), although the glorification of God shall consist in that. As the self-humiliation of Christ, which was proved by His receiving men into His fellowship, led to the glorification of God (see John xviii.), so also, according to the previous verse, shall the same conduct of self-humiliation on the part of Christians have the same effect. But how has Christ received us into His fellowship? Answer: Ver. 8. For I say [λέγω γὰρ. See Textual Note.*] The Apostle now explains how Christ received the Jewish Christians and Gentile Christians into fellowship with himself.—That Christ

* [Dr. Hodge seems to prefer the other reference, while Dr. L. does not decide which reading he adopts. θεοῦ or ὑμῶν; but says that, if the former be the true reading, Paul is "self-censuring the Gentiles or the true character of their conversion to forbearance toward their Jewish brethren." This view is rejected by most of the later commentators, for both parties are addressed, as the context shows. Because, as the Apostle says, when he says θεοῦ, we need not hold that he always uses it in this sense.—R.]

**EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.**

The positive destination of the Christian Church at Rome.


—[R.] God is the common, inexhaustible source of all the matured patience of the New Testament, and of all the preparatory comfort of the Old Testament; and it is from Him that believers must derive the gift of being of the same mind one toward another according to Christ Jesus (not according to His example and will merely, but according to His Spirit),

Ver. 6. It is only in this path of self-humiliation that they shall and can attain to the glorious way of glorifying the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ—Him who has glorified Jesus as Christ, after Christ passed through, the Jesus-way of humiliation, and whom they glorify in the anticipation that He will glorify them with Him, as He has already glorified them in Him. The terms Christ Jesus and Jesus Christ are here reversed with remarkable accuracy, and afford. With one accord, καὶ παρέχω μας, is not explained by the phrase: with one mouth [ἐν ἕνεκ στόμασιν], but the former is the source of the latter, as Meyer has correctly observed, against Reiche. ["When God is so pleased that the same mood impels every one to the same utterance of praise, then party-feeling is banished, and unanimity has found its most sacred expression" (Meyer).—R.]

The God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ [τοῦ Θεοῦ καὶ πατέρος τοῦ Χριστοῦ Πάτερ. He is not only the God, but also the God of Christ, in the highest specific sense (thus Grotius [Bengel, Reiche, Fritzzehe, Jovetta], and others, in opposition to Meyer). Comp. Eph. i. 17.]

*[With this accords the view of Dr. Hodge: "The expression, to be liken-minded, does not here refer to unanimity of opinion, but to harmony of feeling; see chaps. viii. 3; xii. 3." The context favors this very decidedly.—Meyer thinks "the example of Christ (ver. 3) is still the ruling thought;" but it certainly not the exclusive one. The verb παρέχω is the latter Hellenistic form for δοθη.]
[Xριστόν. See Textual Note 1.] The reading Christ, as a designation of God's Son, in view of the incarnation. In this view He hath been made a minister of the circumcision [διάκονον γεννήθαι περιστάτης. See Textual Note 1.]

Dr. Lange, in his German text of this verse, thus explains this phrase: "from a higher, Divine-human, ideal point of view, receiving the Jews into His fellowship, by submitting himself to circumcision."—R. His concrete incarnation as a Jew, in which He became subject to the Jewish law (see Phil. ii. 7; Gal. iv. 4), must be distinguished from His incarnation in the more general sense. By this means, He, as the heavenly Strong One, through voluntary love entered into the fellowship of the infinitely weak in both a human and legal sense, and accordingly received them into His fellowship. It seems far-fetched to regard the circumcision here (with Meyer [Philippi, Hodge], and others) as an abstract idea for the circumcised. The circumcision denotes the law; and as He freely bore a minister of the law, He also became a ministration companion of the Jews; Matt. xx. 28. Therefore it is not the theocratic "honor of the Jews" which is emphasized here (Meyer [Philippi]), but the condensation to serve them. [So Hodge. Διάκονον is in emphatic position. The view of the emphasis taken by Meyer seems confirmed by what follows, which sets forth an advantage of the Jews—R.]

For the sake of God's truth [κατὰ δὲ λογισμὸν καθιστώ προς θεόν. For the sake of the truthfulness of God, in order to justify and to prove it by means of the fulfillment of the promises of the Old Testament.—R.] This undoubtedly seems to express the advantage of the Jews; but it also indicates their pernicious condition. His condensation had a twofold cause: God's mercy, and His promises resting upon it. Principally, His mercy took the precedence; but historically, the promise preceded. The truthfulness of God had to be sealed; He must confirm the promises given to the fathers by fulfilling them, however unfortunate the condition of the posterity; must confirm them in a way finally valid, for, as such sealed promises, they still continue in force, according to chap. xi., especially to believers (see 2 Cor. v. 20; Rom. xi. 14: 20 p. 239)

Ver. 9. And in the Gentiles, &c. [τὸ δὲ εὐαγγελία τῶν ἐλλήνων ἐστάσατο πρὸς θεόν.] Christ had to receive the Jews, acting as a minister to them through His whole life; and He had to confine himself to historical labors among them, not so much because they were worthy of it, as to fulfill the promises given to the fathers. But the Gentiles were now the object of utterly unmerited mercy. This thought, that Christ has redeemed the Gentiles through that which was not historically pledged to them (for the promises in the Old Testament in relation to the Gentiles were not pledged to the Gentiles themselves), now passes immediately over into the representation of the fact that the Gentiles have already come to glorify God as believers, in which they have an advantage on their side also. The meaning of πρὸς θεόν is, that mercy could only help satisfying itself for its own sake, by redemption.

*Joδασαν has been translated by Rückert [De Wette, Hodge, Allford], and others: have glorified; by Kölner [Calvin, Tholuck], and Philippi: should glorify. See Meyer on this point, p. 517. The aorist says, at all events, that they have decidedly begun to glorify God.

For this cause I will give thanks to thee, &c. [ἀνατιθέμενοι εὐχή μετὰ τοῦ λαοῦ αὐτοῦ. See Textual Note 1, for the Hebrew text.

—R.] Deut. xxxiii. 48. From the LXX, which reads μετὰ τοῦ λαοῦ αὐτοῦ for τῷ, "probably following another reading: Τῷ-Τῇ." Meyer. On the impossibility of understanding, by Golm, the single tribes of Israel, which De Wette does, comp. Tholuck, p. 730. [Also Philippi, whose remarks on this citation are unusually full and valuable.—R.]

According to the theocratic idea, the definitions: rejoice to his people, or rather, make his people rejoice (ἡ χάρις); ye Gentiles, and rejoice with his people, amount to the same thing.

Ver. 11. Praise the Lord; Ps. cxvi. 1. [an exact citation from the LXX. See Textual Note 1 and 2, however.—R.] A prophecy of the universal spread of salvation.

Ver. 12. And again, Isaiah saith. [See Textual Note 12.] In chap. xi. 10: According to the LXX., which, however, has translated the original text so freely that the twofold dominion of the Messiah is indicated, on the one hand, over the Jews (as the root of Jesse), and, on the other, over the Gentiles. A root is a sevenfold [Iēsås]. See Isa. xi. 1. The tree of the royal house of David being cut down, the Messiah arose from the root of the house, which is symbolized by Jesse. In a higher sense, Christ was indeed the holy root of Jesse, and of the house of David itself.

*The aorist infinitive διδάσκασας has occasioned some trouble among the grammarians.

1. It has been taken as dependent on Ιησοῦς (ver. 8). So Winne, p. 811; Hodge, Allford, Aldred. [In different senses: (a) I say that the Gentiles have praised God (at the conversion). So Allford, Hodge, De Wette. But this is both contrary to the teaching with the aorist infinitive, and introduces a thought that does not seem to belong here naturally. (b) I say that the Gentiles ought to praise God (Calvin, Philippi, Tholuck). But there is no idea of obligation introduced in ver. 8 which is parallel to this. (c) I say that the Gentiles praise (indefinitely). So Winer, Lange, Tholuck. But this there are three aorists. Besides this, all these involve an incorrect view of the dependence of the infinitive.

2. The criticism is that the natural view is that of the E. V., Meyer, &c. The infinitive stands next to a clause where there is also an aorist infinitive (ἀπεκαθίστατο); it is therefore most coordinate, depending on εἰς τῷ, though expressing the more remote purpose: Jesus was made a minister, &c., in order to confirm the promises, and as a result of this, that the Gentiles might praise God for His mercy.—R.]
CHAPTER XV. 5-13.

Ver. 18. And may the God of hope. A grand description of God here, where the object is to remind the Roman Christians to lead a life in perfect accordance with their universal calling. To this also belongs the duty of looking confidently and prayerfully to the God of hope, the God of that future of salvation which is so infinitely rich, both extensively and intensively.

With all joy and peace. From that hope, the highest possible evangelical, saving joy, shall spring; the result of this shall be the richest measure of peace, and the harmony and unanimity of faith. This shall take place in believing (πιστεύω, it is not by unbelief, or by abridging our faith, that the unity of Christianity should be sought), and accordingly these two spiritual blessings shall ever produce a richer hope, not in human power and according to a human measure, but in the inward measure and divine power of the Holy Ghost.*

Therefore the realization of hope should not be striven for by the aid of earthly and even infernal powers: one shepherd and one fold! According to Grothus, the end of this hope is harmony; according to Tholuck, the immediate end is the gracious gifts of God's kingdom; while the ultimate end is the regnum gloriae. However, there lies just between these the end which the Apostle here has in view—that by the aid of the Church at Rome, in their fellowship with Paul, all nations shall be brought, by the spread of faith, to glorify God; Eph. 1. 18 f.

DOCTRINAL AND ETHICAL.

1. The great grounds of the profound and perfect harmony and unanimity of Christians. a. God as the God of patience and comfort; that is, as the God of the infinite power of passive and active love; b. The pattern, the spirit, the power, and the work of Christ; c. The design that Christians, by being like-minded, and by aiming at substantial fellowship in God and in Christ (as created and redeemed), should find also the ethical fellowship of harmony and unanimity.

2. The universal fellowship into which Christ has entered with humanity, and the special fellowship in which He has pledged himself to the Jews, constitute the basis for the most special and real fellowship into which He, through His grace, has entered with believers. But it is a grievous offence to refuse communion with him whom Christ, by the witness of faith and of confession, has communion, or to abridge and prejudice hearty intercourse with those whom God, in Christ, deems worthy of His fellowship. [Ver. 7 seems to be a dictum probans for what is termed “open communion.”—R.]

3. On the antithesis: Christ Jesus and Jesus Christ, see the Exeg. Notes.

4. It is also clear here (see ver. 8) that we must distinguish between the ideal incarnation of Christ in itself, and His concrete incarnation in Judaism, and, generally, in the form of a servant.

5. God is free in His grace, and yet also bound in His truth, for He has bound Himself to His promises, but this obligation is the highest glory of His freedom. His truthfulness had to satisfy His word, but His mercy had to satisfy itself.

6. The riches of the Old Testament in promises for the Jews, and the high aim of these promises—a world of nations praising the Lord.

7. The God of patience, comfort, hope. All such terms define God to be infinite, and infinite as a fountain, as self-communicating life, and archetype of life. So also is the Holy Spirit defined as the Spirit of truth, &c. See the beautiful remark of Gerlach, below. But the highest thing for which we can praise God, according to ver. 6, is His being the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ. Not only is He His Father in the specific sense, but also His God; the glorious God of His consciousness and life is the true God in perfect revelation, and consequently shall become our God through Him.

8. On the development of hope, within the sphere of faith, into joy and peace, and, by means of peace, into an ever richer hope, see the Exeg. Notes. It is only in this way that irenics can be conducted in the power of the Holy Ghost, and not with the modern artifice of attempting them outside the sphere of faith, beyond all creeds, and with the theory of unconscious Christianity, or even with the violent measures of the Middle Ages. The Apostle says: In the power of the Holy Ghost.

HOMILETICAL AND PRACTICAL.

Jewish and Gentile Christians should agree for Christ's sake, who has received them both.—Christian harmony. 1. It comes from the God of patience and comfort; 2. It is shaped according to the pattern and will of Jesus Christ; 3. It expresses itself in harmonious praise of God, the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ (vers. 5, 6).—A harmonious and fraternal disposition is a source of the joyous praise of God, which is not disturbed by a discordant note (vers. 5, 6)—Jesus Christ a minister of the circumcision. 1. Why? For the truth of God, to confirm the promises. 2. How? In obedience to the Divine law, for freedom from the law (ver. 8).—Receive one another, as Christ also received us, to the glory of God. Every thing to God's glory, and not to our own (ver. 7).—The praise of God out of the mouth of Gentiles: 1. Established in God's mercy; 2. Resounding in many tongues; 3. Ascending to heaven (ver. 9).—God's mercy toward the Gentiles: 1. Present from the beginning; 2. Declared by the prophets; 3. Manifested in Christ (vers. 9-13). Ver. 18 is an appropriate text and theme for addresses on occasions of confirmation or marriage.

STARKE: In Christ, souls are worth so much that God receives them, just as men hoard gold and silver, pearls and gems; Isa. xiii. 4 (ver. 7).—MÜLLER: Patience does not increase in the garden of nature, but it is God's gift and grace; God is the real Master who creates it (ver. 6).—Because Christ is the ever-blooming root, the ever-blooming fruit, and the ever-fructifying root of all. (ver. 12).

GERLACH: God is the source of all good things.
and since He not merely has them, but they are His real essence; since He does not have love and omnipotence, but is actually love and omnipotence themselves, so can He be denominated according to every glorious attribute and gift which He possesses. The advantage which the Gentiles thought that they possessed in their polytheism, when they, for example, worshipped a deity of truth, of hope, &c., is possessed in a much more certain and effective way by the believing Christian, when he perceives, in a vital manner, that the true God is himself personal faithfulness, hope, and love, and thus has all these attributes just as if He had nothing else but (ver. 5).

