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## PREFACE

THE Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans in this series had been entrusted by the late General Editor to Dr Bebb of Lampeter. It was only when Dr Bebb's engagements made it impossible for him to complete the task, that the work was entrusted by the Syndics of the Press to the present editor. No one can be more conscious than the editor himself how much has been lost by the change and how inadequately the trust has been fulfilled. It would, in any case, have been impossible to include, within the limits necessarily imposed, an even relatively complete treatment of this Epistle : and the difficulty of approaching to such a treatment, as was possible, has been increased by the pressure of other occupations. The most that can be hoped is that this edition may serve as an introduction to the study of the Epistle. I have aimed at giving a clear statement of the conditions under which it was written and of the general argument as illustrating and illustrated by those conditions. In the Commentary I have desired to give a close exposition of the text and of the sequence of thought, leaving the larger treatment of theological subjects and the wider illustration of thoughts and language to be sought in the great commentaries.

My obligations to previous writers will be seen by the references throughout the book. But there are some which must be explicitly acknowledged. There are few pages which do not reveal debts to the classical English edition of Drs Sanday and Headlam, and to the Prolegomena to the Grammar of the New Testament of Professor J. H. •Moulton, a work whose constant usefulness to the student makes him impatient for its completion. If I add to these the posthumously published lectures and commentaries of Dr Hort, I am acknowledging a debt which all Cambridge theological students will recognise as not admitting of exaggeration. Finally I wish to express my most grateful acknowledgments to Mr J. H. A. Hart, Fellow and Lecturer of S. John's College, for his generous assistance in looking over the proofs and many most useful criticisms and suggestions.

> Trinity College, Cambridge.
> Michaelmas, 1912.

## NOTE

The Greek Text adopted in this Series is that of Dr Westcott and Dr Hort with the omission of the marginal readings. For permission to use this Text the thanks of the Syndics of the Cambridge University Press and of the General Editor are due to Messrs Macmillan \& Co.
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## INTRODUCTION

## 1. Genuineness.

THE genuineness of the Epistle to the Romans is common ground for the great majority of critics. The few attempts to impugn it are based upon arbitrary and subjective methods which have no foundation in the known history and ignore the ordinary canons of literary criticism. It may be taken as admitted that the whole Epistle is genuine, even if it is composite, with the possible exception of xvi. 25-27, which section is, on arguable grounds, referred by some critics to a Pauline author writing from the point of view of the Epistle to the Ephesians and the Pastoral Epistles, on the assumption that these Epistles also are Pauline but not S. Paul's.

The literary history of the Epistle begins early. It was undoubtedly known to and used by the author of 1 Peter ${ }^{1}$, probably by Hebrews, James ${ }^{2}$, and Jude (24, 25). It is quoted (not by name) by Clement R. and used by Ep. Barnabas, Ignatius, Polycarp, and perhaps Hermas ${ }^{3}$. Justin Martyr and Athenagoras were familiar with it. It appears in the Canon of Marcion ${ }^{4}$, in the Muratorian Canon, and is cited by Irenaeus, Clement of Alexandria and Tertullian. No Epistle, except 1 Corinthians, has an earlier or more continuous record ${ }^{5}$.
${ }^{1}$ See S. H. pp. lxxiv f., Hort, 1 Peter, pp. 4 f.
${ }^{2}$ Cf. Hort, Epistle of S. James, xxiv f. and pp. 66 f., but S. H. pp. lxxvii f. doubt, and Mayor, S. James, pp. 1xxxviii f. takes James to be prior.
${ }^{8}$ New Testament in the Apost. Fathers, Oxford, 1905.
${ }^{4}$ S. H. p. lxxxiii.
${ }^{5}$ The question of the relation of the Epistle to the Testaments of the XII Patriarchs (S. H. p. lxxxii) has been reopened by Cbarles (Testaments, pp. lxxxvi f.) who regards the Testaments as prior to S. Paul, and used by him.

## 2. Integrity.

The integrity of the Epistle has been impugned, on grounds which can be regarded as serious, only in connexion with cc. xv., xvi. The questions raised about these chapters are discussed in the commentary and additional notes. It is sufficient to say here that the only point on which a strong case has been made out against the integrity relates to c. xvi. 1-23, which is"regarded by many critics as a short letter, or fragment of a letter, of S. Paul to the Church in Ephesus. The arguments for this hypothesis and the reasons for rejecting it are given in the commentary. If the hypothesis is accepted, it postulates a very early combination of the two letters, antecedent to the period which is covered by our documentary evidence. Such a combination would be not likely to be made, except on an occasion when a collection of S. Paul's letters was being made. We have in all probability a combination of two letters in the case of the second Epistle to the Corinthians, at a date, again, antecedent to documentary evidence. As both parts of the assumed combination in Romans were written from Corinth, and the two fragments combined in 2 Corinthians were written to Corinth, the hypothesis would increase the probability that a collection of Pauline letters was made at a very early date at Corinth. It would naturally include 1 Corinthians, and 1 and 2 Thessalonians, both written from Corinth, and possibly Galatians on the same ground. The hypothesis implies that copies of letters written from Corinth were made and deposited with the Church there. But in all this there is no more than an interesting hypothesis.

## 3. Date and Place.

The date of the Epistle can be obtained with unusual certainty from the evidence afforded by the Epistle itself. S. Paul has not yet visited Rome (i. 10, xv. 22 f.), but he intends to visit it as soon as he has carried out his immediate purpose of a journey to Jerusalem (xv. 25). The special object of this journey is to carry to the Church in Jerusalem, for the benefit of the poor, a contribution from the Churches of Macedonia
and Achaea (xv. 26, Asia is not mentioned). He has already preached the Gospel as far as Illyricum and so rounded off his missionary labours in Asia and Greece (xv. 19, 23) and hopes to resume them in Spain (xv. 24) after he has visited Rome, preached there (i. 13) and received from the Church in Rome spiritual refreshment and a good send-off for his labours in Spain (xv. 24).

The situation thus indicated is closely similar to the situation described in the Acts as characterising his stay in Greece during the three winter months after his departure from Ephesus (Acts xix. 21, xx. 2-4, xxi. 15, xxiv. 17). It agrees further with the references in 1 Cor. xvi. 1 f. and 2 Cor. viii., ix. to the contribution for the poor saints in Jerusalem. All indications thus point clearly to the winter of $56-57$ ( $55-56$; see Chronological Table, p. xlviii).

The place of this Epistle in the order of S. Paul's writings is, therefore, clearly marked. It comes after 1 and 2 Corinthians, and before Philippians, etc. Its place in reference to Galatians depends upon the view taken of that Epistle and is discussed in the edition of Galatians in this Commentary.

As regards the place of writing, that too is fixed at Corinth by the above consideration, and this conclusion is perhaps confirmed by the reference to Gaius (xvi. 23, cf. 1 Cor. i. 14) and Erastus (ib., ef. 2 Tim. iv. 20). It is possible however that the concluding chapter was written from Kenchreae ; as Phoebe was apparently the bearer of the letter (xvi. 1 f.), and S. Paul appears to have gone to Kenchreae with a view to sailing to Syria, when his plans were changed by the discovery of a conspiracy formed against him by 'the Jews' (Acts xx. 3). It is at least possible that the circumstances which led to this change of plans may have occasioned the insertion of the paragraph (xvi. $17-20$ ) in the last chapter.

## 4. Occasion and Circumstances.

The immediate occasion of the letter is quite clearly and directly stated in the letter itself. S. Paul, it appears, does not regard the Church of Rome as in need of his teaching or assistance (i. 11, 12, xv. 14), nor has he received any appeal or invitation from them. His own keen interest in their welfare has long
inspired him with an ardent desire to visit them : but his missionary labours and the need of supervision of the Churches of his own foundation have been the immediate and constant call (xv. 22). It is only now, when the field of missionary work in the Eastern Mediterranean has been covered, and the needs of the Churches met (xv. 23), that he is able to consider what field of labour is marked out for him next. His call throughout has been to break new ground for the Gospel (xv. 20, 21). He did indeed hope that even in Rome itself he might find scope for missionary work (i. 13), and that hope, by strange and unexpected ways, was, as we know, amply fulfilled (Phil. i. 12 ff .). But he has now decisively turned his mind towards Spain, as the next great opportunity (xv. 24, 28). But, in order to enter upon that great field under the most favourable conditions, he desires to secure for himself the natural and most effective base of operations. As he had evangelised South Galatia from Antioch, Macedonia from Philippi, Achaia from Corinth, Asia (the province) from Ephesus, so he decides that before attacking Spain he must secure in the highest degree the sympathy and support of the Chureh in Rome (xv. 24 b, cf. i. 11, 12). But he is confronted here by new circumstances. In all the other cases, he first founded the Church in the local capital and could then claim the assistance of his converts for further missionary efforts, almost as a right (cf. Phil. i. 4 f.). In Rome, the Church was not of his founding: it was already in existence and in a flourishing condition. He is consequently obliged to invite himself to Rome and to appeal for their support on the general grounds of Christian duty and charity. The delicacy of the situation, as it presented itself to S. Paul, is marked by the character of the section in which he makes the appeal (xv. 14-29), where the eagerness of the Apostle of the Gentiles, the confidence of the Christian appealing to Christians for help in their highest work, and the sensitive courtesy of one who will not offer himself to any but the most willing hosts, combine to form an exquisite picture of the mind of S. Paul.

It would appear that a step in preparation for this visit had already been taken. Aquila and Priscilla (or as they are here named Prisca and Aquila, xvi. 3) had been at Ephesus (Acts
xviii. 18); they had been left there by S. Paul on his first passing visit, no doubt to prepare the way for that longer stay which he then intended and afterwards carried out (Acts xviii. 19, 21, 26). No doubt S. Paul found them there on his return, and they shared his missionary labours in Ephesus and the province of Asia. But now, as he writes, they are at Rome. It is reasonable to conclude that when, at Ephesus, the plan of a visit to Rome was definitely formed (Acts xix. 21), it was also decided that these two faithful companions and fellow workers should return to that city, to which at any rate Prisca probably belonged, prepare the way for S. Paul's own visit, and send him information as to the state of the Church there. It is perhaps even allowable to conjecture that, if c. xvi. 3-16 belongs to the Epistle, the numerous greetings, involving so much detailed knowledge of the Christians at Rome, may have been occasioned by a letter or letters received from them.

The immediate occasion, then, of the letter is S. Paul's desire to enlist the sympathy and assistance of the Roman Church for his contemplated mission to Spain. And the form which the letter takes is primarily dictated by the same desire. He could not appeal to the Roman Christians, as he could to Churches of his own converts, to promote and aid his preaching of the Gospel in an untouched land, without putting before them expressly the character of the Gospel which he preached. No doubt some account of this, but hardly a full or clear account, had reached Rome. No doulbt in these latter days they had learnt more of it from Aquila and Priscilla. But the Apostle needs full and intelligent and wholehearted support: and consequently he lays before the Romans the fullest statement, which we have, of the Gospel as he was wont to present it for the conversion of Gentiles. He is determined that they shall thoroughly understand his position before they pledge their support. There were, as we shall see, other circumstances and influences which led to this systematic exposition of his theme, or rather dictated the terms in which it should be made. But the simple and sufficient explanation of his choice of the Roman Church to be the recipients of such a statement is to be found in the reason he had for writing to that Church at all. It is eminently characteristic of S . Paul's method that the needs
of a particular occasion should have given rise to this elaborate and profound exposition of some of the fundamental elements of Christian truth. And it is of the highest importance both for the understanding of the Epistle itself, alike of what it includes and of what it omits, and for estimating its relation to his other Epistles, that we should constantly bear in mind the particular occasion from which it sprang.

So far we have been considering the explicit indications, which this Epistle itself affords, of the immediate purpose with which it was written. We must now examine, rather more widely the circumstances in which S. Paul came to write it.

The winter sojourn at Corinth marks the close of an extraordinarily interesting epoch in S. Paul's work. For some eight years he had been engaged in the evangelisation of Asia Minor, Macedonia and Achaia : and he had now completed that vast work (xv. 19). He had planted the Gospel in the principal towns of each province of the Roman Empire, which lay in the path between Jerusalem and Rome: and from these towns he, either in person or by his assistants, had evangelised the surrounding countries. He had spent a considerable time in revisiting and confirming all the Churches of his foundation in Galatia, Macedonia and Achaia ; in the province of Asia, he had spent nearly three years in founding and building up Churches. Throughout these labours he had been careful to keep in touch with the Church in Jerusalem : after his first mission, as an apostle of the Church in Antioch (Acts xiii. 1-3), warned perhaps by the difficulties which arose in Antioch on his return from that mission, he had made a practice of visiting Jerusalem before each new effort. He has now in his company at Corinth representatives of many, perhaps of all these Churches (xvi. 16 and Acts xx .4 with Rom. xvi. 16): and his immediate object in returning to Jerusalem again is to carry thither, in company with their representatives, the charitable contributions of the Gentile Churches for the poor Christians in that place. The high importance of this object, in his eyes, is emphasised by the two facts, that for it he delays his cherished project of going to Rome and Spain, and that he persists in his determination in spite of actual perils incurred, and dangers clearly foreseen. These facts bring out the supreme importance to him of the two sides of his missionary work, the first, the
evangelisation of Gentiles, the second, the building up of one Church in which Jew and Gentile should be closely knit, by bonds of brotherhood, in the new Israel springing from the old stock. Anxious, as each and all of his Epistles show him to have been, to consolidate unity within each several community by insisting on all the qualities which marked the Christian brotherhood based on love, he was̉ no less anxious, as is shown by his consistent policy, to consolidate into one spiritual whole all the brethren, of whatever stock or religion, throughout the world. His ideal of the Christian Church was embodied in the conception of the new Israel, sprung from the old stock, and fulfilling, with a wider and deeper interpretation than Jews bad discovered, the prophetic hope of the inclusion of the Gentiles, all members of one body and owning allegiance to one Lord by one faith. The composition of the Epistle to the Romans finds him at the climax of this endeavour. It consequently involves an exposition of this idea with a view to enlist their sympathetic support.
The actual form, which the exposition, at least in great part, takes, was influenced by the experiences he had gone through in his apostolic work. From the very beginning of his ministry (Acts ix. 23, 29) he had been met by the uncompromising opposition of Jews, an opposition which greeted all efforts to preach Jesus as the Messiah. But with the development of work among the Gentiles, he had to face a growing and ultimately even more bitter antagonism within the Christian Church itself. The battle raged not about the admission of Gentiles. That formed one strain in the prophetic hope, and would appear to have been settled by S. Peter's action in regard to Cornelius. S. Paul's action raised the question of the conditions on which Gentiles were to be admitted, and of their status when admitted. The solution was no doubt already involved in S. Peter's action : but that left abundant room for differences of interpretation and reserves. Such differences and reserves S . Paul challenged directly by his assertion that faith in God as revealed in the one Lord Jesus Christ was the sole requisite for baptism, the sole condition of acceptance, and by his consequent denial that the Jewish law, the supreme instrument of salvation in the eyes of Jews, had now any further
obligation, as of right, upon Christians. The position thus asserted exposed him to the unflinching attacks of a class of Judaizing Christians in every place in which he preached, growing in strength in proportion to the success of his preaching and the development of the Churches which he founded. The controversy takes shape for us in the Council at Jerusalem (Acts xv.) and the circumstances which led up to it. The Epistle to the Galatians shows it in its most explicit and critical stage. The battle raged throughout the period of what is called the third missionary journey. In the Second Epistle to the Corinthians we have clear indications that, as a controversy within the Church, it was approaching its conclusion. This is abundantly clear if we take the view that that Epistle is composite, and that cc. x.-xiii. are a fragment of an Epistle preceding ce. i.-ix. But even if the Epistle was written as it stands, it clearly marks the closing of the fight, though the apprehensions and passions which it had called forth are still in vigorous activity. The victory has been won by S. Paul, on the main principle involved and on the important deductions. There remained the last resort of the defeated and embittered party, the personal attack on the probity and character of the champion of their antagonists. But that, full of peril as it was to his person, was in effect an acknowledgment of defeat.

The influence of this experience upon the Epistle to the Romans is seen in the closely reasoned exposition of the relation of faith and law, and of grace and law (cc. i.-viii.): and more obviously, though not more truly, in the elaborate attempt to grapple with the difficulties which Israel's official rejection of the Gospel involved for a Christian who claimed the inheritance of Israel (cc. ix.-xi.). But it is of the utmost importance to notice the positive and essentially uncontroversial character of the treatment; and the calm confidence of tone throughout confirms the conclusion that in S. Paul's view the battle had been won, and it remained ouly to state the positive truths which had been involved and successfully defended. No doubt this temper was largely the result of the reception of his letter to the Galatian Churches and his own reception at Corinth.
In saying this, we do not ignore the signs which the Epistle
itself contains of the seriousness and perils of the controversy. There is one, but only one, reference to danger threatening the unity of the Church (xvi. 17-20). There is one, but only one, indication of perils threatening his own person (xv. 30-32). Both these references are plain and urgent enough to show that the dangers were real. But they threaten, not as before, from the inside and even the very heart of the Church, but as from external foes who may at any time gain a lodgment within, but at present have none. The whole tone of the Epistle indicates that the writer was in comparatively calm waters. He can review the struggles and trials of the last few years, not as one who is in the thick of the fight, but as one who is gathering the fruits of long toil, of a victory hard fought and hard won, both on the arena of his own soul's experience and in the field of the propagation of the Gospel.

## 5. Imperialism.

So far, then, we have seen that his intention of carrying out missionary work in Spain is the immediate occasion of his writing to the Romans an account of the Gospel which he carried to unconverted Gentiles; and the experiences of the work, which he had already carried through, dictate the character of presentation. And it might seem sufficient to stop here. But it has been argued with great force and persuasiveness by Sir William Ramsay, and the position has been illustrated by a very wide examination of contemporary conditions, that S. Paul was influenced, more deeply than had been realised, by his position as a Roman citizen, among the Jews of the Dispersion at Tarsus; that his realisation of the vast unity of the Roman Empire led him to conceive of the Christian Church as providing a religious bond for its component parts; and that his letter and visit to Rome gained a supreme importance in his eyes from these conceptions. Are we, then, to add this idea of imperial statesmanship to the influences which we have already seen to be operative at this stage of S. Paul's activity ?

It is certainly an established fact that S. Paul's plan in his missionary work was to seize upon great centres of Roman
administration in the provinces, and to make them the centres from which to propagate the Gospel. Thessalonica, Pbilippi, Corinth, Ephesus were the principal places which he took for his headquarters in the period of his independent activity. And Rome itself became a special object, when his work in these places was drawing towards completion. But the choice of such centres would be quite consistent with a wise consideration of the most effective means of evangelising the part of the world which lay readiest to his hand, and would not necessarily involve such a conception as is attributed to him. It is true, of course, that much tradition, both among Jew and Gentile, favoured a tribal or national embodiment of religious ideas. But among the Jews there is considerable evidence of a wider conception. And, among Gentiles, the Stoic disregard of all such distinctions was already influencing the thought and practice of the contemporary world. No doubt, the obvious indications of the attempt to establish an imperial religion, in the worship of Rome and the Emperor already fostered in the provinces, and in particular in the province of Asia, would readily suggest to an observant mind the possibility that Christianity might supply the place of an imperial cult. To us looking back upon the historical development, and reading the end achieved under Constantine into the beginnings laid down by S. Paul, it seems all but inevitable that S . Paul must have had some thought of the possibility of such a development. But the deduction is not, as a matter of fact, inevitable. While it is impossible to disprove it, it is still safe to affirm that the evidence for it is all secondary and consists of deductions from the circumstances of his time and position rather than from any clear hint to be found in his writings. If we look to the latter for evidence of the wider conceptions under which he acted we shall find these to be such as are not favourable to the presence of the imperial idea. We may take two illustrations. It is fundamental to S. Paul's conception of the Gospel that it overleaps all distinctions of place, class, nationality and religion. The natural unity of mankind in its most comprehensive sense is insisted upon as the anticipation and even basis of the spiritual re-union in Christ. It is significant in this connexion that while S. Paul does recognise the family, as forming what we may call a
multi-personal unit in the inclusive organism of the Christian body, he uses no similar language about political organisations. Illustrations are indeed taken from city life, but they are definitely metaphorical. He may consistently have regarded the evangelisation of the various parts of the Roman Empire as a stage in and a basis for the wider evangelisation of the world; but of the organisation of an imperial Church there is no hint. Indeed it would appear that any organisation was beyond S. Paul's view, except such simple arrangements as would provide for the internal administration of the locally separated groups of Christians and the intercommunion of the several groups. And we may see the reason for this in a second fundamental conception, which also gives ground for hesitating to attribute to S. Paul the imperial conception. In all his teaching, as we have it, it seems clear that the near return of the Lord was a constañt, almost a dominating, element. The belief gave energy and fire to all he said or did that could bear upon the training of character in the individual and in the community, in preparation for that day. But it almost necessarily put out of thought such measures as would prepare the Church for prolonged activity upon earth and equip it for a relation to the powers of earth. Where S. Paul speaks of these relations, he treats them solely as matters for the individual Christian to regulate for himself : he hardly considers the problems that even in this direction would arise; and indeed does little more than develop, and that not far, the Lord's own saying about rendering unto Caesar the things that are Caesar's.

Consequently, we do not think that a case is made out for attributing to S . Paul far-sighted views of the relation of the Church to the Empire. And we do not include any thought of this kind among the influences which led him to write this Epistle.

## 6. Readers.

The evidence which the Epistle affords of the character and conditions of the readers to whom it was addressed may be divided into two classes. The first class is the evidence directly given by particular passages. The second is that which may
be deduced from the nature of the topics handled and the method of handling them.
(1) In the first class, which is the more direct, we cite the following passages :
c. i. 6,13 ; the readers appear here to be definitely included among the Gentiles. They are among the Gentiles to whom S. Paul has received grace and commission; and he feels it necessary to explain that he has hitherto been prevented from preaching among them, as he has preached among the rest of the Gentiles. c. xv. 14-21 is the second passage which definitely implies that as they were Gentiles he had a prescriptive right to address them; even though, as they were a Church not founded by himself, that right was limited by his self-imposed restriction which prevented him working on ground which others had made their own. A third passage which fixes the readers as at least predominantly Gentiles is c. xi. $25-32$. We may add to these passages, though in a different degree of certainty, c. vi. 12-23 : the suggestion there made as to the state of the readers previous to their conversion is more consistent with the language S. Paul habitually uses about Gentiles than with his descriptions of Jews. It might, on the other hand, be felt that c. vii. 1 f . and c. viii. 3 f . were in no less a degree peculiarly applicable to Christians who had been Jews. But in qualification of this impression, it is clear that S. Paul regarded the whole pre-Christian world as having been in a real sense under dispensation of law (cf. iii. 14 f.), the Gentiles under law communicated through the inner witness of conscience, the Jews having in addition to this the positive revelation of GoD's will in the covenant law. Both these passages in reality apply to the previous experience of all Christians: they take their several colours from the dominant experience of each class. On iv. 1 see the notes ad loc.

The conclusion to be drawn from these passages is that the Christians in Rome were a composite body, in which Gentiles formed the great majority; and it is to them that the letter is primarily addressed.
(2) How far does the second class of evidence bear out this conclusion? We have already seen that the circumstances of the Epistle and its object were the primary influence in dictating
the topics. But those circumstances were independent, to a large extent, of the Church in Rome; it had its influence chiefly so far as S. Paul considered its members fit and suitable to receive this presentation of his Gospel. But that again was the result of their position at the centre of the Empire and the assistance they could afford him in his work in Spain. Consequently we cannot expect to learn much about that Church from the Epistle itself; the less so, because S. Paul's acquaintance with them as a body was entirely at second hand. Thus in cc. i.-xi. the topics seem to be exclusively chosen with a view to making clear the principles of this Gospel and the methods of his preaching. In cc. xii.-xv., on the other hand, where he deals with the application of the Gospel to conduct, we might expect to find more of specific bearing upon the conditions in Rome. But here too the main themes are such as might have been addressed to any progressive body of Christians. Two sections, perhaps, offer some special light. (1) In c. xiii. 1-9 S. Paul deals, at greater length than elsewhere, with the relation of Christians to the civil power; and this may have been due to special conditions which had arisen at Rome (see below); though there is little in the treatment, except its explicitness, to tell us what those conditions were. (2) Again, in cc. xiv.-xv. 13 we have a discussion of the duties of the strong and the weak, as regards certain external practices and observances. Both the tone and the topics of the discussion are inconsistent with the supposition that S. Paul was combating any definite Judaistic propaganda at Rome. They rather point to the common danger of laying too much stress on external observances; and, in the particular instance of food, to some general form of asceticism which appears to have been a widespread characteristic of the higher religious feeling of the times, among Gentiles, perhaps, even more than among Jews. The contrast with the Epistle to the Galatians, where S. Paul uses so much of the principles, which he expounds in this Epistle, to combat a decided and powerful Judaistic propaganda, endorses this conclusion.

It might, at first sight, appear that the large use of the Old Testament and the familiarity with those Scriptures, which he throughout assumes in his readers, afford strong ground for
thinking that the majority at least were Jews. But this conclusion is countered by the observation that all the evidence points to the fact that, at least in S. Paul's work, the nucleus of every Gentile Church was found in those Gentiles who had been in the habit of attending the synagogue: and that we find, as a consequence of this, that the Old Testament was familiar to, and indeed was the Bible of the early Churches, even when they were certainly composed in the main of Gentiles, as was the case at Corinth. It is a significant confirmation of this conclusion, that our New Testament Scriptures seem to have begun to acquire a canonical character from their association with the Old Testament Scriptures in the public readings in the congregation.

We conclude then on this line of evidence, as on the former, that the Church in Rome was at this time predominantly, though by no means exclusively, Gentile.

## 7. History of the Roman Church.

If we ask, further, what evidence we have as to the founding and development of the Church in Rome at this early period, we find little material for anything but reasonable conjecture. Perhaps the most important evidence is to be drawn from S. Paul's own attitude to this Church as expressed, in particular, in c. xv. 14-30. A careful reading of that passage shows that the writer has a sensitive delicacy in approaching the Roman Christians and as it were inviting himself to visit them and to preach among them. He lays emphatic stress on the help and advantage he hopes to gain from intercourse with them, his long cherished desire to visit them, his confidence in their progress and competence in all Christian feeling and practice; he feels indeed that he has something to contribute to them ( $v .15$ ); but he makes much more of the mutual advantage to be gained by the visit (cf. i. 11, 12), and on the especial support he hopes to gain for his mission to Spain. This manner of approaching a Church is peculiar to this Epistle, though there is in some degree a parallel in the Epistle to the Colossians, to whom again he had not himself preached, in the care he takes to explain his deep interest in them (Col. i. 9,
ii. 1 f .). The key to this attitude is no doubt given by the principle which he refers to in $v .20$. The foundation of the Church in Rome has been laid by others; and he will by all means avoid the appearance of trenching upon the sphere of others.

Who those others were, we have no direct evidence to show. The tradition of a visit of S. Peter at this early period has small historic foundation. And although the argument from silence is precarious, it is in the highest degree improbable, considering the whole tone of the passage we have just referred to, that S. Paul would have abstained from all allusion to S. Peter, if he had indeed been in any sense the founder of the Roman Church.
The only passages in the Acts that throw any light upon the subject are ii. 10 and xviii. 2. In the first passage, among the foreign Jews staying at Jerusalem at Pentecost are mentioned
 of course natural; it would be natural, that is to say, that Jews from Rome should be present on this occasion. But the special mention of Jews from that particular city and the definite description of them as temporarily residing in Jerusalem and including 'Jews and proselytes' may be a hint, such as S. Luke sometimes gives, of special importance attached by him to their presence and to the presence of both classes. It is a reasonable conjecture that some of these 'Jews and proselytes' would carry back to Rome news of the events of Pentecost and the account of what led up to them, and would at least prepare the way for the reception of the Gospel, both among Jews and among those Gentiles who had more or less attached themselves to the synagogues in Rome.
In the second passage (Acts xviii. 2) we are told that S. Paul, on his arrival at Corinth, 'found a certain Jew by name Aquila, a native of Pontus by race, lately come from Italy, and Priscilla his wife, because Claudius had ordered that all the Jews should depart from Rome,' and that 'he at once joined them, and because he was of the same craft continued to live with them, and they plied their trade' of tent-making. The connexion with Aquila and Priscilla which S. Paul here formed is evidently of high importance in the writer's view. This appears both from
the full description of these persons and the statement of their reason for being in Corinth. But with the reserve, which so often tantalises us in the Acts, he omits to tell us whether Aquila and Priscilla were already Christians. It seems however to be implied that they were. S. Paul lived with them throughout his stay in Corinth: for the change mentioned in v. 7 refers only to his place of preaching: from which it would appear that they were either already Christians or were converted by S. Paul. But we should expect to have been told if the latter were the case (cf. v. 8). There is moreover another slight indication, pointing in the same direction, in the precise words 'all the Jews' ( $\pi$ ávzas rov̀s 'Iovóaiovs). The ' all' is not required, if the object is merely to refer to Claudius' decree of expulsion against the Jews. It is in point, if S. Luke wishes to indicate that the decree included both Christian and non-Christian Jews. It would explain why Aquila and Priscilla were expelled though they were Christians.

This leads us to consider the one piece of relevant information, which we derive from Suetonius. Suetonius (Claud. c. 25) tells us, 'Judaeos impulsore Chresto assidue tumultuantes Roma expulit.' It is agreed that Suetonius and S. Luke are referring to the same incident, to be dated A.D. 49 or 50 . Suetonius gives us the reason for the decree. There had been constant disturbances among the Jews at the instigation of one Chrestus. It is probable that Chrestus is a vulgar rendering of Christus: and that the cause of the disturbances was either some general excitement in connexion with Messianic expectation, or, as a consideration of all the circumstances makes more probable, dissensions which arose from the preaching of the Gospel, such as are recorded at Corinth (Acts xviii. 12 f.). If we may suppose that events followed something of the same course at Rome and Corinth; that in Rome also the Jews tried to suppress the growing movement by appeal to the civil authorities, and, on their refusal to interfere, took the law into their own hands, we get a natural explanation of the violent disturbances which prompted the decree. The civil authorities, 'caring for none of these things,' would visit their wrath indiscriminately upon both parties to the quarrel. In this case we may conjecture that Aquila and Priscilla were among the

Christian Jews expelled from Rome. And we should further conclude that by the date of the decree the number of Christians was already considerable enough to make these disturbances serious; and, moreover, that the character of the Gospel preached was such as to arouse the bitter opposition of Jews who remained impervious to its call, that is to say, that it appealed to and made great way amông Gentiles. This does not imply that it was specifically Pauline in character, but is consistent with the conclusion we have already arrived at that the Church was predominantly Gentile. It is not unreasonable to conclude that the Church at Rome took its beginnings first from the reports brought from Jerusalem after Pentecost and afterwards from the preaching of the Gospel by returned pilgrims on later occasions. It is even possible that Aquila may himself have been one of these. It is tempting to search $c$. xvi. for other hints. The remarkable description of Mary ( $v .6$ ク̈ँ $\tau \iota s \pi o \lambda \lambda \grave{a}$ éкотiagev $\epsilon i s$ í $\mu a ̂ s$ ) may point to a part taken by her in this early stage : and the still more remarkable description of Andronicus and Junias may possibly imply that they were among those who had brought the Gospel to Rome and so were distinguished among the Apostles ( $v .7 \dot{\epsilon} \pi i \sigma \eta \mu o t$ év rois àmooróloos). If that was so, we should have to find among the original evangelists not only returning pilgrims, but Jews from the East travelling for purposes of business, or even for the definite purpose of propagating the Gospel.

Whatever was the origin of the Church, it had by the date of this Epistle clearly become numerous and important. Its development was of a sufficiently substantial character to make S. Paul feel that its support would be not only desirable but in a high degree advantageous to him in his contemplated work in Spain. Of its constitution we can learn little. It seems to have included a number of groups, probably distinguished by the different houses to which they gathered for worship, instruction and mutual society (xvi. 5, 14, 15), or as forming subsections of social groups in which they were already classified (vv. 10, 11). By what organisation these various groups were held together there is no evidence. The common address of the Epistle implies that there was such an organisation; and the analogy of other churches and the natural requirements of
the situation point to the same conclusion. But in the absence of definite statement, we cannot be more precise. As to the classes of persons who were included, we gather from c. xvi. that there were both Jews and Greeks, freemen, and, apparently in large proportion, slaves. It would be indeed natural that the Gospel should spread most freely among the foreigners from Greece and the East, who were resident in Rome in large numbers, whether for ordinary purposes of business or as attached to the household of wealthy residents. There is nothing to show that the upper class of Romans had yet come within its influence (contrast perhaps 2 Tim. iv. 21).

## 8. Character and Contents.

In character the Epistle to the Romans is a true letter. It has the definite personal and occasional elements which mark the letter. It may be almost described as a letter of introduction. The writer introduces himself to the Romans, with a full description of his authority, office and employment. He takes pains to conciliate their sympathies for an object in which he desires to enlist their help. With a characteristic combination of refined delicacy and intense earnestness he claims their attention and interest. He emphasises his own interest in them, by the repeated account of his desire to visit them, and by his explanations of his delay; and he takes the opportunity of the presence in Rome of some first-hand acquaintances to convey a long list of personal greetings. He carefully explains the immediate occasion of his writing, as well as its ultimate purpose, and gives an account of his present circumstances and plans.

This character of the Epistle has been to some extent obscured owing to the fact that it contains the most systematic account, that S. Paul has left us, of some aspects of his preaching: and readers have been led to consider that it is primarily a treatise, for instance, on justification by faith, and that the epistolary character is secondary and even adventitious. The effect of this mis-reading of the work has been twofold. It has led some to regard it as a treatise intended to be circulated among several churches; and to look upon the form in which
it has been preserved to us as merely that one in which it was adapted for the Romans. Others have concluded that the main part of the epistolary setting is secondary and not in fact original; that, for instance, the sixteenth chapter has been wrongly added to the body of the treatise, being borrowed from a letter to the Church in Ephesus, not otherwise preserved. As regards the second of these views, it is perhaps enough to say that the epistolary character, as described above, is determined even more by the first and fifteenth chapters, than by the sixteenth; and that these chapters, at least, cannot be detached from the main body of the Epistle except by a process of mutilation. And, as regards the first view, the direct evidence in support of it is of the slightest, and may at the most point to a circulation of the Epistle in an abbreviated form by the Church in Rome itself, some time after it had been received. (See pp. 235 ff .)

But we have still to account for the systematic character of the main body of the letter. For it is this character which differentiates it from all the other Pauline epistles, except the Epistle to the Ephesians. It must then be shown that this character is consistent with that which the letter itself declares to be its direct object. We have already seen that the primary and direct object of the letter was to interest the Romans and to gain their support for a contemplated mission to Spain. With this in view S. Paul wishes to prepare the way for a visit; and Aquila and Priscilla have already preceded him to Rome, probably with the same object. But something more was needed than the establishment of personal relations. A connexion between S. Paul and the Christians in Rome had not hitherto been established. What they knew of each other had hitherto been matter only of hearsay and report. He has probably now received full information from his friends, Aquila and Pliscilla, of the state of things in Rome: and he wishes the Roman Church, in its turn, to be as fully informed as possible of his own position and intentions. Consequently, in appealing for their support, he has to explain to them what it is he asks them to support. He wishes to expound to them his conception of the Gospel, as he preaches it to Gentiles, his missionary message. And he does so in a systematic exposition which covers the whole of the Epistle from i. $14-x v .13$.

It is important to lay stress on this missionary character of the aspect of his Gospel which he thus presents. It accounts both for what he includes and what he omits. In the first place, he is not primarily defending his personal action as an apostle of the Gentiles ; though that is vindicated by the way. He has done that in the second Epistle to the Corinthians, which may be described as the Apologia pro apostolatu suo. Nor is he expounding his thought of the Church and the developed Christian life : of this subject again many elements are necessarily included, but in subordinate proportions and rather by hints and implications than by express statements. The full exposition of this aspect of his Gospel he gives in the Epistle to the Ephesians. The Epistle to the Romans contains, in contrast with them, the Apologia pro evangelio suo, an explanation of the Gospel committed to him and preached by him for the conversion of the Gentiles. And the explanation is given, not by way of controversy as against opponents, as it is in the Epistle to the Galatians, nor by way of justification of his action in the past as though he was submitting his case to judges, but simply. as a full explanation offered to men whose support he hopes to enlist for his future work.

A brief summary of the argument of the systematic portion of the Epistle will illustrate this position.

It is significant that S . Paul begins, as he does in no other epistle, with a quite definite statement of the theme he intends to put before his readers. 'The Gospel is God's active power for saving men; its one condition in all cases is faith in God : and this is so, because Gon's righteousness, required to be assimilated by man if he is to be saved, is shown in the Gospel, as resulting from man's faith and leading to faith' (i. 16, 17, see notes). The theme then is that the Gospel is an act of Gon's power, to enable all mankind to be righteous as God is righteous ; that the sole condition demanded of man is faith in GoD; that this condition, being a common human quality not limited by class or nation, marks the universality of the Gospel.
This theme is then worked out in four main divisions. First, it is shown that the actual state of man, whether Jew or Gentile, is so remote from exhibiting Goo's righteousness in human life, that the need for the exercise of GoD's power is manifest : this is
supported by a broad view of contemporary conditions, as we may say historically, in cc. $\mathrm{i} .-\mathrm{v} .:$ and by a penetrating analysis of the experience of the single soul, or psychologically, in cc. vi., vii. Concurrently, it is declared that the need is met by the act of GoD in the person and work of Jesus Christ, to be accepted and made his own by man, through faith (iv. 21-26, vi. 11, vii. 25). Secondly, it is shown that God's power acts, in response to faith, by the presence and working of the Holy Spirit, uniting men to each other and to God through union with Christ, and producing in them the development of that character which in men corresponds to the righteousness of God. The Holy Spirit is God's power in man (c. viii.). Thirdly, we have, what is in reality a digression, but a digression naturally occasioned by the course of the argument. In cc. ix., x., xi. S. Paul attempts to solve, what to him and to others was the most harrowing problem occasioned by the offer of the Gospel to the Gentiles, namely, the position of the great mass of Israel who rejected the very Gospel for which their own history had been the most direct preparation. Fourthly (cc. xii.- $\mathbf{\Sigma v} .13$ ), it is shown what character the power of the Gospel produces in its operation upon the daily life of men, in the transformation of personal character, in their relations to each other as members of the society of faith, and in their external relations to the societies of the world.
S. Paul, therefore, in this exposition sets before the Romans his view of the Gospel as a moral and spiritual power for the regeneration of human life; he explains and defends the condition postulated for its operation, the range of its action, and its effects in life. The last subject suggests a fuller treatment of the Christian life in the Church: but this is not given here; it is reserved, as a fact, for the Epistle to the Ephesians. It is not given here, because S. Paul's object, in writing the Epistle, limits his treatment to the purpose of explaining his missionary message.

It may be well here to point out, that the properly occasional character of the Epistle is seen not only in the introductory and concluding portions, where the need of Roman support gives the occasion: but in the treatment of the main subject, in which the occasion of the details is often given by the actual
circumstances of S. Paul's experience and the time or stage at which he was writing. For instance, c. iv. on Abraham's righteousness is inspired by his desire to show that the Gospel righteousness was essentially of the same nature as the Old Testament righteousness when properly conceived. Again, in cc. ix.-xi. the consideration of the case of Israel bears directly upon the assumption made throughout that the Christian Church is the true Israel, preserved indeed in a remnant but, all the more for that, prophetically designated as the heir of the promises. This sums up and clinches the long sustained controversy with the Judaisers. Again, in c. vi. the insistence upon the power of the Gospel to inspire and maintan the highest standard of morality is the final answer to the charge which S. Paul had been forced to meet, in his controversy with Jews and Judaisers, that in abolishing law he was destroying the one known influence in favour of a sound morality, and guilty of propagating moral indifference or àvouia. And, in the last section, in c. xiv., he deals fully, though in general terms, with a practical difficulty which had confronted him at Corinth and no doubt elsewhere, and which he may have been informed of as existing at Rome, the treatment of scrupulous brethren. All these questions were, in different degrees, of immediate interest and importance. Some of them appear to have ceased to be so, not long after the Epistle was written, and they mark, emphatically, its intimate relation to the actual situation in which S. Paul found himself in those three winter months at Corinth.

The following analysis of the contents does not profess to give more than one presentation of the argument of the Epistle. It is constructed on the general supposition involved in the above account of its character.
A. Introduction, i. 1-17.
i. 1-7. Address: (i) The writer's name, office and commission: the commission is defined by the trust received, the Person from whom, and the Person about and through whom it was received;
(ii) the class and name of the persons addressed;
(iii) the greeting.
i. 8. Thanksgiving, for the widespread report of the faith of the Romans.
i. 9-15. Assertion of the intimate interest the writer has in the readers, his desire to see them, his hope of mutual help, his debt to them in common with others.
i. 16, 17. Statement of his theme:

The Gospel which he preaches is Gon's power to effect salvation for everyone who believes;
for in it is revealed the nature of GoD's righteousness, both as an attribute of God and as His demand from man, and the fact that it follows upon faith, and leads to faith, without distinction of race or privilege; as already indicated in the O.T. Scriptures.
B. First vindication of the theme, drawn from the actual state of mankind: main antithesis $\pi i \sigma \tau \iota s$ and $\nu o ́ \mu o s$.
i. 18-iv. 25. The need of righteousness is universal (i. 18iii. 20) and it is adequately met (iii. $21-31$ ) on lines already laid down in O.T. (iv.).
(i) i. 18-ii. 16. It is needed by Gentiles : they are sunk in sin, due to the neglect of knowledge consequent upon want of faith in God :
(ii) ii. 17-iii. 20. And by Jews; they have admittedly failed in spite of their privileged position, because (iii. 1 -20) they also have ignored the one condition of attainment.
(iii) iii. 21-31. The general failure is met by the revelation of GoD's righteousness in Christ, through His Death, a propitiative and redemptive act ; and by the condition demanded of man, namely, faith in God through Christ; one condition for all men corresponding to the fact that there is but one God over all.
(iv) iv. 1-25. This condition of righteousness is already laid down in the O.T. in the typical case of Abraham.
C. Second vindication of the theme, drawn from a consideration of its ethical bearing and effect: main antithesis $\chi$ ápıs and $\nu o ́ \mu o s$.
v.-vii. 25. The Gospel reveals a power which can do what it purports to do.
(i) v. 1-11. The power is a new life, given by God in love, through the death of Christ, open to faith, dependent upon the life of Christ, and guaranteed by the love of God.
(ii) v. 12-21. This power depends upon a living relation of mankind to Christ, analogous to the natural relation of mankind to Adam, and as universal as that is.
(iii) vi. 1-vii. 6. It involves the loftiest moral standard because it is
(1) a new life in the risen Christ (vi. 1-14);
(2) a service of God, not under law, but in Christ (15-23);
(3) a union with Christ, which must bring forth its proper fruits (vii. 1-6).
(iv) vii. 7-25. It is therefore effective to overcome sin and achieve righteousness in the individual life, as personal experience shows that law could never do.
D. The nature and working of the power thus revealed. viii.
viii. $1-11$. The power is, in fact, the indwelling Spirit, derived from God through Christ, communicating to the believer the life of the risen Christ, and so overcoming in him the death wrought by sin, as GoD overcame in Christ by raising Him from the dead.
viii. 12-39. The consequent character and obligations of the Christian life:
(a) It is the life of a son and heir of God, involving suffering as the path to glory (as in the case of Jesus) (12 $-25)$.
(b) It is inspired by the presence of the Holy Spirit and His active cooperation in working out all God's purpose in us and for us (26-30).
(c) It is due to GoD's exceeding love, an active force manifested in the sacrifice of His Son, in the Son's own love in His offering, triumph and intercession, as a power of victory from which no imaginable thing can separate those who are His (31-39; note the refrain, v. 11, 21, vi. 23 , viii. 11,39 ).
E. Israel's rejection of the Gospel (a typical case of man's rejection of GoD's grace, and in itself a harrowing problem). ix. 1-xi. 36.
ix. 1-4. Israel's rejection of the Gospel is a great grief and incessant pain to S . Paul, and a hard problem in the economy of redemption. But
(1) 6-13. GoD's faithfulness is not impugned by it:
for the condition of the promise was not carnal descent but spiritual, and not man's work but Gon's selection.
(2) ix. 14-x. 21. GoD's righteousness is not impugned (a) because His selection must be righteous because
(i) $14-18$, it is dependent on His Will which is righteous;
(ii) 19-21, it is directed towards the execution of His righteous purposes;
(iii) $22-33$, it acts in accordance with qualities exhibited.
(b) because His selection is not inconsistent with moral responsibility for
x. 1-4, Israel's failure was due to neglect of attainable knowledge;
5-15, as is shown by the warnings of Scripture properly interpreted;
16-21, which Israel can be shown to have received. Consequently Israel is himself to blame.
(3) xi. 1-36. Israel is still not rejected by God for
(i) xi. 1-7. A remnant is saved, as in the time of

xi. 8-12. The rest are hardened, as Scripture warns, but not with a view to their own ruin, but with a view to the call of the Gentiles and the rousing of Israel.
(ii) xi. 13-36. The present condition of Israel and Gentiles.
xi. 13-16. The privilege the Gentiles have received is derived from and belongs to Israel.
xi. 17-24. The Gentiles may fall away as Israel did, if they fail in the same way.
xi, 25-29. The true climax of the call of the Gentiles will be the restoration of Israel; because the gifts and calling of GoD are irrevocable.
(iii) xi. $30-36$. God and man.
xi. $30-33$. The fundamental fact of His mercy can alone be fully known.
xi. 34-36. His wisdom, knowledge and judgments can never be fully fathomed; because they underlie the very origin, process and end of all creation.
F. The power of the Gospel in transforming human life, the subject of exhortation and advice. xii.-xv. 13.
xii. 1, 2. (a) The motive-GoD's compassions are man's obligations;
(b) the main point is personal service of God, involving disregard of the present world, a new character depending on a fresh tone and attitude of mind, a new test of practice, in the revealed Will of God ;
(c) in particular
(i) xii. 3-5 The right temper in the social relations of Christians to each other, as one body;
(ii) xii. 6-21 the right use of gifts, under the obligation of mutual service in unreserved love;
(iii) xiii. 1-10 the true attitude to the civil power-the wide interpretation of love as fulfilling all law;
(iv) xiii. 11-14 all enforced by the urgency of the times, and the bearing of the new character of the Lord Jesus Christ.
(v) xiv. A special case of the law of love-treatment of scrupulous brethren.
(a) 1-13 . Judge not.
(b) 13b-23. Offend not.
(c) $x v .1-13$. Bear and forbear, after the example of Christ, who bore the burdens of others, and included both Jew and Gentile in the object of His work.
G. Conclusion, xv. 14-xvi. 27.
(1) Personal explanations.
(i) $\mathrm{xv} .14-19$. The letter was not caused by the needs of the Romans, but by the demands of Paul's missions to the Gentiles.
(ii) 20-22. He has delayed to visit them because (a) he will not build on another's foundation, (b) he has been engrossed by his proper work.
(iii) 23-29. This work now takes him to Spain, and he will visit them on the way, hoping for their support.
(iv) $30-33$. He entreats their prayers on behalf of his visit to Jerusalem, for full success in that mission of brotherhood, and hopes to come to them in joy and to gain refreshment.
(2) xvi. 1-16. Commendations and greetings.
(3) xvi. 17-20. A final warning against possible dangers to their Christian peace.
(4) xvi. 21-23. Greetings from his companions.
(5) xvi. 25-27. A final solemn ascription of glory to God for the revelation of the Gospel.

## 9. Justification by Faith.

The group of words $\delta \iota \kappa a \iota o v ิ \nu, \delta \iota \kappa a i \omega \mu a$, $\delta i \kappa a i \omega \sigma \iota s$ is so prominent in this Epistle as to mark one of its most definite characters. $\delta \iota \kappa a i \omega \sigma \iota s$ is found only here in N.T. (iv. 25, v. 18): $\delta \iota к a i \omega \mu a$ occurs five times to an equal number in the rest of the N.T.
 times in Galatians, to sixteen times in the rest of the N.T. Two of the latter occurrences are in Acts (xiii. 39) in a speech attributed to S. Paul. The only document, outside the Gospels, Acts and Pauline Epistles, in which the word occurs is James (ii. 21, 24, 25).

The meaning of $\delta \iota \kappa a \iota o v ิ \nu$ is to 'pronounce righteous.' This is the universal use, to which the only known exception in LXX. and N.T. is Isa. lii. 14 ff ., where the context makes it necessary to interpret it to mean 'to make righteous.' The form of the verb (-ow) allows the latter meaning: but use, always a safer guide than etymology, is decisive as to its actual meaning. In this use, this verb is on the same level with other verbs formed from other adjectives implying moral qualities (ảॄıó $\omega$, óvıó $\omega$ ): and the explanation usually given of the peculiar use in these cases is, that moral change cannot be effected from without; only a declaration of the state can be made. This reasoning,
however, cannot be pressed, when the agency of God is in question, and the effect of His action on human character. Consequently, the meaning of the word in S. Paul must be got directly from evidence of his use of it.

There is no question that in the Gospels the meaning 'to declare righteous' is alone found. The same meaning must be given to 1 Tim . iii. 16. In James ii. 21-25 the use is closely parallel to that of the Romans: and 1 Cor. iv. 4, vi. 11, Tit. iii. 7 are clearly connected with the use in the Romans, although the expression is not quite so explicit. In Acts xiii. 39 we have a distinct anticipation of the argument of this Epistle, if the words were actually spoken by S. Paul: if they are put into his mouth by S. Luke, then we have an echo. Consequently, to arrive at the meaning in S . Paul we must examine the use in Romans and Galatians : remembering that the universal use which he had before him gave the meaning 'to declare righteous.'

1. The sense 'to declare righteous' is clearly contained in the following passages where the context involves the thought of judgment:

 $\theta \in$ òs.




2. $\delta \iota \kappa a \iota o v ̂ \nu, ~ \delta \iota \kappa a \iota o v ̂ \sigma \theta a \iota ~ a r e ~ p a r a p h r a s e d ~ b y ~ \lambda o \gamma i \zeta є \sigma \theta a \iota ~ \epsilon i s ~$ סıкatoov́v $\nu \nu$, and the like, in iv. $2,3,5,8,9,11$. Cf. ii. 26 , ix. 8 .
3. In other passages, where there is no such explicit interpretation. in the context, the sense is settled partly by the precedent of the above-cited passages, partly by the elements in the several contexts; e.g.
iii. 24. $\delta \iota \kappa a \iota o v ́ \mu \epsilon \nu о \iota ~ \delta \omega \rho \epsilon a ́ \nu$ must be interpreted in the samè way as $\delta \iota \kappa a \iota \omega \theta \dot{\eta} \sigma \in \tau a \iota$ in $v .20$; as also $\delta \iota \kappa a \iota o v ิ \nu \tau a$ in $v .26$ and 8ııaıov̄ซӨau al., vv. 27, 30.
จ. 1. $\delta \iota \kappa a \iota \omega \theta$ ө́vtes obviously sums up the argument of the preceding chapter, and the word must have the same sense.

จ. 9. The stages $\dot{a} \mu a \rho \tau \omega \lambda \hat{\omega} \nu \ldots \delta \iota \kappa a \iota \omega \theta \in ́ \nu \tau \epsilon s$ vv̂ע $\ldots \sigma \omega \theta \eta \sigma o ́ \mu \epsilon \theta a$ are interpreted by the parallel $\epsilon \in \theta \rho o i . . . \kappa a \tau \eta \lambda \lambda a ́ \gamma \eta \mu \in \nu . .$. $\sigma \omega \theta \eta \sigma$ ó $\mu \in \theta a$ : the aorists катך入入á $\gamma \eta \mu \epsilon \nu$, $\delta \iota \kappa a \iota \omega \theta \epsilon \nu \tau \epsilon s$ both point to the act of GoD which is the starting-point of the process described in $\sigma \omega \theta \eta \sigma o ́ \mu \epsilon \theta a$. That act as expressed by $\delta \iota \kappa a \iota o v ̂ \nu$ is His declaration of righteousness.
 same meaning is quite clearly necessary.
 cannot have a different sense from what it has in $v .33$ : $=\mathrm{He}$ declared righteous : the actual imparting of the character is expressed in $\epsilon$ éógar $\boldsymbol{\nu}$. See notes $a d$ loc.
It is clear that the only sense we can attribute to this word in the Romans is 'to declare righteous.' It is significant that the word occurs only in the first six chapters, in which S. Paul is analysing the elements of the Christian state, and in viii. 30, 33 where he sums up the results of his analysis. In cc. xii. ff., where he is dealing directly with the development of the Christian character, it does not occur.

It is unnecessary to give a detailed examination of the use in Galatians, as it stands on all fours with that of the Romans. The difference between the Epistles is that the fundamental fact of justification by faith is rather asserted than elaborately argued in the Galatians. The full argument is reserved for the Romans. The use of the word in Galatians agrees with the use in Romans.

It is further to be observed that when the verb is used in the passive, the preposition which marks the agency of God is $\pi a \rho a ̀$, not $\hat{v} \pi o ́$ (Rom. ii. 13; Gal. iii. 11), indicating rather the judge than the effective agent; the only other form used is $\epsilon \boldsymbol{\epsilon} \nu \omega^{\prime}-$ $\pi \iota o v$ aủrov̂ (Rom. iii. 20). Once we have $\tau \hat{\eta}$ av̉rov̂ $\chi a ́ \rho ı \tau \iota ~(R o m . ~ i i i . ~$ 24 ); it is an act of grace. Cf. кaтà $\chi a ́ \rho \iota \nu, ~ i v . ~ 4 . ~$
4. We pass now to the description of the state of man which requires this declaration of righteousness, and the conditions on which it is made. The state is the universal state of sin, shown to characterise both Gentiles and Jews: it is shown that the knowledge of GoD's will, whether elementary in Gentiles or even consummate in Jews, had not been sufficient to enable man to do the Will: that as a matter of fact man had failed in his efforts to do the Will, and by this road had not reached a
state on which he could claim a verdict of righteousness. It is assumed that this account of man's efforts is exhaustive, and shows that this way of man's 'works' is a blind alley. The emergency requires divine intervention. This way is found in Jesus Christ, the Son of God, who by His Death, as interpreted by His Resurrection, at once vindicated the righteousness of God (iii. 24 f ; see comm.) and offered Himself as man, an acceptable sacrifice to Gob. In Him as man once for all God declares man (human nature) righteous. The question then arises how are men, as several persons, to be brought under this verdict of righteousness. And the answer is, only by their being united with Christ, by being actually, not merely potentially, included in His humanity as offered to and accepted by God. This inclusion is the purport of baptism (vi. 1-11), involving an inner, living union with Christ, and thus a passing from the old life to the new life in Him. In this new life, the man is a new creature ; as such he is reconciled to GoD; he is under the influence of all the spiritual powers of Christ, who is his life; he is undergoing the process of salvation; he is the subject of the working of Gon's glory. So far all is the act of God, proceeding from His grace, or free giving, the crucial instance of His love.

What is the contribution which man has to make, on his part? If the life is to be his life, it must in some degree from the first involve such a contribution. There must be personal action on his part, unless it is to be a mere matter of absorption into the divine life and action. Yet it was just by the emphasis on the personal action of the man, that Gentile and Jew alike had gone astray. They had hoped to make peace with God result from an active pursuit of righteousness, the attempt to do what was right in detail: and they had failed. The stress had been laid inevitably upon acts rather than character, upon external laws rather than upon inner principles; upon the fulfilment of a task rather than upon a personal relation. The right point of view must be sought in some conception, which would at once preserve the personal activity of the man and yet leave the effective action to God. And this S. Paul finds in the conception of faith.

The meaning of rictis in the N.T. is always belief or faith, as a quality of man's spiritual activity, until in the latest books (Jude 3 f., 20 , and perhaps, but very doubtfully, in the Pastoral

Epistles) it gets the meaning of the contents of faith or the Christian creed. But 'belief or faith' itself is used with different degrees of intensity. It may mean simply a belief of a fact: or belief of GoD's promises : from this latter use, it passes easily to its fuller meaning of belief or trust in God as true to His promises; and thus to the full sense, which we find in S. Paul and S. John, of trust in God as revealed in Jesus Christ, a trust involving not merely the acceptance of the revelation as true, but the whole-hearted surrender of the person to God as so revealed and in all the consequences of the revelation. The kernel of the thought is the active surrender of the whole person, in all its activities, of intellectual assent, of the positive offering of will and action, of unreserved love. It is none of these things separately, but all of them together : it being in fact a concrete and complex act of the personality itself, throwing itself whole, as it were, upon God Himself, in the recognition of the worthlessness of all human life apart from God and of the will and power of God to give human life its true worth. This act of faith involves, that is to say, the element of belief, the element of will and the element of love. And the object of the activity of each of these elements of the person is God, believed, loved, and willed.

It follows from this complex character of faith, that it will be found in different degrees of development, and even in varying forms of manifestation. Sometimes the element of belief will be dominant: sometimes belief will be reduced to a minimum, and the deeper elements of will and love, either together or in different degrees of prominence, will form the staple of the act. In the case of Abraham, which S. Paul takes as typical of righteousness before the Gospel, the belief is mainly belief in the trustworthiness and power of God : the element of will, unquestioning obedience to and service of God, comes to the fore: the element of love, not explicitly mentioned in Romans, is represented in O.T. by the name 'the friend of GoD.' And such differences in the proportion in which the elements of faith are found in particular cases, are a matter of common experience. In 'the woman that was a sinner' it was for her great love that her sins were forgiven: yet by her acts it is clear that the other elements of faith were present at
the back of her action. In the Gospel cases, where faith is the condition and even the measure of the working of Christ's power in miracle, the element of belief is again prominent, but it is a belief not only in the power but in the character of Jesus, which itself is an indication that the other elements were in a degree present, though in varying degrees, in those who threw themselves upon His mercy. Even where the faith seems to be reduced to the mere element of belief, the personal element in the ground for the belief itself implies in the believer the working of the other elements in their characteristically personal action.

Now S. Paul, while he uses rictis and $\pi \iota \sigma \tau \epsilon \dot{v} \omega$ freely in their various senses, still when he is using it in correlation with $\chi^{\dot{a} \rho \iota s}$ and in contrast to $\nu \dot{\prime} \mu$ os and ${ }^{\epsilon} \rho \gamma a$, uses the words in this full sense, of the personal act of surrender in all the elements of personality. It involves acceptance of the revelation of God in the Person of Jesus Christ: and consequently the object of the act is described both as faith in God (iv. 5, 24; cf. 1 Thes. i. 8; 2 Tim. i. 12 ; Tit. iii. 8) and faith in or of Jesus Christ (iii. 22,26 ; Gal. ii. 16, 20, iii. 22 ; Phil. iii. 9, i. 29 al.). It includes belief of the revelation but emphasises the movement of will and love. It consequently determines, as far as the man himself can determine it, the position of man in relation to GoD: and is, for that reason, the occasion or ground of GoD's declaration of the man's righteousness. That declaration implies that the man, in the act of faith, is in the right relation to God, and already qualified to be the subject of all those spiritual influences which are involved in his living union with God in Christ.
If we ask why S. Paul so rigorously isolates this single moment in the man's experience, and connects with it the bare statement of the declaration of his righteousness, I think the answer is clear. He presses his analysis to this ultimate point, because he wishes to bring out the fundamental contrast of faith and law, as qualifying man for God's approval, His declaration of righteousness. It is only when the conception is thus reduced to its simplest elements, that man's true part in righteousness and his true method of attaining it can be made clear. The fact is that righteousness as a state is wholly GoD's work in man ; man's part begins, at any rate in analysis, before that work begins, when by his act of faith he accepts his true relation to God, and
puts himself into righteousness as a relation. Even in this act of faith, he is not acting in vacuo, he is moved by God : yet it is his own act, a complete act of his whole personality; and as such it is the beginning of a course of action, which, although it is God's working in him, is yet his own personal action (Gal. ii. 20). But it is only by isolating, in analysis, this original act that the whole consequent process can be seen to be God's action in him, springing from his faith, not consequent upon his works.

If it be said (as by Moberly, Mozley, al.), that God's declaration of righteousness cannot be ineffective, must involve an imparting of righteousness, that is undoubtedly true in fact. But that truth is not conveyed by the word $\delta \iota \kappa a \iota o v y$, and the word would seem to be intentionally chosen by S . Paul so as not to convey it ; just because S. Paul desires to analyse the relation, which he is asserting, into its elements in order to make its nature clear. Just as the man is considered as expressing himself in faith, before that faith expresses itself in life ; so God is considered as accepting the faith, as declaring the man righteous, before that declaration takes effect by His Spirit in the man's life. And yet it is misleading to speak as if it were a case of temporal succession, as if the moment of faith and justification were a stage in experience to be succeeded by another stage. It is only by a process of abstraction that that moment can be conceived at all : as it exists, it is already absorbed in the mutual interaction of the persons whose relation to each other is so analysed. Neither does man's faith stop at all or exist at all in its bare expression; nor does Gon's declaration exist as a bare declaration. Yet in order to characterise the state into which this relation brings the man, it is necessary to analyse it into its elements, excluding, in thought, the immediate and necessary results of the combination of those elements.

What is that state? It is the living union of the man in Christ with God. There is no moment in the history of that union, in which the power of God does not act upon the spirit of the man, however far we go back. But in the ultimate analysis of the state we reach the two elements, man's faith and Gon's acceptance : these determine the method in which the union acts: and as long as we realise that this analysis, this separation of the elements, is only a separation in thought,
the result of a logical process, we avoid the danger of importing the sense of a 'fictitious' arrangement. We may perhaps say that there is a fiction present; but it is a logical fiction, made for the purpose of clear thinking; not an unreal hypothesis made by God.
It follows from this that throughout the long process of Gon's dealing with man in Christ, man's contribution to the result is solely his faith, in its full sense. The power which originates, supports and develops the new life is throughout the power of God, the Spirit working upon and in the man. Consequently not in the most advanced life of the saint, any more than in the first faltering steps of the novice, is there any thought of meritorious works. It is the apprehension, trust and love with which the man embraces what God gives in Christ, that is his contribution, his whole contribution to the divine working. But it is just this attitude and act of apprehension, trust and love which calls forth and gives play to and indeed is the full realisation of his own personality; because it is the realisation of the true and most complex and most satisfying relation in which his personality can be developed, his relation to God.

For the discussion of this question see S.H., pp. 28 ff ; Moberly, Atonement and Personality, p. 335 ; J. K. Mozley, Expositor, Dec. 1910; Hort on 1 Peter, p. 81 f. and James ii. 22 (p. 63) ; Hastings, DB. art. Romans (Robertson); Du Bose, The Gospel according to S. Paul, pp. 69 ※f.

## 10. Text.

It is unnecessary to enumerate the MSS. and Versions in which this Epistle is found. The reader may be referred to the articles in the Encyclopaedia Biblica (F. C. Burkitt), Hastings' Dictionary of the Bible (Nestle, Murray, al.), Sanday and Headlam (Romans, § 7) and Prof. Lake (The Text of the New Testament). The notation followed in the critical notes is the same as that adopted by Sanday and Headlam.

A selection of passages in which noteworthy variations of text occur is subjoined.

## 11. Critical Noteg.

 Vulg. codd. Arm. Aug. (once) Ambr. Ambrst. and Latin Fathers. The form $\mathrm{X} \rho$. 'I. is confined to the Pauline letters (excl. Hebr.), except Acts xxiv. 24, and increases in relative frequency with time. It is more frequent than 'I. X $\rho$. in Eph., Phil., Col., and is the dominant form in 1 and 2 Tim. Taking all the epistles it occurs slightly more frequently than 'I. $\mathrm{X} \rho .(83-77)$, but this is due mainly to its frequency in 1 and 2 Tim . In the Epistles up to and including Rom. it is decidedly the rarer form (30-56) and probably therefore more likely to be changed by scribes into the other form, than the converse. The difference in significance is slight: in $\mathbf{X} \rho$. ' $I$. the $\mathrm{X} \rho$. is perhaps rather more definitely a proper name than in 'I. $\mathrm{X} \rho$. ; cf. S.H.
7. év ${ }^{e} \mathrm{P} \dot{\mu} \mu \eta$ om. Gg schol. 47 : for this omission cf. Add. Note, pp. 235 f.
16. $\pi р \hat{\omega}$ тov om. Bbg Tert. marc. 5,13 [WH.].
 B and perhaps Clem. Rom. 35. DE Vulg. Orig. lat. and other Latin Fathers had this Greek Text, but showed their doubts of it by adding non intellexerunt (ov̉k Є̉עó $\begin{gathered}\text { noav } \\ \text { D). WH. mark the }\end{gathered}$ clause as corrupt, as involving an anti-climax. But see note.
ii. 2. $8 \grave{e}$ WH. txt. $\gamma \dot{a} \rho$ WH. mg. Tisch. The evidence is fairly balanced. The sense is clear for $\delta \bar{\epsilon}$ : and the substitution of $\gamma \dot{a} \rho$ was probably due to the $\gamma \dot{a} \rho$ of the preceding clause, i.e. mechanical.
 73. 93. tol. al. $\boldsymbol{\eta}$. öтє WH. mg. «DEGKL al. d.e.g. Vg. al.
 Fathers, Orig. lat. Ambrst. The variant is a gloss and involves taking $\tau i$ as the object of $\pi \rho o \kappa$. So syr ${ }^{\text {sch }} \mathrm{ap}$. Tisch, also omits ov̉ $\pi a ́ \nu \tau \omega s$.
28. yàp. «AD*EFG al. plur. Latt. Boh. Arm. Orig. lat. Ambrst. Aug. Tisch. WH. RV. mg. oủv $\mathrm{BCD}^{\circ} \mathrm{KLP}$ al. plu. Syrr. Chrys. Theodot. RV. WH. mg. The combination for $\gamma \dot{a} \rho$ of $\mathfrak{N A}$ Boh. with the Western evidence is strong: and internal evidence is in its favour.
 or after $\dot{\eta} \mu \hat{\omega} \nu$. B 47* alone omit it, and perhaps Chrysostom.

The sense in the context almost demands the omission: and the variation in position of $\varepsilon \dot{\varepsilon} \rho$. suggests a gloss.
19. oủ ins. before катєvó $\sigma \epsilon \boldsymbol{}$ DEFGKLP. om. Vulg. MSS. Syr. Lat. Orig. lat. Epiph. Ambrst. : a clearly Western reading; the sense is not materially affected.
v. 1. Ex exuev has an overwhelming support of MSS. It also makes the best sense (see note ad loc.).
 The influence of the context is ambiguous, as ( v .2 каv $\boldsymbol{\omega}^{\dot{\omega}} \mu \epsilon \theta a$, v. 11 каv $\chi \dot{\omega} \mu \epsilon \nu \iota \iota$ ) : the part. is slightly the more difficult, and perhaps the more characteristic reading.
6. $\epsilon^{l} \gamma \in \mathrm{~B}$ only WH. txt + : other readings are ${ }^{\prime \prime} \tau \iota \gamma$ àp (with ${ }^{\text {é }} \tau \iota$
 variants. Text makes far the best sense. To account for the variants, H. suggests that $\epsilon i \pi \epsilon \rho$ was the orig. reading ; cf. 2 Cor. v. 3, v.l. ; Rom. iii. 30; 2 Thes. i. 6.
14. $\mu \cdot \mathrm{j} \mathrm{om} .67 \mathrm{mg}$. and three other cursives. Latin Fathers: Orig. lat. freq. grk once, d. It is not easy to explain кai if the negative is omitted. It looks like a hasty attempt to correct a difficult expression.
viii. 2. $\sigma \epsilon$ al. $\mu \epsilon$ : om. Arm. perh. Orig. Neither pronoun is quite apt: and WH. app. argue for total omission.
11. Sıd тov̂ ivouk. gen. ※ACP ${ }^{2}$ al., Boh. Sah. Harcl. Arm. Aeth.: Clem. Alex. Cyr. Hier. Chrys. ad 1 Cor. xv. 45, Cyr. Alex. : accus. BDEFGKLP et Vulg. Pesh. Iren. lat. Orig. Did. lat. Chrys. ad loc. Tert. Hil. al. plur. The gen. is thus in the main Alexandrian; the accus. Western. S.H. place the preponderance of textual evidence slightly on the side of gen. The transcriptional evidence would appear to be on the side of the accus. as decidedly the harder reading: especially in view of the Alexandrian tendency to revision.
24. txt B 47 mg . only. RV. WH. $\tau \iota s, \tau i$ кaì $\bar{\lambda} \lambda \pi i \zeta \epsilon \epsilon$. T. R.

35. रрıттov̀. $\theta$ єồ WH. mg.
 ad loc.
x. 9. т̀̀ ¢े $\hat{\mu \mu}$ B 71 Clem. Alex. and Cyril (?) om. rel. ö $\tau \iota$ Kúpıos 'I $\eta \sigma o v i s$ B Boh. Clem. Alex. and Cyril ( $2^{\mathrm{ce}}$ ). K-ov 'I-ovv rel.
xii. 11. $\tau \hat{\varphi}$ кvp $\not \varphi \mathbb{\aleph} A B E L P$ al. Vulg. Syrr. Boh. Gr. Fathers. $\kappa a \rho \varphi$ DFG Latin Fathers. See comm. ad loc.
13. raîs xpéaus: $\mu \nu$ eiaus Western (Gr. Lat.). 'Some copies known to Theod. Mops.' WH. who suggest that it is a mere clerical error. The commemoration of martyrs arose as early as the middle of the second century. Cf. Mart. Polyc. xviii. S.H.
 ble). If this is read, then $\tau \hat{\varphi} \kappa а \kappa \hat{\varphi}$ is masc. $=\tau \hat{\varphi} \kappa а \kappa о \bar{\epsilon} \rho \gamma \varphi$, the compound itself being avoided for euphony's sake. Cf. for a parallel in compound verbs, Moulton, p. 115. This reading certainly gives the best sense.
xiv. 13. om. $\pi \rho о ́ \sigma \kappa о \mu \mu a$ and $\hat{\eta}$, B. Arm. Pesh. Cf. $v .20$ and 1 Cor. viii. 9 .


 áyiov ACDFG Boh. Vulg. Arm. Aeth. etc.

 ...кai $\sigma v v$. Western and later MSS. B has $\epsilon \lambda \theta \omega$ and omits бvуарат.
Sıd̀ $\theta \in \lambda$ ńparos $\theta$ єov̂: Kvpiov 'I $\eta \sigma o v$ B, perh. clerical error for $\mathrm{X} \rho$. ' $\ddagger \eta \sigma o v ̂$ Western. 'I $\eta \sigma . \mathbf{X} \rho$. N* $^{*}$ Ambst. txt ACLP Vulg. Syrr. Boh. Arm. Orig. lat. Chrys. Thdt. Lightfoot (Fresh Revn pp. 106 f.) suggests that the orginal had $\theta \in \lambda \dot{\eta} \mu a \tau o s$ alone. But there is no parallel to this use of the anarthrous $\theta^{\prime} \hat{\lambda} \eta \mu a$ with a prep., and it seems difficult.
xvi. 20. For the place of the benedictions see Add. Note.

## 12. Books.

The following list includes the principal books used and referred to in the Introduction and Commentary.

1. Commentaries on the Epistle.

Field, Notes on Translation of the New Testament. Camb. Univ. Press, 1899.
Gifford, Speaker's Commentary, reprinted, 1886. Giff.
Hort, Prolegomena to Romans and Ephesians. Macmillan \& Co. 1895.
Liddon, Explanatory Analysis, 1896. Lid.

Lietzmann, Handbuch zum N.T. ed. H. Lietzmann. Tübingen, 1906.
Lipsius, Hand-Commentar zum N.T. Leipzig, 1893.
Rutherford, Romans translated. Macmillan \& Co., 1900.
Sanday and Headlam (International Critical Commentary, 1895). S. H.

Weiss, B., Meyer's Kommentar : neu bearb. Göttingen, 1891.

Zahn, Commentar zum N.T. Leipzig, 1910.
2. Commentaries on other Epistles are cited sufficiently in the notes.
3. Grammars and Dictionaries.

Blass, Grammar of N.T. Greek, tr. by H. St J. Thackeray. Macmillan, 1898.
Burton, N.T. Moods and Tenses. Chicago, 1897.
Encyclopaedia Biblica, Cheyne and Black. London, 1899.
Hastings, Dictionary of the Bible. Edinburgh, 1898.
Herwerden, Lexicon Graecum suppletorium et dialecticum 1902--1904.
Kuhring, de praepos. Graec. in Chartis Aegyptiis usu. Bonn, 1906.
Mayser, Grammatik der Griechischen Papyri u.s.w. Teubner, 1906.
Moulton, J. H. Grammar of N.T. Greek. Vol. 1. Prolegomena. Edinburgh, 1906.
Thayer, Greek-English Lexicon of the N.T. (Grimm). Edinburgh, 1890.
Thackeray, Grammar of the O.T. in Greek. Vol. 1. Camb. Univ. Press, 1909.
Winer-Moulton, Grammar of N.T. Greek. Edinburgh, 1882.
4. Linguistic.

Dittenberger, Sylloge Inscriptionun Graecarum. Leipzig, 1883.

Milligan, Selections from the Greek Papyri. Camb. Univ. Press, 1910.
Nägeli, Der Wortschätz des Apostels Paulus. Goettingen, 1905.

Witkowski, Epistulae Privatae Graecae. Teubner, 1907.
5. Other books of reference.

Clemen, Religionsgeschichtliche Erklärung des N.T. (Giessen, 1909).
Dalman, The Words of Jesus. E.T. Edinburgh, 1902.
Davidson, Theology of O.T. Edinburgh, 1904.
Deissmann, Bibel Studien and Neue B. S. Marburg, 1895, 1897.
v. Dobschiitz, Die Urchristlichen Gemeinden. Leipzig, 1902; and Probleme des Ap. Zeitalters. Ib., 1907.
Dubose, The Gospel according to S. Paul. Longmans, Green \& Co., 1907.
Ewald, Devocis $\sum v \nu \epsilon \epsilon \delta \dot{\eta} \sigma \epsilon \omega$...vi ac potestate. Leipzig, 1883.
Hart, Ecclesiasticus. Camb. Univ. Press, 1909.
Hort, The Christian Ecclesia. Macmillan \& Co., 1897.
Judaistic Christianity. Macmillan \& Co., 1894.
Prolegomena to Romans and Ephesians. Ib., 1895.
Journal of Theological Studies. Oxford University Press.
Knowling, Witness of the Epistles. Longmans, Green \& С.., 1892.
Lake, The Earlier Epistles of S. Paul. Rivingtons, 1911.
Lightfoot, On a fresh Revision of the English N.T. Macmillan \& Co., 1891. Biblical Essays. Macmillan \& Co., 1893. Essays on Supernatural Religion. Macmillan \& Co., 1889. Apostolic Fathers. Macmillan \& Co., 1885-1890.
Mommsen, The Provinces of the Roman Empire. E. T. Bently, 1886.
Ramsay, The Church and the Roman Empire. Hodder \& Stoughton, 1894.
Paul the Roman Citizen and Traveller. Ib., 1898. Pauline and other Studies. Ib., 1906.
Historical Commentary on the Epistle to the Galatians. Ib., 1899.
Stanton, The Jewish and Christian Messiah. T. \& T. Clark, 1886.
Texts and Studies. Camb. Univ. Press.
Weiss, Joh. Theol. Studien D. B. Weiss dargeb. Göttingen, 1897.
Zahn, Einleitung zum N.T. 2nd ed. Leipzig, 1900.
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## xlix

|  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\begin{aligned} & \dot{m} \\ & \text { m } \\ & 0 \\ & \text { on } \\ & \text { o } \\ & \text { I } \\ & \text { In } \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { ġ } \\ & \text { ® } \\ & \text { م } \end{aligned}$ |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | $\begin{array}{rrr}  & \text { - } \\ \infty & \infty \\ \infty & 1 \\ 10 & 10 \end{array}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { H } \\ \substack{1 \\ -1} \\ \hline 0 \end{gathered}$ | $\stackrel{10}{0}_{\substack{1 \\ 0}}^{2}$ |
|  |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \end{aligned}$ | 5 |

## $\dot{\sigma}$

## SOME ABBREVIATIONS

LXX. $=$ the Septuagint Version of the Old Testament ; ad loc. $=$ ad locum ; al. $=$ alibi; cf. = confer; cft. $=$ confert ; ct. $=$ contrast ; $i b .=$ ibidem ; l.c. $=$ locus citatus ; mg. $=$ margin ; op. cit. $=$ opus citatum ; s.v. $=$ sub voce $; \mathrm{vb} .=\mathrm{verb} ; \|=$ parallel to; $)(=$ opposed to.

Abbreviated names of authors and books will be plain if the list of books (pp. xlv. ff.) is consulted.

## TPO乏 PSMAIOY

$1{ }^{1} \Pi a \hat{v} \lambda o s ~ \delta o v ̂ \lambda o s ~ ' I \eta \sigma o v ̂ \mathrm{X} \rho \iota \sigma \tau o \hat{v}, \kappa \lambda \eta \tau o ̀ s ~ a ̉ \pi o ́-~$








 ${ }^{\text {'}} \mathrm{P} \dot{\omega} \mu \eta$ ả $\gamma a \pi \eta \tau \circ i ̂ s ~ \theta \in o \hat{v}, \kappa \lambda \eta \tau o i ̂ s ~ a ́ \gamma i o \iota s ' ~ \chi a ́ \rho ı s ~ \dot{v} \mu i ̂ \nu$
 $\mathrm{X} \rho \iota \sigma \tau o v ̃$.
 $\mathrm{X} \rho \iota \sigma \tau o \hat{v} \pi \epsilon \rho \grave{i} \pi a ́ \nu \tau \omega \nu \dot{v} \mu \hat{\omega} \nu$, ӧть $\dot{\eta} \pi \iota 亍 \sigma \tau \varsigma \mathfrak{v} \mu \hat{\omega} \nu \kappa \alpha \tau a \gamma-$











 ध̈ $\theta \nu \epsilon \sigma \iota \nu$. ${ }^{14{ }^{\prime \prime}}$ E $\lambda \lambda \eta \sigma$ ív тє каì $\beta a \rho \beta a ́ p o \iota s, ~$













 ${ }^{21} \delta \iota o ́ \tau \iota ~ \gamma \nu o ́ \nu \tau \epsilon \varsigma ~ \tau o ̀ \nu ~ \theta \epsilon o ̀ \nu ~ o u ̉ \chi ~ \omega ́ s ~ \theta \epsilon o ̀ \nu ~ \epsilon ̇ \delta o ́ \xi a \sigma a \nu ~ \hat{\eta}$ $\eta u ̉ \chi a \rho i \sigma \tau \eta \sigma a \nu, a ̉ \lambda \lambda a ̀$ є́ $\mu a \tau a \iota \omega \prime \theta \eta \sigma a \nu$ èv $\tau o i ̂ s ~ \delta \iota a \lambda o \gamma \iota \sigma-$









 ${ }^{26} \Delta i a ̀ ~ \tau о и ิ \tau o ~ \pi a \rho \in ́ \delta \omega к є \nu ~ a u ̉ t o v ̀ s ~ o ́ ~ \theta \epsilon o ̀ s ~ \epsilon i s ~ \pi a ́ \theta \eta ~ a ̀ т ı \mu i ́ a s . ~ . ~$









 סó入ov какоך $i ́ a s, \psi \iota \theta \nu \rho \iota \sigma \tau a ́ s,{ }^{30} \kappa a \tau a \lambda a ́ \lambda o v \varsigma, ~ \theta є o \sigma \tau v-$




 $\pi \rho a ́ \sigma \sigma o v \sigma \iota \nu$.







 $\kappa а т а ф \rho о \nu \epsilon i ̂ s, ~ a ̉ \gamma \nu о \omega ̂ \nu ~ o ̈ \tau \iota ~ \tau o ̀ ~ \chi \rho \eta \sigma \tau o ̀ \nu ~ \tau о \hat{~} \theta \in o \hat{v} \epsilon i \varsigma ~ \mu \epsilon \tau a ́-~$






 $\theta v \mu o ́ s,{ }^{9} \theta \lambda i ́ \psi \iota s ~ \kappa a i ̀ ~ \sigma \tau \epsilon \nu о \chi \omega \rho i ́ a, ~ є ̀ \pi i ̀ ~ \pi a ̂ \sigma a \nu ~ \psi v \chi \grave{\eta} \nu$



 $\theta \epsilon \hat{\varphi}$.


 $\theta \in \hat{\varphi}, a ̉ \lambda \lambda$ ' oi $\pi о \iota \eta \tau a i ̀ \nu o ́ \mu o v ~ \delta \iota \kappa a \iota \omega \theta \eta ́ \sigma o \nu \tau a \iota . ~{ }^{14}$ ö $\tau a \nu$ үà $\rho$


 $\kappa а \rho \delta i ́ a \iota \varsigma ~ a \cup ̉ \tau \omega ิ \nu, ~ \sigma v \nu \mu a \rho \tau v \rho o v ́ \sigma \eta s ~ a v ̉ \tau \omega ิ \nu ~ \tau \hat{\eta} s ~ \sigma v \nu \epsilon \iota \delta \eta^{\prime}-$


 $\mathrm{X} \rho \iota \sigma \tau o v ̂$ 'I $\eta \sigma o v$.


 ${ }^{19} \pi \epsilon \epsilon ́ \pi \pi o \iota \theta a ́ s ~ \tau \epsilon ~ \sigma \epsilon a v \tau o ̀ \nu ~ o ́ \delta \eta \gamma o ̀ \nu ~ \epsilon i v \nu a \iota ~ \tau v \phi \lambda \hat{\omega} \nu, \phi \omega ̂ \varsigma \tau \omega ิ \nu$ є่ $\nu$ бкóтєו, ${ }^{20} \pi a \iota \delta \epsilon \nu \tau \grave{\eta} \nu$ ảфро́v $\omega \nu$, $\delta \iota \delta a ́ \sigma \kappa a \lambda o \nu \nu \eta \pi i ́ \omega \nu$,









 $\kappa а \iota \omega ́ \mu a \tau a ~ \tau o v ̂ ~ \nu o ́ \mu o v ~ \phi v \lambda a ́ \sigma \sigma \eta$, ov̉ $\chi$ ท ảкроßvбтía aủтov̂





 ả้ $\theta \rho \omega ́ \pi \omega \nu$ ả入入’ є́к тov̂ $\theta \epsilon o v$. $\quad 3^{1} \mathrm{~T}$ í ov้̊ тò
 ${ }^{2} \pi о \lambda \grave{v} \kappa a \tau \alpha ̀ ~ \pi a ́ \nu \tau a ~ \tau \rho o ́ \pi о \nu . ~ \pi \rho \omega ̂ \tau o \nu ~ \mu \epsilon ̀ \nu ~[\gamma a ̀ \rho] ~ o ̈ \tau \iota ~$
 $\sigma a ́ \nu ~ \tau \iota \nu \epsilon \varsigma, \mu \eta े ~ \hat{\eta}$ ä $\pi \iota \sigma \tau i ́ a ~ a v ่ \tau \hat{\omega} \nu ~ \tau \eta ̀ \nu ~ \pi i ́ \sigma \tau \iota \nu ~ \tau o v ̂ ~ \theta \epsilon o v ̂ ~$



кaí nikt́ceic ên Tậ kpíneceaí ce.







