



AN EXPOSITION

OF THE

EPISTLE OF PAUL TO THE ROMANS.

BY

WILLIAM G. WILLIAMS, LL. D.,

LATE PROFESSOR OF GREEK IN THE OHIO WESLEYAN UNIVERSITY.

CINCINNATI: JENNINGS AND PYE.
NEW YORK: EATON AND MAINS.

**COOPYRIGHT, 1902, BY
JENNINGS AND PYE.**

PREFACE.

BROWNING, in the preface to his translation of Æschylus's Agamemnon, says: "If I wished to acquaint myself, by the aid of a translator, with a work of the immense fame of this tragedy, I should require him *to be literal at every cost*, save that of absolute violence to our language. And I would be tolerant, for once, of even a clumsy attempt to furnish me with the very turn of each phrase, in as Greek a fashion as English will bear."

Such is the requirement that every student of Paul's Epistle to the Romans would gladly exact for himself from the translator. In the translation of a work of such "immense fame," and of such immense moment, intrinsically, to us, we are right in demanding, not a free literary modernized translation, but a faithful reproduction of the exact structure, and the exact meaning of the original, even at the cost, if need be, of literary style, and of English idiom. But, happily, a version of this epistle, in order to be literal and exact, need not be un-English, in either style or idiom. We can express, literally and exactly, the words, the articles, the particles, the tenses of the verbs, the grammatical construction of the sentences, and the logical sequence of the thoughts, in clear, strong, idiomatic English. We can reproduce just the thought, and just the color of the thought, in appropriate English utterance.

The history of Bible translation for five hundred years into English, will show how far this aim has been kept in thought, and how far this end has been attained.

The Bible was first translated (from the Latin Vulgate) into English, in 1380, by Wyclif. "His translation of the Bible, and still more his numerous English sermons and tracts, establish his now undisputed position as the founder of English prose writing." —(Encycl. Brit.) Yet this translation, which had only a limited circulation, did not establish the standard of Biblical style for later scholars.

The first English translation from the Greek was made by Tyndale, in 1525. This translation, the work of a single competent scholar, fixed the Biblical style for all its successors; and was the basis and the model for many revisions, notably the "Great Bible" of 1539; the "Geneva Bible" of 1560; and the "Bishops' Bible" of 1568, which were all the work of collaboration. But none of them made any claim to be literal and exact. They were often inaccurate, they were not always comprehensible; and they were not satisfactory to the common readers, or to the scholars. There was still a call for a translation more authoritative, more accurate, more literal, which would displace the former translations.

The formal movement for such a translation began, with the concurrence both of the Church and of the Dissenters, in 1604. By the command of King James First, of England, a committee of fifteen leading scholars, taken about equally from the High Church party, and from the Puritans, prepared the New Testament part of the translation. This translation, whose preparation occupied three years, was published in 1611; and bears the name of "King James's," or "The Authorized."

It was a great improvement upon the former translations, though it did not at once displace them. It kept the best features of the old versions, and added many of its own. It wisely preserved the peculiarities of Tyndale's Biblical style, including especially the old (and partly antiquated) grammatical characteristics, the personal inflections of the verb, the distinction between the singular and the plural of the personal pronouns, *thou* and *ye*; and the distinction between the nominative *ye* and the objective *you*. The style of the Authorized is simple, clear, and graceful; and the turns of expression are idiomatic and happy. There is also in this translation a sobriety and dignity found in few other books in the language. The English Bible, in its vocabulary, its grammar, its style, its cathedral tone, has a unique place in our literature, and ranks (with some grave deductions), as the great classic of the English-speaking people, and the highest standard of the English language. But the Authorized translation, like its predecessors, makes no claim to be literal and exact. Indeed, the translators rather pride themselves on their variety of expression: They say (in their preface), "We have not tied ourselves to a uniformity of phrasing. Nicety in words is the next step to trifling."

But the Authorized, with all its excellencies of style, was not an ideal translation. In the opinion of competent judges it often fails to express precisely what the Greek precisely expresses; it fails systematically to express the force of the Greek tenses (and very frequently of the modes), and of the Greek article, and of the Greek particles; very often the reader does not know what it means, and sometimes it expresses no meaning at all. In fact, this translation did not secure general acceptance, nor reach this high estimation, until long after its publication; nor until, by official recognition as "the *Authorized*," rather than by its merits alone, it had occupied the field against all rivals. But after three hundred years of "authorization," it has now become the conventional style to speak of this translation in extravagant terms, as "the best translation ever made." We are often amused and amazed at the assumption with which men who can not read a word of Hebrew or of Greek, and who have therefore not earned a right to speak on this point, pronounce upon the incomparable excellence of the Authorized translation. It is called "the Bible of our fathers, venerable, sacred." Many, indeed, think it sacrilegious to touch this translation with irreverent hands, to expose its failures and its faults, to criticise it, or to propose to alter it; or even to eliminate the acknowledged blunders that have crept into it.* Yet from the first, the Authorized translation has been the subject of much criticism, both friendly and unfriendly; and many attempts, by individual or associated effort, have been made to improve it, if not to supersede it. Our shelves are full of such books, many of which are better than the Authorized. But the sanction of the crown, and the approbation of the Church, gave it a factitious reputation which it yet holds, and will continue to hold, though ever less securely, for an indefinite time to come.

The Authorized, owing to these adventitious circumstances, has had a wonderful history, and a wonderful influence, religious and literary, in the great nations that speak the English language. But this book to which we owe so much, but which is not a good translation of the Greek, has played its part; and the time has come, it came long ago, when it should retire and leave the stage

*This feeling in regard to our defective translation of the Bible amounts to a superstition. Nearly fifty years ago, the American Bible Society deliberately voted not to cancel or correct more than twenty-four thousand variations (most of them, of course, very insignificant) that their own Committee had found in the text of the standard editions.

to a better player. Far better would it be for the English readers of the Bible, if the Authorized translation should now, like Tyndale's, and the Bishops', be relegated from our tables to our book-shelves.

There is a better book, not as good as it ought to be, to take the place of the Authorized, provisionally.

The dissatisfaction with the Authorized long ago showed that a change must eventually come. At length, in 1870, the Canterbury Convocation ventured upon the task. The Convocation could have given the English world a translation abreast of the Greek scholarship, and of the English scholarship of the times, and perhaps a final translation. But unfortunately, with short-sighted policy, they voted "that they did not contemplate a new translation," but only a revision of the old translation. It would almost seem that the Canterbury divines really preferred the old leaven in the new batch; or, at least, from fear of offense to the conservatives, they decided upon this half-way measure. The committee of revision, to whom the Convocation intrusted the work, gave more than ten years of work to the New Testament. But the committee, with the same dread of criticism, or with superb self-confidence, unwisely maintained, during all those years, absolute secrecy as to the character and progress of their work, until it was too late to correct any of their mistakes,—and they made many mistakes "of omission and of commission." Nevertheless, the Revision is a noble monument to the zeal of the Convocation, and to the ability of the committee, to their conscientiousness, and, with much reserve, to their success. It was published in 1881; and after so long delay, was received with great enthusiasm, and with much disappointment.

The Revision has not had the general and favorable acceptance which so labored an effort, if wisely and rightly carried out, deserved. The English world feels that the Revision is, as its name indicates, only provisional, and is not the last word of advance in this direction. The impolicy in the limit which the Convocation set for the movement, and the unwise secrecy of the committee, have hindered the acceptance of the Revision. At some future time, all the Churches of English Christendom must unite for a full and trustworthy translation, which will not be a mere revision; or, what is now more probable, if not more desirable in itself, each great Church, as it has its own denominational literature, its own denominational theological schools, and its own

denominational pulpit, will have its own denominational translation of the Scriptures, without combinations, and without compromises.*

Readers of the Bible ought not to be content with anything less than what the best scholarship can give them. Especially in critical passages, they want the exactest reproduction of the Greek. The Revised (or any other compromise translation) may answer, as the Authorized has so long done, for general cursory reading, either private or congregational; but for the closet, or the study, students demand, with Browning, to know just what the writers of the Bible thought, and just how they spoke; they demand the most literal and exact translation that scholarship can give them, "in as Greek a style as English will bear." Fortunately, a translation so made can be made also just as suitable for use in the family and in the pulpit as the less exact Authorized or the Revised.

Such is the critical judgment to which the external history and the internal character of these two great rival translations lead us.

The Parallel translations of this Epistle, printed in some editions, illustrate these points. They show, in almost every verse, something of what Bishop Ellicott's preface to the Revised calls "its blemishes and imperfections," but which we may more correctly call its deliberate departures from the apostle's language and meaning. A careful count shows that in this brief Epistle to the Romans, containing only 433 verses, the Revisers made more than twelve hundred changes from the Authorized. But the corrected translation here given makes more than sixteen hundred additional changes from the Revised. Of course, most of those changes, in both texts, are minute in themselves, consisting, for example, of modification of the punctuation, and of the paragraphing; changes in the capitalization (as *Spirit* to *spirit*, viii, 6, 9); a slight modernizing of the inflections (as *hath* to *has*); substituting one word for another (as *to* for *unto*); a rhetorical rearrangement of the words (as, 'I have made thee a father of many nations,' to 'A father of many nations have I made thee,' iv, 17), and other such accessory points. Such textual changes do not greatly affect

* Thus, the American Bible Union, has given the Baptist Churches a translation of the New Testament which, without being perfect, is, on the whole (aside from its peculiar views), better than the Authorized, better than the Revised.

the character or the meaning of the translation; but, though minute, they are not, therefore, trivial. In a book of the immense significance of this epistle (and of the entire New Testament), even the minutest points must be of some moment. At the least, they are of the kind of work that Horace calls "the labor of the file;" and they come within Browning's demand for exactness. But of much greater significance are the internal changes that have to do with the meaning of the several words, and their grammatical relation to each other, and the structure of the sentences; and, especially, the reproduction of the thought. These changes range from the minor words to the most important, from the articles, the particles, the conjunctions, the prepositions, to the crucial verbs and substantives; to the grammatical structure of the sentences, and to the logical coherence of the discourse. Many of these things in the Authorized and the Revised changed, usually for the better; but many equally important things that ought to have been changed, it did not touch; and it sometimes introduced errors of its own.

To verify these statements of the inaccuracies, in both the Authorized and the Revised, it is necessary to give specific illustrations; and the Epistle to the Romans will answer as well as any other part of the Bible.

For example: The first eleven verses of the sixth chapter, though not more marked than many other passages, furnish instances of error (in both translations) for the correction of which the reader may consult the present translation, and the commentary on the passage. 1. We begin with a minor infelicity in the translations, as shown in the unlike renderings for the dative case. In verse 2 we read, "We died *to* sin;" and in verse 10, "He died *unto* sin." In both places the Greek is the same; and the meaning is the same; and the translation should be the same: "We died *to* sin; he died *to* sin;" not *unto* sin, but *to* sin; that is, *to, as to, as regards*; for which, see the commentary. 2. In the fourth verse is a more serious mistake in the meaning of one of the important words. Both translations read, "That we also might walk in *newness* of life"—as if the word meant in a *moral* transformation, or regeneration. But the word "also" associates us with Christ, who did not experience a moral transformation. The translation should run, "That we also may walk in *renewal* of life"—that is, in a judicial restoration to a new career. 3. The fifth verse reads, "We have become united with him *by the like-*

ness of his death." But these words are absolutely destitute of meaning; and the translation should run, "in the sameness with his death." 4. The seventh verse reads, "He that hath died is justified from sin." Here is a double error in the tenses of the verbs: The first verb is in the historical aorist; the second in the present perfect. The translation should run, "He that *died* [with Christ] *has been justified* from sin." 5. The ninth verse reads, "Christ *being raised* from the dead dieth no more." The translation, if not wrong, is, at best, ambiguous. The participle is not in the present tense, denoting a present action, but in the aorist, denoting a complete action; and it should be translated, "Christ *having been raised*." Other instances are common of the same ambiguity. For example, in Rom. iii, 24, and v, 1, we read the same words, "being justified," as the translation of two different Greek words. In the first passage, in which the Greek participle is in the present tense, and expresses a continuous action, the Revised translates, "For all have sinned, and fall short of the glory of God, *being justified* freely by his grace." (Rom. iii, 24.) This translation, though verbally possible, is ambiguous; and the translation should run, "For all sinned, and come short of the approval of God, *becoming justified* (in each successive instance), gratis, by his grace." In the second passage, in which the Greek participle is in the aorist tense, and expresses a completed action, the Revised translates, "Being justified by faith, let us have peace with God." But this translation, too, though verbally possible, is ambiguous; and the translation should run, "*Having been justified* from faith, we have peace with God."

These are some only of the inaccuracies which lie on the surface in the translations of this passage; and many such can be found throughout the epistle, and throughout the New Testament.

The treatment of the simple conjunctions gives us another illustration of the inaccuracies in the Authorized and the Revised. The simple continuative conjunctions in the Greek language are *καί* (or *τέ*), which always means *and*, and *δέ*, which always means *but*. This adversative sense of *δέ*, *but*, is not always very pronounced, but it is always felt by every Greek writer and reader. Plato and Paul never used *δέ* when they meant *and*; and no Greek writer ever used *καί* when he meant *but*. But this discrimination between the two words *καί* and *δέ* is quite disregarded in both the Authorized and the Revised. No one who finds the word *and* in either translation, can ordinarily decide which word it represents,

καί or *δέ*; for either makes sense, though never the same sense as the other. And sometimes it is of little moment which; yet always the exact meaning of the sentence, or the delicate shade of meaning, turns on the conjunction; and the translation ought always to show which Greek word it represents. A cursory examination of the Authorized translation of *Romans*, shows fifty-eight instances in which the Greek word *δέ*, *but*, is translated by *and*; and the Revised shows about the same number of mistranslations of *δέ*, either *and*, or *now*, or *so*, or *howbeit*, or some other of fifteen words, at the guess of the revisers. These words doubtless give variety to the revisers' English style; but they do not translate Paul's word, or express his precise concept in the sentence.

Happily, the more important conjunctions, the logical conjunctions of cause or of inference, are usually translated with a fair degree of correctness, in both the Authorized and in the Revised. Yet sometimes the revisers, in attempting the periodic style, in the place of Paul's simpler paratactic construction, have missed the proper English conjunction. Thus in *Rom. vi, 17*, Paul says, "But thanks be to God that ye were slaves of sin, *but* ye obeyed from the heart that type of doctrine into which ye were initiated." But this compound sentence with the simple conjunction *but*, the revisers replaced with a complex sentence, and used the wrong conjunction to express the apostle's adversative concept. They say, "But thanks be to God, that *whereas* ye were servants of sin, ye became obedient from the heart." But the word *whereas*, which means *because*, does not express the right dependence of the thought: the logical word that the revisers needed was *although*: "Thanks be to God, that *although* ye were servants of sin, ye became obedient from the heart."

There is another class of little words—the prepositions—on the exact meaning of which much often depends, but whose meanings are not always correctly expressed in the Authorized and the Revised. These translations frequently use the same English preposition to express different Greek constructions, and frequently different English prepositions to express the same Greek construction. We have already seen that they use both the words *to* and *unto* to express the relation of the Greek dative case. Careful writers in English use the word *unto* (or *into*), to denote (among other concepts), the motion, or tendency, that is expressed in Greek by the preposition *εἰς*. But the Authorized and the Revised know nothing about these nice distinctions. In this

epistle, the Revised uses the word *unto* thirty-three times to translate the dative case. An illustration of this confusion of the two words is found in Rom. iv, 3. The Revised translates, "Abraham believed God, and it was reckoned *unto* him *for* righteousness." Here the Greek pronoun *αὐτῷ* is in the dative case, without any preposition, and the Greek substantive for "*righteousness*" is the object of the preposition *εἰς*. Both prepositions in the English are wrong; and the translation should run, "It was reckoned *to* him *unto* justification." Again, in Rom. i, 17, the Authorized reads, "—revealed *from* faith *to* faith," in which the first preposition [*ἐκ*] is correct, the second [*εἰς*] is wrong. The Revised reads the words "—revealed *by* faith *unto* faith," in which the first preposition is wrong, the second correct. The translation should run, "—is revealed, *from* faith, *unto* faith."

Another, and more significant error is found in Rom. iv, 25. Both the Authorized and the Revised translate the passage, "Who was delivered *for* our offenses [Rev., trespasses], and was raised again *for* our justification." The Greek preposition in both clauses is *διὰ*, which always looks to the past; and its proper meaning is "on account of," and it does not mean *for* in any proper sense of the English word. Most English readers inevitably interpret the second clause as meaning, "*with a view to* our justification;" or, "*for the sake of bringing about* our justification," as if the justification were to be a result of the Savior's resurrection. But the only meaning the word *διὰ* can have in the first clause is "*on account of* our past offenses;" and this is the only meaning, also, of the preposition in the second clause; and the sense is, that Christ's resurrection was because of our justification. The clauses are parallel after the Hebrew model; and the correct translation gives the verse an entirely different turn from that of the old translations. The translation should run, "He was delivered [to death] *on account of* our trespasses; and he was raised again *on account of* our justification;" that is, because, by his vicarious death, he had wrought out our justification.

But this same ambiguous English preposition "*for*" is mustered into service by the old translations in an entirely different sense, as the translation, or mistranslation, of another Greek preposition, *ὑπέρ*, "*instead of*." In 2 Cor. v, 14, the Authorized translates, "We thus judge [judged] that if one died *for* all, then were all dead [all died]; and he died *for* all, that they which live should not henceforth live *unto* [to¹] themselves, but *unto* [to] him

which died *for* them, and rose again." Now, in these three clauses, the preposition is the same (*ὑπέρ*); and the translation *for*, thrice repeated, is, perhaps, verbally correct, though it is ambiguous. The Pauline concept in the passage is clearly that Christ's death was substitutionary, though the translation does not make this as explicit as it ought to have done.

In the first two clauses, the revisers translate the prepositions correctly, "*for*" [that is *instead* of]; but the last clause they translate, "but unto [to] him, who *for their sakes* died and rose again." This translation for this word *ὑπέρ*, *for their sakes*, is frequently correct in other connections, but it is not self-consistent or possible in this connection. If in the third clause of this verse, this preposition means "*for their sakes*," it ought also to be so translated in the *first* clause, "one died *for the sake* of all; therefore all died." But such a proposition is not Pauline; it is a logical inconsequence, a *non-sequitur*, too bold for even the revisers to admit it. Clearly this is not Paul's meaning. Clearly the revisers' change of the word in the third clause is not a *translation*, but a *commentary*; and worse, it is a commentary that perverts the evangelical teaching of Christ's death as a substitution *in the place* of man, to the un-Pauline teaching that his death is a mere humanitarian sacrifice of himself, like that of the proto-martyr, or of Paul himself, or of any other of the noble army of confessors, who have died *for the sake* of man. Clearly the revisers have emptied the passage of the one meaning which makes it precious to the believer in Christ's vicarious atonement. Clearly the translation (omitting the word *if* from the Greek text), should run, "We thus judged that One died *instead* of all; therefore, they all died; and he died *instead* of all, that they that live should no longer live to themselves, but to him who *instead* of them died and rose again."

In the twentieth verse of this chapter (2 Cor. v, 20), the revisers repeat the same error in the translation of *ὑπέρ*. They say, "We are ambassadors *on behalf* of Christ; we beseech you *on behalf* of Christ, be ye reconciled to God. Him who knew no sin, he made to be sin *on our behalf*." It is difficult to conceive what meaning the words "on behalf of Christ" can have in this connection. Christ has no interests at stake that the ambassadors can safeguard. They do not benefit Christ, but represent him. And in the twenty-first verse it is difficult to understand what the apostle's words can mean except Christ's substitution in our

place. The translation (dropping the Hebraisms), should run, "We come ambassadors *instead of* Christ; we beseech you *instead of* Christ. Him who knows not sin, he made sinful *instead of* us, that we may become justified of God in him."

There is another instance, in Rom. viii, 3, in which this same Greek preposition *ὕπέρ* has troubled the revisers. They are not satisfied with the usual ambiguous rendering of the word, "for;" and the other explicit meaning "for the sake of" is clearly not appropriate here; and so, to relieve this embarrassment over the word *for*, they forget their single duty as *translators*, and add a commentary (without, however, including it in brackets). They translate the verse, "God sending [having sent] his own Son in the likeness of [the sameness with] sinful flesh, and *as an offering* for sin, condemned sin in the flesh." But there is nothing in the Greek, or in the concept of the passage, corresponding to the added words "as an offering." The difficulty of the revisers is imaginary; and, at any rate, is not lessened by the added words; the preposition "for," expresses precisely what it would without the interpolation. The connection makes everything clear, and Paul's words "for sin" mean simply "for the abolition of sin." The translation should run, "God, having sent his own Son in the sameness with the flesh of sin, and *for* sin, condemned [and abolished] the sin in the flesh."

Another frequent inaccuracy in the Authorized and the Revised is shown in their treatment of the definite article. The Greek article and the English article are nearly equivalent in their functions and constructions. But the Authorized seems to have had no law whatever to regulate the introduction or the omission of the article; it inserts it at random where it is absent from the Greek, and omits it at random where it is present in the Greek. The revisers also practically do the same thing in the body of the text, as if they too were without law in the matter of the article; yet sometimes, as if conscious that this text is wrong, they give an alternate translation in the margin, by noting that the article is, or is not, in the Greek. For example, in Rom. iii, 20, the revisers read in the text, "By [from] *the* works of *the* law shall [will] no flesh be justified in his sight; for through *the* law cometh *the* knowledge of sin." Here they insert the article four times; but note at the same time, in the margin, that the first three are wrong. All four are wrong. And similarly in very many places else. Thus, a rapid count shows that in the first eight chapters of

this epistle, they insert the article erroneously sixty times; in every one of which the apostle's exact meaning is lost. If the reader of the Revised follows the body of the translation, apart from the margin (as, of course, most readers do), he misses the sharp and significant discrimination which Paul always makes between a noun with the article, and the noun without the article; for example, between "the law" and "law." Thus, in Rom. ii, 13, the Authorized incorrectly reads: "Not the hearers of *the* law are just before God, but the doers of *the* law shall [will] be justified." But in this passage the revisers, noticing that the definite article is not in the Greek, but not recognizing either the Greek or the English anarthrous idiom, substitute the indefinite article, where the Authorized uses the definite article: "Not the hearers of *a* law are just before God, but the doers of *a* law shall [will] be justified." Of course, either article, definite or indefinite, perverts the apostle's sense; and the translation should run, "Not the hearers of law are just before God; but the doers of law will be justified."

∴ In some critical passages, the insertion of the article contrary to the Greek, completely obscures the apostle's meaning. The famous Resurrection chapter gives us a notable instance. The Revised translation reads, "Now [but] if Christ is preached that he hath been raised *from the dead*, how say some among you that there is no resurrection *of the dead*? (1 Cor. xv, 12.) The apostle is usually understood to teach, in these words, the *general* resurrection of the dead; but such is not his cue in this place; he is simply reporting the error of certain Corinthians who once "received his preaching that Christ *died*, and was buried, *and arose*; and who still stand in this faith," yet inconsistently "say that there is no resurrection." And so Paul is not arguing here that because Christ rose, *all the dead* will rise; though that is true in itself, and is a doctrine which he had already taught the Corinthians, and abundantly sets forth elsewhere. The Greek here has no article, and the word "dead men" in the expression, "no resurrection of dead men," is not enumerative, but *descriptive* of a class. All that Paul here implies is, that *if* Christ, a dead man, arose, then a resurrection *of dead men* is not impossible. The single instance of such a resurrection establishes the possibility; and the insertion of the article misses the point of the sentence. The translation should run, "But if Christ is preached that he has been raised from dead men, how say some among you, that there is no resurrection *of dead men*?"

A similar instance of this error in the insertion of the article, and obscuration of the meaning, is found in Acts xvii, 32. The Revised translation reads, "Now [but] when they heard of the resurrection *of the dead*, some mocked." But there is no article here in the Greek; and the translation should run, "But when they heard of a resurrection *of dead men*, some began to mock."

These are instances, which might be indefinitely multiplied, of the failures in both the Authorized and in the Revised to express the exact meaning of the Greek. But besides the mistakes in expressing the *meaning* of the Greek, these translations are open to continuous criticism on the score of their English *idiom*. One of their most regrettable errors in this direction is their expression of the future tense of verbs, an error which often gives an un-English turn to the meaning, and a lurid color to the sentiment, very different from that of the original. The marked discrimination in meaning and tone expressed by the two English auxiliaries of the future tense, *will* and *shall*, is one which the Greek language can not mark, but which the English language must make, in every instance, correctly or incorrectly. Macaulay says, "Not one Englishman in a million ever confounds his *will* and *shall*." But unfortunately for the exact sense of innumerable passages in the English Bible, and for its ethical tone, it is a discrimination that seems almost unknown, both to King James's translators and to the Canterbury revisers. In simple declarations, and in questions, of the first person, they usually have the right auxiliary; but in verbs of the second and third persons, they generally manage to get the auxiliary verbs wrong; they use *shall* instead of *will*. For example, in this saying from Christ, the Authorized translates, "He that believeth *shall* be saved; but he that believeth not *shall* be damned" (Mark xvi, 16); and in this saying from Paul it translates, "If ye live after the flesh, ye *shall* die; but if ye mortify the deeds of the body, ye *shall* live" (Rom. viii, 13). With these translations, the Revised substantially and wholly agrees; and in hundreds of similar constructions. But in these passages this autocratic word *shall* expresses, to an English reader, that it is the *purpose* of Christ and of Paul that the results be brought about: "He *shall* be damned;" "ye *shall* die." But a correct English idiom in all these places requires the milder predictive auxiliary *will* in the place of the obligative *shall*. And the translation should run, "He that believes not *will* be condemned;" and "If ye live after the flesh, ye *will* die." Unfortu-

nately, these, and similar sentences, which are but the pathetic exclaim of a prophet, are usually, as the compulsive word *shall* suggests, betoned and emphasized by the reader, even in the pulpit, as the stern dicta of a lawgiver or a judge. When Christ wept over Jerusalem, he was not in a mood to denounce its ruin, as the Revised makes him say, "The days of affliction *shall* come upon thee." To his eye, coming events cast their shadows before: he saw, and *wept*, and said, "If thou hadst but known! for the days of calamity *will* come." (Luke xix, 43.) This violation of English idiom is found, usually many times, in every chapter of the four Gospels (with only eight exceptions, in which there was no occasion for the mistake: Matt. xiv; Mark v, xv; Luke xxiv; John ii, ix, xviii, xx).

A remarkable illustration of this wrong use of *shall* instead of *will*, is found in the twenty-fourth chapter of Matthew, in which both the Authorized and the Revised give many times over, this incorrect meaning and this unhappy tone to the Lord's lamentations over Jerusalem. In the fifty-one verses of this chapter they use the word *shall* fifty-seven times; of which, just fifty are incorrect. In the whole chapter there is, in the Authorized, but one solitary instance in which the word *will* is used correctly (copied from Tyndale, by inadvertence): "For where the carcass is, there *will* the vultures be gathered together." (Verse 28.) And the Revised (was it by another inadvertence?) gives also the forty-seventh verse correctly: "He *will* set him over all that he hath." In these errors, King James's translators were perhaps less to blame three hundred years ago, before *will* and *shall* became so sharply discriminated; but the Canterbury revisers, in the year 1881, are not pardonable for perpetuating all these old and sinister blunders in the English of the twentieth century.

I come now to some matters personal, and to the use of the odious pronoun I.

With the conviction that the old translations, in many places and in many ways, do not express the exact sense of the Greek, I have attempted in this translation to reproduce for my readers, literally and exactly, in as good English as the Greek permits, the apostle's turn of thought and turn of expression. And I have written the commentary to justify the translation, and to expound the apostle's meaning. Of course, I do not expect or desire to displace the King James, and the Canterbury, from their place in the family and in the pulpit, though this corrected translation is

adapted to these offices also. Its only claim to recognition is that it is better fitted than the standard translations for the closet and for the study.

I hope that the reader will have no difficulty in understanding the language and the connection of thought in the translation; and that the student will be able to comprehend, if not to accept, the exegesis given in the commentary. I have made the way easier for him in the latter by the fact that, as a teacher, accustomed to the many repetitions of the class-room, I have not hesitated, at the risk of overfullness, to repeat many times, in varied form, the less obvious but more important points in the apostle's discussion, and in my exegesis of them; as, for example, the relation of the Gentiles to the plan of salvation, and the Pauline concept of the gospel of Christ. Thus, in almost every part of the book, the reader will find the apostle's views more or less fully canvassed and expressed.

In the exegesis of this epistle, I accept, without dissent, what I think to be its teachings. If Paul is mistaken in his theology, or his philosophy, as some advanced critics believe, that is not my present concern. I do not hold myself responsible for a *defense* of his views, as if debatable, but only for an *explanation* of his views. Whatever Paul teaches is, for the present issue, "orthodox" and final. As a patient scholar of the Master, and of the great apostle, I have reached conclusions as to the meaning of the gospel, and the meaning of this epistle, that *seem* to me to be very satisfactory. I do not see any weak place, or places, in my interpretation; and I have therefore set forth my views, in the main, as confidently as if there were no different views. I shall be gratified if they commend themselves to the minds of others as at least self-consistent, if not satisfactory. Yet I do not expect unanimity on debatable points, and I frankly concede that I may sometimes be mistaken in my conclusions. It will not be an unprecedented experience that an expositor of this epistle should be wrong. But we may all accept Hooker's thought about the Scriptures: "Let us not think that, as long as the world doth endure, the wit of man shall be able to sound the bottom of that which may be concluded out of the Scriptures." (Eecl. Polity, I, xiv, 2.)

I have avoided the display of learning. It would be easy "to quote the original;" but for ordinary readers (of whom I hope to have many), and even for experts, I prefer, except in a few critical instances, to present, not the *processes* of scholarship, but the

results. The few Greek and Hebrew words found in the book, are given not for parade, but for easier reference, for those who understand them; and others may easily pass them by, without interrupting the continuity of the discussion.

This book does not appeal to the great scholars and exegetes for its right to be, or for approval. I am glad so often to be in agreement with others, whom I honor, but whom, nevertheless, I have not copied. In most cases, I have *worked* out the common result. On the other hand, I often differ from the exegetes; yet I rarely pause to defend my views. In most places I am content to let the translation and the commentary stand on their own independent merits, modest contributions to the study of one of the world's great books.

Finally, I have not waged a polemic, either exegetical or doctrinal, against others; and I have antagonized views, different from those of the commentary, only where the difference is vital; as, for example, in the difference between Paulinism and Calvinism.

INTRODUCTION.

The Epistle to the Romans is a discussion of the relation of the Gentile world to God's plan of salvation.

This discussion was incidental to the apostle's circumstances. The synagogue believed that no one could be saved except the Jews; and all the early believers in Christ, being Jews, held traditionally the same conviction. Paul was the first Jew, the first Christian, to accept and to teach the equality of the Gentiles with the Jews, and this epistle is his defense of the rights of the Gentiles against the Jewish assumption that excluded them from the Church, and from the chance of salvation. Paul's discussion in this epistle involves two questions, which, however, in his treatment of them, so intertwine with each other, as practically to constitute but one; namely, Who may be saved? and, On what conditions may they be saved? These are the essential points in this discussion; everything else, whether in the course of the main argument in the first eleven chapters, or in the side issues in the supplementary chapters, is incidental to his one theme.

RANGE OF THE DISCUSSION.

The discussion is definitely restricted to these limits. But many writers not seeing that the discussion lies wholly within the limits named, and thinking to do more honor to the apostle, describe the compass and the structure of the epistle in exaggerated terms. For example (to mention only some, of different schools, of the recent copyists of the old opinions in the same direction), Gifford, in the *Speaker's Commentary*, says: "This epistle furnishes a general and systematic statement of Christian doctrine." Olshausen says: "It contains a complete system of divinity, since all the essential topics of the gospel are here developed at length." And Shedd says: "It contains, in itself, a whole body of divinity, and is even so encyclopedic in its structure that

the human mind need not go outside of this epistle in order to know all religious truth." But these assertions clearly show that the writers had only the vaguest apprehension of the subject of the epistle, or of Paul's management of the argument. Such extravagance injures the cause of the truth. It leads the sober reader who finds for himself no such general didactic in the epistle, to think that he has misunderstood the apostle, and, perhaps, is incapable of understanding him; or, worse, it tempts him to abandon the study of the epistle, discouraged, if not dazed, by its supposed abstruseness. It is thus that even Coleridge declares, that, "The Epistle to the Romans is the most profound work in existence; it undoubtedly is, and must be, very obscure to the ordinary reader."

SUBJECT NOT ABSTRUSE.

But the subject matter of the epistle is not abstruse; and though there are some difficulties in the treatment of the theme, owing to the brevity and compactness of the argument, and to its remoteness from the modern topics of theology, yet to one who recognizes the apostle's aim, the apostle is not obscure; and it is not difficult as a whole to understand. Peter's "hard places" in his brother Paul's letters, were probably matters of debated theology, and not of thought. (2 Pet. iii, 16.) The apostle of the circumcision understood the apostle of the uncircumcision only too well.

NOT A BODY OF DIVINITY.

The Epistle to the Romans is not, as these critics have thought, a body of divinity, or a discussion of Christian experience. The sole intent of the apostle was to maintain the equality of the Gentiles against the assumption of the Jews. It could not have been his purpose, in this epistle, to give a systematic exposition of the gospel; for, first, at this early date, before any of the Gospels was written, Paul had not sufficiently thought the Christian theology out, to be able to discuss it systematically, as modern theologians, with the help of the entire New Testament, are able to do in our scientific method; and, secondly, there are, in fact, many leading subjects in Biblical theology that this epistle does not touch on at all, or, at the most, barely touches on; including such fundamental points as penitence for sin, conversion, forgiveness, adoption, regeneration, sanctification, all matters of practical

religion, and all eschatological issues. The writer had before him but a single and very distinct theme—the rights of the Gentiles before God; and his discussion confined to this one theme is simple, direct, and coherent, and leads the reader to a clear and satisfactory understanding of the matter in debate, and of it alone. From this line of thought, the apostle never deviated; he never introduced irrelevant matter. He knew just what he wanted to say, and he said it.

ERRONEOUS ANALYSIS OF THE EPISTLE.

The exegetes who think the epistle a systematic treatise on divinity, make, in general terms, the first five chapters a discussion of the doctrine of justification from faith, and the next three chapters a discussion of the doctrine of sanctification. But this division of the epistle is purely fanciful; and completely misses the one practical issue which runs through the whole discussion; namely, that, in God's plans, the Gentiles stand on a perfect equality with the Jews. Beyond doubt, in establishing this truth, the apostle needed to insist upon the one fundamental doctrine, that there is but one method of justification before God, the same for Jews as for Gentiles—the justification from faith, and not from works. But he does not isolate this doctrine from other doctrines, and then discuss them seriatim; for this one doctrine runs through the whole of the epistle, in one part as much as in the other; yet, while fundamental in theology, it stands here only as a subordinate issue to the dominant question, Who then may be saved? Is it Jews only? or, Are Gentiles also salvable? And the great doctrine, the Biblical doctrine of sanctification, he does not discuss at all, and scarcely even alludes to it. These two issues, Who are salvable, and, On what condition, the apostle, with only incidental digressions, keeps constantly before his mind. Of these two issues, one is the great central thought of the epistle, that God took all men, Gentiles as well as Jews, equally into his eternal plans; the other is that the condition upon which all men, Jews as well as Gentiles, come into this gracious relation, is faith in the provisions of the gospel. Yet these two lines of thought are not treated separately, or consecutively, but are woven together as the discussion goes on, and unite as the warp and woof of one perfect web.

But this narrowing of the range of the discussion does not detract from the greatness of the epistle, or lessen its value to

the Church. It remains one of the world's great masterpieces; great in its subject, great in its style, great in its majestic thought, great in its influence over the theology of the Church. Though not a system of divinity, it easily holds the highest place in Christian literature. Only the Fourth Gospel, though occupying an entirely different field of thought, can rank as the equal of the Epistle to the Romans.

THE EPISTLE CONTROVERSIAL.

The epistle is not didactic, or not that mainly; rather it is controversial, a forensic defense, before the tribunal of the human conscience, of the equity of the gospel plan; the apology of one who would justify the ways of God to man. Paul holds that God's dealings with man aimed, from the first, at the salvation of all men alike, on uniform and equitable conditions. And it is in view of the equitableness of God's plan that the apostle declares that "he is not ashamed of the gospel of Christ." The advocate of *such* a gospel, he can look men in the face, without blushing for God who planned the gracious and generous scheme, and without blushing for himself as the ambassador of God, as he presses home upon their consciences, the divine fair dealing which, unlike the Jewish exclusiveness, gives *every* man, the Gentile as well as the Jew, an equal chance.

THE ISSUE ONLY AN INCIDENT TO THE GOSPEL.

This epistle, far from being a complete system of divinity, is, in fact, the discussion of only an incident to the gospel; an incident of large, practical moment, doubtless, to the apostle's readers of that day, but of little moment, *in itself*, to the readers of the present day. The Church of Christ has gotten beyond the need of that discussion. But aside from the settlement of the matter then in issue, whether the Gentiles might be saved, the apostle, happily for the Church, introduces much other evangelical truth, the foundation of all Christian theology. It is this that gives the epistle its great and enduring value.

CAN GENTILES BE SAVED? ON WHAT TERMS?

The theme of the epistle is announced in the words, "For the gospel is God's power unto salvation, to EVERY ONE that HAS FAITH, both JEW AND GENTILE. For in it is revealed God's PLAN OF JUSTIFICATION FROM FAITH, with a view to faith; as it has been written,

‘But the JUST FROM FAITH WILL HAVE LIFE’” (Rom. i, 16, 17.) The words here given in SMALL CAPITALS mark the crucial points in this epistle, exclusive of all other great themes in Christian theology. The apostle does not discuss, What is the gospel? nor, What are its great doctrines? but simply the two salient points before named. Those constantly interlace with each other, yet foremost to Paul’s mind stands the one great question, Who are embraced in the provisions of God’s plan? Are Jews only the subjects of his gracious purpose? or, *are Gentiles also admissible to its privileges?* “Is God God of Jews only? IS HE NOT GOD OF GENTILES ALSO?” And then rises to his mind the other point (which is not second in intrinsic importance, but merely in its subordinate moment in this discussion), On what basis, under the gospel plan, may Gentiles be justified? Is it from works of law, as the Jews held for themselves? or is it from faith in Christ? To these questions, Paul answers, “Yes, God is God of Gentiles also; and Gentiles [and the Jews, too] are justified not from works of law, but from faith in Jesus Christ.” These words show Paul’s understanding of the scope of the divine plan, and of the method of salvation. And this is really the only issue in the whole discussion, the issue, apart from which the apostle had no occasion to write the Epistle to the Romans. He wanted to show them, in antagonism to the current Jewish belief, that the divine plan, dating from the eternal ages, was as wide as the race. It contemplated not the Jews only (as they thought), or mainly; but *the Gentiles* first and foremost, before there were any Jews.

THE PROMISE TO ABRAHAM.

Such is Paul’s interpretation of the gracious and large promise made to Abraham, the man of faith, while he was yet in uncircumcision: “And the Scripture having foreseen that God would justify *the Gentiles* from faith, of old preached the gospel to Abraham, that, In thee will all the Gentiles be blessed.” (Gal. iii, 8.) This salvation of the Gentile world (which at first was *all* the world) was the great end for which God established his Church in the world, and his covenant with Abraham.

CALL OF THE JEWS.

The call of the Jews, which was an after-plan, and the giving of the law on Sinai, four hundred and thirty years still later, did not suspend, or amend, or modify, the simple and all-comprehen-

sive promise to the father of the faithful. Judaism was not the end for which God established his Church (though the Jews arrogated this to themselves); it was only a provisional arrangement to further his world-plan for the rest of mankind. Under this arrangement the Jews were elect, not for themselves alone, or mainly, but that, as a missionary Church, they might bring back the lapsed Gentile world to God. The Hebrew Scriptures are full of announcements to the Jewish Church to this effect: "I will give thee for a light to the Gentiles, that my salvation may be unto the end of the earth" (Isa. xlix, 6); "The Gentiles shall come to thy light, and kings to the brightness of thy rising" (Isa. lx, 3). Yet the Jews, though elect for this work, never met the divine expectation; and our apostle tells us that "God was long minded to show his wrath at their disobedience, and only with much long-suffering endured those Jewish vessels of wrath, fitted for destruction; and endured them, not for themselves, but only that through them he might make known the riches of his gospel upon the Gentile vessels of mercy, which he of old prepared unto glory." (Rom. ix, 22.) But the Jews, forgetful of the reason of their call, and proud of their election, came at last to count all these privileges an endowment exclusively for themselves. They considered the promise to the fathers an indefeasible right, with which all outside the covenant had no concern, and which, once granted to themselves, not even God could justly wrest away. (Rom. ix, 14.) It was a covenant which held good for all Jews, however personally unworthy. Every Jew was to be saved because he was a Jew. None of any other nation could be saved because he was not a Jew. One of their own writers expressed these views: "O Lord, thou madest the world for our sakes; as for the rest of the nations born from Adam, thou hast said that they are nothing." (2 Esdras vi, 55.) This arrogant failing of the Jews never changed. Later on, when Paul made his defense to the Jews, they listened until he announced his mission to the Gentiles. "To the *Gentiles!* At this word they lifted up their voice, and said, Away with such a fellow from the earth; it was not fit that he should live." (Acts xxii, 22.)

THE DIVINE PLAN INCLUDED THE GENTILES.

In entire accord with the Divine plan for the Gentile world were all prophetic voices from the beginning down. Some of those older testimonies Paul quotes in the tenth chapter of this

epistle; and, if he had needed to re-enforce his argument in this direction, he might, with equal pertinence, have quoted a large part of the Hebrew prophets. Whether the prophets themselves, Jews in nationality and thought, fully understood what they were saying, with regard to the Gentile world, or not, there is at least no dissonance in the tenor of their utterances.

And Christ himself, during all his ministry, so preached this gospel of universal embrace. He told the Jews: "Other sheep I have [the outlying Gentile world] which are not of this Jewish fold. Them also I must bring, and there will be one flock and one shepherd." (John x, 16.) No single word of his declared or implied that the gospel was restricted to the Jews. He constantly and consistently spoke and acted on the assumption that mankind are all of one. And his final word was to declare once more this truth, once more in explicit terms to enforce it upon the understanding and the conscience of his disciples, soon to become his apostles to the world: "Go into ALL the world, and preach the gospel to EVERY creature." (Mark xvi, 15.)

THE TWELVE DID NOT UNDERSTAND.

But the apostles, who were sent on this mission before Paul, did not rise to this lofty conception of the gospel, as it reveals itself in their own Scriptures, in the words of their Master, and in Paul's life work and in his writings. So far as we know, not one of the twelve, until after the fall of Jerusalem, ever preached the gospel to any Gentile, with the single exception of Cornelius, who, though uncircumcised, was already a proselyte to the Jewish faith. Not even Peter, to whom was intrusted this greatest of all Christian opportunities, learned the lesson which this incident at Cæstarea was designed to put before him beyond misunderstanding, the lesson that the gospel was intended for the Gentile world, equally with the Jews themselves, and that they should call no man common or unclean. But the apostles and the Church at Jerusalem scarce thought of the case of Cornelius with any forbearance; and seem to have counted it as exceptional, or at least not to be acted upon as yet; and there they quietly rested. Not any more after the conversion of Cornelius than before did they recognize the Gentiles as entitled to admission into fellowship with the Jews; and they did not seek Gentile proselytes even of the type of Cornelius. With this exception, from the day of Pentecost till the destruction of Jerusalem, forty years later, no Gen-

tile was ever baptized into communion with Jewish believers. On the contrary, so pronounced was the bias of the apostles towards their own people exclusively, so decided was this aversion towards the Gentiles, and so unsympathetic was their attitude towards Paul himself, and his Gentile converts, that only after hesitation and debate, did they nominally recognize his apostolate to the Gentiles, and concede the abstract right of the Gentiles to a place in Paul's Churches. After Paul's defense of himself at the council at Jerusalem, and after conciliatory speeches by Peter and James, all that the council conceded was to let the Gentiles severely alone. And it was finally arranged and covenanted between these apostles and Paul, as a *modus vivendi*, that "James and Peter and John, who thought themselves to be pillars, should go to the circumcision, and Paul and Barnabas to the uncircumcision." (Gal. ii, 9.) John lived long enough to change his attitude towards the Gentiles, and for the last thirty years of his life was the bishop of the Gentile diocese of Ephesus; and he is the only writer of the New Testament who speaks of "the Jews" with any bitterness. But Peter and James seem to have practically adhered to this arrangement. Their subsequent history does not credit them with any work among the Gentiles; and their epistles, addressed expressly to Jews only, touch none of the grave issues with which Paul's letters are weighted. They speak, in their epistles, as if they knew naught of the rights of the great Gentile world—the burden of Paul's soul, the burden of his preaching and writings. Their epistles ignore the audience which Paul addressed; ignore, in fact, the only readers that now read them,—the Gentiles.

THE CALL OF PAUL.

Up to the day of Peter's unhappy choice of the Jews as against the Gentiles, he had been incontestably the leader in the new dispensation. From that day he sank out of sight in New Testament history. Another man took his primacy in the Church, as the molder of its policy, the master mind in Christian thought. The once mother Church, hiding itself from the world beneath the shadow of the temple at Jerusalem, ceased to be cosmopolitan, and became provincial, and then disappeared; but long before that time, the Church of Christ, the true mother of missions, found its real home beneath the humble tent of the great apostle of the Gentiles. Paul's inauguration to this work was announced from the moment of his conversion: "He is a chosen vessel to me, to

bear my name before Gentiles, and kings, and sons of Israel." (Acts ix, 15.) Himself a Jew, a Pharisee, a zealot for the traditions, a persecutor of the believers, he at once abandoned his prejudices against the Gentiles, and accepted the gospel doctrine of the common Fatherhood of God, the equal brotherhood of man. He counted his circumcision as nothing; he became a Gentile in thought, sympathies, life; he held all men, of whatever race, as his brethren in the Lord, and spent his life in evangelizing the Gentile world. He demonstrated from the Hebrew Scriptures the universality of God's plan of old, the equal atonement of Christ, and the justification of the Gentiles with God, not, as the Jews boasted for themselves, from works of law, but from faith in the Lord Jesus, the saving faith that antedated the law, and was higher than the law. He won for the Gentiles an equal place in the Church of Christ; he planted Gentile Churches over the Roman world; and when he died, in A. D. 67, Judaism had ceased, everywhere outside of Jerusalem, to be an antagonizing and obstructive power to the cause of the Gentiles. And then, three years later, Jerusalem fell; and all Jewish opposition fell with it; and the Pauline gospel of the Gentiles stood triumphant.

PAUL'S LETTERS.

Paul tells us of his labors, his journeyings, his perils by his countrymen and by false brethren, his persecutions, his distresses; and, besides those things that are without, that which pressed upon him daily, his anxiety for all the Churches. But he nowhere names that which to us is of infinitely more moment than these personal incidents of the day,—*the letters which he wrote to the Churches*. How unconscious this much-enduring man of the rich literary legacy he was leaving to the Church and the world! These letters, at least so many as have come down to us, probably but a small part of the whole number, are few and not long. But they have controlled the thought and the faith of the world. How different without them would dogmatic Christianity now be, if, indeed, there had been any dogmatic Christianity without them!

These letters are the outgrowth of Paul's controversy with the Jews of the Synagogue, and with the Judaizers in the Christian Church. They are full of this issue; some of them are restricted to this one subject. Without keeping this controversy foremost in mind, the reader of these epistles is sure to miss the point of the discussion if not wholly misinterpret the greater part of what he

reads. This is the master-key to a consistent and satisfactory exegesis of the Epistles to the Romans, the Galatians, and the Ephesians; and, indeed, of the most of the Pauline writings and theology. He who would rightly understand these epistles, and comprehend the gospel which Paul preached, and which he justly called "*My gospel*"—*My* presentation of the gospel of Christ, as discriminated from the gospel of Peter and James—must recognize this controversy as the prominent fact in his life.

STRUGGLE AGAINST JUDAISM.

The circumstances in the early Church at the time of Paul's conversion, and call to the apostleship of the Gentiles, were peculiar. There were already in the Church "great multitudes of believers," and even "a great company of priests were obedient to the faith," but those early Christians, all *Jews*, in accepting Christ, and trusting in him for the forgiveness of sins, did not repudiate their obligation to the ritual law, and inconsistently, still relied on circumcision as a saving ordinance. And they still held, like all other Jews, to their exclusive right to the covenant, and still cherished antipathy towards the Gentiles. But Paul was an exception; he espoused the unpopular cause. With regard to himself, he tells us, that, "When God was pleased to reveal his Son in me, that *I may preach him among the Gentiles*, immediately I conferred not with flesh and blood." (Gal. i, 16.) He had no compromise to make with the Jews at large, none with the other apostles, or with his fanatical brethren, none even with himself. He went clean over to Christianity. He burned the bridges behind him. To him the rites of Moses, the creed of the Synagogue, lost their value: "For in Christ Jesus neither circumcision avails anything, nor uncircumcision, but faith [in the Lord Jesus Christ] working through love." (Gal. v, 6.) He preached the lesson which he had once heard Stephen preach, "That Jesus will destroy this place, and will abolish the customs which Moses delivered to us Jews" (Acts vi, 14); and he preached an open gospel to the Gentiles.

Wherever Paul preached this gospel, he came into collision with the unbelieving Jews. They sought to kill him as an apostate from Moses; "in prisons more abundantly, in stripes above measure, in deaths often; of the Jews five times received I forty stripes save one; thrice was I beaten with rods; once was I stoned." (2 Cor. xi, 23.) And even his own brethren in the faith bitterly opposed his views. Instead of extending sympathy and help, they

followed him with aversion and persecution; they denied his authority as an apostle, and strove to hinder his special work among the Gentiles. Emissaries, pretending the authority of Peter and James, taught his Churches, "Except ye become circumcised after the rite of Moses, ye can not be saved." (Acts xv, 1.) This struggle for the equality of the Gentiles with the Jews, in the plan of God, was the one subject that Paul had before him for discussion in this epistle. To him, as the apostle of the Gentiles, no issue could be more important; and it was this that made this one phase of "his gospel," strikingly polemic, impassioned, and copious.

This strife which prevailed everywhere, finally culminated at Antioch, which was already clearly the center of Gentile Christianity. The Church at Antioch appealed to the Apostolic Church at Jerusalem, for relief against this Jewish intermeddling; and after long discussion, the council, under the influence of Peter and James, although themselves conservative, recognized Paul's apostleship to the Gentiles, and proclaimed freedom to his converts from the obligation to the Jewish ritual. This decree was addressed expressly "to the brethren which are of the Gentiles;" and it was not intended to relieve *Jewish* believers, even in Paul's provincial Churches, from the yoke of the law. Perhaps Jewish believers did not wish the relief; their deliverance was yet to come. But freedom for the *Gentiles* was all that Paul demanded, or really expected. Yet the decision, though unanimous, did not free the apostle, or his Gentile Churches, from the clandestine and persistent interference of the Judaistic party at Jerusalem. They still attempted to obstruct his work among the Gentiles, and to pervert his converts. His letter to the Churches of Galatia, ten years later, shows that this strife had broken out afresh there, as, doubtless, in all his Churches. The contending parties in Corinth, "one party of Peter, and one party of Paul" (1 Cor. i, 10-12) were almost certainly arrayed against each other on this one issue. In his other epistles, Paul makes reference, scarcely less explicit, to the same condition of things in the several Churches addressed, in all of which were both Jews and Gentiles. To the Ephesians he says, "I beseech you to walk with all lowliness and meekness, *with longsuffering, forbearing one another*, giving diligence to keep the *unity of the Spirit* in the bond of peace. There is one body [not two parties], and one spirit, one Lord, one faith, one baptism [not circumcision, and ritual observances.]" (Eph. iv, 1-8.) To the Philip-pians he says, "Beware of the (Judaistic) dogs, beware of the evil

workers, beware of the concision [the Jewish manglers of the flesh], for *we* [Gentiles] are the circumcision." (Phil. iii, 3.) To the Colossians he says, "Take heed lest any [Judaizer] make spoil of you, through his philosophy and vain deceit, after the traditions of men, and not after Christ. For in *him* [not in the rite of Moses], ye were circumcised, not with [Jewish] circumcision made with hands, but in the circumcision of Christ." (Col. ii, 8-11.) How many more such letters he wrote, we do not know, but his mind was full of this debate. Evidently it was this same necessity that now, only a few months later than the Epistle to the Galatians, impelled him to write the sister Epistle to the Romans. Such was the occasion for this epistle, such its sole aim.

PURPOSE OF THE EPISTLE.

Paul tells the Romans that he had long "purposed in his spirit" to visit Rome. He had now, in the year 58, finished his Third Missionary Journey; and was on the point of going to Jerusalem with his collections for the saints, before his long-hoped for journey to Spain. He proposed to make Rome a point on his way to this new field; and he wrote this letter to announce his coming. But while sending this friendly greeting, he also took occasion to write at large of subjects with which his life and thoughts were full to overflowing. From such themes just at this period in his ministry, he could not refrain; and he knew that a discussion of these subjects would find an eager audience in the Romans.

These subjects were, of course, what they would surely expect the apostle of the Gentiles to discuss; subjects which some of them, doubtless, had already heard him discuss in his previous ministry,—the great question of the relation of the Gentiles to God's plans. Out of this long debate had finally come to him, in his own mind, a satisfactory solution of the great problems of the gospel—the atonement of Christ, its range, its all-sufficiency of itself, apart from Jewish "works of law," its peace and joy to the believer, and its final conquest of the world to the obedience of Christ. These views which overflowed from his own heart, he was sure would find acceptance with the Gentiles at Rome.

FOUNDING OF THE CHURCH AT ROME.

Of the founding of the Church at Rome we know but little. It is certain, however, that Peter was not, as the Catholic Church claims, the founder, in any sense, of the Church at Rome. We

know that, during all the twenty-five years falsely claimed for his episcopate at Rome, he was at Jerusalem, or elsewhere in Judea, at Antioch, and at Babylon. And if Peter ever went to Rome, it must have been after Paul wrote this epistle, and after Paul's imprisonment at Rome three years later, and just before Peter's own death. But the evidence against his ever having been at Rome is so strong that Protestant scholarship inclines to deny it altogether. Nor was any other of the twelve the founder. Paul always forbore to build on another man's foundation; and the Church at Rome had not the anti-Pauline bent that any other apostle would have given it. But it is certain, too, that Paul himself had not yet set foot on Italian soil, and was not the founder, unless in an indirect way. The probability is that the Christian movement at Rome was started years before this epistle by lay converts from Paul's other Churches. It was this indirect Pauline origin that predisposed the Romans to his teachings, and that gave him the apostolical authority over them, as being really one of his own Churches. The movement was doubtless insignificant at first, and grew only by slow accretions from outside, and by new converts at home. There is no mention of any ecclesiastic organization, or of Church officers, as elders or bishops. Yet they met together, at distinct centers, for congregational worship; they had gifts differing among themselves, according to the grace given them; and they must have had the sacraments of baptism and the Lord's Supper.

MIXED NATIONALITIES.

But whatever the origin of the Church, and whatever the date of its founding, it was, at the time Paul wrote this letter, largely composed of Gentiles, converts from Paul's provincial Churches throughout the Roman world. Paul addresses the Romans as Gentiles: "I received my apostleship, with a view to obedience to the faith, among all the Gentiles, among whom are ye also." (Rom. i, 5.) "That I may have some fruit among you also, as also among the rest of the Gentiles." (Rom. i, 13.) This is confirmed by the number of his salutations in the sixteenth chapter. But there were also some Jewish members, the minority of the Church. Those may have come directly from Jerusalem, or have been under indirect influences from Jerusalem, and so sympathized with the views of the mother Church; but more probably, like the Jewish Aquila and Priscilla, the greater number of these

also were from Paul's Churches, and so were not hostile to his teachings. Yet, naturally, as Jews they were more liable than the Gentile members to be influenced by anti-Pauline propagandism. But from whatever antecedents, certainly at the date of this letter there were these two parties at Rome, with racial prejudices and divergent views. They were living together as yet, apparently without blending, yet without quarreling; though as chapter xiv shows, not without chafing and jealousy. In this fact, as Paul felt, lay the danger of grave dissensions in the future, as in the Churches of Galatia. Indeed the tenor of the epistle, as a whole, and some of the points discussed in particular, show that the great issue between Jew and Gentile, which was at the front everywhere else in Paul's Churches, was already making itself manifest at Rome. The variance, however, had certainly not reached the acute stage; and so Paul does not write with the vehemence that he shows in the Epistle to the Galatians. But the general fact that Paul wrote such a letter at all to the Church at Rome, on the relations of Gentiles and Jews, and the specific fact that he warns the brethren against the (Judaistic) breeders of division (chapters xvi and xvii), is sufficient proof that the debate on the ritual observance of the law, which was agitated elsewhere in Paul's Churches, was beginning to be agitated, though less accentuated, at Rome also. Such was the occasion for this great letter. He wrote it that, by his apostolic authority and argument with men who had been converted under his preaching, he might decide this debate before it became embittered and rent the Church.

GOD'S GOVERNMENT AMONG THE NATIONS.

Over against the cherished views which Paul wished to present, he needed to combat and refute the concept of the Jews in regard to the character and method of God's government among men. He needed to show that the Jews, who assumed that they alone were God's elect, and that the divine plan did not contemplate or include the bringing in of the Gentiles, misunderstood God's plans, and misconceived of his sovereign government in human affairs.

To enter into the apostle's argument in this epistle, and especially in the long passage embracing the ninth, tenth, and eleventh chapters, we must recognize the fact that he clearly discriminates between two things that are essentially different,

but which the Jews always, and many loose thinkers in modern times, identified—God's government in the realm of providence and his government in the realm of spirit. God's government of the outward world belongs to the sphere of his providence. In this God is absolutely *sovereign*; that is, he decrees whatsoever comes to pass, as the result of his administration. In this providential administration of the world, he does as he will with men. He not only creates men and keeps them in being, but he assigns the historic places of man and of nations in the world; he promotes whom he will, yet always for cause, and not from caprice. And all these secular assignments are subject to change, and recall, and revisal, for cause; and always justly. Such are the principles of God's providential administration, which Paul applies to the case of the Jews and of the Gentiles. God dealt with the Jews as also with the Gentiles, racially, *en masse*; and therefore in the line of his providential government. God elected and called the Jews *en masse* to the privileges and opportunities of the theocratic kingdom and Church, that they might serve his purposes in the world. But they disappointed him; and he afterwards displaced them, and extended the same gracious election and call to the Gentile world *en masse*.

But there is another department of God's government: the sphere of his grace, or spiritual administration. In this second and higher department of God's action, he does not deal with men *racially, en masse, but individually*. Herein he makes no sovereign, that is, arbitrary, discrimination between the races of mankind, as the Jews thought, or between individuals of the races, severally, as Calvinists think. To him all men are alike; and his provisions for the salvation of all men are uniform, constant, the same for all, Jew and Gentile. His administration here moves on spiritual lines, and not on physical lines. In this moral, spiritual sphere God as a *legislator* prescribes (that is, enjoins, commands) the actions of men, as in the sphere of providence; but he does not exercise the control of a *sovereign* to enforce his will; he does not decree the actions of men. In this spiritual kingdom, man is the subject, not of physical government, but of moral government; free, independent, possessing the power of alternate choice and action.

If, as the Jews and Calvinists hold, God has decreed whatsoever comes to pass in the spiritual realm, as he has done in the realm of providence, man has no ethical character, is incapable of self-

determination, is not an amenable agent, *is a machine*. And it is of God's *providential* government in his dealings with the Jews and with the Gentiles, and of this only, that Paul speaks in this epistle. In regard to God's administration of the spiritual kingdom, and of its issues in the world to come, the apostle in this epistle makes no affirmation.

CLAIM OF THE JEWS UNSCRIPTURAL.

The law of Moses yielded no encouragement to the narrow, exclusive feeling of the Jews. But by long prescription, certain traditions and opinions of the fathers, dishonoring to God, and dishonoring to man, the creature of God, had become established, with all the force of Scripture, as the creed of the synagogue. Those unscriptural and anti-scriptural sentiments and beliefs of the Jews with regard to themselves on the one hand, and with regard to the Gentiles on the other, formed the great obstacle to Paul's work, whether among Jews or among Gentiles. But this old Jewish obstacle no longer troubles the Church of Christ. To us, in these days of Christian light, the question that was in issue between Paul and the synagogue, the question whether God cared spiritually for the Jews only; or also, and equally, for the Gentile world at large, has little personal concern. We are not agitated or disturbed by it as was the Church in the days of Paul. The question was answered long centuries ago; and thanks to this epistle mainly, so completely and finally answered, that most readers of Paul's epistles now, overwhelmingly Gentiles by birth, do not, in their vague apprehension of the apostle's meaning, at all suspect that it was once a question of vital and bitterest debate in the synagogue, and even in the Church of Christ (as yet wholly Jewish), whether Gentiles could be saved at all; and they do not realize that this is, in fact, the great question discussed in the epistle. That debate has been retired. The old Jewish heresy is dead. All Gentiles belong to Christ; all can be saved. Such is the teaching of the New Testament; such is the teaching of this epistle.

CALVINISM VERSUS PAULINISM.

But Augustine, and after him Calvin, not seeing the point of Paul's discussion, interpreted his language, spoken of God's administration of the kingdom of his providence, as if it were spoken of the kingdom of his grace; or rather, they did not recognize that

God had these two separate spheres of administration. They assumed that because God is sovereign, that is, exercises absolute physical control in the world of *providence*, he is sovereign in the same sense in the world of *grace*; and they thus confound the two spheres of his dealing with men. Such is the grave mistake that underlies the whole system of Calvinism.* The doctrine which Calvinism sets forth as the Pauline scheme of the gospel is intrinsically as inequitable and as unscriptural as that of the synagogue, and far more preposterous. The synagogue drew the line between the races very definitely, if very intolerantly. According to the teaching of the synagogue, God arbitrarily elected the Jews to eternal life *en masse*, and arbitrarily rejected the Gentiles *en masse*. This discrimination *en masse* is physical, and belongs to the sphere of God's providence, and not to the spiritual sphere of his grace. But while it is not defensible ethically, it is simple, definitive, and easily comprehended. But according to the teaching of Calvinism, God capriciously elected and predestinated particular individuals from all races to eternal life, and rejected the rest of mankind, and foreordained them to eternal damnation. This discrimination, too, is physical, not ethical or spiritual. It is as indefensible as that between Jews and Gentiles, but is more incomprehensible. The old Jewish conceit of God's government counted the parties in interest as *all Jews* VERSUS *all Gentiles*; the later Calvinistic conceit counted them as *certain elect individuals* VERSUS *innumerable reprobates*.

THE WESTMINSTER CONFESSION.

This is the view which Augustine first, and Calvin after him, essayed to impose upon the Church of Christ instead of the Pauline teaching in this epistle. This view the Westminster Assembly of Christian divines embodied, in 1645, in certain famous propositions, as execrable as can be conceived by the human mind. These propositions are logical inferences from the unscriptural doctrine of sovereign decrees, by which Calvinism affirms that God of old ordained the spiritual destiny of man. This belief leads

*Thus Dr. Hodge says: "It is undeniable that in his providence God acts as a sovereign. Augustinianism [that is to say, Calvinism] accords with these facts of providence; and therefore must be true [!]. It only [*only!*] assumes that God acts in the dispensation of his grace precisely as he acts in the dispensation of his other favors."—*Theology, II, 335.*

to so monstrous conclusions that even Calvin called this system of decrees "horrible."*

Some of those dreadful propositions are as follows:

"III. By the decree of God, for the manifestation of his glory, some men [the synagogue would have said *all the Jews*] are predestinated unto everlasting life, and others [again the synagogue would have said *all the Gentiles*] are foreordained to everlasting death."

"V. Those of mankind that are predestinated unto life, God, before the foundation of the world, according to his eternal and immutable purpose, hath chosen unto everlasting glory, out of his mere grace, without anything in the creature moving him thereto, and all to the praise of his glorious grace.

"VI. Neither are any other redeemed by Christ, effectually called, justified, adopted, sanctified, and saved, but the elect only.

"VII. The rest of mankind God was pleased, for the glory of his sovereign power over his creatures, to pass by, and to ordain them to dishonor and wrath for their sin, to the praise of his glorious justice."—Westminster Confession, chapter iii.

This doctrine of God's eternal decrees is unscriptural, unethical, unthinkable, untrue. It is an excrescence that mars an otherwise Christian creed. Calvinism is not germane to the Confession, and is not essential to its integrity. The rest of the Confession is, on the whole, evangelical, and (with the exception of a few dead flies in the ointment) is acceptable to all Christian Churches.

"ELECTION."

The question whether certain, particular men, throughout the world, are, by God's eternal decree, elect, favorites of heaven, and predestinated to eternal salvation; and all the rest of mankind, by the same decree, reprobates, under heaven's ban and

*"I again ask how is it that the fall of Adam involved so many nations, together with their infant children, in eternal death without remedy, unless that it so seemed meet to God. . . . Here the most flippant tongues must be silent. The decree, I admit, is dreadful [*decretum horribile fateor*]; but yet it is impossible to deny that God foreknew what the end of man was to be before he made him, and foreknew it because he had so foreordained it by his decrees. The first man fell because the Lord deemed it meet that he should. Why he deemed it meet we know not."—*Calvin's Institutes*, III, xxiii. 7. Calvin might have quoted his classic Juvenal: "*Hoc volo, sic jubeo, sit pro ratione voluntas.*" Sat. vi, 222.

foreordained to eternal damnation, is a question not agitated in this epistle (or anywhere else in the Scriptures); but emerges now in the Calvinistic misinterpretation of Paul's words and meaning. It is a question that was never conceived of by Paul himself, or by his Jewish antagonists, or even heard of by the Church for three centuries after the apostle's death. This is the grave question which Augustine and Calvin thrust upon the Church as the matter in issue in this epistle. Are, as those venerable Doctors taught, some individuals only of the race the so-called "elect," taken capriciously out of the mass of mankind at large, embraced in the provisions of the gospel? and are all the rest of the race, the so-called "reprobates," indiscriminately left outside of the "covenant of grace?" Or on the contrary, are, as Paul teaches, all of the race of Adam equally and fully redeemed, and equally elect and called to the privileges of the gospel, equally salvable on equal and equitable conditions?

Undoubtedly the Scripture speaks of an "election" as a feature of God's plan; and both the Jews and Paul recognized the election; but certainly not in the same sense. The Jews claimed that they were themselves the elect nation, apart from all other men, chosen of God and called to a special and exclusive standing with God. In claiming this election they held that it was in the realm of God's grace, as well as in the realm of his providence; and that it gave them, not only an absolute right to God's favor in this world, but an absolute decree to eternal life in the world to come; and that it took in all of themselves *en masse*, but themselves only. On the other hand, Paul held that this election in God's plans was within his secular providence, that it was an election to religious privileges and opportunities, and to nothing else; and that it took in all the world at large *en masse*. Thus both the Jews and Paul held the election, each in his own sense of the word, to be racial, or national, *en masse*; but neither the Jews nor Paul, neither the synagogue nor the Church of Christ, ever heard of an arbitrary, particular, election and predestination, such as Calvinism teaches, of *some* individuals as against other individuals, whether Jew or Gentile. The mooted of such a particular election of some men and preterition of all the rest, would have astounded both the synagogue and the Church, and would have been received by both parties with indignant protest for its unscripturalness, if not with inextinguishable laughter for its absurdity.

The Jews once filled the ecclesiastical heavens with their clamor against the Gentiles. Paul in this epistle exploded their conceit and exclusiveness; and Judaism is now only a dead issue. And Calvinism once arrogated to itself that it was the gospel scheme; and its awful shadow long rested on this epistle, though it was never widely accepted in the Christian Church. This conceit and arrogance Paul has exploded equally with the Jewish heresy; and it too is now drawing near its end. Its own friends, with the exception of a few belated doctrinaires, have abandoned it piecemeal, and now only contend for the *name*, "to save their face." Oppressed by the burden which they can not carry, and yet hardly know how to throw off, their last anxiety is, "Who shall deliver us from this body of death?" In the coming centuries, the heresy of Hippo and Geneva, like the heresy of the synagogue, will be merely a hateful memory of the past.

ROMANS.

I. PAUL, a servant of Jesus Christ, a called apostle, set apart
2 unto the gospel of God, which he promised of old, through his
3 prophets, in Holy Scriptures, concerning his Son, who was
4 born from the seed of David according to the flesh, who was
marked out Son of God in power, according to [his] spirit of
5 holiness, from resurrection of dead men, Jesus Christ our
Lord; through whom we received grace and apostleship, with
a view to obedience to the faith among all the Gentiles, for his
6 name's sake: among whom are also ye, Jesus Christ's called:
7 to all that are in Rome, God's beloved, called, saints: Grace to
you and peace from God our Father and the Lord Jesus Christ.
8 First, indeed, I thank my God through Jesus Christ, for you
9 all; because your faith is reported in the whole world. For God
is my witness, whom I serve in my spirit in the gospel of his Son,
how unceasingly I make mention of you; always in my prayers
10 making request, if somehow, now, at length I shall be brought
11 on my way in the will of God, to come unto you. For I long to
see you, that I may impart to you some spiritual gift, with a
12 view to your being established; but that is, to my being com-
forted with you, while among you, through our faith, both
13 yours and mine, in each other. But I would not that you be
ignorant, brethren, that oftentimes I proposed to come unto you
(and was hindered hitherto), that I may have some fruit
among you also, even as also among the rest of the Gentiles.
14 I am debtor both to Greeks and to Barbarians, both to wise
15 men and to ignorant. Thus, as for me, I would fain preach the
16 gospel to you also that are in Rome. For I am not ashamed of
the gospel: for it is God's power unto salvation to every one
17 that has faith; both to Jew, first, and to Greek. For in it is
revealed God's plan of justification from faith, with a view to
faith: as it has been written, "But the just from faith will live."

18 For God's wrath is revealed from heaven against all impiety
and unrighteousness of men, who hinder the truth in unright-
19 eousness. Because so much of God as is known is manifest in
20 them; for God manifested it to them. For his unseen attri-
butes, both his eternal power and divinity, since the creation
of the world, are clearly seen, being understood by his works;
21 so that they are without excuse. Because, having come to
know God, they did not glorify him as God, or thank him; nay,
but they became vain in their reasonings, and their foolish
22 heart was darkened. Declaring themselves to be wise men,
23 they became fools; and they exchanged the glory of the incor-
ruptible God for sameness of image with corruptible man, and
birds, and fourfooted beasts, and creeping things.

24 Wherefore God gave them up, in the lusts of their hearts,
unto uncleanness, so that their bodies were dishonored among
25 them; in that they exchanged the truth of God for the lie; and
they revered and served the creature, rather than him
who created it; who is blessed forever. Amen.

26 On account of this, God gave them up unto infamous pas-
sions: for both their females changed the natural use into that
27 which is against nature: and in like manner also the males,
having left the natural use of the female, burned in their lust
towards one another, males with males working the indecency,
and receiving in themselves the recompense of their error
which was due.

28 And according as they did not approve to have God in rec-
ognition, God gave them over unto a reprobate mind, to do
29 the things not becoming; having been filled with all unright-
eousness, wickedness, covetousness, maliciousness; full of envy,
30 murder, strife, deceit, malignity; whisperers, slanderers, hate-
ful towards God, insolent, haughty, boastful; inventors of evil
31 things, disobedient to parents, without understanding, cove-
nant-breakers, without natural affection, unmerciful: who,
32 having come to know the judgment of God, that they that
practice such things are worthy of death, not only do them,
nay, but also are well pleased with them that practice them.

II. Wherefore thou art without excuse, O every man, that
judgest: for in what thing thou judgest the other, thou con-
demnest thyself; for thou that judgest him practicest the same
2 things. But we know that the judgment of God is according
3 to truth upon them that practice such things. But reckonest

thou this, O man, that judgest them that practice such things, and doest them, that thou wilt escape the judgment of God?

4 Or despisest thou the riches of his goodness and forbearance and longsuffering, ignoring that the goodness of God leads
5 thee to repentance? But according to thy hardness and impenitent heart, thou treasurest up to thyself wrath in the day of wrath and of revelation of the just judgment of God;
6 "Who will render to each man according to his works:"
7 to them indeed that by patience in good work seek for glory and honor, and incorruption, life eternal: but to them that are factious, and are disobedient, indeed, to the truth, but obedient to unrighteousness, will be wrath and indignation,
9 affliction and anguish, upon every soul of man who works
10 evil, both of Jew, first, and of Greek; but glory and honor and peace to every man who works good, both to Jew, first,
11 and to Greek: for there is no respect of persons with God.
12 For as many as sinned without law, without law will also perish: and as many as sinned within law, through law will
13 be judged; for not the hearers of law are just with God, but
14 the doers of law will be justified: for whenever Gentiles who have no law, do by nature the things of the Law, these, having
15 no law, are law to themselves: in that they show the work of the Law written in their hearts, their consciousness testifying
16 with them, and their thoughts, one with another, accusing, or else acquitting them: in the day when God will judge the secrets of men, according to my gospel, through Jesus Christ.

17 But if thou art named "Jew," and retest upon law, and
18 boastest in God, and knowest his will, and approvest the
19 things that excel, being instructed out of the Law, and trusted as to thyself that thou art a guide of blind men, a light of them
20 that are in darkness, an instructor of foolish men, a teacher of babes, having in the Law the form of the knowledge and of
21 the truth—dost thou therefore that teachest another, not teach thyself? dost thou that preachest not to steal, steal?
22 dost thou that sayest not to commit adultery, commit adultery?
23 dost thou that abominatest idols, pillage [their] temples? Thou that boastest in law, through the transgression of the Law dishonorest God; "for the name of God on account of you is blasphemed among the Gentiles," according as it has been
24 written. For circumcision indeed profits, if thou be a practicer of law; but if thou be a transgressor of law, thy circumcision

26 has become uncircumcision. If, therefore, the Uncircumcision
 guard the requirements of the Law, will not his uncircum-
 27 cision be reckoned unto circumcision? and the Uncircumcision
 which is from nature, if it fulfills the Law, will judge thee,
 who through letter and circumcision art transgressor of law.
 28 For he is not a Jew who is one outwardly; nor yet is that cir-
 29 cumcision, which is outward in the flesh: nay, but he is a Jew,
 who is one inwardly; and circumcision is of heart, in spirit,
 not in letter; of whom the praise is not from men, nay, but
 from God.

III. JEW. What then is the superiority of the Jew [over the
 Gentile?] or what is the profit of circumcision?

2 PAUL. Much in every way: first, indeed, because they were
 intrusted with the oracles of God.

3 JEW. For, what? If some [of us] did not have faith, will
 their unfaith annul the faithfulness of God?

4 PAUL. God forbid: but let God be found true, but every
 man a liar; as it has been written,

That thou mayest be justified in thy words,

And mayest be victor when thou comest to be judged.

5 JEW. But if our non-justification establishes God's plan of
 justification, what shall we say? Is God unjust?—who brings
 wrath upon us? (I speak after the usages of men.)

6 PAUL. God forbid: since how will God judge the world?

7 JEW. But if the trueness of God in my falseness abounded
 unto his glory, why yet am I also condemned as sinful?

8 PAUL. And [shall we say], as we are calumniated, and as
 some affirm that we say, Let us do the evil things, that the good
 may come? whose condemnation is just.

9 JEW. What, then? are we worse [than the Gentiles?]

PAUL. Not at all: for we before denounced both Jews and
 10 Greeks, that they all are under sin; as it has been written,

There is none just, not even one;

11 There is none that understands,

There is none that seeks out God;

12 They all turned aside, together they became unprofitable;

There is none that does good; there is not so much as one:

13 An opened grave is their throat;

With their tongues they used deceit:

Venom of asps is under their lips:

14 Whose mouth is full of cursing and bitterness:

- 15 Swift are their feet to shed blood ;
16 Destruction and misery are in their ways ;
17 And the way of peace they knew not :
18 There is no fear of God before their eyes.
- 19 But we know that whatever things the Law says, it speaks to them [the Jews] that are under the Law ; that EVERY mouth may be stopped, and ALL the world may become under judgment to God : because from works of law will no flesh be justified before him : for through law comes recognition of sin.
- 20
21 But now, apart from law, God's plan of justification has been manifested, being attested by the Law and the
22 Prophets ; God's plan of justification through faith in Jesus Christ unto ALL them that have faith ; for there is no distinction [between Jew and Gentile] ; for all sinned, and come
23 short of the approval of God ; becoming justified gratis by his
24 grace, through the redemption that is in Christ Jesus : whom
25 God set forth a propitiation, through faith in his blood, unto manifestation of his plan of justification, on account of the
26 passing over of the sins done before, in the forbearance of God ; unto the manifestation of his plan of justification in the present season : that he may be just, and justifying him that is of faith in Jesus.
- 27 JEW. Where then is our boasting?
PAUL. It was excluded.
JEW. Through what kind of law ? of the works ?
- 28 PAUL. No : but through law of faith. For we reckon that
29 man is justified by faith apart from works of law. Or is God
30 God of Jews only ? is he not God of Gentiles also ? Yes, of Gentiles also : if, in fact, God is one [and not many] ; who will justify circumcision from faith, and uncircumcision through the faith.
- 31 JEW. As for law, then, do we abrogate it through the faith ?
PAUL. God forbid : nay, but we establish law.
- IV. JEW. What then shall we say that Abraham, our forefather, has found according to flesh ?
- 2 PAUL. [Nothing at all ;] for if Abraham was justified from works, he has a ground of boasting ; nay, but [he has no ground
3 of boasting] towards God. For what says the Scripture ? " But Abraham had faith in God, and it was reckoned to him unto
4 justification." (Gen. xv, 6.) But to him that works, the reward
5 is not reckoned as a matter of grace, but as a matter of debt.

- But to him that works not, but has faith on him that justifies the
6 ungodly man, his faith is reckoned unto justification; according
as also David tells the happiness of the man, to whom God
reckons justification, apart from works:
- 7 Happy they whose iniquities were forgiven,
And whose sins were covered;
- 8 Happy the man to whom the Lord will not reckon sin!
(Psa. xxxii, 1, 2.)
- 9 Comes this happiness, then, upon the circumcision? or also
upon the uncircumcision? [Upon the Uncircumcision, also];
for we say that, To Abraham his faith was reckoned unto
10 justification. How then was it reckoned to him? Being
in circumcision? or in uncircumcision? Not in circum-
11 cision; nay, but in uncircumcision: and he received the
sign of circumcision, a seal of the justification of the faith
which was his in his uncircumcision: with a view to his
being father of ALL them that have faith, while in uncir-
cumcision, that the justification may be reckoned to them;
- 12 and father of circumcision to the men that are not from
circumcision only, but also to the men that march in
the steps of the faith of our father Abraham, while he was
13 in uncircumcision. For not through law was the promise to
Abraham or to his seed, that he should be heir of the world;
14 but through justification of faith. For if they that are from
law are heirs, the faith has been made void, and the promise
15 has been annulled: for the Law works wrath; but where there
16 is no law, neither is there transgression. On account of this,
[justification] comes from faith, that it may be according to
grace; to the end that the promise may be sure to all the
seed; not to that which is from the Law, only, but also to that
which is from the faith of Abraham; who is father of us all;
- 17 according as it has been written, Because father of many
nations [Gentiles] have I made thee (Gen. xvii, 5); before him
in whom he had faith, God, who makes the dead alive and
18 calls the things not in being, as though in being. Who, against
hope, upon hope had faith, to the end that he should become
father of many nations [Gentiles], according to that which had
19 been spoken, Thus will thy seed be. (Gen. xv, 5.) And not
having been weakened in faith, he considered his own body,
already deadened, being about a hundred years old, and the
20 deadness of Sarah's womb: but in respect to the promise of

God, he doubted not through unfaith; nay, but he was
21 strengthened by his faith, having given glory to God, and hav-
22 ing been fully assured that, what he has promised, he is able
23 also to do. Wherefore also it [faith] was reckoned to him
24 unto justification. But it was not written on account of him
25 alone, that it was reckoned to him; nay, but on account of us
also, to whom it is going to be reckoned, who have faith on
him that raised Jesus our Lord from the dead; who was
delivered up on account of our trespasses, and was raised on
account of his having justified us.

V. Having been justified, therefore, from faith, we have peace
2 towards God through our Lord Jesus Christ; through whom
also we have had the introduction, by faith, into this grace
in which we stand; and we boast upon hope of the glory of
3 God. But not that only, nay, but we also boast in our
4 afflictions: knowing that the affliction works patience; but
5 the patience, approval; but the approval, hope: but the hope
shames us not; because the love of God has been poured out
in our hearts, through the Holy Spirit which was given us.
6 For while we were yet weak, in due season Christ died for
7 ungodly men. For scarcely for a just man will one die: for
8 for the good man perhaps one even dares to die. But God
confirms his own love towards us, in that, while we were yet
9 sinful, Christ died for us. Much rather then, having now been
justified in his blood, we shall be saved through him from the
10 wrath. For if, being enemies, we were reconciled to God
through the death of his Son, much rather having been recon-
11 ciled, we shall be saved in his life; but not that only, nay, but
we also boast in God, through our Lord Jesus Christ, through
whom, now, we received the reconciliation.

12 On this account, just as through one man the sin came into the
world, and through the sin the death; even so the death came
13 throughout unto all men, on the ground that all sinned: for to
the extent of law sin was in the world: but sin is not reckoned
14 if there be no law. Nay, but death reigned from Adam until
Moses, even over them that sinned not after the sameness with
the transgression of Adam,—who is type of the Coming Adam.
15 Nay, but not as was the fall, so also was the act of grace. For
if by the fall of the one man the many died, much rather the
grace of God, and the gift in the grace of the One Man, Jesus
16 Christ, abounded unto the many. And not, as was the fall

through one man that sinned, *so was* the gift: for the judgment indeed *was* from one [fall] unto condemnation, but the
17 act of grace *was* from many falls unto justification. For if, in the fall of the one man, the death reigned through the one man; much rather they that receive the abundance of the
18 grace and of the gift of justification, will reign, in life, through the One Man, Jesus Christ. Accordingly, then, as through one fall [the result was] unto all men unto condemnation; so
19 also through one act of justification [the result] was unto all men unto justification of life. For just as through the disobedience of the one man the many were constituted sinful, so also through the obedience of the One Man the many will
20 be constituted just. But law came in besides that the fall may multiply; but where the sin multiplied, the grace over-
21 abounded: that, just as the sin reigned in the death, so also the grace may reign through justification unto life eternal through Jesus Christ our Lord.

VI. JEW. What then? Shall we say, Let us continue in the sin, that the grace may abound?

2 PAUL. God forbid. How shall we, who died as to the sin, yet
3 live in it? Or do ye not know that we, so many as were bap-
4 tized into Christ Jesus, were baptized into his death? We were buried, therefore, with him, through the baptism into his death: that just as Christ was raised from the dead through the glory of the Father, so also we may walk in renewal of life.
5 For if we have become united with him in the sameness with his death, nay, but we shall be [united with him also in the
6 sameness] with his resurrection; knowing this, that our old man was crucified with him, that the body of the sin may be done
7 away with, that we may no longer be slaves as to the sin; for he
8 that died [with him] has been justified from the sin. But if we died with Christ, we believe that we shall also live with
9 him; knowing that Christ having been raised from the dead
10 no more dies; death no more lords it over him. For the death that he died, he died as to the sin, once for all: but the life
11 that he lives, he lives as to God. Thus reckon ye also yourselves to be dead, indeed, as to the sin, but living as to God, in Christ Jesus.

12 Let not the sin, therefore, reign in your mortal body, that
13 ye should obey its lusts: nor yet yield your members to the sin, instruments of unrighteousness; nay, but yield yourselves

to God, as if living from the dead, and your members to God,
14 instruments of justification. For sin will not lord it over you:
for ye are not under law, but under grace.

15 **JEW.** What then? Shall we sin, because we are not under
law, but under grace?

16 **PAUL.** God forbid. Do ye not know that to whom ye yield
yourselves slaves with a view to obedience, slaves ye are of
him whom ye obey; whether of sin—unto death, or of obedi-
17 ence—unto justification? But thanks be to God, that ye were
slaves of the sin, but obeyed from the heart the type of doc-
18 trine into which ye were delivered; but having been enfrued
19 from the sin, ye were enslaved to the justification: I speak
after the usages of men, on account of the feebleness of your
flesh. For just as ye yielded your members slaves to the un-
cleanness and to the iniquity unto the iniquity, so now yield
your members slaves to the justification with a view to sancti-
20 fication. For when ye were slaves of the sin, ye were free
21 men as to the justification. What fruit, therefore, were ye
then having from those things of which ye are now ashamed?
22 for the end of those things is death. But now having been
enfrued from the sin, but having been enslaved as to God, ye
have your fruit unto sanctification, but the end life eternal.
23 For the wages of the sin is death; but the free gift of God is
life eternal in Christ Jesus our Lord.

VII. Or do ye not know, brethren (for I speak to men knowing
law), that the Law lords it over the man for so long a time as
2 he lives? For the wife, subject to a husband, has been bound
by law to the living husband; but if the husband have died,
3 she has been discharged from the law of the husband. Accord-
ingly then, if, while the husband is living, she become married
to a different husband, she will be called an adulteress: but if
the husband have died, she is free from the Law, so as not to
be an adulteress, upon having become married to a different
4 husband. So that, my brethren, ye also were put to death as
to the Law, through the body of Christ, with a view to your
becoming married to a different husband, to him who was
raised from the dead, in order that we may bring forth fruit
5 to God. For when we were in the flesh, the sinful passions,
which were through the Law, were at work in our members to
6 bring forth fruit to death. But, now, we were discharged
from the Law, having died to that [marriage] in which we

were being held ; so that we are slaves [to God] in newness of spirit, and not in oldness of letter.

7 JEW. What then shall we say? Is the Law sin?

PAUL. God forbid. Nay, but I did not know the sin, except through law: for I was not aware of lust, except the Law was saying, Thou shalt not lust. But the sin, having taken advantage, through the commandment, wrought out in me all lust. 8 For apart from law, sin was dead. But, as for me, I was alive, apart from law once: but when the commandment came, the 9 sin sprang to life, but I died; and the commandment, which 10 was ordained with a view to life, this was found by me unto 11 death: for the sin, having taken advantage through the com- 12 mandment deceived me, and through it put me to death. So that the Law, indeed, is holy, and the commandment holy, and just, and good.

13 JEW. Did then that which is good [in the Law] become death to me?

PAUL. God forbid. Nay, but the sin [became death to me] in order that it may appear sin, through that which is good [in the Law] working out death to me: in order that through the 14 commandment the sin may become exceeding sinful. For we know that the Law is spiritual: but I am carnal, sold under 15 the sin. For what I work out I do not know: for not what I 16 will, this I practice; nay, but what I hate, this I do. But if what I will not, this I do, I concede to the Law that it is right. 17 But now it is no longer I that work it out, nay, but the sin dwells in me. For I know that in me, that is, in my flesh, 18 dwells naught good: for to will is present with me, but to 19 work out the right, not. For the good which I will I do not: 20 nay, but the evil which I will not, this I practice. But if what I will not, this I do, it is no longer I that work it out, 21 nay, but the sin dwelling in me. I find then the law to me 22 who will to do the right, that the evil is present with me. For 23 I accord with the Law of God after the inward man: but I see a different law in my members, warring against the law of my mind, and leading me captive to the law of the sin, which is 24 in my members. Wretched man, I! who will deliver me from 25 this body of death? Thanks be to God [he will deliver me] through Jesus Christ our Lord. Accordingly then I myself with the mind indeed serve the Law of God; but with the flesh the law of sin.

VIII. There is, therefore now no condemnation to them that are in
2 Christ Jesus. For the Law of the spirit of life in Christ Jesus
3 enfreed me from the Law of the sin and the death. For, the
thing impossible to the Law, in that it was weak through the
4 flesh—God, having sent his own Son in the sameness with the
flesh of sin, and for sin, condemned the sin in the flesh: in
5 order that the justification of the Law may be fulfilled in us,
6 who walk not according to flesh, but according to spirit. For
7 they that are according to flesh mind the things of the flesh;
8 but they that are according to spirit, the things of the spirit.
9 For the mind of the flesh is death; but the mind of the spirit
10 is life and peace: because the mind of the flesh is enmity
against God; for it is not subjected to the Law of God, for
11 neither can it be: but they that are in flesh can not please God.
12 But ye are not in flesh, but in spirit, if in fact the Spirit of
God dwells in you. But if any man has not the Spirit of
13 Christ, this man is not his. But if Christ is in you, the body,
indeed, is dead on account of sin; but the spirit is life on ac-
14 count of justification. But if the Spirit of him that raised
Jesus from the dead dwells in you, he that raised Christ Jesus
from the dead will make alive also your mortal bodies on ac-
15 count of his Spirit that dwells in you.
16 Accordingly, therefore, brethren, we are debtors, not to the
17 flesh, to live according to flesh: for if ye live according to
flesh, ye will die; but if by the spirit ye put to death the
18 practices of the body, ye will have life. For as many as
19 are led by the Spirit of God, these are sons of God. For ye
received not the spirit of slavery, again, unto fear; but ye
20 received the spirit of adoption, in which we cry, Abba, Father.
The Spirit itself bears witness with our spirit, that we are
21 children of God: but if children, also heirs; heirs, indeed, of
God, but co-heirs with Christ; if in fact we suffer with him,
that we may also be glorified with him.
22 For I reckon that the sufferings of the present time are
not worthy to be compared with the glory a-going to be re-
23 vealed to us-ward. For the earnest expectation of the crea-
24 ture awaits the revelation of the sons of God. For the crea-
25 ture was subjected to the vanity, not of its own will, but on
26 account of him that subjected it, in hope; because also the
creature itself will be enfreed from the slavery to the corrup-
27 tion, [and brought] into the freedom of the glory of the chil-

22 dren of God. For we know that all the creature groans with
23 us, and travails with us, until now. But not only that, nay,
but also ourselves, who have the firstfruits of the Spirit, we
also ourselves groan within ourselves, awaiting adoption, the
24 redemption of our body. For in the hope [of this] we were
saved: but a hope being seen is not hope: for what one sees
25 why does he hope for it? But if what we do not see, we hope
for it, with patience we await it.

26 But in like manner also the Spirit helps our weakness: for
we know not what we should pray, as we ought; nay, but
the Spirit itself intercedes for us, with groanings unspeak-
27 able; but he that searches the hearts knows what is the
mind of the Spirit, because it is according to God that it
28 intercedes for [the] saints. But we know that all things
work together for good with them that love God, with them
29 that are called according to his plan of old. Because them
whom he of old had in thought, he also of old included in
30 his plan, being conform with the image of his Son; that he
may be firstborn among many brethren: but whom he of old
included in his plan, these he also called: and whom he
called, these he also justified: but whom he justified, these
he also glorified.

31 What then shall we say in regard to these things? If
32 God is for us, who is against us? He that at least spared not
his own Son, but delivered him up for us all, how will he not
33 also with him graciously give us all things? Who will charge
ought against God's elect? Will God who justifies them?
34 Who is he that will condemn them? Is it Christ who died?
but, rather, who was raised? who also is at the right hand
35 of God? who also intercedes for us? Who will separate us
from the love of Christ? Will affliction? or anguish? or
persecution? or famine? or nakedness? or danger? or sword?
36 according as it has been written, that

For thy sake we are put to death all the day long;

We were reckoned as sheep for slaughter?

37 Nay, but in all these things we do more than conquer through
38 him that loved us. For I am persuaded that neither death,
nor life, nor angels, nor principalities, nor things present, nor
39 things to come, nor powers, nor height, nor depth, nor any
other creature, will be able to separate us from the love of
God, which is in Christ Jesus our Lord.

IX. I say the truth in Christ, I lie not, my consciousness witnessing with me in the Holy Spirit, that I have great sorrow, and unceasing pain in my heart. For I could wish that I myself were anathema from Christ instead of my brethren, my kinsmen according to flesh: who are Israelites; whose is the adoption, and the glory, and the covenants, and the legislation, and the temple-service, and the promises; whose are the fathers; and from whom is the Christ, according to flesh, who is over all, God, blessed forever. Amen. But I do not imply such a thing as that the word of God has fallen away. For not all these who are from Israel are Israel: nor yet, because they are seed of Abraham, are they all *his* children: nay, but [it has been written] In Isaac [not in Ishmael] will thy seed be called. That is, not these, the children of the flesh, are children of God; nay, but the children of the promise are reckoned for seed. For of a promise *was* this word: According to this season I will come, and Sarah shall have a son. But not in that instance only; nay, but also Rebecca having conceived from one husband, Isaac, our father (for the children not yet having been born, nor yet having practiced anything good or bad, in order that God's plan of old by way of election, may remain not from works, nay, but from him that calls), it was said to her, that The elder will serve the younger; according as it has been written, Jacob I loved, but Esau I hated.

14 JEW. What then shall we say? Is there injustice with God?

15 PAUL. God forbid. For to Moses the Scripture says, I will have mercy on whom I may have mercy, and I will have compassion on whom I may have compassion. Accordingly then God's election [national selection] is not of him that wills, nor of him that runs, but of God that has mercy. For the Scripture says to Pharaoh, that Unto this very end I raised thee up, that I may show in thee my power, and that my name may be published in all the earth. Accordingly then on whom he will he has mercy, but whom he will he hardens. Wilt thou then say to me,

JEW. Why does he yet blame us? for who withstands his will?