HeuBer: The harmony of hearts is the real soul and power of worship (ver. 6).—Christ is the centre of the Holy Scriptures (ver. 8).—Christ is the bond of all nations (ver. 13).—God alone is the source of all life and blessing in the Church. The means is faith, as the ever new appropriation of saving blessings; from this arises the enjoyment of peace and of all blessed joys—an overflow of hope. But every thing is brought to pass by the Holy Spirit (ver. 13).

Basen: The Scriptures are a book of patience and comfort (ver. 8).—Every thing which is true joy in this life, is a foretaste of the joy of eternal life—joy in the Lord and His word, joy in all His blessings, which make body and soul happy, &c. ... All true peace in this world of contention and anxiety, is a preliminary enjoyment of the peace in the kingdom of glory.

SchrEERMACHER: The limitation in the labors of our Saviour himself, when he looked at His person, and the greater freedom and expansion in the labors of His disciples. 1. Treatment; 2. Application (verses 8, 9).

Vrs. 4–13. THE PERICOPÉ FOR THE SECOND SUNDAY IN ADVENT.—Schultz: On the likeness of Christ and His redeemed ones. 1. In what respect has Christ become like us? 2. In what respect should we become like Christ? a. In patience and humility; b. In the respect and love with which He treated all men; c. In the joyful and peaceful hope which He had for the salvation of the world.—Bernecker: What must there be among Christians, in order that the Church of Christ may stand? 1. One foundation; 2. A harmonious mouth; 3. A common bond.—Bransby: To what does the season of Advent exhort us? 1. To the industrious examination of what has been written; 2. To the unanimous praise of God, the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, for all that has been already fulfilled; 3. To an attentive waiting for the future coming of God's kingdom.—HeuBer: The unity of the Christian Church. 1. In what does it consist? 2. What binds us to it?—The Bible the bond of the Christian Church. 1. Proof: It is the bond, a. In faith, or in doctrine; b. In the holy sense, or in love; c. In worship; d. In daily life. 2. Application. a. A warning against despising the Bible, and an admonition to maintain its authority; &. A dissolution of its use; c. Our own proper use of it. —The Bible the treasury of the evangelical Church.—The inward unity of true Christians amid outward diversity.

Berkitt: The Christian's hope: 1. God is its object, and therefore the sin of despair is most unreasonable; for why should any despair of His mercy who is the God of hope, who commands us to hope in His mercy, and takes pleasure in them that do so? 2. The grace of hope, together with joy and peace in believing, are rooted in the Christian's heart, through the power of the Holy Ghost—that is, through the sanctifying influences of the Holy Ghost—enlightening the understanding, including the will, rectifying the affections, and reducing all the rebellious powers and faculties of the soul to concurrence with the holy endeavors under the government and dominion of reason and religion.

[Henry: The method of faith is: 1. To seek Christ as one proposed to us for a Saviour; 2. And, finding Him able and willing to save, then to trust in Him. They that know Him will trust in Him. Or, this seeking Him is the effect of a trust in Him, seeking Him by prayer and pursuant endeavors. Trust, is the mother; diligence in the use of means, the daughter. What is laid out upon Christians is but little compared with what is laid up for them.—Dorridger: Nothing can furnish so calm a peace and so sublime a joy as Christian hope. That is the most happy and glorious circumstance in the station which Providence may have assigned us, which gives us the greatest opportunity of spreading the honor of so dear a name, and of presenting praises and services to God through Him.

Kollock, Sermon on the patience of God: I. The nature of this patience, or slowness to anger (1.) It is a modification of the Divine goodness; (2.) It is not the result of ignorance; (3.) It is not the result of impotence; (4.) It is not the result of a conamina at sin, or a resolution to suffer it with impunity; (5.) But it is grounded on the everlasting covenant, and the blood of Jesus. II. Some of the most illustrious manifestations of it. III. The reasons why God exercises it: (1.) He is patient because of His benignity; (2.) He exercises it to manifest His perfection more and more; (3.) In consequence of the prayers of pious ancestors; (4.) Because the wicked are often mixed with the pious, and nearly related to them; (5.) The number of His elect is not yet completed; (6.) The measure of the sins of the wicked is not yet filled up; (7.) That sinners may be brought to repentance; (8.) That sinners who continue impenitent may at last be without excuse; (9.) That His power may be displayed; (10.) That He may exercise the trust of His servants in Him. IV. The effects that the belief and knowledge of it should produce upon our hearts and lives: (1.) Because of God's patience we should love Him; (2.) We should repent; (3.) We should imitate Him; (4.) His patience should be our comfort; (5.) We should grieve at the reproaches and insults cast upon God.

SECOND DIVISION.

THE CALLING OF THE APOSTLE TO A UNIVERSAL APOSTLESHP, AND HIS CONSEQUENT RELATION TO THE ROMAN CHURCH, AS THE POINT OF DEPARTURE FOR HIS UNIVERSAL APOSTLESHP IN THE WEST.

Chap. XV. 14-33.

14 And I myself also am persuaded of you, my brethren, [Now I am persuaded, my brethren, even I myself, concerning you,] that ye also [yourselves] are full of goodness, filled with all knowledge, able also to admonish one another: 15 Nevertheless, brethren, I have written the more boldly unto you [Howbeit, I have written more boldly unto you, brethren] ² in some sort [measure], as putting you in mind, because of the grace that is given to me of God. That I should be the [a] minister of Jesus Christ [Christ Jesus] ³ to the Gentiles, ministering the gospel of God, that the offering up [offering] of the Gentiles might be acceptable, being sanctified by [ανευ, in] the Holy Ghost. I have therefore whereof I may glory [I have therefore my boasting] ᶦ through Jesus Christ [in 18 Christ Jesus] in those things which pertain to God. ⁴ For I will not dare to speak of any of those things which Christ hath not wrought [did not work] by [through] me, to make the Gentiles obedient [in order to the obedience of the Gentiles], by word and deed, Through mighty [In the power of] signs and wonders, by [in] the power of the Spirit of God [Holy Spirit]; ⁵ so that from Jerusalem, and round about unto [as far as] Illyricum, I have fully preached the gospel of Christ. ⁶ Yea, so have I strived [Yet on this wise making it my ambition] ᶦ to preach the gospel, not where Christ was [already] named, lest I should [that I might not] build upon another man's foundation: But as it is written, ⁷ To whom he was not spoken of, they [They to whom no tidings of him came] shall see:

And they that have not heard shall understand. 22 For which cause also I have been much [for the most part] ⁹ hindered from coming to you. But now having no more [no more having] place in these parts, and having a great desire these many years [having these many years a longing] 24 to come unto you; Whencesoever I take my journey into Spain, I will come to you [οὖτις οὖν Θεοῦ] ᶧ for [I trust to see you in my journey [as I pass through], and to be brought on my way thitherward [to be sent forward thither] by ᶦ you, if first I be somewhat [in some measure] filled with your company. 25 But now I go unto Jerusalem to minister [ministering] unto the saints. 26 For it hath pleased them of Macedonia and Achaia [Macedonia and Achaia thought it good] to make a certain contribution for the poor [among the] saints which are at Jerusalem. It hath pleased them verily [For they thought it good]; and their debtors they are. For if the Gentiles have been made partakers of [have shared in] their spiritual things, their duty is [they owe it] also 28 to minister unto them in carnal things. When therefore I have performed this, and have sealed [εἰς, secured] to them this fruit, I will come [return] ᶦ by you [through your city] into Spain. And I am sure that, when I come unto you, I shall
come in the fulness of the blessing of the gospel [omt. of the gospel] of Christ. Now I beseech you, brethren, for the Lord Jesus Christ's sake [by our Lord Jesus Christ], and for [by] the love of the Spirit, that ye [to] strive together with me in your prayers to God for me; That I may be delivered from them that do not believe [the disobedient] in Judaea; and that my service [ministration] which I have [is] for Jerusalem may be accepted of [prove acceptable to] the saints; That I may come unto you with [in] joy by the will of God, and may you be refreshed. Now the God of peace be with you all. Amen.

TEXTUAL.

1 Ver. 14.—(Instead of of εὐλαβεῖας (N. A. B. C. D. E.), adopted by modern editors generally, εὐλαβεῖα is found in L., many cursives, versions, and fathers. As an alteration to strengthen the sense, or an error of the transcript, it is readily accounted for. The text of cursives given by Dr. Hodge adds little to the support of this reading.—The εὐλαβεῖα is also omitted, so εὐλαβεῖα put before διαθέμενοι, in some authorities. These are evidently corrections, to avoid repeating εὐλαβεῖα for the third time.

2 Ver. 15.—(A. B. ταμιριστήριον αὐτοῦ. Evidently a gloss, since the adjective is used adversarially.

3 Ver. 15.—(N. A. B. C. omit ἀνεφέλης; rejected by Lachmann, Tischendorf, Tregelles. It is found in N. D. F. L., Vulgata, etc., adopted by Philippus, De Wette, Meyer, Lange; bracketed by Alford. The omission can be accounted for by the interruption the word made in the connection, while there is no good reason for its insertion, save its genuineness.

4 Ver. 16.—(Rec. D. L., some versions and fathers: ἐρωτευόμενον. N. A. B. C. E.: ἐρωτεύομαι ἵνα εἰς Λαχμάννου. So Lachmann, Tischendorf, Alford, Tregelles. The same order is found in ver. 17, on the authority of all MSS., but the E. Vulgate, and against this order, in the r. text, for Λαχμάννου. Omitted in the Rec. N. A. L. by Philippus. The article not being understood, it was omitted.—Hence my baptism.

5 Ver. 17.—The Rec. omits τῷ; but the MSS. all insert it.

6 Ver. 19.—(1) (The Rec. with N. D. F. L.) inserts ὑπὲρ (ὑπὲρ) after παρεξήγησαν. So most cursives, some versions, and fathers; rejected by Lachmann, Tischendorf, Tregelles. This reading was not occasioning grammatical difficulty. Hence the first reading is generally adopted, and the other considered a grammatical correction. The B. V. requires emendation, both on account of the participial form, connecting this verse with the preceding one, and in order to bring out the force of ἔρωτι, The revision of Five Ang. Clergymen is followed. Ersatzer (Amer. Bible Union) objectionable in a popular version. Lange. So aber, dass ich es für Erlaubnisse halte; But, so that I hold it for a matter of honor. This gives the exact force of the verb. See the Exeg. Notes.

7 Ver. 21.—(An exact citation from the LXX., Isa. iii. 15. The Hebrew reads: מֵאֵלָה נֶאֶבֶר יִגְּזֹר כְּיָדְתוֹ. The B. V. (Isa. iii. 15) gives an inaccurate rendering. The LXX. adds, with sufficient ground in the context: τοῖς πάπιοι αὐτοῦ, referring to "my servants." (ver. 19.)

8 Ver. 22.—(Lachmann, 1557, which is probably a gloss. N. A. C. L. τὰ πολλά. So Tischendorf, Philippus, Meyer, De Wette, Alford, Tregelles.

9 Ver. 24.—(Rec. with N. L. inserts δοκιμῶσιν τοῦ Λαχμάνου. Omitted in N. D. F. L., many versions and fathers; rejected by Lachmann, Meyer, Philippus, De Wette, Tregelles. Tischendorf has adopted this reading in ed. 2; De Wette prefers it; Lange adopts it. It is better to reject, since, on many accounts, it is the less difficult reading, and likely to be added.—The real critical difficulty lies in the question respecting ψῆφος (see note 8). Lachmann. Omitted in E., versions and fathers. The minor authorities for the omission are much the same as in the case of the preceding variation (hence Dr. Hodge says most of these authorities omit ψῆφος); but the MS. authority is as decidedly in favor of ψῆφος as it is against δοκιμῶσιν τοῦ Λαχμάνου. The editors differ: Tischendorf and his followers, Philippus, Hodge (apparently) Meyer, reject it; Lachmann, Tischendorf, De Wette, Alford, Wordsworth, Tregelles, Lange. Lange. Meyer thinks its presence in the early uncials shows, not that the whole disputed passage was original, but that it was inserted, and then partially corrected, thus leaving ψῆφος. This is very improbable, since this reading is so difficult; besides, there is no evidence whatever supporting it. Many, for convenience sake, reject ψῆφος. Lachmann puts from δοκιμῶσιν to δοκιμασθῆναι in parenthesis, connecting closely with ver. 23, but this connection is unlikely.—The reader can consult Meyer, Philippus, and critical editors, on the whole question. A careful consideration of the case impels me to retain ψῆφος, putting a period or colon (as in E. V.) after Σχεδόν, to avoid an anacolouthos, or apophasis, and to take the participles of ver. 23 as verbs. This is the most defensible position, but further reasons cannot be added here. See the paraphrase in the Exeg. Notes. The labens of the learned authors have been freely used in this section.

10 Ver. 29.—(A. Παρεξήγησις. I will proceed, with a primary reference to the point of departure (ἀρόις) and followed by εἰς. However, there are other references (V. I.) not given. Neither comma is inserted. Return, in this case, is peculiarly appropriate; return from Jerusalem and go to Spain. Five Ang. Clergymen.—The labens of the learned authors have been freely used in this section.

11 Ver. 29.—The words read εὐλαβεῖαν ρατ. (inserted before Σχεδόν, in N. L. Rec. versions and fathers) are now considered a gloss. They are not found in N. D. F. L., are rejected by the Latin fathers, and by all modern critical editors, also Philippus and Hodge, who are least disposed to vary from the Recepta.