 ย้ข $\downarrow \iota \kappa o ́ v$ ย̇ $\sigma \tau \iota \nu$.




${ }^{11}$ ởk éctin çníms, ổk éctin ékzhtên tòn $\theta$ éón.



taíc 「 $\lambda \dot{\omega} c c a i c ~ a y ̉ t \omega ̂ n ~ e ́ d o \lambda ı o \hat{c a n, ~}$

${ }^{14}$ ôn tò ctóma ápâc кai пикрíac rémel-
${ }^{15}$ ỏzeic of mó $\Delta \in c$ aỷtên ékरéal díma,
${ }^{16}$ ḉntpımma kai tadaıtmpia ên taíc ódoíc aytôn,

${ }^{18}$ ởk Ẻctin фóboc $\theta \in 0$ र̂ átténanti tûn ỏфөadmôn dr̂tên.






 $\epsilon i \varsigma \pi a ́ \nu \tau a s ~ \tau o v ̀ s ~ \pi \iota \sigma \tau \epsilon v ́ o \nu \tau a s, ~ o v ̉ ~ \gamma a ́ \rho ~ є ̇ \sigma \tau \iota \nu ~ \delta \iota a \sigma \tau o \lambda \eta ̀ . ~$
 $\theta \epsilon o \hat{v},{ }^{24} \delta \iota \kappa a \iota o v ́ \mu \epsilon \nu \circ \iota ~ \delta \omega \rho \epsilon a ̀ \nu ~ \tau \hat{\eta}$ av̉тồ $\chi a ́ \rho \iota \tau \iota ~ \delta \iota a ̀ ~ \tau \eta ̂ s ~$
 - $\theta \epsilon o ̀ s ~ i \lambda a \sigma \tau \eta ́ \rho \iota o \nu ~ \delta i a ̀ ~ \pi i ́ \sigma \tau \epsilon \omega s ~ \grave{\epsilon} \nu ~ \tau e ̣ ̂ ~ a v ̉ т o ̂ ̂ ~ a i ̈ \mu a \tau \iota ~ \epsilon i s ~$





е̇є $\pi i ́ \sigma \tau \epsilon \omega \varsigma$ ' $І \eta \sigma o \hat{v}$.















 $\theta \epsilon o ̀ s ~ \lambda о у і \zeta є \tau а \iota ~ \delta \iota к а \iota о \sigma v ́ \nu \eta \nu ~ \chi \omega \rho i s ~ \epsilon ै \rho \gamma \omega \nu ~$
 $\lambda$ ýфөнcan ai ámaptial,











$\dot{a} \kappa \rho \circ \beta v \sigma \tau i a ̨ \pi i \sigma \tau \epsilon \omega \varsigma ~ \tau o v ̂ \pi a \tau \rho o ̀ s ~ \grave{\eta} \mu \omega \hat{\nu}{ }^{\prime} \mathrm{A} \beta \rho a \dot{a} \mu . \quad{ }^{13} \mathrm{O} \dot{v}$













 coү. ${ }^{19} \kappa a i ̀ \mu \eta े ~ a ̀ \sigma \theta \epsilon \nu \eta \dot{\sigma} a \varsigma ~ \tau \hat{\imath} \pi i \sigma \tau \epsilon \iota \kappa a \tau \epsilon \nu o ́ \eta \sigma \epsilon \nu \tau o ̀ ~ \in ́ a v \tau o \hat{v}$


 $\nu a \mu \omega ́ \theta \eta \tau \hat{\eta} \pi i \sigma \tau \epsilon \iota, \delta o u ̀ s ~ \delta o ́ \xi a \nu ~ \tau \hat{\varrho} \hat{\theta} \theta \epsilon \hat{\varrho}{ }^{21} \kappa a i ̀ \pi \lambda \eta \rho o-$





 $\tau \eta ̀ \nu$ סıкаї $\omega \sigma \iota \nu \quad \dot{\eta} \mu \hat{\omega} \nu$.
 $\pi \rho o ̀ s ~ \tau o ̀ \nu ~ \theta \epsilon o ̀ \nu ~ \delta \iota a ̀ ~ \tau o ̂ ̂ ~ к v \rho i ́ o v ~ \tilde{\eta} \mu \omega ̂ \nu$ 'I $\eta \sigma o \hat{v} \mathrm{X} \rho \iota \sigma \tau o \hat{v},{ }^{2} \delta i{ }^{\prime}$

















 ठıà тov̂ кvрíov $\mathfrak{\eta} \mu \hat{\omega} \nu$ 'I $\eta \sigma o v ̂$ [ $\mathrm{X} \rho \iota \sigma \tau o \hat{v}], \delta \iota$ ' oṽ $\nu \hat{\nu} \nu \tau \eta ̀ \nu$




 $\kappa о ́ \sigma \mu \varphi, ~ \dot{a} \mu a \rho \tau i ́ a ~ \delta e ̀ ~ o v ̉ \kappa ~ e ́ \lambda \lambda о \gamma a ̂ t a \iota ~ \mu \eta ̀ ~ o ै \nu т о \varsigma ~ \nu o ́ \mu o v, ~$



 тò $\chi a ́ \rho \iota \sigma \mu a \cdot ~ \epsilon i ̉ ~ \gamma a ̀ \rho ~ \tau e ̣ ̂ ~ \tau o ̂ ̂ ~ є ̂ \nu o ̀ s ~ \pi a \rho a \pi \tau \omega ́ \mu a \tau \iota ~ o i ~ \pi o \lambda \lambda o \grave{~}$






 $\tau \grave{\nu} \boldsymbol{\pi \epsilon \rho \iota \sigma \sigma \epsilon i ́ a \nu} \tau \hat{\jmath} \varsigma \chi^{\alpha} \rho \iota \tau o s, \kappa a i ̀$ [ $\tau \hat{\varsigma} \varsigma \delta \omega \rho \epsilon \hat{\alpha} \varsigma$ ] $\tau \hat{\varsigma} \varsigma \delta \iota-$











 то仑̂ кขрíov $\dot{\eta} \mu \omega ิ \nu$.





















 $\dot{v} \mu \hat{\omega} \nu$ őт $\pi \lambda a \dot{a} \delta \iota \kappa i ́ a \varsigma ~ \tau \hat{\eta} \dot{\alpha} \mu a \rho \tau i ́ a, ~ \dot{a} \lambda \lambda \grave{a}$ тарабтท̇батє


 $\chi$ ápıv. ${ }^{15} \mathrm{~T}$ í ov̊v; $\dot{a} \mu a \rho \tau \eta \dot{\sigma} \sigma \mu \in \nu$ ő $\tau \iota$ ov̉k $\dot{\epsilon} \sigma \mu$ èv



 $\dot{\alpha} \mu a \rho \tau i a s$ víтŋкои́батє $\delta \grave{\epsilon}$ є́к карסías єis ồ $\pi a \rho \epsilon \delta o ́ \theta \eta \tau \epsilon$

 à $\sigma$ Ө́vєє
 $\tau \eta ̀ \nu$ à $\nu o \mu i ́ a \nu]$, oṽ $\tau \omega \nu \hat{v} \nu \pi a \rho a \sigma \tau \eta \dot{\sigma a \tau \epsilon} \tau \grave{a} \mu$ é $\eta \eta$ vi $\mu \hat{\omega} \nu$






${ }^{23} \tau a ̀ ~ \gamma a ̀ \rho ~ o ̉ \psi \omega ́ v ı a ~ \tau \eta ̂ s ~ a ́ \mu a \rho \tau i ́ a s ~ \theta a ́ v a \tau o s, ~ \tau o ̀ ~ \delta e ̀ ~ \chi a ́ \rho ı \sigma \mu a ~$
 $\hat{\eta} \mu \omega \hat{\nu}$.

7 1"H ả $\gamma \nu 0 є i ̂ \tau \epsilon, a ̉ \delta \epsilon \lambda \phi o i ́, ~ \gamma \iota \nu \omega ́ \sigma \kappa о v \sigma \iota \nu ~ \gamma a ̀ \rho ~ \nu o ́ \mu o \nu ~$




 ó ảעク́p, è $\lambda \epsilon v \theta$ épa é $\sigma \tau i ̀ \nu ~ a ̉ \pi o ̀ ~ \tau o ̂ ̀ ~ \nu o ́ \mu o v, ~ \tau o v ̂ ~ \mu \eta े ~ \epsilon i \nu a \iota ~$













































 á $\mu$ артías.


 ápapтías кaì тov̂ $\theta a \nu a ́ \tau o v . ~{ }^{3} \tau o ̀ ~ \gamma a ̀ \rho ~ a ̉ \delta u ́ v a \tau o \nu ~ \tau o v ̂ ~$



 ба́рка $\pi \epsilon \rho \iota \pi a \tau о \hat{\sigma} \sigma \iota \nu$ ảд入à катà $\pi \nu \epsilon \hat{v} \mu a \cdot{ }^{5}$ oi $\gamma \grave{\rho} \rho \kappa а \tau \grave{a}$
 $\pi \nu \epsilon \hat{v} \mu a$ тà тov̂ $\pi \nu \epsilon v ́ \mu a \tau o s . ~{ }^{6} \tau o ̀ ~ \gamma a ̀ \rho ~ ф \rho o ́ v \eta \mu a ~ \tau \eta ̂ s ~$















 ov̉тo九 vioì $\theta \epsilon o v ̂ \epsilon i \sigma i \nu .{ }^{15}$ ov̉ үàp ẻ $\lambda a ́ \beta \epsilon \tau \epsilon \pi \nu \epsilon \hat{v} \mu a$ סov $\lambda \epsilon i ́ a s$
 $\kappa \rho a ́ \zeta о \mu \epsilon \nu$＇ $\mathrm{A} \beta \beta$ á ó татท́p．${ }^{16}$ av̉тò тò $\pi \nu \epsilon \hat{v} \mu a \quad \sigma \nu \nu \mu a \rho-$














 $\lambda v ́ \tau \rho \omega \sigma \iota \nu$ тô̂ $\sigma \dot{\omega} \mu a \tau o \varsigma ~ \hat{\eta} \mu \hat{\omega} \nu .{ }^{24} \tau \hat{\eta} \gamma \dot{\jmath} \rho$ є่ $\lambda \pi i ́ \delta \iota ~ \epsilon ่ \sigma \omega ́-$



 тò $\pi \nu \epsilon \hat{v} \mu a \quad \sigma v \nu a \nu \tau \iota \lambda a \mu \beta a ́ \nu \epsilon \tau a \iota ~ \tau \hat{\eta}$ ả $\sigma \theta \epsilon \nu \epsilon i ́ a ~ \tilde{\eta} \mu \hat{\omega} \nu$. тò

 є่ $\rho a v \nu \omega ิ \nu \tau a ̀ s ~ \kappa a \rho \delta i ́ a s ~ o i ̂ \delta \epsilon \nu ~ \tau i ́ ~ \tau o ̀ ~ ф \rho o ́ \nu \eta \mu a ~ \tau o v ̂ ~ \pi \nu \epsilon u ́ \mu a \tau o \varsigma, ~$



















${ }^{\circ}$ Eneken cô̂ $\theta a n a t o y ́ m e \theta a ~ o ̋ ~ 冗 h n ~ t h i n ~ h i m e ́ p a n, ~$






















 tô̂ton é éeýcomal kai ểctal tị̂ ¿áppa yióc. ${ }^{10}$ ov̉ $\mu o ́ v o \nu ~ \delta e ́, ~$



























Ka入éco tòn oy daón moy daón moy

 моү үंмеic,
ėкê̂ клhӨ́contal yíoi $\theta \in 0 \hat{Y}$ zêntoc.





Ei mi Ḱ̀pıoc $\sum a b a \grave{\omega} \theta$ érкатé入ıten нimin ctépma,
 ळ́мою́өнмел.




 бध́үраттає
 ckandádor,












 ${ }^{8}$ ả $\lambda \lambda a ̀$ đí $\lambda$ é $\gamma \epsilon \iota$; 'Errýc coy tò ṕf̂má éctin, èn tệ ctómatí







 үàp aủtòs кv́pıos $\pi a ́ \nu \tau \omega \nu, \pi \lambda o v \tau \hat{\omega} \nu$ єis $\pi a ́ \nu \tau a s ~ \tau o u ̀ s ~$


 $\sigma a \nu ; \pi \hat{\omega} \varsigma \delta_{\text {è ảкои́ } \sigma \omega \sigma \iota \nu} \chi \omega \rho \grave{\varsigma} \kappa \eta \rho v ́ \sigma \sigma о \nu \tau о \varsigma ;{ }^{15} \pi \omega \hat{\varsigma} \delta_{\text {è }}$








 $\lambda$ ө́ $\gamma \epsilon \iota$



Ef̂pé $\theta$ нn toíc émè mí zhtô̂cin,
émфantic érenómhn toíc émè mHè ẻmepatûcin.
 taca tàc Xeipác moy mpòc daòn ảmeı日ô̂nta kai ánti-入éronta.








 oítinec ởk êkamyan rơny ṭ̂ Báad. ${ }^{5}$ oṽt $\omega$ s ov้̉ кaì év






 $\lambda$ ө́ $\gamma \epsilon \iota$

Гenherita н tpáteza aŕtên eíc maría kai єíc өн́pan кaí єíc cкán $\Delta a \lambda o n ~ k a i ~ \epsilon i ́ c ~ a ́ n t a m o ́ \Delta o m a ~ a y ̉ t o i ̂ c, ~$





 $\pi o ́ \sigma \omega \mu \hat{a} \lambda \lambda o \nu \tau o ̀ ~ \pi \lambda \eta ́ \rho \omega \mu a$ av̉т $\omega \nu$.





 $\kappa \lambda a ́ \delta o \iota$.







 $\kappa a \tau a ̀ ~ \phi u ́ \sigma \iota \nu ~ \kappa \lambda a ́ \delta \omega \nu ~ o v ̉ \kappa ~ \epsilon ่ ф \epsilon є i ́ \sigma a \tau o, ~ o v ̉ \delta \grave{~} \sigma o v ̂ ~ \phi є i ́ \sigma є \tau a \iota$.











 $\sigma \omega \theta \eta ́ \sigma \epsilon \tau a \iota \cdot \kappa а \theta \grave{\omega}$ үє́ $\gamma \rho a \pi \tau а \iota$

ảmостре́чє। ảceBeíac ámò ’lакळ́B.

ötan áфétcomal tác ámaptiac aýtôn.










${ }^{34}$ Tic $\gamma$ à $\rho$ ếrn $\omega$ nô̂n Kypioy；मै tic cýmboynoc aỷtô̂ é「éneto ；



$12{ }^{1}$ Парака入ڤ̂ ov̉v $\dot{v} \mu a ̂ s, ~ a ̉ \delta \epsilon \lambda \phi о i ́, ~ \delta \iota a ̀ ~ \tau \hat{\omega} \nu ~ o i ้ \kappa \tau \iota \rho-~$ $\mu \hat{\omega} \nu \tau o \hat{v}$ Өєov̂ тарaбтท̂бaє тà $\sigma \dot{\omega} \mu a \tau a \quad \dot{v} \mu \hat{\omega} \nu \quad \theta v \sigma i ́ a \nu$



 єv̉ápєбто⿱ каі̀ тé $\lambda_{\epsilon} \epsilon \circ \nu$ ．













 $\phi \iota \lambda o ́ \sigma \tau o \rho \gamma o \iota, \tau \hat{\eta} \tau \iota \mu \hat{\eta}$ à $\lambda \lambda \eta \eta^{\lambda}$ ovs $\pi \rho o \eta \gamma \circ v{ }^{\mu} \mu \in \nu o \iota,{ }^{11} \tau \hat{\eta}$




 ${ }^{15} \chi a i ́ \rho \epsilon \iota \nu \quad \mu \epsilon \tau \grave{a}$ Хaıро́vт $\omega \nu$, к каíєь $\mu \in \tau \grave{a} \kappa \lambda a \iota o ́ \nu \tau \omega \nu$. ${ }^{16} \tau o ̀ ~ a v ̉ \tau o ̀ ~ \epsilon i s ~ a ̉ \lambda \lambda \eta ́ \lambda o v s ~ \phi \rho o \nu o v ̂ \nu \tau \epsilon \varsigma, ~ \mu \eta ̀ ~ \tau a ̀ ~ v ́ \psi \eta \lambda \grave{a} \phi \rho o-$











 $\mu \eta ̀ ~ v i \pi o ̀ ~ \theta \epsilon o v ̂, ~ a i ~ \delta e ̀ ~ o v ̋ \sigma a \iota ~ i ́ \pi o ̀ ~ \theta \epsilon o ̂ ̂ ~ \tau \epsilon \tau a \gamma \mu e ́ v a l ~ \epsilon i ́ \sigma i ́ \nu . ~$







 $\tau \hat{\varrho}$ тò какò̀ $\pi \rho a ́ \sigma \sigma o \nu \tau \iota . ~{ }^{5} \delta \iota o ̀ ~ a ̉ \nu a ́ \gamma \kappa \eta ~ v i \pi о т a ́ \sigma \sigma \epsilon \sigma \theta a \iota, ~$ oủ $\mu o ́ v o \nu ~ \delta \iota a ̀ ~ \tau \eta ̀ \nu ~ o ̉ \rho \gamma \grave{\nu} \nu ~ a ̉ \lambda \lambda a ̀ ~ \kappa a i ̀ ~ \delta \iota a ̀ ~ \tau \eta ̀ \nu ~ \sigma v \nu \epsilon i ́ \delta \eta \sigma \iota \nu, ~$


$\tau a ̀ s ~ o ́ \phi \epsilon \iota \lambda a ́ s, ~ \tau \hat{̣ ̂} \tau o ̀ \nu ~ \phi o ́ \rho o \nu ~ \tau o ̀ \nu ~ \phi o ́ \rho o \nu, ~ \tau ب ̣ ̂ ~ \tau o ̀ ~ \tau e ́ \lambda o s ~ \tau o ̀ ~$















 е̇тіөvuias.



















 ráp


 $\left[\begin{array}{ll}\tau \hat{\varphi} & \theta \epsilon \hat{\varphi}\end{array}\right]$ ．
 ả入入à тои̂то крі́vaтє $\mu \hat{a} \lambda \lambda o \nu$ ，тò $\mu \grave{\eta} \tau \iota \theta$ є́vaı $\pi \rho о ́ \sigma \kappa о \mu \mu a ~$




 ov์ $\mathrm{X} \rho \iota \sigma \tau o ̀ s ~ a ̉ \pi \epsilon ́ \theta a \nu \epsilon \nu . ~{ }^{16} \mu \grave{\eta} \beta \lambda a \sigma \phi \eta \mu \epsilon i \sigma \theta \omega$ ov̂v $\hat{v} \mu \omega \hat{\nu}$







 кре́a $\mu \eta \delta$ è $\pi \epsilon i ̂ \nu ~ o i v o \nu ~ \mu \eta \delta e ̀ ~ \epsilon ̉ \nu ~ ฆ ̊ ~ o ́ ~ a ̉ \delta \epsilon \lambda \phi o ́ s ~ \sigma o v ~ \pi \rho o \sigma-~$



 є́ $\sigma \tau i ́ \nu . \quad 15{ }^{1}$ 'O $\quad 1$




 [ $\pi a ́ \nu \tau a] ~ \epsilon i s ~ \tau \grave{\eta} \nu ~ \eta ̀ \mu \epsilon \tau \epsilon ́ \rho a \nu ~ \delta \iota \delta a \sigma \kappa a \lambda i ́ a \nu ~ \epsilon ́ \gamma \rho a ́ \phi \eta$, '̌va $\delta \iota a ̀$




 X $\rho \iota \sigma \tau o \hat{\text { v }}$.









Aíneite, mánta tà éधnh, tón kýpion,
kai émainecáthcan ał̧tòn mántec ol daoí.

"Ectal í píza tồ leccaí,
kai ó ánictámenoc äpXein éقn $\hat{\prime}$ n


 $\tau \hat{\eta}$ è $\lambda \pi i \delta \iota \iota$ ė้ $\delta v \nu a ́ \mu \epsilon \iota \pi \nu \epsilon v ́ \mu a \tau o s ~ a ́ \gamma i ́ o v . ~$
 $\dot{v} \mu \hat{\omega} \nu$, öть каì av̉тoì $\mu \in \sigma \tau o i ́ ~ \epsilon ̇ \sigma \tau \epsilon ~ a ̉ \gamma a \theta \omega \sigma v ́ \nu \eta \varsigma, \pi \epsilon \pi \lambda \eta-$


 $\mu \circ \iota$ ảmò тố $\theta \epsilon o \hat{v}{ }^{16}$ cis tò єilvaí $\mu \epsilon \lambda \epsilon \iota \tau o v \rho \gamma o ̀ \nu ~ X \rho \iota \sigma \tau o \hat{v}$







 $\kappa \circ \hat{v} \pi \epsilon \pi \lambda \eta \rho \omega \kappa \in ́ v a \iota ~ \tau o ̀ ~ \epsilon v ̉ a \gamma \gamma \epsilon ́ \lambda \iota o \nu ~ \tau o ̂ ̂ ~ \chi \rho \iota \sigma \tau o ̂ ̂, ~{ }^{20}$ oṽт $\omega \mathrm{s}$

 ${ }^{21}$ ả入入à каӨ̀ेs $\gamma \in ́ \gamma \rho a \pi \tau a \iota$

kai oi̊ ởк ảкнко́acin çnticoycin.





 є́ $\mu \pi \lambda \eta \sigma \theta \hat{\omega},-{ }^{25} \nu v \nu \grave{\iota}$ סè торє́vo $\mu a \iota$ єis 'I $\epsilon \rho о v \sigma a \lambda \eta े \mu$ סıaкоעผ̂ע тoîs áyioıs. ${ }^{26} \eta u ̉ \delta o ́ \kappa \eta \sigma a \nu ~ \gamma a ̀ \rho ~ М а к є \delta o v i ́ a ~ к а i ̀ ~$








 $\mathrm{X} \rho \iota \sigma \tau o \hat{v} \kappa a i ̀ ~ \delta \iota a ̀ ~ \tau \eta ̂ \varsigma ~ a ̉ \gamma a ́ \pi \eta \varsigma ~ \tau o v ̂ ~ \pi \nu є u ́ \mu a \tau o s ~ \sigma v \nu a-~$










 aย่тov.







 'Iovvíà тov̀ऽ $\sigma v \gamma \gamma \in \nu \in i ̂ \varsigma ~ \mu о v ~ к а i ̀ ~ \sigma v \nu a \iota \chi \mu a \lambda \omega ' т о v \varsigma " ~ \mu o v, ~$





 ${ }^{〔} \mathrm{H} \rho \omega \delta i ́ \omega \nu a$ тò̀ $\sigma v \gamma \gamma \epsilon \nu \hat{\eta} \mu o v$ ．$\dot{a} \sigma \pi a ́ \sigma a \sigma \theta \epsilon \tau o v ̀ \varsigma ~ \epsilon ̇ \kappa ~ \tau \hat{\omega} \nu$






 ＇Iov入ía $, \mathrm{N} \eta \rho \in ́ a ~ \kappa a i ̀ ~ \tau \eta े \nu ~ a ̉ \delta є \lambda \phi \eta ̀ \nu ~ a u ̉ \tau o v ̂, ~ \kappa a i ̀ ~ ' О \lambda \nu \mu \pi a ̂ \nu, ~$ $\kappa a i ̀ ~ \tau o v ̀ \varsigma ~ \sigma u ̀ \nu ~ a v ̉ т o i ̂ s ~ \pi a ́ \nu \tau a s ~ a ́ \gamma i o v s . ~ 16 ’ A \sigma \pi a ́ \sigma a \sigma \theta \epsilon ~$


 ס८Хобтабías каì тà $\sigma \kappa a ́ \nu \delta a \lambda a ~ \pi a \rho a ̀ ~ \tau \eta ̀ \nu ~ \delta i \delta a \chi \eta ̀ \nu ~ \grave{\nu} \nu$


 $\lambda o \gamma i ́ a s ~ \kappa a i ̀ ~ \epsilon v ̉ \lambda o \gamma i ́ a s ~ \epsilon ̇ \xi ̆ a \pi a \tau \omega ิ \sigma \iota ~ \tau a ̀ s ~ \kappa а \rho \delta i ́ a s ~ \tau \omega ̂ \nu ~$



 $\dot{v} \mu \omega ิ \nu$ ėv $\tau a ́ \chi \epsilon \iota$ ．
＇H $\chi$ ápıs тov̂ кvрíov $\dot{\eta} \mu \hat{\omega} \nu$＇I $\eta \sigma o \hat{v} \mu \epsilon \theta^{\prime}$ v $\mu \hat{\omega} \nu$.







 àтока́入vұıv $\mu \nu \sigma \tau \eta \rho i ́ o v ~ \chi \rho o ́ v o \iota s ~ a i ́ \omega \nu i o \iota s ~ \sigma \epsilon \sigma \iota \gamma \eta \mu$ évov





## NOTES

## CHAPTER I.

## A. i. 1-17. Introduction. Address 1-7. Occasion 8-15. Subject 16-17.

1-7. Address. The writer's (a) name and state; (b) office, (c) commission defined by a statement of (i) the Person from whom it was received, (ii) the Person of whom it dealt and through whom it came, (iii) the persons to whom it was directed, and is now in particular addressed, ( $\bar{d}$ ) greeting.

1. Hav̂גos. Here, Gal., Eph., 1 and 2 Tim., Tit., no colleague is mentioned.

סov̂入os in the address here and Phil. i. 1, Tit. i. 1, only; ef. James i.1; 2 Pet. i. 1; Jud. 1; Rev. i. 1; cf. also Gal. i. 10; Col. iv. 12; 2 Tim. ii. 24. The most absolute term for service, countenanced by our Lord Himself, cf. Mt. xx. 27 and n. Joh. xv. 15; cf. Isa. xlix. 3 f.; Jer. vii. 25, al. Regular O. T. term for prophets. Here adopted by S. Paul for himself, and the name, 'I. X $\rho$., substituted for Jehovah; ef. S. H.
'I $\eta$ бov̂ Xpırтov̂. The personal relation is the foundation of the Christian state whether of the apostle or of his readers ( $v .6$ ). 'I $\eta \sigma$., the personal name, emphasises, as always, the human mission of the Lord, its character and object. X $\rho$., the official name, emphasises the position in the history of God's dealings with men, and the divine commission. N. the fourfold repetition $v v .1,4,6,7$ and $c f$. 1 Cor. i. 1-9.
 This group калєîv, к $\lambda \hat{\eta} \sigma \iota \varsigma, \kappa \lambda \eta \tau \nless s$ is characteristic of Pauline writings; Rev. xvii. 14 only in John. Evv. only Mt. ix. $13 \|$. They describe the call to service, whether accepted or rejected. The emphasis is on the invitation given, Gal. i. 1; cf. Mt. xxii. 3 f. \|. See further n . on viii. 28. The added word describes the nature of the service required.
ámó $\sigma$ тo入os in its widest sense－a commissioned agent－then further defined in the following phrases．The nexus throughout the passage is by development of the implicit meaning into explicit statements， words forming the base of expanding thoughts．The name in its Christian use is derived from the Lord Himself，Mk iii． $14=$ Lk． vi．13．See Add．Note H．
áфшрьт $\mu$ v́vos．Cf．Gal．i．15：repeats and enlarges the idea of $\kappa \lambda \eta \tau 0$ s $=$ separation from all other human relations for this single purpose of absolute service to the commission when the call came． It is a characteristic $\mathbf{O}$ ．T．expression for the relation of Israel to God （as the $\kappa \lambda \eta \tau o s$ ）；cf．the word Pharisee，of which it appears to be an assonant rendering．
els evayyencov $\theta$ eov．As the call and separation are of God，so is the object，God＇s Gospel．

For the spread of the Gospel as the aim of Christian service of． 1 Thes．iii．2；Phil．i．5，ii．22，iv．3；Gal．ii．7； 1 Cor．ix． 12 ； 2 Cor． ii．12，viii．18，x． 14 ； 2 Tim．i． 8 ；below，xv．16， 19 al．The O．T． connexion is with the use of evarye入ljeo $\begin{gathered}\text { at in Isa．xl．f．，esp．lxi．；}\end{gathered}$ cf．Lk．iv．18．It is the Lord＇s own word for His message，Mk i．15， viii． 35 and Lk．iv． 43 al．

The phrase is anarthrous only here（cf．Rev．xiv．6），and so emphasises the character of the object－for propagating good tidings of and from God．

On the word see Thayer and S．H．and Dalman，p． 102.
2．$\delta$ к．．т．入．This message is continuous with God＇s earlier revela－ tion and fulfils it，of．Heb．i．1， 2.
$\pi р о є \pi \eta \gamma \gamma \in(\lambda a \tau o .2$ Cor．ix． 5 only；cf．xv．4；Gal．iii．8； 1 Pet．i．10； for the converse of．Eph，i． 12.
$\delta_{i \alpha} \tau \hat{\omega} v \pi p$ ．a．èv $\gamma p a$ ．a．The fulness of the expression suggests that Gentiles are specially addressed ：not simply＇the prophets，＇ but the prophets whom He inspired，whose utterances are preserved in writings which reproduce in their degree the divine character of the inspiration（dंyials）．It is the same God who used the prophets and now uses Paul，and for the same object．

үpaфais áplais，the permanent record of revelation；cf．xvi． 26 ； 2 Tim．iii．16； 2 Pet．i．20．Anarthrous，expressing the nature of the means by which the utterances of God are revealed，stating that there are scriptures，not appealing to the scriptures as known． Perhaps the earliest extant instance of the use of the phrase．The argument from prophecy was from the first addressed to Gentiles： cf．Acts viii．28，x．43，xxiv．14．So with the Apologists great stress is laid on prophecy．
3. $\pi \in \rho \mathfrak{l}$ тov̂ viov̂ av̉тov̂ к.т. $\boldsymbol{\lambda}$. 'His Son' is the subject of God's Gospel promised beforehand-the words go with the whole preceding clause taken as one idea; their meaning is developed in the participial clauses following, which are strictly parallel and explain the twofold character or nature in which 'His Son' was revealed to men, on the human side (калd̀ $\sigma \dot{\alpha} \rho \kappa \alpha$ ) as the son of David, on the divine side ( $\kappa a r \dot{\alpha} \pi \nu . \dot{\alpha} \gamma$.) as Son of God. Both characters are a fulfilment of prophecy, and together form the fundamental content of the Gospel. The article marks the uniqueness of the relation, ct. Heb. i. 2. The aorists of the participles point to two definite historic acts, the interpretation of which is the key to the mystery which makes 'His Son' the subject of God's Gospel. The consequence of the implied argument is then summed up in the full title 'I. X. $\tau . \kappa$. $\dot{\eta}$.

то̂̂ $\gamma \in v o \mu e ́ v o v . . . к a \tau d ̀ ~ \sigma a ́ p \kappa a . ~ F o r ~ \gamma є v . ~ c f . ~ P h i l . ~ i i . ~ 7 ; ~ G a l . ~ i v . ~ 4 ; ~$ Joh. i. 14. The entry into a new kind of existence is implied in all these passages: the special kind is marked here and Joh. l.c. as кaгd
 $\quad$ ovackós (Gal.). oáp $\xi$ here stands for human nature as such, including all that belongs to it (cf. 1 Tim . iii. 16), and not 'flesh' as contrasted with 'spirit'; cf. Westcott on Joh. i. 14, Thayer, s. v. 3.
ék $\sigma \pi$ ép $\mu a \tau$ os $\Delta a v \in(\delta$. The Davidic descent is referred to as marking the fulfilment of prophecy: a commonplace in the primitive argument; cf. Acts ii. 29 f., xiii. 34 f.; 2 Tim. ii. 8 ; Rev. iii. 7 (v. Swete) ; Mk xii. 35.
4. тоv̂ ópıo日évtos, "who was distinguished, from His brethren $\kappa а \tau \grave{\alpha} \sigma$ d́ $\kappa к$, as God's Son by an act of power," closely || Acts xvii. 31,
 tinguished for that office, by the warrant of raising Him from death." The fundamental notion of $\delta \rho i \zeta \epsilon L \nu$ is to distinguish or mark off one object from others by drawing a line between them: so of local boundaries, of definitions, of appointments to specific work or office, of discriminations. Here, as in Acts l.c., the line is drawn by the act of God in raising Jesus from the dead; that marked Him off from other men and indicated consequently His true character as, not David's son only, but Son of God. N. then that the word does not imply that He then became Son of God, as $\gamma \in \nu \delta \mu \epsilon \nu$ os implies that He became man, but that His unique Sonship then became clear to men. Cf. also Acts xi. 29 with Field's note. Chrys. $\delta \epsilon \iota \chi \theta \in \in \nu \tau o s$, $\dot{a} \pi o \phi a \nu \theta$ évtos comes near to the meaning but does not express so fully the action of God.


when it is a question of office and relation to man, but not of nature and relation to God.
viov̂ $\theta$ eov, anarthrous, as marking the character, not the individual merely.
${ }^{2} v \delta \delta u v a \dot{\mu} \mathrm{t}$, 'by an act of power'; cf. Acts ii. $33, \tau \hat{\eta} \delta \epsilon \xi(\hat{q}=$ by His mighty Hand; 1 Cor. vi. 14; 2 Cor. xiii. 4; Eph. i. 19, 20 ; Heb. vii. 16. The resurrection of Jesus was an exercise of God's power, unique but inevitable, Jesus being who He was, unique but the warrant of consequent exercise of the same power on men in Christ; of. also Phil. iii. 10. The phrase goes closely with ópla $\theta$ évros; for ev of. 1 Pet, i. 5 (v. Hort); Rom. xv. 13, 19; 1 Cor. ii. 5; 2 Cor. vi. 7.

катd̀ $\pi v$. á $\frac{1}{} \boldsymbol{\sigma} v v^{v} \eta s$. кard̀ indicates the correspondence of this act of God with the nature of Him on whom it was exercised. It was natural that, Jesus being what He was, God should raise Him from the dead; cf. Acts ii, 24. It follows that $\pi v$. á $\gamma$. refers to the divine nature of Jesus, in contrast with $\sigma \dot{d} \rho \xi$ which indicates His true human nature. This divine nature is properly indicated by the genitive of quality. äycos is the specific word in the Greek Bible for that which is essentially divine. It is used secondarily of persons and things as related to or belonging to God, ef. Hort, 1 Pet. p. 70; Davidson, O.T. Theology, pp. 256 ff. ; Heb. ix. 14 (with Westcott's note). The al sen e of the article shows that we are dealing with the nature of the son Himself.
 God to His nature; of. Acts i. 22, ii. 24 et passim; 1 Cor. xv. 14 al. With jofo日évtos-the distinction was the immediate result of resurrection; cf. closely Acts xxvi. 23. The phrase d $\nu . \nu$. (without articles, limited to Acts (4), Rom. (here), 1 Cor. xv. (3), Heb. vi. 2) describes most generally the fact and its nature $=$ resurrection from death. $\boldsymbol{v e k} \rho \omega \hat{v}$ is gen. of definition, distinguishing this $\dot{a} \nu \dot{\alpha} \sigma \tau a \sigma \iota s$ from other kinds (cf. Le. ii. 34 ; Heb. vii. 11, 15; Acts vii. 37 al.).
'I. Xp. т. к. $\dot{\eta}$. The full title sums up the argument implicit in the preceding clauses: the Son of Gov is the Man Jesus, the promised Christ, our Sovereign Lord, the one subject of the Gospel; ef. esp. Acts ii. 36, Phil. ii. 11. It occurs about 68 times in S. Paul, about 19 in the rest of N. T.
5. $\delta \imath^{2}$ ov̂. He who is the subject of the Gospel is also the agent through whom God dispenses those powers which enable men to minister the Gospel; cf. Joh. i. 17; Gal. i. 1.
${ }^{\lambda} \lambda \dot{\alpha} \beta^{\prime}{ }^{\prime} \mu \boldsymbol{\varepsilon} v$. The subject of $v .1$ is recovered-the apostolic commission exercised under the Lord. The aorist refers to the act by
which the commission was given; cf. 1 Cor. ii. 12, xv. 8, 9; 1 Tim. ii. 7; 2 Tim. i. 11. The plural=we Christian apostles (ct. $\boldsymbol{\tau} \hat{\nu}$ $\pi \rho o \phi \eta \tau \hat{\omega} v$ a.) as 1 Cor. i. 23, ii, 12. But S. Paul certainly uses the plural with direct, though perhaps not exclusive, reference to himself, e.g. 2 Cor. x. passim; Moulton, p. 86.

Xápıv кal $\dot{\alpha} \pi о \sigma \tau 0 \lambda \lambda_{\dot{\eta}}$. The close connexion of the words, and the immediate context, prove that $\chi$ dops is here used in the specially Pauline sense of the favour of God as extended to all mankind, with especial reference to S. Paul's commission to the Gentiles, ef. Gal. i. 15 f., a decisive parallel; Gal. ii. 7 f. Of. Robinson, Eph. pp. 224 ff., "the freeness and universality of the Gospel." S. Paul felt that his commission was a signal instance of God's free favour. Cf. also xv. 15;

 or belonging to faith in Him (not from keeping of law). The phrase corresponds to eis euar ${ }^{\text {En }}$ ८ov $\theta$ eov̂ in $v .1$ and indicates the attitude of recipients of the Gospel ; their faith accepts and brings them to obey Him who reveals Himself in the Gospel as their God. The genitive is then a genitive of 'derivation or foundation' as in iv. 13; ef. Hort, 1 Pet. p. 89 (see the whole note). With $\dot{\text { juakon}}$ the genitive seems never to be objective in N.T. (not even 2 Cor. x. 5). Obedience will be the sign of the coming in of the Gentiles as disobedience was the cause of the rejection of Israel; cf. x. 21 ; Isa. lxv. 12, lxvi. 4. It is the proper outcome of faith, the acceptance of God's offer; of. 1 Pet. i. 2.
 to emphasise the universality of the commission, of. 13.
v̇mèp tov̂ óvónatos av̉rov̂, i.e. of the Lord Jesus Christ. The name, both in O.T. and N.T., stands for the Person as revealed for man's acknowledgment; cf. Acts ix. 15. 3 Joh. 7 (where see Westcott's add. note) is an exact parallel ; Acts v. 41, ix. 16, xxi. 13, of suffering on behalf of the Name they proclaimed. The full force comes out Phil. ii. 9-11. The idea, not the word, is present 2 Cor. v. 20; Eph. vi. 20. ímèp then = to gain acknowledgment of Him as revealed.
6. Év ois $\kappa . \tau . \lambda$. A hint of the reason of his writing to them. Cf. $v .13$.
kal ípếs. Throughout the Epistle S. Paul primarily considers Gentile Christians.
 $\sigma \tau 0 \lambda o s, v .1$, and $\kappa \lambda \eta \tau o i ̂ s \dot{a} \gamma i o u s, v .7$. The genitive stands for an adjective, e.g. Xpıatlavor.
7. mâбเv к.т.入. The local designation comes first, then the
foundation of their state in GoD's love, then the demand thus made on them for response.

All Christians in Rome are addressed, whatever their previous history.
 4, 2 Thes. ii. 13 , and with äyoo Col. iii. 12. God's love for them is the beginning, the call follows, and it is a call to respond to that love by a life consecrated to God; of. Eph. v. 1.
$\kappa \lambda \eta$ rois $\alpha$ jiots, called to be holy, as God is holy; cf. 1 Pet. i. 15, 16 (see Hort). Oonstructed as $\kappa \lambda \eta \tau \delta \delta$ a $\pi \sigma \delta \sigma \tau 0 \lambda$ os above. See note on $\dot{\alpha} \gamma \iota \omega \sigma \dot{v} \eta \mathrm{~s}, v .4$.

Xápıs $\mathfrak{v}$. к.т.入. The words, while reminding of the common forms of salutation, have their full Christian sense. GoD's favour and the peace which it brings between man and God, and between man and man, is the prayer of S . Paul for his readers. The stress is thrown on $\chi$ ápıs by the interposition of $\dot{v} \mu i \bar{p}$.
àmò ө. т. ท. к. к. 'I. Xp. S. Paul's regular form except Col. i. 2, 1 Thes. i. 1 (2 Thes. i. 2, $\eta \mu \hat{\omega} \nu$ is absent), till the Pastoral Epistles. Note that here the Lord Jesus Christ is coordinated with God our Father as the source of blessing (in $v .5 \mathrm{He}$ is the Agent of the Father's blessing) : this coordination is highly significant; it appears in its clearest form already in Epp. Thes. (n. esp. 1 Thes. iii.11, 2 Thes.i. 12, ii. 16) : it combines the Christian experience and conviction as to the Person of the Lord with the Lord's own teaching as to the Fatherhood of God into the theological conception which (cf. 2 Cor. xiii. 13) was ultimately expressed in the Catholic dogma of the Trinity. See S. H. ad loc. For a Jew the position is already implied in the first phrase סoû\os'I. X $\rho$.

These introductory verses thus lay the foundations of the Gospel in the nature and act of God as revealed through His Son-a fitting introduction to an Epistle which is in fact a reasoned exposition of the Gospel as preached to Gentiles by S. Paul. The main theological conceptions are here stated or implied in a fully developed form, but as attained through religious experience, not deduced or even interpreted by any philosophical method. In full accordance with all other evidence as to the primitive development of Christian thought, these conceptions are seen to be reached by the reflection upon the fact of the Resurrection and the light thrown back from that fact on the teaching, acts, and character of the Lord Jesus Christ.

8-17. Thanksgiving 8-10a introduces the Occasion $10 b-15$ and the Subject 16-17 of the Epistle.

He gives thanks to God for the wide report of their faith as
heartily as (9) his prayers for them have been unceasing and (10) have embodied his eagerness to see them, (11) to help them and be helped by them, by the faith which each finds in the other ; his prayers resulted in definite plans, hindered so far, to go to Rome and win fruit there also, by way of paying his debt, due to them as to others, of preaching the Gospel. He has been always ready to do this, for he has 'no shame' for the Gospel: it is an effective act of God's power promoting salvation for all men, on the one condition of faith ; because it reveals the true nature of God's righteousness in men as starting from faith and leading to faith, in accordance with a fundamental declaration of the old dispensation.
8. єv̉Xapıotê. S. Paul follows his greeting always with thanksgiving or blessing ( $\epsilon \dot{\jmath} \lambda o \gamma \eta \tau \sigma$ s), except in Gal. ( $\theta \alpha v \mu \dot{\alpha} \zeta \omega)$ and 1 Tim., Tit. Peculiar to this place are $\mu o v$ (exc. Phil. i. 3) and $\delta \iota \dot{d}$ 'I. $\mathrm{X} \rho$. This fulness of phrase corresponds to the fulness of statement in 1-7.
$\pi \epsilon p l$ aávt $\omega v$ vi. Cf. $\pi \hat{a} \sigma \iota \nu$ in vv. 5, 7.
 a weighty word, otherwise used only of the Gospel itself or some element in it (only Acts and Paul, 1 Cor., Phil., Col.). $\epsilon^{\boldsymbol{e} v} \boldsymbol{\delta} \lambda \omega \tau \omega \uparrow$ кó $\sigma \mu \varphi$, a not unnatural exaggeration : he is writing from Corinth, the great commercial junction of the Empire.
9. $\gamma d \rho$ introduces the personal reasons for his writing. He establishes personal relations with his readers before communicating his message, as he bases his commission on personal relations with the Lord. Cf. Col. i. 3 ff. (the other unvisited church to which he wrote); 2 Tim. i. 3. Note also the force of xv. 14-30.
$\mu \alpha^{\rho} \rho \tau$ us... ${ }^{0} \theta$ còs к.т. $\lambda$. This form of emphatic assertion is specially used by S. Paul (only), when asserting the state of his own mind, 2 Cor. i. 23; Phil. i. 8; 1 Thes. ii. 5, 10 ; cf. Wisdom i. 6 ; and is no doubt occasioned by the misrepresentations of his motives made by opponents.

థீ $\lambda a \tau \rho \epsilon \mathfrak{v} \omega$ к.т.入. adds emphasis by express assertion of his wholehearted devotion to God's service.
$\lambda a r \rho \in$ íw. Cf. Westcott on Hebr. p. 232, "marks the service of perfect subjection to a sovereign power '"; uniformly expresses religious service, voluntarily offered.
 (cf. Phil. iii. 3), and offered by means of the central function of man's personality. The connexion seems to be, the Gospel absorbs my activity in the service of God, and it is therefore easy to understand my interest in you.
èv $\tau$ ．єv． $\boldsymbol{\tau}$ ．v．a．The sphere of activity：God＇s Gospel（ $\mathbf{v .} \mathbf{1}$ ）is also the Gospel of His Son，whose name is its epitome（ $v .5$ ）and who Himself is the author and commissioner（ $v .5$ ）．
©́s，how．$\mu v \epsilon l a v$ v．$\pi$ ol．，make mention of ；cf． 1 Thes．i．2，Eph． i． 16 al．；always of prayer．
 $\eta$ グठ $\eta$ тотеे，at long last．

єv̉oठwण $\boldsymbol{j} \sigma \circ \mu a \iota$ ，＂in passive always tropical；to prosper，be success－ ful，＂Thayer； 1 Cor．xvi．2； 3 Joh．2；but of．Sept．，Judg．xviii．5； Tob．v．21，xi．5；so S．H．adopt early English vv．，＂I have a spedi way．＂

11．โva $\tau \iota \mu \epsilon \tau a \delta \hat{\omega}$ к．т．入．The complex order and the indefinite $\tau \iota \ldots \chi$ d́pırua give a half apologetic tone to this expression of his object，leading at once to the correction $\tau 0 \hat{\tau} \tau \delta \dot{\epsilon} \dot{\epsilon} \sigma \tau \iota \nu$－if he benefits them they will also help him．xápıo $\mu$ a，a concrete instance of God＇s $\chi$ dpıs，a gift of God．Cf．perhaps 1 Thes．ii．8； 2 Cor．i．11， suggesting that the particular gift is a fuller realisation of the Gospel，in thought and life，at once appealing to and stimulating their spirit，and particularly in its universal character；cf．below xv． 15 and 29.
els $\tau$ ò $\sigma \tau$ ．This gift will be to their strengthening，or rather to the common encouragement of writer and readers．

12．$\sigma v v \pi a \rho$ ．，only here．év（cf．ė $\pi i, 2$ Cor．vii．7），no $\|$ ，＝in my feelings about you．
 in God through Christ，év $\dot{\alpha} \lambda \lambda$ ．，which we each find in the other ： he piles up phrases to emphasise the reciprocity of benefit（ $\sigma v \nu .$, év む $\lambda \lambda$ ．，vi，к．$\epsilon$ ．）．

13．троє $\theta^{\prime} \mu \eta \nu$ ．He had got beyond prayers；he had made definite plans，but had been hindered by the exigencies of his work．
$\tau เ v \alpha \alpha^{\kappa} \alpha \rho \pi \dot{o} v$ ，again the apologetic $\tau \iota s . \quad \sigma \chi \hat{\omega}$ ，＇get，＇as always．
14．The thought of the service he wished to render and the fruit he hoped to gain leads on to the statement of the motive and the theme of the Epistle．He has already got＇fruit，＇and so is in debt to men of all classes and culture，and would wish to preach in Rome that he may be debtor to them too．This connexion is indicated by the asyndeton．
 note）；this is the division of mankind current among the inhabitants of the Empire，primarily depending upon language．It excludes，in Paul＇s mind，the Jew．In speaking of his debt，he thinks only of Gentiles：presently in speaking of the range of the Gospel，he includes
 Lightfoot, l.c. p. 217 b.

бофоîs $\tau \in$ кal ảvoทiroıs, a classification by culture; cf. 1 Cor. i. 18 f. : n. he was writing from Corinth.
 debt in Rome too. But in what sense a debtor? Ramsay (Pauline Studies, p. 55) suggests that this is a reference to what he had gained from his intercourse with Greeks and his position as a Roman citizen. This he felt should be repaid by bringing to them the Gospel. But this seems farfetched. Nor does Giff.'s reference to 1 Cor. ix. 16 seem quite satisfactory. It is best taken in close connexion with $\kappa а \rho \pi \delta \nu \nu \quad \sigma \hat{\omega}$; cf. Phil. iv. 17. He has already 'got fruit' from these classes: he pays the debt by sowing the seed more widely among such.
 do with the matter-ref. to $\dot{\epsilon} \kappa \omega \lambda \hat{\lambda} \theta \eta \eta \nu, v .13$; cf. $\tau \dot{\alpha} \kappa a \tau^{\prime} \dot{\epsilon} \mu \dot{\epsilon}$, Phil. i. 12.
16. émalซ $\chi$ v́voual. Cf. Mk viii. 38; 2 Tim. i. 8. There is no lack of readiness, because there is no need of reserve; the Gospel is its own vindication. The tremendous opposition he had lately experienced, especially at Corinth, seems to be in his mind.

Súvapis $\gamma \dot{d} \rho$ $\theta_{\text {eov к.т. }}$. Cf. 1 Cor. i. 18 f. The Gospel is not a mere message whose ineffectiveness might shame the preacher: it is God's power for producing salvation. It is in fact GoD's word sent out into the world with mighty effect; of. Acts x. 36: it reveals and provides a power for man to enable him to live the life which God means for him. It was a critical matter for S. Paul to show that in sweeping away law, as the condition of salvation, he was not destroying the one source of moral growth, that he was not antinomian, but setting free a new and mightier form of spiritual and moral health than any legal system did or could provide. The whole of this Epistle is directed to show that the Gospel alone provides and is such a power. This thought is developed in 1 Cor. i. 18-31; cf. also 1 Cor. ii. 5, iv. 20; 1 Thes. i. 5; (Heb. vii. 16).

Tr. 'GoD's power for salvation' closely together = GoD's effective means for saving men. The insertion of the article in A.V. and R.V. only weakens the force of the expression. There are other manifestations of GoD's power; cf. v. 20.
$\sigma \omega \tau \eta \rho i a v$ includes deliverance from the slavery of sin and full spiritual and moral health. See S. H. for the development of meaning. "It covers the whole range of the Messianic deliverance, both in its negative aspect as a rescuing from the Wrath...and in its positive aspect as the imparting of eternal life" (Mk x. $30 \|$;

Joh. iii. 15, 16, etc.); of. 1 Thes. v. 9, 10, 11; ib. p. 24. Cf. Ps. xcviii. 2. It is a pity that the two adequate English translations health and wealth are both spoiled by eustom, and we have to fall back upon the Latin 'salvation.'
$\pi a v \tau l$ т $\uparrow$ тเбтєv́ovil. For the connexion of. Joh. i. 12. The range of the power is universal, both as proceeding from God who is one and also as offered on the single condition of faith, a common human faculty. The condition is stated here in its most absolute form, but the context shows that it means trust in God who gives the power through His Son. Acts ii. 44, iv. 32 et passim show that from the first this trust was the recognised distinction of Christians; from belief of the message its meaning rapidly developed into trust in the Person, who was Himself the message, and in God as revéaled in the Person. So the aorist of the verb=to become a Christian; cf. Acts xix. 2: oi $\pi \iota \sigma \tau \epsilon \dot{o}$ response of the heart to the love of God, the source of the power. The basis of the Gospel as active in life is thus the personal relation between God and man in Christ. See Introd. p. xxxviii f.
'Iovסaḷ $\tau \in \pi \rho \bar{\tau} \tau о \nu$ кal" E $\lambda \lambda \eta \nu$ l. The $\pi \rho \hat{\omega} \tau о \nu$ marks the historical sequence of revelation, consistently recognised by S. Paul. Cf. iii. 1, ix. 1 f., xi. 16 f., xv. 8, 9 ; Acts xiii. 46 ; Joh. iv. 22 ; Mt. xv. 24 ; S. H. add Acts xxviii. 24 f . The summing up of all mankind under the two religious divisions is the natural expression for a Jewish writer.
17. rdip. The Gospel is GoD's power, with this wide range and single condition, because in it GoD's righteousness (which man needs if he is to answer to his true destiny) is revealed for man's acceptance as beginning, as far as the human condition is concerned, from faith and promoting faith.

סıкaloovivn $\theta$ єov̂, not 'a righteousness of God,' but 'GoD's righteousness,' i.e. righteousness as belonging to the character of God and consequently required by Him in the character of men : so distinguished from any righteousness which man sets up for himself and thinks to acquire by himself; cf. x. 3; Phil. iii. 9; 2 Cor. v. 21 ; Eph. iv. 24; 1 Joh. ii. 29; Mt. vi. 33 ; and below, vi. 13 f. Cf. S.H. "It is righteousness active and energizing; the righteousness of the Divine Will as it were projected and enclosing and gathering into itself human wills." Cf. Ps. xviii. 2 ib.

This 'righteousness' is in fact man's $\sigma \omega \tau \eta \rho i a$, true state of health; and the Gospel, revealing it as following upon faith, puts it in the power of every faithful man to reach. Hence the Gospel is God's power, etc.

As the $\sigma \omega \tau \eta p l a$ is that state of man in which he has made his own
the righteousness of God and so worked out in himself that image of God (cf. Joh. i. 12) in which he was created, so we shall presently see the converse is true-the damnation, destruction, of man lies in his forsaking that task and reproducing in himself the image of the beasts.
ék $\pi \boldsymbol{i} \sigma \tau \epsilon \omega$ sis $\pi i \sigma \tau \iota v$, resulting, as far as the individual is concerned, from faith and promoting faith. It is of the nature of personal trust in one who is worthy of trust to deepen and widen itself. Ps. lxxxiii. 7 (lxxxiv. 8) (S. H.) is a good \|: but 2 Cor. ii. 16 (ib.) is different. It is important to observe that man's faith is the source of man's righteousness only in a secondary degree. The primary source is GoD's grace.

ảтока入ข́ттєтal. The Gospel is not a new principle in God's dealings with man, but a fresh revelation of what has always been there. This is emphasised by the quotation from Habakkuk, and the argument about Abraham in c. iv.
 is to dangers from external foes and loyalty to Israel's king. This is a good instance of the way in which S. Paul applies what is occasional and local to the spiritual experience of man.
 the life which the man seeks to live, modelling himself, in his degree, on the righteousness of God, requires and results from trust in God.
N. S. Paul seldom reaches such a degree of abstraction in his statements as he does in these verses. It is due to his desire to state in the most summary form the character of the Gospel as he conceived it. But recalling $v v .2-7$, we see that we are not even here dealing with merely abstract principles: the Gospel itself is essentially concrete in the Person of the Son: the power of God is no impersonal force, but Christ Himself quickening men (cf. Phil. iii. 12); salvation and faith are no mere technical terms, but personal activities and conditions; God's righteousness is not a system of laws or ethics, but the character revealed in Jesus Christ ; our righteousness is that same character realised in ourselves.
B. i. 18 -iv. 25. The first Vindication of the Theme. The Universality and Need of the Gospel justified historically.
i. 18-ii. 16. The Gospel is needed by Gentiles, because they are under $\sin$ (i. 18-32), and have incurred the just judgment of God (ii. 1-16).
i. 18-32. (18) This power and condition revealed in the Gospel
meets the need of man; for in the actual state of man we can see that his life lies under God's wrath. Man has by unrighteous action overlaid the truth imparted to him: (20) the knowledge of God, communicated through the visible creation as a means of conceiving the invisible character of God, His power in life and His divine character, has been rejected; (21) men have failed to respond with appreciation and thanksgiving; losing the sense of their own destiny and submitting their intelligence to the influence of blind reasonings and passions, (22) with a false assumption of cleverness, they have substituted for the image of God, in which they were created, the likeness of the mere animal nature. (24) As a consequence, left by Gon to their own devices, under the unclean rule of their own desires, they have taken the false instead of the true view of their due allegiance, substituted in their worship the creature for the Creator, and as a consequence perverted even the natural uses of the body to vile and unnatural indulgence ; (28) their will refusing to act upon the knowledge of God, God has allowed them to surrender themselves to all spiritual and moral ills, personal and social ; (32) for they knowingly and willingly faced the verdict of death, and both practise and promote the practice of such things as incur that verdict.

The revelation of the Gospel is the revelation of the righteousness of God in the Person of Jesus Christ, and of that righteousness as a power for reproducing itself in man, if man will trust it, or rather Him. This is paralleled by a statement of the consequences of man's refusing to trust his knowledge of God, as seen in the lives and characters of men as they actually are, a revelation of GoD's wrath; the state of man shows both the need of power for recovery, and the condition in man for its action, namely recovered faith.

As God's righteousness is revealed in life, the Life of Jesus Christ, so GoD's wrath is revealed in life, the life of men putting themselves into antagonism with God, choosing to be under His wrath.

In this section $\mathbf{S}$. Paul summarises his observations of contemporary conditions and generalises from it and from his judgment on history, in order to estimate the actual needs of man and the cause of his condition, as vindicating the character of the Gospel and its universal necessity, if man is to be delivered.
18. Ydip gives the reason for the revelation just described and for the condition of its effectiveness.
ámoк. ópүฑ̀ $\theta$ єov̂. The revelation here spoken of is the revelation
through the actual facts of human life, just as the Gospel revelation is revelation through the actual facts of the divine life seen in the Man Christ Jesus, the Incarnate Son.
àmoka入úттєтau, as above, of a general fact or principle governing the relations between God and man.
ópyì $\theta$ өov̂, fundamentally $=$ the relation between God as righteous and man as sinner. It is seen under present conditions in the progress of sin and growing alienation. The final issue will be seen in the final judgment. As with $\sigma \omega \tau \eta \rho i a$, so with $\delta \rho \gamma \dot{n}$, we have the double sense of present alterable condition, and future final determination. The eschatological reference is, therefore, always implied, but not exclusive ; of. 1 Thes. i. 10, ii. 16, Lightfoot ; Joh. iii. 36, Westcott, n. ; Eph. v. 6; infra, iii. 5, ix. 22. It is opposed to $\sigma \omega \tau \eta \rho i=$
 used with $\theta$ ebs in N.T., though frequently in O.T. (but cf. Mt. xviii. 34; Lk. xiv. 21).
an' oúpavov, used originally literally and now metaphorically of the seat of God's Presence, and so the place of origin of His judgments and commissions now and hereafter, the home indeed of all spiritual matters ; so here the judgment on man's defections is represented as revealed from thence, in contrast with all earthly opinions and judgments ; cf. Mt. xvi. 19, xxi. 25 ; Lk. xv. 18. Cf. Dalman, p. 219 f., E.T.
 righteousness : sin is regarded as a contempt of GoD's claims on man, or as a breach of His will however revealed.
$\tau \hat{\nu} \downarrow . . . к a \tau \epsilon \chi$ र́vтшv. The participial clause describes the action of man which constitutes him $\dot{\alpha} \sigma \epsilon \beta \hat{\eta}$ and $a \dot{\alpha} \delta \kappa \kappa o \nu$.
$\tau \boldsymbol{\eta} \mathrm{v} \dot{\mathrm{a}} \lambda \boldsymbol{\eta} \boldsymbol{\theta}$ ecav. The next clause shows this to be quite general $=$ the truth or true condition of man in his relation to God; both the truth of man's nature and destiny, ef. Joh. viii. 32; James i. 18, v. 19, and of God, in His revealed character and dealings; cf. 2 Thes. ii. 10-13. Cf. Hort on 1 Peter, p. 87.
${ }^{\boldsymbol{e}} \mathrm{e} v$ ádıcia marks the condition created by man himself under which heholds the truth; it is the combination of the possession of the truth and this selfmade condition which constitutes the act and state of $\sin$. All sin is due to will acting against knowledge.
катєјóvтตv. кате́ $\chi \epsilon \nu$ means either (1) to possess, 1 Cor. vii. 30, xi. 2, or (2), less frequently, to restrain or keep under restraint, Lk. iv. $42 ; 2$ Thes. ii. 6,7 . Here the sequence of thought is decisive in favour of the first meaning: it is essential to the argument that the primary condition which makes an act or state sinful, should be set
down here; namely, that the sinner knows what he is doing. Cf. Origen, Philocal. 73 (ed. Robinson). The compound has the force of real or full possession; of. Moulton, p. 111 f. Contrast Lk. viii. 15.
19. Stótı gives the reason for the wrath. For (Blass, p. 274) they knew God ( $19-21 a$, expanding $\tau \dot{\eta} \nu \dot{d} \lambda$. кar.), but did not act on this knowledge ( $21 \mathrm{~b}-23$, expanding $\epsilon^{\boldsymbol{v}} \boldsymbol{d} \dot{d} \delta \iota \kappa l(q)$. There should be a full stop or colon after катєұbעт $\quad \nu$ : as $v .18$ introduces the whole section.

тò $\gamma$ vcooròv т. 0 . =that element in or aspect of God which cah be known. God can be known by man only in part: but that partial knowledge is true and adequate to man's capacity and sufficient and indispensable for his life. He is revealed partially in nature, including human nature, with relative completeness in the Son. For the construction of. Blass, p. 155, Winer-M., p. 295. This is not a case of the neuter adjective standing for an abstract substantive; the genitive is partitive.

фavepóv é. èv av่rois = ' is clear in them.' They have a clear knowledge of God so far as He can be known to man. Cf. Wisdom xiii. 1 which S. Paul certainly has in mind ; but he defines the situation with a much closer grip.

ठ $\theta$ eos $\gamma \dot{\alpha} \rho$ к. $\tau . \lambda$. explains the fact of the clearness of this knowledge: it was due to a self-revelation of God through creation.
20. $\tau \grave{\alpha} \gamma \dot{\alpha} \rho$ ảópara... $\theta$ єเóтๆs are best treated as parentheticexplanatory of $\dot{\epsilon} \phi a \nu \hat{\epsilon} \rho \omega \sigma \epsilon \nu$-the revelation of God through nature and human nature is true as far as it goes, but it is confined to His power both in nature and in morals, and His character as Divine Ruler and Lawgiver. Of. generally Lk. xviii. 18 f.
 argument from the natural order was the first argument addressed to Gentiles, as the argument from the O.T. order was the first argument addressed to Jews. The invisible things of God, His spiritual and moral attributes, are brought within the range of man's mental vision through a conception gained by reflection upon the things He has made. There is a play on the double meaning of ópâv as applied to sensual and mental vision, the transition to the second being marked by pooú $\mu \in \nu a$; cf. Col. i. 15 f.; Heb. xi. 27.
ámò $\boldsymbol{\kappa} \boldsymbol{\tau} \boldsymbol{l} \boldsymbol{\sigma} \epsilon \mathrm{\omega}$ кó $\sigma \mu \mathrm{ov}$, temporal : ever since there was a world to be the object of sense and thought, and minds to feel and think. Not,
 be tautologous ; cf. Mk x. 6, xiii. 19; 2 Pet. iii. 4.

тоîs moเที $\mu \sigma \iota \iota$, dat. of means. каӨорâтat = are brought within the range of vision.
vooúneva, being conceived or framed into conceptions, made objects of thought ; cf. Isa. xliv. 18 ; qu. Joh. xii. 40 : and n. Heb. xi. 3, esp. the connexion of $\pi i \sigma \tau \epsilon \iota$ and $\nu 0 o \hat{\nu} \mu \epsilon \nu$.
 conceptions of the Maker, formed by reflection upon things, are power and divinity. The fundamental assumption implied is that there must be a Maker-things could not make themselves, and man obviously did not make them. This assumption might well be taken by S. Paul as universally agreed. From that he sees man's reflection passing to the conception of power, and lasting or spiritual power; the conception of divinity is a further step, logically if not chronologically, first involving hardly more than antithesis to man and nature, but growing more complex with continued reflection; it involves qualitative conceptions of the Maker, not merely quantitative conceptions of His Power. The very abstract term $\theta \epsilon \epsilon 6 \bar{\tau} \eta \mathrm{~s}$ (only here in N.T.; cf. Acts xvii. 29 and Wisdom xviii. 9) is used because the conceptions of GoD's nature vary so widely with time and place. The term covers every conception of a Being, antecedent and superior to creation, which man has formed or can form.
àtoıos. Only here and Jude 6 in N.T. ; Sept. only Wisdom vii. 26 ; frequent in class. Gk for lasting, eternal ; e.g. Plato, Timaeus, 40 в,


Sv́vapıs. Esp. used of God's power in creation, old and new. Cf. above, $v .4$.
tis ro may either express ' purpose' (viii. 29) or simple result (xiì. 3) : here generally taken of 'purpose,' in which case it must be connected with é $\phi a \nu \epsilon \in \rho \omega \sigma \epsilon \nu$ above. But there is force in Burton's argument for 'result' (M. T. § 411). Cf. Moulton, p. 219. N. A.V. and R.V. invert text and margin.
 God.
21. Stótı picks up and expands the theme of $v, 19$.
$\boldsymbol{\gamma}$ vóvtes, aor. =having received or gained knowledge of God. \|| $\boldsymbol{\tau} \eta \boldsymbol{\nu}$ à $\lambda$. кате́モХотєs.

ÉSógaoav = did not ascribe the due honour to God for what they knew to be His acts ; cf. Acts xi. 18; Mt. xv. 31, al.
 them $\delta 0 \xi \alpha \varsigma \epsilon \iota \nu$.
 Eph.iv.17. The adjective implies absence of purpose or object, futility : so $=$ they became $\mu$ draıol, turning from the true object of all thought they invented vain and meaningless objects for themselvea.

Sta入oyเซ $\boldsymbol{o l}$ in S. Paul always in a bad sense; of. 1 Cor. iii. 20, which perhaps gives the source of the use. It seems to imply the working of the intellect without correction by facts; cf. xiv. 1. evv perhaps instrumental-they lost the true thread by their speculations.
 lost the true light.
kapsia more nearly corresponds to 'mind ' than to 'heart.' So here dंбivecos, unintelligent; cf. x. 6, 8. Associated with thought and will ( $v .24 ; 1$ Cor. iv. 5) more usually than with feeling (Rom. ix. 2), see S.H. There is the same tragic irony here as in 1 Cor. i. 20 f.; of. Wisdom xi. 15.
22. фáбкоvтєs. The asyndeton shows that this is an explanation of the preceding sentence. $\phi$. of false allegations, Acts xxiv. 9, xxv. 19 and here only.
 of their false conception is a false religion, substituting inferior objects of worship for the one true object. The construction is a survival of poetic usage. Cf. Soph. Antigone 495 (Lietzmann).

т $\grave{v} v$ Sógav. Here apparently = the manifestation of God as an object of worship; cf. $v .21$. \|i $\boldsymbol{\tau} \boldsymbol{\gamma} \gamma \nu \omega \sigma \tau \grave{\nu} \tau$. $\theta$. the manifestation of God as an object of knowledge.
24. The consequences seen in the moral condition, to which God handed man over. Man by ignoring the truth is led to neglect the worship of God for the worship of creatures, and thence (24) to failure in due respect to his own body and (26) consequent misuse of the body for unnatural ends, and (28) misapplication of the mind to devising conduct which ignores his own true end and all social claims.
$\pi a \rho \in ́ \delta \omega \kappa \epsilon v$ ó $\theta$. Cf. $v v .26,28$; of. iv. 25, and for the converse Phil. ii. 12. This surrender of man to the consequences of his own choice is also the act of man himself, of. Eph. iv. 19. But it is still an act of judgment on the part of God. See S. H., Giff., Moberly, Atonement and Personality, p. 15 f.
èv $\tau$ aîs émıӨvpíaıs $\tau$. к. a. The desires, uncontrolled by the choice of man's true end, are the occasions of sin.
 S. Paul, cf. Moulton, p. 217, = the use of the body for purposes not intended; of. $\pi a \dot{a} \theta \eta \dot{a} \tau \iota \mu i a s$ below, and n. esp. Col. ii. 23 (note in C.G.T.). év av̉roîs requires us to take dं $\tau \not \mu a ́ \xi \in \sigma \theta a \iota$ as pass.
25. oitcves. Quippe qui, "seeing that they," repeats $v .23$ with amplification.


God and themselves and their relation to Him; so $\tau \underset{\uparrow}{\text { Wevéfet the }}$ false theory or statement of man and God which they adopted; cf. 2 Thes. ii. 11, 1 Joh. ii. 27.
$\dot{\epsilon} \sigma \epsilon$ ßár $\theta \eta \sigma a v$. Here only in N.T., and O.T. only Hos. x. $5 \mathrm{Aq} .=$ they made their objects of worship.
ѐ $\lambda$ árpєvбav. Of full religious service. See Westoott, Hebr. ref. above, v. 9.
$\pi a p \mathrm{~d}$ гòv $\kappa \tau$., to the neglect of. Winer-M., p. 504; n. the tragic irony of the antithesis.
 deep emotion.
26. Sıà тovivo. Wilful rejection of Gon's self-revelation undermines self-respect, purity, and the whole sphere of duty.
$\pi \alpha^{\prime} \theta \eta$ dirulas. The gen. is descriptive-shameful passion. The thought of misuse is included in ḋтuia; of. ix. 21; as фvбıкท่ and кaтג̀ фúrıv mark a right use.
27. àmo入aцßávovtes, 'receiving as due.'
28. EEok ( $\mu a \sigma a v$, 'they thought not fit' (cf. Field, ad loc.). The verb implies approval after testing: the infinitive is epexegetic. ròv $\theta$ ed̀v closely with the verb; cf. in passive construction 1 Thes. ii. 4. They tested or proved God and decided not to keep Him, etc.

 of mind rather than mastery, though the latter follows in due degree. Cf. Robinson, Eph. 248 f.; Moulton, p. 113 ; cf. iii. 20, x. 2 ; Phil. i. 9; cf. 2 Cor. xiii. 5 f.
dं $\delta$ ókц $\mu \mathrm{v}$ voûv-vov̂s the mind as originating purposed action, good or bad. dं $\delta$ ók $\mu$ os, unable to stand the test which is properly applied to it ; ef. 2 Cor. l.c.; Heb. vi. 8.
29. This catalogue of sins emphasises the false relations of man to man as following upon the false relation of men to God and the false conception of the proper use of man's own nature. The classification is only partially systematic, $29 a$ the mental dispositions, $29 b-31$ the dispositions seen in various kinds of action.
32. oituves к.т. $\boldsymbol{\lambda}$. define once more the root of the evil-rejection of known truth-here as to the fixed judgment of God on such acts and persons.
rò $\delta \iota к а i \omega \mu \mu=$ the just decision or claim, ef. ii. 26, viii. 4 ; Lk. i. 6 , not so much of the judge as of the legislator. The word and its cognates used of a judge seem always to imply acquittal.
$\pi \rho \dot{a} \sigma \sigma o v \tau \epsilon$. Practise-methodically and deliberately. $\pi \mathbf{\pi}$.ov$\boldsymbol{\sigma} \boldsymbol{\nu}=$ commit the acts, without necessarily implying deliberation.
oveveooovorv, join with deliberate and hearty purpose. There is a true climax. A conspiracy of evil is worse than isolated actions, because it indicates the set tendency of the heart. Cf. S.H.; ff. Lk. xi. 48 ; Acts viii. 1, xxii. 20. N. the Test. of the Twelve Patriarchs,
 Charles regards this passage as the original of our verse here.

## CHAPTER II.

1-16. GoD's wrath, thus revealed in human life through the consequences of man's rejection of God, is also seen in the judgment of God upon man's conduct-the only just judgment (1) because all men being implioated no man has the right to judge, and (4) a just judgment because God has offered man the opportunity of repentance and (5) judges wilful wrongdoing (6) by the main tendencies of a man's life, (9) without favour to any privileged race, (12) in accordance with opportunities given even to Gentiles and (14) the use made of knowledge admittedly possessed even by Gentiles. This section is closely conneoted with the preceding by the $\delta i \delta$ and by the verbal and sense echoes (ả $\nu a \pi o \lambda o ́ \gamma \eta \tau o s, \pi \rho a ́ \sigma \sigma \epsilon \epsilon s)$.

1. ảvaто入óүๆтоs к.т.入. The consequence of this state of man, being universal, is that there is no excuse for men judging their neighbours. The statement is quite general ; but $v v .9-11$ show that the Apostle is thinking in particular of the Jew's wholesale condemnation of Gentiles and justification of himself.

крivets...катакрivets, the mere attitude of judgment is a condemnation of thyself ; cf. Mt. vii. 1 f. ; Lk. vi. 37.

тòv $ย \tau \tau \rho \circ$, thy neighbour or thy fellow-man ; cf. xiii. 8 ; 1 Cor. vi. 1, x. 24, al.

т $\dot{\alpha} \gamma \dot{\alpha} \rho$ av̉тd̀ $\pi \rho a ́ \sigma \sigma \in \iota s$, whether you realise it or not-developed, for the Jew, in $v v .21 \mathrm{f}$.
2. тò крí $\alpha a$ тov̂ $\theta \in o v$. The $\delta \rho \gamma \eta^{\prime}$ is now conceived as an act of judgment.
kard $\dot{\alpha} \lambda \eta^{\prime} \theta_{\epsilon} \alpha a v$, in accordance with truth-i.e. the true facts of GoD's nature and man's condition. Moral judgment ought to express the actual mind of the judge in relation to the case submitted to him. 'This is the case with GoD's judgment, not with man's as here considered. Man can judge only so far as he is making his own the mind of God ; cf. 1 Cor. v. 3. God's judgment is just because it corresponds to facts.
3. The nexus seems to be this : do you calculate that this correct attitude towards $\sin$ in others will exempt your case from being considered by God, or are you merely indifferent to His merciful dealing with you? The case is put in the most general way and
applies to all theoretic judgment of others ；but the crucial instance in mind is the Jew；cf．$v v .17 \mathrm{ff}$ ．
éxфev́sn，shalt clean escape ；cf．Lk．xxi．36；Heb．ii． 3.
4．Xpךбтóтŋтоs．The word has special reference to God＇s generous gifts to men ；cf．xi．22；Eph．ii．7；Tit．iii．4．Here＝the generosity which has conferred graces and benefits which the man， who presumes to judge，mistakes for special excellences of his own， and so makes light of the Giver ；e．g．cf．vv． 17 f.
$\tau \hat{\eta} s{ }^{2 v o x} \hat{\eta} s$ ，＇forbearance，＇iii． 26 ；cf．Acts xvii．30．цакро－ $\theta \nu_{\mu}{ }^{\prime} \alpha=$ the long continuance of $\chi \rho \eta \sigma \tau \delta \tau \eta s$ and $\dot{\alpha} \nu 0 \chi \eta$ in spite of men＇s ways ：a favourite word with S．Paul．Cf．Ps．vii．11，the adjective freq．of God in O．T．；ef． 1 Pet．iii． 20.
dyvoŵv．Once more man misses the aim which God proposes．
тo $\mathrm{x} \rho \eta \sigma \tau \dot{2} \mathrm{v}$ ．The neut．adj．for the abstract subst．$=\dot{\eta} \chi \rho \eta \sigma \tau \sigma \tau \eta s$ ． For the thought， 2 Pet．iii． 15.
äyt，＇is（always）leading thee，＇a good instance of the linear action of the present，describing tendency not fulfilled．

5．ठغ к．т．$\lambda$ ．＝however you are deceiving yourself all the while，in fact you are storing up wrath．
 the hardness and unrepentant heart is the measure of the wrath stored up．

ג́цета⿱亠乂口⿱亠ттоv．Only here．
Oŋ $\begin{aligned} & \text { avplģeıs．Cf．James v．3．Contrast Mt．vi．23．It is the man＇s }\end{aligned}$ own act．
év $\mathfrak{\eta}$ ．ob．Rev．vi． 17 only in N．T．；cf．Zeph．i．15，18，ii． 3.
кal ȧтока入и́ $\psi \epsilon \omega$ ．When there will be no evading the true facts．
Sıkaьokpırias．Hos．vi． 5 （Quinta Orig．Hex．ad loc．）only in Greek Bible；＝righteousness in judging，excluding favouritism．

## 6．ôs ámoठ́ஸ́ct．Cf．Ps．lxii． 3 ；Prov．xxiv． 12.

$\tau \dot{d}$ épya．The judgment will correspond to the man＇s real character as shown by the works he produces，not as merits that earn but as evidence of character ：the works are then described in $v v .8 \mathrm{f}$ ．as the main effort and tendency of a man＇s life，the temper which governs him，and the aims he affects．

7．$\tau 0 i ̂ s ~ \mu e ̀ v . ~ E x p l a n a t o r y, ~ t h e r e f o r e ~ t h e ~ a s y n d e t o n . ~ T h e ~ r h y t h-~$ mical movement and the balanced antitheses of these clauses decide two ambiguities：（1）广$\eta \tau o \hat{v} \sigma \iota \nu$ governs the preceding accusatives； （2）there should be a colon at $\theta u \mu b s$ ；$\theta \lambda, \kappa$ ．$\sigma \tau$ ．begin the second pair of antitheses．The whole structure is noticeable．Cf．Joh．Weiss Theol．Stud．D．B．Weiss dargeb．，Göttingen， 1897.

$\dot{v} \pi$ ．$=$ perseverance against opposition．The gen．$=x$ in good work；of． 1 Thes．i． 3.
§ógav кal $\tau$ ．к．d．with $\zeta \eta \tau o v ิ \sigma \iota \nu$ ，describing the aims of the life； cf．i． 23,24 ．The reflection of the known character of God in his own life is a man＇s proper aim ：and the gift of God by which that aim is ultimately secured is jwウ aíwvos，which again is represented in the third clause as $\delta$ ．к．т．кai єiр $\eta \nu \eta$ ．The three words here，then， describe the perfected life of man，his true aim．For $\delta 6 \xi a$ in this sense cf．ix． 23 ； 2 Cor．iii． 18 ；for $\tau \iota \mu \eta$ cf． 1 Pet．i． 7 （see Hort，ref． Ps．viii．6；Rom．ix． 21 ； 2 Tim．ii．20）；for $\dot{a} \phi \theta a \rho \sigma i a$ cf． 1 Cor．ix．25， xv． 42 ； 1 Pet．i． 4 ；Eph．vi． 24 （see Robinson）＝immortality．

ఢ็ฑ̀̀ aíต́vเov．Cf．vi． 23 ；Gal．vi． 8 ；cf．Dan．xii． 2 ； 2 Macc．vii． 9 ； 4 Macc．xv． 3 only ap．LXX．In Synoptics，of the life of the coming age，cf．Mk x．17，30．Eternal life，the peculiar condition of God，is His consummate gift to man，operative in present conditions but consummated only in the future，the sum and crown of all His other gifts ；cf．also vi． 22 ； 1 Tim．i．16，vi． 12 ；Tit．i．2，iii．7；cf．Westcott on Joh．iv． 14.

8．＇$\xi \xi$ épiolas．From the literal sense of＇work for hire，＇through the political sense of＇self－seeking or partisan factiousness＇（cf．Gal． v．20），the word gets the general ethical sense of＇self－seeking＇（cf． Phil．ii．3；James iii．16）to the disregard of service，whether of God or man．So $=\mu \iota \sigma \theta a \rho \nu i a, ~ a m b i t u s, ~ W e t s t . ~ a d ~ l o c . ~ H e r e ~ i n ~ s h a r p ~$ contrast to $\kappa \alpha \theta^{\prime} \dot{\nu} \pi . \epsilon_{.} \dot{\alpha}$ ．（See Hort on James iii．14．）
 obedience to known truth is again the condition of judgment；cf． xi．30－33．
$\tau \hat{n} \dot{\alpha} \lambda \eta \theta_{\epsilon}$ la includes as above，i．18，truth of act and life as is emphasised by the parallelism with $\delta . \kappa . \tau \iota \mu . \kappa . \quad \dot{a} \phi \theta$ ．$\zeta \eta \tau o v \sigma \iota \nu$ ，and so ）（ $\tau \hat{\eta}$ àठıкíq．
 feeling，$\theta v \mu$ ós the outward manifestation，＂S．H．

9．$\theta \lambda i \notin \iota s$ кal $\sigma \tau \in v o x \omega p i a$ ．These words must be separated from万．к．$\theta$ ．：they begin the second pair of antitheses；the adoption of the false and wrong aim worries and narrows the whole life；cf．viii． 35 ； 2 Cor．iv．8，vi．12．But the direct reference here again is to the final state，consequent on judgment．
 emphasise the universality of the judgment and the single condition $\tau \dot{\alpha}$ ép $p a$ ；the underlying thought then comes to the surface in＇Iovoalov к．т．入．；for this pair of antitheses the dominant thought is the univer－ sality of the judgment，as in the first pair its certainty and quality．
10. $\operatorname{\epsilon ip} \dot{\eta} v \eta$ replaces $\dot{\alpha} \phi \theta a \rho \sigma l a$, wider and more ethical : peace with God and man, characterising the true life; in contrast also with $\epsilon \xi$ Épı日eías.
11. oủ үáp é $\sigma \tau เ \nu \pi \rho o \sigma \omega \pi \circ \lambda \eta \mu \psi$ ia. The fundamental quality of the righteous judge. Cf. Deut. x. 17 ; Mt. xxii. $16 \|$ Lk. xx. 21 ; Gal. ii. 6 ; Eph. vi. 9, al.
mapd тథิ $\theta \in \hat{\varphi}$, ' with God,' that is, in Him and His acts, as judge; for this use of mapá (for $\hat{e} \nu$ ) due to reverence, of. Hort on James i. 17 (p. 30), cft Mk x. 27.