20 PAUL. O man, indeed then, who art thou that answerest back to God? Shall the vessel molded say to him that molded it, 21 Why didst thou make me thus? Or has not the potter control

- of the clay, from the same lump to make one vessel a vessel
 22 unto honor, and another a vessel unto dishonor? But if God,
 purposing to display his wrath, and to make known his power,
 [nevertheless] endured with much longsuffering [the Jewish]
 vessels of wrath fitted unto destruction, [this does not commit
 23 him to endure them forever]: And [he endured them only] in
 order that he may [thus] make known the riches of his glory
 upon [us Gentile] vessels of mercy, which he of old prepared
 24 unto glory, whom also he called, us, not only from Jews, nay,
 25 but also from Gentiles. As also in Hosea the Scripture says:
 I will call the non-people of me, my people;
 And her, the not-beloved one, beloved.
 26 And it will be, that in the place where it was said to them,
 Ye are not my people,
 There they will be called Sons of the living God.
 27 But Isaiah cries concerning Israel,
 If the number of the sons of Israel be as the sand of the
 sea,
 [Only] the remnant will be saved:
 28 For a thing will Jehovah do upon the earth,
 Accomplishing it and cutting it short.
 29 And, according as Isaiah before has said,
 Unless Jehovah of armies had left us a seed,
 We should have become as Sodom, and should have been
 made like Gomorrhah.
 30 JEW. What then shall we say?
 PAUL. That Gentiles, who were not seeking justification,
 31 obtained justification, but justification which is from faith:
 but Israel, seeking a law [legal method] of justification, did
 not attain to *this* law.
 32 JEW. Wherefore?
 PAUL. Because [they sought it] not from faith, nay, but as
 from works. They stumbled against the Stone of stumbling;
 33 according as it has been written,
 Behold, I lay in Zion a Stone of stumbling and a Rock of
 offense:
 And he that has faith on him will not be brought to shame.
 X. Brethren, the desire indeed of my heart and my prayer to
 2 God is in their behalf, that they may be saved. For I bear
 them witness that they have a zeal for God, nay, but not ac-

3 cording to knowledge. For ignoring God's plan of justifica-
4 tion, and seeking to establish their own, they did not subject
5 themselves to God's plan of justification. For Christ is [the]
6 end of law unto justification to every one that has faith. For
7 Moses describes the justification which is from law that the
8 man that has done these things will have life in it. But the
9 justification from faith says thus, Say not in thy heart, Who
10 will ascend into heaven (that is, to bring Christ down)? or,
11 Who will descend into the abyss? (that is, to bring Christ up
12 from the dead). Nay, but what says it? The word is nigh
13 thee, in thy mouth and in thy heart (that is, the word of the
14 faith, which word we preach): Because if thou profess with
15 thy mouth Jesus as Lord, and have faith in thy heart that God
16 raised him from the dead, thou wilt be saved: for with the
17 heart faith is exercised unto justification; but with the mouth
18 profession is made unto salvation. For the Scripture says,
19 Every one that has faith upon him will not be put to shame.
20 For there is no distinction between Jew and Greek: for the
21 same Lord is *Lord* of all, being rich unto all that call upon
22 him: for [it has been written] Every one that shall call upon
23 the name of the Lord will be saved.

24 **JEW.** How then shall they [the Gentiles] call on him upon
25 whom they did not have faith? but how shall they have faith
26 upon him whom they did not hear? But how shall they hear
27 apart from one preaching? But how shall they preach if they
28 be not sent? according as it has been written, How beautiful
29 are the feet of them that bring the gospel of good things!

30 **PAUL.** Nay, but not all [the Jews] hearkened to the gospel.
31 For Isaiah says, Lord, who [of us] had faith in that which we
32 heard?

33 **JEW.** Then faith comes from that which one hears; but that
34 which one hears [of the gospel] is through the word of Christ.

35 **PAUL.** Nay, but I say, Did they [the Gentiles] not hear?
36 Yea, indeed, then; [as it has been written],

Into all the earth went out the sound of them,

And unto the ends of the world the words of them.

37 Nay, but I say, Did Israel not know [this call of the Gentiles]?
38 First, Moses says,

I will move you to jealousy at a no-nation;

At a nation without understanding I will anger you.

20 But Isaiah ventures, and says,

I was found by the [Gentiles] not seeking me ;
I became manifest to them not asking for me.

21 But as to Israel he says, All the day long did I spread out my hands unto a disobedient and gainsaying people.

XI. JEW. I say then, Did God thrust away his people ?

PAUL. God forbid. And [I may say so], for *I* am an Israelite, 2 from seed of Abraham, tribe of Benjamin. God did not thrust away his people, which he of old had in thought. Or do ye not know what the Scripture says in the story of Elijah? how he 3 pleads with God against Israel: Lord, thy prophets they killed, thy altars they dug down, and I alone was left alive, and they 4 seek my life. Nay, but what says to him the answer of God? I left over to myself seven thousand men, who did not bow 5 knee to Baul. Thus then also, in the present time, there has become a remnant [of Israel] according to election of grace. 6 But if it is by grace, it is no longer from works: else the grace no longer becomes grace.

7 JEW. What then ?

PAUL. What Israel seeks for, this he did not obtain, but the 8 election obtained it; but the rest were hardened; according as it has been written, God gave them a spirit of stupor, eyes that they may not see, and ears that they may not hear, until 9 this very day. And David says,

Let their table become a snare, and a trap,
And a stumbling stone, and a recompense to them:

10 Let their eyes be darkened that they may not see,
And their back always bow thou down.

11 JEW. I say then, Did they stumble that they may fall?

PAUL. God forbid: nay, but by their fall is the salvation to 12 the Gentiles, to enkindle them to zeal. But if their fall is the riches of the world, and their loss the riches of the Gentiles, 13 how much rather will be their fullness? But I say this to you, the Gentiles. Forasmuch, indeed, then, as I am apostle of 14 Gentiles, I glorify my ministry: if in some way I may enkindle 15 to zeal my flesh, and may save some from them. For if the casting away of them is the reconciling of the world, what will 16 be the taking of them back, if not life from the dead? But if the firstfruit is holy, so also is the batch: and if the root is 17 holy, so also are the branches. But if some of the branches

18 were broken out, but thou, being a wild olive, wast ingrafted
in them, and becamest partaker with them of the root of the
fatness of the olive-tree; boast not against the branches: but
19 if thou boastest against them, not thou bearest the root, but
the root thee. Thou wilt say then, Branches were broken out,
20 that I may be ingrafted. Well; by their unfaith they were
broken out, but thou by thy faith standest. Be not high-
21 minded, but fear: for if God spared not the natural branches,
22 neither will he spare thee. See, then, God's goodness and
severeness: upon them indeed that fell, severeness; but upon
thee, God's goodness, if thou abide in his goodness: else thou
23 also will be cut out. But those also, if they abide not in their
unfaith, will be ingrafted; for God is able to ingraft them
24 again. For if thou wast cut out from the tree, a wild olive by
nature, and contrary to nature wast ingrafted into a good
olive; how much rather will these, the natural branches, be
ingrafted in their own olive?

25 For I would not, brethren, that ye should be ignorant of
this secret, lest ye be conceited with yourselves, that harden-
ing in part has become to Israel, until the fullness of the
26 Gentiles shall have come in; and thus all Israel will be
saved: according as it has been written,

From Zion will come the Deliverer;

He will turn away impieties from Jacob:

27 And this *will be* the covenant from me with them,

When I shall have taken away their sins.

28 As regards the gospel, indeed, they are enemies on account of
you: but as regards the election, they are beloved on account
29 of the fathers. For the gifts of grace and the calling of God
are unrepented. For just as ye once disobeyed God, but now
30 obtained mercy by the disobedience of these, so also these
now disobeyed, that by the mercy shown to you they them-
31 selves also may now obtain mercy. For God shut up all men
unto disobedience, that he may have mercy upon them all.
32 O depth of riches and wisdom and knowledge of God! how
33 unsearchable his judgments, and untraceable his ways! For,

Who knew the mind of the Lord?

Or who became his counselor?

35 Or who first gave to him?

And it will be repaid him.

36 Because from him, and through him, and unto him, are all things. To him be the glory forever. Amen.

XII. I beseech you, therefore, brethren, through the mercies of God, to present your bodies a sacrifice, living, holy, well-pleasing to God, your rational service. And do not be in fashion with this age: nay, but be transformed by the renewal of your mind, to the end that ye may test what is the good and well-pleasing and complete will of God.

3 For I say, through the grace that was given me, to every one that is among you, not to think of himself more highly than he ought to think; but so to think [of himself] as to think soberly, 4 as to each one God imparted a measure of faith. For according as in one body we have many members, but the members have 5 not all the same office: thus we, the many, are one body in 6 Christ, but severally members of one another, but having endowments differing according to the grace that was given us; whether prophecy, according to the proportion of the 7 faith; or ministry, in the ministry; or he that teaches, in the 8 teaching; or he that exhorts, in the exhorting; he that gives, in simplicity; he that presides, in earnestness; he that shows 9 merey, in cheerfulness. Love is without hypocrisy. Abhor that which is evil; cleave to that which is good. In brotherly 10 love, be affectionate to one another; in honor preferring one 11 another; in earnestness not slothful; in spirit fervent; serving the Lord; in hope, rejoicing; in affliction, patient; in 12 prayer, persevering; contributing to the needs of the saints; 13 pursuing hospitality. Bless them that persecute you; bless, 14 and curse not. Rejoice with them that rejoice; weep with 15 them that weep. Be of the same mind towards one another. 16 Mind not the high things, but be carried away with the lowly 17 things. Become not conceited with yourselves. Requite to no one evil for evil. Take forethought for things honorable in 18 the sight of all men. If possible, as far as in you lies, be at 19 peace with all men. Avenge not yourselves, beloved, but give place to the wrath; for it has been written,

Vengeance belongs to me; I will repay, says the Lord. 20 Nay, but,

If thy enemy hunger, feed him;

If he thirst, give him drink: for, this doing,

Thou wilt heap coals of fire upon his head.

21 Be not conquered by his evil, but conquer his evil with thy good.

XIII. Let every soul submit to the higher authorities; for there is no authority except by God; but the authorities that are have
2 been ordained by God. So that he that opposes the authority resists the ordinance of God: but they that resist will receive
3 to themselves judgment. For the rulers are not a fear to the good work, but to the bad. But wilt thou not fear the authority? do that which is good, and thou wilt have praise
4 from it: for it is God's minister to thee unto that which is good. But if thou do that which is bad, fear; for it wears not the sword in vain; for it is God's minister, vengeful unto
5 wrath to him that practices that which is bad. Wherefore there is necessity to submit, not only on account of the wrath,
6 but also on account of conscience. For on this account ye pay tribute also; for they are God's servitors, to this very
7 thing devoting themselves. Render to all their dues: the tribute to whom ye owe the tribute; the custom, to whom the custom; the fear, to whom the fear; the honor, to whom the honor.

8 To no one owe anything, except to love one another: for he
9 that loves the other has fulfilled law. For the [saying], Thou shalt not commit adultery, Thou shalt not kill, Thou shalt not steal, Thou shalt not covet, and if there is any other commandment, it is summed up in this word, namely, "Thou
10 shalt love thy neighbor as thyself." Love works no ill to his neighbor; love therefore is fulfillment of law.

11 And this, knowing the season, that now it is time for you to
awake out of sleep; for now is salvation nearer us than when
12 we *first* had faith. The night sped on, but the day has come near; let us therefore put off the works of the darkness, but let
13 us put on the weapons of the light. Let us walk becomingly as in day; not with revels and drunkennesses, not with chamberings and wantonnesses, not with strife and jealousy; nay, but
14 put ye on the Lord Jesus Christ, and make not provision for the flesh, to satisfy its lusts.

XIV. But him that is weak in the faith, receive ye, not with a view
2 to criticisms of his opinions. One man has faith to eat all
3 things: but he that is weak eats *only* vegetables. Let not him that eats condemn him that eats not; and let not him that eats

4 not judge him that eats: for God received him. Who art thou
that judgest another's servant? to his own lord he stands or
falls. But he will be made to stand; for the Lord has power
5 to make him stand. One man esteems day above day: but
6 another esteems every day. Let each one be fully assured in
his own mind. He that minds the day, minds it to the Lord:
and he that eats, eats to the Lord, for he thanks God; and he
7 that eats not, to the Lord eats not, and thanks God. For no
8 one of us lives to himself, and no one dies to himself. For if
we live, we live to the Lord; and if we die, we die to the Lord:
9 if we live therefore, or if we die, we are the Lord's. For to
this end Christ died, and lived *again*, that he may be lord
10 both of dead men and of living. But thou! why dost thou
judge thy brother? or, also, thou! why contemnest thou thy
brother? for we all shall stand before the tribunal of God.
11 For it has been written,

‘As I live,’ says the Lord, “[I swear] that to me every knee
shall bow.

And every tongue shall confess to God.”

12 Accordingly then each one of us concerning himself, will
give account to God.

13 No longer therefore let us judge one another; nay, but judge
ye this rather, not to put a stumbling-block for your brother,
14 or an occasion of offense. I know, and am persuaded in the
Lord Jesus, that nothing is unclean through itself: except to
him that reckons anything to be unclean, to that man it is
15 unclean. For if on account of thy food thy brother is grieved,
thou walkest no longer according to love. With thy food
16 destroy not that man for whom Christ died. Let not there-
fore your good be defamed: for the kingdom of God is not
17 eating and drinking; nay, but justification and peace and joy
in the Holy Spirit. For he that in this matter serves Christ,
18 is well pleasing to God, and approved by men. Accordingly
then let us follow the things of peace, and the things of
19 edification to one another. Do not for the sake of food
destroy the work of God. All foods indeed are clean, but [to
20 eat them] is bad to the man that eats with offense. It is good
not to eat flesh, nor yet to drink wine, nor yet to do aught in
21 which thy brother stumbles. The faith which thou thyself
22 hast, have to thyself before God. Happy is he that judges not

23 himself in that which he approves. But if he that discriminates eat, he has been condemned, because he eats not from faith; but everything which is not from faith is sin.

XV. But we the strong ought to bear with the weaknesses of the
 2 weak, and not to please ourselves. Let each one of us please
 3 his neighbor unto that which is good, unto edification. And [this do], for Christ did not please himself; nay, but *so lived*, according as it has been written, The reproaches of them that
 4 reproach thee fell upon me. For as many things as were written of old, were written for our instruction, that through the patience and through the encouragement of the Scriptures
 5 we may have the hope. But may the God of the patience, and of the encouragement, give you to be of the same mind with
 6 one another, according to Christ Jesus: that with one accord with one mouth ye may glorify the God and Father of our
 7 Lord Jesus Christ. Wherefore receive ye one another, according as also Christ received you, to glory of God. For I say that Christ has become minister of circumcision in behalf of God's truthfulness, that he may confirm the promises given to
 9 the fathers; but that the Gentiles may glorify God for his mercy; according as it has been written,

On this account I will confess to thee among the Gentiles,
 And to thy name I will sing.

10 And again the Scripture says,
 Rejoice, Gentiles, with his people.

11 And again,
 Praise, all ye Gentiles, Jehovah;
 And let all the peoples praise him,

12 And again, Isaiah says,
 There will be the root of Jesse,
 And he that arises to rule Gentiles;
 On him Gentiles will hope.

13 But may the God of the hope fill you with all joy and peace in having faith, that ye may abound in the hope, in the power of the Holy Spirit.

14 But I myself also am persuaded concerning you, my brethren, that ye also yourselves are full of goodness, having been filled with all knowledge, being able also to admonish one another.

15 But I write to you more boldly in part, as again reminding you, on account of the grace that was given me from God,

16 to the end that I should be a ministrant of Christ Jesus as to
the Gentiles, ministering the gospel of God, in order that the
offering up of the Gentiles may become acceptable, having
17 been sanctified in the Holy Spirit. I have therefore my
18 boasting in Christ Jesus in the things pertaining to God. For
I will not dare to speak of any of the things which Christ did
not work through me, unto obedience of Gentiles, by word and
19 work, in power of signs and wonders, in power of the Holy
Spirit; so that from Jerusalem, and in circuit as far as
20 Illyricum, I have fully preached the gospel of Christ; but
[I have done so], being ambitious so to preach the gospel, not
where Christ was named, that I may not build upon another's
21 foundation; nay, but [to preach] according as it has been
written.

They, to whom nothing was announced concerning him,
will see;

And they that have not heard will understand.

22 Wherefore also I was hindered these many times from com-
23 ing unto you: but now no longer having place in these regions,
but having from many years a longing to come unto you,
24 whenever I may go unto Spain (for I hope, passing through, to
see you, and by you to be sent forward thither, if, first, I may
25 be filled in part, with your company); but now I am setting
26 out unto Jerusalem, ministering to the saints. For Macedonia
and Achaia thought well to make some contribution unto the
27 poor of the saints that are in Jerusalem: for they thought
well; and they are their debtors; for if the Gentiles shared
in their spiritual things, they ought also to minister to them in
28 the carnal things. When therefore I have accomplished this,
and have sealed to them this fruit, I will come away through
29 you unto Spain. But I know that, coming unto you, I shall
come in the fullness of the blessing of Christ.

30 But I beseech you, brethren, through our Lord Jesus Christ,
and through the love of the Spirit, to strive together with me
31 in your prayers to God for me; that I may be delivered from
them that are disobedient in Judea, and that my ministration
32 unto Jerusalem may become acceptable to the saints; in order
that in joy I may come unto you through the will of God, and
33 may find rest together with you. But the God of peace be
with you all. Amen.

XVI. But I commend to you Phœbe our sister, who is a deaconess
2 of the church that is in Cenchræ: that ye may receive her in
the Lord, worthily of the saints, and that ye may assist her in
whatever matter she may need you: and, so, for she herself
became an assister of many, and of my own self.

3 Salute Prisca and Aquila my fellow-workers in Christ Jesus,
4 who for my life laid down their own neck; whom not I alone
5 thank, nay, but also all the churches of the Gentiles: and
salute the church in their house. Salute Epænetus my
6 beloved, who is the firstfruits of Asia unto Christ. Salute
7 Mary, who labored much upon you. Salute Andronicus and
Junia, my kinsmen, and my fellow-prisoners, who are of note
among the apostles, who also became in Christ before me.
8 Salute Ampliatus my beloved in the Lord.

9 Salute Urbanus our fellow-worker in Christ, and Stachys my
10 beloved. Salute Apelles the approved in Christ. Salute them
11 that are from the household of Aristobulus. Salute Herodian
my kinsman. Salute them that are from the household of
12 Narcissus, that are in the Lord. Salute Tryphæna and Try-
phosa, who labor in the Lord. Salute Persis the beloved, who
13 labored much in the Lord. Salute Rufus the elect in the
14 Lord, and his mother and mine. Salute Asyncritus, Phlegon,
Hermes, Patrobas, Hermas, and the brethren that are with
15 them. Salute Philologus and Julia, Nereus and his sister,
16 and Olympas, and all the saints that are with them. Salute
one another with a holy kiss. All the churches of Christ
salute you.

17 But I beseech you, brethren, to mark them that are making
the divisions and the occasions of stumbling, contrary to the
18 doctrine which ye learned: and turn away from them. For
such men serve not our Lord Christ, but their own belly; and
through their smooth and fair speech they deceive the hearts
19 of the innocent. For your obedience came abroad unto all
men. I rejoyce therefore over you; but I would that ye be
wise unto that which is good, but simple unto that which is
20 bad. But the God of peace will bruise Satan under your feet
speedily.

The grace of our Lord Jesus Christ be with you.

21 Timotheus my fellow-worker salutes you; and Lucius and
22 Jason and Sosipater, my kinsmen. I Tertius, who write the

- 23 epistle, salute you in the Lord. Gaius my host, and of the whole church, salutes you. Erastus the treasurer of the city salutes you, and Quartus the brother.
- 25 But to him that is able to establish you according to my gospel and the preaching of Jesus Christ, according to the revelation of the secret doctrine which has been kept in silence
- 26 in times eternal, but now was manifested, and through prophetic Scriptures was made known according to commandment of the eternal God, unto all the Gentiles, with a view to their
- 27 obedience to the faith; to the only wise God, through Jesus Christ,—to whom be the glory forever. Amen.

EXPOSITION.

Verse 1. Paul, servant of Christ Jesus, a called apostle, set apart unto the gospel of God.

Paul. Our apostle received at circumcision a Hebrew name, "Saul," the name of the first king of Israel, held in traditional honor in his patril tribe of Benjamin. This Hebrew name, the Christian apostle, immediately before beginning his great mission to the Gentiles (Acts xiii, 2), changed for the Roman name "Paul" (Acts xiii, 9). Renouncing thenceforth his Jewish character and isolation, he adopted a cosmopolitan name, already honored throughout the Roman world, not very unlike his circumcision name, more euphonious, and, what was a higher recommendation, more suitable in its meaning to his new views of himself. He will no longer bear the regal name of his great tribesman, Saul, "The Desired," but will call himself Paul, "The Little." The once proud rabbi, now servant of Jesus Christ, has humbler views of himself. "To me, the abortion." (1 Cor. xv, 8.) "To me, who am less than the least of all the saints, was given this grace, that I should preach Christ among the Gentiles." (Eph. iii, 8.) This humble but honorable name which he adopted, he made the grandest of all names, except One, in the history of the Church, and of the world.

Paul calls himself **slave**. The Greek word, as the English word "slave," properly means a bond-servant for life, in thralldom to the absolute will of the master or owner. This is the word with which Paul expresses his utter and final surrender of himself to the service of Christ. It is used also by Peter, James, and Jude, of themselves. That Paul and Peter, and James, who was the earthly brother of Jesus, and all the disciples, Jews who spurned the idea of slavery to any man (John viii, 33), should, nevertheless, commonly call themselves "slaves" of Jesus Christ, shows how profoundly they recognized his lordship. No other word in

all of Paul's vocabulary so adequately expresses his concept of the majesty and divinity of the Lord Jesus Christ.

Paul's slavery to Christ was the joyful submission of heart, and will, and life, to such a service. There was for him no release from it. He vaunted the badges of his slavery as evidence that he could not, and that he would not, be separated from Christ. "Henceforth, let no one give me annoyances on this point. I carry in my person the slave-brands of the Lord Jesus" (Gal. vi, 17); the brands with which Christ had literally seared his eyes (Acts ix, 18), and marked him his thrall forever.

In the Gospels, the name **Christ** is an official designation, and as a rule has the article, "*The Christ*;" that is, "The Messiah," "The Lord's Anointed." But in the Epistles, the word has already become a proper name, and as such does not usually carry the article. Accordingly, the Epistles, in speaking of the Savior, use the names Jesus and Christ, severally, almost indifferently, but usually combine them in either order.*

A Called Apostle. Christ's immediate followers during the days of his flesh were called *disciples*, "learners." But early in his ministry he selected twelve whom he named *apostles* (Luke vi, 13); that is, his "emissaries," his "missionaries," so designating them, especially, as the ones whom he would *send* to preach the gospel, after his departure. "As thou sentest me into the world, I also sent [*ἀπέστειλα*] them into the world." (John xvii, 18.) This commission of the twelve became practically effective only after his death and the descent of the Holy Spirit. It was evidently not Christ's intention that the apostolic college should be perpetuated as an ecclesiastic order in his Church; and the nomination of Matthias (Acts i, 26), to the vacant place of Judas was an irregularity that apparently came to nothing, and was never repeated. As the original "twelve" died, their places were not filled. But the Christian apostolate of the first century was not restricted to the twelve; and either the Lord himself, as in the case of Paul, or the Christian consciousness of the united Church, afterwards called other choice leaders into this gospel office. Of these, Paul was clearly foremost. He derived his appointment from Christ

*For illustration, another name has had just the opposite history. "*Cæsar*," from being at first, the proper name of a particular man, afterwards in the first centuries became a dynastic title; and has since come to be a common appellation, expressing imperial rank; The Cæsar (emperor), The Kaiser.

himself, who appeared in person to him for this purpose. His claim of equality in call and office with the elder apostles was fully conceded by them; and certainly, "the signs of an apostle were wrought by him, more abundantly than by them all." (2 Cor. xii, 12; xi, 23.) And Barnabas, a remarkable and better man than Matthias, was afterwards recognized as an apostle, co-ordinate with Paul. (Acts xiv, 14.) This is the claim which Paul here advances. By the word "called" or summoned, he expressly disavows self-nomination to the office, or election by others; he is an "apostle not from men, nor through man, but through Jesus Christ." (Gal. i, 1.) "He accounted me faithful, putting me into the ministry." (1 Thess. i, 12.) "I was appointed a preacher and an apostle, a teacher of Gentiles, in faith and truth." (1 Tim. ii, 7.)

The words of the text are not "called *to be* an apostle," as in the Authorized and the Revised, but, as given above, "a called apostle;" like the common English constructions: "a chosen vessel," "a trusted leader," "a born teacher."

Set apart unto the Gospel. This setting apart from secular pursuits to the special function of the ministry, dated from Paul's birth: "God set me apart from my mother's womb, and called me through his grace." (Gal. i, 15.) The call was repeated at his commission: "He is to me a choice vessel [literally, a vessel of selectness], to bear my name before Gentiles and sons of Israel." (Acts ix, 15.) And it was finally consummated at Antioch, when "The Holy Spirit said, Set apart to me Barnabas and Saul for the work to which I have called them." (Acts xiii, 2.)

The Gospel of God. The Greek word, *εὐαγγέλιον*, and the English translation, "gospel," are etymological equivalents, both meaning "good tidings." In the Scriptures, it means the "gospel of peace, the glad tidings of good things." (Rom. x, 15.) It is the message of God to man, to the Gentile world as well as the Jewish, making known, first of all, that they may be saved; and then telling them how they may be saved. The word "gospel" is peculiarly a Pauline word. It is found twelve times in the Gospels. Paul uses it sixty-three times; Peter, *once*.

Verse 2. Which he promised of old, through his prophets, in Holy Scriptures.

The gospel which Paul preached, the gospel of life to the Gentile world, was not a recent or unexpected revelation, but was

God's oldest and only revelation of himself to men. It was planned before the foundation of the world; it was proclaimed first in the garden; and it was renewed in each succeeding dispensation. Thus we read, "With Noah he established his covenant, and with his seed after him." (Gen. ix, 9.) "To Abraham he preached the gospel, that in him should all the world be blessed." (Gen. xii, 3; Gal. iii, 8.) "By the mouth of all his prophets he showed of old that Christ should suffer." (Acts iii, 18; 1 Pet. i, 10.) "Having begun from Moses, and from all the prophets, he interpreted to them, in all the Scriptures, the things concerning himself." (Luke xxiv, 27.) "Those are my words, which I spoke to you while I was with you, that all things must be fulfilled, which have been written in the law of Moses, and prophets, and psalms, concerning me." (Luke xxiv, 44.)

In Holy Scriptures. The word thus designated, without the article, denotes these sacred writings, not quantitatively or collectively, as if "*the* Holy Scriptures," but in their *qualitative* character. The term "Holy Scriptures" is broad enough to include all the Old Testament; but here "the prophets" in particular are named: "All the prophets, as many as spoke, foretold these days." (Acts iii, 24.) The supernatural origin and the excellence of these "Scriptures, or writings, justified the term "holy," or "sacred," with which the Jews described them. For a similar reason, the Christian Scriptures of the New Testament are accounted "holy;" their divine source and their message to men are the same as of the Hebrew Scriptures. "God, who of old spoke to the fathers in the prophets, in those last days spoke to us in his Son." (Heb. i, 1.) The two "Testaments" constitute for us one "revelation." Augustine says: "In the Old Testament the New is latent; in the New, the Old is patent."

Verse 3. Concerning his Son, who was born from the seed of David, according to flesh.

The connection of the preposition **concerning** is uncertain; it may be taken with "*gospel*," or with "promised." The latter is logically preferable, declaring the tenor of the promise. The affirmation here that Christ **was born** [or "*became*"] **from the seed of David** declares Christ's pre-existence. The verb is the same as in John's saying: "The Word *became* flesh." It is the same conception as Paul expresses in the words: "God sent his

Son in the sameness with the flesh of sin" (Rom. viii, 3); that is, in the sameness with our sinful humanity. The exact line of Christ's descent, as a matter of historical fact, was in the house of David; but it was of the *essence* of the incarnation that he took upon himself the nature of fallen man, "and *became* in the sameness with men." (Phil. ii, 7.) He was a Jew, in the national line of descent, in literal fulfillment of prophecy; but above this non-essential circumstance, he was a *man*, "of our flesh and bones" (Eph. v, 30)—(a doubtful reading, but true in its teaching).

The phrase **according to flesh** means according to his "*human nature.*" The word denotes not Christ's *body* only, but his complete humanity, *body and soul*; or, if we make a point of Paul's "*tripartism,*" "body, soul, and spirit." (1 Thess. v, 23.) Such is one very common sense of the word "flesh:" "No flesh will be justified in his sight." (Rom. iii, 20.) The word, when spoken of men, usually connotes the idea of sinfulness and of frailty: "All flesh is grass." (1 Pet. i, 24.) Christ, by virtue of his incarnation was subject to all human limitations, "but without sin."

Verse 4. Who was marked out Son of God in power, according to the spirit of holiness, from resurrection of dead men, Jesus Christ our Lord.

Note the difference between the two predicates in the two verses. The third verse declares that Jesus was "born [or *became*] of the seed of David according to the flesh;" the fourth verse declares that he was **marked out Son of God in power, from resurrection of dead men**; that is, by this last and crowning miracle of the resurrection, he was clearly designated as the divine, the eternal Son. Before the world was made, he *was* the Son, in the bosom of the Father: by his incarnation he "*became*" man.

The phrase "in power" should be construed *adjectively* with "Son." Christ, by his resurrection was marked out, designated, as God's Son, no longer weak ["He was crucified through weakness," 2 Cor. xiii, 4]; but now risen, *vested with all power.* His resurrection, the close of his life of humiliation, has crowned him the Mighty Lord of all. "I was dead, and, behold, I am alive forever, and have the keys [insignia of power] of death and Hades." (Rev. i, 18.) "All authority was given me in heaven and on earth." (Mat. xxxviii, 18.) The Greek words "in power" are

the same here as in 1 Cor. xv, 43: "The body is raised *in power*;" and there, too, they should be taken adjectively: "sown *weak*, raised *strong*."

According to the spirit of holiness. As the phrase "according to the flesh" evidently refers to Christ's *humanity*, it might seem that the phrase "according to the spirit of holiness" should refer to his *human spirit*; but this, his human spirit, by all psychological and scriptural proprieties is already accounted for in the former term "flesh," which as we have seen includes Christ's entire human nature, "body, soul, and spirit." The word spirit here, then, must mean something else. But it must not be identified with "The Holy Spirit," the third person in the Trinity; for, though the words "spirit of holiness" could grammatically be so explained, this is not in the Christological line of thought. The words apply to the person of Christ only, the second person in the Trinity. "The spirit of holiness," as antithetic to Christ's humanity, means Christ's own *divine nature*, which he had with the Father before the world was, the divine Logos, which was wholly spiritual and holy, "the spirit of holiness," which became incarnate in the Son of Mary, and informed his whole being, molded his earthly life, and was the ground of his resurrection. The phraseology "spirit of holiness," rather than "holy spirit" (aside from the ambiguity in the last words), is explained by the tendency of the writers of the New Testament to adopt Hebrew forms of expression. In Hebrew, adjectives are few, and their place is supplied by substantives. It is in this way that Paul says, "God sent his Son in sameness with the *flesh of sin*." (Rom. viii, 3.) "The spirit of holiness," then, is Christ's divine spirit, whose characteristic is holiness, as "the flesh of sin" is the flesh whose characteristic is sin.

From the resurrection of dead men,—such is the literal translation. Our exegesis must conform to it. The plural number of the words "dead men" forbids its being restricted to Christ. Possibly the plural number here may point to the exemplar instances, during his earthly life, of his "power" to raise the dead to their earthly life again, as in the cases of the young man at Nain, the daughter of Jairus, and Lazarus. But more probably the plural word points to the general resurrection at the last day, of which Christ's resurrection was the first, but the most significant instance: "Christ was the first one from the resurrection of dead men." (Acts xxvi, 23.) This general resurrection,

which has its ground and assurance in the resurrection of Christ, is here conceived of, and spoken of as an accomplished fact. With Christ all men have constructively risen (Rom. vi, 11; Eph. ii, 6); and with him all men will actually rise at the last day.

Verse 5. Through whom we received grace and apostleship, with a view to obedience to the faith, among all the Gentiles, for his name's sake.

The plural pronoun **we** is Paul's official designation of himself alone. Though he always labored in company with helpers, and often courteously joined his colleagues with himself in his salutations, or in general discourse (Gal. i, 2), yet here he speaks solely of his own call to the apostleship of the Gentiles. The word **grace**, that is, "*favor*," expresses his sense of God's condescension in calling him to so high a function; and the word **apostleship** expresses his particular commission to the Gentiles. Yet, perhaps, the two words may be taken together as an instance of the common literary figure, *hendiadys*, one concept in two terms—"the grace of apostleship."

With a view to obedience to the faith. The word *πίστεως* is in the genitive case, and the literal translation is "*of faith*." The word means, as often, not the subjective personal faith which lays hold on Christ, but the gospel *creed*, the objective faith which is believed. The subjective element here is found, not in the word *faith*, but in the word *obedience*; and the obvious meaning of the passage is adequately expressed by the words "with a view to the acceptance of the gospel." It is the same sense as is expressed by the words: "A great multitude were obedient to the faith." (Acts vi, 7.) Accordingly the idiomatic translation here is the one given: "Obedience to the faith."

Among all the Gentiles. The Greek word* here translated "Gentiles" properly signifies "nations," in Classic Greek, and sometimes in the New Testament. The corresponding word in Hebrew,† the "nations," that is, aliens outside the Jewish pale, early acquired in Jewish usage, the opprobrious sense of "pagans," "heathen," "Gentiles;" and such is the sense of the Greek word in the New Testament. The Jews abominated all nations except themselves, many of them the noblest races in the world, and stigmatized them as "Gentiles." It was to those Gentiles, specifically,

* ἔθνη. † ὀἰ.

that Paul, "the apostle of the Gentiles," dedicated his life. His work in this field was regarded with hatred by the Jews at large, and with jealousy even by the Christian Jews; and his life was one long contention against the hostility of his own people, in behalf of the equality of the Gentiles in Christ. His Epistles are full of this subject: and the word "Gentiles" occurs in this distinctive way twenty-nine times in the Romans, and twenty-eight times in his other epistles. It was to discuss the relations of the Gentiles to the gospel that this epistle was written. The word "Romans" does not imply that the people whom he addressed were citizens of Rome, but only residents at Rome; and the majority of them were certainly Gentiles, and but few of them Jewish Christians. We shall have occasion under Rom. iii, 29, to discuss the relation of the Gentiles to the gospel, and to the Church of Christ.

For his name's sake. A person's name represents all that constitutes the person; and is, accordingly, a common synonym for the person. Thus we read: "There was a multitude of *names* together, about a hundred and twenty." (Acts i, 15.) So, here, Paul says, his mission is "for his *name*;" but in 2 Cor. v, 20, he says: "We are ambassadors for *Christ*."

Verse 6. Among whom are also ye, Jesus Christ's called.

The Jews held that they only were God's elect. God had called them "my people, *my chosen*, the people I have formed for myself." (Isa. xliii, 2.) This election, which was only to religious or institutional privileges, they counted an election to eternal life for themselves, for *all* of themselves. They thought it an indefeasible, absolute decree in their favor, with which the rest of the world had nothing to do. No Gentile, as such, no uncircumcised man, could be saved. This assumption for themselves, and disparagement of the Gentiles, was so deeply seated that even the converts from among the Jews to Christianity could with difficulty free themselves from their prejudice. Peter and James never lost their early preconceptions. John, whose last years were spent in the Greek city Ephesus, possibly outlived his prejudices. But very different from the first was Paul's conception and call. In his concept, the "election," in the plan of God, and the consequent "call" at most, involved not an absolute decree,

but only religious privileges or opportunities for salvation; and they embraced not any particular individuals, or any specific nation, but provisionally the whole world, the Gentiles as well as the Jews, and both on equal terms. And so the apostle counts the Gentile world, as well as the Jewish world, God's "elect" (Rom. viii, 33), and God's "called" (Rom. viii, 28). In this verse he salutes the Romans as "Christ's called."

Verse 7. To all that are in Rome, God's beloved, called, saints: Grace to you, and peace, from God our Father and the Lord Jesus Christ.

The words are not to be translated "called to be saints," that is, "summoned to become saints," as if they were not such already; nor do they mean "named [designated] saints," as if this were a title or application conferred on them as we now name the writer of this epistle "Saint Paul." The adjective *κλητός*, "called," never has the sense of "named;" it designates the relation in which the Romans, and all the Gentile world, already stood to the gospel scheme. The Romans are "God's called." The last three words of the first clause are to be taken as substantives appositive to the word "*all*." But Paul's use of these descriptive words shows that he probably has on the surface of his thought only the Christian believers, not the great mass of the Roman population, who were still heathen. Yet with Paul's large conception of the gospel scheme, and of his own universal mission, he could, if his argument required it here, as it does elsewhere, have applied those words *potentially* to *all* men, not in Rome only, but in the whole world. In the Old Dispensation the Jews, standing in special relations, holding special privileges, were *all*, without exception, deemed and named, "God's beloved" (Psa. lx, 5), "God's elect" (Isa. xliii, 20), "God's called" (Isa. xlviii, 12), "God's saints," "a holy nation" (Ex. xix, 6), "a holy people" (Deut. vii, 6), "his anointed" (Psa. cv, 15); so, now, in the New Dispensation, these relations and privileges were extended to *all the race*. All men, and not the Jews only, are constructively and potentially "God's beloved, called, saints." Yet neither the former reckoning nor the latter implies that the persons severally included in the count were therefore ethically right, or were, therefore, all to be saved. The terms used simply imply that men are brought into uniform and universal relations to God and to the gospel scheme, whereby their salvation is possible.

The word **saints**, by its derivation, and by its constant use in the Scriptures, means "*consecrated*," set apart for special ends; and it does not usually, and certainly does not here, connote that the persons so named had "already attained or were already perfect." Above all, it does not mean that they were pre-eminently holy, impeccant if not impeccable. The last sense of the word saint, which is now the current sense of the word in English, is one of the legacies of mediæval superstition, which looked back to the apostolic Church as if peculiarly holy, lifted above the level of the Church of after days. But such, alas! was not the fact. Paul constantly addresses the Churches of his day as "saints," "sanctified," "holy brethren," "elect and holy unto the Lord;" yet the data given in his Epistles show that these very Churches had often, if not always, a very low state of Christian experience and attainment. Certainly there are few evangelical Churches in our days that are not of higher type, in both doctrine and practice, than the Churches to which our apostle preached and wrote. Christians nowadays are better than they, because of the *tendency* of the gospel to lift men. By its transforming power it leads not only to outward consecration, but to the highest type of inward sanctification.

Grace to you, and peace. This is Paul's constant salutation to the Churches. The primary meaning of *grace* is "favor." It involves both the divine benevolence and the divine beneficence; benignity felt towards the undeserving, and practical kindness shown to them. Perhaps this is the utmost meaning of the word here; but it sometimes takes on an added note of efficacious help, of spiritual empowerment for godly living. "Grace" is God's love revealed to us; "peace" is the inner tranquillity that comes from the consciousness of God's approval. "Justified from faith, we have peace with God."

From God the Father of us and the Lord Jesus Christ. Such is the literal translation of those oft recurrent words. What do they mean? The conjunction *and* may grammatically connect the words *us* and *Lord*, putting both words under the regimen of the preposition *of*: "From God, the Father *of us* and *of the Lord Jesus Christ*." Such is the Socinian interpretation. Or, the conjunction *and* may grammatically connect the words *God* and *Lord*, putting both words under the regimen of the preposition *from*: "From God the Father of us, and *from the Lord Jesus Christ*." Such is the orthodox interpretation. Both are grammatical; both

make perfect sense. Which was Paul's meaning? In Titus i, 4, and in 2 Tim. i, 2, he uses the same salutation as here, omitting the words "of us." But in those passages the Socinian interpretation can not hold: God and the Lord Jesus Christ are co-ordinated by the preposition *from*, as the *common source* of the blessings pronounced. Equally in the longer passages, including, as here, the words "of us," the orthodox view must be held as the only one intended by the apostle: "Grace and peace from God our Father, and from the Lord Jesus Christ." The incidental, yet conclusive testimony here to the divinity of our Lord is as clear and satisfactory as in the explicit affirmations of the Gospel of John, or of the Epistle to the Philippians.

Verse 8. First, indeed, I thank my God through Jesus Christ for you all; because your faith is reported in the whole world.

With these complimentary words, Paul comes easily and gracefully to the declaration of his regards for the believers at Rome. He has never visited the Church, but he knows many of the brethren personally, and others he knows of by name. The second clause, with the translation **because**, instead of "that,"* expresses the *ground* of his thanksgiving, *because* their faith is proclaimed throughout the world.

The words, "**your faith is reported in the whole world,**" are doubtless a rhetorical exaggeration, like the one in John xxi, 25; yet it was not extravagant, for already the gospel had been carried to all parts of the Roman world, and to regions outside. (1 Pet. iv, 13.) Christian converts from "all the world" brought to their homes the news of Pentecost; and Paul himself, in the first twenty years of his ministry, had already (A. D. 58), "fully preached the gospel from Jerusalem, and in a circuit as far as Illyricum." (Rom. xv, 9.) Five or six years later he was able to say to the Colossians: "The gospel which ye heard was preached in the whole creation under heaven." (Col. i, 23.) Thus within one generation after Paul had begun his mission to the Gentiles, Christ's last command was approximately fulfilled. The congregation in Rome, the capital of the world, was largely made up of accessions from these provincial Churches, and was certainly widely known; so that Paul could say: "Your obedience has come abroad unto all men." (Rom. xvi, 19.)

*The Greek word *ἔτι* has this double force. For a similar ambiguity, see Rom. viii, 21.

Verses 9, 10. For God is my witness, whom I serve in my spirit in the gospel of his Son, how unceasingly I make mention of you, always in my prayers making request if somehow, now, at length, I shall be brought on my way in the will of God, to come unto you.

The first words here, **God is my witness**, is Paul's customary and solemn attestation of some grave fact known only to himself. Such appeals to God were not unusual with him on momentous occasions. Thus he says to the Corinthians, "I call God for a witness upon my soul" (2 Cor. i, 23); to the Philippians he says, "God is my witness how I long for you all." (Phil. i, 8.) Such asseverations in the name of God are not flippant oaths, like those forbidden by Christ: "Swear not at all." (Matt. v, 34.) Indeed, Christ himself recognized the obligation of judicial oaths (Matt. xxvi, 63, 64); and even God is represented as confirming his words, under the sanction of an oath: "As he could swear by no greater, he swore by himself." (Heb. vi, 13.) "As I live, says Jehovah, I swear* that to me every knee shall bow." (Rom. xiv, 11.) And Paul confirmed his own assertions under the sanction of an oath: "I die daily, I swear* it by my boast in you" (1 Cor. xv, 31); "Behold, before God I swear* that I lie not" (Gal. i, 20).

Verses 11, 12. For I long to see you, that I may impart to you some spiritual gift, with a view to your being established; but that is, to my being comforted with you, while among you, through our faith, both yours and mine, in each other.

The spiritual gifts to which Paul alludes, the miraculous Charisms of the Apostolic Church, are enumerated and discussed in the twelfth chapter of First Corinthians: "Wisdom, knowledge, faith, healings, miracles, prophecy, discerning of spirits, tongues, interpretations, all works of one and the same Spirit, who divides to each one, severally, even as he will." These endowments were conferred by the laying on of the hands of the apostles (Acts xix, 6); and their exercise was either for a sign to those that were without, or for the edification and confirmation of the Church. It was with a view to the latter, that Paul desired to impart to the Romans some such gift. We do not know what special gift he purposed, if, indeed, he had any definite gift in thought; but it

*The form of the Greek sentence implies these words.

was probably one of the first named above, specifically to this end, **that ye may be established.** But this blessing to *them* was not the whole of the apostle's hope; he hoped also to receive a personal blessing through his communion with them; "But if you be established, it is that I, too, while among you, may be comforted with you, through our faith [confidence], both yours and mine, in each other." But the apostle, in this wish, was not thinking of present refreshment only (Rom. xv, 32); he was looking forward to his purposed journey to Spain; "I hope, passing through Rome, on my way to Spain, to visit you, and by you to be sent forward thither, if, first, I have my fill, in some measure, with your society." (Rom. xv, 24.) He longed to visit Rome, but Rome was not the ultimate point of his journey; it would serve only as a new point of departure for yet wider and greater conquests in the distant West.*

Verse 13. But I would that you be not ignorant, brethren, that oftentimes I proposed to come unto you, and was hindered hitherto, that I may have some fruit among you also, even as also among the rest of the Gentiles.

In similar circumstances, writing to the Corinthians, Paul used another word: "In this trust, I *wished* to come unto you." (2 Cor. i, 15.) The expressions are in effect synonymous. But the apostle immediately adds: I was hindered until now. The hindrances we may readily believe to have been the more urgent calls of duty to tarry in the East; or, possibly, some over-ruling providences, such as once before drove him toward the West, when he himself desired to go East: "The Spirit of Jesus did not permit him to go into Bithynia." (Acts xvi, 7.)

Paul wishes: **That I may have some fruit among you also, as also among the remaining Gentiles.** Wherever he journeyed he found colonies of his own countrymen, and synagogues; and his first preaching was always in the synagogues. In these he had two sorts of hearers, Jews and devout Gentiles. The latter were men who had accepted the Jewish faith without submitting to circumcision. Of these two classes of hearers, the Jews usu-

* It was three years before Paul saw Rome; and he came there only as a prisoner, and for two years longer remained under surveillance, in his own hired house. Then, after those five years, he is said to have carried out his purpose (perhaps not immediately) of visiting Spain. Eusebius, *Eccles. Hist.*, II, xxii, 2.

ally rejected the gospel, because it was too liberal for them; but the Gentiles, for the same reason, invariably gave it a grateful and ready acceptance. Thus, at Iconium, "Paul entered into the synagogue of the Jews, and so spoke that a great multitude both of Jews and of Greeks [Gentiles] believed" (Acts xiv, 1); and, again, at Thessalonica, "Paul went into the synagogue, as was his wont, and reasoned with them from the Scriptures; . . . and some [Jews] were persuaded, and of the devout Greeks a great multitude" (Acts xvii, 2). These converts became the nuclei of Christian congregations, which then were built up by further converts directly from the unbelieving Gentiles. The expression, "Among *you*, as among the *other Gentiles*," shows that the Roman Church was preponderantly Gentile. The proper names in the salutations, in chapter xvi, are mostly Gentile, though there was also a Jewish element.

Verse 14. I am debtor both to Greeks and to Barbarians, both to wise men and to ignorant.

This classification of the human race has respect rather to the various culture, or social condition of men, than to their nationalities. It was, originally, a Greek designation for themselves on the one hand, and for the rest of the world on the other. All who were not Greek were **barbarian**; that is, foreign, not *barbarous*, as the Persians, the Romans, the Jews. After Alexander's time, B. C. 323, the Greek language, the language of culture, became cosmopolitan, and the word **Greeks** began to denote the great civilized, dominant races. After the conquest of Greece by the Romans, B. C. 146, the Greek language and culture largely prevailed at Rome. Captive Greece captured its fierce victor,* and the Romans, from this point of view, were classed, as Paul classed them, as "Greeks" (just as, later, in the times of the Byzantine Empire, the Greeks, for political considerations, reversing the names, called themselves "Romaic"). Thenceforward, the word barbarians denoted all the uncivilized world besides. In this grouping of the Gentiles, the Jews are, for the moment, left out of sight; but they come into view in the seventeenth verse, where, from the Jewish standpoint, all the world is divided into Jews and Greeks.

*"Græcia capta ferum victorem cepit." Hor. Ep. II, 1, 156.

Verse 15. Thus, as for me, I would fain preach the gospel to you also, that are in Rome.

Paul held the world as his parish. In this aspect of his work, that he is under equal obligations to all men, he declares that he is eager to carry the gospel to the high places of the earth, to cultivated people as well as to uncultivated. Though Rome is the capital of the world, the center of power, and wisdom, and jurisprudence, yet, the apostle confident in the power, and wisdom, and righteousness of the gospel, longs for the opportunity to carry his message even to this seat of all that is greatest in the institutions of man. He is not ashamed of his message.

Verse 16. For I am not ashamed of the gospel; for it is God's power unto salvation to every one that has faith; both to Jew, first, and to Greek.

The first clause is not an allusion to the popular opprobrium that early attached to the gospel of the Man of Calvary; as when Peter says, "If any one suffer as [on the charge of being] a 'Christian,' let him not be ashamed." (1 Pet. iv, 16.) Nay, Paul declared that the ignominy of his Master's death was the ground of his boasting: "God forbid that I should boast save in the *cross* of our Lord Jesus Christ." (Gal. vi, 14.) But on the contrary, what he means here to say is, that he is not ashamed of the gospel by reason of any inadequacy in it to save man, and to save all men. It can save Gentiles as well as Jews. There are no limitations in its gracious proffers to mankind. While Judaism, did not claim to be a message of peace to the world at large, and even debarred from its communion all who were not circumcised; the gospel on the other hand claimed the world as its own, and invited the world to its fold. Paul counts it a gospel to the Gentiles especially. It is in this light that he declares that he is not ashamed of the gospel. He can look man in the face without blushing for God, for the gospel, or for himself, as its herald, as he proclaims the divine even-handed justice, in giving *every* man, Gentile as well as Jew, an equal chance for salvation. The word **every man** expresses the scope of the gospel plan. Unlike Jewish exclusivism, or Calvinistic particularism, the gospel compasses the whole race, and every man of the race. All are redeemed, all may be saved; not as the Jews thought, and arrogated to themselves, by obeying the law, which no man can do; but on

the simple condition of having faith in Christ, which every man can do.

In the words both to Jew, first, and to Greek, we have the Jewish classification of men, just as in verse 14 we have the Greek. The Jews grouped all outside the chosen race as "the nations," "the heathen," "the Gentiles;" of whom one of the foremost races, "the Greeks," is here put for all. The word "first" does not express preference; but is merely a chronological date. Paul, unlike his countrymen, counted all men equal before God, equal in their inherent rights in the provisions of the gospel; and by this word "first,"* he merely recognizes the earlier historic call of the Jews to the privileges of organized Church fellowship: "First [firstly] indeed because they were intrusted with the oracles of God." (Rom. iii, 2.) As, in the patriarchal days, the divine election and call came first to Abraham, and to Israel, and to the Jews, though not for themselves only, but only provisionally, and in trust for the rest of mankind, so now, the gospel was to be preached to the Jews first, not because of a higher right, but because their prior knowledge of God put them in advance of the heathen world. So Christ commanded to begin at Jerusalem; so Paul always began at the synagogue. It was merely good policy to build on a foundation already laid.

Verse 17. For in it is revealed God's [plan of] justification from faith, with a view to faith; as it has been written: "But the just from faith will live [have life]." (Hab. ii, 4.)

This much-controverted verse is the introduction to the discussion in the epistle; but it is not, as so commonly held, a statement of the great theme of the epistle. The fundamental thesis which Paul discusses is really found in the question: "Is God God of Jews only? is he not God of Gentiles also?" (Rom. iii, 29.) The apostle proposes, as his main purpose, to discuss against the assumption of the Jews, the question, "Who then may be saved?" But, first of all, yet only as incident to this main purpose, he needs to discuss the other grave question,

* "First" is an adverb, as if with the consent of the Dictionaries we might say "firstly." For a similar ambiguity in this word, see 1 Thess. iv, 16. "The dead in Christ will rise first [firstly];" that is, not they, the first ones, but this as the first act, or, "in the first place."

“How [on what basis] may men be saved?” This latter question is the one that emerges in this verse.

The passage opens with the logical conjunction **for**, whose connection and importance in Paul’s argumentation is not always duly apprehended. We shall have frequent occasion to call attention to it. Notice the connection here; the word “for” refers to the words “every man” in the previous verse. The gospel is God’s power unto salvation to *every man*, whether Jew or Greek; to **EVERY** man, I say; **FOR** in it is revealed God’s method of justification; not as the Jews thought from works of law, which are possible to no man, but from faith, which is possible for all men.

Nevertheless, though this verse is not the thesis of the epistle, its several terms, in words and phrases, are the most important in the epistle, and in the apostle’s theology; **justification**, “God’s way of justification,” **faith, just from faith, with a view to faith, life, and will have life.** On the proper understanding of these terms turns the exegesis of the epistle and a consistent exposition of “Paul’s gospel.”

The Greek word,* here correctly translated *justification*, is always represented, or, rather, misrepresented, in the Authorized and Revised Versions of Paul’s Epistles, by the word *righteousness*. This English word is an unfortunate rendering; indeed, in these Epistles, it never expresses the meaning of the Greek word; and, therefore, can never come into the line of the apostle’s thought and argument. This English word, “righteousness,” is a term of *ethical* significance, and is synonymous, or almost synonymous, in popular apprehension, and in theological acceptance, with the word “holiness.” It always involves the notion of character, of upright life and affections. Consistently with this notion, and correctly, Webster’s Dictionary defines the word “righteousness” as *holiness, purity*; and adds the remark: “Righteousness, as used in Scripture and theology, in which it chiefly occurs, is nearly equivalent to *holiness*, comprehending holy principles, and affections of heart, and conformity of life to the divine law.” This definition of the English word “righteousness” will be generally accepted by English scholars as exhaustive and correct. And, with this sense, the word “righteousness” does not express the sense of the apostle’s Greek word. In Paul’s writing, if not

* Δικαιοσύνη; found thirty-four times in Romans, twenty-four times in the other Pauline epistles.

elsewhere in the New Testament, the Greek word is a legal or forensic term, exclusively. It does not mean *righteousness*, that is, approved moral character, or "holiness;" but it means justification, that is, exculpation from guilt, or right-standing, before the law.

Whatever may have been the significance once of the English word "*righteousness*,"* it clearly does not now express the meaning of the Greek word in this epistle; and it is unfortunate that it should have been perpetuated in our translations of the Bible. No reader ever gets out of this English word the right sense of the Pauline passages in which it stands, or ever apprehends Paul's line of argument. Most commentators, with a consciousness that the English word is not an adequate equivalent of the Greek word, realize the need of large explanation of the word; but unfortunately their explanations do not explain. It is difficult even for a verbal expert or a theological athlete to wrest an ethical term to express a forensic concept. But Paul's Greek word was a commonplace in the vocabulary of the synagogue, and of the Christian Church in his day. It expressed to all hearers a *forensic* notion, and once apprehended did not need long discourse to explain it. Nor, if our English Bible gave the proper English equivalent of the Greek word in these sixty passages, would commentators, nowadays, need to waste their effort in giving (as most of them do), a wholly mistaken exegesis of the passages.

Paul's Greek word, for which justification is the exact English equivalent, expresses in Paul's writings, either, first, the divine *way of justifying* the sinner, that is, of acquitting him from his guilt; or, secondly, the resultant *state of justification*, or acquittance from guilt. Both senses frequently occur; and both are found in the passage, "To him that has faith on God who justifies the ungodly man, his faith is reckoned unto justification." (Rom. iv, 5.) It is with these meanings, these only, of the word, that we can keep in touch with Paul's line of thought or argument.

*The Greek word was translated by Wyclif, and by Tyndale, by the old word "Rightwiseness," which was the only purely Saxon word they could command for the Greek "*δικαιοσύνη*," or the Latin "justificatio." This word meant "right-ways-ness," right-standing with the law. The second syllable in "right-wise-ness" has no connection with the adjective "wise;" but is the adverbial element found in "likewise," and in "always." The word has been perpetuated in the English Bible, a little changed in form, but completely warped in signification. So that, unfortunately for English readers, and for theological teaching, the word "righteousness," instead of being a version, is now a perversion of the apostle's meaning.

It is certainly one of the remarkable literary infelicities of the current English translations of the Bible, followed by commentators and theological writers, that Paul's Greek verb *δικαιοῦν*, "justify," which occurs fifteen times in this epistle, and twelve times in his other epistles, should *always* be translated by the correct word "to justify;" and, at the same time (and often in the same sentence, as in the instance quoted just above), the substantive *δικαιοσύνη*, "justification," cognate with the verb in derivation and meaning, should *never*, out of sixty instances, be translated by the correct word, "justification," or by some equivalent forensic term, as pardon, forgiveness, acquittal, but always by "righteousness," a purely ethical term.

Paul's Greek vocabulary was sufficiently large and discriminated in meaning to express his doctrinal concepts definitely and distinctly. We need not go astray in tracing his thoughts. Paul used the words "just," "justification," "to justify,"* always as *forensic* terms, expressing the relation of men to the law of rewards and penalties. He used the words "holy," "holiness," or, "sanctification," "to sanctify,"† as *ethical* terms, expressing character, moral condition. And he never confounded the words of the two groups.

But there is a striking fact in the statistics of the apostle's use of the two groups. Of the forensic words "justification" and "justify," there are fifty-one instances in this epistle; of the ethical words "sanctification" and "sanctify" (or "holiness"), there are twelve instances. The explanation of the disparity is simple. Paul's sole aim in the epistle leads him to the forensic line of thought; this occupies the entire field. His references to ethical points are incidental, few, and brief; and might be omitted without disturbing his argument.

The teaching of the New Testament, properly understood, clearly discriminates justification from righteousness (or holiness, or sanctification). But the distinction has not always been understood by theologians, or indicated or vindicated in their systems. Confusion of thought in their theological systems and discussions, easily follows hard upon the confusion of the Scriptural terms. Jerome's Vulgate (A. D. 400) translated the Greek word for "justification" sometimes by "justitia," and sometimes by "justificatio." The first word, which is quite classical, was not so much a mistranslation as it was equivocal; for it might have the

* δίκαιος. δικαιοσύνη. δικαιοῦν. † ἅγιος. ἁγιασμός. ἁγιαίειν.

correct forensic sense. But later on, Augustine (A. D. 430), who did not read Greek, misunderstood "justitia" as meaning "justness" ethically, that is, a regenerate state; and not, or not merely, the forensic act of justification, that is, the judicial pardon of sin; and he adopted this ethical sense in his theological writings. The Catholic Church accepted Augustine's views; and the Council of Trent says: "Justification is not the mere remission of sins, but also sanctification and renewal of the inner man." (Session vi, Chap. vii.) This misunderstanding of the word leads to a misconception of the plan of justification in theodicy, and of its place in theology. All the Pauline usage of the word is against the Catholic extension of its signification. It means "remission of sin," that is, acquittance from the guilt of sin; and it never means cleansing from the stain of sin; it never means *regeneration*; it never means *righteousness*.

Now, in the text before us, the word used is "justification,"—"God's [plan of] justification." God's way of justifying sinners from faith as contradistinguished from the Jew's scheme of justification from works. We should emphasize the word *God's* here. It is not, as the English translations give it, "the *righteousness* of God," in any possible sense of that word, or of that phrase. It is not, subjectively, God's personal righteousness, the eternal, ethical attribute of his character. That the apostle's expression here, can not mean "the righteousness of God," his inherent personal attribute, is clear from the fact that his phraseology, for the same concept as here, is sometimes different. In Phil. iii, 9 we have the expression: "the justification *from* God,"* where, of course, the sense can not be "God's righteousness." Nor, again, is it God's judicial rectitude, or right-dealing; for this meaning will not suit the context. It is, objectively, God's eternal scheme, or provision, for dealing, when the exigency arose, with the problem of man's sin and recovery; it is his "plan of justification"† for fallen men, which he devised of old, "having found a ransom." (Job xxxiii, 24.) This is the sense of the word everywhere in Paul's epistles.

* τὴν ἐκ θεοῦ δικαιοσύνην.

† Wesley, in his "Notes on the New Testament," written in 1754, had not yet caught the apostle's concept, and misled by the English word "righteousness," stumbled in his explanation of this verse; but eight years later, in 1762, he wrote: "I believe the expression 'Righteousness of God' means God's method of justifying sinners, as in Rom. i, 17: 'For therein is the righteousness of God revealed;' that is, his way of justifying sinners." "Thoughts on Imputed Righteousness." Works, Vol. VI, 101.

It is, for example, the only possible sense of the word in another passage in this epistle: "For the Jews ignoring God's plan of justification [from faith], and seeking to establish their own plan of justification [from works], did not submit themselves to God's plan of justification." (Rom. x, 3.) So also, Paul wrote to the Philippians words even more explicit, to the same effect: "That I may be found in Christ, not having a justification of my own, the one from Law; but the justification through faith in Christ, the justification from God, upon the ground of faith." (Phil. iii, 9.) This, too, is the only possible sense of the word in another passage where the contrast between *κατάκρισις* "condemnation," and *δικαιοσύνη* compels us to give the latter the sense of "justification:" "If the dispensation of condemnation was glorious, much rather does the dispensation of justification abound in glory." (2 Cor. iii, 9.)

This then, this only, is what this word "justification" expressed to the synagogue, and to the apostle Paul, and to the primitive Christian Church. The concept lies at the very basis of all religious thought the world over. There is among men a universal sense of demerit, and a universal anxiety to be acquit from guilt. This feeling of ill-desert and of guilt may in some instances be vague; but it exists even among the lowest savages. And in proportion as men have clearer ethical ideas, the feeling of condemnation grows clearer and stronger, and the solicitude for relief more urgent. Men everywhere are religious for this one end. The great question of all religions, the false religions as well as the true, is embodied in the word of Bildad the Shuhite. "How shall men be justified [or stand acquit] with God." (Job xxv, 4.) The Jews hoped for favor with God, as being "his elect people;" but they all the same claimed to merit their justification from works of law. In the same way the ethnic religions all prescribe the doing of something to merit favor with God, or, at least, to avert his wrath. They enjoin the maceration of the body; the offering of costly sacrifices; of precious things; the blood of animals; the life of human victims, even of those dearest to them; "they slay their first-born for their transgression, the fruit of their body for the sin of their soul." (Micah vi, 7.) In this matter, then, Jews and heathen stand substantially on the same footing. They give a venal God something, that they may get something back. But Paul declares the Jewish claim (and by parity, the heathen) inadmissible: "From works of law will no

flesh be justified before him." (Rom. iii, 20.) The only hope of justification for all men, is through faith in Jesus Christ.

II. The word **faith** is another of the momentous terms in this verse; a word which plays a leading part in Paul's writings, especially in his contention against the Jewish claim to be justified from works.

The careful reader of the Bible finds no more marked contrast between the Old Testament and the New than in their respective vocabularies. The New Testament, expressive of gospel ideas and doctrines, has a rich store of new words, or of words with enlarged senses, that have little or no place in the Old Testament. One of these is the word "faith." In the English translation of the Old Testament this term is found but twice,* in Deut. xxxii, 20, and in the famous passage in Habakkuk, so often quoted, with a variation, in the New Testament, "But the just shall live by his faith" (Hab. ii, 4). Yet if the word is not often found in the Old Testament, the thing itself was not unknown to the patriarchs. The writer of "Hebrews" gives some grand instances of this early faith, and declares of those eldest sons of men that they "all died in *the faith*, not having received the promises, but having seen them from afar, and saluted them." (Heb. xi, 13.) But in the New Testament, the Greek word for faith, *πίστις*, occurs about two hundred and fifty times, and the Greek verb *πιστεύειν*, "to have faith," "to *faith* a thing," † usually translated "to believe," occurs about as many times more. One at least (usually both) of these words occurs in every book in the New Testament, except the two short letters of John. It is worthy of note that in the Gospel of John the noun "faith" does not occur at all, but the verb, "to believe," "to have faith," ninety-five times.

The word *faith* has several special meanings in the Scriptures, according as it expresses the exercises of the intellectual faculties, or of the sensibilities, or of the higher religious faculty of the will.

*The Hebrew word, however, occurs about fifty times. It is usually translated by words denoting *faithfulness*, *truth*. Furerst's Hebrew Lexicon says that it never occurs in the sense of *faith*, which it did not take until the latest period of the language.

†This verb belongs to the old English vocabulary. Shakespeare says: "Would the reposal of trust in thee unke thy words *faithed*?" King Lear II, 1, 72. It is unfortunate that this English verb has not made good its place in literary, and especially in theological usage.

I. 1. Faith may denote, objectively, the *creed*; the system of doctrines accepted by the Church; for example: "He preaches the *faith* which he once destroyed" (Gal. i, 23); "The *faith* once delivered to the saints" (Jude 3); "Your most holy *faith*" (Jude 20).

2. Faith may denote, subjectively, *credence*; an intellectual, a scientific persuasion of any fact, or historical belief of any thing taught; *e. g.*, "Thou *believest* [hast faith] that there is one God. . . . The devils also *believe*." (James ii, 19.) This exercise of *faith* is purely intellectual; and has no saving value.

II. 3. The word may denote fidelity, or faithfulness to obligation; for example: "Shall their unfaith annul the faith [faithfulness] of God?" (Rom. iii, 3); "By their unfaith [unfaithfulness] they were broken out; but thou by thy faith [fidelity] standest" (Rom. xi, 20).

4. Faith may denote confidence, trust in another; for example, "That I may be comforted while with you, through your faith [personal confidence] and mine, in each other." (Rom. i, 12.)

These exercises of faith, in Nos. 3 and 4, are subjective and ethical; but they are not of such religious character as God reckons for justification. Even bad men have these forms of faith.

III. 5. Faith may denote, finally, the Christian grace of trust, or reliance on Christ as the Redeemer and Savior. Faith is the soul's incumbency, or staying of itself on the provisions of the gospel. This is the spiritual, religious, saving exercise of faith: "With the heart, faith is exercised unto justification." (Rom. x, 10.) It is the highest and grandest exercise of the spiritual faculty, the will, and is the appointed condition and channel for the pardoning grace of God. "By grace [that is, *gratis*] ye have been saved, through faith; and that is not of yourselves; it is the gift of God." (Eph. ii, 8.)

The verb is **revealed** suggests that the gospel is not new in itself; only what has previously existed can be "revealed." God's plan of justification from faith was established of old; the revelation of it (in its fullness) is now new. "In former generations it was not made known [fully] to the sons of men, as it was now revealed to his holy apostles and prophets." (Eph. iii, 5.) Yet this plan is the only plan on which God has ever worked. It is said of Abraham that "he had faith in God, and his faith was

reckoned to him unto justification." (Rom. iv, 3.) No man ever found acceptance with God in any other way. Even in the case of those who, in earliest days, or in heathen lands, thought to work out, to earn, their salvation by good works, God, in his willingness and ability to save, counted the *motive* as an *implicit* faith; and though he did not accept the works, he accepted the latent faith for justification. But now the gospel reveals, makes known, to men the primal, and normal, and only plan of salvation,—justification *from faith*.

That in this verse the words **justification from faith** are to be construed together is shown by the invariable sequence of these words elsewhere. Paul declares: "We reckon that man is *justified by faith* [*πίστει*], apart from works of law." (Rom. iii, 28.) This is the keynote to Paul's argument, and to the theology of the Christian Church. It is the *articulus stantis vel cadentis ecclesie*. We read: "God will *justify* the circumcision *from faith* [*ἐκ πίστεως*] (Rom. iii, 30); "Having been *justified from* [*ἐκ*] *faith*, we have peace" (Rom. v, 1); "The Gentiles attained *justification from* [*ἐκ*] *faith*" (Rom. ix, 30); "The *justification from* [*ἐκ*] *faith* . . . says, the word is near thee, in thy heart" (Rom. x, 6-8); "Knowing that man is *justified through* [*διὰ*] *faith* . . . we had faith that we may be *justified from* [*ἐκ*] *faith*" (Gal. ii, 16); "We await the hope of *justification from* [*ἐκ*] *faith*" (Gal. v, 5). The cumulative evidence from Paul's own writings is overwhelming that this is the only admissible construction of the first words of this verse: "God's plan of *justification from faith* is revealed in the gospel." And it is the only construction, and is the only sense which the apostle attaches to the quotation in this verse from Habakkuk: "The *just from faith* will live." (Hab. ii, 4.)

The connection and meaning of the words next following: **unto faith** (*εἰς πίστιν*), or better, "with a view to faith" is variously given. 1. The connection which joins the words "from faith unto faith" in continuous sense, makes them express a gradational progress, or climax in religious experience, "from one degree of faith to another." This interpretation, though not destitute of meaning, and apparently justified by similar (but not the same) construction with other words elsewhere [as, for example, "They go from strength to strength" (Ps. lxxxiv, 7), and "They are changed from glory to glory" (2 Cor. iii, 18)] is yet, not in the line of the apostle's argument, which does not aim to distinguish between different degrees of faith, the incipient and the perfected,

but distinguishes between things that are generically different,—on the one hand, a faith, which is already absolute and complete; and which is presupposed as the one saving condition of the gospel, and, on the other hand, works of law, the non-saving reliance and boast of the Jews. 2. Another combination connects the words “unto faith” with the verb “revealed.” If we look at the English words only, this connection seems grammatically possible; but the interpretation which makes the words “unto faith” mean “to the expectant and receptive faith of the believer,” though good in itself, and evangelical (and apparently in accord with the language of Rom. iii, 22, “God’s justification has been manifested, . . . through faith . . . unto all that have faith”), is also not in the line of the apostle’s argument; and the sense is probably not in accordance with the Greek. This interpretation would be possible, not as here with the preposition *eis*, “into” or “unto,” but only with the dative case, *τῇ πίστει*, “to faith,” as an indirect limit to the verb, (as in 1 Cor. ii, 10, “But *to us* God revealed it;” and, Eph. iii, 5, “It was revealed to the saints.”)* But with the preposition *eis*, the clause “unto faith” must be counted a general adverbial modifier of the verb, and with a telic significance. The proper construction of words with the preposition *eis*, is found in Rom. vi, 16, 19. “As ye yielded your members to iniquity, *with a view to iniquity*, so now yield them to justification, *with a view to sanctification*.” Accordingly, 3, we interpret the passage as meaning “God’s plan of justification from faith was revealed in the gospel *with a view to faith*;” that is, *to excite faith* in the hearer, and thus to do away with reliance on works.

The concluding words in the verse, **The just from faith will live**, are a quotation from Habakkuk. They were uttered in the last days of the Hebrew commonwealth, about B. C. 605. Habakkuk, prophet and patriot as well, foresees the invasion of his country by Nebuchadnezzar; and foretells calamity to the presumptuous Jew, but safety to the righteous Jew. Henderson well translates, for Habakkuk’s sense:

“Behold the proud! his soul is not right within him;

But the righteous shall live [i. e., will save his life], by his faith.” (Hab. ii, 4.)

In this verse, the word *faith* obviously means *fidelity*, or obedience to God. The last clause is famous in New Testament con-

* ἡμῖν δὲ ἀπεκάλυψεν ὁ θεός. ἀπεκαλύφθη τοῖς ἁγίοις.

nections. It is quoted once and again by Paul (Rom. i, 17; Gal. iii, 11), and once by the author of Hebrews (x, 38). And Luther, in the crisis of his religious struggle, in the midst of some humiliating penance at Rome, suddenly recalled these words, "The just shall *live by faith*;" and instantly and forever recoiled from his superstition. It was a memorable incident for him; but though he gave the words the usual evangelical sense, he did not give them the sense of the apostle. What is the meaning in the prophet's Hebrew text? and what is the meaning in these New Testament quotations?

The *order* of the words in the Hebrew, and in the Septuagint, and in the Greek Testament, is that given above: "The just from faith will live." And in both languages the words may be distributed grammatically and logically in either of two ways, according as the prepositional phrase "from faith" is connected in thought as an adverb with the verb "will live," or as an adjective, with the noun "just." We shall then have two alternatives: 1. "The just—from faith will live;" or, 2. "The just from faith—will live." The difference is fundamental, involving the explanation of the words severally, and the whole tenor of the Habakkukian saying, and of the Pauline quotation.

Undoubtedly, in the Masoretic text of the Bible, the disjunctive accent (*Tiphka*), of the Hebrew word for "the just," gives the former construction for the saying as it is in the English Bible, both in the Old Testament and in the New: "The just—will live by faith." This grammatical notation of the synagogue, dates, however, only from about A. D. 600, and so has in itself no final authority; but aside from this late notation of the Hebrew scholars, clearly their interpretation was right; and this was the only possible connection in Habakkuk's own mind. It is plain that the prophet *meant* to say that the righteous man should not be slain by the Chaldeans, but should save his life by his faithfulness to God. Accordingly, we can not hold that the passage in Habakkuk was designed to express the Pauline doctrine of justification from faith; for the connection in which it stands in the Hebrew does not admit of this specific meaning. The interpretation of the synagogue is the correct one for the Hebrew text.

But it is equally plain that the words of Habakkuk, if read independently of the original connection, and of the present Hebrew accentuation, are capable verbally, grammatically, of the other construction, "The just by faith—will live," and therefore

of another interpretation. The words, too, severally, will now take on modified meanings to fit them for the new thought. This different construction for the words, and different interpretation for the sense, is the one which Paul gives to the saying, to express the Christian dogma of *justification from faith*, and the consequent eternal life of the believer. This new dogmatic use of the saying was all the easier to Paul, from the well-known consecution of the words in both the Hebrew and the Septuagint; the latter of which Paul doubtless here had in mind. At all events, whether he had the Hebrew (without accents), or the Septuagint, before him, the now Christian rabbi read into the familiar saying a higher meaning than it had borne to him in the school of Gamaliel, or in the synagogue service. Yet, while Paul reverses the logical connection of the words as they stand in the Hebrew, and reads into the saying this new sense, all that was of ethical value in it of old, remains; and it is now simply lifted from the plane of practical Old Testament piety and obedience, to the expression of the distinctive Christian concept and dogma, that man is justified not by works, but from faith; and that the man so justified from faith, will not die forever, but will have eternal life: "He that is just from faith will have life."

In Habakkuk the words *just, faith, live*, are terms substantially of *ethical* significance; in Paul they are terms substantially of *forensic* note. We have already discussed the word *faith*: it remains that we discuss the other two words.

1. **Just:** In Habakkuk the word "just" means *pious*: it describes the man who has habitually lived an upright (though we can not say a *perfect*) life, and is what we conventionally call a righteous man, innocent of overt offense. This sense of the word is found in the saying: "Against a *just* man [a godly, upright man] Law does not lie." (1 Tim. i, 9.) It is found in a higher sense in regard to Jesus: "Ye refused the Holy and *Just* One." (Acts iii, 14.) This popular meaning is the evident sense of the word in Habakkuk; but Paul, in his citation of the Habakkukian saying, uses the word "*just*," not in the conventional sense of *good* or *pious* (which may have various shades of meaning), but in the legal, or forensic, sense of *acquitted, free from guilt* (which has but one absolute meaning). The word describes, not what a man habitually is, ethically, or as a religious man, but what he forensically becomes in the sight of the law, as the result of faith. The logic of the connection decides absolutely for this sense of the quotation.

That the arrangement of the words in the English translations, both Authorized and Revised, and the sense conveyed by them can not be correct, to express Paul's concept, is shown by the following consideration:

The word "just," if taken apart from the prepositional phrase "from faith," as is assumed by the reading, "The just—will live from faith," assumes that the person described is already just to begin with, that is, *that he must be counted absolutely free from offense and guilt*; but of this just person the apostle declares that he "will live from faith." But what does this declaration, "will live from faith," mean, when spoken of such a subject? It must mean one of two things; either, first, that the "just" man "will lead his [daily] life from faith;" or, secondly, that he "will attain to [eternal] life from faith." But neither of these senses is in accord with Paul's thought in this sentence, nor in accord with the New Testament concept of the place of faith in the gospel plan. A man who is sinful may become "justified from faith" in Christ; and a converted sinner may "lead his life from faith" in Christ (Gal. ii, 20), and not from works. But a man who as this construction of the sentence assumes, is "just," to start with—that is, has never been guilty of offense (as, for example, Adam before he fell, the divine Son of God, the angels in heaven)—gets nothing "from faith." He neither (on the first hypothesis) "leads his daily life *from faith*" in Christ, but from works; nor (on the second hypothesis) attains to eternal life *from faith* in Christ, but from works. To a "*just man*," a man who is *just*, in this absolute sense of the word, both these consequences result, not "*from faith*" in Christ, as the Redeemer from sin, but from his own obedience to law; and his title to life is "from works of law;" as it is said, "Moses describes the justification that is from law, that the man who has *done its works* will live [have eternal life] in it." (Rom. x, 5.)

It follows that the only possible construction of the oft-quoted sentence, in *Paul's evangelical sense* of the saying, is: "*The just from faith—will live;*" that is, any sinner (and Paul's discourse is not of just men but of sinners) who has been *justified* (or acquit of his guilt) *from faith* will have eternal life. Paul is not alleging, as Habakkuk, that "the pious Jew will live [be delivered alive from the Chaldeans] by his fidelity to God;" nor is he alleging (as he is usually understood), that "the pious man will live his daily life by the rule of faith," whatever that may mean; but is alleging,

in the gospel sense which he attaches to the saying, that the man, the sinful man, who has been justified from his sin and guilt, by his faith in Christ (and is therefore no longer amenable to the penalty of eternal death) will have eternal life. Christ himself declares this principle, and interprets the words, "will have life," "Verily, verily, I say to you that he that has faith on me has eternal life." (John vi, 47.)

2. The word will live.

This verb, "*to live*," is susceptible of different senses, which must be ascertained from the connections. It may mean—

1. To be alive; or to come to life, physically, as opposed to *νεκρός*, *dead*. (1) *Literally*: "This thy brother was *dead*, and *lived* again" (Luke xv, 32); "Christ *died* and *lived* again, that he may be Lord of *dead* men and *living*" (Rom. xiv, 9). (2) *Metaphorically*: To be ethically alive. "I *was alive* once—and I *died*" (Rom. vii, 9); "Thou hast a name that thou *livest*, and art *dead*" (Rev. iii, 1).

2. To go on one's way; to continue one's course; to lead one's daily life. "If ye *live* after the flesh, ye will *die*." (Rom. viii, 13.)

3. To pass the time, to be employed, to demean one's self: (1) *Intransitively*. "According to the strictest sect of our religion, I *lived* a Pharisee" (Acts xxvi, 5). (2) *Transitively*. "The life that I now *live*, I *live* by faith" (Gal. ii, 20).

4. To find a livelihood: "The Lord ordained that they who preach the gospel should *live* from the gospel." (1 Cor. ix, 14.)

5. To have eternal life; to be endowed with existence: "The *dead* will hear the voice of the Son of God, and they that have heard *will live*" (John v, 25); "If any one eat from this bread, he *will live forever*" (John vi, 51); "If ye put to death the deeds of the body, ye *will live*" (Rom. viii, 13).

Now, in the text before us, the fifth of those meanings is clearly the appropriate one: "He that is justified from faith will have eternal life;" and he is the only one that will have life, "for from works of law will no man be justified."

Verse 18. For God's wrath is revealed from heaven against all impiety and unrighteousness of men, who hinder the truth in unrighteousness.

The conjunction **for** connects the thought back to the word "justification," in the preceding verse. This term, which means "acquittal from guilt," implies the fact of sin, and points to the

condition of man under sin, and to God's attitude towards it. God's justification from faith is revealed to the world, with a view to stimulate faith; but there is also revealed (*made known* to the world) God's wrath against all unrighteousness of men, with a view to restrain men from it. The word for **wrath**, sometimes also translated "anger," is but the judicial indignation and resentment of a Holy Being towards sin. Anger, which properly is not a malignant passion, is just as normal to the character of God as to man, who was made in his moral likeness. A being rightly constituted can not avoid this feeling when the occasion arises, and ought not to avoid it. Not the emotion of anger, but the improper indulgence of it is wrong. Paul commands, "Be angry;" but adds this admonition, "and sin not." (Eph. iv, 26.) Vengeance (vindictiveness), is never right for man: but "Vengeance [vindication], is mine, says the Lord." (Rom. xii, 19.)

The first clause of the verse perhaps means not only that the *fact* of God's anger was declared from heaven, whether through the voice of inspiration, or in the conscience of men (though both of these things are also true); but also that his primitive wrath is practically *exhibited* in the world, in the unhappy experience of sinners.

The words **impiety and unrighteousness** (injustice), name the two forms of sin, which are the objects of God's anger,—directed, the one against God, the other against man. The word **all** in this clause, as always in Paul's writings, must be taken in its largest latitude. The word here contemplates not the Gentile world only, though first in this catalogue of wicked men; but also the Jewish world. The remainder of this chapter describes the sins of the Gentiles especially. The second chapter describes the sins of the Jews.

The Greek verb, here translated **hinder**, has the double and opposite senses of maintaining and of impeding. In Luke the word has the former sense: "Having heard the word, they *hold it fast* in a good and honest heart." (Luke viii, 15.) In our present passage, it has the other meaning: "Men *hold back* [hinder] the truth;" they keep it from running, and being glorified in its mission. The word **truth** in this description of the Gentile world can not mean the definite truth of revelation; but rather so much of the general knowledge of God as is found among men, from the primitive tradition and from the light of natural religion, as is shown by the next verses.

Verse 19. Because so much of God as is known is manifest in them; for God manifested it to them.

The conjunction **because** relates back to the assumed mass of *truth*, which the heathen know of, but "hinder." They hinder the truth, the truth which enlightens every man that comes into the world. This truth is the primitive and true, though imperfect, knowledge of God which came down from the earliest revelation, the common heritage of man. It was not the full-orbed knowledge of God which was given in later generations. It was only **so much of God as is known to all men**, his being, and his natural attributes; for this much **God manifested to them**. This aorist tense carries the act back to the original constitution of men as moral beings and their first knowledge of God. The image of God in man, and his moral intuition of God, though blurred, has not been lost. All men have clear perceptions of moral distinctions. God has never left himself without this attestation of himself. This never absent recognition of God is reaffirmed, more definitely, in the next verse: "Ever since the creation of the world, his attributes are seen."

Verse 20. For his unseen attributes, both his eternal power and divinity, since the creation of the world are clearly seen, being understood by his works; so that they are without excuse.

These are the attributes which are revealed by the light of nature, the natural attributes which belong to God as an Infinite Spirit, rather than the ethical attributes of holiness, goodness, and justice, which belong to him as a moral Ruler, and which are not revealed by natural theology. This is the utmost lesson of natural theology. It is not through God's works, but by his revealed Word, that we learn the greater lessons of religion and of eternal life.

In this verse we have an excellent instance of the plays on words, in which Paul so often indulges: God's **unseen** things are **seen**. God's attributes, though unseen, are nevertheless clearly seen by the spiritual eye, **being understood by his works**. In these words Paul affirms the value, sometimes disparaged, of natural theology. For long centuries, and for the greater part of mankind, the teaching from his works was the only revelation of God; just as true, *so far as it went*, as the voice of prophet or apostle. Both revelations, the Book of Nature, and the Book of

Revelation, are from one God, the Father of lights, the Father of man. The Old Testament also bears the same testimony as Paul to the value of natural religion:

“The heavens declare the glory of God. . . .

Day unto day pours forth speech. . . .

But there is no speech, no words:

Nowhere is their voice heard:

Yet to all the earth has gone out their strain.”—Psa. xix.

So far the heathen world could walk hand in hand with the psalmist, and with the Christian apostle. They all alike could be sure that there is a God, and that he rules in the affairs of men. To know thus much implied that there was yet more to know; the Infinite One would not forever hide himself. The wisest of the heathen yearned for this fuller revelation; and felt that it would come. But even apart from the revealed *Word*, men had sufficient light to be without excuse for bad lives. The first practical effect of God's law, natural or revealed, is to bring sin into clear light, and to condemn it.

Verse 21. Because, having come to know God, they did not glorify him as God, or thank him; nay, but they became vain in their reasonings, and their foolish heart was darkened.

They came to know God—that is, to recognize his being and attributes—but they did not give him the glory which was his due as the Creator and the Giver of “life and breath, and all things;” and they did not thank him for these gifts of his providence. “Here was the condemnation, that light [on these fundamental points] having come into the world, men [though they *saw* the light] nevertheless loved darkness rather than light; *for their works were evil.*” (John iii, 19.)

The strong adversative conjunction, at the beginning of the second half of the verse, whose force may be expressed by the words **nay**, **but**, or “but, on the other hand,” point to the true explanation of the verb **became vain**. In the Old Testament, the words “vain, vanity,” often denote idolatry, the worship of gods that are not gods, but mere nothingness. “Israel followed vanity [false gods], and became vain [idolatrous].” (2 Kings xvii, 15.) This is the meaning here. The heathen fall into the folly, fatuousness, of idolatry. The word *διαλογισμῶν*, here translated **reasonings** is mostly used in a disparaging sense, almost equiva-

lent to "conceits," or "quibbles." The debasement of the heathen in the religious scale was due, not to the will of God, or to their unfavorable circumstances, with only the light of nature; but it was due to their paltering with their own convictions and consciences.

The apostle's thought is that man has deteriorated from a primitive monotheism, to polytheism, to idolatry, to fetichism, to bestiality. The golden age is behind the race; and man is not developing into a higher and purer life. Ethically there has been no "ascent of man," but only "descent and fall." Whatever the developments in the animal world in the eons past, at least *man* did not begin in the zoological garden, but in the Garden of Eden. The darkening of men's mind, and the hardening of their heart, was self-incurred, and was the normal result of their own folly. God gave them over to their own wickedness. Their lamps went out.

Verses 22, 23. Declaring themselves to be wise men they became fools, and exchanged the glory of the incorruptible God for the sameness of image with corruptible man, and birds, and four-footed beasts, and creeping things.

The first words are sometimes referred to the philosophers of Greece and Rome, in the era of their greatest refinement. But the passage, as a whole, describes rather the original lapse of the heathen into idolatry. The apostle says that men (*all* men, not merely the leaders and thinkers, for these less than the others), while professing to be reasonable beings, nevertheless fell into the absurdity of idolatry, the grossest forms of idolatry. The prophets long before Paul's time satirized this absurd idolatry. "With part of the wood he roasts his meat, with part he warms himself, and the residue he makes into a god, and worships it!" (Isa. xliv, 15.) "Their idols are the work of men's hands, they speak not, they see not; and they that make them are like them;" that is, wooden, stupid. (Ps. cxv, 4.)

The verb in the twenty-third verse, and the preposition following it, *ἠέλαξαν λυ*, are translated in the Authorized "changed into"—that is, "transformed into"—which is impossible for this Greek. The proper meaning is that of substitution, or *putting off*, of one thing for another. The translation here is "exchanged for." The apostle's contemptuous feeling would be expressed exactly by our colloquial word "*swapped for*"—a word level with the action of

"fools." The verse shows how the heathen sank by regular gradations from the spiritual worship of the Invisible God to the worship of images. "Fool"-like, they "swapped" that great glory for the image of corruptible man, as among the Greeks; then of brute animals, as among the Egyptians; then of serpents, as among the lowest savages. Could fatuity and groveling superstition go further? or sell out worse? The word *ὁμοιωμα*, usually translated "likeness," means "sameness," and in this place has "man" for its limit,—"sameness with man." The word is found also in Rom. v, 14; vi, 5; viii, 3, and in Phil. ii, 7, in all of which places it means "sameness."

Verses 24, 25. Wherefore God gave them up in the lusts of their hearts unto uncleanness, so that their bodies were dishonored among them; who exchanged the truth of God for the lie; and they revered and served the creature, beyond Him who created it, who is blessed forever. Amen.

God withdrew the restraints of the Spirit from the heathen, because of their willfulness, and left them to their lusts; just as he dealt with the chosen people. "Israel would none of me; so I gave them up unto their own heart's lust." (Ps. lxxxii, 11.) In morals, as well as in nature, "like begets like." Vice indulged leads with rapid steps to vice of yet more debasing kind. "*Facilis descensus Averni.*" But perhaps we have something more here than the mere abandonment of the heathen to their own ways. God's government is so *planned* that apostasy leads to infamy. God not only passively permits this result, but punitively gives over the apostate to corruptness of life. God bends himself to man's bent. Yet God is not the author of sin, or responsible for man's impurity; and man even in the depths of sin and lust remains consciously master of his own action, conscious of his wickedness, conscious that he ought to repent, and conscious that he can repent.

The last clause in the twenty-fourth verse, so that their bodies were dishonored,—is translated in the Authorized and the Revised, to express God's punitive purpose, "that their bodies *may be* dishonored." This translation is grammatically possible; but the former accords better with the historical drift of the passage, and the apostle's thought lies in this direction. The body is sacred; it is the temple of man's personality; and, in Paul's conception, it

is "the temple of the Holy Spirit." (1 Cor. vi, 19.) Sensuality, especially sexual uncleanness, dishonors the body. "It takes away Christ's members, and makes them members of a harlot." (1 Cor. vi, 15.) Promiscuous social impurity always accompanied idolatry. The temples of the gods, especially the Asiatic gods, and some fanes of their worship in Greece, were but public brothels. The temple of Venus at Corinth, from beneath whose shadow Paul wrote this Epistle, was endowed with more than a thousand public courtesans.

The twenty-fifth verse says, **They exchanged the truth of God for the lie.** Both substantives are abstract; and the latter, "*the lie*," takes the article after the model of the former. "The truth of God," is the reality, the verity, of the divine nature; "the lie" is the *false show* of reality, the *idol*, that has no substantive existence. "An idol is nothing" (or, perhaps better, "there is no idol.") (1 Cor. viii, 4.) "They gave up [swapped off] the eternal substance for—a *nothing!*" **They revered and served the creature beyond Him who created it.** This was the lowest possible abyss of folly: they fell into *fetichism*; and found in sticks, and stones, and snakes, gods to which they bowed down.

Verses 26, 27. On account of this, God gave them up unto infamous passions: for both their females exchanged the natural use into that against nature; and in like manner also the males, having left the natural use of the female, burned in their lust towards one another, males with males working the indecency, and receiving in themselves the recompense of their error, which was due.

The baser men's religious views were, the viler was their actual life. They fell into unnatural lusts even below the level of the animal instincts. Not even the beasts of the field offend against nature as these men who were made in the image of God. This description of lust, sinking even below bestiality, is not overdrawn. Indeed, the contemporary classics abundantly show that Paul's account is quite toned down. The apostle did not defile his page with an adequate recital of what the classics describe in the most unqualified language; and seem even to gloat over. The apostle counted it "a shame even to speak of the things done by them in secret" (Eph. v, 12)—alas! not always in "secret." The ancient heathen "gloried in their shame." In heathen lands these abominations were not only tolerated and condoned, but

were sanctioned and encouraged by their religion. It was no impeachment to any priest or priestess of any heathen God (except barely the Vestals of Rome) to be guilty of the vilest offenses against morality; and to many of them such a life was their vowed and avowed service. Those things existed; and it was needful for the apostle's argument that he should name them, and trace them to their origin in the sinful heart; though he gladly turns from their contemplation. True, some of the vices here described exist in lands called Christian, and some of them are "regulated," or "licensed" *by law!* But they exist, not under the banner of the Gospel, but only under its ban. Once vice vaunted itself and flaunted its flag; now evil-doers put screens before their doors and darken their front windows.

Verse 28. And according as they did not approve to have God in recognition, God gave them up unto a reprobate mind, to do the things not becoming.

Here again we have God's adjusting the measure of his dealings with man to the measure of their sin. This is well expressed in Paul's play on the words, *approved, reproved.*

Verses 29, 30, 31. Having been filled with all unrighteousness, wickedness, covetousness, maliciousness; full of envy, murder, strife, deceit, malignity; whisperers, slanderers, hateful towards God, insolent, haughty, boastful, inventors of evil things, disobedient to parents; without understanding, covenant-breakers, unaffectionate, unmerciful.

The catalogue of vices, as given in the Revised Greek text, and in the Authorized, with the doubtful word "fornication" in the second place, embraces twenty-two distinct specifications, the same number as there are letters in the Hebrew alphabet. This is apparently not an accidental coincidence. Dr. J. Rendel Harris ("Teaching of the Apostles," p. 84) suggests the probable explanation. In the synagogue service for the Day of Atonement, there was a ritual confession of sins, arranged alphabetically, according to the twenty-two letters of the Hebrew alphabet. In "The Teaching of the Apostles" (before A. D. 100) there is a similar list of twenty-two vices and a parallel list of twenty-two vicious classes. The lists in Romans, and in "The Teaching," are not identical, though there are six words which coincide in the two,

and the two catalogues are not close translations from the Hebrew Prayer-Book, and they make no attempt at an alphabetic order; but the sameness of the numbers strongly suggests that both Paul and the "Teaching" made up their lists with distinct reminiscence of the familiar synagogue service. Paul gives, in Gal. v, 19, a similar list of seventeen sins, but more logically arranged than in Romans; and another list of eighteen in 2 Tim. iii, 2. There is also a shorter list of thirteen vices in Mark vii, 21. But just as the alphabetic arrangement of the Hebrew list forbids any proper logical consecution, so these imitative lists are without any systematic logical order; yet we have, within the lists, occasional grouping of words of similar sound, or of cognate meaning.

It is notable that in these quadruple lists of sins and vices, there are so few repetitions. More than fifty distinct offenses are named; and these are very far from exhausting the catalogue. It is a sad commentary on the depravity of the heart, and on the bad lives of men.

Verse 32. Who, having come to know the judgment of God, that they who practice such things are worthy of death, not only do them, nay, but also delight in them who practice them.

The heathen did not act ignorantly. They had, and have, sufficient light to know God's character, and his decision that they who practice such sins as are just named, are worthy of death. Yet they not only themselves do these things, but, what is still worse, they take gratuitous pleasure in those that practice them.

Such is Paul's summation of the character and the life of the heathen world as he saw it in his day, as we see it in ours. He does not give the vile details as found in the classics, or found in heathen lands to-day; but no literature gives, or could give, a more somber portraiture of human depravity and practice.