12 Ver. 30.—A. Παρεξήγησις. The and the variations in position are numerous. Alford accordingly brackets it; but it is received by most editors without question.

13 Ver. 30.—D. F. G. insert ψῆφος (similarly some editions of the Vulgate). A correct gloss, hence the more suspicious.
EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

The following section is termed an Epilogue by Tholuck and Meyer. "But this view does not correspond with the purpose and construction of the Epistle. The Apostle now comes to the last design of his Epistle, which is, to make Rome the principal station for his missionary labors in the West. See Schott, Der Römischenbrief, p. 314, and elsewhere. Summary.—A. The Apostle explains, almost apologetically, that his addressing the Romans was the result of his call to make the Gentiles, in priestly labor, an acceptable offering to God; and he gives information respecting the general completion of his work in the East (to Illyricum), and the results of the same; vers. 14-19.

B. His principle, not to invade the sphere of the labor of others (conduct the very opposite of that of all sectaries). The consequent impediments to his coming to Rome, where Christian congregations already exist. The desire, that nevertheless arose in harmony with his calling, to take this step. His hesitation not being fully removed, he describes his intended visit to Rome as a sejourn to gain strength for his further journey to Spain—that is, to the limits of the West; doubtless in the expectation that the Church will come him, and commit itself to his direction; vers. 20-24.

C. The last hindrance from his journey to Rome. The mention of the collections a proof of his love for believing Israelites, an expression of the proper conduct of Gentile Christians toward Jewish Christians. A further announcement of his journey through Rome, and of his visit, in the spirit of apostolic reformation. A foreboding reference to the consequent hostility of the unbelievers in Judea, and a request that the Roman Christians should pray for the fulfilment of his purpose of coming to them; vers. 25-33.

A. Vers. 14-19.—Ver. 14. Even I myself, αυτός εγώ, chap. vii. 25. He himself, the same, who has admonished them, has also this conviction. Thus he is not in antithesis to others (Tholuck), but he, as the one persuaded, is in antithesis to his condemnation. This is favored by the following verse, Fritzche, De Wette, Philippi [Stuart, Alford], explain similarly.

[Ye also yourselves, καὶ αὐτοί. "Without any extortion of mine" (Alford).—R.—Are full of goodness [μετα τού ἐστι ἄγων ὕποκειται]. In the foregoing section the ἀγάθον was to be understood particularly of humility and self-deying love, as the key-note of Christ's feeling; accordingly, it must also here be construed as a substantive. (Meyer: "That ye are also of yourselves very excellent people.") [Hodge: "Full of kind and conciliatory feelings; or, taking ἀγάθον ὕποκειται in its wider sense, full of virtue, or excellence." This last is adopted, apparently, from Meyer; it is so wide as to seem almost too complimentary.—R.]

With all knowledge [Γνωστος. We re- 2—28. (Alford).—R.—The Apostle very willingly refers the γνωστός particularly to the universal destination of Christianity; comp. Eph. i.—Adorneth, νουσθαι αὐτὸν. Strictly, to direct with brotherly feeling. To set the heart right is not a human affair; but when the heart is properly disposed, the οἶδα (or even the head) can be placed right.

Ver. 15. Howbeit I have written more boldly unto you, τολμησάσθην το διὰ γραφήν ἑνα. The adjective is used adverbially. Meyer insists upon his comparative sense. (The verb γραφήν is the epistolary acrostic, I have written; hence the Amer. Bible Union, I wrote, is a slavish following of the rule which makes the Greek acrost-equivalent to the English past tense. The author of that version unfortunately ignore all exceptions—Brethren, ἀδιδοί. See Textual Note 3.—Ir some measure, επὶ μεγάλης. This qualifies γραφήν: I have written boldly in places (so De Wette, Meyer, Lange); not the advb: I have written somewhere, too boldly (Fritsch, Grotius, Hodge). Hence the E. V. does not convey the meaning our rectally.—R.]. The boldness consists in his having spoken to them as to his own church, although it is not, strictly speaking, its founder, and refers, for the most part, to chap. xiv. ff. Meyer enumerates in preference, a number of other passages: chap vi. 12 ff., &c. [viii. 9; xl. 17 ff.; xii. 8; xiii. 3 ff. xiv. 3 ff. Mo. 15, 15; xv. 1—11.—R.]

As putting you in mind. He can say this in a general sense of the Christian state of development, which he presumes in them, and in a special sense, with reference to his many friends in Rome, who were not only his disciples, but also his helpers.

Because of the grace, &c. [διὰ τὴν χάριν ἡς, &c.] The following verse explains the sense in which he means this. Because his great and gracious call impels him to go far beyond Rome, he must first of all arrange matters perfectly with them [The common interpretation: "My apostolic office was the ground and reason of my boldness," does not exclude the special reference suggested by Dr. Lange.—R.]

Ver. 16. That I should be a minister [εἰς τὸ εὐαγγ. με λειτουργεῖν]. The purpose of the grace given to him.—R.]. The λειτουργεῖν denotes not only according to the immediate connection, but also according to the character of the whole Epistle, the minister in public worship; Meyer: the sacri- ficing priest; Heb. viii. 2; Phil. ii. 17.

Christ Jesus [Χριστὸς Ἰησοῦς]. This reading seems most accordant with the context, since the priestly service under Christ, the King, he referred to.—R.]. Reiche: Christ is the offering brought; Rückert, very properly, says: Christ the High Priest; against which Meyer strenuously
argues, that this is not an idea of Paul, but of the Epistle to the Hebrews. [De Wette, Meyer, Fritzthe, and Philippi, think that Christ is represented here as Head and King of the Church, which is perhaps preferable.—R.]

Ministering (as a priest in) the gospel of God [προσφορά τῶν ἱδων. Genitive of apposition.] Not the offering which the Gentiles bring, but which the Gentiles themselves are (burn-offerings).

Being sanctified in the Holy Ghost [γενηθήτωσι. Agencies of the Godhead.] The holy spirit is to be instrumental, and yet may well indicate the element in which they were sanctified, purified.—R.

In those things which pertain to God [τὰ πράγματα τῶν Θεῶν.] According to the context, the real work of God in the world is meant. [Philippi, De Wette, Alford: 'My above-named sacerdotal office and ministry.—R.] Meyer says, however: 'My boasting is something which belongs to me in virtue of my connection with Christ, in relation to God’s cause.' Reiche: My glorying consists in my glorying of Christ. [Dr. Hodge mentions another: 'I have offerings for God — i.e., Gentile converts.' Too far-fetched.—R.]

Ver. 18. For I will not dare, [ἐὰν γὰρ τολμήσω, καλ.] The γὰρ explains how he meant the foregoing expression in ver. 17. But ver. 17 refers to ver. 10, in proof that he knows that he is placed, as a minister, completely under the direction and operation of the Spirit of Christ, the High-Priest. Thus Paul speaks, and thus John speaks; but modern criticism, on the other hand, boldly maintains the contrary—that Paul corrected the Epistle of Paul to the Romans.

* (This verse, instead of supporting the idea that the Christian ministry is a priesthood, virtually opposes it. Had the Apostle laid claim to actual and special sacerdotal functions, it is very unlikely that he would have kept his claims so constantly out of sight in his Epistles. In this passage, the offering is a figurative one, the priestly function, εἰς προσφοράν, the silence of the rest of his writings of itself proves that this must be regarded in another than a literal sense. See Dr. W. All.)
probably, therefore, that he made an excursion into Illyricum, "possibly to the journey narrated in Acts xx. 1-3." But μίχρη διαλώσας means to the sea, not into the sea. In Acts xx. 1-3 there is no trace of a journey by way of Macedonia and Greece to the West.

I have fully preached, πεπληρωμένοιν. [Literally: have fulfilled; but the E. V. conveys the meaning quite accurately.—E. R.] Not completely discharged the office of the gospel (Beza, Bengel, and others), but completely spread the gospel. The expression, therefore, does not mean: accomplished everything with the gospel (Luther), or, perfectly declared the gospel (Olshausen). See Meyer [p. 527] for other explanations. The difficulty disappears if we appreciate the circumstances and method of the apostles. They had neither time nor calling to perform missionary labor in every village; they understood their calling in a universally historic and dynamic sense, and, consequently, when they had once conquered the fortresses, they had also conquered the surrounding country.

B. Vers. 20-24.—Ver. 20. Yet on this wise making it my ambition [οἴτω δὲ φιλοτιμοῦμεν]. See Textual Note 2. The verb means: to make it a point of honor. Alford thinks, however, that it loses its primary meaning here, which is doubtful.—R.] was in harmony with the labors of the apostles everywhere, because they had to lay the foundation. But it had a special meaning for Paul—that he had to establish the gospel in its full and most universal diffusion, and therein would not collide with the often nationally qualified, though evangelically free, missionary methods of the other apostles (see Gal. ii.).

The subsequent settlement of John in Ephesus was the result of a call to lay an ideal and unifying foundation, by means of which even the work of Paul could be carried further forward; besides, the labors of John embraced many churches which had arisen after Paul's labors in that region.

Ver. 21. But as it is written. [See Textual Note 4. 'Αλλὰ introduces the positive explanation of ὁποῖος, on this wise: not where others had preached, but according to this rule of Scripture.—R.] Isa. lxi. 15, according to the LXX. Meyer says that the subject is the (there mentioned) κίνησις, not the nations. Not at all, even if the subject be violently rent asunder into two parts. The universal impulse of the gospel to go further and farther into the world is not easily expressed in prophecy.

Ver. 22. For which cause also I have been for the most part hindered [δόλο καὶ ενοπτόμενον τὰ πολλὰ]. Because he had to carry on his missionary labors now here and now there in the East. According to Meyer, Paul would say: By this means I have been hindered in most cases (τὰ πολλὰ), besides other instances. Undoubtedly the Apostle knows also other instances of hindrance; see 1 Thess. ii. 18.*

* [Philippi, Hodge, and others, adopt this view of τὰ πολλὰ as πλείους, for the most part,—i. e., this was the principal reason. Alford follows Schott and De Wette, who understand it to mean: these many times—κ. ο. 55.]

Ver. 23. No more having place [Ἀμφίτιτρ τῷ πόντῳ ἔχων]. Meyer, following Luther: space scope. [Philippi, De Wette, Alford: opportunity, occasion.—R.] But the Apostle's scope was conditioned by a standing place, a central point; and here it is most natural to think of such a place. Tholuck: "The apostles were accustomed to carry on missionary labor in the metropolitan cities, leaving the further extension of the gospel to the churches established there, and therefore, after all, to let the pagani remain heathen."

Ver. 24. Whencefore the: ὁ δὲ ἀρχηγός instead of εἰκὼν (Rec.).—R.; quondamque.—Spain [Σπανίας]. Usually called Iberia by the Greeks. The Roman Hispania. According to Meyer, this plan for his journey was not fulfilled; according to Tholuck, the question depends on whether we accept a second Roman captivity, and this again on the evidence of Clement Romanus. See the Introduction to this Epistle [especially Dr. Schaff's note on p. 11], as well as the Introduction to the Pastoral Epistles.

Neander, i. p. 535; Wieseler, Chron. des apost. Zeitalters, 1. Escurus. As a church already exists in Rome, although not established by an apostle, the Apostle cannot designate Rome as his principal object before Rome had met him in this respect; but as ancient Spain embraced the whole Pyrenese peninsula, it undoubtedly has for the Apostle the still further significance of a symbol of the whole West extending beyond Rome. To him, Spain meant the Western world. But Spain itself was a proper object, because there the two preliminary conditions of missionary labor already existed: Jews and Jewish synagogues, and Grecian and Roman civilization. It does not follow, as Meyer supposes, that Paul gave up his plan of going to Spain after receiving the news, in his first captivity, on the state of things in the East, and thought churlishly of a return; Phil. ii. 24.

I will come to you. This clause is retained by Dr. Lange. See Textual Notes 11 and 13. Rejecting it, we paraphrase: But now I have no longer a central point for labor in these parts, and (as I am seeking to begin labor in the extreme West) I have had a desire to see you for many years while on my way to Spain. For (now that there is some hope of my starting for Spain, and as you are the Christian church nearest that region) I trust, &c.—R.

And to be sent forward (on my journey) thither by you ['καὶ ἃς ἰπὲς προσπήνης]. The ἀπο does not merely by them, but from them, as a new point of departure.—R.] The expression προσπήνης, not only expresses a real attendance, such as Paul generally received from the churches for his further journey, but also the friendly furtherance of his journey, or even the department of a missionary force. Acts xx. 14. The expression [ἀπὸ μὲν ἐκτιμήθη]. Gröte: "Non quantum vellex, sed quantum licebat.—R." An expression of the high regard in which he held their fellowship.

Filled, ἐπίληψθε δ' ὑπ' ἡμετήρια, by spiritual satisfaction.

C. Vers. 25-33.—Ver. 25. But now I go. He regards this new official hindrance as the last.—[Ministering, δωτανούσης. Present participle, not the future; the journey is part of the ministry, the whole action is already begun. This is lost sight of in the E. V.; Amer. Bible Union: "I am going

Stuart calls attention to μή as indicating the impossibility of his coming thither.—R.]
to Jerusalem to minister,” is even more objectionable.—R.] On the collection mentioned, see 2 Cor. ix. 1, 2; Acts xxiw. 17. Origen is of the opinion that he wished to bring this collection home to the hearts of the Romans too.* He had time enough still for this.