12-16. These verses bring out, further, the principle of judgment in accordance with the opportunities a man has had and the use he has made of them. Privilege does not exempt from judgment but heightens responsibility; nor does the absence of privilege exempt, provided there is some knowledge which demands corresponding action. The special object of these verses is to justify the inclusion of Gentiles under the judgment of God. In $v .17$ we pass to the case of the Jew.
12. "orol. All without distinction.
ávó $\mu \omega \mathrm{s}$. The antithesis $\dot{\epsilon} \nu \nu \delta \mu \varphi$ and $\delta \iota \grave{\alpha} \nu \delta \mu o v$ and the parallel $\tau \dot{a}$ $\mu \grave{\eta} \nu \delta \mu_{0 \nu}$ EXovia, prove that ${ }^{2} \nu .=$ without law (not ' against law,' as 1 Tim. i. 9 (?)); cf. 1 Cor. ix. 21. In fact it is arguable that äpouos should always be taken in this sense in N. T. See on 14.
$\eta \mu a \rho \tau o v$, in accordance with the whole preceding argument, implies acting against knowledge, even though that knowledge has not been given in explicit law; v. 4 f. explain how it was given. See Add. Note D, on $\dot{\alpha} \mu a \rho \tau i a, ~ p . ~ 213 . ~$

Aor. most simply taken as 'timeless'; cf. Moulton, p. 134 ; Burton, § 54, who calls it 'collective.' The aorist expresses fundamentally ' action at a point' or action simply in itself without time reference. A special difficulty arises in the indicative because the augment gives a reference to past time : but as the present is properly durative, it is natural that the necessity for expressing simple action should lead to the use of the aorist in this sense, in spite of the effect of the augment : so I take it here and iii. 23 and tr. 'all that sin.' Otherwise, it should be translated by the future perfect, under the influence of the future in the apodosis.
13. ov $\mathrm{y} \alpha \mathrm{p}$ justifies the latter clause of 12. If law is a ground of sinning, law must be done, if a verdict of acquittal is to be gained.
 be acquitted. See Introduction, p. xxxvi.
14. őtav $\gamma \dot{d} \rho$. The principle of $v .13$ applies to Gentiles, only we
have to think not of explicit law, but of knowledge of right and wrong evidenced in their conscience and utterances.

Suspicion has been cast on these verses $(14,15)$ on the ground that they interrupt, both the rhythmical antitheses, and the argumentative structure of the passage ( $v .16$ returning to $v .13$ ). Some take them as a later comment, though in strict accordance with the principles of the passage ; some as a marginal note by S. Paul himself. But their genuineness is indicated by the fact that they are not only in accordance with but strictly necessary to the argument; for it is essential to make it clear here in what sense Gentiles are in relation to law : only if in such relation could they be amenable to judgment. Cf. J. Weiss, op. cit. p. 218 n. .
${ }^{*}$ Eev $\eta$. Gentiles as such.

$\phi v \sigma \sigma \iota$ with $\pi o t \omega \sigma \iota \nu=$ without the help of an external revelation in law ; cf. Eph. ii. 3 (n. Robinson) ; Gal. ii. 15, iv. 8. фúcts, morally neutral, depends on man's use ; cf. i. 26, ii. 27.
т $\grave{\partial}$ тov̂ vónov=the acts prescribed by such a revealed law.
éavtoîs eílv vópos. Here S. Paul boldly applies the term $\nu \delta \mu$ os to the condition which has just been described as adoouos. They have no law outside themselves; but the knowledge of God, which they have, takes the place of revealed law and may even be called law for them. It is a good instance of the way in which S. Paul goes behind the ordinary use of language and cuts down to the vital nerve of thought. See further in ch. vii., viii. 1-4.
15. oituves explains the preceding phrase.
'evסekkvuvaal, 'give proof of'; of. ix. 17; of. 2 Cor. viii. 24; Eph. ii. 7; i.e. by their actions. The fact that moral goodness is found in Gentiles is assumed throughout this argument as much as the fact that all sin.
тd̀ épyov tov vóuov. Not the law itself, but that effect which is produced by the law in those who have it. Not=" the course of conduct prescribed by the law" (S. H.); that could hardly be described as 'written in the heart '; but "the knowledge of GoD's will, of right and wrong," which is found in all human consciousness, and in a heightened degree in those who have an external law; cf. vii. 7 f .; \|t therefore to i. 19,21 , and different from iii. 20,28 ; of. Gal. v. 19 ; perhaps James i. 4 ; 1 Thes. i. 3 ; 1 Cor. ix. 1; Mt. xi. 19. (Ewald, de voce $\sigma v{ }^{\text {etiòngeces p. 17, after Grotius, qu. S. H.) }}$
 the seat of knowledge and will, see above, i. 24. Cf. Weiss, Theol. p. 250.
 The epd vb only here and viii. 16, ix. 1. In the two latter places the force of the $\sigma v v$-is clear from the context. Here apparently the other witness is 'their actions'; of. 2 Cor. i. 12. It is possible, however, that the $\sigma v p$-is merely 'perfective.' Cf. Moulton, p. 113.
$\boldsymbol{\tau} \hat{\jmath} \mathrm{s} \sigma \boldsymbol{\sigma} \epsilon \delta \eta{ }^{\prime} \sigma \epsilon \omega \mathrm{s}$. The primary idea of the word is (1) 'consciousness' as due to reflection, on the model of the use of the verb бvעєiঠéval $\dot{\epsilon} a v \tau \hat{\varphi} \tau \iota$, 'to be conscious of an experience good or bad '; on this follows the meaning (2) 'experience' as the sum of reflective consciousness or self-knowledge, subjective always; and (3) so the 'feeling' which admits or rejects as alien a new candidate for admission into a man's sum of experience; then (4), as a special development of the last meaning, 'conscience' as suggesting moral judgments. See Add. Note, p. 208. Here=(2)' their conscious experience'; the effect of the law is recognisably part of their mental equipment or consciousness, their stock of ideas; the next clause then explains how their consciousness bears this witness.
$\mu e r a \xi v ่ ~ d \lambda \lambda \eta \dot{\lambda} \omega \nu=$ as between each other, in mutual intercourse : it is the mutual intercourse of men which arouses the moral judgment, even when that moral judgment is exercised upon the man's own experience, as here ; cf. S.H. This is an instance of the development of personality by social relations. Cf. Ward, The Realm of Ends (1911), p. 366.

т $\bar{v} \nu \lambda o \gamma \iota \sigma \mu \hat{v} v$. Their thoughts exhibit moral judgments, presupposing that knowledge which is the effect of the law. For入оүьرно of. 2 Cor. x. 5 only, freq. in LXX. Here $=$ reflexion passing moral judgment on the contents of consciousness. (In 4 Macc. = reason as master of the passions and champion of piety.) This interpretation seems to be necessitated not only by the regular use of $\lambda o \gamma \imath \sigma \mu$ '́s but also by the context; n. esp. $\tau \dot{\alpha}$ к $\kappa v \pi \tau \dot{\alpha} \tau \hat{\omega} \nu$ $\dot{\alpha} \nu \theta \rho \dot{\mu} \pi \omega \nu, 16$.
 condemnation, but not unknown.
16. Ėv ที ทi $\mu$ épq̣ к.т. $\lambda$. = at the assize (by the judgment) of God who judges not by privilege or appearance but by the secret contents of a man's heart: to be taken with the whole of the preceding sentence, as supporting the analysis of the Gentile state by appeal to the method by which God judges. Gentiles clearly have this knowledge, etc., if judged as God judges by the unseen state of their hearts.

For $\mathfrak{\eta} \mu \rho^{\rho} \rho \underline{\varepsilon}$ in this sense cf. 1 Cor. iv. 3, perh. also above, v. 5.
If to avoid the obvious difficulties of this interpretation we look for some other connexion for $\epsilon \nu \dot{\eta} \dot{\eta}_{\circ}$, we must go back to $v .12$ and regard
the two clauses introduced by $\gamma \dot{\mathrm{a}} \rho$ as parenthetic. The objections to such a conception of the passage may be modified, if we remember that it was in all probability dictated, and we can imagine that in the speaker's pause, while these two clauses were being written down, his mind recurred to the main subject of the paragraph, and he concludes with the thought of the final assize.
kpivet. If we read the present, the stress is laid on the general principles of Gon's judgment ; if the future (kpıcí, ef. iii. 6) on the certain judgment itself.
 Gospel as presented to Gentiles (Acts xvii. 31, xxiv. 25), and as a judgment of character, rather than of acts : and this quality of the judgment was involved in its being administered through the agency of Christ Jesus, who is Himself the judge, as being Himself the standard, of human goodness.
17-iii. 20. The Gospel is needed by Jews, who have also failed through ignoring the one condition of righteousness.
17. Under the same principle comes the Jew, who has full and privileged opportunities (21) and yet makes ill use of them by open unrighteousness (25) from the consequences of which no privilege can deliver him in face of a judgment which considers character and not privilege. (iii. 1) His advantage was an exceptional trust given by God, which his failure does not impair, as on God's part, though it justifies his punishment, but not himself. (9) He is, therefore, as sinning against knowledge, a state foreseen in O. T., under the same condemnation as the Gentile, law having given to him the knowledge which makes wrongdoing into sin.

This section shows explicitly that the Jew belongs to the class $\tau \hat{\omega} v$
 ${ }_{\text {en }} \nu \bar{d} \delta \dot{\delta} \kappa k i a, 21 \mathrm{ff}$. Here, as there is no dispute as to fact, the Jew obviously possessing the truth, the main argument is directed to his supposed plea, that his specially privileged position exempts him from condemnation (iii. 1-20).

It is important to realise that the whole stress is laid on acting upon knowledge, whether embodied in human consciousness or in an external law ; it is this duty of obedience which is the characteristic demand of the pre-Christian dispensation; and its exposition leads to the conclusion that all have sinned and are amenable to judgment, as all have failed to obey law, in one form or another. Cf. S.H., p. 58, Lft, Gal. iv. 11, Hort, R. \& E. p. 25.
17. ©i $\delta \mathrm{E}$. Apodosis $v .21$; on the construction ef. Winer-M., p. 711 (who keeps el $\delta \dot{\epsilon}$ ), Blass, p. 284 (who prefers $\boldsymbol{i} \delta \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}$; so Field ad
loc.). If we read el $\delta 6$ it is a case of anacoluthon, of a quite intelligible kind. The nexus supports $\boldsymbol{\epsilon l} \delta \epsilon$. He is passing from the case of the Gentile to the case of the Jew with his special conditions; and the particle of contrast is required.
'Iovסaios )( "E $\lambda \lambda \eta \nu$ marks nationality, but suggests too all that the distinctive nationality meant to the Jew ; cf. Gal. ii. 4.
emovouá\{n. Only here in N.T. The $\dot{e} \pi i$ gives the force of a specific name, differentiating a part in a wider class. So here=not
 èтоуоцásєıs $\sigma$ eavtob.
ėavaiav́n к.т. $\lambda$. These clauses enumerate the details of the true prerogatives of the Jew, as called by God; so
kavxârat, in a good sense; all your boasting is in God and His dealings with you ; cf. v. 11, 2 Cor. xi. 7.
18. тò 0é $\lambda \eta \mu \mathrm{a}$. Cf. Lft, Revision, p. 106, ed. 1; p. 118, ed. 2 (S. H.).

Soкıцáģets. As above, i. 28, 'approvest, after testing.'
тd $\delta$ เаф́́povтa $=$ the things that are better, the better courses of conduct; of. Phil. i. 10, and for the verb 1 Cor. xv. 41; Gal. iv. 1.

кат $\boldsymbol{\chi}$ Хои́ $\mu \in v o s=$ being taught-all teaching at this time being oral; cf. Lk. i. 4 ; Gal. vi. 6.
19. $\pi \dot{\epsilon} \pi{ }^{2}$ otaćs $\tau \in$ passes to the Jew's conviction of his true relation to other men.
ó $\delta \eta \gamma^{\circ} \mathrm{v}$. Perh. an echo of Mt. xv. 14 ; cf. S. H.
20. Exovta =as one who has.
 of the knowledge and truth of God ; cf. vii. 12. On $\mu \circ \rho \phi \eta_{\text {as }}$ as the proper expression of the inner reality ef. Lft, Phil. 127 f.
$\tau \bar{s} \gamma v$. к. $\tau \hat{\eta} s \dot{\alpha} \lambda$. Of. $\tau \grave{o} \theta \in \lambda \eta \mu \alpha$-all in the most general form.

21-29. The nexus is marked by the particles-oiv (21) sums up the privileges and introduces, in the form of questions, the contrast in the actual facts; $\gamma \dot{\alpha} \rho(24)$ implies the answer yes to the preceding questions and justifies it ; $\gamma \dot{d} \rho$ (25) explains how the event has come about, in spite of the privileges ; oûv (26) draws the conclusion, as to the relative position of Jew and Gentile; $\gamma \dot{\alpha} \rho(28)$ explains this conclusion as resting on the essential superiority of the moral and spiritual to the external and ritual.
21. oův. Well then, does practice correspond to prerogative? If not, prerogative does not exempt from judgment. The charge is put in the form of questions, by way of convicting the Jew in his own
conscience. He cannot plead not guilty. Much more forcible than bare statements.
22. Lepoovdeîs. Cf. Acts xix. 37. S. H. refers to Jos. Antiq. iv. 8, 10 ; Lft, Supern. Rel. p. 299 f. ; Ramsay, Ch. \& R. E. p. 144 n ; Deut. vii. 26. The antithesis is less clear than in the former cases. The charge seems to be that, though they regard idols as 'abominable' things, they do not hesitate to make pecuniary advantage out of robbing temples.
23. àruásets; S. H. and Giff. support di $\tau \mu \mathrm{d}$ jecs. and treat it as a direct statement summing up the points of the preceding questions. Yet the interrogative form is more forcible here too. The claim explicitly brings the Jews under the same imputation as the Gentiles, i. 21.
24. тò $\gamma \mathrm{d} \rho$ övoua к.т.入. Isa. lii. 5 ; the words are adopted (practically in LXX. form), but in a new sense. Here of the contempt brought upon the Name of God by the lives of His professed worshippers ; of. xiv. 16; 1 Tim. vi. 1; Tit. ii. 5; 2 Pet. ii. 2.
25. $\pi \epsilon \rho \iota \tau о \mu \dot{\eta} \mu \dot{\jmath} \nu \gamma \dot{\alpha} \rho$ к. $\tau . \lambda$. The explanation of the awful contrast between the formal condition of the Jew and his actual condition. $\pi \epsilon \rho เ \tau о \mu \eta$ is the symbol of the whole covenant relation of the Jew with God. The symbol has no effect unless the condition imposed by the covenant is kept. It did not either excuse from or enable to obedience. Disobedience evacuates the formal position of all meaning. The 'weakness' of the covenant as a spiritual force is not however developed till ch. vii.
 the absence of the article and the $\mathrm{vb} \pi \rho \dot{\alpha} \sigma \sigma \epsilon \omega \nu$ throw stress on the general character of the life, as distinct from particular acts; of. vv. 1-3.

тараßárךs vórov. So 'a law breaker'-in general.
26 f . It follows that the formal positions of Jew and Gentile may be reversed.
ท ${ }^{\text {dккроßvotla. Abstract for concrete }=\text { the Gentiles ; to emphasise }}$ the absence of the formal condition.
тd̀ $\delta$ เкaıш́ $\mu a \tau a-$ the ordinances in detail as rules of life.
27. $\eta$ é éx $\phi \dot{\sigma} \sigma \epsilon \omega \mathrm{c}$ dikp. This introduces the distinction between the external symbol and the spiritual condition.

тòv vópov $\tau \in \lambda$ доेनa, 'if it keep...' or 'by keeping...': perhaps better $=$ 'which keeps...,' $\tau \epsilon$ 友oṽa, adjectival, owing its position to the fact that there is a second adj., $\dot{\varepsilon} \kappa ~ \phi \dot{v} \sigma$ ecos.
 and circumcision : an advantageous condition as far as it goes. $\gamma \rho$.
is the external form of revelation, as $\pi \epsilon \rho$. is the external form of the covenant. The emphasis is on the character of these forms ; therefore anarthrous ; and 'letter' is a better translation than 'scripture.' For this abstraction of the external form of scripture ef. vii. 6; 2 Cor. iii. 3. For $\delta$ cà $w$. gen., expressing a condition or state, cf. iv. 11, viii. 25, xiv. 20 ; of. Blass, p. 132 f.
28. The grammar is ambiguous, but the sense is clear. The outward state and sign, if they are to have spiritual value, demand a corresponding inward state; which itself has value, even if the outward is absent.
29. द̇v $\tau$ ¢̣̂ крvாтஸ̣. Of. v. 16; 1 Pet. iii. 4.
$\pi є р เ \tau о \mu \dot{\eta}$ карঠias. Here the symbol becomes the reality; of. Deut. x. 16 ; Jer. iv. 4, ix. 26 ; Ezek. xliv. 7; Acts vii. 51, S. H.
ó Eralvos. An allusion to 'Iovסaios, Judah=praise; of. Gen. xxix. 35, xlix. 8, Giff.

## CHAPTER III.

1-20. A brief statement of the true nature of the Jew's position, to be fully dealt with in chh. ix., x. (See p. 55.) The argument is thrown into the form of a dialogue.

1. тò $\pi \epsilon \rho เ \sigma \sigma o ̀ v=$ excess, good or bad. Mt. v. 37; cf. 1 Cor. viii. 8; 2 Cor. iii. 9. Here=advantage or relative gain.
 cf. ix. 4, 5. $\gamma \dot{\alpha}$ p simply introduces an explanation of the preceding statement. " $\gamma \dot{\alpha} \rho$ saepe ponitur ubi propositionem excipit tractatio," Bengel on Lk. xii. 58, ap. Winer-M. p. 568 (b).

The drift of this very condensed argument is-the Jews received in charge the revelation of God's will and purpose in the scriptures; the failure of some to believe, when Christ offered them the consummation of that revelation, does not affect the validity of the revelation or diminish the privilege of the Jew as offered to him by God. The scriptures are still there ready to be used and a charge upon believers; the advantage of the Jew is still for him to take. The failure of some only emphasises by contrast the faithfulness of God.
è $\pi \iota \sigma \tau \epsilon \dot{\theta} \theta \eta \sigma a v . ~ T h i s ~ p a s s . ~ o n l y ~ i n ~ S . ~ P a u l ; ~ c f . ~ 1 ~ C o r . ~ i x . ~ 17 ; ~ ; ~$ 1 Thes. ii. 4, al.

тà $\lambda o ́ \gamma \iota \alpha$ тoû $\theta$ eov̂. Heb. v. $12 ; 1$ Pet. iv. 11 ; Acts vii. 38 only. The last passage is a close parallel in argument.

On the meaning ef. Westcott, Hebr. l.c.; Lft, Supern. Rel. p. 172 ff. ; Sanday, Gospels, etc. p. 155. Orig. = brief sayings, oracles; but by use the word came to mean the scriptures. Cf. Clem. R. 1 Cor. liii. 1 ; and probably here it means the whole written record, but specifically as the utterance of God's Mind and Will.
3. $\tau \ell$ үáp; Phil. i. 18 only. Introduces an objection which must be met. The passage is closely condensed.
 unbelieving), even prob. 2 Tim. ii. 13. The aor. refers to the definite act of the rejection of the Gospel, the climax of $\tau \dot{\alpha} \lambda$ रbyıa тồ $\theta \epsilon o \hat{v}$; of. xi. 20 , and for the limitation in $\tau \iota \nu \in s$ cf. x. 16 and ix. 6 , xi. 25.

т $̀ \boldsymbol{\eta} \boldsymbol{\pi} \boldsymbol{\imath} \sigma \tau เ \nu$ той $\theta \in o v$, the faithfulness of God-apparently the only place in N.T. where the gen. in this or cognate phrases is
subjective; but the sense is determined by $\dot{a} \lambda \hat{\eta} \theta \eta$ s infra; and the thought || 1 Cor. i. 9 ; Heb. x. 23; 1 Thes. v. 24, al. S. H. qu. Lam. iii. 23 ; Ps. Sol. viii. 35 (only in LXX.). For $\pi l \sigma \tau \iota s$ in this sense cf. Mt. xxiii. 23 ; Gal. v. 22 ; 1 Tim. v. 12 (?); Tit. ii. 10 . See Lft, Gal. p. 157; Hort, 1 Pet. p. 81.
 the 'deliberative' subjunctive : 'shall it really annul' $=$ 'are we to allow it or suppose it to annul.' Cf. Moulton, pp. 150, 239; cf. ix. 20, appy the only $\|$. For the thought of. ix, 6, xi. 29. For катapyeîv ef. iv. 14 ; Gal. iii. 17, al. Paul only exc. Lk. (1), Heb. (1); from the literal sense 'to make sterile or barren,' Lk. xiii. 7, the metaph. follows-' to deprive of effect, abrogate, annul.'
4. $\mu$ ท̀ $\gamma^{\text {évouro. Cf. S. H.; characteristic of S. Paul, and esp. of }}$ this group of epistles; expresses the vehement rejection of a possible but false inference.
 here and Joh. iii. 33, viii. 26, of God=true to His word.
mâs äv0p. $\psi$. Ps. cxv. 2 (exvi. 10).
 LXX. mistranslate the Hebrew $=$ 'when thou judgest.' S. Paul adopts the mistranslation, which puts it as though God Himself were on trial. Cf. S. H. Sukaı $\theta \theta$ n̂s = be acquitted. For coord. of aor. subj. and fut. indic. see Blass, p. 212. Burton, §§ 198, 199.
5. el $\delta e$ introduces, in order to remove, a difficulty suggested by this argument : if the confession of man's sin has for its result the vindication of GoD's righteousness, is not that a justification of the sin? It is met by an appeal (1) to a fundamental postulate of GoD's judgment, (2) to a fundamental axiom of man's conduct (v.8). It is not examined in its own elements till ch. xi.
$\hat{\eta} \mu \omega \hat{\nu}$, of us men.
0. Suk., righteousness in God; here of the character of God as a righteous judge.
$\sigma u v(\sigma \tau \eta \sigma \iota v$ establishes by way of proof (cf. v. 8, Gal. ii. 18) from the literal sense ' construct a whole of various parts.'

$\mu \dot{\eta}$, can it really be that...? Puts a question with the implication of a decided negative. Is it a wrong thing to punish that conduct which brings into greater clearness the righteousness of God?
 in judgment.

cf. the vocative in ix. $20:=$ after a merely human manner, so here 'after an ordinary way of men's speaking, in their bold blaming of God.' Common in classical Greek (cf. Wetstein), but with a different reference : in class. $\mathrm{Gk}=$ the normal, truly human, what is right and proper for man; in S. Paul=the merely human, what men do and say when uninfluenced by the divine grace and not responding to their true destiny. So it strikes a note of apology.
6. É $\pi \epsilon \mathrm{l}$, 'or else,' 'otherwise'; of. Field on xi. 22; cf. xi. 6; 1 Cor. xiv. 16, xv. 29; Heb. ix. 17. A good classical use; cf. Wetstein. Only in S. Paul and Heb.
 Judge.
7. $\epsilon i \delta E$. The difficulty is restated more fully and is shown to imply the principle that 'the end justifies the means'; and that is a reductio ad absurdun of the argument.

$\psi \varepsilon \hat{v} \sigma \mu a$. Only here = acted lie, falseness to trust, etc.
érepio $\sigma \epsilon v \sigma \in v$. The aor. used for a single typical case.
'̈ $\tau$ l, after that result. кd. $\boldsymbol{y}^{\omega}$, just I, whose conduct has led to that result.
8. кal $\mu \eta$. In loose construction after $\tau \ell$; strictly $\tau i \mu \eta \eta^{\pi} \pi \kappa \eta \eta^{\prime} \sigma \omega \mu \epsilon \nu$ к.т.л. is required; but the insertion of the statement that this was actually charged against S. Paul breaks the construction.

ка日ஸ̀s $\beta \lambda \alpha \sigma \phi \eta \mu$ ои́нє $\theta$. S. Paul's polemic against the obligation of the law brought upon him the charge of antinomianism; cf. vi. 1 f.

ผิv то̀ крíra. The clear statement of the position furnishes its own condemnation, and the subject is for the time dismissed.
9. $\tau i$ ov̉v; well then, this being so, what follows? Of. Joh. i. 21 ; infra, vi. 15, xi. 7 only. Cf. above on $\mu \grave{\eta}$ रévo九тo, $\tau i$ ổv єं $\rho о \hat{\mu} \mu \epsilon \nu$;

троєХо́цєӨa; ' are we surpassed? are we at a disadvantage?' So R.V. (not mg., not A.V.) ; see Field, ad loc. He shows (1) that there is no example of the mid. = the active 'are we better than these?'
(2) that $\pi \rho \circ \epsilon \chi \in \sigma \theta a \iota=$ to excuse oneself, always requires an accus.;
(3) that $\pi \rho \circ \epsilon \chi \in \sigma \theta a l=$ pass. of $\pi \rho \circ \epsilon \chi \epsilon \iota \nu$, to surpass, is supported by a $\|$, and natural ; qu. Plut. T. II. p. 1038 c after Wetstein.

With the meaning settled, it remains to ask, who are we? and what is the connexion? The question must be taken, dramatically, as put into the mouth of Jews. It has been just shown that while they had an exceptional privilege, their use of this privilege brought
them under judgment. The privilege itself might then appear to be a penalty, the greater call only an occasion of greater condemnation (ef. closely vi. 15). The answer given does not go to the root of the matter-that again is reserved for chh. ix. 30-x. 13-but deals with it only for the purpose of the immediate argument; all have sinned, and as sinners all are equally condemned; yet in a certain sense ( n . oú $\pi \dot{d} \nu \tau \omega \mathrm{~s})$ Jews are in a worse state, because they have sinned against clearer light; yet, again, not to such an extent as to put them at a disadvantage in regard to the new dispensation of the Gospel. The universality of grace covers the universality of sin, and is for all adequate and complete ( $v v .21 \mathrm{f}$.).

This horror-struck question of the Jews, then, rises immediately out of the preceding verses, and the answer completes the statement of their case in comparison with Gentiles. The vigorous dramatic form of expression is due to the depth of feeling with which S. Paul sympathises with his brethren after the flesh.
ov $\pi \alpha{ }^{2} v \tau \omega$. 1 Cor. v. 10 only; not altogether that, either. See above.
$\pi \rho о \eta \tau เ a \sigma \alpha ́ \mu \in \theta a$ only here in Greek appy. So $\pi \rho о є \nu \dot{\rho} \rho \chi \circ \mu a \iota, 2$ Cor. viii. 6; $\pi \rho \circ \epsilon \lambda \pi i \varsigma \omega$, Eph. i. 12 (first) ; $\pi \rho о \kappa v \rho 0 \hat{v}$, Gal. iii. 17. The ref. is esp. to i. 18, ii. $1,9$.
viф' $\alpha \mu a p \tau$ lav. Cf. Moulton, p. 63, for the disuse of the dative after $\dot{u} \pi \boldsymbol{m}^{6}$. Cf. vii. 14 ; Mt. viii. $9 .=$ in subjection to sin and therefore needing deliverance. The whole object of these chapters is to show the universal need of the Gospel.
mávtas includes on this side the $\pi a \nu \tau i$ of i .16.
10-18. This string of quotations is adduced to justify from Scripture the assertion of $v .9$. On the Rabbinic practice of stringing quotations cf. S. H., who instance also ix. 25 f., 2 Cor. vii. 16, al. The references are (W. H.) Ps. xiv. (xiii.) 1 ff., v. 9, cxl. (cxxxix.) 3, x. 7 (ix. 28) ; Isa. lix. 7 f. ; Ps. xxxvi. (xxxv.) 1. The quotation is free in 10, 14, 15-17. On the reaction of this passage on text of Psalms ef. S. H.
11. $\sigma v v i \omega v$, for form, as from $\sigma v \nu^{\prime} \omega$, of. Moulton, pp. 38, 55, Hort, Introduction to App. i. 167, Thackeray, Gr. of O.T. Gk, pp. 244, 250.
 became good for nothing.
13. '́ $6 o \lambda \iota o v \sigma a v . ~ H e b r . ~ ' m a k e ~ s m o o t h ~ t h e i r ~ t o n g u e, ' ~ R . V . ~ m g ., ~$ Ps. v. 9 only, in Gk Bible. Prop.=deceived; form=imperf. with aor. term. Cf. Thackeray, op. cit. p. 214.
19. ot $\delta a_{j \iota \epsilon} \delta \grave{k}$. What is the connexion? The disadvantage of
the Jew has been shown not to be complete－Scripture being adduced to support the statement that all are under sin．So far Jew and Gentile are equal．But the Jew is brought more signally and definitely under God＇s judgment，just because of his possession of the law ：the utterance of the law is in a special degree addressed to him；and he is less able，consequently，even than the Gentile to maintain any plea against God．These verses，then，explain the qualification contained in ou $\pi \alpha ́ y \tau \omega s$ ．In a certain sense he is at a disadvantage as compared with the Gentile．Greater privilege in－ volves greater responsibility．（So with Gifford，practically，though not in detail．）We may say then，also，that we have here the final answer to $\tau i$ $\tau \grave{̀} \pi \epsilon \rho \iota \sigma \sigma o ̀ \nu ~ \tau o \hat{v}$＇I．（iii．1）．It was a true advantage to have fuller light，even though it brought greater condemnation（cf．$\epsilon \nu$ סè фáє九 каl ö入єббор）．
ơ $\delta a \mu \epsilon \nu$ סè．$\delta$ é carries us back to $v .9$ ，ov̉ $\pi a ́ v \tau \omega s$.
or $\delta \alpha \mu \in v$ ．Almost $=$ of course．
 law．＇S．Paul presses the point that the injunctions of the law are meant for those who receive them，and by them the Jew is con－ demned，as against the plea of the Jew that his privileged position exempts him from judgment．Cf．Gifford，ad loc．and on ii． 3.

фраүn̂． 2 Cor．xi．10，Hebr．xi． 33 only．$\epsilon \not \mu \phi \rho a ́ \tau \tau \epsilon \iota \nu$ more common w．$\sigma \tau \delta \mu \alpha$ ；cf．Wetst．
vimó8ıкos．Only here in N．T．；＝liable to an action．The dative seems always to be used of the person injured，not of the judge． The metaphor，then，suggests a trial as between God and His people．

20．Sót explains how law produces this effect．This sentence， while having particular reference to the Jew，is thrown into the most general form，so as to bring the Jew into line with the Gentile，and then to sum up in one conclusion i．18－iii． 19.

蓈 ${ }^{\text {Eppov }} \boldsymbol{v}$ ．，put in the most general form：if works done in obedience to law are taken as the basis of judgment．
 be acquitted when judged．Qu．Ps．cxliii．（cxlii．） 2.
$\dot{\epsilon} \pi \boldsymbol{i} \boldsymbol{\gamma} \nu \omega \sigma$ เs．See n．on i．28．Realisation of $\sin$ as $\sin$ is the specific effect of law．Law is therefore educational，cf．Gal．iii．24，but not in itself a moral or spiritual force，cf．i．32．The sentence here is not strictly wanted for the argument，but crops up as an element in S．Paul＇s view of law．It anticipates and is developed in c．vii．It is important to observe that in i． 19 －iii． 20 S ．Paul bases his assertion of the universality of sin and the consequent universal need of man，not
upon theory but on observation-his experience of human life, both in Jewish and Gentile circles, generalised by the help of history. It is a historical justification of the need of the Gospel, confirmed by the testimony of scripture and by general experience. In c. vii. he reaches the same conclusion by the searching analysis of his own inner experience, treated as typical-what may be called the psychological justification. Of. Giff. on iii. 18 ad fin.
21-31. The failure of Jew and Gentile alike is met by the new dispensation of the Gospel, with the condition it demands of man, faith. The argument having explained 'the revelation of wrath,' returns to the statement of i. 16, 17, and amplifies it in a series of summary propositions, which are developed and explained in cc. v. ff. (21) Under the present dispensation, in the absence of law, there has been an open declaration of Gon's righteousness, not in itself new because it is the same righteousness as the law and the prophets declare, but new in the clearness of the declared condition by which it is to be attained by man, i.e. faith in Jesus Christ, and in its extension to all who have that faith, without distinction of race or person ; (23) for as sin is found in all and all fall short of that divine likeness which God propounds to man, (24) so all are now declared righteous, without merit on their part, by Gop's free act of grace, by means of that redemption and deliverance which is in Christ Jesus. (25) He is indeed God's appointed agent of propitiation, on condition of faith, by the instrumentality of His Blood, shed to exhibit Goo's righteousness which His patient endurance of men's sins through so long a time had obscured, as the characteristic message of the present season, that in the knowledge of all He may be righteous and declare righteous all who begin with faith in Jesus. (27) So there is no resting on privilege, where faith is the one condition of acceptance with God, (28) a condition open to all mankind (29) corresponding to the fact that there is but one God for all men, who from covenanted and uncovenanted alike demands nothing but faith. (31) This view of Gop's revelation, so far from annulling law, alone establishes it.
21. vvvi=èv $\tau \hat{\varphi} \nu v \hat{v}$ кaup $\hat{,}, v .26$, as things now are, under the Gospel dispensation.
xwpls vónov, apart from law. The idea is that man no longer has to look to law as Gon's revelation of Himself, but to the Person and character of Jesus Christ, not against or inconsistent with law but fulfilling it; ef. Hort, Jud. Chr. p. 19; 2 Cor. iii. 12-18.

Sukavorivn $\theta$ eov. Gon's righteousness as characteristic of Him, and therefore the norm for human character; cf. Mt. v. 48.
$\pi \epsilon \phi a v \in ́ \rho \omega \tau \alpha$, has been made manifest, and stands there for all to see ; cf. xvi. 26 ; 2 Tim. i. 10 ; Ti. i. 3 ; esp. 1 Pet. i. 20 ; of. Joh. i. 11, 14 ; 1 Joh. i. 2.
$\mu$ артирочрє́vך к.т.入., so xvi. 26 marks the continuity of God's selfrevelation : pres. part., because the law and the prophets still speak in the scriptures. The phrase sums up the O.T. revelation, the positive law and the comments of the prophets; cf. Mt. v. 17, xi. 13; Joh. i. 45 ; Acts xxviii .23.
22. Sıkalơv́vŋ $\delta \dot{\text { e, }}$, the phrase repeated with a qualification (not of law but by faith), introducing the distinctive condition, and so bringing into emphasis the fact that God's righteousness is the true aim which man must set before himself for realisation in his own life, so far as he may.

Sı̀̀ $\pi \iota \sigma \tau \epsilon \omega$ s 'I. X $\rho$. Phil. iii. 9 ; Gal. ii. 16. Gen. obj. = faith in Jesus Christ as the manifestation of God's righteousness ; see n. on i. 17. Both this and the next phrase ( $\epsilon$. $\pi . \tau . \pi$.) qualify סıкаєобט́vך $\theta \epsilon o \hat{0}$.
eis $\pi . \tau . \pi$., i. 16, shows that faith is not one condition but the only condition imposed on man.

 'constructive' or summary aorist, "which regards the whole action simply as having occurred, without distinguishing any steps in its progress" (Moulton, p. 109; cf. Burton, M. T. § 54), and so should be translated by the perfect 'have sinned,' and is naturally coordinate with the durative present, describing the actual state; see on ii. 12.
viotepoûvcau. The middle of this verb seems to imply, not merely to fall short of a goal (act.), but to be lacking in something of which the need is felt or at least obvious. Cf. Mt. xix. 20 with 1 Cor. viii. 8 and 2 Cor. xi. 5 with Phil. iv. 12; Heb. xii. 15: 'comes short of ' A.V., 'fall short of 'R.V. both therefore seem inadequate translations. Perhaps 'lack' will do. Their lives and characters obviously show the lack of 'the glory of God.'

Tฑ̂s $\delta o ́ \xi \eta \eta s$ тov̂ $\theta$ єov̂ consequently $=$ that exhibition of God in their own character, which is man's proper work: implying the idea of Gen. i. 26, 27 ; cf. 1 Cor. xi. 7; 2 Cor. iii. 18, and Irenaeus, "vivens homo gloria Dei," and probably infra, v. 2 and n. 1 Cor. vi. 20. See S. H. $a d$ loc. God is not seen in them as He ought to be seen. The same thought is expressed by the verb in i. 21. See n. on ii. 7.
 as they are so declared) by a free act of God.' The participle adds
a third element to the description of the universal state, and returns to the thought of $v .22$, els $\pi$ áv $\quad$ as $\tau . \pi$., introducing the further specification of the means of 'justification.' $\delta \omega \rho \in a ́ v$ is the emphatic word and is therefore expanded by $\tau \hat{\eta} a$. $\chi$ dpıtı, \| $\chi \omega \rho$ pis $\nu \delta \mu \circ v, v .21$.

Tท̂ av̉. X . The free grace of God is the source of justification; $\pi l \sigma \tau \iota s$, the human condition ; $\dot{\eta} \dot{d} \pi 0 \lambda$. the means: aúrov is emphatic -by His gift, not by their desert.
 The scriptural idea of dimo入úcpoots is redemption from an alien yoke: orig. of Egypt, then of any yoke other than that of GoD; here the yoke of sin. The word implies the cost of redemption to him that brings it about; and does not involve (as used) a price paid to the alien master. The whole class of words is specially characteristic of S. Paul, in accordance with the essentially historical and experimental character of his religious position. The point here is, then, that man is delivered from that general state of sin by the free act of God working through Jesus Christ, and requiring only trust on the part of man for its realisation.
 Christ, not to the historic Jesus, S. H.
25. $8 v \pi \boldsymbol{v}^{2}$ е́ $\theta$ ero к.т. $\boldsymbol{\lambda}$., explains in a very condensed way how God redeems man by Christ Jesus.
 Eph.i.9; means (1) to purpose, (2) to publish: here, only, the latter, 'set forth on His part'; cf. Polyb. II. 19. 1; mir. 62.1 (=proponere, ob oculos ponere, Schweigh.). The whole passage dwells on the new revelation given by God, for the purpose of doing what could not be done by the emphasised elements of the former revelation; so it is not so much yet the purpose of God as the revelation of that purpose which is in question. The 'publication' was given (aor.) in the Resurrection and $\Delta$ scension as the act of God (cf. i. 4).
idaotriplov. The thought of the redemption of man from his subjection to sin raises the question of God's dealing with sin: the fact of permitted sin affects both man's conception of the righteousness of GoD, and his actual relation towards God. Here, then, S. Paul cuts deeper; but still all is summary and here unexplained (see viii. 1). iגaot. consequently expresses the character of the ascended Lord, as making acceptable to God those who were not in and by themselves acceptable. He in His Person and Work is the agent of propitiation. And the way in which He has achieved propitiation vindicates the righteousness of God ( $\epsilon \tau \tau \hat{\varphi} a \dot{v} . a i$.$) and$
offers righteousness to men ( $\delta \dot{d} \pi / \sigma \sigma \tau \epsilon \omega$ ). The context, then, leads us to take i $\lambda$. as an adjective (accus. mase.), and this is justified by use current at the time, and by the true interpretation of LXX. (cf. Deismann, B. S. I. p. 128; S. H., ad loc.; cf. Westcott, Epp. Joh. pp. 39, 83 f. ; Heb. ii. 17).

Sıa $\pi$ iotews, the means by which man makes the propitiation his own.
Evv $\tau \hat{\Psi}$ av. $\alpha \not{ }_{\mu} \alpha \tau \tau$, the means by which He effects propitiation. Eph. ii. 13 (ef. Col. i. 20), Eph. i. 7 (ef. 1 Joh. i. 7; 1 Pet. i. 19), explain the idea : the Blood shed on the Cross and offered from the Throne is that which makes man acceptable to God, puts away his $\sin$ (äфeढts, not $\pi d \rho \epsilon \sigma \iota s)$, brings him home from the far country, makes him at peace where he was at enmity. So that the Blood indicates not only the Death, but always also the Life offered to God and communicated to man ; this is indicated here by iv $\mathrm{X} \rho$. ' $\mathrm{I} \eta \sigma ., v .24$, see above; cf. Westeott, Epp. Joh. pp. 34 f. $\epsilon_{\nu} \nu \tau \hat{\varphi}$ taváre could not be substituted here; cf. Acts xx. 28. iv, instrumental $=\delta d \boldsymbol{w}$. gen. The two phrases $\delta \dot{d} \pi{ }^{\pi} \pi \tau \tau \epsilon \omega s$, è $\nu \bar{\omega}$ a. ai. are $\|$.

 $\delta \in \xi<\xi^{2} \nu$.
 seem to be impugned by His allowance of sin, and required to be vindicated. It was vindicated, because the Cross showed God's eternal hostility to sin; of. S. H.
 by; ef. Acts xiv. 16, xvii. 30; ef. ii. 4; Mk ix. 19; Lk. xviii. 7; 2 Pet. iii. 15.
t̀v $\tau$ n̂ ávoxn̂ explains $\tau \grave{\eta} \nu \pi \alpha ́ \rho \epsilon \sigma \nu$.

тท̂s $\delta$ เкalooivins aủrov̂. Here in the wider sense of i. 17, etc., His righteousness in itself and as offered to man.
eis tò elvat к.т.入. sums up both strains. kal $\delta$ ккaюoûvta $=$ even when He justifies.
тòv ék $\pi$ ívтews. See $\boldsymbol{v} .30$.
$\pi i \sigma \tau \epsilon \omega \mathrm{~s}$ 'I $\eta \sigma o v ิ$. Cf. Rev. xiv. 12, the only other place where the exact phrase occurs. The simple name ' $I$. is relatively rave (after Evv. and Acts). In S. Paul, its use always emphasises 'the Humanity '-generally in reference to the Resurrection (e.g. viii. 11), but also in reference to the whole Life and Character exhibited on earth. So the Christian confession is Kúplos 'I $\eta \sigma o u$ ôs and the denial of it

of the Life on earth is a precedent for and vindication of the manner of the Apostles' lives (2 Cor. iv. 5-11; cf. Gal. iv. 17) ; truth is there seen as man can see it (Eph. iv. 21); parallel in thought, though not in expression, are 1 Joh. iv. 3, 15; Rev. i. 9; Joh. xiv. 1. So here= faith in Jesus as, in His human Life and Character, revealing as man can see it the righteousness of God.
27. тov̂ oỉv ทீ кav́Xๆбเs; Cf. ii. 17, 22. This whole practice and temper of mind is here set aside, as inconsistent with the truth of man's common relation to God. The class of words is almost confined to S. Paul.

Sid $\pi$ olov vórov; under what kind of law? So better than by ...; ef. iv. $3 ; n$. on iii. 27. The law which required for its satisfaction works might leave room for assertion of personal superiority; but a law of which the only requirement is faith or trust can leave no room for such; all that is done in that case is done by God. With $\tau \hat{\omega} \nu$ tepcov $\tau 0 \hat{v} \nu 6 \mu 0 v$ must be supplied, and the reference is to the claim of the Jew. But in vórov $\pi$. a wider sense of $\nu \delta \mu \circ$ s is introduced.

Std vópov $\pi$ /ठтtews. A unique phrase. S. Paul cuts to the nerve of $\nu b \mu \mathrm{os}$ here, as = God's revealed will. That will is now revealed in Christ Jesus; He is now God's law. Man does law only as Christ is it and does it in him, and this requires faith in Christ; so it is a law requiring not works but faith. The essence of faith as a basis of morals is the acceptance of Another's works and a recognition that all personal achievement is due to that Other. For a similar appeal, as it were, to the deepest meaning of the word, cf. viii. 1, as startling after the argument of $c$. vii., as it is here. Of. for a similar paradox James i. 25 ; Joh. vi. 29 ; 1 Joh. iii. 23.
28. yàp. Context is decisive in favour of this reading: the clause refers to the argument of i. 17, iii. 20 , as supporting the statement that boasting is excluded, and is not a fresh conclusion from $v .27$.
29. $\eta \eta$ 'Iovסaicov к.т. $\lambda$. presses the argument deeper; not only is righteousness a matter of faith which all men can exercise, but God is one-one and the same for all mankind; all men are in the same relation to Him, and He will justify all on the same condition.
30. elmep, if as is the fact; ef. viii. 9, 17; 2 Thes. i. 6; 2 Cor. v. 3 (v.l.) ; diff. 1 Cor. xv. $15=$ if as they maintain (with $d \rho a$ ). els ó $\theta$ és. s . Of. 1 Cor. viii. 4 ; Gal. iii. 20; Eph. iv. 6 ; 1 Tim. ii. 5 ; James ii. 19: always in S. Paul as giving the ground for the unity of mankind and the universality of the Gospel.
$\mathbf{k} \mathbf{k}, \delta \mathbf{c}$. No essential difference : $\mathbf{E} \mathbf{k}=$ as the result of, in implied contrast with ${ }_{\epsilon \xi \xi}{ }^{\epsilon} \rho \gamma \omega \nu \nu b \mu o v$; cf. ix. $31: \delta\llcorner\dot{\alpha}=$ by means of the exercise of faith, which is now open to them.
31. vó $\mu$ оv oviv к.т.入. An anticipatory caution, worked out in ch. vi. The Gospel does not abolish law by insisting on faith as man's sole contribution ; it represents law as fulfilled in Christ, and in man if he has faith in Christ; see above on $\nu \delta \mu o v \pi i \sigma \tau \epsilon \omega s$. Practically a summary of the treatment of law in Mt. v. vópos here is not limited to, though it includes, the Mosaic law.
i๘тávouєv. A later form of $\imath_{\sigma \tau \eta \mu \iota}$; of. Thackeray, p. 247; Moulton, p. 55. Only here simpl.; cf. Acts xvii. 15 (ка日.); 1 Cor. xiii. 2 ( $\mu \in \theta$.). $\sigma v \nu \iota \tau a ́ \nu \omega, 2$ Cor. iii. 1, iv. 2, v. 12, vi. 4, x. 12; Gal. ii. 18.

The difficulty of this passage lies in its condensation; the clue is found when we see in it a return to i. 17, and amplification of that passage, with a view to fuller exposition in chh. $\nabla$. ff.; in fact it restates the subject of the Epistle. In interpreting, we must bear in mind, as we saw on i. 17, that Christ Jesus is throughout the concrete righteousness of God.

## CHAPTER IV.

c. iv. This condition of faith is already seen in Abraham, typical
of righteousness under the covenant of promise.
(1) Abraham was admittedly a righteous man : but how did he become so? (3) The scripture connects his righteousness with his faith. (6) So David makes forgiveness an act of God's grace. (9) Nor is this grace confined to the Covenant people; for in Abraham's case the covenant was not the precedent but the confirmation of his righteousness, (11b) so that he is father (according to the promise) of all that believe though uncovenanted and of the covenanted only so far as they share his faith. (13) For the promise was given not under law but under a state of righteousness due to faith. (14) If the law is a condition of inheritance of Abraham, then Abraham's faith has no effect, and the promise made to him is annulled-for the effect of the law is wrath; where law is not, neither is there transgression. (16) And the reason for this dependence upon faith is clear: it is that righteousness may be absolutely God's gift, and therefore free, in fulfilment of the promise, to all the true seed of Abraham, that is to those who derive from him not by the link of the law but by that of faith, by virtue of which he, as the promise said, is father of all of us who believe, both Jews and Gentiles, (17b) all standing before the same God in whom Abraham believed, the God who quickens the dead and ascribes being to that which is not: (18) the particular act of faith required absolute trust in Him who gave the promise in spite of supreme difficulties, trust both in the truth and in the power of God. (22) This trust was reckoned for righteousness. (23) The incident has reference to us: righteousness will be reckoned to us too for our trust in God : for us too He has shown His truth and power by raising Jesus our Lord from death, delivered up for our transgressions and raised for our justification.

The case of Abraham is taken to illustrate the preceding argument: the Jews would quote it as a clear case of justification under the old covenant, and therefore presumably under law; it would follow that the promise made to Abraham was limited to his descendants who
were under the covenant of law. S. Paul points out, to the contrary, that here all depended on faith, and on an act of faith parallel to that which the Gospel demands. It follows that the principle of $\delta$ ккauo new; and that in this respeet as in others the Gospel is not a breach with the old, but a revival of its fundamental principles in a form in which they reach their perfect exemplification; cf. iii. 21. The case of Abraham was a ourrent thesis of the Rabbinic schools; of. Lightfoot, Gal., p. 158 ff.

1. $\tau \ell$ oiv $\mathrm{t}^{\mathrm{f}} \mathrm{ov} \mu \mathrm{\mu} \boldsymbol{v}=$ what shall we say of Abraham?..., i.e. in relation to the question of boasting and the source of righteousness.
 ... $\theta \in \delta \nu$ as stating an opposed view: but this is too complicated.
тòv $\pi \rho \frac{\pi}{2}$ áropa $\dot{\eta}^{\mu} \omega \bar{v}$. Addressed to Gentiles (as well as Jews); of. 11,12 and 1 Cor. x. 1. The spiritual lineage is an essential strain in S. Paul's conception of religious history.

кагд̀ $\sigma$ ápka. If this goes with $\pi \rho o \pi d$ dropa then the whole clause must be taken as a difficulty raised by a supposed Jew disputant. But it is better taken with $\bar{\epsilon} \rho o \hat{\mu} \mu \epsilon \nu$ in relation to $\bar{\xi} \xi{ }_{\xi}{ }_{\rho} \gamma \omega \nu$ of $v .2$ and $\pi \varepsilon \rho \iota \tau o \mu \eta, v .9 \mathrm{ff}$. $=$ as regards his human condition-his works and the covenant of circumcision ; cf. Hort, R. and E., p. 23.
2. el $\gamma \dot{\alpha}{ }^{\rho}$ 'A. The question bears on our argument, for if Abraham was justified from works, he has the right to boast, and is an exception to our principle which would be a precedent for other exceptions.
 condition was due to a free act of God; not therefore of works, not therefore a subject for personal boasting.
3. $\tau \ell$ रdр $\mathfrak{\eta}$ yp. $\lambda$. Gen. xv. 6; Gal. iii. 6; James ii. 23.
emicrevoev. Here primarily of belief in GoD's word: but this belief implied trust in the faithfulness and power of God, and was therefore essentially faith in the full sense.
enoyiot $\eta$, was reckoned for something more than it actually was because it contained the seed, was the necessary precedent, of that more. For the word in LXX. of. Lev. vii. 8, xvii. 4, with the legal sense of imputation familiar to the Jews; ef. S. H. ref., Weber, Altsyn. Theol., p. 233; of. above ii. 26, ix. 8; 2 Cor. v. 19.
 ture: it was an act of faith that was met by the act of God. No works are mentioned, therefore no works were included in the consideration; if there had been works, the language would have expressed the act of GoD as conferring a due reward; but there is no
such suggestion in the words; they elearly imply a free favour on the part of God.
Eрүa\}opevy has frequently the idea of working for hire, for a living, eto.; of. 1 Thes. ii. 9, al.
 of the qu. in $v .3$ and prepares the way for the enlargement of the idea by the qu., vv. 7, 8. $\pi เ \sigma \tau$. $\mathrm{l}_{\mathrm{i} i}$ brings into explicit statement the notion of trust, not expressed in v. 3. Cf. Moulton, p. 68, who suggests that the substitution of els or $\bar{\epsilon} \pi l \mathrm{w}$. acc. for the simple dative after $\pi$. is peculiarly Christian, and coincides with the deepening of the sense of $\pi$. from belief to trust or faith. The change here is very significant, going, as it does, with the advance from the idea of God as simply faithful to His word $(v .3)$ to the idea of God as acting upon man.

то̀v סıка.ои̂vтa here, as above, = who declares righteous, not who makes righteous; iii. 24, 26, 30. See Introd. p. xxxvi.
ròv $\dot{\alpha} \sigma \epsilon \beta \hat{\eta}$. Not of Abraham, but with the wider reference of the whole clause: of the sinner as ignoring or neglecting God; of. i. 21. It here expresses the thought of the man about himself in the very act of trusting.
6. Davel. Ps. xxxii. 1, 2. The qu. emphasises the act of God in putting away man's sin, without naming conditions; and is used by S. Paul to bring out the wider reference of faith in God, not only as fulfilling promise but as removing and not imputing sin.
tòv $\mu$ aкарь $\mu \dot{\rho} v=$ the blessing (art.)-the act of $\mu$ aкapļєiv. $\quad V .9$ shows that here the blessing is not the congratulation of other men, but comes from God.

Xopls Ëpyov. Conclusion drawn from the absence of any mention of works in qu.
9. i $\mu$ ak. oviv. The blessing mentioned in the ps. is essentially the same as 'the reckoning' of $v .3$; and the question is raised whether it extends to the circumcision only or to all. This is answered by insisting on Abraham's circumstances at the time.
10. Ev $\pi \epsilon \rho เ \tau \circ \mu \hat{\eta}$. The true place of $\pi \epsilon \rho \iota \tau о \mu \eta$ in the history of GoD's dealings with man: it was a sign ( $v .4$ ) of a state already existing and due to God's free gift.
11. $\pi \epsilon \rho \iota \tau \circ \mu \hat{\eta} s$. The gen. of description-not practically different from $\pi є \rho \iota \tau о \mu \dot{\eta} \nu$.
$\sigma \phi \rho a \gamma i \delta a$. App. a common Jewish term for circumcision; of. S. H., Wetst. ad loc., "signum foederis, sigillum Abrahami." For the Jew circumcision marked the inclusion of the individual in the Covenant: here $\mathbb{S}$. Paul treats it as a mark of the righteousness
reckoned by God to Abraham as a result of his faith (a different interpretation), consequently not as excluding others, but as an outward sign and acknowledgment of Abraham's actual position; of. Eph. i. 13.

єis tò elval av่. $\pi$. The essential characteristic of $A$. was righteousness imputed to faith. Circumcision confirmed this, and consequently itself points to the lineage of A . being a lineage dependent on sharing his faith, not on sharing his circumcision.
$\delta_{\imath} \imath^{\prime}$ ákpoßvotias = while in a state of uncircumcision. $=\hat{e} v, v .10$; of. ii. 27 n .
$\tau \grave{\nu} \nu$ Sucalooviv $\eta=$ the same righteousness that was imputed to Abraham.
12. kal $\pi a \tau \epsilon \dot{\rho} \mathrm{pa} \pi \epsilon \rho เ \tau о \mu \eta \mathrm{~g}$. $\pi e \rho$. probably abstr. for concrete, $=\tau \omega ิ \nu \pi \epsilon \rho \tau \epsilon \mu \nu \rho \mu \hat{\ell} \nu \omega \nu$.
roîs oủk ék к.т.入. Among the circumcised only those are sons of Abraham who follow in the steps of the faith which he had before he was circumcised. This is obviously the meaning, but requires the assumption of a primitive error in text. Hort suggests kal aủroîs for kal roîs; W. H., appendix, ad loc.; cf. S. H. and Giff. The alternatives are to accept Hort's emendation or to omit roîs before бтохой $\boldsymbol{\tau}$.
13-16. The relation of law to promise is very briefly treated, just to meet the possible objection that the law is a condition of inheriting the promise, even though it was not an original condition of the promise itself.
13. ov $\gamma \dot{d} \rho \delta\left(\alpha \dot{\alpha}\right.$ vópov, $\gamma{ }^{\alpha} \rho=$ this is a full statement of the case, for law does not come in to qualify it.
Sià vónov, under conditions of law. Abraham was not under law when the promise was made; nor could the fact that his seed came under law affect the range or condition of the original promise; because promise and law have two quite different offices in God's hands: to make inheritance, really based on promise, depend on law is to evacuate the faith, which accepted the promise, of all meaning, and in fact to annul the promise ; because while the promise is given to faith, the law has for its function to emphasise the nature of sin, and transgression can occur only when there is law.
ที $\tau \hat{\varphi} ~ \sigma \pi$ '́ $\rho$ рatı av̉rov̂, 'the seed' (Gen. xxii. 18) is introduced here as recipient of the promise, so as to enforce the above argument as applying to more than Abraham.
тò $k \lambda$. a. $\epsilon$. к. t free summary of the promises.
Sıd $\delta$ ik. $\pi$., under conditions of a righteousness given in response to faith.
14. oi ék vópov, those who base a claim on law, and those only.
 clusive. $\eta \pi .=$ the act of faith seen in Abraham.

кekivvial=is made, by such a qualification, pointless; of. 1 Cor. xv .14, i. 17.

катท́py $\tau_{\text {тal }}=$ is robbed of all meaning; of. Gal. iii. 17.
15. © $\gamma$ àp vó $\mu$ оs...катєрүá̧єтаl. This verse indicates the true function of law, to show that it can have no effect upon the promise; it neither makes nor unmakes the kinship with Abraham, which is a kinship of character (faith) not of works. What the law does is to develop the moral sense of GoD's will; in doing so it inevitably creates the sense of guilt; it cannot in itself evoke faith.
oúbè к.т.入. This clause seems to be added almost automatically; at least its bearing on the context is very difficult to see. Is it possible that it is a primitive gloss? Otherwise=where law is not in question (as in the case of faith and promise), neither can transgression be in question (we have not to consider the acts and doings of Abraham and his true seed, as qualifying them for the promise, but only their attitude towards God, their faith). The subject is worked out in ch. vii. ; of. for similar anticipations iii. 20, 24.
16. Sị̆ тои̂то к.т.入. Here follows the positive side of the argument, of which the negative has been given-not $\epsilon^{\kappa} \kappa \nu \delta \mu_{0 v}$ but кard $\chi d \rho \iota v$. Observe that $\nu \delta \mu o s$ as laying conditions upon men is contrasted with $\pi i \sigma \tau \tau s$, as implying the action of God with $\chi$ ápıs. See. below.

Sıd тоиิтo. Antecedent to $\ell_{\nu}$; for this cause, with this object; cf. Blass, p. 132, §42, 1. Cf. 2 Cor. xiii. 10; 2 Thes. ii. 11 ; 1 Tim. i. 16 ; Phm. 15 ; Heb. ix. 15 (w. $8 \pi \omega s$ ).

₹va кard X Xpıv, se. $\gamma^{\epsilon} \nu \eta \tau a l$, that it might depend on and be measured by God's favour in contrast to man's earning ; cf. iii. 24 and below, chh. v., vi.
eis tò єivau $\beta \in \beta a l a v$. Only if righteousness is the free gift of God could the promise be guaranteed to all the seed: other conditions would have imported an element of insecurity.
$\pi a v \tau \iota \tau \hat{\varphi} \sigma \pi \epsilon \in \rho \mu a r \iota$ determines the meaning of $\tau \hat{\varphi} \sigma \pi \epsilon \rho \rho \mu a \tau \iota$ in $v .13$; contrast Gal. iii. 16.
$\tau \underline{̂}$ êk тoû vórov. The promise is secure to these too, if besides starting from law they have Abraham's faith.

ős $\epsilon \sigma \tau \iota v$ к.т. $\lambda$. expands and emphasises $\pi a \nu \tau i \tau \hat{\varphi} \sigma \pi \epsilon \in \mu a \tau \iota$. $\hat{\eta} \mu \hat{\omega} \nu$, in the widest possible sense.
17. катévavtı ov̊ к.т.入. Of. 2 Cor. ii. 17, xii. 19 ; and esp.


The clause is to be taken with the main sentence, not with the relative clause: the promise to Abraham is secure for the faith of Abraham, wherever it is found, because the promise comes from and the faith rests on the one and the same God who, then as now, now as then, quickens, etc. (Giff., S. H. take it with the relative clause: W. H. and Lft, ad loc., as above.)

тov §. т. v. As v. 19, the type is the birth of Isaac: the antitype is the quickening of man under the action of GoD's grace; cf. 1 Tim. vi. 13; cf. Joh. v. 21, 25 (n. connexion between калєє́v and § $\omega 0$.).
 not $=$ calling into being things that are not ( $=$ eis $\tau \delta$ eival), but either 'naming things that are not as though they were' with reference to the imputed righteousness, or 'summoning to His service things that are not as though they were,' of the call of the descendants of Abraham in the lineage of faith. Then the making the unborn child the vehicle of the promise is typical of this. The context ( $\varsigma \omega 0 \pi$.) points to the latter and fuller meaning, as also does S. Paul's use of калєì ; of. S. H.

It was on the creative power of God that Abraham rested, as is further emphasised in $v .18$.
 stand on hope and trusted, so that he became, etc.
 used with part. ; cf. Moulton, pp. 170, 232.

кatєvó $\boldsymbol{\sigma} \boldsymbol{\epsilon} v$. Really a $\mu$ ѝ̀ clause-though he fully saw...yet ( $\epsilon$ is $\delta \hat{\epsilon}_{1 . . .}$ ).
20. cis = in regard to.

SıєкрiӨŋ. Cf. Mt. xxi. 21; Mk xi. 23; James i. 6 ; = did not hesitate ; of. S. H. ; cf. Field, ad loc. ти̂ ảm., under the disbelief which was natural.
 faith, to beget a son ; cf. Heb. xi, 11, 12, and Talmud qu. S. H.
évరvvapov̂v. Cf. 2 Tim. ii. 1; Eph. vi. 10. Formed from Ėvóvauos; the preposition therefore does not govern a case following; cf. $\epsilon \nu \in \rho \gamma \epsilon i \hat{\nu}$.

Sov̀s Sógav-because he acknowledged God's power to fulfil His promise ; ct. i. 21.
21. $\pi \lambda \eta \rho \circ ф о \rho \eta \theta$ els. Cf. Heb. x. 22; see Lightfoot, Col. iv. 12; Kennedy, Sources, p. 119. =persuaded, convinced. "Almost
exclusively Biblical and Ecclesiastical," Lft, l.c. Eccles. viii. 11 only in Sept. "A word esp. common among the Stoics," S. H.-on what authority? One instance is quoted by Nägeli (p. 63) from the Papyri (2nd cent. A.D.).

22. Sio kal sums up and restates the argument, and so leads to the statement of the parallel between Christians and Abraham, justifying the conclusions of ch. iii.
 2 Tim . iii. 16.
24. тoîs $\pi เ \sigma \tau \in$ viovotv $=0$ olt $\nu$ es $\pi$.
é $\pi i$ ròv ${ }^{\text {É }} \mathbf{\gamma}$. 'I. (1) The trust is personal in a Personal Power, whose Power and Character are revealed in the crucial act. (2) The raising of Jesus is a kind of antitype of the birth of Isaac. Note that the name Jesus is used alone to emphasise the historic factтो̀ к. $\grave{\eta}$. = whom we acknowledge as Lord.
25. ठs mape $\delta \circ{ }^{\prime} \theta \eta$ $\delta \mathrm{ca}$ тd $\pi$. As iii. 25 ; cf. Isa. liii. 12 LXX. Joh. Weiss (op. cit.), p. 172, points out that the two clauses are an instance of the Hebrew tendency to parallelism, and that consequently they must not be regarded as independent statements of distinct elements in the process of redemption; the verbs might be interchanged without affecting the sense; cf. viii. 32; Gal. ii. 20; Eph. v. 2, 25. Of. below, v. 9, $\delta \iota \kappa$. $\epsilon \nu \tau \hat{\varphi}$ a $\downarrow \mu a \tau \iota a$.
 later. Sid= with a view to.

סıkalwotv. v. 18 only; justification as an action $=\delta \iota a$ $\tau \delta$ ठıкatoûv $\dot{\eta}$.

From one point of view, the resurrection of Christ as the act of GoD is the testimony of GoD to the perfection of the Humanity of Christ as well as to His Divinity, the declaration of the complete righteousness of Jesus. As it is through that perfect Humanity, and by union with It, that the Christian is made one with the Christ, the object of the Resurrection is the declaring righteous of those who, by faith, accept the offered condition of righteousness. This leads to the actual making righteous: but that further thought is not included in this statement; $\delta \iota \kappa a l \omega \sigma \iota s$ is limited, as is $\delta \iota \kappa \alpha \iota o \hat{v}$, to the description of Gon's attitude to the sinner. See Introd. p. xxxvi.

On the Resurrection, see S. H. add. note, pp. 116 ff ., and on the connexion of justification with the Resurrection cf. Gifford.

This concludes the first part of the Epistle, in which is set forth what may be called an historical account of the relation of man, both Jew and Gentile, to the revelation of God's Will and to the performance
of the same. It has been shown that the revelation of that Will in the Death and Resurrection of Christ answers to the necessities shown to exist both among Jews and Gentiles; the attitude of both to the Will of God and the character and issues of His dealings with them all point to the Gospel as the one adequate message of righteousness for man. The treatment then has been historical : the great ethical and spiritual principles involved have been used and stated, but not explained ; there follows now the description of these principles as seen by an analysis of the case of the individual sinner (v.-viii.) and of the sinning people (ix.-xi.); and then (xii.f.) the main characters of the Christian life are explained. The argument that follows, in fact, deals with the Gospel as a power of salvation.
C. cc. v.-vii. Second Vindication of the Theme. The Ethioal Need and Bearing of the Gospel, as a Power whioh effects Righteousness. The Power of the Gospel is explained, in contrast with $\nu \delta \mu \circ s$, as a gift ( $\chi$ d $\rho / s$ ) of new life in Christ.

## CHAPTER V.

จ. 1-11. Introduction, describing the nature of the state in which we are, under the power of the Gospel: (1) Since, then, we are justified by God on the single condition of faith, let us maintain the state of peace with God, by the help of Him, (2) by whom we have been brought under this free favour of God, and ground our boasting on hope of attaining the perfection of this state in the future full manifestation of God in us ; (3) and no less in the present straitened condition of our lives, (4) as an opportunity for endurance, proof of character and hope, that hope which cannot disappoint us because it is itself the effect of GoD's love in us; (6) and that love, measured by what was done for us in Christ's death for us while we were enemies and sinners, will certainly complete our salvation by the working of Christ's life in us. (11) So, finally, let us boast in God by the help of our Lord Jesus Christ, through whom, as I have said, we received that reconciliation which is now our state.

These verses describe the state of the Christian. It has been shown to be due to God's free act of justification, requiring only man's faith in Him; it is, summarily, a state of peace with God; it was won by the Death of Christ, and is maintained by His Life; under present conditions it is a state of $\theta \lambda\langle\psi \iota s$, for the man must be tested; but the hope of maintaining and perfecting this state is warranted by the fact that the love which gave it to us will surely maintain us in it and perfect us for its complete realisation. The thought comes out at once that the power of the Gospel is Christ living in us: the section begins and ends with סıà tov̂ Kupiov $\dot{\eta}$. 'I. $\mathrm{X} \rho$. ; of. n. on i. 17 ; the subject is resumed and fully treated in c. viii.
 Notice that in these chapters (v.-vii.) the word $\pi i \sigma \pi \iota s$ occurs only in these first two verses: $\pi \iota \sigma \tau \varepsilon \dot{\omega} \omega$ occurs once only (vi. 8), and then in the simple sense of believe. The fact is that the first fundamental
act of trust, when it has once brought man under the justifying love of God and the power of Christ's life, becomes a permanent though progressive act of submission to and reliance upon that power, a continued act of will realising that power in itself, which is, on man's side, the determining characteristic of the Christian life and is not by S. Paul described exclusively by any one name, but is involved in all the exhortations, and summed up in the phrases $\tau$ ò


єip $ᅱ \downarrow \eta v$. Cf. Acts x. 36 ; Joh. xvi. 33. With $\chi$ ápıs, it is the unfailing element in S. Paul's salutations, and gives him his characteristic phrase ó $\theta \in d s ~ \tau \eta ̂ s ~ \epsilon i \rho \dot{\eta} \eta \eta s(x v .33$, xvi. 20; 2 Cor. xiii. 11; Phil. iv. 9 (cf. 7) ; 1 Thes. v. 23; 2 Thes. iii. 16 ( $\delta$ ки́pıos $\tau . є$. ); cf. Col. iii. 15 ; Heb. xiii. 20). The cardinal passage is Eph. ii. 14-17. Like $\chi$ ápss, it has special reference to the call of the Gentiles, but as involved in the wider conception of the establishment of man as man in a state of peace with God by the removal of sin. The first step is the justification of man upon faith : then that state has to be maintained.
 of exhortation is clearly required by the context (against Field, ad loc.); S. Paul is passing from the description of the fundamental initial act of God in bringing man into this state, to the character and duties of the state so given. The verb ex $\chi$ el is durative= to maintain hold on, and here it has its strict sense-let us maintain (better than the ambiguous 'have') peace; this requires further activities in man, and the continual help of the Lord; cf. Moulton, p. 110.

8ià т. к. ท ' $\mathbf{I}$. $\mathrm{X} \boldsymbol{\rho}$. The fuller name is given because each element in it is an assurance that the help will be given and will be effective, and ought to be claimed.
2. $\delta \iota^{\prime}$ ov kal, the Person, who has brought us into this state by His Death and Resurrection, will help us to maintain it by His Life.

Tクे่ тробаушүウ̀v. Eph. ii. 18, iii. 12 only. Vb 1 Pet. iii. 18; of. Joh. xiv. 6 ; Heb. iv. 14 f. The vb in LXX. freq. of bringing persons and sacrifices before God for acceptance. Here of the initial approach; in Eph. iii. 12 of continual right of access.
 145.

тท̂ $\pi$ iбrel. Perh. = for our faith-the way has been opened for faith to approach God.
eis $\tau \grave{v} v$ Xápıv тaúт $\eta v$. The demonstrative clearly shows that the
reference is to God's free favour shown to man in justifying him. The dominant meaning of $\chi$ d́pıs in the Bible is God's favour shown to man, the effect of His love. The word is a favourite with S. Paul, and has special but not exclusive reference to the light thrown upon GoD's favour, by the inclusion of the Gentiles. This thought is implied here. They have been brought within the range of God's favour, as described; cf. Hort, 1 Pet. p. 25 f., 49, 66 f.; Robinson, Eph. p. 221 f. ; cf. Gal. v. 4; 1 Pet. v. 12.

غ́ $\sigma \tau \eta \dot{\kappa} \alpha \mu \in \nu$, 'we stand'; cf. Moulton, p. 147; Burton, § 75, etc.; 1 Pet. v. 12 ; cf. 1 Cor. xv. 1.

каvхш́нe日a. Indic., to be taken with $\delta \delta^{\prime}$ ov. Here is the Christian opportunity for boasting; of. iii. 27.
$\dot{\pi} \pi^{\prime} \quad \lambda \pi\left(\delta \iota \tau \eta \delta \delta \sigma_{\xi} \eta s \tau\right.$. 0 . The ground of Ohristian boasting is not a privileged or exclusive state, but a hope that by the work of the Lord Jesus Christ the glory of God will be revealed in man; it rests, then, on God's favour and embraces mankind ; of. on iii. 23, Col. i. 27.
3. ov̉ $\mu$ óvov $\delta$ é, ad $\lambda \lambda$..$v .11$, viii. 23, ix. 10; 2 Cor. viii. 19; of. 1 Tim. v. 13. With the ellipse only in S. Paul; not only is the hope of the future revelation a ground of boasting, but also the process of $\theta \lambda i \psi / s$, by which, under conditions of the present life, it is being worked out ; cf. Joh. xvi. 33 ; Acts xiv. 22. The idea is fully worked out in 2 Cor. iv. 8-12.

ท่ $0 \lambda$ ( $\psi$ ıs. xii. $12 ; 2$ Thes. i. 4.
4. Soкıцทे. (1) The process of testing, 2 Cor. viii. 2; (2) the result -the temper given to the steel, Phil. ii. 22 ; 2 Cor. ii. 9 , ix. 13, xiii. 3 : here the latter; cf. 1 Pet. i. 6 ff.; James i. 2, 12. $\theta \lambda i \psi / s$ produces in the Christian endurance or resistance, and this Christian endurance tempers character; the tempered character, as evidence of Gon's working so far, itself produces hope; and this hope, so grounded and won, cannot disappoint him who has it.
5. кataloxúvel, in this connexion= brings the shame of disappointment; cf. Ps. xxi. 6 ; infra ix. 33 ; Phil. i. 20.
őть ท̂ áyámๆ к.т.入. vv. 5-10 enlarge upon the strength of the reasons for hope, an a fortiori argument from the love of God, as already shown in our call and justification in Christ, to the willingness and ability of that love for the completion of His work. Cf. viii. $35,39$.

ग̀ $\dot{\alpha} \boldsymbol{\gamma} \dot{\alpha} \pi \eta$ тov̂ $\theta \in o \hat{v}=$ the love which is characteristic of God in His eternal nature, and therefore in His relation to man, constituting His true relation to man and making the Incarnation divinely natural ; further, this love is, as it were, by the agency of the Holy

Spirit, resident in man, and becomes to him the power of moral and spiritual action by which the new character is originated and gradually developed in the processes of life. It is not the mere sentiment of affection, but an influence of the divine activity which creates its own image in its object and vitalises it into a life like its own. A faint reflection of this divine operation is seen in the way in which a father's or a friend's love influences character. The fundamental passage is Joh. xvii. 26 ; cf. 1 Joh. iv. 12 et passim. In S. Paul note particularly 2 Thes. iii. 5 (Lft's note) and 2 Cor. v. 14 ; Eph. iii. 19 ; infra viii. 35, 36.
ékкéxutal. Cf. Acts ii. 17, 18, 33.
év raîs K., the love of God has flooded our hearts.
$\delta \mathrm{La} \pi v . \alpha \dot{\alpha}, \tau . \delta . \eta$. $\mathrm{\eta}$. viii. $9,11,15$. The gift of the Spirit is almost always referred to as a definite act in the past ( $\epsilon \delta \omega \kappa \in \nu$, é $\lambda \dot{\alpha} \beta \epsilon \tau \epsilon$ ) ; cf. 1 Cor. ii. 12 ; 2 Cor. i. 22; Gal. iii. 2; Eph. i. 13, al. but n. pres. 1 Thes. iv. 8 ref. Ezek. xxxvii. 14. Pentecost was the date of the giving of the Spirit to the Church; baptism with the laying on of hands is the date for each individual.
$\pi v$. di. The first mention of the Holy Spirit in this epistle: the truth here indicated is developed in ch. viii.
6. $\epsilon \ell \boldsymbol{\gamma}$. "Si quidem, 2 Cor. v. 3 (v. l.) ; Eph. iii. 2, iv. 21; Col. i. 23 (classical)," Blass, p. 261. =if, as you will not dispute.

The connexion seems to be this: Christ's death for us when we were still outside the operation of the Spirit is such an overwhelming proof of GoD's love, that it must surely justify all the confidence we can put in it, now that by the indwelling of the Spirit it is a vital power within us. The connexion of these sentences is obscure: it is perhaps best to take $\epsilon l$ l $\gamma \epsilon \ldots \dot{d} \pi \epsilon \theta a \nu \epsilon \nu$ as protasis, $\mu \delta \lambda \iota s \quad \gamma \mathrm{a} \rho \ldots$ $\dot{\alpha} \pi \epsilon \in \theta a \nu \in \nu$ (8) as parenthesis; $\pi o \lambda \lambda \hat{\varphi}$ ovi ${ }^{\prime}$ (9) picks up the apodosis: then $v .10$ in a very characteristic way repeats the main thought in a parallel pair of antithetic clauses. The whole 6-10 incl. is an expansion of $v .5 b$.
$\dot{\alpha} \sigma \theta \epsilon v \hat{\omega} v$, having 'no power of ourselves to help ourselves.' The word is specially chosen to mark the contrast with the new power which is in the Christian : not used quite in this way elsewhere.
érı, with ö $\nu \tau \omega \nu$, of. v. 8, A.V., R.V. But étı almost invariably precedes the word it qualifies, except with negatives (e.g. Rev. viii. 16) or rarely when it has special emphasis. So better here with kard̀ kalpòv, 'while there was yet opportunity,' before the case was hopeless. The rhythm of the sentence points the same way.
$\dot{\alpha} \boldsymbol{\sigma} \in \beta \hat{\omega} \nu$ marks not the weakness, but the relation to God.
7, 8 emphasise the uniqueness of this act of love. This parenthesis
makes an anacoluthon，a constant mark in S．Paul of deep feeling．

7．Sıkalov－dyabov̂．Both masc．The idea is that the appeal of a righteous character hardly stirs the emotion；the good man with more that touches the heart may inspire such an act．Those for whom Christ died were neither．
$\tau 0 \lambda \mu \underset{q}{=}=$＇has the spirit to die＇；cf．Field，ad loc．，qu．Eur．Alc． 644.

8．ovviorఇбเv．Of，iii， 5.
 perfection（v．2）which depends on the love of God is justified a fortiori by our experience of that love in the act of justification．
 negative side，of the $\sigma \omega t \eta p i a$ which is the result of the power of the Gospel（i．16）．The $\delta \rho \gamma \hat{\eta}$（ $\mathrm{cf} . \mathrm{i} .18 \mathrm{f}$ ．）consists now in a state of sin and hereafter in the consequencesj of that state being persevered in． Note that justification does not remove the conflict with evil；it reveals God＇s attitude of love to us and in us，and consequently enables us to engage in that conflict with hope．

10 repeats the $a$ fortiori argument with amplification（of．Eph．ii． 11 f．）．The two clauses are exactly \｜｜vv． 6 and 9.
$\kappa \alpha \tau \eta \lambda \lambda \alpha, \gamma \eta \mu \epsilon \nu$ ref．to $\delta \iota \kappa \alpha \iota \omega \theta \in \nu \tau \epsilon s$ ；cf，the aorists below．Vb and subst．pec．to Rom．and 2 Cor．（al． 1 Cor．vii．11）．גтоката入入． Eph．，Col．only．סıa入入．and $\sigma v \nu a \lambda \lambda .$, implying mutual reconciliation （cf．Mt．v．24），are never used in this connexion．Always there－ fore of God reconciling（not，as being reconciled）．It marks the same stage as oıcaloồ ；the means employed is the Death of Christ； man＇s state，which necessitates it，is that of é $\chi \theta \rho o i, \alpha \pi \pi \eta \lambda \lambda о \tau \rho \iota \omega \mu e ́ v o c$. The fullest passage is 2 Cor．v． 18 f ．

Sıà т тиิ Oavátov т．v．a．Cf，Col．i． 20 ；see vi． 2 ff ．
$\sigma \omega \theta \eta \sigma$ ó $\mu \in \theta a$ includes both the maintenance of the state of peace and the final result；as does $\sigma \omega \tau \eta \rho i a$.
 resurrection life of the Lord as the sustaining environment and inspiration of the new life of the Christian ；cf． 2 Cor．iv．10，11； Eph．iv． 18 fí．

11．ov̉ $\mu$ óvov $\delta \hat{\epsilon}, \dot{d} \lambda \lambda \alpha{ }_{\alpha}$ returns to $v$ ．3．This return，after so long a break，is made easier by the parallelisms pointed out above．kav－ X ${ }^{\boldsymbol{\omega}} \boldsymbol{\mu} \mathrm{v}$ or，part．for indic．；cf．Moulton，p． 224.
év $\tau \hat{\varphi}$ 伦色．The essentially personal character of the whole re－ lation is emphasised：our boast is not in a transaction or a state， but in God Himself and by the help of our Lord Jesus Christ－so
summing up the whole argument. God loved, justified through Christ, gave the Spirit, will finish what He has begun.
N. This passage then marks the transition from the antithesis between $\pi / \sigma \tau / s$ and $\nu b \mu o s$, as ground of justification, to the antithesis of $\chi$ d́ $\rho \stackrel{1}{ }$ and $\nu b \mu \circ s$, as ground of the saving of man's life; the faith in God, which accepts His justification, must lead us on to trust His good will and power to perfect the new life, which is the life of Christ in us. This is the supreme instance of His $\chi d \rho \iota s$, His free favour to man. The range and manner in which this $\chi$ ápss works are developed in the following sections.

12-21. This state depends upon a living relation of mankind to Christ, analogous to the natural relation to Adam, and as universal as that is. So it comes to pass that there is a parallel between the natural state of man and his new condition: by one who was man the sin which has been shown to be universal entered into man's world, and this sin was the cause of man's death, extending to all men because all actually sinned ; (13) for that sin was in the world just in the degree that law was (sin not being reckoned without law) (14) is proved by the fact that death held supreme sway from Adam to Moses, even though the men of that time sinned not, as Adam did, against a positive external command (but only by falling away from the inner standard of well-doing which they had from God). [So far Adam is connected with men merely as the first sinner; their state was due to their own sins, and those not quite like Adam's sin.] Now Adam is a type of Him that was to come. (15) There is a parallel between the transgression of Adam, and the gift of GoD in Christ; but only a qualified parallel : (a) it was the fall of the single man that led to the death of all, a human origin ; the gift is the free favour of God in giving what He does give to all in the single man, and that man Jesus Christ, the Ascended Son. (16) Again ( $\beta$ ) the effect of GoD's gift is out of all proportion to the result which followed upon one man's having sinned; for while the judgment of God followed upon one sin and involved condemnation, the gift of God follows upon many sins and involves acquittal of all. (17) For it is obvious that the sway of death established by one man's sin, and through his action, is far more than overthrown by the kingship realised in life by the help of the one (man) Jesus Christ, which they will gain who accept the superabundance of the favour of God and His generous gift of righteousness (there is far more than a restoration of what was lost). (18) With these qualifications then the parallel may be stated: As one man's transgression so affected all men as to bring
them under GoD's condemnation, so also one man's enacted righteousness affects all men so as to bring them into a state of justification which involves life; for just as the disobedience of the one man was the means whereby all were put into the condition of sinners, so also the obedience of one man will bring all into the condition of righteous men (if, as has been shown, they exercise faith). (20) Now law, whether pre-Mosaic or Mosaic, was imported into man's experience to multiply the fall; but where the acts and state of $\sin$ were thus multiplied, the favour of God was shown in still greater abundance in order that, in antithesis to the reign gained by $\sin$ in the state of death, the favour of God might gain sovereignty in a state of righteousness leading to life eternal by the aid and working of Jesus Christ our Lord.
This is perhaps the most condensed passage in all S. Paul's writings. It is consequently almost impossible to give an interpretation with confidence. The fundamental thought appears to be to establish the universal range of the power of the Gospel, as answering to the universal range of sin and man's need. The universality is then based in each case on the relation of the whole race to one man. As regards sin, its universality is related, in a way which must be called obscure, to the connexion of the race with Adam ; their humanity is derived from him; and his fall has its results in them; this seems rather to be concluded from the observed fact that all came under the sentence of death pronounced on him for his fall, than upon any theory that in some sense they sinned in him ; they died $(15,17)$ because of his sin, but also they sinned themselves; it was the death rather than the sin that they inherited, and individually they justified, so to speak, the verdict of death by their own sin. What they inherited was a nature liable to death; they made it, each for himself, a sinful nature. Note that it is not said that men sinned in Adam or because Adam sinned; but that man died because Adam sinned; death established the mastery thus initiated because men also sinned. At last the vicious series was broken: one Man broke the universal practice of sin, enacted righteousness and by so doing brought within the reach of all men justification, as God's free gift, and a power to realise that justification in their own lives, a power which brings life because it is His own life imparted to them. Thus is the sovereignty of the favour of God established instead of the sovereignty of sin and death. The relation to the one Man, in this case, is a relation of imparted life, as in the former case it is a relation of entailed death. In each case the entail is realised for each person by his
own act : in the first case, by an act of sin; in the second case, by an act of faith. The Second Adam broke the entail by the fact that He did not $\sin (v .18)$; and that condition He imparts by communication of His own life. See Additional Note, p. 210.