CHAPTER II.

Verse 1. Wherefore thou art without excuse, O every man that judgest; for in what thing thou judgest the other, thou condemnest thyself; for thou that judgest him practicest the same things.

In the first chapter the apostle has described and condemned the Gentile world. He now turns upon the Jew, and declares him equally sinful, and equally under condemnation. The point of transition in the thought and argument is easy. The Gentiles not only *do* things worthy of death, but *justify* them, and find pleasure in those who practice them. The Jews nominally condemn these things; and on the ground of this speculative condemnation think themselves better than the heathen; yet, in point of fact, they also practice the very same things. But one's character is determined, and his position before God is ascertained, not by profession, but by practice. "Wherefore," says the apostle, addressing the Jew, though he does not yet openly name him,—“Wherefore thou that condemnest the other [*τὸν ἕτερον*, the man of *different* race, the Gentile] art inexcusable, for thou practicest the very same things.”

Verse 2. But we know that the judgment of God is according to truth, upon them that practice such things.

The words *we know* are, as so often elsewhere, an expression of a generally recognized truth; e. g., “*We know* that whatsoever things the Law says, it speaks to them that are under the Law” (Rom. iii, 19); “*We know* that the Law is spiritual” (Rom. vii, 14); “*We know* that all things co-operate for good to them that love God” (Rom. viii, 28). In commonplace truths like these Paul means that intelligent men are all of one mind; even the Gentiles assent to a proposition as patent as that of this verse.

The judgment of God is according to truth. God can not mistake the facts, nor err in his decision. “The Judge of all

the earth will *always* do right." His judgment, which is not according to appearance, but according to reality, is equally against the heathen who "do" these things and the Jews who "practice" them. Notice the stronger word "practice" which the apostle uses in regard to the Jews. "God is not a respecter of persons." His judgment is definitively against the Jews, even more than against the Gentiles.

The phrase **according to truth** assumes that the standard of right is not God's *will*, but lies back of this will, and higher. Things are not right because God wills them; but he wills them because they are right.

Verse 3. But reckonest thou this, O man, that judgest them that practice such things, and doest them, that thou wilt escape the judgment of God?

The apostle in this verse has interchanged the verbs of the last verse, **practice**, **do**, and now he assigns the confirmed usage in wrong-doing to the Gentiles.

The Jews trusted in their descent from Abraham for exemption from God's judgment. This was the presumption that the Baptist rebuked. "Say not within yourselves that we have Abraham as our father." (Mat. iii, 9.) Paul's language here, both in the verb **reckonest** and in the apostrophe **O man**, is objurgative. He would expose the Jews' exclusive claim as a delusion. The verb here takes on the sense of "calculate," to make a deliberate estimate: as if the apostle said, "If God condemns the Gentiles, dost thou, who practicest the same things, coolly calculate that *thou* wilt escape the same judgment?"

Verses 4, 5. Or despisest thou the riches of his goodness and forbearance and longsuffering, ignoring that the goodness of God leads thee to repentance? but according to thy hardness and impenitent heart, thou treasurest up to thyself wrath in the day of wrath and of revelation of the just judgment of God.

The objurgative strain against the Jew still continues. "On the ground of being God's elect, dost thou despise his kindness, and forbearance, and longsuffering? Dost thou, trusting to be saved at any rate, ignore the fact that his kindness is not a license to sin, but is intended to lead thee to repentance for thy sins,—sins not less gross, and more inexcusable than those of the Gen-

tiles? But according to thy obduracy and impenitence of heart, thou dost but treasure up to thyself wrath, to be revealed in a day of wrath and of revelation of God's just judgment."

Notice Paul's word **ignoring**. A truth may be known with absolute certainty, yet, at the same time, absolutely ignored. This is what Paul charges upon the conceited Jews. He says to them: "Is this your confidence? Vain confidence! The Jew has no immunity on the ground of being a Jew. At the revelation of God's just judgment, all men will stand equal before him. There is no respect of persons with God." Listen to the conclusion of the whole matter:

Verses 6-11. Who will render to each man according to his works: to them indeed, that, by patience in good work, seek for glory and honor and incorruption, life eternal; but to those that are factious, and disobey the truth, but obey unrighteousness, will be wrath and indignation, affliction and anguish, upon every soul of man that works evil, both of Jew, first, and of Greek: but glory and honor and peace to every man that works good, both to Jew, first, and to Greek: for there is no respect of persons with God.

The teaching of the passage is of God's equal dealing with all men, irrespective of birth or caste. A paraphrase will best exhibit the meaning: "God will requite to every man, Jew as well as Gentile, not according to the man's assumption of superior privilege, but according to his works. To those of whatever race, Jew or Gentile, who in the way of patient perseverance in good work, seek for glory, and honor, and incorruption, he will give life eternal; but to those, of whatever race, who are men of captiousness, and assumption, and disobedient to the truth, but obedient to unrighteousness, will be requited wrath and indignation, affliction and distress,—upon every soul of man that works evil, both of Jew, first, and of Greek. But God's approval, and honor, and peace, will be to every man that works good, both to Jew, first, and to Greek. For with God there is no recognition of human distinctions." The arrogant Jew and the despised Gentile are alike to him. In the eleventh verse, the word **persons** does not mean *individuals*, but artificial distinctions of race, or caste, or rank. This is always the meaning of the word "persons" with the verbs *respect, accept, regard*. This principle here announced, and many times reiterated in the New Testament, saps the arro-

gance and complacency of the Jew. It puts him and the Gentile on a perfect equality before God: the Jew has no inherent advantage; only certain institutional opportunities. He needs justification from guilt equally with the Gentile; and must attain it, if at all, in the same way.

Verse 12. For as many as sinned without law, without law also will perish; and as many as sinned within law, through law will be judged.

The first clause describes the status and the condemnation of the Gentile world; the second clause describes the status and the condemnation of the Jews. Both have sinned, but under different circumstances, and with different demerit. The Gentiles had sufficient light, the light of nature, yet sinned; they will be condemned accordingly, yet not by a law of which they were ignorant. And the Jews, who sinned under a law specifically recorded, will be judged according to the more exacting provisions of that law.

Verse 13. For not the hearers of law are just with God; but the doers of law will be justified.

It will be noticed that through this entire paragraph (verses 12-16) the word *law* is found nine times without the article and but twice with it. In this feature the translation here given correctly represents the Greek; and we may safely assume that it is exact to the apostle's thought. The difference in concept between "law" and "the Law," whether in Paul's writings, or anywhere else, is marked, and can be as exactly expressed in English as in Greek. The word "law," without the article, is qualitative, and always expresses the concept of law generically, in its most unrestricted sense. "Law" is the expression of universal and eternal principles, ethical, innate, and dominant for all beings, for God, and angels, and men, alike. It is read in nature and in our own moral constitution. **The Law**, with the article, on the other hand, is quantitative, specific, statutory, read only in the book. "Law" is for all circumstances, and forever; it never changes, nor loses, or gains, any circumstantial element. "The Law" is a particular code (whether of God, or man) enacted for a given set of circumstances, local, temporary, subject to additional legislation or to repeal. "Law" takes note of *motives*: "the Law" takes note of *overt actions*. "Law," which is always *moral law*, prescribes the ideal *maximum* of one's ability and performance; "the Law,"

which is always *statute* law, establishes a specified *minimum* of performance. "Law," as in the Golden Rule, says: "Thou shalt;" "the Law," as in the Decalogue, says: "Thou shalt not." In the Pauline usage, the Mosiac legislation (of circumcision and rites) is always spoken of as "the Law;" but the naked word "law," without the article, expresses the eternal abstract principle as defined above; or if it *alludes* to the Law of Moses, as in this verse, it alludes to it, not as the Law of outward observances, but on its moral side, so far forth, an expression of the eternal, universal law of rectitude. We print "*law*" for the universal qualitative word, "Law" for the statutory quantitative word.

The expression, **The hearers of law** is spoken of the Jews, who on every Sabbath-day heard "the Law" read in the synagogue (Acts xv, 21); and heard, under the letter of that statute Law a revelation of the higher law of morals; and it is "the doers of this higher law" that will be justified.

The use of the two words **just** and **justified** in the contrastive clauses of this verse shows that they are equivalent in meaning,—*"quit—quitted."* The verse expresses the *ideal* condition of things; and we are not to understand that Paul concedes that any man is really justified by works of law; for elsewhere he definitively declares the contrary: "By works of law will no flesh be justified." (Gal. ii, 16.) The apostle's thought is merely to declare the relative superiority of *doing to hearing*; the superiority of a sincere, though legally insufficient obedience of a heathen, to the more intelligent, but barren, service of the Jew. Yet any man, whether heathen or Jew, who does the best he can, will be justified. "In every nation he that fears God and works righteousness is acceptable to him." (Acts x, 35.)

Verse 14. For whenever Gentiles, who have no law, do by nature the things of the Law, these, having no law, are law to themselves.

The word **Gentiles**, which in the Greek language was first used in the sense of "nations" generically, including Jews, was then, in Jewish usage, narrowed to the sense of non-Jewish, the heathen, nations, which is the usual sense; and then, sometimes, as here, narrowed still further to the sense of *individuals* of these nations. Such, when the word has no article, is the sense of the word in the Bible. Thus Paul tells the Corinthian converts: "Ye know that ye were Gentiles." (1 Cor. xii, 2.) The term Gentiles,

denoting all nations except the Jews, carried with it, at first, the implication that those nations were also heathen,* pagan, idolatrous. It was only after the mission of Paul, that this offensive Jewish sense was gradually dropped, and the word retained only its ethnological sense. All nations except Jews, are still "Gentiles;" but not all nations are now heathen.

The word "Gentiles" without the article, does not express the totality of the class, but is only a *descriptive* term. Not *all* Gentiles, but only some (and in fact but very few), "observe the things of the Law;" and not then *all* the things of the Law, nor always, but only certain moral precepts belonging in common to natural religion and to revealed religion. But their conscientious obedience to what they think right is at best only a partial and relative fulfillment of the moral law, such as is possible by "nature"—that is, apart from the surer light of revelation—and, of course, it falls far short of "legal justification." Paul's words elsewhere are decisive on this point against Jew and Gentile alike. Yet though their religion does not come up to the inward spirituality of God's law, such Gentiles (alas, how few!) doing the best they can, "become law to themselves," and in the gospel economy their defective obedience is accepted through Christ.

Verse 15. Who show the works of the Law written in their hearts, their consciousness bearing witness with them, and their thoughts one with another accusing, or, also, acquitting them.

Heathen who aim to do right practically demonstrate for themselves that the gist of the Law, if not the letter of it, is written, not on lifeless tables of stone, as in the Decalogue of the Jews, but in their hearts. And their consciousness bears them testimony that amid abundant failures, their purpose is to do right; their thoughts, in parley one with another, now accusing, or, also acquitting them.

The Greek language uses the same word † for the differentiate concepts *consciousness* and *conscience*; the intuition of one's thoughts, and the intuition of one's right and wrong doing. The

* Indeed this very word "heathen" is itself derived from the Greek word for Gentiles,—*ἔθνη*. *Ethn-e*; and not as Vossius (followed by Trenchard and the English Dictionaries), from the local word *Heath*,—as if "the dwellers on the heath."

† *συνείδησις*.

latter sense has grown out of the former; and both are found in the New Testament. The former is the sense of the words in this verse, and in the same expression in the ninth chapter—"My consciousness testifying with me." (Rom. ix, 1.) Cicero attached the same double concepts to the Latin word *conscientia*, which he first used in the Latin language, as a representation of the Greek word.

Verse 16. In the day when God will judge the secrets of men, according to my gospel, through Jesus Christ.

The connection of this verse is uncertain. The Authorized, and most critics, throw verses 14 and 15 into a parenthesis, and join verse 16 to verse 13. The Revised cancels the parenthesis, and makes this verse a temporal modifier, not of the previous clause, but of the entire paragraph. The apostle's thought goes forward to the *last* day when all classes of men, Jews and Gentiles, will stand before God, and when God will judge them, not by their *outward* distinctions, but by their *inward*, hidden, character.

By the words **according to my gospel**, Paul emphatically and sharply distinguishes "the gospel which he preached" from that of the other apostles. It was a distinction that he needed to make over and over again. He uses this terse expression, "according to my gospel," in two other places,—in Rom. xvi, 25, and 2 Tim. ii, 8; and he uses it substantially, again, in many places more, as, for example: "The gospel, to which I was appointed a herald, and apostle, and teacher of Gentiles" (2 Tim. i, 11). It is this last expression, "apostle of the Gentiles," which marks the unique character of "his gospel," as distinguished from the gospel of his fellow-apostles. The other apostles were, like Paul himself up to the date of his conversion, wedded to Judaism. He calls himself "a zealot for God." (Acts xxii, 3.) But some of them, unlike Paul after his conversion, never lost their bias towards the Jews, and none of them were entirely free from it until their people had finally rejected Christ. They doubtless expected in some vague way the conversion of the Gentiles to Christ; but they thought of Christianity only as developed Judaism, and that the Gentiles must come to Christ by the door of circumcision. But Paul from the first of his apostolate saw that Judaism was only a provisional scheme, of a late date in God's plan; and that the gospel antedated it, and was from eternity God's *only plan*. Paul

calls it "a mystery"—that is, a secret, an esoteric doctrine—"which has been hidden from the eternal ages; but has now been manifested . . . to make known the riches of this mystery among the Gentiles." (Col. i, 26; Rom. xvi, 25.) This is the large and gracious gospel which Paul right proudly calls "*my* gospel."

Verses 17-20. But if thou art named Jew, and restest upon law, and boastest in God, and knowest his will, and approvest the things that excel, being instructed out of the Law, and trustest as to thyself that thou art a guide of blind men, a light of them that are in darkness, an instructor of foolish men, a teacher of babes, having in the Law the form of the knowledge and the truth; —.

In the seventeenth verse, and so generally in the New Testament, the word Jew is a name of honor, expressing citizenship and religious fellowship in the chosen people. It was after Paul's time that the name "Jew" acquired in Christian phraseology its opprobrious sense. John is the only one of the New Testament writers that uses it in a semi-opprobrious sense; and his Gospel was written late in the century, after the alienation of the Jews was complete.

These four verses (17 to 20) constitute the protasis to an equally long apodosis in verses 21-24; and the entire paragraph, 17-24, should be read as one logical whole. The protasis specifies the ten or twelve points of Jewish confidence, or arrogance; the apodosis consists of five or six rapid, trenchant, questions, which leave the Jew abashed and silenced. The apostle's address is pointed and personal. The emphatic pronoun *thou* singles out the offender, and arraigns him for transgressing law and dishonoring God, while at the same time boasting of law and of God.

Paul's words, if thou art named "Jew," imply no doubt on the subject. The conjunction if (*ei*) here used is a word of argument, not of contingency. With the indicative mode, it represents the thing supposed as an objective fact; and it is almost equivalent to "since," or "inasmuch as." Paul concedes that these claims of the Jew were all matters of fact. The creed of the Jew was orthodox. Jesus commanded, "Whatsoever things the scribes say, do." The reason for Christ's command, and for Paul's concession, is, that the Jews accepted the teachings of revelation, being instructed out of the Law. True, they overlaid the Law with the traditions of men, and they did not keep the Law in its

spiritual intent; but first of all, the Jew was proud of knowing the Law, not merely as a ritual, but as a system of ethics. Even a Pharisee could say, "To love God with all the heart, and thy neighbor as thyself, is much more than all offerings and sacrifices." (Mark xi, 33.)

Verses 21-24. Dost thou, therefore that teachest another, not teach thyself? Dost thou that preachest not to steal, steal? Dost thou that sayest not to commit adultery, commit adultery? Dost thou that abominatest idols, pillage their temples? Dost thou that boastest in law, through the transgression of the Law dishonor God? For the name of God on account of you is blasphemed among the Gentiles, as it has been written.

The word **another** in verse 21, is the same as in the first verse of this chapter, and does not mean another (*ἄλλον*) of the same class with the Jews, but a man of a different class (*ἔτερον*), a Gentile. The sense is, "Thou that teachest the *Gentile*, dost thou not first fashion thy own life according to thy teaching?"

The point of these questions lies in the inconsistency of the profession of the Jews with their actual lives. The term of the address **Thou that teachest**, shows that Paul has the rabbis, scribes, doctors of the law, in thought, rather than the common people. The Jews, as a nation, were very much better than any other people in the world; and the common people were better than the rulers. But those leaders, and rulers, and teachers of the people, who ought to have been models of upright living, were often the worst of the nation; and their improbity, unchasteness, and outrages, were frequent and infamous. Yet there were noble and gracious exceptions, such as Paul's teacher, Gamaliel, Nicodemus, and Joseph of Arimathea.

The question, **Dost thou pillage temples?** alludes to the command of Moses to the Jews, "to burn the idols of the heathen, and not to take their votive offerings of silver and gold." (Deut. vii, 25.) Josephus correctly explains this, "not to steal what belongs to strange [heathen] temples, nor to take any of the gifts dedicated to any god." (Ant. IV, 8-10.) Such is Paul's meaning in this passage: "Thou that professest to abominate idols, dost thou make gain to thyself by looting their temples?"

In verse 23, notice the word **law**, first without the article, and then with it; and interpret accordingly. The Jews boasted in hav-

ing and in knowing law; but inconsistently dishonored God by transgressing every commandment in the Decalogue. Malachi, the last of the prophets (397 B. C.), sums up the history of Israel's sinfulness: "Even from the days of your fathers, ye have gone away from mine ordinances, and have not kept them." (Mal. iii, 7.)

The word **for** in the twenty-fourth verse connects back, especially to the preceding verb, **dishonestest thou God?** It is a quotation from Isaiah: "My name continually every day is blasphemed." (Isaiah lii, 5.) And Ezekiel says in still more explicit words: "When I scattered them among the heathen, they profaned my holy name; in that the heathen said of them, These are the people of Jehovah, and are come forth out of his land" (Ezek. xxxvi, 20); that is, as Paul interprets these prophetic utterances. The proverbial wickedness of the Jews led the heathen to judge amiss of Jehovah's character, and to blaspheme his holy name,—*"Like people, like god."*

Verse 25. For circumcision indeed profits, if thou be a practicer of law: but if thou be a transgressor of law, thy circumcision has become uncircumcision.

The conjunction *if (ἐάν)*, used in both clauses of this verse, and in the first clause of the next verse, is, unlike the conjunction of reality in the seventeenth verse, the conjunction of merely subjective possibility; and the matter that comes under the cover of this conjunction is contingent, or unreal; and the unreality in the concept is further expressed by the subjunctive mode in the verb,—*if thou be*.

The word **circumcision** is sometimes with the article, "The Circumcision," a concrete designation of the covenant people, the Jews, over against the Gentile world; which, conversely, is then called "The Uncircumcision." (Gal. ii, 7-10.) But here the word first without the article, and then with it [literally, **the circumcision of thee**] designates the covenant *rite* by which the Abrahamic family was consecrated, set apart from the mass of mankind, to God: a rite which Paul says profits the recipient, yet surely not materially, *ex opera operato*, but only in its spiritual significance—*if thou be a practicer of law*.

This rite stood to the Jewish Church precisely as baptism stands to the Church of Christ. It was only a *sign* (Rom. iv, 11), and had no saving power in itself. Here, also, we must take the

word **law**, without the article, in its widest, ethical sense, and not specifically as "the Law" of Moses, however persistently Jewish thought and prepossessions may have confused the two concepts.

The Jews held that circumcision of the flesh was in itself a saving ordinance, self-operative, aside from the personal character of the recipient. All Jews were then to be saved, as descendants from Abraham, members of the elect nation—all, except heretics and apostates, and the Rabbis held that even these could not go down to hell until an angel had canceled the physical sign in their flesh. (Meyer, Rom., p. 102.) But Paul says to the Jew: If, having come under the seal of circumcision and obligation to keep the Law, thou be a transgressor of law, then thou hast lost all the supposed vantage-ground over the heathen, the seal is broken, and thy **Jewish circumcision has become the same** [that is, as useless] **as Gentile uncircumcision**. The equity of this is apparent to any but a Jew of the older synagogue, or to the Pharisees of the modern sacramentarian Churches; and the converse is also apparent, as Paul declares in the next verse.

Verse 26. If, therefore, the **Uncircumcision** observe the requirements of the Law, will not his uncircumcision be reckoned unto circumcision?

The **Uncircumcision** is the Gentile world at large, and the word is generally used as if in the plural number; but here it is in the singular, and means the ideal Gentile. We have seen that the conjunction here is the word of contingency, expressing a case not real, but merely conceived of—"in the case that." Yet it is not Paul's thought that this Gentile observance of the law, even if it were realizable, is more than formal, external; as when Confucius or Socrates worked righteousness to the best of his light and ability. Such uninstructed Gentiles as do, by the light of natural religion, the things (*some* of the things) of the Law, are acceptable to God; and in their case their uncircumcision, that is, their lack of formal consecration, will be reckoned to them unto circumcision—as good as the circumcision of the Jews. Circumcision (like baptism) is, at the best, but a formal rite, the seal of a covenant, and has no saving virtue. Paul does not yet introduce the mediation of Christ as the procuring element of salvation for Gentile or Jew; but looks, so far forth, only at the receptive attitude of the heart, and an external formal obedience to the

Law; and certainly not at a sinless conformity to the spiritual law. Such a man's uncircumcision will be counted unto circumcision. Though uncircumcised, the seeker after God is put on a level with the man of the covenant. This measure of equity has always characterized God's dealings with men. Naaman the Syrian, the woman of Syrophenicia, Cornelius the centurion, and the centurion at Capernaum, are surely and suggestive illustrations. Paul found such men wherever he went—"Of the devout Greeks a great multitude." (Acts xvii, 4.)

Verse 27. And the Uncircumcision which is from nature, if it fulfills the Law, will judge thee who through the letter and circumcision art transgressor of law.

The expression through letter and circumcision is a hendiadys, meaning "with literal circumcision;" that is, with the outward ritual circumcision *in the flesh*, and not with the inward or spiritual circumcision *of the heart*, as in verse 29. The apostle's meaning is, that the Gentile, who is not "circumcised after the manner of Moses," but retains, "from nature," his physical non-consecration, but who fulfills the Law, will, by this fulfillment, rise up in judgment and condemn the Jew, who with all his literal conformity to ritual law is yet a transgressor of the higher moral law.

Verses 28, 29. For the Jew in the outward man is not a Jew; nor yet the circumcision in the outward man, in flesh, is circumcision; nay, but the Jew in the inward man, is a Jew, and circumcision is of heart, in spirit, not letter; of whom the praise is not from man, nay, but from God.

The passage is a good example of Paul's terseness of utterance, and of the antithetic structure of his sentences. The literal translation here given is as clear as any of the usual paraphrases, and better preserves the emphases in the several clauses.

The conjunction **for** refers to the literal "Uncircumcision" in the twenty-seventh verse; and the following clause is exegetical of this word and of the thought in the verse. The sense is plain: "For it is not the Jew in the outward man, who is a Jew in the inward man, in spiritual reality; nor is it the literal circumcision in the outward man, that is spiritual, real, circumcision: but the Jew in secret, in the hidden man, is the real spiritual Jew; and the circumcision, not of the foreskin, but of the heart, is the real

circumcision, in spirit, not in letter. Of such a 'Jew,' the praise is not from man, but from God." All this is in the exact line of Paul's thoughts elsewhere. He tells the Galatians: "In Christ Jesus neither circumcision avails aught, nor uncircumcision; but faith working through love." (Gal. v, 6.) And to the Philippians he says, "We [*Gentiles*] are the [real] circumcision, who serve by the Spirit of God, and boast [not in rites, but] in Christ Jesus, and trust not in flesh;" i. e., in carnal ordinances. (Phil. iii, 3.)

CHAPTER III.

Verse 1. JEW: "What, then, is the superiority of the Jew? or what is the profit of circumcision?"

The first chapter (verses 19-32) described the moral conditions of the Gentiles; that they are corrupt by nature, and, notwithstanding the light of natural religion, are desperately wicked. The second chapter showed that the Jews are equally corrupt by nature; and, notwithstanding the light of religion, and their boast of a national superiority over the Gentiles, are yet equally wicked: "They condemn the Gentiles, and practice the same things."

The conclusion reached, in the second chapter, that there is no saving virtue in circumcision, in which the Jews especially boasted, might imply that they have no religious advantage over the Gentiles. In the first part of the third chapter the Jew presents his objections to the apostle's teaching. These several objections and the apostle's replies are given in the form of a dialogue. The discussion, thrown into this form, has an almost dramatic liveliness and vigor. The assailant's rapid questions and the apostle's rapid rejoinders seem like the quick thrusts of two skillful swordsmen.

The several parts of the dialogue are clearly distributed between the two disputants as follows:

JEW. Verses 1, 3, 5, 7, 9 (first clause).

PAUL. Verses 2, 4, 6, 8, 9 (second clause), seqq.

The dialogue between the Jewish antagonist and the apostle is resumed in chapter x, 14—to chapter xi, 11. Perhaps too, Paul's ever-present consciousness of a disputant, whose thoughts at least are known and expressed, if his actual words are not quoted, will best explain the frequent controversial questions found throughout the epistle. I have so indicated them in the text, with the proper paragraphing and quotation marks; e. g., Rom. vi, 1, 15; vii, 7; xiii, 9, 14.

The question which the apostle here puts into the mouth of the Jewish gainsayer implies that the Jews claimed by their de-

scent from Abraham, and call as the theocratic nation, and by their circumcision, a racial and personal superiority over the Gentiles. This superiority, they thought, was one which gave them religious acceptance with God; and their circumcision entitled them to his mercy here and hereafter. And so to the apostle's teaching in the second chapter we have the Jew's indignant rejoinder, "If such is the state of the case, **where then is our superiority?**"

Verse 2. PAUL: Much in every [pertinent] way: first, indeed, that they were intrusted with the oracles of God.

In this verse, Paul concedes that the Jews have, from their circumcision, a just claim of superiority over the Gentiles; not a superiority of racial or personal desert, but only of national priority, and of greater religious opportunity. Their circumcision formally consecrated them to God; but separates them from the heathen world only in their incidental circumstances.

The apostle names here only a single point of their superiority—namely, **that they were intrusted with the divine oracles.** This one point was sufficient for the present argument; yet the adverb **first** implies that the apostle had it in thought to mention other privileges; but the eager rush of the discussion prevented, and the enumeration is not continued here. But in the ninth chapter he gives a fuller answer, and names as the national prerogatives of Israel eight other important points in which the Jews were superior to the Gentiles: "The adoption, and the glory, and the covenants, and the giving of the Law, and the temple-service, and the promises, and the fathers, and the descent of Christ,"—all of them, like the one here named, incidents of their religious *circumstances*, and not matters of intrinsic personal desert. (Rom. ix, 4, 5.)

The **oracles** here named were, of course, the Old Testament Scriptures at large; but specifically, in Paul's present mention of them, the prophecies of Christ, and of the accession of the Gentiles. This is clear from the "unfaith" in them as confessed by the Jew in verse 3. No doubt the Jews accepted the volume of the Old Testament Scriptures in its entirety, including these Messianic prophecies; but they did not accept the Christian interpretation of them as fulfilled in the person of Jesus Christ. No doubt, too, they accepted the future conversion of the Gentile world; but their expectations on this point were vague, and they were

very far from accepting, as taught by Paul, the immediate unconditional admission of the Gentiles into the Church, on an equality with the Jews themselves. It was here that the Jewish people stumbled. The Gospel of Christ was too liberal for them: "They stumbled against the stone of stumbling." (Rom. ix, 32.)

The verb **were intrusted** is very expressive; and is decisive of the relation of the Jews to the general purposes of God. They were an elect people; yet they were elect not for themselves, but as "*trustees*" for the nations (Gentiles) at large. Judaism was a provincial dispensation, preparatory to the gospel. The Jews were intended as a Missionary Church, to carry the knowledge of God to the world. (Rom. ix, 22-24.) How infinitely they fell below their call is shown by their repeated religious apostasy, such as invariably characterizes a non-propagandist Church. Religious activity is the condition of life and growth. The Jews did not desire the conversion and accession of the Gentiles, only their subjugation; and they did not communicate to them their oracles which prophesied the Messiah and the incoming of the world; or, if they sought "proselytes" (as they began to do before Christ), they sought them not from a love of souls, but for the sake of added worldly influence and power. Notice the marked contrast between Christianity and Judaism. Christianity, a missionary Church, marches to the conquest of the world; the Jews, though once a proselyting Church, have now, for sixteen centuries, barely held their own, by propagation, not by propagandism. Judaism has absolutely ceased to seek converts; and its only future is disintegration and absorption into Christianity.

Verse 3. JEW. For what if some [of us] did not have faith [in those Messianic oracles]? will their unfaith annul the faith [faithfulness] of God [to his covenant with our fathers]?

The interrogative **what** not merely asks a question, but tells the Jew's impatient dissent from the apostle's position, and challenges his sincerity. The verse expresses the Jew's conceit of God's everlasting covenant with them *as Jews*. They rightly believe that God can not change; but they wrongly fancied that his promise to the fathers and to the elect people was unconditional; and that, no matter what their own subsequent attitude or conduct, God was inextricably obligated to them, and to them exclusively. But it was not God's sense of obligation to them, but his much long-

suffering, that through all those centuries had spared these Jewish vessels of wrath fitted unto perdition. (Rom. ix, 22.)

The Jews held the Scriptures, as they understood them, as sacred as did Paul himself. They were even more rigid than he in their adherence to the traditional sense of the sacred oracles. The apostle does not charge the Jews with general disbelief of the Scriptures; nor does the objector in this verse confess any want of faith in the Scriptures at large, but only unfaith in the Christian interpretation of the Messianic oracles; and the verb **did not have faith**, and the noun **unfaith**, must be taken with this limitation. It was with this recognition of the Jews' general acceptance of the Scriptures, but at the same time of their specific unbelief in Christ, that Jesus said to them: "Search the Scriptures; for they are they which testify of me."

Verse 4. PAUL. God forbid! But let God be found true, but every man a liar; as it has been written:

**"That thou mayest be justified in thy words,
And mayest win the case when thou art judged."**

(Ps. li, 4.)

The words **God forbid** express Paul's rejection of the sentiment of the Jew. The literal translation is, **Not so might it become!** but the terse English phrase "God forbid," while not verbally accurate, best expresses the sense. The phrase is found ten times in this Epistle, and four times elsewhere in Paul's writings. The introduction of the word **God** in the English phrase is not irreverent or flippant, any more than in Paul's repeated asseverations, "God knows," "God is my witness." In this verse, the apostle rejects the inferences of the Jew that God can in any contingency, prove faithless: "Nay, but in all our reasonings and conclusions, let God be found true to his promises, though every man of you [every Jew who does not have faith in this Messianic promise] be found false."

The quotation is from David's penitential psalm, the fifty-first. In this quotation, we have, happily, the Greek forensic terms for a criminal process, and for a civil process, at law. The first verb, **justified**, means either "shown to be free of offense" (which is its meaning here, spoken of God), or "acquit in matters of which one has been guilty" (which is its meaning spoken of men, in theological connections). The second verb means **to win a suit**

at law. It is the regular term in Attic Greek for such a verdict. The connection here restricts the saying, spoken of God, to a justification or vindication of God, as true to his Messianic promises, the "oracles," which Paul interprets in a sense denied by the Jews. But if, in this contention of the Jews against the Gentiles, and so against those divine oracles, God is justified and vindicated,—if God is found true to the oracles with their Christian interpretation,—if God is clearly for the Gentiles,—it follows that the other party, the Jews, who gainsay this interpretation, and reject the equality of the Gentiles with themselves, must be themselves held as "non-justified," as "non-just," as "unjust," as sinners, and amenable to God's wrath.

Paul quotes this psalm to show that God is vindicated in his constancy to the Messianic promises, against the assumption of the Jews. But to most readers, it has an additional value. In the words of this psalm, all human consciousness has ever embodied its truest, liveliest confession of sin. It has been uttered afresh in more closets, with more passionate sobs, than any other human cry. No man, heart-broken over his sin, ever exculpated himself and inculpated God. David's confession of his own sin, is to-day the confession of all mankind: "Against THEE I sinned, that THOU mayest be justified."

Verse 5. JEW: But if our non-justification establishes God's plan of justification, what shall we say [concerning him]? Is God unjust?—who brings wrath upon us? I say it, according to man.

The conjunction *if* (*ei*) here used and the indicative mode in the verb **establishes**, are concessive, and imply that the Jew grants the apostle's last position, that the Jew is not justified, and is subject to the wrath of God. But he grants this only for argument's sake, only to refute it by a further, extravagant, insistence that God must be held literally to his covenant with the Jews. The meaning of the verse may be more fully expressed by a paraphrase: "If, in this contention, the alleged non-justification of the Jews serves, after all, to establish God's plan of justification embracing the Gentiles and excluding the Jews, what shall we Jews say, then concerning the equity of his course? *Is God unjust?* Will he, in order to bring in the Gentiles, displace us from our indefeasible rights? Will he be false to his covenant with the Jews?"

and bring on them his wrath? and punish them for what redounds to his glory?" Such is the bold sophistry of the Jew; but as if conscious that his language may perhaps be too daring, he subjoins the half-apologetic qualification: **I speak as it looks to one from a human point of view**; that is, Our failure to accept this new Gospel does not *seem to men* to discharge God from his obligation to the original covenant-people.

Verse 6. PAUL: God forbid! since how will God judge the world?

The words express Paul's indignant denial that God will prove *unjust*: "Heaven forbid! God unjust?" The supposition is preposterous; **since, in that case, how will God judge the world?** The judge of all the earth must do right. The matter stands indeed just the reverse from the arrogant claims of the Jews. "To bring wrath upon them" is right; to exempt them would be unjust; and "*God is not unjust.*"

Verse 7. JEW: But if the trueness of God [to his Messianic promises] by my falseness [thereto] redounded to his glory, why yet am I also condemned as sinful?

The words are those of the Jewish caviller, and are substantially a reiteration of the vicious reasoning in the fifth verse. We have again the concessive conjunction *if*, as if the objector, for argument's sake, formally grants the apostolic contention, only to deny it, however, in reality. The words **trueness**, spoken of God, and **falseness**, spoken of the Jew, look back to Paul's adjectives in the fourth verse, and used in the same specific senses, "God is *true*, the Jews are *false*"—though we must recollect that the Jew accepts the latter word as his own, only for argument's sake. If God's "trueness" to the Messianic promise is better illustrated and established amid our "falseness" (unfaith in the claims of Christ); if his plans for the Gentiles are more clearly defined and realized by our defection,—why, notwithstanding, are the Jews **also [also as well as the Gentiles] condemned as sinful?** But this is a line of argument which is much the same as to say that, "in view of the objective good result, the Jews not only ought not to be condemned by God as sinful, but, contrariwise, ought to be accounted by him, as they have heretofore accounted themselves, true and justified."

Verse 8. PAUL: And [shall we say then], as we are calumniated, and as some declare that we say, Let us do the evil things that the good things may come?—of whom the condemnation is just.

This verse is Paul's rejoinder to the Jew, and his scornful rejection of the Jew's vicious ethics and vicious reasoning. The word $\mu\eta$ is not the negative adverb, "And why *not*?" as the Authorized and the Revised give it; (as if it were $\omega\delta$) but is the *interrogative* conjunction. The negative sense is impossible, whether as a matter of Greek criticism, or from the apostle's argument. Paul shows the Jew's sophistry by running the principle out to its legitimate, but monstrous, consequences; in substance as follows: "And to follow out your line of juggling morality [it is a pity Paul did not have the apt word *Jesuitical*], shall we say, as some slanderously affirm that we say, Let us do evil that good may come?" The "Jesuitical" ethics of "Evil for the sake of God," need but be named in order to be rejected; and the condemnation of men who so teach is just. The references in the pronouns **some**, **we**, **whom**, are not immediately clear. But we may, perhaps, best take the pronoun "*we*" to mean Christians at large; and the pronoun "*some*" to refer to Jewish calumniators of the brethren. Whether there was any particular occasion for this calumny, we do not know; but it was at all times an easy charge for maligners to bring against the Church; and it was a charge that could not be refuted. The only answer which Paul attempts is to meet the calumny by an indignant denial, and to denounce any who should sanction such ethics:—**of whom the condemnation is just.** This general reference of the relative pronoun is, on the whole, the best, though it makes a good construction, both grammatically and logically, to carry it back to the word **some**, the calumniators.

The word $\beta\lambda\alpha\sigma\phi\eta\mu\epsilon\acute{\iota}\nu$, literally, to "blaspheme," here translated **we are calumniated** (or slandered), is used here of *men*; but in the New Testament it is generally said of the Divine Being, or of divine things. It has this latter sense altogether in later Christian usage.

Verse 9a. JEW: What, then? Are we worse [than the Gentiles]?

The words are, again, the words of the Jew; and mean, literally, **Are we surpassed by the Gentiles?** The sense of the Greek verb is in great dispute. It is disputed whether the verb

is in the middle voice, or in the passive. The Authorized assumes the former: [Do we surpass the Gentiles?] and translates, "Are we *better* than they?" the Revised assumes the latter, and translates, "Are we *worse* than they?" With the former translation, the American Committee, and most of the commentaries substantially agree. But the middle voice of this verb is rare, and is perhaps not found at all in the sense alleged; and, further, if we accept this old translation, we shall have practically only a repetition of the question in the first verse; and not a logical advance in the argument as is suggested by the first words of the verse, **What, then?** The passive voice (though it also is rare) must be adopted here; and the proper translation gives us the appropriate sense, **Are we surpassed?** Are we worse [morally]?"

In the first verse of this chapter, as we saw, the Jewish objector to the Pauline view asked, "What is the superiority of the Jew?" evidently assuming that the Jews were better than the Gentiles racially, if not personally and morally: and we further saw that Paul, while he freely conceded their superiority in a very important sense, yet denied it in the sense which they meant. He recognized that they had a priority in call, and a relatively greater institutional opportunity, but no racial and no moral superiority. It is to this phase of racial and personal desert that the Jew comes back in the ninth verse. But he changes his form of attack, and approaches the question in issue from the opposite standpoint. He will entrap the apostle by apparently yielding the whole matter in debate, and will even query whether, according to the apostle's showing, the Gentiles are not *better* than the Jews: "Are we *surpassed* by the Gentiles? are we *worse* than they, either in our racial claim, or in morals?" But the question, though adroitly put, does not embarrass the advocate of a universal equality among men; and his answer is peremptory and conclusive.

Verse 9b. PAUL: Not in any wise! For we before accused both Jews and Greeks, that they are all under sin.

The verb **accused** is the appropriate forensic term for impeachment under specific charges. In this sentence, the epexegetic clause, **that they are all under sin** expresses the gravamen of the thing charged. The phrase **under sin** is figurative, and means "brought under the dominion and the condemnation of sin." It is the legal figure of master and slave, which the apostle adopts and develops at large in the sixth chapter (Rom. vi, 12-23), and expresses the same relation as he has in thought in the

Epistle to the Galatians: "The Scripture shut up all things under sin,"—counted all the world as legal thralls of sin. (Gal. iii, 22.)

To the question of the Jew, "Are we worse than the Gentiles?" the apostle answers, "No, in no wise! the Jew is not worse than the Gentile; just as I have shown that he is no better. No; the Jews are not better. They have an objective advantage over the Gentiles, in the prior possession of the written revelation of God's will; but they have no subjective, moral superiority." And as this last point is, to put it categorically, the point substantially in debate, the apostle addresses himself to the further consideration of it, by quoting, against the Jewish claim of moral superiority, a series of passages from their own Scriptures, which declare the total depravity of the Jews. For, notice, that all these damnatory passages were originally spoken, not of Gentiles, but of Jews. Their own Scriptures condemn them as being as bad as the Gentiles.

Verse 10. According as it has been written:—

- "There is not a just man, not even one,
 11 There is not a man that understands;
 There is not a man that seeks out God.
 12 They all turned aside, together they were corrupted.
 There is not a man that does good, there is not even
 one." (Ps. xiv, 1-3.)
 13 "An opened grave is their throat;
 With their tongues they used craft."—(Ps. v, 9.)
 "Venom of asps is under their lips."—(Ps. cxl. 3.)
 14 "Whose mouth is full of cursing and bitterness."—(Ps.
 x, 7.)
 15 "Swift are their feet to shed blood.
 16 Destruction and wretchedness are in their ways;
 17 And the way of peace they know not."—(Isa. lix, 7, 8.)
 18 "There is no fear of God before their eyes."—(Ps. xxxvi, 1.)

In these verses the apostle gives a catena of six distinct quotations from various parts of the Old Testament, showing, with cumulative force, the moral character of the Jews. The passages are cited somewhat promiscuously, as they occurred to the apostle's mind; yet we may perhaps trace a slight connection of thought in the order of the citation. The first quotation (verses 10-12) declares the universal sinfulness of the race, but specifically

of the Jew; the next four quotations (verses 13-17) declare the overt offenses in word and act of which men are guilty; and the last quotation (verse 18) declares the utter perversity of their moral character and life. The quotations are from the Greek Septuagint, not from the Hebrew. They were doubtless commonplace, and the apostle evidently trusted to his memory, and did not quote with verbal accuracy; but he faithfully gives us the substance of the passages quoted.

A comparison of these several passages with the original Hebrew is instructive upon the New Testament method of quotation; and shows how little thought the writers of the New Testament had of any verbal inspiration in the Scriptures. Their quotations from the Old Testament were usually given for their substantial sense, germane to the matter in hand, but sometimes (with a people to whom the Bible was the only classic) quotations were made by them, as often by modern literati, because of their verbal patness, and not for their intrinsic pertinence; *e. g.*, Matt. ii, 15, 17, 23. It is usually not difficult to discriminate. In the text before us the passages are quoted as germane to the matter in hand. The translation above is from Paul's citations from the Greek Septuagint.

For the purpose of a ready comparison, I subjoin the following pretty close translation from the Hebrew.

Verse 10. "There is no one doing good.

- Jehovah from heaven looked upon the sons of men,
 11 To see whether any was acting wisely, seeking God.
 12 Every one had gone aside; together they became corrupt.

There was no one doing good; there was not even one."
 —(Ps. xiv, 1-3.)

- 13 "An opened grave is their throat;
 Their tongue they used with guile."—(Ps. v, 9.)
 "The poison of an adder is under their lips."—(Ps. cxl, 3.)
 14 "His mouth is full of cursing and deceits."—(Ps. x, 7.)
 15 "For their feet run to evil;
 And they haste to shed innocent blood.
 16 Wasting and destruction are in their paths.
 17 The way of peace they know not."—(Isa. lix, 7, 8.)
 18 "There is no fear of God before his eyes."—(Ps. xxxvi, 1.)

It will be noticed that some of the verses (10, 14, 18) are in the singular number; the others are in the plural, quite promiscuously. Paul begins these citations with the words. **According as it has been written.** This is the constant formula for quotations from the canonical Scriptures. Jesus and the apostles appealed to the Scriptures of the Old Testament as authoritative and decisive on any point on which these Scriptures affirmed.

The description in the Hebrew of verses 10-12 is very dramatic. The psalmist represents God as looking down from heaven to see whether there were any righteous men. His eyes run to and fro, through the earth,—in vain! “Behold, every man has gone astray!”

The language of verse 13, **An opened grave is their throat,** is figurative, and expressive; the throat of the treacherous is like an open grave, yawning to swallow the unwary. The figure is the same as the Savior’s: “Woe to you, hypocrites, ye are as the graves which the men that walk over them know not;”—and suddenly stumble into them. (Luke xi, 44.)

The language of verse 16, **Destruction and misery are in their way,** describes the desolation and wretchedness which a hostile army, marching through a flourishing country, leaves behind them “in their *track*.” Before them the country is as the garden of God; behind them is a howling wilderness! “The reign of peace between man and man, they know nothing of.”

It is evident, from the tenor of these quotations, that the apostle teaches that the outward difference between the uncircumcised Gentile and the circumcised Jew marks no moral difference between them. Any moral distinction, if found at all, must be found within, in the heart; not without, in their institutions. But there is no such inward distinction; *all* men, Jews and Gentiles alike, are guilty before God, and are equally guilty; and *all* men need justification from sin, and need it equally.

There is some uncertainty as to the proper ending of Paul’s speech, begun in the ninth verse. The doubt is exactly the same as meets us elsewhere in the Scriptures; for example, in Gal. ii, 14, and the following verses, where does Paul’s formal answer to Peter end? and where does he resume his direct discourse to the Galatians? Again, in Christ’s words to Nicodemus, in John iii, 10, and the following verses, we have an uncertainty of the same kind. Where does Christ’s proper answer end? and where does the evangelist resume his narrative? Perhaps in the chapter be-

fore us it is best to understand that Paul's rejoinder runs from the ninth verse to the end of the twenty-sixth verse; though after the twentieth less personal than before, but with equal conclusiveness on the matter of debate. In the twenty-seventh verse the Jew's direct questions are resumed for a moment; and then Paul's final rejoinder goes to the end of the chapter.

This common guilt of Jews and Gentiles, and common need of justification, constitutes the subject of the remaining part of this chapter. The line of thought here followed establishes certain points which are fundamental to the subsequent discussion. These points are as follows:

1. All the world, Jew and Gentile, is guilty before God. (Verse 19.)
2. By works of law no man, not even the Jew, is justified before God. (Verse 20.)
3. There must be another way of justification, aside from law. Yes: apart from law. God's plan of justification, which has hitherto been hidden, has now been made known, and comes to us attested of old in the Law and the Prophets. (Verse 21.)
4. This plan of justification is through faith in Jesus Christ. (Verse 22.)
5. This justification is open to all men, Gentile and Jew, indiscriminately; for there is no distinction. (Verse 22.)
6. For God is God of Gentiles, as well as of Jews (Verse 29); And he will justify the Circumcision and the Uncircumcision, equally, by faith. (Verse 30.)
7. And this mode of justification is not in any sense antagonistic to the Law: but it is the, of old, "intended" end, and fulfillment of law. (Verse 31.)

Verse 19. But we know that whatsoever things the Law says, it speaks to the men within the Law; in order that every mouth may be stopped, and all the world may become amenable to God.

In the first clause, the word we is spoken in the person of all concerned in such matters; the thing declared is a matter of

universal understanding. The description of human depravity in the quotations from the Scriptures, Paul here applies specifically to the Jews. **What the Law says, it speaks not to the Gentiles, but expressly to the men under the Law**; that is, to the Jews, within the pale of the Law. This description of human depravity, as exemplified in the Jews, was true to the facts in all their history. In less than a score of years after this writing, these very Jews who arrogated to themselves the special approval of God as his elect people, in the very crisis of the fate of their nation and of their religion, forebore no enormity of crime, of outrage, of nameless vileness. Upon the very eve of this great catastrophe, the Apocalypse calls "the Holy City" "Sodom and Egypt." (Rev. xi, 8.) And after their calamity, one of their own priests and historians says with regard to his people: "Never, from the beginning of the world, did any age ever breed a generation more fruitful in wickedness than was this." (Josephus, Wars, V, x, 5.)

Undoubtedly Paul's arraignment of the corruption of the race, in the first chapter (verses 18-32), holds especially of the Gentiles. But the Jews can not transfer to the Gentiles the equally dark arraignment in the passages here quoted. As descriptive of fallen human nature, these passages attach indeed to the Gentiles; but they attach first of all to the Jews, **that every mouth (even of the Jews) may be stopped, and all the world may become guilty before God.**

Verse 20. **Because from works of law will no flesh be justified before him; for through law comes recognition of sin.**

Law is here, as always when without the article, the eternal, universal, *moral* law, written in the conscience of all men alike. The proposition of the text is universal. The statement applies to the Jews as well as to the Gentiles. By **works of law** are meant works done in obedience to law, as constituting a meritorious ground of justification and reward: "Which things if a man do, he will have [eternal] life in doing them" (Lev. xviii, 5; Gal. iii, 12); while failure to do them constitutes a ground of condemnation: "For it has been written, Cursed is every one that continues not in all the things written in the book of the Law, to do them" (Dent. xxvii, 26; Gal. iii, 10).

The words **will be justified** are used here, as always, forensic-

ally; and mean, "will be accounted just;" or "be held acquit." The tense of the verb may denote the time when each man shall come to a consciousness of his guilt; but more probably points to the general judgment of the Last Day, as is shown by the final phrase **before Him**,—before his bar. "Justification from works of law" is, undoubtedly, God's normal method for the universe. It is so planned for all moral agents. Angels and men, if they are *upright*, stand in the sight of God approved, "justified from works of law," the law of right. So angels in heaven, who do God's will, stand justified by their works, and need no redeemer from sin, no expiation for violated law. So Satan and his followers stood, for what time we know not, until their fall by sin. So Adam stood, for his brief day of innocence, until his fall by sin. So the Second and Greater Adam stood, without fall; he did the works of law, and could justly say to his enemies, "Which of you convicteth me of sin?" And he was "justified," accounted blameless, thereby. (1 Tim. iii, 16.) Such was God's ideal plan for the justification of man. But the concept of law requires "continuance in *all* the things written therein;" and, failing this, "from works of law *no flesh* will be justified."

The statement that **through law is recognition of sin** is spoken from the standpoint of human experience. The normal office of law is to *justify* men (but unfallen men, only), and thus to bring salvation. To fallen men it brings condemnation; and from this point of view, the apostle here affirms, what all human experience confirms, that it reveals sin, and brings home to the consciousness a sense of guilt. "To what end is the Law? It was added for the sake of bringing transgressions into clearer light" (Gal. iii, 19); "I did not know sin, except through law" (Rom. vii, 7).

Men are sinful, and need acquittal. The question then ever recurs, "How shall man be justified with God?" (Job ix, 2.) It is for the alarmed conscience the question of questions; the one demand of all religions. Two modes of justification are recognized and described in the Bible, and two only: the justification from works, and the justification from faith in the Lord Jesus Christ. The first is obtainable by *earning* it; the other as a *gratuity*. The apostle says: "To him that works, the reward [justification, that is, a verdict of 'guiltlessness,' and consequent salvation] is not reckoned as a gratuity, but as a debt due to him; but to him that works not [that is, does not *rely* on works of law for justification],

but exercises faith on him who justifies the sinner, his faith is reckoned unto justification [that is, acquittal from guilt]." (Rom. iv, 4.) Both modes are conceivable, both possible. *First*: As a mere abstract proposition, a man might now be justified by his works. Moses said: "Ye shall keep my statutes and my judgments, which if a man *do*, he will have life in them." (Lev. xviii, 5.) And to the lawyer who asked, "Teacher, what shall I *do*, to inherit eternal life?" Christ answered, "What is written in the law? this *do*; and thou wilt have life." (Luke x, 25.)

Such was the hope and the boast of the Jews. They were the elect people; they had the oracles of God; and they were jealous for his sovereignty; but everything was overshadowed by their boundless self-conceit. "They ignored God's plan of justification from faith, and sought to establish a justification of their own from works." (Rom. x, 3.) "They tithed the mint, the dill and the cummin [things ethically lighter than the dust of the balance], but they omitted the weightier matters of the Law, judgment, and mercy, and faith." (Matt. xxiii, 23.) They trusted to their scrupulous observance of the law of rites, for favor with God, and fancied that their "election" made up for all defects in their obedience to the inner spiritual law.

Such, too, is the fundamental and fatal error that pervades all the ethnic religions. Said Sir Monier Williams, professor of Sanskrit in Oxford University (died, 1899), in an address before the British and Foreign Bible Society, in 1887: "I have devoted forty-two years of my life, as much as any man living, to the study of the books held sacred by the nations of the East; and I have found the one key-note running through them all is *salvation by works*. They are certain that salvation must be purchased; and that the sole purchase money must be one's works and deservings."

Verse 21. But now, apart from law, God's plan of justification has been manifested, being attested by the Law and the Prophets; but God's plan of justification through faith in Jesus Christ, unto all them that have faith; for there is no distinction.

Here we have the *Second*: The only other method of justification through faith in Jesus Christ. This is the method set forth in the gospel. There is no union or intermingling of the two schemes for justification. The scheme of faith is independent of works. "By grace ye have been saved, through faith,—not from works."

(Eph. ii, 8.) That is, this method of justification excludes *reliance* on works (yet not in any antinomian sense, for it *requires* works as an evidence of one's profession); and it bases man's sole hope of salvation upon the vicarious atonement of Christ. "Christ redeemed us from the curse of the Law, having become a curse [accursed] in our stead." (Gal. iii, 13.)

This scheme of justification, by grace (*gratis*), through faith, is not new in God's provisions for human salvation; but is the primal, eternal plan now, at the end of the ages, manifested to the world. Paul elsewhere says: "This grace was given us in Christ Jesus before eternal ages, but has been manifested now through the appearing of our Savior, Jesus Christ." (2 Tim. i, 10.) Only that which previously existed, though hidden, can be "manifested." "In former generations it was not made known to the sons of men, as it was now revealed to the holy apostles and prophets in the Spirit, that the Gentiles are coheirs with the Jews, and joined in the same body with them, and partakers with them of the promise in Christ, through the gospel." (Eph. iii, 4.) This unrevealed secret was the "mystery" of which Paul so often speaks, not (as in the sense of the English word *mystery*) something incomprehensible and inexplicable, but merely the higher and distinctive doctrine of the gospel, the gospel that is world-wide in its scope, that contemplates, not the Jews only, but the Gentiles also, all of them, and equally. This was God's plan from eternity. He was always working along this line. It was a truth **attested by the Law and the Prophets**. The Scriptures, though the Jews certainly misapprehended them, were nevertheless saturated with this thought. "The testimony concerning Jesus is the spirit of prophecy" (Rev. xix, 10); "To him all the prophets testify." (Acts x, 43); "And all the prophets from Samuel, as many as spoke, foretold these days" (Acts iii, 24). Christ himself said of these Jewish Scriptures, "These are the Scriptures testifying concerning me." (John v, 39.) In his evening walk, with the two disciples, on the way to Emmaus, "Beginning from Moses and from all the prophets, he interpreted to them in all the Scriptures, the things concerning himself." (Luke xxiv, 27.) Such is the evangelical drift of the Hebrew Scriptures. The voice of gospel teaching is heard throughout the volume. And at the end of this epistle, the apostle declares that "this mystery [inner doctrine], kept secret through eternal ages, is now made manifest, and, through prophetic Scriptures [which we now know to interpret correctly], is

made known to all the Gentiles, with a view to their obedience to the faith." (Rom. xvi, 25.)

Faith in Christ, whose name now first appears in this argument, is the only means by which men may be at one with God. The ideal, normal justification by "doing works of law," being now impossible for men, the only alternative is faith in Christ's atonement. "There is no other name given among men whereby we must be saved." (Acts iv, 12.) The prepositional phrase **unto all**, connects back to the word **justification**. In some editions, and in the Authorized, is found a second phrase "and upon all;" which, however, adds but little to the sense, only to the rhetorical fullness of the sentence, as habitual with Paul. But if we retain the clause, we may explain the meaning, "justification reaching **unto all**, and resting **upon all**."

The single condition for actual, experimental, personal justification before God, is faith in the Lord Jesus Christ. It is a condition that is graciously open to *all* men, and possible for *all* men.

The clause for **there is no distinction**, is expegetical of the word **all** in the previous clause. We may safely emphasize this word "ALL" whenever we find it in Paul's exhibition of the gospel plan. It is emphatic here: "In Christ there is justification unto ALL men, *for* there is no difference." The sense is plain without any further words; but elsewhere Paul gives the thought yet more explicitly: "For there is no difference between Jew and Greek [Gentile]." (Rom. x, 12.) All races, and all classes, and all individuals, stand before God, before the Law, before the Gospel on the same gracious footing. Any individual distinctions of blood, or conditions, are in the line of God's providences, not of his spiritual kingdom; and distinctions of rank among men are of men's own making, which God does not recognize; with him there is no respect of persons (social conditions); and the provisions of the gospel are adequate to all conditions and emergencies.

Verses 23, 24. For all sinned, and fall short of the glory of God, being justified gratis by his grace, through the redemption that is in Christ Jesus.

The statement that **all sinned** looks back to the great historic fact of the fall of man, which is all that we here deal with; but we shall have occasion, on the recurrence of these words in the fifth chapter (Rom. v, 12), to discuss the theology and the theodicy of the doctrine of sin and of redemption. It is this objective fact

of universal sinfulness that the apostle makes the ground for the universal counter-provision of the gospel.

To this statement of the *historic* fact that "all sinned," including the Jews as well as the Gentiles in this condemnation, the apostle now adds the *present* fact that all men, including again the Jews, fall short of the glory of God. The sense of the final phrase, the glory of God, is not immediately apparent. Some think that the clause means this: "They come short of rendering to God the glory that is due to him," as in the sentence, "To God only wise be glory through Jesus Christ, forever." (Rom. xvi, 17.) Others think that it means: "They fall short of attaining the consummate glory of the last day," "the glory that will be revealed to us-ward." (Rom. viii, 18.) But "the glory" of our text is not future, but present. Better is the sense of the word in John: "They loved the glory of men rather than the glory of God." (John xii, 43.) Interpret the passage thus: "They lack the approval of God." This is the characteristic result of the sinful state of men, at large; but the connection in the apostle's line of thought shows that he applies it here to *the Jews*. They put forward arrogant claims; but, in fact, "they do not stand approved of God." He does not look with complacency on them and justify them on the ground of law. Nay, as lacking justification on the ground of works, they (and all men in common) are justified—the only alternative—*gratis*, by God's grace, through the redemption of Christ.

"Justified *gratis*!" This under the gospel scheme is the only result, and is the universal result. "All [Jew and Gentile] sinned;" the same *all* (Jew and Gentile) are justified by grace, as a gift from God, and not by works. The word "being justified" (*δικαιοῦμενοι*, in the *nominative* case) can not look back grammatically to the word *all* in the twenty-second verse (*πάντας*, in the *accusative* case), "all that have faith;" but to the word *all* in the twenty-third verse (*πάντες*, *nominative* case), "all sinned." The normal Scriptural view is that "all who sinned," being subjects of redemption, are constructively "justified." And notice: that the language expressly takes in *the Jews*. The terms are coextensive: "Sinned—justified." This is the gospel plan. Such is always Paul's concept of the matter; such are his words whenever he exhibits the plan and process of redemption: "If one died for [in the place of] *all*, then they *all* died, with him" (2 Cor. v, 14); "He that died with Christ has been justified from sin" (Rom.

vi, 7); "As in Adam *all* die, so also in Christ will *all* be made to live" (1 Cor. xv, 22). But notice, further, that the universality of redemption and of constructive justification for the race, which is wholly a matter of God's grace, and not of man's will, does not involve universality of eternal salvation, which, under the gospel plan, is practically conditional, in the case of adults, upon each man's personal faith. The word **grace** has here its first, simple meaning of God's *favor* or kindness; and not the secondary sense of infused, spiritual *help*.

The word **redemption** is one of the most significant terms in the gospel vocabulary. The word means a price paid, a liberation from a previous bondage. The word occurs ten times in the New Testament; the concept which it expresses occurs many times more. These passages represent man in bondage to iniquity, in bondage to death, the wages of iniquity. The ransom is Christ's own life. "Christ gave himself in our place, that he may redeem us from all iniquity" (Tit. ii, 14); "Christ gave himself a ransom in place of all" (1 Tim. ii, 6); "Christ bought us off from the curse of the law" (Gal. iii, 13); "Christ gave himself in our place, an offering, and a sacrifice *to God*" (Eph. v, 2). These last words, "to God," are a sufficient answer to the dreadful notion of some of the fathers, and some modern writers, that the price of Christ's death was paid to the devil! No; it is God who is propitiated by Christ's death. As a Father of men, he gave his Son to die for them: and as a Sovereign he accepted Christ's death as a satisfaction for the sins of men. These two relations to men are not incompatible. "In Christ we have the redemption, *through his blood*, the forgiveness of our sins, according to the riches of God's grace." (Eph. i, 7.)

Verses 25, 26. Whom God set forth a propitiation, through faith in his blood, unto a manifestation of his plan of justification, on account of the passing over of the sins done before in the forbearance of God; unto the manifestation of his plan of justification in the present time; to the end that he may himself be just [justified], and justifying him that is of faith in Jesus.

These verses are felt to be peculiarly difficult. They are compact, implicate in structure, full of weighty and significant words, and some of them very perplexing. The several words, and phrases, and clauses, and the connections of the sentences,

grammatical and logical, need careful study. The translation here given, and the exegesis following, while doubtless open to criticism, will, I hope, be found free from serious misconception or misrepresentation of the apostle's meaning.

The first verse begins with an historical statement that **God set forth his son as a propitiation**. Dependent upon this sentence, there are two co-ordinate parallel clauses, expressing the scope, or object, aimed at in the divine action; and these clauses are each modified by adverbial phrases, causal or temporal; and finally there is a telic clause, expressing the divine purpose. In accordance with this analysis, I arrange the entire passage thus:

"Whom God set forth a propitiation, through faith in his blood:

I. With a view to a manifestation of his plan of justification, on account of the passing over of the sins done of old in the forbearance of God;

II. *Unto* the manifestation of his plan of justification in the present time;

III. To the end that he may himself be justified, and justifying him that is of faith in Jesus."

The verb here translated **set forth** does not so much mean *proclaimed, announced* (yet this, too, is true), as *put forward, constituted*. God constituted his Son a propitiation for the sins of the world. "He *sent* his son a propitiation for our sins." (1 John iv, 10.) This *appointment* dates back to the eternal counsels of God, who counted his Son "a lamb slain, from the foundation of the world." (Rev. xiii, 8.) The first *proclamation* of this Savior was in the promise in the garden: "The seed of the woman will bruise the serpent's head;" and successive proclamations of this appointment run through all the later revelation. "He promised it of old through his prophets, in Holy Scriptures." (Rom. i, 2.) Yet the world waited long for him who was the Desire of all nations. "But in the fullness of the time, God sent forth his Son." (Gal. iv, 4.) "Now once for all, at the completion of the ages, he has been manifested to a putting away of sin, through the sacrifice of himself." (Heb. ix, 26.) These sayings, which describe the great fulfillment of the promise of old, explain the words of our text: "Whom God set forth, or constituted, a propitiation."

The Greek word here translated **propitiation**, found twice only in the New Testament, occurs many times in the Septuagint in the sense of "mercy seat." It is found also in the Epistle to

the Hebrews in this Levitical sense: "Above the ark of the covenant were the Cherubim overshadowing the *mercy seat*." (Heb. ix, 5.) Many interpreters attach this meaning, figuratively, to the text here. But this interpretation is too strained to satisfy the exigencies of the passage. We can hardly say that God constituted his Son a *mercy seat*, an inanimate *altar*. Rather, the Son was the living, willing victim upon the altar, a self-sacrifice to expiate the sins of the world. It is in this latter sense that the verb *ἰλάσκεσθαι*, to propitiate, also twice found in the New Testament, is used: "God, be propitiated to me the sinner" (Luke xviii, 13); "He became high priest . . . to make propitiation for the sins of the people" (Heb. ii, 17). It is in this sense that the other derivative substantive *ἰλασμός*, also twice found, is used: "He is a propitiation for our sins" (1 John ii, 2); "He sent his Son a propitiation for our sins" (1 John iv, 10). These words then have a sense of *atonement*, a means to placate, to conciliate; and they always are used of the change in man's forensic relations towards God. So here: "God appointed his Son propitiation for our sins." "God was in Christ, reconciling the world to himself, not imputing to them their trespasses." (2 Cor. v, 19.)

The phrase **through faith in his blood** is appropriately connected with the word "*propitiation*." No one can fairly misunderstand the general thought. But as the act of propitiation represents the Godward side of the transaction, and the act of faith the manward side, we may, for definition's sake, best express the connection by supplying a word: "*propitiation to be apprehended by us through faith*."

This phrase, "through faith in his blood," is to be taken as a whole, without a comma after "faith;" that is, the preposition *in* shows the relation of "blood" to "faith." (The Authorized is correct; the Revised has missed the sense.) But by the word "*propitiation*," the apostle brings to the front in this sense, not simply faith, but expressly "*faith in the atoning blood of Christ*." True, this verbal expression of *faith in Christ's blood* does not occur elsewhere in the New Testament; but the book is rich in equivalent expressions teaching the propitiation *through his shed blood*. The Savior himself said, "This cup is the new covenant *in my blood*, which is shed for you" (Luke xxii, 20); Paul said, "In him we have the redemption *through his blood*, the forgiveness of our sins" (Eph. i, 7); and John said, "He loved us, and washed us from our sins *in his own blood*" (Rev. i, 5). Yet the term "blood" is but

a figurative expression for death; "For though it behooved Christ *to die*" (which was the essential thing), the *form* of his death was a matter indifferent in itself; and nothing turns on the mere physical *shedding of his blood*. But as Christ's death came in this form, and as his blood was actually shed, the word "blood" most naturally and most expressively runs through all the New Testament representations of his death; and the "*blood* [death] of Christ" is constantly named as the redemption of the world.

The phrase **unto a manifestation of his plan of justification** expresses God's purpose in thus formally setting forth his Son as the propitiation of the world. It was to vindicate himself and his administration. The term *ἐνδείξις* here translated "manifestation," is from the same root and has the same meaning as the parallel expression to the Ephesians, "God made us alive with Christ, and raised us with him, that he may *show forth* (*ἐνδείξῃται*) the riches of his grace towards us" (Eph. ii, 7), and the word might be just as adequately translated by any of the quite synonymous words, "showing forth, display, or exhibition." Paul means simply, but pertinently to his great theme, that God, by the appointment of his Son as a propitiation, exhibits to the world his method of justifying sinners. The Greek word *πάρεσις*, here translated **passing over** (incorrectly given in the Authorized, "remission," which makes it a synonym of "pardon"), means quite exactly *pretermission*, or *letting go by*. The word is used by Xenophon in exactly the same sense: "A trainer of horses, should not let such faults *pass by unpunished*." (Hippiarchus VII, 10.) The predicative word "unpunished" which Xenophon adds is clearly implied in our text. Paul's thought is, that God, down to the time of Christ, instead of promptly punishing sin, as a just Sovereign might be expected to do, let it "*pass him by unpunished*," as if unnoticed; not that he formally *forgave* it or ignored it, but that he mercifully forebore to punish. This was in the time of the non-age of the Church, "the times of ignorance which as yet God winked at" (Acts xvii, 30); "In the bygone generations he suffered all the nations to walk in their own ways" (Acts xiv, 16); or, rather, as Paul represents it, the case of the sinner was held in suspense. And from this point of view we explain his word *pretermission*, as expressing all that God could administratively yet do. Until Christ came, he could only "wink at sin," as if he did not notice it. Yet, in point of fact, God always noticed sin, and often punished it, and often pardoned it, according to the disposition of

the offenders. All along the ages he forgave the sins of penitent men. The psalmist could describe what must ever have been a frequent experience: "Blessed are they whose iniquities are forgiven, and whose sins were covered." (Ps. xxxii, 1.) This forbearance of God in the case of sinners under the old dispensation is, after all, exactly analogous to his forbearance now. God does not now punish sin on the instant; nor does he therefore pardon it or overlook it. He does what human courts often do: He suspends sentence; he waits for our repentance; "he is long-suffering to us-ward."

The sins done before were the sins of men, indiscriminately, during the long ages before the coming of Christ. The same thought is expressed, but still more clearly, in the Epistle to the Hebrews: "Christ's death took place for the redemption of the transgressions under the first dispensation." (Heb. ix, 15.) The text marks two great administrative periods, the one, the era preceding the atonement; the other, the Christian era since. And the sins referred to in the text were the sins during the first long reach of time, while God waited until "Christ should become the Mediator of a better dispensation." (Heb. ix, 15.)

The phrase in the forbearance of God stands in contrast with the phrase in the next verse, in the present time. It follows that both phrases are adverbial elements of *time*; and the first phrase can not express "*the sphere* of the divine action," but must mean "in *the time* of God's forbearance," the forty centuries of the divine patience before Christ came; just as, in the twenty-sixth verse, the phrase, "in the present time," has respect to the Christian era.

We now come to the occasion, or ground, for God's setting forth of Christ as the propitiation for men: and for the public exhibition of his plan of justification. The text says that it was on account of God's pretermission of the by-gone sins of men. This apparent non-punition of sin constituted an anomaly in the moral world that might be misunderstood, to the impeachment of God's justice; it was "on this account" that God in due time exhibited to the world his plan of justification, by which sin could be reckoned with, and pardoned. The *Gospel* scheme provides for this; but the system of *law*, on which the Jews prided themselves, and thought themselves justified under it, really made no provision for pardon. Not the Jews in fact, and certainly not the Gentiles, have any hope under the administration

of law. But God now reveals to the world, to Jews and Gentiles in common, a plan for human salvation more comprehensive in its scope than the Jews had thought, and more gracious in its provisions than the Gentiles had hoped.

In the twenty-sixth verse the words of the previous verse are repeated with a slight deviation. Yet it is not a repetition of the identical thought, for mere emphasis' sake, as is assumed in the Authorized and the Revised, by the words "I say;" but is a distinct co-ordinate proposition. The distinction in the two propositions is made by the contrasted temporal adverbial phrases, **in the time of God's forbearance**—that is, under the old dispensation; and **in the present time**—that is, under the new dispensation. Fundamentally, both dispensations were *Christian*, alike; but the old dispensation looked forward, through types, to a Christ yet to come, and but obscurely revealed; the new dispensation looks back now to a Christ already come, and fully revealed. From the first God planned for the abolition of sin: he marked the first dispensation by the *pretermis*sion of sin; he marks the present dispensation by the *remis*sion of sin. In both administrations "God is just, and in both he justifies the man who has faith." This is the apostle's thought in the next clause.

This final clause gives the purpose with which God manifested to the world his plan of justification, to the end, namely, **that he may be counted just; and that he may justify the man of faith in Jesus.** God's long forbearance with transgressors had the appearance of indifference, or even of judicial trifling. It looked as if he connived at sin; that he overlooked transgression, when he ought to have punished it. But his delay was not caprice, but longsuffering; and this verse declares how he vindicated his administration from this hasty judgment of men. He justified himself in the forum of man's conscience, by exhibiting, not his desire for the condemnation of men, but his plan for their justification, his plan that has always been operative in the world, though men may not always have known it; he justified himself by showing that the gospel plan provided from of old an atonement in the fullness of time for sin, retrospective in its action as well as prospective. It covers the sins of the past, as well as the sins of the present time. In regard to both descriptions, and in both periods of time, God must be beheld as **just** (justified) in justifying men, and this means *all* men, on the ground of the universal atonement.

It is true that the last words in the verse, **him that is of faith in Jesus**, taken apart from the context, might seem to restrict justification to him only (the adult) who has a conscious, saving faith in Jesus; and to restrict it to the present time. Certainly it is eminently true that God does justify such believer; but the connection indicates that the expression includes *all* men, of all time, infants as well as adults, unbelievers as well as believers, because all are the actual purchase of Christ's death, and all must be held as ideally coming under the scheme or category of "faith," as over against the category of works. The expression, "him that is of faith," stands in contrast with men of the other description, "men who are of law" (Rom. iv, 4); men who, like the Jews, count themselves "doers of law," yet who "are not justified by law." Only from faith in Jesus is there justification; and in the gospel scheme this holds ideally commensurate with the entire race, for all time, before Christ as well as after.

In this whole discussion, and in all the terms that Paul employs, he has the Gentile world foremost in his thought: it is their cause that he pleads against the exclusiveness of the Jews; and it is of them in particular that he says, "God justifies him that is of faith in Jesus." It is the same thought that he expresses elsewhere, in reference to the Gentiles—"Whom God had in his thought, he included in his plan; whom he included, he called; whom he called, he justified." (Rom. viii, 29.)

Verse 27. *a.* JEW. **Where then is the boasting?**

b. PAUL. **It was excluded.**

c. JEW. **Through what kind of law? Of the works?**

d. PAUL. **No; but through law of faith.**

a. JEW: **Where then is our boasting?** This verse, like the first part of the chapter, is in the form of a colloquy between the Jewish opponent and the apostle. It is very brief; but it covers the whole matter, that is in issue. The first question inquires for the standing of the Jews before the Law. The question is put in general terms; but the specific reference to the Jews is best expressed with the use of the personal pronoun, "Where is *our* boasting?" The previous discussion has turned on the assumption of the Jews that they have a religious superiority over the Gentiles; and this is still the feeling that lies on the surface of this question. The word **boasting** is sometimes taken in a bad sense, as meaning

“vainglorying:” but the only instance of this bad sense in the New Testament is in the Epistle of James, “Ye boast in your arrogances: all such boasting is bad.” (James iv, 16.) Paul employs the word ten times, always in a good sense, as when he himself says, “This boasting of mine shall not be stopped” (2 Cor. xi, 10); and similarly the psalmist says, “My soul will make her boast in the Lord” (Psa. xxxiv, 2). We must understand the Jews’ word here in this good sense, and interpret it as meaning, “Where then is our wonted boasting? What becomes of our prescriptive claims as God’s peculiar people?” Yet, after all, their question in this connection resolves itself, at best, into a covert expression of spiritual conceit on the part of the Jew. And as such Paul curtly sets it aside.

b. PAUL: It was excluded. These few words are Paul’s sufficient answer to the assumption of the Jew. Indeed his Greek is even briefer yet—only *one* word, which we may imitate, “Excluded!” The historical tense, “It *was* excluded” (which is not recognized in the Authorized or the Revised), dates the exclusion back to the eternal plan of God. And the apostle’s answer means that not only is there no room *now* for Jewish boasting, but there *never was* any room. From the very inception of the Divine scheme for the salvation of the world, down to the present time, all self-glorifying was and is shut out. Boasting in one’s election, or works, or personal desert, is incompatible with the fact of man’s sinfulness, with the fact that God is no respecter of persons (even in the case of the Jews), and with the whole concept of the gospel. All men stand before the Law alike. Through all the history of God’s dealings with man, not works (over which they might boast), but faith (which admits no element of boasting) constituted the sole ground of justification with God.

c. JEW: Through what kind of law? of the works? This question, like the first one, is in general terms, **the works** (though the article is omitted in both the Authorized and the Revised); but the specific reference of the whole passage to the Jews, requires that we translate, as before, with the personal pronoun, “*our* works.” And this word “*our*” determines the sense which we must attach to the word “law.” If the text were simply “works,” without the article or the pronoun, we might explain the word “law” as meaning “principle,” or “authority;” but this interpretation is not logically possible with “*our* works.” We must fall back on the usual sense of law, as meaning “statute,” or

“legislation.” And the question means “Through what kind of statute was our boasting excluded? Was it (though it is self-contradictory to think or ask), was it through the statute which *enjoined* these works of ours?”—works that the Ceremonial Law requires of us, such as circumcision, and sacrifices, and tithes, and observance of things clean, and holy-days? The question thus explained shows still the boastful spirit and attitude of the Jewish objector; and still declares that the Jew has no other concept of the way of justification, than *through works*. He counts the Ceremonial Law as enjoined, and obedience to it as meritorious, over which one may boast. And he urges this point as a *reductio ad absurdum* against the apostle’s declaration that “boasting was excluded.”

This position of the Jews seems at first self-consistent. But here was the fatal fallacy in their argument. They *did not do* the works of which they boasted; and therefore they were not so justified before God. They could boast of works, only if, like the sinless angels, they had always obeyed, and perfectly obeyed, God’s moral law. “The Jews, as well as sinners from the Gentiles, were not justified by works of law, but through faith in Jesus Christ.” (Gal. iii. 16.)

d. PAUL: No; but through law of faith. The question of the Jew is, “Was our boasting excluded through the law which enjoins our works?” In this question the Jew thought only of ceremonial and ritual works, but attached to them a moral and saving value. Now Paul would grant that if there be boasting at all it must be in “works;” but it must be in *moral* works, not in such ceremonial works as the Jew has in mind, and whose moral value Paul does not recognize. It is by this defect in moral value that their boasting of their works was excluded. And so, to their question, Paul’s answer is a peremptory “No.” It is not through such a law of ceremonial works of theirs, that their boasting was excluded; but “through the law of faith.” Not even Abraham, as we shall read in the next chapter, the root and the ideal man of the Jewish Church, had any ground for boasting. The gospel of Jesus Christ excludes reliance on legal obedience, and establishes faith as the sole ground of justification. No man can boast. Everything is of God’s grace, not of God’s indebtedness to man. “What hast thou which thou didst not receive [as a gift]? But if thou also receivest it [as a gift], why dost thou boast, as not having received it?” (1 Cor. iv, 7.)

Verse 28. For we reckon that man is justified by faith, apart from works of law.

Of the two, and only two, conceivable methods of justification, from works, and from faith [see note on verse 20], the former is now clearly shown impossible for man. There remains only the latter: **Man is justified by faith, apart from works.** The word *man* is generic; it includes the whole race of Adam, now the whole race of Christ; and it should not be taken indefinitely "a man," as in the Authorized and the Revised. It may, indeed, be questioned whether that is Greek. The text but expresses the ideal working of the gospel; the atonement embraces the race; every man is justified from the guilt and the penalty of sin. But it is not hence to be concluded that all men are finally to be saved. "Justification is with a view to sanctification," the "holiness without which no man will see the Lord." But if a man will not *sanctify himself*, his erstwhile justification is unavailing. "Once in grace" can be said of all men; "always in grace" can be said only of those who persevere.

Verse 29. Or is God God of Jews only? is he not God of Gentiles also?

The conjunction *or* (which is not given in the Authorized), when it thus introduces a question, implies a demur to the previous proposition and suggests an alternative which is itself not admissible. It is as if the apostle said to the Jew: "Or, if you demur to this statement of the case of the Gentiles, what then will you say? is God God of Jews only?" The question which Paul here asks contains really the kernel of the whole Epistle. The moot point in the Epistle, briefly put, is, Who are embraced in the divine plan? "Is God God of Jews only? *is he not God of Gentiles also?*"

The debate, so far, in this chapter, between the Jew and Paul, has been, substantially, on this very point,—the actual bearing of God's plan of justification, and the relation of the Gentiles to this plan. The conclusion which Paul reaches is that men are justified by faith alone, and not by works, as the Jews boasted; and that the Gentiles thus stand before the law of God, and before the Gospel of Christ, in exactly the same attitude as the Jews. Both are equally sinful, equally need justification, are equally dependent on the provisions of the gospel for pardon and salvation; and

they come into this equal participation because they are equally the children of one common Father. It is with this thought that the apostle asks the question of this verse, "Is God God of Jews only? is he not God of Gentiles also?"

Verse 30. Yes; of Gentiles also; if in fact God is one [and not many]; who will justify circumcision from faith, and uncircumcision through the [same] faith.

The word **one** in this verse is not the indefinite pronoun, but the *numeral*. The Jews' denial that, for all men alike, justification is by faith, and not by works; and the denial that the Gentiles have an equal place in God's plan, involves substantially a denial of the unity of God. If God is one, and not many, he is God everywhere, and God of all men; not of Jews only, but of Gentiles also; he has but one scheme of moral government for men, and therefore but one plan of justification. This conclusion must be conceded by the Jews from their monotheism. There is but one God, and he is God of all. It is only on the assumption that the Jews and Gentiles do not have the same God that we can think them under different economies, or administrations, and under different methods of justification. The Jews who deemed themselves peculiarly God's elect did not cheerfully recognize this common Fatherhood of God with regard to the Gentiles; but they never *denied* it. It is a truth taught in their Scriptures. Their prophets expressed it boldly and broadly. The great evangelical prophet says: "Doubtless thou art our Father: though Abraham be ignorant of us, and Israel acknowledge us not, yet thou, Jehovah, art our Father, our Redeemer." (Isa. lxiii, 16.) And the last of the prophets says: "Have we not all one Father? hath not one God created us?" (Mal. ii, 10.)

The words **circumcision** and **uncircumcision** mean Jew and Gentile. The terms, being without the article, describe rather than enumerate; and mean, therefore, not so much *all* of the one category, or of the other, as they mean persons having the given characteristics; or perhaps, rather, the religious *status* of the several classes. Yet, as we have seen in verse 26, the gospel ideally includes *the race*, *all* of the Circumcision, *all* of the Uncircumcision.

The difference expressed by the two prepositions, "**from** faith—**through** the faith," is not so pronounced but that perhaps they might have been interchanged, or either one used in both clauses. But we may detect a possible shade of difference in the apostle's

concepts, as expressed in his word "faith" *without* the article; and his word *with* it. God will justify Jews, not by works, but *out of* faith in a coming Messiah, which underlay the whole Jewish dispensation; and he will justify the Gentiles *through the faith*, their new *creed*, which they espouse in coming to Christ.

Verse 31. JEW: Do we, then, abrogate law through the faith?

PAUL: God forbid! Nay, but we establish law.

The word **law** is without the article, and, as always, means the ethical law, which in its own nature is universal and eternal. With this law, **faith**, or more exactly **the faith**—that is, the gospel—is not inconsistent. This law, if obeyed, secures justification; it is intended for this and not for condemnation. But, failing this, faith in Christ is the divinely appointed substitute for law, for man's justification. Faith is God's method of justifying those whom law can not justify. (Rom. viii, 3.) And when we preach the gospel of faith, we not only do not antagonize law, or abrogate it, we confirm and establish it. "Christ is the end (fulfillment) of law, unto justification, to every one that has faith." (Rom. x, 4.)

CHAPTER IV.

Verse 1. JEW: What then shall we say that Abraham our forefather has found according to the flesh?

The words must be understood as the words of the Jewish objector, as before, in the third chapter.

The word **forefather** is found in this place only in the New Testament; and it is evidently used in its literal sense, as spoken from the standpoint of the natural Israel. When Paul speaks, from the standpoint of the gospel, of the relation of the spiritual Israel to Abraham, as in the twelfth verse of this chapter, his word is "father," not "forefather." The case of Abraham comes into consideration here in the following way: In the third chapter, the apostle has shown, as we have seen, that the Jews at large can not rely on works for justification, and can not boast of merit before God. But the Jews hold that, however the case stood with the bulk of the nation, at least Abraham, their great forefather, the ideal Jew, the friend of God, was justified by his personal merits, and, so, had a ground of "boasting;" and, further, they believed that his supererogatory merits descended to his posterity, the elect nation.* They prided themselves on their descent: "We have Abraham to our father; we are Abraham's seed." It is with this feeling in regard to their great ancestor that the objector now asks, as a conclusive reply to Paul's views, "What, then (on the ground of your teaching as to the Jews at large), shall we say that Abraham, our forefather, has found according to the flesh?"

The Authorized and the Revised connect the phrase **according to the flesh**, as an adjective element, with the word "forefather." But this word "forefather," as the expression for the

* Cf. Edersheim's "Jesus the Messiah." I, 271.

natural relation, already carries in itself its full specific meaning; and the phrase "according to the flesh" can add nothing whatever to the sense. Besides, such a connection for the phrase would leave the verb **has found** without any words to mark the trend and end of Abraham's seeking and finding. But the phrase "according to the flesh," must connect logically, as an adverbial element, with the verb "has found;" and it is parallel with the equivalent adverbial phrase "from works," in the second verse. So connected, the words "according to the flesh" must mean "on the basis of his personal works and deserts."

Verse 2. PAUL: [Nothing at all]; for if Abraham was justified from works, he has a ground of boasting. Nay, but [he has no ground for boasting] before God.

The conjunction **for** is always explicative and confirmatory; but here it does not at first seem easy to trace the reference of the word. The connection of the thought does not permit us to make the second verse a continuation of the Jew's speech in the first verse, nor, on the other hand, in counting the second verse as Paul's, can we think that his words are meant to explain the language of the Jew. The simple explanation suggested by the word "for," is to *supply*, as Paul's direct answer to the question of the Jew in the first verse, the word *Nothing*; and to refer the word "for" to this supplied word, "nothing." This connection of thought will then run thus:

JEW. "What has Abraham found according to the flesh [that is, on the ground of works]?"

PAUL. "*Nothing* whatever; for if he was justified from works—"

The apostle's compressed style corresponds with his close-packed meaning. Ofttimes his letters (which, we must recollect, were all dictated) do not supply all the steps of his own rapid movement. His thought outruns his utterances, or the pen of his amanuensis; and he skips to catch up with himself. Other more deliberate writers indulge in ellipses of single words; Paul indulges in ellipses of whole logical members; and the reader is left embarrassed, or is constrained to supply the missing link or links, from the proprieties of the connection. The sentence before us is a striking illustration of this ellipsis, and of the need to supplement the sense; and the very next clause of this verse furnishes

another instance of this elliptic construction. The connection runs thus:

“If Abraham was justified by works, he has a ground of boasting. Nay, but not [has he any ground of boasting] towards God.”

In the ninth verse we have another instance of the ellipsis of a logical member; thus:

“Comes this happiness on the Circumcision? or on the Uncircumcision? [On the Uncircumcision] for we say, Faith was reckoned to [the uncircumcised] Abraham unto justification.”

The matter is sufficiently important to justify further illustration. In Galatians, Paul gives us two instances in one verse: “Does he who works miracles among you, do it from works of law? or from preaching of faith? [From preaching of faith]; even as [it has been written] Abraham had faith in God, and it was reckoned to him unto justification.” (Gal. iii, 5.) Again: “Man is not justified from works of law [nor in any way] if not through faith in Jesus Christ.” (Gal. ii, 16.) Again: “In the Law of Moses, it has been written, Thou shalt not muzzle an ox treading out grain. Is it the oxen that God cares for? or does he say it wholly for our sake? [Not for oxen], for it was written for our sake.” (1 Cor. ix, 9.) Again: “But I say, Did not Israel know? [Certainly, he did]: the first witness, Moses, says,— (Rom. x, 19.)

In the sentence **If Abraham was justified**—the postulating conjunction “if” and the indicative mode “was” (not the subjunctive “were,” as in the Authorized) expresses what Paul, who did not hold this view, yet for argument’s sake, concedes as a fact: “*If Abraham was* justified by works (as the Jews affirm), he has a ground of boasting.” The word **boasting** here alludes to the word “boasting” in Chapter iii, 27, the conceit of the Jews that they were just before God.

Nay: but [he has no ground for boasting] before God. The conjunction ἀλλά “but,” here used, is the strongest adversative in the language; and its force can best be reproduced in English with the help of the negative adverb “Nay.” The sentence is the apostle’s summary and curt contradiction to the objector’s assumption. The whole argument, which the objector has based upon Abraham’s case, is unhistorical for the patriarch; and as unscriptural as the claim which he previously set up for the nation at large. Neither themselves nor the father of their race can claim any merit from works before God.

Verse 3. For what says the Scripture? "But Abraham had faith in God; and it [his faith] was reckoned to him unto justification."

The Hebrew original differs from this slightly in the form of expression, but not in the sense: "Abraham believed on Jehovah; and he counted it to him unto justification." (Gen. xv, 6.) Clearly it was not merely his historical belief, the assent of his intellect, that brought him justification; for, on that ground, even Satan could be justified: "The devils also believe, and tremble."^{*} The Hebrew word here translated "he believed," *הֵאֱמַן*, the same word, from which comes the word "amen," "confirmation," "establishment,"[†] implies a repose, a trust, in the saving power of God's promise. Abraham relied first on God's veracity; but his faith went much further; and he trusted in God to the salvation of his soul. "He stayed himself on Jehovah"—which is the literal meaning of the Hebrew—and God counted it to him unto justification. It was on the ground of this spiritual surrender of himself, this recumbency of soul on the promises of God, that he was justified before God, and became "the father of the faithful" (the men of faith), "the friend of God."

In the statement of Moses, here quoted by Paul, and reaffirmed by him, we have the historical fact in regard to Abraham's justification. It was not any work of law, but his *faith* that brought him acceptance with God, pardon of sin, and regeneration of heart. In the case of Abraham, his justification, by the testimony of the Hebrew Scriptures themselves, against what the Jews held, was merely a matter of grace, that is, a gratuity, and not of merit, or earned by his works. And the fifth verse below declares that this is the normal method of justification for all men. It has always been the sole method.

Verse 4. But to him that works, the reward is not reckoned as a matter of grace, but as a matter of debt.

This is a simple business proposition that holds true, first of all, in our secular life. Wherever a workman does his task, he

^{*} Dr. South says there is no one in the universe so orthodox as Satan, except God.

[†] Such is the meaning of the word "amen," with which we conclude our prayers. The word does not so much sum up what has been said, with a brief repetition of the prayer, "Let it be so," as it declares our faith that God has granted all that we asked: "It is so."

earns his wages; and they are not given to him as a gratuity, but of right and indebtedness. As applied to the religious life, the verb **works** means "does works of law" with view to reward; and the man who "does" these *earns* his wages (justification and eternal life) as his right, and not as a gift. In the common everyday life, all workmen work their way, and earn their pay. But in the religious life, no man now earns justification. "By works of law will no flesh be justified before God" (Rom. iii, 20); "Man is not justified by works of law, but only through faith in Jesus Christ" (Gal. ii, 16).

Verse 5. But to him that works not, but has faith on him that justifies the ungodly man, his faith is reckoned unto justification.

By the words **works not** the apostle does not deny good works, or the obligation of them, as the evidence of the Christian man's profession. But works can not go beyond that: no merit attaches to them, nor does any merit indeed attach to **faith**. Herein, Paul argues, is God's way of justification as set over against the vain boasting of the Jews. With God no man has any desert, not even Abraham. He earns nothing. Everything is of grace. Faith in Christ is the only pathway to justification, and to sanctification, and salvation. This is not a novel doctrine, but as old as the race. The Jews ought to have known it; and indeed they did know it, but ignored it. It is the salient feature in the history of Abraham. Nor is this doctrine antagonistic to the principles of law: it confirms the Law. And it is established as the Old Testament doctrine by the testimony of David, in the next verses.

Verses 6, 7, 8. According as also David tells the happiness of the man to whom God reckons justification, apart from works:

Happy they whose iniquities were forgiven,
And whose sins were covered;
Happy the man to whom the Lord will not reckon
sin! (Ps. xxxii, 1.)

This psalm is here expressly assigned to David; and is so recognized by the critics. It was written by him after his sin with Bathsheba. The tense of the verbs shows that the psalmist, when he wrote these words, looked back to a long-past forgiveness.

The verb here correctly translated to **reckon**—that is, to count, accredit—is found ten times in this chapter and about twenty times more in Paul's Epistles. In six of the places in this chapter (verses 6, 8, 11, 22, 23, 24), and elsewhere, the Authorized Version, following the Latin Vulgate (*imputare, reputare*) translates it "to impute;" that is, to attribute. This chapter is the professed Scriptural basis for the famous figment of "imputed sin" and of "imputed righteousness," which, since the days of Augustine, has so strangely leavened the theology of the of the Church in regard to the Scriptural doctrine of justification. Further, the unfortunate mistranslation of the Greek word for justification by the English word "righteousness," and the indiscriminate use, in theological discussions, of this one word "righteousness" for the two unlike concepts "justification" and "holiness," has helped on this doctrinal error of imputation.

"Imputation" in Augustinian and Calvinistic theology is the dogma that, in the divine counsels, Adam's personal sin, and the guilt of it, is attributed to his descendants, as if their own (and, of course, also attributed to Christ, who takes our place before the law); and that, similarly, Christ's righteousness (which, logically, can only mean his personal *holiness*), and the merit of it, is attributed to the elect as if their own.

This is one of the stock tenets of Calvinistic theology. It looks plausible, at first, as a working theory of the atonement. It pervaded almost all the earlier theological literature; and it even infected many who in other points were far from Calvinism. John Wesley, in treating of "Imputation," adopts the expression "imputation of Christ's righteousness," showing that he was caught in the toils of Calvinistic phrasology, if he did not incline to Calvinistic views. And no wonder; for up to his time there was very little theological literature that was not tainted with this heresy. More recently the Wesleyan Churches deny altogether the dogma of "original sin," as defined above, and of "imputation of Christ's righteousness;" and now a considerable school of theologians, who nevertheless still call themselves Calvinistic (the new school Calvinists of New England), reject this tenet *in toto*; and most other Calvinists hold it less obtrusively, if not less tenaciously.

The imputation to men of Adam's sin, and of Christ's righteousness, is unnecessary for a theodicy, unreasonable and unscriptural. The Bible nowhere says, or implies, or can be warped to

mean, that the sin and guilt, or the righteousness (holiness), of one person is transferable, or is ever attributed, to another. The single verse here that affirms in regard to the reckoning of sin—"Happy is the man to whom the Lord will not reckon sin"—by all the implications of the passage limits the "sin" to the man's *own transgression* and guilt; and the single verse here that affirms in regard to God's reckoning aught unto man's justification, limits it, not to Christ's righteousness, but to the man's *own faith*. "His faith is reckoned unto justification."* Affirmation more explicit than these verses, or inconsistent with these verses, there is absolutely none in the Scripture. The passages that can be quoted for the correct view are many, and they are all of one tenor. The imputation to man of aught else than his own sin, unto condemnation, or of aught else than his own faith, unto justification, is unethical, dishonoring to God, unjust to man, subversive of all feeling of personal responsibility.

There may be acts of others that leave their effects in us; some resulting to our injury, as Adam's sin, some resulting to our good, as Christ's vicarious death; both of which are objective to us; but they are not transferable to us; they do not become elements of character, and they can not be "imputed" to us, set down to our merit or to our demerit. In God's dealings with us, it is only our own sin and guilt, and our own faith, subjective elements, that are imputed or reckoned to us, whether unto condemnation, or unto justification. Character, moral quality, can not be transferred from one to another, and infused into his personality. A man is ethically only what he makes himself. In the sphere of ethics, nothing else than what is our own can be imputed or credited to us; and so God never violates man's freedom, either by making him sinful, or by making him holy. In the direction of holiness God presents motives and gives man power to act; but he never acts *for* him; that is, *instead of* him. If man is to be holy, it must be (with God's help) by his own choice, and his own action. The gospel teaches the synergism of man and God. Neither can accomplish human salvation without the other. Paul bids the Philippian, "Work out your own salva-

*The theology in Count Zinzendorf's beautiful hymn is Calvinistic, not Wesleyan or Pauline:

"Jesus, thy blood and righteousness
My beauty are, my glorious dress."