Ver. 26. For Macedonia and Achaia thought it good [eiiyveto yap Ma@x^dovia xal Aj^aia. Dr. Lange: were joyfully willing. The above rendering is perhaps scarcely strong enough, but is taken from later revisions. It seems best to preserve the personification of the organ.—R.] The translation: they have wished, does not at all do justice to the eido.°

A certain contribution [ko^sio^vias tv^i]. Literally, a common contribution or recreation. As used here of a contribution, “honest^e et aqua^li^o plena a^pellatio” (Bengel).—R.] As the symbol and expression of the ko^sio^vias, it is itself ko^sio^vias. The later giving of alms, and particularly that of the Middle Ages, has not kept this meaning in view. Tiva softens the force. Meyer says: “There is no further trace in the Epistles of Paul of the common goods.” We might add: There is no trace from the outset of a legal—carried out community of goods!

Ver. 27. [For they thought it good, iddo^ka^pas yap. The yap introduces an explanation of iddo^ka^pas (ver. 26). The clause is = for they thought it good being their debtors.—R.]—In spiritual things. A statement of the cause of the propriety of this relief in temporal matters. [To minister, le^tou^r^g^a^tas. The figurative priestly service is still in mind, and to it belongs the privilege and duty of providing for the poor saint. Who, then, cannot be Christ’s for the poor saint. Paul, Meyer: so long as we have Christ’s poor with us?—R.]—In carnal things. The ko^sio^vias denote, in a general idea, external things; ko^sio^vias, the external, material, and finite side of human life, of life in general. Conclusion a majoct ad minus.

Ver. 28. And have secured to them. Sigma^q^i yap kai; Luther [marginal reading]: “Truly and faithfully preserved. This belongs also here the full spiritual meaning and effect. Strange view: When I have brought over to them the money, sealed (Erasmus, and others). Still more strange: When I have safely effected, with letter and seal, the proper delivery of their collection. It may be that, by sealing, the Apostle alludes to the usual method of the world in the management of money affairs, as, for example, in Phil. iv. 16, Meyer: Vouched for; that is, corroborated as the fruit ripened for them.—This fruit, to^v kai^po^n to^tv; i.e., the amount of the collection. There seems to be no reference to the fruit of love or faith, still less of Paul’s activity.—R.]—R.

Ver. 29. And I know, &c. [oi^do^ sta, kai.] See Textual Note 3.°- Text applicable in many ways for instruction and exhortation.

Ver. 30. Now I beseech you. The Apostle’s wonderful procession of what he has to experience in Jerusalem; see Acts xx. 22; xxi. 10 E.

By our Lord Jesus Christ. Agi, see chap. xii. 1.—By the love of the Spirit. Meyer. The love effected by the Holy Spirit. As this is self-evident, Paul means love extending itself with

* [A most gratifying assumption is that of Schott, that these collections were to win favor, and protect him during his absence in the extreme West. Decidedly unpainful!—R.]

the Christian spirit, so as to embrace in its univer
sal the entire kingdom of God, which can pray
for all affairs of the kingdom and its administration, and overlows the whole earth.

In your prayers. Codd. D. E. [F. G.] add the proper gloss υιοι; Col. iv. 12. [See Textual Note 3.°- It is not genuine, though correct.—R.]

Ver. 31. The disobedient, δισεδοικοντος. Either unwilling (E. V., Hodge, De Wette, and others) or disobedient (Philippi, and others). The two ideas are intimately related in the New Testament, but the latter seems the prominent one here.—R.] The Apostle describes the unbelieving Jews as disobedient. Those were, in a special sense, rebels against the Messiah, who refused the obe-
dience of faith.—My ministration [η διακο^ν^iα mou]. Meyer: My rendering of service de-
signed for Jerusalem.—May prove acceptable. Of this he had doubts, and with good reason.* Yet he adds: to the saints.—R.

Ver. 32. That I may come unto you in joy [tav in yap τελων ροιοι υιοι. In the element of joy; the emphasis rests on this phrase.—R.] As if he had, to a certain extent, for- bodings that he might come to them in sad circumstances, as a captive.

And may with you be refreshed. By spiritual interchange. [Alford: “That we may mutually refresh ourselves; I after my dangers and deliv-

erances, you after your anxieties for me.” See Textual Note 3.°—R.]—R.

Ver. 33. Now the God of peace. It is very natural for him here to call God the God of peace, in consequence of his conflicts and their differences. Grocius accepts the latter alone; Meyer, the for-

mer alone; Philippi, the peace of reconciliation; Fritzsche, salvation in a general sense; Tholuck, “different occasions;” see chap. xvi. 30; Phil. iv.

9; 1 Thess. v. 23; Heb. xiii. 20.

DOCTRINAL AND ETHICAL.

1. On the great importance of this section, see the Introduction, the Arrangement, and the Summary.

2. On ver. 14. The church of that day at Rome, compared with that of the present day.

3. On ver. 15. The sense of the calling and the duty of the calling embolden. The Apostle’s sense of his great calling.

4. Grand view of the conversion of the whole world. An offering in which the nations are offered to God, Christ, as the High-Priest, has brought a propitiatory sacrifice; now the ministers, as subordinate priests, must present the thank-offering and burnt-offering. But what a source of worship, and of the elevation and purification of worship, has proceeded from the ministerial service of Paul in both an extensive and intensive respect: churches, church-towers, hymns, prayers, festivals without number, and praising Gentiles (ver. 10, 11). The antiphony of praising Gentiles (ver. 11) responds to the exulting intimation of the Apostle (ver. 10).

* [The existence of a closeness between Paul and the Christians at Jerusalem, perhaps the great body of them, is evident from the words all to the Galatians and the Acts of the Apostles. But this by no means implies either a want of unity among the apostles personally, or different camps. See Lange’s Comm. Galatians, pp. 30, 631 Lightfoot, Galatians, Dissertation ii. pp. 383 ff, St. Paul and the Three. —R.]
5 Paul's missionary sphere. See his Life in the Introduction.

Paul's principle in ver. 20; a principle of genuine churchliness, in contrast with hierarchical and sectarian propagandism. [The term used by the Apostle belongs to the sphere of minor morals, to a "point of honor," indeed. Yet the principle is not unimportant. Men may be Christians, and disregard it, but not Christian gentlemen, not men possessed of that delicate sense of propriety which no rules can impart. Besides, such efforts at proselytizing generally ignore the essential graces of Christianity: humility, self-abnegation, charity. He who insists on missionary efforts among Christian people, is necessarily uncharitable. Sects whose main efforts are in this channel, will not be celebrated for the graces of Christianity. Moreover, Christian ethics have so far informed the world, that ungodly men recognize the necessity of "honorable" conduct in Christian workers, and can sneer at the unseemly "competitions" of much that is called pious zeal. This does not prove that the world's sense of honor is higher than that of the Church, but that the standard of sectarian proselytians is far too low. That a man can be a zealous missionary and not be a meddlesome propagandist, is evident from the case of this Apostle.—R.]

7. On ver. 23. The thoroughly dynamical view which the apostles had of the world, is reflected even in their thoroughly dynamical missionary method, according to which they conquered the capital and central points of the ancient world.

8. Vers. 26 ff. The idea of fellowship in its full universality. The sacred method in the matter of collections: (1.) An assignment of reasons (debtors); (2.) Voluntariness; (3.) Authentication; (4.) Connection with the purposes of God's kingdom.

9. Spain, as the representative of France, Britain, Germany, and Scandinavia. [And of America, too! For from the neighborhood of the pillars of Hercules, toward which Paul's missionary zeal led him, the voyager sailed who discovered the new world.—R.] How does the matter stand now? Paul through Rome to Spain—this has again become a prospect of the present day, or a pium desiderium. [From Rome to Spain seems the likelier course; yet, where Spain has long held her hand, how strong is the rule of Rome!—R.]

10. The apostle's great anticipation, see the Exeg. Notes.

11. Prayer a wrestling and striving. See the history of Jacob at Jabbok. The Ismaelites = God's warriors. Christians at Rome must now help the Apostle to fight against the schemes of degenerate warriors of God.

12. The God of peace. As an infinite source of peace, as if peace itself constituted His divinity. So the love of the Spirit; the whole Spirit which in Christianity is poured out over the earth, must be regarded as a breath of Love and of Spring exhal ing over the earth.

13. Amen. See the Lexicons, the Concordance, and the Catechisms. Also the conclusion of chap. xvi.
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30—52.—The God of patience and comfort is a God of hope, and the God of hope is a God of peace (ver. 32; comp. vers. 6, 18).

Lectura: On vers. 14, 15: This is, though you do not need my writing, yet I am urged by my office, which I have by God's grace, to teach and to admonish every one of you.

Stark: Blessed be the land which is full of the gospel of Christ! That is more than if it were full of gold and silver (ver. 19).—Do not remove from one place to another without necessity and a good cause; remain in your country, and live honestly (ver. 23).—Hawkes: Notice that Paul will not build on any other man's foundation; but now it is nothing new in the Church for one to take from another his good ground, Christ, by clamoring, exciting suspicion, and other forms of wickedness (ver. 20).—What does love for Christ not do?—What a journey to Rome and Spain?—Friend, are you not an official successor of Paul, a pastor, and a shepherd of souls? How many miles do you have to go to get to the way to the preaching stations, the school, or the private house of one of your hearers? How often, and how willingly, do you make the visit? (ver. 24.)—Praying is the same as fighting. It is greater labor than ploughing. But how indifferently do you regard it? (ver. 30.)

Skene, on vers. 29: Such confidence of the preacher in the fellowship of his flock effects much good, for it proves love. A want of confidence, on the other hand, destroys much edification.—To the ministerial office there belong: 1. Teaching; 2. Care for the poor; 3. Admonition of the hearers to prayer (vers. 14—33).—He is not worthy to be in Christ's kingdom and to enjoy it, who does not daily pray that it may be extended (ver. 30).

Gelach: Paul regards himself as a priest, who, by preaching the gospel, prepares and presents to God the offering of the whole Gentile world.

Heusser: Paul's solicitude lay: 1. In the office which was given to him, with which he also received strength; 2. In the holy love which he had. Where both of these exist, admonitions are never wholly fruitless (ver. 15).—A minister who is merely a preacher, becomes a talker; but, reversely, the priest should always be a preacher, or else he will become a Japanese house (ver. 16).—Christian love has regard for the rights of others (ver. 20).—The highest service of missionaries is, that they must begin from the very start, and labor with the rough material (ver. 21).—The change in the circle of operation.—The journeys of the Apostles, which were holy, abundant in blessing, and full of suffering (ver. 24).—Spiritual benefactors are the highest, and though temporal blessings cannot perfectly requite their spiritual benefits, we should nevertheless repay even with them (vers. 26, 27).—Christians should not come empty to each other, but with spiritual blessings (ver. 29).—The power of Christian intercession (ver. 30).

Burriss: The Apostle's official seal to the Epistle to the Romans (vers. 14—23).—The pure sacrificial vessel is the gospel of God; the Gentiles, bought by faith in this vessel, are an acceptable offering, sanctified by the Holy Spirit, who is the sacrificial fire from heaven (1 Peter i. 12), who continues the holy burning by which Christ has sanctified himself for a burnt-offering for all (ver. 16).—Miracles in themselves are no proof of truth; but as signs of the real Christ, the miracles of the Apostles imprint a seal upon their doctrine for the joy of believers and for the judgment of unbelievers (vers. 18, 19).—The fight of faith is fought by him who prays, seeing and feeling the opposite of his hope, and seeking the concealed face of God, who is a God of hope (ver. 30).—God gives peace everywhere and in every manner (Thess. iii. 16): Peace in believing on His word (chap. v. 1), peace in reliance on the love of His government (chap. viii. 28), peace in the certainty that Christ reigns over His enemies (chap. xvi. 23), and peace in the love of the Spirit (ver. 28).—Burritt: As we honor the God of peace, whom we serve; as we love the Prince of peace, in whom we believe; as we hope for the comfort of the Spirit of peace, and as we cherish the success of the gospel of peace, let us preserve it where it is, and pursue it where it flies from us.—Henry: The blessing of the gospel is the treasure which we have in earthen vessels. When ministers are fully prepared to give, and people fully prepared to receive, this blessing, both are happy. Many have the gospel who have not the blessing of the gospel, and so they have it in vain. The gospel will not profit, unless God bless it on us; and it is our duty to wait upon Him for that blessing, and for the fulness of it.

Dommers: Let us adore the God of grace and peace, who works the most important ends by methods unthought of by us; and let us be very cautious that we do not rashly judge that He hath rejected our prayers, because we do not see them answered in that particular way which might have been more agreeable to our own wishes.—Clark: Beware of contentious in religion; if you dispute concerning any of its doctrines, let it be to find out truth, not to support a preconceived and pre-established opinion. Avoid all polemical heat and rancor; these prove the absence of the religion of Christ. Whatever does not lead you to love God and man more, is most assuredly from beneath. The God of peace is the author of Christianity; and the Prince of peace, the priest and sacrifice of it; therefore love one another, and leave off contention before it is mastered with.

Horne: As oil poured on water smooths its surface and renders it transparent, so does kindness calm the minds of men, and prepare them for the ready entrance of the truth. Besides these qualifications, he who admonishes others should be entitled thus to act. It is not necessary that this title should rest on his official station; but there should be superiority of some kind—of age, excellence, or knowledge—to give his admonitions due effect.—Barnes: The success of a minister is not for his own praises, but for the honor of God; not by his skill or power, but by the aid of Jesus Christ.—God may disappoint us in regard to the mode in which we purpose to do good; but if we really desire it, He will enable us to do it in His own way. It may be better to preach the gospel in bonds than at liberty; it is better to do it in a prison, than not at all. Bunyan wrote in his "Pilgrim's Progress" to amuse his heavy hours during a twelvemonth's imprisonment. If he had been at liberty, he probably would not have written it at all.—J. F. H.]
T H I R D D I V I S I O N.