The analysis of the structure is this: the anacoluthon in $v .12$ is due to the interruption of the intended statement of the universality of $\chi \alpha{ }^{\alpha} \rho \iota s$ and $\zeta \omega \dot{\eta}$, by the expansion of the thought of the sway of death. The completion of the original idea is then undertaken in $v v .15,16,17$, but only by noting certain qualifications of the parallel which is to be drawn ; then, v. 18 f ., the parallel is finally stated.

Sıd. тov̂ro. The Christian state being as described in $v v .1-11$, it follows that GoD's act in the Gospel has a universal range.
 brought sin into the world of created humanity; sin was no longer a possibility but a fact.
kal $\delta$ tà $\tau \hat{\eta} s$ áp. ó $\theta$ ávaros, the death we know : death as we know it came into man's experience by the act of Adam. The question is not raised, still less answered, whether without sin man's nature would have been liable to death; S. Paul is dealing with our experience of death and its natural associations, alike for Jew and Gentile, as the destruction of life and separation from God. It was sin which gave death this character, and this character, reinforced by the sins of men, led to the tyranny of death over the human spirit. It appears therefore that S . Paul is not distinguishing between physical and moral death, but regarding death as a fact in its full significance in relation to the whole nature of man. See p. 218.

кal ovitws. кal is the simple conj. and the clause is part of the $\dot{\omega} \sigma \pi \epsilon \rho$ sentence, not the apodosis; that would require oü $\tau \omega \boldsymbol{c}$ кal.
ó $\theta$ ávaros $\delta i \hat{\eta} \lambda \theta \in \mathrm{cv}$. The primary stress is on the universality of death, initiated by one sin, reinforced by sin in every man. The universality of sin has already been argued. The order throws stress on $\epsilon i$ s $\pi$. $\dot{a}$. The aorists are 'constative,' they "represent a whole action simply as having occurred without distinguishing any steps in its progress"; Moulton, p. 109.
 range of death included all men because all sinned. The death, which received its character from Adam's sin, retained its character because each and every man in turn sinned. All principles of interpretation require us to take sin here in the same sense as in ch. i. 18 f . There it is clear that $\sin$ involves conscious neglect of knowledge of God and His Will, in however elementary a degree.

It is an individual act against light. To suppose that ${ }^{\epsilon} \nu$ ' ${ }^{\prime} \delta \bar{\delta} \mu$ is to be supplied, is to suppose that the most critical point of the argument is unexpressed. $\epsilon \phi \Phi{ }_{\Phi}=$ ' on the ground that'; of. 2 Cor. v. 4; Blass, p. 137.
13. äxpt yd̀p vópov=just so far as there was law there was sin. It has been shown (ii. 14, 15) that there was law, in a certain and true sense, before the law given to Moses; action against this law was sin, and the fact that it was so is here confirmed by the consideration that the penalty of sin, death, was obviously present in the world before the law of Moses was given. yad then introduces a fresh piece of evidence of the universality of sin-for death, as understood by sinners, was there, therefore $\sin , \sin$ in proportion to knowledge. So I take áxpt $\boldsymbol{v}$. $=$ up to the degree of law, just to the extent to which law was present. So duaptia, anarthrous-men's acts had the character of sin. See Additional Note, p. 210.
duaptla $\delta \hat{e}$, sc. but that law was present, and therefore men's acts were sins, is shown by the reign of death; the law in question is shown to be the law described in ii. 14 f., because the reign of death, the punishment of sin, extended over men who did not sin as Adam did against a positive external command. The two verses 13, 14 together justify the statement mávecs $\eta$ ク̈aprov. See Add. Note, p. 213.
14. Eßarinevrev, the 'constative aorist'; Moulton, p. 109.
 sinned against positive law, and Moses who delivered positive law. In the case of Adam and of those who lived under the Mosaic law

eni roves $\mu \eta{ }^{2} \alpha \mu$. It is noticeable that as sinners men are here distinguished from Adam: their sin was of a different kind; but still it was $\sin$, action against light, though the light came in a different way, that is, through the inner experience of the knowledge of God; i. 18 f .
$\dot{\epsilon \pi i} \tau \bar{\varphi} \dot{\delta} \mu . \quad \tau . \pi$. 'A. The dominant fact in the sin of Adam was that he acted in spite of a positive command : other men acted in spite of the inner light.
 to come.' Adam is typical of Christ in his natural relation to men. The words introduce the parallel now to be stated: tr. 'and he is a type,' etc.; and so there is a parallel in the relations, but a parallel with qualifications. So $\dot{d} \lambda \lambda \dot{\alpha}$, not $\gamma$ áp, follows.
15. Tò $\chi^{\text {áplor }}$ a here is the gift of justification offered in Christ; in range this has as large an effect as the fall; but in quality
it is far greater, as it leads to life, the other to death. This conclusion is not fully stated till $v .17$.

 to $\delta \in \tau_{s}$; of. Lft, ad loc. There are two steps omitted here; Adam's fall lead to his death, death thus introduced spread because all sinned. So, ultimately, it was owing to one man's sin that the many died. Similarly, in the parallel clause, the individual condition of faith and the actual result ( $\zeta \omega \dot{\eta})$ are omitted.
$\mathfrak{\eta}$ Xápıs тov̂ $\theta \in o v ̂$, the favour of God. ท $\boldsymbol{\eta} \delta \omega \rho \in d$, His generous giving, emphasises $\chi$ d́pıs; and then this $\chi$ ápıs is further described as the favour of the Ascended Lord, the one Man (of. 2 Cor. xiii. 14 and viii. 9), to bring out the parallel. The words express the attitude of God to sinning man-His love in all its fulness; not the effect of that love.
 infinite love, and, as will be shown presently, in its effects. But here the nature of the act alone is in question. If its effects were in question, the aorist would scarcely stand.
cis rov̀s mo入入ov̀s, with è $\pi \epsilon \rho i \sigma \sigma \epsilon v \sigma \epsilon \nu$, abounded in fact, as shown in its effects; what those effects were is then expressed, generally in
 sions united in (18) $\delta \iota \kappa a l \omega \sigma \iota \nu \zeta \omega \eta$ §s.
16. kal oủX-тò $\delta \omega \dot{\rho} \eta \mu a$. Still more condensed. $\delta \omega \dot{p} \eta \mu \alpha$ is the concrete effect or result of $\chi \alpha{ }^{\prime} \rho \iota s$ and $\delta \omega \rho \in \alpha \dot{c}$.
 into the world) ; the gift came after many sins.

The v.l. $\dot{\alpha} \mu a \rho \tau \dot{\eta} \mu a \tau o s$ is a true gloss: the absence of the article makes the phrase = through one man's sin : the participial form of the phrase emphasises the responsibility of the act.

тò $\mu$ èv $\gamma \mathrm{d} \rho$ к.т. $\boldsymbol{\lambda}$. This is explained and must be interpreted by the second $\gamma \dot{\alpha} \rho$ clause, v. 17.

крiцa. GoD's decision upon the act of sin led to the imposition of a penalty. $\quad$ és évòs. Neuter.

ката́крцца. See Deissmann, B. S. II. p. 92. A very rare word. Papyri seem to show that it=a burden imposed upon an estate in consequence of a legal judgment : so a judicial penalty of any kind : 'poena condemnationem sequens.'

Xáptora. The gift which God gives, after many sins, leads to aequittal.

ठıкаi $\omega \mu \alpha$. Here $=$ acquittal, $)(\kappa \alpha \tau d \kappa \rho \iota \mu \alpha$ : justification is a sentence of acquittal, though on condition of faith.
17. тథ̣ тараттஸ́ $\mu a \tau$. таратт. is used throughout of the actual fall, whether of Adam, or as repeated in his descendants, v. 20.
 the instrument; $\delta\llcorner\alpha$ тov, the agent. The one was the agent, his fall the instrument by which death entered and established its sovereignty : repeats $12 a$.
$\pi \circ \lambda \lambda \bar{\varphi} \mu \hat{a} \lambda \lambda o v$. The idea seems to be that the state of those who receive GoD's gift is far more than a mere deliverance from death; it is a new life and actual sovereignty.
ot... $\lambda a \mu \beta$ ávovtes. Here is expressed the condition for realising GoD's gift, its reception by faith, parallel to the (unexpressed) condition of the extended sovereignty of death, the sin of each man.
 Here again the excess of Gon's love finds expression : it is not merely justification ( $\delta \iota \kappa \alpha \iota o u ̂ v, ~ \delta \iota \kappa \alpha i \omega \sigma \iota s)$, acquittal, which is given; but positive righteousness under the operation of the new life of Christ in men.
dv $\mathfrak{\xi} \omega \mathrm{y}$. The antithesis of 1 Cor. xv .22.
 but this abstract expression would not represent the vivid thought of the condition of those who receive, etc., as sharing not only the life but the sovereignty of the Lord; of. Eph. ii. 5, 6. The future is used because of the hypothesis implied in oi $\lambda a \mu \beta$ ávovtes; it includes not only the future glorified state of the redeemed but their present share in the Lord's already established sovereignty.

Sıd тov̂ évòs 'I. Xp. It is not necessary again to emphasise the Human Nature by repeating àvepórov; it is understood. N. that 'I. $\mathbf{X} \rho$. means Jesus as Ascended Christ. He is the Agent through whom God's gift comes to men.
18. dpa oviv. The parallel is now summed up without the qualifications, in the simplest form.

ఱs $\delta \iota$ ' évòs к.т.入. The best way of translating seems to be to turn eis $\pi \dot{\alpha} \nu \tau a s \dot{\alpha} \nu \theta \rho$. into a statement-all men were affected. The prepositional form seems almost to be chosen in order to avoid a definite statement as to the nature of the nexus between the one man and all men.
els катákpı $\mu a$, sc. $\theta a \nu a ́ \tau o v i . l \mid ~ e l s ~ \delta i к . ~ \zeta \omega \eta ̂ s . ~ . ~$
סt' évòs Sıкatẃpatos. Possibly as above, 'through one man's acquittal,' as an accomplished fact ; but the antithesis to $\pi$ rapá $\pi \tau \omega \mu a$,
 'righteous act' or 'enacted righteousness.' We have to choose between an inexact antithesis here, or a difference in the meaning of $\delta \iota к a l \omega \mu a$ here and in $v, 16$.
 negative setting aside of $\sin$ ，but the positive gift of life．
$\xi \omega \eta \mathrm{s}$ ．The gen．of definition－an acquittal involving life．
19．$\omega \sigma \pi \epsilon \rho ~ \gamma \dot{\rho} \rho \kappa . \tau . \lambda$ ．The antithesis is repeated in another form， for clearness of thought．

таракоท＇．This word is substituted for $\pi а \rho a ́ \pi \tau \omega \mu a$ as definitely involving the personal action．

катєбтáӨŋनav．Cf，James iv．4．＝were brought into the con－ dition of sinners－i．e．under the doom of death；the condition then realised by their own sins．
 justified men－again the condition to be realised by their own faith； marked by the future tense．

20．vópos $\delta \grave{\text { è }}$ к．т．入．The effect of law，whether the inner law or the law of Moses，was to multiply the fall，i．e．to occasion in each the fall which had taken place in Adam（cf．ch．vii．），so that each became a sinner by his own act in rejecting knowledge；cf．＇every man is the Adam of his own soul．＇
mapeเ⿱亠䒑$\lambda \lambda \theta \epsilon v$ ．The force of the compound is that law came in as an additional element in man＇s experience，not as it were on the direct line of natural development but as an extra imported element，both the inner light and the outer law being especial gifts of God．
¿va．$\pi \lambda \epsilon o v a ́ \sigma \eta$ ．Cf．iii．19，vii． 7 ff．，esp．13，14．We cannot avoid taking tya as final．The knowledge of GoD＇s will was necessary for man＇s moral development；it was necessary to make what was sin to be realised as $\sin$（iii．20）．
ov̂ $\delta \mathbf{\epsilon}$ к． $\boldsymbol{\tau} \cdot \boldsymbol{\lambda}$ ．The resources of GoD＇s favour were abundantly equal to this multiplied demand upon it．

ข์ாєрєтєрí $\boldsymbol{\sigma} \epsilon \cup \sigma \epsilon v$ ，＇became still more abundant．＇
21．โva $\ddot{W}^{\circ} \pi \pi \epsilon \rho$ к．т．入．Here the reign of death is shown to be as a matter of fact the reign of $\sin$ in the atmosphere of death；a summary again of i． 18 f ．
èv $\tau \hat{\varphi}$ Oavátழ．The $\|$ eis jwìv shows that év here is not in－ strumental，but describes the sphere or atmosphere in which sin reigned．
$\dot{\eta}$ Xápls к．т．入．，the grace or favour of God might gain its sovereignty under the condition of righteousness leading to eternal life by the action and agency of the Ascended Man Jesus Christ，now our Lord．Xápis，as throughout，describes not the state of man but the attitude of God towards man．

Sıd Sıxaloov́vŋs＝in or under a condition or state of righteousness：
of. 17 b and for $\delta$ oa ii. 27 n . The elaborate phrasing is due to the difficulty of getting an exact antithesis. The exact verbal antithesis would be $\dot{\eta} \delta u x a \iota o \sigma ט ́ v \eta()(\dot{\eta} \dot{\alpha} \mu a \rho \tau i a) \beta$. $̇ \nu \quad \zeta \omega \hat{\eta} \quad()(\dot{\epsilon} \nu \tau \hat{\varphi}$ $\theta a \mathrm{v}$.$) ; but the true power of sovereignty is not man's righteousness$ but GoD's grace; so $\grave{\eta} \chi$ ápls is put as the subject; then $\delta \iota \kappa a l o \sigma v v^{\nu} \eta$ expresses the state of man under the sovereignty of $\chi$ ápcs, and is therefore introduced by $\delta(d)$; and for $\hat{e} \nu \zeta \omega \hat{y}$ (cf. $17 b$ ) the description of the new atmosphere in which man is or the new power by which man lives (already implied in $\dot{\eta} \chi \dot{\alpha} \rho \iota s$ ) is substituted els $\zeta$. al. as the end to which all tends; and the whole argument is summed up in the phrase $\delta \iota{ }^{2}$ ' $I$. $\mathbf{X} \rho . \tau$. K. $\dot{\eta}$., which comes almost as a refrain (ef, vii. 17, viii. 23).

It is essential throughout the passage to bear in mind the argument of i. 18-iii. 31, and in particular the position there made plain that the sinful state is made actual in each man by his own act, just as the state of righteousness to be made actual in each man requires the personal act of faith.

Then in ch. vi. S. Paul passes from this description of God's favour or grace in its range, effectiveness and purpose to consider man's duty as the object of this grace.
> vi-vii. 6. The ethical bearing and standard of the new life in Christ.

## CHAPTER VI.

(1) Are we to conclude that the state of $\sin$ is to continue, as a provocative, so to speak, of the graciousness of God ; the more sin the greater grace? (2) It is a monstrous thought; the fundamental characteristic of our Christian position is that when we became Christians we died to sin and our sinful life, (3) it is elementary that in baptism into Christ we shared His death, (4) His burial, and His resurrection by the manifest act of the Father; now we are in a new life and our conduct must be correspondingly new. (5) For baptism involved union of our nature to Christ's both in His death and His resurrection; (6) His death implies the destruction of the old nature, the abolition of the rule of $\sin$; His resurrection, shared by us-a freeing from death and sin, a living to God -implies that we are dead to sin and in Him living to God (so that sin is in the highest degree unnatural to this new creature). (12) Therefore both the use and the obedience of even your mortal body must be rendered no longer to sin for unrighteous work, but to God for righteousness; the authority of sin being broken because you are not under law but under grace. (15) Not under law, but not therefore free to sin, for that were a return to the old slavery; but under grace, you are under a new slavery (to use human language), willingly adopted ; (19) your very members must be turned from the old slavery to the new. (20) For that was a state of slavery and freedom-freedom as against the claims of righteousness, slavery to the claims of sin and its result in death: (21) from that slavery you are freed and brought into a new slavery to GoD; with its proper result, sanctification, leading to its end, eternal life. (23) For all that is earned from sin is death : but God gives, of His free grace, eternal life by communion with Christ Jesus our Lord.

The section deals with the response natural in those who are under God's grace. It is, incidentally, a repudiation of the charge made against S . Paul that, by denying the obligation of law, he was
destroying the support and the obligation of a holy life. It gives consequently the true basis for a Christian ethics : and the fundamental point is the new life in union with and dependence on Christ.

1. $\tau \mathfrak{l}$ oủv $\mathfrak{E \rho} \rho \hat{\mu} \mu \epsilon v$; as always, introduces a question putting a case which might occur to the reader.
$\dot{\ell} \pi \iota \mu \dot{\varepsilon} \nu \omega \mu \epsilon v$. So far the emphasis has been chiefly upon the free grace of God as justifying; this might suggest that human effort is not required: and S. Paul meets this by pointing out that as God justifies in Christ alone, communion with Christ is necessary for the individual actualisation of justification, and this involves a characteristic life.

ท่ Xdipıs, that the generosity and marvel of GoD's free favour may be multiplied by increasing the demand upon it.
2. oittves, the appeal is to the character of the Christian-'seeing we are men who...'.
ȧtӨávopev definitely refers to baptism as explained $v v .3$ f. тn̂ גцартia =our $\sin$, the state of $\sin$ in which we were; cf. Gal. ii. 19.
 1 Cor. x. 1, xii. 1 al .; as always, appealing to an admitted principle of Christian instruction.

It has been suggested that here and in 1 Cor. xv. 4 we have a reference to a primitive Baptismal Confession of the Death, Burial and Resurrection. See Clemen Erklärung, p. 172.
 and Gal. iii. $27:=$ were brought by baptism into union with Christ: this community of life is the fundamental thought of the passage, as determining the natural and necessary character of the Christian life.
els $\mathbf{X} \boldsymbol{\rho}$. ' ${ }^{\prime} \eta \boldsymbol{\eta}$. The union is with the full life of the Son as seen both in His Humanity and in His ascended state.
cis ròv Oávarov av̉. : the first stage of the Christian life is death, a death, in its kind, of the same quality as the death of Jesus (cf. 2 Cor. iv. 10), i.e. a death to sin, cf. v. 10.
4. $\sigma v v \epsilon \tau \alpha ́ \phi \eta \mu \epsilon v$. Col. ii. 12 only ; cf. 1 Cor. xv. 4 ; Acts xiii. 29. It is remarkable that S. Paul, alone in N.T. outside the Gospels, lays stress on the Burial : he alone was not an eyewitness of the circumstances of the Death, and therefore for him the burial was of high significance, in its evidential value.
eis т. $\theta$. Closely with $\tau 0 \hat{v} \beta$.-through that baptism into His Death.
tva. The purpose of this sharing the death and burial is negative as regards the old life of sin, but positive also, that we might enter into the atmosphere of the new life and walk in it.
 of the Father in the raising of Christ; $\delta$ เd, instrum. ; cf. Joh. xi. 40, Col. i. 11. The resurrection of Christ is a revelation of the Father.

тои̂ тarpós. Cf. Joh. v. 21; Acts i. 4, 7, ii. 33 (only in A); Eph. ii. 18, iii. 14; Col. i. 12 (?) ; 1 Pet. i. 17; 1 Joh. i. 2, 3, ii. 1, 15 al. (7); 2 Joh. (3) ; Rev. (4).

The use of $\delta$ тavíp absolutely is dominantly characteristic of S. John (but cf. also Mt. xi. 25 f. || Lk.; xxiv. 36 || ; xxviii. 19). It occurs in S. Paul and Acts only as above (but n. Gal. iv. 6). This is the only place where it is used alone in connexion with the resurrection; and consequently it calls marked attention to the character of the resurrection as an act not of power only but of the love of the Father to His Son, and through the Son to those that are His. This thought emphasises the obligations of the new life which has its ultimate source in that love.
oütws therefore covers the whole thought of the $\dot{\omega} \sigma \pi \epsilon \rho$ clause : as in rising Christ left all that was dead behind, as that rising was due to the Father's love and power, as we share that rising, so we must leave our dead selves behind and walk etc.
g $\omega \eta$ is the principle of life, not the manner of life (cf. Gifford and see Lft, Igna. Rom. 7); the fresh vigour of a new principle of life (cf. viii. 2) is the motive power of Christian conduct ( $\pi \epsilon \rho \iota \pi a \tau \eta \sigma \omega \mu \epsilon \nu$ ). This is the answer to $v .1$.
5. yaip expresses what was implied in кal $\dot{\eta} \mu \in i ̂ s$, we are risen as Christ rose: this argument is continued to $v .11$.
 been born ( $\gamma \epsilon \gamma^{\delta} \nu a \mu \epsilon \nu$ ) with a (new) nature characterised by or wearing the likeness of His death. The new nature is stamped with the likeness to Christ's death, as a death to sin ; the idea is expanded in v. 6. $\sigma v \mu \phi .=$ ' of one growth or nature with.' $\gamma \in \gamma \delta \sigma^{v} \alpha \mu \boldsymbol{v}$, cf. xvi. 7, i. 3; James iii. 9. $\delta \mu о$ ' $\omega \mu$ a, of. viii. 3, Phil. ii. 7, implies true assimilation, but of things different. There is that in the Death of Christ which transcends the capacity of men, yet the life of the redeemed man is truly assimilated, in its degree, to that Death. R.V. supplies $a \dot{v} \tau \hat{\varphi}$ and takes $\tau \hat{\varphi} \dot{\delta} \mu$. as instrumental; possible but not quite natural.
 by $\sigma v \nu \zeta \dot{\eta} \sigma о \mu \epsilon \nu, v .8$ and $\zeta \hat{\omega} \nu \tau a s, v .11$. The stamp of the risen Life of the Lord will also be shown in this new life-as a 'life to God,' and therefore not under sin. Éró $\mu \in \theta$ a is a logical future: it follows that our lives will show etc.
6. $\tau . \gamma เ v$. ö $\tau$, almost $=$ schooling ourselves to remember-the idea is one which grows with experience of the new life-contrast elסótes $v .9$, ef. Moulton, p. 113. The point of the sentence lies in the iva clause-the object of our crucifixion with Christ was to deliver us etc.
$\dot{\delta} \pi a \lambda . \dot{r} . \quad$ äv $\theta \rho \omega \pi$ os : ${ }^{〔} v \theta \rho$. as often $=$ human character, humanity: two uses are to be distinguished, (a) $\delta \quad \xi \xi \omega$ and $\dot{\delta} \neq \sigma \omega \not \approx \nu \theta \rho$. marking the twofold character of human nature-mind and body; vii. 22; 2 Cor. iv. 16; Eph. iii. 16; of. 1 Pet. iii. 4. This use goes back to Plato. (b) $\dot{\delta} \pi a \lambda a u \partial ̀ s ~ a n d ~ \dot{\delta} ~ \kappa \alpha u \nu \partial ̀ s ~ a ̈ ̀ ~ \nu \theta \rho$. marking human nature as unregenerate or regenerate; so here ; Eph. iv. 22 f.; Col. iii. 9. This use seems to be peculiar to S. Paul, and is a notable link between Rom., Eph. and Col.; cf. S. H. For the idea of. 2 Cor. v. 17; Gal. vi. 15. It involves the thought of a new act of creation; and is perhaps connected with the idea of 1 Cor. xv. 45 and so with c. v. above. A further development of the thought is found in Eph. ii. 15.
$\sigma v v \epsilon \sigma \tau a v p \alpha_{0} 0 \eta$, a more concrete expression of the idea of $v .5$; cf. Gal. ii. 20 (only, in this sense); also Gal. v. 24, vi. 14.

тò $\sigma \hat{\omega} \mu a \quad \tau \hat{\eta} s$ cipaptias $=$ the body as the instrument of sin; the body which sin had made its own-explained by the next clause and v. 12. S. H. cf. vii. 24 ; Phil. iii. 21 ; Col. ii. 11. The body is the organism of the human spirit; the spirit is the source of all moral action, both positive and negative ; but the use of the body in sinful ways has a cumulative effect upon the bodily activities, and by influencing impulses and habits makes it a ready instrument of the sinning spirit, and of sin regarded metaphorically as an external tyrannical force: all these acquired habits and impulses need to be annihilated. Without metaphor $=$ the body in which and by which we sin. The result of this 'crucifixion' is to make the body an instrument of righteousness, ef. xii. 1.

тоvิ $\mu \eta \kappa$ кít $\delta$. тov̂ with infin. is normally telic in N.T. = 'so as to...,' 'so that we are...'; cf. Phil. iii. 10; Moulton, p. 216 f. The purpose is expressed by $\downarrow \nu a$, the result by $\tau \circ \hat{c} \kappa . \tau . \lambda$. So Sou入єvंєเv pres.: so that we are no longer in slavery to sin.
7. $\delta \gamma \dot{\alpha} \rho$ ároӨavàv then enforces the completeness of this result: =he that dies (cf. Moulton, p. 114) is acquitted of his sin for which he is put to death-he has paid the penalty and is free from further effects. This is not a merely general statement. As $v .8$ shows, the death here is a sharing of Christ's death : it is the voluntary selfsurrender of man to the penalty of his sin, and involves penitential faith. Consequently it receives from God forgiveness, or acquittal from his sin; and sin has no more dominion over him. Cf. Moberly, Atonement and Personality, pp. 39 f.
 death, but relative only. The force of these verses is to bring out the positive effects of this death : it is not only death to the old life but entry upon the new. S. Paul thinks of death not as an end but as a transition from one life to another.
$\pi เ \sigma \tau \epsilon \mathcal{v}^{\prime} \mu \epsilon \nu$ öть is of the nature of a parenthesis = as we believe; it is even possible that there is a reference to a Christian commonplace such as 2 Tim. ii. 12.
 necessitate a reference to the future life, and in the context such a reference is very unnatural; it is rather the logical future marking the new life as fulfilling a promise or natural consequence. So probably 2 Cor. xiii. 4; cf. v. 2. Cf. $\epsilon \sigma \sigma \mu \epsilon \theta a, v, 5$,
9. єiסótes ötᄂ, 'appeal to an elementary Christian belief,' Hort, 1 Pet. i. 18; cf. v. 3; 2 Cor. iv. 14, v. 6. A stronger form is oúk

Xpıròs к.т. . The antithetic and rhythmical balance of these clauses suggests a well-known and well-used formula. Cf, above v. 8 . It is possible that we have here, too, a fragment of a hymn or confession; cf. 2 Tim. ii. 8. N. the rhythmical character stops at $\theta \in \varphi \hat{\varphi}$.

Өávaros a. к.т.ג. His resurrection was a triumph over the sovereignty of death (ef. v. 14; 1 Cor. xv. 57) and has changed the meaning of death.
10. ô $\gamma \dot{d} \rho$ diméarvev, 'a kind of cognate accus. after the second $\dot{a} \pi{ }^{\epsilon} \theta a v e v, '$ S. H. His death that He died was a death once for all to $\sin$.
$\tau \hat{n}$ dipapria. Cf. $v .21$, the sin that reigned by death: for the dative of. $v .2$.
$\delta \delta=\frac{n}{n} \hat{n}$, 'the life that He lives is a life to God.' It is clear that 'the Death' is not limited to the Death on the Cross. The whole life of Jesus was a death to sin, culminating in the final act of the Cross. So 'the life' here is not limited to the post-resurrection life: it is the life which He lived on earth, and still lives. Cf. the very remarkable phrase, 2 Cor. iv. $10, \tau \grave{\eta} \nu \nu \epsilon \kappa \rho \omega \sigma \tau \nu \tau o ̂ ̀ ' I \eta \sigma o \hat{v}$ followed
 'perfectivised' àméधavev ; cf. Moulton, p. 112.
11. ovitcs к.т.d. sums up the argument in answer to the question in $v .1$.
iv X $\boldsymbol{P}$. 'I $\eta \sigma o v$, first time in this Ep. (iii. 24 is different). The relation hitherto has been described by $\delta$ cà (v. 1, 11, 17, 21). The idea then becomes explicit that the new life is life in Christ Jesus, as
the ascended Lord, agent and source of the Cbristian life. As so often, it is the anticipatory mention of an idea which is developed later. See 23, vii. 4, viii. 2.

12 ff . The suggestion of $v .1$ is reversed: the slave is free, the tyrant deposed, the service changed, the instruments of service refurbished, the power of service quickened.
$\mu \eta^{\prime} \beta \alpha \sigma \iota \lambda \epsilon v e ́ \tau \omega$, pres. of the continued reign, under these altered conditions.

ท่ $\dot{\alpha} \mu a p \tau i a$, the sin which hitherto reigned.
${ }^{2} v \tau \varphi \varphi ̂ \theta \nu \eta \tau \varphi ̂$ vi. $\sigma$. Cf. 2 Cor. iv. $11=$ even in your mortal body; the body, which yet must die, must not be allowed to minister to the deeper death.
 sense only thrice in N.T. (Lk. xxii. 15; Phil. i. 23; 1 Thes. ii. 17); otherwise always in a bad sense, of the natural desire when not under the direction of $\nu 0$ ôs or $\pi \nu \epsilon \hat{v} \mu a$; cf. Gal. v. 16; Eph. iv. 22; 1 Pet. i. 14; 1 Joh. ii. 16.
13. $\mu \eta \delta$ te mapıoтávere, do not continue to lend. тaparтท́бarє make a surrender once for all; cf. Moulton, p. 125. Cf. xii. 1.
$\tau \varphi \hat{\theta} \theta \in \oplus ิ$, for God's use.
ėk vekpôv 乌., as men that are alive after being dead.
тà $\mu \hat{e} \lambda \eta$, the component parts of the body. ö $\pi \lambda a$, instruments, tools (not merely for war); cf. xiii. 12; 2 Cor. vi. 7.
14. ov̉ кvpเยv́ $\epsilon \mathrm{\epsilon}$, a promise, not a command.

อที $\gamma \dot{\mathrm{c}} \mathrm{p}$ к.т.入. Cf. 1 Cor. xv. 56 : a verse which shows that this line of argument had been already developed by $S$. Paul in his oral teaching.
v่тò vópov...Xápıv. The contrast is the keynote of this section: from the point of view of ethics, the Christian state is a state of grace, that is, a state in which man is the object of Gon's free favour and recipient of a new power of moral action, not a state of law, that is, a state in which man receives a revelation of God's will, but not the power to fulfil it. The statement of the contrast leads to the question of what freedom from law means, and that to a fuller account of what subjection to law means (c. vii.).

15-23. These verses, starting from the contrast just stated, describe the same conditions as in vv. 1-14 but from a slightly different point of view; there the two states of man have been described; here the two activities of the human will. What demand is made upon us as self-determining agents by this new condition of things? The answer is-a twofold demand; first to apprehend our true position, secondly to act upon it with the full purpose of
will. The release from law is not a licence to sin but an obligation to free service.

$\dot{\alpha} \mu a \rho \tau \eta \dot{\gamma} \omega \mu \epsilon \nu$, are we to commit sin, i.e. by definite acts? As sin may not be used to multiply grace, so it cannot be even used because grace has taken the place of positive law. The question is really raised whether the Christian has any law to which his life must conform, and, if he has, what kind of law?

16-23. These verses answer the question put in $v .15$. The complexity of the passage is due to the fact that S . Paul wishes to explain that the Christian life is subject to law, but that the subjection differs from that of the Jew both in the character of the law and the nature of the subjection. (1) This new law is not a code of precepts but GoD's righteousness revealed in the life of Christ: the life of Christ is the model to which the Christian life must conform. And that, not merely because it is an external standard, but because the living Christ is the source, and naturally therefore determines the character, of the Christian life. This thought gets full and fearless expression
 the true place and character of preceptual law have been expounded, and there is no longer danger of confusion. (2) The nature of the subjection corresponds to the nature of the law: it is a whole-hearted self-surrender to God and to the life which embodies and reproduces, in those who so offer themselves, His righteousness. vimaкon here is very closely allied to $\pi i \sigma \tau \iota s$, and might almost be described as 'faith in action'; cf. $\pi i \sigma \tau \iota s \delta \iota \imath^{\prime}$ á $\gamma \dot{a} \pi \eta s e^{e} \nu \in \rho \gamma o v \mu e ́ \nu \eta$, Gal. v. 6.

It is this complexity of the subject which occasions the inaccurate antithesis in $v .16$; the parenthetic explanation of $v v .19-21$,
 (22)).
16. oủk ơठatє öt兀, appeal to recognised principle.
$\dot{\psi}$, neut.: the case is stated as generally as possible.
eis v̇דaкoท่v=with a view to obeying, for obedience-the proper attitude of the $\delta o \hat{v} \lambda o s$.
 oúv $\bar{s}$ eis $\zeta \omega \dot{\eta} \nu$. The reason for the change appears to be that the latter phrase could not yet be used without risk of misunderstanding:
 his state under law : consequently it is necessary to bring out the
 by substituting these words, in spite of the inexact antithesis; and then by explaining their meaning in 17-18.

บ์такоฑิs. Consequently the gen. here is not objective after $\delta$ oû入ou but descriptive =slaves who obey.

єls $\delta$ เкaloóviv $\eta$, with a view to righteousness-to secure and maintain righteousness. Righteousness here as generally = GoD's righteousness as revealed in Christ and made known in the gospel. Hence it can be used alternatively with $\tau \hat{\varphi} \theta \epsilon \hat{\varphi}, v v .18,22$.
17. Xápıs $\delta \dot{\epsilon} \tau \hat{\varphi} \hat{\theta} \theta \hat{\varphi}$. The outburst of feeling is occasioned by the thought of the magnitude of the change which has been worked in them and in himself by God.
 were' or 'though you were.'
 effect of a deep heartwhole effort of self-surrender in response to the revelation of God : of. exactly x. 9,10 , whence is seen the closeness of $\dot{v} \pi a \kappa o \eta$ as here used to $\pi i \sigma \tau \iota s$. The aor. refers to the definite act of self-surrender made when they became Christians (contrast $\eta \boldsymbol{\eta} \tau$ ).
 $\pi a \rho \epsilon \delta \delta \theta \eta \tau \epsilon$.

тúmov $\delta เ \delta a x \eta ̂ s,(1)$ not 'a type of doctrine' as some comm., e.g. the Pauline form of the Gospel as contrasted with the Judaistic: this is quite alien from S. Paul's manner of thought and expression (2 Tim. i. 13 has quite a different meaning from that usually given), and also to the whole drift of the context: but (2) the model of conduct which they have been taught in the Gospel: of. Eph. iv. 20, ov̉ $\chi$ ovitcos $\epsilon \mu \alpha \dot{\alpha}-$
 in question is $\delta$ रpır $\alpha$ s : the new righteousness being GoD's righteousness revealed in the character of the Christ: as Jesus ascended, He is here regarded not so much as the Master who claims, but as the personal Pattern• who guides, the obedience of the surrendered life. This description of the object of obedience is therefore in line with the others ( $\delta \iota \kappa a \iota o \sigma u ́ \nu \eta, 18,19, \theta \epsilon \hat{\varphi}, 22$ ). For $\tau$ únos as a personal model for imitation of. Phil. iii. 17; 1 Thes. i. 7; 2 Thes. iii. 9; 1 Tim. iv. 12; Tit. ii. 7; 1 Pet. v. 3.
$\pi a p \in \delta o ́ \theta \eta \tau \varepsilon$. The correct interpretation of tónos makes the use of this verb natural-they had been handed over, in their Baptism (aor.), to a new kind of life; \|in thought to $\epsilon \beta a \pi \tau i \sigma \theta \eta \mu \in \nu \in l s \mathrm{X} \rho \iota \sigma \tau \delta \nu$, v. 3. Cf, 2 Cor. iv. 11.
 avoided in $v .16$ is now given, because the sense in which $\dot{\eta} \delta \iota \kappa$. is to be taken has been made clear in the preceding sentence; Art. $=$ the righteousness of God revealed in Christ.

he calls it slavery, because the weakness of the flesh needs just such a masterful control as that word implies, and as it had lent itself to under its former master. The mastery of Christ is even more exacting and exclusive than the mastery of sin: Cf. Mt. v. 20. He developes this thought in $v v$. 19-21.

Sıd rìv dं $\sigma$. gives the reason why he thinks the word $\delta o v \lambda$ eia appropriate even to their new life.
$\omega ँ \sigma \pi \epsilon \rho \gamma \mathrm{~d} \rho \kappa . \tau . \lambda$. A summary of the state described in i. 18 f . Of. ii. 14 f .
 character of the call expressed in the name ärıo: submitting their lives to the influence of the revealed סıкatoovivy: here, as generally, marks the process; cf. 1 Pet. i. 2; 2 Thes. ii. 13; 1 Thes. iv. 7. The hallowing is the work of the Spirit (cf. viii. 2) upon their surrendered lives.
20. yàp. Make this effort, for your former freedom or slavery brought you such gain as now shames you.
 things at which....
 the one case earned and paid, in the other not earned but given.
22. Sov $\boldsymbol{\omega} \boldsymbol{\theta} \hat{\ell} v \tau \epsilon \mathrm{~S} \boldsymbol{\delta} \boldsymbol{\epsilon} \tau \hat{\varphi} \theta \in \hat{\varphi}$. The fullest expression of the service into which they have been brought.
*'Xetc. You bear your proper fruit; or perhaps imper.; of. v. 19. N. the present of continued action.
23. тò хápıб $\mu$. The concrete instance of God's $\chi$ d́ $\rho \iota s$.
év Xp. With $\zeta$. al. as v. 11 : for the full name of. n. on v. 21. N, refrain again.

## OHAPTER VII.

(1) Your experience of human laws helps here: you are aware that law rules a man so long only as he lives-for instance marriage binds the wife during the life of her husband; but after his death she is free to marry another. (4) So you were under the law, but you died with the Christ, by the death of His Body, and that was a death to the law, so that you became united to Another, to Him who was raised from death just in order that (in Him) we might bear fruit to God. (5) For when the flesh was the condition in which we lived, the sinful states which we experienced under the influence of the law were so operative in our members that we bore fruit only for death, (6) but in our present condition we have been freed from all influence of the law, we are dead in respect of that character in which we were held under its influence, so that we are now rendering our due service under the influence of a fresh action of spirit and not by an antiquated action of literal precept.

A new illustration enforces the argument of the preceding section that freedom from law does not imply freedom to sin. There is a change of allegiance which has its analogue in human laws. The change chosen as an illustration is that of the law of marriage. This suggests not only allegiance but a union which is productive of offspring. The old union is of the self with the flesh or the 'old man'; under the influence of law that produced sin: the new union is of the self with Christ; it has been brought about by the self sharing the death of Christ, and consequently becoming united to His risen Life: this union involves as its product service to GoD under the inspiration of a fresh spirit. The progress in the main argument is in this emphasis on the new life as in Christ, developing vi. 11, 23.

If the illustration is to be pressed, the conception must be that there is a persistent self, first wedded to a nature of flesh and, under law, begetting sins; then that nature dies, the self is freed from it and its law, and is wedded to Christ. In this union it brings forth the new fruit. So in vi. 6 it is not the self, but the old character that was crucified with Christ, 'we,' 'ourselves,' were set free. There is a
distinction between the self aụd the*olvaracter whancñ the self assumes whether $\dot{\epsilon} \nu \quad \sigma a \rho \kappa \ell$ or $̇ \in \nu \pi \nu \epsilon v ́ \mu a \tau \iota . \quad$ Cf. Gifford and S. H., aliter Lft.

1. vópov. Quite general-not Roman or Jewish, but a general axiom of law.
ó vópos= the law under which he lives, whatever it be.
2. катท́pүๆтаи diто́. Cf. Gal. จ. 4 : has been made, so to speak, non-existent as regards that law and so freed from it.

$\gamma^{\epsilon} v \eta$ тal advopl. Cf. Lev. xxii. 12; Ruth i. 12 f.
тоงิ $\mu \mathfrak{\eta}$ єโvau. Cf. vi. 6 note.
3. 'éavar由́Өŋтce, you were put to death, i.e. your former nature was slain but you yourselves survived to enter upon a new life, free from that law which bound the old nature, but with its own character-

 ii. 24, and perhaps 1 Cor. x. 16, apparently the only passages outside Evv. where the pre-resurrection Body is spoken of thus. Both Col. and 1 Pet. are parallel : and 1 Pet. so close that it must depend on this passage. Infra xii. $5=1$ Cor. xii. 27, we have the sense of the Body as the form of the Church, developed in Eph. i. 23 et passim. In Col. the words $\tau \hat{\jmath} s \quad \sigma a \rho \kappa 6$ s are expressly added to mark the distinction.

Sıà т. $\sigma$. Cf. vi. 3, 8. The thought is that as they were baptised into Christ, they shared the effects of His Death in the Body as well as those of His risen life. N. тov xpıoтov̂: the article marks the reference to the historic action.
cis $\tau \mathbf{o} \boldsymbol{\gamma} \boldsymbol{\gamma} \boldsymbol{v}$. So that you came to be wedded to another, i.e. than that old nature which was slain.

картофорท́ $\sigma \omega \mu \epsilon v$. Sc. under the influence of the new life imparted by the Risen Lord, constituting in each individual a 'new man' or character.

$\tau \grave{̀} \pi \alpha \theta \eta{ }^{\mu} \mu \alpha \tau \alpha$ тิ̂v $\alpha \mu .: ~ \pi \alpha \theta \eta \dot{\eta} \mu \tau \alpha$ only Paul, Heb. and 1 Pet. $=(1)$ sufferings, cf. viii. 18 , and commonly; (2)=experiences, here and Gal. v. $24=$ concrete instances of $\pi \dot{\alpha} \theta o s$, the state in which the subject is regarded as not active but receptive of experiences. So here $=$ the effects which our sins produced upon our nature. See vi. 6 n .
$\tau \grave{̀} \delta \iota \dot{\alpha} \tau 0$ v̂ vó $\mu$ ov. Developed and explained in $v v .7 \mathrm{ff}$. These experiences came through the influence of law upon the old nature.
év $\ddagger$ pyєito $=$ were constantly being made operative, i.e. by the action
 son, Eph. 247. évepreîб $\begin{gathered}\text { a } \\ \text { in } \text { S. Paul is always passive, implying an }\end{gathered}$ agent, here the context shows that the agent is $\delta \pi a \lambda . a ̈ \nu \theta \rho \omega \pi o s$.

 in which we were held in a state of subjection; $\dot{\alpha} \pi 0 \theta a \nu \delta \nu \tau \epsilon s \tau \hat{\varphi}$ (or
 other instance of the passive in N.T. Cf. Polyb. rv. 51. 1, $\theta \in \omega \rho 0$ ồ $\epsilon \epsilon s$
 prison in which we, our true selves, were detained.
$\ddot{\omega} \sigma \tau \epsilon$ סou入cútเv = so that we are still servants (pres.) but in newness of spirit ete. Cf. Burton, $\S \S 369 \mathrm{f}$.
èv кquvórךтו $\pi \nu \in$ v́ $\mu$ aros. év circumstantial. Our service is rendered in a new atmosphere marked by the presence in us of Spirit, i.e. the Spirit of the life in Christ Jesus ; cf. viii. 1.
талаเóт $\boldsymbol{\tau}$ г $ү р а ́ \mu \mu а т о s=$ the worn-out system which was. marked by the dominance of written precepts. Cf. ii. 29; 2 Cor. iii. 6; S. H. ii. 27. The antithesis occurs only in these passages; and contrasts the external law with the internal quickening spirit.
vii. 7-25. The new life is effective to achieve righteousness in each man, as the law could not do.
(7) Not that the law is itself sin, but it awakes the consciousness of sin, as, for instance, covetousness is not felt as sin till it is known to be a breach of law; sin gets its opportunity through law. (9) In the personal experience, there is first a (non-moral) existence unconscious of law; when a definite precept is brought into this experience, sin springs to life, the man dies: for sin, like some alien power, gets its opportunity by this precept, deceives the man and slays him. (12) While therefore the law represents and is even in detail the standard of holiness, righteousness and good, (13) yet by this good, sin works death and proves itself so to be downright sin, (14) because of the inevitable antithesis between the spiritual character of the law, and the fleshly nature of the awakened consciousness which makes it sin's slave. (15) It is in fact the experienced antagonism of the conscious will and the fleshly practice; the former witnesses to the goodness of the law; the latter to an indwelling power, not the personal will, but sin; (18) in this fleshly nature by itself there is nothing good; it even prevents the good will actualising itself in practice; (20) but in that case, the practice belongs not to the man but to the sin which possesses him. (21) So we are driven by analysis of our experience to recognise, if not a
double personality, at least a person and a power, within conscious. ness; it is a principle of this twofold consciousness that the will sides with the law of God while in the body there appears another, antagonistic, law which enslaves a man: from this slavery I find in myself no power to escape. (25) But thank God there is such a power, not of me bat within me, the help of Jesus Christ our Lord. So that, to sum up all, in one and the same self there is a double servitude : with my mind and heart I am a slave to God's law, with my flesh I am a slave to sin's law.

This section then brings out the true character of the effect of law, as the revelation in positive precepts of God's will for man. Its effect is to give the knowledge of right and wrong, to awaken, that is, the moral consciousness; this at once brings out the antagonism between the nature of man as living in the flesh, and his will and intelligence, which approve the law; the antagonism arises with the attempt to act ; the good will finds itself thwarted by something in the nature, which, as not properly essential to the nature and yet finding its ready instrument therein, is realised as a power lodged there and is called $\sin$. So definite and actual is this power felt to be in our experience that S. Paul, interpreting that experience, describes it as a power imposing, on all but equal terms with God, a law upon his nature, a law which says 'thou shalt' in direct contradiction of God's law 'thou shalt not.' In this conflict he has found no help except in the reinforcement of his will by the new spirit which has become his, by the aid of Jesus Christ our Lord. This is developed in e. viii. The law with all its goodness does not impart such a power. The difficulty of the passage is due to the depth of the psychological analysis to which S. Paul here subjects his own experience; he analyses so thoroughly as to reach the common human element in the individual experience. See Additional Note, p. 216.
7. $\tau \mathfrak{l}$ ov̂v $\mathfrak{\epsilon} \rho \circ \hat{\mu} \mu \epsilon v$; Yet another suggestion stated, to be put aside. If under law we are slaves to sin, under grace to righteousness, it might be supposed that the law itself is sin: but as the law is a revelation of GoD's will, such a supposition would be monstrous.
$\dot{\alpha} \lambda \lambda \alpha^{\prime}$ introduces the true statement of the case, which covers the next few verses.

É $\gamma \boldsymbol{v} \omega \boldsymbol{v}$. Inceptive: I did not become conscious of sin but by the law, making its claim on me for right action.
 introduces a particular example of the effect of law from the 10th Commandment: almost=even, or in particular; ef. Shilleto, Dem. F. L. § 176, crit. ann.
oúk ท̂decv. I had remained without knowledge of the real meaning of covetousness, if the law had not kept saying.... Cf. Moulton, p. 200 f.
8. áфориท̀v ... גaßoûбa, ' having got a handle.' dंфориท̀ =a starting point, base of operations, opportunity.
 or power. It is remarkable that S . Paul comes as near as possible to personifying the conception of sin, but does not actually use the idea of a personal author of evil : he here limits his account strictly to the analysis of actual experience; of. S. H. p. 145. See Additional Note, p. 218.
 particular law) was the opportunity; of. iii. 20, v. 20 . The order of the phrases is due to the necessity of emphasising the manner of sin's entry into experience ; $\delta \dot{d} \tau$. $\epsilon$. is here unemphatic.
ev ėpol. S. Paul analyses his own experience as typical.
катерүа́бато...т. \&. The idea seems to be that the impulses of man's nature are not recognised as being right or wrong, till the sense of right and wrong is awakened by a positive command: when this occurs, what were neatral impulses become 'lusts,' i.e. desires of what is forbidden; it is this perverse desire which is described as the work of 'sin,' impulses persisting when there is present the knowledge that they are wrong, and the will or true self is not yet strong enough to control them.
x wpls $\gamma \mathrm{d} \rho$ к.т.. . For apart from a knowledge of right and wrong sin has no power of action; there is no moral sense or moral judgment. Cf. 1 Cor. xv. 56, a passage which shows that the main idea had been represented already in S. Paul's teaching. For $\nu 6 \mu o s$ as imparting the sense of right and wrong ef. ii. 14 f .
 goes back to a pre-moral state-not necessarily in actual memory of a completely non-moral experience, but comparatively : his life as a child was untouched by numberless demands of law, which accumulated with his moral development; at that period whole regions of his life were purely impulsive; one after another they came under the touch of law, and with each new pressure of law upon his consciousness the sphere, in which it was possible to sin, was enlarged. It was easy to carry this retrospect one step beyond memory and to see himself living a life of pure impulse before the very first voice of law reached him: and to regard such a stage as a typical stage in the general development of the moral sense in man.
avéj $\eta \sigma \in \mathrm{v}$, 'sprang to life': only here and Lk. xv. 24 ( $=$ revived), not classical. We should perhaps recognise here an instance of the
＇perfectivising＇function of the preposition；of．Moulton，p． 112. Both A．and R．V．＇revived＇：but the whole point is that at that moment sin for the first time came to life．For this use of $\dot{\alpha} \nu \grave{\alpha}$ cf．à $\nu \alpha \beta \circ \hat{\alpha} \nu, \dot{\alpha} \nu \alpha \theta \nu \mu \iota a ̂ \sigma \theta a \iota, ~ a ̉ \nu \alpha \kappa u ́ \pi \tau \epsilon \iota \nu, ~ \dot{\alpha} \nu a \tau \epsilon \in \lambda \lambda \epsilon \iota \nu$ ．
 by and in sin ：aor．＝became dead．

єv์pé $\theta=$ proved in my experience；more than é $\gamma$ éveco．
 $\dot{\eta} \dot{\alpha} \mu$ ．，with the echo of Gen．ii．13；cf． 2 Cor．xi．3； 1 Tim．ii． 14. The deceit lies in the representation of the satisfaction of the for－ bidden impulse as more desirable than obedience to the command．

12．$\delta \mu \hat{v}$ к．т．入．The antithesis is not expressed；an interruption is caused by the occurrence of one more false conclusion which has to be removed．Then the line of thought is resumed in $v .14$ ．

Sıkal $\alpha=$ right．
13．тò aya0ìv к．т．入．Did that good thing，law，itself prove death to me？

iva．$\phi$ ．The effect of $\sin$ found to be death proves $\sin$ to be what it is．

14．oरڭ $\alpha \mu \epsilon \boldsymbol{\gamma} \boldsymbol{\gamma} \mathrm{d} \rho$ ötт．Appeal to acknowledged principle．
$\boldsymbol{\pi} \boldsymbol{v \in v} \mu a \tau\llcorner\kappa$ ós introduces the final description of the internal conflict： it is a struggle of $\pi \nu \epsilon \hat{\mathrm{v}} \mu \alpha$ against $\dot{\alpha} \mu \alpha \rho \tau i a$ to win the mastery of $\sigma \alpha \rho \xi$ ． In this struggle law is on the side of $\pi \nu \epsilon \hat{\nu} \mu a$ ，but only as a standard and revelation of right，not as a spiritual power strengthening man＇s will；that can only come from God，by an internal influence on man＇s $\pi \nu \in 仑 ̂ \mu a$ ．
oápkıvos．Fleshy，made of flesh，marks the substance or com－ ponent part of substance；$\sigma \alpha \rho \kappa \kappa \kappa \delta s$ marks character．A $\pi \nu \in \hat{v} \mu a$ may be $\sigma a \rho \kappa \iota \kappa \delta \nu$ but cannot be $\sigma \dot{\alpha} \rho \kappa \iota \nu \circ \nu$. Cf．$\lambda<\theta \iota \nu$ оs，Joh．ii．6； 2 Cor． iii．3；छ́vilvos， 2 Tim．ii． 20 ；see Westcott on Heb．vii．16．Here the word is precise；his nature has in it a fleshy element；if this dominates the $\pi \nu \epsilon \hat{v} \mu a$ ，then the man is $\sigma a \rho \kappa \iota \kappa \delta \delta$ ；if the $\pi \nu \epsilon \hat{v} \mu \alpha$ con－ trols it，the man is $\pi \nu \in \nu \mu a \tau \iota \kappa \delta{ }^{\prime}$ ．$\sigma$ d $\rho \xi$ describes the man in his natural state，including not merely his material body，but his mental and volitional operations so far as they are limited to or dominated by his earthly and temporal concerns．The evil belongs to $\sigma \dot{\alpha} \rho \xi$ not in itself but in its wrong relation to spirit；so far as it is brought
 hence explain 1 Cor．xv． 44 f ．So $\pi \nu \in \hat{\nu} \mu a$ becomes $\sigma а \rho \kappa \iota \kappa \delta \nu$ if it sub－ ordinates itself to $\sigma \dot{d} \rho \xi$ ．Cf． 1 Cor．iii． 1 and 3 fi．
$\pi \in \pi \rho a \mu$ evos, ' one that has sold himself under sin' $=$ ' made a slave under sin,' not explanatory of $\sigma \dot{d} \rho \kappa \iota \nu o s$ but a further determination of the condition. Before law came, man was $\sigma \dot{\alpha} \rho \kappa \iota \nu o s$, but not $\pi \epsilon \pi \rho$. $\dot{v} . \dot{\alpha} \mu$.; now he is both. Metaph. only here in N.T.
15. Yà̀ amplifies the idea of $\pi \epsilon \pi \rho a \mu$ évos; he is no longer his own master but under a tyranny he hates.
$\delta$ катєруá!opa. The effects I produce are not the outcome of my own knowledge and purpose.

- v่ $\gamma \iota \nu \omega \sigma \sigma \omega=$ I form no true conception of, I do not thoroughly realise-the durative present. Cf. $\overline{\xi \xi \eta \pi a ́ \tau \eta \sigma \epsilon \nu, v .11 .}$
$\pi \rho a ́ \sigma \sigma \omega$, put into practice. noŵ, commit in act.

17. vuvi $\delta \hat{e}$. But, in this case, this being so.
 self that is producing these effects, but the indwelling and alien tyrant.
18. $\quad$ i $\delta a=I$ am fully conscious that....
 self there is $\alpha \gamma^{2} \theta \delta \nu$, the knowledge of and appreciation of law.
dv $\boldsymbol{\tau} \hat{\tau}$ rapki. The evil is not the flesh, but alien from, though lodged in, the flesh.

тара́кєเта. Only here and 21.
$19=15$.
$20=17$.
21. ápa sums up the reiterated positions of $v v .15-20$.

т $\dot{\nu} \nu \boldsymbol{\nu}$ ó $\mu \mathrm{ov}=$ this law of my condition: a new sense of the word involving some confusion of language. The law of his condition is that there are two laws at once in his complex nature, one a law of his mind, i.e. the law of God accepted by his mind, one a law intruded upon his 'members' by sin, embodying the law of sin. It is just possible however that $\tau \dot{\nu} \nu \nu \delta \mu o \nu=$ the law of God (cf. $\dot{\eta} \dot{\partial} \rho \gamma \dot{\eta}$ ); and tr. 'I find as regards the Law, that when I will to do the good' (i.e. the bidding of this law) etc. This is strained, but diminishes the confusion. Cf. S. H.

то̀ кa入òv. The ideally true and right, as referred to a standard : dya日óv = that which is good, as judged by effects.
22. т $\hat{\omega}$ vó $\mu \varphi$ тov̂ $\theta \in o v ̂$. The law of God, however revealed, but always in the form of positive command.
 mind and will. Cf. vi. 6 n .
23. év roîs $\mu$ énectv describes the flesh as organised and active in various directions $=$ the $\sigma \hat{\omega} \mu a$ in detail. Observe that S. Paul does not say ' of my members' but 'in my members.' He carefully avoids
using language which implies that this law is proper to the flesh in its essential nature; it has its lodgment there, but the flesh is destined, and must be claimed, for other and higher allegiance.
 made my own in apprehension and acceptance.

$\tau \hat{\varphi} \nu o ́ \mu \varphi \tau \geqslant \hat{\tau} \dot{\alpha} \mu$. The law imposed by sin.
24, 25. A parenthetic exclamation, a cry for help, and the answer.
24. Ék тov̂ $\sigma$. т. $\boldsymbol{\theta} . \boldsymbol{\tau}$. The man has become all but wholly involved in his body which sin has made captive to death. т. $\theta$. т. this moral death.

Just as in v. 9 S . Paul's keen self-analysis carries him beyond actual memory into the imagination of a pre-moral state, so here he carries the analysis of the internal strife, perhaps beyond his actual experience, into the sympathetic realisation of the common human state and need, when man's spirit realises its extremity and does not yet see hope : though the very realisation is the first gleam of hope. Cf. S. H. See Additional Note, p. 218.
25. Xápıs $\delta \grave{\epsilon} \tau \hat{\varphi} \theta \in \oplus ̣$. An exclamation-not in construction. For the phrase cf. 1 Cor. xv. 57.

סıd 'I. к.т.入. Sc. $\dot{\rho} v \sigma \theta \dot{\eta} \sigma o \mu a \iota$ or $\epsilon^{\epsilon} \rho \rho \dot{\prime} \sigma \theta \eta \nu$. Law being the bare declaration of right had no power to move the living springs of action: that power comes from and through the Risen Lord imparting His own new life to man. This thought is developed in c. viii.
d $\rho a$ oviv sums up the whole statement of the condition of man in the face of law on the one hand, and of sin on the other.
av̉ròs éyต̀=I by myself and apart from any new or other power which may be available to change the balance of contending powers. It is important to remember that the whole section is an analysis of man's state under law, definitely excluding, for the moment, from consideration all action of God upon man's spirit except through the channel of communicated law. It has already been shown or assumed that there is such action, both in the case of Gentiles (ii. 14) and in Abraham's case (c. iv.) as typical of the pious Jew; here we are reminded that that action reaches its full and effective operation in the risen Lord. But it was necessary, by this analysis, to isolate, as it were, from these considerations, the case of man under law, in order to bring out the exact place of law in the moral and religious experience of man, and to show that more than law was needed by him and has been and is operative in him. See Additional Note on $\nu_{0} \mu_{0}$, p. 211.

T¢̂ $\mu$ èv vot. The $\nu 0 \hat{v}$ s is here used for the mind as capable of the
knowledge of God and His Will. $\pi \nu \epsilon \hat{\nu} \mu a$ seems to be avoided, because it definitely suggests the direct connexion with and dependence upon God as acting upon man's spirit; and that thought is for the moment excluded. The use of the word is almost confined to S. Paul. Cf. 23, xii. 2 ; Eph. iv. 23 ; Col. ii. 18. Here it includes apprehension and inclination.

There is much to be said for Joh. Weiss' suggestion (op. cit. p. 231 f.) that there has been here a primitive transposition of text, so that originally $\dot{a} p a$ oûv aúròs... $\dot{\alpha} \mu a \rho \tau i a s ~ p r e c e d e d ~ \tau \alpha \lambda a l \pi \omega \rho o s . . . \dot{\eta} \mu \hat{\omega} \nu$. The $\tau a \lambda a i \pi \omega \rho o s$ clause would come most properly after the summary of the all but desperate situation in äpa oûv к. $\tau . \lambda$. The last clause ( $\chi$ djots к.т. $\lambda$. .) would come naturally at the end of the whole discussion; it contains the name which has so often already been used, as a concluding refrain: and it marks the transition to viii. 1.

## CHAPTER VIII.

## D. VIII. The nature of the power and of the working of the New Life explatned.

1-11. The power is the indwelling spirit.
(1) It follows from this examination of man's state under law, that in our present state, as effected by God, those who are made one with Christ Jesus are not under penalties. (2) For the new condition brought by the Spirit, which animates the new life we received on being united with Christ Jesus, liberated us once for all from the former tyranny. (3) God's law, barely declaring His will, could not do this because it was undermined by means of the flesh. But God Himself did the work of liberation, first, through His Son incarnate triumphing over sin even in the flesh, (4) and secondly and consequently through His Son in us, fulfilling the claim of law by conduct on the lines of spirit not of flesh. (5) It was in fact just this reinforcement of man's spirit which was needed, in the antagonism of spirit and flesh, to overcome the limitations of the latter and to bring it under the power of the spirit. (9) That work has now been done in Christians: God's Spirit dwells in them, because if they are Christ's they possess Christ's Spirit, which implies that their bodies are dead for all purposes of sin, their spirits a living power in the body for all purposes of righteousness, (11) for all purposes, because they are thus strengthened by the same Power which raised Christ Jesus from death, and will put life into their bodies, in themselves doomed to death, because it is GoD's Spirit dwelling in them.

This section then brings out the nature of the power of the Gospel in contrast with the description of the powerlessness of law. That power in fact is the power of the life of the Risen Lord in the Christian, bringing to bear upon the human spirit the whole moral and spiritual force of the Spirit of God Himself.

1. ápa. So, after this exposition, it becomes clear. vêv. As things now are, under the new dispensation.

катákрри.. In Christ there is no penal state following upon a verdiet of condemnation, because in Christ men are aequitted (justified) ; cf. v. 16 n.
roîs év $\mathrm{X} \boldsymbol{\mathrm { X }}$. 'I. Those whose relation to God is determined by their union with Christ. $\quad X_{\rho}$. ${ }^{\prime}$. always in this order after ${ }^{e} \nu$ and $e l s$ (unless Gal. iii. 14).
2. ó yd̀p vópos $\boldsymbol{\tau} . \pi \boldsymbol{\pi}$. к.т. $\boldsymbol{\lambda}$. The life in Christ Jesus is the new life of and in men, Christ's life in them, their life in Christ. This life has its instrument or vehicle, as it were, in the new spirit that is in men, new, because the result of their spirit being in union with and invigorated by Christ's Spirit (v.9). This new or renewed spirit has its own law regulating its true condition, just as the old spirit had (vii. 21) : and this law is embodied in the life and character of Christ; its first utterance is justification by faith which at once liberates a man from the tyranny of sin and death and dictates a corresponding manner of life; cf. n. on vi. 16-23. It is very remarkable that S. Paul should use this word $\nu \delta \mu$ os to express any condition of the new life: it at least shows how far he is from having worked out a complete technical vocabulary. "He is using $\nu$. here in the sense of Torah which is very much wider than $\nu$. as ordinarily interpreted." J. H. A. Hart. In $\tau . \pi \nu . \tau . \zeta$. there is a reference to Gen. ii. 7: this is a new creation; cf. 2 Cor. v. 17.
iv Xp. 'I. Closely with $\zeta \omega \hat{p}$; the whole phrase describes the 'new man.'

ámò тov̂ vópov т. ג. к. т. 0. Either (1) the law imposed by sin, of. vii. 23, 25 , or (2) the law which gave sin its opportunity, of. vii. 11. The first is more in accordance with usage in c. vii.; yet it obliges us to take $\nu \delta \mu_{0}$ s in a different sense from $v .3$.
3. $\quad$ do $\rho$ explains the method of liberation.
 тò $\delta$ окіццор, James i. 3; 1 Pet. i. 7 (?); тò $\chi$ р $\eta \sigma \tau o ̀ \nu, ~ s u p r a ~ i i . ~ 4 ; ~ e f . ~$ Blass, p. $155=$ the incapacity, ineffectiveness, lack of power. The construction is pendent; cf. Blass, p. 283.

тov̂ vópov. Here clearly of the law of God as apprehended by man.
 brought to that weakness (by sin) by means of the flesh; of. vii. 14 n . $\eta{ }^{\prime} \sigma \theta^{\prime} \hat{v} \in \iota=$ constantly proved weak.
$\delta \theta \in \dot{d}$. The whole action described is the action of God.
ròv é. viòv. "The emphatic éautov brings out the community of nature between the Father and the Son, cf. v. 32, Col. i. 13," S. H. Add to ' nature' mind and purpose.
$\pi \epsilon ́ \mu \psi$ as. In this connexion only here and in Ev. Joh.
$\epsilon^{\epsilon} v \delta \mu$. $\sigma$. d $\mu$. Cf. Phil. ii. 7; Heb. ii. 17. $\delta \mu$. does not mark unreality but suggests a difference; cf. v. 14, vi. 5 n . The difference here is indicated by the addition of $\dot{\alpha} \mu$. The $\sigma \dot{\alpha} \rho \xi$ which He assumed never admitted the tyranny of sin, though it included the capacity for temptation and sin. In these words S. Paul touches the very nerve of the Passion, and indicates the supreme act of the divine Love. See Moberly, Atonement and Personality, c. vi.
$\boldsymbol{\sigma}$. ápaptias = human nature as it is under the dominion of sin. This phrase comes most near to describing flesh as in itself sinful; but that misunderstanding has already been fully guarded against.
$\pi \epsilon \rho i$ d $\mu a \rho \tau i a s . \quad \pi \epsilon \rho i=$ in the matter of, to deal with. $\dot{v} \pi \dot{\epsilon} \rho=$ on behalf of. But the distinction between these prepositions is obscured in the Greek of this time. vint̀ $\rho$ is never used with the sing. (sin as sin) but only with the plural (men's sins) : $\pi \varepsilon \rho l$ with both. It
 sin-offering ; of. Lev. iv. et passim; Heb. x. 6 al . (of. Heb. x. 26); but the reference is also wider.

катéкрьเє тท̀v $\dot{\alpha} \mu$. Condemned it, gave a verdict against it in its claim upon man : it was just this effective condemnation which law had been unable to compass.

モ̇v тท̂ $\sigma a \rho \kappa$ i. With катє́крıעє $=$ in His flesh; of. vi. 1-10, esp. 6, 7, 10. This parallel shows the reference to be primarily to the Crucifixion (cf. vii. 4) ; but the whole Incarnate Life showed the victorious power over sin which culminated in the Death and Resurrection, and constituted a verdict against sin's claim to man's nature. The whole was one act of redemption of the flesh, i.e. of human nature: it is that act in all its bearings which is in question here, in contrast with тò đ́ $\delta$ úvaтov $\tau 0 \hat{\nu} \nu \delta \mu 0 v$.
4. ₹va. The object of the sending and the condemnation of sin. тò Sukal $\omega \mu \mathrm{a}$, the righteous claim of the law. The law as God's revealed will has a claim over man : the same act which repudiated the claim of sin provided for the fulfilment of the claim of the law. Law and $\sin$ are here conceived as litigants for the ownership of man.

roîs $\mu \eta{ }_{\eta} \kappa . \tau . \lambda$. Not=if we walk, but in us in the character of men whose principle of conduct is regulated not by flesh but by spirit. A summary description of the true life of man, seen and made possible in Christ.

катд̀ бápка...кагд̀ $\pi v \in \hat{p} \mu a$. This antithesis at last becomes explicit, and is developed in $v v .5-8$. In vii. 25 the antithesis was $\nu$ oûs and $\sigma \alpha \rho \xi$; here, when it is more a question of the roots of action, it is $\pi \nu \in \hat{\nu} \mu a$ and $\sigma \alpha, \rho \xi$.
5. Yd. Explains how walking after spirit leads to the fulfilment of the claim of law, by a series of contrasted clauses.
 of reference and line of action.
 interests as your own, to side with him, be of his party: so here,
 flesh, make its aims, characteristics and interests their own; of. Mt. xvi. $23|\mid \mathrm{Mk}$ viii. 33 only. It is just this giving flesh its wrong place in the mutual relation of the elements of man's nature which makes it the instrument of sin
6. тo ф póv$^{2} \mu$ a. Almost = the policy, the leading idea, of the flesh when isolated and uncontrolled, i.e. of man as merely earthly. Only in this chapter.
7. тò $\phi p$. тท̂s ซapkòs "ै $\chi$ 日pa els $\theta$ eóv. As before, it is the flesh as usurping and absorbing man's whole interest which is in question, not the flesh in general.
8. oi '̇v oapkl ővtes, those whose being is wholly involved in flesh, not = those who are living in this passing life.
9. $\mathfrak{v} \mu \epsilon$ îs $\delta \grave{\epsilon}$. Spirit, not flesh, is even now the atmosphere and inspiration of the Christian life.
év $\boldsymbol{\pi} v \in \dot{f} \mu a \tau$. The human spirit (as shown by the contrast with $\sigma \dot{d} \rho \xi)$, which, in Christians, has become the channel or vehicle on and in which the divine Spirit works. $\pi \nu$. is that element in human - nature by which man is capable of communion with God; and that communion reaches its culminating point when it is mediated by the life in and of Christ: then the Spirit of God not only speaks to or influences occasionally but dwells in the human spirit; and this is re-created, becomes new, as the spirit of the life in Christ Jesus; of. Joh. iii. 34. Cf. S. H.
$\pi \nu \in \hat{\mu} \mu a \quad \theta \in \circ \hat{v}\|\pi \nu \epsilon \hat{\mu} \mu a \mathrm{X} \rho \iota \sigma \tau \circ \hat{v}\| \mathrm{X} \rho \iota \sigma \tau \delta \delta \mathrm{s}$. Cf. Acts ii. 33; supra, i. 4 ; v. 5 ; infra, 14. The Spirit is the Spirit of God because He is sent from God: He is the Spirit of Christ, because He comes as representative of Christ, and brings the living power, the life of the ascended Lord, into human lives : so as the result of His action Christ Himself dwells in man. See Moberly, op. cit. pp. 197 ff .

єlтєр, if, as is admitted: an appeal to the acknowledged character of Baptism ; of. vi. 1 ff . It is important to note that in all these sentences, no new teaching is being given, but appeal made to established truth.
el $\delta$ é $\boldsymbol{\tau}$ Is к.т. $\boldsymbol{\lambda}$. To be a Christian is to have Christ's Spirit; not merely to have a spirit like Christ's. Cf. 1 Cor. ii. 14-16.
oủk. Cf. Moulton, p. 171; Blass, p. 254.
 quence of having Christ's Spirit.
סเג $\alpha \mu a \rho \tau i \alpha v=$ for the sake of, for the purposes of sin. Cf. Mk ii. 27; 1 Cor. xi. 9 ; Blass, p. 132.

тò... $\pi v \in \hat{\mu} \mu a$ $\xi \omega \eta$. . The spirit is not merely alive, but a principle of life in the man; under its power the body too is alive.

11. $\boldsymbol{\epsilon i} \delta \boldsymbol{\epsilon}$ к.т. $\boldsymbol{\lambda}$. Develops the thought implied in 10 that the body, too, even now is quickened by the new life; it has become


тò $\pi \boldsymbol{\pi} . \boldsymbol{\tau}$. ${ }^{\prime} \boldsymbol{\gamma}$. The resurrection of Jesus is a measure and warrant both of the will and of the power of the Spirit of God, to bring life into what is dead. Cf. iv. 24 and v. 6, 10, 11.
\}$\omega о \pi \sigma เ \eta(\sigma \epsilon \mathrm{~L}$. Cf. vi. 8. The reference is not to the final resurrection, but to the present spiritual quickening of the whole man, the foretaste of that. The future is used, because a condition has to be fulfilled by man, $\pi i \sigma \tau \iota s$; of. vi. 11 (with 8 ).

тd $0 \nu \eta \tau d$ б $\omega \mu \mu \tau \alpha$. Your bodies, dead though they be; cf. vii. 24 and vii. 4.

The whole context seems to be decisive in favour of this line of interpretation. The section (viii. 1-11) balances the preceding section (vii. 7-25). There the inability of the law by itself to produce the higher spiritual life was shown; and the argument dealt primarily and mainly with human life as it is now. Here the whole object is to show that the Gospel provides just such a power as law lacks, a power, that is, to revive and renew the human spirit so as to enable it to mould and master the whole life. The life and death spoken of are the spiritual life and death already described; the raising is the present liberation of the spirit which affects the body also, making it too serve its true ends and live its true life. The raising of Jesus is a proof both of the will and character and power of that Spirit, which operated then and operates now through the risen Life communicated now to man; cf. vi. 2-11. The future resurrection is not referred to; but it is of course implied as a consequence of the whole relation thus described between GoD and man. Cf. closely 2 Cor. iv. 10,11 , iii. 18, v. 14-16. The thought of the future resurrection life becomes explicit in $v .17$. As .v. 1-11 argued that if God so loved us as to give His Son to die for us, He must love us enough to complete His saving work in us through His Son; so viii. 1-11 argues that if God had power and will to raise Jesus from the dead, He must have power and will to raise us in and through His Son from the death of sin.

12-39. The interpretation of the character and obligations of human life, under the power of the indwelling Spirit, in relation to creation and to God.
(12) If then all this is true, that our spirit in its warfare with the flesh is reinforced by GoD's Spirit, our life intimately dependent upon Christ living in us through that Spirit, then the duty of the Christian is clear; it is a duty not to the flesh but to the spirit, not to live as the flesh dictates, but to live as the spirit dictates, bringing through a fleshly death to a spiritual life all the doings and farings of the body ; (14) only so, as always answering to the leading of the Spirit, do we act up to our character as sons of God-a character which has replaced that of slaves, which enjoins a free appeal to the Father's love and answers to the inner testimony of His Spirit acting upon ours-(17) only so, do we claim as children our share of the life of God in Christ, a share of present suffering as the means to a share in the future glory. (18) For we cannot disregard this character of fleshly death, of present sufferings : nor should we try to do so : they are the stamp placed upon creation to mark its vanity, its transitory character, its merely preliminary and preparatory quality : corruption in nature and in man is the evidence of a redemption now working through the breaking up of present conditions and one day to be manifested in the establishment of a glorious freedom: (23) our adoption to sonship is inchoate but incomplete, and a strain and trial now of mortal nature: hope is its inspiration: patience and endurance its condition: the joy and glory it points to are incomparably greater than the trials and troubles of the present.
(26) Corresponding to this present condition of our nature is the activity of the Spirit helping our infirmity, by supplementing our ignorant and feeble prayers with His indescribable intercessions known in their fullest meaning only to God, (28) to us known only as the incontestable labours of God Himself in carrying out His purpose for the creatures of His love, through the whole wonderful progress from the first idea He formed of them as to be sharers in the character of His Son, through His determination, call, justification, to that final consummation, in which He brings them to the full concrete realisation of His glory.
(31) And as our ultimate comfort and joy we reflect that all this unspeakable procedure rests upon the firm foundation of God's love -instanced by His not sparing His own Son: that act shows that He can grudge nothing to us in the fulfilment of His purpose-no voice can be raised against us, no judgment delivered, when His voice and judgment have been declared in Christ, dead or rather
risen from death, throned at GoD's right hand, interceding for us. (35) Christ in His love has passed through all the possibilities of human experience in bodily and spiritual pain : they cannot separate us from Him. He has faced and subjugated all the most tremendous facts and forces and conditions and influences under which man is placed : they cannot separate us from Him. And to say that is to say, that nothing can separate us from the love of God which is in Christ Jesus our Lord.

Note the refrain v. 11, 21, vi. 23, vii. 25, viii. 11 (al.), 39. This section sums up the bearing of the whole preceding argument upon the character and relations of human life: and ends in the sublime assertion of the Love of God as the spring and root of all GoD's dealings with man, as revealed in the Gospel. Then out of the very heart of this overwhelming joy springs the tremendous problem of Israel's rejection of the Love of God (cc. ix.-xi.).
12. äpa oviv covers the whole argument from v. 12 and proceeds to conclusions as to Christian conduct ; but this purpose is interrupted by the thought of the Spirit and the wide bearings of the relation of sonship to God. The subject of Christian conduct is resumed in c. xii. Here the main character of the Christian life is expounded.
óфєіле́тal. Still debtors, but under a new allegiance. Cf. Gal. v. 3; Mt. xviii. 21; Le. vii. 41.
 present-you will continue in or be in a state of death ; $\dot{a} \pi \circ \theta a \nu \epsilon \hat{\epsilon} \sigma \theta \epsilon=$ you will die, of the single event; cf. Moulton, p. 114; Burton, § 72. Consequently the reference is the same as in vii. 10, 11.

Өavatov̂tc. Sc. $\delta \iota \dot{\alpha} \dot{\alpha} \mu \alpha \rho \tau i a v, v .10$; the durative present. Cf. $\nu \in \kappa \rho \omega \sigma \iota s, 2$ Cor. iv. 10 ; $\nu \in \kappa \rho \circ$ ûv, Col. iii. 5, ct. aor. vii. 4. тàs $\pi \rho \alpha \xi_{\epsilon} \epsilon \iota s$ тоv $\sigma \omega ́ \mu a \tau о s$, in a bad sense, because of the i| катà $\sigma \alpha \rho \kappa \alpha$, and in antithesis to $\pi \nu \epsilon \hat{\jmath} \mu a$ : the body's practices independent of spirit are bad.
14. öซol $\gamma \mathrm{d}$. You must do this, for only if so led by God's Spirit, are you true sons.

15, 16. Parenthetic, enforcing the description of Christians as sons.
15. è $\lambda \alpha{ }^{\prime} \beta \in \tau \epsilon$. Again an appeal to baptism.
$\pi a^{\prime} \lambda \iota v$. Though still $\delta o \hat{\lambda} \lambda o c$ in a true sense (cf. vi. 18, 19, 22) the spirit in which they serve is not a spirit of slavery but of sonship.
 of sonship because it is the effect of the Spirit of His Son; cf. 9.
vioetrias $=$ the status of sons by adoption, sonship by adoption; cf. 23 , ix. 4 ; Gal. iv. 5 ; Eph. i. 5 only. It is the right of son and
heir, given out of the natural order, as in the case of Jacob. Cf, Deissmann, Bibelstudien II. pp. 66, 67; the stress here is of course on the sonship, not on the way it came; cf. Heb. xii. 7.
 slaves to a master but sons to a Father: the reference seems to be direct to the 'Lord's Prayer,' as the norm of Christian prayer, the new basis of appeal to God.
'A $\beta$ ßá o $\pi \alpha \tau \eta$ р $\rho$. Of. Mk xiv. 36 ; Gal. iv. 6. The repetition is not merely for interpretation, but for emphasis; cf. S. H., Lft ad Gal. l.c., Chase, Texts and Studies, 1. 3, p. 24.
o matrip. Nom. for voc. (not merely a Hebraism; cf. Moulton, pp. 70, 235).
16. av่тò $\tau \grave{̀} \pi v \in \hat{\cup} \mu \alpha$ к. $\tau . \lambda$. The absence of a conjunction suggests that this is, in some sort, an explanation of the preceding phrases (rather than an analysis of the consciousness, as S . H.). If this be so, then the idea is that the Spirit, which makes man's spirit a spirit of sonship, by inspiring this cry of man's spirit joins in testifying to the true relation to God.

тékva $\theta$ єov̂. Cf. Phil. ii. 15 ; otherwise only in Joh.; cf. esp. 1 Joh. iii. 2. On the other hand Joh. never uses viol $\theta \in o \hat{v}$ of men (cf. Mt. v. 9,45 ; Lk. vi. 35, xx. 36 ; Apoc. xxi. 7; Heb. ii. 10, xii. 5 f.; here 14, 19, ix. 26 (qu.) ; Gal. iii. 26, iv. 6,7 only). viós rather describes the dignity and privilege of the son, $\tau \epsilon \kappa \nu o \nu$ the sharing in the life of the father; of. Westcott, Epp. Joh., pp. 120, 121. So here $\tau \in \kappa \nu a$ is substituted, as the ground of $\kappa \lambda \eta \rho o v o \mu l a$, because the main thought here is of the life possessed by Christians, not of the privilege.
17. Continues the thought of 15 and so the explanation of $\zeta \eta \sigma \epsilon \sigma \theta \epsilon$ : if children we share the life.
$\kappa \lambda \eta p o v o ́ \mu o l$. The son has a part in the possessions of the father ; cf. Gal. iv. 1 f.
 hereditary succession is not applicable: the O.T. usage of $\kappa \lambda \eta \rho \frac{1}{}{ }^{2} \mu(a$ for 'sanctioned and settled possession' (cf. Hort, 1 Peter, p. 35) suggests that the meaning here is 'possessors,' possessors of God $=$ possessors of the divine life (of. 2 Pet. i. 4) ; and this agrees with the use of $\tau \epsilon \kappa \kappa \alpha$. Then
$\sigma u v \kappa \lambda$. $\delta \grave{e}$ Xpırvoû marks the condition of our possession; we are so possessors only as sharing with Christ, by His life in us.

єlँ $\pi \in \rho$ к.т. $\boldsymbol{\lambda}$. S. H. suggest that there is a reference to a current Christian saying; cf. 2 Tim. ii. 11. See above, vi. 9.
$\sigma v v \pi a ́ \sigma \chi \circ \mu \epsilon \nu \ldots \sigma v v \delta \circ \xi \alpha \sigma \sigma 0 \hat{\mu} \mu v$. These are the two essential characters of the divine life as revealed in Christ and, hy union with Him,
in man; suffering under the present conditions, 'glory,' or unhampered revealing of the life, when present conditions are done away in the future state. This truth is most fully worked out in 2 Cor. iii. 7-10, 18, iv. 7-v. 10. In that Ep. the sufferings themselves are declared to be the natural expression now of the life of Christ in us, as they were in the case of Jesus, and in them the 'glory' is even now present and seen; so that the present life of suffering presents a gradual growth in 'glory' (ib. iii. 18). The full and free manifestation is reserved for the future state, but it is the object of the present state, and already discernible in it; cf. also 1 Pet. iv. 13. The $\sigma v v$. in each case marks the result of sharing the life of Christ. $\sigma v v \delta o \xi$. the aorist, and the next verse, show that the reference is to the future revelation. N, that the fundamental idea of $\delta \delta \xi a$ is manifestation in act or character, esp. of God manifested in Christ and in the lives and character of Christians; of. Phil. iii. 21; 2 Cor. viii. 23.

18-26. In the preceding verses the thoughts worked out in 2 Cor. l.c. have been summarised. In these verses the Apostle includes a wider range of thought, characteristic of Eph. and Col. Man's present state is shown to have its analogy in the whole material creation, which is all undergoing a vital change, from the transitory and perishable to the eternal and spiritual. The connexion between man and creation lies in his physical nature; the full redemption of this nature, when it is brought under the complete control of the spirit by the life of God communicated through Christ, will also be the liberation of all the physical creation from the limitations under which it now lies. The whole conception is difficult but sublime in the extreme. It is based upon the idea that the living God must in the end bring His whole creation to be, in its parts and degrees, a perfect manifestation of His own character and life. Cf. Eph. iii. 9, 10 ; Col. i. 16 ff.
18. $\lambda о \gamma<\zeta о \mu a t ~ \gamma \dot{\rho} \rho$. The reference to $\delta b \xi a$ in $v .17$ leads to the consideration of all that is involved in that final and full manifestation of God.

 Plato, Gorg. p. 471 e , qu. S. H. For the use of $\pi \rho o{ }^{\prime}=$ compared with, judged by the standard of, cf. Gal. ii. 14; 2 Cor. v. 10; Eph. iii. 4; Kuhring, De praep. Gr. p. 22.
 phasising the certainty of the event. aжoк. aor. refers to the final revelation; cf. Gel. iii. 23, 1 Pet. v. 1.
cis $\eta \not \mu \mathrm{a} \mathrm{s}$. Cf. $\epsilon \pi l$, i. 18 ; $\epsilon \nu$ Gal. i. 16 : els implies the shedding of the glory upon us from an external source: for the thought cf. 2 Cor. v. 2.
19. $\gamma \mathrm{d}$ p introduces the expression of the wide range of the future revelation.