It is only as a pious rigmarole of words that any Arminian can sing it.

tion; for it is God who works in you to will and to work, for [ὕπερ, to gratify] his good pleasure." (Phil. ii, 12.)

As holiness is not an objective gift, like justification, but a subjective state of the affections, it is not obtained in a moment, but attained only by long and patient culture. We must *grow* in grace and in the knowledge of our Lord Jesus Christ, "until we come to a mature man, to the measure of the stature of the fullness of Christ." (Eph. iv, 13.) As growth is a process, it implies lapse of time. It must be gradual, though it need not be slow. Maturity of character, which should be the constant aim of every believer, is not reached in a day or a week. If it were the possible product of mere naked power, then we might rationally look for it to be wrought instantaneously through the sovereign agency of God; but it is not such a product; and it is not in this direction that God's sovereignty is exercised. While the Christian life is begun, continued, and ended, under the impulses of Divine grace, it also involves unconstrained human co-operation at every stage.

Verse 9. Comes this happiness, then, upon the Circumcision? or also upon the Uncircumcision? [Upon the Uncircumcision, also]; for we say that to Abraham his faith was reckoned unto justification.

The words **Circumcision** and **Uncircumcision** are here taken concretely, as often, for the Jews, and the Gentiles, and the verse means: Does the happiness of pardoned sin, the blessedness of justification in the sight of God, extend to the Jews only? or can Gentiles also be justified? The answer needs to be supplied, as we have seen in the note on verse 2; "It comes upon the Uncircumcision also:" and the word **for**, which refers to this answer, cites, in proof, the historical instance of Abraham, who, at the time of his justification, was yet an uncircumcised man. And the example of Abraham, a representative man, shows that justification comes upon the uncircumcised Gentile, as well as upon the circumcised Jew—upon both on the common ground of *faith*.

Verse 10. How then was it reckoned to him? Being in circumcision? or uncircumcision? Not in circumcision; nay, but in uncircumcision.

The word **how** means "in what circumstances?" as a circumcised man? or as an uncircumcised? The answer is found in the data in the book of Genesis. Abraham was probably about eighty

years of age when "his faith was reckoned to him unto justification" (Gen. xv, 6); but "he was ninety years old and nine, when he was circumcised" (Gen. xvii, 24). He was justified, then, **not being in circumcision, but in uncircumcision**; and his circumcision was not, as the Jews hold with regard to themselves, the ground of his acceptance and justification with God; but his justification, though it was nearly twenty years earlier, was the ground of his circumcision; as it is said in the next verse: "And he received the sign, or rite, of circumcision, a seal of his justification from faith—the faith which was his while he was in his uncircumcision."

Circumcision was practiced by the priests of Egypt, and elsewhere, before the days of Abraham. Its origin is not known; but it was even thus early the conventional symbol of ritual purity and consecration. As such it was afterwards sanctioned by God, and required of Abraham, and the Jews after him. It was the outward note in the flesh, of the covenant between God and themselves; and marked them off from the rest of the world as "a kingdom of priests, and a holy [that is, a consecrated] nation." (Ex. xix, 6.) The Jews, who at first came to the practice of circumcision only by degrees, afterwards prided themselves in it, as their patent of nobility, as a peculiar discrimination from the Gentile world. It was the rite which admitted their male children, "circumcised on the eighth day," to membership in the national and theocratic Israel. It was the rite by which proselytes from the heathen world became incorporated in the Jewish nation and Church. Without circumcision Gentiles were permitted to enter the synagogue, but not to enter the temple, or to share in the Paschal festivities; or even to eat with a Jew. Finally, from this notion of ritual separation, the name of the rite became exalted and spiritualized into the sense of religious purity and separation; and it was so used by the prophets of the Old Testament, and by the writers in the New Testament. Paul talks much of this higher "circumcision of the heart."

Circumcision denoted consecration to God, and obligation to the ritual Law of Moses; but the Jews went still further, and finally held that their circumcision implied that they actually fulfilled all the Law, moral as well as ritual, and so, by virtue of their circumcision, stood justified before God. This view Paul, of course, rejected; and, holding that the gospel provided another method of justification, he held that circumcision had ceased to

be obligatory on the Jews. "In Christ neither circumcision avails aught, nor uncircumcision; but faith." (Gal. v, 6.) Yet he circumcised Timothy, who was a Jew born, not because it was a saving ordinance, but because only by this rite could Timothy, as Paul's companion, enjoy among the Jews the civil and religious immunities which were his by birthright. (Acts xvi, 3.) But holding that the rite had in itself no saving value, he refused on this ground to circumcise Titus, who was a Gentile. (Gal. ii, 3.) With this conviction of the religious worthlessness of circumcision, he stigmatized the Jews who relied on it, as "the Concision," the *manglers* of the flesh (Phil. iii, 2)! and he called the Gentile believers the spiritual Circumcision: "In Christ ye were circumcised with a circumcision not made by hand [outward and carnal, like that of the Jews], with the circumcision of Christ." (Col. ii, 11.)

Of course, too, circumcision was never obligatory upon the Gentiles; but it was, for some years, still an open question whether Gentile Christians could come uncircumcised into fellowship with the Jewish Christians. After Paul had begun his mission, some Jewish Christians, still zealots for the Law, were for enforcing circumcision on his converts, teaching them, "Unless ye be circumcised after the rite of Moses, ye can not be saved." (Acts xv, 1.) But Paul withstood them; and, at last, at the Council at Jerusalem (A. D. 52), with the help of Peter and James, he obtained a decree that, "We trouble not those who from among Gentiles are turning to God." (Acts xv, 19.) It was a notable triumph for Christianity, and saved it from being a petty sect of Judaism;* but it was also the wedge that finally split the Church: that, while it emancipated the Gentiles, left the Jews wedded to the usages of the fathers, *against Christ*.

Verse 11. And he received the sign of circumcision, the seal of the justification of the faith, which was his, in his uncircumcision; with a view to his being father of all that have faith, while in uncircumcision, that the justification may be reckoned to them.

As we have seen, Abraham's justification antedated his circum-

* "Judaism was the cradle of Christianity, and Judaism very nearly became its grave. From so serious a peril one man saved Christianity. The career of no other man has ever produced such lasting effects on the world's history as that of St. Paul."—"Paul of Tarsus," p. 1.

cision by almost twenty years. His circumcision was the authentication of his already existing faith. It conferred nothing: it only confirmed to his own consciousness, and to the recognition of the world, the fact of God's previous forgiveness and approval. But the point which Paul makes is that this justification came to Abraham, not from circumcision, but from faith, while he was yet in uncircumcision; and therefore could not be credited to his obedience to the rite on which the Jews relied, or to works of law, of which they believed circumcision was the sign. Instead of the word "*sign*" of circumcision, the word "*rite*" would better express the apostle's sense.

The words with a view to express, not Abraham's purpose in receiving circumcision, but the divine aim in Abraham's justification before circumcision; namely, that he might be father, first and foremost, of Gentiles,—of Gentiles upon the sole condition of faith, even though not circumcised; and that the justification which was reckoned to him, an uncircumcised man, may be reckoned to them, though uncircumcised men.

Verse 12. And father of circumcision to the men who are not from circumcision only, but also to the men who march in the steps of the faith of our father Abraham, while he was in uncircumcision.

The word **circumcision** here, without the article, is not the concrete substantive, "The Circumcision," nor yet the Mosaic *rite*; but rather the Jewish Church or cult, of which the symbol is circumcision, and of which Abraham was the recognized head and **father**. But the following clauses designate Jews: the first clause describing Jews who are sons of Abraham by birth merely; the second clause describing Jews who have also the higher title to sonship, the faith which Abraham had in his days of uncircumcision. The words **our father** are spoken, not from Paul's position as a Jew born, but from his standpoint as a Christian believer. He counts Abraham, not as the natural father of the Jews, but as the spiritual father of all believers; just as in verse 16 he says, "Abraham is father of *us all*, Jews and Gentiles." And thus the apostle, both here and elsewhere, excludes from the roll of Abraham's real Scriptural family, all Jews that have no better title to sonship than carnal descent, and circumcision of the flesh; and includes in this large spiritual family all Gentiles, who, though

uncircumcised, have such faith as Abraham the uncircumcised had in the promise of God. And so Paul says to the Galatian Gentiles: "Know, then, that they who are of faith, these are sons of Abraham;" "And if ye are Christ's, then are ye Abraham's seed, according to the promise." (Gal. iii, 7, 29.)

Verse 13. For not through law was the promise to Abraham, or to his seed, that he should be heir of the world, but through justification of faith.

The word **seed** denotes Abraham's spiritual posterity, Christ, and the followers of Christ: "To thy seed, which is Christ;" "And if ye are Christ's, then are ye Abraham's seed, heirs according to the promise." (Gal. iii, 16, 29.) The clause **that he should be heir of the world**, which is epexegetic of the word **promise**, may be taken, grammatically, as appositive to that word. The promise in Genesis reads, "I will make of thee a great nation, . . . and in thee will all families of the earth be blessed." (Gal. xii, 2.) This last clause Paul paraphrases: "He will be heir of the world." The Greek word here for *world* has no article: because, like the English word "Earth," it has become almost a proper noun. In Gal. vi, 14, it is used once without the article, and once with it: "Through whom *the* world has been crucified to me, and I to the world." Of course, the English word here takes the article.

Verse 14. For if they that are from law are heirs, the faith has been made void, and the promise has been annulled.

The expression **they who are from law** means the Jews who are adherents to the system of law, who rely on works of law, for justification. The article with the word **faith** recalls that word as used in verse 13. Probably the concept can be best expressed by "*the system of faith*," as opposed to the system of law. The verb **has been made void** or **has been voided** means "emptied of its value;" and is the same word as is found in First Corinthians, "Lest the cross of Christ *be made of no effect*." (1 Cor. i, 17.) The thought of the apostle is that justification and heirship come wholly from law, or wholly from faith: the two schemes can not co-operate; each is exclusive of the other. The **promise** was that "The seed of Abraham should be heir of the world. In *Christ* will all the families of the world be blessed." Christ represents the

system of faith; but if they who are from law inherit the promise, the faith has been voided, and the promise annulled; and Christ has no place.

Verse 15. [But they who are from law are not heirs]; for the law works wrath; but where there is no law, neither is there transgression.

The explicative conjunction *for* does not explain verse 14, and can not logically connect the fifteenth verse to that. Evidently, we have here another instance of a suppressed member in the line of thought. The apostle elsewhere says: "As many as are from works of law are under a curse; for it has been written, Cursed is every one that continues not in all the precepts in the book of the Law, to do them" (Gal. iii, 10); which is a condition that no Jew attains to. In the light of the quotation, or even without it, from the logical connection of thought in our text, we can easily supply at the beginning of the verse the missing number: "**[But the men who are from law are not heirs]; for the law works wrath.**" The word *law* here, though it has the article, denotes not the Law of the Jewish dispensation, but law universally. The word takes the article because it refers to and resumes the word "law" in the fourteenth verse.

The logical connection of the last clause in this verse is not at first sight quite clear. Certainly the saying is not intended as the statement of a general principle of government; for, while the statement is admirable, and is often quoted, as a legal aphorism, it does not come as such into the apostle's present line of thought. The saying is closely linked to his special discussion. A brief supply sufficiently expresses the connection and the meaning: **But [in the sphere of faith], where there is no law, neither is there transgression.** The adversative conjunction *but* puts the second clause of the verse in sharp contrast with the first. The first clause refers to "the men who are from law," and describes their condition: "They are under the curse of the law." The second clause refers to "the men who are of faith," and describes their condition: "Christ has bought them off from the curse of the law." "They have fled for refuge, to lay hold on the hope set before them, in the gospel." "Their sins are blotted out," and are as if they had never existed. Against them there is "no law;" and God does not "reckon transgression" against them.

Verse 16. On account of this, [justification] comes from faith, that it may be according to grace; to the end that the promise may be sure to all the seed; not to that from the Law only, but also to that from the faith of Abraham, who is the father of us all.

The word **justification**, which is the matter in discussion, must be supplied as the proper subject of the verb **comes**. The reference in the introductory phrase, **on account of this thing**, is not clear. The same words in chapter v, 12, have greatly puzzled the critics; and perhaps in neither instance can any common agreement as to the logical connection be reached. Most critics look for the references in the preceding words or passages. But the word *this thing* in both passages probably does not look backward for its connection, for the simple reason that no one can tell *what thing* is meant. It would rather seem, then, that the reference, in both instances, is not retrospective, but prospective. This preposition, **on account of**, which always looks to something historically past, generally also points to some preceding word. But it may point to some word, or term, that follows in the sentence. See further in the note on Rom. v, 12. In the text before us, the reference is to the clause, **that it may be according to grace**; that is, that "the justification may be a *gratuity*, and not a debt due for works done." And so the verse runs logically thus: "Justification comes from faith, on account of this, that it may be according to grace." This was the antecedent reason in the divine mind why the inheritance was made dependent, not upon works, but upon faith; because no man can compass the first, and all men can meet the gracious conditions of the second. And so the text says that God made all this gracious provision expressly to the end that the promise should be sure to *all* the seed; not to the seed which is, from the Law only, the literal Jews, but also (which is now the salient point) to the seed which is from the faith of Abraham, the Gentiles. And thus, in God's plan, Abraham is held as father of us *all*, Gentiles as well as Jews.

Verse 17. (According as it has been written, Because father of many nations I have made thee) [Gen. xvii, 5]; before him in whom he had faith, God, who makes the dead to live, and calls the things not in being as though in being.

The word translated **nations** is also the word for "Gentiles." The stress of the word, in Paul's application of the passage, is on the sense "Gentiles." Unfortunately, the English language does not give us a word of this double compass. The first clause is parenthetical; and the next word, **before**, connects back to the last clause of verse 16.

The quotation is from the promise to Abraham: "For the father of a multitude of nations have I made thee." (Gen. xvii, 5.) The special instance of Abraham's faith here described was twenty years after the great culminating act of faith which was counted to him unto justification. (Gen. xv, 6.) When Abraham was ninety and nine years old, and Sarah his wife was ninety, God said to him: "I will give thee a son also from her." (Gen. xvii, 16.) This was the promise which Abraham believed, and which was fulfilled. The clause, **God makes the dead alive**, means that God quickened the deadened body of Abraham, and the deadness of Sarah's womb; and the clause, **calls the things not in being as though in being**, means that he summoned into being the yet unbegotten Isaac, the literal seed, and the multitude of nations, both literal and spiritual, that were to be the promised seed, as declared in the next verse.

Verse 18. Who against hope, upon hope had faith, with a view to his becoming father of many nations [Gentiles], according to that which had been spoken, Thus will thy seed be.

Perhaps a paraphrase will be the best comment: "Abraham, contrary to all human expectation, nevertheless, on the basis of his newly-begotten hope of offspring, exercised faith in God's promise, to the end that he became father of countless multitudes, of Gentiles as well as of Jews; in fulfillment of the promise spoken to him: 'Look toward heaven, and count the stars, if thou be able to number them: as the stars of the heaven, and as the sand which is upon the seashore, thus will thy seed be; and in thy seed will all the nations of the earth be blessed.'" (Gen. xv, 5; xxii, 17.)

Verses 19-22. And not having been weak in faith, he considered his own body, now deadened, being about a hundred years old, and the deadness of Sarah's womb; but in respect to the promise of God he doubted not through

unfaith: nay, but he was strengthened by his faith, having given glory to God, and having been fully assured that, what he has promised, he is able also to do. Wherefore also it [faith] was reckoned to him unto justification.

The best manuscripts, and the critical editions, do not give the usual reading, "He considered *not* his own body." Though the negative gives a good sense, its absence gives perhaps a better attestation to Abraham's faith. The Greek verb is intensive: "He took full note of his decayed powers, and yet did not waver through unfaith, because of that fact." The verb **was strengthened** refers to the recovery of his physical vigor—"he was invigorated by reason of his faith." It is the same sense as attaches to the noun in the parallel passage in Hebrews: "By faith Sarah received *power* to the conception of seed." (Heb. xi, 11.) Abraham was nearly a hundred years old and Sarah ninety, at the date of this miracle wrought in his own person, and in that of his wife. "He gave glory to God" for the new strength which was imparted to him, and which he did not lose again. Thirty-seven years later (Gen. xxiii, 1), after the death of Sarah, he married Keturah (Gen. xxv, 1), and by her became the father of six sons.*

The word **wherefore** in the twenty-second verse, looks back to Abraham's whole life of faith, as now again exemplified on this occasion of the promise of Isaac: and the verse is resumptive of the saying that we have already had in the ninth verse: "His faith was reckoned to him unto justification."

Verses 23, 24. But it was not written on account of him alone, that it was reckoned to him; nay, but also on account of us, to whom it is going to be reckoned; who have faith on him that raised Jesus our Lord from the dead.

The thought is, that what holds good of Abraham will be found to hold good of us, his spiritual posterity. That Abraham's faith was reckoned to him unto justification, apart from works, was written on his account, as the Scripture testimony to his acceptance before God. But it was written also on our account, as the assurance of our like acceptance with God, who have like faith in God; and whose faith, like that of Abraham, is a-going to be reckoned to us, unto justification, apart from works.

* But as Keturah was only an inferior wife, or "concubine" (Gen. xxv, 6), like Hagar, Abraham may have married her while Sarah was living.

Yet there is a difference. Abraham's faith in God was a specific faith in the unfulfilled Messianic promise of seed. Our faith is a faith in God, as the One who now has fulfilled his promise, and has raised our Lord from the dead.

Verse 25. Who are delivered up on account of our trespasses, and was raised on account of his having justified us.

The thought in the first clause **he was delivered up** is more fully expressed by Christ himself, "The Son of man is a-going to be delivered up into the hands of men" (Matt. xvii, 22), and still more specifically in the words: "The chief priests . . . bound Jesus, and delivered him up to Pilate; . . . and Pilate delivered him up to be crucified" (Matt. xxvii, 26).

The identity of the preposition and of the construction in the two clauses, compels us to an identity of meaning and of exegesis. This preposition $\delta\acute{\iota}\alpha$ "on account of" with the accusative case of the substantive, is always *retrospective*; it looks back to some thing or some act, as the antecedent reason or the ground of the statement in the sentence; and so never looks, prospectively, to the end to be attained. It always means **on account of** something past; never "for the sake of" something future. The first clause in our text is plain. Our offenses or trespasses were the antecedent causes for Christ's vicarious death. "He died *on account of our offenses*, in order to make atonement for them." All agree that this is the meaning. The second clause is, in fact, equally plain; because it involves the same grammatical and lexical points. But it has usually received a different explanation, due to the equivocal, and therefore erroneous, translation of the preposition, and of the substantive "*for our justification.*" And this translation found in both the Authorized and the Revised, and generally in the commentaries, is interpreted as meaning that "Christ was raised *to bring about* our justification." But this can not be the meaning expressed by the Greek preposition; and it is not the Scriptural doctrine of the passage. Paul in this verse clearly says that Christ was raised from among dead men, not with a view to our justification, as if it were yet future; but *on account of his having already accomplished our justification* by his sacrificial death. His atoning work was complete in his death; and his resurrection simply attested this fact. The resurrection was no part of his expiative work; but simply the seal which God set to his accom-

plished work, the coronation of the victor over death. On the cross, at the point to die, he cried, "It has been completed." By his own death he had conquered death;⁸ and now "God raised him from the dead," because "he could not be held [as a continuation of the penalty] by the bonds of death." (Acts ii, 24.)

The substantive *δικαίωσις* here translated **his having justified us** is found only here and in chapter v, 18. It is a verbal derivative, expressing, like other words of a similar formation, the *action*, or process, indicated by the verb, rather than the result. It differs from the word *δικαιοσύνη*, usually translated "justification"—that is, either the scheme of acquittal or the state of acquittal—as being rather the means which *brings* us to that result. And the literal and proper translation is "*the justifying of us.*" It is needless to remark how perfectly this accords with the translation and explanation above, of the preposition: *On account of his having justified us.*

The doctrine here taught is fundamental to the Scripture exhibition of the atonement. It is clearly expressed in this passage; but we shall see it more fully and variously stated in the sixth chapter, which treats of the vicarious, or substitutionary, character of Christ's work. That chapter, and, indeed, all the gospel, teaches that in Christ's death, which was a vicarious death, we all shared; and that from the instant of his death, the saving power of his work became potentially, constructively, really, the impropriation and the right of the race. By his death all men were and are born to the inheritance of the promise; and "in him every one who hath faith is justified from all things from which men were not able to be justified by the Law of Moses." (Acts xiii, 39.) This accomplished work was the ground of Christ's resurrection from the dead, and of our resurrection.

And thus Paul concludes this long and convincing discussion with the Jew, in regard to God's plan for the justification of men,—of *all* men, Gentiles as well as Jews. He affirms again and again, that we are not justified by works, but by faith in the atonement of Christ; "who was delivered up to death on account of our sins, and was raised again from the dead on account of having wrought out our justification."

⁸ So the old monkish poem "*Mors mortis morti mortem morti dedit*"—"The Death of death by his death put death to death."

CHAPTER V.

Verse 1. Having been justified, therefore, from faith, we have peace towards God, through our Lord Jesus Christ.

We are now at the midway point of the dogmatic part of this Epistle. With the conclusion reached in the previous chapter, Paul ceases his polemic against the Jew; and for the next four chapters treats more distinctively of the rightful place of the Gentiles in the gospel scheme. It is their equality with the Jews that is foremost in all his thought.

Let us trace the line of thought thus far followed. We have seen that the Jews held that they were justified from works; and that, as the seed of Abraham, and the sole subjects of the law of circumcision, they were the only people included in the provisions of the Divine plan, and the only people that could be saved. But early in the epistle, the apostle declared that "The gospel is the power of God unto salvation to *every* man that has faith, to Jew, first, and also to Greek." (Rom. i, 16.) He puts both Jews and Gentiles on the common and only ground of justification, that of faith, as shown in the next words, "For in the gospel is revealed God's plan of justification, as being *from faith*." (Rom. i, 17.) With Paul the fundamental question on which the gospel hangs is, Does God justify from works? or does he justify from faith? And then springing out of this essential and primal issue, arises before the apostle the equally essential, but even more pressing question, Who are embraced in the provisions of the gospel? "Is God God of Jews only? Is he not God of Gentiles also?" (Rom. iii, 28.)

With regard to the first of these two questions, we have seen in the previous chapters that these two methods of justification, whether from works or from faith, are both conceivable, both reasonable, both recognized in the Scriptures, at least speculatively, but incompatible with each other, mutually exclusive. The one, justification from works, was held by the Jews; the other, justifi-

eration from faith, was held by the apostle, in the behalf of the Gentiles. The first implies that men can do what God's perfect law commands, and so can earn justification and eternal life, as their reward. Its banner carries the device "Do this, and live;" that is, do the works that the Law requires, and thou wilt have life. The other teaches that "no man can do the works of the Law;" but must find justification in God's sight in some other way; namely, from faith in Christ, "who bought us off from the curse of the Law, having become a curse for [instead of] us." (Gal. iii, 13.) This is the gospel plan; and its motto is, "Have faith in the Lord Jesus Christ, and thou wilt be saved." (Acts xvi, 31.)

With regard to the second point, the Jews hold that no other people than themselves could be admitted to the privileges of God's covenant with Abraham, except by the door of circumcision; and that such is the teaching of the Scriptures. But the apostle shows that, contrariwise, the teaching of the Old Testament has no such sense—that God, from the first, even before the world was, had no other thought, or plan, for the salvation of men, than justification from faith—and that the Gentile world herein stood on a level with the Jews, and that the only precedence of the Jews over the Gentiles was a chronological one, in having been called earlier to admission to covenant privileges. This view he expands at large, availing himself of the Jews' favorite illustration, the example of Abraham, who was not justified from works, but was justified from faith, while he was yet uncircumcised.

Paul's demonstration of his proposition is conclusive on the two subjects of debate with the Jews. The only means of justification from sin is faith in the Lord Jesus Christ; and the door to it is open, without circumcision, to the Gentiles who, like Abraham, exercise a personal faith in God, who raised Christ from the dead. Nay; this justification already, by the death of Christ, belongs potentially, even without the conscious act of faith, to the Gentiles.

In the third and fourth chapters the discussion has taken on the form of a spirited interloutory debate between a representative Jew on the one hand and the apostle on the other. The Jew is introduced, speaking in the first person, and putting the objections as held by his people on the controverted points in terse, forcible form. The issues are plain and direct; and the apostle meets them in equally direct and conclusive reply. In the end, the well-foughten field is his. He has established his contention

that the gospel plan of justification from faith was the first, and is the only method by which man may stand acquit before God; and that this gospel is not provincial in its range, but cosmopolitan. The Jew is silenced on these issues; and appears only incidentally again as a speaker, until the apostle comes, in the long episode from the ninth to the eleventh chapters, to discuss the destiny of the Jewish nation and Church.

The conclusion reached in this debate the apostle now assumes as established beyond gainsaying; no further argument is needed that men are justified, not from works of law, but from faith in Christ. And in this matter he has the Gentiles chiefly in thought; and he fully identifies himself with them. And so, with this assurance, he begins the fifth chapter, "Therefore, having been justified from faith, we [the Gentiles] have peace with God."

The translation here given, as in the Authorized, we have **peace**, follows the "Received Text" of the Greek verb, *ἔχομεν*, in the indicative mode, expressive of a realized fact. There is another reading of the verb, *ἔχωμεν*, in the subjunctive mode, followed by the Revised (the American committee dissenting), "*Let us have peace.*" The two readings differ only in the length of the mode vowel; but they impose upon the passage widely different senses, and widely different exegeses. The subjunctive mode, "Let us have peace," is found in most of the (few) "uncials"—that is, the oldest manuscripts, written in CAPITALS—in most of the Fathers, and in most of the early translations; and it is the reading adopted, of course, by the recent critical editors, who profess to abide by the oldest diplomatic evidence. The indicative mode, "We have peace," is found in "later hands" in some of the uncials, in most of the (many) "cursives," and in some of the Fathers. The external evidence favors the subjunctive mode; but the internal evidence is overwhelmingly in favor of the indicative mode, "We have peace."* The connection makes the passage didactic, not hortatory. No exegesis based on the reading, "Let us have peace," is satisfactory, or worthy of serious consideration. If this be the

*This subjunctive mode probably crept into some early transcript (which afterward became a standard), either from the pious impulse of the copyist to turn the word into a prayer; or from oversight on the part of the transcriber. Such changes in words are not without abundant parallels in the MSS. elsewhere; e. g., 1 Cor. xv, 49, *φορέσωμεν*, "Let us bear the image;" and the reverse change, in Rom. xiv, 19, *διώκομεν*, "We follow the things of peace."

reading, it can only be an exhortation to seek peace with God, as if it were not yet ours. It is only those who are not already in a state of peace that say, "Let us have peace." But the clause, **Having been justified**, involves the notion of present peace with God. We must recollect that the sentiment is from the standpoint of the Gentiles. They have come into a new and gracious relation with God. They have been justified, and experienced what they never experienced in their heathenism and alienation from God. They are at peace with him.

These words, "Let us have peace," the erroneous reading in Paul's letter, adopted by the Revised, are famous in American history. When General Grant was nominated, in 1868, for the Presidency of the United States, the North and the South, though no longer at war, were not reconciled; and Grant concluded his letter of acceptance with the conciliatory words, "Let us have peace." The words of General Grant were appropriate to the condition of things at that time in America. And they thrilled all hearts; they expressed what all hearts longed for. But the apostle's actual words were very different. They do not represent the Gentiles as needing reconciliation with God. Rather they express their new and satisfactory *experience*: "We have been justified from faith, and *we have peace* with God." This peace with God is just what justification (pardon) brings to the Christian consciousness. David says, "Righteousness [justification] and peace have kissed each other" (Ps. lxxxv, 10); and Isaiah says, "The work of righteousness [justification] is peace, and the effect of righteousness is quietness and confidence forever" (Isa. xxxii, 17).

Verse 2. Through whom also, we have had the introduction, by faith, into this grace in which we stand; and we boast upon hope of the glory of God.

We must keep in mind that it is the Gentiles in particular that the apostle here represents as speaking. His thought is on the Gentiles, not on the Jews; and he uses the pronoun **we** because he identifies himself with them. Yet we must also notice that while Paul begins this long discussion (Chapters v-viii) with distinct reference to the Gentiles, speaking in their person; and while this special reference to them remains the substratum of his thought, all through the passage, yet, in his exposition of the gospel scheme, the special prominence of the Gentiles gradually fades out of his thought, and after the eleventh verse of this chap-

ter, his words widen out until they become general enough to embrace all men, Jews as well as Gentiles. But in the eighth chapter we shall see that the apostle again calls the Gentiles distinctively to the front.

The word **grace** is the collective term for the favor of God, including pardon, peace, purity, and power. The indicative mode in this verse, in both the verbs, is in accord with the indicative in the first verse. The expression **glory of God** probably means, as in Rom. iii, 23, "the praise or approval of God." The boasting of the Jew is in his own works and merits; the boasting of the Christian is in the undeserved approval of God. All our sufficiency is from him.

Verses 3-5a. But not only [upon that hope do we boast], nay, but we also boast in our afflictions; knowing that affliction works patience; but the patience approval; but the approval hope; but the hope shames us not.

The clause in brackets is evidently to be supplied. The sentiment of these verses is appropriate to the man who, though hopeful, is conscious also of his own weakness. Paul elsewhere says of himself: "With regard to myself I will not boast, except in my weaknesses." (2 Cor. xii, 5.) And of the weaknesses and of the **afflictions** that were his, Paul had abundant experience. "Who is weak, and I am not weak?" "Most gladly will I boast in my weaknesses; for when I am weak, then I am strong." It is with this feeling that he here can say that **affliction works patience, and patience approval [or approvedness], and approval hope,—the hope of eternal salvation.** And James says: "Happy is the man that endures trial; because having become approved, he will receive the crown of life." (James i, 12.) The word **approval** may perhaps be equally well rendered by the word "test." Patience puts our character to *test*; and the ability to stand the test confirms our hope of final triumph, and this hope does not disappoint us.

Verse 5b. Because the love of God has been poured out in our hearts, through the Holy Spirit which was given us.

The verse expresses the basis of our confidence in God. Through the Holy Spirit, a grateful sense of his love to us has been diffused in our hearts. We realize that though we are Gen-

tiles he loves us and counts us his children. The result is, that "We love him; because he first loved us" (1 John iv, 19); and "We are persuaded that nothing [not even the hostility of the Jews] will be able to separate us from the love of God, in Christ Jesus, our Lord" (Rom. viii, 39).

From the absence of the article with the words **Holy Spirit**, some infer that the word spirit probably does not mean the Third Person in the Trinity, in his personality; but an endowment, or gift, **given us** from the Divine Spirit. Dr. Vaughan aptly illustrates this difference by explaining the oft-misunderstood passage in the Acts of the Apostles: "Did ye receive *a* holy spirit [an impartation of supernatural gifts] when ye exercised faith?" "No; we did not even hear whether there is *a* holy spirit" [a miraculous endowment promised to the believer] (John vii, 39). . . . "Then Paul laid his hands on them, and *The* Holy Spirit came upon them" (Acts xix, 2). This is very ingenious; and a similar difficulty in Acts viii, 15, is easily solved in the same way.

But it makes at least as good sense to interpret the word here as the Holy Spirit, which was promised by Christ as the "Guide into all the [needed] truth;" and which, after his resurrection, was poured out in all its fullness on the Church. The absence of the article can be accounted for, on the use of the word Holy Spirit as a *quasi* proper name.

Verse 6. For while we were yet weak, in due season Christ died for ungodly men.

The conjunction **for** connects this verse back to the words **love of God**; and thus the saying here is confirmatory of the saying in verse 5. The word **weak** expresses both the moral and the legal inability to help ourselves. The phrase **in due season** means "in the fullness of the time," the time appointed of God, announced of old by the prophets, "when the people were in expectation." When Christ died, the world was ripe for his gospel; all ethnic religions and all ethical philosophies were actual, if not recognized, failures.

The preposition **for**, *ὕπερ*, used in this sentence, "He died *for* ungodly men," and found four times in these three verses, usually means **in behalf of**, but often, as here, takes the same sense as the preposition *ἀντὶ*, "in place of." The preposition **for** in this verse not only means "in our place," which is all that *ἀντὶ* could express, but connotes also Christ's compassion in this substitution of

himself "in our behalf." Christ's death was not only in our behalf, but it was in our place; that is, it was not only sacrificial and redemptive, but it was vicarious and substitutionary. The sense here, "in our place," is absolute, unequivocal. This point is so fundamental in certain passages in the Bible that I take a large space to put it beyond dispute, if not beyond cavil. Bishop Colenso, in his comment on this verse, taking the opposite position, says: "Once for all, let it be stated distinctly, there is not a single passage in the whole of the New Testament which supports the dogma of modern theology that our Lord died for our sins, in the sense of dying *instead of us*, dying *in our place*, or dying so as to bear the *penalty* of our sins. It is often said that he died *for us*, he died *for our sins*; but the Greek preposition *ὑπὲρ* here rendered by 'for,' never, in any single instance, means 'in our stead,' but 'on our behalf,' as in this passage."

So far, Bishop Colenso; though why he should say "the dogma of modern theology," passes all understanding. Christ's substitutionary death was the only form of dogma in the first ages. But Colenso's Greek is as much at fault as his theology, or his creed. He has spoken without the book. There is extant in classic Greek a famous mythological drama by Euripides, the "Alcestis," (B. C. 438). The motive of this drama is the wifely devotion and self-sacrifice of Queen Alcestis in *dying in place of* her husband, Admetus. The king had obtained from the Fates the gift that when his time to die came he might have a double length of life, if he could find a voluntary substitute. Of all his friends, Alcestis wife-like, is the only one who consents *to die in his stead*. Now, in this drama Euripides uses several prepositions, in connection with the verb "to die," in this sense of "*in stead of*,"—*πρό* fourteen times, *ἄντι* eleven times, and (which is the salient point, now) *ὑπὲρ* five times, as follows:

- Verse 155. How could a wife more honor her husband than
in being willing *to die for* [in place of] him?
284. Though it is in my power not to die, *I die for* thee.
682. I am not under obligation *to die for* thee.
690. Do not thou *die for* me.
700. Thou wilt persuade thy wife *to die for* thee.

Other instances, equally explicit, from the classics could be quoted. In the New Testament this sense of the word is often required by the connection. For example:

"If One *died for* all, then all died." (2 Cor. v. 14.)

“We pray you *in Christ's stead*, be ye reconciled to God.” (2 Cor. v, 21.)

“Him who knew no sin he made sin [sinful] *for us*.” (2 Cor. v. 21.)

“I keep Onesimus with myself, that *in thy stead* he may minister to me.” (Philem. 13.)

And we may surely cite our present text, and many more, for this sense and dogma of *substitution of Christ for us*.

Verse 7. For scarcely for a just man will one die; for, for the good man perhaps one even dares to die.

The nice dependencies of the conjunction **for** in each of the two clauses should be noticed. The first refers to the word “ungodly” in the sixth verse; and throws stress upon that word, and upon the word **just**: “He died [how strange the self-sacrifice!] for *ungodly men*; *for* scarcely even for a *just man* will one die!” The conjunction in the second clause refers to the adverb **scarcely**, and modifies the concession made by this adverb. This modifying clause is logically best read as parenthetical.

The words *just* and *good* are in sharp contrast. Both words describe natural dispositions, not qualities that come from grace; and they are far from being synonymous. The word “righteous” in the Authorized and Revised, instead of “just,” misses, as usual, the whole point of the verse. By a “*just man*” we describe one who meets his obligations; who keeps within the letter of the law, but mayhap has no other recommendation. He may pay his debts; yet exact from others the uttermost farthing. People may respect him, yet not love him; may perhaps even hate him. He may be “just;” yet “scarcely would one *die for him*.” On the other hand, “the *good man*” (the article singles him out as the ideal character) is one who is full of the milk of human kindness, benevolent and beneficent. Such a man has friends: **for such a man perhaps one even ventures to die**. Shakespeare's Shylock and Antonio are the typical representatives. Shylock is a “*just*” man; no one charges him with dishonesty or fraud; yet everybody execrates him. He is “incapable of pity, void of every dram of mercy;” but he keeps within the pale of the law; and nobody can catch him on the hip. “He stands for justice; he *will have* his pound of flesh.”

“What judgment shall I dread, doing no wrong?
Speak not against my bond: I'll have my bond.”

Antonio is "the good man" of the drama. He is no more "just" than Shylock; but he is merciful, pitiful, self-sacrificing. Everybody loves him; many a man would die for him. Bassanio says:

"Shylock shall have *my* flesh, blood, bones, and all,
Ere thou shalt lose for me one drop of blood."

Verse 8. But God confirms his own love towards us, in that, while we were yet sinful, Christ died for us.

The leading verb here does not mean commends, that is, recommends, presents for our approval; but demonstrates, "proves." The word "commends" (as in the Authorized and Revised), quite certainly expresses the wrong concept. The Greek word here translated **sinful** is substantive or adjective, according to the proprieties of the connection. I here prefer the word *sinful* to "sinners," because the word points rather to our inward character, than to our outward life and actions. Similarly in the nineteenth verse of this chapter, the substantive "sinners" is not an appropriate translation in contrast with the adjective "just;" and is open to the same objection as holds in this verse.

Instances of men deliberately dying instead of others are rare; yet history records a few, all of them of friends dying *for friends*. The classic story of Damon and Phintias (Cicero, *De Officiis*, III x, 45), has become the world's proverbial instance, as if it were the solitary instance. Yet Christian annals can give us many. But God proves *his* love for us, in that Christ died for men who were not lovable in themselves, and did not love him,—he died for us when we were sinful, and hostile.

Verse 9. Much, rather, then, having now been justified in his blood, we shall be saved through him from the wrath.

It is the argument from the greater to the less. He who gave his Son to die for us though we were sinful and enemies, to save us from our sins, will much rather, now that we have been justified, and become his friends, save us from the wrath to come. The same argument, from the greater to the less, is found in the eighth chapter: "He who spared not his own Son, but delivered him up to death, for [in place of] us all, how will he not also with him grant us all things?" (Rom. viii, 32.) Surely God, having given us so much, will not refuse aught else to make his work complete.

The expression in his blood must not be pressed too closely. We have already seen (Rom. iii, 25) that nothing turns upon the fact that Christ's "blood" was shed; but all turns on the vital fact that he *died* in our behalf and in our place. "Blood" is the synonym of "death," which is the word used in the next verse.

Verse 10. For if, being enemies, we were reconciled to God through the death of his Son, much, rather, having been reconciled, we shall be saved in his life.

The word **enemies** must be taken always as *active* in signification,—enemies, hostile, to God, not the object of his enmity. And this is in harmony with the constant sense in the New Testament, of the word **reconcile**, the reconciliation of man to God, never of God to man. Such is the apostle's explicit teaching elsewhere, as well as here: "God reconciled us to himself through Christ; he was in Christ reconciling the world to himself." (2 Cor. v, 18.) "God is love." This is his essential character; and it is in conformity with this revelation of himself that the Bible never speaks of God's being our enemy, and of his being reconciled to us; but always of our being reconciled to him. Yet the whole tenor and the express words of Scripture teach that sin has changed the administrative relations of God to men; and that as a ruler he is angry with the wicked. "We are consumed in thine anger, and in thy wrath are we troubled." (Ps. xe, 7.) These words, "anger" and "wrath," express, no doubt, very real things; but all this disappears when man "has received the reconciliation through Christ," and turns to God. "In that day thou shalt say, Though thou wast angry with me, thine anger is turned away, and thou comfortest me." (Isa. xii, 1.) And it is in this light that we can in popular phraseology say (though the Scripture does not verbally warrant it) that "*God is reconciled:*"

"My God is reconciled,
His pardoning voice I hear;
He owns me for his child,
I can no longer fear."—*Charles Wesley.*

The phrase **in his life** does not mean in his life as an example; but that we share in his resurrection life, in which "all power has been given him." In his death he has redeemed our life from the grave: "that we may know the power of his resurrection" (Phil. iii, 10); "that the life of Jesus may be manifested in our body"

(2 Cor. iv, 10). It is the promise of Christ: "Because I live, ye also will live." (John xiv, 19.)

Verse 11. But not only [were we reconciled]; nay, but we also boast in God, through our Lord Jesus Christ, through whom, now, we received the reconciliation.

The phrase, **But not only**, is an elliptical formula found four times in this Epistle (v, 3; v, 11; viii, 23; ix, 10) and elsewhere in Paul's writings. The Authorized vaguely supplies "so." A better word would have been the general demonstrative pronoun "that," which is often similarly used in English; but the proper specific supply must be determined for each passage by the connections. Here the supply, **we were reconciled**, is derived from the previous verse. The thought of the passage seems to be this: "Not only were we *reconciled* to God (which is but a neutral or intermediate stage, in which we are no longer *hostile* to God), nay, but we are lifted to the higher level where we make our boast in God." When the apostle says, **we boast in God**, his thought is that of the psalmist: "In God we boast all the day long." (Ps. xlv, 8.) Now, the Hebrew word here is the verb from which comes the Hebrew shout of triumph in the Lord, "Hallelujah," Praise ye Jehovah! To boast in God is to shout unto God with the voice of triumph.

Through whom now we received the reconciliation. Such is Paul's statement; not "*have received*," as in the English translations. The aorist tense carries us back in concept to the one great historical transaction by which Christ wrought and brought redemption to the entire race. The word **now** expresses our present consciousness of this blessing through Christ.

Verse 12. **On this account, just as through one man the sin came into the world, and through the sin the death; even so the death came throughout, unto all men, for that all sinned.**

This famous passage, from the twelfth to the twenty-first verse, is pregnant with matter, and is, perhaps, the most studied by critics of all Paul's writing, both on account of its intrinsic difficulties and on account of its dogmatic importance. The grammatical structure and the logical connection are not clear; and the internal sense and exegesis are not easy. The conclusions that I have reached are not always in-

disputable to my own mind; but, unable to accept, or even to understand, some of the views of others, I venture, with diffidence, to present, as the result of much study and reflection, some of the conclusions, which seem to me the most reasonable, if not entirely satisfactory.

1. The first difficulty is in the first words, **On this account.** The phrase in this instance is usually explained as an illative conjunction, "therefore;" which is assumed to connect back to something preceding, of which premise, accordingly, the following verse expresses the inference, or result. Yet there is no agreement among the critics as to the particular premise referred to. Some go back only to verse 11; others go further back, to the entire paragraph in verses 1-11; while yet others find the premise in the entire discussion from the beginning of the Epistle. But it is difficult to see how any one of those references can be maintained. The passage following does not follow, apparently, as a logical inference, or conclusion, from anything that has gone before. The apostle has not as yet made any allusion even, to Adam, or his sin, or to entailed corruption and death; and now to introduce this discussion of Adam's sin and its effects, by the word "therefore," seems to be as illogical as it is abrupt.

What then is the grammatical construction of the phrase **on account of this thing?** It can hardly be taken as an illative conjunction, carrying the thought back to some (though no one knows what) antecedent. On the contrary, the words constitute a *causal* conjunction, and the reference is not backwards, but forwards. This proleptic reference is very frequent, and, grammatically, can occasion no difficulty.* The word points onward to the last clause in the verse, and marks out, in advance, the reason of death's going throughout to all men, namely, because all sinned. And the verse arranged in the order of its logical sequence reads thus: "As through one man the sin came into the world, and through the sin the death, even so the death came throughout unto all men, on account of this fact, namely, that all sinned."

* Cf. Milton's sentence:

"But that thou shouldst my firmness *therefore* doubt
To God or thee, because we have a foe
May tempt it, I expected not to hear."—Par. Lost, IX, 279.

See the note on Rom. v, 16; and compare John viii, 17; x, 17; xii, 18; 1 Thess. ii, 13; 1 Tim. i, 16; 2 Cor. xiii, 10; and many others. Also Rom. ix, 17. *εἰς τοῦτο*.

The conjunctive phrase ἐφ' ὧ in the last clause can be translated "on the ground that," or, more briefly, "for that," "that," or "because." The word "that" best suits the connection here; the word "because" is best in the only other instance: "*Because* we do not will to put off our earthly house." (2 Cor. v, 4.)

If this explanation of the initial words **on this account** is correct, it follows, first, that the verse before us is not an inference or conclusion from something that has preceded; and, secondly, that the paragraph is independent of all that has gone before, and constitutes, in fact, a fresh departure in the general discussion of the doctrine of justification by faith. And as an independent paragraph, it has no conjunction to connect it back (as is usual in the New Testament) with the previous discussion. The ninth chapter, also, begins with a similar paragraph, independent of the previous matter, and without a conjunction.

2. The logical structure of this sentence is usually assumed to be incomplete. Where the translation adopted above gives **even so**, the Authorized and Revised read "*and so*." The Authorized makes the whole verse a *protasis* (or first member of a complex sentence), to which, however, there is no formal apodosis (or answering member of the sentence). Some exegetes count verses 13-17 as a parenthesis, and find the apodosis in verse 18; but that verse is complete in itself, having both a *protasis* ["as —"] and an apodosis ["so —"] of its own; which is a fatal grammatical difficulty; and, besides, there is a yet more serious logical difficulty, that the apodosis thus found does *not answer* to the *protasis* in verse 12. Others abandon the search for an apodosis, and remand the sentence to the already long list in which Paul, who dictated his letters, has left us a defective construction; and they add that the apostle's appropriate, and apparently intended, apodosis would have been, "so also through One man, Jesus Christ, the justification came in, and through this justification, life." Undoubtedly, on the supposition that the twelfth verse is incomplete, and that it institutes a parallel between Adam and Christ, this would be an appropriate supply. But the twelfth verse does *not* institute a parallel between Adam and Christ; it describes only how the sin and death of *one* man, the first transgressor, culminated in the sin and death of *all* men, the victims of an ill heredity. And it is anticipating the apostle's discussion to bring in thus early, in the paragraph, the famous parallel, or rather the antithesis, between Adam and Christ. This antithetical parallel comes in first, after verse 14; and were it not for the later addition, no

reader of verses 12-14 would have imagined that Paul had any parallel between Adam and Christ in his mind, as he certainly has not in his text.

But in fact the verse is not incomplete, and there is no reason why translators and critics should miss the plain construction. The Greek text of the twelfth verse yields in itself a full and satisfactory grammatical and logical construction, with both a protasis and an apodosis. A substitution in the old translations of the adverb "*even*" for the conjunction "and" (both of which meanings of the word *καί* are very frequent), makes the English sentence complete in itself, and corresponding exactly with the Greek sentence. The sentence thus changed gives the apostle's exact meaning. The sole alleged objection to it is not on the score of the grammar of the sentence (which is conceded by all*), but on Meyer's mistaken interpretation,—that "this change is at variance with the parallel between Adam and Christ, *which rules the whole section.*" It is usually safe to agree with Meyer on any question of construction; but, as we have seen, the parallel between Adam and Christ does *not* begin with this verse, and Meyer's objection falls away with the correct exegesis of the twelfth verse as above.

The contrasted words in the twelfth verse are clearly **one** and **all**,—"As through *one* man came sin and death, even so to *all* men came sin and death." These words give us the logical clue to the whole paragraph, from this verse to the end of the chapter. In the first eleven verses of the chapter, the apostle has discussed the *character* of Christ's work: it brings reconciliation and peace with God. This suggests the correlate question of the *extent* of Christ's redemptive work. Paul holds that it is co-extensive with the reach and ruin of sin: *all* men "sinned" and died; the work of restoration must be equally ample in its scope: "Where sin abounded grace superabounded." This is the fundamental fact in the gospel of Christ; and it is the fundamental thought in the Epistle to the Romans. And the contrast which the apostle now institutes between the consequences of Adam's sin and the consequences of Christ's justification of man is in the direct line of his main proposition.

There are several words in this verse that need special study—**sin, sinned, death.**

* See instances in Thucydides (quoted Bk. III, 33, Ginn's Editt., p. 66).

1. "SIN." In the New Testament there are many words expressing man's non-conformity with God's law. Of these four are found in this paragraph, easy distinguishable in definition: *ἁμαρτία*, "sin;" *παράβασις*, "transgression;" *παράπτωμα*, "fall;" *παρακοή*, "disobedience." The first finds its sphere in man's inward nature, and is subjective; the other three find their sphere in man's outward conduct, and are objective. Sin is a corruption of the nature of man, a moral degeneracy, a falling short of God's approval. (Rom. iii, 23.) "Sin is disconformity with law." This is John's definition. (1 John iii, 4.) This is the first meaning of the word, as in our text, as an abstract term. As such it is always in the singular number. But the word "sin" is often a concrete noun, and (like the other three words named above) expresses a transgression of law, an overt, voluntary act. In this sense the word is sometimes singular, but is also many times in the plural number. The two senses can usually be recognized by the connection; and are carefully discriminated by John: "If we say that we have no sin (sinfulness, corruption of nature), we deceive ourselves, and the truth (the true doctrine on this point) is not in us: if we confess our sins (transgressions, overt acts), he is faithful and just to forgive us our sins, and to cleanse us from all unrighteousness." (1 John i, 8, 9.) Sin implies a proclivity to evil—a proclivity which may result, and with all adults does result, in actual, overt transgression. But this innate degeneration, this abnormality in man's moral faculties, does not involve a destruction, or a change in the nature of these faculties. It is only figuratively that we speak of man's being "*dead* in trespasses and sins." Man still has his original constitution: he is a moral agent, rational, with convictions of the good, with impulses to the right; and he is free.

Sin in this sense of moral corruption is hereditary; and it is in this sense only that we can accept the dogma of "original sin."*

*The Methodist Article of Religion, No. VII (Church of England and Episcopal Article, No. IX) on "Original or Birth Sin," admirably defines thus:

"Original sin . . . is the corruption of the nature of every man, that naturally is engendered of the offspring of Adam, whereby man is very far gone from original righteousness, and is of his own nature inclined to evil."

This means that man is vitiated in nature; but does not connote that he is therefore vicious in practice, or can be until the age of volition; or that he remains vicious after regeneration.

Original sin is not a personal, responsible participation by later generations in the first man's sin (whether as sinfulness or as transgression), and in the guilt of it, but is only a seminal corruption propagated from Adam through our corrupt line of ancestry, and attaching to each successive generation, but not cumulative; the latest generation is not, so far forth, worse than the first. "Original sin" is, at the most, the taint entailed from a corrupt origin, but is not the original transgression of Adam; and it is not guilt. We do not inherit guilt. Such a proposition is unethical and unthinkable. We inherit from Adam a native corruption, a consequence of his fall, but we are without responsibility for it. *So far forth*, our corruption does not need God's pardon or forgiveness, but only God's pity, and forbearance, and remedial measures; not justification (except constructively): but only regeneration. No man is amenable on the ground of sin (sinfulness), but only (in the case of adults) on the ground of his personal, voluntary sins (transgressions).

The other words in this passage, "transgression, fall, disobedience" (the Greek words are all compounded with the preposition *παρά*, "amiss, aside"), express in common (as does the second sense of "sin," and the plural "sins"), overt, voluntary violations of law. They are willful acts of free agents; they are not hereditary; they are always accompanied and followed by guilt; and the transgressor needs pardon and regeneration.

The distinction between the two senses of the substantive, "sin," holds also in regard to all the derivations of the word,—the adjective "sinful," the substantive "sinners," and especially the verb "to sin." The first sense, given above, of seminal or innate corruption, as distinct from overt transgression, is the sense of all these words, as affirmed of the descendants of Adam, in this passage. Clearly in the twelfth verse the noun "sin" can have no other meaning. It would be unreasonable to give it as applied to the descendants of Adam, the sense of overt voluntary transgression. Such a sense is appropriate for the act of Adam, the first willful, culpable sinner; but not for his hapless, helpless posterity. Adam's act is expressly called by all these names, "sin," "transgression," "fall," "disobedience;" but the involuntary participation of his posterity in the results of his act (not in the act itself), is called "sin," that is, sinfulness, innate corruption; but is never called transgression. Adam's transgression entailed corruption, but not transgression, and not guilt. Paul

did not say, and could not have said, "Through one man, the transgression came into the world of men." His thought, correctly expressed in his words, is, "Through one man [‘one man’s fall,’ v. 17] sin (sinfulness, corruption) came into the world."

This, too, is the sense, the only possible sense, of the word "sinful" [or "sinners"], in the nineteenth verse: "Through the disobedience of the one man, the many were constituted sinful" [or "sinners," as the English translations less correctly give it]. This, too, especially, is the sense, the only possible sense, of the much debated verb "sinned" in the twelfth verse: "Death came throughout unto all men, because [or, ‘for that’] all *sinned*." The word "all" includes *infants*, to whom death comes, as well as adults; but infants can not be counted as overt sinners. The apostle’s argument in this passage, and the uniform teaching of the New Testament, and all rational theodicy, require that we consistently explain the verb, if we can not translate it, "They became sinful," they incurred sin [sinfulness], they inherited Adam’s corruption,—though not his guilt. This can be said of infants; and this is all that can be said of them. This, indeed, is Paul’s own explanation of the sense, in the words just quoted: "Through the disobedience of the one man, the many were constituted sinful." (Verse 19.)

But it by no means follows, because the descendants of Adam are held, in consequence of his sin, as "sinful," that they partook of his offense, or share in his guilt, and are accounted as personally violators of law. As born corrupt, though innocently, God’s law counts us sinful; and though it does not look on us with complacency, it does not condemn us, and the Gospel of Christ provides an instant and adequate remedy; it brings regeneration and justification. The death which Adam incurred was his personal punishment for his personal transgression. The death entailed on all his innocent posterity, including infants, who die as belonging to the fallen race, is, administratively, the legal but not inculpatory *penalty to the race*, from inherited corruption; but it is not a personal *punishment* inflicted on us for Adam’s sin, or for our sins. Notice, that *penalty* is simply legal *results*, which may come upon an innocent person; *punishment* is administrative *retribution*, and always implies guilt. There is no imputation of Adam’s sin (transgression) to the race, on the ground of inherited corruption; there is no demerit attaching to us, because of a guilty, or culpable participation in his transgression. It is only our own sin (sinful-

ness) that is imputed to us, as a consequence of the fall; and not that in any inculpativè sense; and the sin thus imputed, and its appointed penalty of death, are effectually and wholly intercepted and remedied by a merciful and just redemption. Born with a corrupt nature, by natural propagation from Adam, we are nevertheless born under an economy of grace, as well as of law. "Where sin [sinfulness, not sins] abounded [in human nature], at the same instant, grace superabounded [in the provisions of the Gospel]." (Rom. v, 20.) Through the redemption of Christ, every infant is born justified from constructive condemnation; and is born regenerate by the blood of sprinkling; and therefore every infant dying is saved. And every infant that lives to grow up, starts with a justified and regenerate nature; and every adult, who, by backsliding,* has lost his infant innocency, and becomes a conscious and willful transgressor (as practically all adults do), may nevertheless, under the same ample provisions of the Gospel, repent of his personal sins, and again find abundant forgiveness, and regeneration of his nature, and final deliverance from death. This is the sole teaching of this vexed passage.

There is no theologian who would venture explicitly to declare what all Calvinistic theologians nevertheless implicitly teach, that Adam sinned for his posterity. And yet, the entire fiction of "the federal headship" of Adam, by which he "represented" us in his sin, and entailed his awful guilt on his unoffending posterity, substantially involves the whole baseless, monstrous absurdity. Who delegated "representative" functions to Adam, under authority of which he acted for us, to plunge us into remediless woe? Augustine's famous saying that "We were all in Adam, since we *all* were that single *one*" ("City of God," XIII. 14), is not true theologically in any sense, real or putative, and is utterly absurd as a philosophical proposition. The fact that we are Adam's posterity, and inherit from him his degenerate nature, is all that can be found in the Scriptures, or made out in reason, as touching our relations to him, or to his transgression. And we must hold that his transgression was his own personal affair, and not ours; though it "brought death into the world, and all our woe." How admirably discriminate is the saying of Jeremiah: "The fathers ate sour grapes, and the children's teeth are set on

* "To backslide" is a genuine Biblical word, expressive of a real theological concept. Jeremiah uses the word thirteen times; Hosea three times.

edge; but every one shall *die for his own iniquity.*" (Jer. xxxi. 29.) Paul declares that: "In Adam we *all die.*" (1 Cor. xv, 22.) That we inherit death, is all that is here declared; but when any affirm further, that "In Adam *all sinned,*" we deny the proposition, which has no scintilla of truth, except so far as the saying "all sinned" has been explained by Paul himself: "*Through* [assuredly not '*In*'] the disobedience of the one man, the many were constituted sinful." (Rom. v, 19.)

Such is the only relation we bear to the great progenitor of the race. There is nothing mystic or transcendental about it. It is in the ordinary line of nature. It was in his paternity only that he entailed on us the awful inheritance of sin and death, and not by any incomprehensible representative headship. The offspring bears the impress, physical and moral, of the father. We see this heredity, not only in the bodily resemblance of son to father, and often in the minutest idiosyncrasies of disposition, but, above all, in the transmitted moral character. "Adam begot a son in his own likeness, after his image." (Gen. iii, 3.) Such is the teaching of the Scripture in regard to the tradition of the race, body and soul, physically and morally; a teaching which all science also equally establishes. This doctrine is known in theology as "traducianism." We derive our body and soul ultimately no doubt from God, but we derive them intermediately through Adam.

2. DEATH. Many theologians attempt to discriminate the *kinds* of death named in the Bible. They catalogue them as Death Physical, Death Spiritual, and Death Eternal. But this catalogue is not Scriptural, and is not generic or logical. There are not three kinds of death. The Bible knows of but one death, *the death of the man*; and herein marks no sharp division into body and spirit.* And the Bible knows of death only as an extinction of being, which, except for the renewal of life in Christ, is eternal death. This surely is what was threatened in the Garden; and we may infer that, but for the gracious intervention of redemption, it would have been inflicted upon Adam "in the day that he sinned," and

* The phrase "Spiritual death" is not found in the Scriptures; and the concept which it is probably intended to express is equally unknown in Scripture. Those who use the phrase mean by it apparently some form of punishment of sin; though not extending to extinction of the spirit. If they mean "alienation from the life of God" (Eph. iv, 18)—that is, the extinction of all goodness—this is not a *punishment* of sin, but is the *sin itself!*

the experiment with the human race would have ended. But Christ intervened and redeemed the race from extinction, and gave man a "renewal of life" (Rom. vi, 4), with probational opportunity to make this life eternal. For Christ's redemption did not restore man unconditionally to the conditions forfeited by sin. It suspended the penalty. It made provision for man's final salvation on new conditions. This provision contemplates the present regeneration of the soul, but leaves the body subject, temporarily, to death. Paul says: "The spirit is life [made alive] on account of justification; but the body is dead [subject to death] on account of sin." (Rom. viii, 10.)

All other senses of the word "death," or of the adjective "dead," are figurative, and are not applicable to the expression of the great penalty. Yet the Biblical uses of the words all refer to the passage in Genesis, where the word first appears, to express the penalty for transgression: "In the day that thou eatest thereof, thou shalt die, *shalt die.*"* (Gen. ii, 17.)

In this passage the word denotes only natural death; and there is nothing in the passage, or anything else in the Bible, which implies that death should not sweep the whole compass of man's being. It suggests nothing to us as to a penal deprivation of the soul apart from the body; or as to a doleful condition of the soul after death, or as to any future life at all, conscious or unconscious, of the soul, apart from the body. The evidence for any such *moral* penalty of sin must be sought elsewhere, and will be sought in vain. And, conversely, the "life" described in the eighteenth verse of this section as bought by Christ, is the resurrection life, the annulling of the natural death of man: "Christ abolished death, and brought life and incorruption [non-death] to light, through the gospel" (2 Tim. i, 10); and this "life" does not, of itself, express moral results or consequences, but only the forensic reversal of the physical penalty.

Verse 13. For to the extent of law sin was in the world; but sin is not reckoned, if there be no law.

The conjunction **for** connects back to the clauses in the twelfth verse, "all sinned,"—"All sinned, I say; for to the extent of law there was sin in the world." The word *law*, having no article,

* Notice the intensive Hebrew repetition. Compare the duplicative verb, "I have seen, *I have seen.*" (Acts vii, 34.)

means, as so constantly in Pauline phraseology, not "The Law," the Mosaic legislation, but the eternal, universal, moral law. And this, as well as the whole logic of the passage, determines the meaning of the preposition *ἄχρι*, up to, to the extent of. This Greek word sometimes denotes *time*, sometimes *extent*, as determined by the connection. In the text before us, the sense is not temporal, but quantitative; it does not express a stretch of time, but of extent or prevalence. In the fourteenth verse, where the sense is evidently of time, Paul uses a different word, *μέχρι*, "until," as if definitely to distinguish the quantitative sense of the other.

This explanation suits not only the meaning of the Greek preposition itself, but the specific limitations laid down by the apostle in the text. He says that "There was sin in the world; but that sin is not reckoned [we might almost say 'reckoned with,' recognized and treated as transgression], only on the supposition of there being no law." Of course the "law" thus alluded to was not the Law of Moses, for that was three thousand years later; nor was it the specific "commandment" to Adam in the garden; for the men who died "from Adam until Moses did not sin after the sameness with the transgression of Adam." There is, then, no other law conceivable than the eternal, unwritten, unspoken, everywhere regnant, moral law of right and wrong. But we can not say, "Until this law," which is dateless; we must translate and explain the text: "To the extent of this law," this great, eternal, universal, moral law. Paul's argument can be restated thus: "Sin is not reckoned with as transgression and punished, if there be no law; but death, the penalty of sin, reigned; and therefore sin was recognized and reckoned with as transgression; and therefore there was law." It stands syllogistically thus: "Sin can not be counted, and reckoned with as sin, if there be no law. But it was so reckoned with, for death reigned; therefore there was law."

And it follows that this law was not that of Moses, and it was not that special commandment given to Adam. It was the universal, divine law of right and wrong, written on the pages of nature, and in the hearts of men. There never was a time when men were not actually, and consciously, subject to this law, if to no other. They recognized it, and understood it, and for the most part obeyed it, because of their conscience; but, alas! they also often disobeyed it, for it carried with it no formal promulgation of penal sanctions. Yet while, during all this long period until

Moses, sin was recognized, and death reigned, man's overt transgressions were not always reckoned with, or visited upon men with absolute and unerring strictness. "In the forbearance of God, he passed over the sins of the olden time" (Rom. iii, 25); "He that knew not his Lord's will, and did things worthy of stripes, was beaten with few stripes" (Luke xii, 48).

Verse 14. Nay, but death reigned from Adam until Moses, even over them that sinned not, after the sameness with the transgression of Adam,—who is type of the **Second Adam** (1 Cor. xv, 45) that was to come.

The statement in this verse is a refutation of the conceit of the Jews that their Law was the universal and final law. Their Law was not the first; it will not be the last; and it was only provisional and provincial. Long before the date of the Mosaic Law, there was another more comprehensive law, which held all men in its mighty grasp, "a law which God manifested to them." (Rom. i, 19.) Nor did the enactment of the Mosaic Law change the relation of men at large, or even of the Jews, to this eternal law. The Law of Sinai defined this great moral, eternal law more clearly, but did not then first enact it, or in any way modify it. It had always existed; and after Sinai, men stood related to it precisely as before. But Moses added, *for the Jews*, the Law of Circumcision and of Rites, not establishing a new standard of righteousness, but simply regulating the religious service of an unspiritual people. The transgression of the moral law was sin, subjectively; the transgression of the Mosaic Law (at least of the ceremonial statutes), was "trespass," objectively, which could be atoned for by bodily mortifications, or fines or sacrifices. The earlier and mightier law was still regnant everywhere, and carrying death to all the race, not "from Adam until Moses" only; but until the coming of the Lord Jesus Christ, and "the bringing in of a better hope." It is only the gospel of Christ which has reversed the conditions of sin and death, under which the race was hopelessly held. The provisions of the Mosaic Law did not call sin into being; but only gave it, already existing, the metes and bounds by which its nature and extent could be more clearly measured. It defined transgression and penalty *for the Jews*, but not for the rest of the world. This Law was but temporary in its design, as well as provincial in its range: "A Law of fleshly ordinances, imposed until the time of reformation." (Heb. ix, 10.) This Law with its "blood of bulls and of goats" did not atone for sin; and did not abolish death.

It is clearly the teaching of this passage, verses 12-14, that death came to all men ("to men," observe, though certainly not to the lower animal races) as the result of Adam's transgression. The heredity of sin brought with it to men not guilt, but *death*, as the penal result of our seminal taint. The verb that denotes the sway of death is very expressive: **Death kinged it over men.** This was our involuntary inheritance from Adam's sin. From this fatal inheritance the redemption of Christ bought us off, and "abolished death" for us. Yet, while this gracious intervention has been effected *for the race*, without our personal co-operation or consent, and has thus delivered all the race of Adam from their ill heredity, we must not lose sight of the other fact that men's voluntary, personal sin in adult life subjects them to personal guilt, and, if they die impenitent, to the penalty of a "second death."

The class described in the fourteenth verse, **who sinned not after the sameness with the transgression of Adam**, does not directly contemplate the case of innocent children (though they are included), but of all the race. None of the descendants of Adam sinned as Adam did, against the specific statute of the Garden. Their sin (sinfulness) came by inheritance; it was for this they died, not for their own sins (transgressions), though these also, upon their occurrence, were worthy of death. But under the gospel scheme, men are born to an inheritance of life, as well as an inheritance of death. Adam who brought condemnation to death upon all his posterity, was in his actual racial headship (but not in any federal sense) the foretype of Christ; and the second and greater Adam, in his constructive racial headship, was the aftertype of Adam, and by his death brought justification to a lost race.

And this last glorious declaration, the first mention of Christ, in this passage, leads us to the apostle's striking antithesis between Adam and Christ, as developed in the next seven verses.

Verses 15-21. Nay, but not as was the fall, so also was the act of grace. For if by the fall of the one man the many died, much rather the grace of God, and the gift in the grace of the One Man, Jesus Christ, abounded unto the many. And not, as was the fall through one man that sinned, so was the gift: for the judgment indeed was from one [fall] unto condemnation, but the act of grace was from many falls unto justification. For if, in the fall of the one man, the death reigned through the one man;

much rather they that receive the abundance of the grace and of the gift of justification, will reign, in life, through the One Man, Jesus Christ. Accordingly, then, as through one fall [the result was] unto all men unto condemnation; so also through one act of justification [the result] was unto all men unto justification of life. For just as through the disobedience of the one man the many were constituted sinful, so also through the obedience of the One Man the many will be constituted just. But law came in besides that the fall may multiply; but where the sin multiplied, the grace overabounded; that, just as the sin reigned in the death, so also the grace may reign through justification unto life eternal through Jesus Christ our Lord.

In verses 15-21 we come to the famous parallel, or, rather, contrast, between Adam and Christ. This brief passage is perhaps the most noted and the most quoted in all Paul's Epistles. There is indeed no other passage of the same extent in the world's literature, sacred or profane, so compact, and complete, and suggestive. The style is grave, noble, impressive, authoritative. The two great heads of the race are introduced, Adam in the Fall, Christ in the Redemption; and the results of the Fall and the results of the Redemption are shown in strong and pointed contrast: Adam's Fall brought sin and death; Christ's Atonement brought justification and life.

The passage is embarrassingly concise, the wording of the antitheses meager and obscure. Paul gives only the barest statements, and, to our disappointment, does not indulge himself, and does not indulge his readers, in any exposition of the grave matters in issue, on either side. The reader constantly desiderates a few more specific, explanatory words in the sentence, a little more expansion of the thought. Yet the brief statements which the apostle has given us amount, when carefully weighed, to a substantial, and, on the whole, satisfactory theodicy. But concise as the passage is, it would be difficult to overestimate the place which these few brief utterances hold in the exhibition of Christian theology: they constitute the basis of all orthodox theological systems of Anthropology and Christology. No words, aside from those of the Master, are so often cited; none appear so often in the teaching of the schools, the preaching of the pulpits.

The antithetical structure of this passage can be best exhib-

ited, and the meaning best apprehended, by arranging the several protases and apodoses in parallel columns; of which the first shall show the fall of Adam and its results, the second the grace of God in Christ and its results. There are nine several antitheses in the following presentation of the passage, marked by Roman numerals, and the several sections of the single verses are marked by the letters of the alphabet. This is a closely literal translation; with a few words supplied [in brackets], as demanded by the current sense, or authorized from other parallel verses. I have *italicized* the contrasted and emphatic words.

ADAM'S FALL.

I. 15a. Nay, but not, as was the *Fall*,

II. 15c. For if, by the *Fall* of the *one* man, the *many* die,

III. 16a. And not, as was [the *Fall*] through *one* man, having sinned;

IV. 16c. For the judgment, indeed, was from one [*Fall*] to a sentence of *condemnation* [of *all* men to *Death*, v. 18a];

V. 17a. For if in the *Fall* of the *one* man the *Death* reigned through the *one* man [over *all* men, v. 12];

VI. 18a. Accordingly, then, as through *one Fall* [the result], was unto *all* men unto *condemnation* [to *Death*];

CHRIST'S GRACE.

15b. So also was the act of *Grace*;

15d. Much rather the *Grace* of God, and the *Gift* in the *Grace* of the *One* Man, Jesus Christ, abounded unto the *many* [unto justification of *Life*, v. 18].

16b. So also was the [perfect] *Gift* [through *One* Man having justified us].

16d. But the act of *Grace* was from *many Falls* unto a sentence of *justification* [of *all* men to *Life*, v. 18b].

17b. Much rather they that receive the abundance of the *Grace* and of the *Gift* of *justification* will reign in *Life* through the *One* Man, Jesus Christ.

18b. So, also, through *one* act of *justification* [the result], was unto *all* men, unto *justification* of *Life*.

ADAM'S FALL.

VII. 19a. For as through the *Disobedience* of the *one man*, the *many* were constituted *sinful*;

VIII. 20a. But law came in besides, that the *Fall* may multiply;

IX. 21a. That as the *Sin* reigned in the *Death*;

CHRIST'S GRACE.

19b. So also through the *Obedience* of the *One Man*, the *many* will be constituted *just*.

20b. But where this *Sin* multiplied, the *Grace* overabounded;

21b. So, also, the *Grace* may reign through *justification* unto *Life* eternal, through *Jesus Christ*, our Lord.

The following is an abstract, or outline, of the teaching of this passage, and of the gospel of Christ:

I.

Adam, the progenitor of the race, carried all his descendants with him:

First. In corruption, or degeneracy of nature. And so we read:

1. "He begot a son in his own likeness." (Gen. v, 3.) "Through the disobedience of the one man, the many were constituted sinful." (Rom. v, 19.)

Secondly. In obnoxiousness to to the penalty, for a constructive, not culpative, guilt. And so we read:

2. "Through one Fall, the results were unto all men unto condemnation to death." (Rom. v, 18.)

II.

Christ, the Second Adam, and constructive Head of the race, carried, potentially, all the race redeemed by his vicarious death, with him:

First. In regeneration of their nature. And so we read:

1. "God saved us through the washing of regeneration, and renewing of the Holy Spirit." (Tit. iii, 5.) "We are conform with the image of his Son." (Rom. viii, 29.)

Secondly. In justification, or acquittal, from condemnation. And so we read:

2. "The results were unto all men unto justification to life." (Rom. v, 18.)

Thirdly. In actual subjection to the penalty of death. And so we read:

3. "Death came throughout unto all men." (Rom. v, 12.)
 "In Adam all die." (1 Cor. xv, 22.)

Thirdly. In removal, or reversal, of the penalty. And so we read:

3. "So in Christ will all be made alive." (1 Cor. xv, 22.)

It will be noticed that the discussion is restricted to the legal, or forensic, phases of the Fall and of the Recovery. The contrast is between sin as condemnatory, not as contaminative; and Grace as justificatory, and not as regenerative. This Epistle does not deal with moral issues. The moral elements in the contrasted spheres of action, contamination and regeneration, are not touched upon here, and are only barely alluded to in any other part of the Epistle. Condemnation and justification occupy the apostle's whole field of view here and throughout the dogmatic part of the Epistle, to the end of the eleventh chapter.

We now come to an examination and discussion of these nine antitheses, severally. There is a marked resemblance in the balanced structure of these antitheses. Of the nine protases describing the action of sin, all begin with the argumentative adverbial conjunctions **for**, or **as**, pointing to the logical apodoses; and of the nine apodoses describing the counter work of Christ, five begin with the answering equilibrant words **so also**, two with the augmentative words **much rather**, and two with the adversative conjunction **but**.

I. 15*a*. **Nay**, but not, as was the Fall,

15*b*. **So also** was the act of Grace;

The first clause begins with the strongest adversative conjunction, which, as we have seen before, is best expressed with the help of the word **nay**. The previous verse ended in a parallel between Adam and Christ, showing the likeness of the great prototype and the greater Antitype in their racial headships. But with the fifteenth verse, and so onward through the chapter, there is, instead of a resemblance, only a sharp contrast, or antithesis, between the two, and between their relations to men.

The translation **act of grace** is used to discriminate *χάρισμα* (here and in 16*d*) from the customary word for **grace**, *χάρις* (in 15*d*). Certainly the translation "free gift" in the Authorized and the

Revised misses the point of the contrast; besides which, the word "free" adds nothing to the meaning of the word "gift:" it is an idle tautology.

This first antithesis contrasts the two antagonistic agencies, the Fall and the Grace, in their nature, or character. In this contrast, the thought in full seems to be this: The Fall was an act that brought corruption and death to the race; sin and its brother, death, travel together. But not so was the Grace of Christ; its work was the opposite: it abolished death, and brought life and incorruption [non-death] to light.

II. 15c. For if by the Fall
of the one man the many
died;

15d. Much rather the grace
of God, and the Gift in the
Grace of the One Man, Jesus
Christ, abounded unto the
many [unto justification of
Life, v. 18].

The second antithesis contrasts the Fall and the Grace in their specific results, and in the extent to which the results reached. The Fall brought Death unto the many; the Grace counteracted the results of sin; but it did more: it abounded unto the many over all the entailment of the Fall. Its reflux wave swept back over all barriers, and left redeemed man in safer condition, ideally at least, than was Adam even in his first probation.

The term **the many**, here, is coextensive with **all** in the eighteenth verse. The word "the many," rather than "all," is suggested by the word "the one," to which it forms the appropriate numerical antithesis; and, besides, it connotes what the word "all" does not, that the class which it describes is not small, but "a multitude such as no man can number."* Certainly we

*The population of the globe to-day is estimated at fifteen hundred millions. But of the whole number of those who are born into the world, half die in infancy, and are never counted in the census; and, as a "generation" may be taken at one-third of a century, it follows that three thousand millions are born and die every thirty-three years. If we count the age of the race as only six thousand years (though it is probably double that), and make allowance for the early paucity of the population, still a very conservative estimate makes the number of the human family that have lived and died to the present time at least two hundred and fifty thousand millions. How dreadful the ravages of sin! Surely Death has "kinged it" among men! And how glorious the Grace that redeemed them all, "the many!"—the Grace that has taken thought for each one, personally, of this vast multitude—that certainly saves one-half the number, and as many more as will, and is adequate to save *all*.

can not concede the Calvinistic explanation that "the many" are fewer than "all," and that the term is used advisedly for only "the *elect*." On the contrary, the word "the many" is used without any mark of difference, on both sides of the antithesis—for those who are affected by the Fall, and for those who are affected by the work of Grace. "The many," in this connection, are "all."

III. 16*a*. And not, as was [the Fall] through one man, having sinned ; 16*b*. So also was the [perfect] Gift, [through One Man, having justified us].

The third antithesis repeats substantially the brief points found in the first antithesis; and takes a step in advance, by adding some qualifications. The yet further supplies [added in brackets], are borrowed from the parallels elsewhere. The word **the Fall**, in 16*a*, is justified by the same word in 15*a*; and the word **perfect** in 16*b*. "the perfect Gift," is inserted on the authority of James i, 17, to discriminate, rhetorically, the special word *δῶρημα*, "gift," from its more general synonym *δωρεά*, gift, in 15*d* and 17*c*. The advanced point in 16*a*, **through one man that sinned**, which specifies the guilty cause of our condemnation, justifies the addition in 16*b*, of the correlate clause, **through One Man that justified us**.

IV. 16*c*. For the judgment indeed was from one [Fall] unto a sentence of condemnation [of all men, to death]; 16*d*. But the act of Grace was from many Falls, unto a sentence of justification [of all men, to life].

The fourth antithesis contrasts, as in II, the work of the Fall and the act of Grace, in the direction and the range of their several operations; but now the stress of the contrast is on the single Fall of Adam, from which the condemnation came, and the many Falls, or transgressions, of his posterity, from which Grace delivers them. Adam's probation was forfeited by a single sin; our probation under Christ, gives the race the opportunity, and the realization, of recovery from many sins.

One text in the first line of 16*c* reads, **was from one Fall**. The old translation "by one" implies that the word "one" is masculine, though it does not supply the word "man." But the parallelism of the two antithetic clauses, as well as the sense, allows no other supply than "Fall."

V. 17a. For if in the Fall of the one man, the Death reigned, through the one man [over all men];

17b. Much rather they that receive the abundance of the Grace, and of the Gift of justification will reign in life through the One Man, Jesus Christ.

The fifth antithesis contrasts the victory of Death and the victory of Grace. Death "kinged it" over all men; but this triumph is short; they that receive Grace and justification [namely, *all men*], will, in their turn, "king it" over Death, in eternal life, through Jesus Christ. This is the ideal and actual result of the gospel. "In Christ *all men* will be made alive." (1 Cor. xv, 22.) And for all who will, the resurrection life will continue to *eternal* life.

VI. 18a. Accordingly, then, as through one Fall, [the result] was unto all men, unto condemnation [to Death];

18b. So also, through one act of justification, [the result] was unto all men, unto justification of Life.

The sixth antithesis contrasts the result, or outcome, of the Fall in bringing condemnation to man, and the result, or outcome, of Christ's work in bringing justification to man. This word *outcome*, or *result*, is the simplest, and sufficient supply for both clauses. The one Fall resulted in condemnation of all men to death; the one justifying work resulted in the justification of all men to life. The last phrase, *justification of Life*, means that gracious justification from condemnation to death, which, contrariwise, entitles men to life. *Life* is simply the opposite of death; and while the word does not, in itself, mean *eternal* life, but only the reversal of the death penalty, yet this title to life, will, as we saw under verse 17, reach, "for those that *seek* incorruption," unto eternal life. But in Scriptural phraseology, the word "life" usually connotes the idea of *eternity*. Christ said: "I came that they may have *life*" (John x, 10); but he also said: "He that has faith upon the Son has *eternal* life" (John iii, 36).

VII. 19a. For just as through the Disobedience of the one man, the many were constituted sinful;

19b. So also, through the Obedience of the One Man, the many will be constituted just.

The seventh antithesis contrasts the results of Adam's Disobedience, and of Christ's Obedience upon man's forensic relation

to the law of God. The conjunction **for** logically refers to verse 18, and adduces the results there described as the grounds severally for the condemnation of the race to death, on the one hand, and for their justification and restoration to life, on the other hand.

The parallelism requires that the predicate *ἀμαρτωλοί* in 19*a* be translated by the adjective **sinful**, as in Romans vii, 13, not "sinners," as in the old Versions. It thus corresponds to the adjective **just** in 19*b*. The word *sinful* has the sense already explained, in the note to verse 12, of being degenerate or corrupt in nature, and not, as the word "sinners" means, of being overt, personal transgressors. It expresses the inherited characteristic of the race, the inculpable seminal taint in our human nature, and not the willful, culpable, transgression in our outer lives. On the opposite side of the antithesis the word *just*, which is almost synonymous with the participle "justified" (Rom. i, 17), expresses the forensic acquittance from condemnation, not the moral regeneration. The word here used does not mean "righteous," that is upright, holy; and in Paul's vocabulary never expresses ethical concepts.

The Obedience of the One Man was his obedience to death. "He humbled himself, having become obedient unto death, even to the death of the cross." (Phil. ii, 8.) It expresses what is sometimes called his "passive obedience," his submission to die the most shameful death, a just man for unjust men, an obedience by which "the many were, and will be constituted just."

VIII. 20 <i>a</i> . But law came in besides, that the Fall may multiply;	20 <i>b</i> . But where the sin multiplied, the Grace over- abounded;
--	---

The verb here correctly translated **multiply** is usually translated "abound" to assimilate it with the last verb in 20*b*; but we had better keep the apostle's word and concept, at the expense of the rhetorical balancing of the clauses. The word **law** means the eternal, moral law. It **came in** into human consciousness and human conscience as a factor quickening the sense of sinfulness, and causing the "offense to multiply," that sin might appear yet more sinful. The word **besides** means in addition to the ordinary rectoral function of law. The working of law does not actually "multiply offenses," but so it seems: it makes the awakened conscience quicker to recognize them. "The sinner is alive; but the law comes home to him, and he dies." But in the counter-working of the gospel, where sin is multiplying itself, to the alarmed soul,

Grace intervenes, and overabounds; and brings justification, and peace, and life.

IX. 21a. That just as the Sin reigned in the Death,		21b. So also the Grace may reign through justification unto Life eternal through Je- sus Christ our Lord.
--	--	--

The ninth antithesis is the triumphant climax. Sin once "kinged it" over men, in the universal dominance of death. Its domain is one of desolation and vacuity. Grace will "king it," through justification, in a higher and better reign, in a domain of Life, eternal Life, through Jesus Christ our Lord.

CHAPTER VI.

Verse 1. JEW: "What then shall we say? Shall we continue in the sin, that the grace may multiply?"

For a correct understanding of the discussion upon which we now enter we must remember, first of all, as we have already seen, that, while the general theme of the Epistle is the equality of the Gentiles with the Jews, yet the specific doctrine set forth in this discussion is that of justification from faith. The whole discussion turns on this doctrine. The usual interpretation of this important section (including the sixth, seventh, and eighth chapters), as being a discussion of the higher, ethical doctrine of regeneration and sanctification, is a grave exegetical error. In point of fact, the apostle, throughout the first eleven chapters, which are the doctrinal chapters of the Epistle, does not touch, or does no more than barely touch, on the great themes of regeneration and sanctification. There are, in this Epistle, only two briefest allusions, of two words each (the same words in both places), to this branch of Christian teaching which elsewhere in the Pauline Epistles meet with so copious and satisfactory treatment. These two allusions are found in this sixth chapter; and there are none at all in the seventh and eighth. They are as follows:

1. "Yield your members slaves to justification, *with a view to sanctification.*" (Rom. vi, 19.) 2. "Having been enframed from the sin. . . ye have your fruit *with a view to sanctification.*" (Rom. vi, 22.) But these brief passages are not *discussions* of the higher experimental doctrine of holiness; they are mere side allusions, which might have been omitted from the Epistle without impairment to the logical trend and tread of the argument on justification.

The question with which the sixth chapter opens evidently belongs to the Jew. The fifth chapter closes with the apostle's say-

ing that "Where the sin multiplied, the grace overabounded." To this statement, so broad and unqualified, the Jew, or any caviler, might object that this doctrine of justification by *grace* alone, unlike the condemnatory and repressive attitude of *law*, not only opposes no restraint to license, but even encourages continuance in it. It is substantially the same objection against the apostle's teaching that we met before in the words of the Jew: "If God's truth [truthfulness to the covenant] abounded to his glory by my falseness [to the covenant], why am I also judged and condemned as sinful?" (Rom. iii, 7.) To that objection the apostle answered with a *reductio ad absurdum*: "Then, on the same principle, shall we do the evil things that the good things may come?—whose condemnation is just?" Of course, the phrase "continue in the sin" means "continue in the indulgence of sin;" and the word "*grace*" here means the grace of God in justification, or pardon, and not in sanctification.

Verse 2. PAUL: God forbid! How shall we who died as to the sin yet live in it?

Some of the most striking expressions in the English translation of these chapters, such as "righteousness," "to die to sin," "dead to sin," "alive to God," "newness of life," "crucified with Christ," have become established common places in our religious phraseology, to express spiritual experiences; and they will, no doubt, continue to be so used. Indeed, the words, and the passages in which they are found, seem at first almost incapable of any other meaning. Yet the exegete must finally recognize the certainty that the apostle in his writings always employs those expressions in quite other senses. In point of fact, first, some of these English expressions are absolutely impossible as translations of the apostle's Greek; the corresponding Greek words never express ethical concepts; and, second, at any rate, ethical concepts are out of place in this forensic discussion. The proper interpretation of the chapter, and of much of the apostle's language here and elsewhere turns upon a different understanding of the words.

What then is the meaning of the saying in our text, **We died as to sin?** In the old translation the passage runs, "How shall we that *are dead to sin* live any longer therein?" This language doubtless expresses an *ethical* death, or deadness to sin; and that only. But aside from the fatal objection that holds against it as a translation of the Greek verb, there are logical difficulties in the

way of explaining this death as an ethical one. If this expression, "dead to sin," means that the believer has become insensitive, apathetic, "dead," ethically, to the seductiveness of sin, and its dominion over the appetites and affections;—if this be the meaning of the passage, why should the apostle inconsistently and inconsequently go on to ask, "How shall we that are *dead to sin* (in this *ethical* sense) *live any longer therein?*" It is a question, whose inconsequence might well stir the envy of St. Patrick himself. But, further, in whatever sense this phrase "dead in sin" is here used in respect to the believer, it is used in the tenth verse in just the same sense in respect to Christ himself. The Greek is the same in both places; though the translators did not venture to translate in the same way in both places. If the tenth verse can not mean that Christ became "dead to sin," in the sense of having ceased, ethically, to be responsive to its influence over him, so neither can the words in the second verse, as spoken of the believer, have that meaning, or receive that translation. It is only when we recognize that the argument of the apostle is wholly forensic, and not ethical, and interpret his language in accordance with this view, that we reach a coherent, consistent, and tolerable sense.

The verb *died* (as also the adjective "dead," in the eleventh verse), must be understood not figuratively, or mystically, but literally. It expresses physical mortality. It describes the death denounced in the Garden (Gen. ii, 17), and incurred in the Fall, and suffered by Christ, vicariously, on the cross, and by the race, in the person of Christ. It was literal and actual with Christ; and it is equally literal, though only *constructive*, with us. The verb is in the past tense, *we died*, not as the Authorized gives it, "we *are* dead." This historical tense of the verb carries the transaction back to the death of Christ; which may be dated, historically, from Calvary, or which is better, potentially, from the day when the promise of his coming was first given. The apostle teaches that Christ "bore our sins," that "he died for us," that is, "instead of us;" that this death was the penalty threatened in the Garden: "In the day that thou eatest thereof, thou shalt die, *shalt die;*" and that, dying "once for all," in virtue of his representative position, *for us*, he exhausted the claim of law, and discharged us from the penalty. In this literal, personal death of Christ, we, "his members," constructively had a part. "We died with him," and are no longer obnoxious to the penalty. Neither he, who thus, once for all, died for us, nor we, whom he repre-

sented, and who died with him, are held to answer, a second time, or further, for the sin of the race. A second infliction of penalty for our offense would violate equity in the divine government, or in any government.

There is another word that requires discussion. Our text reads, we died *as to sin*. The word "sin" in this phrase is in the dative case; and the literal translation is "to sin." And this translation, which is the usual one, is perhaps sufficiently clear. But to avoid the ethical misconception, I prefer to express the dative by the unequivocally forensic phrase "as far as concerns," or "as regards;" or, briefly, *as to*. We have seen that the apostle's concept in the verb "we died" is that our death, like Christ's, was literal and physical, such a death as sunders the tie *as to* everything around us. But the apostle's concept in this saying, "we died *as to sin*," is that we died *so far as respects sin*; only: and not *as to* other things: for example, as to knowledge, happiness, or God. "We died, forensically, only *as to sin*." And we can thus best express this Pauline concept in the saying, "we died to sin," by using the more definite and exact prepositional phrase "*as to*,"—"we died *as to sin*." In the same way, and with the same forensic limitation, we read, "Christ died *as to sin*" (Rom. vi, 10); we also read further, "I died *as to law*" (Gal. ii, 19); we also read, "Reckon yourselves dead *as to sin*" (Rom. vi, 11); we also read, "As Christ lives *as to God*, so reckon ye yourselves living *as to God*" (Rom. vi, 10). Accordingly the saying, "We died *as to sin*," signifies that we died, forensically, "as far as regards sin," or "in reference to sin," that is, "We bore the penalty *as regards sin*; and so stand no longer in any vital or amenable relation, forensically, *as to sin*, or, *as to the law* which takes cognizance of sin."

It is in this same sense, expressive of forensic relations to law and to God, that Paul elsewhere declares: "For I through law died *as to law*, that I may live [have life] *as to God*" (Gal. ii, 19), that is, "Through my constructive death with Christ (in the person of Christ), I died, so far as regards law (so far as I stood related to law), that, conversely, in my resurrection with Christ (in the person of Christ), I may have life *as to God*;" that is, that I may come, forensically, into new, vital relations with him. It is in this same sense that Paul tells the Colossians, "Ye died with Christ (in the person of Christ), *off* (*ἀπὸ*) from (or, as to) the rudiments of the world." (Col. ii, 20.) It is in this same sense

that Peter says: "He bore our sins in his own body on the cross, that we, having become *off* (*ἀπὸ*) from (or, as to) the sins, may live (have our life) as to justification." (1 Pet. ii, 24.) It is in this same sense that, in the after part of this chapter, the apostle describes our death *as to law* (so far as we were related to law) under the figure of *emancipation from* the legal claim of sin (or, of the law which takes note of sin); the sense that he expresses, in the seventh chapter, under the figure of a *divorce from* the legal claim of sin; that is, of the law which takes note of sin.

In the words "*we died as to sin*," and the enlarged statement in the eighth verse, "*we died with Christ*," the apostle teaches that we shared forensically in the death of Christ, which "*he died as to sin*;" a death which indeed is, after all, only *our* own death, and not his, except as he bore it vicariously in our stead. He died for us, once for all, not to die again. Our death with him acquits us, too, from further penalty.

That our death to sin here described is *forensic*, and not *ethical*, is the testimony of our own personal consciousness. A believer may by justification "*have died as to sin*," that is, "*off*" from his penal relations to law; and have the witness of God's Spirit to his adoption; and at the same time, be abundantly alive, ethically, to the seductiveness of sin. Yet the gospel which gives us liberty from condemnation, not only does not give us license to sin, but gives us power over it. Paul needed to tell the Galatians, "Brethren, ye were called upon footing of liberty [from law]; only use not your liberty unto an occasion to the flesh." (Gal. v, 13.) So here, now, he comments on the incongruity of a life of sin with a state of forensic death as to sin. "How inconsistent that we, who had such a gracious deliverance from the penalty of sin, should yet indulge in the sin that was our ruin!"

Verse 3. Or, do ye not know that we, so many as were baptized into Christ Jesus, were baptized into his death?

I repeat the verse, and supply some words in brackets to express the meaning better, and to show the logical connection of the important conjunction *or*, whose presence in the sentence is not even noticed in the Authorized: "[Died, I say]; or [if you do not comprehend what '*dying as to sin*' means], do ye not know that we, so many as were baptized [initiated, incorporated] into Christ Jesus, were baptized into his *death* [and all that this vicarious death signifies]?"

The apostle here turns aside from his controversy with the synagogue to address the Church. The continued argumentative tone of the passage implies that his hearers needed the elementary, yet profound lesson of this chapter. His argument is an "*argumentum ad hominem*:" "Surely, believers, *baptized* believers, ought to know what glorious things their baptism implied." And yet, while the apostle's words take on, for the moment, a tone of animadversion, we must not understand that he really thought the Christian believers "ignorant" of this fundamental doctrine of the gospel; but in thus addressing them, he carries out the line and tone of his argument against the Jew, the argument that justification comes to men from Christ's death, and that it is for *all* men.

The apostle's expression here, **we, so many as were baptized**, seems to designate a limited number only, who were incorporated into Christ; but this saying is not inconsistent with his constant teaching that the gospel embraces all men indiscriminately. The apostle here merely shapes his appeal to his immediate audience of baptized believers; and he does not exclude or forget the rest of the world. He knows of no regenerating or saving power in any ordinance, or rite, *ex opere operato*. Baptism is only an appointed sign and seal of our profession. It does not make us members of Christ, but betokens what we all already were. What he here declares as actually true of baptized believers, he holds equally true, ideally, of every man born into the world. Paul is not sparing of explicit assertions in that direction. "His gospel" teaches that the *plan* of redemption, and the actual *work* of redemption, sweeps the whole circle of humanity. *All* men were redeemed, and stood, at birth, justified, regenerate, united with Christ. Half the whole number die in infancy, and are saved without faith, and without baptism. And adult believers, all of whom are in Christ, potentially, before their conversion and profession of faith, by their baptism only revive their dormant membership in Christ. Baptism does not bring them into this relation; it only proclaims it; it declares that the believers have now come to realize what was already theirs, and to profess it to the world.