THE COMMENDATION OF COMPANIONS AND HELPERS IN A SERIES OF SALUTATIONS, WITH WHICH IS JOINED A WARNING AGAINST SEPARATISTIC FALSE TEACHERS (JEWs AND GENTILES), WHO COULD HINDER AND EVEN DESTROY ROME'S DESTINY AND HIS APOSTOLIC MISSION. YET THE GOD OF PEACE WILL SHORTLY BRUISE SATAN (JUDAISTIC AND PAGANISTIC ERRORS) UNDER THEIR FEET.

CHAP. XVI. 1-20.

A. Phoebe of Corinth.

1 I commend unto you Phoebe our sister, which [who] is a servant [deaconess] of the church which is at Cenchrea: That ye receive her in the Lord, as becoming saints, and that ye assist her in whatsoever business she hath [may have] need of you: for she [too] hath been a succourer of many, and of myself also.

B. Roman friends.

3, 4 Greet Priscilla [Prisca] and Aquila, my helpers in Christ Jesus: Who have for my life laid down their own necks: unto whom not only I give thanks, but also all the churches of the Gentiles. Likewise greet [salute] the church that is in their house. Salute my well-beloved Epenetus, who is the first-fruits of Achaia [Asia] unto Christ. Greet [Salute] Mary, who bestowed much labour on us [or, you]. Salute Andronicus and Junia [or, Junias], my kinsmen, and my fellow-prisoners, who are of note among the apostles, who also were in Christ before me. Greet [Salute] Amplias, my beloved in the Lord. Salute Urbanus [Urbanus], our helper in Christ, and Stachys my beloved.

10 Salute Apelles [the] approved in Christ. Salute them which [who] are of Aristobulus' household [the household of Aristobulus]. Salute Herodion my kinsman. Greet [Salute] then that be of the household of Narcissus, which are in the Lord. Salute Tryphena and Tryphosa, who labour in the Lord. Salute the beloved Persis, which [who] laboured much in the Lord.

13, 14 Salute Rufus [the] chosen in the Lord, and his mother and mine. Salute Asyneritus, Phlegon, Hermes, Patrobas, Hermes [Hermes, Patrobas, Hermes], and the brethren which [who] are with them. Salute Philologus, and Julia, Nereus, and his sister, and Olympas, and all the saints which [who] are with them. Salute one another with a holy kiss. The [All the] churches of Christ salute you.

O. Warning against false teachers.

17 Now I beseech you, brethren, [to] mark them which [those who] cause divisions and offences contrary to the doctrine [teaching] which ye have learned; and avoid them. For they that are such serve not our Lord Jesus [omit Jesus] Christ, but their own belly; and by [their] good words and fair speeches deceive the hearts of the simple. For your obedience is come abroad unto all men. I am glad [rejoice] therefore on your behalf [over you]: but yet I would have you wise unto concerning] that which is good, and simple [harmless] concerning evil. And the God of peace shall bruise Satan under your feet shortly. The grace of our Lord Jesus Christ be with you. Amen [omit Amen].

TEXTUAL.

1 Var. 3.—Instead of Πρίσκα Πρισκᾶς (Rec., versions and fathers), we find Πρίσκης in N. A. B. D. D. L. E., curries, ùn. Universally received now.

8 Var. 5.—Rec. with D3 Ἀγίας. Ἀγίας. N. A. B. C. D. E., most versions, Latin fathers: Ἀγίας. Do Wette defends the former on the authority of the Peshitta, and also because the difficulty arising
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from 1 Cor. xvi. 15, where Stephanas is called the first-fruits of Achaia, might have occasioned the change into Agias. In * the probability is rather that the parallel passage was written on the margin, and thus crept into the text; and at the same time the text of the verb is corrected. The reading in A is accepted by most modern editors and commentators.

2. Ver. 6.—[Rec. C, L, versions and fathers: ἐπαναθέματι; D. F. in the A. B. C. versions and fathers: ἐπάνατεματι.] The change here is an addition in the margin, and is not found in any of the known uncial MSS., and is omitted in a number of versions.

3. Ver. 10.—[D. F. omit καὶ εἰλήφας; found in A. B. C. most versions. Probably omitted from the transcript's mistake at the end of the preceding word for that of εἰλήφας. So modern editors.

4. Ver. 19.—[The Rec. has χάριν ἀνά τοῦ Ἠβραίων, which is sustained by a number of versions, and by N.; the order is found in D. F., which omit χαρίν, however. N. A. B. C. L.: ἐν αὐναίοις ἀνά τοῦ Ἠβραίων; adopted by Lachmann, Tischendorf, Meyer, Alford, Tregelles. De Wette and Philippin retain the order of the Rec. Besides the preponderant uncial authority, it is properly urged against the reading of the Rec., that it gives the more usual order, hence likely to be an alteration. Dr. Lange calls it a correct exegetical guess.

5. Ver. 20.—[Now of the uncial MSS., no known support the ἐναγία of the Rec., which is accordingly rejected by all critical editors.—Alford, Tregelles, and others; brackets οὐκ ηὔθεν, which is not found in N. B. I.; but it seems best to retain it.—R.]

Exegetical and Critical.

Summary.—A. Commendation of Phoebe the deaconess; vers. 1, 2.—3. The salutations to his Roman friends and companions in their household churches, and the commendations therein expressed; vers. 3—16.—C. Warning against false teachers, who create dissension. Benediction; vers. 17—20.

In the Apostle's salutations he does not merely take cognizance of friendly relations in a good-natured way, but rather designs, with a distinct section of his Epistle, and in the wise and sincere form of his salutations, to awaken in the Church at Rome the consciousness that, in its principal elements, it is indirectly a Pauline church—that is, one appropriated by him in his universal efforts.* Comp., on this point, the Introduction, p. 53, and the construction of the Epistle. It is of the utmost importance, that Aquila and Priscilla stand at the head of those whom he salutes; by their settlement in Ephesus they had already prepared for his connection there, just as the vessels of mercy are prepared before the hour; and after they had moved to Rome, they came again to Ephesus; 2 Tim. iv. 19. And so there are many among those saluted who have preceded him, as his precursors. The whole body of those greeted is made up of different classes. Some are helpers of his missionary labors, who have labored with him, and part of whom have exposed themselves to dangers for him: Prisca, Aquila, Mary, Andronicus, Junia, and Urbanus. A number of them are his relatives, such as Andronicus, Junia, and Herodion; or very near friends, as Butus and his mother. Besides, there are those whom he can distinguish as disciples converted through his instrumentality, or well-known friends: Epaphus, Amplias, Stachys, Appelles; perhaps also Tryphena, Tryphosa, and Persis. We can further distinguish companies, a church in the house of Aquila, an assembly at the houses of Hermas, Hermas, and their companions; at the houses of Philologus, Julia, and their companions. Perhaps the believers in the households of Aristobulus and of Narcissus also form separate divisions of the Church.

A. Vers. 1 and 2.—Ver. 1. I commend. [Both an introduction and a commendation are implied. The description consists of two parts: First, she is a sister, which is the general ground for welcoming her; then, more specially, she is a deaconess, who had faithfully discharged her duty (ver. 2). The name is derived from ἀδεικνύω, from past. ἀδεικνύω, but there is nothing remarkable in this, since the etymology would be as little recalled then, as now, in the case of proper names.—R.] See 2 Cor. v. 12. Phoebe is usually regarded as the bearer of the Epistle.

Who is a deaconess; διάκονος. On the institution of deaconesses, comp. Church History and the Pastoral Epistles. Meyer furnishes the special literature on p. 599. [The word διάκονος occurs frequently in later ecclesiastical Greek. Pliny, in the celebrated letter to Trajan, says: "Necessarium crediti, ex duabus ancilliis quo ministerie diocensant, quis est eti quod super timente quarever." Their duties were, to take care of the sick, poor, and strangers in the female portion of the Church.

This office was the more needful on account of the rigid separation of the sexes at that day, especially among the Greeks." (Schaff.) Meyer refers to Bing ham, Orig. i. pp. 341—866; Schleiermacher, Geschichte des Christentums, über d. Kirch. Gebraüche, ii. pp. 102 ff.; Herzog, Encyclopädie, iii. p. 368; Neander, Einleitung, i. p. 265 f. The last named argues that the deaconesses must not be confounded with the γυναῖκας of 1 Tim. v. 3—16. So, however, Lange's Comm. in loc. We may add: Schaff, Apostolic Church, § 136; Suicer, Theoseum, sub voce. Of Phoebe, Caius says (St. Paul, ii. p. 184): "She was
widow of consideration and wealth, who acted as one of the deaconesses of the Church, and was now about to sail to Rome upon some private business, apparently connected with a lawsuit in which she was engaged.” He adds: “She could not (according to Greek manners) have been mentioned as acting in the independent manner described, either if her husband had been living or if she had been unmarried.”—R.

Cenchrea. The eastern seaport of Corinth (see the Encyclopaedias).

Ver. 2. That ye receive her in the Lord. She should be received with Christian interest.—And that ye assist her, 
καὶ παραστῇτε αὐτῇ. The verb is frequently used as a legal term, hence the conjecture of Conybearch, that her business at Rome was connected with a lawsuit.—R.

It is hardly probable that the early Church employed deaconesses to travel in the discharge of official business; the business of Phebe seems to have been of a personal character.

[For she too, 
καὶ γὰρ αὐτῇ. She herself also, not αὐτὴ (this one).—R.] The reason why the Romans should call her a support her in her affairs does not lie in an official call to Rome, but in her services for the churches at home, and for the Apostle in particular. Προστάσις is a specially honorable designation. [It may refer to her official duties, but not necessarily so. The idea it implies is of service bestowed by a superior on inferiors.—Of myself also. “When and where, we know not. It is not improbable that she may have been, like Lydia, one whose heart the Lord opened at the first preaching of Paul, and whose house was his lodging;” Alford.—R.]

B. Vers. 3-18.—Ver. 3. Prisca. [This is the real name; Priscilla is the diminutive, according to the common mode of forming such appellations.—R.] She belonged, like Phebe, to the women who were prominent because of the energy of their faith, and deserved the honorable position before the name of her husband, Aquila (comp. Acts xvii. 2, 3, 6). See 2 Tim. iv. 19. [The frequent sneers at Paul about his views respecting the female sex and their prerogatives might be spared us, were this chapter carefully read. The order here is a sufficient answer: the wife’s name first, because she was foremost, no doubt. The standard is, after all, capacity, not sex. Both are called “my helpers,” and it would seem that, as such, they were both engaged in spiritual labors, which term includes vastly more than public preaching.—R.]

Ver. 4. Their own necks. Meyer translates the ἑκκαταρχάω literally: have laid under, under the executioner’s axe. But there has been no mention made in Paul’s previous history of the executioner’s axe. Even Meyer himself doubts whether we should take the expression in its exact meaning. Since Paul was a member of their family, they were answerable for him in the tumults that arose in Corinth and Ephesus (Acts xvii. 12; xix. 20).—What they did for the Apostle, was done for all the churches of the Gentiles.

Ver. 5. Likewise salute the church that is in their house, 
καὶ τῇ κατ’ οἶκον αὐτῶν ἐκκαθαρίας. The definite prototype of an apostolic household church, the type of the later parish. At the same time, the single household churches in Rome are already connected by the bond of fellowship into one spiritual church. Accordingly, the church in the house is almost = the assembly in a certain house.* Tholuck: “In the metropolis, which was at that time about four miles in circumference, there were not less than five of them (comp. Phil. ii. 12, Kist, in Tholuck’s Zeitschrift für hist. Theologie, ii. 2d part, p. 63).”

Epeneetus. “Unknown, as all the following ones to ver. 15. (Rufus may be the son of Simon Mark xv. 21.) The legends of the Fathers made the most of them martyrs and bishops, and the Synopsis of Dorotheus misplaced the most of them among the seventy disciples;” Meyer.

The first-fruits of Asia [ἀρχαῖαι τῆς Ἀσίας. See Textual Note]. Asia proconsularis. The reading Asia is less authenticated, and creates difficulty, inasmuch as, in 1 Cor. xvi. 15, Stephanas is mentioned as the first-fruits of Achaia. On the solution of this difficulty (by supposing that Epeneetus was a member of the household of Stephanas, now in Rome), see Tholuck, p. 738.—[Εἰς Χριστὸν. Meyer, Philippi: with reference to Christ; De Wette, Lange: for Christ. The meaning obviously is: first converted to Christ.—R.]

The first-fruits:—for this reason, consider the first-fruits as the natural leaders of the incipient churches.

Ver. 6. Mary. Not more definitely known. There is no need of explaining that the reading, 
ἐγενετο μακρὸν ὕπερ αὐτῆς, is much more natural than the other, εἰς αὐτῆς, for elsewhere the Apostle always brings out prominently the relations of the persons saluted to his own labors. [See Textual Note.—R.]

Ver. 7-8. And Junia (or Junias). The word has often been taken, and by Chrysostom [Gregorius] among the rest, as a feminine noun, Junia; it seems more probable that it is Junias, an abbreviation of Junianus (see Tholuck, p. 739). [If feminine, it is the name of the wife or sister of Andronicus; the Όνομα, accented thus: Τοικαίων, which indicates the feminine. Most editors (not Tregelles): Τοικαίων. It is as impossible as it is unnecessary to decide the question, though Meyer thinks the added description favors the masculine form.—R.]