बжокарабокia. Phil, i. 20 only, Lft. The subst. seems not to be found elsewhere $=$ concentrated expectation (cf. $\dot{\alpha} \pi о \beta \lambda \epsilon \pi \epsilon \epsilon \nu$ ).
$\tau \hat{\eta} \mathrm{\kappa} \boldsymbol{\kappa} \boldsymbol{i} \sigma \epsilon \omega \mathrm{~s}$. Of the physical creation, cf. Giff. The renovation of nature was part of the Jewish Messianic hope. It is essentially the hope of the restoration of the state of nature before the Fall, when the earth was cursed for man's transgression. Cf. S. H. p. 210, ref. Isa. lxv. 17-25, Enoch xlv. 4, Schürer E.T. II. 2, p. 172 f. The remarkable, and perhaps unique, feature here is the suggestion of an almost conscious participation of nature in the 'larger hope'; and the interpretation in this sense of its movements and strife and waste. If we are right in understanding the passage so, it is an anticipation of a very modern kind of sympathy. Cf. Edersheim, ii. p. 441 ; Stanton, J. and Chr. Mess., 310 f., 350 f.

тท̀v äттокá入ขభเv т. ขீ. т. 0. Cf. Lk, ii. 32, 35; 2 Thes. ii. 3 f. only, of persons other than divine. It is the climax of the фave $\rho \omega \sigma$ os described in 2 Cor. iv. 11, iii. 18, when the veil shall be removed, all the disturbing influences of earthly conditions and judgments, and the true sons of God stand out in their true light. That manifestation will bring the 'new heavens and the new earth,' to which all the strife and movements of nature tend.
20. Tท̂ $\gamma$ àp $\mu a \tau \alpha \iota o ́ \tau \eta \tau \iota=$ the purposelessness, futility which the world of nature exhibits, until the conception of nature is itself brought under the larger conception of God's eternal providence.

סıà тòv vimotágavta=for the purposes of Him who so subjected it; ef. on v. 10, Heb. ii. 10. S. Paul here connects the actual condition of nature with the Fall, as he does the actual condition of human nature in c. v., no doubt in dependence on Gen. iii. 17.
${ }^{\prime} \phi^{\prime}{ }^{\prime} \in \lambda \pi i \delta_{\imath}$ with $\dot{v} \pi \epsilon \tau \dot{d} \gamma \eta$. The subjection to vanity is a commonplace: the novelty here lies in the vision of hope.
21. öть кal av̉тท̀ $\mathfrak{\eta} \kappa \tau$. Not man only but the natural creation with him will be set free.
 sense, in 2 Pet. ii. 19. $\phi 0$ opá, in St Paul chiefly or always physical, in 2 Pet. generally moral, occurs only in Ro., 1 Co., Gal., Col. and 2 Peter.
ė $\lambda є v \theta \epsilon \rho$ ia. Cf. Gal. iv. 23 f.
 character revealed rather than the process of revealing: $=$ the true character manifested fully, ) ( $\phi \theta$ opd 1 Cor. xv. 42.

тéк $v \omega v$, 'children,' as one in character with God in Christ, of. above 17.
22. or $\delta a \mu \epsilon v$. The appeal to common experience.
$\sigma v v \sigma \tau$. kal $\sigma v v \omega \delta$. $\sigma v v$. not with man, but throughout all its parts, members and organisms. The cpds only here ; for $\dot{\omega} \delta\langle\nu$. of Mt. xxiv. 8 ; the thought is of the pangs of birth $=\dot{\epsilon} \phi^{\prime} \dot{\epsilon} \lambda \pi i \delta \iota \kappa . \tau . \lambda$.
23. kal av̉rol. We Christians, though we have the earnest of the Spirit and of freedom, ourselves still find our body in bondage, not yet fully emancipated.
$\tau \dot{\eta} v \dot{a} \pi a \rho X \mathfrak{\eta} v \tau . \pi v . \quad \dot{a} \pi$. only here in this connexion; of. $\dot{a} \rho \rho a \beta \dot{\omega} \nu$, Eph. i. 14 ; 2 Cor. v. 5 : and cf. 2 Cor. v. 1-5 for a fuller expression of this thought.
vioteciav. Cf. 15 ; Eph. i. 5. vids marking privilege rather than nature, vioterla $=$ putting into that position of privilege; to privilege character must be brought to correspond ; consequently the word suggests a process, and may be used either of the beginning of the process $(v .15)$ or of the end as here, or of the whole (Eph. l. c.) ; cf. Westcott on Eph. l. c.
 not a finished act ; cf. Eph. i. 7; Col. i. 14. Here and Eph. i. 14, iv. 30 it is used to name the object for which the Spirit is given. So
 is used of the beginning of the process, 1 Pet. i. 18; of. Heb. ix. 12. The fundamental texts are Mt. ixx. 28 ; \| Mk. x. 45. N. Eph. i. 10 connects man's redemption and the destiny of creation, as here.
 seat of sin and death (vii. 24, viii. 11) : (2) it is through the body that man is connected with the physical creation. The redemption of the physical organism of man's life has a far-reaching effect upon all related physical creation ; cf. 1 Cor. xv. 51-54; Phil. iii. 21.

Tท̂ $\gamma \dot{\alpha} \rho \bar{e} \boldsymbol{e} \lambda \pi(\delta \iota$. "Hope gives a definite shape to the absolute confidence of faith. Faith reposes completely on the love of God. Hope vividly anticipates that God will fulfil His promise in a particular way" Westcott, Heb. x. 23; cf. Hort, 1 Pet. p. 86; cf. Gal. v. 5; Eph. i. 18, iv. 4 ; Col. i. 27 ; 1 Th. v. 8. For the connexion with Ė $\sigma \omega \dot{\theta} \dot{\eta} \mu \in \nu, 1$ Pet. i. 3 (with Hort's note (p. 34), "The new order of things is represented as in a manner all one great, all-pervading hope ').

The article = this hope, namely of the redemption of the body; of. vii. 25. The dative can hardly mean 'by this hope' but 'in this
 and it begins with faith, on man's part, and is carried on in an atmosphere or condition of hope, the hope of complete redemption.
$\bar{\epsilon} \lambda \pi i_{s} \delta \dot{\varepsilon}$. Hope implies a fulfilment still future, and that demands the expectancy of a steady endurance.
25. $\delta \iota^{\prime}$ vixourov $\hat{\jmath}=$ in a condition of endurance. vi. is steady resistance to adverse influences ; and this is the peculiar Christian temper under present conditions; of. Heb. xii. 1; 1 Thes. i. 3 ; 2 Thes. iii. 5 ; Rev. xiv. 12 ; for Sid of. ii. 27, xiv. 20.

26-end. This section enforces the above description of the Christian life, by the evidence of experience that God Himself helps man in this endurance of hope, the Holy Spirit v. 26, the Father v. 28 , the Son $v .34$.
 tween man and creation, so the attitude of hope wins the help of the Holy Spirit, it is the link of fellowship in action between God and man.
$\tau \dot{̀} \pi v \in \hat{v} \mu a$. Picks up and expands the hint of $v .16$. N. that the Spirit here is definitely represented as in a reciprocal relation to the Father which we can only describe as personal.
ovvavтi入a $\beta$ ávetal. Cf. Lk. x. 40 ; = puts His hand to the work in cooperation with us. The work as shown by $v .16$ and the following sentences is prayer as the first expression of the character of sonship.
$\boldsymbol{\tau} \hat{\eta}$ ácecvelac $\hat{\eta}$. = with us in our weakness. Weakness associated with hope necessarily falls to prayer. In that action the Spirit helps. $\dot{\alpha} \sigma \theta$. = all in ourselves that makes it hard to endure.
ydे. Introduces explanation of our weakness.
т̀ $\tau \ell \pi p o \sigma \in v \xi$. Cf. Blass, p. 158. The groaning (of $v .23$ ) finds no adequate or formulated expression : we know we are in want but how to express our need in particular we know not ; it utters itself in a cry of appeal $(v .16)$ : and in that cry we are conscious that the Spirit joins in terms inexpressible by us, but intelligible to Him whose Spirit He is. The Father understands the Spirit framing the utterance of the children.
 tous, only here; of. 2 Cor. xii. 4.
27. ò סé épavvâv ràs kapסlas. Of. Rev. ii. 23 ; Ps. vii. 10 ; Jer. xvii. $10 ; 1$ Cor. ii. 10. The point seems to be that Gon's knowledge of the hearts of men and their needs enables Him to understand the
particular line ( $\tau \delta \phi \rho \delta \nu \eta \mu a$ ) of the Spirit's intercession which is uttered with and through man's spirit; of. Acts xv. 8, i. 24 ; Lk. xvi. 15 ; Gal. iv. 6.
ő $\tau$, 'that.' кard $\theta \in \delta \dot{v}=$ after the standard and measure of the character of God, not with the imperfection of human utterance.
vi $\pi$ èp $\dot{\alpha} \gamma \boldsymbol{\epsilon} \omega \nu=$ on behalf of men who belong to God, (so \| кavd̀ $\theta \epsilon b \nu$ ), and therefore in pursuance of His will for them.
28. The thought passes from man's striving in prayer with the help of the Spirit, to GoD's constant activity for man, to promote that good, which is the object, even when unexpressed or inexpressible, of the children's prayer.
ol $\delta a \mu \in \boldsymbol{v}$, of an acknowledged fact of experience or conviction.
 and counting on the di $\gamma a ́ \pi \eta$ of the Father; cf. 35, 39. The fundamental attitude on both sides now comes to the front. The dat. =for: see next note.

тávta $\sigma v v \in \rho \gamma \in i . \quad \sigma v \nu$. is intr. (Mk xvi. [20]; 1 Cor. xvi. 16; 2 Cor. vi. 1; Ja. ii. 22) =helps, so Herm. Sim. v. 6. 6 ; $\pi$ ávra is the 'inner accusative' $=$ helps in all ways, gives all needed help; cf. Blass, p. 90;
 रpelav. S. H. qu. Test. xii. Patr. Issach. 3; Gad 4 where $\sigma v \nu .=$ 'help' simply. Chrys. and Theodorus seem to make it tr., taking God for subject and referring $\pi a ́ v \tau a$ to apparently adverse circumstances. Origen takes $\pi$ ávza for subj. but makes it refer to GoD's action described in vv. 29 f., Philocal. (Robinson) p. 229.
[ó $\theta$ ès.] Whether we read this or not, we should supply it as subj. to $\sigma v v$. The whole point of $v v .28-30$ is that God gives active help, etc. To make $\pi$ ávza subj. introduces a quite alien thought, unless with Origen it is strictly referred to $v v .29 \mathrm{f}$.
els áyaOóv, tr. for their good.
тоîs като̀ $\pi \rho o ́ \theta \epsilon \sigma เ \nu$ к $\lambda \eta$ тoîs oviбเv. $\pi \rho \delta \theta \in \sigma \iota s=$ purpose, of man (Acts xi. 23, xxvii. 13 ; 2 Tim. iii. 10), of God (ix. 11 ; Eph. i. 11, iii. $11 ; 2$ Tim. i. 9 ), describes the whole purpose of God for man, which results in the call. It is shown in its elements or stages in $v v .29,30$. The call falls into the lines of the purpose and is conditioned by it alone. Cf. vb of man i. 13, of God Eph, i. 10 (al. supra iii. 25).
29. ठ̋ть because, explains $\pi$ áv $\alpha \alpha \sigma v \in \rho \gamma \varepsilon \hat{\varepsilon}$, the whole long process of GoD's good will to man, a will which is act.
ovis. The consideration is confined, here, to Christians $=$ roîs $\alpha \gamma$. $\tau$. $\theta$. as His children. The aorists throughout refer to the definite acts of God which have come within their experience.
$\pi \rho o \in \mathfrak{\gamma} v \omega$. ${ }^{\text {E }}$ yvov in the Bible, when used with a personal object, implies not mere knowledge, but recognition of the object as in personal relation to the subject; the first act, if we may say so, of God's mind towards man, which then develops in acts of will. Jerem. i. 5 ; cf. Isa. xlix. 1, 3, 5; Ex. xxxiii. 12, 17. So here, xi. 2; 1 Pet. i. 2, 20 (see Hort) = recognition, previous designation to a position or function. Here = the recognition of them as children, a recognition formed in the eternal counsels of God; ef. Mt. vii. 23; 1 Cor. viii. 3; Gal. iv. 9 ; 1 Cor. xiii. 12.

трос́pıбєv. Cf. 1 Cor. ii. 7; Eph. i. 5, 11; in all these passages refers to that character which God meant men to have by being brought into union with Him through Christ. So here, of God's provision of a certain relation or character which should be, therefore, men's true character, and should be gained by conformity to the character of Christ. The thought is not of determining something which in consequence could not be otherwise, but of drawing the lines of a true destiny, which still required further conditions for fulfilment ; cf. Phil. ii. 12, 13, and note on i. 4.

бvрио́рфovs к.т.入. = to share in the character which is exhibited in His Son, as Incarnate. $\sigma v \mu \mu$., cf. 2 Cor. iii. 18, Phil. iii. 10, where the character is described as in process of development; and so perhaps Gal. iv. 19. In Phil, iii. 21 the reference is to the consummation of the process. єiк $\omega \boldsymbol{v}$, cf. 1 Cor. xv. 49, 2 Cor. l.c., ct. supra i. 23. The reference is to the true human character seen in Jesus, the Incarnate Son: man is meant to make that character his own under his present conditions by gradual growth, for complete achievement in the end. tov̂ viov because it follows upon the relation of children. Consequently the likeness is also a likeness of God ; cf. Col. iii. 10 ; Wisd. ii. 23, and there is an underlying reference to Gen. i. 26.
cis rò єival $a$. That He, as firstborn, might have many brethren. God's purpose is to people His household with children, brothers of the Son.

трюто́токоv. Cf. Lk. ii. 7; Col. i. 15, 18 ; Heb. i. 6 ; Rev. i. 5 ; for a kindred idea cf. Heb. ii. 10. On the word ef. Lft on Col. l.c. The question whether $\pi \rho$. is used in reference to the eternal nature of the Son, or to His resurrection, does not arise here; as the stress is on $\epsilon \nu \pi$. dं $\delta$., not on $\pi \rho$. The word, however, is an important link with Col.
30. Éká $\lambda \epsilon \sigma \in v$. Of the stage in which God's purpose is first made known to the individual, in the call to be a Christian heard and, in this case, obeyed. A favourite idea in S. Paul and S. Peter; cf. i. 1, 7.
ésıcal $\omega \sigma \in \mathrm{v}$ ．Justified sc．in answer to faith，as they are oi aja－ $\pi \omega ิ \nu \tau \epsilon s \tau . \theta$ ．
éSógarev．This is generally taken to refer to the final glory of the future state，of．19．But the aorist is a difficulty，and is not satis－ factorily explained． 2 Cor．iii．18，iv． 11 show that even under present conditions there is conferred upon Christians a＇glory＇or manifesta－ tion in them of God，which is plain to those who have eyes to see． It is the＇glory＇of the regenerate life in Christ，the manifest working in them of the Spirit，the earnest and promise of that future state． This passage is full of the ideas of 2 Cor．iii．4－iv．12，and we may therefore without hesitation interpret $\bar{\varepsilon} \delta \sigma \xi a \sigma \epsilon \nu$ by the help of that passage ；cf．Joh．xii．23，xvii． 1 ：and n． 1 Pet．ii． 12 （for the effect upon others）and esp．above iii． 23 n ．；so $=\sigma v \mu \mu$ ó $\phi о ⿱ s, ~ к . \tau . \lambda . ~$ 29.

31－39．The confidence inspired by this evidence of the love of Christ and God．The love which is the ground of the whole relation of GoD to man is shown in its intensity（31），and its power as revealed in Christ（34，35a）：then the consequences are drawn （ $35 \mathrm{~b}-39$ ）．

32．ös $\gamma \in \kappa . \tau . \lambda$ ．N．the piling up of emphasis－loiov－$\pi \alpha^{\prime} \nu \tau \omega \nu-$


33．катळं е̇к $\lambda_{\epsilon к \tau \omega ิ v ~}^{\theta}$ ．Against men whom God has chosen ：the bare words give tremendous emphasis．
$\theta$ eos ó Sukalŵv．In the face of God＇s acquittal，the condemnation of the world is as nothing；ef． 1 Cor．iv． 9 f．； 2 Cor．ii． 16 ；cf． Isa．1．8， 9.

34．Xp．＇I．The whole process of the Son＇s action in redemption， from the Incarnation to the Ascended Life，is given in the succession of forcible phrases ：in them His love is shown．

35． $0 \lambda$（ $\psi$ ıs к．т．$\lambda$ ．External circumstances，however desperate in seeming，cannot separate．

36．$\neq ข \in \kappa \in \nu$ боv̂ к．т．入．Ps．xliv． 22.
37．Sเd̀ тov̂ ả̧．ทั．v．35，n．aorist．
38．Oávatos к．т．入．None of the spiritual powers or influences which beset men＇s lives can separate；cf．Ps．cii．（ciii．） 11 f．，cxxxviii． （exxxix．） 7 f ．Behind all the powers，conditions，influences，is God in His name of love．
 up the whole argument from i． 16.
E. ix. 1-xi. 36. Tee rejection of the Gospel by Israel.

The theme of i. 16,17 has been worked out; it has been shown that the Gospel is a power of God unto salvation for them that believe, a power needed by Gentile and Jew alike, guaranteed on condition of faith and in response to faith by the love of God, and adequate to man's needs as shown in history and in individual experience; and a brief description has been given of the actual state of the Christian in Christ and of the certainty and splendour of his hope, resting upon the love of God. Naturally at this point the question of the Jews arises: they were the typical instance of a people brought into close and peouliar relation to God, and they therefore afford a crucial case of God's dealings with such. How then did it come to pass that they rejected the Gospel? What is their present state? their future destiny? and how does this affect Christians? The answer is found in the conditions under which God selects men for the execution of His purposes. It is important to bear in mind that the selection throughout is regarded as having reference not to the final salvation of persons but to the execution of the purpose of God. Underlying the whole section is the special object of S. Paul to justify himself in preaching the Gospel to the Gentiles.

## CHAPTER IX.

IX. Israel's rejection of the Gospel (a great grief and incessant pain to S. Paul and (4) a great problem in the economy of redemption), (6) is not due to a failure of Gon's word, for the condition of acceptance was not a carnal descent but a spiritual, and depended upon GoD's selection of men for special purposes. (14) This selection was righteous, because it was directed to the execution of His purpose of mercy and was the effect of mercy, by revealing to men His power and character, and (19) acted in accordance with qualities exhibited by men, in their response, as creatures, to the purpose of their creation, shown in the case of Israel, (24) as diagnosed by the prophets, (30) partly succeeding and partly failing to grasp the true nature of righteousness and the means of its attainment.

1. $\dot{\alpha} \lambda \eta \eta^{\theta} \epsilon_{\epsilon} \alpha \nu$, к. $\tau . \lambda$. Cf. 1 Tim. ii. 7 ; 2 Cor. xi. 31, vii. 14, xii. 6 ; Gal. i. 20 : in all cases a strong assertion of his personal truthfulness, in a statement which would be challenged. Here his deep personal interest in Israel is asserted; his championship of the Gentiles had no doubt been interpreted as hostility to Jews.
év Xpıotヘ̂ = as a Christian ; cf. 2 Cor. ii. 17, xii. 19 ; Phm. 8. In this anarthrous and simple form the phrase is confined to S . Paul (all except 2 Thes. and Pastorals) and 1 Pet. ; and seems simply to mark the Christian position.

бvvp.apтvpov́oŋs. ii. 15, viii. 16 only. In ii, 15 and here the ovv is perhaps simply perfective; cf. Moulton, p. 113. Otherwise the conscious reflection is cited as a confirming witness to the uttered statement.
 of myself ; of. ii. 15 n .
 my spirit as consecrated,' but 'in the light of or under the control of the Holy Spirit.' || $\in \boldsymbol{\varepsilon} \nu \mathrm{X} \rho \iota \sigma \tau \hat{\varphi} .1$ Cor. xii. 3 is decisive for this meaning.
2. á. $\delta$ เá $\lambda_{\text {єimtos. }} 2$ Tim. i. 3 only. Adv. Rom. i. 9 and 1 Thes. (3) only.
3. $\eta$ ủx́́ $\boldsymbol{\eta} \boldsymbol{\eta}$. Cf. Acts xxv. 22; Gal. iv. 20; Phm. 13. Here of an impracticable wish, 'I could have prayed if it had been possible'; Blass, p. 207. Contrast Acts xxvi. 29.
dévá $\theta \in \mu a$, lit. a thing set up in a temple and so destroyed as far as use by man goes (LXX. Lev. xxvii. 28) ; then devoted to destruction (Deut. xiii. 15), cursed (LXX. Josh. vii. al.) ; of. Nägeli, p. 49.
 3, xvi. 22 ; Gal. i. 8, 9.
aủvòs モ́ $\mathbf{\gamma}$. vii. $25, \mathrm{xv} .14 ; 2$ Cor. x. 1, xii. 13. ?=instead of them.
ámò тov $\mathrm{Xpt} \mathrm{\sigma} \mathrm{\tau 0v}=$ so as to lose all that the Messiah means to a Jew and to a Christian. For $\delta \chi \rho$. cf. vii. 4, viii. 35, ix. 5. The reference when the article is present (except perhaps where it is due to an article with a governing word) seems always to be to the office of Messiah as exhibited and interpreted in Jesus.
vintè-кãà $\sigma$ ápкa, to distinguish them from the spiritual family of Christ: the Church is now the true Israel. $\tau . \sigma . \mu . \kappa . \sigma$. explains т. a. $\mu$.
4. oitıves. This form of the relative marks the characteristic which is the occasion of his feeling; cf. Moulton, p. $91 \mathrm{f} . ;$ Blass, 172 ; Hort, 1 Pet. ii. 1 f. 'Never absolutely convertible with ôs,' M., 'seeing that they are.'
cloเv, they still are in spite of what has happened.
 nation; cf. Joh. i. 48; below xi. 1; 2 Cor. xi. 22: and for ' $I \sigma \rho a \dot{\eta} \lambda$ cf. below 6 ; 1 Cor. x. 18 ; Gal. vi. 16; Eph. ii. 12 ; closely connected with the expectation of the Messiah and His kingdom, Acts i. 6. The following enumeration gives the details which are all involved in this name, and emphasises the paradox of the rejection of the Gospel by a people so prepared.
$\hat{\eta}$ vio日éia. Not LXX. or class. but common in inscriptions; cf. Deissmann, B. S. ir. p. 66. In N.T. Rom., Gal. (1), Eph. (1) only. This is the only place in which it refers to the sonship of Israel. Was it current among the Jews? cf. Exod. iv. 22; Hart, Ecclus. p. 302 f.
$\eta$ סóga. Cf. Lk. ii. 32; 2 Cor. iii. 7 f. The reference is to the Shechinah, the visible sign of the presence of God among His people.
ai $\delta \iota a \hat{\text { १̂каu. }}$. The plural marks the successive repetitions and ratifications of the covenant from Abraham to Moses; cf. Acts iii. 25 ; Lk. i. 72 ; for the plural Eph. ii. 12.
$\dot{\mathrm{r}} \boldsymbol{v} \boldsymbol{\sim} \mu 0 \theta \in \sigma$ ia, the legislation-the positive revelation of GoD's will
which distinguished Israel from all other nations. Only here in N.T. and LXX. canon : 2 Macc. vi. 23 ; 4 Macc. v. 35.
$\eta^{\eta} \lambda a \tau p \epsilon i a$, the ordered services of the Temple ; cf. Heb. ix. 1, 6.
ai $\dot{\epsilon} \pi a \gamma \gamma \in \lambda$ lal, primarily of the promises made to Abraham; cf. Gal. iii. 16, Heb. vii. 6, but including the whole prophetic revelation as touching the Messiah, cf. 2 Cor. i. 20; Acts xiii. 32: Hart, Ecclus. p. 306.
5. of $\pi \alpha \tau \in \in \in$. Cf. xi. 28 , xv. 8 ; 1 Cor. x. 1 ; Heb. i. 1, viii. 9 (qu.); Lk. xi. 47 ; Joh. vi. 49 ; Acts xiii. 32. On the Jewish insistence on the merits of the fathers cf. S. H., p. 330. The term includes the whole ancestry of Israel, not merely the Patriarchs.
 regards merely human origin, cf. i. 3 ; cf. 1 Clem. xxxii. 2 (F. C. Burkitt, J. T. S., v. p. 455). On the constr. cf. Blass, p. 94, eft Heb. ii. 17; below xii. 18, xv. 17: "the accus. of reference has already become an adverbial accus."
ó $\omega ้ v$ énl $\pi \alpha^{\prime} v \tau \omega v$, к. $\tau . \boldsymbol{\lambda}$. I adopt the stopping of W. H. mg. ( $\sigma \dot{\alpha} \rho \kappa \alpha \cdot \dot{\delta} \hat{\omega} \nu \kappa . \tau . \lambda$. ). This clause is an ascription of blessing to God, in His character as supreme ruler of all things, the author and director of all the dispensations of His Providence, tr. 'He who is over all, even God, is blessed for ever, Amen.' See Add. Note, p. 219.

6-13. The present condition of Israel has not been explicitly stated in $v v .1-5$, but implied in S. Paul's wish that he might have
 रpıбтoû in spite of all their privileges : yet not all; and the fact that some have accepted the Gospel shows that the Word of God, the basis of their call and privilege, has not utterly failed; indeed that Word itself drew distinctions even within the seed of Abraham, between the descent of nature and the descent of promise or spirit; and again in the children of Isaac between the one chosen of God for His purposes and the one not chosen.

In this section, then, the first line of argument is stated: the condition of Israel depends solely on GoD's choice for the execution of His purpose.
6. ov̉X olov-öтt. A unique combination : cf. Field, ad loc. He decides that ov̉ olov is in vulgar use a strong negative=nequaquam, ne minimum : 'It is by no means the fact that....'
$\delta \dot{c}$ contrasts with the implicit thought of $v v, 4,5$ : this wonderful dispensation has not ended in failure on God's part.
éклє́ттшкєv. Absolute use not common. Here=to fail of its purpose (cf. Polyb. 1v. 82. 8); cf. Ecclus. xxxi. 7, slightly different.
o $\lambda$ óyos тov $\theta \in 0 \hat{v}=$ the utterance of the purpose of God, as given in promises and covenants to Israel; cf. Joh. x. 35: a rare, perhaps unique (S. H.), use in N.T.; for the thought of. iv. 14 =Gal. iii. 17 .
ov̉ $\gamma$ àp $\pi$ áv $\tau \epsilon$ s к.т. $\lambda$., blood relationship does not of itself admit to the spiritual position.
7. оv่ठ' öть к.т. $\lambda$., nor does descent of flesh make children, in the sense of the promise, as witness Ishmael's case ; of. Joh. viii. 33 f .

$\alpha \lambda \lambda{ }^{\prime}{ }^{\prime} E v{ }^{\prime}$ I $\sigma$. Gen. xxi. 12.
 the choice of lines and persons for the execution of God's purpose: the starting point is God's promise to Abraham, including both the birth of a son and the blessing of the Gentiles.
$\lambda о \boldsymbol{\gamma}$ दєтai $\epsilon$ is $\sigma \pi \epsilon \rho \mu a$, are reckoned as seed, sc. of Abraham for the purposes of the promise: n. $\sigma \pi \pi^{\ell} \rho \mu \alpha$ is applied here more narrowly than in 7, as the quotation in that verse suggests.
9. '̇тaүү€ (as к.г.入. This utterance, which was directly connected with the blessing (Gen. xxviii. 10), is a matter of promise.
10. oủ $\mu$ óvov $\delta \dot{\text { é, }}$ к.т. $\boldsymbol{\lambda}$. The same principle is seen in the selection of one of two sons, born at one birth of one father and mother, even before birth or any act on their part.
 tion of His promise to bless the Gentiles) is carried out by a principle of selection, not as a matter of favour bestowed on merit but as a choice of fit instruments for attaining the end. $\pi$ pó $\theta$ érs, cf. viii. $\mathbf{2 8}$, here primarily of the purpose indicated in the promise. ék $\lambda_{0} \boldsymbol{\gamma} \eta$, cf. Heb. ix. 15 (below v. 21), selection: God selects nations and individuals not primarily for their own interest, but for work to
 both are subservient to His purpose ; men and nations are His $\sigma \kappa$ eún; cf. 1 Thes. i. 4; 2 Pet. i. 10 : infra xi. 5; Hort, 1 Pet. i. 1.
 their position was not the result of works already done by them by way of reward, but the result of God's call to service.
12. $\delta \mu \epsilon$ l $\xi \omega \nu$ к.т. $\lambda$., Gen. xxv. 23, where it is the nations represented by their founders rather than or at least as much as the founders themselves that are under consideration: throughout S . Paul is speaking of God's purpose as dealing with nations; cf. S. H. ad loc.
13. Mal. i. 2, where the words describe the several fates of

Israel and Edom, the disappearance of the latter and the desolation of their land being contrasted with the wideness of God's love for Israel. That is to say, history confirms the selection : Israel, with all its faults, served GoD's purpose; Edom did not.

The object, then, of these references is to show the character and object of the call of God-it is a choice of instruments for a definite purpose; and the call has not failed because of the failure of individuals, provided that there are still real instruments of His purpose doing His service ( $v .21$ ), and forming a remnant through which His work is carried on (27, xi. 5). That S. Paul was combating an actual position-of the irreversible validity of the call of. Israel after the flesh-is shown by S. H. p. 249. But the question arises as to the justice of God in this discrimination; and this question is handled in the next section.

каөáтєр $\gamma^{\epsilon} \gamma \rho a \pi \tau a l$. The words of the prophet are quoted to show that the actual course of history bore out the statement made to Rebecca. Jacob and his descendants had proved to be objects of God's love, Esau and his descendants, the Edomites, objects of Gon's hate. Malachi, as Genesis, refers to the nations.
'fulo $\ddagger \boldsymbol{\sigma}$. Only here in N.T., and here as a quotation, is the verb used to describe GoD's attitude to a man or men; of. Heb. i. 9 ; Rev. ii. 6. S. Paul uses the natural language of the Jew, in enforcing an argument based upon Jewish conceptions. It is essentially not Christian language. The truth underlying it is the necessary hatefulness of the character and conduct embodied in the history of Edom.

14-33. This choice of God is not unjust, because it flows from His Mercy, not from man's disposition or efforts. (17) Pharaoh himself was raised up to give an instance of GoD's power and to make wide proclamation of His Name: God's will works whether in mercy or in hardening. (19) If you ask what room is there for moral blame, seeing that Gon's will is irresistible? I reply, that man has no right to protest against GoD the conditions of his nature : any more than the vessel can quarrel with the maker for the uses to which it is destined. (22) It was God's will to make plain the conditions which should incur His wrath and to bring home to man's knowledge-His power; in doing so He bore long with those who served only to exhibit wrath and were formed by character only for destruction, His patience serving to reveal the great stores of revelation of Himself opened out to such as served to exhibit His mercy, formed and prepared for such revelation, men called now in our persons not only from Jews but also from Gentiles. (25) This action of GoD's will is
witnessed by the prophets both as regards the call of Gentiles (27) and as regards the call of only a remnant of Israel, representing the true Israel. (30) What then is the conclusion? That the righteousness (which is the purpose of God for man) is found among Gentiles, who for so long made no effort to attain it, while Israel missed even the law of righteousness at which they aimed. (32) And the reason is, that they neglected the one condition of attainment, namely faith : stumbling on the very rock of which the prophet spoke.
S. Paul is here defending his position, that the true people of God, the true Israel, now consists of a remnant of Israel and an incoming of Gentiles, both accepted on the ground of faith, against the objection that this involves an incredible rejection of the main stock of Israel: he shows how such an event was definitely contemplated by the prophets (25-33), and justifies it by the consideration of God's use of man for the execution of His purpose. Man is made for such use; and according to his character he serves that use, either negatively by showing the awful consequences of God's wrath upon $\sin$ (cf. i. 17 f .), and an instance of His power, or positively by showing the operation of Gon's loving mercy and self-revelation. The responsibility of man is maintained because he is a living instrument, who has the choice of faith or rebellion. He has no right to quarrel with the necessity which imposes this choice or the consequences which follow it; they are the conditions of his being a man at all. The clue to the meaning is to be found in the fact that the dominant thought is not that of man's personal destiny and final salvation or the contrary, but the thought of God's call to service, and the relation of man to God in the execution of that service. The call of man to take part in this work of God is a crowning instance of God's mercy to man. The work has to be done; but it may be done either with man's cooperation or against his will. The story of man is in the first case a revelation of God's mercy, in selecting men for certain uses, in the second a revelation of GoD's wrath, in visiting the failure to execute His purpose. The clue to the nature of man's responsibility is given in $\boldsymbol{v}$. 32. See Add. Note, p. 222.
14. $\tau \mathfrak{\imath}$ oűv épov̂นєv; introduces a difficulty, as in vi. 1.
$\mu \dot{\eta} . .$. ; Can there be unrighteousness in God? is this choice of persons mere $\pi \rho \sigma \sigma \omega \pi \sigma \lambda \eta \mu \psi$ la ? (ii. 11)? Cf. iii. 5, where the problem here worked out is just stated.
 instead of $\epsilon \nu$ from an instinct of reverence; cf. Mk x. 27; Rom. ii. 11.

15. $\tau \hat{\varphi} \mathrm{M} \omega v \sigma \in \hat{\imath} \gamma \mathrm{~d} \rho$ к. $\tau . \lambda$. $=\mathrm{LXX}$. Exod. xxxiii. 19. In the original
the force lies in the assertion of effective mercy. S. Paul applies it as asserting selective mercy (cf. 18). The mercy of God depends upon His Will. But how does this exclude the charge of unrighteousness, as $\gamma \dot{\alpha} \rho$ implies that it does? It can only do so, on the unexpressed assumption that GoD's Will is essentially and necessarily righteous; cf. iii. 6. But this is the very point raised by the objector : and we should have expected it to be expressed in the most explicit form. The context however shows that it is not the general mercy of God 'over all His works' which is here being considered, but His mercy in selecting human instruments for carrying out His work of redemption; $\epsilon \lambda \epsilon$ єos is closely connected with $\chi$ ápıs (cf. Hort, 1 Pet. p. 30). Cf. xi. 30 f.
16. dipa oûv. It follows therefore on a consideration of the whole circumstances-a combination very frequent in Rom. (8) and once each in Gal., Eph., 1 and 2 Thes. only.
 particular service depends not on man's will or effort, but on God's mercy.

тре́ $\mathrm{X} \epsilon เ \nu$. Metaph. only in S. Paul and Heb. xii. 1. Cf. тєрıтateîv.
 iva ..i i $\left.\chi^{\prime} \nu . ..\right):$ apparently an independent translation of the Hebrew.
 actors on the stage of history; cf. Hab. i. 6; Zech. xi. 16; Jer. xxvii. 41," S. H. So Lipsius, Zahn, al. Cf. á $\nu \dot{\sigma} \sigma \tau \eta \sigma \epsilon \nu$, Acts ix. 41. Giff. takes $\epsilon \xi \eta \gamma .=$ 'I raised thee from thy sickness.' Pharaoh is cited as an unwilling instrument of GoD's mercy: in his case and person the purposes of Gon's mercy and the revelation of His character ( ${ }^{\prime} \nu о \mu a$ ) are secured, although the process involves for him a 'hardening': that is due to his attitude towards God's purpose.
18. $\sigma \kappa \lambda \eta \rho u ́ v \in l . ~ C f . ~ E x o d . ~ v i i . ~ 3, ~ 22 ~ a l .: ~ t h e ~ o n l y ~ p l a c e ~ i n ~ N . T . ~$ where the hardening is directly attributed to God. Cf. Acts xix. 9; Heb. iii. 8 al . The 'hardening,' which is immediately the result of man's own attitude, is so by reason of the conditions imposed in creation on man's nature and consequently is an act of God; cf. i. 24 , xi. 8 .
19. Épeîs $\mu$ ol ỡv к.т.入. You will say to me, In this case what room is still left for faultfinding? If men are thus appointed to be instruments of GoD's use whether for mercy or hardening, how can they be responsible? how can God find fault? The answer is, on the one hand, that the question cannot be properly raised by man as against God, because man has to accept the conditions of his creation, and on the other hand that the revelation of GoD's wrath is itself
turned by the patience of God into a revelation of mercy. The answer does not seem to us sufficient, for it still leaves the fundamental point unsolved-why are some men to be the subjects of the revelation of wrath in order that the mercy may be revealed in others? If moral responsibility is to be maintained, the cause of this difference must be seen to lie in the man himself. But this is not brought out until we get to $v .31$ where the cause of Israel's failure is named as want of faith. Can we use this particular instance to interpret the whole argument? If we are meant to, it is strange that it should be left so late, and unapplied to the general problem. The reason for this perhaps is that S. Paul's mind is really absorbed in the particular problem of Israel, and does not attempt to elucidate, perhaps did not feel the weight of, the general problem. See Add. Note, p. 222.
 is the primary purpose of God. The use of the term $\beta$ ovi $\lambda \eta \mu a$ slightly
 guided by choice and purpose; $\theta \in \lambda \epsilon \iota$ expressing the mere fact of volition" (Hort, James, p. 32): but the distinction cannot be used to help the situation here.
$\dot{a} v \theta \epsilon \in \sigma \tau \eta \kappa \in \nu$ has ever succeeded in resisting (cf. xiii. 21): if the hardening is God's will, how can a man help it?
 thou that art mere man. For the idea of. Wisdom xii. 12.
$\mu \epsilon v o v ̂ v \gamma \epsilon . \quad$ Cf. x. 18; Phil. iii. 8 only; $\mu \epsilon \nu 0 \hat{\nu}$, Lk. xi. 28. Corrective, 'rather than put such a question consider...,' Blass, p. 270.

 1-6; Ecclus. xxxiii. 13; 2 Tim. ii. 20, 21. The metaphor emphasises the absurdity of the creature who quarrels with the conditions of his creation: and it brings out also again the point that man and, in particular here, nations are made for use and must subserve that use. It must not be pressed to the denial of spontaneity in man, which would be contrary to all S. Paul's ethical teaching. Men are living or personal instruments.
 of. 2 Tim . l.c.
22. $\epsilon \boldsymbol{\ell} \dot{\varepsilon} \ldots .$. No apodosis follows : the current is broken by the introduction of prophetic passages $v .25 \mathrm{f}$. What apodosis was intended? The thought passes from the abstract relation of Creator to created to GoD's actual government of men, as seen in His dealings with those who oppose and those who obey His Will: the principles of government are declared in the words $\eta_{\nu}^{\nu} \boldsymbol{\gamma} \kappa \epsilon \nu$ and $\pi \rho о \eta \tau o l \mu a \sigma \epsilon \nu$, the attitude in
$\pi . \mu \alpha \kappa \rho o \theta v \mu i a$, the end in the revelation of God's power and character, whether by wrath or mercy. The apodosis required, then, is some such appeal as 'what fault can we find here?' It should be remembered that the revelation of wrath is just as necessary for the moral education of man as the revelation of mercy. They are in fact the two sides of the shield.
$\theta \hat{e} \lambda \omega \nu=i n$ willing, or while willing: the clear exhibition of wrath is one side of GoD's revelation to man, and is given in the fact and consequences of $\sin$; cf. i. 18 f . The wrath of God towards sin is as true an outcome of His loving purpose for man, as is His pleasure in righteousness. The participle describes not the reason (because) nor a contrast (although), but the general condition under which the action of the main verb takes place.
 iii. 25; 2 Thes. i. 5; 1 Tim. i. 16.
$\gamma \nu \omega p l \sigma a \iota ~ \tau \grave{~} \delta$ vvaròv av̉. $\gamma \nu \omega \rho / \sigma a \iota=$ to bring to the knowledge of men. tò Suvatòv, His power seen in combating sin no less than in effecting righteousness.

グvєүкєv $\sigma \kappa \in \cup ́ \eta$ ó $\rho \gamma \eta{ }^{\eta} \mathrm{s}$. Jer. 1. (xxvii.) 25 ; Is. xiii. 5 (Heb.), but in both these passages the meaning is 'brought out weapons by which to inflict His purpose of wrath.' Here = 'bore with...instruments of wrath'; cf. ii. 4, iii. 25, 26; 2 Pet. iii. 9, 15 (Mayor cft 1 Pet. iii. 20; Ps. Ixxxvi. 15 ; Is. xxx. 18 al.). Cf. Exod. xxxiv. 6.

бкeúๆ ópyŋ̂s. Instruments whose only use now is for the wrath of God. The image of the preceding verse is continued but the form is changed ( $\delta \rho \gamma \hat{\eta} \mathrm{s}$ not $\epsilon l$ s $\delta \rho \gamma \eta \dot{\eta} \nu)=$ not 'destined for wrath' but fit only to exhibit or effect wrath (cf. S. H.). They have become so fit, by their own neglect of what they could know of God (cf. i. 18 f .). So
 result of a course of preparation, and this must be found (again in accordance with i. 18 f.) in their own conduct. Cf. Lk. vi. 40;
 vii. 13 ; Phil. iii. 19; 1 Tim. vi. 9.
23. ₹va $\gamma \nu \omega \rho i \sigma \dot{n}$. The object of the patience of God is to bring home to men's minds 'the wealth of His glory'; cf. xi. 32, 33. iva depends on $\not \geqslant \nu \epsilon \gamma \kappa \epsilon \nu$. The patience effected this object, because the mercy was revealed in spite of the opposition of sinners, such as Pharaoh or unfaithful Israel; and was recognised as all the more abundant because of that opposition. The redemption of Israel from Egypt, and the saving of a remnant and call of the Gentiles, were all the more signal triumphs of God's purpose for the opposition that was overcome. Hence the emphatic $\tau \partial \nu \pi \lambda . \tau . \delta$.

If кal is read before iva (as S. H.), we may take the final clause either (1) as practically connected with $\epsilon \bar{\epsilon} \pi 0 \lambda \lambda \hat{\eta} \mu \alpha \kappa \rho \circ \theta v \mu i q$ 'bore with much long-suffering and with the object of making known' (so S. H.) ; but the sequence is disjointed; or (2) as connected with $\dot{\epsilon} \nu$ $\delta \epsilon i \xi a \sigma \theta a \iota$, wishing to give an instance of His wrath and to make known His grace; where we have the same combination of constructions as in 1 Cor. xiv. 5 ; and the sequence is good: but the intervention of the main clause makes this very difficult, though perhaps not impossible.

тòv $\pi \lambda 0 \hat{\tau} \tau 0 \nu \tau \mathfrak{\eta} s \delta^{\prime} \xi^{\prime} \eta \mathrm{s}$. $\pi \boldsymbol{\lambda}$. specially characteristic of Eph . and Col.: but of. also ii. 4, xi. 33; Phil. iv. $19:=$ the inexhaustible abundance. Sóga here of the revelation of God's character in His dealings with man, in thought closely || Eph. ii. 7: the great acts of redemption reveal God to man. Cf. Eph. i. 18.
èml. Towards or over as in Eph. ii. 7: depends on the whole of the preceding phrase.
 such as He can use for His merciful purposes.
ai $\pi \rho о \eta \tau о\{\mu a \sigma \epsilon v$. Which instruments He prepared beforehand for bringing about this revelation of Himself. For the word cf. Eph. ii. 10 only. The $\sigma \kappa$. $\hat{\epsilon} \lambda$. are prepared by God Himself; the $\sigma \kappa$. $\delta \rho \gamma \hat{\eta} s$ make themselves so, by rejecting His methods of preparation. The reference is to the training through history and life, not to 'election,' Giff.
cis $\delta$ ógav. $\delta$. must have the same meaning as in the preceding clause $=$ for revelation of His purpose and character. The thought of final glorification is not included here; cf. viii. 30 .
24. ovts кal éкádєбєv. The attraction of ov̂s (to $\dot{\eta} \mu \mathrm{a} s$ ) marks the turn of thought from regarding the persons as instruments to regarding the instruments as persons: the personal agency of men comes out.
$\hat{\eta} \mu \mathrm{c} s$. Even us, or in us-or perhaps-which He actnally called us to be.
oủ $\mu$ óvov к.т. $\boldsymbol{\lambda}$. Here the underlying thought of the whole passage becomes explicit: and its importance is marked by the anacoluthon: instead of finishing his sentence $S$. Paul goes on at once to illustrate the fact of this call from prophetic sayings. It may also be that he shrank from enforcing his argument that the unbelieving Jews were $\sigma \kappa \epsilon \dot{\prime} \eta$ ó $\rho \gamma \eta$ ท̂s.

25-29. The four quotations are cited to show that the prophets contemplated that the choice of the chosen people would be maintained only in a remnant, and that there would be a choice of others
also．There is warrant in Scripture for both sides of his proposition； not only for Goo＇s working $\kappa a \tau^{\prime} \dot{e} \kappa \lambda o \gamma \eta^{\prime} \nu$ ，but also for the assertion that the $\dot{\epsilon} \kappa \lambda$ oj̀ in fact involved a call of Gentiles and at least con－ templated a falling away of Israelites，or，as he here prefers to call them，Jews．

25．Hos．ii．23．The original refers to the restoration of the ten tribes，who had fallen from their privileged state．S．Paul applies this to the inclusion in the privileged state of Gentiles who had not possessed it；on the principle that，if God could bring back the disowned，He could call in those who had not before been called． Cf． 1 Pet．ii． 10 （and Hort＇s note）．
26．Hos．i． 10 describes the reunion of Israel into one nation under one head：again S．Paul extends the reference．
 Gentiles．
Өєồ 乌ิvuros．Of．Acts xiv．15；Westeott on Heb．iii． 12.
27．The next two quotations justify the claim that Israel＇s call survives in a remnant．
Is．x．22．The context speaks of a remnant saved by trust in God． LXX．is followed but slightly altered；the first phrase is from Hos．i． 10，a clear proof that the quotations were from memory（or from a catena？）．

28．$\lambda$ óyov $\gamma$ àp $\sigma v v \tau \epsilon \lambda \omega \hat{v}$ к．т．$\lambda$ ．Cf．Is．xxviii． $22=\mathrm{LXX} . \pi \rho \alpha ́ \gamma \mu a \tau a$ ： $\lambda$ doov w．$\pi$ oth＇$\sigma \epsilon$ ，＇shall effeet a reckoning upon earth，completely and briefly．＇
29．Is．i． $9=\mathrm{LXX}$ ．
30－33．What conclusion is to be drawn？The facts are plain： Gentiles have attained a state of righteousness，though they were not seeking it：Jews，who sought it，have not attained．And the reason too is plain；what faith gave the one，lack of faith lost for the other： and this again corresponds to a prophetic warning．
30．$\tau \mathfrak{i}$ o̊v̀ Ẹpov̂ $\mu v$ ；Cf．viii． 31.
öть к．т． ．introduces the answer to the question：but the answer is incomplete till the second subsidiary question $32 \delta \delta \dot{\alpha} \tau l$ is answered．
 xv．9；Field，ad loc．
 response to faith，not as a result of works nor as yet worked out in life；cf．i． 17.

31．＇Irpaìd．The name of privilege；cf．on $v .4$.
vó $\mu$ ov Sıкaしょovivŋ̧s．A law embodying righteousness，almost＝a legal righteousness ；cf．ii．23，Wisd．ii． 11.
't日arev did not reach; of. 2 Cor. x. 14; Phil. iii. 16. Only in 1 Thes. iv. 15 does the idea of anticipation certainly occur.

 by starting from works.
 The sense in Isaiah is that the Lord of Hosts will be a sanctuary for Israel if they trust in Him : they will not then find Him as a stone to stumble against. The absence of faith makes Him so.
33. Is. xxviii. $16, \mathrm{LXX}$. with $\lambda_{\iota} \theta$. $\pi$. к. $\pi$. $\sigma$. substituted for $\lambda t \theta_{o \nu}$ $\pi г \lambda \nu \tau \epsilon \lambda \hat{\eta}$ к.т.入. and other slighter variations; cf. x. 11; 1 Pet. ii. 6 (see Hort).
In the original, the stone is the Divine King or Kingdom of Israel (in contrast with alien alliances), the recognition of which is to steady the mind of the people: the trust in its divine mission will not be baflled by disappointment (of. Hort, l.c.). The Apostolic interpretation sees this 'stone' in the Messiah, recognising as so often in Christ the fulfilment of what had been said of the true Israel. A good instance of the re-interpretation of O.T. in the light of Christian experience (cf. Mt. xxi. 42 parallels; Acts iv. 11 qu. Ps. cxviii. 22). S. H. refer to Justin M. (Dial. 36, p. 122 1. 34, p. 112 d, Otto) and suggest that $\lambda$ l $\theta$ os was a name for the Messiah among the Jews from an early (? pre-Christian) date. The point of the quotation here is that the Jews instead of trusting in this stone (of foundation for the true Israel, cf. Eph. ii. 20) had taken offence at it as revealed in Christ (1 Cor. i. 23) and trusting instead in their own works had come to grief. The tendency of Judaism at this time, in St Paul's view, was to trust in their performances of law instead of drawing life from communion with the living God; the rejection of the Messiah was the culminating instance of this tendency. This reason, why Israel cis $\nu \delta \mu o \nu$ oủk ${ }^{\text {E }} \phi \theta a \sigma \epsilon \nu$, suggests that Christ is the fulfiller of law; so cf. x. 4; Mt. v. 17; James i. 25.
 the object of trust; cf. v. 5; 2 Cor. vii. 14, ix. 4, x. 8.

## CHAPTER X.

This chapter expands the theme of the last section, and, by showing that Israel failed through ignorance, culpable because in defiance of express warnings, illustrates one strain in the theme of c. ix. that man is responsible for his failure to respond to God's purposes.
(1-4) Israel's rejection of the Messiah due to ignorance of the relation of Christ to law and righteousness (5-15) though the demand of the new righteousness was not hard to meet and they were informed of it by ( $16-21$ ) preaching of the apostles and warnings of the prophets.

1-4. With all my eager longing and prayer for Israel's salvation, I cannot but see and say that they have failed, not for lack of zeal, but for failing to recognise the nature of true righteousness and substituting an imagined righteousness of their own: they refused obedience to God's righteousness and to Christ as putting an end to law, for all believers, as an instrument of righteousness. They had put law in the place of God and could not accept Christ in the place of law.

1. $\dot{\alpha} \delta \epsilon \lambda \phi \circ i$. The personal appeal emphasises the depth of his feeling.

ท̀ $\mu$ èv єv̉ $\delta o \kappa i a$. $\mu e ̀ \nu$ suggests a contrast between 'S. Paul's desire and the facts as he is forced to see them.

є $\delta$ \&oкia $=$ purpose. Cf. 2 Thes. i. 11 ; Phil. i. 15, in which places the idea of purpose involved in goodwill is clear; so probably Phil. ii. 13. The proof of this purpose had been given by his habit of preaching first to Jews, and by his incessant efforts to keep together the Jewish and Gentile sections of the Church.
kapbia involves will (2 Cor. vii. 3, ix. 7) and intelligence (Eph. i. 18, iv. 18) as well as affection. $\dot{\epsilon} \mu \eta \hat{s}=\mathrm{my}$ whole heart.
$\mathfrak{\eta}$ ס́́ $\eta \sigma$ เs. The genuineness of the purpose shown not by acts only but by prayer.
eis $\sigma \omega \tau \eta p i a \nu=\% \nu \alpha \sigma \omega \theta \hat{\omega} \sigma \tau \nu$. Sc. द̇ $\sigma \tau i \nu$.
2. $\wp \mathfrak{\eta}$ خov. In a good sense; cf. Joh. ii. 17; 2 Cor. vii. 7, 11, ix. 2, xi. 2 only.
ov' кат' $\mathfrak{\epsilon} \pi$ ' $\gamma v \omega \sigma \iota \nu=$ without clear or true discernment of the will or character of God. " $\gamma \nu \hat{\omega} \sigma \iota s$ is the wider word and expresses knowledge in the fullest sense: $\dot{\epsilon} \pi \ell \gamma \nu \omega \sigma \iota s$ is knowledge directed towards a particular object, perceiving, discerning, recognising; but it is not knowledge in the abstract; that is $\gamma \nu \omega \bar{\omega} \iota s$, , Robinson, Eph. p. 254 (see the * whole discussion).
3. dंyvoov̂vtes. The Jews and Gentiles failed for the same reason; of. i. 18 f.; Eph. iv. 18.
тท̀v тov̂ $\theta$ єov̂ $\delta$ ıкaıoov́v $\eta=$ the righteousness which God exhibits in His own character and requires from men, contrasted with that righteousness which they tried to gain by their own efforts and methods. This is a decisive instance of the true meaning of the phrase; of. i. 17.

ข่тєтáүךбаv. Cf. 1 Cor. xv. 28; James iv. 7; 1 Pet. v. 5, for the middle sense of the passive form. The revelation of Gov's righteousness in Christ required a surrender of preconceived ideas and habits and a submission : this the Jews did not give.
4. $\tau$ é $\lambda \frac{1}{} \gamma \dot{d} \rho$ к.т. $\lambda$. $\gamma \dot{\alpha} \rho$ explains why this submission was required. $\tau \hat{\epsilon}$ 久os $\nu \delta \mu, v=$ an end of law, as an instrument of righteousness. Law promoted righteousness by revealing GoD's will and awakening the moral consciousness. That dispensation was ended by Christ, in whose Person and character God's will was fully revealed, and who at the same time, in His communicated life, gave the power of fulfilment to all who trust in Him. He thus also fulfils law, both as a revelation of and as a means to righteousness. But the special point here is that He ends the dispensation of law.
vórov. The particular reference is of course to Jewish law: but it is stated comprehensively in accordance with S. Paul's view of Gentile conditions.
cis $\delta$ ıcalooviv $\eta \boldsymbol{\nu}=$ as regards righteousness, or for the purposes of righteousness.
$\pi a v \tau i \quad \tau \hat{\varphi} \pi$. Cf. i. 16-the new condition marks the universality of the effect.

5-15. The reasonableness of such a submission is shown, and the relation of Christ to law explained, by the contrast between righteousness when sought as result of law, and righteousness resulting from faith. For the former S. Paul quotes Moses as laying down authoritatively that such righteousness can be attained only by complete obedience to law ; and that has been shown to be so difficult as to be impossible (cc. iii., vii.). For the latter S. Paul, while using O. T. language, does not quote it as authoritative, but freely adapts it to his purpose, using it because it is familiar and on his general
principle of the fundamental unity of thought in O.T. and the Gospel ; ef. S. H. for a full discussion.
5. $\delta$ тoı ${ }^{\prime} \sigma a s$ к.т.入. $=$ Levit. xviii. 5, LXX. (ä). The stress is on j. $\pi$. he that has done it, and he alone. Evv avivn̂, 'by it.'
6. $\mathfrak{\eta} \delta \dot{\epsilon} \mathrm{E} \mathrm{e} \mathrm{K} \pi$. $\delta$. A personification, a dramatisation of the appeal of the Gospel to man, to make plain the nature of the demand made by it, in contrast to the demand made by the Law. The demand of the Gospel is not for impossible effort, but for trust and confession. Note that S. Paul finds faith-righteousness already included in O.T. teaching ; cf. iv. 13 f. ; Giff. on v. 10.
$\mu \eta$ єlँñs к.т. $\boldsymbol{\lambda}$. The allusions are to Deut. xxx. 11 f . The questions, which are set aside, embody the hesitations of the man who supposes that the facts, on which this righteousness is based, are dependent upon human activity, whereas they are the accomplished acts of God in Christ ; and what is demanded is trust in Him who has done these acts, and confession of His Lordship.

тô̂' 'ैँтเv. Simply explanatory = that is to say; so in $v v .7,8$.
 the Incarnation and Resurrection. These are the fundamental acts of God by which His righteousness is revealed, and made possible for man. The fact that they are God's acts determines the human condition of righteousness, namely, faith in God through the incarnate and risen Son, and consequent confession of Him; cf. Phil. ii. 1-11.
 exxxviii. 8, LXX. ; Swete on Rev. ix. 1.
 of righteousness, expresses itself. The actual $\dot{\rho} \hat{\eta} \mu a$ is K $\dot{\rho} \rho \iota o s$ ' $I \eta \sigma o u ̂ s: i t$ is the expression of a faith which believes with the whole heart that God raised Him from death. The resurrection is the proof of the Lordship. This faith and confession is the demand of the Gospel righteousness. For the subj. gen. with $\dot{\rho} \eta \mathrm{\eta} \mu a$ cf. Ac. xxvi. 25. Other explanations are-the message which has faith for its subject, of. Joh. vi. 68; Acts v. 20 (S. H., Giff.), the message which appeals to faith (Lid.), the Gospel message (Oltramare ap. S. H.).
9. отть=because.
 1 Joh. ii. 23.
\%̈ть K. 'I. Cf. 1 Cor. xii. 3 ; 2 Cor. iv. 5 ; Phil. ii. 11 ; Acts ii. 36, xix. 5 ; above iv. 24 ; 2 Cor. iv. 14 ; Eph. i. 15 ; Phm. 5.

The simplest form of the Christian creed : кúpos the LXX. rendering of Jahweh is predicate to 'I $\eta \sigma o u s$; freq. in Acts in connexion with
baptism and the first confession of faith (cf. Acts xvi. 31) ; of. Knowling, Witness etc., p. 261 f . The simple combination is most frequent in 1 Thes., but occurs in most of S. Paul's Epp. and Heb. xiii. 20, Rev. xxii. 20, 21, and elsewhere ; ef. Robinson on Eph. v. 26.
 addition of $\epsilon \nu \tau \hat{\eta} \kappa . \sigma$. distinguishes this act, as the expression ( $\dot{\epsilon} \nu=$ with) of the whole heart, from bare assent to a fact; cf. Acts viii. 37 v.l., 1 Thes. iv. 14.
10. $\pi เ \sigma \tau \epsilon$ veral $=$ faith is formed, there is a state of faith, the condition, on man's side, of the state of righteousness.

одолоүєitcal $=$ confession is made, a state of confession, the necessary condition for $\sigma \omega$ tppia. The present tense in both cases marks the state of man's mind, not the mere act.

Sıкаıoбv́vๆv- $\sigma \omega \tau \eta \rho i a v$. The parallelism shows that the words are practically synonymous.
11. mâs к.т. $\lambda$. The quotation is suggested by the word $\sigma \omega \tau \eta p l a$; the confession based on faith will not be disappointed; then $\pi$ âs suggests the wide range of the principle and leads to $v .12$. Note $\pi$ âs is added by S. Paul ; but the universality is at once involved when $\pi \iota \sigma \tau \epsilon \dot{\varepsilon} \epsilon \iota$, possible to all, is laid down as the sole qualification; cf. i. 16, 17.
12. $\delta \iota a \sigma \tau 0 \lambda \eta$. Distinction, or distinguishing (cf. 1 Cor. xiv. 7), that is, in the matter of faith, which is a common human quality.
ó $\gamma \dot{\alpha} \rho$ aủròs kúpios. The same Person is Lord of all ; the argument here lies in the universal reach of the term кúpoos, as used in the confession Kúplos 'I $\eta \sigma o u ̂ s$.
$\pi \lambda о v \tau \hat{\omega} \nu$ к. $\tau . \lambda$. The positive side, as from the Lord, of ou кar-


тov̀s èmıka入oupévovs a. Cf. Acts ii. 21, ix. 14, 21, xxii. 16 ; 1 Cor. i. 2; 2 Tim. ii. 22; 1 Pet. i. 17; commonly in LXX. for invoking Jehovah as the God of Abraham, Israel, etc. The phrase is therefore a natural consequence of using the term Kíptos of Jesus, and has the same significance; cf. Knowling, op. cit. p. 263 f.
13. $\pi \alpha \hat{s}$ रàp к.т. $\lambda$. Joel ii. 32 qu. Acts ii. 21. N. the direct application to Christ of the O. T. phrase for Jehovah, as object of worship.
14. $\pi$ ज̂s oűv к.т. $\lambda$. The string of rhetorical questions at once justifies S. Paul's preaching to the Gentiles and shows that the Gospel has been offered to the Jews; they have failed, but not for lack of opportunity; this thought is developed in $\mathbf{1 6}$ f.

16-21. The quotations show that the refusal of the Jews to respond to the Gospel and the consequent call of Gentiles was
anticipated by prophets，from Moses to Isaiah，and typified by the experience of the prophets themselves．

16．$\alpha \lambda \lambda^{\prime}$ ov̉ $\pi a ́ v \tau \epsilon s$ к．т．$\lambda$ ．An objection taken by an imagined interlocutor ：you say＇all＇；but all did not respond to the appeal of the Gospel．
${ }^{\prime}$ Hoalas $\gamma \mathrm{d} \rho$ к．т．入．Is．liii． 1.
$\gamma \dot{\alpha} \rho=$ that was to be expected；for it was also the experience of the prophets．

17．ápa к．т．$\lambda$ ．Then，as now，it was Christ＇s，word heard by the prophet and reported，which was the outward condition of faith． N．the underlying thought that Christ spoke through the prophets； cf． 1 Pet．i． 11.
$\delta\llcorner\dot{\alpha} \dot{p} . \mathrm{X} p$ ．The word is that which the prophet utters，and it is Christ＇s word in the prophet．Pope（J．T．S．iv．，p． 273 f．）argues for taking $\dot{\rho}$ ．X $\rho$ ．here of the word spoken to the heart of the hearer；but the thought is alien from the context．

18．$\dot{\alpha} \lambda \lambda \dot{\alpha}$ к．т．$\lambda$ ．Israel has heard ；$\eta^{\prime} \kappa о v \sigma a \nu$ though oú $\chi \dot{v} \pi \dot{\eta}$－ кovбav．$\mu \eta \dot{\eta}_{\text {can }}$ it be pleaded that．．．．
cis mấav к．т．入．，Ps．xix．4，quoted not for argument but for illustration ：the Gospel has gone forth as widely as the utterance of God spoken of by the Psalmist．
19．$\left.\mu \eta{ }^{\prime} I \sigma \rho a \eta\right\rangle \lambda$ ov̉k ${ }^{\prime \prime} \gamma \nu \omega$ ；Can it be pleaded that Israel did not understand，i．e．Israel，with its privilege of special revelation，cannot plead ignorance in face of the explicit character of the warnings； of．Joh．iii． 10.
$\pi \rho \hat{\text { untos．}}$ ．From Moses onwards the warnings are explicit，of dis－ obedience in Israel and acceptance among others．

є́үш̀ к．т．д．Deut．xxxii． 21.
20．＇Hoalas к．т．入．Is．lxvi．f．

## CHAPTER XI.

XI. God has still not rejected Israel. (1) A remnant is saved now as in the time of Elijah, (8) the hardening of the rest has for its object the salvation of the Gentiles and ultimately of Israel itself. (15) The privilege of the Gentiles is the same as the privilege of Israel; (17) in their case also it may be forfeited, (25) and even for Israel it points beyond the time of hardening to their altimate salvation. (29) For the gifts of God are irreversible; His purpose is comprehensive mercy; His wisdom, knowledge and judgments are deeper than man can fathom, because they underlie the very origin, process and end of all creation.

1-12. The failure of Israel does not even now constitute a rejection by God. As in former times of apostasy there is a faithful remnant in whom the faithfulness and graciousness of God is still seen. And in this remnant lies the hope of restoration.

1. $\lambda$ é $\gamma \omega$ oûv к.т. $\lambda$. picks up the thought of ix. 6. The reference to Ps. cxiv. 14, 1 Sam. xii. 22, enforces a negative answer.
$\mu \eta$ дंтш́бaro к.т. $\lambda$. The form of the question involves a negative answer.
 a rejection he himself would be involved and his whole position, that the Gospel is the climax and fulfilment of the earlier dispensation in its true spirituality, undermined.
${ }^{\prime}$ Iбраŋлєiтŋs к.т. $\lambda$. Cf. 2 Cor. xi. 22 ; Phil. iii. 5.
2. $\pi \rho \circ \epsilon \in \gamma v \omega$. Cf. viii. 29 n .
$\eta$ ท oúc olठarє к.т.入. The point is that in a notorious case of a great apostasy there was no rejection by God, but a preservation of a remnant. So it is now.
év'H $\lambda_{\text {к }}$ (q. "in the section which deals with Elijah," S. H. q.v.
 approaches, and petitions, God against....

3, 4. 1 Kings xix. 10, 18.
 Acts x. 22 ; Heb. xii. 25 ; LXX. 2 Mac. ii. 4, app. in the sense of an
oracle $=\chi \rho \eta \sigma \mu$ ós : but here, in direct reference to $\grave{\epsilon} \nu \tau v \gamma \chi \alpha ́ \nu \epsilon \iota \nu,=$ reply ; cf. Deissmann B. S. p. 118, " $\epsilon ้ \tau \tau \epsilon v \xi ̆ \iota S$ is a technical term for a petition to a king, $\chi \rho \eta \mu a \tau i \zeta \epsilon \iota \nu$ the t.t. for the reply "; cf. Milligan, Grk Pap. 5, 5, 21 ; Polyb. 28. 14, $10=$ answers to $\epsilon \grave{\epsilon} \tau \epsilon \dot{\xi} \xi \in \epsilon s$ of ambassadors (Schw. Lex.).
$\tau \hat{n} B a ́ a \lambda$, on the fem. (LXX. $\tau \hat{\varphi})$ cf. S. H. : "the feminine article with the masc. name was due to the desire to avoid the utterance of the forbidfen name Baal (Hosea ii. 16, 17) and the substitution in reading of ai $\sigma \chi \dot{v} \nu \eta$, just as the name Jehovah was written with the pointing of Adonai ; usage most common in Jeremiah, occurs also in 1 and 2 Kings, Chronicles, and other Prophets; not in Pentateuch ". (summarised).
5. $\lambda$ ( $\mu \mu \alpha$ only here in N. T.; cf. ix. 27 (v̇то入. or ката入. seems to be the usual word in LXX.).
 free grace, cf. ix. 11. The genitive marks the ground of selection and forestalls at once any sense of superiority or merit. It is God's free generosity, not their own deserts, which preserves the remnant; cf. Eph. ii. 9. The statement seems to rest on the words $\kappa \alpha \tau \epsilon \bar{\lambda} \lambda$ וтoע


 their works.
érel, otherwise, of. 22 ; 1 Cor. xv. 9 ; v. Field ad h.l. خ̀ $\chi \dot{\rho} \rho \iota s$ the grace we are speaking of ; oú. $\gamma . \chi$., loses its character of grace, cf. iv. 4.
7. $\tau i$ oviv; sums up the argument : Israel missed its aim; but not all Israel; the select remnant gained it ; the rest were blinded; of. ix. 31.
è $\pi \omega \rho \omega$ ' $\theta \eta \sigma \alpha \nu$ were 'dulled' or 'blinded'; they failed to perceive the true way of attaining their aim; exactly \| x. 3 ajvooûvees, not $\| \sigma \kappa \lambda \eta \rho \dot{v} \varphi \epsilon \iota$, ix. 18. Robinson, Eph. 264 f., points out that $\pi \dot{\omega} \rho \omega \sigma \tau \iota$, $\pi \omega \rho o \hat{v} \nu$ are used in N.T. not of the hardness of the will or obstinacy ( $\sigma \kappa \lambda \eta \rho о к а \rho \delta i a)$ but of the dullness of the understanding, dullness of sight or feeling being applied to the heart as the seat of intelligence; ef. Mk viii. 17 ; Joh. xii. $40 ; 2$ Cor. iii. 14 ; Eph. iv. 18; where the context is decisive, as here, vv. 8, 10. The whole discussion should be read.
8. каӨámєр $\gamma^{\ell} \gamma \rho$. Is. xxix. 10, Deut. xxix. 4, a free conflation. $\pi v \in \hat{\mu} \mu a$ катavú $\xi \in \omega \mathrm{s}$, кaтav. Isa. l.c. Ps. ix. 3 only. 'Torpor' seems to be the meaning of the noun, but is not easily paralleled by the uses of the verb (Isa. vi. 5, Dan. x. 15 are nearest) : perhaps produced by the influence of кaravvotás $\omega$, cf. S. H. n., Field. In
any case the idea is of the dulling of the spiritual sense as in $\dot{\epsilon} \pi \omega \rho \dot{\omega} \theta \eta \sigma a \nu$ ．
óфө．к．т． $\boldsymbol{\lambda}$ ．Cf，Mk iv． 12 qu．Isa．vi． 9 f．
9．Ps．lxix． 22 f．，zxxv． 8 （ $\theta \dot{\eta} \rho a$ ）．A terrible quotation ：it implies that the Jews are to be reckoned among those enemies of God and persecutors of His suffering people on whom the Psalmist imprecates these curses，the sustenance of their lives is to become a snare and trap and retribution for them，their eyes are to be darkened and their strength broken．The justification of this use of the passage is that to the Psalmist also the persecutors were his own people．The punishment is inevitably found in the very privileges and faculties which they had misused．So the situation described is typical of the present situation＝now，as then，the wrath of God works side by side with His grace，

Өท́pa＝a net ；cf．Ps．xxxv． 8 only．divтaтóסopa，of．Lk．xiv． 12 （only in N．T．）．

11．$\lambda$ é $\gamma \omega$ oűv．The moral of the situation is drawn；it does not end in the ruin of the Jews；it has for its first result the offer of salvation to Gentiles，and that gives a hope of a still wider purpose ； cf．$v .25 \mathrm{f}$ ．Their ruin may be disciplinary．

Uтта．бavк．т．入．The context sharpens the meanings of the words： $\epsilon \pi \tau a \iota \sigma a \nu$ and $\pi \epsilon \sigma \omega \sigma \iota$ thus contrasted $=$ stumbled to their final ruin， though the two words are much more nearly synonymous in common use； $\begin{aligned} & \pi \tau a \iota \sigma a \nu \\ & \text { is also defined by the use of } \pi а \rho a ́ \pi \tau \omega \mu a \text { ，a slip aside，a }\end{aligned}$ trespass，as it is suggested by $\sigma \kappa \alpha ́ \nu \delta a \lambda_{o \nu}(9)$（S．H．）．₹va ranges in its use from definite purpose to simple result（cf．Moulton，p．206），so paraphrase：Is the ruin of Israel the only and final result of their fall？Not at all；the immediate result is the offer of salvation to the Gentiles；this should rouse Israel to competition，and we can see that if Israel＇s defeat has enriched the world，their restoration and completion may still enormously increase that gain．That is the end we may anticipate ；of． 15.
$\pi a p a ́ \pi \tau \omega \mu a$ ，a slip from the straight．Pauline except Mk xi． 25 f ． （｜｜Mt．vi． 14 f．）．The dative＝the occasion．
$\dot{\eta}$ бwrmpla $\tau$ ．${ }^{\epsilon} .=$ the salvation which we preach has come to the Gentiles．

тара $\eta_{\eta} \lambda \omega \bar{\sigma} a \iota$ echoes x .19.
12．$\eta \tau \tau \tau \mu a=$ defeat ：they have been defeated in their efforts after righteousness（so 1 Cor．vi． 7 of defeat in a case at law）；of． Field ad loc．He points out that there is a lack of correspondence between $\ddot{\eta} \tau \tau \eta \mu \alpha$ and $\pi \lambda \eta \dot{\rho} \omega \mu a$ as there is between $\pi a \rho a ́ \pi \tau \omega \mu a$ and $\pi \lambda$ ov̂os．There is no justification for translating $\eta$ グ $\tau \tau \eta \mu a$ by＇loss．＇

$\pi \lambda \eta \dot{\rho} \omega \mu$. Cf. Robinson, Eph. p. 255 f. : he shows that substantives in - $\mu$ a represent the result of the action of the verb, and may be either active or passive. Here = the completing of Israel, i.e. the adding the rest to the remnant; cf. vv. $15,26$.

13-33. The relative positions of Jews and Gentiles, which have just been described in brief, are now elaborated, to show that they both stand or fall on the same principle, of God's grace and man's faith ; bare privilege cannot save either. The argument of $i$.-iii. is thus completed. There it was shown that both failed in the same way; here that both must be saved in the same way. (13) Now my word to the Gentiles : though I make much of my office as preacher to the Gentiles, in the hope of stimulating Israel to take up their place in the Gospel-an end of supreme value and (16) natural(17) yet Gentiles must remember that they owe their present state to their being included in the true life of Israel, (19) and may, as did Israel, by lack of faith in the goodness of God, come under His severity. (23) Israel, too, by recovery of faith may be reinstated. (25) The truth is that the love of God persists over all: Israel's partial blindness leads to the call of the Gentiles, that, when completed, to restoration of Israel ; (30) all have been shown to need, that they may receive, GoD's mercy. (33) So we get a glimpse of the unfathomable wisdom and knowledge of God, His impenetrable judgments and untracked ways, in His supreme government of all things and elements in the universal plan: His is the glory for ever.
 implying that those to whom he was writing were all Gentiles; ef. ii. $1,17$.
 then, introducing what he has to say to Gentiles. $\mu$ èv finds its antithesis in $\delta \dot{\epsilon}, v .17$. His stress upon the mission to the Gentiles does not prevent him seeing their real position. There is still the note of apologia : from ix. 1 he has been defending his position as apostle of the Gentiles ; and here he completes the defence. Hence the emphatic $\epsilon^{\prime} \gamma \omega$.
'є $\phi$ ' örov, so far as I am...; the description does not exhaust the meaning of his office; it has a bearing upon Jews as well.
${ }^{\dot{\varepsilon}} \theta \mathrm{v} \omega \mathrm{\omega} v$ áróvтo入os. This seems to be the only instance in N.T. of the gen. after $\dot{\alpha} \pi$. describing the persons to whom the apostle is sent.

т $\boldsymbol{\eta}^{2}$ Sıakoviav. Of the apostolic office; of. 2 Cor. iv. 1, v. 18; 1 Tim. i. 12.


Apostle may magnify his office，for the purpose which he states；but this must not lead his converts to exult over the excluded（кaтaкavरิ， v．17）．

15．ámoßo入ทे，Acts xxvii． 22 only．vv．15， 16 are parenthetic， justifying the statement of purpose in 14 and repeating the idea of 12.
катадлаүฑ̀ кó $\sigma \mu$ ov．Of．v．10，11；Eph．ii．12－16，and 2 Cor．v．， 18，19．катад入．verb and subst．only in Rom．， 1 and 2 Cor． （алток．，Eph．，Col．）．
$\dot{\eta} \pi \rho \rho^{\sigma} \lambda \eta \mu \psi \mathrm{s}$ ．The reception of them（see Hart，Ecclus．p．302； cf． 1 Sam．xii．22）．
̧̧vì è $\nu \in \kappa \rho \hat{\omega} \nu=$ life after death ：the sharpest contrast that human experience affords．In what reference？It must inclụde not merely the recovered Israel but the reconciled world．It seems therefore to point to the final consummation at the second coming，ef．viii． 18 f ．， and esp．Acts iii． 19 ff ．，where the repentance of Israel is the necessary preliminary of that coming；ef． 1 Cor．xv．28．So S．H．，who point out the same reference in i．26．It explains then the $\pi \delta \sigma \psi \mu \hat{\lambda} \lambda \lambda o \nu$ of $v .12$ ．

16．ci $\delta \dot{\epsilon} \hat{\eta} \alpha \pi a p \chi \eta$ ，к．т．入．The metaphor is from Numbers xv． 20，21．ária in both clauses is used in its technical sense of consecrated to God＇s use，without immediate reference to the character of the thing or person consecrated ：but the consecration shows the true destiny of the thing consecrated．The verse gives the ground for the hope of a $\pi \rho \sigma \sigma \lambda \eta \mu \psi$ เs of Israel．The consecration of the firstfruits，of the root，involves the consecration of the whole organism．It is not annulled by the lapse of some members．New members are brought in by the mercy of God；but this does not exclude the possibility of the recall of those who fell away；such is the resourcefulness of the mercies of God．Thus ámap $\bar{\eta}$ and $\dot{\rho} i \zeta a=$ the patriarchs（cf．S．H．and Giff．）；the фú $\rho a \mu a$ and the $\kappa \lambda a \delta o l=$ the generality of Israel；those that remain faithful are the true Israel， the remnant on which faithful Gentiles are grafted．So the true life of Israel persists in the Church in Christ．For this use of $\dot{a} \pi a \rho \chi \chi$ ， of． 1 Cor．xvi．15， 2 Thes．ii． 13 （v．l．），James i．18，Rev．xiv．4．The thought is present in viii． 19.
 катакаvХ $\hat{\omega} \tau \hat{\omega} \nu \kappa \lambda \alpha \delta \omega \nu)(\tau \grave{\nu} \nu \delta \iota a \kappa o \nu l a \nu \mu o v ~ \delta o \xi a ́ \zeta \omega$ ．The point of the simile is that the Gentiles owe their present inclusion in the stock of Israel，the chosen people，solely to that mercy of God which first made a chosen people：the condition of permanence for them is the same as it has been for Israel，namely，faith；they have no reason then to boast over the discarded members of that stock，but rather to
fear for themselves, lest they too should fail in the condition, and further to hope for those members, that the same creative act of God, which has brought them, the Gentiles, into union with this source of life, may also restore those who have cut themselves off from it. The argument is closely || 1 Cor. x. 1-13.

The true Israel is the root or stock with the branches, individual members, whether new or old. The underlying thought is the unity of the life in and from Christ, constituting the unity of the new Church. We have the elements here of the thought of the ' one man in Christ' which is developed in Eph.; cf. Hort, R. and E., p. 179 ; ef. Joh. xv. 1 ff. ; Jer. xi. 16.
 remained as a stock with some branches.

бù...é $\gamma^{\text {évov. The singular emphasises the obligation of the in- }}$ dividual.
áypıé̀alos. See Ramsay, Pauline Studies, p. 223 f. He refers to Prof. Fischer ' Der Oelbaum' to show that two processes of grafting were used in the cultivation of the olive: (1) the ordinary process of grafting a noble olive shoot on a stock of the same kind, all original branches of the stock being cut away, and the grafted shoot forming the tree. This was done when the stock was still young. (2) An exceptional process was employed to invigorate an old olive tree which was failing : the failing branches only were cut away, and a shoot of wild olive was grafted. The effect was both to invigorate the old tree and its remaining branches and to ennoble the new graft. According to Prof. Fischer this process is in practice in Palestine at the present day. If we may suppose it to have been in use in S. Paul's time, it affords an admirable illustration for his subject. The fact seems to have been discovered first by Prof. Fischer and commentators from Origen downwards appear to have no knowledge of $i t$.

Ėv av̉roîs. Among the branches which remained.
ovvkoเv $\omega v$ òs. Partner with the remaining branches in the root which supplies the richness of the olive. The root here too is the 'remnant' as in Christ; cf. 18.
18. $\mu \eta$ к кaтakavx̂. 'Do nọt triumph over' (as you are in danger of doing (cf. Moulton, p. 125)).
19. ou์v. The Gentile is represented as justifying his triumph by the fact that his inclusion was the purpose of their rejection.
20. $\tau \hat{\eta} \dot{\alpha} \pi \iota \sigma \tau \mathfrak{i}-\boldsymbol{\tau} \hat{\tau} \pi \boldsymbol{i} \sigma \tau \epsilon \iota$, dative marking the cause or occasion. Cf. $v .30$, iv. $20 ; 2$ Cor. ii. 13; Blass, § 38. 2 (1898). For $\dot{d} \pi . \pi$., cf. Mk ix. 24.
$\mu \eta$ v..$\phi$. Give up these high thoughts of yourself; school yourself to the humility of fear ; cf. 1 Tim. vi. 17.
22. र $\delta \epsilon$ oủv. This being so observe how in God there is both goodness and severity, meeting in each case the position taken by man.

रठє only here w. accus. N. the absence of articles.
é $\pi\ulcorner\mu \in ́ v \eta$ ŋs. With dat., vi. 1 ; Phil. i. 24 ; Col. i. 23 ; 1 Tim. iv. 16 only. He says $\tau \hat{\eta} \chi \rho$. not $\tau \hat{\eta} \pi i \sigma \tau \epsilon c$ to emphasise this absence of all merit and the need of dependence on GoD's grace exclusively ; the thought of $\pi i \sigma \tau \epsilon t$ is included in è $\pi \iota \mu \in \dot{v} \nu \eta$.
€̇ாel, otherwise ; cf. xi. 6.
23. As the Gentiles came to share in the hope of Israel, so fallen Israel may share the hope of the redeemed Gentile. He now explicitly declares his hope for Israel, hinted in v. 12.

Svvaròs ráp к. $\boldsymbol{\tau} . \boldsymbol{\lambda}$. The same power which grafted the Gentile branches can graft again the broken branches of Israel, and indeed (24) the exercise of power is less, as they naturally belong to the stock.
24. Éк $\tau \hat{\mathrm{y}} \mathrm{s}$ катd̀ $\phi$. á $\gamma \mathrm{p}$. From the wild olive to which you naturally belonged. So maprì фv́бเv contrary to your natural origin, oi katà фv́eเv those who naturally belong to it.

25-32. The argument is summed up in a picture of the wide and patient purpose of God : the end is to bring both Jew and Gentile under His mercy : in the process both have sinned (cc. i. 18-iii.) and experienced His wrath, owing to the same cause in them. But the waywardness of man has no counterpart in God: His gifts and calling are not withdrawn or changed, and will triumph in the end.
25. ov̉ $\theta$ é $\lambda \omega$ v.. ảyvoєiv. Cf. i. 13 ; 1 Cor. x. 1, xii. 1 al., always with $\dot{a} \delta \epsilon \lambda \phi o l$; a solemn emphasis of a fundamental truth.