Baptism was an old Jewish usage, symbolic of the inner washing of regeneration. It was practiced by the Jews from the days of Moses down; and was afterwards practiced by John, and then adopted by Christ and exalted into a Christian rite, yet with the same symbolism of the washing of regeneration. It is the initial

and the initiatory rite in the Christian Church; and the word **baptize**, which expresses it, together with the preposition **into**,* signifies merely the ritual *initiation into* a new *faith*, or into a *person* who represents a faith. This is the meaning of the verse before us. To be **baptized into Christ** means to be *initiated* into him; that is, into the profession of Christ, and into fellowship with him. To be **baptized into his death** means to be initiated into the profession of faith in his death as a vicarious death, and into participation in it. The sense of "being baptized into Christ," that is, into an appropriation of Christ, the apostle expresses, elsewhere, in other and more definite terms: "As many of you as were baptized into Christ *put on Christ*" (Gal. iii, 27), that is, as the connection shows, "Ye are no longer under law, but by your baptism, ye took upon yourselves the obligation of allegiance to Christ."

The thought of the verse may be given thus: "Or, do ye not know that our initiation into Christ, was really an initiation into his death, his *vicarious death*? But if we were initiated into his death, which was a death forensically, *as to sin*, we certainly also died, and died *as to sin*."

Verse 4. We were buried, therefore, with him, through the baptism into his death; that just as Christ was raised from among dead men, through the glory of the Father, so also we may walk in renewal of life.

There are several critical points in this verse that need discussion.

1. The word **therefore** marks the inference to be drawn from the word **death** in the previous verse. The order of incidents in the last days of Christ is, concisely, this: 1. He was crucified; 2. he died; 3. he was buried; 4. he was raised; 5. he was glorified. In all these things the entire race which he represented was constructively united with him. We were united with him in the same order of events: 1. in his crucifixion; 2. in his death; 3. in his burial: "We died with him; **therefore we were buried with him.**" Upon this third item out of the five the Epistle *here* lays

*The formula of baptism in the Scripture always has the preposition "*into*:" "Baptize them *into* the name [profession, faith] of the Father, —" (Matt. xxviii, 19.) Of course, the old translation and the formula current in the Churches, "*in* the name," which can only mean "by the authority," is a mistranslation, and loses the *point* of the rite.

the stress of the sentence as being the natural point of transition to the next item, the fourth, the announcement of our resurrection with him, the grant of new life instead of that which was forfeited in Adam, and which died with Christ on the cross.

2. The statements that we were crucified, and that we died, and that we were buried, and that we were raised, with him, must all be taken, not in any figurative, or mystic, or ethical sense, but as *literally* as they are made in regard to Christ himself; though, of course, holding good *of us*, only *constructively*. Christ *represented* us: whatever he vicariously did for us, we, his clients, or "members," are held to have done. Was Christ crucified? "We were crucified with him" (Rom. vi, 6); Did Christ die? "We died with him" (2 Tim. ii, 11); Was Christ buried (in the tomb of Joseph)? "We were buried with him" (Rom. vi, 4); Was Christ raised? "We were raised with him" (Col. ii, 12); Was Christ glorified? "We were glorified with him," that is, the provision was then made for our glorification (Rom. viii, 17). The assertions here are all of one great historic fact. We look back to Christ's death, and burial, and resurrection as a thing that is past; we look back, too, to our death, and burial, and resurrection, *constructively*, with him, as a thing that is past—past for all the race. It is the conclusive teaching of the New Testament that the race—every individual of the race, past, present, and to come—was in union with Christ by virtue of his vicarious position. We were all crucified with Christ, whether believers or unbelievers; we were all "buried with Christ" where he was buried (in the tomb of Joseph), whether baptized or unbaptized, and we were all raised with him, whether sinners or saints. Christ's death was potentially the death of all mankind. We *all* shared in all this. Just as all Jews *were born* into membership in the theocratic nation and Church, and received circumcision only as a *token*, but not as the conferment of this membership, so all men *are born* into membership in Christ's Church and family, and receive baptism as a *token*, but not as a conferment of this membership. The Jews were Jews *by birth*, and members (though guilty of schism) if without circumcision; all Gentiles are Christians *by birth*, and members of Christ's body (though guilty of schism in the body) if without baptism. And this includes us *and our children*.

When the apostle says "we were buried with him," the word conveys no allusion whatever to the rite of baptism, much less to baptism as being by *immersion*. The words "buried with him," or

more exactly, **put in the grave with him**, are not figurative, but literal; and mean that we were laid in the literal tomb of the Arimathean with the dead body of Jesus (though, of course, only constructively). To press the *mote* of baptism from these words, and to find the proof of immersion in this passage (and in the parallel passage in Col. ii, 8-10), shows ignorance of Greek, and of the logical connection of the passage, and of the intent of the Christian rite. Such an exegesis wholly misses the point in the passage.*

3. The word **glory** expresses, apparently, the complex of all the divine attributes; but here, especially, connotes *power*. It is thus that Paul himself elsewhere puts it: "He lives from the *power* of God." (2 Cor. xiii, 4.)

4. The expression, in the last clause of the verse, **renewal of life**, is more frequently translated "*newness* of life," and is usually understood to mean an ethical or moral transformation in the life of the believer. But the connection forbids this meaning. The "renewal of life" in the case of the believer is the same as in the case of Christ; and in his case it was not an ethical, moral revival, but a literal, physical revivescence, a coming to life again, and a resurrection from the dead. This sameness of meaning is confirmed by the parallelism in this verse, and, especially, by the terms of the argument in the sixth verse: "As Christ was raised from among dead men, *so also* we (who were buried in his grave, and dead, but have now risen with him) may henceforth walk (go on in our new career) in a renewal (a new grant) of life." This change is not subjective, in the sphere of religious experience, but

*The baptism of the apostles was precisely the same as that of the Church in the nineteenth century; any ritual application of water met the requirements of the case. Apostolic baptism was, perhaps, sometimes administered by immersion (though this is in doubt); but it was also administered by pouring or sprinkling (and this is not in doubt). The cumulative argument for this conclusion, from Scripture and history, long ago amounted to almost a demonstration. But if not thus settled before, the recent "find" (1883) of "The Teaching of the Twelve Apostles" puts it now beyond gainsaying. This book, which dates certainly not later than the year 120, and which some critics think even earlier than John's Gospel, says: "Baptize into the name [profession] of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit, in living [running?] water. But if thou do not have living water, [going] unto other water, baptize; but if thou canst not in cold, then in warm [standing?]. But if thou have neither [of these natural supplies], POUR WATER UPON THE HEAD thrice, into the name of Father, and Son, and Holy Spirit." (Chapter vii.)

physical, objective, in the sphere of our forensic relations to the law of God. This is the conception expressed by the martyrs in the time of the Maccabees: "The king of the world will raise us up, who died for his law, unto an eternal revivification of life."* It is the conception which Ignatius expresses in his letter to the Ephesians: "God himself was manifested in the form of a man unto a renewal of eternal life" (Ign. Eph. iv, 13)—the same Greek word as in our text.† It is the same concept as Paul expresses in the Epistle to the Galatians: "I have been put to death on the cross; but it is no longer I (in my own, old self) that live, but Christ lives in me; but *the life which I now live* (in my new self) *in the flesh* I live in virtue of my faith in the Son of God" (Gal. ii, 20); and again in the Epistle to the Colossians: "For ye died, and your life has been hidden (wrapped up) with Christ in God" (Col. iii, 3).

This "renewal (or new grant) of life," through the atonement of Christ, was historically complete for the race, from the first. Such is the nature of justification, a purely legal work. As sin, and death from sin, were complete at the first, and did not come upon the race by degrees, so this countervailing work of Christ did not come by degrees, but was accomplished in a moment. "We died in Adam" (1 Cor. xv, 22), that is, became amenable to the penalty of death; "we died, too, with Christ" (Rom. vi, 8), that is, bore the penalty; and we were raised *with him* to a full and eternal life. The sin, and the justification from sin, are accomplished historical facts. This is all that the apostle has yet affirmed, or needed to affirm in his present discussion as to the grounds of justification, whether by law or by faith.

We must discriminate, in our exegesis, and in our theology, between the *forensic* "renewal of life" here described, which comes complete from the first, from justification in Christ, and the religious life, or holiness; that is a *growth*, coming from the believer's consecration of himself, and struggles to realize in himself the image of God. This life of sanctification is never God's gift, but is always (with God's help) man's own achievement. The believer is commanded "Work out your salvation." "Ye shall be holy."

* εἰς αἰώνιον ἀναβίωσιν ζωῆς ἡμᾶς ἀναστήσει (2 Macc. vii, 9).

† εἰς καινότερα αἰδίου ζωῆς (Ign. Eph. 19).

Verse 5. For if we have become united with him in the sameness with his death, nay, but we shall be [united with him in the sameness] also with his resurrection.

The conjunction **for** introduces a reason, and further explanation of the statement in the previous verse. The conjunction **if** is the word of hypothesis, and not of contingency: the verb in the clause is in the indicative mode; and the point expressed is assumed as a fact; and the thought might be equally well expressed by the conjunction "since"—"since we have become united with him." The word **united** *σύνμυνοι* is, more literally, **grown together, coalescent**. The old translation, "planted together," is not the figure employed, and is wholly aside from the just meaning. If we must harness up a metaphor, it is not that of putting the roots of two plants into one pot, but of engrafting one plant into the other. The real concept of the word is of the union or incorporation of the believer, and of all men with Christ. "We are members of his body;" and, as a doubtful (but evangelically true) reading, adds, "we are of his flesh, and of his bones." (Eph. v, 30.)

The Greek word *ὁμοίωμα*, which is represented in the Authorized and the Revised by the word "likeness," means **sameness**. The word "likeness" yields here no appropriate sense, indeed is destitute of sense. The death of Christ, and the death of "his members," were not like, or similar, to each other (as if—which is probably the meaning most people read into it—Christ's death was a *physical* one, and ours a figurative or mystical one), but they were the *same* death. We both died a literal death on the cross, he actually, we constructively. He assumed our place forensically; he bore our penalty and "died for us," "in our stead;" and **we have become united with him**, by a death such as his, that is, **in the sameness with his death**.

The apodosis in this verse is connected back with the protasis by the strong adversative conjunction—**nay, but**—. This conjunction suggests the supply of a restrictive clause: ["that is not all], **nay, but**—;" and the rest of the apodosis can best be expressed by an additional supply, as given in the text. The full thought is: "Not only have we come into union with him by *dying* the same death with him, **nay, but** we shall be united with him in the same-

ness with his resurrection." These last words repeat the thought of the last words in the fourth verse, "a renewal of life," and confirm the explanation there given.

Our resurrection, in the legal assurance of it, was simultaneous with that of Christ. And so Paul says: "God made us alive with Christ, and raised us up with him" (Eph. ii, 4); "God who raised Christ from the dead, raised you up with him" (Col. ii, 12). But here he uses the future tense of the verb, **we shall be united with him**; that is, the union with Christ, now forensically ours, will be experimentally realized in the distant future, in the great resurrection, at the last day. What has thus been accomplished here, though as yet only constructively, potentially, will be literally, fully, consummated in the last day.

Verse 6. Knowing this, that our old man was crucified [put to death on the cross] with him, that the body of the sin may be done away with; that we may no longer be slaves as to the sin.

There are two distinct words of frequent occurrence that the Authorized and the Revised fail to discriminate—*γινώσκοντες* in this verse, and *εἰδότες* in the ninth verse. The former means "coming to know," "noting," "taking into thought," and the latter "being aware of," "knowing." The apostle here means **noting**, taking into *consideration*, and the expression is logically equivalent to the conjunction "because," and justifies the affirmation in the preceding verse: "We shall share in his resurrection, *because* our old man was crucified [put to death on the cross] with him."

Our old man. Paul has various figurative phrases to express various phases of human nature. He puts in antithesis "The old man," and "the new man" (Eph. iv, 24); "the outward man" (2 Cor. iv, 16), and "the inward man" (Rom. vii, 22). The phrase "our old man"—that is, "our former self"—expresses our human nature in its degenerate, unregenerate state, as offspring of Adam; what we were conceptually, by nature, or heredity, before Christ took our nature upon himself. "The new man"—that is, "our after self"—expresses our human nature in its regenerate state, as members of Christ's body; what we became when Christ assumed our nature and redeemed it. In a similar antithesis, though not identical with the above, Paul contrasts "the animal man" and "the spiritual man" (1 Cor. ii, 14), and "the fleshly man" and "the spiritual man" (1 Cor. iii, 1). And again, with a yet

different antithesis, he contrasts "the animal body" of this life with "the spiritual body" of the resurrection life. (1 Cor. xv, 44.) The teaching of our present passage is this: that "our old man," our degenerate human nature as inherited from Adam, "was crucified with Christ," that is, was literally (though only constructively) put to death on the cross with him, in order that thereby this same **body of sin**, this sin-tainted humanity of ours, may in his person suffer the penalty of death, and so **be done away with** (still constructively); and that thus we may no longer be slaves (forensically, not ethically) as to the power and condemnation of sin. "The *body* of sin" does not mean, as sometimes explained, "the totality, or mass, of sin," which wholly misses the point. The word "body" is to be taken literally of our human nature; though, of course, the saying, as a whole, is only constructively realized. The qualifying phrase, "of sin," is adjective to the word "body;" though not quite equivalent to the adjective "sinful," as that concept of the body is not found in the Scriptures. The expression, "body of sin," means "belonging to the domain of sin," "penetrated with sin," "rotten with sin." The apostle's concept of the "body of sin" is otherwise variously expressed; he calls it "a mortal body" (Rom. vi, 12), "this body of death" (Rom. vii, 22), and "a body of flesh" (with the implication of carnalness) (Col. i, 22).

The figure expressed by the words **slaves as to sin** is a strong and effective one; but much more realistic to the Romans of that day than even to us. The city of Rome was full of slaves. Probably many of those Christians whom the apostle addressed had themselves been slaves, or still were so. Ancient slavery had few of the restraints that Christianity has brought with it; yet often the tenderest ties bound master and slave together. Cicero made his slave (but afterwards his freedman), Tiro, his confidant, his correspondent, his literary executor. Slaves were usually of as good stock as their masters, and when manumitted could become their civil and social peers. In the times of the Empire, many slaves, the favorites of their lords, rose to high positions and enormous wealth; for example, Narcissus, the freedman of the Emperor Claudius (Rom. xvi, 11), and Felix, who also was a freedman of Claudius, the infamous procurator of Judea (Acts xxiii, 24), "the husband of three queens" (Scutonium, "Claudius," 28). The Jewish captives whom Pompey carried slaves to Rome (B. C. 63) were three freed (*liberti*), and their descendants (*liber-*

timi) were numerous, and rich, and influential. They had as many as nine synagogues in Rome, and a leading synagogue in Jerusalem ("Synagogue of the Libertines," Acts vi, 9). This social institution Paul met with everywhere throughout the Roman Empire; and he refers to it, either literally or figuratively, in every one of his letters. In some of these letters, this institution furnished, next to marriage, or even before marriage, the most forcible illustration that he could employ of man's tie to sin or of his tie to Christ. It is so in this Epistle. He makes much of this figure of slavery in the latter part of this chapter; and he makes much of the other strong figure, of marriage, in the seventh chapter.

Verse 7. For he that died has been justified from the sin.

The conjunction **for**, as always, introduces a confirmation of the preceding statement. It is, of course, the forensic concept that we must read into the words. The old translation of the verse (which is not a translation): "He that is dead is freed from sin," does not seize the apostle's thought. The popular understanding of the apostle's words is that "the power of sinning is lost at death," or that "death wipes out all accounts."⁶ But the apostle's sense is that **he that died** (with Christ), as to sin (and thus has once suffered the penalty), **has thereby been acquit from the guilt of sin**. It is the same concept that Peter expresses thus: "Christ, therefore, having suffered [having died for you] as to flesh, arm yourselves also with the same thought; because he that has suffered in the flesh [that has died with Christ, as to sin], has ceased from sin" (that is, not ethically, not from proclivity to sin, or even sometimes not from actual sin, but forensically); from obnoxiousness to its penalty. (1 Pet. iv, 1.) The penalty will not be exacted a second time.

Verse 8. But if we died with Christ, we believe that we shall also live with him.

The hypothetical conjunction **if**, with the indicative mode of the verb, expresses an assumed fact—"Since we died with Christ, we believe that we shall also have life with him." The word **believe** may be equally well, or better, expressed by the literal translation, **we have faith**—the assured conviction. And the

⁶As Shakespeare says, "He that dies pays all debts." (*Tempest* III, III, 124.)

verb, **shall live with him**, means more than that we are to be his companions, and share the joys of his presence (though all this is true: "Where I am, there ye shall be also"); but the word infinitely transcends this notion of "having a good time" hereafter; it expresses the grander concept that "our death will be swallowed up by life" (2 Cor. v, 4); "As the last enemy, death, is done away with" (1 Cor. xv, 26). The emphasis is on the word *live*. "We are to *have life* with him forever;" and this thought reaches the triumphant climax in the next three verses.

Verse 9. Knowing that Christ, having been raised from among dead men, no more dies; death no longer lords it over him.

The emphasis is on **Christ** as standing in antithesis to **we** in the previous verse. "Christ **no more dies**," that is, "Having died as to the sin, *once for all*" (verse 10), "he has obtained eternal redemption," and need not die again; **death no longer lords it over him**. And, glorious consummation! if not over *him*, then not over *us*, who died with him. So Peter says: "Christ *once for all* suffered [died] for sins, a just man in the place of unjust men, that he might bring us to God." (1 Pet. iii, 18.) So the writer of "Hebrews:" "Christ *once for all* having been offered to take away the sins of many, will appear a second time, apart from sin [not obnoxious to its penalty]." (Heb. ix, 28.)

Verse 10. For the death that he died, he died as to the sin, once for all; but the life that he lives, he lives as to God.

The Greek sentence is an illustration of the terseness of an inflected language, and of this language above all. The English sentence here has twenty-six words; the Greek contents itself with just thirteen; and of these, eight are sufficient as the vehicle of the thought. "*What he died, he died to sin; what he lives, he lives to God.*"

When it is said that Christ **died as to sin**, it does not mean that he became insensate, apathetic, to its seductions, unsusceptible to its allurements; for in this ethical sense, Christ never was "alive," or propense, to sin, as other men. "He was holy, harmless, undefiled, separate from the sinful." (Heb. vii, 26.) The saying is purely forensic; it means that he, the Sacrifice for sinners, "died on the cross, as regards sin [that is, *the penalty of sin*]" ; so that he had thereafter nothing more to do with it; he ceased to

be held for its penalty ; which is all the relation that he ever bore to it.

Conversely, when it is said that **He lives as to God**, the saying can not mean that he has become ethically susceptible to God's quickening power, aglow with a new love, which he has not felt before. All this tender, intimate, spiritual relation with God we must postulate as essential to our concept of Christ, and as always having been his. This expression, too, is forensic ; and is spoken from the standpoint of Christ's mediatorial work, by which he died in the place of man, as the penalty of law. "It behooved him to die;" but he could not be held by the bonds of death ; for "it behooved him also to rise." He rose with a "renewal of life," to die no more ; and "he lives now in relation to God," "with this life which he had with the Father, before the world was."

Verse 11. Thus reckon ye also yourselves to be dead indeed as to sin, but living as to God, in Jesus Christ.

This verse is the proper apodosis of the ninth verse. We there read : "Death no longer lords it over *him*;" and now the apostle adds, as the logical conclusion of the whole matter : "In the same manner reckon ye, yourselves also dead as to sin. Ye died with Christ ; inasmuch, therefore, as ye died with his death, as to sin, *count* yourselves dead, not in any mystical or figurative sense of the word 'dead,' but in literal fact." For, of course, the death of man as to sin, and the living of man as to God, is the same as in the case of Christ, which was not figurative, but literal ; not ethical, but forensic. Christ and man have both come, in the same sense, into new, vital, and eternal relations with God. The last phrase, **in Christ Jesus**, does not mean *through* Christ, though that is also true. But that meaning does not line up with the apostle's concept here. The concept of "our *being* in Christ" is, that we are incorporate with him, in his person, members of his spiritual body. "We, the many, are one body *in Christ*." (Rom. xii, 5.)

Verse 12. Let not sin, therefore, reign in your mortal body, that ye should obey its lusts.

The word **therefore** marks the logical connection of the thought. It is as if the apostle had said, "The intent and tendency of your justification is, not to license sin, but to lead you to holiness. As justified men, count yourselves dead, forensically, as to

sin; and, *therefore*, as the practical moral lesson therefrom, do not let your daily life be incongruous with your profession. Liberty is not license. 'Justification is with a view to sanctification' (Rom. vi, 19); 'Glorify God in your body, and in your spirit, which are his' (1 Cor. vi, 20); 'Cleanse yourselves from all pollution of flesh and spirit, perfecting holiness in fear of God' (2 Cor. vii, 1).

In this verse, for the first time in the Epistle, Paul leaves the legal discussion of the subject before him, if only for a moment, to suggest a practical, moral, lesson. The digression is short; and in the fifteenth verse he returns to the legal phase of the discussion.

Paul calls the body **the mortal body**, but he never applies the adjective "sinful" to it. The body is not the *seat* of sin, which is in the will. But the body is the seat of the appetites and passions; and on its sensuous side, as "the flesh," it is the abundant occasion and instrument of sin. "The flesh lusteth against the spirit." The desires (or appetites and instincts) are natural, and in their normal action are not sinful. When an illicit object is presented to the appetites, the emotion which it excites is still natural, normal, and within the limit of innocence. So far, the action of the soul is ethically right.* But let the tempted man now beware. He has come to the dividing of the ways; if he listens to the song of the siren, if he dallies with the impure thought, he has passed the line of innocence. It is thus that James traces the growth of sin: "Each man is tempted (that is *tested*), when he is enticed by his desires. (Thus far, the motion is natural and innocent.) Then the desire, having conceived, beareth sin, but sin, when completed, brings forth death." (James i, 15.)

The word *mortal* does not describe the original or essential character of the body. Man was not created mortal, nor yet was he created definitively immortal, in himself. Which he should be, depended on the Divine will; and the Divine will was contingent on man's obedience. The law commanded, "This do, and live;" but contrariwise, it is also said, "In the day thou eatest thereof thou shalt die." The word "mortal" here suggests that sin wrought death in our body; and gives point to the injunction, "Let not sin reign in your body, which this sin itself made *mortal*."

* "Evil into the mind of God and man
May come and go, so *unapproved*, and leave
No spot or blame behind,"—*Paradise Lost*, V, 117.

Verse 13. Nor yet yield your members to the sin, instruments of unrighteousness; nay, but yield yourselves to God, as if living from among dead men, and your members to God, instruments of justification.

By members, Paul means, first, the physical organs of the body. "The body is one; and it has many members." (1 Cor. xii, 12.) But more than the organs of the body, he intends the faculties of mind and soul, in whose moral determination to right or wrong consists the *character* of the man. The word translated **instruments** is literally "arms," "weapons," as if so called, figuratively, in a military sense. But the apostle's concept is more nearly that of slavery; which is the illustration, or figure, used by him, throughout the rest of the chapter. According to this concept, man is a slave,—either the slave of sin, or the slave of God, or (as the apostle varies his expression) slave of justification. The word for "arms" is better expressed, therefore, by the depreciatory term "tools," or "thralls," which may be interpreted, for better or for worse, to suit the varying aspects of the two clauses: "Do not give up your members to sin as tools, abject thralls of unrighteousness (non-justification) but give yourselves to God as instruments, willing subjects of justification." The first verb **yield** is in the present tense, the tense of continued action; the second is in the aorist tense, of instant action. We may, perhaps, express this difference by saying, "Do not forever yield your members to sin; but yield yourselves to God at once."

Perhaps, however, we may take the phrases **of unrighteousness** and **of justification** as *adjective* elements, describing or characterizing the substantive "instruments;" as if the meaning were "instruments whose character is that of non-justification," in the one case, or "of justification," in the other.

Verse 14. For sin will not lord it over you; for ye are not under law, but under grace.

The apostle's thought is, that hitherto, in the era of law, sin has been the lord of the race; its fetters on every soul. Henceforth, in the era of grace, the sway of sin is broken. The Law was a law of condemnation; you could not find deliverance through law. But Christ's death has delivered you from the law. The scepter is now in other hands; you are not under lordship of law, but of grace. "By grace ye have been justified;" and sin will no longer have you in subjection to itself and to death. The line

of thought is forensic: there is no exhortation to holiness; but only a declaration that believers are not held under the condemnatory dominion of sin; they are Christ's freedmen. That this is the meaning is shown by the next verse: "Shall we sin, because we are . . . under grace?"

Verse 15a. JEW: What then? Shall we sin, because we are not under law, but under grace?

The sentiment, as in the first verse, is from the standpoint of the Jew, the gainsayer to the apostle's doctrine of justification from faith. The objection in the first verse and the objection in this verse express the two forms of Antinomian abuse of the doctrine of Grace. Both objections assume that, since the penalty of law is canceled, law itself is abrogated; and that we now have license to do as we list. Sin ceases to be reprehensible, and we may have its pleasures here without its penalties hereafter. The suggestion in the first verse is that, under the gospel scheme, which frees us from the Law, we may remain in sin, in order that free Grace may yet more abound,—and so cumulatively conduce to yet more license. This suggestion the apostle, in verses 2-14, has rejected as a hideous incongruity: the justified ought also to be regenerate and holy. The suggestion in the fifteenth verse substantially repeats the former suggestion that, because we are under a scheme of Grace, we may at least sin at discretion, in single instances,—as is implied by the aorist tense. But this modified suggestion also the apostle rejects as peremptorily as the first; because it would be presumption on God's forbearance, and would again bring us under slavery to sin and amenableness to its penalties.

Verses 15b, 16. PAUL: God forbid! Do ye not know that to whom ye yield yourselves slaves, with a view to obedience, slaves ye are of him whom ye obey? whether of sin—unto death? or of obedience—unto justification?

The paragraph ought to include the last words of verse 15, **God forbid!** and the objurgative tone of those words is continued in the sixteenth verse.

The phraseology for the rest of the chapter is borrowed from the system of *slavery*. For the purpose of this discussion, the apostle assumes that all men are slaves. They are slaves of the one or of the other of two masters; there is no third. These

masters, whom he here names **Sin** and **Obedience**, but afterwards "Sin" and "Justification" (verse 18), are in utter antagonism, ethically, no doubt, but here they are contrasted forensically. The service of the one is incompatible with the service of the other: "No man can serve these two masters." "He will love one, and hate the other." But, unlike the slaves of men in the kingdoms of this world, the slaves of either master here, in Paul's commonwealth, may choose which one he will serve; and, again, unlike the slaves of men, he may change his masters at his own discretion. But he *must* serve one or the other: when emancipated from one master, he by that very fact becomes enslaved to the other. Such is the scheme of slavery, as Paul conceives it, in the domain of spiritual law. This figure of slavery is found in all literature; and is especially suitable to religious conceptions. Christ says: "Every one who commits sin is slave of sin" (John viii, 35); and Peter says: "Seducers promise liberty to others, themselves being slaves of corruption; for by what one has been overcome, to this he has also been enslaved" (2 Pet. ii, 19).

The prepositional phrases here translated **unto death—unto justification** might be rendered "*tending unto death*;" or perhaps better, with a bolder rhetorical effect, we may read them as interjectional expressions of what the contrasted courses amount to—"unto death!" "unto justification!"

Death here, as always when used of the penalty of sin, means physical death; and physical death, if not "abolished" (2 Tim. i, 10), is an eternal death, the dread end of man's being. The apostle uses the word *justification* here as the opposite of "death," where we might rather have expected him to use the word "life." But this latter word is substantially the apostle's thought. Justification, the acquittal from the death penalty, is tantamount to a restoration *to life*. The concept, indeed, is sometimes expressed in full by using both words: "The result was to all men unto justification of life" (Rom. v, 18); "The spirit is life [alive] on account of justification" (Rom. viii, 10). In fact, this is always the implication in the word "justification." Life eternal is enfolded in God's sentence of acquittal from death.

Verse 17. But thanks be to God that ye were slaves of the sin, but obeyed from the heart the type of doctrine into which ye were delivered.

The first clause expresses not so much the historic fact that the believers had been slaves of sin, and Paul's thanks to God for

that fact, as rather the fact that this slavery is now a thing of the past. This is a common rhetorical form. Vergil says, "Fuinus Troës, fuit Ilium," "We *were* Trojans; Troy *was*" (*Æneid* II, 325), implying that the whole thing is now ended. The two co-ordinate clauses could be translated more logically in close coherence, as if one complex proposition: "Thank God, that, though ye were once slaves of sin, ye obeyed from the heart." The Revised has this construction of the sentence; but uses the wrong word "whereas," instead of "though," as if the apodosis expressed a consequence of the protasis.

The expression **slaves of sin** does not mean that they were once abandoned sinners morally; but that they were conceptually under bondage forensically to *law*, which takes cognizance of sin; and that they then looked to works of law for justification. A change took place in their views when they embraced the gospel scheme of justification from faith. **They obeyed the gospel from the heart**, that is, with conviction of its truth; and they were **given over**, or inducted into a very different type of doctrine from that which they before held. The thought is the same as the apostle expresses in the Epistle to the Galatians: "The Scripture shut up [counted] all mankind under sin, that the promise from faith in Jesus Christ may be given to them that have faith. But before the [dispensation of] faith came, we were kept, shut up, in word, under law, with a view to the faith that was to be revealed." (Gal. iii, 22.) The words **ye obeyed that type of doctrine** do not express a moral transformation of character, a spiritual regeneration; but a change of conviction and of attitude, a transition or turning (which the English Scriptures and theological literature name "conversion") from one creed to another, from Mosaism and works of law to the gospel of Christ, and the law of faith. It was into this *new* type of doctrine that they were now delivered, or "given over," as the new form or law of religious belief.

I repeat the caution against the interpretation of the passage as ethical, or experimental and practical. So interpreted, we shall read into the apostle's words what is not there, and lose the continuity of the argument of the Epistle. This whole chapter, and the next two chapters, contrary to the current view, are forensic, this only, in their line of thought. Paul's great theme is the difference between the Jewish plan of acceptance with God, by works of law, and the evangelical plan, by faith. He rejects the former; he establishes the latter; and, as an inference, he establishes the principle that Gentiles, too, may be accepted.

Surely the apostle knew his theme, and knew how to adhere to it.

Verse 18. But having been enframed from the sin, ye were enslaved to the justification.

The terms here employed are the technical terms of the law of slavery. A slave is **enframed**, or emancipated, when he goes free, by a legal process, from his service to his master. And a freeman who owes no service, or a slave, by transfer, is **enslaved** when he comes under service to a master. Such is the apostle's figure to illustrate man's forensic relations to law, or to grace. The sinner, upon believing in Christ, is "enframed" from his legal bondage to sin, that is, from his obnoxiousness to the penalty of sin; and in the same instant is "enslaved," or brought under a new service, to justification. The old service, and the new service, have, no doubt, very definite ethical features; but the aspects of the case here considered are wholly legal, or forensic. The believer, in his former slavery as to sin, was subject to the penalty of death; in his later service as to justification, he is acquit from penalty, and becomes heir with Christ, of eternal life.

Verse 19*a*. I speak with a human illustration, on account of your feebleness of flesh.

The words are the apostle's explanation, or semi-apology, for the sensuous, trite, commonplace figure which he has adopted to express religious concepts; and he says that he has adopted this method of illustration on account of their inability to apprehend abstract, or purely spiritual, concepts. In a similar embarrassment, he says to the Corinthians: "I was not able to speak to you as spiritual, but as carnal, as babes in Christ. I fed you milk, and not solid food." (1 Cor. iii, 1.) This illustration which he has drawn from every-day life, is intended to help this too carnal understanding of spiritual things. All these Roman Christians were familiar with the institution of slavery; and, beyond any reasonable doubt, many of them had been, or still were, themselves slaves, and had experienced literally all that Paul here describes. For example, "Those of the household of Nareissus," to whom Paul sends his greetings (Rom. xvi, 11), were formerly slaves of that luckless freedman of Claudius; and after his death, slaves in Nero's "household," though still keeping, in that larger imperial family, the name of their former master.

The allusion in the verse is to the illustration in verse eighteen, not to anything following.

The need which the apostle felt to employ this trite illustration of an abstract concept, shows the comparatively low grade of spiritual apprehension in his hearers. To *us*, familiar with such themes, and experiencing no difficulty in grasping the apostle's direct teaching, the illustration is not only not necessary, but is even harder to grasp, *and transfer*, than the abstract, or generalized, expression of the truth, or doctrine which he would convey.

Verse 19b. For just as ye yielded your members slaves to the uncleanness, and to the iniquity with a view to the iniquity, so now yield your members slaves to the justification with a view to sanctification.

We have seen, again and again, that the discussion in this Epistle is exclusively on the subject of justification from faith, the legal, or forensic, phase of the gospel; yet, as the intent of all Paul's teaching was, that men should be saved not only from the penalty of sin, but from the taint of sin, the apostle here turns aside, for a moment, from his forensic line of thought and expression, to enforce, in a single sentence, the moral lesson which arises as an inference from his argument. "As you once, under your old service to sin, gave yourselves over, slaves to uncleanness, with a view to the practice of iniquity, so now, under your new service, give your members over, slaves to justification, with a view to sanctification. The word here translated **sanctification** ἁγιασμός, expresses rather the process of sanctification, than the resultant sanctity (holiness), ἁγιασμένη. The phrase may be best rendered "with a view to growth in holiness;" as though the justified had not already attained this higher experience. The moral work in man is of long and gradual process. It is wrought out with patient continuance in well doing. We are to go on to maturity; to grow up to the fullness of the stature of mature manhood in Christ; to *become* holy, as he is holy.

This is the second, *and the last*, reference to sanctification, in this Epistle. Both references, the one in the twelfth verse, and the one in this verse, are quite incidental, almost accidental; and they might have been omitted, or relegated to the margin, without detriment to the logical connection or to the force of the argument. But perhaps they give us a suggestion or to Paul's style of preaching. When he made a point in his didactic treatment of

his subject he paused to clinch it with a pertinent exhortation. It is not until the twelfth chapter of the Epistle, after he has ended the discussion of his great theme, that he turns to "edifying" teachings on morals and practice; and not even then on "sanctification" as a specialty.

Verse 20. For when ye were slaves of sin, ye were free men as to the justification.

This is a concrete instance of the abstract saying: "No man can serve two masters." **Free** expresses the opposite of **slaves**; and the word might, perhaps, for the apostle's concept, be better rendered "freemen," or even "freedmen," the non-slaves, or ex-slaves of justification. "The slaves as to sin are freemen, or ex-slaves, as regards justification." They are under bondage as regards sin; and they earn the wages of sin, *death*; they are not under bondage as to the law of justification; and they do not reap its reward, *life*. It is in this thought, that the apostle asks the question in the next verse.

Verse 21. What fruit, therefore, were ye having then, from the things of which ye are now ashamed? for the end of those things is death.

By **fruit**, or, perhaps, better, "fruitage," is meant wages, profit, the *harvest* reaped in the days of their slavery to sin. The answer to the question is not given in the text, but is implied in the words of the next sentence, and is easily supplied: "What enjoyment? what harvest were ye having? [Nothing but misery and perdition]; for the end of those things is death." Paul elsewhere tells explicitly what the harvest is: "Whatsoever a man sows, that will he also reap. Because he that sows with a view to his flesh, from the flesh will reap destruction." (Gal. vi, 7.) Death is the penal destruction of their being. It is only in the glad "slavery to justification" that we shall find *life*. "He that sows with a view to the Spirit, from the Spirit will reap life eternal." (Gal. vi, 8.)

Verse 22. But now, having been enfrued from the sin, but having been enslaved as to God, ye have your fruit with a view to sanctification, but the end life eternal.

Slavery as to sin is *slavery* indeed; gross, degrading, wretched, deadly. All creation is intolerant of it; there is no peace to

the wicked ; there is no place in the universe for sin. Conversely, slavery as to God is bountiful, joyful, *freedom*. The twenty-first verse characterizes the harvest that is reaped from "slavery to sin;" this verse characterizes the harvest from "slavery to God." And so in the Epistle to the Galatians: "The fruitage of the Spirit is love, joy, peace, goodness, faith, meekness ; against such things there is no law." (Gal. v, 22.) "Its fruitage is with a view to sanctification ; its end is eternal life."

Verse 23. For the wages of the sin is death : but the gracious gift of God is life eternal, in Christ Jesus, our Lord.

It is a trite saying, and true, that "Sin pays wages ; God gives gifts." The wages of sin are always hardly earned ; God's "grace" is, as the word implies, always a "gratuity." The service of sin is harsh, and its wages are death ; the service of God is easy, and his gratuity is life. The latter is expressly described as eternal ; but the former, the antithesis of life, is also eternal.

CHAPTER VII.

Verse 1. Or, do ye not know, brethren (for I speak to men that know law), that the Law lords it over the man for so long a time as he lives?

We have found repeated occasions to note the two questions that are discussed in this Epistle, "*Who* may be saved?" "*How* may they be saved?" In this chapter it is the latter which particularly comes to the front. In the discussion of this theme, the apostle has already shown the legal relations of men, of all men equally, to the law of God, and the two diverse methods of justification in God's sight,—the justification from works of law, and the justification from faith in Christ. The present chapter falls into line in this argument. And the much-debated passage from verse 7 to the end of the chapter must be interpreted in this direction; and though this passage recognizes that man has a moral nature, a conscience, a knowledge of sinfulness, and a sense of amenability, it is nevertheless in no sense a discussion of Christian experience, or even of ethical issues. It belongs exclusively to the domain of forensic theology.

In the sixth chapter the apostle adopted the figure of *slavery* to illustrate the forensic relation of man to the works of law on the one side, or to the faith in Christ on the other,—the sinner's "slavery as to sin" in his degenerate state, or his "slavery as to justification" in his regenerate state. Paul's readers of the present day, with this knowledge of the gospel plan, would surely have no difficulty in understanding the apostle's teaching, even without the figure which he felt it necessary to use as an aid to the Romans for better comprehension of his abstract teachings. But in writing to the Romans he is not content with one illustration only of so vital a point. In the seventh chapter he attacks his subject afresh through the help of a second striking figure, that of *marriage*, which, of course, does not change, in the slightest degree, the

essential character of the matter in issue, but which gives his readers another aspect of man's forensic relations to law or to faith in Christ.

The apostle introduces this new illustration with the real alternative conjunction **or** (which the Authorized strangely omits); as if he had said, *Or* (to change the illustration), **do you not know—?**

Note the difference here, as always, between **law** and **the Law**. The former expresses abstract *principles*; the latter a particular *statute*. The Romans, beyond the rest of the world, had clear and definite legislation. Paul could safely appeal to them, of all men, that they "knew law." "The Law" here is the particular statute which regulates the marriage relation between husband and wife. This statute **lords it over the man** (τοῦ ἀνθρώπου, the married *person*, man or woman) **for life**. Such was, and everywhere is, the ideal marriage law. The apostle does not recognize divorce, which under the law of Christ exists but for one cause (Matt. xix, 9), and in the present discussion may be safely ignored.

Verse 2. For the wife, subject to a husband, has been bound by law to the living husband; but if the husband have died, she has been discharged from the law of the husband.

We have here, in the mention of **the wife**, a concrete instance of the general principle laid down in the first verse. It suits the purpose of the apostle to take the case of the wife, rather than of the husband; for of the two the wife is the more dependent, **subject to a husband**; and a wife, in those days, never had two husbands, though among many nations, except the Romans, polygamous husbands sometimes had more than one wife. But in carrying out the illustration, we must beware of pressing the details of the figure too closely. We need not inquire too particularly, which of the two married parties, the sinner and the law was, in Paul's conception, the husband, and which was the wife. "The parable must not go on all fours." Paul's fundamental concept was simply this, that the two parties *were married*, and that death alone severs the bond. But always it is the sinner that dies, never the law.* Yet the apostle's figure requires that the sinner, who was married to the Law, shall, the instant that he dies as to the Law (of course,

* See the first note on verse 6.

constructively), become *ipso facto* married again, to Christ. This death, and instant marriage again, of the same party, is sufficiently unnatural; but can easily be granted for the purposes of the illustration. There is in this illustration another seeming weak point, which does not appear in the illustration from slavery; namely, that not all men are married, while all men are conceivably slaves. Yet here again, for the purposes of the illustration, we may affirm, that, in the apostle's forensic sense, *all* men,—men, women, and children, all of Adam's race—are married to the Law; and that, in their death, with Christ, they "die as to the Law," and, therefore, become "married to Christ." This "marriage to Christ" may seem a strained sense of the word; yet we do not count the figure overstrained when we say that "one is *wedded* to his sins," which is a very common expression for a moral entanglement in something bad, or even in something good. The apostle's word in this paragraph is the same; the figure is the same; but he uses his figure and word wholly in a forensic sense; and does not imply that the sinner's "coveting" is enlisted, though this is also true.* As in the previous figure of slavery every man is either a slave to a master, or is freed from his master, but instantly becomes enslaved to another, so with the marriage bond: if the sinner dies as to one husband (law, or sin), he at the same instant becomes married to another husband (justification, or Christ). Indeed the apostle has the thought of slavery or of marriage so set in his mind, that he seems almost unconsciously to use the two figures interchangeably. In the sixth verse, where the figure of marriage breaks down in his application of it, because he can not use it in regard to *God*,† he reverts quite readily to the more common, and easier figure of slavery: "We become slaves to God."

Verse 3. Accordingly, then, if, while the husband is living, she become married to a different husband, she will be called an adulteress; but if the husband have died, she is free from the law, so as not to be an adulteress, though she become married to a different husband.

The verse only reiterates and emphasizes the point already affirmed, that no wife can be married to two husbands. In its

* Similarly for the figure (though, perhaps, not with the same forensic concept), John calls Christ "the Bridegroom," and the Church "his wife." "Come, I will show thee the bride, the wife of the Lamb." (Rev. xxi, 9.)

† And yet the prophets (Isa. liy, 5; Hos. ii, 2) venture on even this figure; and call God the husband of the Church, but in an ethical sense.

application to the matter in hand, it means that the sinner belongs wholly to the Law, or wholly to Justification from faith; or, to adhere to the present figure, he is married to sin (or Law); or is married to Justification from faith. All divided allegiance or service to Christ, is as abnormal, incongruous, impossible, as bigamy to a true wife.

Verse 4. So that, my brethren, ye also were put to death as to the Law, through the body of Christ, with a view to your becoming married to a different husband, the One who was raised from among dead men; in order that we may bear fruit to God.

The expression **through the body of Christ** means "*in the person of Christ.*" The apostle teaches that "we were crucified with Christ" (Gal. ii, 20); that is, "we were put to death on the cross, in the person of Christ." As members of his body, we were put to death through his body. Neither his death, nor ours with him, was mystical or figurative. His death was literal, and actual; our death, too, is to be conceived of as literal, but suffered in his person, constructively. Yet in the eye of the Law it is counted to us, forensically, as if actually endured. Such is Paul's concept; such is his teaching in this sentence, and wherever else he affirms in regard to our relation to the Law, and to Christ.

In actual life, the death of the husband dissolves the marriage relation, and leaves the wife free to marry a different husband. Such, to carry out the apostle's figure in this verse, is the case in regard to the sinner. His marriage to the Law is dissolved by his death, and he can now enter into a new marriage. "He was put to death as to the Law, his first husband, in the person of Christ." And this was done with a view to a new marriage with a different husband, even Jesus Christ, who, too, was dead, but was raised from among the dead. And this marriage took place in order that we may bear fruit to God. (Deut. xxviii, 11.)

Paul uses several terms, "the wife," "you," "we," quite promiscuously, to designate the sinner, the subject of the discussion. Yet, while he seems to change his point of view, the real *dramatis personæ* in the transaction remain the same throughout. There are two parties, only two, involved in the representation—the party of the first part, the sinner, married now to one husband, now to another and very different husband; and the party of the

second part, the husband for the time being, either the Law, or Justification, or Christ.

We must not press the figure too far. The expression "that we may bear fruit to God," while it may have been suggested by the figure of a marriage, is not to be interpreted, grossly, as meaning "to bear offspring," in the marriage state. To interpret it so, introduces a sense contrary to the whole tenor of the passage, which is simply that of a close union with the husband. Besides it is said, that "we are married to Christ, who was raised from the dead," but that "we bear fruit, not to Christ, our married husband, but to God." We are not, in the terms of the figure, "married to God;" we do not "bear offspring" to him, or, in the carnal sense, to our husband Christ; but "we bring forth the fruit of good living," to the praise of his grace. "We have our fruit, the harvest of consecrated lives, unto holiness." The same verb, "to bear fruit," is found in the next verse, in reference to "death," where the sense of "bringing forth children" is out of the question.

Verse 5. For when we were in the flesh, the sinful passions, which were through the Law, were at work in our members to bear fruit to death.

The word *flesh* expresses, properly, our human nature in its physical and psychical aspect, but not in ethical relations. But the flesh is the seat of the appetites and passions, and may through these be the occasion of our sin, though not itself sinful. When we read such expressions as "flesh of sin" (Rom. viii, 3), "the lust of the flesh" (1 John ii, 16), "the will of the flesh" (John i, 13), "the affections of the flesh" (2 Pet. ii, 18), we must understand them to involve the notion (and this only) that the flesh is *the sphere* in which the lusts or appetites display themselves. But nowhere does the Bible, or any reasonable psychology, teach, or imply, that the body, or "the flesh," as the seat of the passions, is itself sinful, or subject to condemnation. The body is but the helpless victim of sin, which belongs to the conscious *will*: and "it will be delivered from this bondage of death into the freedom of God's children." (Rom. viii, 21.)

But, secondly, from the above usage, the word "flesh," in its popular use, connotatively expresses our human nature as affected *by sin*. It thus acquires a quasi-ethical sense, and means our "degenerate self" as "naturally engendered of Adam," and con-

sidered aside from the regeneration in Christ. The passage before us, when we were in the flesh, carries us back in thought to our unregenerate and impenitent state, when we were, *ex hypothesi*, "married to sin." In this condition, before we died as to sin and became married to Christ, our sinful passions, which were through the Law,—that is, stood revealed in their deformity by the sudden flash-light of the Law—were at work in our members, but quite beneath our moral consciousness, bringing forth a harvest of death.

Verse 6. But, now, we were discharged from the Law, having died to that [marriage] in which we were being held; so that we are slaves [to God] in newness of spirit, and not in oldness of letter.

A correct translation retains the historical tense, we were discharged from the Law. The allusion is to the same words, as found in the second verse: "She has been discharged from the law of the husband;" and the explanation requires the supply of the same words here; and the translation should run: "But, as things now are, we were discharged from the Law [of the husband], having died to [the marriage] in which we were being held." The date of this discharge was that of our death with Christ, which (to carry out the figure) was conceptually our death to our former marriage with Sin, or with the Law. The English Version, "*that being dead* in which we were held," makes the Law, which, by the hypothesis, is "our husband," to have died to us; but the correct translation, as also the previous verses, and especially the Scriptural concept, makes "the wife" to die to "the husband," the sinner to die to the Law. The Law does not die.*

In the last clause, the metaphor of a marriage breaks down when applied to God; and the apostle reverts to the far easier figure of slavery: "We have become slaves to God." But see the comment and foot-note at the end of the second verse.

The phrase, in newness of spirit, and not in oldness of letter (that is, "in a new state, one of spirit; not in an old state, one of letter"), expresses the changed attitude of believers in

*The translation in the Authorized, "that being dead," follows an error in the Greek text, *ἀποθανόντος*, instead of the correct reading, *ἀποθανόντες*. The latter reading is given now in all the critical editions. The change in but a single letter changes the tenor of the whole passage.

Christ as no longer "slaves to the Law," but "slaves to God;"—whose service, however, is freedom. "Where the Spirit of the Lord is, there is freedom." (2 Cor. iii, 17.) Believers are in the new dispensation of the Spirit; and not in the old dispensation of the letter, of the Law.

Verse 7. JEW: What then shall we say? Is the Law sin?

PAUL: God forbid! Nay, but I did not know the sin, except through law; for I was not aware of lust, except the Law was saying, Thou shalt not lust.

The first words are the words of the Jew. They express his objection to the apostle's views, amounting, as he thinks, almost to a *reductio ad absurdum*. The apostle has shown again and again, and now once more, that "justification from our sin can not come from works of law, but only from faith in Christ." Works of law can not put us right with God, or relieve the burdened conscience; indeed the Law, as revealed to the Jew, has resulted only in bringing into clearer light, and in exaggerating "the passions of our sin, which have wrought in our members to bear fruit to death." It is only by dying as to law, that we enter into the service of God. The new dispensation, which is one of faith in Christ, is the abolition of the old dispensation, which was one of slavery to the letter of the Law. But the apostle's manner of expressing himself has laid him open to Jewish cavil, if not to honest misapprehension. In the preceding discussion, he declares, at one time, that "the sinner dies as to sin" (Rom. vi, 2, 10, 11); and again that the sinner "dies as to the Law" (Rom. vii, 4, 6), thus seeming to identify, or equate, "Law" with "sin." In reply to this presentation of the apostle's view, the Jew exclaims, **What then, if this is so, shall we say? Is the Law, then, sin?** If the Law does not serve for justification; if it serves only to bring our sins into stronger relief, and even "to multiply them" (Gal. iii, 19); if the Law is not counted in God's plan of justification, but gives place to Faith, is it become a thing accursed, instead of good? "*Is the Law sin?*" Certainly this question, "Is the Law sin?" is the natural and appropriate question of the Jew, who rejects Paul's premises. But the apostle meets the contentious question with his peremptory "**No! God forbid that the Law should be counted sin, a thing accursed.** Nay; but yet it was only through the office of law that I came to know sin *as sin*. I was not even conscious of lust as a matter forbidden, except that the

Law first kept telling me, 'Thou shalt not lust.' That is, Law first defined duty; and I thus came to realize my divergence from the standard that it set up."

Both the verbs, **I came to know sin**, and **I was aware of lust**, are in the indicative mode, and express matters of historical *fact*; and not of unreal conception, as in the Authorized and Revised: "I had not known." Paul looks back to the time when he "was in the flesh," in his yet unregenerate and unawakened state, under sin; and in these verbs describes how the coming of the Law startled him out of his apathy. The second clause means "I was not conscious of my lust, as a thing forbidden and sinful, but that the Law commanded, 'Thou shalt not lust.'" The word *lust* both as substantive and verb, is the proper sense of the Greek word that Paul here uses. The allusion to the "commandment" in the Decalogue (Ex. xx, 17) recalls to us the more familiar words, "Thou shalt not *covet*;" but the word "covet" is not specific enough to express Paul's definite concept here; and the word "desire" is not strong enough, and it, too, is not sufficiently precise.

Beginning with this verse, Paul's discussion through the rest of the chapter is made much more striking by the introduction, nearly fifty times, in the nineteen verses, of the personal pronoun of the first person, **I, my, me**. This use of the personal pronoun has occasioned much needless debate, as if, instead of being Paul's mere rhetorical device for lively effect, he had here turned aside from his main theme, to introduce a bit of personal history and experiences. Most interpreters in this direction, think that he is representing himself as passing through some spiritual crisis in his life, after having abandoned Judaism, and become a believer in Christ, and then these interpreters add that the apostle, speaking here as a Christian, stands as a typical representative of all Christians, because all pass through similar experiences. But whether this experience was before regeneration (which is the Arminian view), or after regeneration (which is the Calvinistic view), no one can tell. No doubt, some of the language here may have this peculiar religious significance read into it; (for all religious experiences have something in common); but to give the passage as a whole this interpretation, is to do violence to much else of the language, and, worst of all, it fails to keep the section in logical coherence with the preceding and the succeeding discussion. Paul has not gotten off the track; he has not interjected

an episode from his own history into the discussion; and these interpretations are purely fanciful, held, the one as the other, in the interest of conflicting theologies.

In reality, Paul is not speaking in the person of a Christian, but in the person of a Jew yet under the dispensation of law. He is depicting a representative Jew, "instructed according to the law of his fathers, zealous for God" (Acts xxii, 3), devout, introspective, religious, but vainly grasping after justification with God, by works of law. This is the one thing in "issue." The particular form of expression, in the first person, may possibly have come to the apostle from his own bitter personal reminiscence of ineffectual struggles to be at peace with himself, and with God: but whether he is describing his own experience or not, it is in the person of a Jew, travailing with a Jew's difficulties, that he thinks and speaks.

To comprehend the apostle's thought, we must hold to the view so often insisted on, that the discussion is wholly from the *forensic* standpoint. Is man justified from his sins by works of law, as the synagogue taught? or is he justified from faith in Christ, as the gospel teaches? And Paul's discussion in this passage is an attempt to show the dead failure of the former method, as portrayed in the experience of a typical Jew. There is no distinctively gospel element in the passage, no Christian experience described, no experience at all, different from that of any devout Jew; or improbable, indeed, for any serious heathen, like Confucius, or Socrates, or Seneca. There is no allusion to the doctrines of Grace, or to witness of the Spirit, or to holiness of heart,—only the forlorn failure of justification from works, only the condemnation of law that rises dreadful and inevitable before the speaker. There is no reference to Christ in all the passage, until, at the very end of it, the speaker, in despair of justification from law, with a cry of anguish, "O wretched man, I," turns to inquire, "Who, then, will deliver me from this death?" and, thus, abandoning all hope of help from works of law, he finds the only answer to his burdened soul is "*Christ*."

The paragraph from the seventh to the thirteenth verse, is purely *historical*; all the verbs in the narrative are in the past (aorist) tense. These verbs, as we have seen, carry us back to the time when Paul, or the Jew in whose person he speaks, "was in the flesh;" the time when he knew of no other way of justification before God than from works of law; yet was all the while only

too conscious that his life and works did not measure up to the standard of the law; and that he was left carnal, sold under sin, subject to condemnation. Paul looks back to this period, and finds no comfort in the thought of law. No doubt it was holy, and just, and good, but to him it was *death!* In this striking description of the inability of the law, Paul is doubtless but expressing what he himself, though a zealot for the Law, once felt in his secret heart. The whole narrative is an intense, acute analysis of the inmost feelings and struggles of an awakened, despairing soul, which in its agony grapples with the great problem, the greatest of problems, and finds no solution: "How shall man be just with God?" "Wherewithal shall I come before the Lord, that I may appease his wrath?" And Judaism has no answer.

The *historic* description in verses 7-13 soon ceases to be vivid enough to suit the apostle's rush of thought; and after the fourteenth verse he brings his verbs forward into the glowing light of the present tense. But though there is a change of tense, there is no new phase of experience; only a new accentuation of the old, and we must date all the experience so described back to the dispensation of law.

Verse 8a. But the sin, having taken a vantage ground, through the commandment wrought out in me all lust.

The figure in the first clause is military. The **vantage ground** is a "base," or starting-point, for a strategic movement. Paul says that Sin has seized a vantage ground, and by a sudden attack has wrought him ruin. The "vantage ground" was the natural appetites for everything that will pander to the gratification of the senses. These natural appetites, which are good in themselves, were given to man for his happiness; it is the abuse of them, and not the proper enjoyment of them, that brings sin and death. And it is the abuse, so almost inevitable in our degenerate state, that Paul here expresses by the last word in the sentence, **lust**, which word, once a synonym for innocent *desire*, has now taken on an offensive sense. The verb **wrought out** lust does not mean *created* lust. The seeds for this ill harvest were already planted and germinant in human nature; and needed but the Ithuriel touch of law to make them, like the classic "dragon's teeth," spring to armed life. The verb "wrought out" is practically a synonym here for "brought out." The thought is the same as in Paul's language elsewhere: "All things that are re-

proved, are made manifest by the light." (Eph. v, 13.) The verse thus means that Sin (the personified sinfulness in our nature) found a weak place in our defenses, the appetites of our degenerate nature, and through the commandment wrought out, brought out, into full growth and activity, *all lust*.

Verses 8b, 9, 10. For, apart from law, sin was dead. But, as for me, I was alive, apart from law, once; but when the commandment came, sin sprang to life, but I died; and the commandment which was ordained with a view to life, this was found by me unto death.

The first clause here is part of the eighth verse, but ought to go with the ninth, as I have given it.

Some critics, and the Revised, read the first clause, "Sin is dead," making it a mere gnome, or general maxim, as in the verse "Where there is no law, there is no transgression." (Rom. iv, 15.) But the clause in our text is a part of Paul's *narrative* of his experience, and correlates historically to the answering clause in the ninth verse: **Sin was dead . . . sin sprang to life.** The Authorized here is correct.

The saying in the first verse above connects back to the word **commandment** (which is equivalent to "law"), and the clause, then explains that the commandment, or law, being dormant, had not always had its normal way and sway in the earth. In point of fact, both the law and sin had always been present in the world; but they had not always come into conscious collision in the hearts of men. **Law was absent, and sin was dead**—not in reality, but only to the then present consciousness of men. It was not so, but so it seemed. Law was present, but not always recognized as condemnatory; sin, too, was always present, but not always thought of as sinful. When the conscience was dormant, the condemnation of law was not realized; and "sin was dead," as if (how grave the mistake!) it did not exist. No! Sin was not "dead," but really as alive and damnable as on the day when Adam fell, or on the day when Paul wrote this chapter; and the Paul described in this narrative was only conceptually alive, **apart from law**, but was really as dead (that is, doomed to death) as on the fatal day, later, in which his conscience and his consciousness awoke to the fact that he was indeed a sinner; and that "the word of God is alive, and active, sharper than any sword, . . . able to discern the feelings and thoughts of the heart." (Heb. iv, 12.)

The next clause, **when the commandment came**, does not imply that it has not always been present and regnant among men, so far as the purpose of God was concerned; but that it only now *came home* to Paul's quickened conscience.* It came empanoplied, his foe. His consciousness of sin came to life. Sin lived, and slew him. How sad his words: "I was living, once; but I died. Once I had no sense of condemnation: then suddenly I felt the sentence of death in myself; and the commandment, which, in God's plans, was normally intended to bring justification and life, was found in my bitter experience to result in condemnation and eternal death!"

Verse 11. For the sin having taken a vantage ground, through the commandment deceived me, and through it put me to death.

The thought of the eighth verse is here repeated with a telling addition: "Sin, through the coming of the law, deceived me." The word is used from the Jewish point of view. The self-satisfied Jew "rested on law, and boasted in God, and was confident that he was upright, because he had in the law the *form* of knowledge and of the truth." (Rom. ii, 17.) To him the law was a system of outward observances, and in minding these, he verily thought that he was rendering obedience to God, and meriting his approval. But he was blind to his spiritual condition before the law. Then, suddenly, he awoke to the fact that he had totally mistaken the character of God's law. It was a law of ethical tenor, and of stringent tenure; it looked at the inward motives, not at the outward service; and it was pitiless towards the slightest non-fulfillment of its demands; it was a searcher of the heart, and pierced even to the dividing asunder of soul and spirit. As such, the law had caught him defenseless against its attack. In his fancied security he had expected no such waking up and shaking up. "Sin, through the commandment, deceived him." This blind sense of security gave place to an equally blind terror; and he felt that the Law had slain him.

Such is the way it seemed to him *as a Jew*; but, perhaps, at a later day, the Christian apostle would more truly have said, from the gospel point of view, that the coming of the law "*undecided* him," by showing him his true self as a lost sinner, without reconciliation with God, and knowing no way of justification.

* "The law hath not been dead, though it hath slept;
— now 't is awake."—"Measure for Measure," II, 2.

Verse 12. So that the Law, indeed, is holy, and the commandment is holy, and just, and good.

This verse is the answer to the question in the seventh verse, "Is the Law *sin*?" The discussion in the intervening verses shows that it is not the Law, but sin which is responsible for the death of man. The Law of God, like its Giver, is **holy**; and the commandment [the tenth commandment of the Decalogue is meant, which commands, Thou shalt not covet ("lust")] is **holy, and just, and good**. The triple predicates are a rhetorical climax; but we may easily discriminate their several senses: the commandment [the Law] is holy in its ethical character, just in its prescriptions, good in its aims.

This verse ends the paragraph beginning with the seventh verse. The thirteenth begins with a new Jewish objection against the apostle's views, and the discussion to which it leads runs through the rest of the chapter. But it is in the same line of thought as the foregoing paragraph—the ineffectual struggle for justification by Jewish works of law.

Verse 13. JEW: "Did then the good [that which is good in the Law] become death to me?"

PAUL: "God forbid! Nay, but the sin [become death to me]: in order that it may appear sin, through the good [that is in the Law], working out death to me; in order that through the commandment the sin may become exceeding sinful."

The Jew's point-blank question in verse 7, "Is law sin?" by which he thought to silence the apostle's argument that law does not justify the sinner, has been answered. But the Jew has yet a further difficulty before he can accept the apostle's creed that Faith is the sole justification. If the law, the law of Jewish works, does not result in justification, as the Jews held that it did, but in condemnation and death; and if (as Paul declares), it is nevertheless not the law *per se* that thus results; is there then something *in* the law (and, of course, something **good**) which has this fatal result? If not the law itself directly, did the good that is in the Law indirectly become death to me? Is there some feature of the law, or something in its working, that is warped to this unintended and unexpected result? The apostle still says *No!* "Not the law itself, nor any feature in the law, has brought death; but as I said before, it was *sin* that became death to me." Sin

became death to me that it might be shown to me to be, not a trivial thing, but *sin* in its true, damning character, through the provisions of law, that were intended for good only, working out death to me. Yes; sin works out death; through the commandment, to the end that sin may become, and may be felt to be, exceedingly sinful.

Verse 14. For we know that the Law is spiritual; but I am carnal, sold under the sin.

The word **for** assigns the reason, and connects the clause in which it stands to "God forbid" of the previous verse, "God forbid that the good (in the law) should have become death to me: **for we know that the Law is spiritual**" [that is, works in a different sphere]. The adjective "spiritual" signifies not so much the divine *origin* of the law (though this, too, lies in the word), as the divine *character* of the law. It rules in the sphere of holiness, justice, goodness; and can not be charged with man's failure to attain justification, and with man's death. The responsibility for this failure is not in the law, but in man's unspiritualness. **I am carnal**, under the appetites of the flesh, a slave **sold under the dominion of sin**, a chattel for purchase and sale.

The last words are a key to the following passage (verses 15-25). The several specifications are such as eminently describe an unregenerate, but not unspiritual man, and can be fairly explained, *on the whole*, only on this basis. True, some of these sayings, though only some, can be aptly spoken of regenerate men; but those same things, and all of them, can be spoken of *all* men, of unregenerate men as well as of the saints. In all men conscience survives, and the natural instinct towards goodness, and much knowledge of God's will; but the flesh is weak; and, so, unregenerate men have only "a certain fearful expectation of judgment, and of fiery indignation." (Heb. x, 27.) I think it would be possible to parallel every God-ward saying here with sayings equally God-ward from writers who never heard the names of Moses and Jesus; and to parallel the despairing expressions with confessions, alas! equally explicit, of human weakness to do God's will, or to stand acquit in his sight. All men were made in God's image, and still keep it:

"Their form has not yet lost
All the original brightness, nor appears
Less than archangel ruined; and th'excess
Of glory obscured."—"Par. Lost," I, 591.

Verse 15. For what I work out, I do not know ; for not what I will, this I practice ; nay, but what I hate, this I do.

In this verse we have a comprehensive and terse statement of the tremendous inconsistencies in human will and human action. The word feebleness of the *will* is the foremost feature in the whole description. Very rightly, the apostle nowhere says that man *can* not do better ; he says “ they *do* not do better, because they *will* not. The three discriminate verbs that the apostle uses cover the whole range of moral action—**work out, practice, do.** The Authorized confounds them and obscures the sense of the passage. The clause, **I do not know** (to which the Authorized incorrectly gives an ethical turn, “ I *allow* not”) literally means, “ I have no knowledge of ;” but it rather expresses heedless inattention. It is not ignorance, but *ignoring* ; and we might well explain it by the expressive colloquialism, “ *I do it blind.*” It is what Isaiah said, “ Israel doth not know, my people *doth not consider.*” (Isa. i, 3.)

Verse 16. But if what I will not, this I do, I concede to the Law that it is right.

The predicate **right** (*καλός*) is different from either of the terms used in the twelfth verse to characterize the Law. They were specific ; this word is the general Greek word of approval (our colloquial “ all right”). The apostle here declares the Law “ right ” in itself and in its bearings.

Our deliberate approval in the forum of conscience of what is right, while at the same time we wantonly cleave in practice to what is wrong, is the standing tribute of unregenerate human nature to the *rightness* of God’s law. Ever out of bad lives, our judgment and conscience rise in protest to what we do. We know, and do not. There is no unregenerate man who does not know virtue from vice, and who is not also conscious that his approval of the one does not restrain him from the other. Long before Paul wrote these words, Ovid expressed the common bias of men towards the wrong, and the failure of reason or of law to hold men in check : “ My mind persuades me to one course, my lust to another. I see the better course and approve it ; I follow the worse course.”

Verse 17. But now it is no longer I that work it out, but the sin dwelling in me.

The language is figurative; Paul personifies Sin, and installs it in the very citadel of his soul—dwelling in me. The verse describes the inner strife in every unregenerate man between his better judgment and his ruling impulses to sin. His conscience commands, but his passions are yet more imperious, and he yields to them. "Sin dwells in me, and I (weaking!) work out what it wills."

Verses 18-20. For I know [am aware] that in me, that is, in my flesh, (there dwells naught) good; for to will is present with me, but to work out the right, not. For the good which I will, I do not; nay, but the evil which I will not, this I practice. But if what I will not, this I do, it is no longer I that work it out; nay, but the Sin dwelling in me.

The conjunction *for*, as usual, assigns the proof of the preceding proposition. The three verses give the proof *in extenso*. They describe the habitual conflict in man's moral being between his conscientious impulse to do right and the ever-prevalent inclination to yield to his evil appetites. Normally, his better nature points him in one direction; his passions drive him headlong in the other. And the logical conclusion is what he before asserted: "It is not I (my true self) that am in control, but the sin which leads me captive at its will."

Yet we must understand this declaration of the impotence of the will as figurative only, or at least as but a partial truth. It expresses the position of the sinner, who sees how hopeless the appeal to law for justification, but who at the same time ignores the other, and efficient, justification from faith. And so, all through the paragraph, Paul is far from disclaiming personal responsibility for what he does. He is ever conscious that he sins voluntarily, and can abstain from sinning; though so strong is the surge of his passions, he declares himself unable to resist. It is the common plea of unregenerate men, who palter with their convictions and their conscience. But it is in this very sense of amenability that constitutes the strife in his bosom. The sinner writhes in the folds of the anaconda; but, unlike Vergil's Laocoön, he can uncoil the folds, and be free, if he really *wills* it. The strife

in his bosom can end only in his stupefying his conscience, or in his submission of his will to the obedience of Christ. With most men it continues till the end of life; continues until, too often, habit has hardened into "another law, within their members." They "resolve and reresolve; then die the same."

Verse 21-23. I find then the law to me who will to do the right, that the evil is present with me. For I accord with the Law of God after the inward man; but I see a different law in my members, warring against the law of my mind, and leading me captive to the law of sin, which is in my members.

These verses, introduced by the words **I find then**, express the despondent conclusion of the whole matter. It sums up the case of the sinner from the standpoint of law—that is, from the standpoint of Judaism—in which man is speculatively left to his natural strength to work out his own justification.

The construction of the twenty-first verse is involved, but the sense is plain. The substantive clause, **that the evil is present with me**, is appositive to **the law**, and explains it. The meaning is, "I find, then, the law that the evil is present with me; this the law I find confronting me when I will to do the right."

The word *law* here is used in a peculiar sense. It is not, as in previous occurrences of the word, a *rule of action*; but, as in the oft-abused phrase, "law of nature," means only a uniform *order of sequence*, the established condition of things. To the self-indulgent sinner it amounts to the constant, enchaining *habit*. The sinner has yielded himself to the dominance of his "pleasant vices until they have become instruments to plague him; the wheel has come full circle," and he feels that he can not (that is, he *will* not) throw off their dreadful incubus. Dr. Jekyll sometimes abandons himself, wantonly, to do evil, in the character of Mr. Hyde. At last, to his dismay, he *becomes* the malignant Mr. Hyde, and dies in the vain effort to recover his proper self. The fallen archangel in Pandemonium boasted that he would "ascend and repossess his native seat;" but he never did it.

In the twenty-second verse, the word **accord** might be equally well translated by "sympathize," but certainly not by "rejoice in." It does not express exultation, but only the sinner's instinctive, involuntary, *shuddering* moral approval of the Law of

God which condemns him. The unconverted sinner, like Satan in Paradise,

“ ——— Feels how awful goodness is, and sees
Virtue in her shape how lovely ; sees, and pines
His loss.” —“ Paradise Lost,” iv, 847.

In verse 16 the word **concede** denotes the assent of the reason ; **accord** (or sympathize) denotes the movement of the feelings. Even unregenerate men intuitively approve goodness and virtue. This approval the apostle expresses by the phrase, **according to the inward man** ; which term denotes simply man’s moral being as “ made in the image of God,” but without connoting either regenerateness of nature or unregenerateness. Here, however, it is, of course, the latter.

In verse 23 the phrase, **the law of my mind**, is but another term for the Law of God, as it stands approved by my mind,—by my reason and conscience ; and the phrase, **the law of sin**, is an enlarged description of the law named in verse 21. “ The law of sin ” is the fixed *habit* which is in his members, the habit of instant, and facile, and fatal compliance with sin.

Such is Paul’s description of the helpless and hopeless condition of the natural man before the Law,—a slave to sin, hating his fetters, yet ever hugging them closer to himself. It is the apostle’s portrait of himself that he has limned—his portrait in the days of his Jewish seeking after God according to the ways of his fathers ; but it is also the portrait of any introspective and serious man. The description finds its parallel, with greater or less clearness and intensity, in all human experience, in Christian, in Jewish, and in heathen lands alike. Nor did Paul, nor does any man, find any way of relief outside of the gospel. “ Man is not justified from works of law, nor at all except through faith in Jesus Christ.” (Gal. ii, 16.)

Verses 24, 25. Wretched man, I ! Who will deliver me from this body of death ? Thanks be to God [deliverance will be] through Jesus Christ, our Lord. Accordingly, then, I myself with the mind indeed, serve the Law of God, but with the flesh the law of sin.

The expression **this body of death** means this body which is made the sway of death. We may compare with it the expression, “ the body of sin ” (Rom. vi, 6), as explained by Rom. vi, 12, “ Let

not sin *lord it* in your body, so that ye shall obey its lusts." So in our text, Paul describes the body as the tool, the medium, of death; and conceives of himself, in his inward humanity, his higher self, as the helpless slave and victim of his own body. He resolves aright, but is swept away from his good resolutions, by this body of appetite, and of sin, and of death. From the domination of this body he cries to be delivered, of course not by a literal death, but by a moral revolution, a new order of things, which will put his now masterful body beneath his foot, and make him lord of himself.

The last clause in the chapter, passing over the interjectional clause **Thanks be to God!** as a mere parenthesis, is logically connected by the conjunction **therefore** with the whole of the preceding paragraph. It must be taken accordingly as the summing up of the entire discussion from the seventh verse. It is the utterance still of the unregenerate Jew, the deliberate conclusion of a man at war with himself. Nevertheless, the emphatic pronoun **I myself** is probably suggested by the words in the parenthesis. "I myself" evidently contrasts the apostle, in his own strength (which is but weakness), under the Law, with the man that finds deliverance in Christ.

The word **I serve** is, literally, "*I slave it.*" (Rom. vii, 6.) The saying, "With my mind *I am a slave* to the Law" denotes first, doubtless, that the apostle with all his reason and conscience, sides with the Law of God; but the verb "I slave it" also connotes that this approval is not a joyful one. For an unregenerate man it *smacks of slavery!* He renders this tribute to the Law, not because he loves it, but because he *must!* "With my mind (not with my heart), I *serve* the Law of God; but with my flesh (the seat and tool of the appetites), I *serve* the law of sin." Hitherto, the apostle (that is, the Jew under the dispensation of Law), has seen but one thing, sin and Sinai. He has had no vision or conception of anything else. In accordance with his line of thought, from the standpoint of Jewish law, he has *talked law*; and has not seemed to have thought of any other justification than *through law*. Until at last! Desperate of relief from law, at last he cries, **Who will deliver me?** The truth and the light burst on him, and the joyful words now spring to his lips, **Thanks! through Christ!** "Christ is the end of the law to justification, to every one that has faith" (Rom. x, 4); "From all things from which ye could not be justified in the Law of Moses, in *him* every one that has faith is justified" (Acts xiii, 39).

CHAPTER VIII.

Verse 1. There is, therefore, now no condemnation to them that are in Christ Jesus.

In attempting the interpretation of this chapter we must keep in mind the dogmatic aim of the Epistle as already described. It treats of but one thing, justification before God; and involves but the two questions: *First*, Who may be justified? and, *second*, On what ground may they be justified? The common interpretation, that the Epistle is a complete body of divinity, a general treatise of theology, and that the first five chapters discuss the doctrine of justification and the next three (vi-viii) the doctrine of sanctification, is, as we have seen, untenable. The subject of sanctification does not come within the scope of this Epistle any more than of the Epistle to the Galatians. And any interpretation of the epistle, or any leading section of it, that brings sanctification to the front, misses the apostle's dogmatic aim, and reads into his words meanings which (though possibly true in themselves) are not logically in place, and which displace other meanings of more moment to this symmetric presentation of "his gospel."

In the seventh chapter the apostle has shown that, to the Jews who appeal to the Law for justification, there is condemnation, nothing but *condemnation*. There is no relief to the gloomy picture which he has painted of the hopelessness of pardon and peace through law. "As many as are of the works of law are under a curse." (Gal. iii, 10.) But in the beginning of the eighth chapter he turns from these Jewish zealots of law, who yet find no comfort in it, to the Gentile believers in Christ, and to their justification through faith. His first words declare the far different condition of the Gentiles who are "not under law:" **There is no condemnation to those who are in Christ.** This is his description of the Gentiles specifically in contradistinction from the Jews who appeal to law, and are "under the curse." The Gentiles are, con-

ceptually, those "who are in Christ," justified in him. They fill the apostle's horizon, to the exclusion of the Jews. And his discussion throughout the eighth chapter is with regard to them exclusively. It is true that he does not use the word "Gentiles" in this chapter; but his line of thought is antithetic to that of the seventh chapter, which treats of the Jews, and the terms he here employs, and the parallelism with his sayings elsewhere, expressly in regard to the Gentiles, determine the limitations of his meaning. The discussion here goes on under the quiet assumption that he is speaking, not of all mankind collectively, including the Jews, nor yet of the Jews apart from others, but of the Gentiles specifically as such, of the Gentiles alone. Numerically, the Gentiles were, of course, the vast majority of the race; but though that fact was, doubtless, ever present in Paul's thought, yet the sense of their vastness of number was lost in the more significant thought that they were "*Gentiles*," with all that the word connoted. It was of them as *Gentiles*, as the real elect of God, that he thought and wrote.

In this verse, the word **therefore** expresses the connection of the chapter with something in the preceding discussion. The nearest immediate point of tangency for this connection is Paul's confession of faith, in the twenty-fifth verse of the seventh chapter: "I shall be rescued through Jesus Christ." But the logical conclusion in our text justifies us in giving the word "therefore" a still wider reference, and including as its premises the entire previous discussion in regard to the doctrine of justification from faith. In the seventh chapter, the apostle has shown that the reliance of the Jews *upon law* has no foundation in Scripture, or in human experience. "By works of law will no flesh be justified." And he concludes that part of the discussion with the despairing words, "Wretched man, I; who will rescue me?" This question, the apostle, once in the days of his ignorance and adhesion to Moses, could not have answered; or would have answered it amiss. The whole of the seventh chapter declares his unavailing struggle, a Jew, a Pharisee, with this great spiritual problem. But now, from the standpoint of the gospel, a Christian, he is able to answer, "I thank God, I shall be rescued through Jesus Christ, our Lord." Here is Paul's new profession of faith. He no longer looks to Moses for justification, but to Christ. He has come to believe that "No man can come to the Father except through him" (John xiv, 6); "His is the only name given under heaven, whereby

we must be saved" (Acts iv, 12); "Christ, and not Moses, is our wisdom and justification and satisfaction and redemption" (1 Cor. i, 30). Yet, in point of fact, even under the Law of Moses, the gospel plan had all along been the only way by which any man was ever really justified. "Apart from law, God's plan of justification has been manifested, being witnessed to by the Law, and the Prophets, God's plan of justification through faith in Jesus Christ, unto *all* who exercise faith [Gentiles as well as Jews]; for there is no difference among men." (Rom. iii, 21.) But it was only now that Paul had come to understand this simple and gracious scheme.

Verse 2. For the law of the spirit of life in Christ Jesus enfreed me from the law of the sin and the death.

This ratiocinative structure of Paul's sentences is a marked feature in his writings. The argumentative conjunction *for* is his favorite connective. It is found one hundred and fifty times in this Epistle, and seventeen times in this chapter, everywhere explicative, and never merely continuative. The word here connects back to the word "no condemnation" in the previous verse: "There is no condemnation; for Christ freed me from the damnable law." In this verse Paul still retains the *singular* pronoun "I," which had such rhetorical prominence in the seventh chapter; but as it is not personal, but only representative, he drops it after this verse.

The word **law** here does not mean either "statute" or "order of succession," the two general senses of "law;" but rather principle or prevalence. **The law of the spirit of life in Christ** is the supremacy of the Holy Spirit which brings life to the soul. This "life" is the "life which is realized in Christ Jesus." Paul uses the same words to Timothy: "The promise of life which is in Christ Jesus." (2 Tim. i, 1.) He that is "in Christ" is a sharer with him in his life, as Jesus promised: "The Spirit will take of that which is mine, and will declare it to you." (John xvi, 14.) In a similar way, **the law of sin and death** means the dominance or sway of sin and death in our sinful nature. From the dominion of "this law in my members" (Rom. vii, 23), the "law of the Spirit freed me." The historical term here carries us back to the great act of redemption, in which Christ, by his death, **enfreed us**, "emancipated" us, from slavery to the law of sin and death. Paul's pronouns in this passage illustrate how, as if

quite unconsciously, he changes his standpoint from time to time, yet all the while having but one real subject in his mind. In this verse he says, **Christ set me free**; in the fourth verse he says, "that the law may be fulfilled in *us*;" in the fifth verse he says, "*they* that are according to the Spirit, mind the things of the Spirit;" and in the ninth verse he says, "*Ye* are not in the flesh, but in the Spirit." His words change, but not his thought. Though Paul's gospel recognizes that Christ's redemption is operative normally, constructively, for every member of the race, yet throughout the passage, throughout the chapter, he thinks of the Gentiles only, and in effect speaks in regard to the Gentiles only. Sometimes he speaks of himself as one of them: "For I have become as ye are" (Gal. iv, 12); sometimes he speaks of them; sometimes directly to them.

Verse 3. For,—the thing impossible to the Law, in that it was weak through the flesh,—God, having sent his own Son in sameness with the flesh of sin, and for sin, condemned the sin, in the flesh.

The grammatical construction has been in debate. The Authorized and the Revised leave the sentence anacoluthic; but the literal translation here given, correctly punctuated, yields the proper grammatical construction, and the appropriate sense. As to the connection, the word **thing** is in the objective case, appositionive in concept to the verb **condemned**. As to the sense, the apostle's thought is, that the Law is **weak**, or impotent, through the proclivity of the flesh (unregenerate human nature) to sin; a proclivity that the Law can not overcome or eradicate. We must not interpret the saying that **the Law could not condemn sin in the flesh** as meaning, "could not *reprobate* sin, or pass sentence upon it;" for this is just what it could do, and it was the only thing it could do. It brought sin out in darker colors; it multiplied, accentuated, the "offense;" it slew the sinner. But it could not give life! Law when it came into collision with sin, had not its primal justificatory function, but only its condemnatory function. It could pass judgment upon sin; but it could not slay sin. This latter point is what Paul meant by the "inability of the Law to condemn sin;" he meant only that it could not annul sin in the flesh. "But what the Law could not do, the atonement of Christ was adequate to do. God sent his Son in the sameness with sinful man, and as an atonement for sin, and through him condemned *and slew* sin in the flesh."

The phrase "flesh of sin" does not imply that the flesh is sinful in itself; but means only that the body, or our physical human nature, is the seat of the appetites, and so becomes the seat of sin. The body is material, and has no moral quality; the *will* alone is sinful. But as "the flesh" is the pander to the sinful appetites, and is corrupt and defiled by sin, it is easy by a rhetorical turn, to call it "the sinful flesh." Yet in our generic human nature there was no essential sinfulness or corruptness, so that "the Word should not become flesh, and dwell among us" (John i, 14); "He was manifested in flesh" (1 Tim. iii, 16); yet "was himself without sin." It was in this flesh, which, in all other men, is proclive to sin, that Christ was born: "God sent him in the sameness with sinful flesh." "For both he who sanctifies, and they who are sanctified, are all *of one*. . . . Since, then, they were partakers of flesh and blood, he also in like manner partook *of the same*; that through his death, he may destroy him that has the power of death." (Heb. ii, 11, 14.) Christ came in the *sameness* with human nature, not in a semblance. He was a real man, not a phantom, as the Docetists taught. Christ's supernatural conception and birth from the Virgin Mary, gave him all of human nature, without the racial entail of sin. It is true that this great fact, reported by Matthew and Luke, is not alluded to in the Epistle.* Yet Paul's silence is not an evidence of ignorance of the facts, or of disbelief. On the contrary, the apostle's abundant teaching of Christ's incarnation is reconcilable with it all, if it does not imply it all.

The phrase **and for sin** is a common one in the Septuagint; it is found fifty-five times in Leviticus alone; and is often translated, rather freely, in the Authorized, by the term "a sin-offering." Yet the noun "sin" standing alone, never, of itself, has the meaning of "a sin-offering," not even in Paul's words: "Him who knew no sin, he made *sin* for us" (2 Cor. v, 21), where, as so constantly in Hebrew, a substantive is used for an adjective; and the word means, forensically, *sinful, guilty*. "Him who knew no sin, God counted sinful in our stead." The phrase "and for sin" finds its explanation in the words of Peter, "Christ once for all suffered

* Paul knew Christ only as the risen Lord, glorified and divine; and, therefore, probably dwelt less in his thoughts, and in his writings, on the details and incidents of the Savior's earthly life. He must have known of all these temporal facts concerning the humanity of Jesus; but they paled and receded before the splendors of the Vision that he saw on the way to Damascus, and of the Vision that he saw in the temple.

for our sins" (1 Pet. iii, 18); and in the words of John, "And he himself is the propitiation for our sins." (1 John ii, 2.) The words "for sin" in our text assign the occasion for Christ's coming, that, by his death, he might atone for the sin of the world. Aside from this need, there is no satisfactory explanation of Christ's incarnation.

In the saying "he condemned (that is, abolished) sin, in the flesh," we must connect the phrase "in the flesh" not with the noun "sin," but with the verb "condemned," just as in Ephesians, "Having annulled in his flesh the enmity." Thus construed, the word "flesh," in the sentence "He condemned in his flesh the sin," refers to Christ's own body, and expresses his vicarious death on the cross, by which he was, constructively, "made sin [sinful] for us." "He died as to sin" (Rom. vi, 10), forensically, in order to condemn sin as exhibited in men, and to abolish it. We died with him once for all; and consequently sin has no longer a legal sway over us; as is expressed in the next verse.

Verse 4. In order that the justification of the Law may be fulfilled in us, who walk not according to flesh, but according to spirit.

The primal purpose of law was not condemnation, but justification. Its voice to man was, "These things do, and live." And man would have been justified by law except for the intrusion of sin, which perverted it into a law of condemnation. But now the vicarious death of Christ has condemned sin, and canceled its guilt, in order that the justification, which the law was intended to effect, but which it failed to effect on account of sin, may be yet fulfilled in us. But it is fulfilled in us now, not through works of law, but through faith in Christ. This justification through Christ attaches normally from birth to all the race; but for adults who have the capacity and the responsibility of personal choice it is practically realized by those only who are spiritually minded: who walk, not on the lower plane of the flesh, obedient to its evil impulses, but on the higher plane of the spirit, the inner life, approving and practicing what is right. The word **spirit** here, as the connection shows, means man's own inward nature: and so in some of the other places in these verses, from the fourth to the ninth, inclusive. But the same word may mean the Holy Spirit. The difference is marked in the translation by printing *Spirit* and *spirit*.

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

The expression here, *to be according to flesh—according to spirit*, means almost the same as the expression in the previous verse, “*to walk according to flesh—according to spirit.*” The two classes described are those that live and are in the sphere of the lower, baser motive and aim, and those that are in the sphere of the higher and nobler motive. The one class **mind the things of flesh**; that is, they savor of, or are propense to these things; their thoughts and affections are directed to the gratification of their grosser animal appetites; and the other class **mind the things of the spirit**, the loftier things of their better nature: “they seek the things that are above.”

Verse 6. For the mind of the flesh is death; but the mind of the spirit is life and peace.

The two clauses characterize the diverse tendencies of human nature, and the diverse issues of each. The word **mind**, “minding” (or possibly we might say “mindedness”), expresses the propension, or settled bent, of the animal man, or of the spiritual man. The affections and acts of the one tend to **death**; of the other, to **life and peace**.

Verse 7, 8. Because the mind of the flesh is enmity against God: for it is not subjected to the Law of God; for neither can it be; but they that are in flesh can not please God.

The flesh is propense to evil; it is absorbed in the impulse to self-gratification; it does not submit to the restraints of law. The appetites of the flesh demand forbidden fruit; it eats, and thus, in the figurative language describing the Fall, “becomes God to itself” (Gen. iii, 5); that is, it usurps what belongs to God, namely, to make its own law. They who live in this sphere of self can not please God; their carnal life, **the mindedness of the flesh**, is enmity towards God, and is death. Yet, under the gospel scheme, **those who are now in the flesh** may come to be in the spirit. Such are they whom Paul addresses in the next verse.

This verse and the tenth verse give us other instances of the Hebrew construction of substantives for adjectives: **enmity** for hostile; **life** for alive.

Verse 9. But ye are not in flesh; nay, but in spirit, if, in fact, the Spirit of God dwells in you. But if any man has not the Spirit of Christ, this man is not his.

Notice that the hypothetical conjunction **if**, twice used in this verse, with the indicative mode (**if the Spirit of God dwells in you, and, if any one has not the Spirit of Christ**), expresses concepts of *fact*, and not of contingency, as in the Authorized ("dwell, have"), and in the Revised ("if *so be*").

These words include, by parity of conditions, *all* men who accept Christ as the ground of justification. But the apostle here addresses only *the Gentiles*, whom the Jews regarded outside of the provisions of the gospel; but whom he holds as "in Christ Jesus." (Rom. viii, 1.) He uses the emphatic pronoun: "But **YE**, Gentiles, are not in flesh." This phrase, **in flesh**, has sometimes a literal significance, "in the body;" as the apostle uses it elsewhere of himself, "It is no longer I that live, but Christ lives in me; but the life which I now live *in flesh*, I live in the faith of the Son of God" (Gal. ii, 20); and this sense holds true of believers in Christ: "They are in flesh." But the phrase sometimes has an ethical significance, meaning the carnal affections. It is in this ethical sense that Paul uses the term here; and he says to the Gentile believers, "Ye are *not* in flesh, **but in spirit**. Once they were in flesh, when the sinful passions in their members were "bringing forth fruit to death" (Rom. vii, 5); but now they stand in new relations to law, on a different ethical plane. Ye are no longer living in the sensuous, sensual, carnal sphere of flesh. Ye died as to sin, in the person of Christ; and now ye serve God in spirit. If God's Spirit is, in fact, in you, your own spirits are transformed, and ye live in the higher sphere of spirit, and not of sense.

Verse 10. But if Christ is in you, the body, indeed, is dead on account of sin; but the spirit is life on account of justification.

In this verse we have two simple co-ordinate clauses (**the body is dead; but the spirit is life**); where a classical writer, or a modern stylist, would, more logically, have thrown the two into one complex sentence, or period: "Though the body is dead, yet the spirit is life." Similarly, in other places: "Though he counted his body dead, yet he wavered not" (Rom. iv, 19, 20); "Thanks be to God, that though ye were slaves of sin, yet ye obeyed from the heart" (Rom. vi, 17).

Union with Christ is the ground of our deliverance from sin and death. The redemption of Christ delivers our entire humanity, body and spirit, from death, but its redemptive power is not at once manifested equally in its results, throughout the two departments of our being. The spirit, immaterial in its substance, at the moment of faith in Christ, is justified, and regenerate, and made coheir with him to eternal life. It is in the nature of justification, in which there are no intermediate or half steps, that its consummation should be instant and complete. But it is different with regard to the body. So far as the operation of grace is concerned, the body, though redeemed, is left, for the present, as it was before the spiritual transformation is wrought in the soul. The body is material in its organization, animal, sensual, thrifid and rotten with sin; and is not delivered immediately from the deterioration and physical corruption of the fall. And so Paul says, "The body is *dead*." He calls it *dead*, not figuratively, but literally, physically; yet only constructively dead at present; it is as good as dead, because it is doomed to die at the end of a temporary life on earth, but with the promise of a resurrection to eternal life hereafter. The work of regeneration does not change the physical body, or affect it, except indirectly, and slowly, through a change in the converted man's personal habits. Yet the redemption has planted in the body, for all men alike, the promise and potency of eternal life. But this restoration will come only in the great palingenesia, "When Christ will transform this body of humiliation into conformity with his body of glory, according to the working with which he is able to subdue all things to himself." (Phil. iii, 21.) It is now a psychical (animal) body; it will become a spiritual body (1 Cor. xv, 44)—a body the same as now in substance, but reconstructed, or, as Paul says, "transformed" (Phil. iii, 21), for the new spiritual life. This is the promise and the prospect that Paul holds out in the next verse.

Verse 11. But if the Spirit of him that raised Jesus from among dead men dwells in you, he that raised Christ Jesus from among dead men will make alive also your mortal bodies, on account of his Spirit that dwells in you.

The tenth verse declared that "the body is dead, on account of sin;" the present verse declares the future resurrection of the body from death. Of course this renewal of our physical life will come then, as the renewal of our spiritual life has come now, "on

account of justification." Paul expresses the same thought, substantially, by saying, **on account of his Spirit which dwells in us.** The believer who has the witness of the Spirit in himself has an assurance that this mortal body will yet rise immortal from the tomb. He who raised the dead Christ from the grave will **make alive also our mortal (dead) bodies** from the grave, because of his Spirit which dwells in us. We shall be united with Christ in the sameness with his literal resurrection.

There are several points in this verse worthy of special note:

1. The two names, **Jesus** and **Christ**, though often used quite indifferently, yet do not seem to be synonyms here. The word "Jesus," which was the "Savior's" personal name ["Thou shalt call his name 'Jesus,' for he shall 'save' his people from their sins" (Matt. i, 21)], expresses that he was, so far forth, merely a man, who was dead, and was "raised from among the dead." The second name, "Christ," which was his official designation (though often becoming a proper noun), expresses that he stood related to us as our Representative and Redeemer; in his resurrection we have earnest of our own. Yet the words are not in contrast, and must not be emphasized in reading.

2. We are told, here and elsewhere, that it was God who raised Christ from among the dead. The dead Christ could not raise himself by any natural or supernatural powers of his own. It is true that he said, "I will rise," and that it was said of him that "he arose;" but this must be taken to express the substantive result, without implying his own agency in the matter. But when the agent of Christ's resurrection is definitely named, it is always, as here, God, the Almighty. This is expressly said at least twenty-four times, and implied fourteen times more.

3. It is also expressly asserted here (and elsewhere) that it is God who will raise up our dead bodies at the last day. Yet we have equally explicit declarations that Christ will be the agent of the last resurrection. The statements are diverse, but not contradictory. We infer that, in this great transaction, Christ will represent his Father. His government is a delegated one, and provisional only; and will end only with the crowning solemnities of the Judgment-day. "Then comes the end, when he will surrender the kingdom to God and the Father; then will the Son also himself be subjected to him . . . that God may be all, in all;" that is, "all things without intermediary, in the case of all men." (1 Cor. xv, 24, 28.)

4. It is equally clear, therefore, that the Agent of the general resurrection is not to be the Holy Spirit (as expressed in the Authorized and Revised, "through his Spirit"). This translation represents an erroneous Greek reading. The translation here given, "on account of his Spirit," is the correct one. It is God's Spirit, dwelling in us, that redeems, and molds, and fits us, body and spirit, to be heirs of eternal life. And it is *on account of* this Spirit, which dwells in us, and leavens and fashions us to this great issue, that we shall be raised up in the last day. But the immediate Agent of the resurrection is the Lord Jesus: "For if we believe that Jesus died, and rose again, so, also, those who fell asleep will God through Jesus bring with him." (1 Thess. iv, 14.)

Verse 12. Accordingly, therefore, brethren, we are debtors, not to the flesh, to live according to flesh;

The logical structure of the sentence suggests an additional clause at the end of the verse: "We are debtors not to the flesh; . . . *but to the spirit.*" The word **debtors** implies moral obligation. We are under obligation, **not to the flesh**, the baser, animal part of our nature, to live in accordance with its lusts; but we owe it to the spirit that is within us, the nobler part of our being, to live in accordance with the rule of righteousness, and true holiness. We thus serve our best and enduring interests. The one course leads to death, the other leads to life, eternal. "God will render to every man according to his works." (Rom. ii, 7.)

Verse 13. For if ye live according to flesh, ye will die; but if, by the spirit, ye put to death the practice of the body, ye will live.

The verse describes the diverse consequences which naturally follow the two diverse courses of life. The Authorized translates "ye *shall* die—ye *shall* live, as if spoken with the authority of a lawgiver. The correct translation is that given in the text, **ye will die—ye will live**, as the words of a preacher, foretelling the normal, inevitable result.