My kinsmen. The expression συγγενεῖς has been understood by Olahhausen, and others, in the broader sense of fellow-countrymen; against which it has been remarked that, in that case, others than Jewish Christians have received this designation.† [Dr. Hodge suggests that, as a tent-maker, Aquila had better accommodations for such an assembly than most of the Christians. See Alford loco, where he quotes Justin Martyr’s statements about these assemblies. Certainly there is no warrant for supposing that only the household servants, &c., are meant.—It is clear that the early Church was formed quite as much upon the household model as upon that of the synagogue. No form of church government should ignore this, nor can Christ-likeness make use of it. As the purpose of Jesus Christ has sanctioned household relations, and elevated them all, how far is the Church responsible for the manifestations of moral decay in social life? May not the schemes in families, produced by sectarian propaganda, so far interfere with any thing akin to these household churches, as to exercise a deteriorating influence? Certainly it is difficult to conceive, that any Christians at Rome would lay in wait for Prisca’s children, to decoy them with presents to forsake an assembly founded in the form of ecclesiastical (I will not say Christian) effort in these days!—R.]

† (The expression, when not followed by ἀνήρ, refers to practical activity, not to preaching and teaching. Here, probably, some acts of womanly kindness are intended, such as Prisca and Aquila have more likely to have received than the whole Roman Church. Hence “♀” is more probably correct than “you.” Besides, why should Paul add this description, were she so well known to that Church?—R.)
nation, besides the three thus denominated. Dr. Beza finds in these kinsmen not only a mark of the unbroken continuity of household, but even of the unfailingness of the author, who, by this fiction, would make for the Apostle the favorable appearance of having sustained a more intimate relation to the Jewish-Christian Church in Rome.

My fellow-prisoners. Further particulars are not known. But as, according to Acts xxiii. 16, the Apostle had a nephew in Jerusalem who took a deep interest in his cause, and as it is said of Andronicus and Junia, or Junias, that they were before him in Christ— that is, were believers—so it is natural to make a family from the names of Andronicus, Junias, or Junia, as the early converted kinsmen of Paul, had already made an impression in Jerusalem upon the unconverted Paul, and, after his conversion, had taken an interest in him in his captivity. Then, these were specially adapted, like Aquila and Priscilla, and this also made them fit for him in Rome. Thus would also give a simple explanation to the apostles, εν τοις ἀπόστολοις. They were highly respected as believers among the apostles in Jerusalem. So also Meyer: “distinguished—that is, most honorably known to the apostles. Thus Beza, Gros, and most others; De Wette, Fritzsche, and Philippi. They take the right ground, for ἀπόστολοι is never used by Paul in the broader sense (as Acts xix. 4-14), and therefore cannot be explained, with Origen, Chrysostom, Luther, Calvin, &c., and Tholuck: among [i.e., among the number of] the Apostles.” See Meyer for hypotheses respecting their conversion.

Ver. 8. Amplias. An abbreviation of Ampliatus.—Beloved in the Lord, “beloved in the bonds of Christian fellowship” (Alford).—R.

Ver. 9. Urbanus—Stachys. The Apostle’s distinctions result from an exact view.

Ver. 10. Apelles. This has been confounded (by Origen, and others) with Apollos, but without any ground whatever. [Comp. Horace, Sat. i. 8. 100. Supposed to be a freedman, but the name was common among this class (Meyer, Philippi). There are various conjectures about the grouping of freedmen and slaves in these verses.—R.]

Ver. 11. Ἀρτέρατος. A predicate of tenced steadfastness in Phil. Who are of the household of Aristobulus. That is, the Christians in the household, probably slaves of Aristobulus. See the additional εν κυρίῳ in the following verse. [Alford: “It does not follow that either Aristobulus or Narcissus were themselves Christians. Only those of their familia (τοῖς ἐν τοῖς) are here saluted who were εν κυρίῳ; for we must understand it to be household, ἀπόστολοι.—R.]

Ver. 12. Narcissus. Gros, Neander, and others, have regarded him as a freedman of Claudius (Sueton., Claud. 28). [This freedman, however, was put to death two or three years before this Epistle was written. It is possible that the salutation is addressed to his family, known thus after his death.—R.]

Ver. 12. Persis. The name is derived from Persia, as the native country of the bearer; but it is not known that it was borne for this reason in this particular instance.—R. She is thus candidly distinguished from the two just named.


Ver. 14. Hermas. This verse contains a numerous group, probably intimately associated, and less known to the Apostle. Hermas has been regarded by Origen and Eusebius as the author of the work: ὁ ποιητής. But this authority belongs to the middle of the second century.—The brethren who are with them. [τοὺς αὐτοῖς ἀδελφοίς. This, as well as the expression in ver. 15: All the who are with them, has been understood as referring to a household church. Incidental hypotheses: (1) Christian associations for common business pursuits, &c. (Fritzsche, Philippi). (2) Missionary unions (Reiche). [The latter is quite improbable.—R.]

Ver. 15. Julia. Probably the wife of Philologus; for, in what follows, she is distinguished from the sister of Nerus.

Ver. 16. With a holy kiss. Εν φιλήματι ἀγίῳ. 1 Thess. v. 26. Comp. 1 Peter v. 14: ἐν φιλήματι ἀγίατις. “In Tertullian, it is the ecce- tum paces; the fraternal kiss after the finished prayer in the assemblies of the Christians is mentioned by Justin Martyr (M. Apol. 1. Op. 86):” Tholuck.—For further particulars see Meyer and Winer. The continuance of this Oriental Christian custom of connecting the salutation and the kiss as an expression of fellowship and of common festivals, is known in the Greek church (see Luke vii. 45).

All the churches. αἱ ἐκκλησίαι πᾶσαι. See Textual Note. As Paul has made known in many churches his intention of going to Rome, and because of this opportunity had received many salutations from Rome, he regarded himself sufficiently warranted to give Rome in the name of all the churches, particularly of those which he had established. Grosius limits the expression to the Grecian churches; others, in other ways. (Stuart, Olshausen, to the churches in Corinth and vicinity; Bengel, to those he had visited.—R.]
ed, and that they increased both intensively and extensively; therefore he could—as he subsequently did in his farewell address at Mileata, when setting out for Ephesus—here definitely predict their presence in Rome. Carpzov has had in mind the differences in chaps. xiv. and xv.; Clericus, and others, the early heathen philosophers. In both, the idea of Christian false teachers is wanting. Others have decided them to be Libertines. That the Apostle, at all events, had in view, besides the future Judaizing and Ebionitic zealots for the law, the gnosticizing and antinomian spirits of the future, is proved on looking at the arrangement for the reception of both these tendencies, which he, according to chaps. xiv. and xv., unquestionably found already in the Church. According to De Wette, the kind of false teachers here mentioned cannot be more specifically determined; according to Tholuck, with reference to Phil. iii. 2, &c., the zealots of the law are meant.

[Alford says: "Judging by the text itself, we infer that these teachers were similar to those pointed out in Phil. iii. 2, &c.: unprincipled and selfish persons, seducing others for their own gain; whether Judaizers or not, does not appear; but considering that the great opponents of the Apostle were of this party, we may perhaps infer that they also belonged to it."—R.]

To mark τον νοητικο. To notice carefully; used in Phil. iii. 17, with reference to those who should be limited; more intensive than βλέπων (Meyer).—R. This, and the avoiding of them, Kreil thinks can be referred only to present false teachers, which is very properly opposed by Tholuck.—Divisions and offences, τας διογμα-σιος και τα σκάνδαλα. The articles point to known divisions and scandals, whether Paul referred to any particular persons or not. Dr. Hodge seems disposed to refer the first word to doctrinal divisions, the latter to moral offences; so Webster and Wilkinson. Philippi and Meyer seem to refer the first to divisions, however occasioned, and the latter to temptations to depart from the gospel ground of faith and life. The objection to the former distinction is, that the "divisions" hinted at in the Epistle were mainly of an ethical rather than a doctrinal origin.—Contrary to the teaching, παρα την διογμασιαν. See chaps. i. 3, 9. Comm., p. 19. Most German commentators are disposed to reject at least the exclusive reference to doctrinal instruction. As our English word doctrine suggests dogmatic theology, we substitute teaching, which includes all instruction.—A commendation of their teachers is implied, which hints at the indirect Pauline origin of the Church.—Avoid them, ορνητίας αν αι-των. There is no reference to official condemnation, but to neglect of the teaching and treatment of those who might or might not be church members.—R.

Ver. 18. Serve not our Lord Christ [τον κυριον Χριστον]. See Textual Note a. See chap. ii. 8; Phil. iii. 19; 2 Cor. xi. 20. Fanaticism, by its confusion of spiritual and carnal affections and motives, degenerates into disguised sensualism.—Their own belly [τον εαυτον καιλα]. This is a symbol of their self-interest, selfishness, sensuality, and of that final turning at a mean world of pleasure; comp. 1 Tim. vi. 6; Titus i. 11. And by their good words and fair speeches [δια της χρηστηλογίας και εικόνας]. See Textual Note b. Comp. 2 Cor. xi. 14. By good words they represent themselves in a rosy light, and by flattering speeches, their hearers. For further particulars, see Tholuck, p. 741. Melanchthon understands, by εικόνα, religious blessings and promises; for example, those of the monks. [Hodge takes the two words as synonymous. Meyer thinks the former characterizes the tenor, and the latter the form, of their words. Χρηστηλογία is found only here in the New Testament. The view given by Dr. Lange is quite tenable.—R.]

The simple τον αναγκο. The unvarying. Those who, as such, can be easily deceived. [How many were deceiving and deceived, appears from Phil. i. 16, written from Rome a few years after.—R.]

Ver. 19. For your obedience [τονα τετοιον]. The γαν is explained in different ways:

1. It implies, indirectly, that they also are not free from this αναγκα (Origen, Fritzsche). [Dr. Hodge takes obedience as obedient disposition, and, with others, regards this as implying a liability to be led astray. But "obedience," without further definition, would mean the "obedience of faith," in this Epistle at least; besides, this view implies that their obedience was not altogether of a commendable character.—R.]

2. It implies an antithesis; as for the Roman Christians, he knows that they are, as being obedient to the gospel, cannot so easily deceived (Chrysostom, Theodoret, Meyer).—R.

3. The γαν specifies a second ground for ver. 17 (Tholuck, De Wette, Philippi). [So Alford. But Meyer correctly says, that γαν is never repeated thus in a strictly coordinate relation. Alford finds also a slight reproach here.—R.]

(Explanation 1.) is, as it seems to us, very aptly modified by Rückert. Since they succeeded in deceiving the simple, they will think that they can also easily find an entrance to you, for they regard your obedience, which is everywhere known, as that very simplicity. [This avoids the objection to which the view, as held by Dr. Hodge, is open. Still, Meyer sees nearest the true explanation.—R.]

On your part (as answer), προς αυτους γαν τινος ημεν. On your part, you yourself have wrought for you ἡ προσωπον γαν. See Textual Note h. The emphatic position of ἡ προσωπον favors Meyer's view of γαν, while the next clause, with its adversative δε, seems to introduce the real warning.—R. It is, at all events, desirable that they allow themselves to be warned, according to the rule which the Apostle lays down.

Wise [φρονεις. u. A. C., Rec., insert μυν, which seems to be an interpolation on account of δε, which follows.—R.] They should be receptive inquirers after what is good. But, on the other hand, they should be as un receptive of, and un teachable in, what is bad, as if they were simplehearted people. — Harmless. [Dr. Lange renders: ungebührlich, einfach, simple, as in E.V. But harmless seems to be preferable, especially as another

* [Meyer finds the ground for this antithesis in the position of ἐκδικησις . . . δεν, and paraphrases: "Not without ground in the hearts of the simple; for you they will not reduce, because you do not belong to the simple; but you are so noted for your obedience (to the gospel) that the warning is everywhere known; about you I am therefore glad, yet I would have you wise and pure," &c. "An elegant mingling of the warning with the expression of firm confidence." This view is now favored by Philippi, and is no longer open to the objection urged against (1), nor does it present any grammatical difficulty whatever.—R.}
Greek word has been rendered "simple" just before (ver. 18).—R.] Meyer explains διακαιόω' by 

pure [i.e., unmixed with, free from, evil], which does not make an antithesis to the foregoing (comp. I Cor. xiv. 20). Matt. x. 16, on the contrary, constitutes a harmonious antithesis to the whole passage. For different expositions of the διακαιόω, see Tholuck. [Dr. Hodge: "Wise, so that good may result, and simple, so that evil may not be done;" so most commentators.—R.]

Ver. 20. And the God of peace, &c. [κ. θεός τῆς εἰρήνης, &c.]. In the divine power of the Spirit and Author of peace. It is just as the God of peace that He will bruise Satan, who, by his false doctrines, causes divisions, and rends the Church asunder. The συνεργίας, shall bruise, is the prophetic future; but not optatively, according to Flatt [Stuart] (see 2 Cor. xi. 16). The expression is an allusion to Gen. iii. 15.

The grace, &c. This is the usual concluding benediction (see 2 Cor. xiii. 13). In 2 Thess. iii. 16, a concluding salutation also follows the benediction. [The presence of the benediction here has led to various conjectures: that Paul intended to close, but afterward added the salutations; that ver. 24 is not genuine, since it only repeats this doxology, &c. But the text is well sustained here, except the final Amen (see Textual Note e); and certainly no one has a right to say that Paul shall always close his Epistles in the same way, or to impute either the genuineness of the text or the inspiration of the author, because he does not conform to a certain mode (however customary with him).—R.]