т̀̀ $\mu$ vбтท'pıov тоvิтo. This secret of GoD's providential government; cf. $x v i .25 ; 1$ Cor. xv. 51. The word in S. Paul always has the sense of a secret of God's purpose now revealed. In its fullest sense, it is the purpose of redemption in Christ, especially as including all mankind : so of the Incarnation ( 1 Tim. iii. 16), of the crucifixion ( 1 Cor. ii. 1, 7), of the consummation (Eph. i. 9), of the inclusion of the Gentiles (Eph. iii. 3, 4; Col. i.-26, 27, infra xvi. 25) ; here of the final reunion of Jew and Gentile in one Church (cf. Eph. ii. 11 f.). S. H.
évéavtoîs $\phi$ póvıцou. $\phi \rho$. has special reference to plans devised for effecting their salvation : they must take Gop's plan, not find one in their own imaginings; cf. xii. 161 Cor. iv. 10 . There is nothing
quite parallel in the use of the verb; but of. roфb's 1 Cor. i. 19 f., and бoфias v. 33.
öть $\pi \omega \rho \omega \sigma เ$ к.т. $\boldsymbol{\lambda}$. The briefest possible summary of the whole argument.
äxpı ov̊ к.т.入. Cf. Lk. xxi. 24.
тò $\pi \lambda \eta$ íp $\omega \mu$. Cf. on $v .12$.
єiซé $\lambda$ 日n. Of entering into the kingdom ; ef. Mt. vii. 21, 13 ; Lk. xiii. 24, S. H. ; so also $\sigma \omega \theta \eta$ خетаи.
 The idea is that Israel as a nation will have its part fully in the consummated kingdom of Christ (cf. 1 Cor. xv.) and in this final reconciliation S. Paul sees the fulfilment of the promises. What fate awaits those Israelites who fell away, he does not consider. Jewish eschatology seems to have provided for the inclusion of all Israel in the Messianic kingdom by means of a general resurrection. But this question of the ultimate salvation of individuals is as completely ignored at this point, as it has been throughout these chapters.
 for éveкev $^{\text {L. LXX. and 'to S.' Hebr. ; the last clause is from Is. }}$ xxviii. 9. The context in Is. concerns the sins of Israel, and the verses quoted give the promise of redemption. This hope, which contemporary Judaism applied to a restoration of Israel by the establishment of the Messianic kingdom in Jerusalem, S. Paul sees fulfilled in the final return of the Christ and the establishment of His spiritual kingdom. For Sion thus spiritualised cf. Gal. iv. 26 ; for the new covenant, 2 Cor. iii. 6 f. For the Jewish interpretation of these passages, of. S. H. The context is quoted in c. iii.
28. karà $\mu \hat{v} v$. The verse states in another form the fact laid down in 25 b . Hence the asyndeton. The Gospel preached by S. Paul, by its abolition of law and inclusion of Gentiles, involved, as a matter of fact, the throwing of the greater part of Israel into a state of hostility to GoD: that hostility was incurred for the sake of the Gentiles : but that does not involve a change in God's original purpose in selecting Israel ; His love still holds towards them for the sake of the fathers in whom that purpose found its first expression and a true response; of. above $v .1$.
 cf. xi. $5, \mathrm{ix}, 11$.

тov̀s $\pi$ tatépas, ix. 5; Acts iii. 25, xiii. 17, 32 ; infra, xv. 8 ; 1 Cor. x. 1; Heb. i. 1, viii. 9 (qu.). There seems no strong reason for limiting the reference to the Patriarchs. The plural seems to include the whole ancestry of Israel, here regarded as the object of GoD's love shown in

His earlier dispensation. It is for the sake of them, on whom He had lavished so much, that their wayward descendants are still not allowed to travel beyond the range of His love.

$\tau \dot{\alpha}$ xaplo $\mu a \tau a$, only here of God's gifts outside the Gospel dispensation ; its use for the privileges of the Jew (ix. 4-6) is a remarkable instance of S. Paul's sense of the unity of revelation : the use of the words marks the fact that the privileges of the Jew were the free gifts of God's love, and, as such, could not be forfeited by rejection, though their operation might be suspended. The love which gave is still there. So
$\dot{\eta} \mathrm{k} \lambda \hat{\eta} \sigma$ s. The call to service, and ultimately to the kingdom, still holds, if Israel will hear.
30. $\tilde{\omega}^{\circ} \sigma \pi \epsilon \rho \gamma \mathrm{d} \rho$. Another ground for the hope in 25 b found in a parallel between the actual experiences of Gentiles and Jews.
$\hat{v} \mu$ îs. Cf. $v .13$; the whole section is addressed to Gentiles.
 due to the refusal to obey the voice of God speaking to them; i. 19 f .
$v \hat{v} \mathrm{~S}$ §̀, now that you have heard and received the Gospel.
$\eta^{3} \lambda \epsilon \eta^{\prime} 0 \eta \tau \epsilon \tau \hat{\eta} \tau . \alpha^{3} \pi$. You came under the mercy of God owing to their disobedience $=28 \mathrm{a}$. As a matter of fact the opposition of the Jews led to the preaching of the Gospel to Gentiles; cf. Acts xii. 9 f., xiii. 46 al.
31. vvิv, again under the Gospel, $\boldsymbol{\eta} \pi \epsilon(\theta \eta \sigma a v$ refused to obey God's voice speaking in the Gospel, т仑̂ v. $\boldsymbol{\epsilon}$. owing to the mercy shown to the Gentiles : the wide range of the Gospel was in S. Paul's experience the principal cause of offence to the Jews. This construction gives a clear and fitting sense : others take $\tau \hat{\psi} \hat{v} . \dot{\epsilon}$. with $\bar{\epsilon} \lambda \epsilon \eta \theta \hat{\omega} \sigma \omega \nu$; but this involves a very awkward order and does not give a quite clear sense.
¿va кal av̉. vv̂v $\mathfrak{\epsilon} \lambda$. In order that they in their turn under the Gospel may experience the mercies of God, in contrast, that is, with their present subjection to His wrath, not with their former covenant relation, as that also was a state of mercy.
32. $\sigma v v_{\epsilon ́ \kappa \lambda \epsilon \mid \sigma \epsilon v ~ \gamma a ̀ p ~ к . \tau . \lambda . ~ C f . ~ i i i . ~ 9, ~ 19, ~}^{23}$; Gal. iii. 22.
tov̀s mávtas. Jew and Gentile alike, regarded as classes : in both classes there were numerous exceptions, but neither class as such was exempt from the doom of disobedience; both need the mercy which is God's ultimate purpose. The point here, as throughout, is to set aside any claim for special consideration on the ground of privilege. Privilege is a sign of GoD's love but not a guarantee of man's response; and in the failure of that response men fall under the judgment of God.
 and in the disobedience of the Jew: the object of both alike is to give occasion for the exhibition of the Divine mercy," S. H. Man's disobedience is GoD's opportunity.

33-36. In dealing with this awful problem the last and deepest thought is, how infinite is the wealth and wisdom and knowledge in God, how far we are from being able to explore all His judgments or to track out all His ways ; He reveals, but to none is His mind open, from none is His counsel drawn, to none is He in debt : He is the source, the ruler, the end of all : man can offer him nothing but the glory which is His due : so let us offer.

These verses contain at once a profound confession of faith in the goodness and wisdom of God, in spite of all the problems which experience raises and does not solve, and a confession of humility and reserve as regards the reasoning which has been given. Something has been seen and said of the purpose and ways of God, but not all : enough to confirm faith and to awake worship and praise; but not to explain everything: glimpses of the end to encourage man in the time of probation ; but not more than glimpses. The fundamental postulates of faith are the wisdom of God and His allembracing and loving purpose; these are the only sure guide among all the problems of experience, and they are a sufficient guide.
33. $\boldsymbol{\omega}$, the only place where $S$. Paul uses the exclamation except with a vocative.
ßátos. Cf. viii. 39 ; 1 Cor. ii. 10 ; Eph. iii. 18: there is the sug. gestion of depth impenetrable to human thought.
$\pi \lambda$ ov́rov. If coordinate with $\sigma o \phi l a s$ and $\gamma \nu \omega \sigma \epsilon \omega s$, represents $\chi$ dןcs or ajaity, and this might be justified by ii. 4, x. 12, xi. 12 ; cf. Phil. iv. 19 ; it is a favourite word in Eph. ; of. esp. i. 7, ii. 7, iii. 8. The argument of the preceding chapters has developed the thought both of the love and of the wisdom of God. Yet here the dominant thought seems to be rather of the ways in which God conceives and brings about, if we may so speak, His ends; and consequently it is better to take $\pi$ 入oútou as governing the other genitives.
kal бофlas кal $\gamma \nu \omega \dot{\sigma} \epsilon \omega$. Combined also Col. ii. 3. бофla is attributed to God by S. Paul with special reference to the wisdom with which the divine dispensations are ordered for the execution of His purpose, especially in the culminating dispensation of the Gospel, the means taken for the redemption of man from sin. $\| \delta \iota^{\prime}$ aย̉rov̂, 36 ; cf. 1 Cor. i. 19 f., ii. 7; Eph. iii. 10 ; Col. ii. 3. This is in accordance with the current use of the word, which applied
specially to the philosophy of conduct, rather than to metaphysical speculation.

кal $\gamma \nu \omega \sigma \sigma \epsilon \omega$. Knowledge of what men and things really are, the necessary basis of $\sigma 0 \phi i a$ as thus used. This is probably the only place where the subst. is used of God's knowledge, cf. Acts i. 24, xv. 8, nor is the verb commonly so used; 1 Cor. iii. 20 ; 1 Joh, iii. 20 ( 1 Cor. viii. 3 ; Gal. iv. 9 ; 2 Tim. ii. 19, slightly different, of. viii. 29 n.). The thought seems to be of that complete knowledge of the nature of man and the issues of action which the wisdom of His dispensation reveals; so \|l $\epsilon l s$ aút $\delta v, v .36$.
$\theta \epsilon 0 v$. The absence of the article emphasises the character of God as God.
$\dot{\alpha} v \epsilon \xi \in \rho \frac{v}{v \eta} \eta \tau a$. Cf. 1 Pet. i. 10 є $\xi \eta \rho a u ́ v \eta \sigma a \nu$; the simple verb not uncommon in N. T. (Jo. Pa. Pet. Rev.) ; an Ionic word preserved in Trag. and revived in the кow $\nu \dot{\eta}$; cf. Milligan Pap. 139 : on the form '́ $\rho a v v$ - for $\epsilon^{\rho} \rho \in \nu-$ cf. Thackeray Gr. 1. p. 78. This adj. in Prov. xxv. 3 Symm. = that cannot be completely probed by searching; of. à $\nu \epsilon \kappa \delta \iota \nmid \gamma \eta \eta \tau o s 2$ Cor. ix. 15, v. Nägeli, p. 23.

тג̀ кр/цата. Cf. ii. 2; Jo. ix. 39. His judgments have been the subject of these chapters.
divegıx ${ }^{\text {la.a.tol. Eph. iii. 8, LXX. (Job); not found elsewhere }}$ ( $̇ \xi \iota \chi \nu \in v^{\prime} \omega$, Trag.), Nägeli, p. 62.
ai ósol. Of. Rev. xv. 3 (qu.) ; Heb. iii. 10 (qu.); Acts xiii. 10, xviii. 26 ; Jo. xiv. 6. Here of the ways along which God moves in His government of creation.
34. Isa. xl. 13 f., qu. 1 Cor. ii. 16 ; cf. Wisd. ix. 13, 17.
35. Job xli. 11 (Heb.).
36. ${ }^{\circ} \mathrm{t}$ t refers not to the preceding verse only but to the whole explanation $v v$. 33-35.
觡 av่тov̂ к. $\boldsymbol{\tau} . \boldsymbol{\lambda}$. In close relation to the context, ascribing to God as God the whole origin, direction, and end of all these elements in the ordering of creation, and in particular of human life and destiny which have been under discussion. The thought gives strength and hope to faith. The nearest parallel in thought is 2 Cor. v. 18, in language 1 Cor. xi. 12.

笑 av̉rov. From Him as creator and giver. \|intoútos v. 33.
 33. The same rare use of $\delta i \dot{\alpha}$ as is found in 1 Thes. v. 14 (=under the guidance of Jesus), Hebr. iii. 16 ( $\delta \iota a ̀$ M $\omega v \sigma \epsilon \in \omega s$ ) ; of. Kuhring, Diss. de Praepos. (Bonn, 1906) who quotes from Papyri only. So Heb. ii. 10. In 1 Cor. viii. 6 the use is different; cf. Joh. i. 3 ; $\delta \dot{\text { d }}$ being used of the Son as agent of oreation=Heb. i. 2. Blass (p. 132) qu. Aesch. Ag. 1486.
eis av่ròv. 1 Cor. viii. 6. He is the end to which all this leads,
 av̉тب̂ $\mathfrak{\eta}$ §óğa. Cf. xvi. 27 ; Ephes. iii. 21 ; Gal. i. 5 ; Phil. iv. 20 ; $1 \mathrm{Tim} . \mathrm{i} .17$; $2 \mathrm{Tim} . \mathrm{iv} .18$. In all cases evolved by the thought of God's mercies, either general or special. ì סóga, sc. द̀ $\sigma \tau i \nu$; cf. 1 Pet. iv. 11 and Lft ad Gal. i. $5:=$ to Him belongs the glory seen in all His works.
$\alpha \mu \eta \boldsymbol{v}$. The word at the end of prayers and praises marks the assent of others to the utterance. In these passages it emphasises the statement by the express assent given to it by the Apostle. Cf. Dalman, p. 227, Swete on Rev. i. 5 (ref. to Chase on Lord's Prayer p. 168 f.).
F. xii--xy. 13. The Power of the Gospel seen in its effeot upon both the Common and the Individual Life of Christians.

## CHAPTER XII.

In this section S. Paul deals with the consequences of the principles he has worked out as they affect the character and the conduct of the Christian life. The main principles are two : (1) The Gospel offers to the Christian power to conform his life and conduct to the will of God (i. 16), the use of that power depending solely on faith or trust, as man's contribution to the result. (2) Service in the execution of Gon's purposes is the fundamental demand made upon man by his relation to God; this principle has been exhibited as the explanation of Israel's failure (ix.-xi.) ; and is now to be expounded in its positive bearing, as determining the main characteristics of the Christian life. In the course of this argument two main thoughts come into prominence. The power, as has been already shown (vi. 1 ff .), is the life of Christ in man, due to the living union given by the Spirit in baptism. And consequently the service is the service due from members of a spiritual society or body, conceived as potentially coextensive with humanity, the service due both to the Head and to the other members. The special instances of the operation of this power in service are determined by the conventions of the time and of the situation in which S. Paul found himself and those to whom he is writing. The section may be summarised as follows:
XII. 1-2. The general principle is stated.

3-5. The right attitude of mind $)$ in view of the social relations and mutual obligations of
6-21. The right use of gifts $\int$ Christians.
XIII. 1-10. The true relation to the civil power and the outside world.

11-14. The urgency of the times calls for the new character in man.
XIV.-XV. 13. The special care for scrupulous brethren and Christian duty towards them.
XII. 1-2. The consequence to be drawn from this exposition of the working of God's compassion towards man, in the call of Jews and Gentiles and in His dealing with them, is the duty to offer the whole nature and capacity of a man, in living and consecrated service for God's use, in the way He pleases, as the reasonable work of a man: and this duty requires a refusal to fashion oneself to meet the demands of what is merely temporary and transitory, and a determination to undergo a radical transformation and renewal of mind, so as to test the will of God, in all its goodness, acceptance, and perfection, as the determining factor in conduct and character.

1. oűv. Cf. v. 1; Eph. iv. 1; Col. iii. 1. The exhortation presents the true state of a Christian as the consequence of all that has gone before.
$\dot{\alpha} \delta \in \lambda \phi \circ$. The appeal is to their realisation of their relation to each other and to the Father.

סıむ̀ тต̂v oi. т. $\boldsymbol{\theta}$. Cf. xv. 30; 1 Cor. i. 10; and esp. 2 Cor. x. 1. The compassionate dealings (plur.) of God enforce the exhortation : $\|$ 'If God so loved us...,' ' If then ye were raised with Christ...' = This being God's attitude towards you, make the due response. Sid, see v. 3.
oikтıp $\bar{\omega} v$. Cf. 2 Cor. i. 3. In O.T. the compassions of God are the basis of the covenant with Israel ; of. Exod. xxxiv. 6 ; Is. lxiii. 15; Lk. vi. 36. The plural signifies the concrete instances of compassion in all the long history, cf. Ps. 1.1 (LXX.), 2 Sam. xxiv. 14. They have been the burden of the preceding chapters.
 where it is the act of the man himself. Of others' action cf. Lk. ii. 22 ; 2 Cor. xi. 2; Col. i. 28: of God's action, 2 Cor. iv. 14 ; Eph. v. 27; Col. i. 22. The sacrificial suggestion seems to be always due to the context, not to the word itself.
 For the thought, cf. 1 Cor. vi. 20. The body is of course more than the flesh: it is the organic vehicle or instrument ( $8 \pi \lambda \lambda, \mathrm{vi} .13$ ) of the mind or spirit which it uses for its own activities under present conditions of human life. This instrument is to be presented to God now for His use, and that involves a change and new development of the mind, which was formerly directed to using the body without regard to God. The body is not to be neglected, but used in this new service. And the reference is to personal activities in the social life.

Ovoiav. Cf. Mk xii. 33 ; Eph. v. 2; Phil. ii. 17, iv. 18; Heb. xiii. 15, 16 ; 1 Pet. ii. 5 (with Hort's note). In 2 Cor. ii. 14 f. the word does not occur but the thought is closely similar. In all these
passages the conception is that the living activities of the man，in the condition of his life on earth，are devoted to service of God by service of man，as a thankoffering．The type of sacrifice implied is not the expiatory but the thanksgiving．The motive is given by the mercies received（ $\delta \iota \alpha$ $\tau \hat{\omega} \nu o l$. ．）；the method is the imitation of the earthly life of Christ（cf．below，vv．3－21；Eph．l．c．）．The＇sacri－ fice＇is not negative merely，in self－denial and surrender，but positive， a willing dedication of self to service in the power of the new life． This is the force of the epithet．It is to be observed that this is the only sense in which S．Paul uses the word $\theta v \sigma i a$ ．
$\xi \omega \sigma a v$ ．The offering takes effect not by destruction or repression of life，but by its full energy；cf．vi． 13.
ajiav．Set apart and consecrated to God．
т $̂$ ê 0 ．єủápєotov．By this full energy of life so consecrated man pleases God：cf．$\grave{\sigma} \mu \boldsymbol{\eta} \dot{\epsilon}^{\dot{v}} \omega \delta \delta i a s, 2$ Cor．ii．14．Cf．Hort，l．c．，p． 113 b．
 к．т．入．This offering to God of the life in its daily activities is the service dictated by the reasonable consideration of man＇s nature and his relation to God．

入oүıкท่． 1 Pet．ii． 2 （only）．In both passages（see Hort on 1 Pet． l．c．）the word has reference to the rational element in man，which，as the mark of his divine origin and the organ of control over the animal nature in its passions and appetites，is his distinctive characteristic． It has its origin in Stoic philosophy，but had spread into common use and may be supposed to have become part of popular psychology． Here as an epithet of $\lambda a \tau \rho \epsilon i a$ it indicates that the service described corresponds to the higher nature of man，in contrast to such action as would be a mere assimilation through the lower nature to the ways of a transitory world：so this thought comes out in the next verse where the idea of $\lambda о \gamma \iota \kappa \dot{s} s$ is taken up by $\tau o \hat{v} \nu o b s$ ．Perhaps＇rational＇ is the best translation，but it comes very near to＇spiritual＇；of． 1 Pet．ii． 5 ；（ $\pi \nu \epsilon v \mu a \tau \iota k a ̀ s ~ \theta v \sigma i a s) ~ a n d ~ P h i l . ~ i i i . ~ 3 ; ~ H e b . ~ v i i i . ~ 5 ~ f ., ~ i x . ~ 14 ~$ （qu．Hort，p．112）；cf．also i． 9.

入arpeiav．See Westcott，Heb．p． 232 （ed．1889）．In LXX．and N．T．alike the verb and subst．are always used of service to God or gods（but see Deut．xxviii．48），Judith iii． 8 of divine worship offered to Nebuchadnezzar ：distinguished from $\lambda$ ecrovp $i$ ia by this limitation and from $\delta o u \lambda e l a$ by its voluntary character．It included the whole ritual service of Israel（cf．ix．2；Heb．ix．1，6）but also all personal service offered to God，as Lord and Master．For its use here of service in life cf．i．9；Phil．iii．3；Heb．xii． 28.
2．каi $\mu \eta \eta^{\kappa} . \tau . \lambda$ ．This service of God involves a change in attitude
of mind: it must no longer be set on meeting the demands of 'this world' by an adaptation which can only be superficial, but by a steady renewal of its true nature must work a radical transformation of character, till it accepts as its standard of action the Will of God, in all its goodness for man, its acceptance by God, and its perfection in execution. This sentence develops the consequence of 'presenting our bodies etc.,' says what that means for a man and explains what is involved, especially, in $\zeta \omega \sigma \sigma \alpha \nu$ and $\lambda<\gamma \kappa \kappa \dot{\eta} \nu$; ef. closely Eph. iv. 22-24.
 p. 122 f.), as you have done in the past; cf. Eph. l.c. 1 Pet. i. 14 adds this point explicitly.
$\sigma^{\circ} \sigma \sigma \mathrm{X} \eta \mu$. Of an outward adaptation which does not necessarily spring from or correspond to the inner nature. Here the whole point is that the true nature of man demands the repudiation of the world's' claims, and so far as the man tries to meet those claims, he is not acting upon or satisfying his true nature. On the word, see Lft, Phil., pp. 125-131; Hort ad 1 Pet. i. 14. Cf. $\mu \varepsilon \tau \alpha \sigma \chi \eta \mu a \pi i j \omega \omega$ of disguise, 1 Cor. iv. 6; 2 Cor. xi. 13-15. In Phil. iii. 21 the outward fashion is made to correspond to the true expression of the inner nature.
 $\dot{\delta} \mu \hat{\ell} \lambda \lambda \omega \nu$, even when the latter is not expressed. Rarely it is purely temporal (Mt. xii. 32) ; but generally the moral contrast is emphasised (Lk. xvi. 8, xx. 34), perhaps always so in S. Paul (?Eph. i. 21; Tit. ii. 12). The moral significance (as in the use of $\kappa \delta \sigma \mu \rho s$, ef. Eph. ii. 2) depends upon the idea of the transitory and superficial character of 'this age' when treated as of independent value: its standards and claims all deal with what is superficial and transitory in man, that is, with his lower nature, ignoring the eternal in him.
$\mu е \tau а \mu о р \phi о \hat{\sigma} \theta \varepsilon$. Execute such a change in the manner of your life as shall correspond to your true nature; of. 2 Cor. iii. 18, where the same process is described but with more explicit statement of the divine influence at work and the new character gained. The word oceurs also in Mk ix. $2=$ Mt. xvii. 2 only. But cf. also viii. 29; Phil. iii. 10, 21.
$\boldsymbol{\tau} \hat{\mathrm{r}}$ àvakatvผ́ซet tov̂ voós. The renewal of the mind is the means by which the transformation is gradually effected. Cf. Eph. iv. 23, where $\dot{\mu} \nu a \nu \epsilon \hat{v} \sigma \theta a l$ corresponds to $\mu \epsilon \tau a \mu o \rho \phi o \hat{v} \sigma \theta \epsilon$ here, and $\tau \hat{\varphi} \pi \nu, \tau . \nu$. $\dot{v}$. to $\tau \hat{\eta}$ d̀vak. $\tau . \nu . \dot{v}$. here. 2 Cor. iv. 16 gives the closest parallel, ef. Col. iii. 10. This renewal is the work of the Holy Spirit (Tit. iii. ${ }^{5}$ ) primarily, but of course requires man's energy of faith; so personal action ( $\mu \epsilon \tau а \mu о р \phi о \hat{\circ} \sigma \theta \epsilon$ ) is required.
$\tau \hat{\text { ńvakatvóvet : the article }=\text { which is open to you in Christ: the }}$ word has its full force = the making fresh and new again, as it once was: the mind has become old and worn; by the Holy Spirit it is made fresh again and vigorous with youth; cf. тò̀ $\pi \alpha \lambda a \iota \partial ̀ \nu . . . \tau \grave{\nu}$ кalvò̀ ä̀ $\begin{aligned} & \rho \rho \omega \pi t o v, ~ E p h . ~ i v . ~ 22, ~ 24 ; ~ \\ & 2\end{aligned}$ Cor. l.c. Cf. also 2 Cor. v. 17; Rev. xxi. 4. The youthful joy and vigour of Christians was the constant wonder of observers. The word brings out vividly the contrast with the prevailing pessimism of contemporary thought. The effect of the Spirit is fresh vitality and a true direction of the mind.

тov̂ voós. The mind is the faculty by which man apprehends and reflects upon God and divine truth. As it is moved by the spirit or by the flesh it develops or degenerates; cf, c. vii. 25 n. Cf. Eph. iv. 17; Col. ii. 18; 1 Tim. vi. 5; Tit. i. 15.
cis tò $\delta$ oк. к.т.入. The aim of the whole effort ( $\epsilon$ is tò dep. on $\mu \epsilon \tau a \mu о \rho \phi$.) is to test what is GoD's will for man both in general and in the particular details of life. The action of the mind is not conceived of as speculative, but as practically discovering by experiment more and more clearly the lines upon which the change of nature and conduct must work. The thought is expressed fully in 1 Cor. ii. 616, esp. ef. vv. 12 and 16. Contrast supra i. 28.

ठoк $\mu \mu \alpha^{\prime} \zeta \epsilon เ \nu=$ to test or find out by experiment.
тí тò $\theta \in \lambda \eta \mu a$ тov̂ $\theta \in o \hat{v}=$ what the will of God is for your new life; cf. ii. 18; Eph. i. 9, v. 17 ; Col. i. 9; 1 Pet. iv. 2. The apprehension of the will is essential to the true conduct of the new life.

тò ajpa日òv к.т. $\lambda$. The will of God here as in ll.cc. means not the faculty which wills, but the object of that will, the thing willed (cf. Giff. ad loc.); consequently these epithets are applicable: the object of GoD's will, here, is the character of the new life in detail, and this is good, as regards man's needs, acceptable, as regards his relation to God, and perfect, as being the proper and full development of man's nature. It is noticeable that here only in N.T. are any epithets given to $\tau \delta \theta \epsilon \lambda \eta \mu \alpha \tau . \theta$.

These two verses, then, summarise, in the most concise form, the practical duty which follows upon man's relation to God as described; they describe conditions of the Christian life as it depends upon the power for salvation to be appropriated by faith : and introduce the detailed applications now to be made.

3-8. The connexion seems to lie in the emphasis just laid upon mind as the instrument of the formation of the new character. This leads to the charge to keep that mind in the attitude and quality proper to one who derives from God faith, by which he can use the given power, and in its use is bound by his relation to Christ
and the other members of the body. These considerations (3) exclude all self-importance, enforce self-restraint, and ( $4-8$ ) dictate the object, service in the one body, and therefore the quality and temper of mind in details of service.
3. $\gamma \dot{\alpha} \rho$ enforces the charge just given by a description of the right temper of mind for men in their circumstances.

סı $\tau \hat{\jmath} \mathrm{s}$ X., 'on the authority of '; cf. 1; 1 Thes. iv. 2, and perhaps 1 Tim. iv. $14 ; 2 \mathrm{Tim} . \mathrm{ii} .2$ : the accus. xv. 15 has a different suggestion.
 9; Eph. iii. 2, 7. His commission to preach the free favour of God to all, and his own share in this grace, authorise him to insist to every one of them upon its conditions; cf. Robinson, Eph., pp. 224 f . The aor. part. of course refers to his call.
 under the same conditions, whatever their special gifts.
 (as $\nu$ oûs the faculty), not the object or contents, of thought or mind; cf. xi. 21, xii. $16 ; 1$ Tim. vi. 17, and perhaps Phil. ii. 5. In all other places it is used of the object or contents as in Mt. xvi. $23=\mathrm{Mk}$ viii. 33 ; Acts xxviii. 22 : and freq. in S. Paul. ن́m $\epsilon \rho \phi \rho$. only here. фpoveîv S. Paul only exc. ll.cc. $\sigma \omega \phi$ poveî̀ Pauline, exc. Mk v. $15 \|$ Lk., 1 Pet. iv. 7. It is impossible to represent the play on words in English with the same epigrammatic point. The clue to the full thought is given by 1 Cor. ii. 16 and Phil. ii. 5 f . The ' mind' of the Christian must reproduce, in his place and capacity, the 'mind' of Christ, of whom he is a member.
$\pi \alpha \rho ’$ ô $\delta \epsilon \hat{i}$ фpoveîv. Cf. the use of $\pi \alpha \rho a ̀$ with comparatives, Heb. i. 4, iii. 3, and also Heb. i, 9 al., infra xiv. 5. $\delta \in \hat{\text {, }}$, as the subject of God's mercies and gifts.
$\sigma \omega \phi \rho o v \epsilon \hat{\tau} v=$ that sound habit of mind which holds to the realities of a man's position, and does not err either by excess or defect: used of sanity, Mk v. 15; 2 Cor. v. 13. eis $\tau \grave{=}=$ up to the point of. The elements of this $\sigma \omega \phi \rho o \sigma \dot{\nu} \eta$ are explicitly. stated in Eph. iv. 2. Comparing viii. 1, we may say that this $\sigma \omega \phi \rho o \sigma v v^{\nu} \eta$ consists in recognising the law of the new life.
éкáбтఱ picks up the $\pi \alpha \nu \tau i$ and emphasises the distinctness of each in the common life: prob. governed by $\dot{\epsilon} \mu \epsilon \rho / \sigma \epsilon \nu$, and transposed for emphasis.
é $\mu \dot{\rho} \rho \iota \sigma \in v$. I.e. at his call, in baptism $=1$ Cor. vii. 17 only; cf. 2 Cor. x. 13 ; Mk vi. 41 ; Heb. vii. 2; $\mu \epsilon \rho \iota \sigma \mu \mathrm{s}$, Heb. ii. 4 : the faith which is the condition of the reception of the Spirit in baptism is itself a gift of God.
 mentators take it; in N.T. it always has its proper significance of 'a measuring instrument.' Consequently the genitive must be a genitive of definition, a measuring instrument consisting in faith. The point is that faith was given to each as a measure by which to test his thinking of himself, to see whether it is true and sound thinking: faith is such a measure because it recognises the true relation of the man to God and his true position in the society of Christ; cf. xiv. 23 n . So far as a man's thinking of himself conforms to his faith, so far is it true and sound thinking ( $\mu \dot{\epsilon} \tau \rho o \nu$ is suggested by $\sigma \omega \phi \rho o \nu \in i v)$. He will then think of himself as deriving all that he has from God, having nothing from himself, and therefore bound to serve GoD in all things and to claim nothing for himself: so his mind will be busy in that transformation which will be a presenting of a living offering to God. This thinking in faith will also show him his special call and aptitudes in the one body.

The usual interpretation makes $\mu \epsilon \in \tau \rho o \nu \pi i \sigma \tau \epsilon \omega s=$ a specific measure or portion of faith: but this, besides the strain on the word $\mu$ é $\tau \rho o \nu$, involves serious difficulties, and practically forces commentators who adopt it to take $\pi i \sigma \tau \epsilon \omega s$ as equal to $\chi$ d́piros.
4. каӨáтєр $\gamma d \rho \ldots$ Cf. 1 Cor. xii. $12-27$. The reason for this exercise of sober thought in contrast to exaggerated thought of self, is the position of the Christian as a member of a body in Christ. In 1 Cor. l.c. the comparison is developed in far greater detail and is applied to elucidating the various functions which the several personal members perform in the body. Here stress is rather laid on the temper of mind in which the several gifts should be utilised, as illustrating the detailed exhibition of $\sigma \omega \phi \rho \sigma \sigma \dot{v} \eta \eta$. In Eph. iv. both lines of thought are combined. The difference of aim in the several passages accounts for certain differences of phraseology.

Év évi $\sigma \omega ́ \mu \mu \tau \iota ~ к . \tau . \lambda$. A favourite analogy with S. Paul. It brings out (1) the dependence of all on the one life received from the union with Christ (cf. vi. 1f.), (2) the mutual dependence of each on each and all for giving effect to that life in each, (3) the common share of each and all in the work to which that life is directed. While the idea of this diversely organic unity of life and aim in Christ underlies all S. Paul's ethical teaching, it may be said to be the single subject of Eph. where it is fully and positively developed. S. H. rightly point out that the comparison of a social organism to the body was very common in ancient writers.
$\tau \grave{\alpha} \delta \grave{\epsilon} \mu \dot{\mu} \hat{\lambda} \eta \pi \alpha \dot{\alpha} v \tau a$ к. $\tau . \lambda$. But the members have not all the same business or mode of action.

8．of $\pi$ о $\lambda$ 入ol к．т．$\lambda$ ．We who are many，being in Christ，are one body；cf．viii．1－10．The connexion of the individual with Christ， made in baptism，is a connexion of life，given by the presence of His life in him．Lut this life is one and the same for all who are baptised into Him；therefore the connexion of the individual is not only with Christ but with all who are instinct with the same life．The in－ dividuality however is not thereby submerged，but socialised，so to speak：it is developed by being brought into these new and living relations and has its part in the organic whole．The emphasis here is not on the connexion with Christ，which is assumed，but on the consequent connexion with others．So in 1 Cor．x．17，xii． 13 ；Eph． ii．16，iv．4．In 1 Cor．xii．27，Eph．i．23，iv． 12 al．，the stress is on the relation to Christ．
 an adverb distributively．M．Gr．кa日єis or ка日є́vas＝each，＂Moulton， p．105．то̀．．．＝as regards our several individualities；cf．ix．5，xii．18； Blass，p．94．The accus．of reference has become an adverbial accus．
$\dot{\alpha} \lambda \lambda \lambda_{\eta} \lambda \omega \nu \mu \hat{\lambda} \lambda \eta$ ．Cf．Eph．iv．25，where also the stress is on the mutual obligations in the society ；otherwise $\mu \epsilon \in \lambda \eta$ X $\rho \iota \sigma \tau o u ̂(1 \mathrm{Cor}$ ，vi． 15，xii． 27 ；Eph．v．30）．Thus again the special direction of the $\sigma \omega \phi \rho \circ \sigma$ óv $\eta$ is indicated．

6．ÉXovтєs $\delta e ̀$ к．т．$\lambda$ ．$\delta \dot{e ̀}$ brings out，in contrast with the unity just emphasised，the difference of function indicated in 4 b ．But，as we have different gifts，we must use them in relation to others，in service． Some place a comma after $\mu \hat{\epsilon} \lambda \eta$ ；but the balance of the sentences and the connexion of thought are against this．

Xapio $\mu a \tau a-\chi^{\alpha} \rho ı s . \quad \chi \alpha \rho / s$ is the one gift of life in Christ，given to all；$\chi \dot{\alpha} \rho \iota \sigma \mu \alpha$ is the special character which this gift assumes as differentiated in each．＂$\chi$ á $\rho s$ is the vital force of the $\sigma \hat{\omega} \mu a \tau$ ． $\chi \rho$ ．which flows from Christ through all its living members；$\chi \dot{\alpha} \rho \iota \sigma \mu a$ a special determination of this force to enable a particular $\mu e \hat{\lambda}$ os to do its part towards the whole $\sigma \hat{\omega} \mu a$, ，Lid．；cf． 1 Pet．iv． 10 ； 1 Cor． xii． 4,7 （where $\tau \dot{\partial} \pi \nu \in \hat{v} \mu a$ takes the place of $\chi$ d́pıs）．

єl＇tє $\pi \rho \circ \phi \eta \tau \in l a v$ к．т．$\lambda$ ．A very characteristic series of elliptical clauses．What is the ellipse？The first member of each clause clearly describes a $\chi$ d́pı $\sigma \mu a$ ，the second member its manner of use； the context demands that all these uses should be instances of $\sigma \omega \phi \rho \circ \sigma \dot{v} \nu \eta$ ，the sober thought of self as meant for service；the ellipse must，then，be supplied in each case to bring out this point．
$\pi \rho о ф \eta \tau \in l a v$. The decisive passage in S ．Paul is 1 Cor．xiv． $1-33$ ； the Rev．claims to be a book $\pi \rho \circ \phi \eta \tau$ elas（i．3，xxii． 7 f ．）；here $=\mathrm{a}$
$\chi$ d́pı $\mu \mu$ ，the gift or power of prophecy as 1 Cor．xii．10，xiii． 2 ；as a particular act， 1 Cor．xiv． 22 ； 1 Thes．v． 20 ； 1 Ti．i．18，iv． 14 ．It may include foretelling，but its normal exercise has olkoдоц̀ in view （ 1 Cor．xiv．3，5，26），i．e．exposition of divine truth in such a way as to bring out the condition of the human heart（ 1 Cor．xiv．25）and to encourage and console．It seems to differ from $\delta \iota \delta \dot{\alpha} \sigma \kappa \epsilon \iota \nu$ as involving the consciousness of acting under direct inspiration，rather than of drawing upon personal experience and reflexion．It is clear from 1 Cor．xiv． 32 that S ．Paul had to heighten and spiritualise the current thoughts about＇prophecy＇and＇prophets．＇

kavd̀ $\tau \eta े \nu \dot{\jmath}$ va入oylav＝in due or full proportion to or correspondence with．
$\tau \eta \mathrm{\eta} \boldsymbol{\pi} \boldsymbol{l} \boldsymbol{\sigma} \tau \epsilon \omega \mathrm{~s}$ ．The faith which animates and enlightens the prophet．The aim of $\pi \rho \circ \phi \eta \tau \epsilon i a$ is oiкo $\delta \mu \mu \eta^{\prime}$ ；its inspiration therefore must be the faith of the $\pi \rho \circ \phi \dot{\eta} \tau \eta$ ；and that faith must be allowed free play，so that he delivers all that he believes，＂without exaggeration， display，or self－seeking，＂Giff．Lid．follows the Latin as against the Greek fathers in taking $\tau \hat{\eta} s \pi i \sigma \tau \epsilon \omega s=$ the Christian Faith（objective）， and кavà $\tau \grave{\eta} \nu$ dava入．$=$＂according to the majestic proportion，etc．＂；but this is exactly a case where the instinctive interpretation of the Greek fathers is decisive．Moreover，the context requires here a reference，not to an external standard，but to the temper and spirit in which the action is performed．
 ${ }^{\prime} \sigma \theta \iota$ ；so with the next two clauses，thoroughness and devotion are insisted upon．

Stakoviav．The widest word for service，including the functions of apostles，prophets，etc．，but here probably of personal service in the community；cf．Phoebe xvi．1．$\epsilon \nu \tau \hat{\eta} \delta \iota a \kappa$ ．，the special way of serving given to each．
© $\delta \iota \delta \alpha^{\prime} \sigma \kappa \omega v$ ．The change of form probably merely the result of instinctive literary feeling．The teacher is distinguished from the prophet（Acts xiii．1； 1 Cor．xii．28；Eph．iv．11）perhaps as ex－ pounding，elucidating and systematically imparting truth rather than discovering and declaring it．It is of course a distinction of functions not of persons．See above，v． 6 ．
 teaching，not the thing taught（so generally in the Pastoral Epp．）．

8．ó тарака入ิิv．S．Paul is not thinking only of gifts qualifying for office，but of all gifts which help the society and its members．So here of the gift of stimulus or encouragement，especially in the
application of truth to conduct；cf． 1 Tim．vi．2；Tit．i．9， ii． 15 ．
o $\mu \epsilon \tau a \delta \iota \delta o v ̀ s ~ к . \tau . \lambda$ ．Here and in the two following clauses we have to supply an imperative from the participle．

๙ं $\pi \lambda$ 人́т $\eta \tau \iota$ ，liberality ；cf． 2 Cor．viii．2，ix．11，13；Ja．i．5；where see Hort：S．Paul＇s use seems to be definitely＝liberality．
ó $\pi$ poïбтápevos，very general，for any one in a position of control or guidance；cf． 1 Thes．v． 12 ； 1 Tim．iii． 4 f．，v． 17 （al．Tit．iii．8，14）．
ó è $\lambda \epsilon \omega \hat{v}$ ，only here and Jude 22 （outside the Gospels）of human mercy．év il ．cf．Ecclus．xxxii．（xxxv．）11，Prov．xxii． 8 S．H．；perhaps there is a special reference to works of compassion，with almsgiving or healing．Cf．è $\lambda \epsilon \eta \mu \sigma \sigma \dot{\nu} \eta$ ，Mt．vi． 2 í．

9．The classification of the following clauses is not systematic ： some refer to duties to Christians，some to non－Christians，some to both；and the different references are intermixed（cf．$\tau \hat{\eta} \theta \lambda i \psi \epsilon \iota, v .12$ ； єủ入oүєîtє к．т．入．14）．Throughout recognised characteristics or con－ ditions of the Christian life are named，and the temper of mind enjoined in which they should be exercised or treated．These commands， then，elements of Christian law，are not rules of action but principles of conduct．The Christian law is not embodied in external precepts， but in the example of Christ，adopted by faith．The contrast with the Jewish law is exactly the same as in the Sermon on the Mount． The particulars can all be signally paralleled from the Gospel account of Jesus．

9．ท่ $\mathfrak{\alpha} \boldsymbol{\gamma} \boldsymbol{\pi} \pi \eta$ ávviókpıros．As in 1 Cor．xiii，S．Paul passes from the question of $\chi a \rho i \sigma \mu a \tau a$ to a ка $\theta^{\prime} \dot{v} \pi \epsilon \rho \beta$ о $\eta_{\eta} \nu \dot{\delta} \delta \delta$ s，the way of love，so here in passing to an enumeration of instances of Christian character in general，as distinct from special gifts，he begins with á $\gamma \dot{a} \pi \eta$ ．It is to be observed that all these characteristics are the result of the＇power for salvation＇which the Gospel brings ；and they illustrate the meta－ morphosis which character undergoes to become Christian．
divvтókpıтos，＇withont dissimulation＇A．V．，＇without hypocrisy＇ R．V．；better perhaps＇unfeigュed．＇и́móкрıтоs＝playing a part，unreality being implied；cf． 2 Cor．vi．6； 1 Tim．i． 5 （ $\pi i \sigma \tau \iota s$ ）； 1 Pet．i． 22. Christian love must be real．
 uncompromising moral standard，easily ignored by any merely class morality or forgotten by a sentimental benevolence．The moral sternness of the Gospel is here strongly represented；of． 1 Thes．v． 22 （but there the reference is more limited）．S．H．connect this clause with the preceding，and take $\tau$ ò $\pi 0 \nu \eta \rho o ̀ v$ and $\tau \dot{\alpha}$ a $\gamma a \theta \delta \partial$ to mean the evil and good in others；but this is farfetched，and blunts the point
of both injunctions．The participles express avoidance and ad－ herence in the strongest possible way．

т̀̀ $\pi$ rovท̨póv．The only certain instance of the substantival neuter of this adj．in N．T．；exc．Lk．vi． $45 \|$ Mt．，wh．compare．

ко入入ópєvol，gen．in N．T．with dat．of person，but cf．Acts viii． 29 ； freq．in Patr．Apost．，qu．Did．5， 2.

10－21．Note the remarkable coordination of participles，ad－ jectives，infinitives（15），and imperatives．All should be translated by the imperative；of．Moulton，pp． 180 f．，222；of． 1 Pet．ii．18， iii． $1,7,8$ f．，iv． 8 f．；of．Col．iii．16， 17 ； 2 Cor．ix．11， 13 ； Eph．iv．2，3；Hebr．xiii．1－5．The participles are all durative in action，implying habits．So the imperatives，except $\delta 6 \tau \varepsilon, v .19$ ， which implies a single act once for all．The negatives with parti－ ciples and imperatives follow the general rule of $\mu$ 方 with the present imperative and imply the giving up of former habits；of．Moulton， p． 122 f ．All are instances of the $\sigma \omega \phi \rho o \sigma \dot{\nu} \eta$ which is the result of the $\mu \in \tau a \mu \delta \rho \phi \omega \sigma \iota$ ．

10．$\tau \hat{\eta}$ ф $\llcorner\lambda \alpha \delta \in \lambda \phi$ lą．Cf． 1 Thes．iv． 9 ； 1 Pet．i． 22 （in LXX．only in 4 Macc．）．A recognised duty，therefore liable to formalities；this must be provided against by an eager feeling of affection as to real members of a family．

ф८入órтopyol．Always of family affection；so 2 Macc．ix． 21 al． Polyb．al．
 iii．7，of respect paid by man to man．
 paralleled construction＝giving each other a lead；this requires the genitive：（2）an unparalleled sense＇each considering another superior to himself．＇Even if we take（1）the proper meaning would be＇taking the lead of each other，＇which is the opposite of the evident sense． （2）assumes that the compound follows the sense of $\dot{\eta} \gamma \in \hat{\imath} \sigma \theta a \iota=$ to hold， consider，$\tau \iota v \dot{\text { à }}$ rotoûtov，the only sense in which the simple verb is used in N．T．except in the participle．This is supported by Phil，ii． 3 and

 à入ג $\pi \rho o \eta \gamma \epsilon i \sigma \theta \epsilon$ ；and although no parallel to this sense of the com－ pound can be found，it is possible and suits the context．

11．Tท̂ $\sigma \pi \circ 0 \delta \hat{\eta}$ ，in the zealous diligence which Christian practice requires．
ókvpol，of hesitation from whatever cause，so sluggish，idle；of． Mt．$x \times v .26$.
$\tau \hat{\varphi} \pi \nu \in \mathrm{v}_{\mu} \mathrm{art}$ prob．$=$ with or by the Holy Spirit－the source in the
man of all the activities which are being urged. Geoves, cf. Acts xviii. 25 ; $\zeta_{\epsilon \epsilon \tau \sigma \delta, ~ R e v . ~ i i i . ~ 15, ~ 16 . ~ T h e ~ w h o l e ~ p h r a s e ~)(~ © к \nu \eta p o t . ~}^{\text {. }}$
 used in the service of the Lord; cf. Acts $\mathbf{x x} .19$; 1 Pet. ii. 16. The two clauses remind them of the power and the allegiance which are the background of the whole exhortation. The alternative reading $\tau \hat{\varphi}$ $\kappa \alpha \iota \rho \hat{\varphi}$ is attraetive, both because it brings this clause more into line with the neighbouring clauses and as parallel to Gal. vi. 10; Eph. v. 16 ; Col. iv. 5. But the parallels are not quite convincingthere the man is urged to make himself master of opportunity, here to be its slave, a very different and even dubious exhortation. And if we take $\tau \hat{\varphi} \pi \nu \in \dot{\epsilon} \mu a \tau \iota$ as above we get an excellent sense and parallel.
Soviéoves. Of the relation of Christians in general ; cf. vi. 18, xiv. 18; 1 Thes. i. 9 ; otherwise generally of apostles or miuisters till Rev.
 their hope is motive of joy; and hope naturally springs from the thought of the Spirit and the Lord; of. Rev. xxii. 17.
 Christian profession; cf. 1 Thes. i. 6, iii. 3 f. al. S. H. call attention to the regular appearance of this note of persecution from the beginning of S. Paul's Epp.
ขтоцévovтє̧. Absol. as 2 Tim. ii. 12; Heb. xii. 7; 1 Pet. ii. 20. It takes the accus. of the object.
 Col. iv. 2; your practice of prayer; in this and the two following clauses the subst. is governed by the verb.
13. taîs xpéaus. Of. Acts xxviii. 10 ; Phil. ii. 25, iv. 16, 19; Tit. iii. $14=$ the needs. On $\mu \nu$ elaus see crit. note, p. xlv.
кolvavov̂vets. кouv. = to be partners or act as partners; the dat. of the thing marks the matter in which the partnership is exercised; cf. $\mathbf{x v} .27$; 1 Tim. v. 22 ; 1 Pet. iv. 13 ; 2 Joh. 11; dat. of person=the persons with whom the partnership is formed, of. Phil. iv. 15; Gal. vi. 6; the gen. of the thing, the matter which the partners share ; of. Heb. ii. 14. So here=acting as their partners in the matter of their needs : goes further than $\mu$ eradiooús, $v .8$, as implying personal service; of. 1 Tim. vi. 18.
 1 Thes. v. 15, al. This use confined to Pauline writings (incl. Heb., 1 Pet.); not the mere exercise, but the active search for opportunity is implied. Hospitality, a recognised duty, is to be carefully cultivated ; ef. 1 Pet. iv. 9 ; 1 Tim. iii. 2; Tit. i. 8.

14．єv่̉入оүєiтє к．т．入．Cf．Lk．vi． 28 （Mt．v．44）； 1 Cor．iv．12； 1 Pet．iii．9．This clause inserted here shows that the order is not systematic．

15．Xaiрєьv к．т．д．，for infin．＝imper．cf．Phil．iii．16，＂familiar in Greek，esp．with laws and maxims，＂Moulton，l．c．；here used in prefer－ ence to the participle perh．on grounds of euphony．

16．тò av̉rò．．．，maintain that mutual agreement with each other which is the basis of peace ；ef．xv．5； 2 Cor．xiii． 11 ；Phil．ii．2，iv． 2.
$\mu \eta ̀ \tau \grave{\alpha}$ v́ $\psi$ ．A potent source of danger to peace．$\tau \dot{d}$ vi $\psi . \phi p .=$
 1 Pet．v． 5 ；here it refers to the estimate of self in comparison with other men；in all other passages of an overweening estimate of self in relation to God．

тoîs tantเvoîs，always masc．in N．T．and O．T．，exc．Ps．exxxvii． 6 （where Heb．suggests persons），in contrast with v゙४os，Lk．i．52； Jas．i．9．The antithesis to $\tau \dot{\alpha} \dot{v} \psi \eta \lambda \grave{a}$ has led some commentators to take it as neut．here．But，against this，is not only biblical use，but the context；masc．gives a better expansion of $\tau \grave{\partial}$ aủ $\boldsymbol{\partial} \boldsymbol{\delta} \kappa . \tau . \lambda$. ，and better suits the verb ovvamar．
$\sigma v v a \pi a \gamma o ́ \mu$ evol．No real \｜to this use is given：Gal．ii．13； 2 Pet．iii． 17 pass．Chrys．gives $\sigma \nu \mu \pi \epsilon \rho \iota \phi \epsilon \in \rho o v, \sigma v \mu \pi \epsilon \rho \iota \epsilon \rho \chi \circ v$ ；cf．Field， ad loc．＝put yourselves on a level with，accommodate yourselves to． S．H．（though preferring the neuter）qu．Tyn．Cov．Genev．，＇make yourselves equal to them of the lower sort．＇Rhem．，＇consenting to the humble．＇
 $\sigma o \phi i \not \subset \mu \eta ̀ ~ \epsilon ̇ \pi a l \rho o v=$ avoid self－conceit；cf．xi． 25.

17．$\mu \eta \delta \epsilon v \grave{\prime} \kappa \alpha \kappa o ̀ v \kappa . \tau . \lambda . ~ 1 ~ T h e s, ~ v . ~ 15 ~ f . ; ~ 1 ~ P e t . ~ i i i . ~ 9 f . ~$
$\pi \rho о v o o v ́ \mu \epsilon v_{0} \kappa a \lambda \alpha$ к．т．$\lambda$ ．Prov．iii．4，LXX．； 2 Cor．viii． 21 ；the
 $\tau \hat{\psi} \mu \eta \delta \epsilon \nu i \quad \delta \iota \delta \dot{\nu} \nu \iota \iota \psi \delta \gamma o v \pi \rho \delta \phi a \sigma \iota \nu$ ，he compares 1 Cor．x．32．Lid．cft 1 Thes．iv．12； 1 Pet．ii．12．There is a common standard of honour which Christians must by no means ignore；cf． 2 Cor．iv． 2.
 depends on yourselves．The accumulation of conditions emphasises the difficulty of the precepts；cf．Field．

19．dyamๆroi．N．the appeal to the treatment which they have received from God，as enforcing this most difficult act of self－denial．

Sóte тómov．The aor．marks the instantaneous and tinal character of the act．тómov，＇room＇or＇opportunity＇；cf．Eph．iv．26； Heb．viii．7，xii．17；Acts xxv． 16.
$\tau \mathfrak{y}$ ópyñ．The wrath of God ；as v． 9 ； 1 Thes．ii． 16 ；cf． 1 Pet．iv． 19.
$\gamma^{\epsilon} \gamma \rho a \pi \tau a l$ үáp к.т.入. Deut. xxxii. 35 Heb.; see Giff. on form of quotation.

ävӨрakas тvpòs к.т. $\boldsymbol{\lambda}$. The context in Prov. and here forbids us to take this as a symbol of mere punishment or vengeance. The 'coals of fire ' are pains, but healing pains, of remorse and repentance. Lid. qu. Jerome and Aug. in support of this interpretation; cf. 1 Pet. ii. 15, iii. 16.
21. $\mu \eta$ ข vเкผ̂ к.т. $\boldsymbol{\lambda}$. sums up 17-20. Comm. qu. Sen. de benef., vir. 31, vincit malos pertinax bonitas. Wetst. gives a long catena of $\|$.

## CHAPTER XIII.

## 1-7. Relation to civil authorities.

There is no introduction or formula of connexion. This is still part of the new $\sigma \omega \phi \rho o \sigma v v^{v} \eta$. It is to be observed that the reasons for civil obedience are fully and clearly given, even with repetitions, as though the matter required explicit treatment. Yet the occasion for the introduction of the subject is not explained or hinted at. It is possible that S . Paul may have had reason to fear, or may have feared that others would expect, that the Christian societies might inherit some of the turbulence of the Jewish, esp. there may have been a danger that Christians at Rome would be infected. Or again, the Christian theory of the civil order may have been raised by the emphasis laid upon the kingdom. And the necessity of clear views may have grown upon S. Paul's mind with his gradual approach to the centre of the Empire, and his realisation of the importance for the propagation of the Gospel. The establishment of Christian societies in so many places and the development of their internal organisation would also bring this question into prominence, as it did that of legal proceedings ( 1 Cor . vi.). At the same time, it is to be noticed that the treatment of the question, though definite, is quite general ; there is no sign either in the argument or in the tone of the passage of any special urgency: and we may conclude that it is duesimply to the desire for completeness in indicating the outlines of Christian duty and the character and temper in which it should be fulfilled.

Note further some significant omissions. (1) The question of duty as between rival claimants to civil authority is not touched. (2) Nor is the question of duty to a corrupt and unjust authority : it is assumed throughout that the authority is just and has for its aim the good. (3) Nor is the question of conflict between the civil and spiritual authorities.
S. H. have an excellent excursus on the question, pp. 369 fi. Cf. also E. von Dobschütz, Die Urchristlichen Gemeinden, p. 95 (Leipzig, 1902). Cf. 1 Pet. ii. 13-17; 1 Tim. ii. 1 f. ; Mt. xxii. 15 f. || Lk.

1. $\pi \hat{a} \sigma a \psi u x \eta े . ~ O f . ~ i i . ~ 9 ~(R e v . ~ x v i . ~ 3, ~ o f ~ f i s h) ~ ; ~ A c t s ~ i i . ~ 43, ~ i i i . ~ 23 . ~$ L. \& S. give \| from Greek class. poetry. Epictet. fr. $33 \psi v \chi a l=$ slaves.
 only; cf. 1 Cor. xv. 24 ; Eph. i. 21 al. ; Col. i. 16 al. ; 1 Pet. iii. 22. v̇тєpexov́caus. Simply of superiority in any degree; ef. 1 Pet. ii. 13.
 of authority being established involves the divine ordinance of it. The two clauses state the same principle, in a negative and a positive form. The repetition emphasises the point.
2. €́auroîs. Emphatic : will bring judgment upon themselves.
 of. Lk. xxiii. 40, xxiv. 20.
3. ràp. The justice of the government is assumed : so 4 a.
 1 Tim. vi. 18, á $\gamma \alpha 0$ oє $\rho \gamma \epsilon \hat{\imath}$; tempting but hardly necessary. тò áyäòv rolet. Of. 1 Pet. ii. 15.
4. Ëкסıкos els ópyŋ̀v. Cf. 1 Thes.iv. 6 : for the execution of wrath ; the wrath of offended authority.
5. dvóyкฑ. "The necessity is twofold, external on account of 'the wrath' which the magistrate executes, internal on account of conscience towards God." Giff.
 own conscience' : because, as your paying tribute shows, you recognise them as authorities duly constituted, and therefore ministers of God. Hence it is a matter of conscience towards God; cf. 1 Pet. ii. 19. See Add. Note, p. 209.
6. фópous. Lk. xx. 22, xxiii. 2 only, direct taxes on persons, houses or land. ré ${ }^{\prime}$ os of customs, taxes on trades.
$\lambda_{\text {eıroupyol, of public service or office; here as administering public }}$ functions committed to them by God : the connexion of the word with public service of religion is secondary.
cis av̉т̀̀ тov̂тo, to this very end, i.e. of securing social order and obedience, $\boldsymbol{\tau}$ ѝ v̇тот $\dot{\sigma} \sigma \sigma \in \sigma \theta a \iota$.
$\pi \rho о \sigma к а р \tau є \rho о \hat{\nu \tau \epsilon \varsigma, ~ a b s o l .: ~ c f . ~ A c t s ~ i i . ~} 46$.
 $\gamma \alpha ́ \rho ~ E ̇ \sigma \tau \iota \tau o ̀ ~ \pi \rho a ̂ \gamma \mu \alpha$, Chrys.

8-10. The question of duty to the civil power leads to a summary of the principle which underlies all duty towards man, found in the duty of love, $\tau \dot{\eta} \nu \quad \mu \eta \tau \epsilon \dot{\rho} \alpha \tau^{\tau} \hat{\nu} \nu \dot{\alpha} \gamma a \theta \hat{\omega} \nu$ Chrys. : still the exposition of the properly Christian character.
8. $\mu \eta \delta \epsilon \nu \grave{\iota} \mu \eta \delta \bar{\epsilon} v$. The repetition of the negative gives a strong
emphasis to the injunction. ©́фє $\lambda_{\lambda \epsilon \tau \epsilon}$ in pres. =remain under debt to no man in any matter, except in love.
 reference as $\mu \eta \delta \epsilon \nu i$; love is a permanent debt (pres. infin.) that can never be fully discharged; cf. Aug. Ep. cxcii. 1 (qu. Lid.) 'semper autem debeo caritatem quae sola etiam reddita detinet redditorem." This sums up all the teaching of xii. 3-xiii. 7.
 this does fulfil it.

Tòv ETєєpov. Apparently used by S. Paul to give the widest possible extension to the principle : anyone with whom a man is brought into
 its individual note and bars all casuistry as to 'the neighbour' ; cf. Lk. x. 29. It is grammatically possible to take $\tau \grave{\nu}$ ย̈тepov with ${ }^{\nu} 6 \mu_{0} \nu$ (cf. Hort on James ii. 8 ad fin.) ; but the phrase would be strained, and the context ( $\dot{\alpha} \lambda \lambda \eta \lambda o u s-\tau \delta \nu \pi \lambda \eta \sigma t o \nu)$ is against it.
 subst. $v .10$. vópos is quite general, though as the next verse shows the Decalogue is the crucial instance. $\pi \in \pi \boldsymbol{\lambda}$. perfect, has by that continuing act fulfilled and does fulfil, not abolished or done away.
9. т $\quad$ 人à к.т. $\lambda_{\text {. }}, \mathrm{n}$. sing. $=$ the injunction regarded as one, contained in the several evtoخal following.
ov̉ $\mu$ оเхєข́бєเs к.т.入. The order differs from the Hebr. text in Ex. xx. 13 ; Deut. v. 17 : follows the B text of Deut. LXX., as also Lk. xviii. 20 ; James ii. 11 ; Philo de decal., Clem. Alex. Strom. vi. 16 S. H. N. the ninth commandment is omitted (but inserted in some MSS.).

dขакєфалаเоข̂тaı, is summed up and included. Eph. i. 10 only.
 limit it to Israelites: here the context has already given the widest interpretation.
10. какòv ov̉к $\mathfrak{\epsilon} \rho \gamma a ́ \xi \epsilon \epsilon a l$. The negative expression corresponds to the negative form of the precepts in v. 9. Love cannot do any of these evils to the neighbour; therefore it fulfils law. Its positive effect in going beyond any possible extension of positive precepts is implied in v. 8.
 again, that in laying down the moral requirements of Christian conduct, S. Paul avoids rules and insists on the quality which in its proper operation belongs to the Christian as such and produces conduct conformable to the character of the life which is in him.

11-14. The exhortations to the detailed development of the

Christian character are enforced by the reminder that the times are critical, and demand effort; that the full 'day' of Christ's coming is near : and the contrast between the life of the natural man and of the regenerate is drawn in a few bold lines. The whole is summed up in the description of the Christian aim, as a repeated effort to 'put on the Lord Jesus Christ,' and a complete abandonment of the satisfaction of the lusts of the flesh; a return to the thought of xii. 1, 2.
11. кal тоข̂тo, ef. 1 Cor. vi. 6, 8; Eph. ii. 8; cf. кal тav̂тa, Heb. xi. 12; resumes with emphasis the whole exhortation.
fiסóres. Cf. Lk. xii. 56 ; Mk xiii. $33=$ realising the character of the present period and its demands upon you.
ròv kaıpóv. Cf. 1 Cor. vii. 29 ; Eph. v. 16; 1 Pet. iv. 17; Rev. i. 3, xxii. 10; Lk. xxi. 8; almost technical for the period before the Second Coming, S. H.
\% $\mathrm{\sigma}$ t explains the characteristies which they ought to realise.
 7-14. Here the contrast is not with the heathen state, but of the awakened and alert spirit with the sleeping and inert: a warning against acquiescence in the present. Giff. cft Mt. xxv. 1 f.; perh. of. 1 Cor. xi. 30.
ท่ $\sigma \omega$ тทpla. Cf. v. $9 ; 1$ Pet. i. 5; 1 Thes. v. 8, 9. It is not always clear whether the word is used of the present state in which the Christian is by faith : or the final state which is the object of his hope and is brought about by the Second Coming. Here the context decides for the latter.
émıгтev́rapev. We became believers-a good instance of the 'ingressive' aorist; of. Moulton p. 129 f.; cf. [Mk] xvi. 16; Acts ii. 44, zix. 2; 1 Cor. iii. 5, xv. 2; Gal. ii. 16 ; Eph. i. 13 ; Heb. iv. 3.
12. ๆ $ข \nu \stackrel{\Sigma}{5}$ к.т.入. 1 Thes. v. $2-7$; Rev. xxi. 25, xxii. 5. $\pi \rho \rho \in \kappa$. 'is far spent' (advanced) : A. and R.V., aor. marks the point reached. The night is almost gone, the signs of the coming day are already in the sky.
 seems to come out. N. the aor., it is to be a single act done once for all. $\tau \dot{\alpha}$ " $\bar{\rho} \gamma a \tau . \sigma$. the deeds which are characteristic of the darkness. $\tau d$ ö $\pi \lambda a \tau$. $\phi$., the weapons needed for the work to be done in the light; of. 1 Thes. v. 6-8, where both thoughts are more fully expressed. Eph. v. 10 f. describes the warfare of the light. Taking v. 14 into account, we see that there is a reference here, as in 1 Thes. and Eph., to the Messianic warfare in which the Christian, as $\epsilon p$ $\mathbf{X} \rho \iota \sigma \hat{\psi}$, has to take his part.
 and its occupations.
14. év $\delta$ v́ $\sigma a \sigma \theta \epsilon$. Metaph. only in S. Paul (exc. Lk. xxiv. 49) ; of. Gal. iii. 27 ; Eph. iv. 24 ; Col. iii. 10, with 11 ad fin. The closest parallel in thought, though not in language, is Eph. l.c., as the reference is not primarily to baptism (as in Gal. l.c., Col. l.c.) but is the repeated effort to realise the Christian character, that is the character of the Christ as living in the Christian. The metaphor is found in O.T. Job xxix. 14 ; Ps. cxxxii. 9 ; cf. Lk. l.c. Col. iii. 12 after 10, 11, shows the meaning of the metaphor, and gives us a clear hint that in describing the details of Christian character S. Paul is consciously reproducing the elements of the character of our Lord, as we learn them from the gospels. In estimating the amount of acquaintance with the Gospel story which S. Paul had, this fact must be given full weight. The aorist here has the 'constative' force (Moulton, p. 130), i.e. describes as one effort the constantly repeated efforts of growth in the Christian character.
tòv кúpıov 'I. X . The full name is remarkable, contrast Gal. l.c. If it is the correct reading, it emphasises (1) the indwelling of the Christ, (2) the model given by the life of Jesus on earth, (3) the motive of obedience and allegiance to the Lord.
rîs $\sigma$ apkòs к.т. $\boldsymbol{\lambda}$. Cease to provide for the flesh with a view to desires : the negative with the present imperative has its idiomatic force (Moulton, p. 122 f.).
 ef. Mt. vi. 25 ; Lk. xii. 22 f. ; Phil. iv. 6.
cis entovplas, quite general, of all desires of the flesh: the needs and desires of the flesh must no longer be the controlling motives in the life of the new man. $=\tau \dot{\alpha} \dot{\epsilon} \pi i \tau \eta$ भेs $\gamma \hat{\eta}$, Col. iii. 2; Eph. iv. 22 is more limited: so Gal. v. 16; 1 Pet. ii. 11.
xiv.-xv. 13. A special case of Christian conduct-its true bearing towards scrupulous brethren.

## CHAPTER XIV.

XIV. (1) Scruples must not be allowed to separate brethren: (3) they do not separate from God : (4) we have no right to judge those who, in their particular choices of action, all own allegiance to the one Lord : (10) judgment is reserved for God.
(13) The true Christian way is to avoid all offence to brethren in matters indifferent, and, positively, to concentrate our aim upon the weightier matters.
XV. (1) The fundamental Christian principle is mutual service and help, after the model of the Christ, and in that endurance and encouragement which God gives to promote harmony in His service.
(7) This mutual service and reception is the proper consequence in the Christian life, of Christ's service and reception of Jew and Gentile unto God's glory, the foundation of the hope, joy and peace of all Christian men.

1. tòv $\delta \boldsymbol{\epsilon}$ á $\sigma \in$ evoûvta к.т. $\boldsymbol{\lambda}$. S. Paul passes to a special case ( $\delta \dot{\epsilon}$ ) of the duty of love and the consequence of the corporate character of the Christian life: we may perhaps regard it as a special case of the injunction, xii. 16.
 Cf. iv. $20 ; 1$ Cor. xvi. 13. $\tau \hat{g} \pi \boldsymbol{\tau} \sigma \tau \epsilon=$ his faith—the weakness lies in the fact that his faith in God through Christ dues not carry him to the detailed conclusions as to the true use and place of all material things and acts in the spiritual life: it is not a wrong faith, but a faith which in certain directions is ineffective. The cause of this ineffectiveness is assigned in 1 Cor. viii. 7, as the associations which certain acts have with the sins of the former heathen life. These prevent him from realising the full Christian $\epsilon \xi 0 v \sigma i a(i b$.$) .$
$\pi \rho о \sigma \lambda \alpha \mu \beta \alpha \dot{v} \in \sigma \theta \epsilon$. Phm. 17; Acts xviii. 26 ; here xi. 15, xv. 7; make it a rule to take him into your company and intimacy, whoever he may be.
$\mu \eta^{\prime}$ к.т. $\boldsymbol{\lambda}$. = but not; the negative qualification is expressed separately, to give its full scope to the positive injunction.

єis $\delta$ เaкpíets $\delta \iota a \lambda$. For settling doubts, or deciding difficulties; cf. 1 Cor. xii. 10 ; Heb. v. 14. This is the only meaning of סıáкрьбıs in N. T. and suits the context well : $\delta \iota a \lambda b \gamma \iota \sigma \mu 0!=$ thoughts involving doubts and scruples ; cf. Mt. xvi. 7, 8 ; Lk. v. 22. They are not to aim at deciding the questions which the weak brother raises in his mind, in the spirit of judging. It is a fine piece of charity to take a man, opinions and all.
2. ठ̂s $\mu \dot{\jmath} \nu$ к.т. $\lambda$. The absence of connecting particle shows that this is an illustration of the principle.
 to-no \| to this use; Acts xv. 11 the only other case of inf. after $\pi$. is different. Giffi. qu. Dem. Onet., p. 866, $\pi \rho \circ \notin \sigma \theta \theta a \iota ~ \delta E ̇ ~ \tau \grave{\eta} \nu \pi \rho o i ̂ \kappa ’ ~ o u ̉ k ~$ ध̇ $\pi$ i $\sigma \tau \varepsilon v \sigma \in \nu$.
$\lambda a ́ x a v a$ ér日lєs, i.e. refuses to eat meat. This is the only clear evidence that an ascetic vegetarianism existed among the Christians of this time. It is very remarkable that S . Paul should choose this form of asceticism as his illustration ; and the reason must be sought in special conditions at Rome. The practice may have been due mainly to the imitation of contemporary asceticism (cf. von Dobschütz, op. cit., p. 93 f., Lietzmann, Romans, p. 65). But it is conceivable that these influences may have been at least reinforced by the difficulty in which Christians found themselves of avoiding ei $i \delta \omega \lambda 6 \theta v \tau \alpha$ (cf. 1 Cor. viii.). For tender consciences a solution was ready, in the avoiding of animal food altogether; of. the wide statement 1 Cor. viii. 13. The whole argument shows that it is not a case of sects imposing rules on others, but of private scruples and practice. See Introd. p. xxx.
3. í $\mathfrak{e} \theta$ ic $\omega v$, sc. крє́a. The injunction is put in form as if the preceding statement had been negative, кр $\mathfrak{\varepsilon} a$ ойк $\boldsymbol{\epsilon}$.
$\mu \eta \eta_{\xi} \xi$. - кр. The idiomatic use=give up despising-judging; cf.v. 13.
 Lk. xviii. 9 ; Acts iv. 11 ; 1 Cor. i. 28, vi. 4.

крเขє́ть. The judgment which makes sins out of what are not sins. Both tempers are subversive of $a^{2} a \pi \eta$.
 against the validity of the law for Christians: but in such a way as to assume that there is now no controversy on the matter. His admission to the body of Christ carried no such conditions. The aor. must refer to that admission in baptism.
4 бù $\tau$ is $\epsilon \mathfrak{\ell}$ к. $\boldsymbol{\tau} . \boldsymbol{\lambda}$.: the tables are turned: in judging him as a
sinner thou art committing a sin of presumption，in judging one who is not accountable to thee．For the dramatic form，ef． 1 Cor．iv． 7 f ．

ḋ入入óтpıov oik．Cf．Lk．xvi，13．oik．only here used of the relation of the Christian to the Lord，but ef．סov̂入os，and oikovbuoc of apostles， olkia of the Christian family．$\dot{d} \lambda \lambda$ ．belonging to and therefore ac． countable to another master．
$\sigma \tau \eta \dot{k \in L}$ ．Of． 1 Cor．xi． 13 ：a present，formed from the perf．é $\sigma \tau \eta \kappa a$ （which is used for the present）probably to allow of emphasis on the durative action（as крás $\omega$ by the side of $\kappa \epsilon \kappa \kappa \rho a \gamma a(=$ pres．））；cf．Moulton， p．147，248．Blass，p． 40 f．，cft $\gamma \rho \eta \gamma \circ \rho \in \in \uparrow$, mainly found in imper．； cf． 1 Cor．xvi．13；Mk iii． 31.

б．ठ̋s $\mu$ ．èv $\gamma \dot{\mu} \rho$ к．т．$\lambda$ ．A second instance is given－scruples as to the observance of days．Here it is almost inevitable to think of Jewish influence（cf．Col．ii．16）：and all the more remarkable is the detached way in which the case is treated：as long as such observance is not made occasion for judging others，it is open to individual choice．

крivé－$\pi a \rho^{3}$ ．No exact parallel ：＝judges or esteems one day as superior to another for certain purposes：and perh．distinguishes one day from another．Cf．on xii． 3.
$\pi \lambda \eta \rho \circ ф о \rho \in(\sigma \theta \omega$ ，be assured．Cf．iv．21；Col．iv． 12 ：al． 2 Tim．iv． 7；Lk．i． 1.
 viii． 33 （｜｜Mt．）．

кvpiч фpovei．Dat．to denote the person whose interest is affected， Blass p．111．Anarthrous кúpıos is used（1）after O．T．as a name for God，passim．（2）of Christ，very rarely without the addition of＇I．or $\mathrm{X} \rho$ ．or both：and then only with a preposition（2 Cor．xi．17；Eph． vi． $8=$ Col．iii． 20 （？）； 1 Thes．v．17）or in gen．after anarthrous subst． （ 1 Cor．vii． 25 ； 1 Thes．iv． 15 ； 2 Tim．ii．24）．There is no clear parallel to the use in this passage if we take $\kappa$ ．as＝the Lord Christ．

So tr．to a master：he has a master to whom he is responsible and in view of whom he forms his opinion；the master is Christ．See next verse．

7．ov̉סєis $\gamma \boldsymbol{\alpha} \dot{\rho} \eta_{\eta} \boldsymbol{\mu} \omega \hat{\nu}$ к．т．$\lambda$ ．None of us Christians．As Christians we all recognise our subordination，in living and in dying，to the one Lord．It must be assumed then that the particular rules a man makes for himself are made with that reference，and must be treated with respect by others accordingly．

ย́avtê，for his own ends，with regard to himself（not by himself）； as contrasted with the Lord＇s ends：the assertion of course involves the supposition that the Christian is living up to his calling．
$\alpha \dot{\alpha} \pi 0 \theta v \eta \sigma \kappa \in L$ ．The service of the Lord is not exhausted by the life
of the servant；it is regarded and furthered in his death also．The decision of time and manner of death，just as the regulation of the details of life，therefore lies with the Lord not with the servant；of． Phil．i． 21 f．；of．Lid．

8．$\tau \hat{\varphi} \kappa v \rho i \varphi$ ，for the Lord；dat．as above， 6.
 Christians as $\delta 0$ û̀oc tov̂ кvplou．

9．єis тоv̂тo үàp к．т．入．To establish this relationship was the object of Christ＇s death and resurrection．Note that in dealing with these secondary matters S．Paul bases his argument on this external relation，not on the deeper vital relation $\epsilon \boldsymbol{\nu} \mathrm{X} \rho \iota \sigma \tau \hat{\varphi}$ ；of．S．H．；cf． 1 Cor．vi． 20.
${ }_{\epsilon}(\eta \eta \sigma \in \nu$ ．Came to life－ingressive aorist：clearly of the entrance into the Resurrection life，in which He became кúplos．S．H．Lid．
qua kal v．к．乌．Cf．Lk．xx．38：the absence of the article emphasises the state of the persons．

кирıє́v $\eta=$ to establish his lordship over－（ingressive aor．）．Is there a reference here to the Descent into Hell ？Lid．eft Phil．ii．10；Eph．iv． 9. The order $\nu$ ．к．ऽ．is remarkable，and suggests such a ref． 1 Pet．iii． 18 f．，iv． 6 f．may be partly dependent on this passage；cf．x．7．Swete， Ap．Creed，pp． 56 f．

10．$\sigma \grave{\delta} \delta \hat{\varepsilon} \tau \ell$ к．$\tau . \lambda$ ．The dramatic emphasis is again applied as in v． 4 ；but here the appeal is based on the equality of brethren．

тávтєs $\gamma$ àp к．т．入．The common responsibility to one Lord is now put in its most forcible form，of ultimate responsibility to God as judge；of． 1 Pet．iv． 5.
 Acts xxv． 10 al ．

11．रéरpaitтal үàp．Isa．xlv．23，xlix． 18 （conflat．）．

12． dpa oviv．The final conclusion on this line of argument：each man will account to God，and to Him alone．

13－23．While Christian freedom is to be maintained，it must not be so maintained as to violate charity．S．Paul has developed in the strongest terms the Christian right，and consequently the wrong of judging．Now he develops the higher considerations，which should influence the strong，in suspending their rights for the greater matters of righteousness，peace and joy，for love＇s sake．The principle is enforced by repetition ；cf． $14 a$ and $20 b, 15 b$ and $20 a$ ；in each case some fresh aspect enforces the principle．The argument is the same as in 1 Cor．viii．9－13．
13. $\mu \eta \kappa \in \mathfrak{\tau} \tau$ oviv к.т. $\lambda$. concludes the preceding argument.

крivatє= make it your judgment-different from $\kappa \rho i \nu \omega \mu \epsilon \nu$; cf. Acts xv. 19.

төध́val к.т.入. To lay a stumblingblock or trap for your brother;
 1 Pet. ii. 8.
$\sigma \kappa \alpha ́ v \delta a \lambda o v . ~ O r i g . ~ a ~ t r a p ~=~ \sigma \kappa a \nu \delta ̄ a \lambda \eta \theta \rho b \nu$ (LXX. tr. for noose, snare), then any cause of offence. It seems generally to include the idea of 'causing to sin' as well as that of 'offending,' so Mt. l.c. and xvi. 23; 1 Joh. ii. 10.
14. oifa kal $\pi \in \in \pi \in \iota \sigma \mu a \iota ~ к . т . \lambda$. A very strong assertion of the complete abolition of legal definitions of clean and unclean, not however by way of controversy, but as fully admitting the principle maintained by the 'strong.'
 of $v .1$ : the force of $\epsilon \nu$ here seems to be 'on the authority of,' and it is a direct appeal to the teaching of Jesus recognised as authoritative ( $\kappa v \rho(\varphi)$; cf. for kindred cases of $̇ \nu 1$ Cor. vi. 2, xiv. 11; Mt. xii. 24; Acts xvii. 31 ; cf. Blass, p. 130 f . The reference would then be to such teaching as is contained in Mk vii. Gif. on the other hand takes $\dot{\epsilon} \nu \kappa$. 'I. $=\hat{\epsilon} \nu \mathrm{X} \rho \iota \sigma \tau \hat{\varphi}$, " the conviction is that of a mind dwelling in communion with Christ, and therefore enlightened by His Spirit." So Lid. S. H. But this interpretation seems to strain the language ( $=\dot{\omega} s \ddot{\omega} \nu \dot{\epsilon} \nu \ldots$ ) and to neglect the peculiar force of the combination $\epsilon \nu$ $\kappa$. 'I $\eta \sigma$. The name 'I $\eta \sigma o v ̂ s$ (without $\mathrm{X} \rho \iota \sigma \tau \sigma$ s) seems in S . Paul always to suggest some act, teaching or characteristic of Jesus in His life on earth. Cf. Zahn ad loc. (p. 578 f.) ; Weiss (p. 561).
$\epsilon i \mu \eta े=$ 'still,' $\pi \lambda \eta_{\eta} \nu$; cf. Blass, p. 216.
kotvóv. The technical term for ' unclean,' i.e. in itself and making the person who does or takes the thing unclean ; cf. Heb. x. 29 ; Rev. xxi. 17; Mk vii. 2; Acts x. 14, 28, xi. 8. So the verb $l l$. cc. ; Acts xxi. 28 ; Heb. ix. 13.
15. $\quad$ do $\rho . \quad v .14$ is a parenthetic admission and qualification, $\gamma \dot{a} \rho$ refers back to $v, 13$. The whole passage is curiously elliptic and interjectional.

Sıd $\beta$ р $\omega \mu$.a. Owing to meat-that meat which you in your strength and freedom take, but he regards with scruples.

кaтà àyó $\pi \eta v$ v $\pi \epsilon \rho$. Cf. viii. 4; 1 Cor. iii. 3: love no longer rules your conduct, as of course it ought to do.
 only hêre and Joh. xii. 25. Moulton, p. 114, includes this verb among those in which the prep. has the effect of 'perfectivising' the action
of the verb. Here it must be the 'linear perfective,' i.e. describe the process which inevitably leads to the end. 'Do not bring to ruin as there is danger of your doing.' The point seems to be (as in 1 Cor. l.c.) that the example which encourages the weak brother to do what he feels to be wrong is destructive to him.
vimèp ov $\mathrm{X} \rho . d \pi$. The strongest appeal to the Christian. You ruin him to save whom from ruin Christ died, 1 Cor. l.c.; cf. Mt. xviii. 6, 7.
16. $\mu \eta$ ㅇำ. As this ruin is the result of such action, do not give occasion for such a charge being brought against what is for you and in itself good.
$\beta \lambda a \sigma \phi \eta \mu \epsilon \sigma \sigma \omega$. The result of such an action would be that an evil character could be imputed to what is in itself good ; cf. ii. 24, iii. 8; 1 Cor. x. 30; 1 Tim. vi. 1.
 1 Cor. viii. 9; 方 $\gamma \nu \omega \hat{\omega} \iota \iota$ ib. 11.
17. จv่ үáp к.т.入. No question of fundamental principle is raised; you may suspend your freedom in such matters: for the fundamental matters are etc.
ov̉ үáp è eтtv ท̀. $\beta$. т. 0. Cf. Mt. vi. 31-33, ib. v. 3 f. This is one of the clearest particular cases of the influence of the teaching recorded in the Gospels upon S. Paul's thought and language; cf. S. H. p. 381. Knowling, The witness of the Epistles, p. 312; id. The Testimony of S. Paul to Christ, p. 316 f.

ท̀ $\beta a \sigma \iota \lambda_{\epsilon} \dot{\alpha} \alpha$ тov̂ $\theta \epsilon o v$. . Here and 1 Cor. iv. 20 only does S. Paul speak of 'GoD's sovereignty' as a present condition : in other places he speaks of it as a future condition, participation in which is dependent upon character formed in the present life; cf. 1 Cor. vi. 9, 10 , xv. 50 ; Gal. v. 21 ; Col. iv. 11 (?); 1 Th. ii. 12, 2 Th. i. 5. In Col. i. 13 the present condition is regarded as the sovereignty of His Son or Christ. The two conceptions are combined in Eph. v. 5 and 1 Cor. xv. 24 ; cf. Lk. xxii. 29 f.; Joh. xviii. 36. (Robinson, Eph. p. 117.) On the meaning of the phrase $=$ 'government or sovereignty of God,' cf. Dalman, The Words of Jesus, E. T., p. 91 f. Dalman, op. cit. p. 135, points out " that the phrase (in Jewish literature) never means the locus of the divine sovereignty but the power itself in its present and future manifestations in the teaching of Jesus. The idea is closely connected with the 'life of the future age,' and includes comprehensively the blessings of salvation." The use here regards the effect of Gon's government as already operative in those that are His and producing in them that condition of life which is a fit preparation for the future life when the 'sovereignty' will be fully revealed. For
the connexion of $\dot{\eta} \beta a \sigma . \tau . \theta_{0}$ with $\delta \iota \kappa \alpha \iota o \sigma \dot{\nu} \eta \eta$ in S．Paul cf．Sanday， J．T．S．，i．，p． 481.
ßpêats kal móvıs，＇eating and drinking＇；cf．Lk．xxii．30．The Gospel gives a metaphorical description of the common life of joy and love in the future life．S．Paul here declares that the character of that life does not depend on these external matters but on the moral and spiritual state．

Sıкаıoбúv $\eta$ к．т．入．Cf．Pss．96－99，descriptions of the revealed and established sovereignty of Jehovah and the conditions it brings in； cf．Dalman，op．cit．，p． 136 ；cf．also Lk．xvii． 21 ：and Mt．v． 3－12．

Sıкaıoбúvŋ．Here＇righteousness，＇as describing the condition of those who do God＇s will－cf．the negative 1 Cor．vi．9，10；Gal．v． 21.