The word **spirit** here must be taken as the human spirit; and the phrase, "by the spirit," expresses the work or agency of man in the sphere of his inward religious life, against the flesh. It is in this sense that Paul bids the Colossians, "Put off the old man with its practices." (Col. iii, 9.) The **body** must be interpreted as equivalent to "the flesh;" and "the practices of the body" are

the evil moral habits, "the lusts of the flesh." These the believer can **put to death**, and so will have eternal life. "He that sows to the flesh, from the flesh will reap corruption; but he that sows to the spirit (his inward man), from the spirit will reap life eternal." (Gal. vi, 8.)

Verse 14. For as many as are led by the Spirit of God, these are sons of God.

The word **for** is explicative of the word "live" in the preceding verse. They who slay the carnal man, have life; and they who "have life," are sons of God. The saying is, of course, universally true; not less true of Jews than of Gentiles; but Paul here has in thought only the Gentiles. The Jews arrogated to themselves an exclusive sonship with God, by virtue of their birth from Abraham; but Paul here declares that the Gentiles by the yet higher title of a spiritual birth are "sons of God." The verse is not the expression of a new religious *experience*, but of a normal state of things, such that, forensically, even Gentiles are God's children. This thought of *Gentile* sonship (and not of Jews only, or preferably), is the same as he develops in the ninth chapter: "Not the children of the flesh [the Jews, descendants of Abraham], these are children of God; but the children of the promise [the Gentile believers] are counted for seed." (Rom. ix, 8.) It is the same thought as he develops at large in the Epistle to the Galatians: "For ye (Gentiles) are all sons of God, through faith in Jesus Christ. . . . And if ye are Christ's, then are ye Abraham's seed, heirs according to the promise." (Gal. iii, 26, 29.)

Verse 15. For ye received not the spirit of slavery, again, unto fear; but ye received the spirit of adoption, in which we cry Abba, Father.

The apostle, though a Jew, has so identified himself with the Gentiles, that, in writing to them, he almost unconsciously uses the two pronouns **ye** and **we** indifferently, as if either, or both, would suit his concept.

The best commentary on this passage is Paul's parallel saying to the Galatians, who were Gentiles: "Because ye are sons, God sent out the Spirit of his Son into our hearts [notice the interchange of the pronouns "ye" and "our"], crying Abba, Father; so that thou art no longer a slave, but a son; but if a son, also an heir, through God" (Gal. iv, 6): and, again, to the Ephesians: "Remember that ye, once the Gentiles in flesh, were at that time

without Christ, alienated from the citizenship of Israel; but now in Christ Jesus, ye who were once afar off, became nigh in the blood of Christ." (Eph. ii, 11.)

The word **spirit** twice used in this verse, expresses the conscious sense of slavery on the one hand, or of sonship on the other. The Gentiles "who through fear of death were all their lifetime subject to slavery" (Heb. ii, 15), did not, when they came to believe in Christ, receive this spirit of slavery again, with a view to fear the judgment to come: but, on the contrary, they received the filial sense of adoption into God's family, as his sons, in which they cry *Abba, Father*.

The word **Abba**, the Aramæan word for **Father**, was the vernacular word which Jesus used in his own prayers. In the garden, he said "Abba, Father, . . . take this cup from me." (Mark xiv, 36.) The disciples, who also spoke Aramæan, themselves used this word. Later, when they came to write in Greek, they kept the hallowed word of the Master; but, of course, also translated it into Greek, for the understanding of those who knew no Aramæan. In a similar way, we may speak of "saying the *Pater Noster*, our Father."

Verse 16. The Spirit itself bears witness with our spirit, that we are children of God;

The Greek word for Spirit, and the pronouns referring to it, are of the neuter gender. It is not irreverent for us to retain the same gender in English, for both the noun and the pronouns. The Authorized says "itself;" the Revised "himself." Yet when Christ spoke of the Divine Spirit as the "Comforter," he used necessarily a masculine noun; and the pronoun takes the same gender: "When the Comforter shall come, *whom* I will send, the Spirit of truth *which* proceeds from the Father, *he* will testify concerning me." (John xv, 26.)

The word "spirit" is twice used in this verse to express *personal agents*, and not an abstract sense, or consciousness, as in the preceding verse. The words mean, first, God's **Holy Spirit**; and secondly, man's conscious self, or **spirit**. The two agents bear concurrent testimony to our sonship with God; the Holy Spirit reveals the fact to our consciousness; and our own human spirit answers back, with the comforting sense of adoption.

The point which the apostle makes in this verse is, that, though his readers are Gentiles, nevertheless God's Spirit bears

them witness that they are as truly children of God, as if descendants of Abraham. He uses the first personal pronouns, *our*, *we*, not speaking in the name of the Church universal (and certainly not in the name of the Jews), but, as in the last verse, identifying himself with his Gentile hearers. It was in this same feeling of community, or oneness, with the Gentiles, that he said to the Galatian Gentiles: "But *we*, brethren, after the fashion of Isaac, are children of promise" (Gal. iv, 28); "For *we* through the Spirit await the hope of justification from faith" (Gal. v, 5); and to the Philippian Gentiles: "For *we* are the circumcision" (Phil. iii, 3). [See Note, Rom. viii, 31.]

Verse 17. But if children, also heirs, heirs indeed of God, but coheirs with Christ; if, in fact, we suffer with him, that we may also be glorified with him.

The words **children** and **sons** are usually discriminated from each other. "Children" is the name of tenderer concern; "sons" is the term of higher note. "Children" marks affection; "sons" marks respect. "Children" are yet minors; "sons" have reached their majority. "As long as the heir is a *child* [in his non-age] he is under guardians; when the fullness of time came [the date of our majority] we received the adoption of *sons*." (Gal. iv, 1.) But the aged John could address his adult hearers as "children," "little children." Christ is never called God's "child;" but always God's "*Son*."

The word "children" here does not suggest Paul's associated notion of *minors*, nor John's associated notion of "little," or "dear," but describes Gentiles merely as members of God's family. Of these Gentiles, who are "children of God," Paul declares that, by virtue of that relation, they are also **God's heirs**; and that, since they are "God's heirs," they are also **coheirs with Christ**—"coheirs to the inheritance imperishable, undefiled, unfading, kept in heaven for you" (1 Pet. i, 4). The word "coheirs" occurs but once again in Paul's writings, and with the same reference to the Gentiles, as here: "It was revealed that *the Gentiles are coheirs* with us [the Jews] of the promise in Christ, through the gospel." (Eph. iii, 6.)

In both clauses of the verse the word *if* is the conjunction of actual fact. In the second clause "*if*" refers to the word "coheirs" in the first clause; and the meaning of the clause is that "if we share with Christ in his sufferings, we shall also share with

him in his glory." The apostle's thought here is, *first*, of Christ's manifold sufferings throughout his earthly life from the contradiction of sinners and the bitter buffetings of his enemies. In Christ's earthly sufferings his followers shared, and share, literally. Christ said, "If they persecuted me, they will persecute also you." (John xv, 20.) The apostolical history testifies how abundantly this was fulfilled. The early Christians had constant occasion "to rejoice in reproaches, in persecutions, in distresses, for Christ's sake" (2 Cor. xii, 10). John was the only one of the apostles that did not die a violent death; and how countless the noble army of martyrs that have suffered with them and with their common Master! Paul's concept in the verse is that in all these sufferings of Christ we share either actually or constructively. But, *secondly*, and especially, the apostle's thought is of Christ's vicarious death on the cross, in which we share, but only constructively. The apostle's language to Timothy covers both phases of Christ's sufferings named above, and of our suffering with him: "If we died with him [on the cross], we shall also live with him: if we endure [with him], we shall also reign with him." (2 Tim. ii, 11.) Similarly Peter says: "Ye share in the sufferings of Christ, in order that in the revelation of his glory ye may also rejoice with exultation." (2 Pet. iv, 13.) As *he* passed through these bitter sufferings into his glory, so also his followers must first enter into the "fellowship of his sufferings" (Phil. iii, 10), in both the senses above, in order to enter into glory with him.

It is from this thought of suffering with Christ here that Paul passes, in the next paragraph, to a description of the transcendent glory which will be revealed in our case in the world of eternal recompense.

Verse 18. For I reckon that the sufferings of the present time are not worthy to be compared with the glory a-going to be revealed to us-ward.

The conjunction *for*, which, as usual, is explicative and confirmatory of what precedes, here connects back to the last words of verse 17, "that we *may be glorified* with him." The thought is, Though we suffer with Christ, yet we shall be glorified, with him; *glorified*, I say; *for* our present sufferings will be eclipsed by a greater glory which will yet be revealed in our persons. The paragraph including verses 18-25 is logically a long parenthesis, suggested by the words in the seventeenth verse, "we shall be glo-

ripled with him." This paragraph describes the sphere and the form of the recompense that awaits us. It declares that our redemption, which is yet only partially realized ["the spirit is alive, but the body is yet dead"], will then be completed by the reunion of spirit and body, and will be eternal.

The apostle's word, I reckon, is the term of mathematical computation. In the light of this reckoning, our sufferings here ("though now for a little while, if need be, we are made to sorrow in manifold trials" (1 Pet. i, 6),) are to be counted as of small moment, in view of the great glory which awaits us in the world to come. The pronoun us, in the final phrase ("to us-ward," *ἐς ἡμᾶς*), holds an important place in the exegesis of the passage, and must not be lightly passed over. In the first place this pronoun "us" can not be taken as the indirect object of the verb revealed; as though the saying meant that "the glory will be shown us," that is, exhibited to our view, for our enlightenment. To express this meaning would require the pronoun to be in the dative case, *ἡμῖν* "to us." Thus Paul writes to the Corinthians: "The things which God prepared for those that love him he reveals to us, *ἡμῖν*, through his Spirit" (1 Cor. ii, 10); in which translation the word "to" is merely the sign of the dative case. And this meaning is never expressed (as in this verse) with the preposition *ἐς*, "unto," "as to," "with regard to." *Secondly*: We must give the preposition in the phrase *ἐς ἡμᾶς* its full and exact significance, "to us-ward," "with regard to us;" and the passage means that "the glory will be manifested unto us, with a view to certain definite results, in our case, in our persons, in our body." It is not only not Paul's thought that this glory is to be exhibited spectacularly to our eyes, or revealed verbally to our understanding; but it is his sole thought that this glory is to be made a practical objective experience in our bodies, in their resurrection from the grave.

Verse 19. For the earnest expectation of the creature awaits the revelation of the sons of God.

The description in this verse is figurative, and very dramatic. The creature, whatever it is, is personified, and endowed with human sensibilities, and human activities. Both the noun and the verb in this sentence are compounded with the intensive word *ἀπό*, "afar" (or, from afar); and while the general meaning is plain, it is difficult to express it in terse and exact terms. The

noun translated **earnest expectation**, or "longing," expresses the attitude and feeling of one standing with head erect looking eagerly for something afar off;* and the verb translated **awaits**, in like manner, expresses the action of one who watches and waits for something from afar.

The word *creature* is the difficult word in the verse; and a satisfactory explanation of this word carries with it the explanation of other words in the verse, and of the entire passage, to the end of the twenty-fifth verse. In the discussion of this word a close adherence to the meaning given to the prepositional phrase, "to us-ward," in the eighteenth verse, becomes doubly important. This prepositional phrase, "to us-ward," or "as touching us," when critically explained, suggests the explanation of the word "creature;" and thus leads to the only tenable explanation of the entire paragraph. The critics, neglectful of this direct personal reference in the words "to us-ward," and of the definite exclusion of other things thereby suggested, have been led into many purely fanciful interpretations of the word "creature." But clearly "the glory that will be revealed," or manifested, at the last day is here declared to be, specifically, "to us-ward," "in regard to us," a "revelation" of glory, in which neither the "creation" at large nor any assignable part of creation outside of ourselves has a share,—nothing but "us." This thought runs through the paragraph to the final word in the twenty-third verse, "the redemption of our *body*;" and this explicit word, which the apostle has held in suspense until he has reached the climax,—this word "body" gives explicitly the lucid and sufficient, and only possible, explanation of the word "creature." If this explanation is correct, "the creature" is simply the human body; and by this phrase, "the redemption of our body," the apostle shows in what respect this consummate glory is to be manifested "to us-ward." The apostle has already said, "Our body, indeed, is dead on account of sin; but the spirit is alive on account of justification." (Rom. viii, 11.) He recognizes the fact that our redemption, while potentially complete, is, as yet, only partially realized; but he expects the

* Milton, in his description of Satan just awaked from the stupor of his fall, says, in words that almost reproduce our text:

"With head uplift above the wave, and eyes
That sparkling blazed."—"Paradise Lost," 1, 193.

time when the body, now subject to the bondage of corruption, will be delivered, from this bondage, this slavery to death, into the liberty of the sons of God. The believer has already, in his inner self, his conscious spirit, the earnest to that effect, the divine pledge of the glory that will be his; and he awaits with steadfast assurance the fullness of adoption, the redemption of his body. Such, in brief, seems to me the sole, and the satisfactory, and the comforting solution of this puzzle of the ages.

But as other views have so long been accepted (though by none with entire confidence), it is necessary to show in detail that no other view than the one here presented meets the conditions laid down in the text.

We may concede in advance that the Greek word *κτίσις*, "creature," whose proper explanation is in question, is a term comprehensive enough to designate any thing that God has made. The word, standing in different connections, is sometimes translated "creature," sometimes "creation." In this passage the Authorized inconsistently gives both translations; the Revised incorrectly only the latter. The Revisers' word "creation" restricts the sense to the material universe apart from man. But the word "creature," like the Greek word, leaves the sense open to all interpretations, including the one here adopted, the human *body*. For brevity's sake, we group the divergent explanations which we reject into two classes, each, however, having manifold subdivisions: *First*, the world below man; *secondly*, the world of man.

I. Of these erroneous views, the first is that "the creature" means the world of nature, creation at large, inanimate and animate, exclusive of man. This view was held by Chrysostom, and others, among the ancients, and is held, in whole or in part, by most of the modern commentators. This view is open, at the first, to a fatal objection. It assumes what needs to be proved, and what can not be proved, for it is a false premise, that nature, the material universe, suffered in the fall of man; that the inanimate world was disturbed and defaced, and that the animal world was subjected to death by the sin of man. It is on this assumption, that some think there will be a reconstruction, in which the material world beneath us will be relieved from the fancied curse, and restored to the happy condition of things at the creation. But there is no evidence whatever, in Scripture, or in science, that the inanimate world, or the irrational animal world, ever suffered disaster by the

sin of man.* Nature remains what it was in the beginning. The natural catastrophes around us are not the recoil of sin. Animal and vegetable death was in the world before man, and death in the natural world is, so far forth, as much a part of God's plan, as life. As the material inanimate world, and the animal world did not share our sin, and were not precipitated by our fall, so they do not share our redemption, and will not share our resurrection. Nature has no "earnest expectation," and does not await any revelation. The "agony" of inanimate nature for deliverance into the freedom of the sons of God is an idle fancy. When the beast and the plant die, they have fulfilled the purpose of their being. Only man is capable of sin, or of penalty, or of redemption, or of the expectation of it. The material universe beneath us has no part or lot in this matter of a final restoration. It was not lost by reason of sin, and is not recovered by the atonement.

Further, it is wholly unbiblical that the earth is to be renewed as the future abode of the sainted dead. We need not press too literally the Scriptures that seem to teach that the world is to be destroyed, not "reconstructed;" as when Jesus said, "Heaven and earth will pass away," and when Peter said, "The heavens will be dissolved; . . . the earth also, and the works therein will be burned up." But more to the point are the specific declarations that our future home is not to be in this world, however transformed. Jesus said, "In my Father's house are many mansions. I go to prepare a place for you; and I will come again, and *take* you to myself, that *where I am, there ye may be also*" (John xiv, 2); and Peter said, "There is an inheritance . . . reserved in heaven for you, ready to be revealed at the last day" (1 Pet. i, 4).

But the real, the insuperable difficulty in this view, lies in the fact that even if this downfall and recovery of the natural world were true in itself, it is not taught in this passage. Nature taken

*The "curse" pronounced on the ground (Gen. iii, 17) "for the sake of man," if it meant any objective change in the habitation of man, was clearly not a change in the constitution of things, but only a superficial change in the single matter of its fertility. The soil was henceforth to produce "thorns and thistles," to plague man for his sin: the ground must now be cultivated with "the sweat of his face." But the change, after all, was probably not in the physical world, but only subjective in man, a reflection from his different attitude to the objective world around him. Certainly science knows of no invading or pervading deterioration in nature, since the Geological ages.

thus universally does not come within the specific limitations expressed here in the precise term, "to us-ward," or "in regard to us." This revelation is a concern of *ours*, and not of the material universe beneath us, or of any class of beings other than man.

II The second erroneous view of the word "creature" is that it means the human race, either in whole or in part. This view was held by Augustine, among the fathers, and is held by many commentators now. But this view also, in either branch of it, is, like the other, beset with insuperable difficulties.

If Paul had really meant mankind as a whole it is strange that he should use so unlikely a designation as "creature." The term might be tolerated if spoken of a single man, or of more, conceived of individually, but it would still be a term of disparagement. When the apostle means "man, men, mankind," he uses the direct word "man," as he does twenty-seven times in this Epistle; or if he wishes a general collective name, especially for unbelievers, he uses the term *κόσμος*, "the world;" and he uses the word nine times in this Epistle; for example, "The rejection of the Jews is the reconciliation of the world." (Rom. xi, 15.)

But aside from the *a priori* improbability of the apostle's using the far-fetched word "creature" to designate *mankind at large*, this interpretation of the word makes the apostle inconsistent with himself. His description throughout the passage (verses 19-23), expressly discriminates the "children of God" from "the creature," and establishes each of them in a class by itself. So that, if "creature" means man at large, we have then two incompatible categories: "*The creature*" (that is according to the hypothesis, *all the race*) AND "The sons of God." Notice the apostle's distinctive expressions.

1. There is to be a revelation of the sons of God. (Verse 19.)
2. "The creature" ALSO will be delivered into the freedom of the sons of God. (Verse 21.)

Clearly we can not interpret the word "creature" as meaning *all the race*.

Nor can we interpret "the creature" as meaning only a *part* of the race, the unregenerate, who are not included among "the sons of God." Why should they be described as "groaning and travailing in pain together" [or, with us]? This description may possibly be true, to a limited extent, in the case of a very few enlightened individuals among the heathen, as Confucius and Socrates; but it is not true, even in a remote sense, in regard to

the great mass of the unregenerate world. Paul has said of the heathen, "They did not choose to retain God in their knowledge." (Rom. i, 28) Certainly the thought here is not with regard to the world outside of Christ. We may hope for the salvation of the heathen; but not on the ground of this passage. The definite limitations fixed by the words "to us-ward" restricts the title and promise of eternal redemption to those who are in Christ.

We repeat that the word "creature," and the terms that characterize it in this verse, are all figurative. They describe the creature as endowed with life and consciousness, and yearning for something that is afar. Such personifications are found in all literature; some with more, some with less, appropriateness. No doubt with regard to the rejected interpretation, "nature," such a personification, though overstrained, is possible. But with regard to the human body, which is a part (if not a conscious part) of ourselves, the figurative ascription to it, of unrest under its present disabilities, and of eager longing for deliverance with ourselves [our spirits] is a more appropriate figure. The body is so closely associated with the spirit of man, in fact, and in our thought, that we constantly ascribe to the body personality and consciousness, and feelings, and volitions, and acts, as if the body were actually capable of those things which properly belong only to our inward selves. This is in exact accordance with the figurative language of all literature and of the Scriptures elsewhere, in regard to the body, or its members. Thus David says: "My flesh shall rest in hope" (Psa. xvi, 8); "My heart and my flesh cry out for God" (Psa. lxxxiv, 2). The term by which Paul calls the human body "the creature," is exceedingly appropriate. It denotes humble, subordinate relation to the spirit. Of course, the soul as well as the body was "created" by God; but it is of the plastic, physical frame, rather than of the soul, that we usually predicate "creation," by the "Creator," who "formed us of clay, and made us men." Indeed, this is the figure that most readily occurs to one who thinks of man's dependency. "Shall the *clay* say to him that fashions it, What makest thou?" (Isa. xlv, 9.) Paul uses the word "creature" here, in a slightly disparaging sense. He expresses the same concept by a similar term, when he says to the Thessalonians: "That each one of you may know to get [get control of?] his own *vessel* (his person) in sanctification and honor." (1 Thess. iv, 4.) He calls the body "the vessel," depreciating it as the vassal of the soul. In like manner, too, the

introspective Hamlet uses a self-disparaging term about himself—his body—"Thine, lady, thine, whilst this *machine* is to him." (Hamlet, ii, 2, 124.)

The verb **awaits**, or "expects," describes the longing anticipation with which "the creature" thus personified looks forward to the time of deliverance. It expresses both the instinctive yearning for that day, and the faith that greets the end from afar. The longed-for deliverance will come at the "revelation of the sons of God," that is, of the redeemed spirits of believers, in the *resurrection* of the last day: "When Christ, who is our life, shall be manifested, then will ye also be manifested with him in glory." (Col. iii, 4.) The best commentary on these words is the saying of Christ, "They that are counted worthy to attain to that world, and the *resurrection from the dead . . . are sons of God*, being sons of the resurrection." (Luke xx, 36.) The resurrection will be the consummate proof of the sonship of believers. Here, in the days of their flesh, "the world maybe knows them not;" but in that day they will be publicly recognized and owned by God, and "manifested" to the world as his sons.

Verse 20. For the creature was subjected to the frailty, not of its own will; nay, but on account of him that subjected it; in hope;

The word **frailty**, usually translated "vanity," means, as shown by the connection, "a waning away, blight, death;" and the thought is resumed in the next verse by the equivalent word "corruption," that is, *mortality*. To this condition the human body was subjected, **not voluntarily** by any act or will of its own, but as the consequence from Adam's sin, **on account of whom** it was condemned to death: "Through his sin, death entered." This fatal result was in pursuance of the divine law; and so we may interpret the verb **was subjected** in this light. It was God indeed who administratively subjected man to death, but the one "on account of whom" the creature was subjected to vanity, to mortality, was Adam, not God.

The last words, **in hope** (or, more literally, "upon a basis of hope"), are to be construed with the first verb, "it was subjected," which expresses God's act, and not Adam's. Yet the words "in hope" do not denote the divine intent in bringing this penal result upon man; but they express the one gleam of comfort which was still left to man. When Pandora's casket lost all

its other treasures, hope still remained behind. The verse should end with a semicolon.

Verse 21. Because also the creature itself will be freed from the slavery to corruption, [and brought] into the freedom of the glory of the children of God.

The first word in this verse (*ὅτι*) the Revised translates **that**, as if to express the substance of the "hope;" but the Authorized more correctly translates it by the word **because**, to express the ground of the hope, as found in the great fact of the coming resurrection. The significance of the word **also** must not be overlooked. It implies that "the creature" is not the only party, or the leading party, concerned in the deliverance. The other party is the spirit of the believer, which has already had this great experience. "Though *the spirit is*, already, *alive*, on account of justification, the body is yet dead on account of sin" (Rom. viii, 10); but the body *also*, though now dead, is destined to a glorious awakening; "it *also*, as well as the spirit, will be brought into the freedom of the glory of the children of God."

Corruption is a synonym for frailty in the verse preceding, and means "mortality," "death." "Corruption" is a term that is not predicable of the *creation* at large in either sense of the word, moral or physical, but is entirely appropriate to the human *body*. Nor can *creation* be brought into the glorious freedom of the children of God: only what is human, the soul and the *body* of man, is capable of such deliverance.

Verse 22. For we know that all the creature groans with us, and travailes with us, until now.

The clause with the conjunction **for** is confirmatory of the truth of the preceding verse: "The body will be delivered." The gospel promises it, and all human presentiment and conviction attest it. The words **we know** mean that we (men generally) accept as a recognized truth the mutual sympathy between the body and the spirit.

The Authorized and the Revised translation, "groaneth and travaileth *together*," misses the point of the verse, and misses the striking correspondence of thought and expression with the next verse. Paul does not mean that nature, or "creation," groans *together* and travailes *together*, as if in mass, or in one conglomerate whole; but that "the creature" [the body] **groans with us**, and

agonizes *with us*; that is, with the conscious spirit of believers. This ellipsis of the object of the prepositions in Greek, with [*us*], is very common. Here the ellipsis of the object of the preposition "with" [σὺν] is exactly parallel with the same ellipsis in the seventeenth verse: "If we suffer with [him], we shall be glorified with [him]." In the first clause of the seventeenth verse the Authorized is right; in the second clause, it is wrong, and the Revised is right. In the verse before us, the twenty-second, both translations are wrong in both clauses.

The word **travails with us** suggests, as in a figure, the birth pangs which will bring body and spirit into the new resurrection life. The words **all the creature** mean that our entire being is absorbed in the "agonizing" for deliverance. This verse declares that the body groans with the spirit, and the next verse declares that the spirit answers back with responsive woe.

Verse 23. **But not only is this [the fact], nay, but also ourselves, who have the firstfruits of the Spirit, we also ourselves groan within ourselves, awaiting adoption, the redemption of our body.**

The verse describes the close sympathy between the believer's spirit and his body, and their joint yearning for salvation. The gospel has made full provision for the *final* salvation of body and soul; but as yet each lacks something of full adoption. The believer has yet only the **firstfruits**, or earnest, **of the Spirit**, in his justification from guilt, and in the regeneration of his nature: while "the body is yet dead on account of sin." Neither the spirit on the one hand, nor the body on the other, can realize the fullness of adoption without the other. The word "firstfruits," by its very meaning, implies that the work of the Spirit is yet incomplete; but it involves also the promise of a fullness of harvest. In this state of suspense both spirit and body wait in unsatisfied expectation and longing. "The body groans with us (with our redeemed spirits), and suffers with us the pangs of the birth agony into life;" and **we also, ourselves** with answering solicitude, **groan within ourselves, awaiting this fullness of adoption, the redemption of our body.** The redeemed spirit is the interpreter of the voiceless body, its mouth to utter the inarticulate cry for life. Such is the Christian instinct; we yearn for an all-round salvation. "He who wrought us out for this very thing is God, who also gave us the earnest of the Spirit." (2 Cor. v, 5.)

This all-round salvation will be accomplished only in the resurrection, when the body *also* will be delivered from corruption. Paul's language elsewhere is an exact commentary on this verse, both verbally and in sense: "The Holy Spirit is the earnest (or guarantee) of our inheritance, unto the redemption of Christ's purchase." (Eph. i, 14.) This yearning of the spirit in behalf of the body, finds vivid expression in Paul's words to the Corinthians: "In this body we groan, yearning to put on over it, our dwelling-place which is from heaven. . . . We who are in the tabernacle [of the body] groan, being weighed down; because we will—not to put off [our earthly body], by dying, but without dying, to put on over it [our body from heaven], that the mortal [body] may be swallowed up by the [immortal] life." (2 Cor. v, 1-8.)

The pronouns "we," "us" in the last two verses of the text, and in the passages quoted in the last note, are spoken, not from the standpoint of our entire being, *spirit and body*, but only from the standpoint of the spirit. This is shown by the discrimination in the twenty-third verse. "*We* ourselves [the redeemed spirits], groan, awaiting the redemption of our *body*." The first clause **Not only this**, means, "Not only does the *body* do this"—namely, "groan *with us*" (verse 22)—"but *we* ourselves groan with it." Similar ellipses are easily supplied from the connection; Rom. v, 3, 11; ix, 10.

Verses 24, 25. For in the hope [only of this resurrection] we were saved. But a hope, being seen, is not hope: for what one sees, why does he hope for it? But if what we do not see, we hope for it; with patience we await it.

In view of the translation here given, "For *in* the hope we were saved," it is almost needless to call attention to the mistake of the Authorized and of the Revised, in the meaning of the passage. Besides their error in Greek, they have introduced a grave error in theology. Men are not saved "*by* hope," in any sense of the word, but only *by faith*.

The apostle here says, **we were saved**. The word can be taken either relatively only, or in its absolute sense; either, *first*, of the regeneration of our spirits, and our adoption here into God's family; or, *secondly*, of the completion of God's work in us, body and soul, hereafter. The former salvation is but provisional, the earnest of our complete salvation, the guarantee of "the salvation

that is ready to be revealed at the last time." (1 Pet. i, 5.) It is in the former sense, of provisional salvation, only, that the word is used in this verse; and the verse declares that it was **in the hope** of this other larger and eternal adoption, in the resurrection, at the last day, of body and soul together, that we were provisionally saved here and now. The gift of God's Spirit to us is his pledge that the promise will be fulfilled. "Salvation" here is the title-deed to our complete inheritance hereafter; but does not put us in immediate possession of our estate.

Paul's thought in this discussion about "*hope*" is very clear. It belongs to the concept of "*hope*," and constitutes a good lexical definition of the word. It declares that hope looks to the future, and not to the present. And so, the apostle with nice discrimination as to the meaning of the word, says that **a hope** (that is, *an object* of hope), which is **seen** (that is, which is now here, in our present enjoyment), is, according to the definition of the word, not "a hope" at all; that is, if it be called by its true name, it is a present fruition. For we do not "*hope*" for a thing which we see (that is, for a thing now in our possession), but we *enjoy* it. The full salvation which we hope for, is, in the nature of the case, yet future, and we shall attain it only on the great day of salvation. Meanwhile, led by the present possession of the Spirit, and hoping further for what else we do not "see," **we with patience await it from afar**. "For we walk by faith, and not *by sight*." (2 Cor. v, 7.)

Verse 26. But in like manner also, the Spirit helps our weakness; for we know not what we should pray, as we ought; nay, but the Spirit itself intercedes for us, with groanings unspeakable.

The discussion which was interrupted by the long parenthesis about the resurrection of the body (verses 18-25), is now resumed; and the apostle describes the intercession of the Spirit in our behalf. This verse, by the words **in like manner**, connects back to the sixteenth verse. In that verse, the apostle said, that "the Spirit testifies with us (the Gentiles) that we are children of God." In this verse, he declares that **in like manner also, the Spirit assists our weakness** (or, possibly we may explain it, assists us in our weakness). The weakness here spoken of, is not simply feebleness of faith, or instability in our life, but, as further described, the inability to frame our longings into articulate and

definite prayer. We would fain come into his audience chamber; but we know not how to call on him, and to get the answer that we need. We are burdened in spirit, and oppressed; we groan for deliverance, but we can not embody our yearnings and sighings in adequate utterance. But the Spirit, which has itself inspired these yearnings, knows what is the unuttered desire of our heart, and intercedes with God in our behalf. Yet not even the Spirit can embody its intercessions in audible, articulate words; its prayers in our behalf are unuttered, **unutterable groanings**. But these groanings, which are the vehicle of our groanings, pierce the Divine ear, and are approved and answered. How often, in the silences, when no human ear can hear, when our own voice is still, our spirits are rapt and thrilled, in the embrace and uplift of the Divine Spirit, which yearns over us and in us!

Verse 27. But he that searches the heart, knows what is the mind of the Spirit, because it is according to God that it intercedes for the saints.

The language here defines God's work and purpose. He describes himself elsewhere as "the One that searches the hearts and the reins" (Rev. ii, 23); and thus he knows what is in man, and thus, too, **he knows what is the mind of the Spirit**, which has its abode in our hearts. The Spirit is given us from the Father, it testifies to us of the Father, and it intercedes for us with the Father; and its intercessory office is in accordance with the purpose and the plan of the Father.

But perhaps we may express the apostle's thought more exactly yet. In the twenty-sixth and twenty-seventh verses, the preposition is *ὑπέρ*, which we have seen often has the meaning "in our place." (Rom. v, 7.) If thus taken, the words should be translated definitely, and precisely, "The Spirit itself intercedes for us;" that is, "*in our stead.*" It is the Spirit that utters our cry to God.

Verse 28. But we know that all things work together for good, with them that love God, with them that are called according to his plan of old.

The last word in the verse is usually translated "purpose," but incorrectly. Paul here, and everywhere, carefully discriminates between God's *purpose* for the salvation of men, and his **plan** for carrying out his purpose. Logically, purpose, which is subjective,

in the mind, antedates plan, which is objective, in the execution. In this verse, Paul does not name the purpose in God's mind, but he names and discusses the plan, the project, *πρόθεσις*, "the plan of old," the working scheme, or measure, which God instituted for the accomplishment of his purpose.*

God's gracious purpose, and the wonderful plan which he devised to carry out his purpose, dated, both of them, from eternity. The "call" to men into the privileges of this saving scheme took place in time, and from the first, took in all men indiscriminately, Gentiles as well as Jews; or, rather, took in the whole world, being "Gentile" only, before there were any "Jews." In comparison with the Gentiles, who had the primal claim to those privileges, the Jews, when they came upon the scene as such [the call of Abraham was B. C. 2217], were but parvenus, upstarts of yesterday. The uncircumcised Gentiles, and not the Jews, were, in point of historic fact, God's real "anointed people," and were the ancient Church, though not having an organic constitution. This is Paul's constant and consistent teaching; he develops the thought at large in the Epistle to the Galatians, especially in the third chapter; and it is his present contention in regard to the comparative claims of Jew and Gentile. He thinks and writes here, from the standpoint of his apostolate to the Gentiles. He carries an abiding and dominating conviction of their primal, and continued, and just relation to God's plan; and of his own divine call to preach this plan to the Gentiles in all its gospel compass. "To me was this grace given, to preach among the Gentiles the riches of Christ . . . in order that may be made known [to the Gentiles (Rom. xvi, 26)] God's wisdom, as respects the eternal plan which he planned in Christ Jesus, our Lord." (Eph. iii, 8.)

It is of the Gentiles, then, expressly, not of the Jews, or of men at large, including the Jews, but of the Gentiles, in special, that the saying of this verse, and of the verses following, is uttered. Of the Gentiles, standing in the relation to God of being **called according to his plan**, the apostle says, "All things co-operate with them for good;" not even the hostility of the Jews, who would rule them out of the Church, can work them any harm.

*The verbs to express "purpose," are *θέλειν* and *βούλεσθαι*. "God *wills* (*θέλει*) all men to be saved" (1 Tim. ii, 4); "not *wishing* (*βουλόμενος*) any man to perish" (2 Pet. iii, 9). The corresponding substantives are *θέλημα*, *βουλή*, *βούλημα*. These are not the words used in this verse; and this is not the concept of the passage.

“Though Abraham is ignorant of us, and Israel acknowledged us not, doubtless thou, Jehovah, art our Father; thy name was our redeemer from of old.” (Isa. lxiii, 16.)

The word *κλητοί*, correctly translated **the called**, Paul extends to all the Gentile world. But Calvin interprets it as embracing certain “elect,” or “select,” men only, chosen from out of the mass of mankind at large, and therefore fewer in number than the whole mass. If Calvin’s interpretation be correct, then the chosen men were chosen, so far as we can see, by the caprice of God, “out of his mere grace, without anything in the creature moving him thereto,” chosen to be God’s “*peculiar*” people, of course to the exclusion of the rest of mankind. Calvin himself is most pronounced on this point of reprobation, which some of his later followers, rejecting for themselves, deny to be his teaching. His words are: “Many, as if wishing to remove odium from God, while they admit election, yet deny reprobation. But in this they speak ignorantly and childishly: since election itself could not stand, except as the opposite of reprobation. God is said to set apart those whom he adopts for salvavation. Those, therefore, whom he passes by he reprobates; and that for no other cause than that he chooses to exclude them. Whence it happens that so many nations, together with their infant children, were sentenced to eternal death by the fall of Adam, without any remedy.”*

To this choice bit of Calvinistic execration the Westminster Confession adds: “All those whom God hath predestinated unto life, and those only [therefore, by implication, relatively a *small* number] he is pleased effectually to call to grace and salvation by Jesus Christ.”

But these limitations, or any limitations of the divine call, are not Scriptural. Under the old dispensation the Jews, *all* the Jews, the nation as a whole, and every individual of the nation, were elected and called as God’s people. They were called, without their own personal consent, to the enjoyment of all theocratic privileges,—which, however, they could individually accept or refuse, at their own volition. But the Jews were not called, as they fondly thought, to a decreed salvation; for many Jews were lost. Similarly, as Paul shows in the gospel plan, which is only the old ideal plan continued in force, and proclaimed now to all the world, and not to the Jews only, the Gentiles, *all* the Gentiles *en masse*,

* Institutes, Bk. III, ch. xxiii, § 7.

and every individual of them, are, in the same sense, elect and called to the same equitable privileges and opportunities as those of the Jews; and, like the Jews, all Gentiles individually can accept or refuse at their own volition. All are redeemed, all are called, a thing not depending on themselves severally, but belonging to the race at large; but none, at least none of adult years and self-determination, are finally saved without their own personal volition and co-operation.

Verse 29. Because whom he of old had in thought, he also of old included in his plan, being conform with the image of his Son; that he may be firstborn among many brethren.

This passage is, perhaps, the most controverted of all in Paul's Epistles. I give, for comparison, the text of the Authorized (which is also nearly that of the Revised), though, to say the least, it is open to gravest objections on the score of its Greek and of its theology:

"For whom he did foreknow, he also did predestinate to be conformed to the image of his Son, that he might be the firstborn among many brethren."

Each several term in the verse needs discussion.

1. In attempting an examination of the controverted points we must steadfastly keep foremost in our minds that Paul had foremost in his own mind the one purpose, to vindicate the rights of the Gentiles to an equal place in the Church, against the exclusiveness of the Jews. As the apostle of the Gentiles, he held that the Gentiles were always included in God's plan; and that, indeed, they were so long before the Jews themselves were chosen as the theocratic people. This is his one thought here. He is not thinking and speaking of men in general—that is, of Gentiles and Jews indiscriminately—but of the Gentiles only, in explicit discrimination from the Jews; and he is speaking of *all* the Gentiles *en masse*, and not of *some* of them only. But the usual interpretation of this verse is very different. The Westminster Confession expresses this different interpretation, in part, thus: "By the decree of God, for the manifestation of his glory, *some* men and angels are predestinated unto everlasting life, and others foreordained to everlasting death." (III, iii.) But, we repeat, this verse does not contemplate "*some* men" only (both Jew and Gentile) as selected in particular out of the race at large, but contemplates the Gentiles only, and *all* of them, in mass.

But in the first clause, **whom he of old had in thought, or,**

as the Authorized gives it, "whom he did foreknow," we are met with the difficulty that the antecedent to the relative pronoun "whom" is not expressed, and the phrase seems, at first sight, vague, and capable of being construed indefinitely in the sense of Calvinistic particularism, "*Those* whom [such persons as] he foreknew." But the antecedent that Paul had in his thought is very definite and precise—not "Such persons as," but "*The Gentiles*, them only, and *all* of them;" "*The Gentiles* whom he had in thought." True, in this verse he has not expressly named the Gentiles, but, as we have seen, the entire discussion of the Epistle is about them; it is their case only that he has before him; his mind is surcharged with his theme; and, quite unconscious of any grammatical ambiguity in his sentence from the lack of the definite antecedent word, "the Gentiles," he uses the word "whom" as referring, of course, to them, the one subject of his thought. But at any rate, in the scope of his thought, logically, there is no room for any doubt. Elsewhere in this Epistle he uses exactly the same language with regard to the Jews exclusive of the Gentiles. Of them expressly, by name, he declares that "God did not cast off *his people*, the Jews, which he foreknew"—that is, "whom he had in his thought"—as a definite class, apart from others; not *some* of the Jews, but *all* of them *in mass* (Rom. xi, 2). Just so, here in the verse before us, he speaks with equal definiteness of the *Gentiles*, *all* of them, in mass. This reference to the Gentiles exclusive of others, but inclusive of all of themselves, which was so clear in Paul's own mind, must have been perfectly clear to the Church at Rome, and to all other readers of that day, inclusive of the Synagogue itself, who all knew perfectly well the great issue and the religious interests involved. The Calvinistic interpretation would not have had any pertinent meaning to them, or, indeed, any meaning at all. And this reference to the Gentiles stands equally clear to modern readers who are able to trace the logic of the Epistle. The only definitive antecedent which can possibly fit into the apostle's line of thought is "the Gentiles,"—"the Gentiles whom he had in thought." That is to say, according to Paul's presentation of the case, God did not foreknow and call the *Jews* only, as the Synagogue held, nor did he foreknow and call a few select men, some Jew and some Gentile, out of the world at large, as Augustine and Calvin interpreted this universal gospel of Christ; but, as Paul's present argument demands, he foreknew and called the Gentiles, not *some* of them, but *all* of them, in mass. This is the single point that Paul is here intent on making; and he makes it.

2. This supply of the definitive word, "the Gentiles," as the antecedent, leads to the proper explanation of the word translated **foreknew**, or, more precisely, "whom *he of old had (or took) in his thought.*"* If the discrimination made in the foot-note below holds true, Paul's word here can not mean, as some English readers have understood it, that God *was aware*, in advance, of the historical place and career of the creatures whom he himself should create; that is, that he foresaw that they would exist, and when, and where, and under what circumstances. Of course all this kind of knowledge belongs to our primary concept of God; and to affirm such intuition, or awareness of his own works yields no help in understanding this passage, and lies outside of the present line of thought.† But Paul's words have a much larger and nobler mean-

* There are in the New Testament two Greek verbs, *οἶδα* and *γινώσκω*, both translated by the same word, "know," and so easily confounded, but which need to be clearly discriminated by the exegete. The former, *οἶδα*, means, properly, "to be aware of;" and, so, when used of God, expresses his intuition or attribute of *omniscience*; the latter, *γινώσκω*, means "to come to know," or, "to take into thought;" and, when used of God, expresses some specific, *initiative act*. Thus the English reader can usually judge, from the connection, which word is used in the Greek Testament. These words are found, each, more than three hundred times; *οἶδα* sixteen times in Romans, and *γινώσκω* nine times, and twice in the compound form *προγινώσκω*. This latter is the word in the text before us, in the form *προέγνω*, compound of *προ*—"before," "of old," and the aorist tense of the verb "he came to know," "he took note of;" and the saying in the text can mean, not that God *was aware* of the Gentiles, but only, that "of old God *took thought* for the Gentiles."

† The word "foreknowledge," used in this passage, in its Scriptural sense of forethought, does not involve the vexed question of God's eternal awareness, or prescience of contingencies. That question is a matter entirely outside of the present line of discussion. The discussion before us is not in regard to God's intuition, or awareness, of *men's* future character and actions, but solely in regard to his own gracious forethought for their salvation. And this forethought for them lies wholly in the line of his fatherly purpose and intervention in Christ,—matters that are not in the sphere of his intuition, or omniscience, but are absolutely, freely, within his own gracious intention, whether to will them, or to refrain. But in regard to contingencies, where the debate is not of the *divine* purpose, but exclusively of *man's* future character and actions, as dependent on his own free will, the case is different. Those are not under God's control. Now, man himself does not foreknow (*is not aware of*) his own future actions, or those of any other man: to him they are contingent; that is, not determinable beforehand. But God's psychological characteristics are of the same *nature* (if not of the same limitations) as those of man. If a man's future actions are *in their nature* contingent, undeterminable beforehand by himself, they are also contingent and undeterminable to God. God does not foreknow (*is not beforehand aware of*) the outcome of contingencies.

ing. His saying, "Whom he of old had in his thought," expresses God's fatherly, gracious yearning, from of old, for all his creatures, his eternal thought and plan, not for a few elect individuals, but for every one of them *en masse*. True, the verbal limitations here restrict the present saying to the Gentile world. But it at least takes in *all* the Gentiles, in mass; and, later, when he comes to discuss the future of the Jews, he makes the same sweeping assertion about them: "His people which he had in his thought." (Rom. xi, 2.) And in this sense "God foreknew" all men, of all races; that is, as Moses once said of the Jews, "He set his love upon them" (Deut. vii, 7); he took them all into his thought, and planned for the salvation of them all alike.

Yet this view, which, I think, lies on the surface of the apostle's saying, is not the one which has usually been taken of it. Two very divergent schools, the Calvinistic and the Arminian, understand and explain the verse very differently from this view, and very differently from each other. But both agree first in some fundamental errors. The first and chiefest of these errors, which brings on all the rest, is that they assume (what is not true) that the Epistle is a complete system of Divinity, written for the perpetual didactic instruction of the Church of Christ, instead of a polemic discussion of the local and transient issues of the day; and that it was addressed to the religious needs of men at large, indiscriminately of races, and of their relation to one another. They do not see that the apostle has throughout the Epistle constantly recognized and emphasized a broad distinction between Jews and Gentiles; and that in this verse (as throughout the Epistle), he is speaking of the Gentiles alone, and not of men indiscriminately. They both hold that the words "whom God had in thought," are spoken, not of the Gentiles alone, *in mass*, or of the world at large, *in mass*, but of a few individuals, both Jew and Gentile, whom God selected out of the whole number of men in the world; while the rest of mankind whom he did not have in thought, and did not select in this special sense, are thereby left without hope in the world, though they constitute an immense majority of the race. Further, these schools do not think that Paul's own words sufficiently define or particularize the select individuals whom God thus foreknew; nor explain on what conditions he foreknew just them, and not the rest of mankind; and so, in order to express what they respectively assume that Paul must have meant, but left unsaid, they supplement his words with some specifications of their own. What

these specifications should be, the two schools are far from being agreed. Indeed, it is here that Calvinism and Arminianism are most divergent.

Calvinism declares that the men whom God selected out of the promiscuous mass of mankind, constitute an exact cataloguable list, whose number is so certain and definite that it can not be either increased or diminished; that God predestinated these men unto life, out of his mere free grace and love, without any foresight of faith or good works, or perseverance in them, or any other thing in the creature moving him thereunto; and that the rest of mankind God passed by and ordained them to wrath, for their sin.

The Arminian divines also hold that God selected out of the promiscuous mass of mankind, Jew and Gentile, certain men, limited in number, but not a definite cataloguable list, whom he has foreknown and predestinated to eternal life, not, as the Westminster Confession teaches, by an act of mere sovereignty, without any foresight of faith, or anything in the creature moving him thereto, but expressly on the higher ethical ground of their foreseen faith in Christ: and that the rest of mankind are not included among the elect on account of their lack of individual faith.

But none of these views, either those in which the two schools agree, or those in which they disagree, express Paul's concept. They are not in accord with his theme in the Epistle, or in the line of his present discussion; and they are found nowhere else in the Bible. Neither in this chapter, nor anywhere else does Paul speak of election to eternal life. For God does not elect men to life, but only to opportunities; and he does not elect particular individuals, but only masses of men. And here he is speaking, not of men at large, but of the Gentiles only, and of them not severally, but in mass. Paul does not deny, what the synagogue held, that the Jews were elect and called; but he holds, what the Jews denied, that the Gentiles also, all of them, are equally God's children, God's elect, God's called, the objects from of old of his fatherly concern and fatherly ingathering. And it is of the Gentiles, in mass, as over against the Jews, that Paul uses here these words: ["The Gentiles] whom God of old had in his gracious thought." These gracious and spacious words, "whom he of old had in thought," leave no room for any interpretative addition about God's sovereign unconditional choice of "some" men from among his

creatures; or, on the other hand, about his "foresight of faith" in some men, as a condition of their election. The saying in our text that "God foreknew the Gentiles," and the parallel saying in the eleventh chapter, that "he foreknew the Jews," can mean only this (but how grand is this meaning, how it ennoble the gospel plan!) that "from eternity God had them, *all* of them, all Gentiles and all Jews, in his thought, his fatherly thought." This is the point that, emphasizing Paul's words, I wish to enforce, that it was *all* of the Gentiles, *all* of the Jews, *in mass*, whom God from eternity had in his thought, and called to the privileges of the Church of Christ. God devised the gospel plan to save *all* men from the ruin of the fall. "He foreknew *all* men," not an elect few only; that is, he had *all* men in his thought, both the men of the synagogue, and the men outside of the synagogue; and of those both, not only those who afterwards should have faith, but those who should not have faith; and the latter as really and fully as the former.*

3. The next debated point in this verse is involved in Paul's Greek word, *προώρυσεν*. This word the Authorized translates by the English word "predestinated," and the Revised by the word "foreordained;" with what difference in the meaning of the words the Dictionaries fail to tell us. These words convey to most readers, as well as to the divines of the Westminster Assembly, the idea of an irresistible decree of God, an inexorable foredoom of men, to something good, or to something ill,—and for the most of the race the latter. But this is not the meaning of Paul's Greek verb. This meaning is exactly expressed by the common English

* This sense of the word "foreknew" is in harmony with all that we read in the Bible in regard to God's outlook for men, whether in mass, or, as the word is sometimes used, in regard to certain individuals. Of the race at large, David cries, "What is man, that thou art mindful of him?" (Psa. viii, 4); and Job says, "What is man, that thou shouldst set thy mind upon him?" (Job vii, 17). Of Abraham, individually, God said, "I knew him [had him in my thought], to the end that he may command his household after him. [The Hebrew has the telic conjunction לְמַעַן אֲשֶׁר "in order that," or "to the end that:" and it does not mean, as the Authorized translates it, "I know him *that* he will command his house after him."] (Gen. xviii, 19). Of Jeremiah, God said, "Before I formed thee, I knew thee [had thee in thought], and ordained thee a prophet to the nations." (Jer. 1, 5.) Of the Jews, God said, "Only you, of all the families of the earth, did I know [had you in my thought as the theocratic nation]." (Amos iii, 2.) "The Lord chose thee to be a special people to himself." (Deut. vii, 6.)

words "marked out," "delimited," or "circumscribed," that is, "included in God's plan."*

This is the only predestination that the Bible knows anything of,—God's eternal forethought for man's salvation, an eternal inclusion of them all in the gracious plan of the gospel. God did not "predestinate" (deeree) the Jews, as they thought, or any one else, to everlasting life; and he certainly did not "foreordain" the countless majority of the race, or any single soul, to dishonor, and wrath, and everlasting death, "to the praise of his glorious justice!" The fatalistic decree, taught by Augustine and Calvin, and formulated three hundred years ago in the Westminster Confession, and held even yet by some belated theologians, to an indefeasible salvation of the elect and an inevitable damnation of countless "reprobates," is not found in the teachings of the New Testament; and the last half of it is, as Calvin himself called it, "a horrible decree," a dreadful travesty of God's most gracious forecasting for all the sons of men.

The translation here set forth, "he included them in his plan," expresses the apostle's concept in full; and the clause should end with a comma.

4. In the next clause the Authorized and the Revised add the complemental infinitive "to be" to express what they conceive to be the specific purpose of the divine "predestination"—namely, that man, as if previously unlike Christ, should now become conformed to his image. But it is not the teaching of the New Testament that men are unlike Christ; and this is not the apostle's thought, and it is not the construction or the meaning of the sentence. First, the leading verb, as we have seen, does not mean "predestinated," but "included;" and, secondly, there is no telic infinitive "to be" (or "to become"), expressed or understood, in the Greek sentence; and, thirdly, the next word is not the participle

*These words, "marked out," express the full content of the Greek verb. The Authorized and the Revised surreptitiously import into this meaning the added notion, not found or implied in the Greek verb, of the preposition "unto," as if the verb meant "*he marked them out unto*"—that is, "destinated" or "ordained them *unto* the being conformed"—though there is no *terminus in quem* "to be," expressed or understood. The word is compounded of *πρὸ*—"of old," "dating from eternity"—and *ὁρίζω*—"to bound, to include in definite limits." This verb is the word from which we get the English word "horizon," the line which "bounds" or "circumscribes our field of vision." In Paul's use of the verb here, it declares that God from of old swept the lines of his plan around the Gentile world.

“conformed” (though this is approximately correct for the sense), and is grammatically the adjective **conform** (like other compounds, “uniform,” “multiform,” “reform,” “deform”^{**}); and, fourthly, this adjective is not predicative of an assumed verb, “to be,” but *attributive* to the word **them** (“the Gentiles”), understood, the object of the verb “predestinated,” “included in his plan;” and the translation should run, “He included them (‘the Gentiles’), men conform with the image of his Son.” The clause does not express the divine *purpose*, but the *ground* of the divine forethought and forecast for the Gentiles; that is, God counted them in, not in order that they might become conform with the image of his Son, but *because* they were *already conform* with his image, already conform with it by the very fact that they were *men*, “*created in his image*” (Gen. i, 27), sharers with Christ in the same humanity, body and soul. It is in this explicit sense that Paul said to the Gentiles of Galatia: “*Because ye ARE sons*, God sent forth the Spirit of his Son into our hearts.” (Gal. iv. 6.) And so, fifthly, the last word, “image,” means, not Christ’s *moral* image of *holiness*, but his *natural* image, all that made him *man*. It is in this sense that in the Resurrection Chapter, Paul says: “As we bore the [natural] image of the earthly man, we shall bear also the [natural] image of the heavenly man.” (1 Cor. xv, 49.) And to the Philippians he says: “We await the Lord Jesus as our Savior from heaven, who will refashion our body of humiliation, *conform with his glorious body.*” (Phil. iii, 21.)

This clause, which expresses a complete sense, should be punctuated with a semicolon.

5. It is only in the last clause, **that Christ may be firstborn among many brethren**, that the apostle expresses the *purpose* of the divine action. This verb, “*that Christ may be,*” is not dependent, as in the Authorized and the Revised, upon the word “conformed,” but on the verb “predestinated,” “included in his plan;” and it sets forth the end that God had in view in his large plans for the world. This divine aim was not so much to glorify Christ among his brethren (though this is also true), as to gather *many* brethren to Christ. The emphatic word here is “*many;*” and, like Paul’s other salient word “*all,*” we can not make it too emphatic. The apostle’s thought is that God, with his gracious and wide outlook, embraced in the scope of the gospel plan, not the

^{**} More dreadful and deform.”—“Paradise Lost,” ii, 706.

Jews only, but the numberless Gentiles as well, "in order that Christ may be firstborn* among *many* brethren;" that is, the divine election and call of men into Church relations here, and their resurrection to eternal life, are not of the Jews only, who, racially, were comparatively insignificant, "the fewest of all peoples" (Deut. vii, 7); nay, but the horizon of the gospel sweeps the compass of the globe; it is, and was from of old, inclusive of the whole Gentile world. This is Paul's concept in the word "*many*." Christ is to be counted firstborn, not, as the Jewish synagogues would have made him, of the few Jews only; not, as Calvinism would make him, of a few elect saints, to the exclusion of all the rest of the world; but as the Pauline gospel makes him, "firstborn of *many* brethren;" that is, of the whole Gentile world, a "multitude that no man can number."

With this underlying thought and interpretation, this verse in particular, and the entire paragraph in which it stands, instead of being irreconcilable with our ideas of right, and incapable of explanation on the basis of God's fair dealing with men, becomes luminous, generous, noble, and in harmony with our sense of the Divine equity and with our concept of the cosmopolitan gospel of Christ. It is a preachable gospel. Paul declared that he was not ashamed of it. He was able to look men in the face without blushing for such a gospel, or for himself as Christ's ambassador. The gospel proclaims to every man an equal chance. God remains tolerable, his government unimpeachable, man's freedom inviolate; and Christ can be preached as the Savior who "wills that *all* men shall be saved and come to the knowledge of the truth."

Verse 30. But whom he of old included in his plan, these he also called; and whom he called, these he also justified; but whom he justified, these he also glorified.

The verbs in this verse express the successive steps of the plan which God planned of old, and which he held, in his counsels, potentially accomplished in Christ, for the entire race, past, present, and future; though, in fact, the fifth and final act in the series will be historically realized only at the last day.

*The term "firstborn" is usually understood as expressing Christ's official pre-eminence. But the connection suggests that it here has reference to the general resurrection. It is thus that Paul calls him "the firstborn from the dead" (Col. 1, 18), and John calls him "the firstborn of the dead" (Rev. 1, 15).

The words of Paul were spoken in the line of his argument for the Gentiles, and must be so interpreted; yet they are general, and broad enough to cover the case of all men. The gospel scheme knows no distinctions among men on the basis of nature, or of divine decree. What the gospel provides and does for our race, it provides and does for all races alike; what it does for one man, it does for all men. The differences which God has established among men in this world are differences, not in their moral and spiritual status, but only in their providential and temporal circumstances. Other distinctions of caste, or social institutions, or positions, are the work of men themselves; and "God does not respect them."

We may notice how strongly the points enumerated in this verse confirm the exegesis of the chapter and of the Epistle at large. The apostle presents the work of *justification* as the central and controlling issue in the discussion; and he does not discuss, or even allude to, the subject of *sanctification*, as one of the steps in this climax.

Verse 31. What then shall we say in regard to these things? If God is for us, who is against us?

The question, **What then shall we say?** is usually a challenge from an opponent; but here seems to be in the line of the apostle's own thought, the inevitable conclusion from his teachings in regard to God's plan for the Gentile world. And so, if a challenge at all, it may be counted as Paul's challenge to the Jewish gainsayer. And the apostle now may well ask his Jewish opponent: "What shall we say in reference to this overwhelming evidence of divine concern and effective interposition in behalf of the Gentile world?" According to this explanation, the pronoun "we" represents not only Paul, but the opponent as well. But in the next clause the personal pronoun **us**—"for us, against us,"—is spoken from the standpoint of the Gentiles, and not of the Jews; and shows, as so often, that the apostle of the Gentiles here identifies himself with them. And with this thought, he asks the question, **If God is for us,**—if God is on our side, if God stands for *us Gentiles*, **who is there against us?** But, possibly, we may let Paul's last pronoun "against us" include One more. It would well accord with his line of thought: *Christ and the Gentiles* are an overwhelming majority: we march to victory! "Who is against us?" Against the Infinite God, how less than nothing the mightiest an-

tagonist; how beneath all count, the *puny Jew!* If God of old marked out the Gentile world for this place in his sight, the Jew will gainsay in vain.

Verse 32. He who, at least, spared not his own Son, but gave him up for us all, how will he not also with him graciously give us all things?

The words which the apostle uses in this verse, in regard to Christ, he quotes from God's words to Abraham when he offered up his son Isaac: "Because thou didst this thing, and didst not spare thy son, thy beloved son—" (Gen. xxii, 16). Abraham's offering of his son was the greatest proof he could give of his obedience to God. In like manner, God's giving up his own Son to death was the greatest proof he could give of his love for man. Jesus himself declared to Nicodemus, "God so loved the world that he gave his only-begotten Son, that whosoever has faith on him may not perish, but may have eternal life." (John iii, 16.) This thought Paul here reiterates: "He gave him up (to death) for us all," and then adds, that, "since God gave this greatest gift, much more will he with him, give us all things." The Greek verb in the last clause means more than "give," it means **give as a matter of grace.**

Verses 33, 34. Who will charge aught against God's elect? Will God, who justified them? Who is he that will condemn them? Is it Christ, who died? but, rather, who was raised? who also is at the right hand of God? who also intercedes for us?

The leading questions in these two verses are a definite reproduction of the more general thought in the question in the thirty-first verse. There it was asked, generally, "Who is against us?" Here the deprecated antagonism is set forth in terms of judicial arraignment. The reference is, of course, to the captious opposition of the Jew to the equality of the Gentile.

These questions (as also in the thirty-fifth verse) are not asked for information, but argumentatively, and they imply negative answers—"There is no one." But the answer in each case is given in the form of a rebutting question. The rejoinder has thus a stronger rhetorical force, and the piled up questions at the end of the thirty-fourth verse, so characteristic of Paul's *cumulative* style, make a very striking climax.

The words, **God's elect**, in this verse are spoken of the Gen-

tiles. They were elect of God, "who *elect*ed them in Christ, before the foundation of the world." (Eph. i, 4.) They were of old in God's thoughts; they were included in his plan; they were marked out as his own; they were called to the opportunity of salvation. While the race was still one, and Gentile, "God established his covenant with them, and with their seed after them." (Gen. ix, 9.) God's election is not an election of some particular men to life, but an election of all men to the opportunity of life. In this sense the Gentiles were chosen *en masse*. The call of the Jews afterwards (which did not cancel, or suspend, the call of the Gentiles) was not *to life* in any sense that was not *already* theirs in common with the Gentiles, but to special theocratic and missionary functions in the way of God's religious provision for the world at large: "Jehovah, thy God, chose thee to be a special people unto himself, above all the peoples which are upon the face of the earth" (Deut. vii, 6); but certainly not to the salvation of every individual Jew, and certainly not to the exclusion of the Gentiles from the earlier covenant and from the opportunity of salvation. All Gentiles and all Jews have always had the *opportunity* of life. But it is very far from being the teachings of the Scriptures that all persons, Gentile or Jew, on the ground of being of these elect peoples, are personally righteous, or are even desirous of being saved. Opportunity is not always importunity. "God wills that all men should be saved;" but at the same time sorrowfully condemns the men who disobey.

Here the Gentile world is spoken of as "God's elect;" and the verse declares that against them, therefore, the gainsaying of the Jew can avail naught. "Who will bring charges against God's elect? Will God, the One that justifies them?" This simple presentation of the case is the conclusive *reductio ad absurdum*. If the Infinite God justifies them, surely the cavil of the petty Jew counts for nothing; it weighs less than the dust of the balance.

Verses 35, 36. Who will separate us from the love of Christ? Will affliction? or anguish? or persecution? or famine? or nakedness? or danger? or sword? according as it has been written, that,

For thy sake we are put to death all the day long;
We were reckoned as sheep for slaughter? (Psa. xl, 22.)

The leading question is a comprehensive one, intended to cover all the points not touched on in the previous verses. And

the apostle, assuming that the Jew avails naught against us, now further asks, in terms of the widest possible range, **Who will separate us from the love of Christ towards us?** And then, as he can name no *person* in answer to his question, he names seven temporal troubles that may befall God's children, but none of which can separate them from his love. The language seems to be a reminiscence of the words of the Temanite: "He will deliver thee in six troubles; yea, in seven no evil will touch thee,—in famine, in war, in destruction," etc. (Job v. 19.) Paul's list is not the same as the older list; but to name the things in either list as separating us from God is to reject them, and to reject the whole possible catalogue of such merely external troubles. Not a whole *Iliad* of woes can separate us from Christ; but they may draw us nearer to him. "He will not hide his face from us in the day of trouble." (Psa. cii, 2.) "Though the outward man decay, yet the inward man is renewed day by day." (2 Cor. iv, 16.)

Paul's word **sword** at the end of the thirty-fifth verse suggested to his mind the apt quotation in the thirty-sixth verse, which is accordingly exegetical of this word only. The interrogative mark should therefore be carried forward to the end of the thirty-sixth verse.

Verse 37. **Nay, but in these things all, we do more than conquer, through him that loved us.**

The intensive verb in this sentence, **we do more than conquer**, means that we wage not merely an equal contest with our troubles, but that we are overvictorious through Christ that loved us. The troubles of this life, and especially the opposition of the Jew, do not exclude us from the covenant, do not sap the peace of God's children, much less alienate them from their fealty to him. The best commentary is Paul's own saying to the Corinthian Gentiles: "For our light affliction, which is but for a moment, works out for us more and more exceedingly an eternal weight of glory." (2 Cor. iv. 17.)

Verses 38, 39. **For I am persuaded that neither death, nor life, nor angels, nor principalities, nor things present, nor things to come, nor powers; nor height, nor depth, nor any other creature, will be able to separate us from the love of God, which is in Christ Jesus our Lord.**

The explicative conjunction **for** assigns a reason for the preceding verse; and expands the thought begun in the thirty-fifth

verse, that nothing will be able to separate us from the love of Christ. In that verse seven external troubles, of the many incident to human experience, are specified, which, yet, the apostle declares, will not be able to separate from the love of Christ. But here, in the thirty-eighth verse, he advances a step still further, and says that no active force, animate or inanimate, will be able to separate us from the love of God. He designates ten such forces. The exact meaning of some of these words is in doubt; but the three styled **angels, principalities, powers** seem to denote various orders of the heavenly hierarchy, as held by the Jews, and incidentally recognized by the Christian Scriptures. Paul in cataloguing these angelic orders does not assume that they are hostile to man; but that for illustration's sake only they may be conceived as working against us. In this same way Paul says to the Galatians, "If an angel from heaven preach a gospel different from that which we preached to you, let him be anathema." (Gal. i, 8.) The other words in this list denote mere natural forces, which can have no animus against us; but may also be conceived of as becoming obstructions. But most probably the apostle in the fervor and rapidity of composition catalogued these ten individual forces quite promiscuously as they occurred to him (as also the seven in the thirty-fifth verse), and without having any very definite conception, himself, of them severally; and he, perhaps, might, with equal appropriateness, have named as many more. This is confirmed by the vagueness of the last one of the ten named: "None of those forces, or things, or any yet different **creature.**"

Such is the noble, inspiring conclusion of this most noble chapter. The grandeur of the apostle's theme, and the grandeur of the apostle's thoughts, and the grandeur of the apostle's style, can not be surpassed, if they can be equaled in all the world's literature. Erasmus, in his commentary on verse 35, says, and we may extend his remark to the whole chapter, "What did Cicero ever say more grandly eloquent?"

CHAPTER IX.

Verses 1, 2. I say the truth in Christ, I do not lie; my consciousness bearing witness with me in the Holy Spirit, that I have great grief and unceasing anguish in my heart.

The argument in the previous chapter has clearly demonstrated that the Gentiles hold an equal place with the Jews, in the eternal and now consummated plans of God. All Scripture testimonies, of which Paul quotes many, point to the fact, that, from the first, the Gentiles (who once were all there were in the world), were ever present in the thought of God, and were included in his plan. The eighth chapter is the triumphal psalm of the Gentile world, as sons of God, in the Church of Christ. No one in heaven, or earth, or hell, can separate them from the love of God in Christ Jesus. The issue in their behalf has been made up, the case heard, the verdict reached. And, so far as concerns the Gentiles, which was the one matter in debate, there is no longer need to vindicate their rights, and the apostle might now have staid his hand.

But there is also another issue made up in the apostle's mind; and to this issue he devotes the next three weighty, much debated chapters. The question that he here discusses is no longer, Where do the Gentiles stand? but, reversing the investigation, rather, Where do the *Jews* stand before God? He no longer inquires, Do they still hold their former pre-eminence in the Church? rather he inquires, Do they hold any place in it at all?

And to the consideration of this grave question the apostle now addresses himself. We shall however follow his discussion better by presenting in advance an outline of the New Testament teachings, and especially Paul's own teachings in regard to his own people, and in regard to their relation past and present and future to God's plan for the world at large.

1. God's plans from the first, as we have abundantly seen, took in the entire race indiscriminately. But afterwards, in view of

the increasing wickedness of the world, and the corruption of religion among men, God selected a particular family, and race, to become an organized Church for the worship of God; and a missionary Church, for the recovery of the rest of the world.

2. This position and its privileges were given provisionally to Abraham and his posterity; not, as the Jews finally came to think, for any personal merit, in themselves, nor yet solely for themselves, to the exclusion of the Gentiles from the provisions of grace; but, on the contrary, explicitly for the conversion of the Gentiles. God, in calling Abraham, expressly said to him, "In thy seed shall all the nations [Gentiles] of the earth be blessed." (Gen. xxii, 18.)

3. God's choice of Abraham and his posterity was not arbitrary or capricious; but for sufficient and evident reasons. He selected Abraham on account of his faith in God; as a man fitted to be the chief in a great religious movement; and later, from the stock of Abraham, by various eliminations of the less promising scions of the family, he selected Isaac, rather than the firstborn son Ishmael, and Jacob, rather than the firstborn son Esau, because of their natural predispositions which fitted them to become the fathers of a nation charged with special religious functions.

4. Of this nation, God became the King, or civil Ruler, in as real a sense as he became their God. Such a government in which the civil and the religious functions are united is called a "*theocracy*." Josephus, who coined this word, and who first gave the Israelites this appropriate name, says: "Our legislator [Moses; but Moses, under God] ordained our government to be what, by a strained expression, may be termed a *theocracy*, by ascribing the authority and power to God." (Apion II, 16.)

Even after the establishment of the kingdom of Israel under Saul, and his successors, until the final destruction of the State, this theocratic concept of the government was still formally retained; God was still thought of as King; the State was a kingdom of God, on earth; the earthly kings were his vicegerents.

5. The call of the Jews as the theocratic people involved for them not only their citizenship in the nation, but also their membership in the State Church; which two things, however, in the Jewish mind were identical. These civil and religious privileges of the Jews were altogether of an external character; and attached to them *en masse* absolutely, by birthright in State and Church; but they did not involve their individual acceptance with God, and

their final salvation : just as, contrariwise, the non-call of Ishmael, and of Esau, and of the Gentiles at large, into this citizenship and Church membership, certainly did not involve their damnation *en masse*, or individually; and did not exclude them severally from the grace of God. No doubt the Jews with their special theocratic privileges had better religious opportunities and encouragements than the Gentiles; but the Gentiles were also equally objects of God's love and care, equally elect to salvation, and, though they were not yet outwardly called, *en masse*, into an organized and visible Church, their title was only dormant. But every man of them could still make his individual calling and election sure. Every man in both classes, Jew and Gentile, equally needed to work out his own individual salvation, independently of his national franchise.

6. While God, in the order of his providential government, dealt with the elect nation *en masse*, he also always, in the sphere of his grace, dealt with each soul, individually. All Jews, indiscriminately, were in the theocratic kingdom by virtue of their natural birth from Abraham and Jacob; no single adult Jew was in the spiritual "kingdom of God," except by virtue of this new birth of the Spirit, from his individual faith. So Jesus said to Nicodemus, "Verily I say to thee, *ye* [that is, *ye Jews*; notice the plural pronoun], must be born again; [your Jewish birth does not avail]. Unless one (even a Jew) be born from water and Spirit, he can not enter into the [new spiritual] kingdom of God." (John iii, 5.) And in this particular, Gentiles could stand side by side with Jewish believers, and be counted with them as "children of God." The Jews trusted to their national descent; they relied on works for justification; the Gentiles who had none of these boasted qualifications of birth and works, could come into God's kingdom only by the inward qualification of faith. And so Christ said to Nicodemus, that "every man [Jew or *Gentile*] that has faith may have life eternal." (John iii, 16.) And it is Paul's thought in his gospel, that as all Jews were in the theocratic kingdom by birth, but must enter the spiritual kingdom by faith, so all Gentiles, also, though failing the outward qualifications, are already, like the Jews, subjects, potentially, of the kingdom of grace; and every adult of either class may by faith at any moment become experimentally a member of that kingdom. The doors open to each believer, Jew or Gentile, at his own forceful will. Said Christ to the Jews, "Since the days of John the Baptist until now, the kingdom

of heaven suffers violence, and violent [strenuous] men of whatever nationality take it by storm." (Matt. xi, 12.)

7. God planned his Church on earth, from the first, on generous lines; he intended it to unfold at last into a spiritual kingdom which should know no limit but that of the entire race. The Jews knew all this; their own Scriptures were full of it. Moses and all the prophets taught this coming universal reign of Messiah, and the free accession of the Gentiles into the spiritual kingdom of God. And they also warned the Jews against unfaith in these prophecies, and foretold their rejection, if disobedient, from the theocratic kingdom. And Christ told them, "The kingdom of God will be taken from you, and will be given to a nation [clearly the Gentiles] bringing forth the fruit thereof." (Mark xxi, 43.) If the Jews had accepted him as their Messiah, and his plans for their Church, what a resplendent future would have been theirs! They might long since have won the world to Christ. Instead, what an awful tragedy their history has been! That last most wonderful prophecy of Moses promised them glorious blessings. Instead of these, they incurred the dreadful curses denounced therein upon a disobedient and gainsaying people. (Deut. chapter xxviii.)

8. But the Jews from the first systematically misunderstood the nature and purpose of their call. They deemed themselves favorites of heaven; they prided themselves upon their descent from Abraham, and upon the covenant with the fathers, and upon the circumcision which was its seal. Instead of seeking to become, as God intended them, a Church and a home for mankind at large, they became ever more narrow, unsympathetic with the spiritual needs of others, inhospitable, repellent. They neglected their one call as a propagandist Church, and closed the doors of hope to the Gentile world. They did not welcome proselytes, until within the century before the coming of Christ, and then not from a love of souls. They believed the Church of Moses was final; and they felt themselves secure of a place in the Church here, and of eternal salvation hereafter. They thought no Jew, however unworthy otherwise, could perish; and no one of any other nation, however righteous, could be saved, except by becoming a Jew. It is true that Gentiles without circumcision were admitted as inquirers to the worship of the synagogue, but they were not admitted to the worship of the temple, or to partake of the passover, or even to eat with a Jew. Indeed some even of the Jewish Chris-

tians taught the Gentile Christians, "Unless ye be circumcised with the rite of Moses ye can not be saved." (Acts xv, 1.)

9. God's covenant with the Jews was not absolute and irreversible, but contingent on their obedience. God was not bound by the letter of his promises; but during all their history held himself free to cancel his covenant and promises for cause. Time and again he changed his course towards the kings of Israel and the people, and revoked his promises, and drove them into captivity, and at last finally canceled his covenant with them, both as nation and as Church. The principle of his conduct towards them was explicitly announced in their Scriptures: "At what moment I shall speak concerning a nation and concerning a kingdom, to pluck up and to break down and to destroy it; and that nation concerning which I spoke, turn from its evil, then I will repent of the evil which I thought to do to it. And at what moment I shall speak concerning a nation, and concerning a kingdom, to build and to plant it, and it do evil in my sight, that it obey not my voice; then I will repent of the good with which I said I would benefit it." (Jer. xviii, 7-10.)

10. And now in these chapters Paul teaches that the condemnation so long threatened has come upon them. They have rejected Jesus as Messiah. God rejects them as the theocratic people, the basis of his Church. Henceforth he will have no theocratic nation, and will build his kingdom and his Church, not upon Jew-born men, but upon regenerate men of any nationality as the spiritual foundation stones, Jesus Christ himself being the chief Corner-stone. And he calls the Gentiles into this open and free communion.

11. But we must recollect that the rejection of the Jews from being the special theocratic nation, which was, of course, a rejection of them *en masse*—men, women, and children—did not involve the rejection of any Jew, individually, from the possibility of being saved. The Jews thus rejected were not, therefore, "turned into hell," but simply fall back into the primitive and promiseous condition of the race from which their great forefather had been called, and which the Gentiles at large still filled. And now, no longer distinguished by any religious prerogative from the Gentiles, they could enter only on the ground of individual faith into the spiritual kingdom of God, the Church of the Lord Jesus Christ. The synagogue of the Jews still survived as a voluntary religious organization, though it was now hostile to Christ, "a synagogue of Satan"

(Rev. ii, 9) ; but many individuals from the synagogue, yet in ever diminishing numbers, "cleaved to Christ."

And so Paul, while he unsparingly condemned their course as apostates from Christ, did not count them as hopeless reprobates. Wherever he went he sought to preach to the Jews first of all. He never taught the eternal perdition of the Jews *en masse* ; but expressly declared that "God did not cast away his people which he had in his thoughts and plans."

The sustained sentiment of the New Testament in regard to the Jews, especially the common people of them, is one of forbearance. Christ prayed for them, "Father, forgive them, for they know not what they do" (Luke xxiii, 34) ; and Peter said to the Jews: "I know that in ignorance ye did it, as did also your rulers" (Acts iii, 17) ; and Paul said with regard to himself: "I obtained mercy, because I did it ignorantly, in unbelief" (1 Tim. i, 13) ; and he said with regard to his brethren: "My heart's desire and prayer is for them, that they may be saved" (Rom. x, 1). He would certainly not have prayed for men whom he knew to be foredoomed reprobates.

It was with such views with regard to God's plan, and such feelings with regard to the Jews, that Paul wrote these chapters. But he wrote them with deepest grief and sorrow of heart. He was himself a Jew, proud of the mighty traditions of his people, and of their holy religion ; he loved his people as his own soul, and would sacrifice his life to save them from rejecting Christ and from being themselves rejected from the Church for their unfaith. Yet in these chapters he judicially declared their rejection from the Church of the fathers, which has now become the Church of Christ.

Verse 3. For I could wish that I myself were anathema from the Christ, for [in the place of] my brethren, my kinsmen according to the flesh.

Two critical remarks: 1. The article with the word "*the* Christ" shows that the apostle uses the term here, not (as usual in the Epistles) as a proper name, but as an official designation, "the Messiah," which is the sense that appeals to the Jews.* 2. The

* The word Christ is found in this Epistle sixty-six times as a proper name (sixty times without the article and six times more with the article for definitiveness) ; but only twice with the article as the Jewish official designation ;—in this verse, and in the fifth verse, "From whom is the Messiah." But cf. note on Rom. vii, 4.

preposition, *ὐπέρ*, in the phrase, **for my brethren**, must be taken logically in the sense of "in the place of," or "instead of." (Cf. Rom. v, 7.) Paul here thinks of himself, not as being made an anathema in behalf of, or *for the benefit of*, his brethren—that is, as a sacrifice or expiation (which does not give any appropriate sense)—but only *as a substitute* for them.

In order to know to what doom Paul would yield himself in the place of the Jews, we must first inquire to what doom they were themselves exposed; for it is this doom only that he would assume in their stead. It has been too rashly taken for granted that their condemnation was to eternal damnation; and that it was, therefore, eternal damnation to which Paul would devote himself in their stead. But this was not Paul's concept with regard to the unbelieving Jews.

We have seen that Paul never taught or conceived that the Jews, whether *en masse* or individually, were doomed to be damned, on the ground of unfaith in the Messianic promises, or that even in their apostasy they were beyond the immediate reach and the ultimate saving power of the gospel. All that Paul thought or taught in regard to the status of the Jews was, that they had been displaced, *en masse*, from being a theocratic people; and that, as individual Jews, in which relation alone God now regarded them, they, by reason of their personal unfaith in the Messianic promises, and by reason of their rejection of Jesus as the Christ, had not become incorporated spiritually in the kingdom of God on earth, the Church of Christ. They were **anathema from the Christ**; they were *en masse* counted outside of the community, and individually out of communion with the Christian Church. Notice their fall, and just how far its consequences reached. The common people of the Jews had at first heard Christ gladly; and were almost ready for a profession of faith in him; but misled by their spiritual guides, they came to look upon him with suspicion, and renounced him and his teachings; and even followed the chief priests, who pursued him to the death as the enemy and subverter of their trusted Judaism. Yet even to the last, the mass of the people [as is the fact with regard to them at the present day], were not incorrigibly wicked; they still believed in God; they still worshiped him as of old; they still clung to the Scriptures, and they still claimed to look for the promised Messiah. Amid much in them that was condemnable, there was still much that was commendable. And surely not all

the Jews who had thus been carried along with the current of popular prejudice, and who rejected Christ, were doomed to eternal damnation for their unfaith. During all Paul's ministry, and later, there continued to be many conversions from among them to Christianity, until the destruction of the Jewish State (A. D. 70), and the utter overthrow of the Jewish Church. And during all the centuries since, though conversions to Christianity have been fewer, they have never ceased. And, further, the separation of the bulk of the nation from Christ is not final, but only for the limited period of their unfaith: and Paul tells us, that some day the veil will be taken from their hearts, and the Jewish people will come back *en masse* to Christ; "and so all Israel as a people will be saved." (Rom. xi, 26.)

These last words, "all Israel will be saved," can have no other meaning than that of the restoration of the Jews *en masse* to membership in the visible Church of Christ. Yet, when the Jews shall have been restored to membership in the organic Church, it will not be, as it was not of old, to any separate nationality, or any theocratic prominence, or any specially favorable conditions; but they will come into the Christian Church, indiscriminately, on a common level with the Gentiles. This was already foreshadowed to Paul's mind by the absorption into the Church of Christ of the many thousand individual Jews who had accepted faith in Christ.

The question of the meaning of Paul's wish turns then upon the word "*anathema*." The Authorized translates it by the word "accursed;" that is, as it is popularly understood, "eternally damned." That the Greek word may have this worst sense is doubtful; but it properly expresses only putting under ban, or "separation" (which is the translation given here in the margin of the Authorized); that is, excommunication from the Church. This milder sense became the accepted one later on, in both the synagogue, and in the Christian Church. The Revised correctly transfers the word "*anathema*." "*Anathema*" is a matter of ecclesiastical discipline, exercised by man, and not by God; and can not carry eternal consequences (though, doubtless, ecclesiastical excommunication for cause suggests danger of hell-fire). This is the sense of the word in this passage. When Paul thinks of *anathema* in connection with the Jews, the utmost that he has in his thought is, that the once elect people are now "*separated*" *en masse* from the Messiah—that is, from the Messianic Church of the fathers, in which they and he gloried—and in fellowship with

which was the normal way of salvation; and he thinks of their separation as disciplinary only, and not damnatory or eternal. Condemnation different from this Paul never dreamed of for his brethren, the Jews. And this is the utmost that he has in his thought in regard to himself, when he says, "I could wish that I were myself anathema from the Christ in the place of my brethren." In his grief over their unfaith in Messiah, and their rejection from their time-honored position, he declares, that to save them to the Church and to Christ, he would fain, if so it could be, devote himself, whom they hated, to excommunication in their stead. The man who had five times been expelled from the synagogue, with the minor excommunication, ignominiously, "with forty stripes save one," and, so far as Jewish discipline could compass it, had been formally "given over to Satan, that he might learn not to blaspheme," felt that he could gladly endure this graver and final excommunication from Messiah; that is, from all ecclesiastical privileges (whether in synagogue or church), in their stead, if, by this sacrifice and ignominy, he could save them to Christ and the Church. But surely Paul, in this contemplated devotion of himself, instead of his brethren, did not deem or dream that it included his own personal alienation from Christ, and an eternal damnation. Such a thought was utterly foreign to all his being. He has just said in his triumphal words in the last chapter, "I am persuaded that nothing will separate me from the love of God, in Christ Jesus, my Lord" (Rom. viii, 38); and he surely does not now straightway unsay this, or mean that "I could wish to be damned from Christ instead of my brethren;" that is, as he did not hold that his brethren were condemned to damnation (which is not the meaning of anathema, an ecclesiastical discipline only), so he could not think of himself (the above quotation shows it), as personally alienated from "Christ Jesus, his Lord."

But, after all, though the wish that he expressed was not so dreadful as is commonly thought, we must notice that the form of expression which he used, clearly implied that he did not really conceive such a personal substitution of himself in the place of his brethren to be within the possibilities, whether from the human, or from the Divine point of view. Paul's saying was but the impulsive expression of an imaginary case. His contingent phraseology showed that he did not himself regard it as possible. The saying "I could wish," implied the condition *if the circumstances permitted*; and showed that he did not expect it. He merely says that he

would it might be so, knowing at the same time that it could not be so.

Verses 4, 5. Who are Israelites; whose is the adoption, and the glory, and the dispensations, and the legislation, and the temple service, and the promises; whose are the fathers, and from whom is the Christ, as concerning the flesh, who is over all, God blessed forever; Amen.

The name Israel was given to Jacob after he prevailed in prayer. "Thy name shall no more be called Jacob [Supplanter], but Israel [Prince of God]." (Gen. xxxii, 28.) This name of honor became the corporate name preferred by the nation, as a whole, until the division of the kingdom under Rehoboam, when it was adopted as the national designation by the northern kingdom of the ten tribes; the southern kingdom taking the name Judah. During the captivity, the ten tribes disappeared as such from history; though many Israelites came back with the captives from Judah. Thenceforward the people collectively were called Jews. But contemporaneously with this later national designation, the name Israel was still used, though now with a higher religious significance. This is the honorary and religious title which Christ gives to Nathanael: "Behold an Israelite indeed, in whom is no guile." (John i, 47.) It is the complimentary term that Paul here employs to express the religious dignity of his brethren; and which further on he uses in regard to himself, "For I am an Israelite" (Rom. xi, 1); but when he speaks of himself, not as a Churchman, but nationally, in secular connections, he uses the other name, "I am a *Jew* of Tarsus" (Acts xxi, 39).

In a former passage (Rom. iii, 2), Paul named a single point in which the Jews had an institutional, but not a moral superiority over the Gentiles,—that they had the oracles of God; but here he enumerates eight more points in which the Israelites [now the complimentary name], surpassed the rest of the world,—1. the adoption; 2. the glory; 3. the dispensations; 4. the legislation; 5. the temple service; 6. the promises; 7. the fathers; and 8. the descent of the Christ [Messiah]. These points are all of an external character, and named the franchises that belonged to the Jews *en masse*. They are worthy of consideration severally.

1. The word **adoption**, or "sonship," is used to express the special call of the elect, priestly nation, to great and sacred privileges with God. But the same word is used in the gospel conception,

to express the more intimate filial relation of individual believers. This relation was sealed to their consciousness by the Spirit of God. "He redeemed them that were under the Law, that we may receive the adoption of sons; but because ye are sons, God sent forth the Spirit of his Son into your hearts, crying, Abba, Father." (Gal. iv. 5.) [Notice the unconscious confusion of the pronouns, "them, we, ye;" which is no confusion after all, seeing that in Paul's thought, Jews and Gentiles are now all one.]

2. The word **glory** expresses, probably, what the Rabbins called the "Shekinah," the visible sign of God's presence, upon occasion, between the Cherubim, above the mercy seat. It appeared to Moses, and to the high priest on the day of atonement, as representatives of the congregation at large. The Shekinah was a literal vision, not figurative; and it ceased with the destruction of the first temple. But Haggai, at the building of the second temple, promised, that "the glory of the latter house should be greater than the glory of the former." This is to be understood figuratively, of the coming of Christ. "The Desire of all nations will come; and I will fill this house with glory." (Hag. ii, 7, 9.)

3. The word *διαθήκαι*, usually translated "covenants"—that is, a compact, or contract, between God and man—is better translated "disposals," or **dispensations**, to express God's sovereign *arrangements* for man. The divine dispensations began with Adam, the first man, and then with Noah, the second head of the race; but the dispensations specially noted here, are those vouchsafed successively to Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, and to the Church of Israel. These gracious dispensations, expressing God's purposes and plans, were renewed upon each successive occasion, with growing fullness and definiteness, until the final one with regard to Christ. Yet, in point of fact, God has had but one dispensation in all his dealings with men; and the plural number here denotes but the repeated confirmations of his one gracious promise, though each time with "more grace," and with enlarged scope.

4. The **Legislation** means especially the giving of the Levitical Law on Sinai. This law was the code which regulated both Church and State; and which, in its enduring principles, survives in large part, in the legislation of all the nations in Christendom. This Sinaitic Law was published with thunderings and lightnings, in the sight and hearing of the people; so that all the people that

were in the camp, trembled. For no other people did God ever enact law with such displays of pomp, and majesty, and power. "Did ever people hear the voice of God as thou hast heard, and live?" (Deut. iv, 33.) This is sometimes called the "Mosaic Law," as recorded in the Pentateuch. Yet from Paul's point of view, we may properly include in his word "legislation" the entire body of divinely revealed Law, as found in the Hebrew Scriptures.

5. **The temple service** was the solemn and imposing ceremonial worship of the temple at Jerusalem. Other ancient religions had showy and expensive temples, and priesthoods, and sacrifices; but there was no system of worship that could compare in magnificence and significance with that of the Jews. The Jewish religion alone had the supernatural sanctions that made their service holy and revered in the sight of the worshipers. Though their temple service was mainly ritual and spectacular, it was often interpenetrated with sincere devotion and spiritual-mindedness. It impressed itself upon the imagination and the conscience of the worshipers, just as the pomps and vanities of Papal Rome, and of other sacerdotal churches impress themselves upon the plastic superstitions of men,—possibly in both cases usefully for unspiritual people. But genuine Christian worship rejects these external observances. Christ declared that the true worshiper does not need forms and outside helps: "Believe me, the hour cometh, and now is, when neither in Samaria, nor in Jerusalem, shall ye worship the Father. The true worshipers will worship in spirit and in truth." (John iv, 23.)

6. **The promises** were God's pledges to Israel of blessings both temporal and spiritual,—the former of the land of Palestine as a possession, and all worldly prosperity; the latter of spiritual prosperity, especially the gift of Messiah. All their religion culminated in this, "I will raise unto David a righteous Branch, and he shall be called the Lord our Righteousness" (Jer. xxiii, 5); "Of the increase of his government, there shall be no end upon the throne of David" (Isa. ix, 7). Such are the Messianic prophecies, rich and explicit, and definite, "which in Christ are Yea, and in him are Amen;" and which (though Israel to this day is blinded to their sense), are fulfilled in no other.

7. **The fathers** were the patriarchal ancestors of Israel. Moses expressly limits the term to these, "Possess the land which the Lord sware to your fathers, Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, to give to them, and to their seed after them." (Deut. i, 8.) But

Jewish usage recognized the twelve sons of Jacob as "patriarchs" (Acts vii, 8), though many of them were at first unworthy men; and David also bore this title of "patriarch" (Acts ii, 29); and to all these men the Jews looked back, not only as fathers of the twelve tribes, but in this spiritual sense, as "fathers in Israel."

8. The last clause in this verse is usually and correctly translated, "**—and from whom is the Christ, as concerning the flesh, who is over all, God blessed forever; Amen.**" Aside from dogmatic considerations, no reader of this Greek sentence would ever think of any other punctuation, or translation, or explanation. The Socinian exegetes place a period at the word "flesh," and translate and explain the next words as a doxology to God: "He that is over all, God, be blessed forever; amen." This is possible for the Greek, though in view of the connection, it is intolerably abrupt as well as inconsecutive. But not a single one of the Greek fathers, or of the Latin fathers, ever felt or mooted any exegetical difficulty. Both grammatically and exegetically, the words are applicable to Christ. The Scripture authorities justify this: for example, John says, "The Word was God" (John i, 1); Christ said of himself, "I and the Father are one" (John x, 30); Thomas said *to him*, "My Lord and my God" (John xx, 28). And Paul gives Christ Divine attributes: "All things have been created through him, and to him." (Col. i, 16.) The literature on the subject of this verse is very extensive; but there would have been no debate, and no literature, as there is really no doubt, if men had not a dogmatic and unscriptural novelty to maintain.

This specification is the last and highest that the apostle can name among the prerogatives of the Israelites. It was an unfading honor to them that the Messiah should be born from their race; and his entire lineage is twice recorded in the New Testament, both for verification of the promises, and for honor to his ancestry. Yet no personal advantage or benefit accrued to his race, or to a single member of his family, from his connection with them. He was a *Jew*; but in a large and better sense, he was *man*, and akin to the world at large. He showed no nepotism during his life; and at his death he sundered all family ties, and thereafter recognized only the relation in which he stood to the common race of man. It is not even probable that he ever met his mother after his resurrection. It is an interesting fact that, though he had "brothers" and "sisters," these had no prominence because they

belonged to him; and of them only James and Jude are named as having a place in the Church; and the entire family probably died out early. The last kinsmen of Christ named in history or tradition were "two grandsons of Jude, the brother of the Lord," whom Eusebius mentions (Hist. III, 20), as poor peasants, Christians, in Judea, surviving till the reign of Trajan, A. D. 98.

Verses 6, 7. But I do not imply such a thing as that the word of God has fallen away. For not all those who are from Israel are Israel: nor yet, because they are seed of Abraham, are they all his children; nay, but [it has been written], In Isaac [only] will thy seed be called. (Gen. xxi, 12.)

We have seen, again and again, the inveterate persuasion of the Jews that God had called them, as descendants of Abraham, the heirs of the promises, to an indefeasible place in the theocratic kingdom here, and to an eternal salvation hereafter; and that these privileges were theirs, to the exclusion of the rest of the world. These views Paul now proceeds finally to refute. He has shown that not only the Jewish exclusiveness has no basis in the Scriptures; but that, contrariwise, the Gentiles were expressly included, from the first, in God's eternal provisions for the world. He will show further, that the call of the Gentiles, with its two phases of citizenship in the theocratic kingdom, and of membership in the organized Church, was wholly in the lines of God's providential administration, and not in the realm of his spiritual administration. These things were provisional and temporal only, and the Jews enjoyed them *en masse*, by virtue of their descent from Abraham, and Isaac, and Jacob, the heirs of the Messianic promises. But membership in the spiritual family of God, with its religious experiences here, and promise of eternal life hereafter, was contingent on their personal faith, and was extended to them individually, and not *en masse*. And this inner call and religious experience was open to the Gentile as fully as to the Jew.

Now it was the revocation of their theocratic call, and their rejection from communion with the Church of Christ, that occasioned the sorrow which the apostle expresses in the second verse of this chapter. But though he sorrows over the downfall of his brethren, he yet says, in verse 6, "I do not imply such a thing as that God's promise has fallen away." The privilege of spiritual life is still theirs; though the encouraging opportunity may be

withdrawn. And so, God's promise, which is Messianic and universal in its trend, and not particular and personal to the Jews, as they thought, remains true and sure to any one that has faith; it is only the Jewish interpretation which is false and untenable.

The language of the promise to Abraham, renewed and enlarged seven times, was, "I will establish my covenant between me and thee, and thy seed after thee, for an everlasting covenant; and I will give to thee, and to thy seed, all the land of Canaan for an everlasting possession; and I will multiply thy seed as the dust of the earth, as the stars of heaven, and as the sand which is upon the seashore; and in thy seed will all the nations [Gentiles] of the earth be blessed." (Gen. xvii, 7; xxii, 17.)

In the next generation, God made the same great Messianic promise to Isaac: "I will bless thee, and I will multiply thy seed as the stars of heaven; and I will give unto thy seed all these countries; and in thy seed will all the nations of the earth be blessed." (Gen. xxvi, 4.)

In the third generation, God renewed the Messianic promise to Jacob: "To thee will I give this land, and to thy seed; and thy seed shall be as the dust of the earth; and in thee and in thy seed will all the families of the earth be blessed." (Gen. xxviii, 14.)

God's promise was not concluded in this earthly sense, nor restricted to the earthly seed. All spiritually-minded Jews must have long felt that the promise was of a Messianic tenor, and had its true fulfillment, not in the literal Israel, but in Abraham's spiritual seed; as Paul declared to the Galatians: "Now to Abraham were the promises spoken, and to his seed, . . . as it is said, 'To thy seed' (Ex. xii, 40), which is Christ" (Gal. iii, 16). In quoting these reiterated promises, Paul declares that "the Scriptures having foreseen that God would justify the Gentiles from faith, preached the gospel of old to Abraham, that 'In thee will all the Gentiles be blessed.'" (Gal. iii, 8.) This was not an afterthought of Paul's, but it was the original and intended sense of the promises. In withholding from Israel a literal fulfillment of the promise, and finally in revoking their call and election as the theocratic people, and in extending the call (but in a spiritual sense) to the Gentile world, God was not unjust to the Jews, who claimed everything for themselves on the ground of their natural descent from Abraham; and he was not untrue to the Messianic promises, but only showed that they had a wider application to the world at large.