DOCTRINAL AND ETHICAL.

1. We become best acquainted with the nature of the office of deaconess in apostolic times from the Pastoral Epistles. From these it is evident, first of all, that this office was not of a missionary character, but a local service in the Church, springing from Christian consecration, and more exactly defined, by the restraint then placed on women, by the general destination of the sex, as well as by age and character. This form of the office in the early Church was succeeded, in the Middle Ages, by the religious orders, which assumed, besides, a qualified missionary function. Recent times have attempted glorious things in relation to this office, and have accomplished great results; but the full development of the matter from the idea of a local evangelical service, into which, in its wider sense, all the female members of the Church are called, remains a grand problem for the Evangelical Church. [Woman's work in the Church dacional, not ministerial.—All Christian women called to a diaconal service; come to a more special, and perhaps official, service of this nature.—The danger of the mediaval extreme best avoided by regarding the Church as founded upon the family; not intended to override it (see the household churches named here). How are we Protestants ignoring this idea?—The diaconal service a priestly one (chap. xv. 27); noble, however humble it appears.—R.]

2. The commendation of Phoebe, a model for Christian commendations.

3. The Apostle's salutations. Christianity is as intensively personal in a holy sense, as actually free from the ungodly respect of persons. The Apostle's friends as preparers of his way, and witnesses of his greatness and humility. His brief descriptions of them are models of a proper estimation of persons, free from all flattery. A group of constellations in the apostolic age, as a segment of that spiritual starry sky which eternity will reveal.

4. The warning against the false teachers. See the Exeg. Notes.

5. The Apostle's glorious prophecy opens a still greater future for Rome. We also read, in Matt. xiii., that it is Satan who sows the tares among the wheat, and thereby causes offences. False teaching seems here to be a ground of divisions and offences. The first practically evil effect proceeds outwardly, the other comes inwardly.

6. It has been said, that the Apostle has pronounced too hard a sentence on his opponents. But the Apostle had established the great festival of peace, and therefore he must regard the enemies of God's Church of peace as just what they really are—the demoniacal disturbers of the institution of a heavenly life on earth.

(The Hemerleatical and Practical Notes are at the end of the chapter.)

CONCLUSION.

THE GREETINGS OF THE PAULINE CIRCLE TO THE CHURCH AT ROME, AND THE INVOCATION OF BLESSINGS BY PAUL HIMSELF. HIS DOXOLOGICAL SEALING OF THE GOSPEL FOR ALL TIME BY A REAL ANTIPHONICAL AMEN.

Chap. XVI. 21-27.

A.

21 Timotheus my workfellow [saluteth you], and Lucius, and Jason, and Sosipater, my kinsmen, salute you [οὖν, ὑμᾶς, salutate you]. I Tertius, who wrote this 23 [the] epistle, salute you in the Lord. Gaius mine host, and [the host] of the
whole church, saluteth you. Erastus the chamberlain [treasurer] of the city 24 saluteth you, and Quartus a [our] brother. The 2 grace of our Lord Jesus Christ be with you all. Amen.

B.

25 Now to him that is of power [who is able] 1 to establish you according to my gospel, and the preaching of Jesus Christ, according to the revelation of the mystery, which was kept secret [in silence] since the world began [during eternal ages], But now is made manifest; and by [through] the Scriptures of the prophets, according to the commandment of the everlasting God, [is] made known to all nations for [unto] the obedience of faith: To God only wise, 2 be glory through Jesus Christ for ever [To the only wise God, through Jesus Christ; to whom be the glory for ever]. 3 Amen.

[TO THE ROMANS].

TEXTUAL.

1 Ver. 21.—The Rec, with D*. L., and a few minor authorities, reads: ἀποκάλυψις. N. A. B. C. D*. E.: ἀποκάλυψις; adopted by Lachmann, Tischendorf, Meyer, Alford, &c., since the alteration to the plural (from the number of persons named) was so likely to occur.—The E. V. must therefore be emended as above.

2 Ver. 24.—This verse is wanting in N. A. B. C. D. and in other important authorities. In some cursives, and in some copies of the Peshito, it is found after ver. 37. D. E. L., Greek and Latin fathers, insert it here. It is rejected by Lachmann, Koppe, Reiske, Tregelles; bracketed by Alford; accepted by Meyer and Lange (Tischendorf varies). It was not inserted to form a proper ending to the Epistle, since the authorities which omit it have the concluding doxology; but was probably omitted on account of the unusual combination of the benediction and doxology. So Dr. Lange, who makes the doxology a liturgical antiphony, expanding the "Amen" of this verse, and of course retains ver. 24-27 in this place.

3 Ver. 25.—The emendations are from the revisions of the Amer. Bible Union, Five Ang. Clergymen, and Noyes.

Dr. Lange's rendering is, in some respects peculiar: "But to Him, who can make you strong (chap. 1. 11): According to (as an antiphony to) my gospel and the preaching of Jesus Christ,—according to the revelation of the mystery; that was kept in silence since eternal ages; but that has been now made manifest, as through the prophetic Scriptures;—according to the command of the everlasting God, made known among all nations for the purpose of their obedience of faith: To the only wise God—Through Jesus Christ, whose is the glory—Into eternity an (encovened) Amen:"

It will be noticed that this differs from the usual view, in some of its details as well as in the liturgical view it presents. See further theEnc. Nore.

4 Ver. 27.—On the concluding Doxology. (1) Ver. 25-27 are found here, in N. B. C. D., Vulgate, Peshito, and other versions, in some fathers. So the Rec., Eusebius, Beza (eds. 3-5), Bengel, Koppe, Lachmann, Schoel, Fritzsche, De Wette, Kischel, Philippi, Tischendorf, Tholuck, Ewald, Meyer, Alford, Tregelles, Lange, and many others. (2.) They stand after chap. xiv. 23 in L., and all cursives (Alford says 193), in the Greeklexicon, in Chrysostom, Theodoret, Tholuck, &c. This position is accepted by Beza (eds. 1, 2), Grotius, Mill, Weststein, Paulus, Kiihlein (and most of those who deny the integrity of the Epistle), but not by the latest critical editors. (3.) They are found in both places in A. and a few cursives, which is indefensible. (4.) They are omitted in D. (or rather marked for erasure by the corrector) F. G. (both, however, leaving a space in chap. xiv., as if intending to insert there), Marcion, some manuscripts in Jamison, Schmidt, Reiske, Kiihlein reject them as not genuine. We inquire, then:

1. Is this Doxology genuine? A careful scrutiny of the external authorities as given above justifies the opinion of Alford: "its genuineness as a part of the Epistle is placed beyond all reasonable doubt." The few authorities which omit it altogether, seem to have done so with no intention of rejecting it. The variation in position is so readily accounted for, as to cast little doubt on the genuineness. Nor is the internal evidence against it. The style is Pauline. Though the other Pauline doxologies are simpler, this was the close of the greatest Epistle. Reiske thinks that, owing to the personal character of chaps. xv., xvi., the public reading closed with chap. xiv.; that then a doxology was spoken, which crept into the text at that point, and afterward was transferred to the close. But this is more conjecture. (See Meyer)

2. What, then, is its true position? We answer, without hesitation, at the close of chap. xvi. (1.) The weight, if not the number of diplomatic authorities favors this position. (2.) In accounting for the variation, it is much easier to account for the change from this place to chap. xiv., than for the reverse. The doxology forms an unusual conclusion; it was preceded by the usual closing benediction; the words ἐπιστεύεις ἐπιστεύεις would seem to point to the "week" (chap. xiv.). Other theories are advanced, but this seems the simplest explanation of the change.—The repetition in some authorities is easily accounted for, since the early criticism could not decide where it properly belonged, and yet feared to reject; the omission arose from the same doubt (since F. G. both have a blank space in chap. xiv.).—Dr. Lange's view of the connection renders extended critical discussion unnecessary.—B.

* [Subscription. That of the Rec. is probably correct, but not genuine. N. A. B. C. D. G. have: ἅπα ράς Παραισίων; to this D* and others add: εὐθείας and ἀποκάλυψειν; G. οἰκοδομής—B.*

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

A. The salutations.—B. The doxology, in conformity with the fundamental thought of the Epistle, in the form of a liturgical antiphony. The everlasting Amen of the Church as a response to the everlasting gospel of God, as an Amen: 1. To the proclamation of the gospel in general; 2. To Paul's proclamation of the call of the Gentiles; 3. To God's command to bear the gospel forth unto all nations, for the consummation of which our Epistle is designed.

A. Vers. 21-24.—Ver. 21. Timothy, See Acts xx. 4; also the Encyclopedias.—Lucius.

* [Comp. Van Oosterzee (Lange's Comm.), 1 Timoth. Intro. §1—2.]
Not Luke (Origen, and others). "It is uncertain whether this is the Lucius of Cyrene in Acts xiii. 1."—Jason. Comp. Acts xvii. 5. —Sosipater. Acts xx. 4. The identity is, at least, by no means improbable. It appears to these three persons commentators differ. All three may be identical with those mentioned in the Acts, yet all the names were common, while Sosipater and Sophater (Acts xx. 4) may be the same name, without the identity of persons being thereby established.—My kinsmen, of Macedonia: see vers. 7, 11. It seems probable that some relationship more close than that of fellow-Jew is here referred to.—R.

And this Tertius. Probably an Italian (he has, without any ground, been identified with Silas: see Meyer). The writer of this Epistle, which Paul dictated to him. On other untenable hypotheses (a clean copy; a translation into Greek), see Meyer. It was natural that he should present his own salutation. [Tholuck considers this irregularity a corruption of the genuineness of the chapter.—R.]

Groundless suppositions: 1. Paul wrote from ver. 23 with very fewhand (Rambach). 2. From ver. 23 Tertius wrote in his own name (Glückler). ["Entirely groundless also is the view of Olshausen: Paul wrote the doxology immediately after ver. 20, but on a special and small parchment, the vacant side of which was used by the anamnesis, Tertius, in order to write vers. 21—24 in his own name;" Meyer. The internal evidence is altogether against this.

—In the Lord, in Christ. Wordsworth follows Origen in joining these words with what immediately precedes, as implying that the work of an anamnesis, not less than that of an apostle, is done "in the Lord." Most commentators connect it with διά ἅπας ομοιότεροι, which is preferable.—R.]

Ver. 23. Caius. Caius. See the Lexicons on the frequent occurrence of the name. The identity with the Caius in 1 Cor. i. 14 is very probable; perhaps he is also the same person as the Caius in Acts xx. 4. Paul was now lodging with him, as he had already done with others.—Probably also a household congregation gathered in his house. [Or he may have been universal in his hospitality to Christians (Alford).—R.]

Erastus. The city treasurer. The same name in Acts xix. 22 and 2 Tim. iv. 20 does not seem to denote the same person, unless, as Meyer remarks, Erastus had his position. —Quartus [Κωνστάντιος]. This shows how the Greeks transferred the sound of the Latin Qu into their language.—R.] A brother in a general Christian sense.

B. Vers. 25—27.—Ver. 25. Now to him who is able to establish you [Τῷ δὲ δυνατῷ ἑαυτῷ στηρισθήσεται.] This to daive, that of ver. 27 corresponds, all that intervenes being dependent in some way upon δυνατίσθη. The real grammatical difficulty is therefore in ver. 27.—R.] Στηρισθήσεται. See chap. i. 11; 1 Thess. iii. 2; 2 Thess. ii. 17. He is very solicitous that the Church in Rome he steadfast and faithful. He clothes his solicitude in the form of a liturgical antiphony, in which he again takes up the first Amen, in order to say Amen to the three solemn representations of the gospel of God, in the name of the Roman Church, and of all God's churches in general. Comp. the liturgical meaning of the Amen in 1 Cor. xiv. 16.

According to my gospel [κατὰ τὸ ἐφόβου σφών αὐτοῦ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ. According to this view of the doxology, we do not explain κατὰ in reference to my gospel, but according to my gospel, as an antithesis to my gospel—and, mentally, for the first, second, and third time. If we mistake this liturgical form, this doxology becomes a network of exegetical difficulties. The first κατὰ is explained by Meyer: may He establish you in relation to my gospel, that you may remain perseveringly true to my gospel. For other explanations, see Alford, p. 561 f. [Philippi, Alford, and others, agree, in the main, with Meyer: in reference to—i.e., in my gospel; He can establish you, or, "in subordination to, and according to the requirements of" (Alford), my gospel. Dr. Hodge prefers through, which is scarcely defensible lexically, Dr. Lange's view of the preposition depends on his view of the doxology as a whole.—R.]

And the preaching of Jesus Christ [κατὰ τὸ χρίσμα Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ. As it is not only spread abroad in his gospel, but also outside of it, in all the world. Explanations: 1. The preaching concerning Christ (Luther, Calvin, Tholuck, and Philippi); 2. The preaching which Christ causes to be proclaimed through him (Meyer, and others); 3. The preaching of Christ during His stay on earth (Grotius).*

According to the revelation [κατὰ ἀποκάλυψιν.] The κατὰ is taken by Meyer, and others, as coordinate to the former one, and dependent on στηρισθήσεται; by Tholuck, and others, as dependent on the whole opening clause, in the sense of in consequence of; by Alford, and others, as subordinate to χρίσμα.—R.] This is the specific designation of the universality of the gospel according to Paul's view; Eph. iii. 3, 9; Col. i. 26, &c.—The mystery relates particularly to the freedom or national enlargement of the gospel. [Philippi, and others, unnecessarily limit mystery here to this enlargement of the gospel. It seems best to take it in its full meaning. See chap. xi. 26.—R.]