єірท́vๆ．Peace with God and between man and man；cf． 1 Thes． v． 23 （after 12－22）， 2 Thes．iii． 16 （after 6－15）．
xapos ．The natural outcome of righteousness and peace ；cf． xv .13 ； Gal．v． 22.
 on Him；cf．Gal．l．c．， 1 Thes．i． 6.

18．$\delta \boldsymbol{\gamma} \dot{\alpha} \rho$ èv тоv่тழ к．т．$\lambda$ ．Cf． xv .3 ，the service of the Christ in－ volves the adoption of His principle of＇not pleasing Himself．＇
èv $\tau$ ov́т＠̣＝in this matter，of conduct as regards things in themselves indifferent．

Sounєúwv $\tau \hat{\varphi} \mathrm{Xp}$ ．This is the true service of the Christ（the Messiah）in contrast with pretended services；cf．Hort，Eccl．，p．111； cf．below xv．3， 4.
 will not be able to find fault．

19．ápa oviv，＇so then after all＇：brings to the front some of the implications of the preceding verses，for further enforcement of the appeal．
 dictates．
 character so that each can take his place in the one building．This is a duty which each Christian owes to each；cf． 1 Cor．xiv．3； 2 Cor． xii． 19 ，xiii． 10.

20．кaтá入ve тò épyov тov̂ $\theta$ єov．The olk．，the duty of Christian to Christian，is God＇s own work；cf． 1 Cor．iii．9；Acts xx．32．кarad．is suggested by the metaphor of building；cf．Mk xv．29；Gal．ii．18； 2 Cor．xiii． 10.
$\pi \alpha \dot{\alpha} \tau \alpha \mu \dot{\varepsilon} v$ ка日apá．The admission of $v .14$ is repeated，to bring
out more explicitly the harm which may be done by insisting on rights； 1 Cor．x．23，viii． 9 ．
$\dot{\alpha} \lambda \lambda \boldsymbol{\alpha}$ кaкòv，sc．your use of this principle，$\tau \grave{\partial} \tau \hat{\eta} \epsilon^{\xi} \xi o v \sigma i \not \chi \chi \rho \hat{\eta} \sigma \theta a \iota$. The assumption，as throughout，is that the weak brother may be led to act against his conscience by the example of the strong．
 Sta w．gen．expresses the conditions of an action；cf．ii． 27 ，viii． 25 ； 2 Cor．ii．4；Blass，p． 132 f．

21．ка入òv к．т．入．Cf， 1 Cor．viii． 13.

 hibit your faith in this matter to men：to be taken with the preceding． нака́pios к．т．入．gives the final contrast between the really strong and the weak ：the one with a clear conscience is to be envied（cf．Ja． i． 25 ）：the doubter must not claim the freedom he does not feel．
 right and sound；of． 1 Cor．xvi．3； 2 Cor．viii．22； 1 Thes．ii． 4 （pass．）．
 doubts，＇who wavers in his judgment ；cf．iv． 20 ；Acts x． 20.

катакќкрьтat is at once condemned by the act，not by the doubt．
ovik ék $\pi \boldsymbol{i} \sigma \tau \in \omega \mathrm{s}$ ，＇because the action does not spring from faith．＇ It is not the result in him，as it is in the other，of faith：and action which cannot justify itself thus proceeds from some other motive， which necessarily makes it sinful．Faith here as throughout is the man＇s faith in God through Christ．This faith settles for the man the principles and details of conduct．Only that conduct is right for him which springs properly from this faith．When a man＇s faith either gives no answer to a question as to conduct or condemns a particular line，the conduct is sinful．Thus we are given here a practical rule for individual action：not a general principle of the value of works done outside the range of Christian profession and knowledge．It has been constantly used for the latter purpose．Of． S．H．＂faith is used somewhat in the way we should speak of a good conscience．＂It is important to observe the negative character of the phrase．It does not follow that everything which a man believes he may do is right ；of．Lid．

## CHAPTER XV.

1-6. The negative principle just laid down-of self-suppression in the interests of the weak-does not exhaust the Christian's duty: there is a positive obligation to share his burdens and to consult his wishes, for his good. This is to do as the Christ did.

1. óфє $\boldsymbol{\lambda} \boldsymbol{\lambda} \boldsymbol{\rho} \mu \mathrm{\epsilon} \boldsymbol{\delta} \boldsymbol{\delta}$. But beyond this we have a positive duty to fulfil; of. for this reference of duty to the example of Christ 1 Joh. ii. 6 , iii. 16, iv. 11; Gal. vi. 2; Eph. v. 2.
$\dot{r} \mu$ eis oi $\delta v v a r o l$. S. Paul includes himself, but he does not here dwell on his own example as he does to his own converts; cf. 1 Cor. ix. 1-23. of $\delta v v a \tau o i=$ who are able; of. 2 Cor. xiii. 9.

тd cioӨevท́para, only here. The several acts and instances of

ßaord'gev. Cf. Gal. vi. 2, not merely='to put up with,' but to help in bearing the load; cf. xii. 13. The strong would adopt the practices of the weak, when in their company, and so help them to bear the burden of these self-imposed regulations; cf. 2 Cor. xi. 29; 1 Cor. ix. 22. This gives full meaning to the following negative clause.
2. Éкабтоs $\mathfrak{\eta}$. к.т. $\boldsymbol{\lambda}$. puts the positive duty in corresponding form: with two qualifications securing that these concessions should not be mere sentimental benevolence, but aim at the good, in conduct, and keep in view what would strengthen the individual character ; cf. on xiv. 19.
3. kai $\gamma$ à $\rho$ o xpiotòs. Who is at once the standard and the inspiration of the Christian's conduct. o xp. The Christ as we know Him in the life of Jesus.
 submitted Himself to the reproaches heaped upon God, rather than please Himself. The quotation illustrates Christ's principle in the extremest case: and the argument from it is a fortiori, Christians should act upon the principle in lesser difficulties. S. H. take it that $S$. Paul is using the quotation in a different sense from the
original-taking $\sigma \epsilon=$ another man : but this seems unnecessary. The Psalm is frequently quoted in relation to Christ (Joh. ii. 17; Mt. xxvii. $27-30,34$; Joh. xix. 29 ; and also xi. 9 ; Acts i. 20, Lid.).
4. ő $\sigma a \quad \gamma \dot{\alpha} \rho$ к.т. $\boldsymbol{\lambda}$. $\gamma \dot{\alpha} \rho$ in a manner apologises for a not very obvious quotation, and S. Paul takes the opportunity of insisting on the value of O.T. for Christians.

троєүра́ф $\eta$. Cf. i. 2; Eph. i. 12 тov̀s $\pi \rho о \eta \lambda \pi \iota к$ бтаs; Gal. iii. 8.
cis тìv к. т.入. 'With a view to'-this was their purpose; cf. 2 Tim. iii. 16.

ทீ $\mu \in \tau \in ́ \rho a v . ~ ' O f ~ u s ~ C h r i s t i a n s . ' ~ \delta i \delta a \sigma к а \lambda(a v, ~ t e a c h i n g, ~ i n s t r u c t i o n . ~$ So perhaps always in N.T. (not=doctrine).
 encouragement of the scriptures.' The repetition of $\delta \iota \dot{\alpha}$ seems to separate the two phrases and limit $\tau \hat{v} v \gamma \rho$. to the second (not so, Gif., Lid.) : then=by means of the steadfast endurance proper to the Christian and with the help of the encouragement afforded by the scriptures. If, on the other hand, we connect both subst. with $\tau \hat{\omega} \nu$ $\gamma \rho a \phi \hat{\omega} \nu$ it is difficult to find a clear meaning for the first: Lid. "the patience of which the O.T. gives such bright examples"; Gif. "the patience is that which the scriptures give"; both seem strained. The two subst. have a special reference here to the 'burdens to be borne.'
$\tau \boldsymbol{\eta} \nu \bar{\epsilon} \lambda \pi\left(\delta a\right.$. The Christian attitude of hope. ${ }^{\prime} \mathbf{~} \chi \omega \mu \in \nu=$ maintain-the proper durative sense; cf. v. 1. Moulton, p. 110. This statement of the use of the O.T. scriptures must be compared with 2 Tim . iii. 16: they imply (1) that the O.T. has a permanent value for the Christian, (2) that that value is two-fold, (a) for instruction, discipline and encouragement of the Christian, (b) as witnessing to Christ in whom is the Christian hope. The statements do not go beyond this, S. H.; cf. Lid.
5. $\delta \delta \dot{\text { è }} \theta$ eòs к. $\tau . \lambda$. The thought passes rapidly from the scriptures to the one Author of the truth they contain, of the power of endurance, and of encouragement; and from the particular instance of unity to the general principle, and from the special end of service of the brethren to the all-inclusive end of the glory of God.
 (exc. Heb. xiii. $20 ; 1$ Pet. v. 10) and to prayers : the gen. describes a gift of God in each case, $\epsilon \rho \rho \dot{\eta} \eta \eta$ (xv. 33 ; 2 Cor. xiii. 11; Phil. iv. 9;
 áүárŋ (2 Cor. xiii. 11); $\chi$ ápıs (1 Pet. v. 10). In each case the gift mentioned has special ref. to context. So here=that God who enables us to endure and encourages us by the scriptures. O.T. $\| \mathrm{s}$ are not frequent and chiefly in Psalms, in prayers $\tau \hat{\eta} s ~ \sigma \omega \tau \eta p l a s ~ m o s t ~ c o m m o n ; ~ ; ~$ cf. Ps. xvii. 46 ; xxx. (xxxi.) 5 ; xli. (xlii.) 8 ; lxi. (lxii.) 7.
rò av̉rò фpoveiv. The unity of mind and interest, easily impaired if difference of opinion is allowed to affect personal relations, is the best preventive of such dissension : the words carry us back to xii. 16 and indicate the presence beneath the surface of the argument of the fundamental theme, the union of Jew and Gentile in Christ : this becomes explicit in $v v .7 \mathrm{ff}$.

кагд̀ $\mathbf{X} \boldsymbol{\rho}$. ' ${ }^{\prime} \eta \boldsymbol{\eta}$. After the manner and rule of Christ Jesus-as exemplified in His life on earth and His mission (Christ) of reconciliation; cf. 2 Cor. v. 18 -vi. 3 f. This combination and order are confined to S. Paul (throughout) and Acts (? Mt. i. 18).
6. ópoovpasiv. Acts ( 10 ) and here only: with one heart and


Sogá̧ñe r. ө. "A phrase much used in both O.T. and N.T. for all forms of human recognition of God's true character and work, rendered by word or by act," Hort, 1 Pet. ii. 12. The special subject of recognition is here indicated by the full description.
 v. 2. This full description is a compendium of the Gospel, especially as the Gospel of reconciliation; and comes suitably here as the climax of the detailed exhortations to unity, echoing the appeal of xii. 1 to 'the compassions of God.' The whole economy of creation and redemption comes from God, revealed as the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, and as in Him 'reconciling the world to Himself.' The full phrase occurs only in benedictions (Eph. i. 3; 2 Cor. i. 3; 1 Pet. i. 3; cf. Col. i. 3) or other places of special solemnity (here and 2 Cor. xi. 31 nearly). Both $\theta \in \dot{\partial} \nu$ and $\pi a \tau \epsilon \rho a$ are to be taken with $\tau . \kappa$.; cf. Hort on 1 Pet. i. 3 (p. 29).
7-13. This is the final stage of the appeal for unity in the new life : and therefore goes to the bottom of the question, the unity of Jew and Gentile. It is not mere toleration that is needed, but full reception, based on the mind and work of Christ.
7. $\delta$ ¿o $\kappa$.т. $\lambda$. This verse resumes and restates $v v .5,6$. $\pi \rho o \sigma \lambda$.

© $七$. On all the grounds stated in xiv. $1-\mathrm{xr} .6$.
$\pi \rho o \sigma \lambda$. $\dot{\alpha} \lambda \lambda$. As in xiv. 1 but wider-each other, in spite of all the differences which tend to separate man from man; cf. xi. 15; Phm. 12, 17; Acts xviii. 26, xxviii. 2. Does this connexion involve the conclusion that "the relations of Jew and Gentile were directly or indirectly involved in the relations of strong and weak"? see S. H. qu. Hort.

кa0is кal к.т.入. resumes the whole argument of i.-xi. incl.

Those chapters show how the Christ brought all men to Himself, with all their differences and all their sins.
ท̀pâs. Us Christians, including already representatively Jews and Gentiles.

 $\dot{\eta} \mu a ̂ s$, by showing that the call of Jew and Gentile alike was a true instance of service rendered by Christ to God in bearing the burdens of the weak.
 throws emphasis on סtákovov, the natural order being $\gamma \in \gamma \in \nu \eta \bar{\eta} \sigma \theta a$, סtákovov $\pi \epsilon \rho \iota \tau \not \mu \hat{\eta} s$ (Blass, p. 287-8). (2) then by $\delta$ taikovov so placed is emphasised that aspect of the work of Christ which specially affords an example of service to others, and so it clinches the appeal to the strong to bear the burdens of the weak. The fundamental use of סoúcovos for menial service to a master makes the word especially appropriate to this purpose. (Cf. Hort, Chr. Eccles., p. 202 f.; cf. Lk. xii. 37 ; Mt. xx. $28, \|$ Mk and n. Joh. xiii. $13-16$.) (3) $\pi \epsilon \rho \iota \tau \circ \mu \hat{\eta} \mathrm{s}$ will in this case define the burden which the סodikovos took up, and stand for the whole order of preparatory law which is summed up in the fundamental requisite of circumcision: an exact parallel to this conception is given in Gal. iv. 4; cf. 1 Cor. ix. 20.
 ejaryentov. He has so taken up the burden of circumcision and used
 perfect ( $\boldsymbol{\text { crovevau }}$ might have been ambiguous, as it is sometimes aoristic; cf. Moulton, p. 146) implying the whole process of Christ's סcanovia as completed by Him and realised in the experience of S. Paul and the Church in its final purpose and result, the common call of Jew and Gentile alike, so 'has proved to be...' (the form here only in N.T., part. Joh. ii. 9 only. For LXX. of. Thackeray \& 24: for papyri Mayser, p. 391).
 of the personal object ( $\tau \hat{\varphi} \hat{\theta} \theta \hat{\varphi})$, the character of God which this service vindicates, and so explains cis $\delta \delta \xi \xi^{\nu} \tau \sigma \hat{v} \theta \epsilon 0 \hat{v}=$ in the interests of God's truth, i.e. truthfulness; of. iii. 4, 7; cf. Ps. xxx. (xxxi.) 6 ; Briggs, Ps. xv. 2 (Internat. Com. I. p. 115) = 'faithfulness, reliableness '; Kirkpatrick, Ps. lxxxv. 10. The faithfulness is vindicated by the fulfilment of the promises made under the covenant in all their comprehensive inclusion of Jew and Gentile together.

єis тò к.т.入. With both $\beta \in \beta a \iota \omega \sigma a \iota$ and $\delta o \xi \bar{\xi} \dot{\sigma} \sigma a \iota$ (cf. Blass, p. 236): the aor. marks the result of the $\delta \iota a \kappa . \gamma$. as done once for all: $=$ so
that He established the promises and the Gentiles glorified God. Both Jew and Gentile received the full benefit of the service-the one in the fulfilment of the promises, their special treasure (ix. 4; Eph. ii. 12) and the other in the call of God's mercy.
$\beta \in \beta a \omega \hat{\omega} \sigma a$. . Here simply 'confirmed,' 'established' by fulfilling; ef. iv. 16; Heb. ii. 2. Perh. in all other places in N.T. the meaning 'warrant' or 'guarantee' is to be preferred.
 of this gen. w. $\epsilon \pi a \gamma \gamma$.: obj. gen. 'made to...' It might be 'possessive'; for the whole thought of. 2 Cor. i. 20.
т $ิ \nu \pi a \tau e ́ \rho \omega \nu, ~ i x . ~ 5 n . ~$
 mark the fact that the twofold result is really one : the confirmation of the promises comes by the call of the Gentiles. The $\delta \dot{\varepsilon}$ marks the contrast between $\tau$ à $\begin{gathered}\varepsilon \\ \epsilon\end{gathered} \nu \eta$ and $\tau \hat{\omega} \nu \pi a \tau \epsilon \in \rho \omega \nu$; the one result brought à double benefit, to Jews and to the Gentiles :=' while for their part.'
vimè è $\lambda \hat{1}$ évs. Cf. xi. 30, 31: =on account of merey received; nearly
 absence of the article emphasises the character of the new state.
кa月 $\dot{s} \gamma^{\epsilon}$ 'रpartar. The four quotations all illustrate the union of Jew and Gentile in 'the promises': the first three as uniting in rendering praise to God for His mercies, the last as sharing in the promise of the Davidic king.
 of David over his enemies and the establishment of his throne is the effect of Jehovah's faithfulness to His servant, and must be celebrated not only in Israel but among the heathen. These then have some share in the knowledge of Jehovah and His faithfulness.
10. єv่фрávөๆ $\tau \in \kappa$ к.т.入. Deut. xxxii. 43 , from the Song of Moses, in close connexion with the execution of vengeance on God's enemies, and the consequent rejoicing of heaven, sons of God and all the angels of God. In this triumph, then, the Gentiles are to share.
11. aiveitte к.т.ג. Ps. exvii. (exvi.) 1 (om. kai bef. ėmaly. LXX.). The Gentiles are called upon to praise God for His lovingkindness and faithfulness to Israel (so here $\dot{\alpha} \lambda \dot{\eta} \theta$ eca and $\begin{gathered}\lambda \\ \lambda \\ \text { eos }\end{gathered}$ ).
 Messianic passage in Isa. i.-xl.; the Messiah, the Davidic king, will include the Gentiles in His dominion by their voluntary ' resort' to Him (for è̀ $\pi t o \hat{\sigma} \tau \iota \nu$ - 'seek' R.V., 'resort' Cheyne).

 to the hope of the gathering of all to Christ, Jew and Gentile (ef. xi.
$13-16,25$ fi.) as already there has been a representative gathering (v. 7).
$\pi \lambda \eta \rho \omega \dot{\sigma a t}$ к.т.入. Joy and peace are the proper consequences of such a hope, as fulfilling what love makes desirable, and putting men at peace with each other in view of the event.
 will accomplish this promise.
fls $\tau$ ò $\pi \epsilon \rho$. The result of this faith, invigorated by the temper of joy and peace, is to increase the activity of this hope in them : their hope in this accomplishment will be more real and vigorous.
${ }_{e} \boldsymbol{v} \delta v v a ́ \mu \epsilon \iota \pi v$. $\alpha \boldsymbol{\gamma}$. The original power of all exercise of Christian grace-in power from the Holy Spirit; ef. 19, Lk. iv. 14 only; of. Eph. iii. 16; 2 Thes. i. 11; of. Hort on 1 Pet. i. 5.
тvéváros áriov. The Holy Spirit: for abs. of article cf. 1 Pet.
 2 Tim. i. 8 (кaт̀̀) and without preposition; 1 Cor. i. 18, 24: in fact the combination is always anarthrous.

## G. Conclusion.

xv. 14-33. Explanation of the occasion of writing.

14-33. The letter passes to personal matters (a) 14-21 a delicate apology and justification of the letter itself: it is not sent with a view to supplementing deficiencies of the Roman Christians, but partly, at least, to remind them of the great truths of the Gospel, and justified by the writer's commission and experience, all under Christ, and of Christ's work among the Gentiles through him, (b) 22-29 it is the outcome of the affection which has always made him eager to visit them, and now that his work in Achaia and the east is finished, he proposes to visit them on the way to Spain, first fulfilling a commission of love and gratitude from his Gentile churches to Jerusalem, where he hopes that his visit will be accompanied by a consummate blessing of Christ. (c) $30-33$. Meantime he almost passionately begs for their prayers that he himself may be rescued from the attacks of the unbelievers in Jerusalem, and that the service he is engaged upon may be thoroughly acceptable to the Church there, that he may come to them in the joy of accomplished purpose and be refreshed with them for further effort. He concludes with the prayer that the God of that peace, which he is hazarding all to promote, may be with all at Rome, overcoming their differences too.

The object of this section is clearly to forestall misconceptions and to establish a thorough understanding and mutual sympathy between writer and readers. The dominant interest of S . Paul at the time is
shown to be the cementing of the union of Jew and Gentile within the Church, the crucial example and the earnest of the establishment of the full peace of God between man and man in all their differences. This brings in the note of deep and almost passionate feeling: and corresponds with the tone and interest of the whole Epistle. The object of the proposed journey to Rome, for which this letter is a preparation, is shown to be twofold : (a) to make personal acquaintance with the Roman Church and to advance the Gospel among them, (b) to secure a base of operations for renewed missionary activity, in Spain.
 letter as involving any distrust or depreciation of them.
$\alpha \dot{\alpha} \delta \epsilon \lambda \phi 0 \ell \mu \cdot v$. A specially intimate and affectionate appeal.
kal av̉ròs è $\mathbf{y} \omega$. I, without waiting for others to tell me, of my own knowledge and confidence. Is there an underlying reference here to a letter from Aquila and Priscilla which has given him full information about the Christians in Rome? See on xvi. 3.
öt кal av̉rol. You, of your own initiative, without requiring help from me.
áyabcoúvys. In LXX. the meaning of kindliness, benevolence, occurs in Neh. ix. 25, 35, xiii. 31 (of GoD) and perhaps Judges viii. 35, ix. 16. The same meaning suits best in Gal. v. 22; Eph. v. 9 (see Robinson); 2 Thes. i. 11 (" denotes a human quality always in S. Paul $=$ moral excellence, but implies specifically an active beneficence" Findlay). Only in S. Paul, ll. cc. in N.T., not found in cl. Greek. Ep. Barn. ii. 9 of God. So here 'goodness towards others' picks up the thought of c . xiv.
$\pi$. $\tau$. $\boldsymbol{\gamma} \boldsymbol{v} \dot{\sigma} \boldsymbol{\sigma} \omega \mathrm{s}$. This again is suggested by the subject of xiv; of. 1 Cor. viii. 1 ff . ; but of course has a wider reference.
voveeteîv. Acts xx. 31 and Epp. P. only; 1 Cor. iv. 14 ஸ́s $\tau \in \kappa v a$ ) ( ${ }_{\epsilon \nu \tau \rho \epsilon \pi}{ }^{2} \nu$; Col. i. $28 \| \delta \delta \delta \dot{\alpha} \sigma \kappa o \nu \tau \epsilon s$, so iii. 16; 1 Thes. v. 12, 14 a work
 'rebuke' is too strong. c. xii. is a good instance of vovecola; of. ${ }_{\nu}$ oveteia 1 Cor. x. 11; Eph. vi. 4; Ti. iii. 10.
15. тo $\lambda \mu \eta \rho o \tau e ́ p \omega s=$ in somewhat bold terms: the comparative gives an apologetic note, which is observable throughout the passage : he will not seem, in any way, to be forcing himself upon them either in teaching or in person.
 11, ix. 15; Gal. vi. 11; Phm. 19, 21.
ámò $\mu$ épous can hardly mean 'in parts of the Epistle': rather with üs 'partly by way of reminding you.' He could not honestly feel that
the Epistle did nothing but remind them of what they knew. $\dot{a} \pi \delta$ $\mu \hat{e}$ pous qualifies an overstrong statement xi. $25, \mathrm{xv} .24 ; 2$ Cor. i. 14, ii. 5 (only).
étavap., here only. Herm. Vis. 4. 1. 7 (only, in Pat. Ap.), Plat. Dem. (L. \& S.). $\quad \begin{gathered}\pi \\ \pi\end{gathered}$ over again, with the hint that it may be superfluous.
$\delta$ da $^{\text {к.т. }}$. The impulse was due to the grace-constituting an obligation.
 ii. 9 ; Eph. iii. 2, 7, 8; Phil. i. 7; Col. i. 6. In all these passages $\chi$ ápıs has direct reference to S . Paul's commission as an apostle to the Gentiles ; and here and elsewhere to the definite act by which he was commissioned, in his call. 'Grace was given to him for his ministry to the Gentiles-to the Gentiles through his ministry.' See Robinson, Eph. pp. 225 f.
16. $\lambda \in \tau \tau о v \rho \gamma o ̀ v \mathrm{X} \rho$. 'I $\eta \sigma$. Cf. xiii. 6 n .; cf. Phil. ii. 25 ( $\dot{v} \mu \hat{\omega} \nu-$
 Heb. viii. 2; cf. S. Paul 2 Cor. ix. 12 ; the Philippians Phil. ii. 17, 30 ; cf. here xv. 27 ; 2 Cor. ix. 12 ; angels Heb. i. 7 : in a more special sense Lk. i. 23 ; Acts xiii. 2 ; Heb. ix. 21, x. 11. The classical meaning of a public service performed to the community still colours the word. S. Paul adds here the name of the authority, who orders the performance, and the persons to whose benefit it is directed. As compared with $\delta$ dárovos the public and representative character is emphasised. The Ecclesiastical usage for services of public worship is to be interpreted by rather than to interpret the wider use. Here the context gives it the specially religious sense.

ífoovpyoûvca. Only here in N.T. 4 Macc. vii. 8 (Sixtine edtn; Sw. $\delta \eta \mu \iota o v \rho \gamma 0 \hat{\nu} \tau \epsilon s$ ) with $\tau \grave{\nu} \nu \delta \mu 0 \nu$, but the doubt as to text makes this passage useless. Subst. 4 Macc. iii. $20=$ sacrifice. The verb is rare and late. It is used (1) abs.= to act as priest in sacrifice : (2) with accus. when the object is the victim sacrificed; and in the pass. of victims. It is very difficult to apply this sense here; $\tau \delta \boldsymbol{\epsilon} \dot{u} . \tau . \theta$. can hardly be the matter offered as a victim; the next clause shows that the matter of the offering is the Gentiles or the consecrated lives which they bring: and this agrees with the other uses of sacrificial terms by S. Paul ( $\theta v \sigma i a$ xii. 1 n.; cf. Hort, 1 Pet. ii. 5, גeıтovpyia Phil. ii. 17). As however iepovpreiv prop. = to be a iepov $\rho \gamma \delta$ bs, the transitive use must be secondary : and we may perhaps take it here as abs, and $\tau \grave{c}$ cva $\gamma$. as an accus. of reference=exercising a priesthood in reference to the Gospel of God. So Lid., S. H. al. i. then specialises the meaning of $\lambda \epsilon \iota \tau o v \rho \gamma b \nu$, and $\tau \dot{\text { ò }}$ єvay. describes the rule
or standard of this priesthood, in contrast with the priesthood of the law; cf. Heb. vii. 28. So Rutherford tr. "discharging priestly duties of the Gospel of God." The accus. with the verb would then correspond to the gen. with the subst. $\mu \nu \sigma \tau \eta \rho i \omega \nu$ i $\epsilon \rho \circ \rho_{\rho \gamma \delta}$ s qu. from Galen. See Field, ad loc.
\&va depends in the whole preceding clause $\lambda$. X $\rho$.'I. І....
$\hat{\eta} \pi \rho \circ \sigma \phi \circ \rho \dot{\alpha} \tau \hat{\omega} \nu \dot{\epsilon} \theta \nu \hat{\omega} v$, for the gen. cf. Heb. х. 10 only. In $\pi \rho \circ \sigma \phi \circ \rho \alpha$ and $\pi \rho \circ \sigma \phi \dot{\epsilon} \rho \epsilon \iota \nu$ the dominant notion is of 'approach to God,' the offering symbolising the approach of the offerer to GoD's presence; cf. Westcott, Heb. x. 10; Hort, 1 Pet. ii. 5, p. $111 a$. The gen. is probably therefore objective. The Gentiles are the offering which S. Paul as Gospel-priest brings to God; this is the matter of the ministry which he exercises under Christ Jesus,
 Eph. v. 2 (cf. 2 Cor. ii. 14 f.) ; $\tau \hat{\varphi} \theta \epsilon \hat{\varphi} \epsilon \in \mathcal{d} \rho \in \sigma \tau o \nu$, xii. 1.
 матıко́s, 1 Pet. ii. 5.
17. ËX $\omega$ oviv. ov̉v refers to the preceding statement of his missionbeing in this relation to Christ Jesus and engaged on this work for Him, I am bold beyond what I should be if I were acting on my own account; shows how this statement justifies $\tau 0 \lambda \mu$. ${ }^{\text {E }} \gamma \rho a \psi a$.

ËХ $\omega$ каv́Х $\eta \sigma \iota \nu=\kappa a v \chi \hat{\omega} \mu a \iota$, emphasising the durative action.
év X $\rho$. 'I. In my union with and service of Christ Jesus.
тd̀ $\pi \rho \dot{s} s$ тòv $\theta$ év. As regards my relation to God: accus. of ref. Blass, p. 94 ; cf. Heb. ii. 17.
18. ov $\gamma \mathrm{d} \boldsymbol{\rho}$ к. $\tau . \lambda$. The comparison with 2 Cor. x. 8 f. seems to show that a double qualification of кaú $\eta \sigma \iota s$ is compressed into this rather clumsy declaration (1) I will only boast of my own works (not $\epsilon_{\epsilon} \nu \dot{a}$ à入orploss кómocs), (2) I will not dare to boast of these works as my own, but only as Christ's achievements through me: the thought of (1) crops up again in $v .20$, of (2) in 19.
eis viтaкoท̀v ${ }^{\text {é } \theta \nu \omega ิ v . ~ C f . ~ x v i . ~ 19 ; ~ t o ~ e f f e c t ~ o b e d i e n c e ~(t o ~ C h r i s t, ~ o f ~}$ faith) on the part of Gentiles.
 of the Gospel and in exemplifying it in life: more specific than 2 Cor. x. 11; cf. Lk. xxiv. 9; Ac. vii. 22; Col. iii. 17; 2 Thes. ii. 17; 1 Joh. iii. 18.
19. év 8. $\sigma \eta \mu \epsilon i \omega v$ кal $\tau \in \boldsymbol{q}^{\prime} \tau \omega v$. Cf. 2 Cor. xii. 12. There is no doubt that S. Paul himself claimed to work miracles ; cf. Heb. ii. 4; Acts pass.
 power of the Gospel.

## 

 the Gospel is in conception exactly \| 2 Cor. x. 14-16 (there too, as he is addressing the Corinthians, Corinth itself is the limit) : n. that in S. Paul's view Jerusalem is the beginning for himself as for the other Apostles (cf. Hort, R. E. pp. 39 ff.).

кúk $\lambda \varphi$. With $\mu \epsilon \in \chi \rho \iota \tau$. 'I., marking the course of his missionary journey : as S. H. with the Greek commentators whose verdict on such a question of language is weighty. $A l$. take it with 'I $\epsilon$. but (1) S. Paul did not preach as a missionary in Judea, (2) кúклє could hardly include Syria, (3) it would need the article.
'I $\lambda \lambda \lambda_{v}$ uкov clearly marks the furthest point as towards Rome which his preaching had reached at the time he was writing this letter (in Corinth). The name was given to the western districts of the province of Macedonia (Mommsen, Provv. 1., p. 299 f.). It would mark his nearest approach to Rome: as at Thessalonica he had been on the direct road to Dyrrhachium, the most direct route from the East to Rome. It is most probable that $\mu$ é $\chi \rho t$ is exclusive ; (1) it is not easy to find a place in the Acts for any preaching in the interior of the province of Macedonia, scarcely in Acts xx. 2; (2) there were then no important towns till the sea coast was reached, the inhabitants being " a confused mass of non-Greek peoples." It was not S. Paul's practice to preach in such country districts: (3) in marking limits $\mu \epsilon \chi \rho \iota$ would be more naturally exclusive; cf. Mommsen, $i b ., 256 \mathrm{n}$. ; but see Ramsay, Gal. p. 276.
$\pi \in \pi \lambda \eta \rho$. тò єv่. $\tau$. xp . 'The Gospel of the Christ' has special reference to the call of the Gentiles and missionary work among them; cf. 1 Cor. ix. 12; 2 Cor. ii. 12, ix. 13, x. 14; Gal. i. 7; Phil. i. 27. $\pi \epsilon \pi \lambda \eta \rho$. he has completed the preaching throughout all this area-by establishing the Gospel in all the principal centres. The statement must be taken in connexion with S. Paul's own conception of his mission and of the methods by which it could be carried out: cf. again 2 Cor. x. 13 f.; of. Ramsay, Pauline Studies, p. 77 f. For constr. cf. Col. i. 25 ; Acts xiv. 26.
 eager desire.
$\phi і \lambda о \tau \iota \mu$ ои́ $\mu$ vov. This word is a good illustration of meaning determined by use, rather than by derivation. The primary (derivative) sense is 'to be ambitious': in the 'general usage of the best Greek writers' $=$ 'to make one's best efforts.' So 2 Cor. v. 9 a heightening of $\theta a \rho \rho \circ \hat{v} \mu \in \nu$ кai єv่סoко仑̂ $\mu \epsilon \nu$; 1 Thes. iv. 11 (only, in N.T.);

 29) = was named as an object of allegiance and worship; cf. 1 Cor. i. 2 ; Isa. lxvi. 19.
 ad $\lambda \lambda$. = laid by another.
21. кa0 ஸ̀s $\gamma$ ย́ $\gamma \rho$. Isa. lii. 15.

22-29. Siò kal_к.т. $\boldsymbol{\lambda}$. This work has detained him; but its completion leaves him free to fulfil his long cherished purpose, as soon as a special mission, in the interests of his work, has been fulfilled at Jerusalem. His visit to Rome has for its object a journey to Spain, for which he wishes to enlist their sympathy and support. The complication of motives and purposes here as so often leads to incomplete and involved sentences. The hesitancy of expression is partly due to his delicacy; he will not seem either to have neglected the Church in Rome, or to force himself upon them. So he explains his delay and in the same breath his reason for coming, as an appeal for their help in his work.

Sio кai=this was just the reason why I was so constantly being hindered from etc.

є̇vєкотто́ $\boldsymbol{\eta} \boldsymbol{\imath}$. Of. 1 Thes. ii. 18; 1 Cor. ix. 12 (subst.); (Polyb.
 $\kappa \alpha \lambda \alpha$ 'you are hindering us finely.' No class. instance is quoted for this meaning. N. imperfect, 'I was constantly being hindered.'
$\tau \grave{\alpha} \pi 0 \lambda \lambda \alpha$. Adverb. accus. ( $=\pi о \lambda \lambda \alpha \kappa \iota s$ ) akin to the accus. of the inner object; of. Blass, p. 94.

тоv̂ éd $\theta$ єiv. Cf. Blass, p. 235: more commonly the pleonastic negative is inserted after verbs of hindering.
23. тómov " ${ }^{\text {X }} \boldsymbol{\omega} \boldsymbol{\nu}=$ having opportunity or opening ; cf. xii. 19 ; Eph. iv. 27 ; Heb. viii. 7, xii. 17; Acts xxv. 16.
$\kappa \lambda$ ( $\mu$ абь. 2 Cor. хi. 10; Gal. i. 21, 'districts'; cf. Ramsay, Gal., p. $278 \mathrm{ff} .=$ 'a comparatively small geographical district'; of. Polyb. x. 1. 3.

ย̇тเтóOcıav. Here only; cf. 2 Cor. vii. 7, 11; vb i. 11, al.; adj. Phil. iv. 1; 'eager longing.'
 27. The linear present in this combination is best expressed by our perfect, 'having had for several years past'; Burton § 17 cft Acts xv. 21 al.; but ef. Blass, p. 189.
 subj. = 'as soon as I shall have': here $=$ 'when I am on my way to,' 'on my journey to Spain 'Rutherford. In LXX. $\dot{\omega}$ s ${ }_{a} \nu$ w. aor. subj., = when, is frequent: only once in this sense with pres. subj. (Prov. vi. 22); ef.

Moulton, p. 167 (where he notes the use of the futuristic present in the subj. mood) and Blass, p.272. This use appears to be Hellenistic. In cl. Gr. $\dot{\omega} s{ }^{\circ} \nu$ is final ; and this use would make good sense here: but it seems to have died out; cf. however Witkowski, Ep. Priv. Gr. 1. 3.
${ }^{\boldsymbol{\epsilon}} \lambda \pi \pi$ ( $\} \omega \mathrm{\omega}$ 人 p . A parenthesis occasioned by the mention of Spainthe ultimate object of his journey west.
$\theta$ eáracӨal. To visit, only here in N.T.; of. 2 Chr. xxii. 6 LXX. only. My visit to you is to be 'in passing.'

ข่ф’ ข. $\pi \rho \circ \pi \epsilon \mu \phi \theta$ ฑ̂val. Cf. 1 Cor. xvi. 6; 2 Cor. i. 16; Tit. iii. 13 ; 3 Joh. 6 ; Acts (3) it implies assistance and speeding for the journey, and so here enlists the interests of the Romans for his work in Spain, and claims their support.
$\dot{v} \mu \omega ิ \nu-\dot{\epsilon} \mu \pi \lambda \eta \sigma \theta \omega \hat{\text {. }}$. Cf. Od. xx. 452 vios $\bar{\epsilon} \mu \pi \lambda \eta \sigma \theta \hat{\eta} \nu a \iota \ldots \delta \phi \theta a \lambda \mu o i ̂ s$.
ámò $\mu$ épovs. 'In some degree.' R.
25. vuvi $\delta \hat{k}$. The sentence is broken off, to allow of explanation of still further delay; this journey was much in his mind, both for the interest of it, and the danger ; of. Hort R. and E., p. 43.

Sanovêv roîs áylous. Cf. 2 Cor. viii. 4, 9, 20, ix. 1f. This service for the saints occupied a great part in S. Paul's mind at this time: it symbolised in a most expressive form the union of Jew and Gentile in the one Church: we may indeed say that the same thought so eagerly cherished and indefatigably pursued appears in the mission to Jerusalem and in the Epistle to the Romans. The synchronism cannot have been accidental. Introd. p. xiv.; Hort, R. and E., p. 40 ff. ; Rendall, Expositor, Series Iv., vol. 8, p. 321 f.
26. そủถóкทŋбav of men; cf. 2 Cor. v. 8, xii. 10; 1 Thes. ii. 8, iii. 1; 2 Thes. ii. 12 ; subst. Lk. ii. 14 (v.l.) ; Rom. x. 1; Phil. i. 15 only.

Mak. кal 'AX. The provinces are named to include all the Churches in them; cf. 2 Cor. ix. 2 f. The Churches of Galatia are also named in this connexion 1 Cor. xvi. 1; cf. the list of companions Acts xx .4.
 Contribution is rather too cold a word. кoเv.=act of partnership or fellowship; cf. 2 Cor. ix. 13 where eis $\pi$ ávzas brings out the fuller meaning: so here $\tau \iota \nu a=$ a kind of partnership to help the poor etc. The act united the Gentile Churches in fellowship with each other and with the Church in Jerusalem whose poor they were helping; cf. also 2 Cor. viii. 4.
27. Ydip corroborates-yes indeed; Blass, p. 274 f.
rois $\pi v$. - roîs $\sigma a p k . \quad$ Of. 1 Cor. ix. 11.
$\lambda$ eıтoupyฑ̂नat. Cf. Phl. ii. 30 (-la) 25 (-os) of service from man to man.
28. тov̂тo $=$ this business-of his mission in this cause.
 word is used in the same connexion in 2 Cor. viii. 6, 11.
 quotes from Papyri instances of sealing bags of corn etc. to prevent their being tampered with and so to secure them for the assignee: and following Theod. Mops. and Lipsius tr. 'bring it safely into their possession.' This will be an instance, then, of the commercial metaphors not infrequent in S. Paul (cf. $\beta \in \beta \alpha \iota o ̂ ̂ \nu, ~ \chi \epsilon \iota \rho б \gamma \rho a \phi o \nu$, $\dot{a} \rho \rho a \beta \dot{\omega} \nu)$. The present of money, symbolising brotherly fellowship, is the fruit received by the Jerusalem Church as the result of the spiritual labours of S. Paul, working on their behalf among the Gentiles. The seal was primarily a mark of ownership and authenticity and then secondarily of security and correctness (cf. Mt. xxvii. 66) as here. So Rutherford "when I have securely conveyed to them this return." So Chrys., Theodt (Cramer's Catena iv. p. 512).
av่̉oîs =oi äyloc (v.25) in Jerusalem.
 language, Blass, p. 52 ; cf. Thackeray, p. 257, 267.
tis $\Sigma \pi a v i a v$. Cf. S. H. Whether S. Paul visited Spain or not is doubtful. That he should have intended to is completely in accordance with his general plan of mission work; cf. Introd. p. xii; cf. Ramsay, Paul the Tr., p. 255.
 blessing in its full completeness. He feels no doubt (oija) that, if he succeeds in reaching Rome, that is, in getting safe through his mission to Jerusalem, he wili have been successful too in the great aim of that mission, that is, in producing a signal manifestation of the union of Jew and Gentile and securing a full acknowledgement of it. This he regards as a complete execution of Christ's blessing-i.e. God's blessing offered in Christ to all mankind (ef. Gal. iii. 9, 14; Eph. i. 3) and, if he comes to them at all, it will be with this supreme achievement. See also Acts xx. 24 ; infra v. 31 and Hort $R$. and $E$., p. 42.
 (1 Cor. iv. 21), ėv $\mu$ ãaí $p \not$ Papp. = using or wearing, or furnished with; "haec exempla ad vestitum pertinent, significantia qua veste quis indutus, deinde quibus rebus ornatus et instructus sit," Kuhring Prepos. Graec. ; cf. Deissmann, B. S., p. 115.
30. тарака入へ̂ $\delta^{\mathbf{\epsilon}} \boldsymbol{\kappa} . \tau . \lambda$. This urgent appeal reveals, as by a lightning flash, the tension of mind in which S. Paul was living at the time: the supreme importance of this mission was only rivalled
by its extreme dangers. The hostility of the Judaizers and still more of the unbelieving Jews naturally culminated at the moment when the success of his work was on the point of being secured; of. Acts xx .3 . It is no wonder that to himself at one time success at another the dangers were more obvious (cf. Acts $x x .22-25$, xxi. 4, 13). Here, as he above appealed to their support for his projected work in Spain, he appeals for their prayers in this great crisis.
$\delta \iota \alpha$ тоv̂- $\delta$ เ $\alpha$ т $\hat{S}$ к.т. $\lambda$. See xii. 3 n . 'on the authority of.'
тท̂s ảyámๆs тov̂ $\pi v \in \dot{\jmath} \mu a \tau o s . ~ A ~ u n i q u e ~ p h r a s e: ~ n o t ~| | ~ G a l . ~ v . ~ 22 ; ~$ Col. i. 8. The idea = viii. 26 f . The parallelism of the clauses points to the meaning-the love which the Holy Spirit has for us and works in us-not the latter only.
ouvaywif(бaбӨal. Only here; of. for the simple verb Col. i. 29, iv.12, of strenuous effort. N. aor., the case brooks no delay.
èv raîs $\pi \operatorname{coservx}^{2}$ ais marks the way in which they can help in this supreme struggle.
31. Yva к.т. $\boldsymbol{\lambda}$. The two elements in the situation are already marked : (1) rescue of S . Paul from the enemy who thought by one blow to shatter the work, (2) acceptance of the offering and its meaning by the Church in Jerusalem.
$\tau \omega \hat{\nu} \dot{\alpha} \pi \epsilon \in \theta 0$ v́vт $\omega \nu$. Cf. Acts xiv. 2 supra, x. 21, xi. 30; 1 Pet. ii. 8.
32. $\sigma v v^{2}$ anavi $\sigma \omega \mu$. Only here in N.T., sc. after the áróv. As they shared the struggle, so they should share the relief and rest.
 the peace, which Christ has won, and which is now at stake; cf. $v$. 5 n . The prayer naturally concludes the impassioned appeal of the last few verses ; cf. Hort, R. and E., p. 52.

## CHAPTER XVI.

1-2. Commendation of Phoebe (the bearer of the letter).
3-16. Greetings to Christians at Rome.
17-20. Warning against mischief-makers and disturbers of the peace.
The grace.
21-23. Greetings from companions of the writer.
25-27. Final ascription of praise to God through Jesus Christ, summing up the fundamental thought of the Epistle.
 preceding section : he has explained his desire to visit them, the reasons for delay; instead of coming, he is writing and commends to them the bearer of the letter.
बvvioт $\eta \mu$. Cf. 2 Cor. iii. 1; cf. Milligan, Greek Papyri, 14. 5, and for instances of letters of introduction $i b .8$, and for the word $i b$. 3. $2,5=$ 'I introduce, commend' hereby. The common formula makes it clear that Phoebe was the bearer of this letter.
$\Phi_{0}(\beta \eta \nu$. Mentioned only here. Wetstein qu. Suet. Aug. for the name.
 (with $\dot{\eta} \mu \hat{\omega} \nu$ and $\mu \circ v$ ) to fellow workers to whom he was under obligation for personal service; of Titus 2 Cor. ii. 13 ; anon. viii. 22 ; Epaphroditus, Phil. ii. 25; Timothy, 1 Thes. iii. 2; and the phrase may here anticipate the $\pi \rho$. каi $\epsilon \mu \circ \hat{v}$ aúrov̀ of $v .2$.
 Paul, this phrase marks her relation to the Church : and the form of the phrase suggests that $\delta \iota a \dot{\kappa o \nu o \nu ~ i m p l i e s ~ a n ~ o f f i c i a l ~ p o s i t i o n . ~ I f ~ s o, ~}$ it is the only mention of this office in N.T. (unless we take 1 Thes. iii. 11 in this sense). The next mention is Plin. Ep. x. 96.8 duabis ancillis quae ministrae dicebantur : then later still in the Apostol. Constitutions. The existence of such an office cannot be thought improbable even at this early stage, in view of the social condition of women ; cf. S. H. Against this is the very general use of ठ८áкoуos
and ocakovia (cf. 1 Cor. xvi. 15) in this group of Epistles, and the unlikelihood that the word would be used in the official sense in this passage alone; n. also the similar combination in 1 Thes. iii. 2; ef. Ency. Bibl. 'Deacon' and Hort Eccles. p. 207 f. On the whole there seems to be insufficient reason for taking it officially. So in the ordinary sense 'being also one that ministers to...,' an additional ground of commendation.
$\tau \hat{\eta} \mathrm{s}$ ékı $\boldsymbol{\lambda}$. $\boldsymbol{\tau} \hat{\eta} \mathrm{S}$ èv K. The address of 2 Cor. i .1 and xv. 26 above suggest that there were other Churches in Achaia besides Corinth. This was one of them.

Kevxpeais. The seaport of Corinth on its eastern shore; cf. Acts xviii. 18, xx. 3. See Introd, p. xi.
2. $\pi \rho \circ \sigma \delta \epsilon_{\xi}^{\xi} \eta \sigma \theta \epsilon$. Lk. xv. 2; Phil. ii. 29.
$\dot{d} \xi(\omega \bar{\omega} \tau \hat{\omega} v \dot{\alpha} \gamma \boldsymbol{\gamma} \omega v$. In a manner worthy of the saints-as saints should.
$\pi а р а \sigma \tau \eta ิ \tau \epsilon$, help; cf. 2 Tim. iv. 17.
 her own business, and that $\mathbb{S}$. Paul used the opportunity of sending his letter.
 12; 1 Tim. v. 17; cf. Witkowski, Ep. Priv. 48.9, ib. 9.4, 'protectress.' A word used technically to mean the representative or patron; but here to describe the way in which Phoebe 'looked after' any who wanted her help.

3-16. Greetings ; see Lightfoot, Phil. pp. 171 ff. S. H. ad loc.
3. Прட́каv кal'Aкv́лav; cf. Acts xviii. 2, 18, 26; 1 Cor. xvi. 19; 2 Tim. iv. 19. We first hear of this pair at Corinth, where they were found by $S$. Paul on his first visit and that connexion was formed which lasted for the rest of his life. They had then lately come from Rome, and presently went with S. Paul to Ephesus, where they remained while he went on his way to Jerusalem. At Ephesus they were when Apollos arrived, and probably were influential in the small Church there, as they put Apollos in the way of full Christian teaching. They were there still, or again, when S. Paul wrote 1 Cor., certainly nine months, perhaps more than a year, before this Epistle. Now they are at Rome, and again some years later ( 2 Tim.) in the province of Asia. A difficulty has been raised about this frequent change of home: and it has been directed against the originality of this passage in this place. But, apart from the migratory habits of Jews engaged in business, it is clear from Acts, 1 Cor. xvi. 19 and this passage that A. and P. had given themselves to the work of propagating the Gospel : and it is not unreasonable to conjecture that just as they were left
behind at Ephesus (Acts xviii. 18) to begin the work there and to prepare for S. Paul's return, so they may now have been sent by him to Rome to prepare the way for his intended visit; and returned to Asia at a later date, perhaps when he himself was released from Rome. This conjecture is supported by the fact that S . Paul's intention to go to Rome was already formed at least before he left Ephesus (Acts xix. 21). It would explain his knowledge of the Christians who were at Rome at this time, both of those who seem to have centred round these two and of the other groups mentioned. For if they went to Rome to prepare for S. Paul's visit, they would naturally communicate with him as soon as they had got into full touch with the Church there. The list of salutations gains much in naturalness and point, if we can suppose it to have been based on information sent by A. and P. And we may see in such a letter from Rome the direct occasion of S. Paul's letter and even in some degree the influence which determined its character. (Zahn, Einl. p. 275, also makes this suggestion.) See Introd. p. xii f.
 Phm. 24; 1 Thes. iii. 2 (v. 1.) : in all cases of sharing in the apostolic labours. Jews as they were, they were devoted workers in the Gospel with S. Paul, and shared his mission to the Gentiles: see below on $\pi$. al éкк. т. è.
4. oituves. 'For they,' 'seeing that they,' a ground for this prominent greeting.
vimèp $\tau \hat{\eta} \mathrm{S}$ 廿. к.т. $\boldsymbol{\lambda}$. We have no further information about this. It may have been either at Corinth or at Ephesus.
v่ $\epsilon \in \emptyset \eta \kappa \alpha v$. In this sense only here in N.T. = 'they pledged' risked, cf. Plat. Protag. 313 a (L. and S.); for the form cf. Thackeray, 23 § 10.

єบ̉Xapırtê. The only place in the N.T. where the verb or subst. is used with a human object (cf. and ct Acts xxiv. 3).
$\pi$. ait ékк $\lambda$. т $\hat{\omega} v \hat{e ́}^{2} \theta v \omega ิ v$. A unique combination and very significant. It emphasises their share in carrying the Gospel to the Gentiles, and shows the purpose of this elaborate reference to them. mâoal. We know of P. and A. at Rome, Corinth and Ephesus only. But Corinth and Ephesus mean Achaia and Asia : and their influence, direct and indirect, may well have gone further. The occasion for gratitude should not be limited to this special service rendered to S. Paul.
5. каi т $\grave{v} v \kappa a \tau^{\prime}$ оікоу к.т.入. Cf. 1 Cor. xvi. 19. It is natural to suppose that as P. and A. had formed a centre at Ephesus they would also form one at Rome. This phrase suggests that S. Paul had heard from them since their arrival at Rome: and this to some extent supports the suggestion that they had gone there to prepare the way
for him. Some communication from them may have been the direct occasion for this letter. Zahn suggests that all the names that follow to $v .13$ are to be included in this group of Christians, vv. 14, 15 naming two other groups. This seems probable.

For the 'Church in the house' cf. Col. iv. 15; Phm. 2; Acts xii. 12; cf. S. H., Lft ad Col. l.c. " no clear example of a separate building set apart for Christian worship before the third century, though apartments in private houses might be specially devoted to this purpose"; of. Hort, Eccles. 117.
'Eraiveтov. "Not an uncommon name in inscriptions from Asia Minor" S. H. Zahn suggests that he was an early convert of P. and A. at Ephesus and possibly worked under them in their trade, and so accompanied them to Rome.
đòv áy. $\mu \mathrm{ov}$. This phrase (and below 8,9) marks of course personal intimacy (contrast v. 12).
ámapX ${ }^{\prime}$ Tท̂s 'A. cis $\mathbf{X p}$. means that he was the first or at least among the first converts at Ephesus, therefore of P. and A.; of. 1 Cor. xvi. 15.
6. Mapiav. As this name may be either Roman or Jewish, it tells us nothing. The v.l. Mapıd $\mu$ would be decisive.

ทךтıs... $\epsilon \mathrm{s}$ ípâs. It may be questioned whether the reading $\dot{v} \mu a ̂ s$ is not too difficult to come under the praestat ardua rule. The names before and after at least to $v .9$ inclusive are all of personal friends and some of fellow-labourers of S. Paul. It is unlikely that one who was known to him only by report would be included at this point. Moreover the selection of one person at Rome as having laboured much for them is remarkable. If $\dot{\eta} \mu$ âs be read, the $\eta^{\prime} \tau c s$ clause here is exactly $\|$ oiँт८ves к.т.入. in 7 and brings the name into line with the others. But see Introd. p. xxv.
7. 'AvSpóvıov. A Greek name, used, as so often, by a Jew. Zahn, p. 607 n. 56, remarks that Jewish names are rare in the Jewish inscriptions of Italy. This name occurs among members of the imperial household, S. H.
'Iovviav. Probably for Junias = Junianus a man's name, though not a common one.

тoùs $\sigma v \gamma \gamma \in \nu \in$ îs $\mu \mathrm{mv}$, i.e. Jews. So 11, 21 ; cf. ix. 3.
ovvaıx $\mu$ àஸ́тovs. Cf. Col. iv. 10; Phm. 23. We have no ground for identifying the occasion.
oiтtvés єiotv к.т.入. (1) è $\pi i \boldsymbol{i} \eta \mu \mathrm{ot}=$ marked men, notable : here of course in a good sense; ct Mt. xxvii. 16. Class. both in good and bad sense ; cf. 3 Macc. vi. 1 (not elsewhere in LXX. of persons). (2) év тois ámooródors (a) among the apostles sc. of Christ, themselves being
reckoned as apostles: so Lft Gal. p. $96 \mathrm{n} .1, \mathrm{~S}$. H. ad loc. This is the obvious meaning. In that case, according to S. Paul's use, they must belong to the class which he describes in Gal. i. 17 as $\tau o v s \pi \rho \grave{~}$ $\dot{\epsilon} \mu \mathrm{v} \hat{v}$ àroorbخous. He uses the term to include members of the primitive community who had received their commission from the Lord Himself, a class not limited to the Twelve (e.g. Barnabas, perhaps Silas), S. Paul himself being its latest member (1 Cor. xv . 8). (b) Others take it = men of note in the judgment of the Apostles (Gif., Zahn). There is no advantage in this rendering, unless it is assumed, wrongly, that A. and J. cannot have been apostles. We may conclude then that A. and J. were among the earliest preachers of the Gospel, and that they had shared S. Paul's labours, as well as his imprisonment. They are now at Rome, and may have been among those who first brought the Gospel to Rome. See Introd. p. xxv, Add. Note, p. 225.
 were made and have been apostles in Christ.' The form $\boldsymbol{\epsilon} \boldsymbol{\nu} \mathbf{X} \rho$. is occasioned by the turn of phrase : if he had repeated diroor. he would have written $\dot{\alpha} \pi \sigma \sigma \tau$. X $\rho \iota \sigma \tau o v \hat{\text {. }}$. This is quoted as a clear use of $\gamma \in \mathfrak{\gamma}$ ova

 two instances from papyri, though he doubts the use in N.T.; ef. Dr Weymouth ap. S. H. But we have to note that $\pi \rho o ̀ ~ \epsilon \epsilon \mu o \hat{v}$ gives a mark of time $=$ ' even longer than $I$ ': and the use is $\|$ to the case of perf. with $\pi$ d́入al (see Moulton, p. 141). Cf. Joh. vi. 25 ; Mt. xix. 8, xxiv. 21 ; 1 Cor. xiii. 11 ; Gal. iii. 17; 1 Tim. v. 9. There is no clear case of the strictly aoristic meaning of this form in N.T. For the form -a ef. Thackeray, pp. 209, 212; Mayser, p. 323 ; Moulton, p. 52 : cf. Col. ii. 1; Acts xvi. 36, and rérovap, Rev. xxi. 6 only: it is a case of the gradual intrusion of the weak aorist form into the perfect and strong aorist.
 common slave name occurs among the imperial household: but in particular, to a chamber in the cemetery of Domitilla, one of the earliest of Christian catacombs, containing the name Ampliati, in bold letters of the end of the first or beginning of the second century. The single personal name suggests a slave : the honour of an elaborately painted tomb suggests that he was very prominent in the earliest Roman Church : the connexion with Domitilla seems to show that it is the name of a slave or freedman through whom Christianity had penetrated into a second great Roman household. See the whole note.
9. Oủp $\beta$ avòv. "A common slave name, found among the members of the (imperial) household,"S. H. The name of course tells us nothing as to nationality. He may have been a Jew or a Greek.
tòv $\sigma v v \in p \not o{ }^{2} v$ ทipûv. Prob., as S. H., a general description of working in the same cause as S . Paul and his companions, not necessarily of personal fellowship; cf. Phm. 1 only: elsewhere always $\mu_{0 v}(v .3,21$; Phil. ii. 25, iv. 3; 2 Cor. viii. 23 ( $\epsilon \mu \partial s)$; Phm. 24).
$\Sigma \tau a ́ x v v$. "Rare but found in the imperial household," S. H. ; cf. Witkowski, Ep. Priv., p. 73.
10. 'A $\pi \in \lambda \lambda \eta \bar{v}$. A name borne by Jews; of. Hor. Sat. . v. 100, see Lft.
тòv Sókцนov êv X X . marks some special difficulty faithfully overcome; cf. 1 Cor. xi. 19; 2 Cor. x. 18 ; 2 Tim. ii. 15; Ja. i. 12.

тov̀s ék тต̂v 'Apıoтoßov́גov prob. = Aristobulus, brother of Herod Agrippa I., who lived a long time in Rome and was a friend of the Emperor Claudius. of ék $\tau$. = some of his slaves, probably now connected with the imperial household, though treated as a separate group; A. being either dead or resident in Palestine. Zahn, ad loc. Lft, S. H.
11. 'Hpwsicva. Coming between the two groups of slaves, prob. belonged to the former: the name suggests a connexion. with the Herod family.

тoùs ék тต̂v Napкíбov. N. is reasonably identified with the freedman of that name, powerful under Claudius and put to death by Agrippina shortly after Nero's accession. S. H., Lft.
12. Tpúфaıvav кai Tpuфŵَav, perh. sisters, and belonging to the last-named group. The names are found in household inscriptions: Tryphaena in one case with Tryphonilla, in another with T $\rho \nu \phi \omega[\nu$ or бa]. Zahn, Einl. pp. 297-8.

Пєроt( $\alpha$ к.т. $\boldsymbol{\lambda}$. A slave name (not in the household inscriptions) : the special emphasis ( $\tau \grave{\eta} \nu \dot{a} \gamma \ldots \pi 0 \lambda \lambda a ́)$ indicates some special knowledge on S. Paul's part, possibly personal, though $\mu_{0} v$ is omitted.
13. 'Pov̂фov к.т.入. The unique epithet (unless cf. 2 Joh. 1, 13) suggests that there was some marked peculiarity attending his conversion, and the reference to his mother points to personal connection with S. Paul ; perh. = Rufus of Mk xv. 21 (Swete's note).
14. 'Aбv́vкрıтov. The two groups of five persons now following make it probable that we have here two more centres of Christian life in Rome, known to S. Paul by report, but not otherwise; there are no distinguishing epithets. The names are all slave names, many of them found among the imperial household.

Пaтрóßav, abbrev. for Patrobius.
${ }^{\text {＇Eppaiv，abbrev．for Hermagoras or other variations on Hermes．}}$
15．Фidódoyov．The name may suggest the occupation，in the secretariat or the record department；ef．Lft，op．cit．p． 177 n． 1.
＇Iov入lav．Very common，and esp．in the imperial household．
Nๆpéa．Cf．S．H．on the association of this name with the early history of the Roman Church．
＇ $\mathbf{O} \boldsymbol{\lambda} \nu \mu \pi \hat{\imath} \nu=$ Olympiodorus．
16．èv $\phi \downarrow \lambda$ ．$\dot{\alpha} \gamma^{\prime} \dot{\varphi}$ ．Cf． 1 Cor．xvi．20； 2 Cor．xiii．12； 1 Thes．v． 26； 1 Pet．v． 14 （ $\dot{\text { 人 }} \boldsymbol{\alpha} \boldsymbol{\alpha} \pi \eta s)$ ：earliest reference to the＇kiss of peace＇in the Christian service is in Just．Mart．Apol．i．65．S．H．


 the inclusion of Xpıc⿱㇒⿻二丿⿴囗⿱一一儿丶⿸厂⿱二⿺卜丿．in the phrase we have only Gal．i．22； 1 Thes． ii． 14 ：for the relation of X $\rho \iota \sigma \tau 6$ s to（ai $\epsilon \kappa \kappa$ ．）$\dot{\eta} \dot{\epsilon} \kappa \kappa \lambda$ ．cf．Eph．v． 23 f．
（1）$\delta$ Xplotós in this Ep．emphasises the relation of Christ as Messiah to Gentiles as well as Jews（Hort，Eccles．p．111，eft vii．4， ix．3，5，xv． 3 and 7）．Hort，l．c．，concludes that the phrase refers to the Churches of Judea：but the limitation to a single group seems quite inconsistent with the emphatic $\pi \hat{\alpha} \sigma \alpha l$ ；and he himself gave up this view，R．and E．p．53．v． 4 shows such a limitation；so Gal．i．22； 1 Thes．ii．14．The force of the phrase seems rather to lie in its formal assertion of the equality and unity of all the Churches， as equally and together belonging to the Christ，in whom，as truly conceived，the ancient barriers are thrown down and mankind is one in God＇s mercy；cf．xi． 25 ff ．It is a definite step to the $\dot{\eta} \epsilon \kappa \kappa \lambda \eta \sigma$ ia of Eph．
（2）In what sense can S．Paul convey this greeting？＂Doubtless S．Paul had information which enabled him to convey this greeting，＂ Hort，R．and E．，p．53．We may however go further．There were in his company at Corinth representatives，probably all formally ap－ pointed（cf． 2 Cor．viii．19，23），of many if not of all（cf．Acts xx .4 ）of the Churches of his own foundation．He may have regarded himself or there may have been others in his company who could be regarded， as representing the Church in Jerusalem；cf．Igna．Trall． $12 \dot{\alpha} \sigma \pi d \zeta o \mu a \iota$
 Magn．15．The inclusion of the Jewish churches is parallel to the emphasis on his Jewish friends in the above greetings．
（3）For тâoal in emphatic position cf． 1 Cor．vii． 17 and ct 1 Cor．xiv． 33 ； 2 Cor．viii．18，xi． 28.

17－20．A brief but pointed warning against teachers，who under fair seeming introduce divisions and offences．The fundamental
strain in the Epistle, the assertion that in the Gospel all men are united to each other and to God in Christ, has been enforced by the long list of greetings, giving detailed and practical point to teaching and exhortation. It is natural that before ending S. Paul should give a clear and strong warning against those elements in the Christian society which tended to establish divisions and to create or continue practices which were the cause of offence. Phil. iii. 18 f . is a close parallel, in the general character of the warning following upon the exposition of the teaching which the persons indicated endanger, and in the immediately added contrast with the true state of Christians.
17. à $\delta \varepsilon \lambda \phi o$. Cf. xii. 1, xv. 14, 30; Phil. iii. 17. бкотєîv. 'Keep an eye upon'; cf. Gal. vi. 1; Phil. ii. 4, iii. 17 (for imitation).
rov̀s ràs $\delta$. к.т.入. These persons are described in quite general terms : the warning is based on S. Paul's own experience in Asia Minor and Greece, rather than on any particular information from Rome, and may be due to the event described in Acts xx. 3. See Introd. p. xi.
tàs $\delta$ exootarias. 'The divisions' of which he had had such bitter experience and which no Church could be ignorant of; cf. Phil. i. 15 f.; Gal. v. 20 ; cf. Phil. iii. 18 f. The great instance was the attempt to maintain division between Jew and Gentile in the Church: subsidiary to this but probably at this time more practically operative was the attempt to set up authorities in rivalry to S. Paul. In both cases the effect would be to establish two rival Churohes in every locality, and to render nugatory the union in Christ.
$\tau \dot{\alpha} \sigma \kappa \alpha ́ v \delta a \lambda a$. Such teachings and precepts as put difficulties in the way of the practical exercise of Christian love, reinstating those barriers of convention and exelusiveness which had been done away in Christ; cf. xiv. 13.
 Phil. iv. 9 (in a similar connexion). The 'teaching' is all the instruction which led them to become Christians and informed them in what true Christianity consists ( $\bar{\epsilon} \mu \dot{A} \theta \epsilon \tau \epsilon)$.
18. of $\begin{gathered}\text { àp } \\ \text { к. } . \text {. } . ~ T h e ~ w a r n i n g ~ i s ~ a g a i n s t ~ m e n ~ w h o ~ c l a i m e d ~ t o ~ b e ~\end{gathered}$ true servants of Christ and were not; of. 2 Cor. xi. 13: therefore Judaising Christians, not necessarily themselves originally Jews.
 N.T.)=selfish desires and objects in the widest sense. He does not say éautoîs because they are not even serving their own true interests.
$\delta \iota \alpha ̀ \eta ̂ s \mathrm{X}$. The 'fair speech' employed by them or characteristic of them; cf. Gal. iii. 1, iv. 17. S. H. qu. Jul. Capitol. Pertinax 13, $\chi \rho$. eum appellantes qui bene loqueretur et male faceret.

ยv̉doyias seems to get a bad meaning here by its connexion with $\chi \rho$. S. H. qu. Aesop Fab. 229, p. 150 ed. Av. In N.T. elsewhere always of 'blessing.' Plat. Rep. 400 d of fine speech, in a good sense.
$\tau \hat{\nu} \nu$ áка́к $\varphi \nu=$ simple, guileless, and therefore unsuspicious; combined with єủ $\begin{array}{r} \\ \theta \\ s \\ \text { Diod. Sic. ap. Wetstein; ) ( } \pi \alpha \nu o u ̂ \rho \gamma o s ~ D i o ~ C a s s ., ~ i b . ; ~ c f . ~\end{array}$ Prov. i. 4; Heb. vii. 26. S. Paul is careful not to suggest that they have as yet any hold upon the Church.
19. Yàp justifies his appeal to them and what they had learnt.

ท̂-vimakoŋ̀. Their response to the teaching-obedience; ef. 2 Cor. x. 5 ; above vi. $17 ; 2$ Thes. i. 8.
áф(кєто (only here in N.T.) ; cf. 1 Thes. i. 8, supra i. 8. This would not be a natural form of expression, if S . Paul was writing to a Church with which he was personally acquainted.
' $\boldsymbol{\phi}^{\prime}$ ' $\mathfrak{v} \mu \mathrm{i} v$. The warning is not due to his distrust of their present state, but to apprehension of what the future may bring.

бoфov̀-ákepalovs. Cf. Mt. x. 16; Phil. ii. 15 only; cf. Lft. In Polyb. the word=uninfluenced from without (cf. Schweighäuser's Index). So here=admitting no influence for evil.
 these men are breaking up; cf. xv. 33 and xv. 5 n .
tòv Earavâv. Cf. 2 Cor. ii. 5-11, xi. 14. One special work of 'the Satan' is to set men at variance; cf. 1 Thes. ii. 18 and cf. Gen. iii. 15 ?.
$\mathfrak{\eta}$ Xápıs к.т. $\boldsymbol{\lambda}$. There is no parallel to the position of these words before more greetings. For the whole question see Add. Note, p. 233.

21-23. Greetings from companions.
21. Tup. ó $\sigma v v \in \rho$ yós $\mu$ ov. Cf. on 3. The last we have heard of Timothy is in 2 Cor. i. 1. He probably accompanied S. Paul to Corinth; unless we detect him in 2 Cor. viii. 18.

人ov́кıos. Perh. = Acts xiii. 1, not=Luke (Lucanus, $\Lambda$ ovkâs).
${ }^{3}$ Iárowv. Cf. Acts xvii. 5-7, 9, the host of S. Paul at Thessalonica: he had probably accompanied or preceded S. Paul; cf. 2 Cor. viii. 23.
$\Sigma \omega \sigma i \pi a \tau \rho o s$. Cf. $\Sigma \omega \dot{\pi} \pi a \tau \rho o s$, Acts xx. 4, of Beroea. Was he in charge of the contribution from Beroea?
oi $\sigma v \gamma \gamma \in v \in$ ês $\mu$.ov. Cf. $v .7 \mathrm{n}$.
 cf. 1 Cor. xvi. 21; Gal. vi. 11; Col. iv. 18; 2 Thes. iii. 17. S. H.
23. Taîos ó $\xi$. $\mu$ ov. Perh. $=1$ Cor. i. 14 : for ő. т. є.. cf. v. 4 ; prob. refers to hospitality exercised by Gaius in Corinth to all Christian travellers-not to his house being the place of assembly for Corinthian Christians. It is not probable that they had only one such place.
"Epartos. Cf. 2 Tim. iv. 20.
oiкоvóцоs. "In civitatibus Graecis saepe commemoratur" Herwerden; cf. Dittenberg for Ephesus, Magnesia, Cos; and for Egypt, Pap. Berl. al. ; ' the treasurer.'

Kov́aptos ó ádèфós. S. Paul seems to use this title of men who were closely associated with him in his work. Cf. 1 Cor. i. 1, xvi. 12; 2 Cor. i. 1, viii. 22; Eph. vi. 21 ; Phil. ii. 25 al.

25-27. It appears from $v .22$ that the whole letter was written by Tertius from dictation up to this point. We may conclude that S. Paul wrote these last verses in his own hand, by way of signature; cf. Gal. vi. 11; 2 Thes, iii. 17.

The doxology forms a conclusion, unique in S. Paul's Epistles, the only parallels in Epp. are 2 Peter iii. $18 b$; Jude 24, 25. For other doxologies in S. Paul, concluding and summarising a section, cf. Eph. iii. 20, 21; 1 Tim. i. 17; cf. also 2 Tim. iv. 18; Heb. xiii. 21; supra xi. 33-36. This doxology sums up, tersely but completely, the main conception of the Epistle, and reproduces its most significant language. In particular, it is so closely related to i. 1-17 that it takes the place of a categorical statement that the description there given of S. Paul's mission has been justified by the detailed arguments of the Epistle. The comparison is drawn out below.
 $\theta \epsilon o \hat{\text { è èriv }} \boldsymbol{\epsilon}$ is $\sigma \omega \tau \eta p l a \nu$.
$\sigma \tau \eta p l \xi a l$. Cf. i. 11-12, of God; 2 Thes. ii. 17, iii. 3; 1 Pet. v. 10 (a near \|). ipâs. The need for strengthening is indicated in i. 11, xvi. 17-20. "The pronouns face each other with an emphasis which in such a context is hard to explain till we remember the presaging instinct with which $S$. Paul saw in the meeting of himself and the Roman Christians the pledge and turning point of victory"; Hort ap. Lft, Biblical Essays, p. 325 ; cf. i. 10 f., xv. 29-32.

кard̀ тò єv̉aүy. Adverbial to $\delta v \nu a \mu e ́ v \varphi: ~ \kappa a \tau \grave{a}=a s$ my Gospel declares; cf. ii. 16, xi. 28 in both cases with the same special reference as here to the inclusion of Gentiles, St Paul's distinctive Gospel.

 severally correspond to the names 'I $\eta \sigma o u$ s and X $\rho / \sigma \tau \delta$ 's, and are recapitulated in $v .4$ by the full name and title; for ки́pvүиa cf. ii. 16, x. $8-15$, xv. 15 f.; 1 Cor. i. 21, ii. 4 ; 1 Tim. iii. 16 ; 'I. X $\rho$. objective genitive.

ката̇ àтока́入ขұเv к.т. $\lambda$. This should probably be taken as $\|$ кат $\dot{\alpha}$ тò evarr., describing in its character what that phrase states specifically. Cf. i. 16 f., xi. 25 f.; 1 Cor. ii. 6, 7, 10.

катд̀ áтока́ $\lambda \cup \nLeftarrow \iota v$ verbally = Gal. ii. 2; Eph. iii. 3; but the reference is different; nearer in thought is Gal. iii. 23; closest Eph. iii. 5-9; Col. i. 26 ; cf. а̇токал. i. 17.
$\mu v \sigma$ тทpiov. 'Of a secret'; cf. xi. 25; 1 Cor. ii. 1, 7-10, iv. 1; then Eph. i. 9, iii. 3-9, vi. 19 (|| Col.); 1 Tim. iii. 16. The secret is the whole purpose of God for man's redemption, formed in and ultimately revealed in the Christ, as born of David's seed and marked by the resurrection as Son of God. In the argument of this Epistle, the special lesson of that secret, as revealed in Christ, is the union of all mankind in Him with God, as connected with justification by faith. The word has the same bearing in Eph., Col.: but there the special Iesson is the development of this conception of union to illustrate the nature and work of the Church as such. In Romans this development is not directly treated but the foundation thought is here fully worked out.

Xpóvots ail $\omega \nu$ loıs. Cf. $\pi \rho o ̀ ~ \chi \rho \delta \nu \omega \nu$ al $\omega \nu \ell \omega \nu 2$ Tim. i. 9; Tit. i. 2, the only occurrences of the combination; cf. $\dot{a} \pi^{3}$ aî̂vos, Lk. i. 70; Acts iii. 21, xv. 18; Joh. ix. 32. It seems to be a vague expression for an indefinitely long time. $\pi \rho \delta \tau \hat{\omega} \nu$ aićs $\omega \nu 1$ Cor. ii. 7, Eph. iii. 9, 11 is more definite, but probably not very different in meaning. For the dative of extension of time cf. Lk. viii. 29 and epistolary formulae $\epsilon \rho$ -

 26). The silence of that long time past is contrasted with the utterance of the present; but it was not complete, as the next clause shows; cf. 1 Pet. i. 12, supra i. 2; Tit. i. 2. Tr. by pluperfect-'which had been kept in silence.'
26. \$avєpw日́vios. Cf. iii. 21 where exactly the same relation between the manifestation and the witness of prophets is expressed. The secret was manifested in the Person and history of Christ; He is the secret of God; ef. 1 Cor. i. 24.
$\nu \hat{v}=$ ' in our day' as contrasted with the $\chi \rho$. al.; cf. 1 Pet. i. 12 (Hort, p. 59), supra v. 11, xi. 30, 31.

Sıá $\tau \in \kappa$ к.т.入. The $\tau \epsilon$ connects $\gamma \nu \omega \rho$. closely with $\phi a \nu$., both in contrast with $\sigma \epsilon \sigma \iota \gamma$. 'But has in our day been manifested (in Christ) and made known.' The aorists should be translated by perfects. Then this clause tersely describes the apostolic preaching (1) in its support in the prophets, (2) in its commission from God, (3) in its direct aim, (4) in its range in the world.
 cf. xii. $1,3 \mathrm{n}$., an extension of the use of $\delta(\alpha$ for the means or instrument : cf. a slight further extension=under the guidance of 1 Thes. iv. 14 ; Heb. iii. 16.

үp．троф．Cf．i．2，iii．21．The fact is seen throughout the Epp． and Acts ；e．g．cc．ix．－xi．，xv．4， 9 ff．；cf． 1 Pet．i．12； 2 Cor．i． 20 ； Lk．i．70．The particular phrase is unique，and includes all the O．T． as all in its degree prophetic，cf． 2 Pet．i．20．The absence of the article emphasises the character of all，rather than any specific writing．

 authority of all apostolic work $=\delta \iota \dot{\alpha} \dot{\alpha} \pi \sigma \sigma \tau \delta \lambda \omega \nu$ ；of． 1 Tim．i．1； Tit．i． 3.

тov̂ al．$\theta$ €ov．Only here in N．T．In LXX．Gen．xxi．33；Isa．xxvi． 4，xl． 28 ； 2 Mace．i． 25 ； 3 Macc．vi．12，viii． 16 ；for the idea cf．xi． 33－36； 1 Cor．ii．7，x．11；and Eph．iii．9，11；Col．i．26； 1 Tim．i． 17； 2 Tim．i．9；Tit．i． 2.
 $=$ to secure an obedience rendered by faith； $\mathfrak{v} \pi$ ．in this sense only in the earlier epistles vi．17，x．16； 2 Thes．i． 8 ； 2 Cor．vii． 15.

єls $\pi$ ávтa $\tau \dot{\alpha}$ é $6 v \eta$ ．Cf．i．5，xv．11，xvi．4；Gal．iii．8； 2 Tim．iv． 17 and Rev．（saepe）for the whole phrase；cf．$\pi \alpha \nu \tau i ̀ ~ \tau \hat{\varphi} \pi \iota \sigma \tau$ ．＇I．кai＂E． i． 16 ．
yvøpıo日́́vtos．Cf．ix．22， 23 ； 1 Cor．xv．1；Eph．vi． 19.
27．Hóvழ．Cf．iii． 30 where the＇singleness＇of God is the basis of the universality of the Gospel，as here．See note ad loc．For $\mu$ óvos cf．Joh．v．44，xvii．3； 1 Tim．i．17，vi． 15 （in a similar connexion）； Jude 25.
$\boldsymbol{\sigma} \boldsymbol{\phi} \hat{\text { w }}$ ．Cf．xi． 33 ：specially of the wisdom which orders in detail the age－long and world－wide purpose．Cf． 1 Cor．i．21－30；ii．7； Eph．iii．10；Col．ii． 3.
$\theta \in \bar{\varphi}$ ．To God as God，sole and supreme Creator and Dispenser of all His wondrous dealings with men．

Sıd＇I．Xp．As through Him God has manifested Himself to men， so through Him returns the due acknowledgment from man to God；cf． i． 8 ，vii． 25.

ท̂ Sóğ к．т．入．Cf．хі． 36.

## Note on Text．

1．xvi．20．The Benediction．
The case is stated by S．H．thus ：
＂ぶABC Orig．－lat．have a benediction at $\boldsymbol{v} .21$ only．
DEFG have one at v． 24 only．
L Vulg．clem．Chrys．and the mass of later authorities have it in both places．

P has it at $v .21$ and after $v .27$.
The correct text therefore has it at $v .21$, and there only; it was afterwards moved to a place after 24 [presumably as in any case the more natural place] which was in some MSS very probably the end of the Epistle [e.g. FG], and in later MSS, by a natural conflation, appears in both."

Zahn holds that both benedictions are original, the slightly different form of the second ( $+\mathbf{X} \rho \iota \sigma \tau o \hat{v}$ and $\pi a ́ \nu \tau \omega \nu$ ) justifying the repetition.
2. xvi. 27. $£$ om. B. 33. 72, Pesh., Orig-lat., ins. rel. exc. aủtệ P. 31, 54.

The strongest argument for retaining $\Psi \uparrow$ is the difficulty of the reading, and the consequent unlikelihood of its invention. But this principle must not be pressed to the adoption of an all but impossible reading. With $\ddagger$ we can only explain on the assumption of a very awkward anacoluthon. Zahn and Weiss defend this by referring to the strong emotion, with which this passage is written. But even so this is not a natural anacoluthon; there is no parenthesis or interruption of thought; the sentence is regularly and strongly constructed up to X $\rho \iota \sigma \tau 0 \hat{v}$, and throughout it is obvious that it is to end with $\dot{\eta} \delta o \dot{\xi} a$; after the participial clauses, the dative has come, picking up $\tau \hat{\varphi} \delta \delta \nu \alpha \mu \hat{\ell} \nu \varphi$ and resuming the whole thought ( $\mu \delta \nu \varphi \sigma \sigma \phi \hat{\psi})$; then $\delta \iota \dot{a}$ 'I $\eta \sigma$. X $\rho$. again makes us expect $\dot{\eta} \delta 6 \xi a$, and cannot be connected with anything that has gone before: no amount of emotion could justify the insertion of $\dot{\psi}$ here, between the words that are crying for $\dot{\eta} \delta b \xi a$, and $\dot{\eta} \delta b \xi a$ itself. It is a sheer though early blunder due to the frequent occurrence of the combination $\dot{\psi} \dot{\eta} \delta \delta \xi a$. There is a closely similar case in Mart. Polycarp. xx. 2 (qu. by Weiss but with the wrong reading), $\tau \hat{\varphi} \delta \dot{\epsilon}$


 serted by two MSS before $\delta 6 \xi$ (Lightfoot, Ap. Fathers iI. § ii. p. 983). Further, Jude 24, 25, clearly modelled on this passage, supports the omission of $\hat{\psi}$; and even in Jude $\aleph^{*}$ am. and apparently aeth. insert $\psi_{\mathcal{~}}$ before $\delta 6 \xi$ a.

## ADDITIONAL NOTES.

A. $\sigma v \operatorname{ci}^{18 \eta \sigma \iota s, ~ c . ~ i i . ~} 15$.

The word is found only in the Pauline writings (Rom., 1 and 2 Cor., 1 and 2 Tim., Tit., 1 Pet., Heb.) except [Joh. viii. 9], and Acts xxiii. 1, xxiv. 16 (speeches of S. Paul). The verb ( $\sigma$ v́voıōa) only in 1 Cor. iv. 4. In the LXX. it occurs only in Wisdom xvii. 11 (R.V. conscience), Eccles. x. 20 (R.V. heart), and perhaps Sir. xlii. 18 (R.V. knowledge). The verb, Job xxvii. 6; Lev. v. 1; 1 Macc. iv. 21; 2 Macc. iv. 41. The two passages which make clear the use of the word are Job l.c.,
 $\epsilon\lceil\lambda \eta \phi \epsilon \nu \tau \grave{\alpha} \chi a \lambda \epsilon \pi \grave{\alpha} \sigma v \nu \epsilon \chi \circ \mu \epsilon \bar{\nu} \eta \hat{\eta} \sigma v \nu \epsilon \epsilon \delta \dot{\eta} \sigma \epsilon \epsilon$. In both these passages it is the state of mind which is conscious of certain actions in their moral aspects.