Of all the explicit temporal blessings here promised, not one has ever been literally fulfilled. They were all conditional; and the conditions were never met by the unfaithful Jews.* And the only promise that is valid now, or was valid when Paul wrote, is the last, and the most important one of all, the promise of Messiah, and the spiritual blessings to the Gentile world through him. For this promise was fulfilled to the Gentile world as well as to Israel, though Israel did not admit it.

In the passage which we are considering, Paul cites the case of these several families; and shows that while the literal terms of the promise, as first spoken, embraced, in each instance, *all* of Abraham's offspring, yet in its fulfillment not all his fleshly seed were heirs of the promise; not even his first born was heir by right of primogeniture, but only such of the children as God selected on the basis of spiritual or supra-natural, adaptedness to his purpose. In the families of Abraham and of Isaac, God indicated his choice by naming, expressly, the younger sons as ancestors of the theocratic kingdom, and members of the family of faith. In the family of Jacob, he made no outward selection, but let all the twelve sons stand as nominal members of the theocratic kingdom; but he counted only the spiritually minded descendants of Jacob as members of the household of faith. That is, though all Jews belong outwardly to the theocratic nation, only those that have the inward qualification are "Israelites" of the spiritual class. And so Paul says, "Not all those who are from Israel [the natural Jacob], are Israel [that is, spiritual Israelites]." And the point which Paul makes against the assumption of the Jews, is that, as God *made an election* within the families of Abraham and Isaac, so now he makes an election within the family of Jacob;

* Clearly the covenant with the Jews was not "an everlasting covenant," unless in a figurative sense. It was often forsaken by the Jews, often repudiated by God, and finally abrogated. Clearly the land of Canaan was not "an everlasting possession." It never came into full possession of the Jews. Time and again they were subjugated by their enemies, or exiled; and now they have no possession of it; and never will have. "Zionism" is an hallucination. The combined powers of Christendom could hardly compel the Jews back to the desolate and accursed land of their fathers. Clearly the Jews have never been as the dust of the earth for multitude. And so with other temporal, outward promises. The Jews of Paul's time must have seen all these failures of a literal fulfillment; and it was only in a figurative sense that they could hold any of these promises to be true. But if they interpret them in this *figurative sense*, Paul, in his Messianic argument with them, *has them at his mercy*.

that is, the present Jews. The promise does not hold for *all* Jews, literally. *Some* Jews, like their uncles Ishmael and Esau, are not counted in as "children." Of old there was an election within the limits of Abraham's family; and, again, within the limits of Isaac's family; and even this election was not absolute, but conditioned; so, Paul argues, there is an election among the Jews, with whom he is now contending. The promise came, in unqualified terms, "to Abraham and his seed;" yet subsequently God showed that it was not to *all* the seed, not to Ishmael the first born (whom Abraham preferred), nor to the six sons of Keturah; but only to Isaac, the second born, "the son of promise;" as it was written, "God said to Abraham, Let it not grieve thee because of Ishmael; for in *Isaac* [not in Ishmael] will thy seed be called." (Gen. xxi, 12.) And thus, just as of old, some of Abraham's seed, Ishmael and Esau, were rejected from the theocratic kingdom, so, the apostle argues, some Jews now may be rejected, with all deference to the promise; nay, in fact, *all* Jews are so rejected. They reject Messiah; Messiah rejects them.

Verses 8, 9. That is, these, the children of the flesh, are not [theocratic] children of God; nay, but the children of the promise are reckoned for seed. For of promise was this word: According to this season I will come, and Sarah [not Hagar], will have a son. (Gen. xxv, 21.)

These verses are not an advanced step in the discussion, but only expegetic of the saying in the seventh verse, "*In Isaac* [not Ishmael], will thy seed be called." Paul holds that the mere natural descent from Abraham counts for nothing in the way of inheriting the promise. The seven sons of Abraham were born of the flesh; and do not inherit "sonship" with God. They were not called even to a subordinate citizenship in the theocratic kingdom of which Isaac was the head. But the other seven might, equally with Isaac, have had a place as members of God's spiritual family. The second son, Isaac, was born in the line of the special Messianic promise; and he and his seed were counted as the only heirs. As we have seen, Paul cites this historic case of Isaac, to apply the principle involved to the Jews of his own day. He declares that *not all* those whose lineage was from Abraham and Isaac, and Jacob, were, on that ground, children of the promise, elect and called to the national inheritance. But the Messianic promise looked, from the first, not to a literal descent from Abra-

ham, but to a different qualification for a yet richer inheritance with God. It looked to the inward, spiritual qualification of personal faith in Messiah, and this qualification may be found in Gentiles as well as in Jews; as Paul says to the Galatians, "If ye [Gentiles] are Christ's, then ye are Abraham's seed, and heirs according to the promise" (Gal. iii, 29); and as John the Baptist said to the Jews, "Think not to say within yourselves, We have Abraham as father; for I say to you, that God is able from these stones [Gentiles], to raise up children to Abraham" (Matt. iii, 9).

Verses 10-13. But not in that instance only [was there an election]; nay, but also Rebecca having conceived from one husband, Isaac, our father (for the children not yet having been born, nor yet having practiced anything good or bad, in order that God's plan of old, by way of election, may remain, not from works, nay, but from |the sole will of | him that calls); it was said to her, that The elder will serve the younger (Gen. xxv, 21), according as it has been written, Jacob I loved, but Esau I hated (Mal. i, 2).

The sentence is anacoluthic, the result (as so often in Paul's style) of his habit of dictating his letters. But the sense is clear, and we need not stumble over the construction. The word **Rebecca** is pendent, and the reference to her is resumed in the twelfth verse, which should be read in connection with the tenth. The eleventh verse is parenthetic, as in the Authorized. The Revised evades the difficulty, and leaves the connection of the conjunction, *iva*, **in order that**, in the eleventh verse, in doubt. But this word connects back to the previous clause, to show that God's plan in his providential election of men still holds good, not as depending upon birth or works, as the Jews thought, but on God's sovereign will. The apostle's argument here is that, as God, in this yet stronger case of Esau and Jacob, of his sole will, yet *for cause*, elected the younger, and made him the theocratic nation, without injustice to the elder, *so* he may *now*, for cause, elect the Gentiles without injustice to the Jews.

These three points need discussion:

1. The parentage of Rebecca's twin sons.
2. The conditions named in the eleventh verse.
3. The personal relations of Esau and Jacob to each other, and their relations to God's government.

1. Paul in the seventh verse cited the theocratic election of

Isaac over Ishmael to show that God did not count all born from Abraham as born to citizenship in the theocratic kingdom and to outward membership in the Church of God. God as a sovereign elects among men, as he will, to providential franchises. But a cavalier might object that, in the case of these two sons, God elected the younger because he was the son of the free woman. But in the verses before us Paul shows that the objection does not lie; for, first, neither God nor Abraham recognized the bar sinister in Ishmael's scutecheon as a bar against the election of the son of the slave woman; and, secondly, the apostle now cites a similar election of a younger son in preference to an older son, but in the more decisive circumstance that both boys had the same father and the same mother; and, thirdly, he declares that the election of Jacob and the non-election of Esau were fixed and announced to the mother before their birth.

2. This election of Jacob and non-election of Esau before their birth were, therefore, not the result of their having done anything good or bad, but wholly from God's sovereign will, for cause. Accordingly Paul says that in the case of these twins God's plan of old, of electing to providential franchises whomsoever he would, still remained operative, not from works (as the Jews thought with regard to themselves), but solely from the sovereign act of God, who called them as he would.

This perilous word *sovereign*, which the commentaries habitually use in this connection (but which Paul never uses), I deliberately accept; but certainly not in a Calvinistic or fatalistic sense. It does not mean, as sometimes understood, that God's election was arbitrary or capricious, or even mysterious; but simply that it was authoritative and final, but, of course, equitable and reasonable, and adapted to the desired end; and it was so wise and so level to our comprehension that we can judge of it correctly. God chose Isaac over Ishmael and Jacob over Esau, not from caprice or favoritism—for all four were of Abrahamic descent, equally his children, equally dear to him—but with an infallible judgment concerning their individual adaptability to religious functions. How wholly unfitted, even from our standpoint, Ishmael and Esau were for such a mission, and for the progenitors of a theocratic people, their subsequent history showed. In the case of Esau and Jacob, their different temperaments and bents fitted them for different spheres in life. "Esau was a cunning hunter, a man of the field; and Jacob was a quiet man, dwelling in tents." (Gen.

xxv, 27.) Esau was a man of affairs, and was characteristically better fitted for a life of outward activity and enterprise. Jacob was contemplative, introspective; he had a greater capacity for spiritual things. Both careers were equally worthy; but they were different; and God appropriately chose Jacob as the father of the theocratic nation. The principle of God's choice in the world is expressed in his words to Samuel: "I have rejected Eliab [David's oldest brother]; for man looks on the outward appearance; but Jehovah looks on the heart." (1 Sam. xvi, 7.)

But what is of still more moment,—we must recollect that God's sovereignty over men and their surroundings is always in the sphere of providential, temporal things, and never, as Calvinism teaches, in the sphere of spiritual and eternal things. Within the limitations of his providences, God is absolutely sovereign, the sole legislator, the sole judge, the sole executive, uncontrolled by any of his creatures. As creator and ruler of men, and of the material world, he casts our lots as he sees best; never capriciously, but always looking to our general interest and our individual rights; and always with needed help and with fair treatment. He does not deal with us, as a chessplayer may arbitrarily shift the chessmen, as make-weights on the figured board; or, still more arbitrarily, as a dice player may cast the dice at random on the table. But he considerately and equitably marks out, for every separate soul, the appointed seasons and the bounds of our habitations, expressly "that *we* should *seek God*, if, then, we may feel after him, and find him; though he is not far from each one of us." (Acts xvii. 26.)

True, God's providence sometimes seems to have a hard side. To every scheme of government, divine as well as human, we must concede something: the material conditions of time and place can not, in the nature of things, fall to all men exactly alike. Dogberry says, "If two men ride of a horse, one must ride behind." ("Much Ado About Nothing," iii, 5.)* Of two brothers, both can not be first born. And so we may not always understand, or be able to explain to everybody's present satisfaction, God's providential

* And Pope says:

"Order is heaven's first law; and, this confessed,
Some are, and must be, greater than the rest,
More rich, more wise; but, who infers from hence
That such are happier, shocks all common sense."

"Essay on Man," IV, 1,

arrangement of men's times, and habitations, and circumstances; and some caviler will be sure to say [as the Jew in the twentieth versel, "Why didst thou make [appoint] *me* thus?" But considerate men will defer to God's providences as, on the whole, gracious and wise, and the best possible. Whatever in God's providences now seems dark and unequal, or even inequitable, is only transient, and will, in the long run, be rectified and equalized, and clarified. God's ledger will be balanced, and his ways justified to men, if not here and now, in the infinite future. "Behind a frowning providence he hides a smiling face."

Such is the doctrine of God's sovereignty in the sphere of his providential administration; but in the higher and more momentous department of spiritual life, and character, and eternal destiny, God's sovereignty has no place. These two spheres of God's working, the sphere of his providence, and the sphere of his grace, can not be confounded with each other. And it is only of God's working in the sphere of his providence, which is temporal, and sensible, and local, that Paul here speaks. The whole Calvinistic concept of God's sovereignty in the spiritual realm, and of an absolute decree of the souls of men, lying supine and powerless in his hands, to eternal weal or woe, is utterly alien to the gospel scheme, and, of course, outside of the apostle's discussion in this Epistle. God's government in the spiritual life of men must be understood, not as meaning control over the destinies of men, but as only another name for divine efficiency co-operating with men's sovereign volition. It is the divine side of the Pauline *synergism*. Man, under God, is sovereign over his own spiritual concerns. The human will is as free as God's will; and is subject to God only through moral influences, and not by an arbitrary and necessitarian sway. Though God is creator, and legislator, and judge, he negotiates with man as his equal in the forum of conscience, and of morals, and free choice. Such is the awful power and responsibility over his own destiny, that God remits to man's free will.

3. The announcement to Rebecca, that "The elder will serve the younger" (Gen. xxv, 23), is expressly declared to have been in the line of God's world-plan of old, by which his election of men, and their providential assignment to place in the world, does not result from their works, but from God's own unappealable will. The election of Jacob to the theocratic place, and to a higher national rank than Esau's, and the non-election of Esau, and his

inferior national rank (which is the sole thing that the apostle is here describing), was, as is always the fact in God's administration in this world, wholly in the sphere of his temporal providences, and not in the sphere of spiritual predestination; and it did not carry with it either the personal salvation of Jacob, or the personal reprobation of Esau.

Paul, by his quotation in this verse, makes the point against the Jews, as we saw also in the seventh verse, that God elected only a part among the descendants of Abraham. He elected Isaac over Ishmael, Jacob over Esau. But notice; the election of Isaac over Ishmael, and of Jacob over Esau was in the line of his providential government, and for cause; and it was not, as the Jews thought, and as Calvin thought, an election to salvation, or even to inward Church membership. At the most it was theocratic, not spiritual; at the most it made Isaac and Jacob rather than Ishmael and Esau the head of the elect nation; but it did not constitute their posterity, the Jews, the exclusive members of the Church, and heirs of salvation. Ishmael and Esau were circumcised men, consecrated to God; and they feared God, and were members of his family, and were as salvable, and as probably saved, as the elect Isaac and Jacob.

But while Paul doubtless had this thought of the theocratic election of Jacob in his mind, he did not in this passage, say it in so many words, or at all. Not only in his words is there no allusion to the salvation of Jacob, the damnation of Esau, there is no allusion, even, to the theocratic election of one brother over the other. The two sentences which Paul quotes, one from Genesis, and one from Malachi, do not declare the theocratic preferment of Jacob (which, however, would still lie in the line of God's providences, and not involve eternal interests); but they simply declare his coming national prominence over Esau. And this is all that the apostle's argument with the Jews demands. He wishes only to show them that God holds to his fixed plan of election, or providential choice, in the affairs of the world, and turns the scales as he wills (of course, *for cause*); and that he is doing this now with the Jews.

This is really all that is found in the words, or in the meaning of the quotation before us, **The elder will serve the younger**; and this meaning of the saying from Genesis, Paul says is confirmed by the similar saying which he is able to quote from Malachi, **Jacob I loved, but Esau I hated**, a saying which must be

explained in the same line—that of the national standing of the two brothers. These names, “Jacob” and “Esau,” are used by Malachi, not as the personal names of the two men, but as eponyms, historical designations of the two races sprung from them. The name Jacob is very frequent in the sense of Israel, the *people* of Israel, the Jews; and the name Esau, though not as frequent as the other name, is here just as clearly in the sense of Edom, the Edomites. Long before the times of Malachi, Moses had said, “These are the generations of Esau: the same is Edom.” (Gen. xxxvi, 1.) Both sayings, the one from Genesis, and the one from Malachi, have to do only with God’s providential allotment of the habitations, and secular history of the twin brothers; or, rather, of their descendants; and not at all with regard to their personal character, or their eternal destinies. But as these sayings, and especially the one from Malachi, have received a sinister interpretation in support of the doctrine of the predestination of some men to salvation, and of all the rest to damnation (a doctrine which has no standing here, or anywhere else in the Bible); and as the saying in Malachi casts its lurid shadow back on the other saying (to which, however, Paul intended it to be only an historical confirmation, and not a doctrinal interpretation), it becomes necessary to examine both sayings at large.

The clause which Paul quotes from the announcement to Rebecca about her unborn children is possibly capable of being misunderstood, if taken apart from its connections; but the passage, taken as a whole, makes the meaning of the excerpted words clear beyond dispute, almost beyond perversion: “And Jehovah said to her,

“Two *nations* are in thy womb,

“And two *peoples* will be separated from thy bowels:

“And the one *people* will be stronger than the other *people*,

“And the elder [people] will serve the younger.” (Gen. xxv, 23.)

In the same way we must take the passage in Malachi as a whole, and not the single clause apart from its connections. The entire paragraph goes together; and it also, thus taken, makes the meaning of the excerpted words clear beyond dispute, almost beyond perversion. It is clear that they are spoken, not of the two persons, Jacob and Esau, but of the two nations descended from them. The saying in Genesis does not define the personal relations of the brothers during their life—much less their spiritual

condition or opportunity for this life or the next; but it means simply this, that in God's administrative forecast for the two brothers he promised a *national* superiority to the descendants of Jacob, the younger, over the descendants of Esau, the elder. That this is the sole meaning is further shown by the tenor of the blessings which Isaac pronounced on his two sons, blessings differing from each other in compass, but of the same secular and national character. (Gen. xxvii, 28-40.) And it must be clear from these sayings, and from the entire subsequent history of these brothers, that the preferment of Jacob over Esau was not intended to affect, and certainly did not affect, their personal relations or the family right of primogeniture, but only looked forward to the comparative status of their several posterities, when grown to be nations, at a future day. The natural rights of the two brothers remained undisturbed, except by family jealousy; and the birthright remained Esau's (as Jacob himself recognized by his foolish and futile attempt to buy it). Their case was the same as in the previous generation with the two brothers, Ishmael and Isaac; and as was the case afterwards in the precisely similar instance of Joseph's two sons, Manasseh and Ephraim; and as was the case with the sons of Jesse. David, the youngest, was chosen king over all his seven brothers. (1 Sam. xvi, 6-13.) But this did not give David the rights of primogeniture. Did not the words of Jacob, when he blessed Ephraim, bitterly recall the circumstances of the prophecy about himself a hundred and fifty years before, and his own unfraternal attempt to supplant his older brother?—"Manasseh will become a people, and will be great; but truly his younger brother will be greater than he, and his seed will become a multitude of nations." (Gen. xlviii, 19.)

Esau the hunter never served Jacob the shepherd—never "served" him personally in any sense of that word. It was only the distant posterity of Esau that served the posterity of Jacob. Twenty years after the brothers had parted in anger they met in kindness; and Jacob offered to Esau the usual tokens of an inferior to a superior, and called himself *servant* and Esau *lord*: "These droves are thy servant Jacob's: they are a present to my lord Esau." (Gen. xxxii, 18.) That the predominance of Jacob over Esau was not at all spiritual, and was not even personal and immediate, but only in their remote posterities, grown to be "nations and peoples," is clear, not only from the original announcement to Rebecca (which can have no other meaning), but from the words

of their father, Isaac. To Jacob he said, "Let peoples serve thee, and nations bow down to thee;" and to Esau he said, "Thou wilt serve thy brother, and it will come to pass, when thou shalt rebel, that thou wilt break his yoke from off thy neck." (Gen. xxvii, 29, 40.) Both parts of this prophecy were literally fulfilled: the first part ("Thou wilt serve thy brother") not until seven centuries afterwards (B. C. 1040), when Edom (the country and the people of Esau) was conquered for the first time by David: "And all they of Edom became David's servants" (2 Sam. viii, 14); and the second part ("Thou wilt break his yoke from off thy neck") one hundred and fifty years still later (B. C. 885), in the reign of Jehoram: "In his days Edom revolted from Judah, and made a king over themselves" (2 Kings, viii, 20).

But the relations, not of Jacob and Esau personally, but of the two nations, with each other, with their varying fortunes, are shown yet further, in the Bible history, down to the days of Malachi, the last of the prophets (B. C. 397), and after him in the narrative of Josephus. Two centuries before Malachi, all Judah and all Edom had been wasted by Nebuchadnezzar, and carried into captivity to Babylon. (B. C. 593. 2 Chron. xxxvi, 20.) Sixty or more years later, the Israelites, under Ezra and Nehemiah, came back from captivity; while Edom remained captive and their country desolate. Jeremiah gives us a vivid picture of the desolation of Edom, during those centuries. (Jer. xlix, 7-22.) Yet the Israelites, too, were in a wretched state. Though they were restored to their land, they were few and feeble; and in their ill lot they murmured that God had dealt hardly with them. But, bad as their condition was, Malachi contrasts it favorably with the far worse condition of their Edomite kinsmen. "Do ye ask," says the prophet, "Wherein has Jehovah loved us? Thus says Jehovah, Was not Edom Jacob's brother? *yet I loved Jacob, but I hated Esau*, and laid his heritage waste. . . . Edom says, We will return, and build the desolate places. Thus says Jehovah, They will build, but I will throw down; and men will call them The people against whom Jehovah has indignation forever." (Mal. i, 2-4.) This is the famous saying, which, taken out of its connection, Calvinism builds into the dread dogma of an eternal decree of Jacob to salvation, and of Esau to damnation; and after their type, of countless saints and of countless reprobates. But as the words spoken to Rebecca have respect only to Jacob's secular superiority, and Esau's secular inferiority, and as they can not be made to allude, in

any way whatever, to the spiritual and eternal destinies of the two brothers, so, the words of Malachi, spoken fifteen hundred years later, with the same significance, but only with regard to the posterities of Jacob and Esau, can not look back to Rebecca's children, and declare what was God's feelings toward them. Indeed, the prophet's words do not even allude to the theocratic election of Jacob, and the non-election of Esau; which (though these things were true in themselves), were not involved in either saying. And so far are these words, or any words in the Bible, from expressing that Esau and the Edomites were damned, or damnable, because they were not included in the theocratic election, it must, contrariwise, be remembered, that the command of Moses expressly provided that all Edomites, as descendants of Abraham, should be permitted fully and freely, whenever they themselves chose to become united by circumcision with the elect nation, and to enter the congregation of the outward Israel, and to come into communion with the spiritual Israel: "Thou shalt not abhor an Edomite, for he is thy brother. The children that are born unto them shall enter the congregation of Jehovah, in their third generation." (Deut. xxiii, 7.) And this actually happened to Esau, or Edom. In B. C. 129, John Hyrcanus, high priest and ruler of the Jews, conquered Edom as it had never been conquered before, even by David, and compelled the sons of Esau to be circumcised, and to become Jews. From that date, the national separateness and estrangement to Israel ceased; and one of themselves, Herod the Great, arose even to be king of Judea. Next to Solomon, he was the greatest, the most magnificent, as he was the worst monarch the Jews ever had. His reign lasted forty years, and at its close Christ was born, whose kingdom knows no difference among men. Esau had ceased, in both senses, religiously and nationally, to be servant to Jacob. The Edomites became Jews as much as any proselytes; so that no genealogist can now tell what proportion of so-called Jewish blood is not really Edomite.

But the Calvinistic commentators think that the saying, "Jacob I loved, but Esau I hated," expresses literally (as in the English sense of the word) God's inward, personal feeling of predilection towards Jacob, in person, and of animosity towards Esau, in person. And they refer the aorist tense of the verbs, "I loved," and "I hated," to the eternal decree of God, who, before the foundation of the world, looked on these children of Rebecca, and predestinated

them, though they had not yet been born, or had done anything good or bad, one to eternal salvation, and the other to eternal damnation. And these commentators, instead of making Malachi's sentence, written fifteen centuries later than the date in Genesis, explanatory, as Paul quoted it, and in line with the quotation from Genesis, "The elder will serve the younger," have reversed the logical sequence, and make the quotation from Malachi the leading sentence and sentiment, and make the first quotation subordinate and exegetical of the second. They first read a sinister meaning into the passage from Malachi, and then transfer this sinister meaning to the passage in Genesis. Accordingly the words in Genesis must mean that "the elder will be *reprobate*, the younger will be elect." Further, these commentators object to "softening the word *hated*." Of course, if the word loses its hard dogmatic meaning, their exposition, like Othello's occupation, is gone; and Calvinistic reprobation has no place in the text. But philology has its rights; and there is no doubt that the word "hate" is used here, as often elsewhere in the Hebrew Scriptures, and Hebrew thought, not in the offensive sense of our English word *hate*, but only to express a relatively less degree of love. No one stumbles at Christ's saying, "If any man *hate* not his father, and mother, and wife, and children, and brothers, and sisters, he can not be my disciple" (Luke xiv, 26); or at the word in the Mosaic Law, "If a man have two wives, one beloved, another *hated*, and if the firstborn be hers that was *hated*, he shall acknowledge the son of the *hated* for the firstborn" (Deut. xxi, 15); or at the word in regard to Jacob's wives, "Jacob loved Rachel more than Leah; and Jehovah saw that Leah was *hated*; and she bare a son, and said, Now my husband will love me" (Gen. xxix, 30). And there can be no doubt, further, that this is the sole and simple meaning here in Malachi; and that the verbs in the aorist tense express simply the well-known historical facts with regard to the two *peoples*, Israel under the name of Jacob, and the Edomites under the name of Esau. The saying means, that to the Israelites God gave the more desirable country, and greater institutional opportunities, and to the Edomites he gave the less desirable. Both peoples long prospered, as Isaac promised (Gen. xxvii, 29, 39); and both peoples were afterwards, for their wickedness, taken captive to Babylon. When the Israelites repented, God brought them back; but he left the Edomites in captivity. This is all

that Malachi means; in the strong Hebrew form of expression, he says, "God *loved* the one; he *hated* the other;" that is, he showed more favor (for cause) to the Jews; he showed less favor to the Edomites; but he showed favor to both, until they forfeited his forbearance. But no one, except in the interests of an unscriptural creed, could warp this act of Divine Providence into an election of Jacob, personally, to eternal life, and a reprobation of Esau, personally, to eternal damnation.

Jacob and Esau, personally, are of smallest moment to us; and it is a matter of very little concern to us, or to the Church, whether they were saved or not. Paul neither affirms nor denies; for it did not come into the scope of his argument. Their case is named in this discussion only to illustrate the principle of God's providential government of nations. The point of the discussion turns, not on the eternal predestination of individuals (which is not true); but on God's sovereignty in the providential ordering of nations, or peoples, *en masse*; and here of Israel *en masse* (and this only is true).

Such were God's dealings in the days of old with the family of Abraham to whom the promises were given; such his discriminative election in the order of his providences, among the branches of the family. God's election, so far as here described, was wholly within the confines of the peoples descended from Abraham,—the election of Isaac over Ishmael, of Jacob over Esau. But the apostle goes on to show the Jews that God is not restricted to these limits; he can widen his range of selection; he can leave the Jews entirely out of count. The apostle goes further in his argument with the Jews; and, on the broad ground that their descent from Abraham does not of itself make them the children of the promise, and that the Gentile non-descent from Abraham does not exclude them from being children of the promise, he says, that God has effaced the old limits; that he rejects the Jews *en masse* from being the elect nation of God, and now calls the Gentiles *en masse*, potentially, into the Church of Messiah.

When Chilon asked Æsop, "What is God doing?" Æsop answered, "He is bringing down the high and exalting the low;" and Bayle calls this the philosophy of human history, which is only another way of saying, from a Scriptural standpoint, the philosophy of God's providences among men.

Verses 14-16. JEW: What then shall we say? Is there injustice with God?

PAUL: God forbid. For to Moses the Scripture says, I will have mercy on whom I may have mercy; and I will have compassion on whom I may have compassion. (Ex. xxxiii, 19.) Accordingly then [promotion] is not of him that wills, nor yet of him that runs, nay, but of God that has mercy.

The words of verse 14 belong to the Jew. They express the sentiment that instinctively arises in his breast, on hearing the apostle's declaration that God has rejected the chosen seed of Abraham, "to whom pertained the promises," and has opened the door of faith, and of Church membership to the uncircumcised Gentiles. To such abhorrent views of the apostle, the first response of the Jew's thought and lips is the indignant remonstrance of the text, **What, then? Is God unjust?** Does God, who of old promised our fathers an everlasting kingdom, and during all those centuries has continued his goodness to us, now violate his covenant, and reject us from our prescriptive place, and rights, and hopes? "Is there injustice with God?"

To this objection from the Jew, the apostle's conclusive reply is, that the Jews misunderstand the character and the limitations of God's government; that it is God's sovereignty in the administration of nations that is in question: and his promises to the elect nation were of this character, were in the nature of the case contingent, and did not bind God without a corresponding fulfillment on their part. His change of attitude towards the Jews was in line with this established principle of his government, which was not new and was not now announced for the first time. It is found in words with which the hearers of the synagogue were familiar, words spoken by God to Moses upon occasion of the sin of the Israelites in the worship of the golden calf. When, on the intercession of Moses, God forgave their sin, he expressly declared that he was not under obligation to the Jews to continue them in favor; he will elect whomsoever he chooses. The Scripture says to Moses, "I will have mercy on whomsoever (*Jews or Gentiles*) I may [choose to] have mercy; and I will have compassion on *whomsoever* I may [choose to] have compassion."

But observe that the words, **I will have mercy, I will have compassion**, spoken in this connection, are figurative, and have

identically the same meaning as the other Hebrew figure in the thirteenth verse, "I loved Jacob;" they refer to God's favorable providences, in the world; and do not point at all in the direction of predestination of individuals to eternal life. As the saying in Exodus, and as the connection in Paul's discussion demands, they can apply only in the way of God's temporal administration of the nations, *en masse*. And observe further, that the saying, "I will have mercy on whom I may have mercy," can not refer to spiritual blessing; for spiritual blessing is always individual, is never arbitrary, is always uniform, and constant to the obedient. "God will have all men to be saved." But in God's providential government, of nations, where he deals with them *en masse*, his promises are conditional. He does not bind himself irrevocably to any particular nation, or to any particular course. He is free from obligation when any new occasion or emergency arises. And Paul quotes this saying to the Jews, with the implication that the emergency for a change of action in the case of the Jews has now arisen. God elected and promoted them once to high place and opportunity: he now consistently, and without injustice, displaces them; and promotes the Gentiles.

From the question which the Jew asks, "Is God unjust?" it would almost seem that the Jews had really never read those words of God to Moses, or, at least, had not thought that they could possibly apply to themselves. But this application of the saying to the Jews is just what Moses intended, and is what Paul has all through the Epistle been insisting on. He has told them that God grants nothing unconditionally, nothing exclusively. Nay, God has mercy (that is, gives providential promotion) on *whomsoever* he may choose to have mercy, under particular circumstances. Once he had mercy on the Jews [gave them promotion], just as he himself then willed it. Accordingly this promotion is not within the control of the Jew to will it, or of the Jew to run after it; but wholly in the control of God who has mercy just as he himself wills it. But now, under changed circumstances, God for cause displaces the Jews, and has mercy on the Gentiles, and promotes them to vacated membership in the Church of Christ.

Verses 17, 18. For the Scripture says to Pharaoh, that Unto this very end I raised thee up, that I may show in thee my power, and that my name may be declared abroad

in all the earth. (Ex. ix, 16.) Accordingly then he has mercy on whom he wills; but whom he wills he hardens.

The apostle cites the case of Pharaoh as a further illustration of the principle that God **has mercy**; that is, confers worldly promotion (which is the only point here in issue) impartially on peoples or individuals of various nationalities (and not upon the Jews only), according as they may serve his purposes. God's message to Pharaoh declares that God "had mercy" on him—that is, raised him to the throne—that he may show in him, as his chosen servant, his gracious power, and that, through the king, the divine name may be glorified through the earth. This message has usually been understood as having just the opposite sense; but the connection of the passage makes it clear that we must understand it as here described. Such is Paul's use of the passage.

That God should "have mercy" on Pharaoh, and promote him, and use him as his servant, for his glory, is perhaps a novel view to take of the Egyptian incident; but it is quite apposite to the principle which the apostle is here developing, and it is quite in accord with the teaching of Scripture. God is no respecter of persons: the Gentile Pharaoh was as precious in his eye as the father of the faithful himself, or the great liberator of the Jews, man for man. And so God sent to Pharaoh, a Gentile, and an oppressor of the Jews, this message, not of denunciation—or of that only—but of expostulation, that he may win him and save him and his people: "To this very end I 'had mercy' on thee, and raised thee to the throne, that I may make thee see my power, and that through thy agency my name may be honored in all the world." There is nothing strange in this explanation; it is, in fact, the only consistent one. God would bring Pharaoh to be his willing servant, and would use him to his own ends; just as afterwards he had mercy on Nebuchadnezzar, and on Cyrus, and, though they were Gentiles, and heathen, he called them "his servants," and raised them to high place, not to destroy them, but for his own glory: "I will set the throne of Nebuchadnezzar, king of Babylon, my servant, upon the stones of Egypt" (Jer. xliii, 10); and "Cyrus, my servant, my anointed, will perform all my pleasure" (Isa. xlv, 28).

The conjunction **for**, at the beginning of the seventeenth verse, points logically to the same interpretation. This word connects back to the preceding clause, and adds this confirmation, in

the following sentence: "God has mercy (that is, gives temporal promotion): for the Scripture says to Pharaoh, that for this gracious purpose I raised thee up." Another confirmation is found in the Hebrew text, in a minor word which Paul has not quoted, but which, correctly translated, becomes an important factor in the interpretation—the conjunction אַרְלָט, which is found nineteen times in the Hebrew Bible. The Authorized and the Revised translate this word twice as an intensive *adverb*—here, and in 1 Sam. xxv, 34: "In very deed, for this cause, I raised thee up." But the word is always a *conjunction*, and its meaning, *yet*, instead of intensifying the clause in which it stands, waives the meaning in the preceding verse and expresses a retraction or counter view. We must recollect that the message to Pharaoh is expostulatory, and not denunciatory. The following is a correct translation: "For now had I stretched out my hand and smitten thee and thy people, thou hadst been cut off from the earth; BUT YET, for the sake of this I raised thee up, namely, that I may show thee my power, and that my name may be declared in all the earth."

This does not mean that God raised Pharaoh to that bad eminence, with the purpose to pillory him before the gaze of the world, as a terrible example of his autocratic power to crush and damn. Paul quotes from the Septuagint translation "to show *in* thee," which *might* (though not necessarily) have the sinister sense that God proposed to make *in* him an example to the eyes of others. But the Hebrew word is "to show thee," or, more literally, "to make thee to see" God's sovereign power in his providences. Certainly it was not the destruction of the king that God wished, but his repentance and obedience. God's long forbearance with the king followed the natural phenomena of the seasons through an entire year. It was only after the sixth plague that God sent him this message. No life had yet been destroyed; and the tenor of the narrative shows that God's feeling towards the king was not threat, or threat only, but expostulation and admonition. There is but this one interpretation. Nine times God warned the king; nine times he brought him to repentance. To the last God would have been glad to save the king, as Christ was glad to save the penitent robber on the cross; and it was only upon the king's final incorrigibility that he destroyed him and his people.

The saying, "Whom he will he hardens," seems to make it God's act. But God certainly never takes the initiative in hardening man's heart. Besides, in Jewish psychology, the word "heart"

stands as often for the *will* as for the *affections*. Such seems to be the meaning in the story of Pharaoh; and when it is said that "Pharaoh *hardened* his heart," it does not so litly express callousness of affections (which comes on only by slow growth) as stubbornness of will. Pharaoh stiffened his will against God. But it is also said that "God hardened Pharaoh's heart;" but this act of hardening was in response to the king's self-hardening. "With the froward God showed himself froward." (Psa. xviii, 26.) It is in this responsive fashion that God said, "Ephraim [that is, the northern kingdom of Israel] is joined to idols: leave him to himself" (Hos. iv, 17); "God gave rebellious Israel their own desire" (Psa. lxxviii, 29); "God gave the heathen up to their wickedness" (Rom. i, 24, 26). Yet none of these things did God desire; and so far was he from driving Pharaoh to hardness of heart, or obduracy of will, he ten times essayed to restrain him from it; and ten times Pharaoh repented, and God as often relented, and turned him from his anger. Only when Pharaoh was persistently obstinate, did God "harden him,"—that is, abandon him to his willfulness,—and smite him and his people (who seem to have been equally guilty with the king) (Ex. ix, 27, 34) with the last plague. On the renewed resistance of the Egyptians (Ex. xiv, 17) "he hardened their hearts," and drowned them in the sea.

We must keep in mind that throughout this chapter Paul's one topic is God's providential administration as shown in the rejection of the Jews and the inbringing of the Gentiles, and he mentions the case of Pharaoh, not as an advance step in his argument, but only as a further instance of the principle already stated and illustrated in the cases of Jacob and Esau, that God has mercy (gives promotion) wherever he will, to Jew or to Gentile alike. Beyond this, the apostle is not concerned here in the history of Pharaoh personally, or in God's dealings with the king; just as we saw before, in the cases of Jacob and Esau, that the mention of them was impersonal. But the commentators quite unanimously think that the personal fate of Pharaoh is the sole reason, or the main reason, of the apostle's introduction of his history here. And they interpret Paul's words as meaning, "I raised thee up in order signally to destroy thee, that is, to damn thee." This interpretation is in the line and in support of a doctrine which has not the shadow of a place in this discussion. This case of Pharaoh is, indeed, the typical and authoritative one for theologians of this school. And in the light of this concrete in-

stance of Pharaoh, and of the general affirmation of the potter's power over the clay, these commentators count this chapter as the conclusive authority on God's sovereign and absolute predestination of the souls of men to eternal weal or to eternal woe. He has mercy on whom he will (and saves them, at any rate), and whom he will he hardens, *and damns!*

The apostle's single and simple intent in this reference to Pharaoh is to show that, as in the providential government of the Jews, so, in the case of the king, God determined his sphere in the world and shaped his opportunities (but surely he did not shape the king's actions; they were his own). This promotion of the king to the throne was wholly of God, who "has mercy" (that is, extends favor to men and nations), as he wills. "Promotion comes not from the east, nor from the west, nor from the south; but God is judge; he puts down one, and sets up another." (Psa. lxxv, 6.) Yet this man whom God once promoted to the throne, he afterwards, *for cause*, rejected and destroyed. And this is the point which Paul makes upon the Jews. God once called these Jews to high place and to gracious prerogatives: they have disobeyed and hardened themselves; and now God retributively "hardens" them; and rejects them from their theocratic place in his plans.

Verses 19-21. Wilt thou then say to me:

JEW: Why does he yet blame us? for who withstands his will?

PAUL: O man! indeed then, who art thou that answerest back to God? Shall the thing molded say to him that molded it, Why didst thou make me thus? Or has not the potter control of the clay, from the same lump to make one vessel a vessel unto honor, and another vessel unto dishonor?

The word *withstands* in the Revised is more exact than the word "resists" in the Authorized. Paul's word does not merely mean *resists*, for the Jews did that; but it means *withstands*, offers successful resistance, which the Jews disclaim.

The inferential conjunction *then* (or "therefore"), and the whole tenor of the apostle's words, "Wilt thou therefore say to me?" shows that the Jew accepts the last words of verse 18 as aimed at himself, or his people. The mere "hardening of their heart" does not exhaust the apostle's meaning in his application

of the saying to the Jews. It meant all this, this hardening of of their heart (or obstinacy of will), as it did in the case of Pharaoh; but it meant more in the case of the Jews. It implied, for them, the penalty they had incurred for their unfaith in Messiah and their obduracy. It implied their rejection *en masse* from being the theocratic nation; and the reception *en masse* of the Gentiles into favor (position) with God. And this subversion of all their national theocratic hopes and boasting is what the Jew correctly understood Paul to mean. His captious question and reclamation at the apostle's position shows that he understood him too well. "Why, then, does God yet blame us Jews, with our unfaith in Christ? On your own showing, he has his sovereign way with us; for who withstands his will?" That is, Why does he depose us from our time-honored theocratic position, and promote the Gentiles to an equality with us, or even to a supereminence in the Church?

To this self-sufficient and carping question of the Jew, the apostle's answer is a sharp rebuke: **O man! indeed then, who art thou that answerest back to God?** To some persons this answer of Paul's is, after all, not a reply to the Jew's difficulty, but seems like an attempt to bully and browbeat his opponent. If Paul had not had a reasonable answer, it would have been better policy not to state the Jew's objection, and then resort to bluster to meet it. But the apostle's line of thought shows that his answer is not petulant, but pertinent, and conclusive. The Jews, as we have seen, assume that their election as the theocratic people of God was unconditional; and that not even God could, without injustice, dispossess them, or bring the Gentiles into enjoyment of their vested rights. Paul's reply is, that in the temporal affairs of men, of which the election of the Jews is one, God is sovereign; that all his administration is conditioned; that he has the right to dispose of men as he wills: that he once assigned the Jews to a high and honorable place, but now, for cause, he assigns them to a lower and humbler place; and promotes the Gentiles to membership in the Church; and that in doing all this, he works the Jews no injustice. In point of equity, the Jews have no more right of reclamation against God's providential disposal of them, than the Gentiles had had for all the centuries past; or than have the pots which a potter has made, out of the same clay, one for a nobler use, and one for a meaner use. All men are in the hands of God, to be appointed and used, in his providential plans, as he wills, just

as the clay is in the potter's hands to be molded as he wills, into a parlor vase when he can; but if the clay is stiff and intractable, into a washpot.* The figure of a potter is as frequent in the Scripture as it is expressive; and Paul uses it here (as the other Scripture writers do), to illustrate God's providential manipulations of men, for temporal and, usually, national issues. It is in the line of this figure of a potter, that Paul asks the Jew, **Shall the thing molded say to him that molded it, Why didst thou make me thus?** The last question needs explanation. The verb *make* does not here mean, as it does in some places, to create, or to bring into being; nor to constitute, to give one a wrong bent; but, as the connection shows, it means to appoint, to destine to a certain sphere or rank (just as, in every-day English, we use the word in the same sense; we *make* [appoint] a man chief, or subordinate). So here, the Jew does not mean to ask why the Potter gave him existence, or why he constituted him as he is; but why the Potter so disposed of him in the world: "Why didst thou make me, once so high in thy plans, now so mean? Why didst thou degrade me, and exalt the Gentile to a higher place?" It was not the mere words of the question to which Paul objected, but the spirit of it. God asks that man should reason with him, and even arraign him. "Come, let us reason together; are not my ways equal?" and David says, "That thou mayest be found blameless, when thou art judged." But this question of the Jew was captious, and disrespectful: it inveighs, not inquires; it reproaches, not expostulates. Yet even thus, Paul gave it an answer.

This discussion (as we have so often seen) has reference only to God's sovereignty in the temporal affairs of men; and here only so far as God appoints men (as nations, not as individuals) to their relative place and rank in the world and in the Church. This is the point which he illustrates by the figure of the potter; and he alludes specifically to the noted passage in Jeremiah, familiar, doubtless, to every Jew, a passage so clear and decisive on this point as to be beyond misunderstanding or perversion. The matter to be illustrated by this figure of the potter, is not the Divine creation of vessels [men] of different moral character, and different eternal destinies; but God's sovereign designation of those vessels to different spheres in the world. The passage from Jere-

* "Moab is my washpot." (Ps. lx, 8.)

miah is so significant that I quote it in full: "I went down to the potter's house, and, behold, he was making a work on the wheel. And the vessel which he was making of the clay was spoiled in the hand of the potter; and he turned and made it another vessel, as it seemed good to the potter to make it. Then the word of Jehovah came to me, saying, O *house of Israel*, can not I do with you as this potter? Behold, as the clay in the hand of the potter, so are ye in my hand, O *house of Israel*. If ever I speak concerning a *nation*, and concerning a *kingdom*, to pluck it up, and to break it down, and to destroy it; and that *nation*, concerning which I spoke, turn from its evil, then I will repent of the evil which I thought to do unto it. And if ever I speak concerning a *nation* and concerning a *kingdom*, to build it and to plant it; and it do evil in my sight, that it obey not my voice, then I will repent of the good wherewith I said I would benefit it." (Jer. xviii, 3-10.)

Nowhere is God's absolute sovereignty in the affairs of *nations*, and his change (*for cause*) in his dealings with them, more clearly and consistently exhibited. And this exhibition of God's attitude towards Israel, and dealings with them, nationally, is just what Paul aimed to declare in the verse before us. His words are spoken, not of men at large, but of Jews exclusively; and not of the Jews, individually, in relation to their spiritual and eternal interests, but of the Jews nationally, *en masse*, in relation to their place in God's administrative plans. God does not deal with the Jews now individually, just as, in the days of Moses, he did not deal with their fathers individually; but thought to consume his people *en masse*. So now, instead of continuing the Jews as the chosen nation, the leaders of God's hosts, he has taken their commission from them, and reduced them to the ranks; or rather he has banned them out of service, until the time of repentance shall come for them, and the Potter shall once more take the clay into his hands, and mold it anew to his will. Meanwhile the Jews will stand where all mankind stood before the call of Abraham, and where the Gentiles have always stood, undistinguished from the mass of mankind. The Potter has reconsidered the high call of the Jews, and has brought them down from the rank of a parlor vase, to the rank and office of a washpot. Paul elsewhere says, "In a great house there are not only vessels of gold and of silver, but also of wood and clay; and some unto honor, and some unto dishonor." (2 Tim. ii, 20.) It is to the latter class that God now assigns the Jews.

Verses 22-24. PRELIMINARY TRANSLATION:—"But if God willing to display his wrath and to make known his power endured in much long-suffering vessels of wrath fitted unto destruction and in order that he may make known the riches of his glory upon vessels of mercy which he of old prepared unto glory whom also he called us not only from Jews nay but also from Gentiles."

I have given above a literal translation of the sentence, that is, of the *words*, without any editorial suggestion, in the way of added words, or of punctuation. The sentence in this naked form doubtless represents verbally Paul's original autograph, or dictation.

The passage in the Greek, in its unsupplemented form, has given the translators and exegetes great vexation of soul. It is evidently (as so often in Paul's writings) defective, doubly defective. It may be divided into two parts. The first part, verse 22, is, in itself, a complex sentence, of which only the protasis (the "if" clause) is given; and the apodosis (the responsive, assertive, or consequent clause) is to be supplied. The translators usually supply as an apodosis at the beginning of the sentence, the interrogative pronoun "*What?*" which is grammatically sufficient, though it alone scarcely helps us to any satisfactory, logical sense. The second part of the passage, verses 23 and 24 (after the word "*and*"), is likewise a complex sentence, of which (unlike the first sentence) only the consequent clause is given, and the verb of the protasis is to be supplied. But here the translators have not essayed to help us at all. To make any sense whatever, we must supply what they have left lacking.

In attacking the passage we may assume, at the start, that the apostle has not wandered from his one theme in the chapter, the relations of the Jews to the call of God, and to the Church of Jesus Christ. And it remains that we inquire what disposition, grammatical and logical, we *must* (not may) make of the saying, so as to conform it with the apostle's line of thought. And the discussion of the passage before us must follow this line; for only thus can we reach any tenable result. We must supply something in each sentence, not necessarily the same supply; but the supply or supplies must help explain the apostle's words, and be apposite to his theme.

I name a few points in advance:

1. We may safely make two complete sentences out of the passage; the first embracing verse 22, and the second verses 23 and 24.

2. The apostle's argument is in effect addressed to the Jews; and for directness and clearness' sake, we may express his thought in the second person.

3. The concessive conjunction "if" (*ei*) and the indicative mode in the verb "endured" (*ἤνεγκεν*) are used of a matter of historical fact.

4. The word "What," supplied by the Authorized and Revised as the apodosis in verse 22, gives us no definite sense; as this interrogative pronoun may have various meanings. We should need additional words to interpret it, such as Paul always adds to his question, "What then shall we say?" But,

5. The Greek does not indicate that the sentences are questions, as in the old translations; and therefore,

6. The apodosis to be supplied in verse 22 may be (1) interrogative, (2) imperative, or (3) declarative. Thus:

(1) "If God—endured the Jews,"—what follows? Will he always endure?

(2) "If God—endured the Jews"—do not look that he shall do so forever.

(3) "If God—endured the Jews"—his forbearance does not imply that he will always endure.

I adopt the last, as being also the best solution of the next sentence.

7. The Greek word (*θελων*) translated "willing," does not mean "consenting" (for which the Greek is *εκων*), but "having a will to;" that is, resolving, purposing. And the force of the present tense of the word may be expressed by the words "all along."

8. In the second sentence, verse 23, the apodosis is made by the simple and easy repetition of the verb "endured," from the twenty-second verse.

With these preliminaries we are now prepared to retranslate the passage, both for its grammar and its thought:

Verses 22-24. But if God, though purposing all along to display his wrath, and to make known his power, nevertheless endured with much long-suffering [the Jewish] vessels of wrath, fitted unto destruction, [this endurance does not imply that he will always endure them]. And [he endured them] only in order that he may make known [through them as his provisional missionary Church], the riches of his glory upon [the Gentile] vessels of mercy,

which he of old prepared unto glory; whom also he called, —us [I say], (not only from Jews), nay, but also from Gentiles:

The passage, thus completed and explained, makes coherent sense in itself, and falls into perfect harmony with the previous discussion. This is proof of the correctness of the exegesis, the only exegesis which the Greek permits, or the argument admits.

The phrases **vessels of wrath, vessels of mercy**, are Hebraisms which mean “*objects of wrath, of mercy;*” and those words (like “*loved*” and “*hated,*” in verse 13), are words expressive of concepts in the line of God’s providences. The two phrases do not describe bad men indiscriminately, and good men indiscriminately, out of the world at large; and in relation to their eternal destinies; for that is not what Paul is discussing; but they describe, definitely, and definitively, the Jews, “the vessels of wrath,” *en masse*, on the one hand, and the Gentiles, “the vessels of mercy,” *en masse*, on the other, in their national relations to God’s government. The term **fitted unto destruction** expresses the Jews’ self-fitting (but against God’s will), not to eternal destruction, but to national rejection from their theocratic position and privileges. And the phrase, **he prepared of old for glory**, expresses God’s plans and measures from the foundation of the world, to bring the Gentiles into this higher relation to the Church. The twenty-fourth verse expresses Paul’s concept of the “glory” as being the national glory just spoken of. By the pronoun **us**, which Paul here uses, he identifies himself with the Gentiles, **whom, he says, God called** to this high calling,—**even us Gentiles**. And the next clause, read as a parenthesis, **not only from Jews**, stands as Paul’s protest against the exclusiveness of the Jews.

And then the apostle proceeds to quote from the Hebrew Scriptures various passages in which the call and in-bringing of the Gentiles are explicitly prophesied.

Verses 25-29. As also in Hosea the Scripture says [concerning the Gentiles],

I will call the non-people of me, my people;

And her, the not-beloved one, beloved. (Hos. ii, 23.)

And it will be, that in the place where it was said to them, Ye are not my people,

There they will be called Sons of the living God. (Hos. i, 10.)

But Isaiah cries concerning Israel,
 If the number of the sons of Israel be as the sand of
 the sea,
 [Only] the remnant will be saved :
 For a thing will Jehovah do upon the earth,
 Accomplishing it and cutting it short. (Isa. x, 22.)
 And according as Isaiah before has said,
 Unless Jehovah of armies had left us a seed,
 We should have become as Sodom, and should have
 been made like Gomorrah. (Isa. i, 9.)

The words of Hosea, which Paul quotes here as if spoken of the Gentiles, were originally spoken of the ten tribes of Israel. It may be thought either that Paul forgot their first application, or that from their appositeness to his purpose he intentionally read into them a reference to the Gentiles. But the more probable explanation is that Hosea spoke the words as of a sinful and almost heathen Israel; and that it was in this light that Paul took the saying to describe the return of the actual Gentile, heathen world. In the same way Peter quotes the first of these Hosean passages to describe the recall of the literal Israel, once sinful and out of Christ, but now believing. (1 Pet. ii, 10.)

Paul quotes the two passages from Hosea to express the future enlargement of the Gentiles; and, conversely, the two quotations from Isaiah to express the future diminution and rejection of Israel, all but a bare remnant. We must understand the contrasted futures of the two peoples as involving, not their spiritual and eternal destinies, but only their national rank and ecclesiastical standing in relation to God's plans. The Gentiles come to the front, as the people to whom the gospel has given enlargement; the Jews fall to the rear, and are counted no longer as the elect and promoted people, but as outside of the general Church of the future.

The salient point of the two quotations from Isaiah is, first, that the national Israel *may be* rejected; and secondly, that it actually *was* largely *rejected* in the downfall and captivity of the kingdom of Israel; from which only a remnant returned. Such was the concept and the teaching of Isaiah seven centuries before Christ; and Paul reads in it now a lesson to the Jews of his own day, that what was possible and actual in the days of the fathers is possible and actual in the days of their descendants. And the

point of the quotations from Hosea is, that the Gentiles may be called to be God's people, and gathered into the Church. These two points were equally abhorrent to the feelings of the Jews; but Paul, in the next verses tells them that both have been accomplished.

Verses 30-33. JEW: What then shall we say?

PAUL: That Gentiles, who were not seeking justification, obtained justification, but justification which is from faith; but Israel seeking a law of justification, did not attain to law.

JEW: Wherefore?

PAUL: Because [they sought it] not from faith; nay, but as from works: they stumbled against the Stone of stumbling; according as it has been written,

Behold, I lay in Zion a Stone of stumbling, and a Rock of offense:

And he that has faith on him will not be brought to shame. (Isa. viii, 14; xxviii, 16.)

The word **Gentiles**, without the article, is not enumerative, but descriptive; that is, it does not catalogue all who belong to this people, but describes their character or type, without reference to the number of the persons included. "The Gentiles" (with the article) would comprehend all. Paul doubtless has in his thought *all* men outside of Israel, but he uses the anarthrous word "Gentiles," not so much to *include* all as to characterize them.

The quotations are from the Hebrew Scriptures, to which all Jews bow as final. What bearing have they on the matter under discussion? The quotations from Isaiah exclude the Jews from the Church; the quotations from Hosea declare the introduction of the Gentiles into the Church. Where, then, do the Jews stand? The Jew, driven to feel for his ground, asks (verse 20), **What then shall we say?** What, according to this showing, is the position of the Jews before God? This question, which seems a candid asking for the facts, Paul answers in like spirit, but in the line of all the previous discussion. He has taught that the one felt need that lies at the basis of all religion is justification, or acquittal from guilt. And his answer now assumes that both Gentiles and Jews have felt this need, yet neither knew how to obtain it. The Gentiles have groped for it in the dark, not knowing how to seek

it, and Paul says they can hardly be said to seek it. Nevertheless the gospel has opened the doors of the Church to the Gentiles, and they now have *en masse* (potentially) obtained justification, but it is justification from faith in Christ. The Jews, on the other hand, had the light of the Scriptures, and knew just what they needed; but they sought it amiss. **They sought a law of justification**—that is, a legal method of justification—from works of law; and Paul says they **did not attain to it**. Unlike Abraham, who was justified from faith, the Jews sought justification from works: they rejected the faith which would bring them to the feet of Jesus. **They stumbled over the Stone of stumbling**, the Rock which the gospel has laid in Zion, Jesus Christ the Messiah; and only **he that has faith in him will not be disappointed** in his search for justification.

CHAPTER X.

Verses 1-4. Brethren, the desire indeed of my heart, and my prayer to God is in their behalf, that they may be saved. For I bear them witness, that they have a zeal for God; nay, but not according to knowledge. For ignoring God's plan of justification, and seeking to establish their own, they did not subject themselves to God's plan of justification. For Christ is end of law as regards justification, to every one that has faith.

The word *brethren* is addressed to the Romans, and not to his other "brethren," the Jews, of whom he continues, from the last chapter, to speak in the third person. Yet as the Jews are foremost in his thoughts, and as he is writing expressly about them, and almost *at* them, we may interpret his language as *de facto* addressed to them, until, in the fourteenth verse, he again formally introduces the Jew as an interlocutor in the discussion.

Paul's desire and prayer is offered for his people, **that they may be saved.** By this word he does not so much mean their eternal salvation in the life to come (though this is, of course, the ultimate aim) as their present obedience to the faith in Christ and their recovery to the Church. This he clearly shows in his declaration that "When the fullness of the Gentiles shall come in (into the Church), then all Israel also *will be saved*" (Rom. xii, 26); and he further shows this in the verses now following, in which the thought turns entirely on their unfaith in Christ, from which he prays that they may be saved. And, though they yet reject Christ, he does not regard their case as hopeless, or without redeeming elements. In the second verse Paul, himself a Jew, and thoroughly informed and candid, credits his Jewish brethren with zeal for God, a zeal such as no other people ever exhibited. After their return from captivity, five hundred years before Christ, and for all the centuries since, they have shown an outward adhesion to their

religion, and their law, and their God, which has often amounted to fanaticism. But their zeal, Paul adds, was not in accordance with the higher spiritual concepts of God or of vital religion. Their blind devotion to the Law of Moses, the law of rites and ceremonies, kept them from recognizing that in Christ, who is the substance, all these things, which were only shadows, were fulfilled.

Such is the good trait with which Paul credits his people: they were zealous for their God. Yet in the third verse he charges the Jews with willful and stubborn self-blindness to the truth and claim of the gospel. The word that Paul uses does not mean, as the Authorized and Revised give it, that the Jews were ignorant, for that would plead in their behalf; but that, knowing the truth very well, they deliberately **ignored it**. (Cf. Rom. ii, 4.) They knew their own scriptures, they knew the story of Abraham (Gen. xv, 6), they knew God's method of justification from faith; but they were wedded to their conceit of acceptability with God from works, and they sought to establish their acceptance with him by their "tithing of mint and cummin to the neglect of the weightier matters of judgment, mercy, and faith" (Matt. xxiii, 23); and they did not submit themselves to God's method of justification from faith.

But the point which Paul makes here is, that this faith from which justification comes, is specifically faith in Jesus Christ. Paul is more copious and explicit on this point than on any other in "his gospel." He declared to Cephias that without Christ there is no justification: "Knowing that man is not justified from works of law, but through faith in Jesus Christ, we [the Jews] exercised faith in Jesus Christ, in order that we may be justified from faith in Christ, and not from works of law: because from works of law will no flesh be justified." (Gal. ii, 16.)

In attacking the fourth verse we must notice that the words *τέλος νόμου* are both without the article, and can not be made definite, as in the Authorized and Revised, "the end of the law," but must be given abstractly, in the most general terms, **end of law**. The meaning of the words is a much debated point; but the apostle's line of thought determines their meaning and the exegesis of the verse. Some interpret the verse to mean that Christ is the *fulfillment* of the Law. Doubtless "law" and "the Law" had for their aim the justification of man, and doubtless Christ accomplished this aim of law by his atonement; but, while this is true in itself, it does not fall into line with the apostle's thought in verse 3.

That verse names (as we saw before, Rom. iv, 2, 3) two conceivable, but incompatible, methods of justification—one from works, one from faith. In the fourth verse Paul affirms that practically the first is now abolished. Christ's vicarious death has put an "end" to justification from works, the boasted reliance of the Jews. "Christ is the end (*τέλος*) [the finality, or termination] of law, so far as concerns justification, to every one that has faith."

The last words put everything and every man on the gospel basis. Justification with God is no longer from works (if it ever was, as the Jews thought); and it is no longer limited to the Jews (as they arrogated to themselves); but **every one**, Gentile as well as Jew, who has faith in Christ, comes within the provision of the gospel. And we may put all Gentiles *en masse*, potentially, in this class. The Jews *en masse* vacate their place in the Church; the Gentiles *en masse* come in into their place, if not in their stead.

Verses 5-10. For Moses describes the justification which is from law, that the man who has done these things will have life in it. But the justification from faith says thus: Say not in thy heart, Who will ascend into heaven? (that is, to bring Christ down); or, Who will descend into the abyss? (that is, to bring Christ up from the dead). Nay, but what says it? The word is nigh thee, in thy mouth, and in thy heart; (that is, the word of the faith, which [word] we preach). Because if thou profess with thy mouth Jesus as Lord, and have faith in thy heart that God raised him from the dead, thou wilt be saved; for with the heart faith is exercised unto justification; but with the mouth profession is made unto salvation.

The critical editions of the Greek, and the Revised, give the fifth verse, "Moses writes that the man who has done the justification which is from law, will live in it (justification)". These words may, perhaps, have a meaning; but, first, they are not the words of Paul. Paul nowhere else uses the expression "to do justification," or even, as the Revised translates, "to do righteousness." Besides, Paul never gives the word *δικαιοσύνη*, the general ethical sense of "righteousness." Secondly, the words which this sentence attributes to Moses, *are not his*. What he did say, is, "Ye shall keep my statutes, and my judgments; *which if a man do, he will live in them.*" (Lev. xviii, 5.) With this accords the received text of this verse in the Greek Testament, and the

Authorized translation; and I adopt this reading without hesitation, as being Greek, as being true to the words of Moses, and as having an intelligible meaning.

The passage as it stands in Leviticus describes the method of justification from works. A man must *do* the things which the law commands, "which if he do, he will live in them;" that is, he will have life eternal as the wages for his obedience. But strictly this is only an imaginary case. Moses certainly did not mean that man could *do the works of the law*; but only that his defective legal service would be supplemented by the provisions of grace and pardon for the contrite believer, mediated to him by faith, not by works. Such was the working scheme under the Old Dispensation; and Paul who is discussing with the Jew the abstract and rigorous difference between Jewish justification from works, and Christian justification from faith, necessarily interprets the words of the Law in this strictest legal sense. No man does the works of law; no man *earns* life as the reward of obedience. "From works of law will no man be justified." (Gal. ii, 16.) And so we reach the conclusion that this method of justification from works is out of the question.

The sixth verse brings forward the other alternative, **the justification from faith**. The apostle personifies justification and lets it state its own conditions: "Justification thus says." To do this, he quotes from a striking passage in Moses' last address to the Children of Israel, in which the great lawgiver teaches them that, to the believer, God's law is not hard, nor far off. I quote so much of Moses' words as involves this thought: "The commandment is not hard for thee, nor is it far off. It is not in heaven, that thou shouldst say, Who shall go up for us to heaven, and bring it to us, that we *may do it*? Nor is it beyond the sea, that thou shouldst say, Who shall go over the sea for us, and bring it to us, that we *may do it*? But the word is very nigh thee, in thy mouth, and in thy heart, that thou *mayest do it*." (Deut. xxx, 11-14.) The passage in Deuteronomy is conceived from the standpoint of *law*, of something to be done, "*that we may do it*;" and, in itself, might be cited on the side of justification from works. But it is so evangelical in its tone, that Paul easily appropriates it to express, with his running comment, or interpretation, the Christian concept of justification from faith, which requires no work, nay, which excludes work. In this direction, St. Augustine says: "The Lord did not say, Go to the East to seek justifica-

tion; or, Sail to the farthest West in order to obtain forgiveness; but he said, I ask nothing of thee which is not within thee." (Sermon III, De Martyribus.) And Chrysostom says: "In order to obtain forgiveness of our sins, it is not necessary to expend money; it is not required to travel to distant lands; nor to undergo bodily labors and dangers; but an act of sincere will alone is required." (Homily I, To Philemon.) Penny Cyclop., Vol. IX, 157.

This triple saying of Moses looks undoubtedly to legal obedience, and to justification from works. Paul does not profess to find Christian sentiment in these sayings; but he seizes on them as capable of Christian interpretation; and with his word **that is**, he introduces this interpretation in each case. He adopts and adapts the words of Moses to his own purpose; but by this word "that is," he shows that he goes beyond the expression and the thought of Moses; and, from the Christian standpoint, teaches that one need not ascend to heaven to bring Christ down, or descend into the abyss (the grave) to bring up Christ from the dead; or, in general, to *do any work* transcending human ability. All this has been accomplished for man, and in his stead, by the vicarious atonement of Christ. **The word of faith which we preach marks out the simplest, the easiest, of means for justification,—just accept it.** Salvation is *nigh you*; you do not have to go one step after it. Nay, it is closer yet, even than "beside you;" it is *in your mouth*. Nay, it is closer even than that; it is *in your heart*. Closer than this it can not be, or easier to reach. "Only profess, with your mouth, that Jesus is Lord; only have faith, in your heart, that God raised him from the dead (that Jesus is a living Christ, not a dead man),—this is all you have *to do*,—and you will be saved." And the tenth verse repeats this as the sole principle and condition of the gospel plan. There is no "work" required for justification, or admitted. **With the heart** (affections) **faith is exercised unto justification; with the mouth** (a public declaration of faith in Jesus Christ as Lord), **profession is made unto salvation.**

I have used the word "*profession*" rather than the word "confession," as in the Authorized and Revised. There is perhaps not much difference between them; but to some minds "*confession*" might imply an acknowledgment or concession of something at which you blush; while *profession* implies a bold proclamation of something of which you boast. Paul avoids the very

appearance of shamefacedness in regard to the gospel. "God forbid that I should glory, save in the *cross of Christ*."

Verses 11-13. For the Scripture says, **Every one that has faith upon him, will not be put to shame.** (Isa. xxviii, 16.) For there is no difference between Jew and Greek; for the same Lord is Lord of all, being rich unto all that call upon him; for [it has been written], **Every one who shall call upon the name of the Lord will be saved.**" (Joel ii, 32.)

The eleventh verse is quoted by Paul from Isaiah; the same words that he had already quoted (Rom. ix, 33), "He that has faith on him will not be disappointed" (Isa. xxviii, 16). This is verbally exact to the words of Isaiah, and expresses all that the prophet, speaking of Jews only, contemplated from his Jewish point of view. But in this place, the apostle, speaking from the wider view of a Christian preacher, and with his apostolical authority, enlarges the saying by introducing the word **every one** (or **all**); **Every one that has faith will not be put to shame.** The prophet's saying, even without this additional word, was really pregnant with this meaning, but the apostle's enlargement of the saying now, unquestionably makes the assertion ample to cover the case of the Gentiles as well as of the Jews. This is the point which the apostle has under discussion. The old legal system of the Jews is abolished; and justification from works is come to an end. And *all* men now stand before God, with whom is no respect of persons, equally entitled to justification from faith. This word "*all*" (as we have often seen) expresses the universal embrace of the gospel. To the synagogue it was a novel and unacceptable teaching; but to Paul it constituted the very staple of his gospel. The word *all* is a salient word in Paul's theological vocabulary, and it is always safe to emphasize it in his writings. This universalism of the gospel is the subject of this paragraph before us; and in the twelfth verse, the apostle affirms that there is no difference in God's sight between Jew and Gentile: "The same Lord is Lord of *all*; and is rich in grace towards *all* who call on him." To confirm this teaching by an additional Old Testament authority, he quotes further, from the prophet Joel, the last words in his startling prediction of the revolution in the ecclesiastical firmament at the coming of Christ—the same words that Peter quoted in his speech at Pentecost. (Acts ii, 21.) But Paul finds in the Hebrew of this quotation from Joel, what he did not find in

the quotation from Isaiah, his own favorite word "all" (or "every one"),—"For every one who shall call upon the name of the Lord, will be saved." (Joel ii, 32.) This word, of course, Paul interprets as meaning the *Gentile* as well as the Jew; and he interprets the word "Lord," which in Joel is Jehovah, as meaning the Lord Jesus Christ.

Verses 14, 15. JEW: How then shall they [the Gentiles] call on him upon whom they did not have faith? But how shall they have faith upon him whom they did not hear? But how shall they hear apart from one preaching? But how shall they preach, if they be not sent? according as it has been written, How beautiful are the feet of them that bring the gospel of good things. (Isa. liii, 1.)

These verses are the questions of a gainsayer, and express dissent from Paul's declaration that *whosoever* may call on the name of the Lord will be saved.

The first question that arises in the exegesis is, Who are meant by the pronoun **they**?—"How shall *they* call on him?" It can not be referred to the Jews; for no one doubts that the Jews called on the name of the Lord [Jehovah], and had faith (though not always an evangelical faith) in him. The case of the Jews is clearly not in doubt. It remains that the questions in the mouth of the Jewish objector refer to the Gentiles: "How shall the Gentiles call on him [Jehovah], of whom they know nothing, and on whom they never had faith?" The point which the Jew makes against Paul's universalism is historical and geographical, as if he said, Judaism is confessedly local, and is limited in the number of its adherents; while Christianity claims to be without limit of place or numbers, and its claims are, therefore, physically impossible. The Gentiles *en masse* can not have faith in Christ, for they never heard of him. They never heard of him, for no preacher has ever gone to them. And preachers have never gone, for they have never been sent. And the Gentiles never felt the joy of the captive Jews in Babylon in welcoming the messengers of liberation: "How beautiful the feet (how welcome the coming) of the messengers that bring us the good tidings!"

The argument of the Jew in these verses is plausible; but it proves too much. In all moral questions we must get the *general* truth, or meaning, and can not require geographical or numerical exactness of fulfillment. A general statement that "Christ is the

Savior of all men" is not invalidated or disproved because some have not heard the gospel and many disbelieve. And so the Jew has overstated the case. On the Jew's own style of argument Paul retorts that *Judaism* is a failure; it has not carried every vote of the Jews themselves.

And this is the answer that the apostle makes in the next verse:

Verse 16. PAUL: Nay; but not all [the Jews] gave heed to the gospel; for Isaiah says, Lord, who of us had faith in that which we heard? (Isa. liii, 1.)

The interlocutory debate between Paul and the Jew continues through these verses and into the next chapter. Verse 16 belongs to Paul for reasons potent in the text. The subject of the verb in the first clause is **the Jews**, as is shown by the question from Isaiah, in which the Jews are represented as speaking in self-condemnation over their unfaith. The famous fifty-third chapter of Isaiah has always been interpreted by both Synagogue and Church as Messianic. Yet the English translations have not caught the striking sense of Isaiah's Hebrew, which, written eight hundred years before Christ's death, nevertheless represents Israel as looking back from the standpoint of Christ's time and mourning their unfaith in him as revealed in prophecy: "**Who** [how few!] **of us had faith in the announcement** to us about Messiah? and to whom of us, was the arm of Jehovah revealed?" The chapter is so undeniably Christologic that Paul here says that the Jews in not accepting it really **gave no heed to the gospel**. This word "gospel," the word which Paul here uses, ought not to be diluted (as in the Authorized and the Revised) into "good tidings." Observe, too, that in the first verse of Isaiah's Hebrew, and in Paul's quotation from it, both the Authorized and the Revised translate the words "our report" as if it meant "the report which we (the prophets) gave out," instead of, on the contrary, "the report which we, the people of Israel," heard. And this is the charge which Paul now brings against the Jews: they heard the gospel and did not hearken to its message: "Who of us (Jews) had faith in what we heard?"

Verse 17. JEW: Then faith comes from that which they [the Gentiles] hear; but that which they hear [of the gospel] is through preaching of Christ.

This verse is the answer of the Jew. It substantially concedes Paul's charge against the Jews; but it does so only to repeat the

objection of the fourteenth verse, that it was impossible that the *Gentiles* should have heard of the gospel of Christ. The sense may be expressed by the following paraphrase: "Then [*ἀρα*, it follows] that faith in the gospel comes only from what one hears; but no one hears of the gospel except through the preaching of Christ by his messengers. Now, admitting that *we Jews* heard this Messianic message of the prophets, yet certainly, in the physical nature of the case, *the Gentiles* can not have heard about Christ, and can not have faith in him."

Verse 18. PAUL: Nay, but I say, Did they [the Gentiles] not hear? [They did] indeed, then [as it has been written]:

Into all the earth went out the sound of them,
And unto the ends of the world the words of them.

(Psa. xix, 4.)

That this verse is Paul's is clear from the structure, the internal evidence, and the connection. The apostle applies the quotation from the Psalms to all people throughout the world. This shows that the subject of the verb in the first line is "the Gentiles." Paul takes up the objection which the Jew has made in the fourteenth verse, "How can the Gentiles have faith in him whom they did not hear?" and declares now that the Gentiles as a class [*qua* Gentiles] *did hear* the proclamation of the gospel—not every individual of them, it is true, without exception (which is the difficulty urged by the Jew), but that this is the normal and standing fact for the Gentile world. Already the gospel has been preached throughout the world; already the apostle was able to say to the Colossians, "The gospel was preached to every nation under heaven." (Col: i, 23.) The Jews, "the diaspora," had gone to the extremes of the Roman world; and so we read: "In every city Moses had them that preach him." (Acts xv, 21.) And Paul himself had preached in these synagogues, and covered all the central parts of the empire with his Gentile Churches. It was not, then, an extravagant application to this spread of the gospel which he makes of the words of the Psalm describing the testimony of the heavens to the glory of God:

"Their voice has gone out into all the earth,
And their words to the ends of the world."

(Psa. xix, 4.)

Verses 19-21. Nay; but I say, Did Israel not know [this call of the Gentiles]? Moses, first, says,

I will move you to jealousy at a no-nation;

At a nation without understanding I will anger you.
(Deut. xxxii, 21.)

But Isaiah ventures, and says,

I was found by the [Gentiles] not seeking me;

I became manifest to them not asking for me. (Isa. lxxv, 1.)

But as to Israel, he says, All the day long did I spread out my hands unto a disobedient and gainsaying people.
(Isa. lxxv, 2.)

The strong adversative conjunction **Nay; but**— is usually found in correction or rebuttal of some previous saying. This holds good of the use of the word in verses 16 and 18, in which Paul rejects the sentiment just preceding. But in the nineteenth verse, where this conjunction comes in after the interruption of the quotation from the Psalms, it is not used in disproof of that quotation, but resumes the disproof of the eighteenth verse. And so we clearly assign these words, to the end of the chapter, to Paul as the speaker.

The point which Paul makes in this paragraph is, that the Jews knew all along, or might have known, that the admission of the Gentiles was foretold in their own Scriptures. In this direction he quotes two decisive testimonies—one from their great lawgiver and one from their greatest prophet. Paul says, “Moses is the first witness.” This great man, to whose authority the Jews deferred, predicts the condemnation and rejection of Israel, and the call of another people into their privileges. God, says he, will move his people to jealousy against a people who were as yet “no people” (ecclesiastically), but whom he will call to be his people; against a people who were as yet “a foolish people,” that is, idolatrous, but who shall be brought to the true God and the true faith. (Deut. xxxii, 21.) This quotation from Moses applies to the Gentile world,—the Jews must have known this fact. And Isaiah, the evangelical prophet, introduces God as saying:

“I was entreated of by them that asked not for me;

I was found by them that did not seek me.” (Isa. lxxv, 1.)

And this passage, again, the Jews knew applied only to the Gentile world. Their Scriptures plainly declare that the Gentiles will become God’s people. But what was more offensive to Jewish

arrogance, their prophets declare that the Jews themselves will be rejected from their place as God's elect people. And this result Isaiah indicates in the verse next following the one just quoted. And Paul quotes this next verse in its sadly logical connection: "But as regards Israel, he says, I have spread out my hands all the day to a rebellious people." (Isa. lxxv, 2.)

CHAPTER XI.

Verses 1-6. **JEW:** I say then, Did God thrust away his people?

PAUL: God forbid: And [I so say], for I am an Israelite, from seed of Abraham, tribe of Benjamin. God did not thrust away his people, which he of old had in thought. Or, do ye not know what the Scripture says in the story of Elijah? how he pleads with God against Israel: Lord, thy prophets they killed, thy altars they dug down; and I alone was left alive, and they seek my life? (1 Kings xix, 10.) Nay; but what says to him the answer of God? I left over to myself seven thousand men, who did not bow knee to Baal. (1 Kings xix, 18.) Thus then also, in the present time, there has become a remnant [of Israel] according to election of grace. But if it is by grace, it is no longer from works; else grace no longer becomes grace.

The apostle's line of thought in this chapter is not immediately apparent; and yet it is not very far to seek. The discussion in the Epistle, up to the ninth chapter, largely turned on the relations of the Gentiles *en masse* to the plan of God, and to the Jews and their prior call. That discussion is now practically closed. The Gentiles have come to the front, the Jews fall to the rear; and from this reversed standpoint the apostle faces about and now discusses, rather, the relation of the inferior party, the Jews, to the superior party, the Gentiles, and the future of the Jewish people *en masse*. And these three chapters must be interpreted in accordance with this thought.

The discussion here turns on the question of the Jew, **I say then, did God thrust away his people?**—that is, the Jewish nation *en masse*? This is the painful and embarrassing question which Paul now sets himself to answer. Undoubtedly Paul held and taught that when the Jews rejected Christ, God cast them off;

but by this he meant only that God had canceled their call as the theocratic people and had suspended them from fellowship with the Church, and further than this he does not go. In antagonism to this teaching, the Jew here asks: "Did God *thrust away* his people?" He adroitly selects this verb, with its exaggerated and offensive presentation of the case, as if it expressed Paul's view of the matter. It is an attempt to push the apostle's teaching to an extreme, and thus reduce it to an absurdity. The word which the Jew slyly adopts would signify that God's attitude towards his people has become one of aversion, and that he *thrusts them* from his presence resentfully, violently, finally. But Paul peremptorily rejects this word as a perversion of his views, as untrue to his own feelings towards the Jews, and as untrue to the facts in God's dealings with them. His prompt and emphatic denial that God has *thrust away* his people may, at the first blush, seem inconsistent with his sayings about the Jews elsewhere, and even in this chapter. Paul undoubtedly speaks of the Jews as being hardened, as stumbling, as falling away, as being broken off from the parent stock, as being cast off; but he also speaks of them as "holy," as God's beloved, as obtaining mercy, as being reingrafted, as being received back into the Church. These views are quite compatible. When Christ came, and the Jews rejected him, "God did not *thrust them away* from himself," but simply displaced them from their foremost theocratic position and suspended them from the Church. In his general attitude towards them in all the centuries since that time, and in his dealings with them now, he acts towards them as towards the rest of the world. All souls are God's; but Paul here says that the Jews were, and are, in a special sense, "his people," because they inherited special promises made to the fathers, and they were "beloved for the fathers' sake." And from this point of view he now declares that though the elect people, once the theocratic nation and Church of God, has been suspended from the Church of Messiah for their unfaith, and though the Gentiles have come to be the Church by their faith, yet the Jewish people is not "thrust off," and disintegrated, and destroyed. And this people, now disobedient and gainsaying, as once were their fathers, in Elijah's time, is still, as the Israel of old, God's people, and has yet a future before it, in accordance with God's plans and with his promises to the fathers.

Paul rejects the Jew's question and insinuation: "Did God thrust away his people?" His first answer is for himself: **God**

forbid! The clause in the Authorized and Revised, **For I also am an Israelite**, does not express the apostle's meaning.* In this sentence Paul is not alleging his own case as a proof that God has not thrust away his people; for he does not feel that the matter needed proof; and if this had been Paul's meaning he would have called himself "a Jew." Besides, the Jews would not have accepted *him* as an instance to the contrary. His words are his protest against his ill-repute with the Jews. They hated him as an enemy to his own people; and he would put himself right on this subject. The translation in the text is correct: "God forbid! and [I say this from out of my heart], for I am a loyal Israelite." The word "Israelite," which Paul applies to himself, was the loftiest, proudest title that a Jew could assume; and by this word Paul declares that he still held himself as one of the chosen people.

His second answer is for God: **God did not thrust away his people which he of old had in his thought**. God is not a man that he should change. The obstacle is not with God, but with the Jews themselves. He has always had his people in his plans; he still counts them as "his people." Observe that the expression, "his people which he foreknew," determines beyond controversy that Paul here contemplates the Jewish people *en masse*, and not as individuals. Yet even for them, individually, as for the disobedient Israelites of old, he stands all the day long, with outspread hands, wooing them, yearning for their salvation in Christ, waiting till they shall return.

This declaration that "God did not thrust away his people," the apostle now substantiates by citing from the story of Elijah, what God said in a similar historical crisis in the darkest day of Israel (that is, of the northern kingdom of "Israel" where Elijah lived). The prophet, after his losing contest with Jezebel, thought the Church extinct except himself alone. But God declared that his cause was not lost. **I left to myself seven thousand men who bowed not knee to this She-Baal.**† Those faithful men

* In the common Greek phrase *καὶ γάρ* (which Paul uses twenty times), the first word is never an adverb ("also"), but always a conjunction ("and"); and this conjunction serves to repeat, *for emphasis*, what has gone before.

† The word for Baal here is in the feminine gender, *τῆ βᾶαλ*. Some think this means the Beantious goddess Ashtoreth (Astarte), the Phœnician Venus. But Gesenius more correctly thinks that the word Baal, which is properly masculine, is here put in the feminine gender, in contempt of the claim that Baal was a god; as if the Divine voice said, "A god, indeed,—a she-god!" This was a common sarcasm of the rabbis.

were the remnant of the theocratic nation and Church, after the riffraff were sifted out. God's Church is not to be estimated by numbers; he can save by many or by few. Only one man, the faithful Elijah, with God behind him, may constitute the victorious nation and Church; millions without God are but a no-nation, disintegrated grains of sand. "Even so," continues the apostle, "at the present juncture, amid the apostasy of the Jews, there is left from among them, a remnant of select men, who can be counted as the real nation and Church.

"This remnant according to the election of grace," are the same whom Paul counted as the real Church of God among the Jews. They are, in Paul's way of expressing it, "the election," or, better, "the selection;" that is, the select body of believers in Christ, the true kernel left from the winnowing away of the chaff of the Jewish Church. And so Paul says in the sixth verse, that their faith, and piety, and consequent acceptance with God, came *by grace*, not, as the Jews fondly believed, from works; since in the latter case, the gospel system of salvation "by grace" can no longer be counted as "grace."

Verses 7-10. JEW: What then?

PAUL: What Israel seeks for, this he did not obtain; but the election obtained it; but the rest were hardened: according as it has been written, God gave them a spirit of stupor, eyes that they may not see, and ears that they may not hear, until this very day. (Isa. xxix, 10; Deut. xxix, 3.) And David says,

Let their table become a snare and a trap,
And a stumbling-block, and a recompense to them;
Let their eyes be darkened, that they may not see,
And their back always bow Thou down.

(Psa. lxix, 22; xxxv, 8.)

The question, **What then?** is found seven times in this Epistle, and nowhere else; but, except in this place and in Rom. iii, 9, it is found in the fuller and more explicit form, "What then shall we say?" The question is controversial, and must be assigned to the Jew. Here the shorter form seems abrupt and discourteous, and betrays that it is asked, not for information, but for disputation only. It is the Jew's impatient reply to the apostle's assertion that the theocratic nation had been displaced, and only a remnant of select men left; and he asks, in bad spirit, or at least in bad form, "What then?" as if he meant, "Have you

anything more to say against us Jews?" The apostle's answer is clear. He has just said, in the fourth verse, that the Israel of Elijah's day had lapsed from their fidelity until only seven thousand were left to be counted in God's Church. So now, he says, the Israel of the present day have missed the object of their search (justification before God), and only "the election," the "select remnant" of Paul's own times, has attained to it. This Christian remnant of Paul's time was doubtless larger than the remnant of Elijah's time, and contained "many ten thousands of the Jews who believed" (Acts xxi, 20); but it was, after all, discouragingly small in comparison with the ten millions of the Jewish nation who did not believe. But this small body of select souls alone obtained the justification which the Jews at large professedly, but insincerely, sought after. Israel as a people sought justification *from works* of law; they rejected the only means whereby man may be saved. The election alone obtained it, because they sought it from faith in Christ. And the apostle declares that the rest of Israel, the great bulk of the nation, were hardened, and blind, and deaf, and out of touch with God and his plan; and in confirmation of this he quotes, as is his custom, the testimony of their own Scriptures to their condemnation.

Those quotations are marked with a rhetorical peculiarity, common in English and very common in Hebrew, in which some unanticipated result of an action is stated as if the purpose. Thus Shakespeare says: "The duke was thrust from Milan, *that* his issue should become king of Naples." (Tempest, v, 205.) So we may say, "The Jews rebelled against Rome, *that* they might be destroyed." It is thus that Isaiah and Paul say, "God gave them eyes, *that* they may not see." Of course the sense in every such instance is plain; only people who do not understand the laws of rhetoric, and fatalists, misunderstand. Prospero was banished from Milan, *but* his son became king of Naples. The Jews rebelled, *and* were destroyed. "God gave them eyes, *yet* they did not see; and ears, *yet* they did not hear."

This rhetorical difficulty in the expression in the eighth verse is easily removed; but less easily can we overlook the bitter sentiment of the ninth verse. Yet we must hold that the malediction uttered by the psalmist [we may safely hold, with Paul, against the critics, to the Davidic authorship] is the just resentment against the enemies of God and his Messiah, as represented by David.

Two verbal criticisms. 1. In the eighth verse, the spirit of

stupor means a sense or feeling of stupor or dumbness; surely not a "demonic influence." 2. In the ninth verse, the **table** is an expression for physical ease and enjoyment. The enemies of God, in their satiety of good things, find themselves full. David prays that their gluttony be turned into a sudden trap, and a recompense to them for their revelry. The word **Thou** in the last line of the quotation is addressed to God. It is a prayer that he would crush his enemies.

Verses 11, 12. **JEW:** I say then, Did they stumble that they may fall?

PAUL: God forbid; nay, but by their fall is the salvation to the Gentiles, to enkindle them to zeal. But if their fall is the riches of the world, and their loss is the riches of the Gentiles, how much rather will be their fullness?

The verb "stumbled," *ἔπραισαν*, is not the same as in Rom. ix, 32, *προσέκοψαν*, but has substantially the same meaning. In the earlier passage Paul says that the Jews "stumbled ('struck their foot') against the Stone of stumbling" (the Messiah), and so fell away from God. In this verse the general sense of the verb is the same; but the Jew, who is here represented as speaking, and from his standpoint, is not so explicit as Paul. He asks in more guarded terms, **Did the Jews stumble** (trip)? and he does not add, "against Messiah;" yet, as this is the only matter in debate, this is the only sense that Paul could attach to the question about the falling of the Jews. "Did they stumble, that they should fall from God?" And, of course, the last verb must be taken as if it meant "fall away from God into utter and hopeless ruin?"

And here, too, as in the quotations in verses 8 and 9, we must take the word **that**, after the Hebrew usage, not as expressing the Divine *purpose* or aim in their fall, but as the unpurposed and undesired result,—“Did they stumble, *and* fall from God?”

To this question, "Did the Jews stumble and fall?" Paul says, as before, "God forbid!" Yet, as it is plain from the connection that they did stumble and fall (that is, they lost their place in the Church), we must understand Paul's denial to mean only that the Jews as a people had not fallen *forever*; and the apostle confidently expects their conversion to Christ.

But though the Jews stumbled and fell, there were, notwithstanding, in the providence of God, some compensations to the Church for their loss. Their fall was the occasion (but not the

cause or the means) of great benefit to the Gentiles. The opposition of the Jews (God used to make the gospel known, and attractive to the rest of the world, and it consolidated the Gentile Church against the arrogance of the Jews.* All Paul's Epistles are the echo of the great strife. Paul declares that, **By their fall salvation came to the Gentiles**; yet, he does not assert, or imply, the Divine purpose, or agency, in bringing about the fall of the Jews. The Authorized says, "*Through* their fall," as if to express the result of a previous plan, or arrangement. But this is not the sense of the Greek *dative*. Paul means only to say that, *By occasion* of the fall of the Jews, God brought a great blessing to the Gentiles. In God's providence, the one result concurs in time and operation, with the other; but not in any sense as the result of the other.

This, too, is the only sense in verses 30 and 31. "Ye obtained mercy by occasion of their disobedience;" and "By occasion of the mercy shown to you, they also may obtain mercy;" that is, in the administration of his providences, God, when the adverse emergency arose, nevertheless worked out his will,—not as a result of a previous plan that the Jews should fall, but with an efficient overruling of things that occurred against his will. "He makes the wrath of man to praise him."

Certainly it was not in God's plan that the Jews should reject Christ; nor was it necessary or desirable that the Jews should oppose the introduction of the Gentiles into the Church; yet when they took this course, against God's will, God instantly overruled their opposition, to the easier enlargement and emancipation of the Gentiles from the Jewish exclusiveness. This is a purely historical statement; the Jews fell; and coincidentally with their fall, and facilitated by their fall, the great franchise was more fully extended to the Gentiles.

And, conversely, there will be another incidental result from

*The incident in the synagogue at Antioch of Pisidia illustrates the constant attitude of the Jews towards the Gentiles: "On the coming Sabbath, almost all the city was gathered together to hear the word of the Lord. But when the Jews saw the multitudes [of the Gentiles] they were filled with jealousy, and contradicted the things which had been spoken by Paul. And Paul said, It was necessary that the word of God should be spoken to you first; but since ye thrust it off, behold we turn to the Gentiles. But when the Gentiles heard this, they rejoiced, and glorified the word of the Lord. But the word of the Lord was spread abroad throughout the whole country." (Acts XIII, 44-49.)

this gracious intervention of God. Paul sees that this abundant extension of the gospel to the Gentiles in the coming ages will, in God's working, enkindle the zeal of the Jews to recover their lost place in the Church. This result, though yet far off, Paul looks forward to, as assured in the providence and the grace of God. The twelfth verse declares, once and again, that **the fall of the Jews is the enrichment of the world, and their loss the enrichment of the Gentiles**; but then he also declares that if the loss of the Jews is the enrichment of the Gentiles, conversely their reception back into the Church will be manifold more a blessing to the world.

In verse 12, the contrasted words *ἡττημα* (loss, diminution) and *πληρωμα* (fullness, plenitude) do not express merely numerical *loss* or *gain*; but here must be taken in an ecclesiastic sense, the defection of the Jews to unfaith, and their full recovery *en masse* to faith in Christ. The sense is, "If the unfaith and defection of the Jews inures, in the providence of God, to the present advantage of the Gentiles, how much more will their recovered faith and return to Christ inure in the changed circumstances to the advantage of the Gentiles?"

Verses 13-15. But I say this to you, the Gentiles, Forasmuch, indeed, then, as I am apostle of Gentiles, I glorify my ministry, if in some way I may enkindle to zeal my flesh [my own people], and may save some from them. For if the casting away of them is the reconciling of the world, what will be the taking of them back, but life from the dead?

The verb in the first clause, *λέγω*, means I **say**, not I *speak*, which does not express the sense of the Greek verb here, or in twenty other places where the Authorized mistranslates it.

The Authorized translation in the eleventh verse, "provoke to jealousy," suggests that Paul would encourage the rivalry, or even the antipathy, of the Jews. The same verb in the fourteenth verse is better translated by the Authorized, "provoke to emulation;" yet it retains the offensive suggestion of racial antagonism. The translation in our text, **enkindle to zeal**, is correct for the sense, and unobjectionable. If I might coin a word, or, rather, transfer the Greek word, I should say, "enzeal;" that is, stir up, stimulate. Paul's concept is that the Jews are apathetic, indifferent, towards the Messianic hopes of their Church; and he would rouse them

from their stupor and "enzeal" them with a fresh religious fervor towards Messiah, the one, the only hope of the world. This is his meaning in the words, **save some from them**. He does not mean "save them from hell" (which probably is not at all in his thought concerning his people), but bring them to a saving acknowledgment of Christ; and it is in this sense that, in the twenty-sixth verse, he declares that "so all Israel will be saved;" that is, reconciled to Christ.

The passage before us repeats the thought of the twelfth verse. The apostle addresses himself expressly **to the Gentiles**—not only the Gentiles of the Church of Rome, but to all Gentile readers throughout the world. And his remarks, addressed to them in particular, as distinguished from any Jewish readers, are an explanation of his hopeful views of the future of his own people, and a defense of himself for bringing into the discussion here a topic apparently alien to the main subject of the Epistle. But, as he shows, it is not alien to the main subject, nor on a minor issue. He declares that, as the apostle of the Gentiles, he can, in point of fact, best fulfill his ministry by also serving and saving the Jews: "I [best] glorify my ministry to the Gentiles, if by any means I may arouse the Jews, and may save some from them." It is his thought that there is really but one organic Church of God, of which the Jews were the first representatives; and, though now suspended from Church fellowship, they are still "God's people." The apostle puts their relation to the Church figuratively: Theirs was once the first loaf of the batch, and theirs was the whole kneading; theirs was the root of the olive-tree, and theirs the whole tree; and the Gentiles, coming later into the Church, are only "grafts upon this stock, partakers of its fatness." Yet now the interests of the two peoples are together—not apart. This real intercommunity of interests of Gentiles and Jews, notwithstanding the present antagonism of the Jews, will, in God's plan, bring about the final unification of the Church. And this thought of the solidarity of the two races the apostle follows out to yet greater length, and with varied illustration, to the end of the paragraph in the thirty-second verse. This is his thought. He has shown in the previous verses that the interests of the Gentiles have been promoted in the overruling providence of God by the defection of the Jews; and he now affirms afresh that the interests of the Gentiles will again be yet more promoted by the return of the Jews to Christ.

In the fifteenth verse the contrasted words, **the casting away** and **the taking back**, express notions of Church relationship,—almost, if not quite, the equivalents of our modern disciplinary terms, “expulsion” and “receiving back into fellowship.” And Paul’s thought is, as we saw in verse 12, that if the expulsion of the Jews worked, in the providence of God, to the great advantage of the Gentiles, “to the reconciliation of the heathen world to Christ,” their reception back into fellowship will be to the Gentiles a glad time, like “life from the dead,” like getting back one’s dead from the grave. “These our brethren were dead and are alive again.” Of course, there is no reference in these words to the final resurrection of the dead. The history of the Church on earth is not ended with the conversion of the Jews. Indeed, it is only after this joyful return of the Jews to Christ that the full career of the Church on earth may be said to begin. O that the veil upon their hearts may soon be removed, and “that they may look upon him whom they pierced, and mourn for him!” (Zech. xii, 10.)

Verses 16-21. But if the firstfruit is holy, so also is the batch; and if the root is holy, so also are the branches. But if some of the branches were broken out, but thou, being a wild olive, wast ingrafted in them, and becomest partaker with them of the root [and] of the fatness of the olive-tree: boast not against the branches; but, if thou boastest against them [reflect], not thou bearest the root, but the root thee. Thou wilt say then, Branches were broken out, that I may be ingrafted. Well: by their unfaith they were broken out; but thou by thy faith standest. Be not highminded; nay, but fear. For if God spared not the natural branches, not even thee will he spare.