Ver. 26. [But now is made manifest, γανειροθέντος δὲ τὸν οὐρανόν. This is obviously in antithesis to the latter part of the preceding verse. The question respecting the relation of the clauses is, however, a difficult one. Beza, Platt, Meyer, De Wette, and others, join these words closely with ver. 25, making the rest of this verse subordinate to γανειροθέντος. They render somewhat thus: "But which is made manifest in the present age, and by means of the prophetic Scriptures, according to the command of the everlasting God, is made known unto all nations, in order to lead them to the obedience of the faith." Hodge, Alford, and others, join together the first part of the verse as far as "the everlasting God," while Dr. Lange takes the third κατὰ as coordinate to the first and second. Besides, there is room for a great variety of opinion in regard to the relation of the different phrases.—R.]

Through the Scriptures of the prophets [διὰ τῆς γραμματείας προφητείας.] The presence of τῆς favors the connection with what follows, but Dr. Lange renders "as through," &c.,

* Of these, (3.) seems most untenable. (1.) makes this phrase an extension of the preceding κατὰ; (2.) an explanation of it. They are not, however, contradictory of each other. Dr. Lange seems really to combine them.—R.]

* [The ground of this supposed identity is that the Hebrew word answering to the Latin Tertius (ὑπὲρτις) sounds like Silas. But the latter is a contraction from Σιλάς.—R.]
thus adopting the other view.—R.] By this addition, Paul proves that this present revelation, whose special organ is Paul himself, is not neologically new, but according to the analogy of faith. Through the Scriptures of the prophets means, that their sense has now become fully clear.*

According to the commandment of the everlasting God [καὶ ἐπιταγῇ τοῦ αἰω-

This view now meets with much favor.—R.]...—as well as the proposed supplements, prove only that there must be a mistake in the whole conception of the doxology. We may regard it as removed by the liturgical construction of the conclusion corresponding to the fundamental liturgical thought of the Epistle. The Amen of eternity shall again ascend to God through Christ, just as the eternal gospel has come from God to man through Him. But we do not read τοῦ θεοῦ, because the conclusion is not didactic, but a prayer.

[Dr. Lange thus avoids an anacoluthon, by making a double doxology, as it were—to God an eternally accordant Amen, to Christ the glory. It must be confessed that this view is novel, with scarcely an analogy in the New Testament or elsewhere; yet it is beautiful, poetic, and appropriate. For the Apostle, in closing such an Epistle as this, must have been filled with thoughts not less grand than these. Still, should we accept the view of Meyer, the thought remains grand, Pauline, and appropriate. (See Winer, p. 528, on the anacoluthon.) For he who had cleft so deeply into the riches of the knowledge of God in Jesus Christ, might well close by declaring that God was revealed as absolute wisdom in Jesus Christ, and ascribe to Him, as such, the glory forever. And when, through the preaching of Jesus Christ, according to this gospel, the mystery of God's love in Jesus Christ shall be made known to all nations, and they, through the knowledge of the revealed Scriptures, become obedient in faith, then to Him, whose wisdom shall be thus revealed, be all the glory. The true antiphonial Amen is pronounced by those who labor for and await that glory, who to-day, with uplifted heads, expect the final triumph, not less than he who closes his great Epistle in such confidence.—R.]

DOCTRINAL AND ETHICAL.

1. See the Exeg. Notes.

2. The doxology is presented to God, as the only wise, in the same sense as His wisdom, in the economy of salvation, is glorified at the conclusion of chap. xi.

3. On the liturgical meaning of the Amen, comp. Deut. xxvii. 15 f.; Ps. cvii. 10; 1 Chron. xvi. 26; 1 Cor. xiv. 16; but especially Eph. iii. 21.

HOMILETICAL AND PRACTICAL.

Chap. xvi. 1-16.

The abundance of apostolic salutations (vers. 1-16).—The Apostle's good memory of his friends (vers. 1-16).—Phœbe, a pattern for every Christian deaconess. 1. Every one, like her, should minister to the poor and sick in the Church of the Lord; 2. Every one, like her, should not teach God's word, but bring it over, as Phœbe brought the Epistle to the Roman women (vers. 1, 2).—The evangelical office of the deaconess arose from living faith: 1. In the apostolic Church; 2. In the Middle Ages; 3. At the present time.—How should our churchers act toward the deaconesses?—He who exercises love may also lay claim to love (ver. 2).—Aquila and

* [Hodge: "To the only wise God, through Jesus Christ, to Him, I say, be glory forever." So Stuart, taking τοῦ θεοῦ in the demonstrative sense.—R.]
The Ephistle of Paul to the Romans.

Priscilla, a Christian couple of the apostolic age; comp. Acts xviii. 2, 26 (vers 3, 4).—Aquila and Priscilla contrasted with Ananias and Sapphira; comp. Acts v. 1 ff.—The Christian Church originally a household church (ver. 6).—The family, the birthplace of Christian service in the Gentile world; comp. Acts xv. 1 ff., xviii. 7; 1 Cor. xvi. 19 (ver. 5).—The Marys of the New Testament. 1. Mary, the mother of our Lord; 2. Mary, the sister of the mother of Jesus; 3. Mary of Bethany; 4. Mary Magdalene; 5. Mary, the mother of John Mark; 6. The Roman Mary (ver. 6).—See the Concordance.

The Marys of the New Testament grouped in pairs. 1. Two of them belong to the immediate family of Jesus; 2. Two are friends of our Lord; 3. Two are protectresses of His apostles (ver. 6).—The various yet well-considered designations of the individuals saluted by the Apostle: Helpers in Christ (ver. 3); well-beloved, my beloved, beloved (vers. 6, 9, 12); beloved in the Lord (ver. 8); approved in Christ (ver. 10); chosen in the Lord (ver. 13); sister (ver. 1).—The salutation with a holy kiss (ver. 16).—The holy kiss of fraternal fellowship, and the judicious use of the kiss hereafter (ver. 16).

Luther, on ver. 17: This is said against all doctrines of men.

Stier: Christianity does not abrogate worldly transactions and external business, but rather directs them aright, and brings a blessing upon them (ver. 2).—Hedinger: How beautiful! Pious women in the service of the Church, taking care of widows, children, the poor, and the sick! Oh, how sadly has this zeal died out in the Church; every one is for himself in his own house! Yet who does not see the footprints of a God still living? (ver. 2.)

Spener: We see, at least, that women are prohibited from no spiritual employment, with the exception of the public office of the ministry (ver. 2).—With a holy kiss, without any wantonness, actual or imagined (ver. 16).

Hawkes: Commendations of the Christian are very different from mere worldly ones, for they have a holy cause and a holy purpose (ver. 1. 2).—Natural weakness, strengthened by grace, accomplishes much (ver. 6 ff.).—The true Christian must read all these names with hearty interest, even though we know but little or nothing of their works. Their names stand in the Book of Life. —Celebrity, so called, is something very ambiguous; the lowest faithful servant of Christ is more than the most admired worldly hero. Pious souls can even wish to remain concealed, λόθριον Βιοικός (vers. 5, 6 ff.).—The kiss can be most unholy and most holy (ver. 16).

Harkness, on vers. 5-7: 1) Happy houses, and thrice happy householders, whose families are little churches for piety and devotion!—Observe: 1. That seniority in grace is a very great honor: and to be in Christ before others, is a transcendent prerogative. 2. That God will have the good works of all His saints, and the services especially which are done to His ministers and ambassadors by any of His people, to be applauded, valued, and recorded. —Henry: In Christian congregations there should be lesser societies, linked together in love and converse, and taking opportunities of being often together. —Doormouse: Many women have been eminently useful. The most valuable ministers have often been assisted by them in the success of their work, whil: their pious care, under the restraint of the strictest modesty and decorum, has happily and effectually influenced children, servants, and young friends; yea, has been the means of sowing the seeds of religion in tender minds, before they have been capable of coming under ministerial care.—Scorr: We should hope the best of others, and commend what is good in their conduct.—Hedges: The social relations in which Christians stand to each other as relatives, countrymen, friends, should not be allowed to give character to their feelings and conduct to the exclusion of the more important relation which they bear to Christ. It is as friends, helpers, fellow-laborers in the Lord, that they are to be recognized.—Barnea: Religion binds the hearts of all who embrace it tenderly together. It makes them feel that they are one great family, united by tender ties, and joined by peculiar attachments. —J. F. H.]

Vers. 17-27.

Warning against disturbers of the Church. The Apostle pronounces against them: 1. With all frankness, designating them, a. as those who cause divisions and offences; 2. whom the others should avoid, because they are not in Christ, but serve themselves, and deceive simple hearts by hollow words and false speeches. 2. With all confidence in the members of the Church at Rome; because, a. their obedience is come abroad unto all men; b. he himself is glad on their behalf; c. but desires that they be very careful, wise unto that which is good, and simple concerning evil. 3. With the strongest hope in the peace, who he expects will shortly bruise Satan under the feet of believers (vers. 17-20).—On divisions and offences in the Church (ver. 17).—We can cause offence, not only by a bad life, but also by bad teaching (ver. 17).—Good words and fair speeches very easily deceive simple hearts (ver. 18).—Not every thing which tastes sweet is healthy, nor is every thing which has a pleasing sound true (ver. 18).

Wisely unto that which is good, and simple concerning evil! Comp. Matt. x. 16; 1 Cor. xiv. 20 (ver. 19).—The God of peace conquers, Satan is trodden upon (ver. 20).—To God alone be glory through Jesus Christ forever! Amen (vers. 26-27).

Stier, Hedinger: Christians are not dumb blocks (Ps. cxix. 100, 104); but industrious, wise, zealous in that which is good, full of excellent counsel and wise execution. But it is owing to their godly simplicity and love that they do not understand wickedness, intrigues, and all kinds of low tricks (especially when men make themselves pleasant, according to the flesh, by shifting about, talking politics, and flattering with the cross of Christ), and are often deceived (ver. 19).

Spener: A lie cannot stand long, but must finally be exposed (ver. 20).

Bengel: In this whole Epistle the Apostle mentions the enemy but once; in all his Epistles he mentions Satan nine times, and the devil six times (ver. 20).


Harkness: The holiest union can be dissolved
by evil desire and unbelief; the purpose of the evil spirit is always separation and destruction (Divide et impera). This takes place especially by means of false teachers (vers. 17, 18).—The world is wise in doing evil, and unskilful in doing good (ver. 19).
—By God and His Spirit we can conquer Satan and his works. Christ has begun to destroy the works of Satan, though the task is not yet finished (ver. 20).

[Fardinon, on vol. 20: If the devil inspire evil thoughts, God is both able and willing to inspire good; and in all our trials, in all time of our tribulation, and in all time of our wealth, in the hour of death and in the day of judgment, His "grace is sufficient for" us.]

[Jeremy Taylor: All people who desire the benefit of the gospel are bound to have a fellowship and society with these saints, and communicate with them in their holy things, in their faith, and in their hope, and in their sacraments, and in their prayers, and in their public assemblies, and in their government; and must do to them all the acts of charity and mutual help which they can and are required to; and without this communion of saints, and a conjunction with them who believe in God through Jesus Christ, there is no salvation to be expected: which communion must be kept in inward things always, and by all persons, and testified by outward acts always, when it is possible, and may be done upon just and holy conditions.]

[Burkitt: God is only wise, because all wisdom is derived from Him; all the wisdom of angels and men is but a ray from His light, a drop from His ocean. Let the wisdom of God, in all His dealings with us and ours, be admired and adored by us; for all His works of providence are as orderly and perfect as His works of creation, though we perceive it not.]

[Henry: Mark those that cause divisions; mark the method they take, the end they drive at; there is no need of a piercing, watchful eye; to discern the danger we are in from such people; for commonly the pretences are plausible, when the projects are very pernicious. Do not look only at the divisions and offences, but run up those streams to the fountain, and mark those that cause them; and especially that in them which causes these divisions and offences; those lusts on each side, whence come these wars and fightings. A danger discovered is half prevented.]

[Scott: In order to maintain communion with the Lord and with His saints uninterrupted, avoid, with decided disapprobation, those persons who aim to prejudice believers against each other, to draw them off from faithful pastors, or to seduce them into strange doctrines, contrary to the simple truths of God's word.]

[Clarke: The Church of God has ever been troubled with pretended pastors, men who feed themselves, and not the flock; men who are too proud to beg, and too lazy to work; who have neither grace nor gifts to plant the standard of the cross on the devil's territories, and, by the power of Christ, make inroads upon his kingdom, and spoil him of his subjects. By sowing the seeds of dissensions, by means of doubtful disputations, and the propagation of scandals; by glaring and insinuating speeches—for they affect elegance and good breeding—they rend Christian congregations, form a party for themselves, and thus live on the spoils of the Church of God.]

[Hodge: However much the Church may be distracted and troubled, error and its advocates cannot finally prevail. Satan is a conquered enemy with a longened chain.]

[Barnes: Let men make peace their prime object, resolve to love all who are Christians, and it will be an infallible gauge by which to measure the arguments of those who seek to promote alienations and contensions.]

[McClintock: There is nothing in religion incompatible with the natural affections. Nay, you will find that he who loves God most, has the strongest and most trustworthy love for kindred and friends. The human affections are purged of all dross by the fire of love to God. A heart full of charity prompts to all good and kind actions, just when they are called for. It will give tears, when tears and sympathy can bless or save; it will give sacrifice, when sacrifice can help or save some suffering soul. Earnest love to God must display itself in tender attributes, in good, kind, and gentle ministrations—in all forms of benevolence and personal sacrifice. And these things become the more easy, the more we know of the love of God.