The customary meaning of the substantive follows the use of the verb. $\sigma \dot{v} \nu \iota \delta \alpha \dot{\alpha} \tau \nu t \tau \iota=$ to be privy to the action of another; $\sigma \dot{v} \nu o \delta a$ $\dot{\epsilon} \mu a v \tau \hat{\psi} \tau \iota$ or $\tau \iota \pi \rho \alpha \xi a s=$ to be privy to an action or thought of my own; but, as a man in general cannot help being privy to his own thoughts and actions, the phrase is used with the special meaning of the recognition or feeling of the character, and especially the moral character, of one's own thoughts or actions. So we get first the simple meaning, the feeling or knowledge that we have done or thought certain things imputed to us, and, secondly, the more definite meaning, the feeling or knowledge that such thoughts or actions are right or wrong. This feeling can be appealed to as a witness to character, either by the man himself appealing to his self-consciousness in support of a statement, or by others appealing to the man's own consciousness of himself. So Wisdom xvii. 11, R. V. "Wickedness, condemned by a witness within, is a coward thing, and being pressed hard by conscience ( $\tau \eta \sigma v \nu \epsilon \delta \delta \eta \sigma \epsilon \iota$ ) always forecasts the worst lot," the consciousness of being wrong makes a coward of the man. Here the conscience or consciousness is an incorruptible witness before whose evidence the man trembles. Cf. Polyb. xviII. 26.13, oúסels oütcs $\mu$ áprus

$\dot{\epsilon} \kappa \alpha ́ \sigma \tau \omega \nu \psi v \chi \alpha \hat{s}$, where the last phrase $=\dot{\eta} \sigma v \nu \in i \delta \eta \sigma \iota s$. It is rather as a witness than as a judge that $\dot{\eta}$ ovvei $\delta \eta \sigma \iota$ is regarded in ordinary Greek use : and it is only as a witness that it is appealed to in N. T.

In Romans the word occurs three times, ii. 15, ix. 1, xiii. 5. In ii. 15 and ix. 1 it is used of a man's knowledge of himself, his motives and thoughts, called as a witness to his true character. In ii. 15 the Gentiles' self-consciousness, knowledge of their own minds, witnesses to their possession, in a sense, of law, and so confirms the evidence of their acts. In ix. 1 S . Paul's knowledge of himself, as controlled by the Holy Spirit, witnesses to the pain and distress he feels for Israel, and confirms the witness of the assertion which he makes as in Christ. In xiii. 5 there is no idea of witness, but the consciousness of their own motives and feelings as shown in the fact that they willingly pay tribute, is appealed to as an argument for obedience.

Closely parallel to Rom. ix. 1 is 2 Cor. i. 12, where the consciousness of motive is alleged as a witness to the truth of his confident assertion.

With xiii. 5 may be grouped the passages in which an epithet is attached (Acts xxiii. 1, á yä́n, xxiv. 16, ám $\dot{\sigma} \sigma$ котоs; 1 Tim. i. 5, 19, 1 Pet. iii. 16, 21, áraөŋ́; 1 Tim. iii. 9, 2 Tim. i. 3, ка日apá. Cf. Heb. ix. 14, каӨapıє̂̂ $\tau \grave{\eta} \nu \sigma \nu \nu \in \ell \hat{\delta} \eta \sigma \iota \nu$; Heb. xiii. 18, $\kappa a \lambda \eta$; Heb. x. 22, торұра́). In all these passages it is clear that the word indicates the self-consciousness which includes good or bad contents, as matter of feeling and experience, as simply a matter of self-knowledge, without any direct thought of judgment. So 1 Pet. ii. 19, $\delta \iota a ̀ ~ \sigma v \nu \epsilon i \delta \eta \sigma \iota$ $\theta \epsilon o \hat{v}$, a remarkable phrase, seems to mean, owing to a feeling of or about God, bringing Him as it were into the field of conscious motive. This feeling or consciousness can be dulled by evil courses ( $\mathbf{1}$ Tim. iv. 2; Tit. i. 15). External ordinances leave it untouched (Heb. ix. 9), but it can be cleansed (Heb. ix. 14, x. 21, 22).

In 2 Cor. iv. 2, v. 11 the Apostle appeals, for the recognition of his claim, to the conscious experience ( $\sigma v v e i \delta \eta \sigma \iota s$ ) which others have acquired of his character and life, their inner knowledge of him ; in this use we have the substantival form of the verbal phrase oúvoiod $\tau \iota \nu i \tau \iota$. And it is possible that we have the same use in 1 Cor. x. 28 , 29, where the $\sigma v \nu \in i \delta \eta \sigma \iota s$ may $=$ the weak brother's knowledge of and feeling about the acts of the strong.

In 1 Cor. viii. 7-12 we have the remarkable epithet $\dot{\alpha} \sigma \theta \epsilon \nu \eta \eta^{\prime}$, where if we translate $\sigma u v e i \delta \eta \sigma \iota s$ as 'conscience,' we have the paradox of calling a sensitive conscience weak. We can hardly get a nearer translation here than 'feelings.' The man 'feels' that to eat ei $i \delta \omega \lambda \delta$ $\theta v \tau a$ is wrong. This 'feeling' cannot be justified by reason; it is
due to association ( $\tau \hat{\eta} \sigma v \nu \eta \theta \epsilon l \underline{q}$ है $\omega$ s ă $\rho \tau \iota \tau o \hat{v} \epsilon i \delta \omega^{\prime} \lambda o v$ ), and he cannot shake it off : it is called 'weak,' because in it the man is not really master of himself. The argument of the passage is directed to gaining from the strong a tender consideration for those who are in this weak state of feeling. It is a pity that the true character of many 'conscientious objections' of the present day is obscured by their association with our modern term 'conscience,' when they should be really described as $\sigma v \nu \epsilon i \delta \eta \sigma \iota s ~ a ̈ \sigma \theta \epsilon \nu \eta$ 's.

On the whole, then, we may say that in the N. T., as in common Greek use, $\sigma v \nu \in i \delta \eta \sigma \iota s$ describes rather a state of consciousness, than a faculty or act of judgment : some uses of the word 'conscience' correspond to this meaning of $\sigma v \nu \epsilon(\delta \eta \sigma \iota s$; but in more cases than not the meaning will be adequately given by such renderings as 'consciousness,' 'self-knowledge,' or even simply ' heart.'

## B. ON v. 13 .

The usual interpretation takes äxpt $\nu b \mu o v=$ till the Mosaic law was given, and understands $S$. Paul to deny that sin could be imputed in the full sense to those who were ignorant of that law : consequently $\pi \dot{\partial} \nu \tau \epsilon s{ }_{\eta} \mu \alpha \rho \tau o \nu$ is regarded as =all men sinned in Adam. It cannot be denied that this interpretation is highly strained; but the extreme complexity of the passage might be taken to excuse that, if two further objections did not arise: (1) By supplying $\dot{\epsilon} \nu \tau \hat{\varphi}{ }^{\prime} \mathrm{A} \delta \dot{\alpha} \mu$ with $\pi$. $\tilde{\eta}$. we assume the omission by the writer of words essential to the understanding of the passage; (2) by taking ä $\chi \rho \iota \quad \nu \delta \mu 0 v=$ until the Mosaic law was given, and making the consequent assumption that sin was not imputed to Gentiles till they were aware of the Mosaic law (for the interpretation must extend so far), we make S. Paul say here that sin could not be imputed to the Gentiles, including Adam and the Patriarchs up to Abraham, because they had no law. But this is in direct contradiction with one main argument of the preceding chapters, and of course with the whole teaching as to the sinful state of Gentiles. I should further urge that for this meaning here the article would be indispensable before $\nu \delta \mu o v$, as there is a specific reference to the Mosaic law as and when given. The interpretation given in the notes involves the difficulty (which I do not minimise) of translating ${ }^{2} \chi \chi \rho \nu \delta \mu o v=s o$ far as there was law. $a_{\chi \rho t}$ is used frequently of time and place (Acts xx. 4, al.) : the gen. expresses generally the point of time or space reached; but sometimes
expresses also the interval before that point is reached; cf. axpe кaı $\rho 0 \hat{v}$, for a season (Lk. iv. 13; Acts xiii. 11); ä $\chi \rho \iota ~ \tau a u ́ \tau \eta s ~ \tau \hat{\eta} s ~ \dot{\eta} \mu \epsilon ́ \rho a s$ w. perfect (Acts xxiii. 1), à $\chi \rho \iota$ тoútov $\tau 0 \hat{\text { 人 }}$ 入ó $\gamma o v$ w. imperfect (Acts xxii. 22). The extension of meaning to=just in the degree that law, so far as there was law and no further, seems justifiable. If this meaning can be taken, then $\dot{\alpha} \lambda \lambda \grave{\alpha} \dot{\epsilon} \beta a \sigma i \lambda \epsilon \nu \sigma \epsilon \nu \kappa . \tau . \lambda$. goes closely with $\dot{\alpha} \mu$. oúk $\dot{\epsilon} \lambda \lambda \frac{\gamma}{a} \tau a t$, as an indication that the punishment of sin being in evidence sin itself must have been there. кai $\epsilon \pi i$ к. $\tau . \lambda$. brings out the fact that the sin was not on all fours with that of Adam, so making explicit the restriction hinted in dxpı $\nu \dot{\rho} \mu \circ v$, the unlikeness consisting in the fact that Adam sinned against a positive revealed command, men in general sinned against the internal law of a conscience, enlightened, if only partially. This interpretation is in strict agreement with the view put forward in the early chapters, and does not make S . Paul say anything but what he says explicitly.

## C. vó $\mu$ os.

## vópos and $\delta$ vór.os.

Gifford, Introd. pp. 41-48; S. H. p. 58; Lift, Gal. ii. 19, iv. 5 ; Hort, R. and E. pp. 24, 25.

Two questions have to be answered: (1) what was St Paul's conception of law? (2) what distinction is made by the presence or absence of the article?
(1) It is obvious that S. Paul's conception of law was derived primarily from his experience of the law of Moses, with the accretions of Pharisaic tradition (cf. iii. 17-20). Law was for him the expression of the Will of God in application to the conduct of man, as revealed to Moses and embodied in the written law and its authorised interpretations. The experience of his own religious growth, probably even before he became a Christian, threw into strong emphasis two characteristics of this revelation. First, that it put before man an exalted ideal of duty; the law was holy, righteous and good. Secondly, that neither in the law itself, nor in his own nature, could he discover any power which enabled him to fulfil the law. The law, in fact, was essentially an external standard, embodying declarations, apprehensible by man, of what was right ; but not an internal power providing or imparting the ability to do what was right. To a nature which was capable of appreciating this standard, but did not find in itself the power nor even an unmixed desire to attain it, the result was that law produced a sense of sin, and a despair of righteousness,
an almost hopeless lack of correspondence between the conduct of man and the Will of God. To this experience the revelation of Christ came as a moral and spiritual revolution. The fundamental meaning, from the point of view of conduct or ethics, of that revelation was, that in Christ is offered to man not merely a new standard of knowledge or conduct, but a new power of action. The spiritual life, seen in Jesus, as man, crucified and ascended, is offered directly to man as a reinforcement of his own higher intelligence and will through the living union of man with the ascended Christ. It is a revelation of spirit, communicated to spirit, enabling man to live as a spiritual being. Its primary condition, on the part of man, is trust, the realisation, in act as well as in consciousness, of personal and vital dependence upon God through Christ. It is therefore, in the fullest sense, a complete deliverance from the sense of sin and despair of righteousness, which the bare knowledge of the law had produced: it supplies the power of which the law terribly emphasised the want.

Such were the conclusions of personal experience. But, further, from his Jewish training (cf. Giff. p. 436), S. Paul had already conceived of the Gentile state as also under law. They too had received an expression of the divine will, in manifold application to the conduct of life; a universality of law to which the universality of the new revelation corresponded. And this wide conception of the range of law led to the emphasising of the general aspect of law, in distinction from its special embodiment for Jews in the Mosaic code. And, in both cases, the same essential characteristic comes out. Law is for the Gentile too an external standard, not carrying with it the inner spiritual power of framing conduct according to its demands. The description then of the natural state of man under law is common to Jew and Gentile. The penetrating analysis of the experience of the Jew is typical of all men, as possessed of moral consciousness.

Two further points require to be stated. First this revelation in law was not properly twofold. In both cases law is the expression of Gon's will : the Mosaic law is only a more complete, clear and lofty expression: the law given, in conscience, to the Gentiles is on the same lines, but less complete. Consequently, in a certain sense, the Mosaic law was regarded as binding upon all men. This explains some of S. Paul's language, and also the insistence of the Judaisers on enforcing the law.

In the second place, it is not to be supposed that S . Paul denies to the pre-Christian world all power of doing God's will. It is clear (from ii. 14 al.) that he recognised a righteousness among Gentiles, and of course among Jews. The point of his argument is, that this
righteousness was due, not to law, but to faith, in real though elementary activity. This is elaborately argued in the case of Abraham and his case is shown to be typical both for Jews and Gentiles (iv. 12, 16 f. ; cf. Mt. viii. 11 ; Jo. viii. 39). The argumentation of c. vii. is, in a certain degree, abstract (cf. Introd. p. xli); it isolates, for the moment, the one influence upon man provided by law, in order to bring out the exact measure and character of that influence; it does not deny the other influences by which God has, in all ages and places, kept not only the knowledge of His will alive but also the actual fulfilment of it.
(2) Bearing these considerations in mind, we can answer the second question briefly. The distinction between $\nu \delta \mu$ os and $\delta \nu \delta \mu_{0}$ depends on the ordinary rules of the article. Generally : $j \mu o s$, without the article, means law as such, without consideration of any particular form in which it may be known or embodied. It refers to the character of law, not to its particular mode or occasion. On the other hand $\delta \nu \delta{ }^{\prime} \mu$ os means the particular law, which either ordinary experience, or the context in which it occurs, would bring to the mind of the hearer or reader. It follows, that $\boldsymbol{\nu} \delta \mu$ os without the article may refer to the Mosaic law, but, when it does, will refer to it in its character of law, rather than in its derivation from Moses (e.g. iv. 13). On the other hand, o $\nu \delta \mu o s$, while naturally and generally in S. Paul's use referring to the Mosaic law, may refer to some other law which is for the moment under consideration (e.g. vii. 3). Within these general rules, the interpretation in any particular passage must be determined by the context.

On the very peculiar uses in iii. 27, vii. 21, viii. 2, see notes.

## D. $\dot{\text { a }}$ рартla.

Cf. Davidson, O. T. Theology, pp. 203 f.; Westcott, Epp. Joh. pp. 37 ff. Kennett, Interpreter, July, 1910.

This word is used as the most general name for sin in itself and in all its forms. The original suggestion of ' missing' an aim or a way, contained both in the Hebrew (Davidson l.c.) and the Greek may be detected in such a phrase as iii. 23. But the word has got its full
 какд̀ $\pi о \iota \epsilon i ̂ \nu, \pi \rho a ́ \sigma \sigma \epsilon \iota \nu, \epsilon^{\epsilon} \rho \gamma \alpha \dot{\xi} \epsilon \sigma \theta a \iota$. It is antithetic in its full range to $\delta \iota \kappa a \iota \sigma \sigma \dot{\nu} \eta$, as applied to men.

Two uses of the word must be distinguished. (1) It describes a state or condition in which men are, although it does not properly
belong to human nature as meant by God. (2) It describes particular acts and habits in which men choose what is wrong rather than what is right.
(1) This use is found only in S. John (Ev., 1 Ep.) and S. Paul (Rom., 1 and 2 Cor., Gal., 2 Thes. (v.1.) only). In S. Paul the use occurs twice in Gal. (ii. 17, iii. 21), twice in 1 Cor. (xv. 56), once in 2 Cor. (v. 21), and 2 Thes. (ii. 3 v.l.). On the other hand it occurs more than forty times in Rom. (in cc. iii., v., vi., vii., viii.), in S. John Ev. six times, in 1 Joh. five times (i. 8, iii. 4, 5, 8, 9).
(2) This use is found in Evv. Syn., Joh. (4), Acts, S. Paul (in above Epp. (7), in Eph., Col., 1 Thes., Past. (6)), Heb., James, 1 and 2 Pet., Rev.

This second use is reinforced by the occurrences of $\dot{\alpha} \mu a \rho \tau a ́ v \omega$, as well as by $\dot{a} \mu \dot{a} \rho \tau \eta \mu a$ and other substantives which are more or less synonymous. The verb naturally is used of sinful acts and habits only; and always of the direct action of the man himself. In v. 12 indeed it has been thought by some that a qualification such as $\epsilon \nu$ ' $A \delta \alpha \dot{\alpha} \mu$ must be introduced, but this is quite unwarrantable. See note.

The explanation of this distribution is that S . Paul in this section of the Romans and S. John (both Ev. and 1 Ep .) treat of $\sin$ in itself, as in some sense distinguished from particular sinful acts and habits: and they alone do so.

We will consider (1) in a little more detail, in relation to these chapters of Rom. According to it, sin is regarded as a principle or power, in itself external to and alien from man, but intruded into the world by an act of man (v. 12) and gaining authority and establishing a hold over man's nature (v. 21, vi. 12, 14, 17), owing to the character of that nature, as composed of $\sigma a ́ p \xi$ and $\nu 0 \hat{s}$ or $\pi \nu \epsilon \hat{v} \mu a$ (vii. 15 f.).

It is important to distinguish between the two stages of treatment. First, the fact of the presence and power of sin, its true relation to human nature, and the means of escape, are treated as matters of general experience, historically whether (cc. i.-iii. summed up in v. 12-21) of mankind in general or of the personal experience of Christians (vi.). Secondly, in c. vii. 7-viii. 11 the examination of the case is pursued by way of analysis of a single experience, in order to bring out, psychologically, the real nature of this experience of sin.

In the former passages the universality, power and effect of sin are elaborated. In the latter what we may call the rationale of $\sin$ is explained, as it occurs in man. In neither case is there any treatment of the existence or meaning of evil in itself. We are dealing at no point with the metaphysical problem, but throughout with the
moral problem. This is made clear in a very remarkable manner, when we observe that S. Paul seems constantly to be on the verge of personifying sin, but never does so (cf. S. H. p. 145 f.). Considering that he undoubtedly believed in a power and powers of evil, this is most noteworthy. He would seem to abstain from any such reference because he wishes to concentrate the whole attention on man's responsibility and to exclude all secondary considerations whether of a metaphysical or other character. (Contrast 1 Joh. iii. 8-11; Ev. Joh. viii. 41, 44 f .) This is in accordance with the main object of these chapters, to bring out the universality and urgency of man's need which God meets by the power and the universality of the Gospel. Cf. Hort on James i. 14 (p. 24).

This emphasis on the responsibility of man for sin is most remarkable in v .12 , the beginning of the most obscure passage in the whole treatment. There we are told, one man was the cause of sin coming into the world, and death through sin; but the spread of death to all is made to depend on the fact that each and all at one time or another sinned ( $\pi$ áv $\boldsymbol{\tau} \epsilon \mathrm{g} \ddot{\eta}_{\mu} \mu \rho \tau o \nu$ ). It is not the sharing in but the repetition of the original act which brings all under the same doom of death. The statement is all the more significant, because it would be fully in accordance with the most prominent strain of O.T. thought to represent men as being under doom of death owing to the one sin, not because they were themselves guilty but because in them their first forefather was still being punished (Davidson, op. cit. p. 220). This idea is repudiated in the text almost in set terms; and the individualistic morality of the later prophets is explicitly adopted. The universality of sin, an assumption made in full accordance with O.T., is not regarded as being merely an universal liability to sin, but as an universal commission of sins. (So i. 18, iii. 23.) So in v. 14 actual sin is not denied in regard to any men, but only exact correspondence in character of the actual sins of some with the transgression of Adam. And so too in c. vii. the psychological analysis of man's nature, which is undertaken to show how he sins, shows sin to be in each the neglect to do what he knows to be right (cf. i. 18 b).

What then is the connexion between Adam and other men which is indicated in v. 12-21? And what is the line of analogy between that relation and the relation of men to Christ? Probably the true answer to these questions is that S. Paul does not give an answer in the sense in which we ask the questions. He is not in fact presenting a theory but appealing to acknowledged facts. Adam's act was the beginning of sin: owing to that act Adam died; and all died, because all sinned $(12-15)$. The only hint of the nexus here is in the phrase
 with Adam in natural humanity, as there is a connexion with Christ in regenerate humanity. But the latter connexion does not attain a moral value without an act of each man, and we must conclude that neither does the former connexion assume a moral value without an act of each man. In accordance with this conclusion, v. 20 reminds us (cf. 14, vii. 9) that the single act of Adam's fall would not have been repeated, had not law, in whatever form, come within men's experience. All we can conclude is thąt there is a connexion of nature : and that in each man this nature, when in face of the knowledge of good and evil, fails as Adam failed. This failure is a matter of fact and observation, not explained by any theory. If we ask, what would have happened, in S. Paul's view, if Adam had not sinned, we can only answer that S. Paul does not ask or answer the speculative question. He gives no theory: he merely elicits the facts as they appeared to him.

When we pass to the psychological treatment of c. vii. 7-viii. 11 (cf. vii. 5), we find ourselves in presence of a distinction which has not been made explicitly in the preceding chapters, the distinction between $\sigma \alpha \dot{\alpha} \rho$ and $\pi \nu \in \hat{v} \mu a$. And it is important to observe that $\sigma \dot{\alpha} \rho \xi$ is used throughout the passage, not in its simple sense of human nature, as through its physical element transitory and perishable, but in the sense in which it admits of moral predications. S. Paul describes himself as $\sigma \dot{d} \rho \kappa \iota \nu o s$, of a fleshly nature; and this is immediately supplemented by $\pi \epsilon \pi \rho a \mu \epsilon \dot{\nu}$ os $\dot{v} \pi \delta \dot{\partial} \tau \dot{\eta} \nu \dot{\alpha} \mu a \rho \tau i a v$. Flesh is a source in him of action, and, being under the dominion of sin, prompts to wrong action. It does not cover his whole being, though it dominates it. There is behind all an ego (17) which resists its promptings, in sympathy with the good which the poûs apprehends, though it is not strong enough to carry it out. It is this ego which, in spite of the domination of the $\sigma \alpha \rho \xi$, still preserves the knowledge of and the will to good. It is in fact the $\pi \nu \in \hat{v} \mu a$ which, when reinforced by the power of the life which is of and in Christ, asserts its supremacy, defeats sin in its stronghold, and makes the man free from the policy and power of the 'fleshly' element (viii. 1-11).

On this we observe in the first place that this analysis is undertaken in order to bring out the real function and character of law. Man's constitution properly understood shows how law, being itself spiritual, holy, righteous and good, may yet be an occasion of sin. And the reason is shown to lie in the actual behaviour of man in the face of the knowledge of law, not in the nature of law itself. But the transference of the sinful character from law to man necessitates
further consideration of the nature of man. It might be supposed that man was essentially sinful. This is shown not to be the case. Sin is due not to man's nature in itself and therefore necessary, but to the play of the elements of that nature among themselves, to the domination of the transitory and perishable nature ( $\sigma \alpha \rho \xi$ ) over that element by which man is essentially man and inwardly related to God ( $\pi \nu \epsilon \hat{v} \mu a)$, or, to put it the other way, to the failure of that in man, which should rule, to establish its rule. The analysis represents that domination as complete, as far as action goes; but not complete so far as to extinguish the higher element. And this state is unnatural, in the truest sense: for it is the result of a passing under the power of sin (14). Why and how this comes about, S. Paul does not indicate; he describes it wholly by metaphors
 no theory; he describes the fact, which he experiences, of the double forces at work in a man's consciousness. There is the knowledge of good, there is the wrong act, there is the sense of sin and helplessness: there is again the reinforcement of the spirit by the Christ and the change of balance. Sin is man's own act and yet not his true act : yet as his act it becomes a power dominating him by the use of what is trulypart of himself. The whole process is within his own experience (vii. 5, 9, 14 f.). The sin which dwells in him is his own sin. In regard to 'flesh,' the flesh is not in itself sinful ( $v .9$ ) but neither is it in itself good; it is neutral till the man begins to use it, with the knowledge given by law: but just because it is neutral, it is not easily malleable to the uses of the spirit; the man lets it engross his activity, in contradiction to such uses, and becomes not only 'flesh' but 'fleshly'; the uses of the flesh supplant the uses of the spirit; and this disproportion or false relation, false to man's true nature, is the state of $\sin$. Consequently, $\sin$ is still originally and essentially due to man's own act; it does not characterise flesh till an act of the kind has been committed : and when man's spirit is so far renewed and reinforced that its habitual actions are changed and reversed, the flesh itself becomes, even with its present limitations, no longer the field of sin but an instrument of the spirit; of. vi. 12, viii. 11.

In regard to this passage as a whole, the question is asked whether S. Paul is here giving his own experience or dramatising in his own person what he conceives to be the general experience of men. There can be but one answer. The personal element is too definite, too sustained, and even too passionate, to allow the hypothesis of mere imagination. But even so there are two observations to be
made. First the analysis of a personal experience is so far akin to the poetic dramatisation of common human experience, that both, if they are true and deep enough, carry us down to the fundamental facts and elements of human nature, which are common. The experience here analysed is typical just because it is so intensely and veraciously personal. Secondly, we are not to assume that in this analysis $\mathbf{S}$. Paul is giving us the whole even of his pre-Christian experience. It is not his object to exhaust the account of himself, but to show his particular experience of the relation of law and sin. It is wrong to conclude that he could recognise in his pre-conversion life nothing but sin. As in Gentiles (ii. 15) and in Abraham and his true descendants (iv. 16 f.), so in himself he would recognise the presence, in its degree, both of the working of GoD's Spirit and of the response of faith, the testimonium animae naturaliter Christianae. What he gives us here is not an exhaustive account, but a description of the dominant character of his religious life before his conversion, and, undoubtedly, a very real and awful experience.

What conception, then, does S. Paul mean to convey by 'sin' as a power or influence? It seems to follow, from the above examination, that it is the conception of sin as a habit, formed by a succession of acts and seeming to acquire, and indeed acquiring for our experience, a control and mastery over a man, such as might be exercised by an external power. If comes to be felt as a power which holds man under bondage. And it is this feeling which S. Paul expresses by the metaphors, $\beta a \sigma \iota \lambda \epsilon$ éciv, סou入єia etc. But he does not go on to account for it, beyond the testimony of experience. He assumes its universality, as a matter of common acknowledgment. He describes its character in such a way as to connect it with the action of the human will. He shows its operation, in the springing up of a wrong relation between the two main elements in human nature. And the deductions he draws are the necessity for man in the first place of forgiveness and justification and in the second place of the re-creation of, or communication of a new life to, his spirit, and through his spirit to his whole nature. Beyond these limits he does not go.

## E. Oávatos IN CC. V., VI., VII,

The use of this word and its cognates, in these chapters, is a striking instance of S. Paul's method. He passes without hesitation from one meaning to another. In c. v. 12-21 the sense seems always to be that of natural death. In c. vi. it is used of the death of Christ upon the cross, of the death to sin in baptism, of
natural death or perhaps spiritual $(16,23)$; in c. vii. $1-3$ of natural death; 4,6 of death to the former state of $\sin$ under law; 9 ff . of spiritual death in sin. There is no attempt to harmonise these various meanings; the context alone decides between them in each case. And in some cases, as the notes have shown, it is by no means easy to decide. The natural and the spiritual are too closely interwoven, not only in S. Paul's thought but in common religious experience. It is interesting to notice that the metaphorical or spiritual use of the term is rare in S. Paul's other epistles (2 Cor. ii. 16, iii. 7 (?), 2 Cor. v. 15 ; Gal. ii. 19 ; Col. ii. 20, iii. 3 ; 1 Tim. v. 6 ; cf. $\nu \epsilon \kappa \rho o ́ s$, Eph.ii. 5 ; Col. ii. 13 ; Col. iii. 5 only), and paralleled only in S. John (1 Jo. iii. 14, v. 16, 17; Ev. v. 24, viii. 51 only) and perhaps James i. 15.

## F. IX. 5.

## 

The insertion of the participle throws emphasis on $\dot{\delta} . . . \epsilon^{\prime} \pi l \pi d \dot{\lambda} \tau \omega \nu$ and shows that it must be taken as subject and $\theta \in \delta$ s as in apposition. Otherwise we should expect $\delta \dot{\epsilon} \pi i \pi a ́ v \tau \omega \nu \quad \theta \epsilon 6$ s. $\grave{\epsilon} \pi i \pi \alpha \dot{d} \nu \tau \omega \nu$ implies not mere superiority (which seems never to be indicated by $\epsilon \pi i$ with gen.) but authority and government,$=\mathrm{He}$ who is supreme governor of all things, a periphrasis for кúplos. $\pi \alpha \dot{\nu} \tau \omega \nu$ is probably neuter and refers to the whole process, in sum and in detail, of the ordered government and dispensations of the ages. The only other occurrence of $\epsilon \pi i \pi \alpha \dot{\alpha} \nu \tau \omega \nu$ in N.T. is in Eph. iv. 6. The question, therefore, whether the phrase can be applied to $\dot{o} \chi \rho \iota \sigma \tau \delta s$ depends not on any strict parallel, but on the analogy of the use of кúplos: for this cf. x. 9 with 12 ; 1 Cor. xii. 3 ; Phil. ii. 10, 11 ; and esp. 1 Cor. viii. 6 ; Eph, iv. 5 ; and generally the application of кúpıos, with its O.T. associations, to Christ; see Hort, 1 Pet. p. 30 f. It still remains open to question whether S. Paul would name, as an attribute of the Christ, the management of the dispensations; Heb. i. 3 ( $\phi \epsilon \rho \omega \nu$ к.т.入.) is only partly paralleled by Col. i. 17 ; and S. Paul himself seems to reserve this function of providential government to God as creator. The term кúplos seems to be applied to Christ rather as sovereign over the present dispensation, than as the director of all the dispensations, the Son being the agent of the operations of the Father: cf. xvi. 25, 26. It was probably some such consideration as this that led Hort to say (Appendix, $a d l o c$.) that the separation of this clause from $\delta \chi \rho . \tau . \kappa$ к. $\sigma$. "alone seems adequate to account for the whole of the language employed." Neither S. H. nor Giff. elucidate this point. The question is not
 used of Christ by S. Paul (there is strong evidence for an affirmative answer); but whether he would assign to Him this function of deity. It is to be observed that it is generally agreed that the form of the phrase $\dot{o} \hat{\omega} \nu \dot{\epsilon} \pi i \pi d \dot{d} \nu \tau \omega \nu$ throws the stress exactly on this function. These considerations point to a separation of this clause from the preceding; of. 1 Clem. xxxii. 2.

Two questions remain: (1) is the insertion of the clause, if separated from the preceding, natural in the context? (2) does the run of the whole sentence allow of such separation?

As regards (1) the immediate context deals with GoD's dispensation to and through Israel suggested by the strange paradox that the dispensation of the Gospel, expounded in the preceding chapters and in full climax in ch. viii., finds Israel alien. That the Gospel should have been prepared for in Israel, and that in spite of Israel's opposition the Gospel should now be in full course in its comprehensive universality, are both the results of GoD's government or management of the dispensations : it is not unnatural that when the climax of the description of Israel's past has been reached, while the climax of ch. viii. is still in mind, S. Paul should turn to bless Him who directs and orders all, God worthy to be blessed for ever. The emphatic position and phrasing of $\dot{\omega} \tilde{\omega}^{\mu} \dot{\epsilon} \pi i \pi \dot{\alpha} \nu \tau \omega \nu$ suits the turn of thought exactly. Nor is this assumption out of place here, in view of the great sorrow spoken of in $v .2$ (as Giff.) : that sorrow does not even for a moment suspend S. Paul's trust in the just and merciful government of God.
(2) It is no doubt true that the change of subject is abrupt: but it is of the very nature of an interjectional ascription to be abrupt: and the formal abruptness is compensated by the naturalness of the interjection.

Two further points require to be noticed. (1) It is argued that in ascriptions of blessing eủdorचròs always comes first in the sentence. But no order of words is so fixed that it cannot be changed for emphasis' sake : and the emphasis on $\dot{\delta} \hat{\omega} \nu \quad \in \pi i \pi \alpha \dot{\alpha} \tau \omega \nu$ is amply sufficient to account for the order here; cf. Ps. 1xvii. (lxviii.) 2 LXX.
 other side of the nature of the Christ. But this argument ignores the reason for the mention of the Christ here at all, namely, to complete the enumeration of the privileges of Israel.

On the whole I conclude that the most natural interpretation is to place the stronger stop after $\sigma \dot{\alpha} \rho \kappa \alpha$ and to translate 'He that governs all, even God, be blessed for ever. Amen.'

It is perhaps necessary to observe that this comment is not influenced by the consideration that S. Paul was not likely to apply the term $\theta$ eòs predicatively to Christ. The possibility of his doing so ought not to be denied in view of 2 Thes. i. 12, Phil. ii. 6, 2 Cor. xiii. 13, and other passages in which the Father and the Son are coordinated.

Prof. Burkitt (J.T.S. v. p. 451 ff .) argues that the $\alpha \mu \eta{ }^{2} \nu$ marks the clause as an ascription of blessing to God, not a description of nature. The ascription is here made, as an appeal for GoD's witness to the truth and sincerity of his statement in 1-4; cf. Rom. i. 25 ; 2 Cor. xi. 31. He takes $\delta \not{\omega} \nu$ (cf. Exod. iii. 14, 15; Rev. i. 4) as representing the 'Name of the Holy One,' the mere utterance of which with the necessarily accompanying benediction is an appeal to the final court of truth. So he connects "Rom. ix. $1,5 b$, ou
 not. The Eternal (Blessed is His Name!) I call Him to witness." While this argument seems to me conclusive as to the main connexion and intention of the clause, and the reference in $\dot{\delta} \ddot{\omega} \nu$ to Exodus seems very probable, I still feel that the context and the Greek order point to connecting $\dot{\epsilon} \pi i \pi \alpha \dot{\alpha} \nu \tau \omega \nu$ with $\dot{o} \dot{\omega} \nu$, nor does this seem inconsistent with such a reference. If $\dot{\epsilon} \pi i \quad \pi \alpha \dot{\partial} \nu \tau \omega \nu$ had been meant as epithet to $\theta \in \dot{\delta}$, I should have expected the avoidance of ambiguity by a change of order- $\theta \epsilon$ ès $\grave{\epsilon} \pi i \pi \alpha ́ \nu \tau \omega \nu$.

A conjectural emendation of the text ( $\omega \nu \dot{\delta}$ for $\dot{\delta} \hat{\omega} \nu$ ) has occurred to commentators from time to time. Jonas Schlicting in his commentary on the Romans (1656) mentions it, as likely to suggest itself, and points out the suitability of the climax, but rejects it as giving an unscriptural phrase. John Taylor (of Norwich, 1754) makes the same suggestion and justifies it as giving a proper climax. Wetstein refers to these and others, without comment. Bentley (Crit. Sacr. ed. Ellis, p. 30) mentions it, apparently with favour. John Weiss (op. cit. p. 238) adopts it, referring to Wrede, Lic. Disp., a work which I have not seen. Hart, J. T. S. xi. p. 36 n., suggests the same emendation,

Mr Hart supports the emendation, in a letter to me, as follows: " St Paul is writing here if anywhere as a Jew, and the relation of Israel to the GoD of Jacob forms the proper climax: Christian scribes altered the text because in their view that privilege was forfeited and had lapsed to the Church. I think this passage from Philo clinches the matter-de praemiis § 123 (M. ii. p. 428) (Lev. xxvi. 12) тои́тои калєî-

 ärcos.-So St Paul says 'to whom belongs the supreme God, blessed
be He for ever and ever, Amen.' But his reporters did not sympathise and desiderated an antithesis to каг̀̀ $\sigma \dot{\alpha} \rho к а$, having identified the (abstract) Messiah with our Lord."

It will be seen that here again the justification of the conjecture depends on the propriety of the climax. The quotation from Philo does not, I think, carry us far. He is there emphasising the establishment of a personal relation between the God of all men and the individual saint, and he calls this single person a $\lambda a d s{ }_{\epsilon} \xi \alpha \iota \rho \in \tau \delta \delta$ s. Such language could of course be used by any Jew or Christian. We have
 aủv $\omega \hat{\nu}, \dot{\eta} \tau o i \mu \alpha \sigma \epsilon \nu \gamma$ à $\rho$ aúroîs $\pi \delta \lambda \iota \nu$. But the point need not be laboured. Against this suggestion the following points may be urged:-(1) It ignores the effect of the $\dot{\alpha} \mu \dot{\eta} \nu$ in making the whole clause an ascription: see above. (2) The question is raised whether the idea embodied in the term 'The God of Israel' is naturally to be expected as the climax of the enumeration here made. It may be premised that that term is never used by S. Paul in his Epistles, or indeed in the N. T. except in Mt. xv. 31, Lk. xvi. 18, Acts xiii. 17. It does not occur, either explicitly or implicitly, in the other enumerations of the privileges of Israel (Rom. ii. 17, iii. 3, 2 Cor. xi. 22). Further, in this Epistle the whole argument has been based on the universal
 $\sigma$ д́pка seems to exclude the divine relation of the Christ, and a fortiori the relation of man to God, from the list of the special privileges of Israel. Finally, the phrase $\dot{\epsilon} \pi i \quad \pi \dot{\alpha} \nu \tau \omega \nu$ (see above), as referring directly to the governing and dispensing operations of God gives, almost necessarily, a wider range of reference than to the relations to Israel alone.

## G. Oapp. ix.-xi.

The difficulty of the passage for us lies in the fact that we habitually think primarily of the destiny of the individual as such and the determination of his final position in relation to God: and we bring into this passage the problems of predestination and freewill as they affect the individual man. S. Paul's thought here is different. He is thinking, first, of the purpose of God and the work to be done in the execution of that purpose. He then sees in the selection of certain men and nations for this work, the determination, that is to say, of their position in regard to the work, a signal instance of God's graciousness and mercy. It is a high privilege to be called to assist in carrying out God's purpose.

Finally, he holds that, with this call and determination by God, there still remains to man the choice of acceptance of the call. If he accepts willingly, he becomes an instrument of mercy, that is an instrument in the execution of GoD's purpose for mankind. If he rejects the call and sets himself against the purpose, he still cannot escape from the position of an instrument; but, by his own act, he puts himself into that relation to God, which involves the exhibition of GoD's wrath on sin; he becomes an instrument of wrath, serving God's purpose still, but in spite of himself and to his own destruction.

Within the lines of this conception, we can see the rationale of S. Paul's treatment of individual cases. In the case of Esau and Jacob, the selection assigned to Jacob the leading part in the execution of the purpose, to Esau the part of a servant. In the history of Esau and his descendants, it is clear this part of a servant was rejected; Edom set itself in antagonism to Israel, fell under the wrath of God and received the doom implied in the word $\dot{\epsilon} \mu i \sigma \eta \sigma \alpha$. In the case of Pharaoh, the selection assigned to him the rôle of giving a signal exhibition of GoD's power and proclamation of His Name. The way in which Pharaoh played that rôle was again the way of opposition : he set himself against the purpose of God: a 'hardening' of his own character and purpose was the result; where he might have been an instrument of mercy, he became an instrument of wrath; and while GoD's purpose of mercy in Israel was still fulfilled, Pharaoh was doomed. In the case of Israel, we see an ambiguous result. The selection, again, assigned to Israel the place in the execution of the purpose, which involved the storing up and ultimately the communication of God's purpose of mercy to all mankind. As the history of Israel develops, some are seen to accept this duty, others to reject it. There follows in part, a blinding of perception ( $\pi \omega \dot{\rho} \rho \omega \sigma \iota s \dot{a} \pi \bar{\partial} \mu \hat{\epsilon} \rho o u s$ ), an ignorance (ả $\gamma^{2} o t a$ ) of the end itself for which they are selected. The end itself cannot now be carried out by their means; and they are rejected. But this very rejection of part of Israel is a further revelation of God's true purpose in Israel; and the continued acceptance of the faithful remnant is a triumphant vindication of the patience of God and the permanence of His purpose. Only in the case of the faithless portion of Israel, does S. Paul's thought pass on to the ultimate issue for those who reject their proper work in the execution of the purpose. Here he derives from the fact of the original selection a far-reaching hope. He seems to suggest that the ultimate realisation of the purpose of God for all mankind, through the faithful stock, may itself produce such an effect upon the blinded Israel, that they too will see the truth and
again come under the mercy of God (xi. 11, 12, 17-23, 28-32). In most remarkable language he speaks of the gifts and the calling of God being irreversible, and the love of God, manifested in the original selection and exhibited towards 'the fathers,' as still marking His real relation even to these children who have rejected its appeal.

We observe, then, in these chapters, as in the earlier, that S. Paul is dealing with what he regards as the facts of history and experience, and drawing his conclusions from them. He is not expounding a solution or even a statement of the metaphysical problems of predestination and freewill. He conceives of human experience as witnessing to a comprehensive and far-reaching purpose of God in His self-revelation to man. The destinies of men he sees as determined, on the one hand, by God's call to men and to families and nations to take part in the execution of that purpose, and, on the other, by the attitude which men, as individuals or families or nations, take up towards that call. The call assigns in each case a definite part and duty, not the same for all, but differentiated, that each may have his part. And in accordance with the way in which each undertakes the part assigned to him, comes success or failure for him. The grounds on which the several parts are assigned are hidden in the mystery of creation. The ultimate issue for individuals is hidden. What is known is that behind the vast purpose remains eternally the love of God, and in its execution is manifested inexhaustible wisdom and knowledge. If we feel, at first, a sense of disappointment, when we realise that we can get little light from these chapters on those metaphysical problems, a little reflection will show that the religious significance of the position here expounded is of enormously greater importance than any such solution could be. The conception of the whole process of the ages as being based upon the love of God, and directed in whole and in detail by His infinite wisdom and knowledge; the conception of man as called to cooperate with God in the execution of this mighty plan; the assertion of man's undiluted responsibility for playing his part in the place assigned to him, in free response to the call of God; here are ideas which touch life at every point, and have the power to inspire faith and to invigorate character in the highest degree.

On this question of election there is a very interesting discussion by Hort, in the Life and Letters, ii. p. 333.

## H. Apostles.

1. This word, in the sense of a commissioned representative, is not found in Greek later than Herodotus (1. 21, v. 38). In classical Greek it means 'a fleet' or 'expedition.' It has not yet been found in Hellenistic Greek; but it would not be surprising if it should occur at that stage in the same sense as in the old Ionic language (cf. Nägeli, pp. 22-23).
2. In the Synoptic Gospels, the word is used by all three with reference to the Galilean mission of the disciples (Mt. x. 2; Mk iii. 14, vi. 30 ; Lk. vi. 13, ix. 10). It is possible that, as von Dobschütz argues, all these cases may be traced to S. Luke. But the use of the verb $\dot{a} \pi \sigma \sigma \tau \epsilon \lambda \lambda \omega$ in the same connexion (Mt. x. 5, 16, 40; Mk iii. 14, vi. 7) in Mt. and Mk makes it probable that the substantive also is original in these passages. Otherwise it is found in S. Luke only (xi. 49, xvii. 5, xxii. 14, xxiv. 10). But the verb, again, is used by the Lord both of His own mission, and of the mission of prophets, and of disciples, both in plain sayings and in parables. The quotation in Lk. iv. 18 may be the origin of the whole usage.
3. S. John uses the substantive only once (xiii. 16) to describe, though indirectly, the relation of the disciples to the Lord. He also uses the verb both of the Lord's own mission and of His mission of the disciples.

While these facts do not prove conclusively that the word was used of the Twelve by the Lord Himself, they show that the adoption of the title by the Twelve from the first would have been natural, if not inevitable.
4. The use in the Acts is consistent: (1) it is commonly used of the Twelve (Eleven) in the early chapters (i.-xi., xv.) only. They are otherwise described, as the Eleven (ii. 14) or the Twelve (vi. 2) only. It is to be noted that in this section the properly missionary work of the Twelve is the main subject : in c. xv. the conditions of missionary work are under discussion. The dominant use therefore of this term is natural: and its strict limitation to the Twelve shows that it already has an official sense. It is hardly possible, however, to say whether the word belongs to an early document used by $\mathrm{S}^{5}$. Luke, or whether it is chosen by him as the best description in the circumstances of the character which the Twelve bear. There is nothing so far to show that he included any others than the Twelve in the title. (2) Twice and only twice he uses the word of Barnabas and Paul, on
their first mission (xiv. 4, 14). It is to be noticed that he does not use the word in describing the origin of the mission (dंфopifare... $\dot{a} \pi \epsilon \in \lambda v \sigma \alpha \nu$, xiii. 2, 3) but in siii. 4 he uses the remarkable phrase
 mission and the work were not given by the Church but by the Holy Spirit, and under 'the grace of God.' We cannot say, therefore, that the term $\dot{\alpha} \pi \delta \sigma \sigma \tau o \lambda o s$ is here used of them as commissioned by the Church of Antioch. As with the Twelve, so with these two the commission is from above.

It is remarkable that the word does not appear again after c. xv. As regards the Twelve the explanation is obvious: they are not mentioned again ${ }^{1}$. But it is very remarkable that the term is never again used of S. Paul ${ }^{2}$. If we bear in mind how frequently S. Paul uses it of himself, the fact of its absence from this whole section of S. Luke would seem to militate against the suggestion that S. Luke is dependent on S . Paul for his use of the word; and to favour the supposition that in the earlier chapters he found it in his sources,
5. S. Paul's letters give us the earliest direct documentary evidence for the current meaning of the word: it is therefore important to consider in detail his use.
i. He uses the word of himself in the addresses of all his epistles, except 1 and 2 Thessalonians, Romans, Philippians and Philemon. In all cases the source of the apostleship is described, either by the simple genitive ' $\mathbf{I} \eta \sigma \circ \hat{v} \mathrm{X} \rho$. or $\mathbf{X} \rho$. 'I $\eta \sigma$., or in Galatians by an expanded prepositional clause having the same effect. The absence of the title in 1 and 2 Thessalonians is probably due to the greeting being a joint one from 'Paul, Silvanus and Timotheus': that he claimed the office is clear from 1 Thes. ii. 6. In Romans and Philippians, for different though cognate reasons, he suppresses the title: in Romans it is part of his delicate waiving of authority ; in Philippians it is one of the many marks of intimacy and affection. But in the introduction to the Romans he describes his own position in terms of the apostolate
 relation to the Lord ( $\delta \delta^{\prime}$ oṽ) as in Galatians.

The use of the word of himself is rare in other parts of the Epistles. Once in 1 Corinthians (ix. 1, 2) he insists on his position as apostle and the consequent rights. In the same epistle (xv. 7) he recalls its original basis. In 2 Corinthians we may say that the whole of cc. x.-xiii. are an assertion and defence of his apostolic
${ }^{1}$ Cf. Harnack, Lukas etc., p. 200, n. 1.
${ }^{2}$ The verb occurs in this sense only in xxii. 2, xxvi. 17, S. Paul's eeches.
character, though he does not apply the word directly to himself except in xii. 12. In 1 Thes. ii. 6 and 1 Cor. iv. 9 he includes
 In 1 Tim. ii. 7, $2 \mathrm{Tim} . \mathrm{i} .11$ he refers to his appointment ( $\dot{\epsilon} \tau \in \theta \eta \nu$ ) as apostle. Finally, in Romans xi. 13 he speaks of himself as $\epsilon \theta \nu \omega \hat{\omega} \nu$ $\dot{a} \pi \delta \sigma \sigma 0 \lambda$-the only place where he uses the word with an objective genitive: though in Gal. ii. 8 we have ajoorto入̀ with the same genitive.

There can be no doubt as to the meaning of the title to $\mathbb{S}$. Paul. It involves a definite and direct appointment received from the Lord, to preach the Gospel, in particular to the Gentiles, to carry the due authority as representative of the Lord (cf. 2 Cor. v. 20), and to do the acts belonging to such an office. It is an independent and plenipotentiary office, in the assertion of which often the whole cause of the Gospel proves to be involved. At the same time there is no trace that either the office or the name or the contents are new. Where there is explanation, it is of the nature of an appeal to acknowledged facts rather than of exposition of any new idea or interpretation. When his position is disputed, it is his right to the office which is challenged, not his presentation of it. Consequently we conclude that the idea of the office, in the full sense as conceived by S. Paul, was already present and the word current in the Church when he first used it.
ii. The question, however, arises, was it also current in a looser and wider sense? And as far as S. Paul's evidence goes this leads to an examination of those passages in which he either includes others with himself in the designation, or applies it to others apart from himself.

There are three classes of passages to be examined. First those in which there is a reference to all or some of the 'original apostles' whether exclusively or not; secondly, those in which the name is given to definite persons other than the original apostles; thirdly, those which speak of 'apostles' generally.
(a) To take first the references to the 'original' apostles.

Gal. i. 17, 19. The exact references in this passage are not clear. S. Paul first says that he did not go up immediately after his conversion to Jerusalem, $\pi \rho \delta \dot{s} \tau o u ̀ s ~ \pi \rho \delta \dot{\epsilon} \mu \rho \hat{v} \dot{a} \pi \tau \sigma \sigma \tau 0 \dot{\lambda} o u s$. The phrase implies his own inclusion at that time in the class of Apostles: it must, presumably, refer to the Eleven or Twelve; but whether it includes others besides them is an open question. Anyhow, it implies that they were all apostles in the full sense in which he claimed to be one. Secondly, he seems to include both Cephas and James the
brother of the Lord in the class of apostles $(v v .18,19)$ : here we find an additional member of the class beside the Twelve, unless 'James the brother of the Lord' is, as is supposed by some, to be identified with James the Less. In the following chapter he speaks of James, Cephas and John as $\sigma \tau u ́ \lambda o t$ סoкov̂vres.... And his language shows that they as well as Barnabas were included with him, on an equality, though with different spheres of work.

Here, then, we have the apostolate including, besides the Twelve, James (if not one of the Twelve), Barnabas and Paul. There is no question as to what an apostle is, only as to who are apostles.

 t' $\xi$ ovalap -

Here clearly Paul and Barnabas are assumed to be $\dot{\alpha} \pi \delta \sigma \tau 0 \lambda o c$. The clause is кal...K $\eta \phi$ âs is strangely worded. But as $\mathrm{K} \eta \phi$ âs is clearly
 also be included in the class : i.e. other brethren of the Lord besides James.

1 Cor. xv. 7, єita тoîs àmoбтbरoıs $\pi a ̂ \sigma \iota \nu$.
This follows the mention of Cephas, the Twelve, the Five Hundred Brethren, James. It is possible that as 'the Twelve' in this enumeration include Cephas, so 'all the apostles' include the T'welve and James only. But it is more natural to understand the phrase, with its emphatic $\pi \hat{a} \sigma \iota \nu$, as including others. And in that case there were others, apostles in the same sense as the Twelve and James. There is no question here of a looser meaning of the word, but only of a wider range in its application.

2 Cor. xi. 5, xii. 11, ol ט́ $\pi \epsilon \rho \lambda \backslash a \nu$ à $\pi \delta \dot{\sigma} \sigma \tau 0 \lambda o t$.
In spite of the strong statement of certain critics, there is much to be said for referring this phrase to the same persons as are described in Galatians as ol $\pi \rho \delta \dot{\delta} \mu 0 \hat{\nu} \dot{\alpha} \pi \dot{\delta} \sigma \tau 0 \lambda o c$. The exact range implied is not clear. If, however, it is to be taken to refer to those who are described
 is ironic, and describes the claim of those persons, not an admitted status. That claim may well have included a commission from the Lord, whether truly or falsely asserted; and indeed the words $\dot{a} \pi \delta \sigma \tau 0$ $\lambda_{01} \mathbf{X} \rho$. seem to imply that these persons did in any case make such a claim. In this event, as $S$. Paul does not exclude the possibility of others than the Twelve, James, Barnabas and himself having such a commission, we should have here definite evidence that there were hers who rightly claimed the direct commission which is distinctive he apostle in the strict sense of the word.
 imply that to none later than S．Paul was such a direct communi－ cation addressed as could form the basis of the apostolic status．He was the last of the Apostles．

Consequently，if the name covers the wider range that has been suggested，it still excludes all whose conversion must be dated later than S．Paul＇s．
（b）We pass to the cases in which the word is used of others than those specifically named．

This passage has been already dealt with．It supports both the strict meaning and the wide range of the word．

The context clearly decides that this phrase means＇representa－ tive agents of churches．＇They are therefore called $\delta \delta \xi a$ Xpıб⿱亠䒑ov a manifestation of the power and the love of Christ，working in these churches to produce the exhibition of Christian brotherliness，in the contribution raised for the poor saints at Jerusalem．The whole passage deals with this contribution，and，in particular，with the precautions taken by $S$ ．Paul to have the whole matter put above suspicion．Representatives of all the contributing churches were associated with him in the company that conveyed the gift（see note on Rom．xvi．16）．Thus here we have a clear case of the use of the word not with a wider meaning，but in a different meaning，clearly defined by the genitive and by the context．



Here again the context defines the meaning．Epaphroditus has been sent to represent the affection and support given by the Philip－ pians to S ．Paul in his labours．He has brought the assurance of their eager and unfailing affection，of their keenness for the propaga－ tion of the Gospel，and a contribution in money for this purpose． He is the agent whom the Church has sent to minister to S．Paul＇s need．The sense of the word is exactly the same as in 2 Cor．viii． 23.
（c）In four passages－1 Cor．xii．28；Eph．ii．20，iii．5，iv．11－the word is used absolutely，twice to describe the first order of members of the Church，each with their distinctive function and work（ 1 Cor． xii．28；E．ph．iv．11）；once to describe the foundation on which the Church is built（ $\mathrm{Eph} . \mathrm{ii} .20$ ）；once to describe the primary recipients of the Gospel revelation（Eph．iii．5）．There can be no question but that in these passages the word is used in its strict sense：but the range covered by it is left undefined．

We conclude, then, as to S. Paul's use of the word:
(i) In all but two passages, he uses it of commissioned preachers of the Gospel. Wherever he defines the source of the commission, it is referred to the direct intervention of the Lord. It is reasonable to infer that the same direct intervention is implied in those passages where there is no precise definition.
(ii) In two passages only is it used in another sense, and there the special sense is clearly defined.
(iii) There is no evidence that he used the word in such a general sense of 'missionaries' as would dispense with this condition.
(iv) He includes under the name, the Twelve, the Brethren of the Lord, himself, Barnabas, perhaps Silas and probably others unnamed ( 1 Cor. xv. 7) ; he must be taken to imply that all these men were original Apostles, in the sense that they received their commission from the Lord Himself.
(d) We now come to Rom. xvi. 7.

The obvious meaning of this passage is that Andronicus and Junias were themselves apostles. According to S. Paul's usage, this must mean that they were apostles in the strict sense, that is, that they had received their commission from the Lord Himself and probably (see above, on 1 Cor. xv. 8) before S. Paul. They were among the
 $\dot{\alpha} \pi \delta \sigma \tau 0 \lambda o l$ to $\gamma^{\epsilon} \gamma^{\gamma} \nu a \nu$-who became apostles in Christ even before me.
6. In other passages of the N.T. (a) we find the title $\dot{a} \pi$. 'I. X $\rho$. in 1 and 2 Pet. i. 1.
(b) In 2 Pet. iii. 2, Jude 17 we have a general reference to oi $\dot{\alpha} \pi \dot{\delta} \sigma \tau 0 \lambda o c(\tau . \kappa . \dot{\eta}$. Jude) as the original authorities for teaching.
(c) Rev. xviii. 20, the apostles are the first class in the Church, followed by ol $\pi \rho \circ \phi \hat{\text { gेau. }}$
 are written on the twelve foundation-stones of the city.
(e) Rev. ii. 2, there are those who assert themselves to be apostles and are not as in 2 Cor. xi. 13.

The only passage which contributes new light is Rev. xxi. 14, where there is an apparent identification of 'the Twelve' and the 'Apostles.' It would appear that the number twelve has become symbolic: and we can hardly argue from this passage as to who were included in the class.
( $f$ ) Heb. iii. 1 gives us a unique description of our Lord as àmb́ $\sigma \tau 0$ -入os. This must be connected with those passages in Synn. Evv. and Joh., in which the verb is used by our Lord of His own mission.
7. In the Patres Apostolici the word is used exclusively of the
original apostles as deriving their authority directly from the Lord. None are mentioned by name as apostles except S. Peter and S. Paul. Papias, who names several of the Twelve, does not use the word apostle.

The only exception to the rule is to be found in the Didache, where 'apostles' seem to be itinerant missionaries. The use is unique; unless Hermas, Sim. $9 ; 15,4 ; 16,5$, are to be taken as implying a wider range. But $i b, 17,1$ seems to limit the term $\alpha \pi \sigma \sigma \tau 0 \lambda 0 ;$ to the Twelve; the others would be included under $\delta 1 \delta \alpha{ }_{\sigma} \sigma \kappa \alpha-$入oc. We must either suppose that the author of this portion of the Didache used what had become a current term for wandering evangelists: or that the application of the term to such is his own invention (see Dean Robinson, J. T. S., April 1912, pp. 350-351). In either case it cannot be taken as evidence for the use or meaning of the term in the Apostolic times.
8. It has been suggested that the term is derived from contemporary Jewish practice. It is supposed that it was customary to send from Jerusalem persons representing the authorities to the various settlements of Jews of the Dispersion. The definite evidence for this is found in Justin Dial. 17 and 108, where he speaks of 'chosen men' being sent from Jerusalem to denounce the new Christian heresy. Saul's mission to Damascus is regarded as an instance of this procedure. The supposition is in itself, on general grounds, probable; but there is no evidence that the name 'apostles' was given to such persons: and it is obvious that the character of their office and business was widely different from that of the Christian Apostles.

Further, it has been suggested that a parallel may be found in the use of the name apostoli, for agents sent by the central authority to collect the annual tribute of the Jews of the Dispersion. But such agents do not seem to have been sent out till after the destruction of Jerusalem. Before that time, the process by which these contributions were remitted to Jerusalem is clearly described both by Philo (de mon., Mang. II. 224 : leg. ad Caium, Mang. II. 568, 592) and Josephus (Antt. xiv. 7, 2; xvi. 6 ff .). The contributions were stored up in a safe place in the locality and remitted to Jerusalem by the hands of members of the particular community, carefully selected. These people were called iєр $\boldsymbol{\pi} о \mu \pi о$ (Philo) and the contributions iepà $\chi \rho \eta \dot{\mu} \mu a \tau a$. There is no hint of any agents from Jerusalem being concerned in the matter: and the persons actually engaged were not called 'apostles.' The real parallel to this arrangement is the measures taken by S. Paul for providing for the safe and trustworthy remission to Jerusalem of the contributions of the Gentile

Churches. It was not till after the destruction of Jerusalem, when we may suppose that it became necessary to provide further means for the consolidation of the relations with the central community, that we hear of 'apostles' sent from the centre for this and other purposes.

## To sum up:

1. There is practically no evidence for the use of this term in the sense required in classical Greek later than Herodotus (Nägeli, ad $v b$ ).
2. It is used in LXX., 3 Kings xiv. 6 (A), of Ahijah the prophet; and of messengers, Isa. xviii. 2 (Q).
3. In Joh. xiii. 16 it is used as correlative to $\tau \delta \nu \pi \epsilon \mu \psi a \nu \tau a$ : it does not occur elsewhere in S. John: but the verb is used both of the Lord's own mission and of His mission of the disciples.
4. In the Synoptic Gospels it is used in connexion with the Galilean Mission (by all three); otherwise only by S. Luke (thrice); in all cases with reference to the Twelve.

The verb is used in sayings attributed to the Lord, of Himself, of the O.T. prophets, and of the Twelve, in reference to the Galilean mission.
5. In Hebrews it is used of the Lord Himself.
6. It is used of the Twelve and of Barnabas and Paul in Acts; of the Twelve (? exclusively) in Rev. and (including S. Paul) in the Patres Apostolici.
7. In S. Paul it is used of himself (as 1 and 2 Pet.) : of those who were apostles before him including the Twelve and others: of apostles as original and first order in the Church (so 2 Pet., Jude, Rev.), in no case with precise definition of range: and in two cases of agents commissioned by churches.
8. There is no distinct evidence that it was in use among the Jews in the Apostolic age.
9. The Didache is the only evidence in the first 150 years for its use among Christians in the more general sense of evarye入ıनTท́s.
10. It is a probable conclusion that the word was derived from the Lord Himself; either that He called the Twelve apostles: or that His use of the verb to describe His own mission and theirs, led His followers who received the special commission to describe themselves as His áróoro入ou.

On this subject see Lightfoot, Galatians, pp. 92 ff. ; Von Dobschütz, Probleme, pp. 104 f. ; Batiffol, Primitive Catholicism (E.T. 1911), pp. 36 ff.; Hort, The Christian Ecclesia, pp. 22 f. ; Chapman, John the Presbyter.

## I. Capp. XV., XVI.

## A.

There is considerable difficulty as to the original place of the doxology (xvi. 25-27). The facts are as follows:
I. The doxology is placed

1. at the end of the Epistle (after xvi. 23 (24))
i. by the MSS preferred by Origen (Ruf.),
ii. by NBCDE minusc. 3, 4, def, Vulg., Pesh., Boh., Aeth., Orig. (Ruf.), Ambrosiaster, Pelagius, Aug., Sed., 16, 18, 137, 176.
2. After xiv. 23
i. Some MSS ap. Origen.
ii. L, most minusc., Syr. Harcl., Goth., Theodoret, Joh. Damasc. : Antiochian recension and commentators.
3. In both places AP 5, 17, Arm. codd.
4. Omitted altogether
i. Marcion ap. Origen. Codd. ap. Hieron. (in Eph. iii. 5) $=$ Origen (Hort, Lft Essays p. 333).
ii. FGg.
II. There is some, very obsoure, evidence that cc. xv. xvi.-23 (24) were omitted in some systems of Church lections. This depends on the list of capitula in Codices Amiatinus and Fuldensis, both of which seem to omit cc. xv. xvi. while including the doxology immediately after xiv. 23. The only other evidence for this omission is Marcion, ap. Origen (as generally interpreted, see below). G has a blank space after xiv. 23 ; but the attempt to show that in its ancestry occurred a manuseript which omitted ce. xv. xvi. seems to have failed.
III. A variation of text, which has to be considered at the same time as the above, occurs in GF. In i. 7, $15{ }^{\text {en }}{ }^{\prime} \mathrm{P}{ }^{\prime} \mu \mu \eta$ is omitted by Gg ( F defective), 47 mg . (note on i. 7). Some support has been sought for this omission in Origen and Ambrosiaster (Lightfoot), but without sufficient grounds. Zahn (Exc. r.) considers the reading to be original.

Origen's testimony is contained in the following passage from Rufinus' translation x. 43, Vol. viI., p. 453 ed. Lomm.

Caput hoc Marcion, a quo Scripturae Evangelicae atque Apostolicae interpolatae sunt, de hac epistola penitus abstulit; et non solum hoc, sed et ab eo loco, ubi scriptum est : "omne autem quod non est ex
fide peccatum est:" usque ad finem cuncta dissecuit. In aliis vero exemplaribus, id est, in his quae non sunt a Marcione temerata, hoc ipsum caput diverse positum invenimus. In nonnullis etenim codicibus post eum locum, quem supra diximus, hoc est: "omne autem peccatum est": statim cohaerens habetur "ei autem qui potens est vos confirmare." Alii vero codices in fine id, ut nunc est positum, continent. Sed iam veniamus ad capituli hujus explanationem.

These statements, always with reserve as to the accuracy of Rufinus, have usually been taken to show that Origen had before him

1. Marcion's Apostolicon, omitting the whole of cc. xv. xvi.
2. Some Codices independent of Marcion, which included these chapters but put the doxology after xiv. 23.
3. Other Codices, which he accepted, which put it at the end, in its present place. But Hort, reading 'non solum hic sed et in eo loco,' interprets this statement as to Marcion to mean that he omitted the doxology in both places, and to have no reference to the rest of cc. xv. xvi. Zahn takes 'dissecuit' to mean 'mutilated or tore to shreds' (in contrast with 'penitus abstulit') and regards the statement as attributing to Marcion the omission of the doxology and the mutilation of xv. xvi. by corrections and omissions.

Hort's suggestion has not been adopted by other critics. Zahn's translation seems hardly adequate to the phrase "usque ad finem cuncta."

This testimony of Origen is probably to be supplemented from Jerome on Eph. iii. 5 (Vallarsi, vol. viI., p. 591 b) that the doxology is found "in plerisque codicibus." Hort (Lft, B. E., p. 332) gives reasons for thinking that Jerome is here drawing upon Origen's commentary and therefore that we have again indirect evidence from Origen of the omission of the doxology being due to Marcion.

We have, then, evidence that in Origen's time there were three forms of the text.
(a) Marcion's text $=\mathrm{i}$.-xiv. 23 (or i.-xiv. $23+\mathrm{xv}$. xvi. 23 (24) altered).
(b) Nonnulli codices = i.-xiv. 25, xvi. 25, 27, xv. xvi. 1-23.
(c) Codices used by Origen = i.-xvi. 27 (=W. H.).

There is no existing textual support for (a). But
(a) Marcion's text + xv. xvi. 1-23 is the text of GFg.
(b) is supported by the MSS given above I 2. ii.
(c) is supported by the MSS given above I 1. ii.

There is therefore very strong MSS authority for preferring (c). But the question arises how the various changes came about.

Marcion's text is generally explained as due to the principles on which he revised the Gospels and Epistles. There is some difference of opinion as to whether he had any textual authority behind him.

Of the other variations three principal accounts have been given:

1. Lightfoot (Bibl. Essays, p. 287, 1893) holds that S. Paul himself made two recensions of his Epistle; (i) the original letter= i.-xvi. 23 sent from Corinth to Rome, (ii) a second edition altered to form a circular letter to a number of Churches unnamed, either late in or after the Roman imprisonment $=\mathrm{i}$.-xiv. $23+$ the doxology, written for a conclusion, and omitting $\epsilon^{\prime} \nu{ }^{\prime} \mathrm{P}{ }^{\prime} \mu \nu \eta$ in i. 7, 15. This letter was in circulation, and afterwards was completed by the addition of $x v .-x v i .23$ (24). Against this theory it is argued (1) that no sign of the existence of this letter remains, though such might have been expected in the case of a circular letter addressed to various localities, unless the obscure testimony of the Capitulations can be alleged : (2) that it is inconceivable that S . Paul himself could have made a division after xiv. 23, the argument being continuous to xv .13 (S. H.) : (3) that the argument which Lightfoot himself bases on the uniqueness of the doxology in its present place as a conclusion holds with much greater effect against its position in the circular letter as conceived by him. These objections though of various weight are conclusive.
2. Hort holds that the W. H. text represents the original letter: that for purposes of reathg in church cc. xv. xvi. were omitted, and the doxology placed at the end of xiv. 23 : that the position of the doxology in church lections caused certain scribes to place it here, and either to duplicate or to omit at xvi. 23.
3. Zahn argues that the original position of the doxology was at xiv. 23. He bases this position on internal grounds: (1) the absence of a doxology at the end in all other epistles of S. Paul, (2) the anacoluthic oharacter (leg. $\psi_{*}^{*}$ ) of the doxology implies a strength of emotion which is unlikely after the list of salutations, (3) its close connexion with the argument of xiv. 1-xv. 13, (4) the confusion of text (in connexion with the benediction) at xvi. 20,23 can only be explained by the intrusion of the doxology, (5) its transference from after xvi. 24 to xiv. 23 cannot be accounted for. Some of these arguments are unsubstantial: (3) would be strong if the doxology occurred after xv. 13 : but the interruption of the argument, if it is placed at xiv. 23, is strongly against this theory as it is against Lightfoot's.
4. S. H. differ from the above by giving an influential position to Marcion's text. They hold that (i) the original text was
that of W. H., (ii) Marcion cut off the last two chapters including the doxology partly on doctrinal grounds partly as unimportant for edification, (iii) Marcion's text, i.-xiv. 23 om . also $\notin \nu$ ' $\mathrm{P} \dot{\omega} \mu \eta$, i. 7, 15 , had a considerable circulation and influence, (iv) for Church use it was supplemented by addition of the doxology i.-xiv. $23+$ xvi. $25-27$ (so arriving at Lightfoot's second recension), (v) this form of the Epistle was then supplemented by scribes by the addition of xv. xvi. $1-23$, and in some cases by the addition of xv. xvi. 1-27, with a duplicate doxology. This explanation gets over the difficulty of the break at xiv. 23 by attributing it to Marcion's doctrinal objection to parts of $x v$. (e.g. xv. 8). It rests mainly upon the assertion of the influence of Marcion's Apostolicon.

On the whole it seems to give the simplest explanation of a very complicated problem.
5. Lake (Expositor, Dec. 1910) offers another explanation. He establishes the existence of a short recension i.-xiv. $23+$ xvi. 25-27 and argues that this recension omitted $\epsilon^{\prime} \nu{ }^{\prime} \mathbf{P} \hat{\omega}^{\prime} \mu \eta$ in c. i. The evidence -for this recension is carried back (1) to the European type of the Old Latin Version (to which the capitulations of Cod. Amiat. are assigned), (2) to the African type of the same version, as evidenced by the fact that Cyprian fails to quote from cc. xv. xvi., and Tertullian adv. Marc. also omits all references to those chapters, although Marcion must either have omitted or mutilated them (see Origen, qu. above) : and (3) is supported by the evidence of MSS which have xvi. 25-27 after xiv. 23, on the ground that the doxology must naturally come at the end of the Epistle. He argues that the two recensions were both current till Cyprian's time; and that the doxology was placed after xvi. 23, when the two were combined (Alexandrian MSS in Origen's time, Ambrosiaster and Jerome). It follows that no MS is preserved which has either recension in its original form.

His theory of the recension is that the short recension preceded the long, both being due to S . Paul himself. The short recension was written as a circular letter, a companion to Galatians (as Ephesians to Colossians), and this circular letter and Galatians were written considerably earlier than 1 Cor. In his winter sojourn at Corinth, S. Paul wishing to send to Rome a statement of his Gospel sent this circular letter with the addition of $\mathrm{xv} . \mathrm{xvi} .1-23$, and the insertion of Ev ' ${ }^{\prime} \dot{\omega} \mu \eta$ in c. 1, to give it special application to the Christians at Rome.

This hypothesis is clearly very attractive. The textual criticism on which it is founded is comprehensive and strong. The absence of direct documentary evidence for the short recension may be partly
accounted for by the lack of Old Latin evidence for the Epistle. But the difficulty besetting any theory which ends the Epistle, in one of its forms, at xiv. 23, is peculiarly strongly felt in this theory. The argument is brought to an abrupt conclusion, and it is really unfinished. Yet in a circular letter, accompanying Galatians, most of all should we expect the argument to be finished off and summed up. The abruptness of the conclusion is only emphasised by the doxology, or the grace and the doxology, supposed to follow immediately on 23. In fact in any theory of the textual variations, it ought to be regarded as fundamental that the separation between xiv. 23 and $\mathrm{xv} .1-13$ must have been due to violent interference with the original text-either of definite mutilation on doctrinal grounds, or of a mechanical arrangement for purposes of Church use.

The references for this discussion are Lightfoot, Biblical Essays (1893), Zahn, Einl. § 22, S. H. Romans Lxxxv f., Westcott and Hort, Appendix ad loc., Kirsopp Lake, Expositor, Dec. 1910.

## B.

Two other questions have been raised as to these chapters, on internal grounds.

1. The doxology is said to belong, in style and thought, to a later period of S. Paul's writings than that of the Epistle to the Romans. Lightfoot accepted this view and supported it by a close comparison with the Epistle to the Ephesians (Biblical Essays, 317 f.) and the Pastoral Epistles: and met it by attributing the doxology to a recension made by S. Paul himself at a later period (see above). Hort met this argument by pointing out (1) the close correspondence of the doxology with the main thoughts and object of the Epistle, (2) the correspondence of the language and thought with particular expressions and conceptions found in Romans, 1 Corinthians (esp. c. ii.), Gal. and 1 and 2 Thes. (l.c. p. 327 f.). I have followed S. H. in adopting Hort's position here (see notes). The fact seems to be that the doxology sums up in terse and comprehensive form the positive view, which S. Paul had reached, of the relation of Jew and Gentile in Christ to each other and to God, as seen in relation to the whole purpose of God for man in creation and redemption. The Epistle to the Romans, as a whole, is a positive exposition of this theme, and so concludes the great period of strife through which S. Paul and the Gentile Churches had been passing. In the later Epistles, especially Ephesians and Colossians, this position is assumed as settled and made the basis for further teaching both positive and polemical on the nature and place
of the Christian Society. It is not, therefore, unnatural that the language in which here S. Paul sums up the position should be represented, both in earlier Epistles where the main thought crops out, and still more in the later, where it is the foundation of additional superstructure. The doxology is, in this very important sense, a link between the two groups of Epistles.
2. Some commentators have found a difficulty in the list of salutations in xvi. 3-16; and have argued that this must be a fragment of a letter addressed to the Church at Ephesus. There is no external evidence for separating these verses from the rest of cc. xv. xvi. As to the internal evidence it has been sufficiently shown by Lightfoot (Philippians, pp. 171-178, Caesar's Household) and S. H. (notes ad loc.), that both as regards individual names and groups, and in view of the combination of Roman, Greek and Jewish names, a strong case can be made out for Rome, and to some extent against Ephesus. These authorities I have followed, both in this matter and in regard to the presence of Aquila and Priscilla at Rome (see notes).

It may be further pointed out that in none of his Epistles addressed to Churches of his own founding does S. Paul send salutations to any individuals by name. Only in one case (1 Cor. xvi. 19) does he send to such a Church a salutation by name from individuals in his own company: and there the salutation is from the group centring round Aquila and Priscilla. In Col., written to a Church he had not visited, he sends salutations from six of his companions by name, and names two members of the Colossian Church, one for greeting, one for warning. The unexpected fact comes out that in writing to Churches which he knew intimately S. Paul's practice was to suppress all names. So far as this argument goes, then, it is against c. xvi. being addressed to Ephesus, and in favour of its being addressed to Rome. Nor is the reason far to seek; where he knew intimately large numbers, selection would be difficult if not invidious. On the other hand, where he knew few, he would lay stress on this acquaintance, as qualifying his want of familiarity with the Church as a whole.

## INDICES

## A. INDEX OF SUBJECTS.

Abraham, xxx, xxxix, 70 f.
Adam, 83 f., 215 f.
Anacoluthon, 132, 133, 191
Andronicus, xxv, 198, 230
Aorist, 52, 61, 65, 171, 172, 187
Apostles, 225 f .
Aquila and Priscilla, xiif., xxiiif., xxvii, 196, 238
Asceticism, xxi, xxx, 174
Baptism, xxxviii, 101, 174
Call of God, 130, 222 f.
Christ, the incarnate life, 111, 127; death, xxxviii, 76, 81, 111; burial, 92 ; descent into hell, 176; resurrection, xxxviii, $34,76,111,113$; return, xix ; full name, 34 ; and God, 36 ; two natures, $33,34,122$; firstborn, 122; the body, $160 \mathrm{f}$. ; union with, xxix, xxxviii, xli, 79, 82, 91 f., $95,109,216$; and law, 138 f. ; in the prophets, 141
Cbristian life, 115, 154, 161; formula or hymn, 95, 116; standard, 97, 122, 181
Church, ideal of, xv , xxviii ; organisation, xix; relation to empire, xvii
Churches, representatives of, xiv
Circumcision, 72 f., 184
Civil power, xxi, 168, 169
Collection for the saints, $x$, xiv, 192

Corinth, S. Paul at, xiv.
Corinthians, Second Epistle to, xvi, xxviii

David, 33
Days observed, 175
Death, 94 f., 218 f.
Doxology, 204, 235, 237 f.
Edom, 129, 223
Election, 224
Empire, Roman, xvii
Ephesians, Epistle to, xxviii, xxix, 237 f .
Epistles, collection of, x, xiv
Faith, xxxv f., xxxviii f., 35, 40, 41, 135, 138, 180
Flesh and spirit, 105, 111f., 216 f.
Freedom, 100
Freewill, 224
Future, volitive, 60
Galatians, Epistle to, xvi, xxi, xxxvi, xxxvii
Genitive of result, 46
Gentiles, xv, xx, xxix, xxxvii, $35,40,135,148$ f., 150, 184 f., 189
Glory, 116 f., 122 f.
God, compassions of, 155 ; divinity, 45 ; knowledge of, 44, 45; love, 145 f., 151 f.; mercy, 130; patience, 133 ; power, 45, 133 ; providence, 219 f. ; unity, 68 ; will, 132 f., 158

Gospel, S. Paul's, xiii, xxi, xxviif., 32, 33, 36, 39, 40, 41; and O.T., 32
Grace, 38, 96, 143
Grafting, 147
Holiness, 34, 36
Illyricum, xi, 190
Imperialism, xviif.
Infinitive for imperative, 164, 166
Israel and the Gospel, xvi, xx, -xxx, xxxvii, 35, 124 f., 127, 129, 137 f., 142 f., 148 f., 184 f., 223
Israel, the true, 126, 146
Jerusalem, xiv, 190
Jews, privileges, 56, 221 f. ; expulsion from Rome, xxiv f.
Judaizers, xv f., xxi
Junias, xxv, 198, 230
Justification by faith, $\operatorname{xxxv} \mathrm{f}$.
Knowledge of God, xxxviii
Law, xv, xx, xl, 39, 56, 63, 73, $74,97,101,103,110,138,174$, 211
Life, the new, 110, 113
Love, 36, 114, 123
Man, made for use, 130; responsibility, 130, 131; and nature, 117
Miracles, 189
Moral sense, 104
Morality and the Gospel, xxx, 163

Name, the, 35
Nature, 118
Old Testament, use of, xxi f., 71, 182

Participle for imperative, 164

Paul's commission, 35 ; missionary work, xii, xiv; and the Jews, 137, 142
Peter, S., xxiii
Pharaoh, 131 f., 133
Politioal organisation, xix
Potter, the, 132
Prayer, 120; the Lord's, 116
Predestination, 224
Promises, the, 73, 127, 128
Prophecy, 32
Prophets, 31, 32
Redemption, 114
Religion, false, 46
Remnant, the, 143 f., 146 f.
Representatives of Churches, xiv, 201
Righteousness, xxxviif., 40, 41, $42,66,98,131,138$ f.
Rome, x, xviii; Church at, xif., xxf., xxii f., xxvii

Salutations in c. xvi, xiii, 238
Salvation, 39 f.
Selection, 129
Sin, xxxvii, 43, 47, 103, 213
Son, the, 33, 110
Sonship, 114
Spain, xi, xii, xvii, xxvii, 186 f., 193
Spirit, the Holy, xxix, xlii, 81, 109, 112, 114, 120
Spirit of man, 109, 112
Suetonius, xxiv
Suffering, 114, 116 f.
Text, transposition, 108
Theology, 36, 44
Truth, 43, 46
Vegetarianism, 174
Weak brethren, 173 f .
Works, xxxviii
Wrath of God, 43, 50, 130, 133

## B．GREEK．

This Index contains only the principal words which are commented upon in the notes．
dं $\gamma \dot{\pi} \pi \eta, 80,163,170$ ；гои̂ $\pi \nu \epsilon$ ú $\mu$－ ros， 194

à үıабцо́s， 99
ayıos， 34,36

a $\gamma \nu 0 \in \hat{\nu} \nu, 50$
à $\delta \epsilon \lambda \phi \dot{\eta}, 195$
d́ $\delta \in \lambda \phi \dot{\prime} s, 204$

а́бо́кєцоя， 47
átőos， 45
аi $\mu a, 67$
aísv， 157
aíúvios，205， 206
$\dot{\alpha} \lambda \dot{\eta} \theta \epsilon \iota a, 43,46$
d $\lambda \lambda \alpha \dot{\alpha} \sigma \sigma \omega, 46$
$\dot{\alpha} \mu а р т і а, 213$
а $\mu \dot{\eta} \nu, 153$

à $_{\alpha} \dot{\alpha} \theta \epsilon \mu a, 126$

д̀ $\nu a \pi \mathrm{o} \mathrm{\lambda} 0 \gamma \eta \tau 6 \mathrm{~s}$ ， 45
à ${ }^{2}$ á $\sigma \tau \alpha \sigma \iota, 34$
ảvoŋтós， 39
àvo $\mu \mathrm{la}$ ， xxx
$\dot{\alpha} \nu \dot{\partial} \mu \omega \mathrm{s}, 52$
áopatos， 44
aं $\pi a \rho \chi \dot{\eta}, 146,198$
$\dot{\alpha} \pi เ \sigma \tau \in \hat{\imath} \nu, 59$
ג்тока入и́ттєєข，41， 43
ддтока́入v廿ıs， 118
$\dot{\alpha} \pi о \lambda a \mu \beta \dot{\alpha} \boldsymbol{\nu} \iota \nu, 47$
àто入úт $\omega \omega \sigma \iota s, 66,119$
ȧтобто入ทㅁ， 35

$\dot{\alpha} \sigma \epsilon \in \epsilon \iota a, 43$
ḋбن่ขєтоs， 46

ḋтц $\boldsymbol{i a}, 47$
áфөapoia， 51

Bápßapos， 38
ßабıлєía тồ $\theta \epsilon o \hat{v}, 178$
$\gamma^{\prime}$＇रovav， 199
үє́ $\gamma \rho a \pi \tau \alpha \iota, 41$

$\gamma^{\nu \omega ิ \nu a \iota, ~} 45$
$\gamma^{\nu} \omega \bar{\sigma} t s, 152$
$\gamma^{\nu} \omega \sigma \tau \delta \delta, 44$
үра́ $\mu \mu$ ，57， 102

סєb $\mu \in \nu 0 s, 38$
סıá，58，73， 89 f．，120，152，159， 180， 205
бь $\alpha \theta \eta \dot{\kappa \eta, ~} 126$
סсакоуlа，145， 162
סца́коуоя，184， 195
סıáкрıбıs， 174
$\delta \iota a \lambda o \gamma \iota \sigma \mu \delta s, 46,174$

סíкalos， 41
Sıкаเьбن́vท，40， 138
סıкaloûv，xxxv f．，52， 122
סıкаl $\omega \mu a$, xxxv，47，87，88， 111
סıкаi $\omega \sigma \iota$ ，xxxv， 76
סı $6 \tau \iota, 44,45$
ঠокц $\mu$ а́ऽєь， 47
бокц $\mu \dot{\eta}, 80$
$\delta 6 \xi a, 46,51,65,114,117,126$, 134
סoそás $\epsilon \iota,{ }^{\prime} 45,122$
סô̂̀os， 31
ס仑́vapıs，34，39， 45

$\epsilon \ell \pi \omega s, 38$
єірグขๆ， 79
els $\tau 0,45$
е́ккл $\begin{aligned} & \text { бía，197，} \\ & 201\end{aligned}$
éклоүท́，128，143， 222 f.

＂E $\lambda \lambda \eta \nu, 38,40$
e $\lambda \pi \pi / s, 80$
$e ̀ v, 193$
Є̇ข $\delta v \nu a \mu 0 \hat{\nu} \nu, 75$
$\epsilon \nu \kappa \delta \pi \tau \epsilon \iota \nu, 191$

${ }_{\epsilon} \xi \in \gamma \varepsilon i \rho \epsilon \nu, 131$


є̇ $\pi \epsilon i, 61,143$
ย่ $\pi i \gamma \nu \omega \sigma t s, 147$
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