The word *holy*, which Paul here applies to the Jewish people *en masse*, expresses a ritual or ceremonial consecration, and not a moral or spiritual sanctification. A person, or thing, is “holy,” in this sense, when formally consecrated to the service of God. It is in this sense that Paul uses the word in regard to the marriage of unbelievers with believers. The apostle holds the marriage is a holy relation; and he says that “the heathen husband is sanctified, or consecrated [the Greek word is “holied” (hallowed)] in the Christian wife; and the heathen wife is sanctified in the Christian husband; since otherwise your children are unclean; but now are they holy.” (1 Cor. vii, 14.)

The apostle illustrates this consecration of Israel, *en masse*, as "holy to the Lord," by a double figure, taken from the Old Testament, the figure of the harvest (or of the emblematic first loaf); and the figure of the olive-tree. Those emblems of Israel are expressive, and easily understood. The Levitical Law commanded the children of Israel: "When ye shall reap the harvest of the land, ye shall bring a sheaf of the firstfruit of your harvest to the priest; and he shall wave the sheaf before the Lord, to be accepted for you." (Lev. xxiii, 10.) This oblation symbolized the consecration of the whole harvest; which thus was constructively "holy to the Lord." Similarly (or, perhaps, it is the same command in other words), the children of Israel were commanded, "When ye eat the bread of the land, ye shall offer the Lord a loaf from the first of your dough, for a heave-offering" (Num. xv, 19); and this symbolized the consecration of the whole batch, as "holy." The latter is the special form of the figure which Paul here adopts of his first illustration in regard to the Jewish people.

In Paul's figure, the batch of dough stands for the people of Israel, *en masse*; and the firstfruit (or first loaf) of the batch stands for the patriarchs Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob. As in the Levitical symbolism, the first loaf of the batch being consecrated to God was holy, and therefore all the batch was holy; so in Paul's figure, the fathers of the nation were holy, and therefore the nation *en masse* was holy.

Such is the apostle's concept in regard to the national consecration of Israel to God, a consecration which as ritual, and outward, is not vitiated or canceled by personal ill desert. Very much in the same way we may say that baptismal consecration is not vitiated or canceled by subsequent misconduct.

But though the nation *en masse* is holy, by reason of the consecration of the firstfruit, the fathers, to God, yet some individuals are not worthy of their standing in the consecrated or "holy" mass of Israel, the Church of God. And thus this figure of the batch of dough of one uniform consistency, does not quite satisfy the apostle's present need to discriminate between those individuals of the nation who come up to the standard of the firstfruits, and those who have now been excluded from the fellowship of the saints on account of their unfaith. This need he easily satisfies by his second illustration, the familiar figure of the olive-tree. The olive-tree, in its turn, stands for all Israel, *en masse*; but, unlike the batch of dough, can be conceived of in its several parts,

root, stock, branches, and not in an indiscriminate mass. The *root* of the tree (like the first loaf from the batch), represents the patriarchs, in whose consecration all Israel constructively shares. **The root is holy, and the branches, all of them are holy.** Yet some of the branches are practically very unlike the others; some are individually good, others bad. And so in verse 17 the apostle declares that **some of the branches were broken out**; evidently the bad branches, and evidently on account of their badness. But this excision of the bad branches, the bad members of the Church of Israel, was not meant for their destruction; but in the way of discipline, and that, hopefully, not forever; for in the twenty-third verse, the apostle tells us that those excised branches will be grafted in again.

Further, Paul, by his use of this figure of the olive-tree, puts beyond doubt what he meant in the eleventh verse: "*By* the fall of the Jews, salvation comes to the Gentiles" The "*fall*" was not the cause, or the means, of "the salvation;" the two events simply came at the same time.

This figure of the ingrafting of the Gentiles into the Jewish stock implies that in Paul's immediate view the organic Church of Christ had its root in the theocratic people; and that the Gentiles were not original members, but only late accessions to this organic Church. This view of the case is true in itself; but it is only a partial truth, and the apostle puts it forward here so strongly only the better to present his plea for the Jews. But elsewhere he declares even more strongly that the Gentiles, all the world at large, were from the first, even before the foundation of the world, in God's thought, and that the gospel was, from eternal ages, ordained for the Gentiles; and that the Gentiles, therefore, really constituted God's first Church, though perhaps not in organized form.

No one need stumble over a presumed inexactness of the apostle's figure of wild grafts upon cultivated stock. It was not even inadvertence on the part of Paul; and the figure is valid for his purpose either way. His sole point is of coalescence of graft with stock. He says, simply, that some of the branches of the good olive were cut out and scions from the wild olive were ingrafted among the good branches, and so became partakers of the fatness of the good stock; that is, dropping the figure, some Jews (alas! the vast majority of them) were excluded, and upon their exclusion the Gentiles were brought into vital relations with the Church.

The singular pronoun **thou** does not single out some one Gentile more than the others, but is used collectively for the Gentiles *en masse*. This use of the singular pronouns **I** and **thou** for the plural is rhetorically strong; and the words are often so found in Paul's writings. He uses "thou" predominantly in the second chapter and "I" in the seventh. And that the singular pronoun "I" is also here used in the collective form, for the Gentiles *en masse*, is clear from the conditions in the nineteenth verse: **Branches (plural) were broken out, that I (singular for plural) may be ingrafted.**

In the eighteenth verse Paul warns the Gentiles not to boast against the branches that have been cut out; and adds, **But if thou art for boasting, reflect, that not thou bearest the root, but the root thee.** And then he rebukes the Gentile assumption "The branches were broken out *in order that* I may be ingrafted." These boastful words of the Gentile are entirely too arrogant for Paul the Jew; entirely too fatalistic for Paul the theologian. This conjunction *iva*, **that**, as we have seen in other places, often expresses, in Hebrew style, what with us is really a result and not a purpose, and the sentence might mean only: "They were cut out, *and* we were ingrafted." But even this milder view Paul barely accepts; indeed, his word **Well**, like the same deliberative word in English debate, expresses only a half assent, or, rather, denotes a decided dissent; and in the next verse Paul puts the matter in its true bearing: the two results, that the Jewish branches were cut out and the Gentiles were grafted in, came together, but without any logical, or causal, interdependence. **The Jews were excluded from the Church by their unfaith in Messiah; but thou standest by thy faith. Be not arrogant against the Jews, but humble. For if God spared not the natural branches, beware lest he shall not spare thee.**

Verses 22-24. See then God's goodness and severeness: upon those indeed that fell, severeness; but upon thee, God's goodness, if thou abide in his goodness; otherwise thou also wilt be cut out. But those also, if they do not abide in their unfaith, will be ingrafted; for God is able to ingraft them again. For if thou wast cut out from the tree, a wild olive by nature, and contrary to nature wast ingrafted into a good olive; how much rather will these, the branches by nature, be ingrafted in their own olive?

The words **goodness and severeness** do not express subjective characteristics of God, but objective facts in his administration. "Goodness" might equally well, or better, be expressed by "kindness," and "severeness" by discipline"—discipline which is prompt, yet not unkind. The first word expresses God's kindness, which is not above law, but in accordance with law, in opening to the Gentiles the door of faith, and in bringing them into the Church; and the second word expresses the fact, or act, also within law, of the expulsion of the Jews from the Church. Indeed, this act of discipline towards the Jews might even more properly be expressed by giving to Paul's Greek word, *ἀπορούαν*, the literal and exact translation, "cutting off"—that is, from Church fellowship.

But these acts and facts of God's disciplinary administration of the affairs of men are not final, but contingent as to their results, as always in his government of the world, upon the conduct of the subjects of his government,—both those that are the recipients of his kindness and those that are the objects of his discipline. If men, now the objects of his favor, prove disobedient, and do not **abide in his goodness**—that is, do not meet the conditions of his goodness—**he will cut them out**; and if those now under censure and discipline for their unfaith **do not abide in their unfaith**, he **will again ingraft them into their own olive**; that is, will again bring them into the fellowship of the Church.

To this hopeful expression and expectation about the conversion of the Jews, Paul adds the saying, **For God is able to ingraft them again**. This saying does not express arbitrary sovereignty, by which God can do anything that is objectively possible. If it were a matter of arbitrary power, God might as well have kept the Jews in the Church, as was the expectation of the Jews themselves. It is not Paul's thought that God is able, by an arbitrary act like this, to force the will of the Jews, to remove their stubbornness, and to change their unfaith into faith. God can not do anything that is inconsistent with a moral government. Nor does Paul mean simply that God can exert all persuasive influences and all grace and forbearance to induce their conversion; for this is what he is doing all the time with all men, the disobedient Jews as well as the unbelieving Gentiles. But what Paul means is simply this, that if the Jews should change their attitude towards God, and towards Christ, God can, consistently with the

principles of his administration, change his attitude towards them, and can again ingraft them into their native stock. Such is Paul's thought: God *can* save Israel. And he waits with outspread hands to do this. "He wills that not any should perish, but that all men should come to the knowledge of the truth, in Christ, and be saved." To this end he ingrafted the wild olive into the good olive. How much more will he have mercy on his early people, and again ingraft the natural branches into their own good olive-tree? O, would they but let him!

Verses 25-27. For I would not, brethren, that you should be ignorant of this secret, lest ye be opinionated with yourselves, that hardening in part has become to Israel, until the fullness of the Gentiles shall have come in. And thus [in this event] all Israel will be saved, according as it has been written:

"Out of Zion will come the Deliverer;
He will turn away ungodlinesses from Jacob.
And this will be the covenant from me with them,
When I shall have taken away their sins." (Isa. lix, 20.)

The explicative conjunction **For** looks back to the long passage, verses 17 to 24, in which Paul cautions the Gentiles against contemning the Jews because the latter have fallen under the displeasure of God. Fearing that the Gentiles may misunderstand their relation to the Jews, he now reveals to them a *secret*, the knowledge of which will keep them humble.

He says, **I will that ye be not ignorant of this secret.** The word *μυστήριον* (*secret*) which Paul here uses, and which the English translators render "mystery," is a good illustration of the common fallacy that a word must always keep its original meaning. This word is found twenty-eight times in the Greek Testament; and is always represented in the English versions by the English word "mystery," which reproduces the Greek word, verbally, in an English form, but wholly fails to convey the meaning. To our translators, blinded by the fallacy above alluded to, this Anglicized word seemed the proper and exact representative for the meaning of the Greek. Yet the two words are far from having the same meaning. The English word "mystery," by a wide perversion from its first sense, now means something that, *in itself*, is not only occult, but is incomprehensible to our reason, and incapable of present explanation. The Greek word *μυστήριον* means some-

thing secret (usually an esoteric doctrine), that, *in itself*, is comprehensible, and if not yet comprehended, is capable of explanation to the initiated. Of course, in the New Testament, the word signifies a *religious* secret, or doctrine, sometimes explained, sometimes still awaiting explanation, but always *in itself* comprehensible.

The word is important enough to justify a fuller discussion.

Paul's most frequent use of the word is to express the call of the Gentiles. This is a doctrine which in the early days of apostolic teaching was of a secret or esoteric character, an advanced doctrine, which at first was published only sparingly; and perhaps was not cordially accepted at once by any even of the apostles, except Paul. Not even Christ ventured, at first, explicitly to unfold this teaching before the Jews at large. He told the twelve, "To *you* it has been given to know the advanced doctrines of the gospel (the call of the Gentiles); but to others (the unspiritual Jews) I speak in parables (they are not yet prepared for this open avowal).^{*} (Matt. xiii, 11.) But the time for this revelation came after his death. "What I tell you in the darkness (in this inner circle), tell ye in the light: proclaim it upon the housetops." (Matt. x, 26.) Paul was the first one of the apostles to comprehend and to obey; and how gloriously he did it!

Paul has almost pre-empted this word "mystery:" he used it twenty-one times, and none of the other apostles used it, except John, in the Apocalypse. And Paul uses it almost exclusively in the special sense above described. For example, in this Epistle, he describes "his gospel" as being "according to the revelation (the making known) of the *inner doctrine* (of the call of the Gentiles), kept secret in the eternal ages, but now manifested and made known to all the Gentiles." (Rom. xvi, 25.) Again, in the Epistle to the Ephesians, this special meaning of the word is copiously developed: "The grace of God was given me toward you Gentiles, that by revelation the secret doctrine (of the call of the

* Indeed it may be questioned whether a large number of the leading parables do not turn on this very point, the call of the Gentiles. What other exegesis is so clear, for the parables of the Vineyard let to Husbandmen, of the Laborers in the Vineyard, of the Prodigal Son, of the Two Sons, of the Lost Sheep, of the Great Supper, of the Marriage Feast? The parables were necessary in the first teachings of Christianity. By the time John wrote, the need of parabolic teaching had ceased; and John's Gospel has no parables.

Gentiles) was made known to me . . . the secret doctrine of Christ, which in other generations was not made known, as it was now revealed, . . . that the Gentiles are partakers with us [Jews] in the promise of Jesus Christ." (Eph. iii, 3-6.)

There is one passage in Paul's writings in which, at first blush, the word seems to have the advanced sense of the English word "mystery:" "Confessedly great is the *mystery* of godliness." (1 Tim. iii, 16.) It is one of the stock quotations for the doctrine of the Trinity, and is usually explained as if it meant "Great is the myteriousness of the Godhead;" that is, of the Divine nature, the Trinity. This may be a true teaching in itself; but it is not found in the passage. The fatal difficulty is that the word *εὐσεβεία*, "*godliness*," can not be taken in the sense of the Godhead, or Divine nature; but of "piety, religion;" and the word "mystery" must keep its invariable sense of *secret*, inner doctrine, and it does not refer to the special doctrine of the Trinity, but to the general doctrines of the gospel scheme. These doctrines, easily understood, are embodied in the early hymn following; and the passage means simply: "Great (worthy of all acceptance) is the inner doctrine of the religion of Christ:

"Who in the flesh was manifest,
 In spirit just was shown;
 To angel eyes he stood confest,
 Was preached the Gentiles' own;
 On him the world has glad believed,
 In glory now, on high received."

There is one more instance of this word worthy of an explanation. In the Resurrection Chapter, the Authorized says, "Behold, I *show* you (point out to you) a mystery." (1 Cor. xv, 51.) The Revised says, "I *tell* (declare) you a mystery." The verb is better; but the meaning remains about the same as with the verb "I *show*;" and I think most readers of either version understand the apostle as meaning, "I point out (or declare) the existence of a mystery." Thus translated, no one gets the meaning of the leading word, and above all he does not get the logical connection of the passage. But if we *translate* the word, and read, "I tell you a *secret*," the meaning of the word, and the connection with the following clause, becomes clear: "I tell (divulge) to you a secret doctrine (in relation to the last day); we shall not all sleep; but we shall all be changed."

The frequent occurrence (twenty-seven times) in the English

New Testament of this word "mystery" (always conveying to English readers the sense of something incomprehensible), inevitably suggests that Christianity is at least largely a scheme of doctrines which are incomprehensible by finite reason, yet demanding to be accepted even without being understood. Christianity has many distinctive doctrines; but it has no characteristic mysteries (in the English sense of the word) aside from those pertaining to the person of Christ (which, however, are never called "mysteries"); indeed, with this exception, it has no mysteries at all, that are not common to it with all the ethnic religions. And if we eliminate the misleading word "mystery" from our English Scriptures, we go far to relieve the gospel from unjust obloquy and from unjust burdens. In fact, Christianity is the simplest, and most *reasonable* of all religions; and it is easy to comprehend.

In the passage before us, verse 25, the apostle now reveals to the Gentiles a Divine *secret* that the hardening of the Jews against Christ, which has put them out of favor and present touch with God, is after all only partial, and does not detract from their knowledge of other Divine truth, or bate their zeal for God; and above all it does not cancel, in God's sight, their original consecration to him as "holy." Though they are under his displeasure, he still regards them as "his people." Further, the apostle declares that their apostasy from Christ is not final. Their hardness will continue only until the full volume of the Gentile world has actually come into the Church of Christ; and then with this persuasive evidence for Christ, and the overwhelming influence of the conversion of the world, "all Israel," too, will yield, *en masse*, and be saved to the Christian faith, and the Church.

But a question arises in many hearts, What of the individual Jews who live and die meantime, unconverted to Christ? Shall we hope in their final and eternal salvation? Paul does not discuss this question at all, and the Scriptures elsewhere are silent on this point, just as they are silent in regard to the salvation of the heathen world, and on most eschatological points. Some passages apparently condemn all non-believers in Christ to eternal ruin; but the drift of the gospel teaching is not so dreadful; and there are few now who think all heathen people will perish. "They are saved through the grace of the Lord Jesus," though they know him not. Surely the future of the Jews, who fear God and trust in his mercy, is much more hopeful than that

of the heathen world. We may trust the issue with God who will save all *he can*.

“ Let not our weak, unknowing hand,
Presume *his* bolts to throw.”

Verses 28-32. As regards the gospel, indeed, they are enemies |to it| on account of you; but as regards the election, they are beloved on account of the fathers. For the gifts of grace and the calling of God are unrepented. For just as ye once disobeyed God, but now obtained mercy, by the disobedience of these, so also these now disobeyed, that, by the mercy shown to you, they themselves also may now obtain mercy. For God shut up all men unto disobedience, that he may have mercy upon them all.

Out of thirty-two times in which the word *ἐχθροί*, here translated **enemies**, is found in the New Testament, thirty-one instances are clearly in the *active* sense of “inimical;” that is, “*haters*,” hostile. But the commentators here think this instance is a single exception, and must be taken *passively*, “*hated*” of God. They reach this conclusion partly by assuming what is not true, a logical parallelism with the word **beloved** in the next verse,—that both words may be referred to the same subject, *God*. Thus interpreted, the text represents God as treating the Jews, at one and the same time, with mingled and all but incompatible feelings and dealings: he “*hates*” them and “*loves*” them at the same time. Another reason, in part, with the commentators, for adopting here this passive sense of the word “enemies” is found in the incorrect sense which (following the Authorized and the Revised) they give to the preposition *διὰ* in the two clauses. These versions translate *διὰ ὑμᾶς* “for your sakes,” which can mean only “for your interests”—that is, “for your conversion;” and this can mean only that God hated the Jews and ruled them out of the Church in order to get the Gentiles in. This meaning—“for the sake of”—for this Greek preposition is so peculiar and so far-fetched, and so non-Greek, that even if it were grammatically possible elsewhere (which is at least doubtful), we must adopt the usual sense of *διὰ* with the accusative case, “on account of,” to express *why* the Jews were “hostile,” and why they were nevertheless “beloved.” Again, they translate *διὰ τοὺς πατέρας* “for the fathers’ sake,” which (seeing that the fathers are dead) can mean

only "from regard for the memory of the fathers," individually, as men, instead of (which is the correct meaning) "because of what the fathers were," representatively; namely, "the firstfruit and the root" of the consecrated nation.

This active meaning of "enemies," as "*haters* of the gospel," is quite certainly the one that Paul had in his mind; and it does not involve mixed and incompatible feelings towards the Jews on the part of God. The sentence means that the Jews are hostile (to the gospel) on account of the Gentiles, and not that God is hostile to the Jews. On the contrary, they are "God's beloved;" and Paul's thought in this verse is briefly: "The Jews are hostile to God; God is loving to the Jews." First: **So far as the gospel is concerned, the Jews are enemies to it, on account of you, the Gentiles;** that is, on account of the admission of the Gentiles into the Church. Secondly: **But so far as regards the election** [the original choice] of the theocratic people (which still holds good for the Jews *en masse*), **they are God's beloved, on account of the fathers.**" Paul might well have embodied his sentiment in the expressive words of Moses to Israel: "The Lord had a delight in thy fathers to love them, and he chose their seed after them, as it is this day." (Deut. x, 15.)

The word **for** in the saying, "**For God's gifts of grace are unrevoked,**" looks back to the word "beloved," and the apostle, with the idea of that word in his mind, declares that God has not changed his feelings towards the Jews, nor repented of his gracious gifts to them. The Jews are still "holy," and beloved on account of the consecration of the fathers.

Again, the word **for** in the thirtieth verse looks back to the gracious attitude and purpose of God as shown in the twenty-ninth verse. In view of the irrevocable calling of the Jews the apostle declares that just as the Gentiles once disobeyed God, yet obtained mercy by (upon the occasion of) the disobedience of the Jews, so in their turn the Jews, by (upon the occasion of) the mercy shown to the Gentiles, may themselves eventually obtain mercy. It is Paul's thought that the mercy shown to the Gentiles, which will be illustrated yet more fully in the conversion of the Gentile world *en masse*, will stimulate the zeal of the Jews, and bring them, too, *en masse* to accept Christ and be saved to the Church.

The word **for** in the thirty-second verse points back to the statement in the two preceding verses, in which the apostle sums up the

religious history of both the Gentiles and the Jews; and declares as one side of their history, that disobedience was a fact, perhaps the leading fact, common to them both, yet attaching to each race in its own time, and sphere, and way. Nothing turns on the time of the disobedience; but the apostle notes their *equal* disobedience. And this gives him occasion to say that God treats them all with equal condemnation, and with equal mercy. The saying that **God shut up all men unto disobedience**, seems, at first blush, to mean that God restricted men to this result, without any alternative on their part. But we can not make God the author of sin. This same verb is used elsewhere without this necessitarian meaning. In the Epistle to the Galatians, Paul says, "The Scriptures *shut up* all things under sin—we were *shut up* unto faith" (Gal. iii, 22); where the sense is simply, that the Scriptures counted all men under sin, in order that the promise by faith may be given to men of faith; but that before, we were in ward under law, *restricted to faith*, for our only hope of justification. There is no sovereign decree of God, but only the voluntary actions of men. In the same way we must explain our text, "God counted all men as given up to disobedience; yet counted them thus, not that he may condemn them all, but that he may have mercy upon them all. The date of this condemnation, and intention of mercy is fixed by the aorist tense of the verb, "he included them," as in the counsels of eternity, when he foresaw the fall of man, and also made provision to have mercy on them.

With these words, Paul has now finished the doctrinal part of his work. He has vindicated his rightful place as the apostle to the Gentiles; and has vindicated their right to an original, equal, and final place in the Church with the Jews, who claimed to be the only Church; and has vindicated God's plan of justification from faith, instead of from works as maintained by the Jews; and he has shown that the Jews have no racial and no personal superiority over the Gentiles; and, finally, has shown that the Jews, by their unfaith in Christ, have forfeited their fellowship in the Church, though still with a latent title by virtue of their first call, to be reinvested with this forfeited privilege when they shall come back to Christ.

Such are, in brief, the matters which have been discussed in the part of the Epistle now concluded. Issues more weighty, more momentous than these here discussed *and settled*, there are none in the theology of the Bible or in the history of dogma. The

eleven chapters which we have now gone over constitute, more than all the other epistles, the text-book of the Christian pulpit, and of the theological schools, and of all writers on doctrine.

The rest of this Epistle is occupied with the discussion of the practical issues which emerged in the early days of the Christian Church at large, or were of local moment in the Church at Rome.

Verses 33-36. O depth of riches and wisdom and knowledge of God! How unsearchable his judgment and untraceable his ways!

For who knew the mind of Jehovah?

Or who became his counselor?

Or who first gave to him?

And it will be repaid him. (Isa. xl, 13.)

Because from him, and through him, and unto him, are all things.

To him be the glory, forever; Amen.

With these words Paul closes this part of his epistle. The first verse is his burst of praise and amaze over the wonderful profundity, and the wonderful richness and wisdom and knowledge shown in God's purposes and plans, and ways for man's salvation.

The quotation from Isaiah, in the form of an argumentative question, re-enforces the thought that the gospel is from God alone. He devised it, he executed it, his own arm has gotten him the victory. No one knew Jehovah's mind; no one became his adviser; no one has given aught to complete God's work; no one has any claim to reward for co-operation.

And the concluding verse reiterates this thought in words so simple, so beautiful, so comprehensive, that they have become the world's model for compactness and strength. Lincoln's famous aphorism, which will go down the centuries as the vollied embodiment of the only wise political science, is strong and memorable because it borrows its form and its force from the saying of the apostle: "The government of the people, by the people, and for the people, shall not perish from the earth."

CHAPTER XII.

Verses 1, 2. I exhort you, therefore, brethren, through the mercies of God, to present your bodies a sacrifice, living, holy, well-pleasing to God, your rational service. And do not be in fashion with this age; nay, but be transformed by the renewal of your mind, to the end that you may prove what is the good, and well-pleasing, and complete will of God.

We come now within the sphere of practical religion; or of morals applied to the every-day life of the Church. In these chapters Paul discusses the outward behavior of men, especially to others, and not their forensic relations to law, and not their subjective belief or experiences. Of course, the two lines of religious thought and of religious life, of doctrines and of precepts, often touch and sometimes seem to cover the same field; but they run on different plans, and seek different ends. The theology of the Creed, or doctrinal religion, which is found in part in the first part of this Epistle, declares the relations of men with God; the theology of morals, or preceptive religion, which is found in part in the chapters following, declares the relations of men with each other.

The points discussed in these five chapters are fewer than in the Epistles to the Corinthians, which touch on all the practical relations of Church, family, and social life. The few points that Paul here names, spring almost exclusively out of the mixed constitution of the Church community at Rome,—partly Gentile, and partly Jew. We know that feelings of racial jealousy, and matters of doctrinal debate were rife in all the mixed Churches of the first century. Reference to this condition of things is found in the Acts, and in most of the Epistles; and the fact that Paul addressed such a letter as this to the Roman Church, discussing the great controversial issues between the Jews and the Gentiles; and the

further fact that in these supplementary chapters, he introduces these practical matters, prove that the Gentiles and the Jews in the Church at Rome, were, if not openly dissident, at best only in armistice.

These points of caution, or apostolical precept, may be grouped under certain heads.

1. In chapter xii: Forbearance towards one another, and abstinence from self-assertion, or vainglorying in matters of Church prominence, and the exercise of spiritual gifts.

2. In chapter xiii: Deference to civil authorities and obedience to law.

3. In chapter xiv: Toleration of the scruples of others, Jews and Gentiles, in matters of ritual, foods, times, and persons.

4. In chapter xv: Exhortations to unity among themselves, Jews and Gentiles, in Christ; and a defense of himself as "minister of Christ unto the Gentiles."

5. In chapter xvi: His salutations to his many friends in the Church.

In the first verse before us the conjunction *therefore* looks back to the discussion in the previous chapter, where the apostle shows that in the gospel plan the racial jealousy and the doctrinal differences between the Jew and the Gentile are finally reconciled. "Both disobeyed God; and God has now *had mercy* on them all." These are the *mercies* (or, more literally, "the compassions") through which the apostle appeals to the Romans. Some of these Romans were Jews, once accustomed to the Mosaic ceremonial (still glorious and impressive) at Jerusalem; some were Gentiles, once accustomed to the splendid idolatry of heathen temples at Rome; but they are now no longer Jewish ritualists, no longer heathen idolaters, but believers in Christ. And he beseeches them, as believers in Christ, no longer to offer mere dumb animals, the unavailing sacrifices of the Jewish rite, or the sacrifices of the heathen superstition, but to offer *themselves* to God, their own persons, *living, holy, well-pleasing, a rational sacrifice*. This sacrifice of themselves, which Paul calls rational (or reasonable), is the only kind of sacrifice which a rational (or reasoning) worshiper can now render to the Infinite Spirit. And it may be offered without the intervention of priest, or altar, or shed blood, by any one, at any hour, at any place. Accordingly, in the next verse, Paul exhorts the Romans, once addicted to the old routine of the Levitical rite, or to the gross sacrifices and orgies

of the heathen superstition, no longer to fashion themselves to the unmeaning mummeries of the present age, but by the renewal of their mind to test what is God's will concerning them, the will that is good, and well-pleasing, and perfect.

Verses 3-5. For I say, through the grace that was given me, to every one that is among you, not to think of himself more highly than he ought to think; but so to think [of himself] as to think soberly, as to each one God apportioned a measure of faith. For according as, in one body, we have many members, but the members have not all the same office; thus we, the many, are one body in Christ, but severally members of one another.

The third verse is an excellent illustration of Paul's frequent plays on words. The literal translation runs as follows: "— Be not high-minded beyond what it behooves to be *mind*ed; but *mind* to be sound-minded."

The paragraph before us, while not inappropriate to the Jews, more naturally pertains to the Gentile members of the Church at Rome, who were doubtless in the majority, and held most of the Church offices and enjoyed most of the miraculous gifts of the Spirit. And as we have seen in the previous chapter (verses 13, 25), the apostle felt it necessary to caution the Gentiles, as the dominant party, against being conceited, so now he resumes the rôle of admonition, and warns them to think of themselves soberly and to behave themselves towards their brethren in a conciliatory and generous spirit. We do not know, indeed, that the miraculous charisms of the apostolic era had yet been conferred on any of the Roman Christians; but, as many members of this Church had come from the provincial Churches established by Paul, where these gifts had doubtless prevailed, they had doubtless brought these endowments with them. Nor do we know that the rivalries and bickerings which prevailed in the Church at Corinth among those endowed with miraculous charisms also prevailed at Rome. But the admonitions which Paul here addresses to them leave us little room to doubt. These gifts or endowments were conferred by God, through the laying on of the apostles' hands, for the edification and comfort of the body of the Church; but though miraculous, and exercised with spiritual power and grace, the persons who had these gifts were often individually vainglorious in displaying them. This personal element is not inconsistent with the

genuineness of these gifts. We see exactly the same exhibition of human weakness, and vanity, and self-seeking, yet with spiritual power, in the holy ministries of our own times.

Verses 6-8. But having miraculous gifts, differing from one another according to the grace that was given us,—whether prophecy, [use it] according to the analogy of the faith; or ministering [be] in the ministering; or he that teaches, in the teaching; or he that exhorts, in the exhortation; he that gives, in simplicity; he that rules, in earnestness; he that shows mercy, in cheerfulness.

The whole passage from the sixth verse to the nineteenth, and practically to the end of the chapter, is peculiarly anacoluthic; that is, the grammatical construction is incoherent, and almost jerky. One might think that the apostle, who is never prodigal of speech, on this special occasion, in dictating this long paragraph, uttered only catch-words, intending a fuller composition at a later sitting, and never returned to complete it. Yet Tertius (chap. xvi, 23) caught enough of the apostle's winged words to preserve the heads of the thoughts, if not their full expression. A passage equally anacoluthic would be hard to find in all literature. In the whole of the twelve verses, the only finite verbs ("bless, curse," in the fourteenth verse, and "become," in the sixteenth) are in the imperative mode. All the other verbs are either not expressed at all, or are jotted down in the participial or infinitive modes; and the reader is left to make out the sentences at his best judgment. The translators, or exegetes, are not always agreed; but they mostly adopt the imperative mode, following the model in the three just named. But it is best to leave the apostle's utterances to take care of themselves, both as an illustration of his over-packed style, and as a good lesson in exegesis. We shall not be at a loss to get some appropriate meaning, even without working his words up into formal sentences.

There are seven distinct charisms named in this section, **prophecy, ministering, teaching, exhortation, giving, ruling, and showing mercy.** All those functions were inspired, and were exercised, under the guidance of the Holy Spirit, in the service of the Church. "Prophecy," as shown in the parallel passage in Corinthians (1 Cor. xiv), was the most useful, if not the most coveted, endowment in the early Church. It was the gift of inspired preaching; it did not ordinarily mean prediction, but only

edification. But like the showy gift of "tongues," it was liable to extravagance; and the apostle here directs that it be exercised only in accord with the sober analogies of the faith. The next charism here named is that of "ministering" to the wants of the Church. The word *διακονία*, usually translated by the equivocal word "ministry," does not mean (as that word so often) either the clerical body or the clerical function, but rather any helpful ministration to the practical needs of believers. The other charisms severally named, may come under the general head of "ministering," though each with its special significance. But in those early days, they were all prompted and regulated by the Holy Spirit.

Verses 9-21. Let love be unfeigned; abhorring that which is evil; cleaving to that which is good; in brotherly love towards one another affectionate; in honor preferring one another; in earnestness not slow; in spirit fervent; serving the Lord; in hope rejoicing; in affliction patient; in prayer persevering; contributing to the necessities of the saints; pursuing hospitality. Bless them that persecute you; bless, and curse not. To rejoice with them that rejoice; to weep with them that weep. Having the same mind towards one another; not minding the high things; nay, but being carried away with the lowly. Do not become wise in your own conceits. To no one evil for evil repaying; taking forethought for things honorable in the sight of all men. If possible, as far as in you lies, being at peace with all men; not yourselves avenging, beloved; nay, but give place to the wrath [of God]; for it has been written, To me belongs vengeance; I will repay, says the Lord. Nay, but if thine enemy hunger, feed him; if he thirst, give him drink; for this doing, coals of fire thou wilt heap upon his head. (Prov. xxv, 21.) Be not conquered by evil; nay, but conquer evil with good.

Aside from the anacoluthic structure of the sentences, the thought is plain; and the whole paragraph needs but few words of criticism or comment.

In the tenth verse, the clause **in honor prefer one another**, probably means "to promote others" to honors and positions in Church and State, instead of selfishly seeking these things for one's self. Generosity in such matters is as worldly-wise, as it is noble. Men will repay into your own bosoms.

In the thirteenth verse, the verb, **contributing to the wants of others**, means giving from one's own means; or making others to share in your means, *in common* with yourself.

In the seventeenth verse, the English verb **providing things honest** (Authorized), seems to mean "to acquire an honest livelihood;" but the Greek means to take thought (or to plan) for a life reputable in the judgment of the world. Not only that your gains be honest; but let your occupation be honorable.

The eighteenth verse implies that it was not always possible for Christians in Paul's days to live peaceably. The initiative was in the hands of their enemies; and persecution often made the persons and the lives of Christians unsafe.

In the nineteenth verse, the article, **the wrath**, implies the words in brackets [**of God**]; and this renders the same plain. As declared in the next clause, Vengeance belongs to God: we must leave our vindication to him. In Ephesians, we have the opposite sense: "Let not the sun go down on your wrath; nor yet give place to the devil." (Eph. iv, 27.)

CHAPTER XIII.

Verses 1-7. Let every soul submit to the prevailing authorities; for there is no authority, except by God; but the authorities that are have been ordained by God. So that he that opposes the authority, resists the ordinance of God; but they that resist will receive to themselves judgment. For the rulers are not a fear to the good work, but to the bad. But wilt thou not fear the authority? Do that which is good, and thou wilt have praise from it. For it is a minister of God to thee unto that which is good. But if thou do that which is bad, fear; for not in vain does it wear the sword; for it is God's minister, an avenger unto wrath, to him that practices that which is bad. Wherefore there is a necessity to submit, not only on account of wrath, but also on account of conscience. For on account of this ye pay tribute also; for they are agents of God, to this very thing devoting themselves. Render to all their dues; the tribute, to whom ye owe the tribute; the custom, to whom the custom; the fear, to whom the fear; the honor, to whom the honor.

The early Christians belonged largely to the common people; many of them were poor and oppressed, and not a few of them were slaves. From these civil disabilities they saw in the gospel a promise of speedy and summary deliverance. Christ himself had announced, in the words of Isaiah (lxi, 1) that he came to "preach the gospel to the poor, to proclaim release to the captives, to set at liberty them that are bound." (Luke iv, 18.) These gracious and consoling words intended in a spiritual sense, were easily misunderstood by the oppressed, who would gladly see their civil abusers overthrown, even if by violence. Undoubtedly social reforms were destined to come about under the steady pressure of the gospel; but neither Christ in his preaching, nor the apostle in

his letters, contemplated any sudden and, least of all, any violent revolution. We do not know of any general agitation in the Church at Rome for civil and political change; but we know that in the Church at Corinth Paul needed to repress a social unrest, and commanded, "Let each man abide in the condition (even of slavery, or social inequality) in which he was called." (1 Cor. vii, 20.) At all events, his words of admonition, in the present chapter, show that there was danger of such commotions in the Church at Rome. A single mistaken step in this direction would have precipitated the Church at Rome, on real grounds, into the awful persecution in which, a few years later, on vague suspicion, the whole Church nearly perished.

Paul felt that the Christians at Rome should not show hostility to the authorities, both for policy's sake, and for conscience' sake. Six hundred years before Paul's time, Jeremiah wrote to the exiles in Babylon: "Seek the peace of the city whither ye have been carried away captive; and pray unto Jehovah for it; for in the peace thereof will ye have peace." (Jer. xxix, 7.) In like manner, Paul wrote to Timothy: "I exhort, first of all, that prayers be made for kings, and all that are in authority; that we may lead a tranquil and quiet life in all piety and decorum." (1 Tim. ii, 1.) And now he bids the Romans that **every soul shall be subject to the higher authorities**, evidently meaning the civil rulers. To appreciate the wisdom and magnanimity of this command, we must recollect that the ruler at Rome, whom Paul had foremost in his mind, was Nero, the world's proverbial monster of vice and cruelty, the wild beast from whose mouth the apostle himself but a few years later wrote that he had been marvelously delivered, yet only to be destroyed by him at last. This tyrant was then emperor of Rome; but the apostle teaches that human government, even Nero's, is an ordinance of God; that is, that the *de facto* rulers, even though bad, ideally represent the authority of God. Nero, the murderer of brother, and mother, and wife, and of multitudes of the best men of Rome, the incendiary of his own capital, and the persecutor of the Christians, was, for what time he was the actual head of the state, the **authority** to whom was due, within enduring limits, the obedience of all subjects. Even Nero was better than anarchy; tyranny is an abuse of government; anarchy is the abolition of government.

Even Paul, two years after this letter, "appealed to Cæsar" (that is, to Nero, as emperor) from the cabals of the Jews: and

found, under the protection of the emperor, safety and a righteous deliverance.

Nero's government was bad ; none could be worse, except that of Turkey, or of China ; but it was government, and it adequately conserved the ends of society, the rights of person and of property. Strange to say, Nero was a popular ruler. Sometimes, amid civil commotions, there may be a brief doubt which of two antagonist parties subjects ought to obey. The doubt is usually one which is soon decided either peacefully or violently. The question is not, which party is *justly* in power, but which is *actually* in power. The victorious party becomes "the authorities that are," and exactly answers to the term used by the apostle,—“the prevailing authorities,” or, more literally, “the authorities having themselves above.”

But there is also another side to the duty and the rights of citizens,—the final right of self-vindication, and of revolution. It did not come in Paul's line of thought to present this side ; but there is nothing in his gospel inconsistent with the teachings on this subject of the “American Declaration of Independence:” “Governments are instituted among men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed. Whenever any form of government becomes destructive of these ends, it is the right of the people to alter or abolish it, and to institute a new government, laying its foundations on such principles, and organizing its powers in such form, as to them shall seem most likely to effect their safety and happiness.” (Declaration of Independence, July 4, 1776.)

Verses 8-10. To no one owe anything, except to love one another ; for he that loves the other has fulfilled law. For the [saying], Thou shalt not commit adultery, Thou shalt not kill, Thou shalt not steal, Thou shalt not covet, and, if there is any other commandment, it is summed up in this [saying], namely, Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself. Love works no ill to his neighbor ; love therefore is fulfillment of law.

The command in the seventh verse, “Render to all men their dues,” is apparently comprehensive of all obligations of all kinds ; but the added specifications in the next clauses of the verse show that the apostle has in his mind thus far only the outward obligations of the citizens to the civil authorities. At the most it is the

secular life that has been touched. But in the eighth verse the command, while not more general in form, goes very much further. The thought of the verse touches not upon the outward conduct of men only, but upon their inward motives. We now go down to the seat of the moral affections; and we are required not only to pay men their dues, but to love our neighbor, which is the summing up of all our obligations. The "two commandments," on which, Christ says, "hangs the whole law, and the prophets" (Matt. xxii, 40), are found, it is true, in the Old Testament (Deut. vi, 5; Lev. xix, 18), the dispensation of legal obedience more than of spiritual religion; but Christ quotes these sayings in a higher strain, and enforces their obligation on the consciences as well as on the conduct of men. The prescriptions of the Law (as in the Decalogue) aim to regulate our outward lives; the prescriptions of the gospel seek the control of our inward lives, our affections, and hearts, and soul, and mind.

Paul here makes the negative statement that **Love works no ill to his neighbor**,—which is as far as the commandments in the Decalogue reach: "Thou shalt *not*—," and it is in this legal phase of the matter that he adds that **Love is therefore fulfillment of law**. But the apostle's saying is really stronger than this. The word "law" in our text is anarthrous, and, as we have so often seen, signifies not the special law of Jewish legislation, or, at least, not that only, but "law" in its widest range, the law of the universe, the great ethical law which holds in its sway God, and angels, and men. And it is in this comprehensive sense of "law" that we must translate and interpret the saying that "love is fulfillment of law" for all beings, always, and everywhere.

In the ninth verse the apostle quotes the Seventh Commandment, "Thou shalt not commit adultery," before the Sixth, "Thou shalt not kill." The same peculiarity, whether from inadvertence or from some rabbinic tradition is found also in Mark (x, 19) and in James (ii, 11).

Verses 11-14. And this, knowing the season, that it is time for you already to be awaked from sleep; for now salvation is nearer us than when we [first] had faith. The night went on, but the day has come near. Let us put off therefore the works of the darkness, but let us put on the weapons of the light. Let us walk becomingly, as in day, not with revels and drunkenness, not with lewdness and

lasciviousness, not with strife and jealousy: nay, but put ye on the Lord Jesus Christ; and do not make provision for the flesh, to satisfy its lusts.

This paragraph continues the thought of the last paragraph, that love avoids offense against his neighbor, and so fulfills law. But the offense now takes shape in the apostle's thought, especially in regard to social (or sexual) impurity. It is a remarkable testimony to the low state of morals in the Gentile world that the apostle needed to write this chapter to the Church at Rome, or the sixth chapter of the First Epistle to the Corinthians, or that the Council at Jerusalem needed to write to the Gentile Christians, "Abstain from fornication." (Acts xv, 29.)

The first words, **And this**, are equivalent to the more common phrase, "and that, too," and must be explained in the same way; that is, they restate the thought of the preceding sentence. It is as if the apostle here said, "Owe no man aught but love, and do not sin against your neighbor; and that, too, because you are aware of the upward movement of the Church; that the hour has come when you should wake from your long sleep of sin; for now you are nearer being saved from your sins than when you first made a profession of faith in Christ. While you slept, the night went on; the day dawn is at hand. Put away the deeds of the night: put on the armor of the day: put on the Lord Jesus Christ, and take no thought to gratify your lusts."

CHAPTER XIV.

Verses 1-4. But him that is weak in the faith receive ye; not with a view to criticisms of his scruples. There is one man, who, indeed, has faith to eat all things; but he that is weak eats only vegetables. Let not him that eats count for naught him that eats not; and let not him that eats not judge him that eats; for God received him. Who art thou that judgest another's servant? To his own lord he stands, or falls. But he will be made to stand. For the Lord is able to make him stand.

This chapter treats of the forbearance due to the scruples of others, especially on points which the apostle says (verse 14) are of no moment in themselves. The term which he uses to describe the Jews was appropriate; not because they were weak, numerically, though this was true, but because they were feeble in their faith; and therefore the more required to be borne with. The last word, **weak in the faith**, means in the gospel, yet here not as a system of doctrines, but only so far forth as it is deliverance from the Levitical ordinances. The early Jewish converts still had scruples on the subject of circumcision, of foods clean and unclean, of things offered to idols, and of the feast days of the Jewish year. The Gentiles, on the other hand, besides being the majority of the Church, were not in bondage to any of these things; and so Paul calls them "the strong." (Rom. xv, 1.) And it is to the "strong," Gentile element of the Church that the apostle now addresses his appeal for tolerance of the views of the others—**Receive the weak Jews into fellowship**; receive them to your love and confidence, not to decisions of their doubts; or perhaps we might translate, **to wrangles over their scruples**. Paul's word here for "weak" is not the adjective, as if a characteristic, or permanent, defect in the Jew, but a participle implying only his temporary condition. And the thought of the apostle was not that these scruples are

indifferent; but that they are not the most important matters of the religious life; and that weaknesses, which are not sins, may be tolerated in the Church, until the leaven of the gospel shall bring both Jew and Gentile, both weak and strong, into one.

The first matter of difference between the weak and the strong refers to the Jewish discrimination between "clean" foods and "unclean." The Mosiac legislation prescribed certain animals that might be eaten; but proscribed certain others that might not be eaten at all. This distinction which the Jews scrupulously observed, is the basis for Peter's vision of the sheet let down from heaven. But no Jew ate even "clean" animals, unless ritually butchered ("kosher meat"), so that no blood was left in the flesh. "Ye shall eat no manner of blood: whosoever eats any blood, that person shall be cut off from his people (excommunicated as unclean from the congregation)." (Lev. vii, 26.) And to this end, the Jews abstained from all flesh sold in the common market. But there was a point under the latter head that was just as serious for some Christian Gentiles, at first, as for the scrupulous Jew. Most, if not all, of the flesh sold in the public markets had first been offered as sacrifices (the blood poured out on the altars of idols); and was thereby "unclean" to the Christian; and most of the wine sold had first been offered (by symbolic libation) to the idol, and was thereby unclean; and to eat these meats offered to idols was, religiously, "to have communion with the idol." (1 Cor. x, 20.) This was the scruple which withheld Daniel from eating of the king's food, and drinking the king's wine, lest he should defile himself with meats offered to idols. Pliny, in his famous letter to Trajan (A. D. 104) says that even before that date the Christians had so multiplied in Bithynia, that there could scarcely be found purchasers for the flesh of idol sacrifices, offered for sale in the markets. (Pliny x, 96.) This was the condition of things at Corinth; and Paul devotes two chapters, in the main, of the First Epistle to the Corinthians to a discussion "concerning things sacrificed to idols" and afterwards sold in the markets (chapters viii, x). Paul tells the Corinthians that as for himself he did not recognize the idol as being anything real in the world, and that, therefore, he had no scruples about eating such food; and he bids them: "Whatsoever is sold in the shambles, eat, asking no question about it, on account of scruples of conscience." (1 Cor. x, 25.) Yet he says that out of regard to others he would not sin against the (weak) brethren, and wound their consciences:

“If my food scandalizes my brother, I will not eat flesh for evermore.” (1 Cor. viii, 18.) Such, too, was the condition of things at Rome also. Some of the Romans had faith (that is, felt free) to eat all things,—evidently meats bought in the market, which doubtless had been offered to idols. But others of the Church, the weaklings, ate only vegetables, like Daniel and the other scrupulous Jews at Babylon. And here again, as also to the Corinthians, the apostle commands that the two parties should not incriminate each other for eating, or for not eating; but, without wrangling, should frankly leave every believer to his own conscience, and to God. The strong must not make naught of the weak, as crotchety, as sticklers for trifles; and the weak must not judge and condemn the strong as lawless, heady followers of their own caprices.

The last clause in the third verse, **For God received him**, might equally well apply to either of the two, the strong, or the weak; but the connection, and the verb **judgest** in the fourth verse, which characterizes the “*weak*” man, make the pronoun **him** point rather to the *strong* man, the Gentile, who is free from scruples. The caution to the weak man is that he should not judge and condemn the strong man on the ground of laxity; “for God received him;” and the weak brother has no right to sit in judgment on one whom God approves and receives. He stands or falls to his own Lord, not to the fallible man who assumes to judge him. And then the apostle adds, **But he will be made to stand**; for, notwithstanding what to the weak brother may seem license and instability, the Lord of both parties has power to make him stand. Notice that both here and in the Epistle to the Corinthians, Paul evidently sympathizes with the strong man, who, like the apostle himself, is Christ’s *free* man: but his words are non-partisan, dispassionate, and gentle even to the uncharitable condemner of the brethren.

Verses 5-9. For there is one man, who, indeed, esteems day above day; but there is one who esteems every day. Let each man be fully assured in his own mind. He that minds the day minds it to the Lord; and he that eats, eats to the Lord, for he thanks God; and he that eats not, to the Lord eats not; and thanks God. For no one of us lives to himself, and no one dies to himself. For if we live, we live to the Lord; and if we die, we die

to the Lord: if we live, therefore, or if we die, we are the Lord's. For to this end Christ died, and lived, that he may be Lord both of dead men and of living.

The discussion here still continues in regard to foods clean and unclean. And the first two verses about the distinction in *day* come in only as a parallel instance of the principle which holds in the matter of foods. The meaning is, that just as differences of opinion are now innocently held in regard to the days once esteemed holy and obligatory (a freedom of opinion in those matters which all parties concede), so differences of opinion may now innocently be held in regard to the eating of flesh. The days referred to are the now obsolete feast days of the Jews, the Passover, the Pentecost, the Feast of the Tabernacles, New Moons, and the Jewish Sabbath. These are the days that Paul elsewhere enumerates. Thus he says to the Galatians, "Ye (Gentiles) are observing [the Jewish] days, and months, and seasons, and years" (Gal. iv, 10); and to the Colossians, "Let no man condemn you in your eating, or in drinking, or in regard of a feast day, or of a new moon, or of a Sabbath-day,—which things are a shadow of the things that were to come, whose substance is Christ" (Col. ii, 16). The man who has scruples about "the days" is evidently the man of weak faith, who also has scruples about eating. On the other hand, it is "the strong" man that eats all things, **who also esteems all days.** [The meaning of this last phrase is, that he counts all days equally consecrated to God not desecrated as over against the Jewish Sabbath.]

The observance of certain days as hallowed is a matter indifferent in itself, with a strong presumption against the observance as indicating overscrupulousness. But Paul bids, **Let every man be fully persuaded in his own mind.** It thus resolves itself into a question of the judgment as well as of the conscience. It is equally so in regard to the eating of all foods indiscriminately. And so Paul says, **He that minds the day** (the weak man), **minds it to the Lord,**—that is, deferring to what he thinks God's will in the matter; **for he thanks God**; but in the same way, **he that eats, eats to the Lord; for he thanks God.**

The next verses, seventh to the ninth, declare what we must hold true of *all* believers, of the strong as well as the weak. Both live with good conscience before God: **no one of us lives to himself, or dies to himself:** but to the Lord—that is, we must

count ourselves as belonging to him. And his servants we are, in life and in death. To this end Christ was manifested, that he (and not *we*, the censor of the brethren, or the despiser) may be the Lord of us all, both of dead men and of living.

Verses 10-13. But thou! why dost thou judge thy brother? or also thou! why dost thou count thy brother for naught? For we all shall stand before the bar of God. For it has been written,

As I live, says the Lord, [I swear] that to me every knee shall bow,

And every tongue shall confess to God. (Isa. xlv, 23.)

Accordingly then, each one of us concerning himself will give account to God. No longer, therefore, let us judge one another; nay, but judge ye this rather, not to put a stumbling-block for your brother, or an occasion of offense.

In the ninth verse the apostle has said that Christ died and lived that *HE*, and not *we*, finite and fallible, may be Lord of *all* men, both dead and living. Yet the Jew has dared to judge the Gentile for his offense in "eating all things;" and the Gentile has dared to ridicule the Jew for his narrow scruples about the same harmless foods. It is in view of this unfraternal bearing that the apostle now sharply reprehends them both, and asks first of the Jew, **Thou! why dost thou judge (and condemn) thy brother?** and of the Gentile, **Thou! why dost thou count thy brother as a man of naught?** Neither thou, nor thou, art judge; it is at God's bar, not yours, that we all shall stand. God himself said, **To me (not to men) shall every knee bow.** (The sentence here is the regular formula of an oath; the structure of the sentence implies the words, "I swear it.") **Accordingly then**, the apostle continues, **each one of us will give account concerning himself to God**, not to his brother; and he concludes with the exhortation, **Let us no longer judge.** This thirteenth verse gives a good illustration how, in the same sense, a leading word may, for the sake of parallelism, be used in unlike (almost opposite) meanings: "Let us not judge *and condemn* one another; nay, but let us rather judge *and approve* of a charitable course towards our failing, falling brother,—namely, **not to put stumbling stones in his path.**"

Verses 14-18. I know and am persuaded in the Lord Jesus, that nothing is unclean through itself; except that to him that reckons anything to be unclean, to that one it is unclean. For if on account of thy food, thy brother is grieved, no longer thou walkest according to love. Do not with thy food destroy that man for whom Christ died. Let not therefore your good be evil spoken of. For the kingdom of God is not eating and drinking; nay, but justification, and peace, and joy in the Holy Spirit. For he that in this matter serves Christ, is well-pleasing to God, and approved by men.

The words in the Lord Jesus, are sometimes thought to describe the apostle's assurance, as being in Christ, but this is not very clear. It is better to hold that there is substantially here a trajection of the conjunction *that*, and that the sentence should read, "I am persuaded that in the Lord Jesus." At all events, the apostle describes how the dispensation of the gospel has gone beyond the old dispensation of Jewish observances. Once, certain things were made ritually clean, and unclean, to serve as outward symbols of moral distinctions. This kindergarten period of Church training has gone by. Now, "in the Lord Jesus," that is in the mature kingdom of God (which the apostle expressly names in the seventeenth verse) there is no need or place for these elementary things. "In the Lord Jesus," that is, in the gospel of Christ, "there is nothing ritually clean, nothing ritually unclean." The gospel does not concern itself about foods and drinks, and ritualistic mummeries in general.

This is Paul's own conviction for himself. But he holds that for others the whole matter of things clean and unclean turns on their personal attitude. If the weak Jew, still wearing the fetters of Moses, reckons anything to be unclean, to him it is unclean. His scruples (though his scruples are now only a superstition) establish for him certain limits on the matter of foods, which he can not transgress without guilt. And so the apostle teaches that the strong man (the Gentile, who has none of these scruples) must not, through his own latitude in the matter of food, give his weaker brother pain, or by his example influence him to violate his conscience. Do not with thy food [Alford admirably puts it, "by a meal of thine"] destroy him for whom Christ died. Do not, by needless indulgence in that which is all right

for you, but may not be so to others, bring evil reports upon yourself. And it is not a great personal sacrifice to make. "For the kingdom of God (whose *privileges* you share with your weaker brethren) does not consist in the sensuous enjoyments of eating and drinking, to please yourself, but in the higher enjoyment of justification, and peace, and joy, in the Holy Spirit."

Verses 19-23. Accordingly, then, let us follow the things of peace, and the things of the edification of one another. Do not for the sake of food destroy [tear down] the work of God. All foods indeed are clean; but [to eat them] is bad to the man that eats with offense. It is good not to eat flesh, nor yet to drink wine, nor yet to do aught in which thy brother stumbles. The faith which thou thyself hast, have it to thyself before God. Happy is he that judges [and condemns] not himself in that which he approves. But if he that doubts [about his food] eat, he has been condemned; because he eats not from faith. But everything which is not from faith is sin.

The paragraph opens with a practical exhortation arising from the religious nature of Christ's kingdom, and the obligations which it imposes on its members. Christians should look, not on their own things, but on the things of others. They are members of one another, and must "seek one another's peace and edification." Notice that, by this word **edification**, Paul does not mean mere instruction or enlightenment of the understanding, as if the "strong" man should seek to teach the weaker brother on the points of debate. This contention is forbidden in the first verse of the chapter. But the sense of the word here (and always in Scriptures) is that of upbuilding and establishing in personal faith. This work is not so much intellectual as religious; and applies to the upbuilding of the spiritual house of God in the hearts of believers.

After this general exhortation, the apostle in the twentieth verse, resumes the special discussion of the eating of unclean foods. And the first words repeat substantially the command in the fifteenth verse, but with specific differences in expression and words. In the fifteenth verse, the command is, "Do not *by* thy food (that is, by eating 'unclean' food) *destroy the man* for whom Christ died." This verb "destroy" means "cause to perish," that is, make thy brother fall away from his integrity. In the

twentieth verse, the command is, **Do not for the sake of food** (that is, that you may enjoy the dainties of the market) **destroy the work of God.** The verb "destroy" here means, "tear down;" and the word "work" means "the *building* of God." "Do not, for the sake of a little self-indulgence, tear down what God is building up." Both verbs, "destroy," "tear down," are in the present tense, and may rather express the tendency, than the actual result. But neither verb implies that the result will be the perdition of the weak brother, but only his stumbling in his Christian life.

The principle exemplified in the last part of the twentieth verse is far-reaching; and is put in yet more general terms, in the last verse of the chapter. No man can rightly do what he does not know to be innocent. All foods are really clean; but to eat them is a sin to the man, the "weak" brother, who can not eat them without wounding his own conscience. And to eat them is equally a sin to the "strong" man, who if he eat them, scandalizes his brother and causes him to stumble. And so the apostle gives a double admonition. To the "strong" man he says, "If you have faith (are conscience-free) to eat all things, do not vaunt your liberty, or parade your eating, to the offense of your weaker brother. Have it to yourself." And to the "weak" man he says, "Do not eat against your convictions. Happy is he that does not bring condemnation on his conscience, in eating that in which he is overbold to indulge himself."

And then he adds a concluding and conclusive summing up; that he that discriminates in his own conscience, between foods on the ground of their being clean or unclean, if he nevertheless eat them indiscriminately, has by his own act, brought condemnation on his own conscience, because he eats without inward assurance that the eating is innocent. But whatever in this direction is not done from this quiet inward assurance of soul is sin.

CHAPTER XV.

Verses 1-6. But we, the strong, ought to bear with the weaknesses of the weak, and not to please ourselves. Let each one of us please his neighbor unto that which is good, for his upbuilding. And [do this], for Christ did not please himself; nay, but [denied himself], according as it has been written, The reproaches of them that reproach . . . thee fall on me. (Psa. lxxix, 9.) For as many things as were written of old, were written for our instruction, that through the patience and through the encouragement of the Scriptures, we may have the hope. But may the God of the patience and of the encouragement give you to be of the same mind with one another, according to Christ Jesus; that with one accord, with one mouth, ye may glorify the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ.

This paragraph is an additional appeal to the strong men in the Church in behalf of the weaker brethren (literally, the not strong), on the ground of conscience and of Christian forbearance: **We ought to bear with them.** The verb should be translated "to bear with," not "to bear" (that is, "to carry"), which is inappropriate with the word **weaknesses**. But we are directed "to carry the burdens," not the infirmities, of others. (Gal. vi, 2.) But the man of sympathy and patience "bears with" the weakness of his weaker brethren. He will not let their failings, even though they verge upon being *faults*, anger or vex him. The example of Christ is cited, who **did not please himself**, but "bore with the contradiction of sinners," and, like David in the Psalms, "endured the reproaches" of the ingrates, who reproach even God. And Paul adds that these lessons of the Old Testament **were written for our instruction.** If we take to heart these lessons of patience and encouragement from the Scriptures, and this lesson of Christ's patience and endurance under provocation, we shall have oneness of mind with one another.

Verses 7-13. Wherefore receive ye one another, according as also Christ received you, to the glory of God. For I say that Christ has become minister of circumcision, in behalf of God's truthfulness, that he may confirm the promises of the fathers; but that the Gentiles may glorify God, for his mercy [to them]; according as it has been written,

On this account I will confess to thee among Gentiles.

And to thy name I will sing. (Psa. xviii, 49.)

And again [the Scripture] says,

Rejoice, Gentiles, with his people. (Deut. xxxii, 43.)

And again,

Praise all the Gentiles Jehovah;

And let all the peoples praise him. (Psa. cxvii, 1.)

And again Isaiah says,

There will be the root of Jesse,

And he that arises to rule Gentiles;

On him Gentiles will hope. (Isa. xi, 10.)

But may the God of the hope fill you with all joy and peace in having faith, that ye may abound in the hope [of eternal life] in the power of the Holy Spirit.

The conjunction **wherefore** refers back to the discussion on the forbearance of the strong towards the weak. In the first verse of chapter xiv, Paul bids the strong Gentile, "Receive him that is weak, the overscrupulous Jew, not into debate and wrangle over his scruples, but into kind and fraternal relations." It is the Gentile who is there required to make allowance for the Jew. But in our present verse the apostle's concept is, that both parties must yield somewhat, each to the other; and so now he bids both the Gentile and the Jew, **Receive ye one another, as Christ also received you, to the glory of God.** Nominally he addresses both parties; yet his underlying thought is still chiefly of the Gentiles, and perhaps the clause, "Christ also received *you*," applies wholly to the Gentiles. It is the implication of the verse that the Jews were already in the Church, but that now Christ received the Gentiles also, to the glory of God.

The conjunction **for** in the eighth verse has its usual explicative function, and it refers to the phrase, "Christ received you." The argument is that the Jews and the Gentiles should receive one another as equals in the Church, for the reason that Christ

has become minister of circumcision—first, that he may confirm to the Jews the promises made to their fathers, and, secondly, that the Gentiles may come to glorify God for his mercy to them in Christ. Both words, minister and circumcision, here used are anarthrous; not “*the minister of the Circumcision,*” as in the Authorized and the Revised. The word “circumcision” does not mean “the Circumcised,” that is, the Jewish Church (as frequently; for example, Rom. iii, 30; Gal. ii, 7-9); but the *rite* of circumcision, and it is quite equivalent to the covenant of the Jews. This rite was the requirement on which the promises to the fathers were conditioned; and it was of this covenant that Christ became “minister.” This word “minister” in the New Testament does not mean, as the common English term “minister,” an ecclesiastic, or preacher, for Christ did not preach circumcision, but, as the Greek word always signifies, “a servitor;” but better here, a *subserver*, or functionary, whose office was to interpret and fulfill, to the Jews, this rite of their religion, in its real, underlying significance. Christ thus subserved the truth of God so as to confirm to the Jews the spiritual promises made to their fathers. But this confirmation of the promises extended also to the Gentiles. They, too, are the recipients of the universal promises. “Christ received” both Jews and Gentiles on a common basis. And so the second result of his “ministry” is, **that the Gentiles may glorify God for his mercy to them.**

And on this mentioning of the Gentiles, Paul bursts out afresh with a few more citations (just as they occur to him) of Scriptural passages in which the Gentiles are named as having a place in the Church of Christ. How abundantly and proudly the apostle to the Gentiles magnifies his office; and how copiously the Jewish Scriptures yield him their riches! The number of these explicit quotations about the Gentiles, in previous chapters and here, is pretty large; but if he had so needed, or desired, he could easily have centupled the count. The Hebrew Scriptures are full of such proofs of the coming recognition and salvation of the Gentile world.

Verses 14-21. But I am persuaded, my brethren, also myself, concerning you, that yourselves also are full of goodness, having been filled with all knowledge, being able also to admonish one another. But I write to you more boldly, in part, as again reminding you; on account of the

grace that was given me from God, to the end that I should be a ministrant at the altar of Christ Jesus, as to the Gentiles, ministering the gospel of God, in order that my oblation of the Gentiles may become acceptable, having been sanctified in the Holy Spirit. I have therefore the boasting in Christ Jesus in the things towards God. For I will not dare to speak of any of the things which Christ did not work through me, unto obedience of Gentiles, by word and work, in power of signs and wonders, in power of the Holy Spirit. So that from Jerusalem, and in circuit as far as Illyricum, I have fully preached the gospel of Christ; but [I have done so] being ambitious so to preach the gospel; not where Christ was named, that I may not build upon another's foundation; nay, but [to preach] according as it has been written,

They to whom nothing was announced concerning him
will see;

And they that have not heard, will understand.

(Isa. lii, 15.)

The apostle has twice admonished his brethren to forbearance towards one another. (Rom. xiv, 1; xv, 7.) But he now changes his tone; and, in the verses before us, he turns from his words of apostolical authority to the words of fraternal compliment. He tells his brethren that they really need no words of admonition, except such as they can administer to one another. He uses the emphatic pronouns to make his point clear: **I am myself persuaded that ye yourselves are good, and wise, and able to admonish one another.** Yet he says that, notwithstanding his opinion concerning them, he has been more free, in part, to write them these admonitions (not enjoining a burden on them), but only by way of reminder. **But I write you the more boldly, on account of the grace which God gave me to be an apostle, and in the line of this authority.**

The next verse, the sixteenth, is the only passage in these letters in which even a quasi-priestly function is ascribed to the gospel minister. And here the apostle's words are evidently only a figurative appropriation of the terms of the Jewish ritual to the evangelical office of a Christian pastor. In this figurative style, Paul speaks of himself as set apart, to the end that he should be a ministrant (or sacrificant) at the altar of God, in reference to the

Gentiles, officiating in this gospel priesthood, to offer them up, as an acceptable oblation to God. But this figure of a priesthood, though cast in a Jewish mold, does not point in the direction of the sacerdotalism of the mediæval Roman Catholic Church (and later sacramentarians), which counts all Christian ministers (of their orders) as "priests," in the old Jewish sense of the word, invested with sacrificial functions; and which holds that these priests, in solemnizing the mass, offer up, on an altar, the veritable body and blood of the Lord Jesus, as an atoning sacrifice. Paul's concept of his priestly office is totally different. He kneels at no altar; but in the privacy of his closet. He offers no atoning sacrifice for sin; but only a figurative oblation of the body of the Gentile Church, a thank-offering to God for his mercies. This is only what all evangelical Christians recognize as "the priesthood of believers," in which the laity, as well as the clergy, offer themselves (and all the world) a sacrifice to God. It is what Paul has already expressed to the believers in Rome: "I beseech you, brethren, through the mercies of God, to present your bodies a living sacrifice, holy, well-pleasing, to God, your reasonable service." (Rom. xii, 1.) This, and this only, is Paul's meaning in this verse. Yet, while it is perfectly aside from sacerdotalism, never before, and never after, did Paul even thus incidentally venture on this far-fetched figure of a Christian priest, to describe his gospel office. Christ is the only atoning sacrifice that the gospel knows anything of; and the Christian minister is not a "priest" in any such sacerdotal sense as this.*

*The English word "priest" is but a shortened form of the old Greek word *πρεσβύτερος*, "presbyter," which occurs twenty times in the Greek Testament, in the sense of an elder in the Christian Church (besides other uses), and it is always translated "elder." This is the proper official description and title of the gospel minister. His function is to be a pastor, and to feed the flock of Christ. The Greek word applying to the Jewish priest is *ιερεύς*. It occurs over thirty times. This word *ιερεύς* means a "sacrificer," which was the proper description and title in the Greek Testament of the Jewish priests; though it is always translated, in the English Bible, by the perverted word "priest." But the meaning of the word *ιερεύς* is clear. It was of the function of the priesthood to offer sacrifice. And so it is said, "Every priest is ordained to offer sacrifice for sins." (Heb. v, 1.) This is never the function of the Christian minister, or "elder;" but this is the conception which the sacramentarian Church of Rome would fain attach to the Christian ministry; and which, in the course of long centuries of unobstructed perversion of the truth, it succeeded in imposing upon the Greek-English word "priest" (that is, presbyter, elder), the New Testament name for the non-sacerdotal minister of Jesus Christ. What a his-

The word **therefore**, in verse 17, is Paul's reference to the grace granted him to be Christ's apostle to the Gentiles; and to his inference that he has a boasting over his labors in this field, which was all his own. He declares that of nothing else will he boast, of nothing done by others in this field, and of nothing done by himself in fields outside of his proper geographical and *ethnic* limits. In this spirit, he says, **I will not dare to speak of any of the things which Christ did not work through me.** The sentence is plain; but the sense may be rendered clearer by dropping the double negative: "I will speak only of the things which Christ wrought by me." And he describes, incidentally, but too briefly, the geographical range of his work. It reached from Jerusalem, in a circuit through Asia Minor, and Greece, to Illyria, on the Adriatic Sea. The description embraces, substantially, the eastern half of the Roman Empire. Much of it he traversed many times; and though he does not tell us how many Churches he founded, or the number of his converts to Christ, yet he says that within these extremes, from east to west, he had **fully preached the gospel of Christ.** The Church at Rome was quite certainly largely composed of representative converts from Paul's provincial Churches, whom he knew personally, and to whom he now sends his greetings. Paul drove his plow in virgin soil; he was ambitious not to preach where Christ was named, nor to build on other men's foundations. His motto is found in Isaiah's description of Messiah's work: "The Gentiles to whom Christ was not yet preached shall now hear and understand."

tory do these divergent senses of the one word "presbyter" (In the New Testament an "elder," and in the Roman Church a "sacrificer") reveal to us of the corruption of the dark ages, and of encroachment of the Roman hierarchy! The change in the *form* of the word, from "presbyter" to "priest," is of little significance; but the change in the *meaning* of the word is vital, and fatal to the evangelical truth. We need to be watchful against the imposture that lies concealed in the word. While the word "priest" is identically the old New Testament word "presbyter," for "elder," and ought to retain the old meaning, yet the sense which papal Rome, and the sacramentarians of other confessions, attach to it, is not the New Testament sense of the word. Rome and Anglican High-churchmen impose upon the New Testament word "presbyter" (elder) the sense that properly belongs to the New Testament word *ιερευς*, a sacrificer. And so, instead of designating themselves as Christian "elders," they (at least in the rituals of ordination, and especially of the Lord's Supper) arrogate to themselves the name of "priest," because this word, with its warped meaning, becomes subservient to their sacramentalism. With the help of a false philology they dupe the people (and are duped) into a false theology.

Verses 22-29. Wherefore also I was hindered these many times, from coming unto you. But now no longer having place in these regions, but having from many years a longing to come unto you, whenever I may go unto Spain; (for I hope when passing through to visit you, and by you to be sent forward there, if first I be filled in part, with your company), but now I am setting out unto Jerusalem, ministering to the saints. For Macedonia and Achaia thought well to make some contribution unto the poor of the saints that are in Jerusalem; for they thought well; and they are their debtors; for if the Gentiles shared in their spiritual things, they ought also to minister to them in the carnal things. When, therefore, I have finished this, and have sealed to them this fruit, I will come away through you unto Spain. But I know that when I come unto you, I shall come in the fullness of the blessing of Christ.

The conjunction *wherefore* connects back to the previous verses, in which Paul shows how, in his wide field of work, he had so fully preached Christ: "Wherefore," he continues (that is, in view of these absorbing labors), I was being hindered these many times from coming to you. But now [the word is emphatic, *now*], no longer having place [that is, fresh opening] in these regions, I can gratify my longing, from many years past, to visit you.

The grammatical construction in the paragraph is broken, but the continuous sense is clear. In the following verses he declares his purpose to make a missionary journey to Spain; and he joins this expression of his purpose with a hope to make the journey an occasion for the visit to Rome: I hope, on my journey to Spain, to visit you, and by you to be helped forward thither; and then he adds the courteous words, if I be first somewhat filled with my stay with you.

The question arises whether this desire to visit Rome, and to preach there, and to impart to them some spiritual gift, infringes on his settled policy "not to preach where Christ was named." In answering this question, we must recollect the other condition which really is what he means, that he would not *build* on another's foundation. His incidental preaching as a visitor would be no infringement of his general purpose. But at any rate Rome

was not within the field of any other apostle, certainly not of Peter, who was never in Rome. And the probability is that the Church at Rome was made up of Paul's own converts from elsewhere, and so was really within the terms of his own rule.

Did Paul ever visit Spain? His purpose of an immediate journey thither was defeated by his imprisonment of two years at Caesarea, and of two years more at Rome. Ecclesiastical tradition credits him with having finally carried out his purpose. But aside from his own expressed purpose, and these vague traditions, we know nothing.

But Paul's plans now were settled; his face was fixed towards Rome, and Spain; yet he tells the Romans that he must first see Jerusalem. He has an errand of mercy to the poor of the mother Church. Since the days of the communal experiment at Jerusalem, after the Pentecost (Acts iv, 32), the Church there had a large element of poor people, dependent on the aid of others. This chronic pauperism had now lasted nearly thirty years; and it probably lasted till the destruction of the city, by Titus, A. D. 70. In Paul's agreement on terms of peace with the apostles, at the Council at Jerusalem, they stipulated with him that in his Gentile Churches he should remember the poor at Jerusalem. This he did over and over again; and one such collection from the Churches of Macedonia and Achaia was now in his hands, to carry to Jerusalem. But he says that when he has fulfilled his mission to the Jews, he will promptly set out to Spain, taking Rome in his course. And he adds that, **I know that I shall come in the fullness of the blessing of Christ.**

Verses 30-33. **But I beseech you, brethren, through our Lord Jesus Christ, and through the love of the Spirit, to agonize with me, in your prayers to God, on my behalf, that I may be rescued from them in Judea, that obey not [the Lord Jesus Christ], and that my ministry unto Jerusalem may become acceptable to the saints; in order that I may come to you, with joy, through the will of God, and may be refreshed with you. But the God of peace be with you all. Amen.**

Paul's errand to Jerusalem was one of mercy. It was his fifth journey to the Holy City. It had been four years since his last flying visit; and the breach now between him and the Jews was complete. He felt unusual solicitude with regard to his reception,

and even his safety. No Jew looked with kindly eye upon the renegade from Moses and the customs of the fathers. The non-Christian Jews hated him; and even the believers felt little affection for him. He knew the enmity of the former; he was uncertain of the attitude of the latter. And so, in these verses, he beseeches the brethren at Rome, by all the motives he could name, **through our Lord Jesus Christ, and through the love of the Spirit**, to join him in agonizing prayers to God, on his behalf. Yet the utmost that he could hope, and all that he asked in prayer, was to be rescued from **the disobedient**, and not to be rejected by the saints. His fears were only too well founded. The story of the bitter vindictiveness of the Jews, and of the lukewarmness, or even ingratitude of the brethren, who needed to be conciliated, if not reconciliated to the apostle to the Gentiles, is most graphically told in the Acts of the Apostles. (Acts xxi, 17.)

Paul did not come to Rome, as he hoped, **with joy**, but in chains. Yet the Church to which this letter was sent, still existed; and on the apostle's approach, though a prisoner, "the brethren from thence, when they heard of us [it is Luke who writes; and his pronoun shows that he was with Paul], came forty miles, to meet us; whom when Paul saw, he thanked God, and took courage." (Acts xxviii, 15.) Nearly thirty of these "brethren" were Paul's personal friends; and they ought to have "taken his part;" but where they were during the next two years (and, later, during his second imprisonment, and at his death), is one of the perplexing puzzles of history. Yet we possibly have a clue to their presence, and practical intervention in his behalf, in the last sentence in the Acts. "And he abode two whole years in his own *hired* lodging, and received *all* that went in unto him, preaching the kingdom of God, and teaching the things concerning the Lord Jesus Christ, with all boldness, none forbidding him." (Acts xxviii, 30.) It is in this home, *but in chains* (Acts xxviii, 20), that the sacred history finally leaves him.

CHAPTER XVI.

Verses 1, 2. But I commend to you Phœbe our sister, being deaconess of the Church that is in Cenchrea; that ye may receive her in the Lord, worthily of the saints, and that ye may assist her in whatever affair she may need you; and [do so], for she herself became a helper of many, and of myself.

Cenchrea was the eastern seaport of Corinth, distant about nine miles. Though a dependency of Corinth, the capital of the province, it was itself a flourishing city, and was probably the site of a Jewish synagogue. Phœbe, whom the apostle commends to the assistance of the Romans, was servant, or **deaconess of the Church in Cenchrea**. The term "deaconess" here applied to her, marked the beginning thus early of the office which afterwards became a regular order in the Church; and which, after falling into neglect, is now being revived in all Protestant Churches. Phœbe's office in that Greek city, where the sexes were socially apart, shows that she was a woman of mature age, and probably a widow. Her errand to Rome was, as the Greek word here translated **affair**, means some "matter of law." And the apostle takes advantage of her journey thither, to make her the bearer of this Epistle. His words of commendation give us another play on words,—literally translated, **stand by her, for she has been a stand by of many, and of myself**. This position which expresses her general work in the new Church, implies that not only was she a person worthy to be trusted with those functions, but that, like Lydia (Acts xvi, 14), she was able from her private means, to extend assistance to those in need. It must have been in the way of personal services that she helped Paul. His health was always infirm, and he depended largely on the ministrations of others. Upon his first visit to Corinth, which lasted eighteen months, he was the guest of his Jewish friends, Aquila and Pris-

cilla. Upon his second visit, he was the guest of Gaius, a wealthy and liberal Gentile, whom Paul calls "my host, and the host of the whole Church." Here he was also brought under personal obligations to Phœbe, "the helper of many, *and of myself.*" Phœbe is the only woman of all Paul's friends whom he calls **our sister**. These words, "our sister," are found also in the English translation of Philemon, verse 2, but the Greek there is "*the sister;*" and Apphia is the only other woman whom he calls "sister." But it was in Phœbe's position of a "woman of affairs," that she had legal business to look after away from her home. Aside from these few points, we know nothing of this excellent woman, the forerunner of a mighty host of "deaconesses," consecrated helpers in the Church of Christ.

Verses 3-16. Salute Prisca and Aquila, my fellow-workers in Christ Jesus, who for my life laid down their own neck, whom not I alone thank, nay, but also all the Churches of the Gentiles: and salute the Church in their house. Salute Epænetus my beloved, who is the firstfruits of Asia unto Christ. Salute Mary, who toiled much upon you. Salute Andronicus and Junia, my kinsmen, and my fellow-prisoners, who are notable among the apostles, who also became in Christ before me. Salute Amplias, my beloved in the Lord. Salute Urbanus, our fellow-worker in Christ, and Stachys my beloved. Salute Apelles, the approved in Christ. Salute them that are from the household of Aristobulus. Salute Herodion, my kinsman. Salute them that are from the household of Narcissus, who are in the Lord. Salute Tryphæna and Tryphosa, who toil in the Lord. Salute Persis, the beloved, who toiled much in the Lord. Salute Rufus, the elect in the Lord, and his mother, and mine. Salute Asyncritus, Phlegon, Hermas, Patrobas, Hermes, and the brethren that are with them. Salute Philologus, and Julia, Nereus and his sister, and Olympas, and all the saints that are with them. Salute one another with a holy kiss. All the Churches of Christ salute you.

This long paragraph of personal salutations is very interesting, both for the insight which it gives us into Paul's private life and character, and for the light which it sheds, though so meager, upon the constitution of the Church at Rome (and

doubtless elsewhere), and the personal relations of the members to one another.

The fact that Paul sends greetings to at least twenty-five persons by name, and to many others in a less specific way, but of whom he evidently had personal information, has led some critics to think that this chapter was really addressed, not to Rome, where he had never been, but was probably addressed, though as a supplement to a duplicate of this Epistle, to the Church at Ephesus, where he so long resided, and where he must have known many believers individually. This view is plausible; but the cumulative evidence in favor of Rome is strong, and for the present decisive. And we must find the explanation of the apostle's knowing so many of the believers in Rome in the probability already named (Rom. xv, 20), that they were converts from his Churches throughout the provincial Roman world. We know that this was the fact with Aquila and Priscilla, whom he had known (and probably led to Christ) at Corinth; and it must have been the case with quite a number of others, of whom he speaks as **kinsmen**. It is possible, however, also that he had learned the names of some of these people from the reports that had come to him from the city: "Your faith is proclaimed throughout the whole world." (Rom. i, 8.)

These salutations by name, while we can not appreciate all the points, were a stronger evidence of his personal regard, and much more persuasive to the Romans, especially where so many were named, than a general greeting, as so often elsewhere, "Peace be to the brethren." And this special mention of persons, whose names would otherwise have been unknown to us, has given them an historic place and fame for all the ages to come; and has led to many curious and instructive attempts to trace them and their position in the Church.

The names, with perhaps one exception, "Mary," are Greek or Latin; but this does not determine the nationality of the persons, and might indicate only that they were Hellenists, not Hellenes. The names of seven deacons in Acts vi, 5, are all Greek, but the men were all Jews, with one exception. The probability is that, while the Church at Rome was preponderantly Gentile, most of those here named were Jews. Paul greets at least six persons as his "kinsmen" who were Jews beyond question; and we may safely say the same of quite a number more.

The first persons to whom Paul sends salutations are Aquila

and Priscilla. They were Jews from Pontus, tent-makers by trade, whose business led them to many places. Paul found them at Corinth (A. D. 53), where he staid a year and a half, "and he abode with them." (Acts xviii, 2.) A year or two later they went with Paul to Ephesus (Acts xviii, 18); and now, after a few years, at the date of this Epistle (A. D. 58), we find them again in Rome, and yet again, perhaps eight years later, we hear of them once more at Ephesus. (2 Tim. iv, 19.) They were people of property and of social prominence; and at each of their places of residence they had "a Church in their house."

Whether the **Church in their house** included all the believers in Rome is doubtful. The first places for Christian worship were (when accessible) the Jewish synagogues. But soon excluded from these, the disciples next met in schoolhouses (Acts xix, 9), private dwellings, or any chance place (as Paul's private lodgings, Acts xxviii, 30). It was two centuries after Christ before church buildings were common. Meanwhile families, like the one before us, sheltered the congregations in their homes; and in a large city like Rome perhaps several such centers for Christian worship were found. Is this the meaning of verses 14 and 15,—**the brethren, —the saints that are with them?**

Paul thanks these endeared friends, and says that **all the Churches of the Gentiles thank them** for saving his life at their personal risk. The phrase **laid down their own neck**, is probably figurative; but it expresses some extreme peril to which Aquila and Priscilla exposed themselves to spare him. We know not the occasion; but it comes within the uncounted, unnarrated "perils," which he eight times lists in his catalogue to the Corinthians. (2 Cor. xi, 26.)

Epænetus, in the fifth verse, is called **the firstfruits of Asia unto Christ**. The word "Asia" means simply the Roman province of that name, of which Ephesus was the capital, and in which were the seven Churches of the Apocalypse. (Rev. i, 4.) Paul's first visit to Ephesus, and the founding of the Christian Church at that center, was in the year 54, on his way home, after his second missionary tour, from Corinth, with Aquila and Priscilla. (Acts xix, 19.) If Epænetus was one of Paul's converts, as seems implied by the word "firstfruits," and the endearing title **my beloved**, he had probably afterwards gone to Rome with Aquila and Priscilla.

The name "Mary" is strictly "Maria;" and a various reading

gives us *Mariam*, the same as the genuine Jewish form "*Miriam*" —which was also the name of Christ's mother. If this be accepted, it is the only real Jewish name in the list. The fact which Paul mentions in regard to her, that **she toiled much upon you**, shows that he was minutely informed of the home affairs of the Roman Church. Can we not count *Mary* and the three women named in the twelfth and thirteenth verses as "deaconesses" in the work of the Church?

The names in the seventh verse seem to be of husband and wife, "*Andronicus and Junia*;" though the latter name may be read "*Junias*," in the masculine gender. Paul calls them **my kinsmen**, which word signifies probably not members of his family, but Jews; and yet not even that word too broadly (as he uses it in other places, "**my kinsmen according to the flesh, who are Israelites**" (Rom. ix, 3)); for there are others in the list who are Jews, but whom he does not call "kinsmen." The word probably means here, and in verse eleven ("*Herodion, my kinsman*"), members of his tribe of Benjamin. Those two he says were his **fellow-prisoners**; but we do not know on what occasion. The apostle's history, to this date, names expressly only the brief detention at Philippi. Yet we know from what he tells the Corinthians that he had already been "in prisons more abundantly." (2 Cor. xi, 23.) Further, he says, that these fellow-tribesmen, fellow-prisoners of his, were in Christ before himself; and **were notable among the apostles**. The last words are ambiguous; but they probably mean only that *Andronicus and Junia* were well known in apostolic circles; yet there is nothing in the meaning of the word "apostles" to exclude those lay-people from being themselves of that number. Perhaps they were lay-preachers, evangelists, among the founders of the Roman Church.

The same may be said of *Urbanus*, whom Paul greets as **our fellow-worker in Christ**; where the plural pronoun "our" signifies that *Urbanus* was counted not with Paul only, but also with the other "workers" in Rome.

The words in the tenth and eleventh verses, "**Salute them that are from the household of Aristobulus . . . of Narcissus**," are suggestive of a striking condition of things in Rome, and in the Church. The word **household** is not given in the Greek of these verses; but instead thereof the word "slaves" would more exactly express the meaning. The two persons named were rich, and had

large slave families. Aristobulus was grandson of Herod the Great; but lived at Rome; and Narcissus was the corrupt freedman of Claudius. Of course they were not Christians; and both had died a few years before the date of this letter. After their death their large slave families, numbering probably many hundred persons, were confiscated by the emperor, Nero, and were kept unbroken among the emperor's yet larger slave family. At a later day, Paul, in writing from Rome to the Philippians, says, "All the saints salute you, especially they [the slaves] that are of Cæsar's [Nero's] slave household." (Phil. iv, 22.) The text of both passages implies that some of these slaves were Christians. To these slaves, the apostle, not knowing their names, but knowing of their relation to the body of Christ, now affectionately sends his greetings. "He was not ashamed of their *bonds*."

The next names in his list are those of three women **who toiled in the service of the Lord**. It is possible that they, too, were slaves. Their names are Tryphena, Tryphosa, and Persis; but the meaning of those words ("Luxurious, Wanton, Persian"), implies that they were significant names, given to them with allusion to their destined ill life as slaves. From such a life the gospel of Christ has saved them.

In the thirteenth verse, Paul sends his regards to Rufus, **that choice man in the Lord, and his mother and mine**. The last words are a touch of delicate and affectionate remembrance, that has no superior in all literature. It is his grateful and tender tribute to her maternal care of himself in some hour when he needed, and received from her, such services as "mother" only could extend.

Philologus and Julia are probably another instance of husband and wife; who, like Aquila and Priscilla, were workers in the Church, and had their doors open to the gatherings of the saints, **all the saints that are with them**.

Verses 17-20. But I beseech you, brethren, to mark them that make the divisions, and the offenses against the teaching which ye learned; and turn away from them. For the men of such sort do not serve our Lord Christ; nay, but their own belly; and through their excellent talk and fair talk, they beguile the hearts of the innocent. For your obedience came abroad unto all men. Over you, therefore,

I rejoice; but I will that ye be wise unto that which is good, but simple unto that which is bad. But the God of peace will bruise Satan under your feet speedily.

The grace of our Lord Jesus be with you.

The salutations that precede seem the fitting close of the Epistle; but Paul has left to this place one solemn duty; and he now adds a warning against an evil graver than the disputes about foods and drinks. This warning is, **to mark the men who make the divisions in the Church, and the scandals against the doctrine which ye learned.** The presence here of the article "*the divisions*" and "*the scandals*," and the emphasis (in the Greek) on the pronoun "*ye*," and the drift of the entire passage, show that the apostle is not dealing with an imaginary case which may yet arise in Rome, but with an actual condition of things. The evil existed; but how widely it had spread we do not know. But we know quite certainly on what points the divisions arose, and what the scandals against Paul's doctrine were. There were partisans, or factions, in Rome (of Jews, or of mixed Gentiles), just as in Corinth, and Galatia, and probably in all of Paul's Churches. These were partisans of the Apostle Peter, and of his retroactive prejudice against the gospel which Paul preached. These men were prompt to promote disaffection to the person of Paul, and to discredit his apostolical authority. Though Peter had never been in Rome, any more than in Corinth, doubtless there were men there who knew him, and sided with him and his conservatism as against Paul and "his gospel." Those men, nominal Christians, were not seeking the glory of God, and the extension of Christianity in the Gentile world, but were self-seekers rending the garments of Christ, and wounding his body, for their own greed, or the gratification of their appetites. Their advocacy of Peter, and of circumcision, was making "the divisions" in the Church, and was making "the scandals" against the doctrine which the Romans had learned from Paul (or his friends), the doctrine of the liberty of the Gentiles from all Jewish bonds. From these dissension-sowers Paul bids the Romans **turn way**, lest with their **fair talk** they deceive the unwary. But he adds that the hurt is as yet small; **for your obedience to the truth has come abroad to all men.** In you (your steadfastness) therefore I rejoice. But I should be glad to have you wise to everything (like

“my gospel”) that is good; and uncontaminated by anything (like the Jewish leaven) that is bad. You have fightings now among you; but the God of peace will soon crush Satan, in the person of these emissaries of his, beneath your feet.

Verses 21-23. Timotheus, my fellow-worker, salutes you; and Lucius, and Jason, and Sosipater, my kinsmen. I, Tertius, who write the Epistle, salute you in the Lord. Gaius, my host, and of the whole Church, salutes you. Erastus, the treasurer of the city, salutes you, and Quartus the brother.

The apostle now, to his own many salutations, adds some special salutations from his immediate associates. Timothy, whom Paul found at Lystra, on his first missionary journey, was son of a Greek father and a Jewish mother. He was very young at that date, for twenty years after, Paul exhorts him, “Let no one despise thy youth.” (1 Tim. iv, 12.) On Paul’s second journey, in the year 51, he took Timothy with him, and made him, from that time on, his assistant through many years of faithful and varied labor. The many mentions of his name enable us to trace him all along Paul’s routes of travel, and in all his mission fields. He was with Paul in Corinth at the writing of this letter, and joined him in his salutations to the Romans. The last we know of him is during Paul’s second imprisonment at Rome in 65, or possibly 67. At that date Timothy was in Ephesus, and probably the bishop of the Church. To this place Paul writes him the Second Epistle, and begs, as his dying request, that his loved disciple should “come to him, before the winter, with all diligence.”

Of Tertius, whose name shows that he was of a Latin family, we know only what he himself reveals to us, that he was Paul’s amanuensis in writing the Epistle; and with the pen in his own hand he naturally introduces his own name with the personal pronoun “I.” This confirms what we know from other indications, that Paul dictated all his letters. The Epistle to the Galatians seems, from the words in the Authorized, to be an exception; but the correct translation points in the other direction. The body of the letter was evidently dictated; but at the last Paul takes up the pen to add, with his own hands, as was his custom, the last words to authenticate the letter. He begins his autograph addi-

tion with an apology for his ill-formed writing, "See with how large serawls, I write to you with my own hand." (Gal. v, 11.) The explanation and defense of his poor writing may be found in the seventeenth verse of this chapter, "I bear the *brands* of the Lord Jesus in my person,"—that is, in his eyes, which were yet dim from being seared at his conversion. (Acts ix, 18.) Yet, aside from any injury to his sight then received, we must recollect that Paul was now getting to be an old man, and needed the help of others' eyes and pen.

Of Gaius, Paul's host at Corinth, and the host of the whole Church, this mention shows that he was a man of social distinction, and of large generosity. He was one of Paul's converts, on his first visit to Corinth; and was one of the three men, whom, alone, Paul had personally baptized. (1 Cor. i, 14.)

Verses 25-27. But to him that is able to establish you according to my gospel, and the preaching of Jesus Christ, according to the revelation of the secret doctrine which has been undivulged in times eternal, but now was manifested, and, through prophetic Scriptures made known, according to the commandment of the eternal God, unto all the Gentiles, with a view to their obedience to the faith; to the only wise God, through Jesus Christ,—to whom [to him?] be the glory, forever. Amen.

The grammatical construction of these verses is perplexing. There is but one sentence. The first word, **To him**, an indirect dative, is held in suspense until the twenty-seventh verse, where the word **to . . . God** stands as an appositive, and the sentence is not yet finished. Then comes a subordinate clause, containing a relative pronoun, which, *as it stands*, must refer to Christ, **to whom be the glory**. This is the only possible construction for the grammar of the sentence. But this attribution of the glory to Christ (while doctrinally unobjectionable) does not work into the sentence, and does not seem to be the apostle's intention in the doxology. He begins the doxology, and continues, with words that point to *God*. Evidently the relative pronoun has crept into the sentence by an inadvertence on the part of Paul or of his amanuensis, and should be canceled entirely; or the relative should be replaced by the demonstrative (personal) pronoun **him**, and this be construed as another emphatic appositive to the first

word in the doxology, "To *him* . . . to *God* . . . to HIM (I say) be the glory."

This doxology, which closes the Epistle, sums up in terse and telling words the substance of the entire Epistle. Paul declares here what he has declared in all the preceding chapters, that the gospel which he preaches is a gospel of universal compass; that it was God's plan from eternity, but was not revealed in full until now that it is accomplished in Christ. The expression, **my gospel**, is Paul's designation of the full, all-rounded gospel which he preached to the Gentiles, as contrasted with the one-sided, garbled gospel of the Jewish, anti-Gentile sectarians. I have discussed the Greek word **mystery** (which always means "secret," or "secret doctrine") in the notes on a previous chapter (Rom. xi, 25); and have there shown that the word always means the primal call of the Gentiles and their equality with the Jews in the Church of Christ. This doctrine was eternally true; but Paul here says that it was not promulgated in former ages, but is now published to the world, and made known (and extended, *eis*) unto all the Gentiles with a view to their obedience to the faith.

Such is the gospel which Paul preached. It is not an emasculated gospel. It is circumscribed by no limits of race, or color, or previous condition of servitude. It is free to any who will accept it. And this plan contemplated, ideally, the acceptance of its provisions by all. Judaism in the days of Paul, Calvinism in modern times, teaches that God foreordained some men to be saved, and left the rest of mankind outside the pale of mercy. Paul teaches that God included all in the limits of the gospel domain; and he teaches that no creature, except man himself, will be able to separate us from the love of God which is in Christ Jesus our Lord. Every man can be in Christ; and every man can know for himself that he is in Christ. A limited, individual election to life of a few, and a wholesale preterition of the rest of the world to damnation, has no place in Paul's theology; and can not be read into this Epistle. Paul declares that notwithstanding Jewish exclusiveness, Jewish abhorrence of the rest of the world, the Gentiles *en masse* are embraced equally with themselves, and before themselves, in the divine plan. "But those whom he thus from of old included in the divine plan he also called; and those whom he called, he also justified; and those whom he justified he also glorified." Such is the glorious an-

nouncement of the gospel of Christ. It is not a visionary ideal. It is vindicated by its work in the hearts of men, and in the world. Christ's redemptive work is complete; it extends conceptually in the counsels of God, and actually in its historic manifestation, to all the race. It saves men; all who consent to be saved; and it is adequate to save all men. We echo with our apostle, "We are not ashamed of such a gospel." And we unite with him in his last words, "To the only wise God, through Jesus Christ, *to him* be the glory forever. Amen."

